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a) Languages

Bulgarian: B
Common Slavio: CS
English: Eng, E.
French: Fr
German: Ger
Germanio: Germ, Gmo
Greek: Gk
Indo-European: IE
Latin: Lat
Latvian: La
Lithuanian: L, Lith
Macedonian: M
Old Church Slavic: OCS
Polish: Pol
Proto-Indo-European: PIE
Russian: R
Sanskrit: Skt
Ukrainian: Ukr
White Russian: WR

b) Grammatical terms,

Adjective: adj
adverb: adv
ancient: anc
aorist: aor
feminine: fem, f
frequentative past: fp
imperfect: imp
imperfective: i
Instruments: instr
Intensive: intens
Intransitive: intr
Iterative: iter
dual: du (insert between aor and fem)
Masculine: masc, m
perfective: p
person: P
plural: pl
present: pres
singular: sg
verb: vb

(Questionnaire = Q
sentence = s.
Questionnaire No 15 = Q15
Informants are indicated by the letter of the language concerned
followed by a number, i.e. B 1. = Bulgarian ONE.
Chapter 1.

In this chapter are discussed the factors which led us to make a typological study of the languages in question (Lithuanian, Latvian and Bulgarian). The two surviving Baltic languages show sufficient common features with Bulgarian to make such a study worthwhile and yet, since they are at no point contiguous geographically, such similarities are likely to be the result of separate development. Since one can exclude the possibility of direct influence it became necessary to discuss what Baltic and Slavic had inherited from IE.

Both language groups inherited certain grammatical features from IE, but not in every case the same features. Baltic, for instance, inherited the future in -s-, while Slavic inherited the sigmatic aorist (also found in Skt and Anc. Gk.). Despite these initial differences the two language groups have converged at least in respect of certain of their members. Thus while Bulgarian inherited the imperfect: aorist opposition from OCS Lithuanian has subsequently created an opposition of this type.

Chapter 2.

This chapter discusses the aspect system in modern Lithuanian. This system shows many similarities with the Slavic system in general. It is characterised, however, by a series of limitations not present to nearly the same extent in Slavic. We have concentrated here on past usage.

Chapter 3.

The Latvian aspect system diverges somewhat from both Slavic
and Lithuanian. It is proposed tentatively here that these differences arose from the internal phonological development of the language. These phonological changes have brought in their train morphological changes which precluded the adoption of the means used to differentiate aspect found in both Lithuanian and Slavic. The Latvian response to the problem of differentiating aspect has been different. It is suggested that the Latvian system is of fairly recent development.

Chapter 4.
A discussion follows of the tense oppositions still to be found in SS/ (in this instance Bulgarian and Macedonian). These oppositions though closely linked to aspect show certain distinctive features which are not present in the aspectual opposition (perfective : imperfective). Nevertheless there is a tendency to polarise tense and aspect, i.e. to associate imperfect tense and imperfective aspect and aor and perfective aspect.

Chapter 5.
Here we investigated the development of a temporal opposition in Baltic. Since such an opposition already existed in Slavic, Bulgarian usage has been taken as the norm. Baltic usage has been compared with that of Bulgarian where this was possible.

Chapter 6.
Conclusion.
Despite their very extensive normalisation of the inherited verbal system (particularly with reference to the trans : intr opposition)
in the matter of aspect the Baltic languages show an incomplete realisation of the opposition imperfective : perfective. Both Lithuanian and Latvian innovate, Lithuanian in the direction of Slavic, since it uses suffixal morphemes to differentiate the imperfective from the perfective. Latvian uses semi-free morphemes (in origin adverbs of place and manner) to replace the prefixes of the compound verb.

In the matter of tense Lithuanian shows a greater capacity for innovation in creating the opposition between the freq past and the preterite. This opposition recalls the Slavic opposition of imp : aor, though it is restricted in its range of meaning. Latvian shows a potential for forming such an opposition though its relative infrequency precludes the formation of an effective opposition.

In general the Baltic languages show a lower degree of grammaticalisation in the temporal and aspectual oppositions. This factor is accompanied as one might expect by a heightened capacity for realising the Aktionsarten. In fact one cannot exclude the factor of expressiveness; this factor is even more important than completeness when it is a matter of selecting the appropriate aspect. For that matter the selection of the appropriate simple past tense also depends on the expressive nature of the context. The Lith forms in -davo and the Latvian construction with medza are more emphatic than the Bulgarian imperfect, though for this very reason their range of meaning is more restricted.
1.0. Introduction

1.1. The aim of the present study is to show how a distinction which is essentially aspectual in nature has developed temporal formal oppositions and how these are distributed within the aspectual category. In two of the languages chosen the features included under the terms aorist and imperfect are inherited features from an earlier stage of the language and indeed, it appears, from IE. In Lithuanian an imperfect:aorist contrast has arisen in recent historical times, and, while this imperfect is a feature of the standard literary language it is in origin dialectal (Aukštaitiai) and not to be found in the closely related Latvian, where with a low frequency other means have been used to make this contrast.

1.12. The aspectual nature of the opposition is of considerable antiquity and this is confirmed by the formal distinctions: it is to be observed in Anc. Gk. where in the oldest verbal strata a system of three roots can be detected in certain verbs: in terms of this system, while the perfective was marked by contrast with the imperfective, there also existed a third term, the aorist, which in certain contexts could be in opposition with both imperfective and perfective. (cf. JA*, 314-315).

1.13. The Greek imperfect tense was formed from the same base as the present tense, since the feature of duration was present in both these tenses but absent from the aorist, which was formed from another base. The concept of anteriority is shown by other features: the present tense uses the primary set of endings (-mi, -si, -t).
Sanskrit too shows an imperfect tense formed on the present base while the aorist has a separate base. The augment too, if one is to judge by formal criteria, appears to have had a temporal significance. The imperfect possesses a different set of endings from the present (the secondary endings) but the feature of pastness which differentiates it from the present is further reinforced by the presence of the augment: of sunomi - I pressed out: asunavam (imp) - I pressed out. The aorist shares this augment with the imperfect.

The characteristic of the perfect on the other hand is reduplication: tan - stretch, has a perfect tatana (tātana). Sanskrit does not use the pluperfect but in Anc. Greek this tense, though not in frequent use, is differentiated from the perfect by the use of an augment, thus further stressing the concept of anteriority.

1.14. The aorist as has been mentioned, contrasts thematically with the durative tenses. This distinction became eroded with time and in any case was not characteristic of every verb, and a special suffix was developed to keep this distinction clear, namely the morpheme -s-, giving rise to the term "sigmatic" as applied to this tense. Sigmatic aorists were highly developed in Gk. and Skt. Vestiges of this formant are to be found in some Latin perfects, e.g. dixi. In that language, however, the aspektual distinction has become blurred in favour of the concept of tense. The Romance descendants of Latin have re-created this aspektual distinction in both writing and speech where a past definite (<Lat perfect) contrasts with the perfect (compound past).

1. Italian, Spanish and Portuguese do use the past definite in speech whereas in French it is confined to the written language.
1.20. The earliest written records of Slavic show a similar aspectual opposition between an aorist and an imperfect. There are certain notable differences when compared with the systems of Greek and Sanskrit. The causes for this appear to be the loss of certain formal distinctions: firstly the augment, which was one of the signs conveying anteriority, disappeared (or had never been present). At a certain stage in the pre-history of OCS the formal aspectual distinction between imperfect and aorist was lost. The position of the so-called root aorists became unstable. Certain persons of their paradigm were indistinguishable from that of the present tense: idete 2P aor or 2P pres. The spread of parallel forms with a sigmatic aorist resolved this source of confusion. For a time both forms are to be met in texts. Already extant was a sigmatic form for the imperfect whose characteristic marker was -ax or -šax. The origin of this suffix is obscure, though it may reflect a form of the vb to be -šes-. The distribution of the variants was: -ax- to vowel stems and -šax- to consonant stems; cf. бир -ax-; nesš -ax-.

Whatever its origin the suffix suffered the attraction of the not dissimilar aor paradigm. Within the imp paradigm we find variants which have been borrowed from the latter. Besides the correct nesšаša we find nesšаšа.

1.21. The long endings of this tense, like the long endings of the definite adjective, suffered contraction in later texts: -a-ax- was reduced to -ax, and -š- ax to -šx. In the modern languages
which still possess aor and imp tenses the formal distinction
between them has been eliminated in certain classes of verbs with
the exception of the 2/3P sg. (HGL, 23.1, note 1). The levelling
in the vowel of the suffix has been accompanied by levelling in the
morphemes distinguishing person, and this was already taking place
in the OCS period. In modern Bulgarian and Macedonian as stated above
there remains in effect only one personal morpheme which can be
assigned unambiguously to one of the tenses and not to the other,
namely the suffix -še. This suffix is unambiguously imperfect.
The 2P suffix -ha could be assigned to either aor or imp. In
contexts where aorist alternates with historic present doubt
could again arise, but only in the 3P sg. In the 2P sg only the
aorist could have this suffix. Other environmental factors can be
invoked to clear up the occasional confusing instances.

1.30. The most highly developed verbal system in the Baltic
group is the Lithuanian. Again we see an opposition between two
simple past tenses. The Baltic nomenclature is different: the
tense that would formally be identified with the aorist is the
preterite; though the distributional pattern is somewhat different
the usage shows sufficient similarity for one to make comparisons
between the two language groups; the Slavic imperfect is to be
equated with the Lithuanian frequentative past.

1.31. The marker of the preterite in Baltic is the morphemic
alternation -ą/-ę-. The modern reflexes of this morphemic
alternation are in Lithuanian -ą/-ę, which can be derived historically
from the two long vowels. In Latvian contraction has taken place in
final position in both verbal and nominal suffixes to a much greater extent than in Lithuanian. Thus in the paradigm of the long (definite) adjective L mazļē and mažļē have both become mazo; the -a- marker of the preterite has become -a, though -ā- is found in the reflexive form of the preterite: mūmā: pūmās (took). The cause of this is undoubtedly a shift of the stress on to the first syllable at some time in the pre-literate period. 2.

