_____

ASPECT AND ACTIONALITY IN LITHUANIAN
ON A TYPOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Peter M. Arkadiev (Moscow)

INTRODUCTION

In this paper I am going to present some preliminary remarks on the problem of
the realization of aspectual meanings in Lithuanian, seen from the perspective
of current typologically oriented theory of aspect[1]. Despite the fact that there
has been quite a number of papers and monographs touching upon the problem
of aspect in Lithuanian[2], till the last decade the linguists who addressed this

---

2. See in particular Safarewicz (1938), Dambriūnas (1959, 1960), Бух (1961),
   Галнайтите (1963, 1966), Galnaitytė (1962, 1978), Paulauskas (1958), Paulauskienė
   (1971, 1979), Reklaitis (1980), Matthiassen (1996), Вимер (2001), Wiemer (2002),
   Holvoet, Čižik (2004).

issue, in my opinion, have been systematically misinterpreting some basic facts about the Lithuanian verbal system. In this paper I will not only assume, with the majority of my predecessors, that Lithuanian aspect is not a grammatical category *sensu stricto*, but rather is expressed by lexical and derivational means, but, following some recent contributions (cf. Вимер 2001, Wiemer 2002, Holvoet, Čižik 2004) will also make one step further and claim that in Lithuanian there is no aspectual opposition "perfective" vs. "imperfective" at all. I will try to demonstrate that what serves as the basis of Lithuanian aspectual (in a broader sense of the term) system is not *aspectual viewpoint* (as this term is used by, e.g. Smith 1997/1991), but *actionality*, i.e. lexical-semantic properties of verbs, such as telicity, atelicity, stativity, punctuality, etc., and that apparent correlations between actional properties of particular verbs and verb classes and their use in perfective or imperfective contexts, which are attested in Lithuanian, are due to the universal compositional rules of mapping between lexicon, semantics and morphosyntax.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 I will briefly outline the theory of aspect and actionality I am adhering to in this paper, and give a most general typological overview of aspectual systems. In Section 2 I will address the problem whether "grammatical" or "lexical" aspect exists in Lithuanian and will motivate the negative answer to this question. In Section 3 the system of actional classes of Lithuanian will be described, and its typological peculiarities will be discussed.

1. A Theory of Aspectuality

In this paper, a *two-component* theory of aspect is assumed[3]. That means that a clear distinction is drawn between (at least) two different kinds of phenomena, which exist independently of one another, are structured by different notions, and are represented by different linguistic and metalinguistic means. One component I will call **actionality**[4]; by actionality I understand those components of the lexical meaning of the predicate which reflect the temporal and causal structure of the event it describes, i.e. stativity vs. dynamicity, telicity vs. atelicity etc. A more precise definition of actionality will be given below.

---

3. Cf. Маслов (1984), Breu (1994), Smith (1997/1991), Bertinetto, Delfitto (2000), Sasse (2002).

4. Cf. Tatevosov (2002); different terms are used for this notion, cf. *aspectual class* (Vendler, 1967; Verkuyl, 1989), *inherent lexical content* (Klein, 1994), *situation type* (Smith, 1997/1991, 1995), *eventuality description* (de Swart, 1998), *eventuality type* (Filip, 1999), *таксономическая категория* (Падучева, 1996, 2004), etc.

The other major component of aspectual systems is the *aspectual viewpoint* (cf. Smith 1997/1991, Johanson 2000). Two aspectual viewpoints are to be distinguished : the **imperfective** vs. the **perfective**. The principal difference between these two viewpoints lies in the realm of pragmatics, and pertains to the *perspective* the speaker imposes upon the situation described by the predicate[5] : using the imperfective viewpoint the speaker assumes a *synchronic* perspective on the situation, which is presented as ongoing and lacking external boundaries (more precisely, the existence of this boundaries is irrelevant to the speaker, and they lie outside of his "window of attention"). On the contrary, the perfective viewpoint imposes a *retrospective* point of view, whereby the situation is seen in its entirety as having external boundaries (be they inherent, as with telic eventualities like *write a letter*, or arbitrary, as with atelic eventualities like *walk*). Using a commonly assumed metaphor, the imperfective viewpoint allows the speaker to refer to the "internal structure" of the situation, whereas the perfective aspect does not.

It is important to underscore that both components of aspect are assumed to be universal in the following sense : all human languages are able to describe different extralinguistic situations as static or dynamic, telic or atelic, as well as to impose upon them one of the two viewpoints – despite the fact that the ways these notions are applied and encoded are subject to considerable cross-linguistic variation. What is of particular relevance for the discussion of Lithuanian is the assumption that the two aspectual viewpoints are available on the level of semantics and pragmatics even in those languages which possess no formal means for their expression[6]. Let us illustrate this with the data from Hungarian[7] :

(1)   a.   *Amikor megérkez-t-ünk Frici   rögtön   telefonál-t.*
              when   arrive-PST-1PL   Frici(NOM)   right.away   phone-PST
              "When we arrived, Frici phoned right away"   → perfective

       b.   *Amikor   megérkez-t-ünk   Frici   éppen   telefonál-t.*
              when   arrive-PST-1PL   Frici(NOM)   just.then   phone-PST
              "When we arrived, Frici was speaking on the telephone" → imperfective

In Hungarian, there is no consistent and productive morphosyntactic means to mark the distinction between perfective and imperfective[8] ; however, this by no means implies that the viewpoints are irrelevant for Hungarian : it is obvious, that although formally identical, the occurrences of the wordform *telefonált*

---

5. Cf. Comrie (1976), Dahl (1985), Падучєва (1996), Klein (1994).
6. See in particular Csirmaz (2004a, 2004b).
7. Csirmaz (2004b).
8. Cf. Kiefer (1994), Csirmaz (2004c).

"phone+past tense" instantiate perfective viewpoint in (1a) and imperfective viewpoint in (1b).

Certainly, the two components of the domain of aspect I have just outlined do not exhaust the range of aspectually relevant semantic features; for instance, the whole variety of meanings that belong to the so-called "quantificational" aspect[9] have been left out; they constitute an important separate layer (or, more probably, several layers) of aspectual meanings, which interact in a complex way with both actionality and viewpoint (it is necessary to mention here that quantificational aspect is richly represented in Lithuanian on the level of both lexical, i.e. derivational, operations, and grammatical categories[10]; these phenomena, however, will be only very briefly touched upon in this paper, since they require a separate detailed investigation).

Let us turn back to the notion of actionality. As I have already mentioned, it is assumed to be universally available to human languages on a par with the aspectual viewpoint. Now it is necessary to clarify in which sense actional notions are cross-linguistically valid. As is now more or less evident, the classical Vendler's classification of situations into *states*, *activities*, *accomplishments* and *achievements*, as well as a whole variety of its refinements proposed by different linguists during the last three decades[11] are by no means universal[12]. Languages vary not only in that they may assign verbs with similar meanings to different actional classes, but also – and more importantly – in their whole actional systems (see especially Tatevosov, 2002). This, however, by no means implies that actional meanings show no cross-linguistic consistency and do not allow typological comparison; that they vary across languages is merely an indication of the need for the linguists to use more refined methods when studying actionality.

Since actional classes are not identical in different languages, there is a need for a universal system of notions which would be able to describe them in a way that allows cross-linguistic comparison, coupled with an empirical procedure with the help of which it would be possible to discover actional classes in any given language. A theory of actionality which incorporates both features in question has been proposed in Tatevosov (2002). Below I will give a brief description of it.

---

9. Cf. Dressler (1968), Cusic (1981), Храковский (red., 1989), Шлуинский (2006a).
10. Cf. Dambriūnas (1960: ch. IV, V), Галнайтите (1980a, 1980b), Генюшене (1989), Geniušienė (1997), Roszko, Roszko (2006).
11. See Tatevosov (2002) for a critical overview.
12. Cf. Ebert (1995), Johanson (1996), Tatevosov (2002), Botne (2003).

The theory of actionality I adhere to in this paper assumes that all actional classes in human languages are composed of *universal elementary actional meanings* which constitute a small closed[13] set of semantic primitives. The universal elementary actional meanings are **state** (S ; "sleep", "know John"), **process** (P ; "work", "walk in the park"), **multiplicative process** (M ; "cough", "twinkle"), **entry-into-a-state** (ES ; "fall", "write a letter")[14], **entry-into-a-process** (EP ; "start running"), **quantum** of a multiplicative process (Q ; "give a cough")[15]. Among the six elementary actional meanings it is useful do distinguish between *homogeneous* or *durative* (S, P, M) and *non-homogeneous* or *instantaneous* ones (ES, EP, Q), the latter correspond to e.g. transitions of Pustejovsky (1991).

The discovery procedure proposed by Tatevosov and based on the elementary actional meanings crucially hinges on the universal aspectual viewpoints. Let us call the pair <Ipf, Pf>, where Ipf and Pf are the sets of elementary actional meanings a given verb V is able to express when combined with the imperfective and perfective viewpoints, respectively, the **actional characteristic** of V. Note that both sets may contain more than one element, and, moreover, that Ipf may be empty (as e.g. with the English verb *find*). We may now define **actional class** as the (maximal) set of verbs with identical actional characteristics. In order for the actional classification of verbs in a given language to be representative the sample of verbs whose actional characteristics are studied has to be sufficiently large (no less than hundred lexemes) and include predicates of different semantic classes (see Tatevosov, 2002 : 358).

Cross-linguistic research on actionality[16] has shown that the empirical procedure just outlined is a useful and effective method which allows not only to discover actional classes in a given language in a non-aprioristic fashion, but also to compare actional classes across languages. Such a comparison has

---

13. This set, however, is not aprioristic : the meanings which are assumed to belong to it have proved to be necessary for the description of actionality in several particular languages; moreover, in case cross-linguistic research shows that more elementary actional meanings are necessary, the set will be augmented accordingly.

