

Referential and pragmatic-discourse properties of Lithuanian reference impersonals: 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP

Lidia Federica Mazzitelli

Slavic Institute
University of Cologne
Weyertal 137
DE-50931 Cologne, Germany
E-mail: lidia.mazzitelli@uni-koeln.de

Abstract. In this paper I describe the semantics, pragmatics and the discourse functions of three Lithuanian agent-defocusing constructions, featuring the non-referential use of second person singular/third person verbal forms and the non-agreeing participial forms in *ma/ta*. These three constructions can all be defined as impersonal, in the broader sense of the word, as the agent (or the main participant, whatever its semantic role may be) is constructed as non-referential: I label them 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP. My corpus consists of original Lithuanian texts (a short story and entries on an Internet forum) and of the Lithuanian translations of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's novella *Le Petit Prince* and J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. My analysis shows that 2SG-IMP are preferably used to express generic agents (anyone) and 3-IMP are preferably used to express referential indefinite agents (someone), while *ma/ta*-IMP are referentially flexible. 2SG-IMP are pragmatically marked in that they are used to express empathy between the speaker and the pool of potential referents; they are mostly used in specific discourse types, such as opinion statements and life drama situations. 3-IMP are preferred in situations where the indefiniteness of the agent is relevant to the development of the narrative; *ma/ta*-IMP are instead preferred when the agent is irrelevant, and the focus is on the event itself. The behavior of Lithuanian 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP is consistent with the one already described for similar constructions in other European languages.

Keywords: impersonal constructions, semantics, pragmatics, *ma/ta*-participles, discourse analysis

1 Introduction

In this paper I will describe the referential and pragmatic-discourse functions of three Lithuanian reference impersonal constructions, which I will label 2SG-IMP (1), 3-IMP (2) and *ma/ta*-IMP (3).

- (1) *Mūsų šalis kalba 3 kalbom, taip yra ir*
 our country.NOM.SG speak.PRS.3 3 language.INS.PL so be.PRS.3 and
nieko nepadarysi
 nothing.GEN.SG NEG.make.FUT.2SG
 ‘Our country speaks in three languages, and there is nothing **you can do** (lit. ‘you will not do’) with it’
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

- (2) *Be abejo gerai mokėti užsienio kalbą. Bet*
 without doubt.GEN.SG well learn.INF foreign_country.GEN language.ACC.SG but
piktintis, kad su tavim nekalba rusiškai Lietuvoje -
 be.angry.INF that with you.SG.INS NEG.speak.PRS.3 Russian.ADV Lithuania.LOC.SG
absurdas ir menko protelio požymis.
 absurdity.NOM.SG and poor.GEN.SG.M mind.DIM.GEN.SG sign.NOM.SG
 ‘Undoubtedly, it is good to learn a foreign language. But getting angry because **people do not talk** (lit. ‘they do not talk’) to you in Russian in Lithuania is absurd and a sign of weak intelligence.’
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

- (3) *O rusai Lietuvoje (ne visi - dalis reikalauja,*
 but Russian.NOM.PL Lithuania.LOC.SG not all.NOM.PL.M part.NOM.SG require.PRS.3
kad su jais būtų kalbama rusiškai
 that with they.M.INS.PL be.SUBJ.3 speak.MA-IMP Russian.ADV
 ‘But the Russians in Lithuanian (not all – some) require that **one speak** (lit. ‘it would be spoken’) in Russian to them’
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

All three constructions are used to encode events where the agent – obligatorily human – is de-focused: semantically, it is very low in individuation (non-referential); morpho-syntactically, it is realized as zero as in (1) and (2), where the subject is encoded through verbal agreement only, or it is completely demoted, as in (3). 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP overlap to an extent, as they are all agent-demoting constructions: however, each one has specific semantic properties and discourse functions. In the following sections, I will

describe the referential properties as well as the discourse-pragmatic functions of 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP in contemporary Lithuanian. The paper is organized as follows: In Section 1. I offer a typological overview of impersonal constructions and in Section 2. I introduce 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP in Lithuanian. In Section 3, I present my data and the results of my analysis of the corpus. Finally, in Section I draw some conclusions.

1.1 Impersonal constructions from a typological perspective

In typological literature, different kinds of constructions have been subsumed under the label ‘impersonal’ (cf. Siewierska 2008): constructions lacking a syntactic and referential subject, such as meteorological verbs; constructions with a dummy, non-referential subject such as *es* ‘it’ in German; constructions lacking a grammatical but not a semantic subject, such as dative experiencer constructions in many Indo-European languages; and, finally, constructions featuring non-referential grammatical subjects, such as the *man*-construction in German and the ‘vague *they*’ construction in English. In this paper, I follow the definition of impersonal constructions adopted in Siewierska (2008) and Malchukov & Ogawa (2011, 20) as “constructions lacking a referential subject”. This definition is broad enough to subsume both constructions that qualify as impersonal from a syntactic point of view (lack of agreeing subject altogether; cf. example 4a) and from a functional point of view (lack of referential subject; cf. examples 4b and 4c, where *they* and *it* are non-referential):

- (4) a. German
 Mir ist kalt
 I.DAT be.PRS.3SG cold
 ‘I am cold’
 (Haspelmath 2001, 66; my glosses)
- b. *They usually clean cows in Switzerland*
 (Siewierska 2008, 10)
- c. *It rains*

The sentences exemplified in (4) above all qualify as impersonal, albeit because of different criteria. In (4a) the main participant (the experiencer) is indeed highly identified and specific, but it is not a grammatical subject: therefore, the sentence is syntactically impersonal. The example sentences (4b) and (4c) are not syntactically impersonal, as they feature grammatical subjects triggering agreement on the verb (*they are* / *it rain-s*): in (4b), however, the grammatical subject is non-referential and non-specific and in (4c) the grammatical subject is a dummy, and there is no real referential argument. Therefore, (4b) and (4c) are functionally impersonal.

Malchukov & Ogawa (2011) classify impersonal constructions into three types: A-impersonals, T-impersonals and R-impersonals. A-impersonals are sensitive to reductions in the animacy/agentivity of the subject. In 4a. above, for instance, the experiencer is coded as an oblique (dative) instead of being coded as a nominative subject, because it is not agentive. T-impersonals are sensitive to a reduction in topicality: in the French sentence in (5a) the participant *moqueurs* ‘scoffers’ is the grammatical subject and the topic; in (5b), the role of grammatical subject is taken over by the dummy *il* ‘it’, while the participant *moqueurs* ‘scoffers’ is in focus and stripped off agreement control (cf. Malchukov & Ogawa 2011, 30).

