

## The perfect in Lithuanian and Latvian: a contrastive and comparative study

### 1. Preliminaries

The Baltic languages Lithuanian and Latvian have not heretofore figured prominently in the theoretically and typologically oriented discussions of tense and aspect in general and perfect grams in particular:

- not discussed in Dahl (1985) and even in Dahl (ed.) (2000);
- not included into the survey of the European perfects in Lindstedt (2000) or Dahl & Hedin (2000).

The only theoretically informed works on the perfect in the Baltic languages we know of:

- on Lithuanian: Geniušienė & Nedjalkov (1988) (in English) and Geniušienė (1989) (in Russian), Wiemer (2012) on the typologically rare ‘have’-resultative in Lithuanian (in English), Sakurai (2015) on Lithuanian (in English, yet unpublished).
- Nau (2005) on Latvian (in Latvian).

Our study:

- the first typologically oriented contrastive study of the uses of the perfect grams in Lithuanian and Latvian;
- based both on elicited and corpus data.

In both Baltic languages the perfect grams are expressed by periphrastic constructions consisting of the auxiliary ‘be’ and an Active Past Participle agreeing with the Nominative subject, cf. (1a) and (1b). The auxiliary can appear in any tense. In the Present the auxiliary can sometimes be omitted.

(1) PQ4: Question: You MEET my sister (at any time in your life up to now)?

a. Lithuanian

*Ar es-i mat-ęs mano seser-į?*  
Q AUX.PRS-2SG see-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M my sister-ACC.SG

b. Latvian

*Vai es-i satic-īs man-u mās-u?*  
Q AUX.PRS-2SG meet-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M my-ACC.SG sister-ACC.SG  
‘Have you met my sister?’

Apart from the Perfect, both Latvian and Lithuanian have synthetic Present, Past and Future tenses which may compete with the Perfect at least in some contexts. Additionally, in Lithuanian there is also a Past Habitual. (Note that inflectional morphology of both Baltic languages is fairly complicated and involves much allomorphy and cumulation.)

Table 1. Synthetic tenses in Lithuanian

	Present	Past	Past Habitual	Future
<i>matyti</i> ‘see’	1Sg <i>matau</i> 2Sg <i>matai</i> 3 <i>mato</i> 1Pl <i>matome</i> 2Pl <i>matote</i>	1Sg <i>mačiau</i> 2Sg <i>matei</i> 3 <i>matė</i> 1Pl <i>matėme</i> 2Pl <i>matėte</i>	1Sg <i>matydavau</i> 2Sg <i>matydavai</i> 3 <i>matydavo</i> 1Pl <i>matydavome</i> 2Pl <i>matydavote</i>	1Sg <i>matysiu</i> 2Sg <i>matysi</i> 3 <i>matys</i> 1Pl <i>matysime</i> 2Pl <i>matysite</i>

Table 2. Synthetic tenses in Latvian

	Present	Past	Future
<i>satikt</i> ‘meet’	1Sg <i>satieku</i> 2Sg <i>satiec</i> 3 <i>satiek</i> 1Pl <i>satiekam</i> 2Pl <i>satiekat</i>	1Sg <i>satiku</i> 2Sg <i>satiki</i> 3 <i>satika</i> 1Pl <i>satikām</i> 2Pl <i>satikāt</i>	1Sg <i>satikšu</i> 2Sg <i>satiksi</i> 3 <i>satiks</i> 1Pl <i>satiksim</i> 2Pl <i>satiksīt</i>

We will focus both on similarities and differences in the functions and patterns of use of the Lithuanian and Latvian Perfects.

## 2. The data

1) “The Perfect Questionnaire” (PQ) from Dahl (ed.) (2000: 800–809) consisting of about 150 examples:

- 7 Lithuanian and 4 Latvian native speakers (female, age 20–50, unfortunately, all linguists or philologists);
- manually annotated for the verb forms used in each example;
- considerable variation in both languages, with the same speaker often allowing different possible translations for a single input (all counted separately);
- contexts strongly (> 4 Perfect translations for Lithuanian, > 3 Perfect translations in Latvian) and moderately (> 1 Perfect translation for both languages) favouring the Perfect selected and analysed.

2) The LiLa parallel Corpus comprising original Lithuanian and Latvian texts (literary works by prominent writers published after 1991) and their translations into the other of the two languages, as well as translations of EU documents into both Latvian and Lithuanian. There is no morphological annotation, which makes search for Perfect forms very time- and effort-consuming.

