

Baltic Languages and White Nights, Helsinki, 11–12 June 2012

“EXTERNAL PREFIXES” IN LITHUANIAN: A TYPOLOGICAL RARUM

Peter Arkadiev

(Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow)

peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

0. Epigraph on typological rarities

“A rarum is a trait ... which is so uncommon across languages as not even to occur in all members of a single (middle to lower level) family or diffusion area (for short: sprachbund), although it may occur in a few languages from a few different families or sprachbünde. Diachronically speaking, a rarum is a trait which has only been retained, or only been innovated, in a few members of a single family or sprachbund or of a few of them.” *Frans Plank*, <http://typo.uni-konstanz.de/rara/intro/index.php?pt=1>

“...rara and rarissima, features and properties found in very few languages, can tell us as much about the capacities and limits of human language(s) as do universals.” (Cysouw & Wohlgemuth 2010: 1)

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

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

- (2) a. *ne₋₄-be₋₃-at₋₂-si₋₁-kel-s*
NEG-BE-PRV-RFL-raise-FUT(3)
‘will not rise anymore’
- b. *te₋₅-pra₋₂-si₋₁-ded-a*
TE-PRV-RFL-begin-PRS(3)
‘let it start!’
- c. *te₋₅-ne₋₄-be₋₃-nor-i* *daugiau* *niek-o*
TE-NEG-BE-want-PRS(3) more nothing-GEN.SG
‘let him/her want nothing more’ (LKT)

2. “Internal” vs. “external” prefixes

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

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

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

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

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

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

☞ Participate in deverbal derivation:

- (4) *ap-rašyti* ‘describe’ → *aprašas* ‘inventory’; *at-likti* ‘remain’ → *atlaikai* ‘waste’

2.2. “External” prefixes:

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

☞ Do not affect the verb’s telicity, though can express aspectual meanings.

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

– the permissive *te-*

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

– the restrictive *te-*

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

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

☞ Do not participate in deverbal derivation:

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

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

☞ “Reflexive displacement” (cf. Stolz 1989):

- (7) a. *džiaug-ė-si* b. *ap₋₂-si₋₁-džiaug-ė*
rejoice-PST(3)-RFL PRV-RFL-rejoice-PST(3)
‘rejoiced’ ‘became happy’
- c. *te₋₅-si₋₁-džiaugi-a* d. *ne₋₄-be₋₃-si₋₁-džiaugi-a*
TE-RFL-rejoice-PRS(3) NEG-BE-RFL-rejoice-PRS(3)
‘let rejoice’ ‘is no longer happy’

☞ Stress retraction (cf. Andronovas 1995):

- (8) a. *nėša* ‘is carrying’ b. *ap-si₋₁-nėša* ‘gets covered with’
c. *at₋₂-nėša* ‘is bringing’ d. *te-bė₋₃-nėša* ‘is still carrying’
e. *nė₋₄-nėša* ‘is not carrying’ f. *tė₋₅-nėša* ‘let carry’

3. History of the research

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

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

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

Recent studies: Arkadiev (2010) on the restrictive *te-*, Arkadiev (2011a, 2011b) on the uses of *be-*, Ostrowski (2010, 2011a, 2011b, Ms., to appear) on the history of *be-*.

Etymological origins of *te-* and *be-* remain obscure, and existing hypotheses are largely speculative, cf. Vaillant 1947, Fraenkel (1962-1965: 38; 1071), Zinkevičius (1981: 195–196, 198), Smoczyński (2007: 51), cf. also works by Ostrowski.

4. The restrictive *te-*

(For a comprehensive treatment see Arkadiev 2010)

Belongs to a rare type of **restrictive markers** (elements meaning ‘only’, König 1991) morphologically attached to the verb but able to take any constituent in its scope (marked SMALL CAPITALS in the examples below): subject (9), direct (10) and indirect object (11), adverbial phrases (12), non-finite (13) and finite (14) clausal complements.