Long vowels do occur in final position in open syllables but they are the reflexes of original diphthongs rather than simple vowels. 3.

The marker of the preterite in Latvian is -a/-ja, with the latter appearing after front vowel; the variant -e is no longer found in the standard literary language though it does occur in the daņas (folksongs), collected for the most part at the end of the XVIII century. Nevertheless for the reasons stated above it is possible to postulate -ā/-ē as common Baltic, or at least common East Baltic since there is not enough evidence to come to any firm conclusions on the verbal structure of Old Prussian.

1.32. The distribution in Lithuanian of -o/-e is determined partly on phonetic grounds and partly on lexical class and need not concern us here. The suffix -e can only be assigned to the

2. There seems little doubt that the shift of stress is due to the influence of a Finnic substratum.

3. The marker of the lacative -ā can be derived from a form -āje, of L -oje. By analogical extension masc o-stems also have -ā (L -a); sim. L -yje, -uje and eje correspond to La -ī, -ū and -ė.
past tense while -o is found in the present (of vbs with the infin in -yti and -oti). Similarly in Latvian -a is also a present tense formant. No ambiguity arises, however, within the verb itself. For instance Lithuanian sakyti has 3P pres sako; the past is however, sakė. Similarly žinoti has 3P pres žino and the 3P past žinojo. Attention should be drawn here to the fact that the Baltic vb only distinguishes number in the first and second persons.

1.33. As stated above (1.1.) only Lithuanian clearly distinguishes the imperfect category. Latvian can make this distinction by use of the auxiliary verb megt (of. KM, II., mögt - gewohnt sein) followed by an infinitive, i.e. es medzu iet (I used to go). Some informants claim that this usage is disappearing, though examples do occur in recent Latvian literature. In Lithuanian the category is still very productive and the contrast between this form and the preterite is clearly marked.

1.34. The Lithuanian Imperfect (Frequentative Past).

This tense is very clearly marked by the suffix -davo which is attached to the same base as the infinitive: i.e. neš-davo - he used to carry, saky-davo - he used to say. A synchronic analysis of this suffix would reduce it to two bound morphemes: -dav- and -o where -dav is the iterative intensive element and -o one of the possible alternants of the past (-o/-ė). A diachronic analysis on the other hand finds three bound morphemes; -d- -au- -ė. If we work from the end the -ė is again the marker of the past tense; -au- is in origin a derivational suffix with an iterative-intensive meaning and it is still productive in verbal derivation. These verbs with
the suffix -au- before the infinitive replace -u- by -v- before the past suffix. The initial -d- had no referential significance, for its purpose is merely to prevent hiatus when the vb stem ends in a vowel or a diphthong, and this is still its function (cf. papildyti (fill up), where -il is diphthong). The -d- in -davo no longer serves this purpose and it would seem reasonable to accept Christian Stang's explanation for this phenomenon (ChSt, pp 172-173). In Stang's view the suffix -davo was originally found with vbs whose stem ended in a vowel, for instance ei-davo < ei-ti (to go). Later it was attached to all vbs as a pure suffix without any change by analogical extension.

1.35. Although it is a feature of the standard literary language it is, as we have remarked, (1.1.) in origin a dialectal feature of Aukštaitišiai. It is found only in the Aukštaitišiai area, where two other variants occur, -lavo where -l- appears to fulfil the same function as -d- in the standard variant, and a combination of the two -dlavo.

1.36. It is evident from the above that this tense is the result of internal development within the Lithuanian language area. There does not appear to be any stimulus from outside. In fact in White Russian and Polish the inherited aorist and imperfect had for the most part disappeared before the first Lithuanian written records appeared before the end of the XVI century. Conversely this Lithuanian form has not spread beyond the borders of Lithuania, nor has it influenced Latvian.
1.40. The Category of Aspect in Baltic and Slavic.

1.41. The presence of aspect in Baltic and Slavic is well attested and the existence of an earlier aspectual system in PIE as exemplified by Anc. Greek usage would in all likelihood have acted as a stimulus to the formation of the Baltic and Slavic systems. The Baltic and Slavic systems closely resemble each other though they differ from that of Gk in that they are essentially oppositions of two different verbal paradigms of one verb.

1.42. The aspectual systems of Baltic and Slavic are hierarchic: in addition to the higher category of aspect there are sub-categories which are usually referred to as Aktionsarten. These can be very numerous depending on the level of analysis and they can be assigned places within the higher category. If one posits limitation of an action as one of the basic concepts embodied in the notion of perfectivity, then verbs connoting the beginning of an action could be assigned to the perfective aspect. A verbal action can be conceived as a line to which the beginning and the end stand as fixed points, as boundaries. Both of these fixed points may be considered as ends or limits, and as limits they are in opposition to action looked upon as a continuum. To the perfective aspect too could be assigned verbs connoting a single action (semelfactive). The imperfective aspect is not concerned with limitation; here it is a question of duration. The action is a continuum and a vb in this aspect will be neutral as to limitation. It is the action that is important and not the limits one may set to it. Thus verbs which connote frequent action are imperfective; intensification of an action
(smash, shatter, beat) is also an imperfective category. There can be no doubt, however, that Aktionsarten are sub-categories and are hierarchically on a lower level than the two main categories; perfective or imperfective.

1.421. The part played by the Aktionsarten in the development of the aspectual system has nevertheless been considerable. It would seem likely therefore that the elements differentiating the Aktionsarten were in existence before the full development of a two-aspect system which was later to make use of these same elements. The inherited feature in Baltic and Slavic would consist of the following: root and thematic morphemes which distinguished the two tense systems, 'aorist' and 'present', and a less systematic group of morphemes which characterised the various Aktionsarten.

1.422. In the Slavic group as we have seen (1.20) the distinction inherent in the PIE aorist and imperfect tenses was lost and this may have prompted the development of an aspect system making use of the elements which characterised the Aktionsarten. The development of aspectual distinctions in the Slavic group can be analysed as follows: firstly the simple verb (i.e. non-prefixed) was prefixed; this limited the action of the simple and in time created an aspectual opposition to the simple verb. One can compare the simple verb 'pisat' (K. to write) with its perfective counterpart 'napisat'. No change in the meaning of the verb has taken place, it still means to write, though the attitude of the speaker to the verbal action has changed in that he now looks on the act of writing as finished. In the modern language such prefixes can be characterised as 'empty'
in that they do not transfer the verb to a different lexical set.

If we were to add the prefix pod- to this verb the verb again
becomes perfective though here a semantic change has taken place;
the verb podpisat' is no longer to write but to sign. Had the
system remained static a lack of balance would have existed within
each lexical set; for some lexemes there would have been a pair of
verbs (one prefixed and one simple) napisat': pisat' contrasting
aspect though not meaning, others again would have had only one
member (the perfective prefixed member). The response to this
problem could be set out as follows: Simplex përeti ¹ prefixed
sëbëreti ² 2 = both limit (goal) achieved and limit aimed at.

To resolve this ambiguity, suffixed forms are created on analogy
of (vy-)nesti: (vy-)nositi to give sëbërësiti ³: 3 now - goal
(limit) aimed at and is imperfective; 2 continues to equal limit
achieved or arrived at and finally resolves into limit achieved only.

This process was carried throughout the whole verbal system, thus
creating the resultant polarisation into two aspects which has been
regarded as one of the most characteristic features of the Slavic
verb.

1.50. In a comparative study of this nature one must ask oneself
to what extent the same system (i.e. the Slavic system) can be said
to be true of the Baltic languages since these languages can also
be shown to possess aspect. It would be perfectly possible to
compare Lithuanian and Polish but since no past tense differentiation
exists in either Russian or Polish the comparison would only give
imperfect results. Bulgarian and Macedonian on the other hand do
possess this contrast and in addition there are other typological
features which are sufficiently alike for such a comparison to give adequate results. No attempt is being made here to suggest that there existed at one stage a genetic link between Baltic and Slavic and that these languages on the periphery of the Balto-Slavic language area are too distant to have influenced each other. One of the more striking typological features shared by these four languages to a greater or lesser degree is the existence of a group of verb forms which serve to indicate that an utterance may refer to a hypothetical action, or one for which the speaker cannot vouch personally. (In Lithuanian such verb forms are not so fully developed as in the other three languages since these forms are used to indicate indirect speech and not for hypothetical contexts).

Here again is one case where no genetic link can be proved. In fact the presence of the so-called renarrative tenses in Bulgarian and Macedonian can be directly traced to the influence of the Turkish superstratum during the long period of Ottoman domination of the Balkan peninsula. In modern Turkish these renarrative tenses correspond to forms in -mi$ (where -mi$ stands for any one of four possible variants -mi$ -m$ -mu$ mi$) which render a similar concept of. Profesor $ar$ me lece$mi$ $ar$ - The professor is supposed to be coming tomorrow. or, Tre$le gelmi$sin$ - (I gather) You came by train.

Since there has been no direct or indirect influence between the Balkans and the Baltic, the Baltic 'relative mood' can only be considered as an independent development.

1.51. The Bulgarian and Macedonian renarrative tenses make use of compound forms to represent this compound formally. In origin
these forms are based on the 1-tenses, i.e. those participles in -1 which have been used throughout the Slavic area to form the perfect and the pluperfect. Theoretically the 1-participle used in the formation of the perfect, pluperfect and future perfect is based on the aorist stem (or the infinitive stem when the language in question does not possess an aorist), while the 1-participle used in forming renarrative tenses is based on the imperfect stem. Thus Bulgarian 'Az ašm pisaļ' is formally similar to the R 'Ja pisaļ' or P (Ja) pisašem'. Opposed to Az ašm pisaļ we have the renarrative form 'Pisaļ aš'. Though these renarrative forms exist for every verb, some verbs have only one form for both the aorist and imperfect 1-participle. This is even more true of Macedonian than of Bulgarian.

