

Building a partial aspect system in East Aukštaitian Vilnius dialects of Lithuanian: Correlations between telic and activity verbs*

JURGIS PAKERYS

Vilniaus universitetas

BJÖRN WIEMER

Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz

This paper is a pilot study based on tape-recorded and transcribed Lithuanian dialectal texts (from the northern part of the East Aukštaitian Vilnius dialect group) to investigate the correlation between telic and activity verbs. We analyzed morphologically correlated (prefixed and unprefixed) verbal stems which are potential members of “gradual-terminative” (GTER) verb pairs. We conclude that the prefixed members of the pairs are ‘perfective’ in the sense that they are restricted to events, whereas the simplex verbs are functionally much less constrained (and thus aspectually diffuse). Nonetheless, this aspectual specialization of prefixed derivatives has not led to a complementary distribution of functions, as it would be required if these productive processes of morphological pairing yielded true aspect pairs.

0. INTRODUCTION

The morphological structure of Lithuanian verbs is very similar to that of Slavic ones, because it is based on stem derivation (see Figure 1). Since the immediate Slavic contact languages of Lithuanian belong to East Slavic (Belarusian, Russian) and West Slavic (Polish in its local varieties, comprised by the name ‘polszczyzna kresowa’), which are all characterized by a fully de-

* The research was done as a part of the project *LITTERA: Lithuanian national identity in the context of cultural dialogue in 16th-20th century* funded by the Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation. We would like to thank dr. Vytautas Kardelis and Daiva Kardelytė-Grinevičienė for the dialectal texts and numerous comments on the material.

veloped opposition of perfective vs. imperfective aspect (pf. : ipf.), it comes as a natural assumption that Lithuanian has developed such an opposition, too. For sure, it should be admitted that local Slavic varieties – in particular the ‘polszczyzna kresowa’ just mentioned and Belarusian dialects bordering on or even reaching into Lithuanian speaking territory – have experienced reverse influences from Lithuanian, on the substrate of which they most probably developed. However, as far as we can judge on the basis of both the literature on the subject and fieldwork done by ourselves, these Slavic varieties do not exhibit any considerable differences in their aspect systems (“measured” either by functional oppositions or the way aspect pairs are formed) in comparison to Polish or Belarusian varieties outside this contact area. Of course, this complicated and hitherto neglected issue requires systematic investigation on the basis of reliable data. Since this cannot be the task of the present article, we, for the time being, have to leave open the question of mutual impact in the domain of verbal morphology and grammatical opposition between Lithuanian and Slavic varieties in contact with each other.

On first sight, the assumption formulated above is confirmed by the observation that stem derivation in Lithuanian appears to be even more productive than in the surrounding Slavic languages. There have indeed been numerous attempts to show that Lithuanian has grammatical aspect as have the latter ones, often by just projecting functional principles of the Russian aspect system onto Lithuanian. However, the expression of aspectually relevant oppositions in Lithuanian is considerably less grammaticalized than it is in its nearest Slavic neighbours, even if we admit that aspect oppositions can at least in part be based on other functional distinctions than in Russian or Polish (cf. Wiemer 2002: ch. 4.1).

To show this it does not suffice to look at morphology itself; the stem-derivational nature of Slavic aspect does not belong to the canonical examples of grammaticalization, which, first of all, include processes of morphologization. Slavic aspect as well as the “half-way” grammaticalized Lithuanian aspectual derivation can be adequately described only if we understand it as a process of tightening of temporal (and other) functions paralleled by a consequent re-distribution of morphologically related and lexically identical stems that are mapped onto opposite functional values (cf. Wiemer 2002: 4.1.2; 2003: 41-45; 2006; 2008). Looked at from this perspective, the de-

gree of grammaticalization should be “measured” on the basis of how far morphological operations fulfil the following criteria, which originate from Lehmann (1999: 208):

(a) With regard to the lexical stems of a given syntactic class (noun, verb, etc.) the distribution of grammatical markers (here: derivational affixes) has reached its maximum.

(b) Both formal distinctions (here: derivation patterns) and functions are obligatory.

(c) The formal distinctions consist of regular oppositions.

(d) The functions are maximally abstract (i.e., in our case, they involve not only aspectual oppositions proper, but also modal, illocutionary and textual ones).

How this applies in the evolution of an aspect system, will be further discussed in 1.1.

The assertion that Lithuanian has not grammaticalized stem-derivational aspect to a degree comparable to its nearest Slavic neighbours holds for any variety of Lithuanian, even for those dialects which have been in immediate contact with (or even surrounded by) Slavic, usually Belarusian, varieties as, e.g., the extinct dialect of Dzjatlava (Lith. *Zietela*), or the moribund dialects of Peljasa (Lith. *Pelesa*) and Harvjaty (Lith. *Gervėčiai*). All these varieties fail to pass at least some stronger criteria, first of all: they lack complementary functional distribution between morphologically related stems with identical lexical meaning (= criterion (b) above); neither are these stems apt to functional neutralization in clearly definable contexts (for the standard language cf. Wiemer 2001: 39–45; 2002: 4.1.2.8; Kardelis & Wiemer 2002: 63–65, 78). These criteria are not met, for instance, in the dialect of Dzjatlava, as far as can be inferred from dictionary data (cf. Kardelis & Wiemer 2003: 59–64), but also from specialized in-depth descriptions (cf. Vidugiris 1961; 1998), which anyway lack a theory of aspect and its interaction with lexical units (stems).

In order to better understand what has really been going on in different varieties of Lithuanian, it proves to be mandatory to turn to the analysis of texts, i. e. to coherent speech tape-recorded in as spontaneous circumstances as possible. Only richer contexts supplied by coherent discourse give a sufficient guarantee for a reliable enough “check” of temporal and other properties of different verb forms which are relevant for a qualified judgment

on the degree of grammaticalization of aspect distinctions in a particular variety. Since such work has never been done before on Lithuanian data, and since a reliable judgement concerning the functional oppositions distinguished by morphologically related stems would actually require a thorough investigation of a large amount of verbs belonging to different aspectually sensitive classes (see 1.2), we decided to begin such a work by restricting ourselves, first, to one aspectual class, namely: to telic verbs correlated with activities (see 1.3, section 3), and, second, to one clearly delimited dialect area (see section 1). In this respect, the present article is a pilot study. A similar study, though on a broader dialectal basis and concentrating on other aspectual classes, was published as Kardelis & Wiemer (2002). This study and the present one share the same theoretical foundations and pursue the same research goals.

The article is structured as follows. First, we will dwell on the question how aspect oppositions marked by stem derivation can arise. In connection with this we will discuss the derivational patterns and the functions which a full-fledged aspect opposition should display (see 1.1). After that we will give a general idea of the ILA-theory ('Interaktion von Lexik und Aspekt'), which has been developed by Walter Breu in a couple of publications since the late 1980s (1.2) and which will be applied by us to Lithuanian dialectal data. In 1.3 we will focus on the correlation of telic verbs with verbs denoting activities. This correlation is of particular significance for a derivational aspect system, since telic and correlated activity verb stems can easily render "gradual-terminative" (GTER) verb pairs, which give a starting point in the rise of such an aspect system. This type of "pairing" between morphologically correlated stems will become the proper subject of the main part, namely: the analysis of potential GTER pairs in the material (section 3). Before this data section we will give some general information on the dialects investigated, the type of data used and the way they were collected and prepared for linguistic analysis (section 2). Section 4 gives some conclusions.

1. BUILDING AN ASPECT SYSTEM VIA STEM DERIVATION

1.1. General outline: morphological patterns and aspectual classes

In general, we speak of grammatical aspect in all cases in which there is a stable correlation between oppositions of verb forms and their functions concerning the inherent temporal structure of situations. Notice that such an opposition can involve not only verb forms organized into a paradigm in the usual sense, i.e. as a set of inflected forms applied to the same stem (simple or affixed)¹, but it may also consist in a regular relation between two stems of which one is derived from the other (see Fig. 1 below). In any case grammatical aspect is to become manifest in morphology. For this reason, so-called “aspectual composition”, often described in formal semantics, should not be considered as an instantiation of grammatical aspect. This is a matter of aspectual interpretation only on clause level. Consequently, the labels ‘perfective’ : ‘imperfective’ (verbs, aspect) will be used strictly as indications of the *grammatical* status of verbs (verb forms), not in a purely semantic sense.

This accepted, aspect markers should be treated as operators on the lexical content of verb stems, which, in turn, should be viewed as operands. Such an operator—operandum relationship holds regardless of the morphological form by which aspect oppositions are expressed, i.e. whether these forms have an inflectional status or not, or whether they are coded by bound or free morphemes (cf. also Breu 2007: 138–141). What we thus need is a theory of grammatical aspect which takes into account the interaction between morphological marking devices and the lexical meaning of verbs, and which allows to group the inventory of lexical verb stems (as the operands) with reference to the “output” received from the application of aspect markers (as the operators). Up to date there are several such theories, and essentially all of them are based on the notion of borders of situations (events or states) and the possibility to focus or disfocus them (cf. the overview given by Sasse 2002, especially pp. 222–225). The ILA-theory developed by Breu belongs among these theories.

¹ This includes analytic forms as, e.g., the English progressive or the East and West Slavic analytic future (for 1pf. verbs).

Figure 1: Rise of patterns of aspect derivation

- I. productive affixation
 - Ia. Russian
 - (i) simplex stem \Rightarrow prefixed stem :
pisat' \Rightarrow *na-pisat'* 'to write' (\Rightarrow † *napis-yva-t'* 'the same')
 - (ii) stem \Rightarrow suffixation with {nu}:
dostigat' \Rightarrow *dostig-nu-t'* 'to reach'
 - (iii) prefixed stem \Rightarrow (secondarily) suffixed stem:
(pisat' \Rightarrow) s-pisat' \Rightarrow spis-yva-t' 'to copy'
 - Ib. Lithuanian
 - (i) simplex stem \Rightarrow prefixed stem:
rašyti \Rightarrow *pa-rašyti* 'to write'
 - (ii) stem \Rightarrow suffixation with {telė / terė}:
šokti 'to jump' \Rightarrow *šok-telė-ti* 'to jump (once)'
 - (iii) prefixed stem \Rightarrow (secondarily) suffixed stem:
(rodyti \Rightarrow) į-rodyti 'to prove' \Rightarrow *įrod-inė-ti* 'to (try to) prove'
- II. functional reinterpretation
 - (a) imperfective \Rightarrow perfective verb (pair)
 - (b) perfective \Rightarrow imperfective verb (pair)

Before we go on explaining ILA-theory (see 1.2–1.3), let us comment on linguistic forms expressing aspect distinctions. How can an aspect opposition be built on something different from inflection (as in, e.g., Romance past tenses) or analytic forms (as, e.g., with the English progressive), namely: on derivation? To understand this, let us look at Figure 1, which represents the way so-called aspect pairs are created in Slavic languages. The upper part (I.) subsumes the basic patterns of affixation productive in Slavic verbal morphology (Ia); these are paralleled by Lithuanian (Ib). From a morphotactic viewpoint these patterns are independent from inflectional distinctions, they thus apply also for indefinite (untensed) forms. They create derived stems whose lexical meaning is either identical to that of their deriving bases (stems), or the lexical meaning is somehow modified and/or acquires another aspectual (phasal etc.) character. A necessary condition of becoming an aspect pair is however that deriving and derived stem share an identical lexical meaning; part Ia. of Fig. 1 illustrates such cases. Here it is essential to notice that lexical identity need not be changed by prefixation;

see the pairs Russ. *pisat'* \Rightarrow *na-pisat'* 'to write' (telic), *stroit'* \Rightarrow *po-stroit'* 'to build', contrary to, e.g., *pisat'* 'to write' \Rightarrow *za-pisat'* 'to take a note', *stroit'* 'to build' \Rightarrow *pere-stroit'* 'to reconstruct'. In part II. we see the basic patterns of aspect pairs in Slavic². These are reinterpretations of those derivationally related stems from part I. which are (or can be, under certain circumstances) identical in lexical meaning (cf. Kardelis & Wiemer 2002: 53f.).

Further, it is crucial to understand that such paired verbs (stems) are not ordinary synonyms, because they cannot replace one another *ad libitum*. On the contrary, their use is constrained by the grammatical context (e.g., in the scope of verbs denoting phases, like 'start, continue, end', infinitives of only those verbs can be used which are qualified as ipf.), and they show more or less clear distributional preferences over functions comprising not only aspectual distinctions, but also functions in the domains of temporal location, temporal definiteness (episodicity), modality, illocution and presupposition³. The respective verbs constituting a pair show an almost complementary distribution on these functions, so that they share into a common paradigm (cf. Wiemer 2001: 37–39). If grammaticalization proceeds further, conditions arise under which verbs from a pair have to be substituted for one another. The best-known example of such a condition is the narrative present, in which in East Slavic and Polish only ipf. verbs can be used, becoming, as it were, lexical substitutes of their pf. counterparts (cf. Zaliznjak & Šmelev 2000: 44, 47–49)⁴. This process, which changes the grammar without changing derivation into inflection, can thus be called 'functional expansion of complementary restrictions'. It consists in an increasingly complementary

² Suppletive pairs are left apart here (e.g., *klast'* ^{IPF} / *položit'* ^{PF} 'to put down', *brat'* ^{IPF} / *vzjat'* ^{PF} 'to take'). Since suppletion is by definition understood as kind of exception from a rule (here: the derivational pattern), the existence of such pairs just confirms the validity of the rule.

³ This expansion of functions beyond temporality appears to be particularly strong in East Slavic (first of all in standard Russian) and in Polish (cf. Wiemer 2008).