(5) French

- a. *Des moqueurs viendront*
 INDEF.PL scoffer.PL come.FUT.3PL

‘Scoffers will come’ (LBA, 2 Peter, 3:3)

- b. *Il viendra des moqueurs*
 3SG.M come.FUT.3SG INDEF.PL scoffer.PL

‘Scoffers will come (lit. ‘it will come some scoffers’) (LSG, 2 Peter, 3:3)

Finally, R-impersonals are sensitive to reduction in referentiality: in (6a.) Mr. Darcy, a character from Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*, declares his love to Elizabeth Bennet, the protagonist of the novel, referred to in the text by the deictic *you*. In (6b.), instead, *you* has a non-referential, generic interpretation (‘anyone who would utter such a remark in Britain would not get away with it’):

- (6) a. *You must allow me to tell you how ardently I admire and love you.*
 (Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*; ch. 33)

- b. *You would not get away with such a sexist remark in Britain*
 (Siewierska 2011, 58)

In European languages, R-impersonals are expressed by a variety of constructions (Siewierska 2011, 58): pronominalized forms of the numeral ‘one’, as in English *one* or Italian *uno*; impersonal pronouns such as German *man* and French *on*; personal pronouns used non-referentially, such as the English *they* in (4b) above and *you* in (6b) and zero-subject constructions like the obligatory ellipsis of the third person plural pronoun in Italian (7b); indefinite pronouns such as English *someone* or, finally, morphological impersonals such as the Romance reflexive impersonal or the German impersonal passive (8).

(7) Italian

- a. *Loro dicono che Maria è a Londra*
 they say.PRS.3PL that Maria be.PRS.3SG in London

‘They (referential) say that Maria is in London’

- b. *Dicono che Maria sia a Londra*
 say.PRS.3PL that Maria be.SUBJ.PRS.3SG in London

‘They (non-referential) say that Maria is in London’; ‘Maria is said to be in London’ (personal competence)

(8) German

- Hier wird getanzt*
 here become.PST.3SG dance.PP

‘People are dancing here’

(Holvoet 2001, 364; my glosses)

1.2 Impersonal constructions in discourse

What all impersonal events have in common is the demotion/ de-focusing of the agent and the consequent irrelevance of the agent’s perspective (Sansò 2003, 251). In impersonal constructions (A-impersonals, T-impersonals and R-impersonals alike), the agent (or the main participant, which can also be an experiencer) is always de-focused (Myhill 1997): morpho-syntactically, being encoded as an oblique or as zero; semantically, being encoded by a non-referential pronoun; pragmatically, being non-topical. According to Giacalone Ramat & Sansò (2007), demoted agents can have three main interpretations: species generic, where the agent represents virtually all of humanity (9a); non-referential indefinite, where the agent represents a given sub-group of humanity (‘anyone’; 9b); referential indefinite (or ‘vague’), where the agent represents a specific group of people, which is left unspecified (‘someone’; 9c).

- (9) a. *There is nothing **one** can give to regain his life*

(Giacalone Ramat & Sansò 2007, 100)

- b. *In such a situation **one** would look for another job*

(Giacalone Ramat & Sansò 2007, 102)

- c. German

***Man** hat letzte Woche bei uns eingebrochen*
Man-IMP have.PRS.3SG last week at we.ACC break_IN.PP

‘**Someone** burgled our house last week’

(Giacalone Ramat & Sansò 2007, 103; Zinofun 2010, 237)

A further development of impersonal constructions is their ability to encode specific reference: the agent is specific and defined, and even co-referential with the speaker (10; Giacalone Ramat & Sansò 2007; Siewierska 2011).

(10) French

Avec Jean on ira au théâtre ce soir
 with Jean IMP go.FUT.3SG in.DEF theater this evening
 ‘Jean and I will go to the theater tonight’
 (Creissels 2009, 6; Siewierska 2011, 65)

Furthermore, impersonal constructions have also developed pragmatic functions. Impersonals can be used to express humility and politeness. In some Polynesian languages, for instance, the Proto-Austronesian pronoun **kita* ‘1PL.INCL’ has been reanalyzed as *kita* ‘1SG.INCL’ and it is used to convey generic reference (‘one’; ‘anyone’) as well as to encode first person singular expressing emotional involvement of the speaker (Moyse-Faurier 2011, 600–601). In English, 2SG-IMP are typically used to convey high subjectivity and the speaker’s identification with the referent (Ushie 1994, 144; see also Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990).

1.3 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and participial-IMP from a European cross-linguistic perspective

As seen above (Section 1.1), European languages make use of different constructions to encode R-impersonals: pronominalized forms of the numeral ‘one’, impersonal pronouns; personal pronouns used non-referentially, zero-subject constructions, indefinite pronouns and morphological impersonals. In this paper, however, I will only focus on three constructions, featuring a non-referential 2SG¹ personal pronoun, a 3(SG/PL) personal pronoun or a participial form of the verb: I label them 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and participial-IMP.

2SG-IMP are attested in many European languages; their semantic and pragmatic uses have mostly been studied in Germanic, Slavic and Romance (Deringer *et al.* 2015). 3-IMP are also widely attested in Europe (Siewierska 2011 and Siewierska & Papastathi 2011 for an overview). In some languages, such as Russian and Italian, 3-IMP require a zero subject: overt subjects are interpreted as referential by default (cf. example 7 above). As for the label 3-IMP, a note is required. Siewierska (2011) labels this construction 3PL-IMP, because in all the languages she analyzes the used pronoun/bound forms are plural (English *they*, Italian bound verbal agreement). However, Lithuanian lacks a morphological distinction

¹ In some languages, such as French, non-referential second person pronouns can also be plural; in other languages, such as German, only the second person singular can have an impersonal meaning (Malamud 2012, 3). In Lithuanian, only second person singular pronouns have been mentioned in the literature (see Žeimantienė 2005, 2006). In this paper, I will only focus on the second person singular.

between 3SG and 3PL: *gyventi* ‘live.INF’ – *gyvena* ‘live.PRS.3SG/PL’. A disambiguation is only possible by means of the personal pronouns (*jis*.3SG.M; *ji*.3SG.F; *jie*.3PL.M; *jios*.3PL.F), but, crucially, impersonal uses of the third person are always pronoun-less in this language.² Therefore, for Lithuanian, 3PL-IMP should be redefined as 3-IMP; in this paper, I extend this label also to languages other than Lithuanian.

Participial-IMP are not as common in Europe as the two other strategies. They are found in Germanic, Baltic, Slavic and Finnic (Siewierska 2008, 21): notable examples are the German passive impersonal (11a, 11b), the Polish *no/to* construction (13) and the Lithuanian *ma/ta* constructions (see Sections 2 and 3). In European languages, participial impersonals feature a form identical with or derived from a participle, usually past passive: therefore, they share morphology with passives, cf. the following German examples (11a and 11b).

(11) German

a. Impersonal

Hier wird getanzt
 here become.PST.3SG dance.PP
 ‘People are dancing here.’
 (Holvoet 2001, 364; my glosses)

b. Agentless passive

Zwei Frauen wurden ermordet
 two woman.PL become.PST.PL murder.PP
 ‘Two women were murdered.’ (DW)

The structure of (11a) and (11b) is almost identical; however, in (11b) the main verb *wurden* ‘became’ agrees with the subject, *zwei Frauen* ‘two women’, while the sentence (11a) is subjectless. In German the impersonal construction cannot have an object: if an object is present the main predicate agrees with it, and the whole construction is formally an agentless passive (12).

(12) *Bei uns werden keine Kinder geschlagen*
 at we.ACC become.PRS.3PL NEG.INDEF.PL child.PL hit.PP

‘In our home one does not beat children (lit. ‘children are not beaten’).’
 (Bahr 2013, 126)

² In compound tenses, where a finite form of the verb *būti* ‘be’ is combined with a participial form, the reference SG/PL becomes clear: *yra.be.PRS.3 dirbęs.work.PAP.M.SG* ‘he has worked’/ *yra dirbę.work.PAP.M.PL* ‘they have worked’.