– Our subcorpus consists of original Latvian texts and their translations into Lithuanian (about 1.5 million words). Perfect constructions have been extracted by searching for Active Past Participle forms with a final sequence *-usi* (e.g. *darīj-us-i* do-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F)<sup>1</sup> and *-uši* (e.g. *darīj-uš-i* do-PST.PA-NOM.PL.M)<sup>2</sup>. Participles accompanied by the auxiliary ‘be’ in the non-negated Present, Past or Future tenses have been selected manually and identified as forms of the Perfect. “Bare” Active Past Participle, ambiguous between Present Perfect and Evidential, as well as negated forms, have not been analysed.

– The final results include about 1400 Latv. sentences containing Perfect forms ( $\approx$  1200 FemSg forms and  $\approx$  200 randomly selected MascPl forms) of which 56% are translated into Lith. by synthetic tense forms and only 34% by Perfect forms. 7% are translated by Active and Passive Participles serving as independent predicates (marked as “PTCP FIN” in Table 3<sup>3</sup>). At least some of these participles are in fact Present Perfect forms with the omitted auxiliary.

<sup>1</sup> The final string *-us-i* PST.PA-NOM.SG.F is less common and therefore easier to identify than *-is* PRS.PA-NOM.SG.M, which is also found in the NomSg forms of some productive noun classes.

<sup>2</sup> The MascPl forms of Active Past Participles are chosen in order to verify the distribution of the FemSg forms with *-us-i*. Translations of both forms show almost identical distributions.

<sup>3</sup> “PTCP FIN” is a label for participles used in attributive and adverbial functions, as well as heads of non-finite complement clauses.

Table 3. Overall distribution of the Lithuanian translations of the Latvian perfect in LiLa

Latv. original →	all forms		PRS PRF		PST PRF		FUT PRF	
<b>Lith. translations ↓</b>	<b>1405</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100%</b>
PRS	58	4%	55	8%	2	0%	1	2%
PST	689	49%	402	57%	275	43%	12	19%
FUT	15	1%	0	0%	0	0%	15	24%
HAB	28	2%	14	2%	14	2%	0	0%
PRS PRF	137	10%	135	19%	2	0%	0	0%
PST PRF	301	21%	7	1%	294	46%	0	0%
FUT PRF	37	3%	2	0%	1	0%	34	55%
PTCP FIN	99	7%	72	10%	27	4%	0	0%
PTCP NFIN	26	2%	10	1%	16	3%	0	0%
IMP	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no verb	14	1%	9	1%	5	1%	0	0%

3) LMLVTK (The Balanced Corpus of Modern Latvian): ca. 4.5 mil. tokens, several subcorpora. We used the non-annotated subcorpus miljons-2.0 in order to search for individual examples containing combinations of particular Perfect forms with certain words.

4) DLKT (The Corpus of Modern Lithuanian): ca. 140 mil. tokens of different (mostly written) genres, of which more than 60% is constituted by press. No morphological annotation, search facilities very limited, especially when searching for constructions involving more than one wordform.

### 3. Similarities between the Baltic Perfects

**3.1.** In both languages the Perfects have two primary functions correlating with the actionality of the lexical verb (cf. Geniušienė 1989, who rather appeals to the traditional notion of “perfective” vs. “imperfective” aspect, which have been shown to instantiate actional, rather than viewpoint, meanings, cf. Arkadiev 2011):

– The subject-oriented resultative (in the sense of Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 9) with telic verbs

(2) LiLa

a. Lithuanian

*Es-u sukait-us-i ir išprakaitav-us-i*  
AUX.PRS-1SG become.hot-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F and perspire-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F  
*kaip ir visi šokėjai.*

b. Latvian

*Esm-u nokars-us-i un nosvīd-us-i*  
AUX.PRS-1SG become.hot-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F and perspire-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F  
*tāpat kā visi dancotāji.*

a = b ‘I am hot and sweating like all dancers.’

Transitive input verbs normally have the possessive resultative meaning (in the sense of Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 9–10), and only if they denote events somehow affecting the subject:

(2) PQ43: I COLLECT some two hundred dolls by now.

a. Lithuanian

*Es-u surink-us-i du šimt-us lėli-ų.*  
AUX.PRS-1SG collect-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F two hundred-ACC.PL doll-GEN.PL

## b. Latvian

*Šobrīd esm-u sakrāj-is ap divsimt lēll-ēm.*  
 this.moment AUX.PRS-1SG collect-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M about two.hundred doll-DAT.PL  
 a = b ‘I have collected about two hundred dolls by now.’

