Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, 14 December 2012

"EXTERNAL" VERBAL PREFIXES IN LITHUANIAN

Peter Arkadiev
(Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow)
peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

0. A brief introduction to Lithuanian

Lithuanian (*lietuvių kalba*) < East Baltic < Baltic <? Balto-Slavonic < Indo-European.

Ca. 3.3 mil. speakers in Lithuania, Belorussia, Russia, USA etc.

Two main dialect groups: High Lithuanian (Aukštaitian) and Low Lithuanian (Samogitian, Žemaitian).

Written tradition since 1547.

Selected grammars in languages other than Lithuanian: Schleicher 1856, Kurschat 1876, Otrębski 1956–1966, Dambriūnas et al. 1966, Senn 1966, Ambrazas (ed.) 1997, Mathiassen 1996a.

In WALS (Dryer & Haspelmath (eds.) 2011) Lithuanian is represented on 80 maps.

Major typological characteristics:

– highly inflectional with many types of declension and conjugation;

– a relatively rich case system: Nom, Acc, Gen, Dat, Ins, Loc + Voc + vestigial Illative;

– masculine vs. feminine gender + definiteness marking in adjectives;

– "free" (information-structure based) order of clausal constituents, but largely SVO;

– rather rigid head-final order in NP/DP + prepositions.

Major characteristics of the verbal system:

– no number distinction in the 3rd person;

– no grammaticalized perfective ~ imperfective aspectual distinction: aspectual contrasts are expressed by derivational means (verbal prefixes and more rarely suffixes) and are not fully regular (Dambriūnas 1959, 1960, Mathiassen 1996b, Wiemer 2002, Arkadiev 2011a);

– four tenses: Present, Preterite, Habitual Preterite (-*dav*-), Future (-*s*-) (Sližienė 1995, Mathiassen 1996b);

– a rich system of participles employed in various functions (Klimas 1987, Wiemer 2000, Arkadiev 2012), distinguishing tense, voice and agreement;

– periphrastic constructions based on the auxiliary *būti* 'be' + participles: passive (Geniušienė 2006), perfect/resultative (Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1987), avertive (Arkadiev 2011b, see below);

– evidential use of participles in place of finite forms (Wiemer 2006).

1. The structure of the prefixal domain of the Lithuanian verb

(1)

external			internal		
permissive restrictive affirmative	negation	aspectual and modal meanings	Aktionsart preverbs	reflexive	stem
te-	*ne-*	*be-*	12+	*-si-*	

(2) a. **ne₋₄-be₋₃-at₋₂-si₋₁-kel-s**
NEG-BE-PRV-RFL-raise-FUT(3)
'will not rise anymore'

b. **te₋₅-nu₋₂-si₋₁-leidži-a**
TE-PRV-RFL-descend-PRS(3)
'let (him/her/it/them) go down!'

c. **te₋₅-ne₋₄-be₋₃-nor-i** daugiau niek-o
TE-NEG-BE-want-PRS(3) more nothing-GEN.SG
'let him/her want nothing more' (LKT)

2. "Internal" vs. "external" prefixes

2.1. "Internal" prefixes, or preverbs (for more details cf. Paulauskas 1958):

➲ Affect the lexical meaning and argument structure of the verb.

(3) *rašyti* 'write': **ap-rašyti** 'describe', **at-rašyti** 'reply by writing', **į-rašyti** 'inscribe', **iš-rašyti** 'write out; cover with writing or drawings', **nu-rašyti** 'copy out; write off', **pa-rašyti** 'write; sign', **per-rašyti** 'rewrite', **pri-rašyti** 'add by writing', **su-rašyti** 'write down', **už-rašyti** 'superscribe, inscribe' (+ **da-rašyti** 'write to completion')

➲ Affect the aspectual properties of the verb, i.e. make it telic (terminative).

➲ Are polysemous, with individual meanings forming semantic networks partly similar to those of the corresponding Slavic prefixes (Galnaitytė 1959, Rinholm 1990, de Penanros 2010, Dzikaras 2011, Kozhanov 2011a, 2011b).

➲ No restrictions on co-occurrence with various inflectional forms of the verb.

➲ Always occur in the scope of the habitual past: [[**at-ei**]-*dav*]-*o* 'used to come'.

➲ In periphrastic tenses, never attach to the auxiliary:

(4) *buv-o* **pa-stat-o-m-as** **pa-buv-o statomas*.
AUX-PST(3) PRV-built-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
'was being built'

➲ Can occur in the scope of the iterative suffix -*inė*-: [[**per-raš**]-*inė*]-*ti* 'to rewrite repeatedly'.

➲ Participate in deverbal derivation:

(5) *ap-rašyti* 'describe' → *aprašas* 'inventory'; *at-likti* 'remain' → *atlaikai* 'waste'

2.2. "External" prefixes:

➲ Do not affect the lexical meaning of the verb (Paulauskas 1958: 323).

➲ Do not affect the verb's telicity, though can express aspectual meanings.

➲ Are polysemous, but individual meanings often have little in common:

– the permissive *te-*

(6) a. *T-as,* *kur-is* *sukurt-as* *rašy-ti* – **te-raš-o,**
that-NOM.SG.M which-NOM.SG.M created-NOM.SG.M write-INF TE-write-PRS(3)
kalbė-ti – **te-kalb-a…**
speak-INF TE-speak-PRS(3)
'Let that who is created to write, write, and that who is created to speak, speak.' (LKT)

– the restrictive *te-*

b. *…man ne-at.rod-o natūral-u, kad j-is*
I:DAT NEG-seem-PRS(3) natural-DF that 3-NOM.SG.M
*vis-ą laik-ą apie tai **te-kalb-a.***
all-ACC.SG time-ACC.SG about that TE-speak-PRS(3)
'It does not seem natural to me that he is always speaking only about that.' (LKT)

➲ In different meanings show different restrictions on co-occurrence with particular verbal forms, e.g. the permissive *te-* normally co-occurs only with the 3rd person present, and some meanings of *be-* are attested only with participles (see below).