14. In the case of *fall* it is the subject of the predicate which enters a new state "be fallen, lie on the ground", whereas with *write a letter* it is rather the object which changes its state becoming "written".

15. This actional meaning was not used in the original paper by Tatevosov, who identifies it with ES ; I have introduced it for the reasons of conceptual symmetry.

16. Some of its results are presented in Tatevosov (2002), some other may be found in Татевосов *et al.* (2006), Шлуинский (2006b, 2008), Arkadiev (2009).

shown that among quite a large variety of actional classes attested in particular languages there is a number of classes which consistently recur in one language after another, the so-called **cross-linguistic actional classes** (see Table 1). What is most important about Table 1 is that it clearly shows that the set of cross-linguistic actional classes identified so far is by no means similar to the set of Vendlerian classes. Indeed, **stative**, **processual** and **punctual** classes more or less correspond to Vendler's *states*, *activities* and *achievements*, but Vendler's *accomplishments* are further subdivided into **weak** and **strong telic** classes, whereas **inceptive-stative** and **ingressive-processual** classes have no corresponding Vendlerian class at all.

Table 1. Cross-linguistic actional classes (following Tatevosov, 2002: 376)

Actional class	Actional characteristic
stative	<S, S>
processual[17]	<P, P>
strong telic	<P, ES>
weak telic	<P, {ES, P}>
punctual	<–, ES>
strong inceptive-stative	<S, ES>
weak inceptive-stative	<S, {ES, S}>
strong ingressive-processual	<P, EP>
weak ingressive-processual	<P, {EP, P}>
strong multiplicative[18]	<M, Q>
weak multiplicative	<M, {Q, M}>

The typological research on actionality, despite the important results already attained, is only in its initial phase, and it is so far impossible to say anything about possible types of actional systems. However, a more or less reliable general typology of systems of grammatical aspect are at hand[19]. The most important features of this typology are the following ones : (1) whether any kind of aspectual viewpoint is grammaticalized at all ; (2) whether viewpoint is incorporated into the system of expressing temporal reference (tense), or is independent of it. There are languages which do not have grammaticalized viewpoint, e.g. German, Hungarian (Csirmaz, 2004), Eskimo (Swift, 2000), Maybrat (West Papuan, cf. Dahl, 2001) ; in this paper I will argue that

---

17. I prefer this term to *atelic* used by Tatevosov.
18. This class is not identified by Tatevosov as a cross-linguistic actional class; subsequent research has shown that this class may be considered such on a par with the weak-multiplicative one.
19. Cf. especially Dahl (1985), Bybee, Dahl (1989), Bybee *et al.* (1994), Dahl (ed., 2000), Ebert, Zúñiga (eds., 2001).

Lithuanian belongs to this (in fact, quite heterogeneous) class, too. Among the languages with grammaticalized viewpoint distinctions there are some, e.g. French and Italian as well as quite a number of languages all over the world, where viewpoints do not constitute an independent grammatical category but rather contribute to the distinctions between tenses; usually the opposition between the imperfective and perfective viewpoints is limited to **past** tenses (e.g. in French there is *Imparfait* which expresses imperfective viewpoint in the past, and *Passé Composé* and *Passé Simple* with a perfective value, also in the past). Other languages with grammaticalized viewpoints express them independently of temporal reference – either because their tense systems are only marginally grammaticalized, as in Classical Arabic, or because they have full-fledged grammatical categories separately encoding tense and aspect (e.g. Russian or English).

However, another important parameter for the typology of aspectual systems is also necessary. As Bybee, Dahl (1989) and Bybee *et al.* (1994: 87-90) show, there are some crucial differences between those Perfective[20] grams which are historically derived from *Perfects* (*Anteriors* in their terminology) and those which go back to the combinations of verbs with the so-called *bounders* – adverbial elements or satellites (Talmy, 1985) with originally locational meaning, which "pair with verbs to create a sense of completion or... attainment of a limit" (Bybee *et al.*, 1994: 87). The difference between the anterior-based systems (e.g. the Romance one) and the bounder-based ones (which are attested in the Slavic languages, in some languages of the Caucasus etc.) are, according to them, as follows[21] : (1) Anterior-based Perfectives are usually inflectional whereas bounder-based Perfectives are usually derivational : not all verbs allow perfectivization by means of bounders, "not all verbs take the same bounders, and the bounders often add meanings other than perfectivity" (Bybee *et al.*, 1994: 88) ; (2) Anterior-based Perfectives have meanings which are closer to the corresponding universal aspectual viewpoint : they denote "a single event, seen as an unanalyzed whole" (Dahl, 1985: 78), whereas bounder-based Perfectives "do not quite fit this prototype, since they emphasize that a limit has been attained, not just that the event is viewed as an unanalyzed whole", and (3) "the derivational Perfective occurs with all tenses and is not necessarily

---

20. I use Initial Capitals in order to distinguish the names of cross-linguistic and language particular grammatical categories from the names of universal semantic categories.
21. Bybee *et al.* (1994: 88-89).

restricted to the past as the inflectional Perfective usually is" (Bybee *et al.*, 1994: 89).

This correlation between formal (synchronic as well as diachronic) and functional properties of the Perfective is reflected, among other things, in such important parameter as the co-occurrence of Perfective forms with temporal adverbials[22]. In languages with inflectional Anterior-based Perfective this form may be more or less freely combined with adverbials of temporal duration (such as French *pendant deux heures* "for two hours") yielding the meaning that the situation denoted by the predicate completely occupies the time interval denoted by the adverbial, cf. the following examples from de Swart (1998: 373):

(2)   a. *Anne a été malade pendant deux semaines*.
            "Anne has been ill for two weeks."
         b. *Eve a chanté la Marseillaise pendant cinq minutes*.
            "Eve has sung the Marseillaise for five minutes."

This is due to the fact that the perfective viewpoint, which regards the situation as bounded, is the only one which is compatible with the boundedness imposed on the situation by temporal adverbials (cf. Krifka, 1998). By contrast, the imperfective viewpoint, which assumes an internal perspective on the situation, cannot logically co-occur with durative adverbials; indeed, Romance Imperfective Past when combined with such adverbials, yields a habitual or iterative meaning (cf. Bertinetto, Delfitto, 2000: 201).

However, derivational bounder-based Perfective behaves quite differently in this respect. Since its use normally entails not only the external perspective on the situation which is viewed as bounded, but also implies that the situation has reached some kind of natural endpoint, such Perfective does not usually co-occur with durative adverbials, cf. the following Russian example:

(3)   a. **Мальчик   на-писа-л(PF)   письм-о   два   час-а.*
            boy (NOM.SG)   PRV-write-PST   letter-ACC.SG   two (ACC)   hour-ADNUM
            Intended: "The boy was engaged in writing a letter for two hours, but did not finish it."

In Russian and other Slavic languages it is the Imperfective Past which expresses the same meaning as French examples in (2), cf. the following example:

---

22. See Bertinetto, Delfitto (2000) for a detailed discussion of this matter.

(3)   b. *Мальчик*   *писа-л(PF)*   *письм-о*   *два*   *час-а*.
             boy (NOM.SG)   write-PST   letter-ACC.SG   two (ACC) hour-ADNUM
             "The boy wrote a letter for two hours."

The distinction between the inflectional and derivational aspect is highly relevant to our discussion, since the situation observed in Lithuanian very much resembles a typical bounder-based system similar to those found in the Slavic languages; moreover, as stated already in Вимер (2001), it is precisely the influence of the Slavic tradition and an implicit or explicit orientation of the Lithuanianists towards looking at the Lithuanian verbal system through the prism of notions available in the Slavic aspectology which has led to some misconceptions concerning the nature of aspect in Lithuanian. I am turning to the discussion of these problems in the next section.

2. THE PROBLEM OF ASPECT IN LITHUANIAN

The Lithuanian grammatical tradition since at least Jablonskis (1922/1957) has identified a category of aspect (*veikslas*) with two members : Perfective (*įvykio veikslas* "event aspect") and Imperfective (*eigos veikslas* "process aspect"). In the late 1950-ies – mid 1970-ies there has been an important debate in Lithuanian linguistics concerning the nature and status of this aspectual opposition, partly provoked by an influential monograph (Dambriūnas, 1960), cf. especially Galnaitytė (1962, 1978), Paulauskienė (1979). Thus, A. Paulauskienė (1979: 83, 208) unequivocally states that aspect in Lithuanian "is a purely derivational category", but caveats that this concerns only the formal expression of aspectual oppositions, whereas semantically, she claims, aspect in Lithuanian is "analogous to that in other languages", and postulates a "grammatical opposition" of aspects. One of a few papers on aspect in Lithuanian published in English (Reklaitis, 1980) tries to look at Lithuanian from a more cross-linguistic point of view, and demonstrates quite a complex interaction between different kinds of formal and semantic properties of verbs and verb forms, but takes the distinction between "Perfective" and "Imperfective" verbs for granted. The same position is taken by more recent grammatical studies, too[23]. Thus, even if the grammatical status of the opposition between *įvykio veikslas* and *eigos veikslas* may be subject to doubt, the very fact that such an opposition exists in Lithuanian is considered to be a firmly established truth.

---

23. See Ambrazas (ed., 1997: 234-237), Valeckienė (1998: 285-287), Ambrazas (1999).

One of the main objectives of this paper is to argue that the very opposition between "Perfective" and "Imperfective" verbs does not exist in Lithuanian, and that the properties of verbs and verb forms which are usually accounted for in terms of this opposition are derived directly from the lexical semantics of the predicates, i.e. from their actionality (cf. the already mentioned contributions by B. Wiemer). In order to do it, I will first briefly discuss a language where such an opposition does exist, viz. Russian.