– The experiential (Dahl 1985: 141–144), mostly with atelic verbs including statives, cf. (1) above and (4):

(4) PQ51: [A is visiting a town she used to live in several years ago; now she lives somewhere else.] A: I LIVE here, so I know every street here.

## a. Lithuanian

*Es-u čia gyven-us-i, taigi žin-au vis-as gatv-es.*  
 AUX.PRS-1SG here live-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F so know-PRS.1SG all-ACC.PL.F street-ACC.PL

## b. Latvian

*Es te esm-u dzīvoj-us-i,*  
 1SG.NOM here AUX.PRS-1SG live-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F  
*tāpēc zinu šeit katru ielu.*  
 a = b ‘I have lived here, so I know every street here.’

– The “inclusive” or “universal” function denoting the situation lasting up to the reference time (Dahl 1985: 141–144), prominent with the English or Bulgarian Perfects (Iatridou et al. 2001), is not characteristic of the Baltic Perfects, being altogether impossible in Lithuanian and only rarely attested in Latvian (cf. Nau 2005: 147–148), cf. (6). In such contexts the Present tense is the default option in both languages.

(5) PQ49: [A is still living in this town.] A: I LIVE here for seven years.

## a. Lithuanian

*Aš gyven-u čia septyneri-us met-us.*  
 1SG.NOM live-PRS.1SG here seven-ACC.PL.M year-ACC.PL

## b. Latvian

*Es šeit dzīvoj-u septiņ-us gad-us.*  
 1SG.NOM here live-PRS.1SG seven-ACC.PL year-ACC.PL  
 a = b ‘I have been living here for seven years.’

(6) Latvian (Nau 2005: 147)

*viņ-š vienmēr ir izcēl-ie-s ar t-o,*  
 3-NOM.SG.M always AUX.PRS.3 stand.out-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M-RFL with that-ACC.SG  
*ka vienmēr meklēj-is kaut ko jaun-u.*  
 that always search-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M something-ACC.SG new-ACC.SG

‘... he [=Gidon Kremer] has always stood out because he has always been looking for something new.’

3.2. In both languages the Past and the Future Perfects can have compositional interpretations, e.g. resultative in the past/future, cf. (7)–(9).

(7) resultative in the past (LiLa)

## a. Latvian

*Bij-ā-m nošķied-uš-ie-s un nogur-uš-i.*  
 AUX-PST-1PL sprinkle-PST.PA-NOM.PL.M-RFL and get.tired-PST.PA-NOM.PL.M

## b. Lithuanian

*Buv-o-m nu-si-tašk-ę ir pavarg-ę.*  
 AUX-PST-1PL PVB-RFL-sprinkle-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M and get.tired-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M

a = b ‘We were sprinkled with water and tired.’

## (8) resultative in the future (LiLa)

## a. Latvian

*Mēs vēl redzēsimies pēc tam,*  
*kad es būš-u nomir-us-i.*  
 when 1SG.NOM AUX-FUT-1SG die-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F

## b. Lithuanian

*Mes dar matysimės, ir tada,*  
*kai aš bū-si-u mir-us-i.*  
 when 1SG.NOM AUX-FUT-1SG die-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F

a = b 'We will see each other even after I am dead (lit. will have died).'

## (9) experiential in the past (LiLa)

## a. Latvian

*Saimniece nedaudz uztraucās,*  
*kaut gan sav-ā mūž-ā bij-a pie-redzēj-us-i vēl vairāk.*  
 although RPOSS-LOC.SG lifetime-LOC.SG AUX.PST-3 PVB-see-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F still more  
 'The hostess was slightly worried, even though she had seen much in her life.'

## b. Lithuanian

*Šeimininkė bemaž nesijaudino,*  
*nes savo gyvenim-e buv-o mači-us-i dar ne toki-ų dalyk-ų.*  
 because RPOSS life-LOC.SG AUX-PST.3 see-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F still not such-GEN.PL thing-GEN.PL  
 'The hostess was almost not worried because she had seen even worse things in her life.'

In addition to that, the Past and Future perfects have specific functions not related directly to the basic meanings.

– Past Perfect: “antiresultative” (Plungian & van der Auwera 2006):

## (10) PQ37: You OPEN the window (and closed it again)?

## a. Latvian

*Tu bij-i atvēr-is log-u?*  
 2SG.NOM AUX.PST-2SG open-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M window-ACC.SG

## b. Lithuanian

*Ar buv-ai atidar-ęs lang-q?*  
 Q AUX-PST.2SG open-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M window-ACC.SG

a = b 'Did you open (lit. had opened) the window?'