➲ Can take the past habitual *-dav-* in its scope:

(7) *Ukrain-a ...   iš   kur   j-am   vis dar   [**te-be-**[**at.ei-dav**]]-**o***
Ukraine-NOM.SG from   where 3-DAT.SG.M   still   TE-BE-come-HAB-PST(3)

t-ie   laišk-ai   su   širdel-ėm.
that-NOM.PL.M   letter-NOM.SG   with   heart-INS.PL

'Ukraine ... from where he was still receiving those letters with hearts.' (LKT)

➲ By contrast, never occur in the scope of the iterative *-inė-*: *ne-*[[*per-raš*]*-inė*]*-jo* 'did not repeatedly rewrite', not *'repeatedly did not rewrite'.

➲ In periphrastic tenses, can attach both to the main verb and to the auxiliary, sometimes with a difference in meaning (cf. Sližienė 1967: 70–72):

(8) *es-u   **ne-**miegoj-ęs   ~   **ne**-s-u miegojęs*
AUX.PRS-1SG   NEG-sleep-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M

'I have not slept'.

➲ Do not participate in deverbal derivation:

(9) ***te-be**-miegojo* 's/he was still sleeping' → ***te-be**-miegoj-imas* intended 'the fact that somebody is still sleeping'

2.3. Some common properties shared by "internal" and "external" prefixes:

➲ "Reflexive displacement" (cf. Stolz 1989):

(10) a. *džiaug-ė-**si***   b. ***ap**-₂-**si**₋₁-*džiaug-ė*
   rejoice-PST(3)-RFL   PRV-RFL-rejoice-PST(3)
   'rejoiced'   'became happy'

 c. ***te**₋₅-**si**₋₁-*džiaugi-a*   d. ***ne**₋₄-**be**₋₃-**si**₋₁-*džiaugi-a*
   TE-RFL- rejoice-PRS(3)   NEG-BE-RFL-rejoice-PRS(3)
   'let rejoice'   'is no longer happy'

➲ Stress retraction (cf. Andronovas 1995, Stundžia 1995: 148):

(11) a. *nẽša* 'is carrying'   b. *ap-sì₋₁-neša* 'gets covered with'
   c. *àt₋₂-neša* 'is bringing'   d. *te-bè₋₃-neša* 'is still carrying'
   e. *nè₋₄-neša* 'is not carrying'   f. *tè₋₅-neša* 'let carry'

3. History of the research

Lithuanian verbal prefixes, "internal" as well as "external", have not received as much attention as Slavic of Germanic prefixes. Cf. the studies already cited and Endzelins 1971/1906, Rinholm 1980, and Kozhanov 2013+. for a historical survey.

"External" prefixes are only sporadically mentioned in the literature, cf. Schleicher (1856: 139, 305–306), Paulauskas (1958: 321–323), Otrębski (1965: 368–369), Senn (1966: 245), Ulvydas (red.) (1971: 295–296), Mathiassen (1996a: 171–172), Ambrazas (ed.) (1997: 222, 250, 261, 348, 397, 399), and are often considered "particles" (which is clearly at odds with their morphological status).

Just a couple of the uses of "external" prefixes have received systematic treatment in grammars, i.e. those which have "made their way" into the officially recognized system of grammatical categories, viz. the permissive *te-* ("3rd person imperative") and the use of *be-* in the periphrastic "inceptive/continuative" constructions (*sudėtiniai pradėtiniai laikai*), cf. Dambriūnas (1960: 103–108), Sližienė 1961; Ulvydas (red.) (1971: 145–148).

Recent studies: Arkadiev (2010) on the restrictive *te-*, Arkadiev (2011b, 2011c) on the uses of *be-*, Ostrowski (2010, 2011a, 2011b, Ms., to appear) on the history of *be-*. Etymological origins of *te-* and *be-* remain obscure, and existing hypotheses are largely speculative, cf. Vaillant 1947, Fraenkel (1962-1965: 38; 1071), Zinkevičius (1981: 195–196, 198), Smoczyński (2007: 51), cf. also works by Ostrowski.

4. The restrictive *te-*
(For a comprehensive treatment see Arkadiev 2010)

Belongs to a rare type of **restrictive markers** (elements meaning 'only', König 1991) morphologically attached to the verb but able to take any constituent in its scope (marked SMALL CAPITALS in the examples below): subject (12), direct (13) and indirect object (14), adverbial phrases (15), non-finite (16) and finite (17) clausal complements.

(12) *... o kit-ą   vard-ą   **te**-žin-o   ARTIMIAUS-I J-OS   ŽMON-ĖS.*
   and   other-ACC.SG   name-ACC.SG TE-know-PRS(3) closest-NOM.PL.M 3-GEN.SG.F people-NOM.PL

'... and the other name is known only to her closest friends.' (LKT)

(13) *Aš   SAVO ŽMON-Ą   **te**-myl-iu.*
   I:NOM   own   wife-ACC.SG   TE-love-PRS.1SG

'I love only my own wife.'

(14) *Kaz-ys   gimim-o   dien-os   prog-a   gėli-ų   **te**-dovanoj-o*
   Kazys-NOM.SG birth-GEN.SG day-GEN.SG occasion-INS.SG   flower-GEN.PL TE-give-PST(3)

SAVO ŽMON-AI.
own   wife-DAT.SG

'Kazys gave flowers only to his own wife as a birthday present.'

(15) *Aš   tav-e   PIRM-Ą   SYK-Į   **te**-mat-au.*
   I(NOM)   you-ACC.SG   first-ACC.SG   time-ACC.SG   TE-see-PRS.1SG

'I see you only for the first time.' (LKT)

(16) *J-os   **te**-gal-i   ŽAIS-TI   MEIL-E...*
   3-NOM.PL.F   TE-can-PRS   play-INF   love-INS.SG

'They can only play with love.' (V. Mykolaitis-Putinas. *Altorių šešėly*, 1933, II:15[1])

(17) *... o kit-i   **te**-myl-i   tik sav-e   ir   **te**-nor-i,   KAD VIS-I*
   and   other-NOM.PL.M TE-love-PRS(3) only self-ACC and TE-want-PRS(3) that all-NOM.PL.M

J-UOS   TE-MYLĖ-TŲ.
3-ACC.PL.M   TE-love-SBJ(3)

'... and others love only themselves and only want that everyone loved just them.' (LKT)

Such freedom of scope taking creates potential multiple ambiguity, normally resolved only by context:

(18) *Kaz-ys   **te**-dovanoj-o   mergait-ėms   knyg-as.*
   Kazys-NOM.SG TE-give-PST(3)   girl-DAT.PL   book-ACC.PL

i. 'Only Kazys gave books to girls.'
ii. 'Kazys only gave books to girls <and not sold flowers to boys>.'
iii. 'Kazys gave books only to girls <and not to boys>.'
iv. 'Kazys gave girls only books <and not flowers>.'
v. 'Kazys only gave books to girls <and not sold books to girls>.'