Despite the well-known facts about Russian aspectual system (and aspectual systems of Slavic languages in general[24]), that there is no uniform morphological means to express any of the two aspects and that both Perfective and Imperfective are excessively polysemous and resist characterization in terms of an abstract "invariant"[25], i.e. show characteristic properties of a bounder-based derivational aspectual system, both aspects in Russian are highly grammaticalized. This degree of grammaticalization is reflected in a whole array of features which are shared by all Perfective (resp. Imperfective) verbs and are only indirectly related to the semantics of aspect. Among the grammatical properties associated with Russian aspects are the following : (1) Perfective and Imperfective verbs have different inflectional paradigms, cf. Table 2 ; thus, all and only Imperfective verbs form a Periphrastic Future.

Table 2. Paradigms of Perfective and Imperfective verbs in Russian

	Imperfective	Perfective
Present	*рисует* ("is drawing")	*нарисует* ("will draw")
Past	*рисовал*	*нарисовал*
Future	*будет рисовать*	**будет рисовать*
Present Participle	*рисующий*	**нарисующий*

(2) Only Imperfective verbs may be embedded under phasal verbs such as "begin" or "end", cf. example (4), and only Imperfective verbs form a synthetic Passive, cf. example (5) :

(4)   a.   *Иван*   *нача-л*   *писать*(IPF)   *письм-о.*
            Ivan-NOM.SG   begin-PST   write-INF   letter-ACC.SG
            "Ivan began to write a letter."

        b.   **Иван*   *нача-л*   *на-писать*(PFV)   *письм-о.*
            Ivan-NOM.SG   begin-PST   write-INF   letter-ACC.SG

---

24. Cf. Issatschenko (1975), Маслов (1984), Dickey (2000), Зализняк, Шмелёв (2000), Петрухина (2000).

25. Cf. various contributions to Черткова (ed., 1998).

(5)   a.   *Дом*   *строи-т-ся*(IPF)   *рабоч-ими.*
             house-NOM.SG   build-PRS.3SG-REFL   worker-INS.PL
             "The house is being built by the workers."
       b.   **Дом*   *по-строи-т-ся*(PFV)   *рабоч-ими.*
             house-NOM.SG   build-PRS.3SG-REFL   worker-INS.PL
             intended meaning :
             "The house will be built by the workers."

These two features by no means exhaust the list of properties of Perfective and Imperfective verbs in Russian which may be considered grammatical[26].

Another important feature of Russian aspectual system is that the opposition Perfective ~ Imperfective may be neutralized in certain contexts (see Маслов 1984 and Вимер 2001), e.g. in the so-called historical present use, cf. (6) and the habitual meaning, cf. (7) :

(6)   *...и   вот   он*   *при-ход-ит*(IPF)   *и*   *говор-ит*(IPF)*...*
       and   now   he-NOM.SG.M   PRV-go-PRS.3SG   and   say-PRS.3SG
       "... and now he comes and says..."
(7)   *Директор*   *кажд-ый*   *день*   *за   полчаса*
       director-NOM.SG   every-ACC.SG.M   day-ACC.SG   in   half.an.hour
       под-пис-ыва-л(IPF)   *вс-е*   *документ-ы*   *и*   *у-ходи-л*(IPF)*.*
       PRV-write-IPF-PST   all-ACC.PL   document-ACC.PL   and   PRV-go-PST
       "Every day the director signed all the papers in half an hour and left."

The Imperfective verbs in (6) denote a succession of bounded events ; in the Past tense, only their Perfective counterparts would be felicitous. In (7) the adverbial of temporal extent *за полчаса* "in half an hour" clearly indicates that each event of the director's signing the documents has attained its inherent endpoint ; in an episodic context only Perfective verbs may have such meaning.

This brief discussion clearly shows that, whatever the precise nature of Perfective and Imperfective verbs in Russian may be, both categories are firmly established in Russian grammar. However, in Lithuanian it is different. As recent studies[27] have pointed out, the fact that a given verb in Lithuanian belongs to one of the three major categories – "Perfective", "Imperfective" or "Biaspectual" does not really bear on its grammatical behaviour. All Lithuanian verbs, regardless of their "aspect", have a full paradigm of inflectional (both finite and non-finite, including deverbal nouns with the suffix -*imas*/-*ymas*) and

---

26. Cf. e.g. Перцов (2001: 120).
27. See e.g. Matthiassen (1996), Вимер (2001), Wiemer (2002), Holvoet, Čižik (2004).

periphrastic forms[28]. In Lithuanian there is no strict grammatical ban on co-occurrence of "Perfective" verbs with phasal verbs, cf. example (8a) from Dambriūnas (1960: 94) and (8b) from LKŽ :

(8)   a.   *Ir   policij-a   èm-ė   j-uos*
            and   police-NOM.SG   begin-PST.3   he-ACC.PL.M
            į   vakar-ą   pa-leis-ti(PFV).
            in   evening-ACC.SG   PRV-let-INF
            "And the police began to let them go when the evening came."
       b.   *Ryt-ais   praded-a   pa-šal-ti*(PFV).
            morning-INS.PL   begin-PRS.3   PRV-cool-inf
            "It begins to freeze a bit in the mornings."

Finally, the opposition between "Perfective" and "Imperfective" verbs is never neutralized in Lithuanian : in the contexts similar to those of Russian examples (6) and (7) only "Perfective" verbs may be used[29], cf. (9) illustrating a "Perfective" verb in a habitual context :

(9)   *Sekretori-us   kasdien   per   dvi   valand-as*
       secretary-NOM.SG   every.day   in   two-ACC.PL   hour-ACC.PL
       pa-raš-o(PFV) || *raš-o*(IPF)   *tr-is*   *laišk-us*
       PRV-write-PRS.3   write-PRS.3   three-ACC.PL   letter-ACC.PL
       ir   iš-ei-na.
       and   PRV-go-PRS.3
       "Every day the secretary writes three letters in two hours and quits the office."

These facts indicate that the categories "Perfective" and "Imperfective" are in Lithuanian grammaticalized to a much lesser degree than in Russian. Further I will argue that it is possible to dispense with them altogether in favour of more fine grained actional distinctions.

   Let us now briefly look at the aspectual values Lithuanian verb forms may have (following L. Dambriūnas's insights, I look at the meanings of individual tense forms of verbs rather than on the "aspectual value" of the lexemes), focusing on the Simple Past (*būtasis kartinis laikas*). This tense form in Lithuanian is aspectually neutral, i.e. it is not associated with any of the two universal viewpoints. This is not in itself novel, since it has been traditionally assumed that Simple Past is "perfective" with "Perfective" verbs and "imperfective" with "Imperfective" verbs, cf. the following examples :

---

28. Cf. the relevant paragraphs of Ambrazas (ed., 1997).
29. Cf. Dumašiūtė (1962) and Sawicky (2000) for a discussion of historical present in Lithuanian and Sawicky (2010) on the use of Lithuanian verbs in discourse in general.

(10) a. *Tėv-as*   *ėj-o*   *į*   *kambar-į.*
          father-NOM.SG   go-PST.3   in   room-ACC.SG
          "Father was going into the room ‖ *went into the room."
      b. *Tėv-as*   *į-ėj-o*   *į*   *kambar-į.*
          father-NOM.SG   PRV-go-PST.3   in   room-ACC.SG
          "Father entered the room ‖ *was entering the room."

However, this is not the whole story, since "Imperfective" verbs are compatible with the perfective viewpoint, as the following example demonstrates :

(11) *Berniuk-as* *skait-ė* *knyg-ą*   *2*   *valand-as,*   *po*   *t-o*
      boy-NOM.SG   read-PST.3 book-ACC.SG   two   hour-ACC.PL   after   that-GEN.SG
      žiūrė-jo   *televizori-ų*   *ir*   *nu-ėj-o*   *miego-ti.*
      watch-PST.3   television-ACC.SG   and   PRV-go-PST.3   sleep-INF
      {What did the boy do yesterday afternoon ?}
       "The boy read a book for two hours, then watched TV, and then went to sleep."

In (11) only the last verb in the sequence belongs to the traditional "Perfective" class, viz. *nueiti* "to leave", whereas all other Simple Past forms are "Imperfective" ; this, however, does not preclude their use in a genuine perfective context of a succession of bounded events. The difference between *nuėjo* on the one hand and *skaitė* and *žiūrėjo* on the other lies not in the domain of viewpoint, which is perfective in all three cases[30], but rather in that of actionality : only *nueiti* denotes a telic situation with a lexically specified inherent bound ; other two verbs lack such a semantic limit, hence their combination with the perfective viewpoint denotes a situation with an arbitrary bound : (11) does not imply, for instance, that the boy finished reading the book.

    These facts are not unexpected, since Lithuanian evidently has a bounder-based aspectual system, where a primary role is played by prefixation[31]. Actually, Russian Imperfective verbs behave similarly in this respect, allowing perfective viewpoint in certain contexts. However, as we have already seen, Lithuanian and Russian differ in the degree of grammaticalization of their respective aspectual systems : Russian system has attained a very high degree of grammaticalization, whereas the Lithuanian one is located on the first steps of the common grammaticalization path. Therefore, I conclude that in Russian the possibility for Imperfective verbs to combine with perfective viewpoint in some contexts is a consequence of the special way aspectual grams are organized in this language. On the other hand, in Lithuanian, I believe, there is

---

30. Reklaitis (1980: 169) is incorrect assigning imperfective value to such uses.
31. Cf. Paulauskas (1958) and other publications already mentioned.

no need of a separate level of aspectual categories mediating between lexical-semantic properties of verbs and their aspectual behaviour.

