A SURVEY OF PERFECTS IN BALTIC AND SLAVIC

Abstract

In our talk we will give a survey of the diversity of perfect grams 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, Sicinava 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 annulled 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.
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