Furthermore, *te-* can scope into nominal (19) and verbal (20) constituents:

---

[1] http://www.antologija.lt/texts/37/turinys.html

(19) **Te**-skait-au [MAIRONI-O eilėrašči-us], kit-ų poet-ų ne-mėgst-u.
TE-read-PRS.1SG Maironis-GEN.SG poetry-ACC.PL other-GEN.PL poet-GEN.PL NEG-like-PRS.1SG
'I read only poetry by Maironis, I don't like other poets'.

(20) Ši-os scen-os grož-į **te**-gal-i-m-a
this-GEN.SG.F scene-GEN.SG beauty-ACC.SG TE-can-PRS-PP-DF
[sulygin-ti SU GERV-ĖS SKRYDŽIIU]...
compare-INF with crane-GEN.SG flight-INS.SG
'The beauty of this scene can be compared only to a crane's flight...' (G. Beres-nevičius, *Apie pagavimą šnipų*, 1998[2])

Though variable scope adverbal restrictive markers are attested cross-linguistically, most often they are clearly independent lexical elements such as particles or adverbs, cf. English *only* (21) or Mandarin Chinese *zhi* (22).

(21) *John **only** gave a book to Mary.* English
'... only gave/only a book/only to Mary ... /*only John'

(22) *Wo **zhi** xie shu.* Mandarin Chinese
I RSTR write book
'Only I write books/I write only books', etc. (König 1991: 18)

The kind of restrictive marker attested in Lithuanian is a clear instance of typological rarity. The only parallel example of a variable scope restrictive marker being a verbal affix comes from from Bininj Gun-wok, a polysynthetic Gunwingguan language of North Australia (Evans 1995: 248–256):

(23) *A-**djal**-wokdi GUN-DJEIHMI.* Bininj Gun-wok
1SG-RSTR-speak language.name
'I speak only Gun-djeihmi.' (Evans 1995: 250)

In contrast to the polysynthetic Bininj Gun-wok (24), in Lithuanian only verb-external full-fledged words and phrases can fall into the scope of *te-* (25):

(24) *Ga-bi-**djal**-ganj-wo-n.* Bininj Gun-wok
3SB-3OB-RSTR-meat-give-NPST
i. 'Only she gives him meat.'
ii. 'She gives him only meat.'
iii. 'She gives meat only to him.' (ibid., 252)

(25) a. ****Te**-at.ėj-AU.* b. *T**e**atėjau AŠ.*
TE-come-PST.1SG TE-come-PST.1SG I:NOM
'*Only I came.' 'Only I came.'

A typology of "adverbal" restrictive markers:

(26)

	scope over subject	embedded scope	verb-internal scope
English *only*	–	+	–
Mandarin *zhi*	+	+	–
Lithuanian *te-*	+	+	–
Bininj Gun-wok *-djal-*	+	(–)	+

4. The polyfunctional *be-*
(For a more detailed treatment see Arkadiev 2011b, 2011c)
➲ Aspectual functions.
➲ Modal and evaluative functions.
➲ The purely structural "empty" function in reflexive participles (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 348): triggering the "reflexive displacement", *be-* helps avoid the morphophonological complications arising when the reflexive marker attaches to the adjectival desinence:

(27) a. *juok-iąs-is* b. *be-si-juok-ia-nči-o / #juokiančiosi*
laugh-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M-RFL BE-RFL-laugh-PRS-PA-GEN.SG.M

4.1. Aspectual functions of *be-*
4.1.1. Continuative
(For a comprehensive treatment see Arkadiev 2011b)

(28) *...miestel-yje **te-be-gyven-o** daug našli-ų.*
small.town-LOC.SG TE-BE-live-PST(3) many widow-GEN.PL
'... in the town there still lived many widows.' (LKT)

(29) *Tada j-is jau **ne-be-gyven-o** su žmon-a...*
then 3-NOM.SG.M already NEG-BE-live-PST(3) with wife-INS.SG
'Then he already no longer lived with his wife...' (LKT)

➲ In the modern language only occurs with the markers of polarity: *te-* (positive) or *ne-* (negative); in Old Lithuanian independent continuative uses of *be-* are still attested until the XVIII century (Ostrowski to appear).

(30) *Surink-a tada ir pri.pil-e dwilika pintini-u trupucz-u isch*
collect-PST(3) then and fill-PST(3) twelve bucket-GEN.PL piece-GEN.PL from
*penketa miesz-u dŭn-as kur-ie **be-lik-a**...*
five barley-GEN.PL bread-GEN.SG which-NOM.PL.M BE-remain-PST(3)
'Therefore they gathered them together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which [still] remained...' (Baltramiejus Vilentas' translation of the New Testament, 1579, John 6:13, quoted after Ostrowski Ms.)

➲ In principle co-occurs with all finite and non-finite verbal forms.
➲ In periphrastic forms more frequently attaches to the auxiliary (31), though attachment to the participle is also attested (32).

(31) *Apie t-as serij-as ir pakartojim-us jau buv-o daug*
about that-ACC.PL.F series-ACC.PL and repetition-ACC.PL already AUX-PST(3) many
*kalbė-t-a ir **te-bėra** kalb-a-m-a.*
speak-PST.PP-DF and TE-BE+AUX.PRS.3 speak-PRS-PP-DF
'It has been already said a lot about these series and repetitions and they are still being talked about.'[3]

(32) *ir kalb-a apie daug k-ą, apie k-ą jau*
and speak-PRS(3) about many what-ACC about what-ACC already
*buv-o kalbė-t-a ir **yra** **te-be-kalb-a-m-a**.*
AUX-PST(3) speak-PST.PP-DF and AUX.PRS.3 TE-BE-speak-PRS-PP-DF
'... and they talk about many things which have already been discussed and are still being talked about.' (LKT)

➲ The negative continuative has acquired a more discourse-related use 'no longer' > 'already no more':

(33) *Laik-as pra.ei-s ir ne-be-at.ei-s.*
time-NOM.SG pass-FUT(3) and NEG-BE-come-FUT
'Time will pass and won't come back again.'[4]

4.1.2. Progressive

Rather restricted in usage, mostly occurring in non-finite clauses headed by converbs or participles.

