Peter Arkadiev (Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences / JGU Mainz)
peterarkadiev@yandex.ru
Björn Wiemer (JGU Mainz)
wiemerb@uni-mainz.de

A SURVEY OF PERFECTS IN BALTIC AND SLAVIC

Abstract

In our talk we will give a survey of the diversity of perfect grams[1] in Baltic and Slavic and of their diachronic background and areal biases both within the respective group and on a larger areal scene. An account of the relevant constructions and of their changing status in the grammars of Baltic and Slavic languages (including dialectal variation) through space and time implies a focus on the morphological make-up of the participles (as core components of perfects) and of their interaction with HAVE- vs. BE-verbs on their way toward auxiliation. Inner-Slavic differentiation and differences between both extant Baltic languages will be considered against standard criteria of grammaticalization (Chr. Lehmann 1995) and additional criteria, such as loosening of restrictions on the lexical input (V. Lehmann 1999, Wiemer/Giger 2005).

The functional development of constructions that belong to different chronological layers and form:function correspondences will be treated not only as indicative of degrees of grammaticalization, but also as a means to refine semantic maps (building on the coarse picture given in Bybee et al. 1994: 51-105). For this purpose, we try to give a comprehensive account of the polyfunctionality and meaning shifts of participle-based constructions in Slavic and Baltic, for which the experiential perfect will be posed in the center of maps. In general, the perfect function seems to result largely from lexical expansion of resultative participles, which are a regular source of voice-related constructions and of constructions like the perfect which *eo ipso* do not manipulate argument structure. Expansions into indirect evidentiality (as in Baltic and in Balkan Slavic) occupy a particular place, both in terms of functional changes and in areal terms (Wiemer 2006b). At any rate, across the entire territory covered by Baltic and Slavic (and adjacent languages) we observe a bifurcation of constructions based on mostly cognate participles into voice-related and voice-neutral grams (Wiemer, forthcoming 2: §5.1). In areal terms, this bifurcation appears to be independent from HAVE/BE-distinction of perfect auxiliaries (for which cf. Drinka, forthcoming).

The classification of perfects in Baltic and Slavic will be captured according to the following catalogue of criteria:
1. What are the morphosyntactic sources of perfect constructions?
2. Into which other categories have they evolved? With which grammatical categories (gram types) have they interfered?
3. Which diathetic (voice-oriented) changes have occurred with participles? How did these changes correlate with auxiliation of HAVE or BE?
4. Are there perfects (or anterior grams, in terms of Bybee 1985 and Thieroff 2000) on other tense levels than the present perfect? I.e. do we find pluperfects and future perfects? If so,

---

[1] The term 'gram', as used in the linguistic typology, is meant to include multi-word constructions, not only synthetic forms.

how "vivid" are they and what are their functions (e.g., in terms of the recent typological proposal regarding the pluperfect as an independent cross-linguistic gram type; Plungian & van der Auwera 2006, Sičinava 2013)?

5. Can the chronology of changes been established? If not, what are the reasons for "gaps"?

6. Which types of changes have been involved in the evolution (and the decay) of perfects? Can these changes be understood as grammaticalization? Or have other processes been more important (and recurrent)?

7. How can perfects in the particular languages been characterized on a typological and a broader areal background? How do particular languages (or groups thereof) inscribe into larger areal clines? Are there isolated phenomena?

Diachronic background

Although our diachronic background starts with the Indo-European heritage of perfects (i.e. practically the origin and role of participles around which resultatives and perfects evolve), we will mainly be concerned with the functional developments of inherited constructions and their paradigmatic organisation as well as with new constructions as they arose in better documented periods. This includes the following issues.

1. All perfects seem to have come about from earlier resultatives.

2. Following an observation known from Maslov (1983), we will try to relate the rise of relevant constructions to "rounds". In fact, different chronological layers of perfects can be figured out for Slavic; Baltic is markedly different in this respect, inasmuch as the perfect paradigms (and the forms of the participles involved) prove to be surprisingly stable through the entire (reconstructable or documented) history of Baltic. This raises two questions. First, what has helped sustain these paradigms and their forms? Doesn't Baltic provide a counterexample to the otherwise well-documented perfect>past shift, which occurred both to the west and to the east of the Baltic territory (cf. Breu 1988; 1994; Thieroff 2000)? Or the other way around: what has supported the old "synthetic" past tense to survive and keep its position as an unmarked paradigm (in comparison to the perfect)? Second, haven't there occurred any functional changes during the last centuries?

Areal background

Here we name only some of the specific issues to be taken into account:

1. The peculiar stability of the old Baltic perfect paradigms/forms (see above), in particular on the background of the immediate linguistic environment (East Slavic, Polish, but also Finnic).