In the remainder of this paper, I will not take into account agentless passives. These fall into the definition of impersonal constructions by virtue of their agent-demoting function: as Malchukov & Ogawa (2011, 36ff.) notice, agentless passives have a very broad functional range, cross-cutting the domains of A-, T- and R-impersonals. However, syntactically they are personal, as the semantic patient is the syntactic subject and triggers verbal agreement (when the language has it, cf. German example 12). In participial-IMP such as the Lithuanian *ma/ta*-IMP, on the other hand, the patient does not trigger agreement and it can even be encoded as a syntactic object in the accusative case: the two constructions are therefore to be kept apart. Similarly, in Polish, the *no/to* impersonal construction has always an active alignment, with the object in the accusative case (13)³: thereby, in Polish impersonal and agentless passive are both morphologically and syntactically distinct.

(13) Polish

Budowano szkołę

build.IMP school.ACC.SG

‘They were building a/the school’

(Kibort 2008, 265)

2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and participial-IMP differ from one another not only formally, but also semantically and functionally. First of all, they differ in their referential range, that is, the pool of possible implied agents. As far as the inclusion of speech act participants is concerned, 2SG-IMP usually include the speaker, while 3-IMP usually exclude them. Moreover, 2SG-IMP cannot be used in a referential indefinite meaning (**you broke into my house yesterday*, meaning ‘someone’). Participial-IMP show more cross-linguistic variety: in Finnic, they can include the speaker, too, whereas in Polish the referential range of the *no/to* construction coincides with that of 3-IMP (Siewierska 2008, 7; 21).

The three constructions have been shown to be different also on the stylistic and pragmatic level. In some languages, such as English or Danish, 2SG-IMP and 3-IMP belong to the colloquial register, while in others, such as Modern Greek, they are also used in the literary language (Sansò 2006). Pragmatically, 2SG-IMP have been shown to be preferred to express empathy (Deringer *et al.* 2015).

2 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP in Lithuanian

In Lithuanian, 2SG-IMP and 3-IMP are formally identical with the respective deictic forms. However, in 3-IMP the pronouns *jie/jos* ‘they.M/F’ must be dropped (14): overt 3PL pronouns are always interpreted referentially. On the other hand, the pronoun *tu* ‘you.SG’, while being usually dropped, can also be retained: in (15), both the pronoun-less form *prašai* ‘ask for.2SG’ and the pronoun *tu* in *tu esi* ‘you are’ are found.

³ *No/to* forms reflect the former neuter passive participle, nowadays ending in *ne/te*.

- (14) *Bet kurioje parduotuvėje prakalbus rusų ar lenkų tave*
 but any.LOC.SG.F shop.LOC.SG speak.PSGER Russian or Polish you.SG.ACC
 (*jie) aptarnaus nes supras
 (*they.NOM.M) serve.FUT.3 because understand.FUT.3
 ‘In any shop, if you talk in Russian or Polish, **they will serve** you because **they will understand**’
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)
- (15) *Jei prašai avies, tai iš to matyti, kad tu esi*
 if ask_for.PRS.2SG sheep.GEN.SG, then from that.GEN.SG.M see.INF that you.SG.NOM
 be.PRES.2SG
 ‘If **anybody wants** a sheep, that is a proof that **they exist**. (lit. ‘if you ask for a sheep, then it follows from that that you exist’) (LPP)

The participial impersonal in Lithuanian is formed by means of the non-agreeing (old neuter form) of the present (marking simultaneity) passive participle (in *-ma*; 16) or the past (marking anteriority) passive participle in *-ta* (17). They can be formed from both agentive as well as non-agentive (unaccusative) verbs:

- (16) *Apie tai buvo daug kalbama*
 about this be.PST.3 much talk.ma-IMP
 ‘**It was talked** much about that’
 (Spraunienė *et al.* 2015, 325)
- (17) *Taip apmaudu, kad kovota ir žūta be reikalo*
 So disappointing.N that fight.ta-IMP and perish.ta-IMP in vain
 ‘It is so disappointing that **one fought** and **died** in vain (lit. ‘it was fought and died’)’
 (Spraunienė *et al.* 2015, 326)

Ma/ta participles are used to form canonical personal passives, which can be realized as agented or agentless (18a, 18b). In canonical passives, the participle in *ma/ta* agrees in gender and number with the subject.

- (18) a. *Namas buvo statomas*
 house.NOM.SG be.PST.3 build.PPP.NOM.SG.M
 ‘The house was being built’
- b. *Namas buvo pastatytas*
 house.NOM.SG be.PST.3 PVF.build.PRPP.NOM.SG.M
 ‘The house was (had been) built’
 (Holvoet 2011, 376; my glosses)

Just as in the Polish *no/to* construction mentioned above, Lithuanian *ma/ta*-IMP may display an active alignment, where the object of the impersonal construction is in the accusative case, the case of direct objects (19a). However, while in Polish the accusative encoding of the object of *no/to* impersonals is obligatory, in Lithuanian it is not. In fact, accusative objects of *ma/ta*-IMP are very infrequent: objects appear usually in the nominative case (19b; see. the discussion in Spraunienė *et al.* 2015, 339–340).

- (19) a. *Rašoma laiškas*
 write.*ma*-IMP letter.NOM.SG
 ‘A letter is being written’
 b. *Rašoma laišką*
 write.*ma*-IMP letter.ACC.SG
 ‘A letter is being written’
 (Ambrazas 1966, 661; my glosses)

The *ma/ta* construction has also developed a further function, namely evidential/inferential (see Wiemer 2006; Usonienė & Šinkūnienė 2017). In their evidential function, *ma/ta* participles require an overt agent, which may not be human, and cannot have an overt auxiliary (20, 21): these requirements differentiate the evidential from the impersonal construction, where the agent must be covert and semantically human. It must be remarked, however, that the evidential function of *ma/ta*-IMP is very limited in contemporary Lithuanian: “the evidential *-ma/-ta* construction is actually obsolete in modern Lithuanian discourse; it is occasionally used in specific contexts and it is nearly restricted to one verb, namely *būti* ‘be’” (Usonienė & Šinkūnienė 2017, 35).

- (20) *Vyruko būta liekno – paspruko pro kaminą.*
 guy.GEN.SG be.*ta*-IMP slim.GEN.SG.M escape.PST.3 through chimney.ACC.SG
 ‘The guy was obviously slim – (he) escaped through the chimney.’
 (Usonienė & Šinkūnienė 2017, 172; my glosses)
 (21) *Naktį pasnigta*
 night.ACC.SG PFV.SNOW.*ta*-IMP
 ‘(Apparently) snow fell last night’
 (Wiemer 2006, 35; my glosses)

So far, scientific scholarship about *ma/ta*-IMP has mostly focused on their syntactic properties and on their development into an evidential construction (see *inter alia* Wiemer 2006; Spraunienė *et al.* 2015; Usonienė & Šinkūnienė 2017 and references therein). The functional (referential and pragmatic) properties of *ma/ta*-IMP, as well as 3-IMP and 2SG-IMP, instead, have been discussed in lesser detail. In the remainder of this paper, I will consider only the impersonal *ma/ta* construction, and I will disregard the evidential/inferential one.