(34) *Net ap.si.ašaroj-au be-skaity-dam-a.*
even shed.tears-PST.1SG BE-read-CNV-SG.F
'I even shed a few tears while reading (it).'[5]

(35) *Pa-mači-au j-į be-stov-i-nt prie ol-os įėjim-o...*
PRV-see-PST.1SG 3-ACC.SG.M BE-stand-PRS-PA at cave-GEN.SG entrance-GEN.SG
'I saw him standing at the entrance to the cave...'[6]

In this function, *be-* is optional:

(36) *Dviratinink-ai važiuo-dam-i žinuči-ų siųs-ti ne-galė-s.*
cyclist-NOM.PL drive-CNV-PL.M message-GEN.PL send-INF NEG-can-FUT(3)
'Cyclists won't be allowed to send messages while driving.'[7]

(37) *...ne-žin-o, k-ą reiški-a jaus-ti tėv-ą stov-i-nt*
NEG-know-PRS(3) what-ACC.SG mean-PRS(3) feel-INF father-ACC.SG stand-PRS-PA
sau už nugar-os.
self:DAT behind back-GEN.SG
'[They] don't know what it means to feel one's father standing behind one's back.'[8]

The function of *be-* here is probably to emphasize the temporal meaning of the participle, which in the absence of *be-* can have a broader range of adverbial meanings, such as conditional or causal.
Rare examples of periphrastic progressive forms with *be-* attached to the present active participle are attested only with stative verbs (38); in Old Lithuanian, the progressive was more widely attested, cf. (39).

(38) *Aš bū-si-u be-mieg-ąs, kai at.ei-s-i man-ęs guldy-ti.*
I:NOM AUX-FUT-1SG BE-sleep-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M when come-FUT-2SG I-GEN lay.down-INF
'I will be already sleeping when you come to put me to bed.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 250)

(39) *Tu awinaeli-o ne-wir-k kolei ira be-szind-ans.*
you:NOM lamb-GEN.SG NEG-boil-IMP while AUX:PRS:3 BE-suck-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
'Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk.', lit. 'Do not boil a lamb while it is sucking [it's mother]' (Jonas Bretkūnas' translation of Luther's Bible, 1579–1590, Gen. 34:26, quoted after Schmalstieg 1987: 101)

With dynamic verbs the progressive meaning of this periphrastic construction is marginal and is close to the avertive (see next section), always implying either the breach of the natural course of events (40) or the approach of the culmination of the process (41).

(40) *Autobus-as buv-o be-grįžt-ąs į Lietuv-ą iš Ryg-os...*
bus-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) BE-return-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M in Lithuania-ACC.SG from Riga-GEN.SG
'The bus was on its way back to Lithuania going from Riga...' (report of an accident near Riga)[9]

(41) *Tai aišku tamsu – saul-ė jau buv-o be-nu.si.leidž-ia-nt-i!*
that clearly dark sun-NOM.SG already AUX-PST(3) BE-decend-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F
'Surely, it's dark – the sun has almost set by that time!'[10]

4.1.3. Avertive

"An action which was potentially imminent but did not ultimately get realized" (Kuteva 2001: 78). A gram well-attested cross-linguistically (Kuteva 1998).
Has been described in the literature as "compound inceptive tenses" or "compound continuative tenses", both labels being inadequate.

(42) *Skubiai už-si-met-ė rūb-ą ir buv-o be-iš-ein-a-nt-i,*
hurriedly PRV-RFL-throw-PST(3) clothes-ACC.SG and AUX-PST(3) BE-PRV-go-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F
tačiau pri.si.min-ė, k-o čia at-ėj-us-i.
but recall-PST(3) what-GEN.SG here PRV-go-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F
'She hurriedly slipped the clothes over her and was about to go, but remembered for what reason she had come here.' (LKT)

Contexts intermediate between the pure avertive (the action denoted by the verb phrase did not happen at all) and the pure progressive (ongoing action) are attested, where the action did happen but was interrupted:

(43) *Pon-as Kalvait-is buv-o be-ein-ąs į savo kambar-į*
mister-NOM.SG p.n.-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) BE-go-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M in self's room-ACC.SG
antr-ame viešbuči-o aukšt-e, bet kažkodėl netrukus grįžt-a atgal.
second-LOC.SG.M hotel-GEN.SG floor-LOC.SG but for.some.reason soon return-PRS(3) back
'Mr. Kalvaitis left to go (lit. was going) to his room on the second floor of the hotel, but soon comes back.' (LKT)

Historically, the Avertive is a specific development of the Progressive (Ulvydas (ed.) 1971: 146; Ambrazas 1990: 180–181), stemming from the generalization of the interruption implicature frequent in the "focalized" uses (Bertinetto et al. 2000: 517) of the Progressive such as the Old Lithuanian (44).

(44) *Tawa tarn-as buw-a be-gan-ans aw-is sawa*
your servant-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) BE-pasture-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M sheep-ACC.PL свой
Tiew-o, ir at.eij-a Lęw-as.
father-GEN.SG and come-PST lion-NOM.SG
'Your servant has been keeping his father's sheep, and a lion came...' (Jonas Bretkūnas' 1579–1590 translation of Luther's Bible, Sam. 17:34, cited after Ambrazas 1990: 181)

4.1.4. *be-* in admirative contexts

Ulvydas (red.) (1971: 145–146): "present participles with *be-* and no copula express events which are suddenly perceived or recognized and which cause surprise or other emotional attitude". This function, well attested in folklore, seems to be a peculiar development of the progressive.