It is notable that the Past Perfect appears to be more robust in Lithuanian than the Present Perfect: of the 636 sampled Latvian sentences with the Past Perfect 294 (46%) were translated by means of the Perfect into Lithuanian, which is a significantly higher incidence than in the case of the Present Perfect ( $p < 0,0001$ , chi-square).

This is related to the functional asymmetry between the different tense forms of the Perfect in Latvian and Lithuanian (cf. e.g. Dahl 1985: 144–149; Squartini 1999; Plungian & van der Auwera 2006; Sitchinava 2013 on the Pluperfect as a separate gram type).

– Future Perfect: epistemic possibility or inferential

## (11) LiLa

## a. Latvian

*Bū-s kād-i dzērāj-i sa-mainīj-us-i durv-is.*  
 AUX-FUT.3 some-NOM.PL.M drunkard-NOM.PL PVB-change-PST.PA-NOM.PL.M door-ACC.PL

## b. Lithuanian

*Kok-ie girtuokli-ai bu-s su-painioj-ę dur-is.*  
 some-NOM.PL.M drunkard-NOM.PL AUX-FUT.3 PVB-confuse -PST.PA.NOM.PL.M door-ACC.PL

'It seems that some drunkards have found the wrong door.'

3.3. In both languages, the Perfects are not used as narrative tenses, this role being fulfilled by the synthetic Preterites (see below on the uses of the Latvian Perfect, though):

(12) PQ10: [Do you know what happened to my brother yesterday? I saw it myself.]

We WALK in the forest. Suddenly he STEP on a snake. It BITE him in the leg. He TAKE a stone and THROW (it) at the snake. It DIE.

a. Lithuanian

*Mes ėjome miške. Staiga jis užmynė ant gyvatės. Ji įgėlė jam į koją. Jis paėmė akmenį ir metė į gyvatę. Gyvatė mirė.*

b. Latvian

*Mēs pastaigājāmies mežā. Pēkšņi viņš uzkāpa čūskai. Tā iekoda viņam kājā. Viņš paņēma akmeni un meta ar to čūskai. Tā nomira.*

a = b ‘We were walking in the forest. Suddenly he stepped on a snake. It bit him in the leg. He took a stone and threw it at the snake. It died.’

However, it is possible for both Lithuanian and Latvian to use the Past Perfect in the narrative to mark the first event of an episode with further events marked by the Preterite (the “introductory” or “stage-setting” function, cf. Sitchinava 2013: 107–124):

(13) LiLa

a. Latvian

<b>Bij-a</b>	<b>at-nāk-us-i</b>	<b>vien-a</b>	<b>sportist-e,</b>		
AUX.PST.3	PVB-come-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F	one-NOM.SG.F	athlete(F)-NOM.SG		
<b>atnes-a</b>	<b>ieteikum-a</b>	<b>vēstul-i</b>	<b>no Olimpisk-ās</b>	<b>komitej-as.</b>	
bring-PST.3	recommendation-GEN.SG	letter-ACC.SG	from Olympic-GEN.SG.DEF	committee-GEN.SG	

b. Lithuanian

<b>Buv-o</b>	<b>atėj-us-i</b>	<b>vien-a</b>	<b>sportinink-ė,</b>		
AUX.PST.3	come-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F	one-NOM.SG.F	athlete(F)-NOM.SG		
<b>atneš-ė</b>	<b>rekomendacin-į</b>	<b>laišk-q</b>	<b>iš Olimpini-o</b>	<b>komitet-o.</b>	
bring-PST.3	recommendatory-ACC.SG.M	letter-ACC.SG	from Olympic-GEN.SG.M	committee-GEN.SG	

a = b ‘A athlete woman came [lit. had come], she brought a recommendation letter from the Olympic Committee.’

3.4. In both languages the Present Perfect is attested with time position adverbials such as “yesterday”, “on Monday” or “last year”, though the Preterite is certainly the preferred option; more research is needed on this issue.

(14) Lithuanian (DLKT)

*Tiesa, Prezident-as pirmadien-į yra pareišk-ęs,*  
true president-NOM.SG Monday-ACC.SG AUX.PRS.3 announce-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M  
*kad dar palieka galimybę Premjerui pačiam atsistatydinti.*

‘True, the President announced (lit. has announced) on Monday that there is still a possibility for the Prime Minister to resign himself.’