2. The HAVE+PPA-construction in colloquial Lithuanian (e.g., *Turiu susidėjęs visus savo daiktus* 'I have all my items put together', with subject-agreement of the participle).

3. The peculiar interaction of perfect with negation in Lithuanian and neighbouring Slavic varieties as opposed to Latvian and Western European languages (Arkadiev 2015; forthcoming).

Perfect(s) in Baltic

On this background Baltic stands out in several respects.

The perfects are robustly attested in both Baltic languages and their dialects, however, they have never been subject to theoretically or typologically oriented research, with an exception of Geniušienė & Nedjalkov (1988) on Lithuanian. Despite this, the data of Baltic languages is essential for a better understanding of the historical development of perfect grams as well as of the areal distribution of such grams in Europe.

Despite formal similarity, the perfect constructions in Lithuanian and Latvian show significant differences in their usage suggesting different degrees and probably directions of grammaticalization. It appears that in Latvian the perfect is grammaticalized to a greater extent than in Lithuanian, which is evidenced by the greater frequency of usage of the

construction in Latvian, and by the fact that in many contexts Lithuanian speakers allow the perfect to occur in free variation with the synthetic preterite, which is apparently not possible in Latvian, at least not to such an extent.

In terms of semantics, the most prominent functions of the perfects in both languages are the experiential and the subject-oriented resultative (at least in Lithuanian, these two functions are almost complementarily distributed for atelic resp. telic verbs), though the Latvian perfect seems to be more advanced into the domain of expressing the so-called 'current relevance'. Both languages allow the auxiliary in the perfect to appear in all available tenses, including past and future. The past perfect (pluperfect) in both languages expresses not only anteriority, but such functions from the "discontinuous past" domain (Plungian & van der Auwera 2006, Sičinava 2013) as annuled result and narrative backshift. The future perfect is mostly used in inferential contexts (as in many Germanic and Romance languages).

With respect to the expression of the resultative proper, the Baltic perfects functionally overlap with constructions employing the passive participles. It has to be noted, however, that, differently from (standard) North Slavic, active resultatives in Baltic languages are rigidly distinguished from passive resultatives implying the presence of an agent or some external force (see the discussion by Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988). One wonders whether this more clear-cut distinction is connected to the fact that the Baltic languages strictly distinguish between subject-oriented and object-oriented resultative participles (cf. Nedjalkov 1983/1988 for the terminology and Wiemer/Giger 2005: 43-45 for the facts in Baltic).

From the areal point of view Baltic languages are outstanding for the following reasons:
1) In contrast to both (standard) North Slavic and SAE languages, but similarly to Baltic Finnic, they have a robust and fairly stable distinction between perfect and preterite.
2) Unlike the SAE languages, but again similarly to Baltic Finnic (and South Slavic), Baltic languages employ active participles in perfect formation; most notably, Lithuanian has even developed a 'have'-perfect based on active participles, a clear typological rarum (Wiemer 2012).
3) Baltic languages are more restrictive in their use of the perfect than those European languages which retain this gram, e.g. English, Spanish or Bulgarian, and seem to impose stricter constraints on the interaction of the perfect with different aspectual classes of verbs.

References
Breu, Walter 1988: Resultativität, Perfekt und die Gliederung der Aspektdimension. In: Raecke, Jochen (ed.): *Slavistische Linguistik 1987*. München: Sagner, 44-74.

Breu, Walter 1994: Der Faktor Sprachkontakt in einer dynamischen Typologie des Slavischen. In: Mehlig, Hans Robert (ed.): *Slavistische Linguistik 1993*. München: Sagner, 41-64.

Bybee, Joan 1985: *Morphology: a study on the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca 1994: *The evolution of grammar (tense, aspect, and modality on the languages of the world)*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Drinka, Bridget (forthcoming): *Language Contact in Europe: The Periphrastic Perfect through History*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge U. P. (*Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact*.)

Geniušienė, Emma & Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. 1988. Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of resultative constructions*, 369–386. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lehmann, Christian (1995): *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München, Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Lehmann, Volkmar (1999): Sprachliche Entwicklung als Expansion und Reduktion. In: Anstatt, Tanja (ed.): *Entwicklungen in slavischen Sprachen*. München: Sagner, 169-254.

Maslov, Jurij S. 1983: Rezul'tativ, perfekt i glagol'nyj vid. In: Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.): *Tipologija rezul'tativnyx konstrukcij (rezul'tativ, stativ, passiv, perfekt)*. Leningrad: Nauka, 41-54.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.) 1983: *Tipologija rezul'tativnyx konstrukcij (rezul'tativ, stativ, passiv, perfekt)*. Leningrad: Nauka. [English *Typology of resultative constructions*. Benjamins, 1988.]