1.52. In Baltic too participial verb forms are employed to render this concept. A Lithuanian example occurs in Dr. Petras Jonikas (Lietuvių Kalbos Istorija, p 38). Speaking about the Kurs (a tribe speaking a dialect closely related to Latvian) he refers to the comments of a mediaeval traveller, G. de Lannoy: '1413 m. kelisauninkas G. de Lannoy sako, kad Kuršiai turij savo atskirį kalbą' (In 1413 the traveller G. de Lannoy said (says) that the Kurs have their own separate language.) Here Jonikas uses the present participle turij (nom pl m) instead of the expected finite form. Latvian in this context makes frequent use of indeclinable forms in -ot (cf. esot) to render the relative mood, to use the Baltic term for this phenomenon. In fairy tales and legends, however, one also finds the past participle in -is (-us-).

1.60. Compared with Lithuanian the verbal system of Latvian is
simpler. While the process of normalisation on the basis of the more regular thematic paradigm has been carried out to a very great extent in Baltic, the phonetic changes which took place in Latvian (in the XIV century for the most part) have resulted in a loss of certain contrasts which are still present in Lithuanian. In this period there took place a palatalisation of velars strongly reminiscent of the Slavic Second Palatalisation; i.e. k>c and g>dz. The third element of the Slavic palatalisation x>s/š is not represented since the spirant /x/ has never been present in Baltic outside German or Slavic loan words. A new series of morphophonemic alternations was set up, as for instance in tu roč (you dig) viņš rok (he/they etc., dig(s)). Nasal vowels became oral vowels or diphthongs⁴ and these changes altered the verbal paradigm. In some instances minimal pairs were set up differing only in this feature: the verb krist (to fall) contrasts present kristu (I fall); pret kristu (I fell). In Lithuanian the same forms appear as kristu: kristau where the past: present contrast is marked both by the nasal infix (in the present) and by the opposition -u: au in the first person suffix. The conditional in Lithuanian has a full paradigm in three numbers (Lithuanian has preserved the dual). In Latvian on the other hand the paradigm has been reduced to one form -tu which is used for all persons, thus necessitating the constant presence of the personal

4. Lithuanian: Latvian correspondences:

L/an/ : La/u0/ (written o)
L/en/ : La/iε/
L/in/ : La/I/
L/un/ : La/u/
pronouns.

1.61. The presence of aspect is marked in Latvian as in Lithuanian. One can set up the following set of contrasts using an 'empty' prefix: Lējo: La gāja: R ėšel/hodil - imperfective: L paējo: La pagāja: R poņel. Here the aspect is clearly distinguished and in each case we have a pair of verbs contrasted for aspect but exhibiting no other contrastive features.

1.62. Formally the distribution within the Baltic languages of aspectually contrasted forms is not so simple as would appear from the above example; for in Petras Čvirka's novel Zemė Maitintoja (p. 67) we have a sentence with the perfective verb atvykti: 'Po piety jie atvyko i Kauną.' (After dinner they arrived in Kaunas). In this context the perfective is correct and this sentence type would fit just as well into a Slavic pattern. There appears, however, to be no corresponding imperfective form for this verb, and this is by no means an isolated case. The going verbs can take most of the verbal prefixes; beside the basic opposition eiti: paẹiti we find the following: ateiti (come); iēseiti (go out); nueiti (go away); praeiti (pass, cross), and so on. Of these it is only the simple verb eiti which has a corresponding p form paẹiti (or one might say that only paẹiti has a corresponding i form: eiti). At first glance all the others appear to be only perfective. In a dictionary one will find the R vb 'pribyvat' glossed not only by p atvykti but also by ateidinėti, which is imperfective. Is the existence of such a form sufficient reason for one to set up a system of aspectual pairs such as one finds in all Slavic languages?
Before going on to discuss this feature in greater detail one must also mention briefly at this stage a certain type of imperfective opposition which is to be found in Latvian. In this language as in Lithuanian prefixation is a means of creating perfective verbs. If one takes the simple verb *ie* and prefixes *pa-* one obtains the corresponding perfective *paiet*; one may change the meaning of the verb by using other prefixes and at the same time creating a new series of perfective verbs which correspond aspectually to *paiet* and not to *ie*. These closely resemble the L equivalents as can be seen from the following examples: *La noiet* - *L nueiti* (go away); *La iziet* - *L iBeiti* (go out), etc. According to *Tys*, p.180, analytical forms corresponding to the prefixed verbs exist.

If one takes as one's starting point the simple verb *nest* (carry), which is imperfective, and adds to this form the prefix *ie-* (in) one obtains *ienest* (carry in) which is perfective; 'I carried in' would thus normally be *'es ienesu'. Corresponding to this form there exists an analytical form *es nesu iekš* which is identical in meaning but contrasts aspectually with *'es ienesu'!*

Many other examples of this type of construction can be cited: e.g. *pieliet*: fill up; *p es pieoloju*; *es leju pilmu; uzcelties:* get up; *p es uzcejos; i es cejos aukš; iest*: go in; *p es ieeju:* *es aju iekš*.

(The above examples are all present tense)

Structurally the separable elements *iekš*, *pilmu*, *augš* etc., are free forms of adverbial origin; elsewhere they are used as adverbs of place and manner. An illustration of this usage where no aspectual contrast is being made is as follows: *Janis iegaja mājā; iekš bija viņa brūlis* - John went into the house; his
brother was inside. For analytical forms of this type to constitute the basis of an aspectual polarity within the verbal paradigm it would have to be established that potentially any prefixed verb could have such an analytical form, and secondly that this process could be applied to any member of the verbal paradigm; for instance one does find gaja iekša; is it also possible to find examples of veda iekša?

1.64. The Baltic languages possess iterative forms and Lithuanian is particularly well equipped in this respect. In Latvian we find vadat beside vest (lead) nesat: nest (carry). In Lithuanian there are easily recognisable cognates - vesti: vedžioti and nešti: nešioti. Here again we have a potential source of imperfectivisation, though the above forms do not by any means exhaust the suffixes available for this purpose. In the next chapter we shall consider in greater detail the distribution of aspectual contrasts within the Lithuanian verb, but concentrating on the preterite.
2.0. The aspectual distribution of the Preterite in Lithuanian.

2.1. An analysis of the aspectual distribution of the Lithuanian past tense (preterite) shows certain divergences from the Slavic pattern in respect of the formal criteria: thus a prefixed vb may occur in a context where following Slavic usage one would normally expect an imperfective. In such contexts the Lithuanian verb is formally perfective. One is obliged therefore to consider whether the formal criteria (i.e. suffixes, prefixes etc.) are a reliable means of assigning vbs to this category or whether one should lay greater stress on the contextual criteria.

2.11. In considering distributional criteria no noticeable difference can be seen in material collected from Leskien, or in the literature of the present day. For instance in Juozas Baltušis, 'Paskutinis tylus džiaugsmas' we find an imperfective use of the verb skaityti (read):

'Budinga medicinos darbuotojams aistra skaityti galingą literatūrą ir apie viską turėjo savo nuomones. (She read with a passion characteristic of a medical worker artistic literature (belles-lettres) and had her own opinion about everything). (Ptd p. 4).

The Russian translation while differing slightly in the choice of the verb (Ru: vlekalas') agrees in using the imperfective aspect. This is perfectly reasonable, since the author is concerned with the manner in which she read literature and not in the finishing of a particular act of reading. In an example from Leskien (ALLL p7)

we find the perfective form of the same verb: 'jis uukšty
pažiūrėjo ir pamatę ir ji paskaitę (he looked up and saw the
writing and read it). Here there are a series of actions 'looking
up', 'seeing' and 'reading' all completed, and as one might expect
one finds a series of perfective vbs. In each case the same prefix
is used pa- corr. to Sl po-; used as an aspect marker it frequently
acquires a purely formal meaning, that of perfectivity. Even as
an aspect marker it may contain the additional nuance that the action
of the verb in question is of short duration. We thus have a series
of aspectual pairs: skaitė: paskaitė; žiūręjo: pažiūrėjo and
matė: pamatę. It is worth noting in passing that the verbs
žiūrėti and matyti occur more frequently in the imperfective form
than in the perfective. Again in Leskien we have "'kš tu čia
matei? (what did you see here?) and 'Aš čia mašiu baisingį
bedugnį degantį, .... (I saw a fearsome burning place,....) (ALLL,
p. 5.) In both instances we are interested in what he saw, i.e.
the object of the 'seeing' and not in the result of the act of
seeing. Further consideration leads one to suspect that we are
concerned with a verb whose normal forms will be imperfective and
that perfectivisation will imply a special type of action. One
can compare this usage with that of verbs of perception in Russian.
'Videt' is far commoner than uvidet' and 'to see' is in effect a
bi-aspectual verb; the form uvidet' corresponds to 'to see for
a moment or to catch sight of'. An example of the latter usage
of matyti can also be found in Leskien: 'C taip bekalbėdami jis
tolyn ėjo ir pamatę butelį. (And speaking thus they carried on their
way and caught sight of the house, ALLL., p. 4). The Lithuanian
sentence can be rendered into Russian: Govorja tak, oni был дал'ше
i uvidel domik. Both the Russian uvidel and the L pamatę have the
meaning of *caught sight of* where the verbal meaning contains both the notions of 'suddenness' and 'momentariness'. In contrast the verbs *ėjo* and *kėi* are unmarked since they connote an action which is in progress when the house was seen for the first time. A perfective usage of *girdėti* (to hear) further exemplifies this type of verbal action: 'Tuos kūdžius unterapičie lin bevėgadams gerai išgirė ir įsitvėrė (While running the NCO heard those words clearly and took careful note of them, *LLU*, p 5). Of the aspectual pair *girdėti; išgirėti*, the perfective *išgirėti* is the less common. Many other instances of this type of opposition can be found: cf. Petras Čvirkas: 'Ir tikrai Monika *pazėjė* iš tolo mieste,... (And indeed Monika saw the city from afar. *PCZM*, - 68) Again the subject was given only a glimpse initially of the object she was looking for.