⁴ In Russian aspectological literature this kind of substitution has usually been named "aspect neutralization" ('vidovaja nejtralizacija'). In fact, it should be viewed as but an extreme case of so-called "aspect rivalization" ('vidovaja konkurencija'), in which verbs of both aspects may be used, but with slightly different shadowings of meaning (depending on the semantic or pragmatic context).

re-distribution of derivationally related verb stems for a growing number of semantic and pragmatic distinctions.

The more verbs (of different aspectually sensitive classes) get involved into this process, the more stem derivation becomes a matter of grammar or, more precisely, of grammatical restrictions as a consequence of functional re-distribution. This process can be called 'lexical expansion by repartition' (more on this topic in Lehmann 1999: 203–205, 207–229; 2004). Both functional expansion of complementary restrictions and lexical expansion are necessary ingredients of a gradual grammaticalization process.

Thus, the reinterpretation of derivational patterns (see II. in Fig. 1) is an outcome of a gradual increase of complementary functional restrictions on productive affixation. Simultaneously it involves an increase of pairs of verbs with a common lexical meaning. These criteria first of all concern so-called secondary suffixation (see the example in Ia. (iii) in Fig. 1), inasmuch as prefixation in most cases leads to a modification of the lexical meaning of the simplex stem. Above we have however noticed that prefixation of a simplex stem without lexical change is possible. In section 3 it will be exactly those cases which will be of interest.

All mentioned types of affixation are productive in standard Lithuanian, too; they are probably even more productive than in (standard) Russian or Polish. However, apparently there are no contextual constraints on the use of either verb from such a pair, let alone rules of neutralization (obligatory substitution). Complementary distribution between derivationally related stems seems to hold only for aspectual meanings proper, i.e. for functions concerning the internal temporal contour of the situation, and only with certain telic verbs (cf. Wiemer 2001: 41f.). This can be considered as the central function of aspect oppositions (see the classical definition of aspect in Comrie 1976: 3), and it can reasonably be regarded as the diachronic starting point if grammatical aspect is to arise in the system of a language, temporal location and other domains becoming marked only later (as has been shown for Russian by Bermel 1997; see also the argument in Wiemer 2003: 41–46). In Lithuanian, however, all these domains have remained largely irrelevant for stem derivation of verbs, as until now no clear functional restrictions of this kind could be found (cf. Wiemer 2002: 4.1).

1.2. ILA-theory, aspectual classes and the lexicon

Breu's ILA-theory aims at classifying and explaining the interaction between verb lexemes⁵ and aspect markers; the former are understood as operands, the latter as operators⁶. As we have seen, the Slavic pf. : ipf. opposition is based on the derivational relation between stems. Breu starts from the assumption that verbs (as well as other lexical units able to function as predicates) are inherently sensitive to aspectual distinctions. This sensitivity serves as a basis for their lexicon-internal classification and is in principle valid for all languages, regardless of whether they have an aspect system or not. The ILA-classification divides verbs into groups according to whether they show inherent boundaries (beginning or end) or not. If a language has aspect markers, these either focus on a lexically inherent boundary (pf. aspect), or they defocus it (ipf. aspect). This central division into aspect functions is captured as 'focus aspect'. Below we will concentrate on this issue, although the theory also makes predictions concerning the behaviour in cases of lack of time-locatedness (iteration etc.).

All remarks and illustrations in the remaining part of this section pertain to the standard language (Lith. 'bendrinė kalba'), and they are of a preliminary nature (cf. Wiemer 2002: 4.1). They serve as a starting point for the description of the dialect data.

Verb lexemes can be divided into four simple ILA-classes, three of which can further combine into three complex classes. The four simple classes are the following ones:

(i) 'totally stative' (TSTA): these typically denote inalienable properties, e. g. *sverti* 'to weigh', *prilygti* 'to be equivalent' (e.g., *Viljamas Frajus padarė išvadą, jog, nusijuokus 100 kartų, tai prilygsta 10 minučių bėgimo ristele* 'William Fry made a conclusion that laughing 100 times a day is **equivalent** to 10 minutes of jogging').

(ii) 'relatively stative' (RSTA): such lexemes represent temporary states presupposing a starting point which is focussed on if a pf. aspect exists. Compare, e.g., *girdėti* 'to hear', *mylėti* 'to love'.

⁵ By 'lexeme' we mean a verb in one lexical meaning. Furthermore we will simply speak of 'verbs', if there is no danger of confusion.

⁶ For the latest explication of the theory cf. Breu (2005: 46–56; 2007: 144–155).

(iii) 'activities' (ACTI): this type can be equated with atelic duration, i.e. activities which are not inherently bounded and consist of homogeneous subintervals. Compare, e.g., *juoktis* 'to laugh', *bėgioti* 'to run around', *rūkyti* 'to smoke'. Merely temporal limits (beginning and end) can, however, be set by bounders, e.g. by prefixes (see below).

These three classes are atelic and can provide the lexical motivation for ipf. verbs. Apart from them, there is a fourth simple class:

(iv) 'totally terminative' (TTER): it consists of verbs which denote punctual events, i.e. events without any temporal extension; e.g. *suklupti* 'to stumble', *pažadėti* 'to promise', *apsirikti* 'to commit an error'. Such verbs can motivate pf. aspect. TTER-verbs sometimes occur in pairs, either in the simplex—prefixed pattern (usually with verbs denoting speech acts, e.g., *žadėti* ⇒ *pa-žadėti* 'to promise', *sakyti* ⇒ *pa-sakyti* 'to say') or via secondary suffixation (e.g., *susitikti* 'to meet' ⇒ *susitik-inė-ti* 'to meet frequently, on a regular basis'). In the latter case however the suffix often evokes an additional iterative (habitual) meaning component. Suffixation occurs less often, though. Because of the punctual character of the events denoted by TTER-verbs their pairings do not distinguish different components of the situation; therefore focus aspect here fulfils an empty application. If with TTER-verbs any functional differences can be detected, they concern either the multiplicity of events (iteration) or some pragmatic features (which remain to be investigated thoroughly).

Let us now come to the three complex classes⁷. They refer to situations consisting of an event and either a state followed by it or a telic activity preceding it. Complex classes are therefore composed of simple classes; the TTER-component participates in each case, since it focusses on the boundary, either the beginning or the end or both. If it combines with a subsequent state (RSTA-lexeme), we get 'inceptive-stative' (ISTA) verbs (or verb pairs). Lithuanian does not have many stem pairs representing this ILA-type, see

⁷ For a detailed account on Russian data cf. Breu (1998a).

however, e.g., *galvoti* 'to think' \Rightarrow *pa-galvoti* 'to think', *jausti* \Rightarrow *pa-jausti* 'to feel', *draugauti* 'to be friends' \Rightarrow *susi-draugauti* 'to become friends', *sirgti* 'to be ill' \Rightarrow *su-sirgti* 'to become ill' and possibly also *matyti* 'to see' \Rightarrow *pa-matyti* 'to see' (inceptive), *girdėti* 'to hear' \Rightarrow *iš-girsti* 'to hear' (inceptive).

If the TTER-component applies to a preceding activity (ACTI-lexeme), the result is a 'gradual-terminative' (GTER) verb (or verb pair), provided the activity is telic, i.e. if it implies an incremental approximation to a final result. Pairs that fit this condition appear to be more numerous than ISTA-pairs. Some of them are listed here:

(1) **GTER verbs pairs**

\rightarrow focus on event \rightarrow focus on telic process

- (1a) *įtikinti* 'to convince' \Rightarrow *įtik-inė-ti*⁸ 'to (try to) convince, persuade'
 (1b) *įrodyti* 'to prove' \Rightarrow *įrod-inė-ti* 'to (try to) prove'
 (1c) *pa-rašyti* 'to write (up)' \Leftarrow *rašyti (laišką)* 'to write (a letter)'
 (1d) *pa-statyti* 'to build' \Leftarrow *statyti* 'to build'
 (1e) *pa-taisyti* 'to repair' \Leftarrow *taisyti* 'to repair'

As we see, both prefixation and suffixation occur.

Finally, if the TTER-component combines alternatively with a subsequent state or the end of a telic activity, 'inchoative' (INCO) verbs are the result. As an example we can give the pairs *siekti* \Rightarrow *pa-siekti* 'to reach' and *slėptis* \Rightarrow *pa-sislėpti* 'to hide':

- (2a) *Jis visada siekė tobulybės.* \rightarrow ACTI
 'He always **reached** for perfection.'
 (2b) *Turistų grupė pasiekė kalno viršūnę.* \rightarrow TTER
 'The group of tourists **reached** the top of the mountain.'
 (2c) *Vanduo siekė kaklą.* \rightarrow RSTA
 'The water **was up** to one's neck.'
 (3a) *Mergaitė slėpėsi už krūmo.* \rightarrow ambiguous: either RSTA or ACTI
 'The girl **was hiding** behind the bush.'

⁸ We assume here that the derivative suffix {inė} in verbs like *įtik-inė-ti* (\Leftarrow *į-tik-in-ti* 'to convince') arose as a merger from {in} + {ė}, which subsequently was identified with the generalized suffix {inė}.

(3b) *Mergaitė pasislėpė už krūmo.* → TTER

‘The girl **hid** behind the bush.’

(3c) *Miškuose slepiasi senas dvaras.* → RSTA

‘An old estate **lies hidden** in the woods.’

Another good example would be *supti* ⇒ *ap-supti* ‘to surround’.

The three complex ILA-classes can be subsumed as follows:

ISTA = TTER (“left” boundary) + RSTA (subsequent state)

GTER = ACTI (telic, incremental process) + TTER (“right” boundary, goal of that process)

INCO = ACTI (telic) + TTER + RSTA.

We are now left with atelic activities. They can be delimited, but limits put on them are purely temporal, rendering a general meaning ‘for a certain amount of time’. An operator which focusses on its beginning, end or both renders a result which differs markedly from GTER- or INCO-lexemes. Notice that delimitatives from atelic ACTI-lexemes remain ACTI.

Lithuanian atelic ACTI verbs productively derive stems with the prefix {pa}, which serves to delimit the unbounded activity in time (without an inherent goal), e.g. *pa-sijuokti* ‘to laugh (for a while)’, *pa-bėgioti* ‘to run (for a while)’, *pa-rūkyti* ‘to smoke (for a while)’. In section 3 lexemes belonging to this group will be especially indicated, because it often becomes difficult to decide whether the ACTI-lexeme + prefix renders a simple delimitative (atelic) or a GTER-lexeme (telic).

We once more want to stress that in stem derivation we have to do with verb pairs, but we can speak of an aspect pair only if the two stems distribute among themselves the aspectual functions of focussing on the event vs. focussing on the correlated state or activity, respectively⁹. In Lithuanian verbs very often are aspectually diffuse. Take, for example, state verbs. Such a verb can either refer to a state or, without any change in the stem, it denotes an event setting the beginning of that state. For instance, *patikti* ‘to like’ can be used both inceptively to denote the beginning of a state or to denote simply the subsequent state. The following sentence is ambiguous in this regard:

⁹ The same would apply to inflectional markers of aspect as, e.g., with the past tenses of Romance languages (cf. Breu 1996; 1998b; 2007: 139f. for a comparison with Slavic).

(4) *Milda patiko Egidijui.*

‘Egidijus **liked** Milda.’ (inceptive event or subsequent state, or both?)

Other cases in point are, for instance, *suprasti* ‘to understand’, *sutikti* ‘to agree’ (speech act and mental state), *apnikti* ‘to fall upon, to beset’ (e.g., *Mane apninka abejonės* ‘Doubts beset me’).

Let us now briefly examine this question with regard to potential GTER-pairs.

1.3. Potential GTER verb pairs

Verbs which denote a situation with an inherent endpoint are telic; e.g., *atidaryti* (*duris*) ‘to open (the door)’, *grįžti* (*namo*) ‘to return (home)’. The event denoting this goal often presupposes a telic process, i. e. a process which evolves toward that goal. In Lithuanian many telic verbs can denote such a process without a change in the stem, as, for instance, *ateiti* ‘to come’:

(5) *Pažiūrėk, jis kaip tik ateina.*

‘Look, he **is coming** right now.’

In many cases such aspectual diffuseness has to be disambiguated by the grammatical form or inferred from the broader context. Thus, it has often been mentioned that telic verbs like *atidaryti* ‘to open’ or *ateiti* ‘to come’ “behave like pf. verbs” (i.e. focus on an event), if they are used in the past tense, but “like ipf. verbs” (i.e. with focus on the telic process), if used in the present tense. Look at the behaviour of *grįžti* ‘to return’. Its past tense forms, as a rule, indicate an event (6a), whereas as a half-participle (Lith. ‘pusdalyvis’) the interpretation can be ambiguous oscillating between process and event (6b):

(6a) *Tą naktį ministras pagaliau truputį nusileido ir priėmė mano siūlymą, kad galima į aikštę leisti po kelis žmones prie badaujančiųjų. Grįžau pas ministro pavaduotoją, pasakiau jam apie tai, jis dar patikrino, ar aš nemeluoju, ir tada praleido dešimtį, nors praėjo daugiau.* (V. Landsbergis, *Lūžis*, p. 117)

‘(...) I **returned** to the vice-minister and told him about that (...)’

- (6b) (...) *ji šitaip galvojo, **grįždama** atgal į savo kambarėlį, nusivilko paltą tamsoj, nes jo langai taip pat buvo tamsūs, ir tuojau atsigulė kaip vakar (...).* (R. Granauskas, *Raudoni miškai*, p. 24)
 ‘(...) she was thinking thus **on the way** (returning) back to her room (...).’