Table 1 shows the referential range of these constructions (Žeimantienė 2005, 2006; Geniušienė 2016; blank cells represent situations not explicitly mentioned in literature). 2SG-IMP behave in Lithuanian quite similarly as in other European languages: they are used to express a state of affairs that refers to the speaker (or to the addressee) and to anyone, who is in the same situation as them. 3-IMP are the rarest form of impersonal constructions; *ma/ta*-IMP have the widest referential range.

Reference	3-IMP	2SG-IMP	<i>ma/ta</i> -IMP
Non-referential indefinite	YES	YES	YES
Referential indefinite	YES	NO	YES
Specific 1SG/PL	NO		YES
Specific 3SG/PL	YES		YES

Table 1. Referential range of 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP

According to Geniušienė (2016), who compares the use of 3-IMP and agentless passives/ impersonal constructions (in her paper she does not distinguish between the two), 3-IMP are used when the emphasis lies on the indefiniteness of the agent; the agentless passive or the impersonal construction are instead used when the emphasis lies on the event itself.

My investigation builds on the studies by Žeimantienė (2006, 2005) and Geniušienė (2016). Differently from Žeimantienė, however, I do not consider all possible Lithuanian impersonal constructions (for instance, indefinite pronouns such as *kas* ‘someone’, modal predicates such as *galima* ‘it’s possible’, the indefinite noun *žmogus* ‘person’), focusing solely on 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP.

3 Referential, semantic and pragmatic properties of Lithuanian 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP

3.1 The corpus

In order to analyze the actual use of Lithuanian 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP, I have created a convenience sample of occurrences. The Lithuanian National Corpus is not morpho-syntactically annotated and, thus, it is very difficult to extract impersonal constructions. My corpus of occurrences is based on the following sources: the Lithuanian translation of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry’s novella *Le Petit Prince* (henceforth LPP); the Lithuanian translation of J. K. Rowling’s novel *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s stone* (henceforth HP); the first 11 pages of the thread “Lietuvių kalba” on the Internet forum *supermama.lt* (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>) and the short story *Aš mirštu, tu miršti, jis (ji) miršta* by Jurga Ivanauskaitė (1989).

These sources are extremely different from each other: LPP and HP are translations, where the influence of the original may have led to linguistic choices that would have been different in an original text. I have chosen to examine them because they offer an easy way to find impersonal constructions in their Lithuanian translations. I have checked translation equivalents of French *on*-IMP, English 3-IMP (impersonal *they*) and 2SG-IMP (impersonal *you*). French *on* has a very wide referential range (species generic, non-referential indefinite, referential indefinite, specific): therefore, different Lithuanian translation equivalents may be determined by different referential semantics, blended out in the original⁴; conveniently, *on* has no direct equivalent in Lithuanian, and therefore there is no risk of the original form being directly calqued into the translation. As for the English 3-IMP, I have not considered instances where *they* anaphorically refers to an antecedent such as *anybody* or *somebody*, or to a noun referring to a person of indefinite gender (such as *teacher*).

The two original Lithuanian texts are also extremely different. The forum thread “Lietuvių kalba” is about the use of Russian and Polish languages in Lithuania: the main questions of the thread, “Should Russian and Polish speakers learn Lithuanian? Should Lithuanian speakers also speak Russian and Polish, if talked to in these languages?”, generated a very heated and highly emotional debate. The forum texts are written in an informal style, very similar to spoken language. They often do not follow standard orthographic and punctuation rules; sometimes they present ungrammatical constructions (perhaps due to haste in writing), not representative of standard Lithuanian. I have not edited the examples, except I added missing diacritics for ease of reading.

The short story by Ivanauskaitė (1989), on the other hand, is a dramatic piece of fiction, describing the experience of a young Lithuanian girl confronting drug addiction and depression. The stylistic register is quite formal. In this text, I only found three occurrences of referential impersonal constructions. Tables 2. and 3. offer an overview of my occurrences sample.

	2SG-IMP	3-IMP	<i>ma/ta</i> -IMP
Forum thread “Lietuvių kalba”	14	3	10
Ivanauskaitė (1989)	0	1	2
Tot.	14	4	12

Table 2. Original Lithuanian texts

⁴ Žeimantienė (2005, 2006) follows the same method of investigation, analyzing translation equivalents of German *man* ‘one’. Similarly, Siewierska & Papastathi (2011) also partially base their typology of 3-IMP in some languages of Europe on the analysis of translation equivalents of impersonal *they* in *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone*.

	Original text	2SG-IMP	3-IMP	<i>ma/ta</i> -IMP	Translator used another strategy
LPP	52 occurrences of <i>on</i>	18	1	2	31
HP	23 occurrences of 3-IMP	0	12	1	9
HP	7 occurrences of 2SG-IMP	6	0	0	1
Tot.		24	13	3	

Table 3. Translations equivalents

The tables show that 2SG-IMP is the most frequent impersonal construction in both translated and original texts. 3-IMP, on the other hand, is by far over-represented in the translated texts (namely, in HP), and it is very marginal in the original Lithuanian texts. This is probably the result of the influence of the original English text; it must be noted, however, that in nine cases the translator of *Harry Potter* chose another strategy to translate 3-IMP, and in one case she chose to use a *ma/ta*-IMP.

3.2 Referential properties of 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP

As seen above, both cross-linguistic analyses as well as analyses of Lithuanian data point out to a difference in the referential range of 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP. My analysis confirms these results, as shown in Tables 4a. to 4d.

	2SG-IMP	3-IMP	<i>ma/ta</i> -IMP
Non-referential indefinite	14		8
Referential indefinite		1	
Specific 1SG			
Specific 3SG/PL		2	2
Tot.	14	3	10

Table 4a. Original Lithuanian texts: Forum texts “Lietuvių kalba”

	2SG-IMP	3-IMP	<i>ma/ta</i> -IMP
Non-referential indefinite			2
Referential indefinite		1	
Specific 1SG			
Specific 3SG/PL			
Tot.		1	2

Table 4b. Original Lithuanian texts: Ivanauskaitė (1989)

	2SG-IMP	3-IMP	ma/ta-IMP
Non-referential indefinite	16		2
Referential indefinite		1	
Specific 1SG	1		
Specific 3SG/PL	1		
Tot.	18	1	2

Table 4c. Translations: LPP

	2SG-IMP	3-IMP	ma/ta-IMP
Non-referential indefinite	6		
Referential indefinite		12	1
Specific 1SG			
Specific 3SG/PL			
Tot.	6	12	1

Table 4d. Translations: HP

In my corpus, non-referential indefinite, generic agents ('anyone') are always coded either by 2SG-IMP or *ma/ta*-IMP (22, 23), while referential indefinite agents ('someone') are coded only by 3-IMP (24). In (22) and (23) the referent is generic: anyone would/should behave in the same way in that situation (learning the country's language, speak in Lithuanian). In (24), on the other hand, the speaker does not know who exactly is calling, but the pool of possible referents is limited to the employees of the clinic.