- (9) ... o *kit-q* *vard-q* *te-žin-o* ARTIMIAUS-I J-OS ŽMON-ĖS.
and other-ACC.SG name-ACC.SG TE-know-PRS(3) closest-NOM.PL.M 3-GEN.SG.F people-NOM.PL
‘... and the other name is known only to her closest friends.’ (LKT)
- (10) *Aš* *SAVO ŽMON-Ą* *te-myl-iu.*
I:NOM own wife-ACC.SG TE-love-PRS.1SG
‘I love only my own wife.’
- (11) *Kaz-ys* *gimim-o* *dien-os* *prog-a* *gėli-ų* *te-dovanoj-o*
p.n.-NOM.SG birth-GEN.SG day-GEN.SG occasion-INS.SG flower-GEN.PL TE-give-PST(3)
SAVO ŽMON-ĄI.
own wife-DAT.SG
‘Kazys gave flowers only to his own wife as a birthday present.’
- (12) *Aš* *tav-e* *PIRM-Ą* *SYK-į* *te-mat-au.*
I(NOM) you-ACC.SG first-ACC.SG time-ACC.SG TE-see-PRS.1SG
‘I see you only for the first time.’ (LKT)
- (13) *J-os* *te-gal-i* *ŽAIS-TI* *MEIL-E...*
3-NOM.PL.F TE-can-PRS play-INF love-INS.SG
‘They can only play with love.’ (MPA, II:15)
- (14) ... o *kit-i* *te-myl-i* *tik sav-e ir* *te-nor-i,* *KAD VIS-I*
and other-NOM.PL.M TE-love-PRS(3) only self-ACC and TE-want-PRS(3) that all-NOM.PL.M
J-UOS *TE-MYLĖ-TŪ.*
3-ACC.PL.M TE-love-SBJ(3)
‘... and others love only themselves and only want that everyone loved just them.’ (LKT)

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

- (15) *Kaz-ys* *te-dovanoj-o* *mergait-ėms* *knyg-as.*
p.n.-NOM.SG TE-give-PST(3) girl-DAT.PL book-ACC.PL
i. ‘Only Kazys gave books to girls.’
ii. ‘Kazys only gave books to girls <and not sold flowers to boys>.’
iii. ‘Kazys gave books only to girls <and not to boys>.’

- iv. ‘Kazys gave girls only books <and not flowers>.’
v. ‘Kazys only gave books to girls <and not sold books to boys>.’

Furthermore, *te-* can scope into nominal (16) and verbal (17) constituents:

- (16) *Te-skait-au* [*MAIRONI-O eilėrašči-us*], *kit-ų* *poet-ų* *ne-mėgst-u.*
TE-read-PRS.1SG p.n.-GEN.SG poetry-ACC.PL other-GEN.PL poet-GEN.PL NEG-like-PRS.1SG
‘I read only poetry by Maironis, I don’t like other poets.’
- (17) *Ši-os* *scen-os* *grož-į* *te-gal-i-m-a*
this-GEN.SG.F scene-GEN.SG beauty-ACC.SG TE-can-PRS-PP-DF
[*sulygin-ti* *SU* *GERV-ĖS* *SKRYDŽIUU*]...
compare-INF with crane-GEN.SG flight-INS.SG
‘The beauty of this scene can be compared only to a crane’s flight...’¹

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

- (18) *A-djal-wokdi* *GUN-DJEIHMI.*
1SG-RSTR-speak language.name
‘I speak only Gun-djeihmi.’ (Evans 1995: 250)

4. The polyfunctional *be-*

(For a more detailed treatment see Arkadiev 2011a, 2011b)

- Aspectual functions.
- Modal and evaluative functions.
- The purely structural “empty” function in reflexive participles (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 348): triggering the “reflexive displacement”, *be-* helps avoid the morphophonological complications arising when the reflexive marker attaches to the adjectival desinence:

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

4.1. Aspectual functions of *be-*

4.1.1. Continuative

- (20) ...*miestel-yje* *te-be-gyven-o* *daug* *našli-ų.*
small.town-LOC.SG TE-BE-live-PST(3) many widow-GEN.PL
‘... in the town there still lived many widows.’ (LKT)
- (21) *Tada* *j-is* *jau* *ne-be-gyven-o* *su* *žmon-a...*
then 3-NOM.SG.M already NEG-BE-live-PST(3) with wife-INS.SG
‘Then he already no longer lived with his wife...’ (LKT)
- In the modern language only occurs with the markers of polarity: *te-* (positive) or *ne-* (negative); in Old Lithuanian independent continuative uses of *be-* are still attested until the XVIII century (Ostrowski to appear).

- (22) *Surink-a* *tada* *ir* *pri.pil-e* *dwilika* *pintini-u* *trupucz-u* *isch*
collect-PST(3) then and fill-PST(3) twelve bucket-GEN.PL piece-GEN.PL from
penketa *miesz-u* *dūn-as* *kur-ie* *be-lik-a...*
five barley-GEN.PL bread-GEN.SG which-NOM.PL.M BE-remain-PST(3)

¹ Gintaras Beresnevičius, *Apie pagavimą šnipų* 1998, <http://www.tekstai.lt/tekstai>

'Therefore they gathered them together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which [still] remained...' (VEE, John 6:13, quoted after Ostrowski Ms.)