(45) *...ogi Seim-e, pa.si.rod-o, j-is be-dirb-ąs grup-ėje,*
and seim-LOC.SG appear-PRS(3) 3-NOM.SG.M BE-work-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M group-LOC.SG
kur-i vadin-a-si "francija"
which-NOM.SG.F call-PRS(3)-RFL France
'It turns out that in the Seim he is working in the group called "France"'[11]

---

[4] http://patarles.dainutekstai.lt/z/67b5083
[5] http://www.tindirindi.lt/forum/planavimas-nestumas-gimdymas/gimdymas/mano-gimdymo-istorija/ilgai-lauktas-mazylis?page=1
[6] http://www.bernardinai.lt/straipsnis/-/8303
[7] http://www.alietuvis.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=19009:dviratininkai-vaiuodami-inui-sisti-negals&catid=69:aktualijos
[8] http://www.vmsi.lt/n/4/41/Tevo-Ieskojimas

[9] http://www.lrytas.lt/-11662660661165664569-latvijoje-sudegė-autobusas-iš-lietuvos-žmonės-nenukentėjo.htm?id=12956927691293949054&view=6
[10] http://fotokudra.lt/img.php?img=239215
[11] http://www.delfi.lt/news/balsuok2011/politikoakimis/article.php?id=40931245&com=1&s=2&no=960

4.2. Modal-evaluative functions of *be-*

Understudied and hard to investigate due to (i) high degree of context-dependence and vagueness and (ii) relatively low textual frequency.

4.2.1. "Dubitative"

With events considered to have low probability, normally in the contexts of "suspended assertion" (Paducheva 2005) such as (rhetorical) questions (46), hypothetical conditionals (47), negative quantifiers (48), or complements of verbs expressing lack of knowledge or doubt (49):

(46) *Kada* **be-su.ei-si-m,** **be-su.skri-si-m** *vėl?*
when BE-come.together-FUT-1PL BE-fly.together-FUT-1PL again
'When will we ever come together, fly together again?' (LKT)

(47) *Ne, tai visai kitok-s* *jausm-as,* *j-ame* *reik-s*
no this totally different-NOM.SG.M feeling-NOM.SG 3-LOC.SG.M need-FUT(3)
su.si.gaudy-ti, jeigu dar kada nors **be-at.ei-s.**
make.out-INF of again when ever BE-come-FUT(3)
'No, this is a totally different feeling, and one has to understand it, if it ever comes again at all.' (LKT)

(48) *...nes* *turbūt* *ne kiekvien-as* **be-skait-o** *laikrašči-us.*
because maybe not each-NOM.SG BE-read-PRS newspaper-ACC.PL
'Since perhaps not everyone reads newspapers.'[12]

(49) *Abejoj-u,* *ar j-i* **be-kalbė-s** *su man-im atvirai...*
doubt-PRS.1SG Q 3-NOM.SG.F BE-talk-FUT(3) with I-INS openly
'I doubt whether she would speak with me openly at all...' (LKT)

4.2.2. "Attenuative"

Occurs when the situation is evaluated as showing a low value of some contextually relevant parameter and often implies emotional envolvement of the speaker/narrator. Usually co-occurs with expressions of low degree (50) or difficulty (51).

(50) *Daktar-ai* *iš.ėj-o,* *su.leid-ę* *Jurg-ui* *vaist-ų,*
doctor-NOM.PL go.away-PST(3) inject-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M Jurgis-DAT.SG medicine-GEN.PL
bet j-ie *mažai* **be-pa.dėj-o.**
but 3-NOM.PL.M little BE-help-PST(3)
'The doctors left having injected Jurgis some medicines, but these medicines hardly helped him.' (LKT)

(51) *...jaun-i* *žmon-ės* *sunkiai* **be-su.si.kalb-a** *su vyresni-aisiais.*
young-NOM.PL.M man-NOM.PL hardly BE-agree-PRS(3) with elder-INS.PL.M.DEF
'... the young and the elder understand each other only with difficulty.'[13]

In the context of quantificational expressions this use of *be-* implies that the quantity is regarded as low, cf. (52):

(52) *Teritorij-os* *miškingum-as* *1958 m.* **be-su.dar-ęs** *23,9 proc. ...*
territory-GEN.SG beforestedness-NOM.SG BE-constitute-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
pa-didėj-o *iki 32 proc.*
PRV-grow-PST(3) to
'The territory covered with forest, which in 1958 constituted (just) 23.9%, ... has grown to 32%.' (LKT)

➲ This use of *be-* is close to the restrictive function of *te-*, and in many contexts these prefixes seem to be interchangeable. The main difference between the two is that *be-* introduces an emotional attitude lacking with *te-*:

(53) a. *J-is* ANTRADIENI-AIS **te-nu.ei-dav-o** *į* *universitet-ą.*
3-NOM.SG.M Tuesday-INS.PL TE-come-HAB-PST(3) in university-ACC.SG
'He came to the university only on Tuesdays.' (neutral statement)

b. *J-is* ANTRADIENI-AIS **be-nu.ei-dav-o** *į* *universitet-ą.*
3-NOM.SG.M Tuesday-INS.PL BE-come-HAB-PST(3) in university-ACC.SG
'He came to the university only on Tuesdays.' (something prevented *him* from coming more often, or the speaker wishes *he* came more often)

A possible link with the continuative function can be suspected in examples like (54), but note that the "attenuative" use of *be-* is freely compatible with telic/punctual eventualities (50), which do not co-occur with the Continuative *tebe-*.

(54) *Ši-omis* *dien-omis Kolk-oje* **be-gyven-a** *vos 20 lyvi-ų*
this-INS.PL.F day-INS.PL Kolka-LOC.SG BE-live-PRS(3) hardly Livonian-GEN.PL
kalb-a *kalb-a-nči-ų ...* *žmoni-ų.*
language-INS.SG speak-PRS-PA-GEN.PL people-GEN.PL
'These days in Kolka there remain living hardly 20 people speaking Livonian.'[14]

4.2.3. "Universal"

In concessive conditionals with wh-words; have been documented in Drotvinas 1963 and Paulauskienė & Tarvydaitė (1986: 178–179).