Non-referential indefinite agent

- (22) *Kurioje šalyje gyveni, privalai mokėti tos šalies kalbą.*
 which.LOC.SG.F country.LOC.SG live.PRS.2SG must.PRS.2SG learn.INF that.GEN.SG.F
 country GEN.SG language.ACC.SG

'In whatever country **you live**, **you must learn** the language of that country.'
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

- (23) *Kita vertus, labai jau kvailai atrodytų, jei lietuvis, gyvendamas kitoje šalyje reikalautų, kad ten su juo būtų kalbama lietuviškai.*
 on the other hand much already stupidly look_like.COND.3 if Lithuanian.NOM.SG
 live.PRAP.NOM.SG.M other.LOC.SG.F country.LOC.SG require.COND.3 that there
 with he.INS be.COND.3 speak.ma-IMP Lithuanian.ADV

'On the other hand, it would look really stupid, if a Lithuanian living in another country required that **people speak** (lit. 'it would be spoken') with him in Lithuanian.'
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

Referential indefinite agent

- (24) *Staiga aš supratau, kad skambina iš klinikos,*
 suddenly I.NOM understand.PST.1SG that call.PRS.3 from clinic.GEN.SG
norėdami pranešti apie mano brolio mirtį.
 want.PRAP.NOM.PL.M inform.INF about my brother.GEN.SG death.ACC.SG
 ‘Suddenly I understood that **someone is calling** (lit. ‘they call’) from the clinic,
 wanting to communicate my brother’s death’
 (Ivanauskaitė 1989)

Specific reference in the 3rd person can be coded by 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP alike (25, 26, 27). In (25), the scenario is fictional: however, in this scenario, the speaker knows who is the shopkeeper, who represents thus a specific, referential referent. Similarly, in (26) the referent is a specific work colleague of the speaker.

Specific reference 3SG/PL

- (25) *Imam situaciją: ateinu į parduotuvę, rusiškai*
 take.PRS.1SG situation.ACC.SG arrive.PRS.1SG in shop.ACC.SG Russian.ADV
ko nors paklausiu - ir man atrežia: Kalbėk
 what.GEN any PVF.ask.PRS.1SG and I.DAT reply.PRS.3 speak.IMP.2SG
lietuviškai, nieko nesuprantu!
 Lithuanian.ADV nothing.GEN NEG.understand.PRS.1SG
 ‘I make an example: I come into a shop, I ask something in Russian, and **they**
reply to me: Speak Lithuanian, I don’t understand anything!’
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)
- (26) *Darbe netyčia apie tai prakalbome. Mano nuomone*
 work.LOC.SG recently about this talk.PST.1PL my opinion.INS.SG
gyvenantis žmogus Lietuvoje turi mokėti
 live.PRAP.NOM.SG.M person.NOM.SG Lithuania.LOC have.PRS.3 learn.INF
lietuvių kalbą nesvarbu kuriam Lietuvos
 Lithuanian language.ACC.SG independently which.LOC.SG.M Lithuania.GEN
kampe gyvena. Manęs buvo paklausta kodėl tu
 corner.LOC.SG live.PRS.3 I.GEN be.PST.3 PVF.ask.ta-IMP why you
nesimokai ir nemokai dukros lenkų kalbos?
 NEG.learn.PRS.2SG and NEG.learn.PRS.2SG daughter.GEN.SG Polish language.GEN.SG
 ‘We talked about this not long ago at work. My opinion is that a person who lives
 in Lithuania must learn Lithuanian regardless of which part of Lithuania they live
 in. **I was asked** (lit. ‘it was asked me’), why don’t you learn Polish and don’t you
 teach it to your daughter?’
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

In (27), the author is speaking about the Little Prince, who is referred to by the personal pronoun *il* ‘he’ in the second sentence. The impersonal construction – *on* in French, 2SG in Lithuanian – in the first sentence has therefore a clear third person reference.

(27) a. French LPP

On es *distrain* *une fois ou l’ autre, et ça suffit!*
IMP be.PRS.3SG distracted INDEF time or DEF other, and that suffice.PRS.3SG

Il a *oublié,* *un soir, le globe de verre, ou bien le mouton*
he have.PRS.3SG forget.PP DEF evening DEFglobe of glas or well DEF sheep

est *sorti* *sans* *bruit* *pendant la nuit...*
be.PRS.3SG get_out.PP without noise during DEF night

b. Lithuanian LPP

Vieną *kitą* *sykį* *būsi* *išsiblaškęs,* *ir -*
one.ACC.SG.M other.ACC.SG.M time.ACC.SG be.FUT.2SG absent-minded.NOM.SG.M and

baigta! *Kokį* *vakarą* *pamiršo* *uždėti* *gautą* *arba*
finished.N some.ACC.SG.M night.ACC.SG forget.PST.3 close.INF globe.ACC.SG or

avis *patylomis ištrūko* *nakčia...*
sheep.NOM.SG silently get_out.PST.3 at_night

c. English LPP

*At some moment or other **one** is absent-minded, and that is enough! On some one evening **he forgot** the glass globe, or the sheep got out, without making any noise, in the night...*

Specific reference in the 1st person may be encoded by 2SG-IMP: in (28) the impersonal *on* clearly refers to the author himself (also reference by the possessive *mon* ‘my’) and in the English translation it is translated as ‘I’.

Specific reference 1SG

(28) a. French LPP

C’ est *dur de se remettre au dessin, à mon âge, quand on*
there be.PRS.3 hard of REFL start_again at.DEF drawing at my age when IMP

n’ a *jamais fait d’* *autres tentatives que celle d’un* *boa*
NEG have.PRS.3 never done INDEF.PL other attempt.PL that that of INDEF.SG boa

fermé et celle d’ un *boa ouvert, à l’ âge de six ans!*
closed and that that of INDEF.SG boa open at DEF age of six year.PL

b. Lithuanian LPP

Sunku vėl imtis piešimo mano amžiuje, kai nesi
 difficult.N again take.REFL.INF drawing.GEN.SG my age.LOC.SG when NEG.be.PRS.2SG
mėginęs nieko daugiau, tik būdamas šešerių metų,
 try.PAP.NOM.SG.M nothing.GEN more only be.PRAP.NOM.SG.M six year.GEN.PL
piešei uždarą smauglį ir atdarą smauglį!
 draw.PST.2SG open.ACC.SG.M boa.ACC.SG and closed.ACC.SG boa.ACC.SG

c. English LPP

*It is hard to take up drawing again at **my** age, when **I** have never made any pictures except those of the boa constrictor from the outside and the boa constrictor from the inside, since I was six.*

Crucially, all 2SG-IMP, even when they have a contextually specific reference, have the pragmatic inference that the expressed experience is common to everyone: in (27) and (28) above, the specific referent is contextually clear, but the experience is related as universal, applicable to anyone who would be in the same situation. However, the use of 2SG-IMP to express a clear specific reference may not be typical for Lithuanian, and it may be due to the influence of the source text. In a later translation of *The Little Prince*, (27) is translated with a first person plural (*Kartais būname išsiblaškę* ‘sometimes **we are** absent-minded’) and (28) with a first person singular (*nesu piešęs* ‘**I have** not drawn’; LPP2, 21, 106).

Sometimes, 2SG may be ambiguous between specific 2SG reference and universal, impersonal meaning. Example (29a) is taken from *Harry Potter*, where a character, Hagrid, addresses directly another one, Harry. Hagrid is explaining to Harry what is the Gringott, the Wizards’ Bank, and the 2SG form may be understood as being at least in part deictic and referential. However, Harry has never expressed any intention to rob the bank: Hagrid’s utterance, thus, must be understood as a generic warning and not one aimed solely at Harry. In fact, later in the dialogue, Harry repeats the question to Hagrid (29b), again in the second person, without switching to the first person, as it would be expected if (29a) would have been a purely deictic form. Therefore, I have counted the instance in (29a) in my corpus as having a generic reference.

