The Lithuanian passive perfect and its history

Birutė Spraunienė & Paweł Brudzyński
Vilnius University

The aim of the article is to establish the existence and structure of the passive perfect in Lithuanian. This language has a periphrastic active perfect, but its passive counterpart, consisting of 'be' and a past passive participle, is not completely severed from its grammaticalisation source, the object resultative. Experiential uses are attested, which suggests that the resultative has to some extent become a perfect, but it is not clear to what extent the two can be teased apart. On the other hand, the experiential passive perfect has dedicated marking of its own as well, though it is not frequent. The Lithuanian passive perfect is thus a rather diffuse and weakly entrenched gram. The failure of the language to develop a clearly defined passive perfect can probably be explained formally and functionally by the overall low degree of grammaticalisation of the perfect (including the active perfect) in Lithuanian.

Keywords: Lithuanian, passive, perfect, object resultative, resultative perfect, experiential perfect, evidential

1. Introduction[1]

While the body of literature on the active perfect both as a language-specific gram and a cross-linguistically identifiable gram-type is now vast (Comrie 1976, 52–64, Dahl 1985, 129– 153, Lindstedt 2000, Ritz 2012, Velupillai & Dahl 2013 etc.; as 'anteriors' in Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994, 51–105), its passive counterpart has not received the same amount of attention. In some languages, defining a passive perfect is straightforward: in English, it is a passive whose auxiliary is in the perfect:

---

(1) *The Letter of Implementation has now been signed by all parties.*

In many languages, however, it is less easy to define what exactly can be described as a passive perfect because of the closeness of this category to the resultative construction from which it has developed. Resultative constructions, which are recognised as a cross-linguistically identifiable construction type referring to a state resulting from a previous event (Nedjalkov, ed. 1988), are potential sources for both passives and perfects. Passives consisting of a copula and a passive participle (a type more or less restricted to Indo-European languages according to Haspelmath 1990, 29) are originally copular constructions used to characterise the result of a past process, and a certain persistent ambiguity between a dynamic and a stative interpretation is a hallmark of this type of passive (Keenan & Dryer 2007, 337). Perfects, on the other hand, often arise from the combination of a copula or a 'have'-construction with a past participle (Bybee & Dahl 1989, 67–68), and in the case of a passive perfect this will obviously be a passive participle.

In the Baltic languages, the point of departure for the passive is an originally copular construction with the so-called past passive participle:

(2a) Lithuanian
  Langai *yra* *uždaryti*[2].
  window.NOM.PL be.PRS.3 close.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M

(2b) Latvian
  Logi *ir* *aizslēgti.*
  window.NOM.PL be.PRS.3 close.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M
  'The windows are shut.'

The creation of a system of passive forms on the basis of this originally copular stative passive[3] involved, in both Baltic languages, processes of reanalysis (stative passives becoming reanalysed as dynamic) as well as extension by means of additional lexical and morphological devices. A process of reanalysis has led to Lithuanian constructions as illustrated in

---

[2] When no textual reference is given, the example has been constructed by the authors.

[3] We here use the term 'stative passive' in accordance with Geniušienė (2016, 47). 'Stative passives' satisfy the definition of 'object resultatives' given in Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988, 8–9). In our article, we use the terms '(object) resultatives', 'resultative passives' and 'stative passives' synonymously.

(2a) acquiring past-tense or perfect interpretations ('The windows were/ have been closed') in addition to the original present resultative function. Extension of the paradigm through introduction of new morphological devices took different directions in the two Baltic languages. In Lithuanian, the passive paradigm was expanded through the introduction of the present passive participle (the -*m*-participle) to provide progressive (imperfective) passive forms alongside the resultative/perfective forms based on the past participle, as illustrated in (3):

(3) Lithuanian
 Langai   *yra*   *uždaromi.*
 window.NOM.PL be.PRS.3 close.PRS.PP.NOM.PL.M
 'The windows are being closed.'

In Latvian, the expansion of the paradigm was achieved through introduction of the verb *tikt* 'get, become' (formerly also *tapt* and *kļūt*, with the same meaning) as an auxiliary alongside 'be', as a means of providing unequivocally dynamic (actional) passive forms alongside resultative/ perfect forms based on the past participle; this is shown in (4):

(4) Latvian
 Logi   *tika*   *aizslēgti.*
 window.NOM.PL become.PST.3 close.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M
 'The windows were shut.' (dynamic reading)

While the forms with -*m*-participles in Lithuanian and *tikt* in Latvian are grammatically unambiguous, forms based on 'be' show frequent and sometimes multiple ambiguity (cf. Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988, 372; Geniušienė 2016, 48). The following should be pointed out for Lithuanian:

(5) *Langai*   *yra*   *uždaryti*
 window.NOM.PL be.PRS.3 close.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M
 (a) present tense of stative passive ('the windows are closed')
 (b) perfect tense of dynamic passive ('the windows have been closed')

(6) *langai*   *buvo*   *uždaryti*
 window.NOM.PL be.PST.3 close.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M
 (a) past tense of stative passive ('the windows were closed, i. e., not open')
 (b) past tense of dynamic passive ('the windows were closed')
 (c) pluperfect tense of dynamic passive ('the windows had been closed')

(7) *langai   bus   uždaryti*
     window.NOM.PL   be.FUT.3   close.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M

    (a) future tense of stative passive ('the windows will be closed, i. e., not open')

    (b) future tense of dynamic passive ('the windows will be closed')

    (c) future perfect tense of dynamic passive ('the windows will have been closed')

While (6a–c) and (7a–c) are rather straightforward instances of ambiguity, the case of (5a) and (5b) is less obvious. A passive perfect may coexist with a present tense of the resultative (stative) passive, as shown by the example of English *has been closed* and *is closed*, but in view of the closeness of the resultative perfect to the resultative, and the lack of a formal distinction between the two in Lithuanian, we may ask whether they have indeed become sufficiently differentiated to warrant the claim that there is a relationship of ambiguity rather than vagueness between them.

The purpose of this article is to find an answer to the questions already indicated above: does Lithuanian have a passive variety of the prototypical perfect with the usual resultative/experiential function cluster, or is the passive perfect a not fully emancipated or not fully entrenched gram? The structure of the article is as follows. We will first discuss the treatment of the passive perfect in Lithuanian grammars (where it does not always figure under this name) and formulate the descriptive problem of how to integrate these forms in the passive paradigm. The next sections provide a historical background for the discussion by describing the picture that emerges from Old Lithuanian texts. Then, on the basis of modern language data, we will deal with the problem of the passive resultative perfect, and whether it can be teased apart from the present tense of the resultative. Next, we will examine the passive experiential perfect and its formal variants. In the final section, we will attempt to formulate some conclusions.

2. What the grammars say

In Lithuanian reference grammars, the grammatical interpretation is dictated by the tendency to view the verbal system as a set of correlations enabling the arrangement of inflectional forms in tense paradigms neatly represented in tabular form. Thus, the English-language Lithuanian Grammar (Ambrazas, ed., 2006, 324–325) calls *esu (at)neštas* be.PRS.1SG

bring.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M 'I have been brought' a present perfect of the passive. But this does not reflect the description given in the Academy Grammar (Ulvydas, ed., 1970, 162–167), where such forms are cautiously described as 'passive constructions with past participles', while the notion of perfect does not appear at all, being alien to the older grammatical tradition of the language. The Academy Grammar describes the meaning as twofold, and the formulations offered correspond to the notions of resultative (stative) and actional (dynamic) passive respectively. Now that we have the notion of the perfect as a cross-linguistically valid gram-type (Dahl 1985, 129–153), we can pose the question whether *esu atneštas* is an instance of this gram-type. Taking our cue from the Academy Grammar as well as from Geniušienė (2016, 47, 227–230, 231–245), we can interpret this expression as representing at least the resultative (stative passive). Is it also a passive perfect? We should note that the language also has a construction with perfect form of the auxiliary, formed by present tense form of the auxiliary 'be' followed by past active participle of 'be', of a type comparable to English *has been closed.*

(8) *Už   smurtą   L. B.   yra   buvęs*
    for   violence.ACC.SG   be.PRS.3   be.PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
    išvežtas   ir   uždarytas
    take_away.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   and   lock_up.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
    policijoje,   teistas.
    police.LOC   convict.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
    'For violent behaviour L. B. has (on one or more occasions in the past) been taken away and put in police custody, and also convicted.'[4]

This construction, as we will see, is rare, and the grammars do not note its existence (Ulvydas, ed., 1970, 164–167). The function illustrated in (8) is experiential. Is this variety always experiential? Is the experiential perfect passive always of this form, or can passives as illustrated in (5) also be experiential? The situation is undoubtedly more complex than the reference grammars suggest, and the passive forms can probably not be squeezed into neat conjugational tables as we find them in Ambrazas, ed. (1996, 323–326).

---

[4] https://e-teismai.lt/byla/115481079643281/A2_9_-622-363/2016 (accessed 2021-06-25)

3. Diachronic aspects

The development of an actional passive out of a resultative passive, a form characterising a state resulting from a prior event, involves a meaning shift foregrounding the prior event, so that, for instance, a present-tense resultative passive comes to be reinterpreted as a past-tense actional passive. This development is shown in (9):

(9) *yra*   *uždarytas*
    be.PRS.3   close.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
    initial meaning: 'is closed'
    new meaning 'was closed/has been closed'

At an initial stage *yra uždarytas* was ambiguous between the old meaning (stative passive) and the new meaning (past or perfect-tense of the actional passive), much as in the case of Latin *ianua clausa est* 'the door is closed' or 'the door was closed'. This ambiguity has been at least partly eliminated in modern Lithuanian, where the past-tense actional passive has a past-tense auxiliary:

(10) *yra*   *atrastas*
     be.PRS.3   find.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
→   *buvo*   *atrastas*
     be.PST.3   find.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M

That is, in modern Lithuanian *yra uždarytas* has lost its past-tense function; whether it has retained or acquired a perfect function is a question we will consider further on.

In Old Lithuanian both forms, the older one with the present-tense form of the auxiliary and the new one with the past-tense auxiliary, seem to have been used more or less interchangeably in what can be recognised as typical past-tense function, a function that can be identified on the basis of the ability to be used in narrative text portions. The following examples are from the 17th-century Chyliński Bible:

(11) *Numire*   *teypag*   *ir*   *ans*   *bagoczius,*
     die.PST.3   likewise   also   that.NOM.SG.M   rich_man.NOM.SG
     ir   *pakaſtas*   *buwo.*
     and   bury.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   be.PST.3
     Chyliński NT Luke 16.23
     'The rich man also died, and was buried.[5]'

---

[5] The English translation of the Bible verses cited is taken from the King James Bible.