Some further evidence against postulating grammatical aspect in Lithuanian comes from the so-called biaspectual (*dviveiksliai*) verbs. In a language with a clear-cut distinction between the Perfective and Imperfective aspects we would expect biaspectual verbs, if they exist at all, to constitute a small class of exceptions to the general pattern, and to be unstable. Indeed, this is the case in Russian[32], where there are left only a few biaspectual verbs inherited from the older period (*жениться* "to marry", *казнить* "to execute, to put to death"), whereas the majority of such verbs are newer borrowings with special suffixes (*ликвидировать* "to eliminate", *реагировать* "to react"). Both sets of biaspectual verbs are shrinking in Russian, since there is a strong tendency to use prefixes in genuinely Perfective contexts.

The situation in Lithuanian is significantly different. First of all, the "biaspectual" verbs are in no sense a marginal or exceptional phenomenon in Lithuanian: in my sample of about 200 predicates from different semantic classes there are more than 20 "biaspectual" verbs[33], many of which belong to the core of the verbal lexicon of Lithuanian (*duoti* "to give", *ateiti* "to come", *padėti* "to help", etc.)[34]. There is no clear evidence that there is a tendency to get rid of the "biaspectual" verbs by making them "Perfective" or "Imperfective". Thus, "biaspectual" verbs are recognized as an important category of Lithuanian verbal lexicon on a par with "Perfective" and "Imperfective" verbs[35]. Last but not least, the "biaspectual" class in Lithuanian is not homogeneous ; it comprises predicates which show quite different type of behaviour. The majority of Lithuanian "biaspectual" verbs are better called "aspectually-split" : their Present tense is compatible with both perfective and imperfective viewpoint, while their Simple Past is unequivocally perfective, cf. example (12) :

(12)   a.   *Jon-as*   *par-ei-na*   *namo*.
              Jonas-NOM.SG   PRV-go-PRS.3   home
              "Jonas is coming home ‖ (usually) comes home."

---

32. Cf. Зализняк, Шмелёв (2000: 71-77), Черткова (1996).

33. This is the minimal figure, in the sense that I did not include in the count those verbs for which the native speakers' judgments vary ; the number of verbs that were classified as biaspectual by at least one native speaker is about 40.

34. See Dambriūnas (1959), Ambrazas (ed., 1997: 234-237).

35. Cf. Галнайтите (1963).

     b.   *Jon-as*   *par-ėj-o*   *namo*.
          Jonas-NOM.SG   PRV-go-PST.3   home
          "Jonas came home || *was coming home."

However, there are some verbs whose Simple Past is compatible with both viewpoints; it is important to note that such verbs crucially differ from those illustrated in (11) in that when used in perfective contexts they imply a definite limit of the situation, cf. (13):

(13)   a.   *Kai* *aš*   *j-am*   *pa-skambin-a-u,*
            when I-NOM   he-DAT.SG.M   PRV-call-PST-1SG
            Jon-as   *ne-galė-jo*   *kalbė-ti,*
            Jonas-NOM.SG   NEG-can-PST.3   talk-INF
            nes *padė-jo*   *Aldon-ai*   *plau-ti*   *ind-us.*
            because help-PST.3 Aldona-DAT.SG   wash-INF   dish-ACC.PL
            "When I called on Jonas, he could not talk because he was helping Aldona to wash the dishes." → imperfective
     b.   *Jon-as*   *padė-jo*   *Aldon-ai*   *su-plau-ti*   *ind-us*
            Jonas-NOM.SG   help-PST.3 Aldona-DAT.SG   PRV-wash-INF   dish-ACC.PL
            ir   *iš-ėj-o*.
            and   PRV-go-PST.3
            "Jonas helped Aldona to wash the dishes and left." → perfective

The difference between these two types of "biaspectual" verbs in Lithuanian can be accounted for if one takes a careful look at their actional properties; such notions as "Perfective" and "Imperfective" in the sense attributed to them in traditional Lithuanian studies are of no help here (see Section 3).

    I hope to have shown so far that the traditional partition of Lithuanian verbal lexicon into "Imperfective", "Perfective" and "Biaspectual" verbs is not motivated by the system of oppositions that really exist in Lithuanian, but rather by the influence of the linguistic descriptions of the neighboring Slavic languages. The "Perfective" and "Imperfective" categories in Lithuanian are only indirectly related to the universal aspectual viewpoints and, which is no less important, are not sufficiently grammaticalized. In the next section I will turn to what I believe constitutes the core of the Lithuanian aspectual system: the actional classification of verbs.

3. ACTIONALITY IN LITHUANIAN AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

Traditionally, the classification of verbal lexemes in Lithuanian was usually limited to the tripartite distinction between "Perfective", "Imperfective" and "Biaspectual" verbs, on the one hand, and a multitude of "Aktionsarten", which

were never defined with sufficient rigidity[36]. In order to arrive at an actional classification of Lithuanian verbs that would have some cross-linguistic validity, I have applied to Lithuanian the empirical procedure described in Section 1. The sample of verbs I used contains almost 220 lexemes which fall into two classes : the morphologically simple verbs (ca. 100 lexemes) and verbs derived from them via different morphological processes (mainly prefixation) (ca. 120 lexemes). Totally, the sample includes verbs formed from some 110 roots. The reason for including the morphologically complex verbs into the sample is that without taking them into consideration the resulting classification would have been incomplete. On the other hand, the current sample cannot be said to be completely unbiased, because some roots are represented there by several derivates ; this is especially due to the fact that it is a common phenomenon in Lithuanian to have lexicalized prefix+verb combinations with a non-compositional meaning, e.g. *padėti* "to help" from *dėti* "to put" or *atidaryti* "to open" from *daryti* "to do".

As the diagnostic forms served the Present tense (*esamasis laikas*) and the already discussed Simple Past tense. It is necessary to bear in mind that the range of functions of the Lithuanian Present tense is much broader than the imperfective viewpoint *per se*, i.e. the "progressive", denoting an ongoing situation simultaneous to the moment of speech. Present may also be used habitually, in the "historical present" function in narratives[37], for reporting sequences of events the speaker is witness of (the so-called "reportive" function, cf. Dumašiūtè, 1962). For the purposes of actional classification, however, it is necessary to take into account only the genuine progressive use of the Present ; so the native speakers were always asked whether a given sentence with a Present form of the verb may be used to denote an ongoing event seen in its development; special contexts excluding non-progressive understanding of the Present were also used. With the Simple Past there was no such problem : the most natural reading of this form in a neutral context was taken into account.

Besides looking on tense forms of the verbs, special attention was paid to the ability of verbs to combine with temporal adverbials sensitive to actional distinctions, i.e. adverbials of temporal duration (*dvi minutes* "for two minutes", *pusvalandį* "for half an hour", *ilgai* "for a long time") and adverbials of temporal extent (*per dvi minutes* "in two minutes", *per pusvalandį* "in half an hour") and those adverbials which naturally combine only with predicates

---

36. Cf. Галнайтитe (1980a).
37. Cf. Michelini (1982), Sawicky (2010).

denoting events (transitions from one state or process to another), e.g. *staiga* "suddenly" of *iš karto* "at once".

The application of the discovery procedure showed that Lithuanian has quite a rich system of actional classes. In Tables 3-5 are represented, respectively, the actional classes of simple verbs, of derived verbs, and the general distribution of actional classes in the whole sample.

Table 3. Actional Classes of Simple Verbs in Lithuanian

Class	No. of lexemes	Actional characteristic	Examples
Processual	53	<P, P>	*ieškoti* "search", *rašyti* "write"
Stative	29	<S, S>	*norėti* "want", *gulėti* "lie"
Multiplicative	10	<M, M>	*kosėti* "cough", *lašėti* "drip"
Punctual	4	<—, ES>	*mušti* "hit", *rasti* "find"
Strong Telic	3	<P, ES>	*laimėti* "win", *grįžti* "return (intr.)"
Weak Telic	1	<P, {ES, P}>	*plyšti* "tear (intr.)"

Table 4. Actional Classes of Derived Verbs in Lithuanian

Class	No. of lexemes	Actional characteristic	Examples
Punctual	79	<—, ES>	*sustoti* "stop", *atrakinti* "open", *mostelėti* "wave once"
Strong Telic	18[38]	<P, ES>	*pareiti* "come home", *atidaryti* "open"
Limitative Stative	5	<—, S>	*nusnūsti* "doze for a while", *palaikyti* "hold for a while"
Weak Inceptive -Stative	4	<S, {ES, S}>	*pažinti* "know", *suprasti* "understand"
Limitative Telic	4	<—, {ES, P}>	*pažiūrėti* "watch for a while", *parašyti* "write for a while"
Processual	3	<P, P>	*pykdyti* "make angry"
Multiplicative	3	<M, M>	*mojuoti* "wave repeatedly"
Punctual-Ingressive	3	<—, EP>	*užvirti* "start boiling"
Weak Telic	2	<P, {ES, P}>	*padėti* "help"
Limitative Processual	1	<—, P>	*pasisukti* "turn around for a while"
Stative	1	<S, S>	*priklausyti* "belong"
Strong Multiplicative	1	<M, Q>	*nulašėti* 'drip'

---

38. Here all the verbs are counted for which at least some native speakers allow the progressive interpretation of the Present.

Table 5. The General Distribution of Actional Classes in Lithuanian

Class	Simple	Derived	Total
Punctual	4	79	83
Processual	53	3	56
Stative	29	1	30
Strong Telic	3	18	21
Multiplicative	10	3	13
Limitative Stative		5	5
Limitative Telic		4	4
Weak Inceptive-Stative		4	4
Punctual-Ingressive		3	3
Weak Telic	1	2	3
Limitative Processual		1	1
Strong Multiplicative		1	1

These tables reveal several important properties of the Lithuanian actional system. First of all, it is clear that the division of verbs into actional classes is much more detailed than the traditional classification into two "aspects". There is, however, a correspondence between the "traditional" aspects and the actional classes : those actional classes where Ipf and Pf are identical (i.e. Stative, Processual and Multiplicative) correspond to "Imperfective" verbs, the classes with the empty Ipf (i.e. Punctual, Punctual Ingressive and the three Limitative classes) correspond to "Perfective" verbs, and all other classes, which allow the progressive interpretation of the Present and have different Ipf and Pf (i.e. Strong Telic, Weak Telic, Strong Multiplicative, Weak Inceptive-Stative) comprise the traditional "biaspectual" verbs.