(29) a. English HP

So yeh'd be mad ter try an' rob it, I'll tell yeh that⁵

Lithuanian HP

Taigi būtum tikras beprotis, jei bandytum apiplėsti
 so be.COND.2SG real.NOM.SG.M madman.NOM.SG if try.COND.2SG rob.INF

b. English HP

'Why would you be mad to try and rob Gringotts?' Harry asked.

My analysis confirms the results of previous studies: 3-IMP have their semantic referential nucleus in the expression of referential indefinite agent, 2SG-IMP are confined to the expression of generic and specific agents and *ma/ta*-IMP are able to code all types of reference.

3.3 Discourse functions and pragmatic properties of 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP

As shown in the foregoing sections, the three constructions under investigation have a different referential range: 2SG-IMP denote generic agents, and are always inclusive of the speaker; 3-IMP mostly denote referential indefinite agents and *ma/ta*-IMP are extremely flexible, being able to express all types of reference. Their use, however, is not only determined by reference: discourse functions such as the establishment of empathy or the emphasis on the indefiniteness of the agent are relevant as well.

3.3.1 2SG-IMP

The pragmatically marked character of 2SG-IMP has already been pointed out in literature. Deringer *et al.* (2015) claim that 2SG-IMP have the fundamental function of expressing “generalized empathy that is, “empathy with the members of a class of referents over which a generalization is made, and solidarity between the speech act participants” (Deringer *et al.* 2015, 313). Kitagawa & Lehrer (1990, 750) state, that 2SG-IMP are found in the following narrative contexts: (a) ‘situational insertion’ (‘I hit a guy who swung at me. **You** react instinctively at a time like that’), (b) ‘moral or truism formulation’ type (‘**you** kill yourself to raise your kids properly, and guess what happens’), (c) ‘life drama’ (‘**you** are in Egypt admiring the pyramids and feeling that **you** have really left your own world and time behind when suddenly **you** meet your next-door neighbor from home.’). In (a) *you* can be replaced by *anyone/one* and in (b) by *one*, with no semantic or discourse-effect changes. In (c) contexts, instead, 2SG-IMP are the only strategy available in order to preserve the intended dramatic effect (Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990, 751). ‘Life

⁵ This sentence is uttered, in Rowling’s novel, by Hagrid, a character who speaks a distinctive variety of non-standard English. In his speech, “you” is rendered as *yeh*.

drama' situations are those, where the referent is specific, and it is identical with the speaker: either in real life, as if would be the case if the speaker had really been to Egypt and was relating on something happened to them, or in a potential, irrealis situation, in which case the speaker describes an experience to which they can relate, and expect the hearer to relate as well ('if I/anyone were in this situation, then I/anyone would do so-and-so'; 'simulation' in terms of Deringer *et al.* 2015). In the forum texts, 2SG-IMP are mostly used in opinion statements (30) and 'life drama' situations (31).

- (30) *Kurioje šalyje esi, tos šalies*
 whatever.LOC.SG.F country.LOC.SG be.PRS.2SG that.GEN.SG.F country.GEN.SG
tvarkos ir laikaisi
 order.GEN.SG and hold.PRS.2SG
 'Whichever country **you are** in, **you behave** by the rules of that country.'
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)
- (31) *Buvo anais laikais tokie piliečiai (...) kuriem*
 be.PST.3 that.INS.PL.M time.INS.PL such.NOM.PL.M citizens.NOM.PL which.DAT.PL.M
 „*moj adres ne dom i ne ulica, moj adres Sovietskij Sojuz*“. *Deklaruoti*
 my adress not house and not street, my adress Soviet Union declare.INF
galima daug ką apie lygyb ir brolybę, bet
 possible.N much what.ACC about equality.ACC.SG and fraternity.ACC.SG but
budavo juokinga kai laikaisi kokioj nors Vologdoj,
 be.HAB.PST.3 funny.N when visit.PRS.2SG some.LOC.SG.F any Vologda.LOC
kai pasakydavai, jog esi iš Lietuvos, atsakymą
 when PFV.say.HAB.PST.2SG that be.PRS.2SG from Lithuania.GEN answer.ACC.SG
dažniausiai sulaukdavai „Aaaa... Ryga“.
 often.SUPER get.HAB.PST.2SG ah Riga.NOM
 'There were in those times [Soviet times, LM] such citizens (...), who felt like
 'my home address is not a street or a house, my address is the Soviet Union' [in
 Russian in the original text, LM]. One can declare many things about equality
 and fraternity, but it was funny when **you were** in some [Russian city such as,
 LM] Vologda, when **you told** that **you were** from Lithuania, **you usually got** the
 answer "Ah, Riga!"'
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

In (31) we have no way of knowing whether the reference to the speaker is real (they have really been in Russia and got such an answer) or simulated (the speaker imagines themselves in a possible situation they relate to emotionally). In any case, the use of

2SG-IMP adds to the dramatic/comic effect of the narrative in a way that would be lost with any other strategy; the writer in the forum is using this ‘real life situation’ to make a point: in Russia, people knew about Lithuania much less than the Soviet propaganda would have liked Lithuanians to believe. The switch between the impersonal *galima deklaruoti* ‘it is possible to declare; one can declare’ and the 2SG-IMP of the following predicates clearly marks not a switch in reference itself, but in perspective and inclusiveness: ‘one can declare’ excludes, at least for the argument’s sake, the speaker (who does not agree with what was declared), while ‘you were in some Vologda and [...]’ includes them, expressing their true opinion. In (32) the speaker openly declares that the 2SG-IMP statement is their opinion:

- (32) *Mano nuomonė tokia: namie kalbėk kaip nori,*
 my opinion.NOM.SG such.NOM.SG.F house.LOC.SG speak.IMP.2SG as want.PRS.2SG
bet parduotuvėje ar kokioje kitokioje ištaigoje kaip jau kaip
 but shop.LOC.SG or what.LOC.SG.F other.LOC.SG.F office.LOC.SG as already as
malonėk kalbėt lietuviškai
 please.IMP.2SG speak.INF Lithuanian.ADV
 ‘My opinion is this: at home, **speak as you want**, but in shops or other institutions **please speak** (lit. ‘be so kind as to speak’) Lithuanian’
 (<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

3.3.2 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP

In terms of discourse functions, already Geniušienė (2016, 254) claims that in Lithuanian texts 3-IMP are preferably used when the emphasis is on the indefiniteness of the agent and *ma/ta*-IMP when the emphasis is on the action itself. Geniušienė’s claim agrees with the fundamental difference in reference between 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP: the first refer to a subgroup of humanity (Sansò 2006, 268), whereas *ma/ta*-IMP can refer to the whole of humanity, a subgroup thereof or even a specific individual, including the speaker. Therefore, 3-IMP are eminently suited to encode those situations, where the speaker wants to focus on the fact that the action has been fulfilled by an unspecified ‘someone’. *Ma/ta*-IMP are instead preferred to encode situations where the agent is completely irrelevant: either because it can be anyone or because it is specific but irrelevant to the development of the story. In (33)⁶, the linguistic competence and behavior of the person, answering in Lithuanian, is the subject of the whole text: the agent, therefore, though indefinite, is focused on. In (34), instead, the emphasis is put on the fact that, no matter what, Americans will get an answer in German; the German-speaking shopkeepers are not relevant to the subsequent narrative development. Similarly, in (35), the co-worker

⁶ I omitted glosses in the longer text excepts in this Section for ease of reading. The relevant constructions are highlighted in bold in both the original example and the English translation.

asking the question is irrelevant to the development of the story: what was important to the speaker was the content of the question.