The aspectual interpretation of *grįžti* depends on the inflectional form or the stem extension of a nominal derivative (participle). It is remarkable that *grįžti* does have a prefixed counterpart, *su-grįžti*, which does not differ from the simplex in lexical meaning. This derivative however can focus only on the telic event; compare:

- (7) *O dabar vis dėlto vėl turėjome Laisvės alėją, laisvės kelią. Jis buvo senas ir duobėtas, vėliau dar pareikalavęs ne tik vargo, ašarų, bet ir kraujo. Tačiau **sugrižo** laisvės kelias, kuriuo vėl pradėjome žengti.* (V. Landsbergis, *Lūžis*, p. 167)
 ‘(...) But the road of freedom **returned** and we began to step on it again.’

No less intriguing is the fact that *grįžti* can also be suffixed (\Rightarrow *grįž-inė-ti*). This derivative likewise does not differ from the simplex in lexical meaning, but it is used in colloquial Lithuanian if the speaker wants to focus on the telic process; compare:

- (8) *Kai **grįžinėjome** namo, patekome į avariją.*
 ‘**On our way** home, we had an accident.’

Therefore, the derivatives *sugrižti* and *grįžinėti* “specialize” for the complementary components of telic process vs. telic event, whereas the deriving simplex *grįžti* can in principle be used for both purposes.

The last examples are typical for the situation at least in the standard language (example (8) is not considered to be entirely acceptable due to the norms of standard Lithuanian). As concerns the dialects, the proliferant extension of lexical stems by the suffix {*inė*} (with variants) has been observed for some Lithuanian insular dialects in Belarus (see Introduction; also Vidugiris 1961; 1998). But these dialects are (or: were) mostly located south from the Lithuanian-Belarusian border. The dialects we want to deal with are located considerably farther to the north and are spoken within the

Lithuanian “motherland”. In that territory stem extension by {inè} is virtually absent (V. Kardelis, p.c.).

For this reason we want to concentrate on another morphological type of potential GTER-pairs, namely on the type

(9) simple stem $X \Rightarrow$ prefix- X .

This corresponds to the derivational pattern in (1c-e) above. With this pattern we observe another problem, which we have to cope with in our data analysis. Simplex verbs that are potential members (and derivational bases) of GTER-pairs often alternate between telic and atelic readings. We again can treat this phenomenon as ‘aspectual diffuseness’: the telic and atelic readings can be understood as variants which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. This means that the grammatical or discourse context can disambiguate between these variants, but need not¹⁰.

2. REMARKS ON THE DATA AND THE DIALECTAL AREA

We have chosen to analyze tape-recorded speech from the East Aukštaitian Vilnius (*rytų aukštaičiai vilniškiai*) dialect group, which borders with Belarus in the East; some isles of the dialect merge into Belarusian territory¹¹. Some speakers of the dialect have skills of Polish (local) or Russian (Kardelis et al. 2006: 41–42). It is thus not surprising to encounter noticeable influences of Slavic languages all over the place in these dialects. Our data come from three parishes located in the northern part of the dialect area: Vidiškės, Daugėliškis and Palūšė (more texts are published in Kardelis et al. 2006: 48–205). We have collected unprefixd and prefixd verb forms from two texts of Vidiškės (henceforth VID, ca. 17.000 characters long) and Daugėliškis (henceforth DGLŠ; ca. 38.000 characters long). These verbs were morphologically correlated, one being a simplex stem, the other (or others) prefixd derivative(s); semantically they were good candidates for members of gradual-terminative aspect pairs (see section 3).

¹⁰ In a more formal semantic description this fact can be accounted for by an inclusive disjunction ($a \vee b$), meaning: ‘choose “a” or “b” or both’. However we will not pursue this task in the present contribution.

¹¹ Basic linguistic features of the dialect and a selected bibliography can be found in Bacevičiūtė et al. (2004: 100–110) and Kardelis et al. (2006).

Since this was a pilot study, and we wanted to gain a comprehensive overview of the stems which are of interest to us and their usage types in the texts, we decided to analyze such stems by a random choice, taking examples from each third page of the transcripts (VID, DGLŠ). This rendered 107 stems (types), which we could qualify as separate lexemes, with 211 occurrences (tokens) for VID, 208 stems (types) with 416 tokens for DGLŠ. We further used additional texts from Palūšė (henceforth PLŠ; ca. 96.000 characters long) to search for correlating GTER pair members which we could not locate in VID and DGLŠ. When we were unable to find a correlate in the texts, we worked with informants of the dialect to check if such a verb was used in their dialect. We also worked with these informants to verify the lexical meaning of the potential GTER pair members. Our final list of the material includes 67 GTER pairs (see Table 1 at the end of the paper).

3. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

We have divided the potential GTER pairs into the following four semantic groups:

- 1) verbs with directly affected or effected objects (e.g. *to close, to harness, to wake up; to weave, to bake*),
- 2) verbs of motion and moving (e.g. *to go, to ride; to drive (horses), to bring*),
- 3) intransitive verbs denoting a change of state (e.g. *to dry, to turn yellow, to dawn*),
- 4) verbs denoting social and/or mental activities or events (*to bargain, to teach, to organise, to tell a story*).

It is generally very difficult, and often impossible, to establish an array of aspectual functions for particular verbs (lexemes, stems) on the basis of a very limited amount of data. Even though we study text data here, the token frequency of some particular functions can be considered to be high, whereas others are encountered rarely, so that they are likely to be absent in a relatively small corpus. As a consequence, the data investigated here most probably render only a fragmentary picture of the distribution of functions. Since however we chose verb stems from even intervals of pages, i.e. by a “mechanic” device not guided by *a priori* semantic considerations, it can at

least be claimed that the selection is representative of the use (meanings) of these verb stems in natural dialect texts.

We will put into square brackets those verb stems (infinitive forms) that were not found in the texts, but confirmed by informants. The forms encountered in the texts are ordered by grammatical criteria (tenses and infinite forms) and, subsequently, by their functions, as far as these can be determined with sufficient reliability. If they cannot, we will indicate this and give the relevant examples. Lack of examples for grammatical forms or functions simply means that they are not attested in our data. In this respect, we are offering here an ordered collection of representative dialect data for lexicographic and aspectological purpose. Conclusions will follow in the final section.

3.1. Verbs with directly affected / effected objects

3.1.1. [arpuiti]¹² : *iš-arpuiti* ‘to winnow (out)’

Present tense, habitual:

- (10) *tĩ mašĩ.na.s bú.daũa. šitiẽm isikũ.lt gru.dá.m arklĩ.nie.s bú.ũũ.gĩ mašĩ.na.s paskuĩ.gĩ aĩpas tĩ tũkĩs išarpujĩ* (VID).

‘There used to be horse powered threshing machines, and there was that winnower, you **winnow out** (grain using it).’

Informants also confirm the existence of *pa-arpuiti*, which however means a purely temporal delimitation of the action denoted by the simplex (‘to winnow grain for a while’).

3.1.2. *austi* : *iš-austi* ‘to weave’

Simplex: present tense, habitual:

- (11) *iĩ.verẽ i kiẽk ní.ũu. / i dvi.liku ní.ũu. / i aštuõĩĩ.likũ ní.ũu. skaĩ.tũ.s / i ketuũũ.m / i dviẽm ní.tim và // jũũ / jũũ.tĩ. / i---/ iĩvẽ.rta tai.tĩ jũũ drũ.bĩ. á.ũge* (VID).

‘They put a number of threads, twelve or eighteen, or they thread four or two threads and **weave** linen cloth.’

¹² LKŽe gives only *arpavoti* with the same meaning.

Prefixed stem: participle praet. pass. neutr. (habitual):

- (12) *da. bú·daua. / šl̥.tas kēlnieni.s sá.ka. / tai̯ ké.l̥ne.m̥.jáu va ví·ram apa-
c̣š·n̥.tai // d̥a. kop̣.navatnai̯ bú·dauā. aḡlú·ti và išá.usta* (VID).

‘There used to be that cloth for men’s underwear trousers [...] and (that cloth) used to be **woven** in a fir-tree pattern.’

Informants confirm the existence of a purely delimitative *pa-austi*.

3.1.3. [*autis*] : *ap-si-auti* ‘to put on footwear’

Participle praet. act. nom. sg. masc.:

- (13) *dievū.lāu / tas kadulī·nais aḡsīevi.s klaṃ klaṃ klaṃ šitaīs keleīs j̥au
sē.ḳa.j̥au / iṇ.tuř.gu.* (DGLŠ).

‘My God, that man **with** the clogs **on** [...] follows (that thief) to the market.’

Although the simplex *autis* is not attested in our texts, it is used in the dialect. Its basic meaning is telic. Notice that *autis* can also correlate with the corresponding prefixed verb of the reverse meaning: *nusiauti* ‘to take off footwear’. This likewise is not attested in our texts, but exists according to informants. *Autis* therefore represents a case of enantiosemy, and in both meanings forms a GTER pair with the respective prefixed derivative.

3.1.4. *braukti* : *iš-braukti* ‘to scutch (out), swingle’

Both simplex and prefixed derivative: present tense, habitual:

- (14) *nū̯.tai / tadū̯ i.šmina / tadū̯ juōṣ.ti. tā·kū̯ / br̥āũ.ktuve.s medī.nies
padarī·ta skaĩ.ta. ižbr̥āũ.ke // br̥au.--- / br̥āũ.ke // tai̯ i--- / i.šmuša*
(VID).

‘And then they break it (the flax) and then they use wooden scutchers, **scutch** it **out**, **scutch** it and beat it.’

Only simplex: infinitive and past habitual:

- (15) *linū̯z gi mī.ndaua.m tālḳā.z / bú.ūā. / talḳō·sū̯ mī.ndava.m / tai̯ ta-
dū̯ gi j̥au̯ kop̣.i.šmini / tai̯ br̥āũ.kt / mēz gi vadī.ndavā.m br̥āũ.kt*

raĩ.gdaya. / [...] brãũ.gdava.m / šukúɔdava.m (PLŠ).

‘We used to break flax, we would work together, and when you break the flax down, you have **to scutch** it, we used to say „**to scutch**“, [...] and we **would scutch** and then hackle (the flax).’

Also in this case the simplex *braukti* is in any type of use to be considered as telic. Although here we have thus a good instance of a GTER pair, it remains unclear whether the functions of its members are distributed complementarily.

3.1.5. *¹daryti : až-daryti* ‘to close, to lock up’

Simplex: present tense, narrative, progressive:

(16) *ε.má.na. tievaĩ sanì / rá.uda // atajãũ / rá.uda / in.pé.čãũ---// cè tik brɔ---/ sú.nu. pakavã.jã. / cè mañ. [...] jãũ.dã.ra. kalẽ.man (DGLŠ).*

‘And my parents were old, they weep, I came there, they weep on the masonry heater, they just buried the son and now they (the police) **are going to lock** me in the prison.’

This single instance of *daryti* can also be read in a more specific conative meaning (‘they are trying to put me into prison’).

Prefixed derivative: participle praet. pass. nom. pl. fem.:

(17) *á.šei prabundù / má.na. [...] avé.lu. nierà / avé.la.š.jãũ.izbẽ.gi. má.na. // [...] nuveinù pĩrkõ.ñ i.sakaũ / má.ma / má.na. avé.lu nierà / až.bijãũ.ãĩ.t / jĩška.t // nù su.mã.mù mẽš.ĩ.ãĩ.nam abì // nu.ataĩ.nam.gi mú.su. až.darí.ɔ.s avé.les (PLŠ).*

‘And I wake up and my sheep are gone, my sheep have run away, [...] I come inside the hut and say: “Mummy, my sheep are gone, I’m afraid to go to look for them”. And we go together with my mummy and we come and (we see that) our sheep are **locked up** (inside).’

3.1.6. ²*daryti* : *pa-daryti* ‘to make, produce’

Simplex: past habitual:

- (18) *sañāũ bū.ũā. ká.lvei / ká.ldava. / á.řklus ká.usti.dava. / i(r)ratūs da-rí-dava.* (PLŠ).

‘In earlier times, there were smiths, they used to do smithery, they used to shoe the horses, and they **used to make** wheels.’

Prefixed derivative: present tense, participle praet. pass. neutr., both with habitual function:

- (19) *tai bū-dava. padá.ra. padarí.ta t-kìs va šakalīs ílgas medí.ni.s žu-va.só.nai gi jāũ bū.ũā. medí.nei* (VID).

‘And there used to be that they **make**, it was **made**, that long splinter, (certain tools) were wooden.’

In both meanings (1. ‘to lock up’, 2. ‘to produce’) the simplex *daryti* has to be interpreted as telic. In both cases thus it enters into a GTER pair, again, however, with unclear distribution.

Compare this with *darytis* : *pasidaryti* ‘to come into being’ (change of state, group 3) and with *daryti* : *padaryti* ‘to organize, arrange’ (social / mental activities, group 4).

3.1.7. [*džioventi*] : *iš-džioventi* ‘to dry (up)’ (transitive)

Present tense, habitual:

- (20) *i jós va šl.te sustá.ta. tì gi bū-dava. sá.ka. in pá.lu. // va kap vaná.ties / sustá.ta. sustá.ta. i paku.ré.na ižže.vé.na* (VID).

‘There they would put it (the flax) on the benches (in the steam bath house) (...), heat the house and **dry it up**.’

There also exists the derivative *pa-džioventi* with the meaning ‘to dry to some degree (not entirely)’. The simplex *džioventi*¹³ thus renders two different pairs of telic stems: one with an absolute limit (*džioventi* : *iš-džioventi*) and one with a relative limit (*džioventi* : *pa-džioventi*).

¹³ For the simplex cf. a DGLŠ example from LKŽe: *Šienq* [praes. 3] *džiovēnam* DGLŠ. Cf. also *džiūti* : *išdžiūti* (spontaneous change of state) in group 3.