2.12. Statal verbs are another lexical class where perfectivisation is not commonly found. Examples of these verbs are very frequent, particularly of *gulėti* (to lie) and *sėdėti* (to sit); cf. in Petras Čvirkas: '... Monika *sedėjo* prie surištos, pusiau mukirptos avies ... (Monica was sitting by the tethered, half-clipped sheep..., *PCZM* p 17); in Leskien: 'Taip tie trys vyrai *siai gyveno* kaip kokie kunigaikščiai. (So these three men lived here like lords. *LLU*, p. 5); Leskien ... tai jie įsimetė išgirę (girę), kuri ne per-toliaus nuo miesto *gulėjo*. (... then they rushed into the forest which lay not too far from that town. op. cit. p. 3). Here there is an evident contrast between *rushed* (p) and *lay* statal and imperfective. A change of state will, however be represented by a change of aspect. Cf. Leskien: ...., ale permier
but being absolutely famished they simply sat down at that table and ate, ... op. cit., p. 4). Here sat down contrasts with sat or were sitting.

2.13. Difficulties arise with a group of verbs with a wide variety of meanings where one form is used for both aspects. Some of these verbs are simple, some are prefixed. The simple verb grižti (to return) is mainly used in the unprefixed form. In Leskien: 'Bet jiems nieko pilko nemusi to ir teip jie vėl tais pačiais takais ir keliais grižo atgal,...' (But nothing wrong happened to them so they once more returned along the same path and way,... ALLL, p 5/6). Similarly rasti (to find) is unchanged in the vast majority of cases. In Leskien we find many examples of this verb: 'Paskui radau boselį su riešutais priplės... (Afterwards I found a small tub full of nuts,..., ALLL, p 2) or, '0 štai, jis šia rado popieratą,... (And look, here he found a piece of paper,... ALLL p. 4). In all cases so far observed the context has been such as would normally require a perfective verb. Indeed where a single concrete notion is concerned the verb is always perfective. Another verb where we find a high proportion of examples in the simple form with perfective meaning is sakytì (to say). In Leskien: 'Aš pilna baisių sakiau:....(Full of fear I said:....ALLL p. 1), and,...' tai unterapiciers savo sapna papasakojo št į tą pabaigas sakę: ....' (then the NCO told his dream and when he had finished it said: ... ALLL, p 4) It will be noticed that while sakę and papasakojo are in distributional terms perfective, only papasakojo is so marked.
2.131. Closely related to **sakyti** is the derived (denominative) verb **pasakoti**; the verb **sakyti** and the noun **pasaka** (tale, fairy-tale) are derived from a common Baltic root sak- (to say, tell); in its turn the noun pasaka has given a secondary verb **pasakoti** (narrate, tell). This verb forms its perfective in pa-, thus **papasakoti**.

However, again in Lekšien we find an example which may be compared with the previous examples with saké: 'Toliantus and dienos jie ir į to sodą šio, apie kurį ana jįsuprova pasakojo ... (Furthermore during the day they went into the garden about which the young woman had spoken, ... All p 5). Both saké and pasakojo refer to past acts which have been completed before the time of utterance, yet neither is formally perfective.

2.132. In some of its meanings the verb **tarti** (to say, utter) is a close synonym of **sakyti**; the divergence where it does occur appears to be a matter of register: if one is talking informally one uses **sakyti** whereas a more formal speech would be rendered by **tarti**. In the middle range they are, however, virtually synonymous and one observes the same factors operating in the case of **tarti** as operate in the case of **sakyti** and to a lesser extent **pasakoti**; in other words there has been a tendency to use the imperfective form in both imperfective and perfective contexts. Thus in the examples quoted above it has been left to the context to indicate the aspect of the verbs in question.

Yet **sakyti**, **tarti**, **pasakoti** all have normally marked perfective forms and one can construct aspectual pairs as with many other verbs, but the range covered by the formally contrastive elements is comparitively restricted. The formal criterion in each case is the
prefix па- : i.e. sakyti: pasakyti; tarti: patarti; papaskoti. A confirmation of the above statement can be found in a random selection from the New Testament where out of thirteen examples of the form said Nine are rendered by taré and two by saké. Two versions of the Lithuanian New Testament were used and the modern variant differed not at all from the older one in most of these instances; in two instances we find taré in one and saké corresponding to it in the other. The remaining two examples were in the first person and it is here that we meet the first divergence between the old and the modern version of the New Testament. In both instances the old version has sakiau and the modern pasakiau. The Bulgarian and Macedonian equivalents corresponding to these Lithuanian forms are all perfective: for the third person реh throughout: for the first person we have the Bulgarian rekoh and kasah, and for the Macedonian rekov in both cases.

2.1311. An analysis of modern literary examples containing the verb pasakyti suggest that we are once more concerned with a bi-aspectual verb and that the prefix па- connotes an action of short duration or else a certain degree of suddenness. The use of па- and also the context in the following examples points to short duration (the most usual meaning of па-): "Kai taip pasakojo kūnečini, Linkus Baltramiejus į šoną pasivedė Tarutį, ir visi matė, kaip kažin ka pasakė." (While the labourers were talking in this way, Linkus Baltramiejus took Tarutis aside for a moment, and all could see that he was telling him something. PCZM, p 13). And: "Pasakė šituos žodžius tokiu ramiu balsu, jog man vėl pasirodė: juokiasi iš mangu." (She said these words to me in
such a quiet voice that again it seemed to me that she was making fun of me. FTDz. p 38). In the second example the duration of the action is precisely delimited by the expression 'kituos žodžius' (these words).

Again the action of speaking may be short and sharp: - Mūrsite, - vėl pasakė moteris,... (You will die, - the woman said once more, FTDz p 35). Actions of this type resemble closely those where the action represents the sudden resumption of the act of speaking after a silence. Such is the example from Petras Čvirka: 'Ilgai ji ten Žiūrėjo, kol vėl pasakė, - ko tu parėjai?... (She looked here for a long time and then once more said/ lit. until she once more said/, - Why have you returned home?... PCZN, p 15). Perfective like the above examples is the simplex: 'Aš sakiau: tamsta privalai įsimylėti'. (I said: You need to fall in love. FTDz p 41).

2.1312. Lithuanian possesses two auxiliaries meaning to begin: pradėti and imti (whose original meaning is: to take). Imti in the meaning of to begin is always followed by an infinitive and can only appear as a simplex; the normal perfective: imperfective opposition paimti: imti is thus excluded in this particular meaning.
On the other hand pradėti is only found in the compound form and may further function in the non-auxiliary role. Thus in Juozas Baltušis: 'Ir tada prasidėdavo mūsų pokalbiai'. (And then our talks would begin. FTDz p 45). Prasidėdavo is marked as frequentative past by the suffix -davo; the whole emphasis of the utterance is on the habitual natures of the action; on every visit the author paid to the doctor a certain ritual was followed. Thus the verb form must be considered imperfective despite the presence
of the prefix pra- which would normally mark the verb off as
perfective. Similarly imperfective is the vb praděti in the
following example from Leskien: '... kaip jau aušt pradėjo, ...
(... as it was already beginning to dawn,...). The vb pradėjo is
imperfective since the action 'was beginning to dawn' is not
envisaged as complete and occurs simultaneously with a group of
actions. All these actions culminates in one final pair of actions
as follows: ....'o aš iš to krūmo tada atstojošs palikeu Maskolią
ir kiems Prūsijos, kur ir dabar teiseu. (.. and I stepped back from
behind the bush and left Russia and the estate and my father and all
my goods and came to this village in Prussia where indeed I am still
living. ALLL p 3).

In the sentence 'Mitaip pradėjo jos gydymas. (In this way
her treatment began. PNDž p 39), the verb pradėjo points to an
action that is completed and is consequently perfective. Also
perfective is imti in an example from Leskien: 'Dabar juodu ūmė
avilius kilnot,... (Now the two of them began to raise the hives,..
ALLL p 2); here 'ūmė avilius kilnot' is the first of a sequence ofverbs describing the actions carried out by the two robbers in
this folk tale. In the next two examples 'ūmė' appears in imperfetive
contexts: 'Ūmė atgyti seniai pradingas noras sustikti su žmonėmis,
girdėti jų balsus. (There began to revive a desire to meet people
and to hear their voices which had earlier been lost. PNDž p 42)
and, 'Vieni juokėsi, kiti ūmė plūsti grafas murmėti, tarpusavy
ginkytis. (Some laughed, others began to reproach the count, to
murmur and fight amongst themselves, PCŻM p 40).

There is a further use of imti which is clearly perfective
since it serves to stress a sudden resolve: ūmėu ir įvaida nau
j London. (I left for London without hesitation.); 'Jie īmā ir nušovē jį. (They shot him on the spot). Both the above examples are taken from Vilius Pēteraitis: Latvīškai Angļuškas Eiogynas (Chicago, 1960).

2.132. If one analyses the above mentioned cases of what one may call anomalous distribution within the aspeccial system the following pattern which covers a fairly wide range appears to exist. At one extreme there is only one aspeccial form for the verb and this form is perfective only: Such a verb is atvykti:6. to arrive which is prefixed or resti: to find which is unprefixed. There are other verbs which can be made perfective (in most cases with the aid of the prefix pa-); the forms without pa- can be used in both perfective and imperfective contexts. Such verbs are matyti: pamatyti (see); žiūrėti (look): pažiūrėti; sakyti (say): pasakyti; tarti (say) patarti, and with a different prefix and change in the root of the word: girdėti (hear): išgirsti. To this group one may also assign grižti (return) which is usually unprefixed.

2.20. Before going on to discuss these anomalies in the system and the reasons why they exist, it will be appropriate at this stage to look in greater detail at the formal means which Lithuanian uses to make aspectual contrasts. The most productive method is, of course the prefix, as in Slavic.