(12) [*Ó waykey Izraelaus łaydes nog Beeroth-Bene-Jaakan, ir Moſeros:*]

tęn	*numire*	*Aaron,*	*ir*	*pakaſtas*
there	die.PST.3	Aaron	and	bury.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M

tęn	*ira,*
there	be.PRS.3

[*ó funus jo Eleazar atprowinejo Kunigiſzki-uredą wietoy jo.*]

Chyliński, OT, Deut. 10.6

'[And the children of Israel took their journey from Beeroth of the children of Jaakan to Mosera:] there Aaron died, and there he was buried; [and Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his stead.]'

When did forms of the type *yra pakastas* lose their past-tense function? There is probably no easy answer to this question because the Old Lithuanian texts are translations, whose linguistic features may be influenced by those of the source texts. The problem can be seen from the following example:

(13)

Ir	*augo*	*ans*	*waykas,*	*ir*
and	grow.PST.3	that.NOM.SG.M	child.NOM.SG	and

atjunkitas	*ira*	*nog*	*piena.*
wean.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M	be.PRS.3	from	milk.GEN.SG

'And the child grew, and was weaned.'

Chylińskis, OT Gen. 21.8

crevit igitur puer et ablactatus est (Vulgate)

rosło tedy dziecię, i zostawione iest od piersi (Polish Danzig Bible)

ende het kint wert groot, ende wert gespeent (Dutch *Statenvertaling*).

Though the Dutch version, which was the primary source of Chyliński's Bible translation, has an auxiliary in the past tense (*wert*), both the Latin and the Polish (secondary sources) have present-tense auxiliaries. Latin *ablactatus est* is a normal passive perfect (perfective past), whereas the Polish form is as problematic as the Lithuanian one—it could also have had, at that stage, different tense values. While the tense forms of the auxiliary could have influenced the choice of the tense form in the Lithuanian translation, there is no direct dependency on other language versions: in (14) the Polish version has the present tense of the auxiliary, but the Lithuanian one the past tense:

(14)

Teypo	*paſtypryntas*		*buwo*	*ans*
so	confirm.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M		be.PST.3	DEM.NOM.SG.M

łaukas	*ir*	*lindyne*	*kuriy*	*tęn*
field.NOM.SG	and	cave.NOM.SG	REL.NOM.SG.F	there

> *buwo,*
> be.PST.3
> [*Abrahomuy and teywaynifzkio-pakafima*]
> Chyliński OT Gen. 2320
> 'And the field, and the cave that *is* therein, were made sure
> [unto Abraham for a possession of a buryingplace].'
> *I oddane iest pole i iaskinia, która była na nim, Abrahamowi w osiadłość
> grobu*

However, judging from our data, examples like (13–14) were not numerous and the tense form of the passive auxiliary in Lithuanian Bible translations largely corresponds to that of the source text. In Bretke's Bible, 94% of *yra* + PST.PP constructions correspond to a present tense auxiliary in Luther's Bible, and 97% of *buvo* + PST.PP correspond either to the auxiliary 'be' or 'become' (18% and 82% of corresponding examples respectively) in the past tense. In Chyliński's Bible, 90% of *yra* + PST.PP correspond to the auxiliary 'be' in the present tense in the *Statenvertaling* and 100% of *buvo* + PST.PP correspond either to the auxiliary 'be' or 'become' (52% and 48% of the cases respectively) in the past tense. In Ruhig's and Giedraitis' Bible translations, the number of matching examples is similar (approximately 90%).

Though we can never be sure about the possible influence of other language versions (Latin, Polish, Dutch etc.) on the choice of the tense form of the auxiliary in individual cases, it seems likely that in the 17th century the two varieties of the past actional passive were both fully alive.

In order to establish when the variety with the present-tense form of the auxiliary went out of use, we compared four versions of the New Testament. We selected Bible translations as our source because they enable a comparison of longer parallel texts. However, this can only be a pilot study as for Bretke's Bible only a limited number of books from the New Testament are available in electronic form; we restricted ourselves therefore to the Gospels. As our material we chose the translations by Johannes Bretke (1590), Samuel Boguslaus Chyliński (1660), Philipp Ruhig (1727) and Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis (1816). In the following, we will give some background information about the four Bible translations, their authors and the possible translation sources.

Johannes Bretke (Lith. Jonas Bretkūnas, 1536-1602) was a Lutheran pastor, born in the Duchy of Prussia. He was the author of the first Bible translation into Lithuanian. He translated the whole Bible text in the span

of more than 10 years, and finished his work in 1590. There is no doubt that his main source was Luther's Bible (1534) though he presumably also used some older translations from Vilentas' *Evangelijos bei epistolos* ('Gospels and Epistles', 1579). It is believed that Bretke tried not to be a blind follower of Luther and while translating he expressed the wish to be assisted by a person knowing Hebrew, in order to compare his text with the original, but no such person was found. Although Bretke's Bible was completed, it never appeared in print but is extant in the manuscript (Bukantytė 2006).

Samuel Boguslaus Chyliński (1631-1668) was a Calvinist pastor, descendant of a Polish pastor, Adrian Chyliński, and a Lithuanian mother from the gentry family Minvydas. The author undoubtedly spoke both Lithuanian and Polish. The source text for his Bible translation was most certainly not the Hebrew or Greek original but the Dutch *Statenvertaling* (the Translation of the Estates General, 1637), which was highly regarded among Lithuanian Protestants. Chyliński also episodically used the principal Polish Calvinist translation—the Danzig Bible (1632). The printing of Chyliński's Bible translation was stopped in 1660, and only the printed part of the Old Testament and the manuscript of the New Testament have survived until our times (Kavaliūnaitė, 2008).

The so-called Ruhig Bible was actually a collective work, and among other translators we should mention Christoph Rebentisch (1682–1724) and Hiob Naunien (1672–1730). However, Philipp Ruhig (1675–1749), Lutheran pastor, philosopher and philologist, was the main translator. Ruhig's Bible was most certainly translated from Luther's Bible. This is confirmed by lexical and syntactic similarities as well as structural features, such as the fact that the text was printed in two columns: the German version on the left and the Lithuanian version on the right. Like the earlier Lithuanian Bible translations, the Ruhig Bible was not based on the originals.

Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis (Józef Arnulf Giedroyć, 1754–1838) was Bishop of Samogitia, then part of the Russian Empire. His New Testament translation saw the light in difficult circumstances. Giedraitis was forced to have his translation printed by the (Protestant) British Bible Society, of which a section had been established in Vilnius with the Czar's support. It was a complex situation in which he had to manoeuvre between the Pope and the Czar (Prašmantaitė 2000). Giedraitis' language and the sources of his translation have not been researched thoroughly. It is as-

sumed that his main translation source was the Greek original, but there is no firm evidence. It is also acknowledged that Giedraitis' translation was influenced by the Bythner New Testament (1701).[6]

For the purpose of our study, a corpus based on the aforementioned translations was created on the Sketch Engine platform (392728 tokens). From this corpus we compiled a sample of passive constructions with an overt auxiliary in the present tense (*yra*) or in the past tense (*buvo*). In our search for relevant forms we used a formula consisting of the passive past participle (further -*t*-participle or PST.PP) endings (-*tas, -ta, -ti, -tos*) preceded or followed by an auxiliary verb in the present tense (*yra*) or in the past tense (*buvo*). As a starting point we took Chyliński's Bible and found 206 Gospel fragments that had either the *yra* + PST.PP or the *buvo* + PST.PP construction. After that the corresponding verses were collected in other translations. In total, 824 examples were collected. The collected passages were then compared with the source texts: the Luther Bible (1534), the Dutch Statenvertaling (1637) and the Danzig Bible (1632) as well as the modern Lithuanian Bible translation by Kostas Burbulys (1999).

The collected data was then divided according to the type of structure used to describe the event in individual translations. The following table shows the results:

Table 1. *Distribution of tense forms in researched Bible translations*

Bible translation	*yra* + PST.PP	*buvo* + PST.PP	PST.PP	active (incl. **reflexive**)	other	Total
Bretke (1590)	89	39	15	18	45	206
Chyliński (1660)	126	77	0	0	3	206
Ruhig (1727)	52	35	65	18	36	206
Giedraitis (1816)	82	60	22	28	14	206
Total	349	211	102	64	98	824

---

[6] For this information I am indebted to Gina Kavaliūnaitė. The Bythner New Testament was a collective translation from the Greek original, carried out at the behest of the Reformed Synod of the Grand Duchy and printed in Prussia thanks to the efforts of Samuel Bythner (c. 1632–1710).

As can be seen in the table, the most prominent group are constructions with auxiliary verb in the present and past tense. A relatively large number of examples with the -*t*-participle do not have an overt auxiliary, which is a striking feature characteristic of Ruhig's translation; in such cases it is hard to determine which form of the auxiliary is omitted. This issue will be discussed in detail further on in the paper.