4.1.2. Progressive

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

(23) *Net ap.si.ašaraj-au be-skaity-dam-a.*

even shed.tears-PST.1SG BE-read-CNV-SG.F

'I even shed a few tears while reading (it).'²

(24) *Pa-mači-au j-į be-stov-i-nt prie ol-os įėjim-o...*

PRV-see-PST.1SG 3-ACC.SG.M BE-stand-PRS-PA at cave-GEN.SG entrance-GEN.SG

'I saw him standing at the entrance to the cave...'³

In this function, *be-* is optional:

(25) *Dviratinink-ai važiuo-dam-i žinuči-ų siųs-ti ne-galė-s.*

cyclist-NOM.PL drive-CNV-PL.M message-GEN.PL send-INF NEG-can-FUT(3)

'Cyclists won't be allowed to send messages while driving.'⁴

(26) *...ne-žin-o, k-q reiški-a jaus-ti tėv-q stov-i-nt*

NEG-know-PRS(3) what-ACC.SG mean-PRS(3) feel-INF father-ACC.SG stand-PRS-PA

sau už nugar-os.

self:DAT behind back-GEN.SG

'[They] don't know what it means to feel one's father standing behind one's back.'⁵

Rare examples of periphrastic progressive forms with *be-* attached to the present active participle are attested only with stative verbs (27); in Old Lithuanian, the progressive was more widely attested, cf. (28).

(27) *Aš bū-si-u be-mieg-ąs, kai at.ei-s-i man-ęs guldy-ti.*

I:NOM AUX-FUT-1SG BE-sleep-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M when come-FUT-2SG I-GEN lay.down-INF

'I will be already sleeping when you come to put me to bed.' (Ambrasas (ed.) 1997: 250)

(28) *Tu awinaeli-o ne-wir-k kolei ira be-szind-ans.*

you:NOM lamb-GEN.SG NEG-boil-IMP while AUX:PRS:3 BE-suck-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M

'Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk.', lit. 'Do not boil a lamb while it is sucking [it's mother]'. (BB, Gen. 34:26, quoted after Schmalstieg 1987: 101)

Such constructions are productive only in the next function.

4.1.3. Avertive

"An action which was potentially imminent but did not ultimately get realized" (Kuteva 2001: 78). A gram well-attested cross-linguistically (Kuteva 1998).

Has been described in the literature as "compound inceptive tenses" or "compound continuative tenses", both labels being inadequate.

(29) *Skubiai už-si-met-ė rūb-q ir buv-o be-iš-ein-a-nt-i,*

hurriedly PRV-RFL-throw-PST(3) clothes-ACC.SG and AUX-PST(3) BE-PRV-go-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F

tačiau pri.si.min-ė, k-o čia at-ėj-us-i.

but recall-PST(3) what-GEN.SG here PRV-go-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F

'She hurriedly slipped the clothes over her and was about to go, but remembered for what reason she had come here.' (LKT)

² <http://www.tindirindi.lt/forum/planavimas-nestumas-gimdymas/gimdymas/mano-gimdymo-istorija/ilgai-lauktas-mazylis?page=1>

³ <http://www.bernardinai.lt/straipsnis/8303>

⁴ http://www.alietuvis.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=19009:dviratininkai-vaiuodami-inui-sisti-negals&catid=69:aktualijos

⁵ <http://www.vmsi.lt/n/4/41/Tevo-leskojimas>

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

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

4.1.4. *be-* in admirative contexts

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

(31) *...ogi Seim-e, pa.si.rod-o, j-is be-dirb-ąs grup-ėje,*
 and seim-LOC.SG appear-PRS(3) 3-NOM.SG.M BE-work-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M group-LOC.SG
kur-i vadin-a-si "francija"
 which-NOM.SG.F call-PRS(3)-RFL France
 'It turns out that in the Seim he is working in the group called "France"'⁶

4.2. Modal-evaluative functions of *be-*

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

4.2.1. "Dubitative"

With events considered to have low probability, normally in the contexts of "suspended assertion" (Paducheva 2005) such as (rhetorical) questions (32), hypothetical conditionals (33) or complements of verbs expressing lack of knowledge or doubt (34)

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

(33) *Ne, tai visai kitok-s jausm-as, j-ame reik-s*
 no this totally different-NOM.SG.M feeling-NOM.SG 3-LOC.SG.M need-FUT(3)
su.si.gaudy-ti, jeigu dar kada nors be-at.ei-s.
 make.out-INF of again when ever BE-come-FUT(3)

'No, this is a totally different feeling, and one has to understand it, if it ever comes again at all.' (LKT)

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

4.2.2. "Attenuative"

Occurs when the situation is evaluated as showing a low value of some contextually relevant parameter. Normally occurs with expressions of low degree (35) or difficulty (36).

