

**Academia Grammaticorum Salensis Tertia Decima
Salos, Lithuania, 1–6 August 2016**

Peter Arkadiev, Anna Daugavet***

*Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow State Pedagogical University, peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

**Saint-Petersburg State University, anna.daugavet@gmail.com

**The perfect in Lithuanian and Latvian:
a contrastive investigation**

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on the typologically rare ‘have’-resultative in Lithuanian (in English), Sakurai (2015) on Lithuanian (in English, yet unpublished).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-is 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 (Justina Bružaitė, Kristina Bukelskytė-Čepelė, Milda Jucevičiūtė, Auksė Razanovaitė, Benita Riaubienė, Inesa Šeškauskienė, Danguolė Valančė) and 4 Latvian (Inga Laizāne, Laura Rituma, Jana Taperte, Inga Znotiņa) native speakers (female, age 25–50, 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 (<http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/page.xhtml?id=parallelLILA>) 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 Lithuanian texts and their translations into Latvian (ca. 4.0 million words), as well as 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 the final sequence *-usi* (e.g. e.g. Lith. *neš-us-i*, Latv. *nes-us-i*, carry-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F, LATV. *darīj-us-i* do-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F)¹. 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.²

- The final results include ca. 600 original Lith. sentences and ca. 1200 original Latv. sentences containing Perfect forms, although the Lith. subcorpus is much larger. The frequency of Perfect forms is 1 per 6670 words in Lith. and 1 per 1250 words in Latv.

- The Lith. perfect is usually rendered into Latv. by Perfect forms (69%) whereas the translations of the Latv. perfect into Lithuanian more often feature synthetic forms (57%) than Perfect forms (34%), the difference being highly statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 185,7$,

¹ The final string *-us-i* PST.PA-NOM.SG.F, identical for the both languages, is less common and therefore easier to identify than *-is* (Latv. PRS.PA-NOM.SG.M, cf. Lith. *-ęs*), which is also found in the NomSg of some productive noun classes.

² Some of the Latvian examples below and their translations into Lithuanian come from randomly selected MascPl forms with a final sequence *-uši* (*darīj-uš-i* ‘do-PST.PA-NOM.PL.M’).

$p < 0,0001$). Some Lithuanian and Latvian sentences are translated by Active Past Participles serving as independent predicates. At least some of these participles are in fact Present Perfect forms with the omitted auxiliary.

Table 3. Distribution of the Latvian translations of the Lithuanian perfect and the Lithuanian translations of the Latvian perfect in LiLa

	Lith > Latv	Lith > Latv %	Latv > Lith	Latv > Lith %
PRF	395	69%	401	34%
simple	94	16%	667	57%
FIN PPA	61	11%	76	6%
varia	24	4%	31	3%
all	574	100%	1175	100,00%

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 (cf. Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 9) with telic verbs:

(2) LiLa

a. 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.

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

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

(3) 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.’

As an extension of the latter, there is also a Perfect of “current relevance” involving mostly transitive verbs with an inherent result (cf. Dahl & Hedin 2000: 389–393); this use is much more prominent in Latvian than in Lithuanian, see below.

(4) LiLa

a. Latvian

Jūs sav-ā biogrāfij-ā es-at noklusēj-us-i daž-us fakt-us.
 2PL RFL-LOC.SG biography-LOC.SG AUX.PRS-2PL conceal-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F some-ACC.PL fact-ACC.PL

b. Lithuanian

Tamsta savo biografij-oje es-i nutylėj-us-i kelet-q fakt-ų.
 2SG RPOSS biography-LOC.SG AUX.PRS-2SG conceal-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F some-ACC.SG fact-GEN.PL
 a = b ‘You have concealed some facts in your biography.’

– The experiential (Dahl 1985: 141–144), mostly with atelic verbs including statives, cf. (1) above and (5):

(5) 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. (7). In such contexts the Present tense is the default option in both languages.

(6) 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.’

(7) 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. (8)–(10).

(8) 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.’

(9) 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).'

(10) 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):

(11) 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?'

– Future Perfect: epistemic possibility or inferential

(12) LiLa

a. Latvian

Būs pievāk-us-i kād-as patron-as,
 AUX-FUT.3 pick.up- PST.PA-NOM.SG.F some-ACC.PL cartridge-ACC.PL
ja soma tik smaga.

b. Lithuanian

Bus pagvelb-us-i kok-į patron-q,
 AUX-FUT.3 pick.up- PST.PA-NOM.SG.F some-ACC.SG cartridge-ACC.SG
jei rankinukas toks sunkus.