As already mentioned, the emergence of the passive system involves reanalysis of originally copular constructions. As is argued for the corresponding active constructions by Kapkan (2021), in a significant portion of constructions with *yra* the participle can be interpreted as describing a state or quality not necessarily viewed as a result of prior action. In our material numerous constructions with overt present tense auxiliary (45 examples) and without it (32 examples) can be interpreted as containing adjectival participles rather than verbal past passive participles. This function is retained even in the most recent translations, cf. (17):

(15)   ***Paſchlowinti***   ***ira***,   *kurie*   *Dwaſiſchkai*
glorify.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M   be.PRS.3   REL.NOM.PL.M   spiritually
ubagais   *ira*
poor.INS.PL.M   be.PRS.3
Bretke NT Matthew 5.3
Selig sind, *die da geistlich arm sind*
'Blessed are the poor in spirit'

(16)   ***Paßlawinti***   ***(ira)***   *ubagey*   *Dwasioy*
glorify.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M   be.PRS.3   poor.NOM.PL.M   spirit.LOC.SG
Chyliński NT Matthew 5.3
Zalig zijn *de armen van geest*
Statenbijbel NT Matthew 5.3
'Blessed are the poor in spirit'

(17)   ***Palaiminti***   *vargšai*   *dvasia...*
bless.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M   poor.NOM.PL.M   spirit.INS.SG
Burbulys NT Matthew 5.3
'Blessed are the poor in spirit'

As Kapkan (2021) notes, such adjectival participles can be identified on the basis of their not presupposing a prior event, or having acquired a new meaning diverging from that of the finite verb. In our Bible translations we can also single out a group of -*t*-participles meeting these criteria, such as: *pašlavintas/palaimintas* 'blessed', (cf. Greek μακάριος, Latin *beatus*, Ger-

man *selig,* Dutch *salich*; 22 examples), *priligintas* 'similar' (Greek ὡμοιώθη, Latin *simile factum est*, but German *gleich,* Dutch *gelijck*; 16 examples). It is basically constructions with participles denoting a state implying a prior action that are relevant for the development of the passive. Such *yra* + PST.PP constructions are numerous in the analysed texts (236 examples) and they could be interpreted either as the present tense of the resultative or the perfect of the dynamic passive, as illustrated in example (18):

(18) (a) *Wel*   *taipaieg*   ***raſchita***   ***ira.***   *Diewo*
           again   therefore   write.PST.PP.NA   be.PRS.3   God.GEN.SG
           Wieſchpaties   *tawo*   *ne*   *turi*   *gundinti.*
           lord.GEN.SG   2SG.POSS   NEG   must.PRS.3SG   tempt.INF
           Bretke Matthew 4.7

     (b) ***Paraßyta***   *teypag*   ***ira:***   *Negundÿnsi*
          write.PST.PP.NA   therefore   be.PRS.3   NEG.tempt.FUT.2SG
          Pona   *Diewa*   *tawo.*
          lord.GEN.SG   god.GEN.SG   2SG.POSS
          Chyliński Matthew 4.7

     (c) *Wěl*   ***paraßyta***   ***yra:***   *Ne*   *gundįk*
          again   write.PST.PP.NA   be.PRS.3   NEG   tempt.IMP.2SG
          Diewą   *ſawo*   *Wießpatį.*
          god.ACC.SG   RPO   lord.ACC.SG
          Ruhig Matthew 4.7

     (d) *Wel*   ***paraszita***   ***ira:***   *Ne*   *gundinsi*
          again   write.PST.PP.NA   be.PRS.3   NEG   tempt.FUT.2SG
          Wieszpaties   *Diewo*   *tawo.*
          lord.GEN.SG   god.GEN.SG   2SG.POSS
          Giedraitis Matthew 4.7
          'It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'

The same ambiguity or vagueness can be observed in the contemporary language. However, as mentioned above, *yra* + PST.PP constructions can also be interpreted as preterital. According to Bybee and Dahl (1989, 57), resultative constructions may become passive perfects, which subsequently may develop into past-tense forms. This scenario implies that we must posit a passive perfect as an intermediary stage in the process of creation of the passive preterite. As the relationship between preterite and perfect is hierarchical (the existence of a perfect presupposes the existence of a preterite), this implies that the category of perfect had been previously

established, e.g., in the form of an active perfect consisting of 'be' + past active participle. In the opposite case, we must assume the original resultative to have developed into an undifferentiated preterite/perfect. To support this claim, consider (19), where the form *yra* + PST.PP co-occurs with a definite time adverbial 'when eight days were accomplished'. Such use indicates that *yra* + PST.PP in (19) should be interpreted as preterital, especially when we take into consideration that in Ruhig text the same event is rendered in an active past-tense form, and in the modern language the construction *buvo* + PST.PP is used:

(19) (a) *Ir   kaip   afchtonias   dienas   ifsipilde [...],*
          and   when   eight.NOM.F   day.NOM.PL   fulfill.PST.RFL.3
          wadintas   eft   ia
          call.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   be.PRS.3   3SG.M.GEN
          wardas   Iesus...
          name.NOM.SG   PN.NOM
          Bretke NT Luke 2,21

      (b) *Jr   kad   aßtonios   dienos   ifipiłde [...],*
          and   when   eight.NOM.F   day.NOM.PL   fulfill.RFL.PST.3
          pramintas   ira   wardas
          call.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   be.PRS.3   name.NOM.SG
          jo   Jezus...
          3SG.M.GEN   PN.NOM
          Chyliński NT Luke 2,21

      (c) *Ir   kaip   iffipilde   aßtŭnos   Dienos [...],*
          and   when   fulfill.RFL.PST.3   eight.NOM.F   day.NOM.PL
          tadda   praminne   Ii   Wardu   Iéʒumi...
          then   call.PST.3   3SG.M.ACC   name.INS.SG   PN.INS
          Ruhig, NT Luke 2,21

      (d) *Praslinkus   aštuonioms   dienoms [...],   Jam   buvo*
          elapse.CVB   eight.DAT.F   day.DAT.PL   3SG.M.DAT   be.PST.3
          duotas   Jézaus   vardas...
          give.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   PN.GEN   name.NOM.SG
          Burbulys, NT Luke 2,21
          'And when eight days were accomplished [...], his name was called
          JESUS'

The interpretation of individual Old Lithuanian forms with the present-tense auxiliary *yra* is often difficult; the perfect (of the active) is not as strongly grammaticalised in Lithuanian as, say, in English, and even in

modern Lithuanian it can often be replaced with a simple past. In (20a), the form *ira regietas* could be interpreted either as a past tense or as a perfect; subsequent translators offer either the perfect (20b) or the preterite (20c) of the active here. The past tense *kieles* suggests that *regietas ira* should perhaps be read as a preterite as well:

(20) (a) *Wießpats   tykrey   **kieles,   ir   regietas***
        lord.NOM.SG   truly   rise.PST.3   and   see.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
        ira   nog   Simona.
        be.PRS.3   of   PN.GEN
        Chyliński NT Luke 24.34

    (b) *Wießpat's   tikkray   prifikėlęs,   ir   Simonui*
        lord.NOM.SG   truly   rise.PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   and   PN.DAT
        paſiródęs.
        appear.PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
        Ruhig NT Luke 24.34

    (c) *uźtikra   kéles   Wieszpats,   ir   **pasirode***
        truly   rise.PST.3   lord.NOM.SG   and   appear.PST.3
        Simonuy.
        PN.DAT
        Giedraitis NT Luke 24.34
        'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.'

    A precondition for the ultimate loss of the past-tense meaning in forms like *yra regėtas* was the introduction of forms with the past-tense form of the auxiliary in past-tense function. This form was not in itself new, for even at the resultative stage there had to be, alongside the present-tense form *yra parašyta* 'it is written', a past-tense form 'it was written'. In the Old Lithuanian texts it is already firmly established as a past-tense dynamic passive. 96% of the constructions (100% in Chyliński's text) with *buvo* in the analysed material correspond in the source texts to passives with the auxiliary 'be' or 'become' in the past tense:

(21) *Bet   buwo   prieg   tos   wietos,   kur*
      but   be.PST.3   on   this.GEN.SG.F   place.GEN.SG   where
      buwo   nukriʒawotas   Darʒas...
      be.PST.3   crucify.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   garden.NOM.SG
      Bretke NT John 19.41
      Es war aber an der Stätte, da er gekreuziget ward, ein Garten
      'Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden.'

(22) Ó   buwo   and   anos   wietoσ   kame
     and   be.PST.3   on   this.GEN.SG.F place.GEN.SG   where
     buwo   nukryʒiawotas,   darʒaσ
     be.PST.3   crucify.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   garden.NOM.SG
     Chyliński NT John 19.41
     En er was in de plaats, waar Hij gekruist was, een hof (Statenbijbel)
     *A był na onem miejscu, gdzie **był ukrzyżowany**, ogród* (Danzig Bible)
     'Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden'

In a small number of instances *buvo* + PST.PP represents the past tense of
the resultative passive:

(23) Bet   Pétras,   ir   kurrie   fu   jůmi
     but   PN.NOM   and   REL.NOM.PL.M   with   3SG.M.INS
     buwo,   Miegu   **buwo**   **apimti**.
     be.PST.3   sleep.INS.SG   be.PST.3   envelop.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M
     Ruhig NT Luke 9.32
     Petrus aber, und die mit ihm waren, waren voll Schlafs. (Luther)
     'But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep.'

Finally, *buvo* + PST.PP could also function as a pluperfect; in (24) it conveys
the meaning of 'Perfect in the Past' (for the term, see Daugavet & Arkadiev,
this volume), more specifically, experiential in the past:

(24) Ir   ataia   ing   Nazareth   kur   buwa
     and   come.PST.3   to   PLN   where   be.PST.3
     uźchaugintas.
     bring_up.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
     Bretke NT Luke 4.16
     vnd er kam gen nazareth / da er erzogen war (Luther)
     endy hy quam tot Nazareth daer hy opgevoedt was (Statenbijbel)
     'And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up.'

An important step in the development of the dynamic passive was the
introduction of the -*m*-participle[7] alongside the -*t*-participle. It is already
firmly established in Bretke's Bible translation, in agreement with Am-

---

[7] The -*m*-participle is formed on the basis of the present-tense stem and is therefore labelled
'present passive participle'. In modern Lithuanian passive forms with the -*m*-participle are
always dynamic, regardless of the actionality class of the input verb. In the present tense
-*m*-passives may refer to an ongoing action or a habitual situation, they may also acquire
impersonal, generic and modal uses, while in the past tense -*m*-passives are used mostly for
atelic processes and activities (for details see Nau, Spraunienė & Žeimantienė 2020, 53–74).

brazas' assumption that in West Aukštaitian (reflected in Bretke) the -*m*-participle entered the passive paradigm much earlier than in other dialects of Lithuanian (Ambrazas 2001, 15). In the researched material there are only 19 instances of passives with the -*m*-participle, 15 of them in Bretke's text and 4 in Ruhig's New Testament. The -*m*-participle is also well attested in Chyliński's Bible. Already in Bretke, the -*m*-participle occurs in two tense varieties, present and past (Bretke: 6 *yra,* 8 *buvo*; Ruhig 1 *yra*, 2 *buvo*):

(25) (a) *akis*   *iu*   **laikamas**   **buwa**,
eye.NOM.PL   3PL.GEN   hold.PRS.PP.NOM.PL.F   be.PST.3
idant   *ia*   *ne*   *pazintû.*
that   3SG.M.GEN   NEG   know.IRR.3
Bretke NT Luke 24.16

(b) *akis*   *ju*   **buwo**   **uzturetos**
eye.NOM.PL   3PL.GEN   be.PST.3   hold.PST.PP.NOM.PL.F
jog   *nepazyna*   *jo*
that   NEG.know.PST.3   3SG.M.GEN
Chyliński NT Luke 24.16

(c) *jû*   *dwiejû*   *Akis*   **buwo**
3PL.GEN   two.GEN   eye.NOM.PL   be.PST.3
laikomos,   *jog*   *Io*   *ne*   *paźinno.*
hold.PRS.PP.NOM.PL.F   that   3SG.M.GEN   **NEG**   **know.PST.3**
Ruhig NT Luke 24.16
'But their eyes were holden that they should not know him.'