(15) Lithuanian (DLKT)

*Panaš-ų bals-q pernai es-u girdėj-ęs ne kartą,*  
similar-ACC.SG.M voice-ACC.SG last.year AUX.PRS-1SG hear-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M not once  
*bet paukščių nematydavau.*

‘I have many times heard such a voice last year, but haven’t seen the birds’

(16) Latvian (LLMVTK)

[...] *mēģini saprast,*  
*no kur-as pus-es tu vakar es-i nāc-is.*  
from which-GEN.SG.F side-GEN.SG 2SG.NOM yesterday AUX.PRS-2SG come-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M

‘You are trying to understand which direction you came (lit. have come) from yesterday.’

## (17) Latvian (LLMVTK)

*Eiropas Parlamenta deputāte Inese Vaidere*

*18. februār-ī ir paziņoj-us-i par iz-stā-šan-o-s*  
 18 February-LOC.SG AUX.PRS.3 announce-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F about PVB-stand-NML-ACC.SG-RFL  
*no apvienības “Tēvzemei un Brīvībai”*

‘EP deputy Inese Vaidere announced (lit. has announced) on November 18th that she was leaving the alliance “For Fatherland and Freedom”.’

Adverbials denoting indefinite time periods in the past (“in the childhood”), are certainly fine with the Perfect (cf. also Quirk et al. 1985: 195 on similar patterns in English):

## (18) Lithuanian (DLKT)

*Katedr-oje ir vaikyst-ėje es-u buv-us-i,*  
 cathedral-LOC.SG and childhood-LOC.SG AUX.PRS-1SG be-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F  
*bet tik atsitiktinai.*

‘I have been to the cathedral in my childhood as well, but only by accident.’

## (19) Latvian (LLMVTK)

*Kaut arī pat-s jaunīb-ā esm-u mazliet pa-niekoj-ie-s,*  
 although also self-NOM.SG.M youth-LOC.SG AUX.PRS-1SG a.bit PVB-dally-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M-RFL  
*nu jau labu laiku nenāk ne prātā.*

‘Although I have dallied a bit in my youth myself, it has been a long time now that I would think (about dallying).’

## 4. Differences between the Baltic Perfects

4.1. In general, it appears that in Latvian the perfect is grammaticalized to a greater extent than in Lithuanian:

– greater frequency of the Perfect in Latvian: in LiLa of the sampled 707 Latvian sentences with the Present Perfect only 135 (19%) were translated by means of the Present Perfect into Lithuanian, while 471 (67%) were translated by the synthetic tenses (Past or Present);

– in many contexts, including ex. (1) above, Lithuanian speakers allow the Perfect to occur in free variation with the Preterite, cf. the following minimal pair where both Latvian sources have the Present Perfect:

## (20) Lithuanian (LiLa)

a. *Pavarg-au nuo amžin-o stumdym-o iš virš-aus.*  
 get.tired-PST.1SG from constant-GEN.SG.M shoving-GEN.SG from top-GEN.SG  
 ‘I am tired of the constant shoving from the above.’

b. *Es-u pavarg-us-i nuo užsikrautos nereikalingų darbų naštos.*  
 AUX.PRS-1SG get.tired-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F from  
 ‘I am tired of the self-imposed burden of unnecessary work.’

## (21) Latvian (LiLa)

a. *Esm-u nogur-us-i no mūžīg-ās virsvadīb-as.*  
 AUX.PRS-1SG get.tired-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F from constant-GEN.SG.F.DEF supervising-GEN.SG  
 ‘I am tired of the constant supervising.’

b. *Esm-u nogur-us-i no sev uzlikto lieko darbu nastas.*  
 AUX.PRS-1SG get.tired-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F from  
 ‘I am tired of the self-imposed burden of unnecessary work.’

4.2. The Latvian Perfect is more advanced into the domain of “current relevance” or “perfect of result” (as opposed to resultative proper as defined by Nedjalkov & Jaxontov

1988) than the Lithuanian Perfect. While in Lithuanian the Perfect admits transitive verbs only in the experiential and lexically restricted possessive resultative meanings, in Latvian examples like (22) are also possible, where Lithuanian only admits the Preterite.

(22) PQ40: [The window is open but A has not noticed that. A asks B: why is it so cold in the room?] B: I OPEN the window.

a. Latvian

*Esm-u atvēr-is log-u.*  
 AUX.PRS-1SG open-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M window-ACC.SG

b. Lithuanian

*Aš atidari-au lang-q.*  
 1SG.NOM open-PST.1SG window-ACC.SG  
 a = b 'I have opened the window.'

In LiLa "current relevance" is conveyed by half of all the examples with Present Perfect forms in the Latvian original sentences.