6. It is true that beside atvykti there exists the form vykti and theoretically one could construct an opposition vykti: atvykti = eiti: ateiti, yet vykti in the non-prefixed form is comparatley rare (I).
2.21. These prefixed verbs may be divided into two classes: those where only the aspect is changed (i.e. what I have called empty prefixes) and those which change the aspect and at the same time change the meaning (again a parallel with Slavic). The commonest prefix is pa- whose affinities with the Slavic po- have already been mentioned. Like the Slavic prefix the Baltic pa- may also have the additional meaning of to do a little of; this meaning would appear to be the original one and the purely aspectual meaning has been derived from it. One can find many examples of pa- as a purely aspectual prefix. A few will suffice here for illustration; cf. in Leskien: 'Bevalgant jiems pelė pasiroke (While they were eating a mouse appeared before them. ANAB p 8). And in Juozas Baltušis: 'Patylėjo ir nupraka: ... (She fell silent and then asked: ... PTDz p 47). Other prefixes may be used as an aspect marker, while in other contexts and with other lexical bases they will have their full significance, cf. Leskien: 'Tuos žodžius unterapicieras bebegdams išgirdo..., see above 2.11.

In other cases the prefix will change the meaning of the verb as well as the aspect. Such changes occur in atėiti (come); eiti (go); sakyti (command): sakyti (say); perkoti (jump over): šokti (jump). As in Slavic inceptive action may be indicated by a prefix; in Slavic sa- is found everywhere, in Lithuanian the prefix which renders this concept is su- (normally - together with, Lat con-), cf. in Juozas Baltušis: 'Suulbo balandžiai aikštėse (In the squares the doves began to coo. PTDz - 46).

2.22. The aspectual contrast may be indicated by means of suffixes, though as a means of marking the perfective suffixation is less used in Lithuanian than in Slavic. There is in fact only one suffix
which can be used to mark this aspect, namely: -tereti/-teleti, which can be compared to R -n(u)- or B and R -ne-. In origin this suffix (-tereti is only a free variant of -teleti) served to indicate actions of very short duration; occasionally vbs with this suffix could occur in iterative contexts but in all such cases what was being marked was a series of short completed actions and not the iteration process. By their very nature actions of short duration tend to gravitate to the perfective aspect. In the same way pa- became generalised as an aspect marker. Since the similarity in meaning between verbs with the prefix pa- and verbs with the suffix -tereti is obvious an aspectual system which used pa- as a marker of perfectivity would tend also to use the suffix tereti for the same purpose. The addition of this morpheme to a verb may cause an internal change of the ablaut type in the verbal root. Three examples from Juozas Baltušis will show the perfective nature of this suffix: "Daktare! 'Mūktelėjau nejuščiau." (Doctor! - I shouted all of a sudden. PTDz p 47); 'Ir moteris ramiausiu veidu pakilo, pokštelėjo laidoj ir išėjo į kitą kambarį. (And the woman rose with a very calm face, clattered about on her stick and went out into the other room. PTDz p 37); 'Ramiai atsisėdo vėl savo kėšlai, iš karto padėdama rankas išėtis ant jų atkalčių. Suktelėjo. (She quietly sat down again in her chair, letting her hands rest together on its arms. She smiled. PTDz p 35) A change from -au- to -u- has taken place in Mūktelėjau (cf. Šaukiau). The contrast between Šuktelėti and its corresponding imperfective verb can be seen in the following example from Leskien '... tie Žia ir visi drauge dege ir visi gavuto Šaukė išgelbėjimo. (... here they were all burning together and all shouting loudly for rescue. Ašūr p 5). The alternative form in
-tereti is to be seen in the following example from J. Baltužis:
'Cydotoja mękpsjo, ėvigelotėjo i mane truputį skersomis. (The
doctor smiled and looked at me somewhat askance. PTDs p 36). The
form ėvigeloteti is derived from the basic verb ėvelgti; the form
ėvilg- is historically a reduced grade of ėvelg-

2.221. From the last example it can be seen that the same verb
may have more than one perfective form. There is no apparent
difference between the two forms. A Russian-Lithuanian Dictionary7
gives for ulybat'sja ėkypsotis and ėkypšioti, and for ulybat'sja
mušėkypsotis and ėkypštelėti. One finds the prefixed form in similar
contexts to the forms in -telėti. In J. Baltužis we have: 'Ir
mušėkypsotis, maitydama mano sumikišą. (And she smiled seeing my
confusion. PTDs p 36). In the same author we find the -telėti form
of this verb which has been quoted above at 2.22. Besides ėvigeloteti
there is also pabvelėti. The following example (again one from
Juozas Baltužis) shows how more than one type of perfective may
exist side by side for the same radical morpheme: 'Dar kertę
pabvelės i mane ilgu ir tiriančių mélynu akių ėvilgėniu:... (Once
more she glanced at me with a long and enquiring glance of her blue
eyes. PTDs p 42)

2.222. Empty and full prefixes.

As we have seen, Lithuanian is able to form perfective verbs
from imperfective verbs by suffixing -tereti/-telėti or alternatively
by prefixation. The prefixes used in forming compound verbs fall

into two classes. These classes may be said to consist of *empty* and *full* prefixes. The time has come to look at these concepts in greater detail. Both groups of prefixes perfectivise: *i.e.*: ἵπποςτις; μῦπποςτις; πυκτί (grow angry); σύππυκτι; εἰππέτι; ἱμείτι (go out) δάρτι (do); πάδαρτι; άτιδάρτι (open); ῥύδαρτι (shut).

Analysis of this list of verbs shows that only three (ἱμείτι, άτιδάρτι, ύδαρτι) change their meaning: ἱμείτι: εἰππέτι - go out: go; άτιδάρτι/ὑδάρτι: δάρτι - open/shut: do. In these examples then ἵ-, άτ(ι)-, ύ- are *full* prefixes in that they transfer the simple verbs (εἰππέτι, δάρτι) from one lexical class to another.

The prefixes μῦ-, σῦ-, πα- are *empty* prefixes, there is no transfer from one lexical class to another. In these instances the change is grammatical and not lexical. Thus the prefixation of ςυ- to πυκτί transfers πυκτί from the *grammatical category of imperfective* to the *grammatical category of perfective*. The functional role of these empty prefixes is to effect this transfer between these categories, and the transfer is always unidirectional - from imperfective to perfective. The suffixes -τετεί/-τελέτι share this functional role with the empty prefixes.

The full prefixes on the other hand change the lexical meaning of the simple verb, but at the same time they change the aspectual category. The form ἰμείτι differs from εἰππέτι in that it means go out; *i.e.* direction has been added to the basic concept of movement. The compound form ἱμείτι is now a member of the lexical class containing such verbs as ἰμβεγτί (run out), ἰμτελέτι (flow out), ἱμβεκτί (jump out). In grammatical terms ἱμείτι may be assigned to the same category as πεαέτι (both are perfective), though they differ lexically; ἱμείτι and πεαέτι differ from εἰππέτι in that the latter is *imperfective*. 
Difficulties of classification may arise with certain prefixes: for instance, su- in suulbti might be classified as a full prefix since a new lexical element has been added to basic meaning of ulbti. Moreover, in an utterance of the type 'Balandžiai suulbo' (The doves began to coo) the prefix su- could be replaced by an auxiliary verb: cf. 1. Balandžiai pradėjo ulbti; 2. Balandžiai ėmė ulbti. Yet the prefix su- perfectivises the verb ulbti, and hence suulbti is in grammatical opposition to ulbti.

The function of su- could be described in grammatical terms were one to create an inceptive category. In fact prefixes of this type form a link between the empty prefixes which have grammatical rather than lexical significance and the full prefixes whose significance is primary lexical. Since, however, inceptive verbs are a sub-category of aspect (in this case the perfective aspect) it is more appropriate to allocate the suffix su- to the class of empty prefixes.

Other prefixes may have a specialised meaning, as for instance ik-. Ik- may be used with its spatial meaning: i.e. išėjo (came/went out); išraskė (dug out); at other times it may function as an empty prefix: i.e. išgirdo (heard). The most distinctive non-spatial meaning of this prefix is, however - 'to carry out an action thoroughly' or 'to the very end'. Cf. here R is-: is "ezdit" (to travel all over) or ishodit' (stroll, walk all over). As in Lithuanian this usage is exclusively perfective and is more

8. The spatial meaning of prefixes such as iš-, nu-, ap- is their basic meaning when functioning as full prefixes, i.e. out of, away from, round about (cf. R is-, ot-/u-, ob-).
restricted in R, than in L. We find examples of the prefix iš-
used with this meaning in Petras Čvirka: 'išsipasakojo jam Monika...'
(Monika told him to the end...PCZM p 17); 'akimis išsiūrėjo,...'
(she examined it all, op cit p 17); 'akimis išglamonėjo,...'
(she caressed him all over with her eyes,... ibid p 17). All the
above-mentioned perfective forms contrast with the corresponding
past-forms, and here past may be considered the empty perfectivising
element. Both perfectives have the same imperfective form since we
are not dealing here with a change in meaning but with a change in
the type of action; in other words the iš-forms are Aktionsarten.

The existence of more than one perfective form to the simple verb
in Baltic is not unusual since it is also to be found in Latvian
(see below 3.20). For the above-mentioned verbs we have the
following relationships: pasakoti: papasakoti: iš(si)pasakoti;
išurėti: pakišurėti: iš(si)išurėti; galmonėti: pagalmonėti: išgalmonėti.

2.223. As we have seen Lithuanian uses prefixes to mark aspectual
contrast, i.e. prefixes mark the perfective from the imperfective
(simple) form of the verb. Again prefixes may be used to indicate
certain Aktionsarten. Finally they may indicate both a change in
meaning and aspect. In all the above instances the prefixed verb
is formally perfective. Similarly the prefix -terėti (tolėti) is

9. This usage of iš− in L may be due to Slavic influence,
through the intermediary of WR. Since, however, it is commoner in
L than in R, it is reasonable to suppose that it is the result of
independent Baltic development, and that any influence would have gone
from L to R.
used to distinguish the perfective from the imperfective verb.