The introduction of the -*m*-participle into the passive paradigm presumably changed the division of tasks between auxiliary and participle as far as tense marking was concerned. As the present tense of the auxiliary in combination with the -*m*-participle referred to an event evolving in the present (at speaking time) rather than a state resulting from a prior event, the only means of conveying past-tense reference if a construction with the -*m*-participle was to refer to the past was to use the past-tense forms of the auxiliary. Though the material is too scarce to confirm such a hypothesis, it seems at least plausible that the increased functional weight carried by the past-tense form of the auxiliary contributed to its generalisation and extension to constructions with the -*t*-participle.

While in 16th and 17th century texts the passive forms with the -*t*-participle and the present-tense form of the auxiliary can still have past-

tense function, in Ruhig's Bible these uses do not seem to appear any more. What we do see is the appearance of the past-tense auxiliary *tapti* (4 examples) in the passive past tense:

(26) (a) *Bet*   *ſtaghįſi*   *eſt*   *kaip*   *numire*
        but   happen.PST.PA.NA   be.PRS.3   how   die.PST.3
        ubagas,   *ir*   **neſchtas**   **buwa**
        beggar.NOM.SG   and   carry.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   be.PST.3
        nog   *Angelû*   *ing*   ſterblį   Abrahama.
        from   angel.GEN.PL   to   bosom.ACC.SG   PN.GEN
        Bretke NT Luke 16.22

      (b) *Jr*   *stojos*   *jog*   *numire*   *ans*
        and   happen.PST.3   that   die.PST.3   this.NOM.SG.M
        elgieta,   *ir*   **nugabentas**   **ira**
        beggar.NOM.SG   and   carry.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   be.PRS.3
        nog   *Anjełu*   *priegłaupstÿn*   *Abrahoma.*
        from   angel.GEN.SG   bosom.ILL.SG   PN.GEN
        Chyliński NT Luke 16.22

      (c) *Bet*   *nuſidawe,*   *jog*   *Ubbag's*   *numirre,*
        but   happen.PST.3   that   poor_man.NOM.SG   die.PST.3
        ir   *Angelû*   **nuneßtas**   **tape**
        and   angel.GEN.PL   carry.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   become.PST.3
        į   *Prieglobſtą*   *Abraomo.*
        to   bosom.ACC.SG   PN.GEN
        Ruhig NT Luke 16.22

      (d) *Ir*   *stojos*   *jog*   *numire*   *pawargelis;*
        and   happen.PST.3   that   die.PST.3   beggar.NOM.SG
        ir   *buwo*   *nunesztas*   *par*
        and   be.PST.3   carry.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   by
        Aniołus   *ant*   *prigłopstes*   *Abraomo.*
        angel.ACC.PL   on   bosom.GEN.SG   PN.GEN
        Giedraitis Luke 16.22
        'And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the
        angels into Abraham's bosom.'

Ambrazas (1990, 193) also mentions that periphrastic passive forms in Old Lithuanian could be formed with the auxiliary *tapti* 'become'. He gives two illustrations, both from Bretke: *surischts tapa* 'was bound' (from the hymnal *Giesmės duschaunas*, 1589) and *pakasti tampa* 'are being buried' (from Bretke's Postil, 1591). According to Jakulienė (1968, 212–213), in Old

Lithuanian the 'imperfective passive' could not only be expressed by present passive participles combined with the auxiliary *būti* 'be', as in modern Lithuanian, but also by present and past passive participles occurring with different auxiliaries: *būti*, 'be', *tapti* 'become', *stotis* 'happen' etc. She cites two examples with the passive auxiliary *tapti* 'become': one from Bretke's Postil (1591) and one from Daukša's Postil (1599). Thus we see that in Old Lithuanian the passive could be expressed by various competing structures (including reflexive verbs, Jakulienė 1968)). The variation of passive forms was often dialectally determined but, as the passive became more grammaticalised, the structure *būti* 'be' + PRS.PP/PST.PP ousted the other means of expressing the passive.

Where Ruhig has *yra* + PST.PP it is a perfect or the present of a resultative passive:

(27) *Girdėjot,*   *jog*   **ʃakyta**   **yra***:*   *Artimą*
hear.PST.2PL   that   say.PST.PP.NA   be.PRS.3   neighbour.ACC.SG
ʃawo   *mylėk.*   *O*   *Neprietelą*   *ʃawo*
RPO   love.IMP.2SG   and   enemy.GEN.SG   RPO
nekęʃk.
hate.IMP.2SG
Ruhig Matthew 5.43
'Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.'

What is most characteristic of Ruhig's translation is the frequent occurrence of a bare past passive participle where other translations have an overt auxiliary (65 examples). In a number of instances (37 examples) the omitted auxiliary corresponds to the present-tense auxiliary of other translations, and the value is that of a resultative passive:

(28) (a) *Wėl*   **prilyginta**   *Dangaus*
again   equate.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F   heaven.GEN.SG
Karalyʃte   *Tinklui,*   *į*   *Marres*
kingdom.NOM.SG   net.DAT.SG   to   sea.ACC.SG
įmeʃtam...
throw.PST.PP.DAT.SG.M
Ruhig NT Matthew 1347
*Abermal **ist gleich** das Himmelreich einem Netz...* (Luther)

(b) *Wel,*   **pryliginta**   **ira**   *dangauσ*
again   equate.PST.PP.NOM.F   be.PRS.3   heaven.GEN.SG

> *Karaliſte*   *newaduy*   *uʒmeſtamuy*
> kingdom.NOM.SG   net.DAT.SG   throw.PST.PP.DAT.SG.M
> *Marioſna,*
> sea.ILL.PL
> Chyliński NT Matthew 1347
> *Wederom is het Coninckrijck der hemelen gelijck een net...* (Statenbijbel)
> 'Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into
> the sea'

(29)   *Ʒmogau,*   *tawo*   *Griekai*   *taw*
      man.VOC.SG   2SG.POSS   sin.NOM.PL   2SG.DAT
      atléiſti.
      forgive.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M
      Ruhig NT Luke 5.20
      *Mensch, deine Sünden **sind** dir **vergeben**.* (Luther)
      Zmogau, griekey tawo ira tau atłayſti. (Chyliński)
      'Man, thy sins are forgiven thee.'
      However, in other cases (7 examples) the PST.PP without overt auxiliary
      clearly has the value of a past tense, as the context is narrative:

(30)   [*Kaip Marya jo Mótina pazadėta buwo Ioʒėpui dar ne parweſta*]
      raſta   *jiji*   *neʒćia*   *iß*
      find.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F   3SG.F.NOM   pregnant.NOM.SG   from
      Sʒwentôs   *Dwaſês.*
      holy.GEN.SG   spirit.GEN.SG
      Ruhig Matthew 1.18
      radoſe, kaip ana neſchcʒe buwo nug ſchwentos Dwaſies (Bretke)
      atraſta ira nießcʒa iß Dwaſios ßwętos (Chyliński)
      '[When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came
      together,] she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.'

This situation seems to be in conformity with what we find in the modern
language. We will discuss this further on.

    The lack of clear instances of a past-tense value of forms with the
present-tense form of the auxiliary in Ruhig's Bible might suggest that in
the 18th century this function had been lost. However, this claim should
be formulated cautiously as *yra* + PST.PP in the past-tense function reap-
pears once again in Giedraitis' Bible:

(31)   [*O kad iszsipilde asztuonios dienos, idant apipjaustitu waykeli;*]
      pramintas   ***ira***   *wardas*   *jo*
      call.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   be.PRS.3   name.NOM.SG   3SG.M.GEN

Jezus,	*kursay*	*pramintas*	*buwo*	*nuog*
PN.NOM	REL.NOM.SG.M	call.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M	be.PST.3	from

Anioło...
angel.GEN.SG
Giedraitis NT Luke 2.21
'[And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child,] his name was called JESUS, which was so named of the angel'

The reason for the reappearance of these forms can be explained by the fact that it is believed that the author often used older translations, prominently the Bythner New Testament translation (1701):

(32)	*wardas*	*jo*	*pramintas*	*ira*
	name.NOM.SG	3SG.M.GEN	call.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M	be.PRS.3

IEZUS,	*kurſai*	*buwo*	*pramintas*	*nůg*
PN.NOM	REL.NOM.SG	be.PST.3	call.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M	from

Angeło
angel.GEN.SG
Bythner NT Luke 2.21

In spite of the difficulties in interpreting the data of Old Lithuanian texts, the following conclusions seem to emerge from this brief overview. In the course of the Old Lithuanian period forms consisting of the present-tense auxiliary 'be' and the -*t*-participle shed the past-tense function which they still show well into the 17th century (the present-tense form of the auxiliary was replaced in this function with the past-tense form of 'be', less frequently 'become'). They did not, however, develop into a dedicated form for the perfect because they retained the function of a present resultative passive. In 18th-century texts forms without auxiliary appear; they can have the value both of a past tense and of a perfect.