(55) *...kur pasaul-yje* **be-gyven-au,** *visur* *jauči-au-si* *tik pakeliui...*
where world-LOC.SG BE-live-PST.1SG everywhere feel-PST.1SG-RFL only on.the.way
'...wherever I lived in the world, everywhere I felt myself being on the way...' (LKT)

(56) *Koki-a* *valdži-a* **be-at.ei-dav-o,** *j-is* *dirb-o.*
which-NOM.SG.F power-NOM.SG BE-come-HAB-PST(3) 3-NOM.SG.M work-PST(3)
'Whoever took power he kept working.'[15]

4.2.4. "Long ago" -contexts

It is unclear which of the above functions of *be-* is instantiated in constructions with the adverbial *seniai* 'long ago':

(57) *Seniai* *knyg-ą* *rank-oje* **be-laik-iau.**
long.ago book-ACC.SG hand-LOC.SG BE-hold-PST.1SG
'I haven't held a book in my hands for a long time.'[16]

(58) *Seniai* *jau* **be-pa-raš-iau,** *bet priežast-is* *daugiau nei akivaizd-i...*
long.ago already BE-PRV-write-PST.1SG but reason-NOM.SG more than obvious-NOM.SG.F
'I have not written anything for a long time, but the reason is more than obvious.'[17]

It could be both the "attenuative" ('long ago' → 'less than desirable') and "dubitative" (cf. the affinity of this meaning with negation in Russian (59) and the implication 'P occured long ago' → 'P has not occured for a long time').

(59) *Ja* *uže* *davno* **ne derža-l** *v ruk-ax* *knig-u.*
I:NOM already long.ago NEG hold-PST(SG.M) in hand-LOC.PL book-ACC.SG
'=(57)'

---

[12] http://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=10150093254023523&id=201678468522
[13] http://forumas.draugas.lt/messageview.cfm?catid=82&threadid=29191&title=jaunimas-suauge-kalba-skirtingomis-kalbomis-mokykla-mokslai
[14] http://www.way2latvia.com/lt/keliones-latvija/kolka
[15] http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3319&kas=spaudai&st_id=17699
[16] http://www.hotnot.lt/profilis_ajax.php?vardas=karstaskraujas
[17] http://mindaugas.blogspot.com/2006/06/futbolas.html

4.3. Some generalizations

➲ The aspectual functions of *be-* are clearly interrelated. As is claimed by Ostrowski (Ms.), the historically original meaning is the continuative, going back to the adverbial particle meaning 'still' (60). The avertive is believed to have developed from the progressive (see above), thus the putative development in (61).

(60) *ir   warto-ke-m   kun-a   sawa   kolei   **be**   iaun-as.*
    and use-IMP-1PL body-ACC.SG own   while still young-NOM.SG.M
    '...and let us use our body while it is still young.' (Jonas Bretkūnas, Postilla,
    1591, I 237.17-18, quot. after Ostrowski, Ms.)

(61) continuative > progressive > avertive
                              ? > admirative

        specialized continuative reinforced with *te-*

➲ Establishing mutual relationships between the modal-evaluative meanings of *be-* is a more difficult task, even if a purely synchronic perspective is taken (for a historical study there does not seem to be enough reliable data available, though cf. Ostrowski 2011b). As a putative common semantic feature of the three different modal-evaluative functions of *be-*, the rather abstract notion "low on a contextually relevant scale" may be taken:

– with the "attenuative" function, the scale relates to the "quality" of an actual situation;
– with the "dubitative" function, the relevant scale is that of the probability of the situation taking place in the real world;
– the "universal" use in concessive conditionals can be analysed as follows: the consequence is taken to be true even in the least probable of the cases denoted by the antecedent, which creates a scalar implicature whereby the consequence is also true in all other, more probable cases (cf. König 1986: 231).

➲ If the mutual relations of the functions **inside** the two domains of the uses of *be-* can be established with some degree of reliability, it is hardly possible to envisage any common rationale applying **both** to the aspectual and the modal-evaluative functions of this prefix, though it can be hypothesized that the latter can also ultimately go back to the pragmatic extensions of the continuative, cf. (54). This question, however, remains open pending sufficient and reliable historical evidence.

➲ From the cross-linguistic perspective, the majority of the functions of *be-* do not seem to be frequently expressed by morphological means, especially in the languages of Europe. Though the languages of the region (Slavic, Germanic and Hungarian) are rich in verbal prefixation, their preverbs express spatial and perfectivizing meanings. The "nearest" cases of prefixes with aspectual functions from the imperfective domain are attested in the languages of the Caucasus, Ossetic (Tomelleri 2011) and Mingrelian (Harris 1991). As to the scalar modal-evaluative uses of *be-*, the expression of such meanings has not been investigated cross-linguistically, but it does not seem that they are frequently expressed by bound morphology.

5. Co-occurrence restrictions of "external" prefixes

"External" prefixes are subject to rather peculiar constraints on mutual combinations.

➲ Strict linear order *te-ne-be-*; examples like (62) and (63), though semantically well-formed, are extremely rare and considered to be "borderline".

(62) *t-ų   boči-ų,   kur-iems   ir   mir-us,   j-ų   vėl-ės   čia pat*
    that-GEN.PL dad-GEN.PL which-DAT.PL.M and die-PST.PA 3-GEN.PL soul-NOM.PL here INTF

te-be-ne-rim-sta,   ne-pa.liek-a   vien-ų   savo   aini-ų.
TE-BE-NE-calm.down-PRS(3) NEG-leave-PRS(3) one-GEN.PL own offspring-GEN.PL
'... those elders, whose souls, even when they die, still do not calm down, do not leave alone their offsprings.' (LKT)

(63) *Žalgiris **te-be-ne-tur-i**   (įdom-us   žod-is,   ar ne?) pinig-ų.*
    p.n.   TE-BE-NE-have-PRS(3) interesting-NOM.SG.M word-NOM.SG Q NEG money-GEN.PL
    'Žalgiris [a basketball team — *P.A.*] still does not have money.' — with a metalinguistic comment about *tebeneturi*: 'a funny word, isn't it?'[18]

➲ Combinations of "external" prefixes are very restricted semantically:
– *ne-* and *te-* can combine with *be-* only in its continuative meaning;
– in combination with *be-*, *te-* does not retain any of the functions it has independently;
– the restrictive *te-* does not combine with negation:

(64) a. ***Te-ne-atėj-o***   *PRAN-AS.*
        TE-NEG-come-PST(3) Pranas-NOM.SG
        intended: 'Only Pranas did not come.'

    b. ***Ne-atėj-o***   *tik*   *PRAN-AS.*
        NEG-come-PST(3) only   Pranas-NOM.SG
        'id.'