Table 4. Distribution of the uses of the Latvian Present Perfect in LiLa

total	707	100%
current relevance	368	52%
experiential	155	22%
resultative	116	16%
anterior	53	8%
other	15	2%

66% of Latvian examples of the Present Perfect denoting current relevance are translated into Lithuanian by the synthetic Past, and only 13% by the Present Perfect.

Table 5. Distribution of the Lithuanian translations of the uses of the Latvian Perfect in LiLa

	current relevance	experiential	resultative	anterior	other	total
total	368 (100%)	155 (100%)	116 (100%)	53 (100%)	15 (100%)	707 (100%)
PRS	31 (8%)	6 (4%)	8 (7%)	8 (15%)	2 (13%)	55 (8%)
PST	<b>243 (66%)</b>	79 (51%)	40 (35%)	33 (62%)	7 (47%)	402 (57%)
HAB	1 (0%)	13 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14 (2%)
PRS PRF	<b>47 (13%)</b>	49 (32%)	26 (22%)	10 (19%)	3 (20%)	<b>135 (19%)</b>
PST PRF	4 (1%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (1%)
FUT PRF	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (13%)	2 (0%)
PTCP FIN	28 (8%)	4 (3%)	38 (33%)	1 (2%)	1 (7%)	72 (10%)
PTCP NFIN	5 (1%)	1 (1%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (1%)
IMP	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)
no verb	8 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	9 (1%)

(23) translation by the synthetic Past (LiLa)

a. Latvian

*Esm-u pa-ņēm-us-i, pie-ņēm-us-i naud-u*  
 AUX.PRS-1SG PVB-take-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F PVB-take-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F money-ACC.SG  
*un jūtos labi.*

b. Lithuanian

*Pa-ėmi-au, pri-ėmi-au pinig-us ir jauči-uo-si ger-ai.*  
 PVB-take-PST.1SG PVB-take-PST.1SG money-ACC.PL and feel-PRS.1SG-RFL good-ADV  
 a = b 'I have taken, accepted the money, and feel well.'

The distribution of translations by the Lithuanian synthetic Past vs. Present Perfect (and by the other forms) shows the same tendency for the experiential and the anterior meanings. However, the Latvian examples with the resultative meaning have a smaller share of translations by the Lithuanian synthetic Past, which is compensated by an increase in the use of the “bare” participle forms serving as independent predicates. The latter also include Active Past participles that may be interpreted as Present Perfect forms without the auxiliary, as in (24) (but in some cases may also be forms of the Evidential).

(24) LiLa

a. Latvian

[...] *spuldz-e* *virš* *durv-īm* *ir* *gluži* *noputēj-us-i*  
 bulb-NOM.SG above door-DAT.PL AUX.PRS.3 utterly become.dusty-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F

b. Lithuanian

[...] *lemput-ė* *virš* *dur-ų* *stipr-iai* *apdulkej-us-i*  
 bulb-NOM.SG above door-GEN.PL strong-ADV become.dusty-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F  
 a = b ‘The light bulb above the door is heavily covered with dust.’

4.3. In Latvian, but not in Lithuanian, the Present Perfect can be used in the “hot news” contexts (see e.g. Dahl & Hedin 2000), though such usage does not seem to be very frequent, cf. (25). Lithuanian employs the Simple Past here. In Tables 4 and 5 above we do not single out the “hot news” usage from other “current relevance” contexts.

(25) PQ56: [A has just seen the king arrive. The event is totally unexpected.] A: The king ARRIVE!

a. Latvian

*Karal-is* *ir* *ierad-ies!* / *ierad-ā-s!*  
 king-NOM.SG AUX.PRS.3 arrive-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M.RFL / arrive-PST.3-RFL

b. Lithuanian

*Karali-us* *atvyk-o!*  
 king-NOM.SG arrive-PST.3  
 a = b ‘The king has arrived!’

In LiLa the “hot news” sentences are translated into Lithuanian by the means of the synthetic Past.

(26) LiLa

a. Latvian

*Jā, Margarēt,* *mēs* *es-a-m* *vinnēj-uš-i!*  
 yes Margaret[VOC] 1PL.NOM AUX-PRS-1PL win-PST.PA-NOM.PL.M

b. Lithuanian

*Taip,* *Margarit-a,* *mes* *laimėj-om!*  
 yes Margaret-VOC 1PL.NOM win-PST.1PL  
 a = b ‘Yes, Margaret, we have won!’

Rather than conveying new information, the Present Perfect in Lithuanian is used to emphasize what is already known, cf. (26) vs. (27).