4. Teasing apart the passive perfect and the resultative passive in contemporary Lithuanian

In this section we will take a closer look at the range of uses that predicative past passive participles may assume in contemporary Lithuanian in order to find out which of these uses pertain to the expression of the passive perfect, and which types of perfects may be distinguished. Our data is taken from the internet corpus Lithuanian WaCv2 (abbreviated LtWaCv2), containing more than 48 m. words, available on https://www.

sketchengine.eu/. We chose this particular corpus because it is morphologically annotated and can generate a random sample of any size. We adopted the following method of data collection: first, a search[8] of past passive participles including both agreeing and non-agreeing forms (negated as well as non-negated) was performed. The search yielded 659,584 results from which a random sample of 1000 examples was obtained and filtered manually for uses of predicative passive participles either with an auxiliary in present or past tense, or without any auxiliary. Our decision also to include cases with past-tense auxiliary into the sample was motivated by the fact that it is well known from the literature that the Lithuanian perfect (of the active) is relatively weakly grammaticalised, and its functions are often assumed by preterite forms (see, e.g. Daugavet & Arkadiev 2021). Daugavet & Arkadiev have also found that the combination of past active participles with past tense auxiliary—the pluperfect form—may assume uses characteristic of the present perfect gram type, namely the experiential use. However, as the passive pluperfect is homonymous with the passive preterite, it is impossible to say whether a combination of a past-tense auxiliary with a past passive participle, when used in a function reminiscent of the present perfect, is an instance of a preterite or a pluperfect. The filtered sample contained 282 examples. All the examples cited in sections 4 and 5 come from the corpus Lithuanian WaC v2, unless otherwise stated.

A few words are in order about the constructions that were not included in the sample. Apart from adnominal passive participles, which made up a considerable amount of the sample, we also filtered out cases with predicative participles which were clearly adjectivised, e.g. *įtemptas* 'tense, intensive', *pagrįstas, paremtas* 'based (on)', *ribotas* 'limited', *izoliuotas* 'isolated', *priverstas* 'forced (to)', *pasmerktas* 'doomed (to)', *užimtas* 'busy', *girdėtas* 'familiar'. Such participles are only morphologically related to the respective verbs, as they denote states or qualities with no implication of prior events, e.g.:

(33) *Mokytojo*   *darbas*   **pagrįstas**
      teacher.GEN.SG   work.NOM.SG   base.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M

---

[8] We used the query: [tag="Vppnpspn…"]|[tag="Vppnpsno"]|[tag="Vpnnpspn…"]|[tag="Vpnn psno"]

meile,   supratimu.
love.INS.SG   understanding.INS.SG
'A teacher's work is **based** on love and understanding.'

Adjectival participles often occur with degree adverbs, such as *labai* 'very', *pernelyg* 'too', *šiek tiek* 'somewhat, a little':

(34) *Nors*   *tradicinė*   *koncepcija*
      although   traditional.NOM.SG.F   notion.NOM.SG
      svarbi,   *ji*   **šiek tiek**
      important.NOM.SG.F   3SG.NOM.F   a_little
      ribota.
      limit.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F
      'Although the traditional notion is important, it is **a little limited**.'

In her paper on the Lithuanian perfect, Kapkan (2021) argues that a significant number of instances of past active participles (with or without a copula) do not represent "perfects, but rather adjectival participles in copular constructions". Kapkan shows that although some of those participles are lexicalised adjectives, others are clearly verbal, but many of them are ambiguous between an analytical verb phrase and an ascriptive copular construction with an adjectival participle. The situation is similar with past passive participles. It is well known that the Lithuanian past passive participles with the suffix **-to* were originally deverbal adjectives, neutral with respect to voice, and only later on developed passive meaning (Ambrazas 1979, 53, Nau & Holvoet 2015, 7). Lithuanian passive constructions originated from copular constructions (for details see Holvoet 2001) and have retained strong ties with the source construction. Many actional passives in Lithuanian are homonymous with copular constructions, mostly with object resultatives. All instances susceptible of a verbal interpretation, such as *įrengtas* 'equipped', *padarytas* 'made', *pateiktas* 'given', were included in our sample. However, we must admit that the distinction between adjectivised and non-adjectivised participles is fuzzy and there were borderline cases, e.g. the participle *skirtas* 'earmarked':

(35) [*Wfa turtas, perkeltas prie pagrindinio kapitalo, rezervų, kito turto ir*
      būsimojo pelno,]
      pirmiausia   *yra*   **skirtas**   *būsto*
      primarily   be.PRS.3   earmark.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   house.GEN.SG
      statybai   *remti*
      building.DAT.SG   promote.INF

'Wfa's transferred capital, reserves, assets and future profits are still **earmarked** for housing promotion.'[9]

Example (35) was included into the sample because it presupposes a prior action performed by an agent ('X earmarked the assets for …'). The example represents an objective resultative (stative passive), which we will deal with below.

Another construction type excluded from the sample was evidentials (for details on passive participles used as evidentials see, e.g. Nau, Spraunienė & Žeimantienė 2020 and the references therein):

(36) *Turgų*   ***būta***   *pačių*   *įvairiausių:*
      market.GEN.PL   be.PST.PP-NA   EMPH.GEN.PL   various.SUPER.GEN.PL
      valstiečių,   *žuvų,*   *malkų,*
      peasant.GEN.PL   fish.GEN.PL   firewood.GEN.PL
      sendaikčių   *ir kt.*
      old_stuff.GEN.PL   and_etc.
      '[Judging from the evidence that we have], there **were** various markets: peasants' markets, fish markets, firewood markets, flea markets etc.'

Lastly, we filtered out examples which occurred in headlines, incomplete sentences, or which were difficult to interpret because of bad orthography etc. Table 2 gives an overview of the results from a formal perspective, i.e. the frequency of the structures:

Table 2*: Occurrence of past passive participles in different structures in the sample*

be.PRS PST.PP	PST.PP	be.PST PST.PP	Total
22 (7.8%)	142 (50.2%)	119 (42%)	283 (100%)

The figures in Table 2 show that the bare past passive participle is most frequent in the sample: it accounts for half of the cases. A combination of past-tense auxiliary with past passive participle makes up 42% of all cases and the use of a present tense auxiliary is rare—it occurs only in 7.8% of the data. In this connection it is important to mention that Ambrazas (1990,

---

[9] The example, as well as its English version, are from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT-EN/TXT/?from=LT&uri=CELEX%3A32006D0737&qid=1626424381730 .

194) states that predicative passive participles without an overt auxiliary occur considerably more rarely (than cases with an overt auxiliary). This statement is contrary to our findings and makes us hypothesise that the frequent auxiliary omission we observe in modern Lithuanian texts might be a recent development. A separate research is required though to test this hypothesis.

In the following we will provide an analysis of the examples in terms of what temporal meaning they convey in order to find out which of them may be attributed to the passive perfect.

4.1. Resultatives

52 examples (18.4% of the sample) were identified as objective resultatives (stative passives). 12 cases were with present-tense auxiliary, 4 with past-tense auxiliary and in the remaining 36 cases the auxiliary was left out.

Stative passives can only be distinguished from the preterite and perfect forms of dynamic passives by their meaning: they refer to states resulting from a prior event (cf. Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988, 6). Therefore, they are not denotationally synonymous with corresponding active clauses, and cannot be replaced with them in a text without a meaning difference (Geniušienė 2006, 49–51; 2016, 81). (37ab) is an illustration:

(37) (a) [*Iš tvartų išlenda berniukas. Jis … nueina prie klėties durų.*]
           *Ant   durų …   **įkabinta**   spyna.*
           On   door[PL].GEN   hang.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F   padlock.NOM.SG
           [*Vaikis atrakina, … durys atsidaro …*] (I. Simonaitytė)
           '[From the barns a boy *emerges*. He … *walks* toward the store-room door.] On the door, … a padlock **is suspended**. [The lad unlocks [it] … the door *opens…*]'

      (b) [*Iš tvartų išlenda berniukas. Jis … nueina prie klėties durų.*]
           *Ant   durų …   **įkabino**   spyną.*
           on   door[PL].GEN   hang.PST.3   padlock.ACC.SG
           [*Vaikis atrakina, … durys atsidaro …*]
           '[From the barns a boy *emerges*. He … *walks* to the store-room door.] On the door, [they] **hung** a padlock. [The lad *unlocks* [it] … the door *opens…*]' (Geniušienė 2006, 50, our glossing)

In (37a) the resultative *įkabinta* occurs in a chain of perfective verbs in the active voice, denoting a sequence of actions. In this case it refers to "a state that exists while the actions are performed". Replacing the resultative in (37a) with its active counterpart in (37b) "breaks the sequence of a chain of actions" (Geniušienė 2006, 51).

As far as lexical input is concerned, it is important to note that stative passives may only be derived from perfective[10] telic verbs (cf. Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988, 369), with the exception of *qualitative resultatives*, on which see below. Another feature characteristic of stative passives is that they are compatible with durative time adverbials, such as *visą laiką* 'all the time', *visada* 'always', *ilgai* 'for a long time', although this criterion does not apply to all objective resultatives. Here is an example of a stative passive from our data:

(38)　*Mano*　　*veidas*　　　　**išpieštas**　　　*tatuiruotėmis,*
　　　1SG.POSS　face(M).NOM.SG　paint.PST.PP　tattoo.PL.INS
　　　ausyse　　**įverti**　　　　　*auskarai.*
　　　ear.LOC.PL　insert.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M　earring.NOM.PL
　　　'My face **is painted** with tattoos, earrings **inserted** in my ears.'

Only stative passives may be coordinated with adjectives (Geniušienė 2016, 91), as (39) shows:

(39)　*Visiškai*　*neseniai*　*buvo*　　*išleista*
　　　quite　　recently　be.PST.3　release.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F
　　　nauja　　　　*šios*　　　　*knygos*　　　*versija*
　　　new.NOM.SG.F　this.GEN.SG.F　book.GEN.SG　version.NOM.SG

---

[10] The terms 'perfective verbs' and 'imperfective verbs' are problematic in Lithuanian grammar. Perfective verbs often have a perfectivizing preverb, which their imperfective counterparts lack, e. g.:

(i)　*J̃-is*　　*stat-ė*　　*nam-ą.*
　　3NOM.SG.M　build.PST.3　house.ACC.SG
　　'He was building a house.'

(ii)　*J̃-is*　　*pa-stat-ė*　　*nam-ą.*
　　3NOM.SG.M　PFX-build.PST3　house.ACC.SG
　　'He built/has built a house.'