(35) *Daktar-ai iš.ėj-o, su.leid-ę Jurgi-ui vaist-u,*
 doctor-NOM.PL go.away-PST(3) inject-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M p.n.-DAT.SG medicine-GEN.PL
bet j-ie mažai be-pa.dėj-o.
 but 3-NOM.PL.M little BE-help-PST(3)

⁶ <http://www.delfi.lt/news/balsuok2011/politikoakimis/article.php?id=40931245&com=1&s=2&no=960>

‘The doctors left having injected Jurgis some medicines, but these medicines hardly helped him.’ (LKT)

- (36) ...*jaun-i žmon-ės sunkiai be-su.si.kalb-a su vyresni-aisiais.*
 young-NOM.PL.M man-NOM.PL hardly BE-agree-PRS(3) with elder-INS.PL.M.DEF
 ‘... the young and the elder understand each other only with difficulty.’⁷

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

- (37) a. *J-is ANTRADIENI-AIS te-nu.ei-dav-o į universitet-q.*
 3-NOM.SG.M Tuesday-INS.PL TE-come-HAB-PST(3) in university-ACC.SG
 ‘He came to the university only on Tuesdays.’ (neutral statement)
- b. *J-is ANTRADIENI-AIS be-nu.ei-dav-o į universitet-q.*
 3-NOM.SG.M Tuesday-INS.PL BE-come-HAB-PST(3) in university-ACC.SG
 ‘He came to the university only on Tuesdays.’ (something prevented him from coming more often)

4.2.3. “Universal”

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

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

4.3. Some generalizations

➤ The aspectual functions of *be-* are clearly interrelated. As is claimed by Ostrowski (Ms.), the historically original meaning is the continuative, going back to the adverbial particle meaning ‘still’ (39). The avertive is believed to have developed from the progressive (Ulvydas (ed.) 1971: 146; Ambrasas 1990: 180–181).

- (39) *ir warty-ke-m kun-a sawa kolei be iaun-as.*
 and use-IMP-1PL body-ACC.SG own while still young-NOM.SG.M
 ‘...and let us use our body while it is still young.’ (BP I 237.17-18, quot. after Ostrowski, Ms.)

- (40) continuative > progressive > avertive
 ? > admirative

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

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

➤ If the mutual relations of the functions **inside** the two domains of the uses of *be-* can be established with some degree of reliability, it is hardly possible to envisage any common rationale applying **both** to the aspectual and the modal-evaluative functions of this prefix.

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

5. Co-occurrence restrictions of “external” prefixes

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

➤ Strict linear order *te-ne-be-*; examples like (41), though semantically well-formed, are extremely rare and considered to be “borderline”.

- (41) *Žalgiris te-be-ne-tur-i (idom-us žod-is, ar ne?) pinig-ų.*
 p.n. TE-BE-NE-have-PRS(3) interesting-NOM.SG.M word-NOM.SG Q NEG money-GEN.PL
 ‘Žalgiris [a basketball team — P.A.] still does not have money.’ — with a metalinguistic comment about *tebeneturi*: ‘a funny word, isn’t it?’⁸

➤ Combinations of “external” prefixes are very restricted semantically:

- *ne-* and *te-* can combine with *be-* only in its continuative meaning;
- in combination with *be-*, *te-* does not retain any of the functions it has independently;
- the restrictive *te-* does not combine with negation:

- (42) a. **Te-ne-atėj-o PRAN-AS.*
 TE-NEG-come-PST(3) p.n.-NOM.SG
 intended: ‘Only Pranas did not come.’
- b. *Ne-atėj-o tik PRAN-AS.*
 NEG-come-PST(3) only p.n.-NOM.SG
 ‘id.’