Second, there is a clear asymmetry between the simple and underived verbs in several respects. The system of actional classes of derived verbs is richer than that of the simple verbs ; actually, the latter is a subset of the former. More importantly, however, these two systems substantially differ in that the majority of the underived verbs belong to the Processual and Stative classes, while the majority of the derived verbs fall into the Punctual class.

Here we come to the main typologically peculiar feature of the Lithuanian actionality. Comparison of Tables 1 and 5 shows that Lithuanian possesses quite a number of cross-linguistic actional classes : Stative, Processual, Punctual, Strong and Weak Telic, Weak Inceptive-Stative. However, the distribution of lexemes over these classes is radically different from that found in other languages to which Tatevosov's procedure has been applied. Usually the majority of the verbs in a language belong to the Strong and/or Weak Telic classes (cf. Tatevosov, 2002: 363-367). In Lithuanian it is different. Although the Strong Telic class proves to be a well-established category in this language,

the Weak Telic class is clearly marginal, and both of them comprise no more than 10 per cent of the verbal lexicon. The majority of the verbs whose analogues in other languages fall into the Telic class, in Lithuanian are "split" into two (or even more) independent lexemes, one of which is Processual, and another is Punctual, with the following morpho-semantic relation between them : the Punctual verb is derived from the Processual one by means of a prefix, and denotes the culminating point of the process denoted by the simple verb. Examples of such "actional pairs" are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Correlative Processual and Punctual verbs in Lithuanian

Processual	Punctual	Gloss
dainuoti	***su****dainuoti*	"sing"
gerti	***iš****gerti*	"drink"
rakinti	***a****trakinti*	"unlock"
griauti	***nu****griauti*	"destroy"

It must be kept in mind, however, that such pairs are only superficially analogous to "aspectual pairs" in Russian and other Slavic languages[39]. As has been already mentioned, the distinction between the "correlative" Processual and Punctual verbs is never neutralized in Lithuanian (cf. (10)). This is clearly due to the fact that the difference between them lies not in their aspectual properties, but in their actional (i.e. lexical) content : such verbs as *rakinti* and *atrakinti* do not merely describe the same extralinguistic situation from different points of view, but refer to different situations : *rakinti* denotes a process and implies nothing about its endpoint (according to LKŽ, this verb may be used to denote the process of locking the door as well as that of unlocking it), whereas *atrakinti* "to unlock" (or *užrakinti* "to lock") denotes the instantaneous event of the object coming into the state of being unlocked (resp. locked).

It is also possible to establish similar correlations between Stative verbs such as *girdėti* "to hear" and *išgirsti* "to come to hear"[40], one of which denotes the state while the other is used to describe the entry into this state, cf. examples (14) and (15) :

---

39. Cf. the discussion in Galnaitytė (1962), Галнайтите (1963), Paulauskienė (1979), Вимер (2001), Аркадьев (2008).

40. Note that in such "pairs" the formal relation between the Stative verb and the Punctual derivate denoting the entry into the corresponding state is more complex than mere prefixation : usually the Punctual verb has different stem grade and inflectional class, see Аркадьев (2010).

(14) a. *Girdži-u*   *kažkok-ius*   *keist-us*   *gars-us*.
          hear-PRS.1SG   some-ACC.PL.M   strange-ACC.PL.M   sound-ACC.PL
          "I hear some strange sounds."
      b. *Girdė-ja-u*   *kažkok-ius*   *keist-us*   *gars-us*.
          hear-PST-1SG   some-ACC.PL.M   strange-ACC.PL.M   sound-ACC.PL
          "Some strange sounds were heard (for some time)."

(15) a. *Iš-gird-a-u*   *kažkok-ius*   *keist-us*   *gars-us*.
          PRV-hear-PST-1SG   some-ACC.PL.M   strange-ACC.PL.M   sound-ACC.PL
          "I (suddenly) heard some strange sounds."
      b. *Iš-gir-st-u*   *kažkok-ius*   *keist-us*   *gars-us*.
          PRV-hear-PRS-1SG   some-ACC.PL.M   strange-ACC.PL.M   sound-ACC.PL
          "(and then) I hear some strange sounds."

These examples demonstrate that the Stative and Punctual verbs denote the same type of situation – durative and instantaneous, respectively – regardless of the tense form with which they are combined : (15b) is actionally identical to (15a) and thus may be used only in habitual or narrative functions, but not in the progressive.

Finally, similar observation is applicable to Multiplicative verbs, too. They differ from the Processual predicates only on the notional level, in that the processes they denote have different internal structure. However, the crucial difference between Processual and Multiplicative verbs lies in the fact that only from the latter it is possible to derive verbs which denote a single quantum of such a process (cf. the "semelfactive" Aktionsart). Thus, from a Multiplicative verb *kosėti* "to cough" the Punctual *sukosėti* "to give a cough, to cough once" is formed; their actional difference is evident from their interpretations in the context of the adverbial expression *vieną kartą* "once", cf. example (16):

(16) a. *Berniuk-as*   *kosė-jo*   *vien-ą*   *kart-ą*.
          boy-NOM.SG   cough-PST.3   one-ACC.SG   time-ACC.SG
          "The boy has been coughing once."
      b. *Berniuk-as*   *su-kosė-jo*   *vien-ą*   *kart-ą*.
          boy-NOM.SG   PRV-cough-PST.3   one-ACC.SG   time-ACC.SG
          "The boy coughed once."

In (16a) the adverbial appears to have wider scope over the denotation of the predicate than in (16b) : the first sentence means that there was one event of the type "the boy coughs" which could last for an indefinite time and consist of many discreet coughs; the second denotes strictly one single instantaneous cough. Semelfactive Punctual verbs are usually formed from Multiplicative verbs by means of special suffixes *-telė-* / *-terė-* (cf. *moti* "to wave (for some time)", vs. *mostelėti* "to wave (once)"), but this is by no means necessary, as the "pair" *kosėti* ~ *sukosėti* shows.

Let us now turn to other actional classes attested in Lithuanian – the minor ones, which, nevertheless, are of great interest. The largest of these is the Strong Telic class which comprises lexemes of several types[41]. Some of the Strong Telic verbs are lexicalized combinations of a simple verb with a prefix, where the semantics of the whole complex is not compositional, like *atidaryti* "to open" or *uždaryti* "to close" which are superficially similar to the pair *atrakinti* and *užrakinti*, with the exception that the underived verb *daryti* "to do" does not normally denote the process of opening or closing[42]. The contrast between *atrakinti* and *atidaryti* is evident in the Present tense : the latter allows the imperfective viewpoint, while the former does not, cf. (17) :

(17)   a.   *Jon-as   ati.dar-o   lang-ą.*
                Jonas-NOM.SG   PRV.open-PRS.3   window-ACC.SG
                "Jonas is opening the window."
       b.   *Jon-as   at-rak-in-a   dur-is.*
                Jonas-NOM.SG   PRV-lock-CAUS-PRS.3 door-ACC.PL
                "Jonas unlocks the door || *is unlocking the door."

Another subclass of the Strong Telic class is formed by prefixal verbs of directed motion[43]; when used in the Past tense they denote the event of reaching the endpoint of motion, but their Present tense may have the progressive meaning, cf. (18) :

(18)   a.   *Lėktuv-as   at-skrid-o   į   Ryg-ą.*
                airplane-NOM.SG PRV-fly-PST.3   in   Riga-ACC.SG
                "The airplane arrived in Riga."
       b.   *Žiūrė-k,   lėktuv-as   jau   at-skrend-a.*
                look-IMP   airplane-NOM.SG   already   PRV-fly-PRS-PRS.3
                "Look, the airplane is already arriving."

There are a few simple Strong Telic verbs, too, and these are particularly revealing. Those which are present in my sample are the following : *laimėti* "to win", *mirti* "to die" and *grįžti* "to return, to come back"[44]. The last one is similar to verbs of directed motion, but the other two are peculiar in that from a point of view of "common-sense" the fact that they happen to belong to the Strong Telic class in Lithuanian seems to be quite unmotivated. Indeed, their

---

41. Cf. Dambriūnas (1959, 1960), Галнайтите (1963).

42. More precisely, the simple verb can be used in this meaning, but this use is clearly marginal and significantly less frequent than that of the semantically specialized prefixal verbs.

43. Cf. Галнайтите (1984).

44. Cf. also the verb *duoti* "to give" discussed in Галнайтите (1963: 140).

basic meaning is that of entry into a new state – of being dead or of having won. The "processes" these verbs nevertheless denote in their Present tense are not processes in the same sense as "write" or "walk" are : they are mere "tendencies", and the causal relation between such "process" and the attainment of the final state is rather weak (especially in case of *laimėti*). The fact that these situations are lexicalized as complex eventualities in Lithuanian suggests that the actional classification is not reducible to "extralinguistic" semantics.

Another piece of evidence for the role of actional classification in the verbal system of Lithuanian comes from the few Weak Telic verbs. In section 2 I have demonstrated that there are two types of "biaspectual" verbs in Lithuanian - those which allow imperfective viewpoint only in the Present tense, like those just discussed, and those whose Simple Past tense, too, may co-occur with the imperfective viewpoint, cf. example (13). It turns out that the two types of "biaspectual" verbs differ on the level of actionality : imperfective interpretation of the Simple Past is possible with the verbs which belong to the Weak Telic and Weak Inceptive-Stative classes, but not with those of the Strong Telic class. Cf. the following examples of a Weak Inceptive-Stative verb *patikti* "to like, to be fond of" :

(19)   a.   *Aldon-ai   ilg-ai   pa.tik-o   Algird-as.*
             Aldona-DAT.SG   long-ADV   PRV.like-PST.3   Algirdas-NOM.SG
             "Aldona was fond of Algirdas for a long time."

       b.   *Aldon-ai   iš   kart-o   pa.tik-o   Algird-as.*
             Aldona-DAT.SG   from   time-GEN.SG   PRV.like-PST.3   Algirdas-NOM.SG
             "Aldona liked Algirdas at once."