The use of prefixes in Slavic presents a basically similar pattern: i.e. prefixation (and in certain cases suffixation) renders a simple verb perfective. Thus in Russian the simple verbs читать', смотреть', писать', correspond to the perfective forms посмотреть', на-писать'. In all these instances it is a question of the purely grammatical alternation of aspect, imperfective: perfective. With the use of other prefixes and the same verbal bases we obtain: за-читать' (reckon); о-смотреть' (examine) and под-писать' (sign). These new perfectives agree with the first series of perfectives (продать', посмотреть', написать') only in their perfectivity. They are new lexical items and thus the simple verbs читать', смотреть', писать' can not act as imperfectives to the new series.

If one excludes certain bi-aspectual verbs the Slavic aspectual system requires every perfective form to have a corresponding imperfective. For зачитать therefore there has been created the form зачитывать', for смотреть' смотреть', and for подписать' подписать'. The marker of the imperfective is ы (ы is a variant). This suffix - in diachronic terms an iterative - has here a purely aspectual significance, it marks the imperfective. The frequentative form of the verb to be *быть* is still to be found with this meaning. In colloquial Russian (i) ва-forms of other verbs are occasionally to be found: cf. накрыть'; носить'. There is an example of this usage in Бабель's Красная Москва: 'нам будет тяжело мной' (Guys like us would never do such things)! Similar too

in Polish is the expression 'pisywać do gazety' (to write for the papers, GEPD). Here it is obviously a question of a regular contribution to the papers. The iterative pisywać is in contrast with the basic form pisać.

In addition to the (i)va- forms other imperfective markers are to be found in Russian and Polish. The commonest opposition is that between -i- (p): -ja- (i); concomitant with this change is a change of conjugation (II → I). A Russian example of this alternation is to be found in the verb 'to explain': ob "jasnit'(p): ob'jasnjać' and in Polish the verb 'to earn': zarobić (p): zarabiać (i); the Polish form also shows the characteristic ablaut (-ra-:-rab-) found with this type of derivational suffix.

More restricted are the alternation -i-: -a- and -e-: -a-

Examples of the former are verbs with a root in -ub-, i.e. uśibit' (p): uśibat' (bruise); for -e-: -a- of the verbs with the root -er-

11. The suffixation of (i)va- may lead to a change in conjugation, i.e., R'ugovorit': ugovarivat' To persuade; no change of conjugation takes place in the opposition: podpisat': podpisyvat'.

12. The change resulting in the creation of a new perfective verb preceded in terms of relative chronology the creation of the new imperfective.

13. Cf. also kupit': pokupat' where the new imperfective not only changes its conjugation but acquires a prefix, a reversal of the normal procedure.
umeret' (p): umirat' (i) (to die). An isolated example would be the simple verb brosat' (i) 'to throw' which has a perfective brositi'. Compounds of brosat' however, have an imperfective in -vyvat': cf. vybrasyvat' (i): vybrosat' (p) 'To throw out'.

2.2231. The distribution of imperfective markers in Bulgarian and Macedonian.

Among the commoner imperfectivising morphemes in Bulgarian as in East and West Slavic are forms in -v- and -ja-. -v- has three forms -ava-, -va- and the much less common -uva-. Some va-forms are to be found in the following examples: izgavam: izvâravam: izvârâ to make, do, accomplish. In -va-: -sedjavam: -sedja 'sit' (meaning of simplex); globjavam: globja 'to fine, mulot'; otstojavam: otstoja 'to defend', vindicate. An example of -uva- is the verb kupuvam kupja 'to buy'. Of the imperfectives in -ja- may be cited, izjarjam: izgorja 'to burn away, down'; zadavjam: zadava 'to choke, suffocate'. And with a consonant alternation: predhusdam: predhodja 'to precede'. To conclude this brief picture of the distribution of imperfective markers in Bulgarian one may cite a few examples of the -a- forms: cf. umiram: umra 'to die'; sjadam: sedna 'to sit'; tikam: tîkna 'to shove'; zalitam; zalitna 'to stagger'. The last group is to a certain extent an unrepresentative selection since the verbs 'to take', -biram, -bera and other common roots have been omitted. In fact this suffix is characteristic of that group of verbs of which the root ends in a consonant plus sonant.

14. Many of the above examples have been culled from Howard I. Aronsen, Bulgarian Inflectional Morphophonology, pp 92 - 104.
It is not necessary to analyse in detail the system of imperfective markers in Slavic, since enough has already been said to point to the essential polarity of perfective: imperfective that Slavic has developed. Though it has been customary to talk of the perfective as being the marked member of the perfective: imperfective opposition it is the ability to create imperfective forms that is a characteristic feature of the Slavic aspectual system. A prefixed perfective verb which did not correspond to an imperfective verb could not be termed marked since it would not be in true contrast. The tendency to derive imperfective forms from perfective forms is highly developed and inceptive verbs which may be regarded as belonging to a sub-category (Aktionsart) of the perfective are on occasion imperfectivised in the more colloquial registers, cf. zadremyvat' (doze off): zadremat'.

In the standard language the Aktionsarten stand outside the system in so far as they do not reflect the aspectual polarity which is characteristic of the vast majority of verbs, i.e. they belong to one aspect or the other and do not form contrastive pairs. Since, however, they are found in comparatively restricted numbers they do not affect the general picture. If one turns to Lithuanian one finds a more complicated situation. Hitherto we have examined the means used to form perfectives in that language and the pattern thus revealed is not very different from Slavic. It is now time to consider the process of imperfectivisation.

2.30. Imperfectivising suffixes in Lithuanian.

Hitherto we have considered only those forms which serve to distinguish the perfective aspect from the imperfective where the
latter is not further differentiated. These consist of prefixes of which there are a large number, and one suffix -teléti/teréti.
In a comparison between Baltic and any of the Slavic languages certain factors need to be considered. There are several types of aspectual systems. The distinctive characteristic of the Slavic system is the spread of aspectual concept to every part of the verb. This differs from the system of Classical Arabic, for instance, in which certain tenses are found in one aspect and not in the other.
Secondly Slavic has created a systematic opposition for almost every vb. It is the existence of an imperfective to almost every perfective verb that is the basis of the system. To achieve this end certain suffixes have been generalised as imperfective formants. Many such formants can be traced back to original iteratives:
cf. R nosit’: nesti.

2.31. In Lithuanian too such iteratives exist; among the commoner derivational suffixes of this type is-ioti/joti. This causes palatalisation in stems ending in dentals: e.g. t > ć and d > dž.
As an example of this process one may take the verb vedžioti iterative to vesti (where vesti=ved-ти). This recalls the Russian vodit’: vesti. In Latvian an iterative may be formed from the same verb: e.g. vadāt; vest. Though the suffix is different the process is the same; one can also see a vowel gradation which is not dissimilar to that found in R vodit’: vesti (the vowels are historically cognate: IE *GSL o/ Balt a). J. Otrypski says of these verbs:
'Derivative verbs in -ioti, ʒ pres in -ioja, are iteratives or duratives, certain of them also have a diminutive nuance.'

The selection of markers of imperfectivisation leads one to consider

15. (See page 40).
those suffixes which normally render such concepts which belong by their nature to the imperfective category. Thus one would prefer for instance suffixes which distinguish the factors of iteration, duration and intensiveness. The main criterion rests on the admitted conventionality of language; if native informants agree in accepting such forms as imperfective them we have here a similar type of suffix to the generalised Slavic formants of imperfectivisation.

2.32. The formant -ioti is not the only potential marker of the imperfective; even more productive is the suffix -inėtī, and this suffix is cited by the Lithuanian linguist, Leonardas Dambrininas in an article in the Polish linguistic journal, Lingua Posnanensis. The suffix -inėtī used both with a simplex, i.e. bėginėtī (durative) 'to creep on running' beside the basic form bėgti, and also with compound verbs, is met with in the 16th century in for instance the Postilla Catholicae of Daukša. These examples among others are to be found in J. Otrybski, and he glosses the Lithuanian compound

15. 'Czasowniki odwzorowane na -ioti, 3 pras. na -ioja, są to iterativa wzgl. durativa, po części z odcieleniem deminutywnym.' J. Otrybski, Gramatyka Języka Litewskiego, II, see 584, p 348.


17. Vilnius, 1599; Mikalojus Daukša (1527/8 - 1613)

verbs in -inėti with Polish imperfectives: thus L iešgėinėti 'to run away' corresponds to Polish susiekać and ušešgėinėti 'run up' to zabiegać. In the modern language examples of this suffix are not lacking; cf. J Baltužis, 'Vaistų metų rašinėjo pati, ber reikalavo neštį jai visus receptus,...' (She herself did not make out a prescription for medicines, but asked me to bring her all the prescriptions,... PTDs p.40). Corresponding to iešgėinėti is the form iešgėkyti, and the two forms are sufficiently differentiated for an aspectual contrast to be made.

2.40. Many attempts have been made to systematise verbal aspect in Lithuanian. In recent times the hypothesis which provides the most adequate solution has been presented by Leonardas Dambriūnas (see above page 40 footnote 16). Following in the steps of J. Safarewicz and J. Endzelins he makes two statements about the Lithuanian verb; 1. one should not treat the Lithuanian verbal paradigma as integral in terms of aspect; i.e. one should not include every tense of a Lithuanian verb within the compass of one aspect, whether it be imperfective or perfective. 2. Certain verbs are indifferent with regard to aspect; there are three terms within this system: perfective: imperfective: neutral. This does not mean that Dambriūnas believes that there are more than two aspects; his neutral vbs (cf. terti, grįšti) are normally capable of indicating either aspect without any change of form. Thus grįšo 'returned' will be imperfective in imperfective contexts and perfective

19. Stan badań nad aspektem czasownikowym w języku litewskim.
Balticoslavica III, Wilno 1936. (Quoted by Dambriūnas).
in perfective contexts. Prefixed forms of these verbs do exist— in this case sugriko—but the perfectivity is adequately expressed by the context, the prefix is redundant.

Statistically too sugriko is the less frequent of the two possibilities. When asked to provide translations for the sentence, 'We heard he came back on Thursday.' three out of four informants preferred griko to sugriko.