However, the Lithuanian aspect system is far more complex and rather different from that of Slavic languages, which has even made some authors (e.g. Arkadiev 2011) argue that Lithuanian does not have aspect as a grammatical category at all. For an alternative view of aspect in Lithuanian, see Holvoet, Daugavet & Žeimantienė (2021).

kuri		*yra*	*atnaujinta,*	*pilnesnė*
REL.NOM.SG.F		be.PRS.3	update.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F	full.COMP.NOM.SG.F
ir	*dar*	*įdomesnė.*		
and	even	interesting.COMP.NOM.SG.F		

'A new version of this book, which **is updated**, more complete and interesting, has been released quite recently'

Lithuanian also has a special subtype of resultatives, namely *qualitative resultatives* (for details, see Nau, Spraunienė & Žeimantienė 2020, 81–85) which permit imperfective predicates:[11]

(40)

O	*Lapių*	*bažnyčia*	*yra*	*statyta*
but	PLN	church.NOM.SG	be.PRS.3	build.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F

1620 metais
in_1620
[*ir yra dvylikta bažnyčia Lietuvoje pagal amžių.*]
'But Lapiai church **was built** (literally: **is built**) in 1620 [and it is the 12th church in Lithuania according to age.]'

In (40) it is presupposed that the church has been built, and it is ascribed the distinguishing feature of having been built in 1620, which means that it is of considerable antiquity. Qualitative resultatives usually need a qualifying element: it may be a definite time adverbial as in (40) or an agentive adverbial receiving emphatic stress, as in (41), where the act of composition is presupposed and authorship is established:

(41)

Visas	*šios*	*operos*	*libretas*
entire.NOM.SG.M	this.GEN.SG.F	opera.GEN.SG	libretto.NOM.SG
yra	*mano*	*rašytas.*	
be.PRS.3	1SG.POSS	write.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M	

'The entire libretto of this opera **is written by me**' (LtTenTen14)

From the syntactic point of view the absolute majority of objective resultatives have referential subjects, that is, they are subjectful passives. This follows from the definition of the construction: if an objective resultative denotes a resultant state of an entity (previous object which is now

---

[11] We are not saying that perfective telic verbs are totally excluded from qualitative resultatives; we just want to say that the use of imperfective verbs is characteristic of the qualitative resultative construction and that such use distinguishes them from resultatives proper which cannot be formed from imperfective verbs.

promoted to subject), then this entity needs to be expressed and have a referent (cf. Geniušienė 2016, 47; 231). Geniušienė mentions, however, that stative passives may occasionally be derived from intransitives and thus be subjectless, e.g.:

(42) *Kambaryje*   **prirūkyta,**   **prišiukšlinta.**
      room.LOC.SG   smoke.PST.PP.NA   litter.PST.PP.NA
      'The room **has been smoked in** and **littered** (= The room is full of
      smoke and litter.)' (Geniušienė 2016, 47; our glossing)

According to Geniušienė, in (42) the resultant state is predicated of a place. Almost all examples which we have classified as resultatives are agreeing subjectful passives with the exception of one instance with a non-agreement form:

(43) [*Visa portale vz.LT esanti medžiaga priklauso UAB „Verslo žinios",*]
      jeigu   **nenurodyta**   *kitaip.*
      unless   NEG.state.PST.PP.NA   otherwise
      '[All materials on the vz.LT portal belong to UAB Verslo Žinios,] unless
      otherwise stated.'

4.2. Passive past tense

Past-tense forms of the dynamic passive make up 172 examples (61%) in our data set. They are easiest to identify, as they denote past events and the time of the event is often expressed by a definite time adverbial:

(44) *Po*   *1963 m.*   *baisaus*   *žemės drebėjimo,*
      after   year_1963   terrible.GEN.SG.M   earthquake.GEN.SG
      miestas   **buvo**   *smarkiai*   **sugriautas.**
      city.NOM.SG   be.PST.3   severely   destroy.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
      'After a terrible earthquake in 1963, the city **was** utterly **destroyed**.'

Compared with resultatives, past-tense forms of the dynamic passive include, to a larger extent, subjectless passives (13 cases out of 161):

(45) [*Tai pasakytina ir apie skulptūrą.*]
      Čia   **buvo**   **sugrįžta**   *prie*   *bronzos*
      here   be.PST.3   return.PST.PP.NA   to   bronze.GEN.SG
      kaip   *plastiškos*   *medžiagos.*
      as   plastic.GEN.SG.F   material.GEN.SG
      '[The same is true of sculpture.] Here there was a return to bronze as
      a sculptural material.'

Unlike stative passives, the lexical input of past-tense forms of the dynamic passive is not restricted to perfective verbs. Examples with imperfective verbs are rare in our sample, but they are attested:

(46) *Gal*   *todėl*   *štabavietės,*   *įskaitant*   *ir*
      maybe   therefore   headquarters.NOM.SG   including   and
      fiurerio   *Vilko*   *guolį,*   *būtent*
      Führer.GEN.SG   Wolf.GEN.SG   Lair.ACC.SG   exactly
      tuose   *miškuose*   **rengtos**.
      those.LOC.PL   forest.LOC.PL   set_up.PST.PP.NOM.PL.F
      'Maybe that's why the headquarters, including the Führer's Wolf's Lair, **were set up** in those forests.'

The form *rengtos* has a past habitual meaning and could be reformulated as *būdavo rengiamos*, with a past habitual form of the auxiliary and the present passive participle. On the other hand, omission of finite auxiliary as well as inferential meaning (making a guess) brings (46) close to evidential constructions.

As shown in Table 2, past passive participles with omitted auxiliaries constitute the majority of our sample. Although in the literature on the Lithuanian passive it is generally assumed that auxiliary omission is equivalent to its use in the present tense (cf. Geniušienė 2006, 30, Wiemer 2006a, 276), Nau, Spraunienė & Žeimantienė (2020, 58) draw attention to the fact that the auxiliary with past passive participle is often omitted in a past-tense context, where it would be incorrect to assume omission of a present-tense auxiliary. Our data also confirmed that the bare participle may be used with a past-tense value:

(47) *1959 m.*   *Veisiejų*   *rajonas*   **buvo**
      in_1959   PLN.GEN   region.NOM.SG   be.PST.3
      panaikintas.   *1960 m.*   *Veisiejuose*
      abolish.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   in_1960   PLN
      įsteigtas   *žemės ūkio*   *technikumas.*
      found.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   agricultural   technical_school.NOM.SG.M
      [1975 m. Veisiejų žemės ūkio technikumas panaikintas.]
      'In 1959 the Veisiejai region was abolished. In 1960 an Agricultural Technical School was founded in Veisiejai. [In 1975 the Veisiejai Agricultural Technical School was closed…']

(47) is a typical example where only the first passive has an overt past-tense auxiliary, while the subsequent instances have a zero auxiliary.

In fact, in 40% of the preterite examples in our sample the past-tense auxiliary is left out.

Compared to stative passives, past-tense forms of the dynamic passive contain more instances of subjectless passives:

(48)   *Be to,*   **buvo**   **rekomenduota**   *ištaisyti*
       in_addition   be.PST.3   recommend.PST.PP.NA   correct.INF
       likusius   *trūkumus,*
       remain.PST.PA.ACC.PL.M   shortcoming.ACC.PL
       [*ypač susijusius su Banko tikslais.*]
       'In addition, it **was recommended** that the remaining shortcomings be addressed, [in particular as regards the Bank's objectives.]'

A small group of past-tense forms of the dynamic passive (7 examples) stand out from the rest of the cases. Although they have an overt past-tense auxiliary and formally should be categorised as passive preterites, they do not contain adverbials of exact time and they also exhibit meanings characteristic of the present perfect gram type. In some of these examples, reference is made to an event that occurred in the recent past and which has a result that holds at the moment of speech. In other words, they satisfy the definition of resultative perfect (Dahl & Velupillai 2013). Such cases may contain a relative time adverbial, such as *visiškai neseniai* 'quite recently' as in the first part of Example (39), repeated here for the sake of convenience as (49):

(49)   **Visiškai**   **neseniai**   **buvo**   **išleista**
       quite   recently   be.PST.3   release.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F
       nauja   *šios*   *knygos*   *versija ...*
       new.NOM.SG.F   this.GEN.SG.F   book.GEN.SG   version.NOM.SG
       'A new version of this book ... **has been released quite recently** ...'

The resultative perfect interpretation is often triggered when the preterite of the passive is preceded or followed by present-tense forms, e.g., in regulations:

(50)   *Jei*   **buvo**   **duoti**   *visi*
       if   be.PST.3   give.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M   all.NOM.PL.M
       vežimui   *būtini*   *sutikimai,*
       shipment.DAT   necessary.NOM.PL.M   consent.NOM.PL
       kilmės   *valstybės*   *narės*   *kompetentingos*
       origin.GEN.SG   state.GEN.SG   member.GEN.SG   competent.NOM.PL.F

institucijos	*turi*	*teisę*	*leisti*
institution.NOM.PL	have.PRS.3	right.ACC.SG	authorise.INF
turėtojui	*vykdyti*	*vežimą*	
holder.DAT.SG	carry_out.INF	shipment.ACC.SG	

'If all the consents necessary for shipment **have been given**, the competent authorities of the Member State of origin shall be entitled to authorise the holder to carry out the shipment.'[12]

Other preterite forms of dynamic passives which have the value of present perfect convey experiential meaning, as they refer to types of events which occurred at least once (or have never occurred) over a period of time, extending up to the moment of speech (Dahl & Velupillai 2013). Such clauses may contain adverbials characteristic of experientials, such as *daug kartų* 'many times', *ne kartą* 'several times':

(51) [*Negalime patikrinti, ar ši teorija teisinga, ar ne; kas žino,*]

pasaulis,	*kuris,*	*manome,*	*kad*	*yra*
world.NOM.SG	REL.NOM.SG.M	think.PRS.1PL	that	be.PRS.3
unikalus,	*galbūt*	*anksčiau*	***buvo***	
unique.NOM.SG.M	maybe	earlier	be.PST.3	
perkurtas		*daug kartų.*		
redesign.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M		many_times		

'[We cannot verify whether this theory is correct or not; who knows,] the world that we think is unique may **have been redesigned** many times before.'

(52)

IAE	*ne kartą*	***buvo***	***išjungta,***
PN	several_times	be.PST.3	shut_down.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F
bet	*apie*	*tai*	*sužinodavome*	*tik*
but	about	it	find_out.PST.HAB.1PL	only
iš	*žiniasklaidos.*		
from	media.GEN.SG		

'Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant **has been shut down** several times, but we only found out about it from the media.'