Though cf. (65) — the only example of this kind I know of:

(65) *GERAŠIRD-Ė   BUTKIEN-Ė   vien-a   **te-ne**-už.mirš-dav-o*
    kindhearted-NOM.SG.F Butkiene-NOM.SG one-NOM.SG.F TE-NEG-forget-HAB-PST(3)
    savo   kaimyn-ės   Šnervien-ės...
    own   neighbour-GEN.SG Šnerviene-GEN.SG
    'Only the kindhearted Butkienė alone did not forger her neighbour Šnervienė.'
    (J. Tumas-Vaižgantas, "Nebylys", example courtesy of Axel Holvoet)

6. Conclusions

Lithuanian "external" prefixes are interesting for the following reasons:

➲ they have not received enough attention in the descriptive and theoretical literature and remain underdocumented;

➲ they show an exceptional degree of polyfunctionality and context-dependence of interpretation, as well as peculiar combinatory restrictions with respect to verbal forms and each other;

➲ their functions are exceptional for verbal prefixes attested in the genetically and areally related languages (notably, they have no counterparts in Latvian and Latgalian), and some of them (e.g. the restrictive meaning of *te-*) constitute a clear typological rarity;

➲ thus they can be considered among the most typologically outstanding features of Lithuanian grammar, regretfully neglected both by traditional linguists and by typologists.

Abbreviations
ACC – accusative, AUX – auxiliary, CNV – converb, DAT – dative, DEF – definite, DF – default agreement, F – feminine, FUT – future tense, GEN – genitive, HAB – habitual, IMP – imperative, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, INTF – intensifier, LOC – locative, M – masculine, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, NPST – non-past tense, OB – object, PA – active participle, PL – plural, PP –past participle, PRS – present tense, PRV – preverb, PST – past tense, Q – question particle, RFL – reflexive, RSTR –restrictive, SB – subject, SBJ – subjunctive, SG – singular

---

[18] www3.krepsinis.net

References

Ambrazas V. (1990). *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov* [*Comparative Syntax of Participles in Baltic Languages*]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Ambrazas V. (ed.) (1997). *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

Andronovas A.V. (1995). Priešdėlinių veiksmažodžių kirčiavimas morfologinės akcentologijos požiūriu. *Baltistica* 30(1), 93–100.

Arkadiev P. (2010). Notes on the Lithuanian restrictive. *Baltic Linguistics* 1, 9–49.

Arkadiev P. (2011a). Aspect and actionality in Lithuanian on a typological background. In: D. Petit, Cl. Le Feuvre, H. Menantaud (eds.), *Langues baltiques, langues slaves*. Paris: Éditions CNRS, 57–86.

Arkadiev P. (2011b). On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2, 37–78.

Arkadiev P. (2011c). O funkcijax prefiksa *be-* v litovskom jazyke [On the functions of the prexix *be-* in Lithuanian]. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 7 (3), 252–257.

Arkadiev P. (2012). Participial complementation in Lithuanian. In: V. Gast, H. Diessel (eds.), *Clause Linkage in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Data-Driven Approaches to Cross-Clausal Syntax.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 285–334.

Bertinetto P.M., K.Ebert & C. de Groot (2000). The progressive in Europe. In: Ö. Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 516–558.

Dambriūnas L. (1959). Verbal aspects in Lithuanian. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 7, 253–262.

Dambriūnas L. (1960). *Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių aspektai*. Boston: Lietuvių enciklopedijos spaustuvė.

Dambriūnas L., A. Klimas & W.R. Schmalstieg (1966). *Introduction to Modern Lithuanian*. Brooklyn, New York: Franciscan Fathers.

de Penanros H. (2010). La préfixation en lituanien: le cas de iš-. *Faits de Langues – Les Cahiers* 2, 105–137.

Drotvinas L. (1963). Ustupitel'nye konstrukcii litovskogo literaturnogo jazyka [Concessive constructions in Standard Lithuanian]. *Kalbotyra* 7, 145–170.

Dryer M. & M. Haspelmath (eds.) (2011). The World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. Available online at http://wals.info/

Dzikaras L. (2011). Lietuvių ir latvių veiksmažodžių priešdėlio *at-* semantinė analizė remiantis kognityvine lingvistika. BA Thesis, Vilnius University.

Endzelins J. (1971/1906). *Latyšķie predlogi* [Latvian Prepositions]. P. II. In: J. Endzelins. *Darbu izlase*. T. I. Rīga: Zinātne, 521–655. (1st ed. Jur'ev, 1906).

Evans N. (1995). A-quantifiers and scope in Mayali. In E. Bach, E. Jelinek, A. Kratzer & B.H. Partee (eds.), *Quantification in Natural Languages*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 207–270.

Fraenkel E. (1962-1965). *Litauisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Bd. I–II. Heidelberg: Winter; Göttingen: Vandenhoec & Ruprecht.

Galnaitytė E. (1959). Leksičeskie značenija glagol'noj pristavki *po-* v sootvetstvii s litovskoj pristavkoj *pa-* [Lexical meanings of the Russian verbal prefix *po-* in comparison with Lithuanian prefix *pa-*]. In: V.V. Vinogradov (ed.), *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie* [*Slavic Linguistics*.] Moscow.: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 59–71.

Geniušienė E. (2006). Passives in Lithuanian (in comparison with Russian). In: W. Abraham, L. Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and Typology. Form and Function*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29–61.

Geniušienė E., Nedjalkov V.P. (1988). Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian. In: V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 369–386.

Harris A.C. (1991). Mingrelian. In: *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus. Vol. 1. The Kartvelian Languages*. Delmar, New York: Caravan Press, 313–394.

Klimas A. (1987). The Lithuanian participles: Their system and functions // *Lituanus* 33, 38–73.

König E. (1986). Conditionals, concessive conditionals, and concessives: areas of contrast, overlap, and neutralization. In E.C. Traugott et al. (eds.), *On Conditionals*. Cambridge: CUP, 229–246.