- (33) *Imam situaciją: ateinu į parduotuvę, rusiškai ko nors paklausiu - ir man **atrežia**: Kalbėk lietuviškai, nieko nesuprantu! O jei paklausčiau, rusu budama, angliškai? Kažin, irgi atrežtų tą patį, ar tada jau angliškai atsakytų? Aš suprantu, kad jei nemoki rusiškai, tai tada ir neatsakysi, rusiškai užkalbinta. Gali taip būt juk. Bet jei moki - vat kodėl tuomet tas išsidirbinėjimas, piktinimasis?*

‘I make an example: I come into a shop, I ask something in Russian, and **they** **reply** to me: Speak Lithuanian, I don’t understand anything! And if I asked, being Russian, in English? I wonder, would they say the same or would they then answer in English? I understand that if you have not learnt Russian, then you will not answer when asked in Russian. It may well be so. But if you have learnt it, then why immediately such showing off and irritation?’

(<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

- (34) *Beje, vokiečiai kelia tokias pat diskusijas dėl amerikiečių, dar likusių po II Pasaulinio Karo, kurių daugelis taip ir neišmoko vokiškai. Jei jie ir bando parduotuvėje ką angliškai, jiems **bus atsakyta** vokiškai. O tavo reikalas suprasi ar ne.*

‘By the way, the Germans have the same discussions about those Americans, who stayed after WWII and whose majority has not learnt German. If they try to say something in English in a shop, **the answer will be** (lit. ‘it will be answered’) in German. It’s your business if you understand or not’.

(<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

- (35) *Mano anyta nemoka lietuviškai. Nors gyvena Lietuvoje. Mudu su vyru kalbame lietuviškai. Su dukra taip pat kalbame lietuviškai. Su anyta aš susikalbu rusiškai. (Ji lenkė) Kaip jau supratote anyta su dukra nesusikalba nes nesupranta viena kitos. Darbe netyčia apie tai prakalbome. Mano nuomone gyvenantis žmogus Lietuvoje turi mokėti lietuvių kalbą nesvarbu kuriam Lietuvos kampe gyvena. Manęs **buvo paklausta** kodėl tu nesimokai ir nemokai dukros lenkų kalbos? Man iškilo klausimas, o kam? Kad aš galėčiau susikalbėti su anyta jos gimtąja kalba, ar mokyt dukra lenkiškai, kad jos galėtų susikalbėti.*

‘My mother-in-law does not know Lithuanian. Even though she lives in Lithuania. My husband and I talk to each other in Lithuanian. With our daughter we speak Lithuanian. I talk with my mother-in-law in Russian. (She is Polish.) As you can already understand, my mother-in-law and my daughter do not speak with each other as they do not understand each other. We talked about this not long ago at work. My opinion is that a person who lives in Lithuania must learn Lithuanian regardless of which part of Lithuania they live in. **I was asked** (lit. ‘it was asked me’), why don’t you learn Polish and don’t you teach it to your daughter? I asked,

but why? So that I would be able to talk with my mother-in-law in her native tongue, or teach my daughter Polish, so that they could talk with each other’.
(<https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba>)

3.4 Deictic meaning and discourse function

The original deictic meaning of the constructions highly correlates with their functions (Sansò 2006; Siewierska 2011; Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990). *Ma/ta*-IMP with no overt agent and a formally impersonal form are the best candidates for encoding events, where the agent is either completely irrelevant or, though being relevant, should not overshadow the event itself. Similarly, 2SG-IMP, having in their non-generic, deictic use a reference to a speech act participant, are the best candidates for encoding specific inclusive reference (1SG). 2SG-IMP are therefore also quite apt to express agentless generic events, where the agent is generic (and implied to be ‘all of humanity’). Its empathy-generating pragmatics can be seen as a result of the implication ‘everyone is the same as me and you’: the speaker’s experience is presented as universal, thereby establishing empathy with the addressee/reader. The empathy effect is strengthened by the fact that 2SG-IMP directly address the addressee/reader, making the statement ‘personal’. Finally, 3-IMP have the narrowest functional range, because they cannot express any other person than their original personal function (third): as they are intrinsically exclusive, 3-IMP are bad candidates to express reference to ‘anyone’, as this necessarily also includes the speaker (Sansò 2006).

4 Conclusions

Despite the relatively small number of analyzed occurrences, the results of the analysis presented in the foregoing sections depict a clear picture of the semantics and functions of Lithuanian 2SG-IMP, 3-IMP and *ma/ta*-IMP, and show that the referential properties and pragmatic-discourse functions of these constructions are in line with those already described for other European languages.

As for their referential properties, *ma/ta*-IMP are quite flexible, being able to encode all types of reference (generic, referential indefinite and specific); 3-IMP and 2SG-IMP have a more restricted referential range, the first being restricted to the encoding of referential indefinite agents and specific 3rd person agents, and the second to the encoding of generic and specific agents. Having a wide referential range, *ma/ta*-IMP may replace both 2SG-IMP and 3-IMP. However, these constructions differ greatly on the pragmatic-discourse level, and are therefore not always freely interchangeable (cf. also Geniušienė 2016). 2SG-IMP are pragmatically marked, expressing empathy. They are used to express a strong emotional identification: 2SG-IMP are extremely frequent in the forum texts and in *The Little Prince*, which are both text characterized by a high level of emotionality.

In discourse, 3-IMP are preferred to *ma/ta*-IMP whenever the indefiniteness of the agent is focused on; *ma/ta*-IMP are instead preferred whenever the focus is on the event itself.

As for their distribution, *ma/ta*-IMP and 2SG-IMP are by far more frequent than 3-IMP. Siewierska (2011) puts Lithuanian in the group of languages that “virtually lack 3(PL)-IMP”: while it is true that this strategy is the least frequent, it is nevertheless present even in my small sample, in all four sources (in the translation of *Harry Potter*, 3-IMP are more frequent than in the original Lithuanian texts, probably due to the influence of the original text). 2SG are more frequent in stylistically informal texts – it is by far the predominant strategy in the forum texts, while it is completely absent in the more formal language of Ivanauskaitė’s short story. *Ma/ta*-IMP are stylistically neutral, and they are found in both original Lithuanian sources.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the precious advice I got from Anastasia Bauer, Daniel Bunčić, Maria Katarzyna Prenner, Jogilė Teresa Ramonaitė and Björn Wiemer on different topics discussed in this paper. A thank you goes to Thomas Stolz and colleagues at the University of Bremen for letting me use their corpus of *The Little Prince* translations. Also, I would like to thank Aurelija Usonienė and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions and corrections. All remaining errors and shortcomings are my responsibility only.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3	first, second, third	M	masculine
ACC	accusative	N	neuter
ADV	adverb	NEG	negation
COND	conditional	NOM	nominative
DAT	dative	PAP	past active participle
DEF	definite	PFV	perfective
DIM	diminutive	PL	plural
F	feminine	PP	past participle
FUT	future	PPP	past passive participle
GEN	genitive	PRAP	present active participle
HAB	habitual	PRPP	present passive participle
IMP	impersonal	PRS	present
IMPER	imperative	PST	past
INDEF	indefinite	PSGER	past gerundive
INF	infinitive	SG	singular
INS	instrumental	SUBJ	subjunctive
LOC	locative	SUPER	superlative