2.41. Dambriunas as we have seen tends to agree with both Endzelins and Safarewics (see above p. 41), and he maintains that difficulties arise from the fact 'that in Lithuanian there is no doublet corresponding to the Polish doublet przysiac : przechodzić or the Russian doublet prijiti : prichodit'. There is no doubt that the Lithuanian doublet daryti : padaryti corresponds to the Polish robić : zrobić. However, for the first two Polish infinitives there is only one adequate Lithuanian infinitive ateiti. The question arises what is the aspect of the Lithuanian verb ateiti?' Leaving this question for the moment unanswered Dambriunas turns to the three main finite forms of the verb; in his opinion the present tense form ateina is always imperfective (despite the fact that it is prefixed) while the corresponding future ateis and preterite atėjo are always perfective. He further divides present tense forms into

20. The sentence was translated as follows:

L.1 : Mes girdejome, kad jis griko ketvirtadienį.
L.2 : Girdėjome, kad jis griko ketvirtadienį.
L.3 : Mes girdejome, kad jis sugriko ketvirtadienį.
L.4 : Girdėjome, kad jis griko ketvirtadienį.
two categories: those which can express actual present action and those which cannot. The first category of verbs describes actions occurring at the time of utterance and is durative. The second can express timeless action, implying perpetual, repeated or possible action: 'Niršia daržai pasako tai, ko galva nesupranta' (The heart often says things that the head does not understand).

Here we have a verbal action which is repeated but does not refer to any segment of time. The use of the perfective present to render proverbs is also found in South Slavio, cf. SCR: Veliko drveče dugo raste, ali za 5as padne, Great trees take a long time to grow but fall in a moment. Verbs of this second category may also use the present tense to express action in the past, i.e. historic present. Here again parallels may be drawn with South Slavio, cf. SCR: On sjedne na divan i pregleda jutarnje novine. He sat on the couch and looked through the morning papers. The use of the present to express past action is a common stylistic construction. Finally the perfective present may have future significance: Eimiu ir pasakau ( - eisiu ir pasakysiu): 'I'll go and say'. The notion of the near future is one of the characteristics of the present tense in many languages, and in East and West Slavio the perfective future has been generalised in this meaning since in neither of these language groups has been developed a tense (in either aspect) which is formally marked as future. The present is marked as future because it is perfective but it does not differ formally from the present of the imperfective which is not so marked. In Lithuanian and Latvian the future is

21. L. Dambriunas, LP 7, p 256
marked thematically and is found in both aspects (by means of the thematic morpheme -s-) and the use of the present for the future may be regarded as a stylistic variant. 22

2.4.11. The division of the present into two categories is susceptible to further sub-division as follows:

Imperfective.

a) all simple forms except verbs in -telēti and point action verbs.

b) compound verbs: i) where there are no simple forms; ii) where prefixation creates a new word differing in meaning from the simple form; iii) where the prefix modifies the meaning (in the spatial sense) but where the meanings of the prefixed and simple forms are not totally dissimilar as in the prefixed group; in group ii) the simple verb deda (gives) is obviously unrelated to the prefixed verb pradeda (begins).

Perfective

a) Unprefixed verbs with the suffix -telēti and the small number of point action verbs where the action is accomplished in a very short space of time.

b) compound verbs where no change of meaning takes place. Here we find most of those aspeptual pairs which may be directly compared with similar Slavic forms: cf. daryti: padaryti - robiō: zrobiō;

22. In Scr., Mac. and Bulg. the future is clearly marked; whether this marker be an auxiliary or a clitic it marks futurity and not aspect and may be directly compared with the Lithuanian (and Latvian) thematic morpheme -s-.
to this group must also be added those prefixes which are used in the formation of Aktionarten.

2.420. The past tenses show a similar distribution; simple verbs are mostly imperfective with the same exceptions as for the present i.e. verbs in -telëti and point action verbs. Others are neutral; here Dambriunas gives a fairly full list and one may add to his list (LP 7, p 236) certain synonyms of these verbs. For instance he mentions tarë said as neutral and as we have seen sakë is virtually interchangable with it over a large part of the range covered by tarë.

2.421. The compound past tenses are mainly perfective. Exceptions, as with the present tense forms, are those verbs which are either not found unprefixed or where the prefixed meaning differs considerably from that of the simple verbs. These verbs are imperfective or neutral (cf. 2.411. b)i)and ii). The third group in 2.411. b) are, of course, perfective. Dambriunas lists those he considers imperfective: atrodë, pasakojo, pažinojo etc., and those he considers neutral.

2.430. The frequentative past tense can also be either perfective, imperfective or neutral. Because of its inherent meaning of a repeated or habitual action this form shows a tendency to be neutral. In certain cases we shall find a neutral frequentative past where the preterite is perfective: of. išëjo: išeidavo; atëjo: ateidavo. Confirmation can be found in the use of this form in contexts where only the perfective is appropriate and in those cases where only an imperfective may be used. To summarise, if we take the
verb atelėti, we find that the present atėjimo is imperfective, the past and future, atėjo and atėjis are perfective and the frequentative past atėsidavo is neutral.

2.431. Where the present tense is perfective the frequentative past is also perfective. Thus one would have to substitute an unprefixed form for the prefixed form in imperfective contexts: cf. 'Kai senelis skaitydavo pasakas, mes vise sėdėdavom ir klausa davomės' (LP 7, p 259) 'While the old man was reading the stories, we all used to sit and listen'. In this instance paskaitydavo would be impossible. Conversely in the sentence 'Kai senelis paskaitydavo pasaky, visi ėsdavome gulti' (p 259): When the old man used to tell stories we used all to go off to bed'. In the last instance the imperfective skaitydavo cannot be substituted for the perfective paskaitydavo. Though the action of reading in the second example is habitual it is regarded as a series of completed actions and the action of reading is moreover limited by the use of the partitive pasaky in contrast to the accusative pasakas in the first example.

2.432. The aspeotual distribution then may be summarised as follows:

i) a simple frequentative past is imperfective, with the same exclusions as for the present, i.e. vbs in telėti and point action verbs.

ii) prefixed verbs in frequentative past are a) perfective if the present is perfective, or b) imperfective or neutral if the present is not perfective.

2.44. Having discussed the distribution within the aspeotual
system of individual tense forms. Dambrūnas then turns to the suffix, -inēti. Hitherto we have considered only one suffix, -telėti (-terėti), which served to render a simple verb perfective; the simple iterative form -inēti is according to the Lithuanian author (LP 7 p 259) 'one of the most important means of expressing the imperfective aspect'. Perfective verbs with this suffix become imperfective or neutral (but, cf. also -ioti, 2.32). Only verbs which are perfective in the present tense remain perfective with this form. Past tense forms with the exception of a few forms, mostly with pa-, become imperfective or neutral when combined with this suffix. Some iteratives have lost the iterative meaning but have acquired a durative significance: atsakinejo, atsiprašinējo, įrodinējo, įtikinējo (answered, made excuses, proved, asserted). The above examples are to be found in Dambrūnas at p. 260.

2.450. The forms with be-

2.451. A compound verbal form can be created by prefixing be- to either a simple or a compound verb and the participial suffix -as. The compound participle contains the idea of duration. It should be noted here that the suffixal morpheme -as is normally associated with the present, and the idea of duration inherent in the compound form may be in part derived from this association of forms. These participles are marked for durativeness but are neutral with regard

23. parašinėjo (wrote), pašokinėjo (bounded for a while), pakausinėjo (inquired about) and pavašinėjo (drove about) remain perfective, LP 7 p 259.
to tense. From the verbs eiti (go), rašyti (write), dirbtı (work) and išeiti (go out) we can form the following durative participles: beeinas, herkašas, bedirbaš, beišeinas; the association with the present tense is further confirmed in the verb 'to go' since the thematic morpheme is marked for presentness. The form beeinas may thus be broken up into four elements: 1) be- prefix: denoted continuation; 2) ei- root of verb: 'go'; 3) -n- thematic morpheme marking presentness as opposed to pastness; 4) -as: suffixal morpheme, formally identical with the present participle.

2.452. The participle above marks duration but not tense; tense is marked as with other participial forms which function as tenses by the use of the auxiliary verb buťti (to be). The tenses of the auxiliary which can be used are buvo (preterite), bus (future), budavo (frequentative past) and butu (conditional). The following examples are from the Lithuanian-English Dictionary of Vilnius Petersaitis (see Bibliography): 'buvo beeinas, kai draugas atėjo' - I was just going as my friend came; esu beišęs laiškę - 'I am just about to finish the letter'. The present example given above is additional to the possible tense forms quoted by Dambrūnas and while it is formally identical with the preterite, future conditional and frequentative past forms and resembles them in meaning the normal present tense form contains the idea of duration already. The participle therefore merely emphasises what is normally associated with the present tense. Both examples from Vilnius Petersaitis point to an action which is incomplete. In the first one also a clear contrast is made between the completed action kai draugas atėjo and the incompleted action buvo beeinas. This type
type of verbal action has thus moved from the sphere of Aktionsart (i.e. duration) into the higher concept of aspect; the participle be- as can be considered to have assumed additionally the functional load of aspect marker.

2.453. Following Dambriūnas one may note certain restrictions on the use of this form. The verb ateiti as we have seen has a present ateina which is an imperfective form while the past atejo is perfective. The form yra beateina is not in contrastive opposition with the present ateina, whereas a contrastive opposition does exist between buvo beateina and atejo. Similarly an imperfective future would be expressed by bus beateina, contrasting with the perfective future ateis. On the other hand the frequentative past is less likely with this form since ateidavo is neutral and can function in both the imperfective and perfective contexts.