(27) LiLa

a. Latvian

*Mēs* *es-a-m* *vinnēj-uš-i* *šaj-ā* *prāt-ā!*  
 1PL.NOM AUX-PRS-1PL win-PST.PA-NOM.PL.M this-LOC.SG mind-LOC.SG  
*Un tiesa būs vien formāls akts.*

## b. Lithuanian

*Š-iuo atžvilgi-u mes es-a-me laimėj-e,*  
 this-INS.SG.M view-INS.SG 1PL.NOM AUX-PRS-1PL win-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M  
*ir teismas bus tik aktas formalus.*

a = b 'In this respect, we have won, and the court will only be a formality.'

## 4.4. In Latvian the Perfect can be used in the contexts of reported evidentiality like (28).

(28) Latvian (Nau 2005: 149)

*Bet cit-i sak-a, ka klas-ē tu*  
 but other-NOM.PL.M say.PRS-3, that class-LOC.SG 2SG.NOM  
*es-i varēj-is bū-t arī diezgan neciešam-s.*  
 AUX.PRS-2SG can-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M be-INF also rather unbearable-NOM.SG.M  
 'But other people say you could be pretty insufferable in class.'

The more common way of expressing past evidentiality in Latvian (as in Lithuanian, see e.g. Wiemer 2006) is by means of "bare" Past Participles without any auxiliary, or by Past Participles combined with the Evidential form of the auxiliary, cf. (29), where the use of the non-evidential Present Perfect is admittedly ungrammatical.

(29) PQ60: [Do you know what happened to my brother yesterday? I did not see it, but he told me.] He WALK in the forest. Suddenly he STEP on a snake. It BITE him in the leg. He TAKE a stone and THROW (it) at the snake. It DIE.

*Viņš esot (AUX.PRS.EVID) pastaigājies (walk.PST.PA.NOM.SG.M.RFL) mežā. Pēkšņi viņš esot uzkāpis čūskai. Tā esot iekodusi viņam kājā. Viņš esot paņēmis akmeni un metis ar to čūskai. Tā esot nomirusi.*

'He was walking in the forest. Suddenly he stepped on a snake. It bit him in the leg. He took a stone and threw it at the snake. It died.'

4.5. In Latvian, the "introductory" use of the Past Perfect in narratives (see above) is often hard to distinguish from uses where the Past Perfect denotes a sudden unexpected turn of events. However, in Lithuanian the latter is translated by means of the synthetic Past.

(30) LiLa

## a. Latvian

*Eins-zwei, un viņ-a bij-a uz-zīmēj-us-i*  
 Eins-zwei and 3-NOM.SG.F AUX.PST-3 PVB-draw-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F  
*uz Andželo vaiga sarkan-balt-sarkanās stripas.*

## b. Lithuanian

*Eins-zwei ir j-i iš-pieš-ė*  
 Eins-zwei and 3-NOM.SG.F PVB-draw-PST.3  
*ant Andželo skruost-o raudon-ai—balt-ai—raudon-as juost-as.*

a = b 'Eins zwei, and she drew (lit. had drawn) red and white stripes on Angelo's cheek.'

Both interconnected uses of the Past Perfect in Latvian have served as the basis for the development of the analogous uses of the Present Perfect in the context of *praesens historicum*. There are about 20 such examples in our subcorpus of LiLa. In Tables 4 and 5 such uses are classified together with 'current relevance' and 'anterior'. In Lithuanian they are commonly translated by the Present.

(31) LiLa

## a. Latvian

*Es esm-u sa-knieb-us-i lūp-as un atbild-u [...]*  
 1SG.NOM AUX.PRS-1SG PVB-press-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F lip-ACC.PL and answer.PRS-1SG  
 'I purse (lit. have pursed) my lips and answer.'

## b. Lithuanian

Aš *su-kand-u* *dant-is* *ir* *atsak-au* [...]
   
1SG.NOM PVB-bite-PRS.1SG tooth-ACC.PL and answer-PRS.1SG
   
'I grit my teeth and answer.'

## 5. Summary and discussion

Table 6. Functions of Lithuanian and Latvian Perfects

Tense	Function	Lithuanian	Latvian
Present Perfect	resultative	yes	yes
	experiential	yes	yes
	current relevance	marginal	yes
	universal	no	marginal
	narrative	no	yes
Past Perfect	resultative-in-the-past	yes	yes
	experiential-in-the-past	yes	yes
	antireresultative	yes	yes
	introductory	yes	yes
Future Perfect	resultative-in-the-future	yes	yes
	inferential	yes	yes

1) In terms of the stages of grammaticalization of the perfect outlined in Squartini & Bertinetto (2000), the Lithuanian Present Perfect is at stage II (possessive resultative and experiential contexts) while the Latvian Present Perfect is at stage III ("current relevance", cf. Nau 2005).