3.1.8. [galabyti] : nu-galabyti ‘to kill’

Past tense:

- (21) *da. i nemažai ti jū bū. uā. a. paskui gi va. kietīs jāu juōs [žydus] nugaluō. bija.* (VID).

‘There were not a few of them (sc. Jews), and then the Germans killed them.’

The simplex *galabyti* is not confirmed by the informants.

3.1.9. *ginti* : *raz-ginti* ‘to separate, to drive away’

This case is problematic, because *ginti* in the telic meaning ‘to separate’ is not confirmed by the informants, neither found with this meaning in LKŽe. It might be a back-formation based on *razginti* (*ginti*).

Simplex: past tense, progressive; prefixed derivative: infinitive. Both stems are attested in the same context, which we give here unabridged.

- (22) *kai susi. ja. me. bā. ba. (s) su vėlneī. s/ nieka p ražgī. nt nemuō. žna // da- bař diēvaz dabō. damas iž. dunģā. s tū vā tvarkō. s niēr // šviñ. tu. * jū. r- gi. / līp in. ā. rkle. i. jō. k sutā. iki. k / kat. nešpeštū. nesmuštū // tas atjā. ja i. dā. [...] jō. gi šl. tas gī. ŋklas sanī. bā. s šō. čkū ti kō. kū vadī. ndavā. [...] // dabař taz. gī. nē. gī. nē/ tā. ike. tā. ike. / kuř. tū vé. lñu. su bā. bu su- tā. iki. si* (DGLŠ).

‘When the (old) women started fighting with the devils, there was no way **to separate** them, now the God, watching (the scene) from the skies (sees) that there is no order, (and tells) St. George: mount the horse, go and settle them so that they do not fight. He came there with his sword (...). And he **tried to separate** them, tried to reconcile them (with no luck). How can you reconcile a(n) (old) woman with the devil!’

Because the status of *ginti* is problematic, we can well treat *razginti* as a TTER verb. Otherwise *ginti* and *razginti* render an ideal case of a GTER pair. *Ginti*, as used in this context, might also be interpreted as conative (‘tried to separate’).

3.1.10. *karti* : *pa-karti* ‘to hang, to string’

Both simplex and prefixed derivatives are attested in the infinitive, the simplex also in the present tense in a habitual context (with conative function):

- (23) *aštāĩ gi dabarĩ gi jāũ išẽĩ.nā prasmā.nē. svā-tūs ká.rt/ kat.á.ni.š me-lújā / kat.á.nas ti tuĩtĩ.ŋgāz bú.ũā. / tĩ. ti šulnẽĩ vĩ.nā. / tĩ / tĩ.ĩ / ti sã.dai bú.ũā. / ti kaup.atvažẽ.vā. niẽka. nẽ.rā //* *tai išẽĩ.nā jāũ tadũ svā-tas paká.rt/ kat.neteĩsĩ.ŋgāz bú.ũā.* (DGLŠ).

‘And this is why they introduced the habit **to hang** the matchmakers¹⁴: because they tell lies, because that (particular) one lied that the groom was rich, there were wells of wine, gardens, and when they arrived (to his place), there was nothing. And it follows that, one has **to hang** the matchmaker, because he did not tell the truth.’

3.1.11. [¹*kavoti*] : *pa-kavoti* ‘to hide’¹⁵

This case is likewise problematic, insofar as the simplex *kavoti* is usually used in RSTA function (e.g., *Kur anas kavoja žirkles?* ‘Where does he **hide** (has he **hidden**) the scissors?’). Informants confirm that *kavoti* can also have a reading of a telic process, cf.: *Kavok greičiau peilį!* (‘**Hide** the knife now!’), *Žiūrėk, ką jis ten kavoja?* (‘Look, what is he **trying to hide** over there?’).

Prefixed derivative: past tense:

- (24) *atā.jā. á.nāš iš.pirtēs jāũ pasprāũ.sĩ.s šĩ.tā(s) šuvė.jas/ e. á.nas pakavó.žĩ.rklas* (DGLŠ).

‘And that tailor came back from the steam bath house after bathing, and he (the taylor’s apprentice) **had hidden** the scissors.’

3.1.12. *kelti* : *pa-kelti* ‘to wake up’ (transitive)

Simplex: past habitual; prefixed derivative: present tense, habitual:

¹⁴ The verb refers to a practice of figurative hanging of the matchmaker for his lies.

¹⁵ This is homonymous to ²*kavoti* ‘to bury’ (see group 4). *Kavoti* ‘to hide’ is a borrowing from Polish *chować* ‘to hide’ or Belarusian *хаваць* (same meaning) (Kardelis 2003: 180).

- (25) *uŋkštì pá.kele // nãũ.gì miegã·sì kai i·rà dá.rbã. // ké.ldava. / neda·bã·dava. ka(t) tú.jaina.s má.žas // kàt.và jáũ. pa.-auglũ.kas* (VID).
 ‘(And he) **wakes** me **up** early, how can you sleep when there is work. They **used to wake** (people) **up** (early), no matter if they were kids or teenagers.’

The simplex *kelti* can hardly be conceived of as atelic, this pair should thus be qualified as GTER. However, it is doubtful whether *kelti* can denote a telic PROCESS, so that this pair should rather be considered as belonging to TTER (both simplex and prefixed derivative denote the same telic event).

3.1.13. *kepti* : *iš-kepti* ‘to bake’

Simplex: present tense, habitual:

- (26) *isivė.řdi tai.raugíene.z bú·dava. pridã.ra. // dúonu. gĩ.namiė / namiė keptì* (VID).
 ‘You would usually make a dish of rye flour and the bread was (usually) **baked** at home.’

Prefixed derivative: infinitive; past habitual:

- (27) *tai.bú·dava. katarã·s mó·teras labãí mó·ka dúona.š iškė.pt // tá·kè garđì dúona žinãí/ kvė.pja/ in.klé.va. lá.pu. / abã in.ã·lieřu. iškė.bdava. // [...]. ále.jãũ labãí raĩke šeimíní·ke.s gerã·s/ kat.dúonu. geraí iškèpt// nelabãí kas ma.kė·dava. d--- / dúona.š iškė.pt* (DGLŠ).
 ‘There used to be women who could **bake** bread so well, the bread would be so tasty and would smell good, it **was usually baked** on maple or sweet flag leaves. But you need a good housewife **to bake** good bread, there were few who could **bake** (good) bread.’

With a concrete-referential object-NP the simplex *kepti* has to be considered as telic. There is another derivative, *pa-kepti*; it has merely delimitative function and should be classified as atelic.

3.1.14. [*kinkyti*] : *pa-kinkyti* ‘to harness’

Present tense, habitual function:

- (28) *tĩ mašĩ.na.s bú.dava. šitiém̃ isikú.lt gru.dá.m arklĩ.nies bú.ũa.gĩ mašĩ.na.s paskuĩ.gĩ aĩ.pas tĩ tɔ.kĩs isi---* / *išarpujĩ bet / ne.viĩ juĩs turė.davũ. //* *arklėĩ.z.gĩ bú.dauũ. pakiĩ.kũ. i.sũ.kũ //* *ĩ i.isĩ.kuĩ.gĩ ná.udu.* (VID).

‘There used to be horse powered threshing machines, and there was that winnower, you winnow out (grain using it), but not everyone had them, they **used to harness** the horses, they drive (the machine) and you thresh out the grain for yourself.’

Kinkyti is telic from the start. According to the informants, *kinkyti* can also correlate with a prefixed derivative with a reverse meaning, viz. *iškinkyti* ‘to unharness’. *Kinkyti* is thus another example of an enantiosemic verb (compare with *autis*).

3.1.15. *kulti* : [*iš-kulti*] / *nu-kulti* ‘to thresh’

Simplex: past habitual, present tense in habitual function:

- (29) *i tadũ [rugius] mašinũ kũ.ldava. ná.kti. paĩ.kele nuɔ.dviė vũ.landu. / á.rklũ paškiĩkie. ĩprivuũ.dan / tai.dabaĩ.jũ kũ.kũ? kambá.ina.m?* (PLŠ).

‘And then they usually **threshed** (the rye) using a (threshing) machine (late) at night. They get up at 2 a.m., harness the horses (and thresh the rye). And how do they **thresh** now? Using the combine harvester?’

Prefixed derivative: present tense, habitual function:

- (30) *nu tai.šituũs sá.menis vadĩ.nas tai / šitũs / và / ta.kũ.s padarĩ.tũ medĩ.nies kũ.ltũve.s i.nũ.kuĩ šitũs / jũũ.jũ.gĩ deĩũ. kap.sũ.kũ.* (VID).

‘And you **thresh out** these flax-seeds using a certain wooden bat.’

Kulti is atelic (see ex. 29). *Iškulti* is confirmed only by the informants. The reflexive-benefactive *išsikulti* ‘to thresh for oneself’ is attested in the texts, in the present tense and with habitual meaning:

- (31) *arklėĩ.z gi bú.dauã. pakiĩ.kã. i.sũ.kã // iř i.isĩ.kuli gi ná.udu. (VID).*
 ‘They used to harness the horses, they drive (the machine) and you **thresh out** the grain **for yourself**.’

The difference between the prefixes *iř-* and *nu-* is not clear, the former is qualified as more common by the informants.

3.1.16. *kūrenti* : *iř-kūrenti* ‘to heat (a stove)’

Both simplex and prefixed derivative: narrative present tense:

- (32) *tadũ jãu mɔ.mã pẽ.čũ. ku.rã.nã / nu pẽ.čũ. ku.rã.nã jãu/ dúɔnã jãu pasĩ.kele anã sulik šituũ jãu bačkelĩ jãu pí.lnu/ tadũ jãu iřku.rã.nã. mɔ.mã/ ti.tũ.ri jãu tã.kó.san/ in.pã.gale. pušĩẽs jãu šlúɔtu vadĩ.nas/ pušĩ.nie. kã.imi sanĩ.bã.s/ tadũ šĩ.tu. pušĩ.ni.jãu/ mɔ.mã iřlúɔja gražẽĩ vĩ.su. pẽču (PLŠ).*

‘And then (my) mom **heats** the (bread baking) stove, **heats** the stove, the bread (= the bread dough) rises up to the brims of this cask, then my mom **heats** the stove (**up to required temperature**), and then she uses a pine broom to clean the stove well.’

In this example, the progressive function of *kūrenti* appears to contrast with the function of *iřkūrenti* denoting the completing of the heating procedure, thus an event. This would illustrate an ideal case of GTER pairing.

3.1.17. *kurti* : *ažu-kurti* ‘to make up the fire’

Both simplex and prefixed derivative are attested only in narrative present tense:

- (33) *tadũ kuri pẽ.čũ. / ažũ.kuri i.ce.padarĩ.tã tũ.kó medĩ.nie.s / kai.lã.pe.tã.vã lí.žie. vadĩ.nas // nu.tã tadũ šĩ.tu. bã.kanu. tãĩ / kai/pã.dedi gi in šitã.s lí.žie.s [...] (VID)*

‘Then you **ignite (start)** the stove. After you **have it started**, then there is kind of wooden spade, it is called peel, then you put the loaf on that peel.’

To this example (and the pair *kurti* : *ažukurti*) the same remark applies as for the previous one.

3.1.18. [mažinti] : su-mažinti 'to decrease (tr.)'

Present tense:

(34) *ti.ná.i ti.ná.i jáu pal.cini.ku. sumá.žina. *ceikiñuõs* (PLŠ).

'There in Ceikiniai they **reduced** the number of policemen.'

Mažinti is not attested in the texts, but cf. LKŽe from another dialect: *Mato tie vilkai, kad juos per daug mažina* (šaudio) (J. Basanavičius, *Lietuviškos pasakos yvairios*, IV 284). Informants qualify it as rare, but cf. also the anticausative [mažintis] : *susimažinti* in group 3 below.

3.1.19. *melžti* : *pa-melžti* 'to milk'

Simplex: participle praet. pass. acc. pl. fem.:

(35) *pažu.rù / pú.sa.i dví.likā.s naktiēs // a.diev / aš.kā.rve.z da.ú.n.laukī. / i.né.melšta.s* (DGLŠ).

'And I realise that it is already 11.30 p.m. Oh my God, and my cows are outside and **not milked**!'

Prefixed derivative: past tense:

(36) *tai tadù tu kō.lā kā.rves ací.vežāu namō. / kō.lā pá.melžāu* (DGLŠ).

'And then it took some time for me to bring the cows home and **to milk** (them).'

Since the simplex is attested only by this one token with a past participle, we do not dare to say whether it can denote a telic process. But according to informants, it is in any case telic.

3.1.20. *minti* : *iš-minti* 'to break (flax)'

Both simplex and prefixed derivative in narrative present tense:

(37) *ižže.vé.nā tedù ml.nā // tā.kì mintuvaí padarí.ta [...] nù tai / tadù l.šminā / tadù juõs.ti. tā.kù / brāũ.ktuve.s medí.nies padarí.ta skaĩ.ta. ižbrāũ.ke // brāũ.--- / brāũ.ke // tai i--- / l.šmuša* (VID).

'And then they dry (the flax) and **break** it using flax brakes [...] And then they **break** it **down**, and then they use wooden scutchers, scutch it out, scutch it and beat it.'

The simplex could be used as an atelic verb (compare with *braukti* : *iš-braukti*).

3.1.21. [*mūryti*] : [*iš-mūryti*] ‘to build of bricks’

The verb attested in the texts is a reflexive-benefactive one, *iš-si-mūryti* ‘to build (of bricks) for oneself’, but only as a participle praet. pass. neutr.:

- (38) *jā. bū. uā. (namai) mūrinei isimūrī.ta / plī.tā.m raudā.na.m* (DGLŠ).
 ‘His (house) was **built** of red bricks.’