6. Conclusions

Lithuanian “external” prefixes are interesting for the following reasons:

- they have not received enough attention in the descriptive and theoretical literature and remain underdocumented;
- they show an exceptional degree of polyfunctionality and context-dependence of interpretation, as well as peculiar combinatory restrictions with respect to verbal forms and each other;
- their functions are exceptional for verbal prefixes attested in the genetically and areally related languages (notably, they have no counterparts in Latvian and Latgalian), and some of them (e.g. the restrictive meaning of *te-*) constitute a clear typological rarity;
- thus they can be considered among the most typologically outstanding features of Lithuanian grammar, regrettably neglected both by traditional linguists and by typologists.

⁷ <http://forums.draugas.lt/messageview.cfm?catid=82&threadid=29191&title=jaunimas-suauge-kalba-skirtingomis-kalbomis-mokykla-mokslai>

⁸ www3.krepsinis.net

Abbreviations of sources

BB: Biblia tatau esti Wissas Schwentas Raschtas Lietuwischkai pergulditas per Janą Bretkuną ... Karaliaucziui 1579–1590.

BP: POSTILLA. Tatau esti Trumpas ir Prastas Jschguldimas Euangeliu ... Per Jana Bretkuna ... Karaliaucziui ... 1591.

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

MPA: Vincas Mykolaitis-Putinas. *Altorių šešėly*, <http://www.antologija.lt/texts/37/turinys.html>

VEE: Euangelias bei Epistolas ... per Baltramiejū Willenta ... Karalaucziui ... 1579.

Abbreviations used in glosses

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

References

- Ambrasas V. (1990). *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltiškix jazykov* [Comparative Syntax of Participles in Baltic Languages]. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrasas V. (ed.) (1997). *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Andronovas A.V. (1995). Priešdėlinių veiksmažodžių kirčiavimas morfologinės akcentologijos požiūriu. *Baltistica* 30(1), 93–100.
- Arkadiev P. (2010). Notes on the Lithuanian restrictive. *Baltic Linguistics* 1, 9–49.
- Arkadiev P. (2011a). On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2, 37–78.
- Arkadiev P. (2011b). O funkcijax prefiksa *be-* v litovskom jazyke [On the functions of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian]. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 7 (3), 252–257.
- Cysouw M. & J. Wohlgemuth (2010). The other end of universals: Theory and typology of *rara*. In: J. Wohlgemuth & M. Cysouw (eds.), *Rethinking Universals. How Rarities Affect Linguistic Theories*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–10.
- Dambriūnas L. (1960). *Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių aspektai*. Boston: Lietuvių enciklopedijos spaustuė.
- de Penaros H. (2010). La préfixation en lituanien: le cas de *iš-*. *Faits de Langues – Les Cahiers* 2, 105–137.
- Drotvinas L. (1963). Ustupitel'nye konstrukcii litovskogo literaturnogo jazyka [Concessive constructions in Standard Lithuanian]. *Kalbotyra* 7, 145–170.
- Dzikaras L. (2011). Lietuvių ir latvių veiksmažodžių priešdėlio *at-* semantinė analizė remiantis kognityvine lingvistika. BA Thesis, Vilnius University.
- Endzelins J. (1971/1906). *Latyškie predlogi* [Latvian Prepositions]. P. II. In: J. Endzelins. *Darbu izlase*. T. I. Riga: Zinātne, 521–655. (1st ed. Jur'ev, 1906).
- Evans N. (1995). A-quantifiers and scope in Mayali. In E. Bach, E. Jelinek, A. Kratzer & B.H. Partee (eds.), *Quantification in Natural Languages*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 207–270.
- Fraenkel E. (1962-1965). *Litauisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bd. I-II. Heidelberg: Winter; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Galnaitytė E. (1959). Leksičeskije značeniija glagol'noj pristavki *po-* v sootvetstvii s litovskoj pristavkoj *pa-* [Lexical meanings of the Russian verbal prefix *po-* in comparison with Lithuanian prefix *pa-*]. In: V.V. Vinogradov (ed.), *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie* [Slavic Linguistics.] Moscow.: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 59–71.
- Harris A.C. (1991). Mingrelian. In: *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus. Vol. 1. The Kartvelian Languages*. Delmar, New York: Caravan Press, 313–394.
- König E. (1986). Conditionals, concessive conditionals, and concessives: areas of contrast, overlap, and neutralization. In E.C. Traugott et al. (eds.), *On Conditionals*. Cambridge: CUP, 229–246.
- König E. (1991). *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Kozhanov K.A. (2011a). Lietuvių kalbos priešdėlio *da-* sematika arealiniame kontekste. In: T. Civjan, A. Judžentis, M. Zavalova (eds.), *Baltai ir slavai: Dvasinių kultūrų sankirtos. Tautartinė mokslo konferencija akad. Vladimirui Toporoviui atminti*. Vilnius: Valstybės žinios, 42–43.
- Kozhanov K.A. (2011b). Semantic networks of Lithuanian verbal prefixes *nu-* and *už-*. In: J. Pakerys, E. Žilinskaitė (red.), *Morfologijos seminaras, skirtas prof. Albertui Rosinui atminti. Pranešimų tezės*. Vilnius, 13–14.
- Kozhanov K.A. (Ms.). Istorija izučeniija glagol'nyx prefixov v litovskom jazyke [The history of the study of Lithuanian verbal prefixes]. Ms.
- Kuteva T. (1998). On identifying an evasive gram: Action narrowly averted. *Studies in Language* 22/1, 113–160.