2) Even in those contexts where both languages allow the use of the Perfect, Latvian seems to employ it more consistently and systematically, while in Lithuanian the Perfect is in many contexts optional and can be substituted by other verbal forms, most commonly by the Preterite. The degree of similarity between the two languages in the uses of the perfect, measured by the share of matching translations, is correlated with tense: Fut > Pst >> Prs.

3) Both Lithuanian and Latvian Perfects have a number of uses rarely figuring in the descriptions of perfect grams. Perhaps most notable is the "intrusion" of the Latvian Present Perfect into the domain of narrative tenses.

4) Desiderata for further research:

- a study of the Latvian translations of the Lithuanian Perfect, which would complement our findings based on the parallel corpus with the opposite direction of translation;
- a more direct comparison of the Baltic Perfects with their counterparts in such languages as English, Bulgarian or Spanish (e.g. on the basis of existing parallel corpora);
- lexical input of (different meanings of the) Perfects in Lithuanian and Latvian (on the latter, cf. observations in Nau 2005);
- a diachronic and areal investigation.

**Abbreviations**

1 — 1<sup>st</sup> person; 2 — 2<sup>nd</sup> person; 3 — 3<sup>rd</sup> person; ACC — accusative; ADV — adverb; AUX — auxiliary; DAT — dative; DEF — definite; EVID — evidential; F — feminine; FIN — finite; FUT — future; GEN — genitive; HAB — habitual; IMP — imperative; INF — infinitive; INS — instrumental; LOC — locative; M — masculine; NFIN — nonfinite; NML — nominalization; NOM — nominative; PA — active participle; PL — plural; PRF — perfect; PRS — present; PST — past; PTCP — participle; PVB — preverb; Q — question particle; RFL — reflexive; RPOSS — reflexive possessive; SG — singular; VOC — vocative.

## Sources

DLKT: The Corpus of Modern Lithuanian, <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/>

LiLa: Lithuanian-Latvian Parallel Corpus,

<http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/page.xhtml?id=paralleLiLA>

LLMVTk: The Balanced Corpus of Modern Latvian, <http://www.korpuss.lv/>

## References

- Arkadiev, Peter (2011). Aspect and actionality in Lithuanian on a typological background. In: Daniel Petit, Claire Le Feuvre & Henri Menantaud (eds.), *Langues baltiques, langues slaves*, 57–86. Paris: Éditions CNRS.
- Dahl, Östen (1985). *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dahl, Östen (ed.) (2000). *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Östen & Eva Hedin (2000). Current relevance and event relevance. In: Dahl (ed.) 2000: 385–402.
- Geniušienė, Emma (1989). O vzaimodejstvii perfekta i vida v litovskom jazyke [On the interaction between perfect and aspect in Lithuanian]. *Baltistica* 3(2), 285–291.
- Geniušienė, Emma & Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (1988). Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of resultative constructions*, 369–386. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Iatridou, Sabine, Elena Anagnostopoulou & Roumyana Izvorski (2001). Observations about the form and meaning of the perfect. In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 189–238. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Lindstedt, Jouko (2000). The perfect — aspectual, temporal and evidential. In: Dahl (ed.) 2000: 365–384.
- Nau, Nicole (2005). Perfekts un saliktā tagadne latviešu valodā [Perfect and compound present in Latvian]. *Baltu filoloģija* 14(2), 137–154.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Sergej Je. Jaxontov (1988). The typology of resultative constructions. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, 3–62. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Plungian, Vladimir & Johan van der Auwera (2006). Towards a typology of discontinuous past marking. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 59(4), 317–349.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, New York: Longman.
- Sakurai, Eiko (2015). Perfect in Lithuanian: An empirical study. Presentation at the 12<sup>th</sup> *International Congress of Balticists*, Vilnius, 28–31 October 2015.
- Squartini, Mario (1999). On the semantics of the Pluperfect: Evidence from Germanic and Romance. *Linguistic Typology* 3(1), 51–89.
- Squartini, Mario & Bertinetto, Pier Marco (2000). The simple and compound past in Romance languages. In: Dahl (ed.) 2000: 403–440.
- Wiemer, Björn (2006). Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (a typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41(1), 33–49.
- Wiemer, Björn. (2012). The Lithuanian HAVE-resultative – a typological curiosum? *Lingua Posnaniensis* 54(2), 69–81.