The simplex *mūryti* and its derivative *pa-mūryti* are confirmed by the informants of the dialect, but only in atelic meaning (e.g., *Prastas meistras: pamūrijo, pamūrijo ir vėl sėdi* ‘He is a bad master: he just **layed some bricks** and is sitting (not working) again’).

3.1.22. *plauti* : [*iš-plauti*] ‘to wipe (floor), to wash (clothes)’

Narrative present tense (plus habitual meaning indicated by *būdavo*):

- (39) *nu tai / jāu griūdīs plā.unu/ bū.dava. [...] // ę.kni.gā i šitū./ tai ne-numanāu kop.acivercū i paskaitāu* (DGLŠ).
 ‘And I used to **wipe** the floor [...] And I just do not notice how I open this book and read a bit.’

The simplex *plauti* can hardly be imagined as atelic. *Išplauti* is not attested in the texts, but confirmed by the informants. We have however encountered the reflexive-benefactive *iš-si-plauti* ‘to wash for oneself’:

- (40) *ę.kat nuvejaĩ kučkĩne.n (su perkelio suknele) tai vė. isipló.vei isiprā.sujėĩ i vė. nediėle.s lá.uki* (PLŠ).
 ‘And if you go to a party (with a percale dress), then you **wash** it again, iron it and wait for the (next) Sunday.’

3.1.23. [*ruošti*] : *pa-ruošti* ‘to prepare’

Only infinitive:

- (41) *sanā.ve.(s) stalāĩ nē.din̄kta / tai kat išėĩ.na stā.las padiņktĩ / i pa-*

ruōšt jāu piřšlī·ba.m // nū. tadū klā·ja // nu. jāu tadū klā·ja / i rā.išķe jāu/ jāu mergà·gi tā· ruōšes (DGLŠ).

‘In earlier times, tables were not covered with the cloths, and if a table has to be covered and **prepared** for the matchmaking, then they cloth it, and it means that the girl is getting ready (for the matchmaking).’

The reflexive-benefactive verb is attested as a pair: *ruōšti-s / pa-si-ruōšti* ‘to get ready (prepare oneself)’; the simplex in the present tense (42), the prefixed derivative in the participle praet. act. nom. masc. sg. (43):

(42) *taī kat išeĩ.nα stā.las padiņkt ī / i parúōšt jāu piřšlī·ba.m // nū. tadū klā·ja // nu. jāu tadū klā·ja / i rā.išķe jāu/ jāu mergà·gi tā· ruōšes* (DGLŠ).

‘And if the table has to be covered and **prepared** for the matchmaking, then they cloth it, and it means that the girl is **getting ready** (for the matchmaking).’

(43) *i ta.kū. da. bū.ūā. svā·tu. / kuris pasrúōši.(s) svā·tū bú·t/ tai nēt ap·gá.udava. tē·vus* (DGLŠ)

‘There were matchmakers who **were** (always) **ready** to be matchmakers (to do the matchmaking), and they used to cheat, to lie to the parents.’

3.1.24. *rišti : pri-rišti* ‘to tether’

Simplex: narrative present tense:

(44) *bā·bā.s rī.šā da. kā.rves píevā.ī* (DGLŠ).

‘The (old) women **tether** cows (for grazing) in the meadow.’

Prefixed derivative: participle praet. pass. neutr.:

(45) *mā.na. bū.ūa. kā.rve.s pri.rišta ce.vā ašķiluō.metra.* (DGLŠ).

‘And my cows were **tethered** (for grazing) a kilometer away (from here).’

The reflexive-benefactive *rištis* is also attested, but it correlates with *at-si-rišti* ‘untie, untether (for oneself)’. The prefixed verb (*pri-si-rišti*) is not attested in our corpus, but confirmed by the informants:

- (46) *tai á.nas pilnai sakìs/ kàt á.nas tá.u suma.ké / i.pē.jĩ knigė.lė. i / i á.nas á.rkli. rí.šas* (DGLŠ).

‘And he will argue that he had already paid you, and that he has got the papers of the horse, and he **untethers** the horse.’

3.1.25. *sėti* : *pa-sėti* ‘to sow’

Both simplex and prefixed derivative in the infinitive, the simplex occurred also in the present tense (narrative):

- (47) *(anas) tik paklá.use kas kur pásė.t kas kur kap tai á.nas jáu.pasá.ka. kur.sė.t/ á.nas i.sė.je* (PLŠ).

‘And he only asks where to **sow** what (grain) and when he is told where to **sow**, he **sows**.’

The two occurrences of the simplex *sėti* have different aspectual values; only the second occurrence can be qualified as progressive. This indicates that the pair *sėti* : *pasėti* is a good instance of a GTER pair.

3.1.26. [*sodinti*] : *pa-sodinti* ‘to place, to put (into prison)’

Participle praet. act. nom. masc. sg:

- (48) *vàt / á.naz žinai.ku. / á.naz bú.t mùs/ mañ. pasá.dí.ni.s* (DGLŠ).

‘And you know, he could have **put** us, me in prison.’

The simplex *sodinti* in this specific meaning is confirmed by the informants, but regarded as rare. Examples from LKŽe record this verb in the present tense used for habitual acts of imprisonment, e.g. *Kap kuris pavogė ką ar ažušė, turmon sodina* (Šalčininkai) ‘If someone stole something or murdered somebody, then they **put** (him / her) in prison’. Since in this meaning the simplex does not denote a telic process, but the same event as its derivative (*pasodinti*), this pair should rather be characterized as TTER. *Sodinti* can however denote a telic process if used in the more concrete meaning ‘to plant’ (e.g., *sodinti mišką : pasodinti mišką*); then the pair belongs to the GTER class.

3.1.27. *statyti* : *pa-statyti* ‘to build, to erect’

Simplex: past tense, infinitive; prefixed derivative: past tense, participle
praet. pass. neutr.:

- (49) *e. trl. ždešimpiŋktaĩs métaĩs ji. stá.tie. // [...] i. pastá.tie va. cè krĩ-
žũ. // [...] tai. cè jãu tadũ šl. tas krĩ-žũs nupũ. ũa. / [...] jãu. dabar̃ nã.ri
i. vẽ. statí.t (DGLŠ).*

‘They **erected** it (the cross) in 1935, [...] and they **erected** it here.
And then this cross rotted off, and now they want to **erect** it
again.’

There are no clear examples of the simplex in progressive function.

3.1.28. *šukuoti* : *iš-šukuoti* ‘to hatchel, hackel (flax)’

Both simplex and prefixed derivative: narrative present tense (in habitual
context):

- (50) *paskũ šepeceĩ padari.ta tri.z bú. ũa. // vienas medl.neis tã.keĩ.z duĩtim̃.
nemã.žas va. šl.te. va // tai. juos tadũ. šukú.ɔjα (VID).*

‘And then there were three brushes, one was rather big and it had
wooden teeth, and then they **hatchel** it (the flax using these brush-
es)’

- (51) *tai. bú.daua. má.n atá.neš--- / atá.nešα pá.kulã.s // tá. jãũ išukú.ɔjα /
linũs l̃šminα (VID).*

‘And then it used to be so that (they) would bring the tow (and you
get the tow after) they break and **hatchel** the flax (to the required
limit).’

The simplex can be used as atelic as, for instance, in (50).

3.1.29. [*tapyti*] : *nu-tapyti* ‘to deceive, to cause sb’s bad life’

Past tense, deictic tense use:

- (52) *tai. á.nas ne. vienu. meĩgĩ. ti. nutá.pija. // šl.ta. ku madũ (DGL).*

‘And he (the matchmaker) **deceived** more than one girl this way.’

This verb literally means ‘to drown’¹⁶. The metaphoric meaning arising from the context seems to be rather exceptional. Informants lack experience with this verb and its (supposed) simplex counterpart, so that no clear judgment concerning their aspectual functions can be made.

3.1.30. *tvarkyti* : *su-tvarkyti* ‘to put in order, to take care of, to repair’

Simplex: infinitive (53); prefixed derivative: participle praet. pass. neutr. (54):

- (53) *jău va dabar šl.tas va nă.mas [...] va pral.ja.gi [...] nù tai gi raĩke tvarkí.ĉ gi* (PLŠ).

‘And now that house [...] lets the rain water in [...] and you have to repair it’

- (54) *niėkur nel.gdavă. niėkas nešienă.uta visur. sutvaŕkí.ta / visakàs nù.imta / vl.saz deŕ.łus* (VID).

‘And no place would remain not hayed, everything was taken care of everywhere, all harvest would be gathered in.’

The simplex is telic from the start. However informants imagine *ap-tvarkyti* as a derivative with a delimitative value (‘to put in order to some degree’).

3.1.31. *ũgenti* : *užũgenti* ‘to bring up kids’

Simplex: past and present tense; prefixed derivative: past tense:

- (55) *i àš jău suŕkei vaikùs u.genăũ. / e. jău mă.na. vaikaĩ kitėp vaikùs jău u.gé.na. // jău dăũg lingvăũ u.gé.na. // [...] àš va ušũ.genăũ. sá.va. sú.nu. šl.tu. *gíedŕu. bla.gă.ĩ / bla.gă.ĩ vató.uka.ĩ* (DGLŠ).

‘And for me, it was hard (time) to bring up kids, and my children already bring up their kids differently, they bring them up easier. And I brought up my son, Giedrius, only having that really bad (quilted) jacket for him.’

It does not seem that the simplex could be used as atelic. Thus these two verbs can be classified as a GTER-pair.

¹⁶ As such it is evidently a borrowing from Russian (y)monumь or Polish (u)topić ‘to drown’.

3.1.32. *valyti* : *iš-valyti* ‘to clean (up)’

Simplex: past tense, habitual:

- (56) *mes šī.ta. dī.rba.m bū.daṽa. [...] aš.á.řklus valaú/ ká.řves valaú/ šerù/ ma.n.patiņ.ka šī.tas dá.rbas* (PLŠ).

‘It used to be so that we work [...] I **clean** the horses, **clean** the cows, feed them, I like this work.’

Prefixes derivative: participle praet. pass. gen. sg. fem.:

- (57) *ažmā.ki [...] kīekei trīs tai.kē.tuřus ti pu.dūs / ar.šēšūs pu.dūs ti kã. / a(r).ruģú. / a(r).kviēčú. va // e.ģerã.z.ģi naudã.s jāú išvalī.ta.s* (VID).

‘And then you pay [...] three or four or six poods of rye or wheat, of good grain already **cleaned**.’

The simplex *valyti* can denote atelic processes, and the derivative *pa-valyti* exists, which means that the cleaning has reached some degree, but has not come to its absolute endpoint (compare, for instance, with *pa-džioventi*, *pa-kepti* above).

3.2. Motion verbs

The motion verbs we found in our data can be subdivided into two groups: 1. self motion (*to go*, *to ride* etc.) and 2. causative motion (*to carry*, *to drive*). A common feature of all motion verbs is their deictic directivity expressed by prefixes. In most of the cases, *at(a)-* and *nu-* are used with corresponding meanings of moving toward the deictic centre or away from it; cf. *at(a)-eiti* ‘to come (here)’ : *nu-eiti* ‘to go, to get (there)’.

For all simplex verbs of this group holds that they are diffuse with respect to this deictic orientation. For this reason they occur several times with different prefixed derivatives. The problems this raises will be briefly discussed immediately below.

3.2.1. Verbs of self motion

3.2.1.1. *eiti* ‘to go’ : *at(a)-eiti* ‘to come’

Although from the lexicological point of view it is debatable whether this

pair can be considered as representing one lexeme¹⁷, there obviously is no further derivative of *ateiti* (like, e.g., *atei-dinė-ti* in some other dialects). For this reason we decided to include it into our list.

Simplex: present tense (progressive); prefixed derivative: imperative, past tense (narrative):

- (58) *paskaĩ.binau vá.ndai/ sakáu *vá.nda tu kat nerasivĩ.kus sakáu atá.j*
[...] *sá.ka. gercĩ ainù/ tai atá.ja.* (PLŠ).

'I called Vanda and I say: „If you are not already in bed, please **come** (and help me)“ [...] (she says:) „OK, I **am coming**“. And she came.'

In any case, the simplex *eiti* can denote a process, so that together with its derivative it renders a GTER pair.

3.2.1.2. [*eiti*] 'to go' : *i-eiti* 'to go in'

Narrative present tense:

- (59) *dabar iné.ja. muziká.ntas vidun / e.vé.lnes lí.ka. až dú.ru.* (DGLŠ).
'Now the musician **came in**, and the devil stayed outside.'

This case is debatable, since in the texts there is no clear example of unprefixated *eiti* used in the meaning 'to go into some closed space'. Examples with the imperative, like *eik vidun!* 'go inside!', are confirmed by the informants; but in this case the direction of movement is made explicit by a petrified illative form of the noun *vidus* 'inside'.

3.2.1.3. *eiti* 'to go' : *nu-eiti* 'to go, to get somewhere (on foot)'

Here apply the same remarks as for *eiti* / *ateiti* (see above).

Simplex: imperative; prefixed derivative: past tense (narrative):

- (60) *á.na(s) sá.ka. aĩ.nam *vižúsan// jau netá-lì *vĩ.žei // nuvé.ja.//*
dabar isirũj.k in vĩ.sa. tuĩ.gaus á.rkli. (DGLŠ).

'He says: "**Let's go** to Vidžiai, it is already not far from here". They

¹⁷ First of all, for *eiti* it is not clear whether its deictic orientation is rather 'here' or 'there' and whether, consequently, it can be considered as enantiosemic (see the correlation with *nu-eiti* below).

went there, (and he says:) “Now choose any horse you like in the market.”

As with *eiti* : *ataeiti*, *eiti* in this meaning can also denote a telic process.