- Kuteva T. (2001). *Auxiliation. An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mathiassen T. (1996). *A Short Grammar of Lithuanian*, Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Ostrowski N. (2010). Negacja zewnętrzna / negacja wewnętrzna, czyli o historii lit. *nebe-*. Talk at the conference *Perspectives on Baltic Philology 2*, Poznań.
- Ostrowski N. (2011a). Iš lietuvių kalbos istorinės morfologijos problemų: apie *nebe(-)* ir *bent* kilmę. *Lietuvių kalba* 5.
- Ostrowski N. (2011b). Apie veiksmažodžio priešdėlio *be-* funkcijas XVI a. tekstuose. In: J. Pakerys, E. Žilinskaitė (red.), *Morfologijos seminaras, skirtas prof. Albertui Rosinui atminti. Pranešimų tezės*. Vilnius, 13–14.
- Ostrowski N. (to appear). Pochodzenie litewskiego afiksu duratywnego *teb(e)-*. To appear in S. Schab, D. Skrzypek, P. Zborowski, eds., *Logos et mundus*. Poznań.
- Ostrowski N. (Ms.). On the origin of the Lithuanian verbal prefix *be-*.
- Otrębski J. (1965). *Gramatyka języka litewskiego*. T. 3. Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe.
- Paducheva E.V. (2005). Negation in Russian: suspended assertion and duality. Paper presented at *The Fifth Annual Conference of the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Association*, The University of Kansas, 22–23 October.
- Paulauskas J. (1958). Veiksmažodžių priešdėlių funkcijos dabartinėje lietuvių literatūrinėje kalboje, *Literatūra ir kalba* 3: 301–453.
- Paulauskienė A. & D. Tarvydaitė (1986). *Gramatikos normos ir dabartinė vartoseną*. Kaunas: Šviesa.
- Rinholm H.D. (1980). *Toward the Semantic Distinctive Features of Lithuanian Prepositions and Preverbs: An Invariant Component Analysis*. Indiana University PhD dissertation.
- Rinholm H.D. (1990). On the meaning of the Lithuanian preposition and preverb *už, už-*. In: B. Metuizalė-Kangere & H.D. Rinholm (eds.), *Symposium Balticum. A Festschrift to Honour Professor Velta Rūke-Dravina*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Schleicher A. (1856). *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache. Bd. I. Grammatik*. Prag: Calve.
- Schmalstieg W.R. (1987). *A Lithuanian Historical Syntax*. Columbus (OH): Slavica.
- Senn A. (1966). *Handbuch der lithauischen Sprache. Bd. I. Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Sližienė N. (1961). Apie sudurtines pradedines veiksmažodžių formas. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 4, 67–72.
- Smoczyński W. (2007). *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Wilno: Vilniaus Universitetas.
- Stolz Th. (1989). Zum Wandel der morphotaktischen Positionsregeln des Baltischen Reflexivzeichens. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 9/1, 13–27.
- Tomelleri V. (2011). Sulla categoria dell'aspetto verbale in Osseto. In: *Anatolistica, indoeuropeistica e oltre nelle memorie dei seminari offerti da Onofrio Carruba (anni 1997–2002) al Medesimo presentato*. Tomo I. Milano: Qu.A.S.A.R. S.R.L., 67–111.
- Ulvydas K. (red.) 1971. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika. II tomas. Morfologija*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Vaillant A. (1947). Lituanien *be-*, slave *-bě*. *Révue des études slaves* 23, 151–152.
- Zinkevičius Z. (1981). *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. T. II. Vilnius: Mokslas.