Sičinava, Dmitrij V. 2013. *Tipologija pljuskvamperfekta. Slavjanskij pljuskvamperfekt*. [*Typology of pluperfect. Pluperfect in Slavic*] Moscow: AST Press.

Plungian, Vladimir A. & Johan van der Auwera 2006 Towards a typology of discontinuous past marking. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 59.4, 317–349.

Thieroff, Rolf (2000): On the areal distribution of tense-aspect categories in Europe. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.): *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 265-305.

Own publications (related to perfects)

Arkadiev, Peter M. 2011. On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2. 37–78.

Arkad'ev, Petr M. [Arkadiev, Peter]. 2012. Aspektual'naja sistema litovskogo jazyka (s privlečeniem areal'nyx dannyx) [The aspectual system of Lithuanian (with some areal data)]. In Vladimir A. Plungjan (ed.), *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki*, vyp. 6: *Tipologija aspektual'nyx sistem i kategorij* [Studies in the theory of grammar. Vol. 6. Typology of aspectual systems and categories]. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 8(2). 45–121. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka.

Arkad'ev, Petr M. [Arkadiev, Peter]. 2014. Kriterii finitnosti i morfosintaksis litovskix pričastij [Criteria of finiteness and the morphosyntax of Lithuanian participles]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5. 68–96.

Arkadiev, Peter M. 2015. Negative events: Evidence from Lithuanian. In Peter Arkadiev, Ivan Kapitonov, Jury Lander Ekaterina Rakhilina & Sergej Tatevosov (eds.), *Donum semanticum: Opera linguistica et logica in honorem Barbarae Partee a discipulis amicisque Rossicis oblata*, 7–20. Moscow: LRC Press.

Arkad'ev, Petr M. [Arkadiev, Peter]. Forthcoming. Vzaimodejstvie perfekta i otricaniâ v litovskom jazyke: areal′naja i tipologičeskaja perspektiva. To appear in Timur A. Majsak, Vladimir A. Plungjn & Ksenia P. Semenova (eds.). *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki. Vyp. 7. Tipologija perfekta* [Studies in the theory of grammar. Vol. 7. Typology of the perfect].

Wiemer, Björn (2006a): Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (a typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41-1, 33-49.

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

Wiemer, Björn (2007): Kosvennaja zasvidetel'stvovannost' v litovskom jazyke. In: Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.): *Èvidencial'nost' v jazykax Evropy i Azii. (Sbornik statej pamjati Natalii Andreevny Kozincevoj)*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 197-240.

Wiemer, Björn (2009): Taksisnye konstrukcii v litovskom jazyke. In: Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.): *Tipologija taksisnyx konstrukcij*. Moskva: Znak, 161-216.

Wiemer, Björn (2011): Grammaticalization in Slavic languages. In: Heine, Bernd & Heiko Narrog (eds.): *Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford etc.: Oxford U.P., 740-753.

Wiemer, Björn (2012): The Lithuanian HAVE-resultative – a typological curiosum? In: Nau, Nicole & Krzysztof Stroński (eds.): *Lingua Posnansiensis* 54-2 (special issue on resultatives), 69-81.

Wiemer, Björn (2014): Umbau des Partizipialsystems. In: Berger, Tilman, †Karl Gutschmidt, Sebastian Kempgen & Peter Kosta (eds.): *Slavische Sprachen (Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung)*, 2. Halbband; Reihe HSK. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1625-1652.

Wiemer, Björn (forthcoming 1): On the rise, establishment and continued development of subject impersonals in Polish, East Slavic and Baltic. In: Kittilä, Seppo & Leonid Kulikov (eds.): *Diachronic typology of voice and valency-changing categories*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Wiemer, Björn (forthcoming 2): "Matrëška" and areal clusters involving varieties of Slavic: On methodology and data treatment. In: Danylenko, Andrii & Motoki Nomachi (eds.): *Slavic in the Language Map of Europe*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton (*TiLSM*).

Wiemer, Björn & Giger, M. (2005): *Resultativa in den nordslavischen und baltischen Sprachen (Bestandsaufnahme unter arealen und grammatikalisierungstheoretischen Gesichtspunkten)*. München, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.

Wiemer, Björn & Björn Hansen (2012): Assessing the range of contact-induced grammaticalization in Slavonic. In: Wiemer, Björn, Bernhard Wälchli & Björn Hansen (eds.): *Grammatical replication and borrowability in language contact*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 67-155.

Wiemer, Björn, & Il'ja Seržant & Aksana Erker (2014): Convergence in the Baltic-Slavic contact zone (Triangulation approach). In: Besters-Dilger, Juliane, Cynthia Dermarkar, Stefan Pfänder & Achim Rabus (eds.): *Congruence in Contact-induced Language Change (Language Families, Typological Resemblance, and Perceived Similarity)*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 15-42.