König E. (1991). *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge.

Kozhanov K.A. (2011a). Lietuvių kalbos priešdėlio *da-* sematika arealiniame kontekste. In: T. Civjan, A. Judžentis, M. Zavjalova (eds.), *Baltai ir slavai: Dvasinių kultūrų sankirtos. Tauptartinė mokslo konferencija akad. Vladimirui Toporovui atminti*. Vilnius: Valstybės žinios, 42–43.

Kozhanov K.A. (2011b). Semantic networks of Lithuanian verbal prefixes *nu-* and *už-*. In: J. Pakerys, E. Žilinskaitė (red.), *Morfologijos seminaras, skirtas prof. Albertui Rosinui atminti. Pranešimų tezės*. Vilnius, 13–14.

Kozhanov K.A. (2013 +). Istorija izučenija glagol'nyx prefiksov v litovskom jazyke [The history of the study of Lithuanian verbal prefixes]. *Slavjanovedenije*, 2013 (to appear).

Kurschat Fr. (1876). *Grammatik der Littauischen Sprache*. Halle: Waisenhaus.

Kuteva T. (1998). On identifying an evasive gram: Action narrowly averted. *Studies in Language* 22/1, 113–160.

Kuteva T. (2001). *Auxiliation. An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LKT: Lietuvių kalbos tekstynas, http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/

Mathiassen T. (1996a). *A Short Grammar of Lithuanian*, Columbus, OH : Slavica.

Mathiassen T. (1996b). *Tense, Mood and Aspect in Lithuanian and Latvian. Meddelelser av Slavisk-baltisk avdeling*, Universitetet i Oslo, No. 75.

Ostrowski N. (2010). Negacja zewnętrzna / negacja wewnętrzna, czyli o historii lit. *nebe-*. Talk at the conference *Perspectives on Baltic Philology 2*, Poznań.

Ostrowski N. (2011a). Iš lietuvių kalbos istorinės morfologijos problemų: apie *nebe*(-) ir *bent* kilmę. *Lietuvių kalba* 5.

Ostrowksi N. (2011b). Apie veiksmažodžio priešdėlio *be-* funkcijas XVI a. tekstuose. In: J. Pakerys, E. Žilinskaitė (red.), *Morfologijos seminaras, skirtas prof. Albertui Rosinui atminti. Pranešimų tezės*. Vilnius, 13–14.

Ostrowski N. (to appear). Pochodzenie litewskiego afiksu duratywnego *teb(e)-*. To appear in S. Schab, D. Skrzypek, P. Zborowski, eds., *Logos et mundus*. Poznań.

Ostrowski N. (Ms.). On the origin of the Lithuanian verbal prefix *be-*.

Otrębski J. (1965). *Gramatyka języka litewskiego*. T. 3. Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe.

Paducheva E.V. (2005). Negation in Russian: suspended assertion and duality. Paper presented at *The Fifth Annual Conference of the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Association*, The University of Kansas, 22–23 October.

Paulauskas J. (1958). Veiksmažodžių preišdėlių funkcijos dabartinėje lietuvių literatūrinėje kalboje, *Literatūra ir kalba* 3: 301–453.

Paulauskienė A. & D. Tarvydaitė (1986). *Gramatikos normos ir dabartinė vartosena*. Kaunas: Šviesa.

Rinholm H.D. (1980). *Toward the Semantic Distinctive Features of Lithuanian Prepositions and Preverbs: An Invariant Component Analysis*. Indiana University PhD dissertation.

Rinholm H.D. (1990). On the meaning of the Lithuanian preposition and preverb *už, už-*. In: B. Metuizāle-Kangere & H.D. Rinholm (eds.), *Symposium Balticum. A Festschrift to Honour Professor Velta Rūķe-Draviņa*. Hamburg: Buske.

Schleicher A. (1856). *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache. Bd. I. Grammatik*. Prag: Calve.

Schmalstieg W.R. (1987). *A Lithuanian Historical Syntax*. Columbus (OH): Slavica.

Senn A. (1966). *Handbuch der lithauischen Sprache. Bd. I. Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Sližienė N. (1961). Apie sudurtines pradėtines veiksmažodžių formas. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 4, 67–72.

Sližienė N. (1967). Lietuvių literatūrinės kalbos sudurtinių veiksmažodžio formų struktūra. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 9, 63–84.

Sližienė N. (1995). The tense system of Lithuanian. In: R. Thieroff (ed.), *The Tense Systems in European Languages*, Vol. II. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 215–232.

Smoczyński W. (2007). *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Wilno: Vilniaus Universitetas.

Stolz Th. (1989). Zum Wandel der morphotaktischen Positionsregeln des Baltischen Reflexivzeichens. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 9/1, 13–27.

Stundžia B. (1995). *Lietuvių bendrinės kalbos kirčiavimo sistema*. Vilnius: Petro ofsetas.

Tomelleri V. (2011). Sulla categoria dell'aspetto verbale in Osseto. In: *Anatolistica, indoeuropeistica e oltre nelle memorie dei seminari offerti da Onofrio Carruba (anni 1997–2002) al Medesimo presentato*. Tomo I. Milano: Qu.A.S.A.R. S.R.L., 67–111.

Ulvydas K. (red.) 1971. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika. II tomas. Morfologija*. Vilnius: Mintis.

Vaillant A. (1947). Lituanien *be-*, slave *-bě*. *Révue des études slaves* 23, 151–152.

Wiemer B. (2000). Partizipien zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik: Ein Überblick zu aspektuellen, diathesebezogenen und diskursrelevanten Eigenschaften im modernen Litauischen. In: B. Wälchli, F. Zúñiga (Hrsg.), *Sprachbeschreibung und Typologie*. Bern: Universität Bern, 65–81.

Wiemer, B. (2002). *Grammatikalisierungstheorie, Derivation und Konstruktionen: am Beispiel des klassifizierenden Aspekts, des Passivs und des Subjektimpersonals im slavisch-baltischen Areal*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Konstanz.

Wiemer B. (2006). Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (A typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41:1, 33–49.

Zinkevičius Z. (1981). *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. T. II. Vilnius: Mokslas.