(20)   a.   *Kai Aldon-a   su-si-pa-žin-o   su Algird-u,*
             when   Aldona-NOM.SG   PRV-REFL-PRV-know-PST.3   with Algirdas-INS.SG
             j-is   j-ai   pa.tik-o.
             he-NOM.SG.M   he-DAT.SG.F   PRV.like-PST.3
             "When Aldona got acquainted with Algirdas, she became fond of him"
             → perfective

       b.   *Kai aš   su-si-pa-žin-a-u   su   Aldon-a,*
             when   I-NOM   PRV-REFL-PRV-know-PST-1SG   with   Aldona-INS.SG
             j-ai   pa.tik-o   Algird-as.
             he-DAT.SG.F   PRV.like-PST.3   Algirdas-NOM.SG
             "When I got acquainted with Aldona, she was fond of Algirdas."
             → imperfective

These examples show that there is an intricate connection between the actional properties of Lithuanian verbs (e.g. the range of universal elementary actional meanings which are available to the verb when it is used in the perfective

viewpoint) and the possibility for certain tense forms to be combined with the imperfective viewpoint. Let us examine this connection in greater detail.

It is well-known[45] that there is a cross-linguistically well-attested correlation between certain types of actional properties of verbal lexemes and aspectual viewpoints they typically co-occur with. Thus, verbs denoting atelic eventualities (states and processes) preferably combine with the imperfective viewpoint, while verbs with telic actionality (telic as well as punctual predicates) usually occur with the perfective viewpoint. The explanation for this correlation is roughly as follows[46]: in order for a telic event (e.g. *writing a letter*) to be realized, it must attain its inherent endpoint (the letter must be written to the end); by contrast, for an atelic event (such as *walk*) to be realized, it suffices that it be started and continue for some time. This does not, certainly, mean that the reverse is not possible – telic events are compatible with the imperfective viewpoint as well as atelic ones allow the perfective aspect, but these combinations are usually formally and functionally marked.

This logic allows us to explain the affinities which exist between different actional classes of verbs in Lithuanian and certain aspectual meanings. First of all, it is obvious that the verbs which belong to the Punctual class cannot co-occur with the imperfective viewpoint at all, since the eventuality they denote does not have any temporal duration – it is mere transition from one state of affairs to another. Consequently, when used in the Simple past, these verbs denote a single completed punctual event, and the perfective viewpoint is assigned to such uses automatically ("by default"). The Present tense with such verbs receives a marked interpretation, either habitual (the predicate then comes to denote an indefinite plurality of completed events of the type denoted by the lexeme) or the "historical present".

On the other hand, verbs which belong to the Processual, Stative and Multiplicative classes denote durative eventualities and are therefore compatible with the imperfective viewpoint both in the Present and in the Simple Past. What is necessary to note here, is that Lithuanian allows to regard as atelic those types of situations which in many languages are treated as telic (e.g. "write a letter" *rašyti laišką* or "go home" *eiti namo*): this is because, as I have demonstrated above, in Lithuanian the processes of *writing* of *going* are lexicalized separately from their respective final points – *finishing the letter* and *coming home*. However, since processes and states may be viewed as either

---

45. See e.g. Маслов (1984), Olsen *et al.* (1998), de Swart (1998), Bohnemeyer, Swift (2004).

46. Cf. Bohnemeyer, Swift (2004) for a formal account.

unbounded or having arbitrary boundaries (a process may be interrupted before it has reached its logical endpoint), Processual, Stative and Multiplicative predicates in Lithuanian may be combined with the perfective viewpoint, too; such combinations are facilitated by temporal adverbials of duration, which impose external boundaries, cf. (11) and the following examples:

(21)   a.   *Berniuk-as   miego-jo   septyn-ias   valand-as*.
            boy-NOM.SG   sleep-PST.3   seven-ACC.PL.F   hour-ACC.PL
            "The boy slept for seven hours."

       b.   *Ligon-is   kosė-jo   penk-ias   minut-es*.
            patient-NOM.SG   cough-PST.3   five-ACC.PL.F   minute-ACC.PL
            "The patient coughed for five minutes."

       c.   *J-is   vaikščio-jo   park-e   vien-ą   valand-ą*.
            he-NOM.SG.M   stroll-PST.3   park-LOC.SG   one-ACC.SG   hour-ACC.SG
            "He strolled in the park for one hour."

       d.   *Aldon-a   dvi   valand-as   raš-ė   laišk-ą*.
            Aldona-NOM.SG   two-ACC.F   hour-ACC.PL   write-PST.3   letter-ACC.SG
            "Aldona was engaged in writing a letter for two hours (but did not finish it)."

The sentence in (21a) indicates that the event of the boy's sleeping lasted for seven hours; since "sleep" does not entail an inherent endpoint, this sentence does not make it clear whether the boy woke up by himself or was intending to sleep for another three hours when something happened which roused him from his slumber. The same is true about sentences (21b) and (21c), too. However, the story may appear to be different with (21d): it means that the event of Aldona's writing a letter lasted for two hours, but also entails that the situation did not reach its inherent goal: the letter remained unfinished. This, however, is not unexpected, since the meaning of the Processual verb *rašyti* does not include this endpoint; therefore all four durative predicates in (21) behave identically.

   The story is more complicated with the genuinely Telic verbs. As we have seen, cf. (17), (18), they are similar both to Processual predicates in that their Present tense may have an imperfective value and denote an ongoing event in its development, and to Punctual verbs, since their Simple Past may denote only the transition point, thus combing only with the perfective viewpoint, but not with the imperfective one. I believe that this may be explained in the same line of reasoning as the behaviour of the actional classes already discussed. The basic meaning component of these verbs is the momentaneous change of state, which is, obviously, incompatible with the imperfective viewpoint. When combined with the Simple Past tense, such verbs are assigned the default aspectual interpretation for transitions, i.e. perfective viewpoint. The

imperfective viewpoint is available only in the context where the perfective is semantically marked, viz. in the Present tense. It might be probably reasonable to treat at least some Strong Telic verbs as so to say "not completely punctual" Punctual verbs : they normally denote an instantaneous transition but under certain conditions may also refer to the more or less well defined process which leads to this endpoint. Such an analysis is corroborated by the fact that quite a number of verbs fluctuate between these two classes ; e.g., some native speakers allow the progressive interpretation of (22), while others do not, translating it as "that's what the teacher usually does" :

(22)   *Mokytoj-as*   *su-galvo-ja*   *užduot-į*   *mokin-iams*.
       teacher-NOM.SG   PRV-think-PRS.3   assignment-ACC.SG   student-DAT.PL
       "The teacher is thinking over || thinks over an assignment for the students."

Therefore, at least for some types of predicates, their classification as Punctual or Strong Telic is probably best regarded as not strictly lexically specified, but as depending on considerations of semantic and pragmatic naturalness of their use in progressive contexts.

The same logic applies also to the few Weak Telic and Weak Inceptive-Stative predicates, such as *patikti* "to like" illustrated in (19)-(20). These are genuinely actionally "ambiguous" in that they may denote both the process and its endpoint (or the state and the entry into this state), even when used in the perfective contexts (this is particularly clear for the Weak Inceptive Stative verbs). Therefore it is not surprising that they may combine with the imperfective viewpoint in all relevant tense forms : the durative subevent of the situation they denote is unambiguously lexically specified and thus available to other semantic operators.

The discussion above was an attempt to show how the aspectual properties of the principal tense forms of Lithuanian verbs, described already in Dambriūnas (1960), follow directly from the actional features of predicates and universal principles of semantic compositionality. However, more has to be said about the actional classification of Lithuanian verbs itself ; the whole set of productive actional types has not yet been discussed, viz. the so-called Limitative classes[47]. These are the only verbal lexemes in Lithuanian, to which the traditional label "perfective" may be justly applied. What they all have in common is the lexical specification of external boundaries imposed on the durative eventuality their root denotes. Thus, for example, the verb *pasisukti*,

---

47. Despite their productivity (Limitative verbs are almost freely derivable from Stative and Processual verbs), for obvious reasons they constitute only a minority of my sample.

just like its base *suktis* "to turn around", denotes a process, but, unlike the latter, a bounded process ; thus, (23a) denotes an event which has reached its endpoint, whatever may have caused it, while (23b) does not have such implication.

(23)   a.   *Rat-as*   *pa-si-suk-o*.
           wheel-NOM.SG   PRV-REFL-turn-PST.3
           "The wheel turned around for some time (and then stopped)."
       b.   *Rat-as*   *suk-o-si*.
           wheel-NOM.SG   turn-PST.3-REFL
           "The wheel was turning around."

Limitative verbs are compatible only with the perfective viewpoint, which is natural, since a bounded eventuality cannot be looked at from a synchronic perspective. However, it is not as clear with Limitative verbs as it is with the Punctual ones that their viewpoint value is derived compositionally rather than lexically specified. Particularly telling is the comparison of Limitative Telic and Weak Telic verbs. Both classes have in common the actional ambiguity of the Simple Past form, which may denote both the transition (entry into a state) and a durative subevent (e.g. a process leading to the transition), compare the examples above with (24) :

(24)   a.   *Jon-as*   *15*   *minuč-ių*   *pa-žiūrė-jo*
           Jonas-NOM.SG   15   minute-GEN.PL   PRV-watch-PST.3
           t-ą   *film-ą*   *ir*   *iš-ėj-o*.
           this-ACC.SG   film-ACC.SG   and   PRV-go-PST.3
           "Jonas watched this film for 15 minutes and left."
       b.   *Jon-as*   *per*   *2*   *valand-as*   *pa-žiūrė-jo*
           Jonas-NOM.SG   in   2   hour-ACC.PL   PRV-watch-PST.3
           3   *film-us*.
           3   film-ACC.PL
           "Jonas watched three films in two hours."