'It seems that she has picked up some cartridge(s), since the bag is so heavy.'

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):

(13) 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 **vaikščiojome** miške. Staiga jis **užmynė** ant gyvatės. Ji **kirto** jam į koją. Jis **paėmė** akmenį ir **trenkė** gyvatei. Ji **nusibaigė**.

b. Latvian

Mēs **pastaigājāties** 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):

(14) LiLa

a. Latvian

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

b. Lithuanian

Buv-o **atėj-us-i** **vien-a** **sportinink-ė**,
 AUX.PST.3 come-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F one-NOM.SG.F athlete(F)-NOM.SG
atneš-ė **rekomendacin-į** **laišk-q** **iš Olimpini-o** **komitet-o**.
 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.’

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, see the figures above;
- the fact that the Lith. perfect is usually rendered into Latvian by Perfect forms (69%) whereas the translations of the Latv. perfect into Lithuanian more often have synthetic tense forms (57%) than Perfect forms (34%).
- 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:

(15) 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**
 AUX.PRS-1SG get.tired-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F from
užsikrautos nereikalingų darbų naštos.
 ‘I am tired of the self-imposed burden of unnecessary work.’

(16) 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*
 AUX.PRS-1SG get.tired-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F from
sev uzlikto lieko darbu nastas.

‘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 mostly in the experiential and lexically restricted possessive resultative meanings, in Latvian examples like (18) are also possible, where Lithuanian only admits the Preterite.

(18) 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-ą.*
 1SG.NOM open-PST.1SG window-ACC.SG
 a = b ‘I have opened the window.’

In the Latvian original sentences from LiLa “current relevance” is conveyed by half of all the examples with the Present Perfect forms, while in the Lithuanian original sentences “current relevance” accounts for just 18% of the examples, most of which belong to the possessive resultative type (the difference is highly statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 41,9$, $p < 0,0001$).

(19) Lithuanian (LiLa)

- Bet dar reikė-s* *ir Natalij-os* *paklausinė-ti.*
 but still need-FUT.3 and Natalia-GEN.SG interrogate-INF
K-ą *j-i* *yra* *su-galvoj-us-i.*
 what-ACC.SG 3-NOM.SG.F AUX.PRS.3 PVB-think-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F
 ‘We will still have to ask Natalia. What did she decide?’

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

	Latv PRS.PRF		Lith PRS.PRF	
current relevance	333	53%	18	18%
resultative	156	25%	55	55%
experiential	134	22%	27	27%
total	623	100%	100	100%

81% of Latvian examples of the Present Perfect denoting current relevance are translated into Lithuanian by synthetic tenses (including 72% by the synthetic Past), and only 11% by the Perfect forms (including 10% by the Present Perfect). The difference in translation strategies between current relevance and the other two meanings of the Latvian Present Perfect is highly statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 41,9$, $p < 0,0001$.

Table 5. Distribution of the Lith. translations of the uses of the Latv. Present Perfect in LiLa

	current relevance		resultative		experiential	
PRF	38	11%	48	31%	48	36%
simple	271	81%	64	41%	79	59%
FIN PPA	13	4%	38	24%	5	4%
varia	11	3%	6	4%	2	1%
total	333	100%	156	100%	134	100%

(20) 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 of the Latv. Present Perfect by the Lithuanian synthetic tenses vs. Perfect forms shows the same tendency for the resultative and the experiential meanings, but to a significantly lower degree. However, the Latvian examples with the resultative meaning have an increase in the use of the “bare” Active Past participles serving as independent predicates. These may be interpreted as Present Perfect forms without the auxiliary, as in (21) (but in some cases may also be forms of the Evidential).

(21) LiLa

a. Latvian

[...] *spuldz-e virs 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 apdulkėj-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. (22). 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.

(22) 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 Latvian “hot news” sentences are translated into Lithuanian by the synthetic Past.

(23) 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. (23) vs. (24).

(24) 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-ę,
 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 (25).

(25) 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. (26), where the use of the non-evidential Present Perfect is admittedly ungrammatical (such strings of Evidential Perfect forms seem, however, to be rather artificial).

(26) 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 a threw it at the snake. It died.'

4.5. The Past Perfect appears to be more robust in Lithuanian than the Present Perfect: 77% of original Lithuanian sentences from LiLa are in the Past Perfect whereas in Latvian the share of the Past Perfect is only 43%, which is lower than the present perfect (53%); the difference is highly statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 179,4$, $p < 0,0001$).