3.2.1.4. *joti* ‘to ride on the horseback’ : *at-joti* ‘to come on the horseback’

Simplex: imperative; prefixed derivative: past tense (narrative):

- (61) *dabaŕ diēvaŕ dabó·damas iž·duŋgāũ.s tũ và tvarkõ.s niēr // šviñ·tu. *jũ.rgi. / lĩp in·á.rkle. i. jõ·k sutá.iki.k / kat·nešpeštũ· nesmuštũ· // taš atjã·ja* (DGLŠ).

‘Now the God, watching (the scene) from the skies (sees) that there is no order, (tells) St. George: mount the horse, **go** and settle them so that they do not fight. And he **came** there.’

The same remarks as with *eiti* : *ataeiti* and *eiti* : *nueiti* are at place here.

3.2.1.5. *lipti* ‘to climb, to get on’ : *už-lipti* ‘to climb up, to get on’

Simplex: imperative (62); prefixed derivative: past tense (63):

- (62) *vė.lne(s) sá.ka. lĩ.p i(n) nũ.garã.s/ aš·tãũ pé.rnešũ* (DGLŠ).

‘Now the devil says: “**Get** on my back, I will carry you over (the ditch).”

- (63) *nũ i ũ.šlĩpe. in·pé.čãus i rã.da.* (DGLŠ).

‘Now they **got** on the masonry heater and found (our hare there).’

The simplex *lipti* can be used to denote a telic process.

3.2.1.6. [*važiuoti*] ‘to drive’ : *at-važiuoti* ‘to get, to drive here’ (i.e. toward the deictic centre)

We have not found any example in which the simplex *važiuoti* would have been used synonymously to *atvažiuoti*. An illustration of the latter (in the past tense) can be seen in (65), where it is used as an antonym to *nuvažiuoti*.

3.2.1.7. *važiuoti* ‘to get somewhere, to drive’ : *nu-važiuoti* ‘to get, to drive there’ (i.e. away from the deictic centre)

Simplex: present tense (progressive and habitual) (64); prefixed derivatives: present tense, narrative (65):

(64) *kəp važúɔji in vĺ.nčāus/ tadù / dúɔda pl.nigus* (DGLŠ).

‘When you **go** for a wedding ceremony, then they give you the money’

(65) *taɪ atvažé.vā. / arklīz gražùs/ lineika-ĩ // nù taɪ gi / jāu nuvažúɔja gi *daugielĩ.škin* (DGLŠ)

‘And he **came** with a carriage and a nice horse, and now they **drive** to Daugėliškis.’

3.2.2. Verbs of causative motion

3.2.2.1. [*nešti*] ‘to carry’ : *at(a)-nešti* ‘to bring (here)’

Imperative, past tense:

(66) *αĩ.k in dǔ.ktařu. / atnèš paži.mé.jimu. ka(t)tù neščè [...] // nuvejāú/ atá.nešāu* (Dglš)

‘“Go to the doctor and **bring** the paper (to confirm) that you are pregnant”. [...] And I went (to the doctor) and **brought** (the paper).’

Again, we have not encountered examples with the simplex which would show its synonymy with the derivative *atnešti* explicitly stating the direction of movement toward the deictic centre. However, examples like *Žiūrėk, ką anas ten mums neša?* ‘Look, what is he **bringing** for us?’ are acceptable for the informants.

3.2.2.2. *nešti* ‘to carry’ *nu-nešti* ‘to bring (there)’

Simplex: present tense (narrative, habitual) (67); prefixed derivative: past tense (68):

(67) *pavá.sari. / labaĩ unksčì / rá.da.m zuĩkú.ku. mažú.ti. // aci.nešiem namá [...] né.šam i dā.bilú.ti i avižú. pribraũ.ki.* (Plš).

‘Early in the spring, we found a baby hare and brought it home [...] (now) we **bring** clover, oat (to feed it).’

(68) (*būdavo vilkų ir mama vis bijodavo, sakydavo:*) *vīl.kas gá.ĭ ti jáu.nú.-neš.kur má.na. vaĩ.ku. / ĭ.dé.kui diėvui nē* (PLŠ).

‘(There used to be wolves and my mom was afraid and she would say:) “A wolf probably **carried away** my child”. Thanks God, it did not happen.’

3.2.2.3. *varyti* : *nu-varyti* ‘to drive (an animal) somewhere’ (away from the deictic centre)

Simplex: infinitive, past tense; present tense; prefixed derivative: past tense:

(69) *išėĩ.na raĩ.ke arklĩ.s va---/ varĩ.t.jáu mú.m // tai.má.na. tē.ų---/ àž.gi tai.vaĩ.kaz buų.áu/ tik.tē.vas nuvá.rē. tu.á.rkli.// dāũ.k/ vĩ.sas ká.imas mú.s vá.rē.* (DGLŠ).

‘And we had to **drive** (to give away) the horse (for the army). And my father, I was still a child, my father **drove** that horse (there), everybody from our village **drove** horses (there).’

3.2.2.4. *vežti* : *at-vežti* ‘to drive, to bring, to deliver here’ (i.e. toward the the deictic centre)

Simplex: present tense (negated, habitual); prefixed derivative: future:

(70) *tai.asima.kė.ĩ / tá.u atvėš namó. [...] alė alė ale.gi tiktaĩ.na.s tá.u.nė. vež.α geró.s / tá.u atvėš ka.kiś.gi va.puvė.se.* (DGLŠ).

‘If you pay, then he **will deliver** you (the fire wood) home. [...] But he **does not deliver** good (fire-wood), he **will bring** you some piece of rotten wood.’

3.2.2.5. *vežti* : *nu-vežti* ‘to drive (sb, sth) there’ (i.e. away from the deictic centre)

Both simplex and prefixed derivative: past tense:

(71) *mùš ĭ.pačũz.gi kàp sĩlpnĩ bú.vā.m / manĩ.gi ĭ.bró.li. / tai.ĩ.ĩ.gi ná.kti. vé.žie / *ceikiñúcsan.vā [...] ĭn.kú.nigu* (PLŠ).

‘When we, me and my brother, were weak (newborn), they **drove** us also to Ceikiniai, to the priest (to baptize)’

(72) *mēs kaṗ.é.jā.m (namo) i mū(s) stá.cei iñ šitū pɔ.lí.ciniŋku. [...] (sulai-kè) i nū.vežie. mūs palí.cijon* (DGLŠ).

‘When we were going home, the policemen were on our way [...] they (arrested us) and **drove** us to the police station.’

3.2.3. Intransitive change of state verbs

3.2.3.1. *aušti* : [*iš-aušti*] ‘to dawn’

Narrative present tense:

(73) *bū.ua. šá.kei / ti netā.lì [...]. nū i nuvejāú // atajāú jāú gi zá.ra dienà āũštα* (VID).

‘There was dancing (party) not far from here. I went there, came back and (I see that) the day already **dawns**.’

The simplex *aušti* here denotes a telic process. A prefixed derivative denoting the correlating telic event could not be found, but was confirmed by the informants.

3.2.3.2. *daryti-s* : *pa-si-daryti* ‘to come into being’

Simplex: infinitive (74); prefixed derivative: present tense, habitual (75):

(74) *ka(p) pradé.jāu / šviesà darí.tes/ jāu lĩ(k) ká.rvę.s šniegì gi sliedé.lei* (*pradėjo matytis*) (DGLŠ).

‘When the day light started **to come into being** (when it began to dawn), one could already see the track of the cow in the snow.’

(75) *tai tadù stó.ja. dù žmó.ni.s // tai šitū. žmā.nū. tadù vaikaí. / vaikaí. rasipí.la. / vat.pazdá.ra. šėĩ.ma.s* (DGLŠ).

‘Then two people started living together, then they had many children, and then (new) families (of the children) **come into being**.’

In (74) *darytis* is in the scope of the phasal verb *pradėti* ‘to begin’ and denotes a process. Since it denotes a change of state, its meaning is telic. In (75), the derivative *pasidaryti* is clearly oriented toward a telic event.

3.2.3.3. *džiūti* : *iš-džiūti* ‘to dry (up)’ (intrans.)

Simplex: past tense; prefixed derivative: present tense (narrative, habitual):

- (76) *raĩ.ke sakít (toki užkalbėjimą) ėja. *jiėžuš jis kelù / susitĩ.ka. tris rō-žės / vienà žū.vō. / antrà vīt.a. / ū tračė visai pranĩ.ka. (PLŠ).*

‘One has to say (the following incantation): “Jesus was on his way, and he met three roses, one **was drying up**, another one was wilting, and the third one disappeared altogether.”’

- (77) *pĩ.rma juós nurá.uni // tadù.vā sustataĩ / vā šĩ.te.vā šĩ.ta.kėĩs ku.lũ.kai(s) sustataĩ sustataĩ jãũ ižžũ.sta / tai.tedù / sũ.vežã.gi jãũ tĩ kluō.nũsan (VID).*

‘First, you root up the flax, then you put it in small bundles, and then it **dries up**, then they bring it to the barn.’

Compare with the corresponding causative pair *džioventi* : *išdžioventi* (group 1).

3.2.3.4. [*gelsti*] : *iš-gelsti* ‘to turn yellow’

Participle praet. act. nom. pl. masc.:

- (78) *vā.ikšče.dava. die.vũ.li visi ižgelĩ.ti. / utielũ. apstō.tĩ (VID).*

‘My God, they used to walk all **yellowish** and they had louses.’

According to our informants, *gelsti* can be used only with the telic meaning, contrary to *geltonuoti*.

3.2.3.5. [*geltonuoti*] : *su-geltonuoti* ‘to turn yellow’

Participle praet. act. nom. sg. masc.:

- (79) *i.pervã.sar kã.rves adgã.na. vãĩ.kas šĩ.ta(s) sugeltĩ.na.vĩ.s (VID).*

‘And that kid, all **yellowish** (due to hard labour), pastures the cows during all summer.’

According to the informants, *geltonuoti* can have stative ‘to be, to look yellow’ or progressive-telic meaning ‘to turn yellow’.

3.2.3.6. [gisti] : aŝ-gisti ‘to go out (about fire)’

Participle praet. act. neutr.:

- (80) *paškãũ αĩ.nα αĩ.nα ta.lãũ / rañ.da tré.çu. kã.tilu. // jãũ ti ku.rí.ntα i. aŝgĩ.si.* (DGLŠ).

‘And then he goes further and finds the third caldron, and the fire is already **out** (under it).’

Gisti is confirmed by the informants and attested in LKŽe from locations close to Vidiškės, Daugėliškis and Palūšė (although the infinitive, according to LKŽe, is *gýsti* in Dūkštas, Linkmenys, Rimšė).

3.2.3.7. [mažinti-s] : su-si-mažinti ‘to decrease (of number, quantity)’ (intrans.)

Past tense:

- (81) *paskuĩ gi jãũ / jãũ cè kai kã.raĩ šitiẽ praždíeja. visi / tai tedu tiẽ gi i ci-gĩ.nai susmã.žinã.* (VID)

‘And then when these wars broke out, the number of Roma **decreased**.’

Mažintis is not attested in the texts, but cf. LKŽe, where this verb has telic meaning: *Kap vištos tūpia (peri), tai kiaušiniai mǎžinas, tuoj visai nebus* (Leipalingis). The informants describe it as rarely used; cf. [mažinti] : *sumażinti* (tr.) (see first group above).

3.2.3.8. [nykti] : iš-/pra-nykti ‘to disappear, to vanish’

Past tense (with either prefix):

- (82) *(kai) á.ni.z.gi (vagys) jãũ uščuvã / kat á.nas vé.jas // tai kã.rvi. in pu-šė.lvi. prĩ.rišė. / pá.ti.š išnĩ.kã.* (DGLŠ)

‘(When) they (the thieves) realized, that he is following them, they tethered the cow to the pine and **disappeared** (ran away).’

- (83) *raĩ.ke sakít (toki užkalbėjimą) ė.ja. * jiẽzuš jis këlũ / susitĩ.ka. tris r-žės / vienà žũ.vũ. / antrà vĩ.ta. / ū tračė visai pranĩ.ka.* (PLŠ).

‘One has to say (the following incantation): “Jesus was on his way,

and he met three roses, one was drying up, another one was wilting, and the third one **disappeared** altogether.”

Nykti ‘to disappear, to diminish’ is not found in the texts, but confirmed by the informants. The difference between *išnykti* and *pranykti* is not clear, due to the lack of examples.

3.2.3.9. *prausti-s* : *pa-si-prausti* ‘to wash oneself (up)’

Simplex: past tense (84); prefixed derivative: participle praet. act. nom. sg. masc. (85):

(84) *tai vé.lneš [...] uu.pé.li. pú.si. vá.landa.s praũse.s mir.ka. undeni.* (DGLŠ).

‘And the devil **was washing** himself **up** in the stream for half an hour and was soaking in the water’

(85) *atá.ja. á.naš iš.pĩtēs.jáu paspraũ.si.s šl.ta(s) šuvė.jas* (DGLŠ).

‘He, that taylor, came from the steam bath house **having washed** himself **up**.’

3.2.3.10. [*taisyti-s*] : *pa-si-taisyti* ‘to get better, to recover (from illness)’

Present tense (habitual):

(86) *tai jo. bá.ba kap.apsar.ǵa/ [...] tai kàp.jáu vištienā.s me.sā.s pavá.lgā. / tadù / pastaĩ.sā.* (DGLŠ).

‘When his wife gets sick, [...] and when she gets some chicken meat to eat, she **gets better**.’

The simplex *taisytis* is confirmed by the informants.