The crucial difference, however, lies in the fact that Limitative Telic verbs can never combine with the imperfective viewpoint and denote ongoing events. Thus, it is probable that there is indeed a special class of verbs in Lithuanian[48] which are specified not only for their actional properties, but also for their viewpoint, which is peculiarly "built into" their lexical semantics (cf. Keydana, 1998). This, however, is a question of further research.

---

48. Moreover, a morphologically homogeneous class, since most Limitative predicates are formed with the prefix *pa-* (for a detailed discussion of its semantics cf. Галнайтите, 1959).

Finally, I would like to briefly touch upon another verb class which is usually considered aspectually specified, i.e. the so-called "secondary imperfective" verbs with the suffix *-inė-*. Their status in Lithuanian grammatical tradition is rather controversial; Dambriūnas (1960: 89-90) considers this suffix to be "an important means of imperfectivization" in Lithuanian; indeed, quite often the function of this suffix is to allow the verb to denote an ongoing event, cf. the following examples:

(25) a. *Kai   aš   at-ėj-a-u,   berniuk-as   pri-riš-o*
          when   I-NOM   PRV-go-PST-1SG   boy-NOM.SG   PRV-tie-PST.3
          šun-į   prie   medž-io.
          dog-ACC.SG   to   tree-GEN.SG
          "After I came, the boy tied the dog to the tree."

      b. *Kai   aš   at-ėj-a-u,   berniuk-as   pri-riš-inė-jo*
          when   I-NOM   PRV-go-PST-1SG   boy-NOM.SG   PRV-tie-ITER-PST.3
          šun-į   prie   medž-io.
          dog-ACC.SG   to   tree-GEN.SG
          "When I came, the boy was tying the dog to the tree."

However, Галнайтите (1963, and especially 1966) correctly objects that this is possible only with a special subclass of prefixal "perfective" verbs; e.g. the verb *parašinėti* "to write from time to time, to write usually" cannot be used in contexts like (25b).

What is crucial, however, is not whether all or only some verbs in *-inė-* may be used in the prototypical progressive contexts, but what precisely allows them to be so used. The same native speaker who clearly indicated the contrast between *pririšti* and *pririšinėti* in (25), gave me the following examples (the verb *pranešti* "to broadcast" is considered to be Punctual by some native speakers and Weak Telic by others):

(26) a. *Kai   aš   par-ėj-a-u   namo, radij-as   *pra.neš-ė ||*
          when   I-NOM   PRV-go-PST-1SG home radio-NOM.SG   PRV.carry-PST.3
          pra.neš-inė-jo   paskutin-es   naujien-as.
          PRV.carry-ITER-PST.3   last-ACC.PL.F   news-ACC.PL
          "When I came home, the radio was broadcasting the news."

      b. *Radij-as   2   minut-es   pra.neš-inė-jo*
          radio-NOM.SG   2   minute-ACC.PL   PRV.carry-ITER-PST.3
          stulbin-a-nč-ią   naujien-ą.
          surprise-PRS-PART-ACC.SG   news-ACC.SG
          "The radio was broadcasting an astonishing news for two minutes."

From (26a) and (26b) it is obvious that the verb *pranešinėti* and its whole kin are in no way different from other processual verbs in Lithuanian in their ability to combine with both viewpoints. Therefore, we may safely conclude

that the function of *-inė-* is not "imperfectivization" but rather *homogenization* (Vikner, 1994) : it turns a Punctual verb into a Processual one, either by imposing a quantificational structure (the resulting verb then denotes a plurality of events of the same type conceptualized as a single complex situation) or by "shifting" the lexical semantics of the predicate from the transition to the process which leads to it. The latter operation is lexically restricted, and the scope of its application in the present-day Lithuanian is not completely clear (cf. e.g. Kardelis, Wiemer, 2002, 2003).

4. CONCLUSIONS

The main objective of this article was to show what the aspectual system of Lithuanian (more precisely, a small but principally important subpart of it) might come to look like from the perspective of a non-aprioristic and non Slavic-centered theory of aspect grounded in the typologically oriented ideas proposed during the last decades. Though the foregoing discussion has been by necessity brief and preliminary, the following conclusions may be drawn.

First of all, the traditional classification of Lithuanian verbs into "perfective", "imperfective" and "biaspectual" turns out to have no theoretical validity. The ability of Lithuanian verbs of different types to combine with perfective or imperfective viewpoint or with both is reducible to the lexical semantics of verbs, more precisely, to their actional properties, most crucially, to the distinction between durative (State, Process, Multiplicative process) and punctual (Entry-into-a-State, Entry-into-a-Process, Quantum of a Multiplicative Process) actional meanings. Lithuanian predicates are lexically specified only for the actional meanings and their combinations, but not for the aspectual viewpoint ; the latter is compositionally derived by universal rules of default association. Only a special class of predicates, i.e. the Limitative verbs, probably have also a sort of lexicalized perfective viewpoint.

Second, the actional system of Lithuanian turns out to have important typological features which distinguish it both from the "Standard Average European" and Slavic-type systems. The majority of simple verbs in Lithuanian are atelic and denote states and processes ; in order to express the transition point between previous state and the one denoted by the verb or between the process and the resulting state a prefix must be added which makes the verb punctual. Thus most complex eventualities are lexicalized in Lithuanian as "split" into their elementary subevents ; the verbs which denote these "correlative" subevents are independent lexemes and retain their actional properties in all contexts. No neutralization of event semantics is possible, which makes the Lithuanian system different from, e.g., the Russian one.

The situation observed in Lithuanian is a representative of an important but rather poorly documented type of aspectual system, where the core distinctions structuring both the paradigmatic relations between verb forms and verbal lexemes and the syntactic (in the broad sense of the term) properties and functions of predicates are purely lexical in nature. The data from Lithuanian thus seems to bear crucially on the current theory and typology of aspect, actionality and the verbal lexicon in general.

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative, ADNUM – adnumerative, ADV – adverbial, DAT – dative, F – feminine, GEN – genitive, IMP – imperative, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, IPF – imperfective, ITER – iterative, LOC – locative, M – masculine, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PF – perfective, PL – plural, PRS – present, PRV – preverbal prefix, PST – past, REFL – reflexive, SG – singular

REFERENCES

AMBRAZAS, V., 1999. "Veikslas", V. Ambrazas (red.), *Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija*. Vilnius, Mokslas, 693-694.

—, (ed.), 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*, Vilnius, Baltos lankos.

ARKADIEV, P.M., 2009. "Lexical and compositional factors in the aspectual system of Adyghe", L. Hogeweg, H. de Hoop, A. Malchukov (eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Semantics of Tense, Aspect and Modality*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 55-82.

BACHE, C., BASBØLL, H., LINDBERG, C.-E. (eds.), 1994. *Tense, Aspect and Action. Empirical and Theoretical Contributions to Language Typology*, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

BERTINETTO, P. M., BIANCHI, V., HIGGINBOTHAM, J., DAHL, Ö., SQUARTINI, M. (eds.), 1995. *Temporal Reference, Aspect and Actionality*, vols. 1-2. Torino, Rosenberg & Seiler.

BERTINETTO, P.-M., DELFITTO, D., 2000. "Aspect vs. actionality : Why they should be kept apart", Ö. Dahl (ed.), 2000, 189-226.

BOHNEMEYER, Y., SWIFT, M., 2004. "Event realization and default aspect", *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 27/3, 263-296.

BOTNE, R., 2003. "To *die* across languages : Toward a typology of achievement verbs", *Linguistic Typology*, 7/2, 233-278.

BREU, W., 1994. "Interactions between lexical, temporal, and aspectual meanings", *Studies in Language*, 18/1, 23-44.

BYBEE, J., DAHL, Ö., 1989. "The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world", *Studies in Language*, 13/1, 51-103.

BYBEE, J., PERKINS, R.D., PAGLIUCA, W., 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, London, The University of Chicago Press.

CSIRMAZ, A., 2004a. "Aspect and aspect change crosslinguistically", L. Hunyadi, G. Rákosi, E. Tóth (eds.), *Preliminary Papers of LOLA 8*, Debrecen, 2004.

—, 2004b. "Aspect, aspect variation and universality", Handout of the paper presented at *The Cornell Symposium on Language Universals*, May 2004.

—, 2004c. "Perfective and imperfective aspect in Hungarian : (Invisible) differences", *Proceedings of CONSOLE XII*.

COMRIE B., 1976. *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

CUSIC, D., 1981. *Verbal Plurality and Aspect*, PhD Dissertation. Stanford.

DAHL, Ö., 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*, Oxford, Blackwell.

—, 2001. "Languages without tense and aspect", K. Ebert, F. Zúñiga (eds.), 2001, 159-173.

—, (ed.), 2000. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, EUROTYP, Vol. 6, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

DAMBRIŪNAS, L., 1959. "Verbal aspects in Lithuanian", *Lingua Posnaniensis*, 7, 253-262.

—, 1960. *Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių aspektai*, Boston, Lietuvių enciklopedijos spaustuvė.

DE SWART, H., 1998. "Aspect shift and coercion", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 16/2, 347-385.

DICKEY, S., 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect* (*A Cognitive Approach*), Stanford, CSLI.

DRESSLER, W., 1968. *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität. Iterativum, Distributivum, Durativum, Intensivum in der allgemeinen Grammatik, im Lateinischen und Hethitischen*, Wien, Böhlau.