We know from studies on the active perfect (e.g., Daugavet & Arkadiev 2021) that in Lithuanian the past tense can in most situations be used as

---

[12] The example, as well as its English version, is from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/ LT-EN/TXT/?from=LT&uri=CELEX%3A32006L0117&qid=1626968929256 .

an alternative to the perfect. This is related to a lesser degree of grammaticalisation of the Lithuanian perfect in comparison with, e.g., the Latvian or English perfect. Examples (49–52) suggest that the same is true of the passive preterite—it freely encroaches upon the semantic domain of the perfect.

4.3. Passive perfect

51 examples (18% of the sample) were classified as instances of the present perfect gram type (or at least they could be interpreted as such). The identification of perfects was more complicated than identification of other types of constructions, as they are homonymous with stative passives. As illustrated in Table 3, auxiliary deletion is also the most common option with perfects:

Table 3. *Use of auxiliary with passive perfects*

be.PRS PST.PP	PST.PP	Total
8	43	51

As mentioned earlier, a fully-fledged present perfect must have at least two types—the resultative and the experiential type. We will start our analysis with examples which we have categorised as resultative perfects.

Resultative perfects differ from object-oriented resultatives in that they are verbal— they denote a completed past event and focus on results of this event which are relevant for the present (cf. Aikhenvald 2004, 112). Here are some unambiguous examples:

(53) [*Tokia įmonė tiki, kad vartotojai antrą kartą pirks dėl to, kad yra patenkinami jų poreikiai,*]

o	*taip pat*	**suformuota**	*palanki*
and	also	form.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F	favorable.NOM.SG.F
visuomenės	*nuomonė*	*apie*	*įmonę*
society.GEN.SG	opinion.NOM.SG.F	about	company.ACC.SG
ir	*jos*	*siūlomą*	*prekę.*
and	3.GEN.SG.F	offer.PRS.PP.ACC.SG.F	product.ACC.SG

'[Such a company believes that consumers will buy a second time because their needs are being met,] and also a favorable public opinion **has been shaped** about the company and the product it offers.'

The dynamic rather than resultative character of (53) can be established with the aid of tests, e. g., coordination with adjectives is not possible:

(53') | *o | taip pat | suformuota | | ir |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| and | also | form.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F | | and |
| *palanki* | | *visuomenės* | *nuomonė* | |
| favourable.NOM.SG | | society.GEN.SG | opinion.NOM.SG.F | |

'[Intended meaning]: and also public opinion was shaped and favourable.'

A preterital interpretation of (53) is also highly unlikely because there is no definite time adverbial and the passive verb form *suformuota* is used in a present context. The focus is on the result of a past event which is relevant for the present. Consider also (54):

(54) [*Čilėje tęsiama 33 kalnakasių kėlimo iš avarinės šachtos, kur jie praleido 69 dienas, operacija—*]

į	žemės	paviršių	specialia	
to	earth.GEN.SG	surface.ACC.SG	special.INS.SG	
kapsule	**iškeltas**		*14–asis*	*šachtininkas.*
capsule.INS.SG	lift.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M		14th	miner.NOM.SG

'[In Chile, the operation of lifting 33 miners from an emergency mine, where they spent 69 days, continues—] the 14th miner **has been lifted** to the surface with a special capsule.'

In (54) coordination with adjectives is impossible, and the past passive participle refers to an event, not a state. So it cannot be a stative passive. The preterital interpretation is also unlikely, as the previous clause refers to an ongoing rescue operation (the present tense is used), and the past passive participle denotes an event of the recent past, which has a result that is relevant for the moment of speech.

The perfect interpretation may be triggered by time adverbials, such as *dabar* 'now', *jau* 'already', *nuo praėjusių metų pradžios* 'since the beginning of last year':

(55) | **Dabar** | „*Augimo ribos*" | **yra** | **išverstos** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| now | Growth Limits | be.PRS.3 | translate.PST.PP.NOM.PL.F | |
| *į* | *daugiau* | *nei* | *30* | *kalbų* |
| into | more | than | 30 | language.GEN.PL |
| *ir* | **parduota** | *apie* | *10 milijonų vienetų* | |
| and | sell.PST.PP.NA | about | 10 million unit.GEN.PL | |

'Growth Limits **has now been translated** into more than 30 languages and **has sold** about 10 million copies.'

(56)   *Tokia*   *kova*   *su*   *kramtomosios* *gumos*
       such   fight.NOM.SG   with   chewing   gum.GEN.SG
       spjaudytojais   **jau**   **pradėta**   *ir*
       spitter.INS.PL   already   start.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F   also
       Vokietijoje.
       PLN.LOC
       'Such a fight against chewing gum spitters **has already begun** (literally: 'has already been started') in Germany.'

(57)   **Nuo**   **praėjusių**   **metų**   **pradžios**
       since   last.GEN.PL   year[PL].GEN   beginning.GEN.SG
       užfiksuota   *penkiolika* *psichologinių*   *ir*
       record.PST.PP.NA   fifteen   psychological.GEN.PL   and
       penki   *fiziniai*   *išpuoliai.*
       five.NOM.PL   physical.NOM.PL   attack.NOM.PL
       'Fifteen psychological and five physical attacks have been recorded since the beginning of the last year.'

Some examples, which we have classified as perfects, are indeed ambiguous between a perfect and a stative passive interpretation:

(58)   *Nuomonėje*   *turi*   *būti*   *nurodyta,*
       opinion.LOC.SG   must.PRS.3   be.INF   state.PST.PP.NA
       kokia   *apimtimi*   **neįvykdytos**   2
       what.INS.SG   extent.INS.SG   NEG.fulfill.PST.PP.NOM.PL.F   2
       straipsnio   *nuostatos*[13].
       Article.GEN.SG   provision.NOM.PL
       'The opinion shall state the extent to which the provisions of Article 2 **have not been complied with**.'
       'Det skal af udtalelsen fremgaa, i hvilket omfang bestemmelserne i artikel 2 **ikke er opfyldt**.'

In ex. (58), the ambiguity is revealed by different English and Danish versions where the English version uses present perfect, while the Danish version uses present tense of the stative passive.

---

[13] The example, as well as its English and Danish translations are taken from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/LT-EN-DA/TXT/?from=LT&uri=CELEX%3A31973L0023&qid=1626509223001 .

5. Variation in the expression of the experiential passive perfect

There were only a few clear cases of experiential perfect in our sample. The experiential perfect may be signalled by such time adverbials as *ne kartą* 'repeatedly, several times', *daug kartų* 'many times', *kol kas* 'so far':

(59) „*Zepter*"   *produktai*   **yra**   **ne kartą**
PN   product.NOM.PL   be.PRS.3   more_than_once
apdovanoti
award.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M
[*už aukštą kokybę, puikų dizainą ir sveikatinimo bei žmonių gerovės skatinimą.*] 'Zepter products **have repeatedly won awards (**literally **have been repeatedly awarded)** [for high quality, excellent design and the promotion of health and human well-being.]'

(60) *Kol kas*   *Lietuvoje*   *neatlikta*
so_far   Lithuania.LOC   NEG.perform.PST.PP.NOM.SG.F
visuotinė   *Tokių*   *objektų*   *inventorizacija,*
general.NOM.SG   such.GEN.PL   object.GEN.PL   inventory.NOM.SG
[*todėl tikslus jų kiekis nežinomas.*]
'**So far**, no general inventory of such objects **has been drawn up** in Lithuania, [therefore the exact amount is unknown.]'

Unlike the resultative perfect, the experiential perfect of the passive may also be expressed by a structure where the auxiliary *būti* 'be' is used in the present perfect tense. Such cases are quite rare—a separate search for *yra buvęs* PST.PP in LtWaCv2 only yielded 3 examples (see (61)), one of which is actually a perfect form of the stative passive (62):

(61) [*275 m laivo ilgis šiaurinėje uosto dalyje uosto tarnybų atstovų negąsdina –*]
yra   **buvęs**   *įvestas*   *274 m*
be.PRS.3   be.PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   dock.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   274 m
ilgio   *tanklaivis.*
length.GEN.SG   tanker.NOM.SG
[The ship in the northern part of the port is 275 m in length overall, which does not frighten the representatives of the port authorities at all—] a tanker of 274 m in length overall **has been docked** before.'

(62) [*Pareiškėjo prašymu padavęs protestą ankstesnio Bendrijos prekių ženklo savininkas turi pateikti įrodymus, kad penkerius metus iki paraiškos Bendrijos prekių ženklui paskelbimo ankstesnis Bendrijos prekių ženklas Bendrijoje iš tikrųjų buvo naudojamas žymint prekes ar paslaugas, kurioms*

jis įregistruotas, ir kurias savininkas mini pagrįsdamas protestą, arba kad
buvo rimtų priežasčių ženklo nenaudoti,]

jeigu	*tą*	*dieną*	*ankstesnis*
if	DEM.ACC.SG	day.ACC.SG	earlier.NOM.SG.M
Bendrijos		*prekių*	*ženklas*
community.GEN.SG		wares.GEN.PL	mark.NOM.SG
yra	***buvęs***		***registruotas***
be.PRS.3	be.PST.PA.NOM.SG.M		register.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
ne	*mažiau*	*kaip*	*penkerius* metus.
not	less	as	five.ACC year(PL).ACC

['If the applicant so requests, the proprietor of an earlier Community
trade mark who has given notice of opposition shall furnish proof that,
during the period of five years preceding the date of publication of the
Community trade mark application, the earlier Community trade mark
has been put to genuine use in the Community in connection with the
goods or services in respect of which it is registered and which he cites
as justification for his opposition, or that there are proper reasons for
non-use,] provided the earlier Community trade mark **has** at that date
been registered for not less than five years.'[14]

It is well known from the literature that perfects may develop evidential
uses (Aikhenvald 2004, 112; Dahl & Velupillai 2013). The basic grammatical
means of marking evidentiality in Lithuanian is using participles—both
active and passive—instead of finite verbs (cf. Wiemer 2006b, 35). As ar-
gued by Holvoet (2007, 81–105), omission of finite auxiliary is an essential
element of such constructions, as the participle is advanced to the position
of the finite verb.

Interestingly, a search for the structure *buvęs* PST.PP (with omitted fi-
nite auxiliary) in LtWaCv2 did not yield a single instance of a perfect—the
absolute majority of the examples were evidentials (mostly reportative,
but also inferential), cf. (63–65):

(63)
Esama	*legendos,*	*jog*	*Mindaugas*	*su*
be.PRS.PP.NA	legend.GEN.SG	that	PN.NOM	with
sūnumis	***buvęs***	***nužudytas***		*ir*
son.INS.PL	be.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M	kill.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M		and

---

14 The example, as well as its English version, is from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/
LT-EN-DA/TXT/?from=LT&uri=CELEX %3A62008TJ0148&qid=1627046058413 .