3.2.3.11. *temti* (*timti*) : *su-temti* (*su-timti*) ‘to get dark’

Simplex: narrative present tense (87); prefixed derivative: past tense (88):

(87) *kai.gañáu (tada) aš.sá.va. gí.vūlus/ tai (matau, kad) dabar.ǵi jáu.tí.msta* (PLŠ).

‘I was pasturing my cattle (back then), and (I see that) it **is getting dark** already’.

- (88) *atvažǎ́ · *ká.ľvesalin //ti.pa. · *ignalinù [...] ká.imas// bé.ŋ grǎ́.jǎ. grǎ́-
jǎ.ti.jǎu.kú./ kie(g) grǎ́.jǎ./ ku.dá.rɛ.// tadù jǎũ.skaĩ.tai / i.sutí.-
ma.* (DGLŠ).

‘They arrived in Kalvésalis, a village close to Ignalina, and they played the music, and it **got dark**.’

The simplex cannot be used with reference to a state (‘to be dark’). It therefore behaves like *gelsti*, but not like *geltonuoti* (see above).

3.2.4. Social / mental activities

The verbs of this subsection refer to mental and social events. It was hardly possible to verify whether simplex verbs of this subgroup can denote ongoing processes, although it is plausible to assume that at least some of them can (e.g., ¹*derintis* ‘to accommodate oneself’, *mokytis* ‘to learn’, *taikyti* ‘to reconcile’).

3.2.4.1. ³*daryti* : *pa-daryti* ‘to organize, to arrange (party), to prepare’

Simplex: past tense (89), narrative past tense (habitual) (90); prefixed derivative: past habitual (91):

- (89) *mez.dabar̃ dá.rɛ.m vesé.ľu.// ketureždèšimdevintaĩ.s mé.tais* (DGLŠ).

‘We **were arranging** our wedding party in 1949’.

- (90) *i.dá.re.m špektakľùs// *žemá.ities raší.tɔ.jɔ.s iĩ.davau knĩ.gu.// jɔ.s.ti
aprašĩ.tɔ tɔ.kì idá.mu.s [...]* (PLŠ).

‘And we **did (staged)** performances, we used to take some book of Žemaitė, she has some good stories.’

- (91) *nù.e.àš pa--- / pá.skaitas bú.dava. padarí.davau/ tai.ape.šviñ.tu.
kazĩ.mieru. papá.saka.davau (PLŠ).

‘And I **used to prepare** and **give** lectures, I used to tell them stories about St. Casimir.’

3.2.4.2. *derėti-s* : *su-derėti* ‘to bargain, to make a bargain’

Simplex: narrative present tense (habitual) (92); prefixed derivative: present tense (habitual) (93):

- (92) *zajiedlì bú. uã. ví-rai // jãú bró/ i tiek dé.raž gi/ i kap dé.ras/ i kiek kàs dúot/ i kap dúot* (DGLŠ).

‘The men were hard (on bargaining). Oh man, they **bargain** a lot on how much, how and what has to be given’.

- (93) *iñ.dava. tarná.ut [...] // nu tai / tai kiek sú.dera gi kiek pũ-du. / ti tiek i ma.kiedava.* (VID).

‘They used to to hire [...], and they used to pay the number of poods (of grain) which they **agree** (had agreed) upon.’

3.2.4.3. [¹*derinti-s*] : *da-si-derinti* ‘to accomodate oneself to sb, to get into close contact with sb’

Present tense (habitual):

- (94) *tai á.nas nevã.gdavã. ú.baga. // išeĩna kur vargúolã. / ale [vã.gdavã.] kuĩ in pã.nu. dazdẽ.rina* (DGLŠ).

‘He would not rob a poor man, but he would rob when he could **get close** to some rich man.’

Derintis and *derinti* are confirmed by the informants of the dialect. Cf. also LKŽe ‘to try to accomodate oneself to somebody’: *Marti kiek galẽdama prie visũ derinasi* (The daughter-in-law **tries to accommodate herself** to everyone as well as she can (Geistarai)). See also *derinti(s)* : *paderinti* immediately below.

3.2.4.4. [²*derinti(-s)*] : *pa-derinti* ‘to catch, choose a moment’

Participle praet. act. nom. sg. masc.:

- (95) *tai šĩ.tas [...] ti kadũ padẽ.rini.s muó.mentu. / inliñ.dã. / paló.vẽ.n* (DGLŠ).

‘And he [...] once **caught** a moment and got under the bed’.

Derinti(s) is not found in the texts, and no adequate meaning is provided in LKŽe either¹⁸. *Derintis* and *derinti* are confirmed by the informants of the dialect; compare with ¹*derinti* : *dasiderinti*.

¹⁸ Cf. LKŽe, where *derinti* is recorded in a meaning close to *ketinti* ‘to have plans, to be going to’: *Šitq vištq dẽrinam pjaut* (‘We **are going** to kill this hen’) (Dusetos). One example comes from Daugeliškis: *Dievas dẽrina sušaldyt visus* (‘The God **is going** to freeze everyone’).

3.2.4.5. [²kavoti] : *pa-kavoti* ‘to bury’

Past tense:

- (96) *i vaiku(s) sapťi-nus turá.u* [...] / *e. ké.turŭs pakavó.u* (DGLŠ).
 ‘I had seven children [...] and I **buried** four of them.’

The simplex *kavoti* is confirmed by the informants, cf.: *Šiandien kavoja Juozapą* (**The funeral** of Juozapas **is held** today’).

3.2.4.6. *laikyti* : *at-/iš-laikyti* (*mišias*) ‘to serve (the Mass)’

Both simplex and prefixed derivative (*at-laikyti*): narrative present tense (habitual).

Simplex also: past habitual (97). Derivative with prefix {iš}: infinitive (98), with prefix {at}: present tense (narrative):

- (97) *leñ.kiškai pá.maldas vā laikí.dava.* // *dešimťi vā.lundu.* [...] (PLŠ).
 ‘At 10 a.m., they **used to serve** the Mass in Polish’.
- (98) *taĩ vāt / bú.ųā. vagis* // *taĩ á.nas mǎ.kieja.* / *i mišēs išlaikít* // [...] *taĩ á.nas* [...] *priś.meta kat á.nas kú.nigas* / [...] *nū i mĩ.šu. atlaĩ-ka.* / *nu tai tadū nuzdabó-ja kur pinigai* / (*ir pavagia*) (DGLŠ).
 ‘There was a thief who knew how **to serve** the Mass. He [...] pretends to be a priest [...] he **serves** the Mass, and then finds out where the money is (and steals it).’

We could not establish any noticeable difference between *atlaikyti* and *išlaikyti*, both verbs are attested in the same passage of the text.

3.2.4.7. *mokyti* : *iš-mokyti* ‘to teach’

Simplex: past habitual (99); prefixed derivative: future, past tense (100):

- (99) *par mūz bú.ųā. ká.imi vienà mǎ.terá.le.* / *taĩ anà mus mǎ.ki.davǎ. skaitít maldá.kni.gie* (PLŠ).
 ‘There was a woman in our village who **used to teach** us to read a prayer book’.

- (100) *meš nó·ri eš tãũ išmó·ki.šu* va i. nu₂ kiŕme.lẽs kalbėt ĭ / i nu₂ akũ.
va // tai išmó·kie anà manì (PLŠ).

‘If you want, I **will teach** you the incantation against worms or (the evil) eyes, and she **tought** me.’

Compare with *mokytis* : *išsimokyti* immediately below.

3.2.4.8. *mokyti-s* : *iš-si-mokyti* ‘to learn’

Simplex: infinitive (101); prefixed derivative: past tense (102):

- (101) *dá.rba. má.n né.raikie. jieška.t/ aš dá.rbu. namiẽ turė·jau// galė.u su*
ta.tukũ gi ká.lt galė.u// mó·ki.tis ká.lt (PLŠ).

‘There was no need for me to look for a job, I had a lot to do at home, I could do smithery with my dad, (I could) **learn** smithery.’

- (102) *padabó·davau padabó·davau ĭ / dã. bí.ški. paró·di.dava. / krĩ.kštama-*
me. nũ i. isimó·kãu (austi ir verpti) (PLŠ).

‘I would look (how other women spin and weave), and my god-mother would show me a bit, and (this way) I **learned** (to spin and to weave).’

3.2.4.9. *pasakoti* : *pa-pasakoti* ‘to tell a story’

Simplex: past habitual (103); prefixed derivative: future (104):

- (103) *ce pavardie bú.ua. pirmà ne *kũ·jiškie / ale *kũ.nigiškie / a.hã. / *kũ-*
nigiškie// ale kai cẽ bú.ua. má.na. tievaĩ / tai má.n tievaĩ pá.saka.
dava. (DGLŠ).

‘Earlier, this village was called not Kũjiškė, but Kunigiškė, but (it was earlier) when my parents (lived there) and they **used to tell** me **a story** (why the name changed).’

- (104) *na. kũ. aš jú.m papó·saka.šu sanó·ve.ĩ // jãu ka(s) sanó·ve.ĩ bú-*
uã. / dauãũ nebegĩ·š (DGLŠ).

‘What **will** I **tell** you (about the past?), what was in the past, it will not come back any more.’

3.2.4.10. [rinkti-s] : iš-si-rinkti ‘to choose’

Imperative, past tense:

- (105) *dabar isiriñ.k in.vi.sa. tuĩ.gaus á.rkli // kurès tá.u patìks [...] //*
bá.ba isiriñ.kā. / ažma.kė. ažu.šl.tu. á.rkli. (DGLŠ).

‘(And he says:) „Now **choose** any horse you like in the market”.
 And the (old) woman **chose** one and he paid for it.’

The informants confirm that the simplex *rinktis* is also used.

3.2.4.11. skaityti : pra-skaityti ‘to read (through)’

Simplex: past habitual (106); prefixed derivative: past tense (107):

- (106) *tėvas labai skaiti.dava. kni.gu.dauk (PLŠ).*

‘My father **used to read** a lot of books’

- (107) *tik.á.tmiñti. turė.davau/ jãu.ku.praskaičãu kas.ceká.va to.neaž-miřšù (DGLŠ).*

‘I had good memory and what I **read through** and what I found interesting, I will not forget.’

3.2.4.12. taikyti : su-taikyti ‘to reconcile’

Simplex: past tense; prefixed derivative: future:

- (108) *dabar taz.gi.ne. gi.ne/ tá.ike. tá.ike. / kuĩ.tù vé.lñu. su.bá.bu sutá.i-ki.si (DGLŠ).*

‘And he tried to separate them, **tried to reconcile** them. How can you **reconcile** a(n) (old) woman with the devil!’

Here the progressive (maybe even conative) function of the simplex is strengthened by the reduplication.

3.2.4.13. tikrinti : pa-tikrinti ‘to check, to verify’

Simplex: narrative present (109); prefixed derivative: infinitive (110):

- (109) *išẽ.na tĩ.krina / ar.tù miegi // kap.arklĩ.s tuõpsi/ tai / tai ar.tù mie-gi (DGLŠ).*

‘And it follows that that he **is checking** if you are asleep by tramping like a horse’

- (110) *dabar̃ atá.ja. rú.su. laikāĩ.s pé.kla.n raví.zija kap̃.i.vĩ.sadu patí.k-rint / ka(p).pé.kla.i kã-kè tvarkà* (DGLŠ).

‘During the Russian (Soviet) times, the inspection committee came to hell **to check** the order.’

4. CONCLUSIONS

In the present paper we have been interested in establishing a representative sample of pairs of verbs which correspond to each other morphologically as simplex and prefixed derivative. Since in these cases prefixation does not lead to a change in lexical meaning, they can be considered as good candidates of gradual-terminative aspect pairs. We saw that their qualification as GTER pairs crucially hinges upon whether the simplex is able to denote a telic process. Very often we were unable to find appropriate examples, and not always replies from informants rendered satisfying results, either. An even more serious problem arises if we ask whether the two morphologically correlated stems are distributed complementarily over temporal (and other) functions. No such tendency could be disclosed, but the restrictedness of our data should prevent us from any more far-reaching assumptions in this regard.

What we can however affirm is the following. Prefixed stems are often used to denote habitual events, both in the context of past tense and present tense forms (sometimes marked additionally by the past habitual form *būdavo* ‘(it) used to be/happen’); compare ex. 10, 14, 19, 25, 28, 30, 31, 51, 75, 77, 86, 93, 94, 98. Although simplex stems are also encountered in this function, their prefixed derivatives seem to be used in the present tense only for the purpose of denoting iterated (in particular, habitual) events; in these cases processes (or states) are excluded. An analogous observation was made already in Kardelis/Wiemer (2002: 63f.) on the basis of a broader area of Eastern Lithuanian dialects with reference to verbs denoting speech acts and various ways of talking. These verbs predominantly belonged to other ILA classes than GTER.

These observations taken together make us inclined to assume that, if simplex stems by prefixation render extended stems with identical lexical

meanings, the prefixed member of the pair is ‘perfective’ in the sense that it is restricted to events, whereas the simplex verbs are functionally much less constrained (and thus aspectually diffuse). Nonetheless, as far as we can judge, this aspectual specialization of prefixed derivatives has not led to a complementary distribution of functions, as it would be required if these productive processes of morphological pairings rendered true aspect pairs.

Apart from this, the following conclusions can be drawn from the analyzed textual material:

1) Many simplex stems can be prefixed with {pa}. They mostly were not attested in the texts, but given by informants on request. More often than not these derivatives denote a merely temporal delimitation of atelic processes (named by the simplex stems), e.g. *pa-arpuiti* ‘to winnow grain (for some time)’. Exceptions are *sodinti* \Rightarrow *pa-sodinti* in the meaning ‘to plant’ and *kelti* \Rightarrow *pa-kelti* ‘to wake up, raise’. However, since with the latter the progressive function of the simplex seems doubtful, the pair *kelti*—*pakelti* should rather be considered as belonging to the TTER class (i.e. both members of the pair denote the same event).