DUMAŠIŪTĖ, Z., 1962. "Dėl dabartinės lietuvių literatūrinės kalbos eigos ir įvykio veikslo veiksmažodžių vartojimo esamuoju laiku", *Lietuvos TSR Mokslų akademijos darbai, Ser. A*, 12/1, 227-247.

EBERT, K., 1995. "Ambiguous perfect-progressive forms across languages", P.M. Bertinetto *et al.* (eds.), vol. 2, 185-204.

EBERT, K., ZÚÑIGA, F. (eds.), 2001. *Aktionsart and Aspectotemporality in Non-European Languages*, Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, 16. Zürich.

FILIP, H., 1999. *Aspect, Eventuality Types, and Noun Phrase Semantics*, New York, Garland.

GALNAITYTĖ, E., 1962. "Ginčytini lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžio veikslų klausimai", *Kalbotyra*, 4.

—, 1978. "Veikslų definicijos lietuvių aspektologijoje klausimu", *Baltistica*, 14/1, 66-74.

GENIUŠIENĖ, E., 1997. "The multiplicative and the iterative in Lithuanian", V.S. Xrakovski (ed.), *Typology of Iterative Constructions*, München, Newcastle, LINCOM Europa, 220-240.

HOLVOET, A., ČIŽIK, V., 2004. "Veikslo priešpriešos tipai", A. Holvoet, L. Semėnienė (red.), *Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai, 2. Gramatinių kategorijų tyrimai*, Vilnius, Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 141-162.

ISSATSCHENKO, A.V., 1975. *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart*, München, Max Hueber Verlag.

JABLONSKIS J., 1922/1957. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, Kaunas, 1922 (2nd. ed. in J. Jablonskis, *Rinktiniai raštai*, t. 1, Vilnius, 1957).

JOHANSON, L., 1996. "Terminality operators and their hierarchical status", B. Devriendt *et al.* (eds.), *Complex Structures : A Functionalist Perspective*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 229-258.

—, 2000. "Viewpoint operators in European languages", Dahl (ed.), 2000, 27-188.

KARDELIS, V., WIEMER, B., 2002. "Ausbildung von Aspektpaarigkeit in litauischen Grenz- und Inseldialekten (am Beispiel von Sprechverben)", *Linguistica Baltica*, 10, 51- 80.

—, 2003. "Kritische Bemerkungen zur Praxis der Erstellung litauischer Wörterbücher, insbesondere von Mundarten (am Beispiel des slavischen Lehnguts und des 'veikslas')", N. Ostrowski, O. Vaičiulytė-Romančuk (red.), *Prace bałtystyczne. Język, literatura, kultura*, Warszawa, Uniwersytet Warszawski, wydział polonistyki, 45-72.

KEYDANA, G., 1998. "Aspekt im älteren Litauischen", *Linguistica Baltica*, 7, 119-145.

KIEFER, F., 1994. "Some peculiarities of the aspectual system in Hungarian", C. Bache *et al* (eds.), 185–206.

KLEIN, W., 1994. *Time in Language*, London, New York, Routledge.

KRIFKA, M., 1998. "The origins of telicity", S. Rothstein (ed.), *Events and Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 197-235.

LKŽ — *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (http://www.lkz.lt/).

MATHIASSEN, T., 1996. *Tense, Mood and Aspect in Lithuanian and Latvian*, Meddelelser av Slavisk-baltisk avdeling, Universitetet i Oslo. Nr. 75.

MICHELINI, G., 1982. "Apie 'istorinio' prezenso tekstualinę funkciją", *Kalbotyra*, 33, 72-77.

OLSEN, M.B., WEINBERG, A., LILLY, J.P., DRURY, J.E., 1998. "Acquiring grammatical aspect via lexical aspect : The continuity hypothesis", *Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics*.

PAULAUSKAS, A., 1958. "Veiksmažodžių priešdėlių funkcijos dabartinėje lietuvių literatūrinėje kalboje", *Literatūra ir kalba*, 3, 301-453.

PAULAUSKIENĖ, A., 1971. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodis*, Vilnius.

—, 1979. *Gramatinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžio kategorijos*, Vilnius, Mokslas.

PUSTEJOVSKY, J., 1991. "The syntax of event-structure", *Cognition*, 41, 41-87.

REKLAITIS, J.K., 1980. "Aspect in the Lithuanian verb", *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 11/2, 158-171.

ROSZKO, D. ROSZKO, R., 2006. "Lithuanian frequentativum", *Études cognitives*, 7, 163-172.

SAFAREWICZ, JAN, 1938. "L'aspect verbal en vieux-lithuanien", *Actes du 4ème congrès international des linguistes*. Copenhague.

SASSE, H.-J., 2002. "Recent activity in the theory of aspect : Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-progressive state ?", *Linguistic Typology*, 6/2, 199-271.

SAWICKY, L., 2000. "Remarks on the category of aspect in Lithuanian", *Linguistica Baltica*, 8, 133-142.

—, 2010. "Preverbation and narrativity in Lithuanian", *Baltic Linguistics*, 1, 167-192.

SMITH, C., 1997/1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*, Dordrecht, Kluwer (1st ed. 1991).

—, 1995. "The range of aspectual situation types : Derived categories and a bounding paradox", P.M. Bertinetto *et al.* (eds.), vol. II, 105-124.

SWIFT, M.D., 2000. *The Development of Temporal Reference in Inuktitut Child Language*, PhD Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

TALMY, L., 1985. "Lexicalization patterns : Semantic structure in lexical form", T. Shopen (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, vol. III, 57-149.

TATEVOSOV, S.G., 2002. "The parameter of actionality", *Linguistic Typology*, 6/3, 317-401.

VALECKIENĖ, A., 1998. *Funkcinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, Vilnius, Mokslas.

VENDLER, Z., 1967. "Verbs and times", Z. Vendler (ed.). *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 97-121.

VERKUYL, H., 1989. "Aspectual classes and aspectual composition", *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 12/1, 39-94.

VIKNER, C., 1994. "Change in homogeneity in verbal and nominal reference", C. Bache *et al.* (eds.), 139-164.

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

АРКАДЬЕВ, П.М., 2008. "Уроки литовского языка для славянской аспектологии", *Славянское языкознание. XIV международный съезд славистов. Доклады российской делегации*. Москва, Индрик, 28-43.

—, 2010. "Ещё раз о семантике литовских *n/st*-глаголов : от непереходности к начинательности", М.В. Завьялова, Т.В. Цивян (ред.), *Топоровские чтения. I-IV. Избранное*. Москва, Институт славяноведения РАН, 309-324.

БУХ, Т. И., 1961. "К вопросу об изучении категории вида в литовском языке". *Вопросы составления описательных грамматик*, Москва, Институт языкознания АН СССР, 53-69.

ВИМЕР, Б., 2001. "Аспектуальные парадигмы и лексическое значение русских и литовских глаголов", *Вопросы языкознания*, 2, 26-58.

Галнайтите, Э., 1959. "Лексические значения глагольной приставки *по-* в соответствии с приставкой *ра-* литовского языка", *Славянское языкознание*.

—, 1963. "Особенности категории вида глаголов в литовском языке (в сопоставлении с русским языком", *Kalbotyra*, 7, 123-144.

—, 1966. "К вопросу об имперфективации глаголов в литовском языке", *Baltistica*, 2/2, 147-158.

—, 1980a. "К проблеме способов глагольного действия в русской и литовской аспектологии", *Kalbotyra*, 30/2, 7-22.

—, 1980b. "Типология глаголов многократного способа действия (на материале русского и литовского языков)", *Kalbotyra*, 31/2, 75-87.

—, 1984. "Глаголы движения в системе способов глагольного действия", *Kalbotyra*, 35/2, 77-88.

Генюшене, Э.Ш., 1989. "Мультипликатив и итератив в литовском языке", В.С. Храковский (ред.), 122-132.

Зализняк, Анна А., Шмелёв, А.А., 2000. *Введение в русскую аспектологию*, Москва, Языки русской культуры.

Маслов, Ю. С., 1984. *Очерки по аспектологии*, Ленинград, Издательство ЛГУ.

Падучева, Е.В., 1996. *Семантические исследования. Семантика времени и вида в русском языке. Семантика нарратива*, Москва, Языки русской культуры.

—, 2004. *Динамические модели в семантике лексики*, Москва, Языки славянской культуры.

Перцов, Н.В., 2001. *Инварианты в русском словоизменении*, Москва, Языки русской культуры.

Петрухина, Е.В., 2000. *Аспектуальные категории глагола в русском языке в сопоставлении с чешским, словацким, польским и болгарским языками*, Москва, Издательство МГУ.

Татевосов, С.Г., Лютикова, Е.А., Иванов, М. Ю, Пазельская, А.Г., Шлуинский, А.Б., 2006. *Структура события и семантика глагола в карачаево-балкарском языке*, Москва, ИМЛИ.

Храковский, В.С. (red.), 1989. *Типология итеративных конструкций*, Ленинград, Наука.

Черткова, М. Ю., 1996. *Грамматическая категория вида в русском языке*, Москва, Издательство МГУ.

— (red.), 1998. *Типология вида. Проблемы, поиски, решения*, Москва, Языки русской культуры.

Шлуинский, А.Б., 2006a. "К типологии предикатной множественности", *Вопросы языкознания*, 46-75.

—, 2006b. "Акциональные классы глаголов в хакасском языке (на материале сагайского диалекта)", *Доклад на 3ей Конференции по типологии и грамматике для молодых исследователей*, Санкт-Петербург.

—, 2008. "Акциональные типы предикатов в языке эве", *Основы африканского языкознания Т. IV. Лексика и словообразование.* Москва, Academia, 189-271.

Peter M. Arkadiev
(Moscow)