Table 6. Distribution of tenses in original Lithuanian and Latvian sentences from LiLa

	Lithuanian		Latvian	
PST	443	77%	506	43%
HAB	9	2%	0	0%
PRS	100	17%	623	53%
FUT	22	4%	46	4%
total	574	100%	1175	100%

The Past Perfect in the Lithuanian translations of the Latvian sentences with the Past Perfect is also found more frequently than the Present Perfect in the Lithuanian translations of Latvian sentences with the Present Perfect (the difference is highly statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 87$, $p < 0,0001$).

Table 7. Distribution of tenses in translations of the Lith. and Latv. perfect from LiLa

	Lith PST > Latv		Lith PRS > Latv		Latv PST > Lith		Latv PRS > Lith	
PRF	319	72%	59	59%	243	48,0%	134	22%
simple	65	15%	17	17%	231	45,7%	414	66%
FIN PPA	43	10%	17	17%	20	4,0%	56	9%
varia	16	4%	7	7%	12	2,4%	19	3%
total	443	100%	100	100%	506	100,0%	623	100%

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

In Latvian, the “introductory” use of the Past Perfect in narratives (see ex. (14) above) is often hard to distinguish its uses to denote a sudden unexpected turn of events. However, in Lithuanian the latter is translated by means of the synthetic Past.

(27) 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*. (Cf. Engel & Ritz (2008) on the narrative uses of the Present Perfect in Australian English.) There are about 50 such examples in our Latv. subcorpus of LiLa. In Tables 4 and 5 such uses for the most part fall together with ‘current relevance’ and ‘resultative’. In Lithuanian they are commonly translated by the simple Past or Present.

(28) LiLa

a. Latvian

Esm-u sa-sildīj-us-i kartupeļ-us <...> sa-griez-u-si salāt-us,
AUX.PRS-1SG PVB-heat-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F potato-ACC.PL PVB-cut-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F salad-ACC.PL
nu ie-klaus-o-s, kā man-s vīr-s un viņ-a
now PVB-listen.PRS-1SG-RFL how my-NOM.SG.M husband-NOM.SG and 3-GEN.SG.M
tēv-s atkal lāpa pasaul-i.
father-NOM.SG again curse.PRS3 world-ACC.SG

‘I heat (lit. have heated) the potatoes, <...>, make (lit. have cut) the salad, and now listen how my husband and his father are cursing the world again.’

b. Lithuanian

Pašildž-iau bulv-ių <...> su-pjausči-au salot-as ir bandži-au
PVB-heat-PST.1SG potato-GEN.PL PVB-cut-PST.1SG salad-ACC.PL and try-PST.1SG
į-si-klausy-ti į mano vyr-o ir j-o tėv-o pokalb-į.
PVB-RFL-listen-INF in my husband-GEN.SG and 3-GEN.SG.M father-GEN.SG conversation-ACC.SG
‘I heated the potatoes, <...>, made the salad, and tried to listen to my husband’s conversation with his father.’

5. Summary and discussion

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.

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, cf. Caudal & Roussarie (2006).

Table 8. 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
	antiresultative	yes	yes
	introductory	yes	yes
Future Perfect	resultative-in-the-future	yes	yes
	inferential	yes	yes

4) Desiderata for further research:

– a more direct comparison of the Baltic Perfects with their counterparts in such languages as English, Bulgarian, Spanish, or Estonian (e.g. on the basis of existing parallel corpora);

– investigation of the uses of the perfects in the monolingual corpora (severely impeded by the lack of morphological annotation);

– a study of the 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 — 1st person; 2 — 2nd person; 3 — 3rd 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.

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.
- Caudal, Patrick & Laurent Raussarie (2006). Brands of perfects: Semantics and pragmatics. In: P. Denis et al (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2004 Texas Linguistic Society Conference*. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla, pp. 13–27.

- 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.
- Engel, Dulcie M. & Marie-Eve Ritz (2008). The use of the Present Perfect in Australian English. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 20(2), 119–140.
- 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 12th *International Congress of Balticists*, Vilnius, 28–31 October 2015.
- Sitchinava, Dmitry (2013). *Tipologija pljuskvamperfekta. Slavjanskij pljuskvamperfekt. (The Typology of the Pluperfect. The Slavic Pluperfect)* Moscow: AST Press.
- 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.