2) In connection with this we can observe that simplex stems are often diffuse (underdetermined) with regard to telicity. Their telic vs. atelic interpretation correlates with differences in prefixation: {pa}, as a rule, renders atelic derivatives, other prefixes, e.g. {iš}, telic ones. Cf. the remarks, for instance, on *austi* ‘to weave’, *džioventi* ‘to dry’ (trans.), *kepti* ‘to bake’, *valyti* ‘to clean (up)’.

3) In contrast to the previous group, a couple of simplex stems are inherently telic, so that prefixation does not add this feature to the stem. Corresponding stem pairs are ideal cases of GTER pairs. See, for instance, *braukti* ‘to scutch, wipe’, ¹*daryti* ‘to lock up’, ²*daryti* ‘to produce’, *ruoštis* ‘to prepare oneself’, *ūgenti* ‘to raise children’, *gelsti* ‘to turn yellow’, *temti* ‘to get dark’.

4) A few verbs from this latter group show enantiosemy, which can be disambiguated by different prefixes. Here belong *autis* ‘to put on/off footwear’, *kinkyti* ‘to harness/unharness (a horse)’, possibly also *rišti(s)* ‘to tether/untether’.

Table 1.**1. Verbs with directly affected / effected objects**

-
1. [arpuiti] : iš-arpuiti 'to winnow (out)
 2. austi : iš-austi 'to weave'
 3. [autis] : ap-si-auti 'to put on footwear'
 4. braukti : iš-braukti 'to scutch (out), swingle'
 5. ¹daryti : až-daryti 'to close, to lock up'
 6. ²daryti : pa-daryti 'to make, produce'
 7. [džioventi] : iš-džioventi 'to dry (up)' (transitive)
 8. [galabyti] : nu-galabyti 'to kill'
-
9. ginti : raz-ginti 'to separate, to drive away'
 10. karti : pa-karti 'to hang, to string'
 11. [¹kavoti] : pa-kavoti 'to hide'
 12. kelti : pa-kelti 'to wake up' (transitive)
 13. kepti : iš-kepti 'to bake'
 14. [kinkyti] : pa-kinkyti 'to harness'
 15. kulti : [iš-kulti] / nu-kulti 'to thresh'
 16. kūrenti : iš-kūrenti 'to heat (a stove)'
 17. kurti : ažu-kurti 'to make up the fire'
 18. [mažinti] : su-mažinti 'to decrease (tr.)'
 19. melžti : pa-melžti 'to milk'
 20. minti : iš-minti 'to break (flax)'
 21. [mūryti] : [iš-mūryti] 'to build of bricks'
 22. plauti : [iš-plauti] 'to wipe (floor), to wash (clothes)'
 23. [ruošti] : pa-ruošti 'to prepare'
 24. rišti : pri-rišti 'to tether'
 25. seti : pa-seti 'to sow'
 26. [sodinti] : pa-sodinti 'to place, to put (into prison)'
 27. statyti : pa-statyti 'to build, to erect'
 28. šukuoti : iš-šukuoti 'to hatchel, hackel (flax)'
 29. [tapyti] : nu-tapyti 'to deceive, to cause sb's bad life'
 30. tvarkyti : su-tvarkyti 'to put in order, to take care of, to repair'
 31. ūgenti : už-ūgenti 'to bring up kids'
 32. valyti : iš-valyti 'to clean (up)'
-

Continuation of table 1

2. Motion verbs
1. Verbs of self motion
1. <i>eiti</i> 'to go' : <i>ata-eiti</i> 'to come'
2. [<i>eiti</i>] 'to go' : <i>į-eiti</i> 'to go in'
3. <i>eiti</i> 'to go' : <i>nu-eiti</i> 'to go, to get somewhere (on foot)'
4. <i>joti</i> 'to ride on the horseback' : <i>at-joti</i> 'to come on the horseback'
5. <i>lipti</i> 'to climb, to get on' : <i>už-lipti</i> 'to climb up, to get on'
6. [<i>važiuoti</i>] 'to drive' : <i>at-važiuoti</i> 'to get, to drive here' (i.e. toward the deictic centre)
7. <i>važiuoti</i> 'to get somewhere, to drive' : <i>nu-važiuoti</i> 'to get, to drive there' (i.e. away from the deictic centre)
2. Verbs of causative motion
1. [<i>nešti</i>] 'to carry' : <i>at(a)-nešti</i> 'to bring (here)'
2. <i>nešti</i> 'to carry' <i>nu-nešti</i> 'to bring (there)'
3. <i>varyti</i> : <i>nu-varyti</i> 'to drive (an animal) somewhere' (away from the deictic centre)
4. <i>vežti</i> : <i>at-vežti</i> 'to drive, to bring, to deliver here' (i.e. toward the deictic centre)
5. <i>vežti</i> : <i>nu-vežti</i> 'to drive (sb, sth) there' (i.e. away from the deictic centre)
3. Intransitive change of state verbs
1. <i>aušti</i> : [<i>iš-aušti</i>] 'to dawn'
2. <i>daryti-s</i> : <i>pa-si-daryti</i> 'to come into being'
3. <i>džiūti</i> : <i>iš-džiūti</i> 'to dry (up)' (intrans.)
4. [<i>gelsti</i>] : <i>iš-gelsti</i> 'to turn yellow'
5. [<i>geltonuoti</i>] : <i>su-geltonuoti</i> 'to turn yellow'
6. [<i>gisti</i>] : <i>až-gisti</i> 'to go out (about fire)'
7. [<i>mažinti-s</i>] : <i>su-si-mažinti</i> 'to decrease (of number, quantity)' (intrans.)
8. [<i>nykti</i>] : <i>iš-/pra-nykti</i> 'to disappear, to vanish'
9. <i>prausti-s</i> : <i>pa-si-prausti</i> 'to wash oneself (up)'
10. [<i>taisyti-s</i>] : <i>pa-si-taisyti</i> 'to get better, to recover (from illness)'
11. <i>temti (tūmti)</i> : <i>su-temti (su-tūmti)</i> 'to get dark'
4. Social / mental activities
1. <i>derėti-s</i> : <i>su-derėti</i> 'to bargain, to make a bargain'
2. ³ <i>daryti</i> : <i>pa-daryti</i> 'to organize, to arrange (party), to prepare'
3. [¹ <i>derinti-s</i>] : <i>da-si-derinti</i> 'to accomodate oneself to sb, to get into close contact with sb'

Continuation of table 1

-
4. [²*derinti(-s)*] : *pa-derinti* ‘to catch, choose a moment’
 5. [²*kavoti*] : *pa-kavoti* ‘to bury’
 6. *laikyti* : *at-/iš-laikyti (mišias)* ‘to serve (the Mass)’
 7. *mokyti* : *iš-mokyti* ‘to teach’
 8. *mokyti-s* : *iš-si-mokyti* ‘to learn’
 9. *pasakoti* : *pa-pasakoti* ‘to tell a story’
 10. [*rinkti-s*] : *iš-si-rinkti* ‘to choose’
 11. *skaityti* : *pra-skaityti* ‘to read (through)’
 12. *taikyti* : *su-taikyti* ‘to reconcile’
 13. *tikrinti* : *pa-tikrinti* ‘to check, to verify’

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

DGLŠ	Daugeliškis
LKŽE	<i>Lietuvių kalbos žodynas</i> (t. I–XX, 1941–2002), elektroninis variantas, redaktorių kolegija: G. Naktinienė (vyr. redaktorė), J. Paulauskas, R. Petrokienė, V. Vitkauskas, J. Zabarskaitė, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, http://www.lkz.lt
PLŠ	Palūšė
VID	Vidiškės
⇒ ⇐	direction of morphological operation (stem derivation)
INTRANS.	intransitive stem
TRANS.	transitive stem
PF., IPF.	perfective, imperfective (aspect, stem – regarding Slavic)

ILA-CLASSES

1) simple classes :

ACTI ‘activity’

RSTA ‘relatively stative’

TSTA ‘totally stative’

TTER ‘totally terminative’

2) complex classes:

GTER 'gradual terminative'

ISTA 'inceptive stative'

INCO 'inchoative'

REFERENCES

- BACEVIČIŪTĖ, R., IVANAUSKIENE, A., LESKAUSKAITE, A., TRUMPA, E. 2004: *Lietuvių kalbos tarmių chrestomatija*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- BERMEL, N. 1997: *Context and the Lexicon in the Development of Russian Aspect*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press.
- BREU, W. 1996: Komponentenmodell der Interaktion von Lexik und Aspekt. In: W. GIRKE, ed., *Slavistische Linguistik 1995*. München: Sagner, 37–74.
- BREU, W. 1998a: Komplexe aktionale Verbklassen, insbesondere Inchoativa. In: T. Berger & J. Raecke, eds., *Slavistische Linguistik 1997*. München: Sagner, 55–80.
- BREU, W. 1998b: Sopostavlenie slavjanskogo glagol'nogo vida i vida romanskogo tipa (aorist : imperfekt : perfekt) na osnove vzaimodejstvija s leksikoj. In: M. Ju. ČERTKOVA, ed., *Tipologija vida (problemy, poiski, rešenija)*. Moskva: Škola «Jazyki russkoj kul'tury», 88–99.
- BREU, W. 2005: Verbalaspekt und Sprachkontakt. Ein Vergleich der Systeme zweier slavischer Minderheitensprachen (SWR/MSL). In: S. Kempgen, ed., *Slavistische Linguistik 2003*. München: Sagner, 37–95.
- BREU, W. 2007: Der Verbalaspekt im Spannungsfeld zwischen Grammatik und Lexikon. *Sprachwissenschaft* 32–2, 123–166.
- COMRIE, B. 1976: *Aspect*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- KARDELIS, V., WIEMER, B. 2002: Ausbildung von Aspektpaarigkeit in litauischen Grenz- und Inseldialekten (am Beispiel von Sprechverben). *Linguistica Baltica* 10, 51–80.
- KARDELIS, V., WIEMER, B. 2003: Kritische Bemerkungen zur Praxis der Erstellung litauischer Wörterbücher, insbesondere von Mundarten – am Beispiel des slavisches Lehnnguts und des 'veikslas'. In: N. OSTROWSKI & O. VAIČIULYTĖ-ROMANČUK,

- eds., *Prace bałtystyczne. Język, literatura, kultura*. Warszawa: Wydział Polonistyki UW, 45–72.
- KARDELIS, V. 2003: *Rytų aukštaičių šnektų slavizmų fonologijos bruožai*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.
- KARDELIS, V., KARDELYTE-GRINEVIČIENE, D., NAVICKAITE, A., STRUNGYTE, I. 2006: *Šiaurės rytų aukštaičiai vilniškiai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- LEHMANN, V. 1999: Sprachliche Entwicklung als Expansion und Reduktion. In: T. ANSTATT, ed., *Entwicklungen in slavischen Sprachen*. München: Sagner, 169–254.
- LEHMANN, V. 2004: Grammaticalization via extending derivation. In: W. BISANG, N. P. HIMMELMANN & B. WIEMER, eds., *What makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 169–186.
- SASSE, H.-J. 2002: Recent activity in the theory of aspect: Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-progressive state? *Linguistic Typology* 6–2, 199–271.
- VIDUGIRIS, A. 1961: Veiksmazodžiai su priesagomis *-inėti* ir *-dinėti* Zietelos tarmėje. *Lietuvos TSR MA darbai*, Serija A, 2 (11), 219–231.
- VIDUGIRIS, A. 1998: Dėl daugkartinio veiksmo raiškos pietrytinėse lietuvių kalbos tarmėse. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 39, 183–191.
- WIEMER, B. 2001: Aspektual'nye paradigmy i leksičeskoe značenie russkix i litovskix glagolov (Opyt sopostavlenija s točki zrenija leksikalizacii i grammatikalizacii). *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2001–2, 26–58.
- WIEMER, B. 2002: *Grammatikalisierungstheorie, Derivation und Konstruktionen: am Beispiel des klassifizierenden Aspekts, des Passivs und des Subjektimpersonals im slavisch-baltischen Areal*. Unpublished MS of postdoctoral thesis, Konstanz.
- WIEMER, B. 2003: Objektive Wiederholungstaten, verworrene Funktionsbelegungen und entartete Inferenzen in der Synchronie als Folge der Diachronie. In: T. ANSTATT & B. HANSEN, eds.: *Entwicklungen in slavischen Sprachen 2 (Für Volkmar Lehmann zum 60. Geburtstag von seinen Schülerinnen und Schülern)*. München: Sagner, 35–62.

- WIEMER, B. 2006: O razgraničenii grammatičeskix i leksičeskix protivopostavlenij v glagol'nom slovoobrazovanii, ili: čemu mogu naučit'sja aspektologi na primere sja-glagolov? In: V. Lehmann, ed., *Glagol'nyj vid i leksikografija* (= *Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida IV*). München: Sagner, 97–123.
- WIEMER, B. 2008: Zur innerslavischen Variation der Aspektwahl und der Gewichtung ihrer Faktoren. In: K. GUTSCHMIDT, U. JEKUTSCH, S. KEMPGEN & L. UDOLPH, eds., *Deutsche Beiträge zum 14. Internationalen Slavistenkongreß, Ochrid 2008*. München: Sagner.
- ZALIZNJAK, ANNA A., ŠMELEV, A. D. 2000: *Vvedenie v russkuju aspektologiju*. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Jurgis Pakerys

Vilniaus universitetas,

Baltistikos katedra

Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius

Björn Wiemer

Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz,

Institut für Slavistik, Jakob-Welder-Weg 18

D-55099 Mainz, Germany