Primary sources

Lithuanian original texts

Ivanauskaitė, Jurga. 1989. Aš mirštu, tu miršti, jis (ji) miršta. In *Kaip užsiauginti baimę* (novelių ir apsakymų rinkinys). Vilnius: Vaga.
Forum: <https://www.supermama.lt/forumas/topic/692682-lietuviu-kalba> [accessed on 12.11.2019]

Translations

HP English: Rowling, Joanne K. 1997. *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. London: Bloomsbury
HP Lithuanian: Rowling, Joanne K. 2000. *Haris Poteris ir isminties akmuo*. Vilnius: Alma Litera.
LPP English: Saint-Exupéry, Antoine de. 1996 *The Little Prince*. London: Heinemann
LPP French: Saint-Exupéry, Antoine de. 1943. *Le Petit Prince*. Paris: Gallimard
LPP Lithuanian: Saint-Exupéry, Antoine de. 1995. *Mažasis Princas*. Vilnius: Džiugas.
LPP2 Lithuanian: Saint-Exupéry, Antoine de. 2011. *Mažasis Princas*. Vilnius: Alma littera.

References

- Bahr, Robert. 2013. *Die Dublonen des Samiel*. Published on-line: <http://www.lulu.com/shop/robert-bahr/die-dublonen-des-samiel/paperback/product-21377282.html>.
- Creissels, Daniel. 2009. *Impersonal pronouns and coreference: The case of French on*. Ms, University of Lyon.
- Deringer, Lisa, Volker Gast & Florian Haas. 2015. Impersonal uses of the second person singular and generalized empathy: An exploratory corpus study of English, German and Russian. In *The Pragmatics of Personal Pronouns*. Sandrine Sorlin & Laure Gardelle, eds. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 311–334. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.171.15der>.
- DW: *Projekt Deutscher Wortschatz*. <http://wortschatz.uni-leipzig.de>.
- Geniušienė, Emma. 2016 [1973]. The relation between the indefinite personal and the passive in Lithuanian. In *Passive constructions in Lithuanian. Selected works of Emma Geniušienė*. Anna Kibort & Nijolė Maskaliūnienė, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 247–268.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna & Andrea Sansò. 2007. The spread and decline of indefinite man-constructions in European languages. In *Europe and the Mediterranean as Linguistic Areas*. Paolo Ramat & Elisa Roma, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 95–131. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.88.07gia>.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. Non-canonical marking of core arguments in European languages. In *Non-Canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects*. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon & Masayuki Onishi, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 53–83.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2001. Impersonals and passives in Baltic and Finnic. In *Circum-Baltic languages. Volume 2: Grammar and Typology*. Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 363–389. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.55.04hol>.
- Kibort, Anna. 2008. Impersonals in Polish: An LFG perspective. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 106 (2), 246–289.
- Kitagawa, Chisato & Adrienne Lehrer. 1990. Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 739–759. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90004-w](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90004-w).
- LBA: Bovet, Félix & Louis Bonnet. 2012 [1900]. *La Bible (Traduction de la Bible annotée)*. ThéoTeX. Published electronically: www.theotex.org.
- LSG: Segond, Louis. 1910. *La Bible. Traduction de Louis Segond*. Geneva: Alliance Biblique Universelle.
- Malamud, Sophia. 2012. Impersonal indexicals: *one, you, man, and du*. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 15 (1), 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10828-012-9047-6>.
- Malchukov Andrej L. & Akio Ogawa. 2011. Towards a typology of impersonal constructions: A semantic map approach. In *Impersonal constructions. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Andrej Malchukov & Anna Siewierska, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 17–54. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.124.02mal>.
- Moyse-Faurier, Claire. 2011. Impersonal constructions in some Oceanic languages. In *Impersonal constructions. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Andrej Malchukov & Anna Siewierska, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 581–606. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.124.20moy>.
- Myhill, John. 1997. Towards a functional typology of agent defocusing. *Linguistics* 35, 799–844.
- Sansò, Andrea. 2003. The network of demotion. Towards a unified account of passive constructions. In *Meanings Through Language Contrast*, Vol.1. Ken Turner & Katarzyna Jaszczolt, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 245–260. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.99.20san>.
- Sansò, Andrea. 2006. ‘Agent defocusing’ revisited. Passive and impersonal constructions in some European languages. In *Passivization and typology. Form and Function*. Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 232–273. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.68.15san>.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2008. Ways of impersonalizing. In *Current Trends in Contrastive Linguistics*. Maria de los Angeles Gomez Gonzales, Lachlan Mackenzie &

- Elsa Gonzalez Alvarez, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445609342501>.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2011. Overlap and complementarity in reference impersonals. In *Impersonal constructions. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Andrej Malchukov & Anna Siewierska, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 57–89. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.124.03sie>.
- Siewierska, Anna & Maria Papastathi. 2011. Towards a typology of third person plural impersonals. *Linguistics* 49(3), 575–610. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2011.018>.
- Spraunienė, Birutė, Auksė Razanovaitė & Erika Jasionytė. 2015. Solving the puzzle of the Lithuanian passive. In *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds. Berlin: John Benjamins. 323–365. <https://doi.org/10.1075/vargreb.2.07spr>.
- Ushie, Yukiko. 1994. Who Are You? And What Are You Doing? Discourse and Pragmatic Functions of the Personal Pronoun You in Conversational Narratives. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281119326_Who_Are_You_And_What_Are_You_Doing--Discourse_and_Pragmatic_Functions_of_the_Personal_Pronoun_You_in_Conversational_Narratives
- Usonienė, Aurelija & Jolanta Šinkūnienė. 2017. Potential vs use: revisiting an evidential participial construction in Lithuanian. In *Evidentiality Revisited: Cognitive Grammar, Functional and Discourse-Pragmatic Perspectives*. Juana I. Marín-Arrese, Gerda Haßler & Marta Carretero, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 297–340. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.271.08uso>.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2006. Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian. In *Passivization and Typology: Form and function*. Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö, eds. Berlin/Amsterdam: Benjamins. 274–309. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.68.16wie>.
- Zifonun, Gisela. 2001. ‚Man lebt nur einmal‘. Morphosyntax und Semantik des Pronomens *man*. *Deutsche Sprache* 3, 232–253.
- Žeimantienė, Vaiva. 2005. Einzelsprachliche Realisierungen des Subjekt-Impersonals: Das Beispiel deutscher *man*-Sätze und ihrer Entsprechungen im Litauischen. *Kalbotyra* 55 (3), 81–90.
- Žeimantienė, Vaiva. 2006. Deutsche subjektlose Passivkonstruktionen und „*man*-Sätze“ im Vergleich zu ihren Entsprechungen im Litauischen. In *Menschen – Sprachen – Kulturen*. Lucyna Wille & Jaromin Homa, eds. Marburg: Tectum Verlag, 379–387.

Submitted 13 November 2019

Accepted 23 December 2019