> ***palaidotas***   Agluonoje
> bury.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   PLN.LOC
> 'there is a legend that Mindaugas and his sons were killed and buried in Agluona'

(64) [*Miltono apmąstymuose Derrida, kaip ir Borgesas, išskiria netikėtai juos sudominusią idėją: Homeras iš tiesų nebuvęs aklas poetas.*]

> *Jis*   *tik*   ***buvęs***
> 3NOM.SG.M   merely   be.PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
> ***pavaizduotas***   *aklas,*
> depict.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M   blind.NOM.SG.M
> [*siekiant pabrėžti poezijos ne vizualinę, o girdimąją prigimtį.*]
> '[In Milton's reflections, Derrida, like Borges, singles out an idea that unexpectedly intrigued them both: Homer in fact was not a blind poet.] He **was** merely **depicted** blind [to emphasise the audible rather than the visual nature of poetry].'

(65) [*Kadangi „Pilkainyje" rašoma: tikt pereit miestus Naujų Prūsų,*]

> *o*   *Naujieji Prūsai* [...]   ***buvę***
> and   PLN   be.PST.PA.PL.M
> ***įkurti***   *tik*   *po*   *1796 m.,*   *tai*   *ir*
> found.PST.PP.NOM.PL.M   only   after   1796   then   also
> *kūrinys*   ***buvęs***   ***parašytas***
> work.NOM.SG   be.PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   write.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M
> *ne*   *anksčiau*   *kaip*   *1796–1797 m.*
> NEG   earlier   than   in_1796–1797.
> '[Since it is written in Pilkainis: you shall pass through the cities of New Prussia,] and New Prussia (Neuostpreussen) **was founded** only after 1796, the work **must have been written** not earlier than 1796–1797.'

5. Conclusions

The conclusion emerging from what was shown above is that the passive perfect exists in Lithuanian, but seems to have been arrested in its development. It does not have dedicated and regular means of expression and is in most cases homonymous with the object resultative. The experiential variety of the passive perfect may additionally be expressed by the present perfect form of the auxiliary *būti* followed by the past passive participle of the main verb (*yra buvęs ištremtas* 'has been deported'), though this is rare. The same structure without a finite auxiliary (*buvęs ištremtas* 'been

deported') is never used as a perfect—it has developed an evidential use. Both the resultative and the experiential variety of the passive perfect are attested, but the latter seems to be less frequent than the former.

The passive perfect in Lithuanian is most often expressed by the bare past passive participle in predicative position, which, depending on the context, may also have the meaning of present resultative, and also of preterite and sometimes of pluperfect of the dynamic passive. Thus, Lithuanian passives with past passive participles are highly polysemous. In many cases the temporal meaning of a passive clause can be disambiguated with the help of time adverbials and other contextual clues, but there are also cases where it is impossible and even meaningless to try to distinguish dynamic passive perfects from object resultatives in Lithuanian (cf. Geniušienė 2016, 81). That is, the relationship between the passive perfect and the present resultative passive is often one of vagueness rather than of ambiguity.

All this creates an impression of the passive perfect as a gram that has not come to full development. The dedicated marking consisting in the use of the perfect of the auxiliary could provide a regular means of expression for a fully-fledged, autonomous passive perfect, but it is, as noted, rare and never extends to the resultative perfect. Looking at it from the functional side, we see that perfect-type meanings, in the passive domain, oscillate between three types of marking: present-tense auxiliary + PST.PP, perfect auxiliary + PST.PP, and past-tense auxiliary + PST.PP. It is probably this last type of marking that yields a clue as to why the passive perfect appears to be stuck in its emergent status: it is the overall low degree of grammaticalisation of the perfect, including the active perfect, in Lithuanian. As can be seen from Kapkan's (2021) analysis of close-to-spoken Lithuanian language, the Lithuanian active perfect has not moved very far away from the subject resultative. As a perfect in a strict sense, it experiences a strong competition from the preterite, by which it can always be replaced. It has, however, regular means of expression. In the domain of the passive, on the other hand, this low degree of grammaticalisation of the perfect manifests itself also in the failure to develop regular means of expression.

To attempt an answer to the question why the Lithuanian perfect was arrested in its development is beyond the scope of this article. The

areal context in which Lithuanian developed in historical times could hardly have supported the development of a perfect, active or passive. It was mainly that of the North Slavonic languages, where the inherited Common Slavonic perfect was transformed, at an early date, into a past tense (a process that is only indirectly reflected in Old Russian texts due to Church Slavonic influence). To the extent that language-internal factors were in play, they could have affected the development of the active and the passive perfect in ways specific to each. To different extents in different Lithuanian dialects, active and passive participles were put to use for the formation of evidential constructions, as mentioned above. These constructions could well have split off the resultative at an early, prehistoric stage, though opinions on the rise of the Baltic evidential are divided. Whether the strongly developed evidential profile of Baltic participles could have been a factor in the weaker development of the resultative profile is a question worth considering, though a definitive answer is unlikely to emerge.

Birutė Spraunienė
Paweł Brudzyński

Vilnius University
Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic
Universiteto 5, LT-01131 Vilnius
birute.sprauniene@flf.vu.lt
pawel.brudzynski@flf.vu.lt

Abbreviations

ACC — accusative, COMP — comparative, CVB — converb, DAT — dative, DEM — demonstrative, EMPH — emphatic pronoun, FUT — future, GEN — genitive, HAB — habitual, ILL — illative, IMP — imperative, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, IRR — irrealis, LOC — locative, NA — non-agreeing form, NOM — nominative, PA — active participle, PFX — prefix, PL — plural, PLN — place name, PN — personal name, POSS — possessive, PP — passive participle, PRS — present, PST — past, REL — relative pronoun, RPO — reflexive possessive, SG — singular, SUPER — superlative, VOC — vocative

Sources

Lithuanian WaC v2, available at https://www.sketchengine.eu/

LtTenTen2014, available at https://www.sketchengine.eu/

References

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS. 1979. *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė* [A Historical Syntax of Lithuanian Participles]. Vilnius: Mintis.

AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS. 1990. *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov* [A Comparative Syntax of Baltic Participles]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS, ed. 2006. *Lithuanian Grammar.* Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

ARKADIEV, PETER. 2011. Aspect and actionality in Lithuanian on a typological background. In: Daniel Petit, ed., *Langues baltiques, langues slaves.* Paris: Editions CNRS, 61–92.

BYBEE, JOAN L. & ÖSTEN DAHL. 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13.1, 51–103.

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

DAHL, ÖSTEN. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems.* Oxford: Blackwell.

DAHL, ÖSTEN & VIVEKA VELUPILLAI. 2013 The Perfect. In: Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath, eds., *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online.* Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. http://wals.info/chapter/68.

Daugavet, Anna & Peter Arkadiev. 2021. The perfects in Latvian and Lithuanian: A comparative study based on questionnaire and corpus data. *Baltic Linguistics* 12 = *Studies in the TAME Domain in Baltic and Its Neighbours* (thematic issue), 73–165.

Geniušienė, Emma Š. 2006. Passives in Lithuanian (in comparison with Russian). In: Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö, eds., *Passivization and Typology: Form and Function.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29-61.

Geniušienė, Emma. 2016. *Passive Constructions in Lithuanian. Selected Works of Emma Geniušienė.* Edited by Anna Kibort & Nijolė Maskaliūnienė. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Geniušienė, Emma Š. & Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. 1988. Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, ed., *Typology of Resultative Constructions.* English translation edited by Bernard Comrie. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 369–386.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticalization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14.1, 25–72.

Holvoet, Axel. 2001. Impersonals and passives in Baltic and Finnic. In: Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds., *Circum-Baltic Languages.* Vol. 2: *Grammar and Typology.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 363–389.

Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and Modality in Baltic.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Holvoet, Axel, Anna Daugavet & Vaiva Žeimantienė. 2021. The perfective present in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 12 = *Studies in the TAME Domain in Baltic and Its Neighbours* (thematic issue), 249–293.

Jakulienė, Audronė. 1968. Lietuvių kalbos pasyvo formavimasis ir sangrąžiniai veiksmažodžiai. *Baltistica* 4.2, 211–220.

Kapkan, Danguolė K. 2021. Perfect in Lithuanian: A case study based on the data from Facebook comments. *Baltic Linguistics* 12 = *Studies in the TAME Domain in Baltic and Its Neighbours* (thematic issue), 21–71.

Kavaliūnaitė, Gina. 2008. Introduction. In: Gina Kavaliūnaitė, ed., *Vetus Testamentum Lithuanicâ Linguâ donatum a Samuelo Boguslao Chylinski unâ cum texto Belgico.* Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, lxxvi–cxxvii.

Keenan, Edward L. & Matthew S. Dryer. 2007. Passive in the world's languages. In: Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description.* Vol. 1: *Clause Structure*, 325–361.

Lindstedt, Jouko. 2000. The perfect—aspectual, temporal and evidential. In: Östen Dahl, ed., *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe.* Berlin etc.: De Gruyter Mouton, 365–384.

Nau, Nicole & Axel Holvoet. 2015. Voice in Baltic: An overview. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–36.

Nau, Nicole, Birutė Spraunienė & Vaiva Žeimantienė. 2020. The passive family in Baltic. *Baltic Linguistics* 11 = *Studies in the Voice Domain in Baltic and Its Neighbours* (thematic issue), 27–128.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Sergej E. Jaxontov 1988. The typology of resultative constructions. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, eds., *Typology of Resultative Constructions.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3–62.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P., ed. 1988. *Typology of Resultative Constructions.* English translation edited by Bernard Comrie. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ritz, Marie-Eve. 2012. Perfect tense and aspect. In: Robert I. Binnick, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 881–907.

Ulvydas, Kazys, ed. 1971. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika.* II. *Morfologija* [Lithuanian Grammar, Vol. II: Morphology]. Vilnius: Mintis.

Wiemer, Björn. 2006a. Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian. In: Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö, eds., *Passivization and Typology: Form and Function.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 274–309.

Wiemer, Björn. 2006b. Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (a typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41.1, 33–49.