2.50. Analysis of neutral verbs in the preterite.

2.51. An analysis of the neutral (or bi-aspectual) verbs leads one to the conclusion that many of these verbs are characterised by certain inherent qualities which obviate the necessity for formal definition. Dambriūnas' list contains approximately fifty verbs and it is more suitable for our purpose if we divide them further into subgroups on the basis of similarity of meaning. It can be argued that the selection made by Dambriūnas includes verbs which from their meaning should perhaps be attached to one or other of the two categories (perfective or imperfective). Such being the case it would be better here to discuss further the term neutral
which he uses. In terms of meaning, the neutral verbs cover a wide range: at one end they will tend towards the perfective and at the other the imperfective. They are neutral in that they may be found in imperfective contexts or perfective contexts without any change in form (i.e. without prefixation or suffixation). Any of the verbs cited may be found in perfective contexts and may be so marked, i.e. they may be prefixed (or in certain cases suffixed). Nevertheless the prefix is not essential to the change in aspect. If one were to take the verb grjiti (return), the form grjiko and the form sugriko are both perfective in perfective contexts. The form sugriko however, is only perfective and will occur only in such contexts. The form grjiko on the other hand may occur in either perfective contexts or imperfective contexts and the aspect will depend on the context.

Nevertheless there are certain verbs whose basic meaning will determine the context in which it will most frequently appear. Thus certain verbs will have a tendency (and one may only speak of tendencies here) to appear in perfective aspects, while again others will show a marked preference for imperfective contexts.

2.52.

i) two verbs connote the end of an action: baige 'ended', llovési 'stopped.

Here the resultative quality is self-evident and these verbs tend towards the perfective end of the spectrum.

ii) There are several synonyms for seised:

§iupo
iii) Five verbs refer to the act of falling; the main distinction lies in the violent content of the action in some cases:
krito 'fell' (the pure act; there are no undertones)
griuvo 'fell down' (additionally direction is indicated in the verb itself).
klupo 'stumbled', 'tripped'.
puolé 'fell', 'collapsed'.
virto 'fell down', tumbled'.

iv) There are two synonyms for rose: both are intransitive, but the second is the reflexive form of a transitive verb:
kilo (intr)
kéléš (originally trans)

v) A sub-group of six verbs indicates a change of state - this may be of very short duration or it may cover a period of time:
miré 'died'
gimé 'was born'
sádo 'sat down'
stojo 'stood up'
grášino 'beautified' (here change in state of object and not subject)
yuvo 'perished'.

vi) These are contrasted with a small group where no change of state is envisaged:
like 'remained'
tiko 'like' synonymous with the more usual compound form - patiko.
tilpo 'had/found room for'

vi) The next sub-group contains verbs connected with the act of speaking:
taré 'said'
lémé 'told'
spéjo (for îspéjo) 'predicted, guessed'
lispé 'ordered'.
saké 'said', might be added to this list in view of the fact that it is over much of its range virtually interchangeable with taré.

viii) The common feature of the majority of the verbs in this group is the idea of violence implicit in the action:
těšké 'threw violently'.
šoko 'jumped'
truko 'burst, rent exploded'
stũmě 'thrust, shoved'
plyšo 'broke, burst, split'
spjojvé 'spat'
spyřé 'kicked'
sviedě 'hurled'
kliuvo 'knocked against'
dűré 'pierced'
sprogo 'burst, exploded'
To this list may be added the basic verb meté 'threw' and also skyré 'divided' which is closely linked with one of the meanings of plyšo. The violence implicit in the meaning of most of the verbs of this series is absent from meté and skyré.
There appears to be no common ground for the remaining verbs in Dambriūnas’ list. Two are auxiliaries and in that sense they might have been allocated to a special sub-group.

II) 

stengė 'was able'

émé 'began'

In origin émé is, of course, the preterite of imti 'to take' and when used in the meaning of 'to take' it follows the normal pattern and we may find either émé or paémé depending on the context. However, in the meaning of 'began' émé is never found in the prefixed form. There is a prefixed verb 'to begin' pradėti. If one desired to stress the perfectivity of the auxiliary one could use pradėti.24

Many common auxiliaries tend to be used in the simple form; a synonym of stengė is galiot and this is the usual form.

The remaining verbs share no features common to them all.

They are:

rykšis 'determined, decided'

pelné 'gained', 'benefited'

vedé 'led'

drūs 'risked, dared'

davé 'gave'

tesėjo 'carried out'

apruko 'slipped away'

griko 'returned'

leido 'let go'

kibo 'hung onto, attached oneself to'.

24. Cf. also previous discussion of these two vbs 2.1312. Both the simplex émé and the compound vb pradėjo (and other tenses of these verbs) may appear in either aspect.
It is possible to link up rušting, dring, tenjo and palē. There would be a tendency to gravitate towards the perfective end of the aspectual range, but they could be fitted quite easily into many imperfective contexts. For instance one could risk one's life on more than one occasion. Similarly one could gain or benefit from something over a considerable period of time. The action of 'letting go' could take place on one occasion or on several. The form palējo is also found with the same meaning and would be used where more definition was required. To some of these there exist iterative forms: davē; davējo; vedė; vedējo, and these would be used to stress the imperfective iterative element. An example of vedējo in this usage occurs in Petras Cvirka, Monika jau keliantas vakaras zulino alkunäis stalę, prisiglaudusi prie vyro, kuris dalimis smiliu vedējo knygoje. 'Already on several evenings Monica would wear out (rub) the table with her elbows, leaning against her husband, who was running the index finger of his right hand over a page of the book' (PG&M p 60).

2.53. In general terms one may say that the verbs classified as neutral by Dambriūnas have the potential of either aspect without any formal distinction being necessary. Within the groups certain tendencies are to be found in Russian in the same class: e.g. the verb sidjet' 'to sit', 'be sitting' is basically durative. If one wishes to infer that the action, though statal, was of short duration and had been completed before another action commenced, one would use the prefixed form of the same verb: cf. 'On posidel minutočky,... The Lithuanian verb sėdėti may be used the same way: 'Jis trumputelį pasėdėjo,... Similarly there is a prefixed form peliko opposed to
like which appears in the list which would mean 'remained for a short while'. Nevertheless the prefixed forms of the verbs in this list, where they exist, have proportionally a much lower frequency than the simple form.

2.54. In direct contrast to the statal verbs which show a preference for the imperfective we find at the other end of the neutral verb types (largely in sections (v) and (viii)) a group of vbs whose distribution shows an equally marked preference for the perfective. These verbs form a link between the class of neutral vbs as a whole and the point action verbs. Despite their similarity to the point action verbs these neutral verbs can be found in either aspect. As Dambriūnas says (LP 7 p 257): "This can be explained by three circumstances. First of all, such verbs do not represent a very short action equal to a mathematical point. For instance, sprogimas 'explosion' may last only for one moment, but it can be somewhat longer, and therefore sprogo can have both aspects. It can be used to translate both Polish pokł and pokół. Secondly such verbs can be used as iteratives, in which case they take on an imperfective meaning, e.g. 'Zmonės tada mirė it lapai rudenį krito.' Here mirė 'died' means 'died one after another, many people died'... Finally these verbs can mean not merely the transition from one state to another but also the last moments before the transition. Mirė can mean not only 'died', 'became dead', but also 'was in his last moments of life'...25. These statements cannot be made about the small group of point action verbs which will be treated briefly in

25. This last statement recalls the oft quoted apology of Charles II on his deathbed for being an uncenscionable time a-dying.
the next section.

2.60. The point action verbs:

2.61. The so-called point action verbs are a much smaller group than the neutral verbs, and they share certain attributes with verbs in -tsleti. A verb such as dingo 'disappeared' expresses an instantaneous change from one state to another, from 'being present' to 'not being present'. A contrast is set up between the state previous to the verbal action and the state after the action has taken place. Stress is laid on the minimal quantity of time within which the action takes place. Similarly the verbal action of 'finding' may be contrasted with that of 'looking for something', which may take some considerable time. An example of the use of rasti 'to find' where the idea of instantaneousness is particularly stressed comes from Leskien: O štai, jis šia rado popierats' (And look, here he found a piece of paper, ALLB p 4). The verb gavo 'obtained' expresses a similar type of verbal action to rado 'found', where the instantaneous acquisition of some object is stressed rather than the regular occurrence of the act. The act of 'shooting' expressed in the past šovę covers virtually the same duration of time as the action of 'disappearing' in the form dingo.

2.62. Certain verbs in this group are open to a wider interpretation. The form tapo 'became' may refer to the rapid transition from one state to another, on the other hand the idea of a process of some duration is conceivable in some contexts. Laimėjo 'won' may refer to more than one occasion. The preterite spėjo is obviously
perfective since the idea of 'arriving' is reinforced by that of 'on time'; again, however, it could refer to an action that took place frequently. One could say, for instance, "The train always arrived on time."

'Arriving' took place more than once, but on each occasion this action was completed within a specific limit.

2.63. In the group of neutral preterites we find the form davé 'gave'. Dambriūnas contrasts this with the form dovanojo 'presented, gave a present', in origin a denominative from the noun dovana 'gift'. Both are found most frequently without a prefix, yet dovanojo is considered a point action verb. This seems arguable, and it would be possible to class it with davé. An example of the prefixed form is found in J. Baltušis: 'Prieš šešiadešimt metų Žiūrėjo man padovanojo šimogus' (Sixty years ago a man made me a present of this lion. PTDp48). The prefix emphasises not only the result which is already implicit in the verb, but that it happened on one specific occasion.

2.64. The remaining verbs in this section are all synonyms whose basic idea is 'dealt a blow'. The base verb in this group is smogé 'struck'. The verbs drožę, kirto, pyle, réžę, skélé, šiebė have this meaning when they are synonyms of 'smogé, elsewhere they may have slightly different meanings; for instance skélé normally means 'split' or 'cleave' and is the transitive constituent of the opposition which contains the verb skyré 'divided'. In the meaning 'dealt a blow' it would be found in such constructions as 'Jis skélé

26. Traukinys visuomet spėjo.
broluių dantis' (He punched his brother in the teeth). Again as in the case of spėjo, the action may be repeated, but each action is entire in itself and characterised by its short duration. There may be doubtful examples such as dovanojo (see 2.63.) but the majority of the verbs in this section share the common attribute of instantaneous action or action which is of extremely short duration.

2.70. The suffix -telēti.

2.71. In contrast to the previous group where it was the basic meaning of the verb which determined its allocation to a class, namely the class of point action verbs, the distinctive feature of the -telēti-class is the suffixal morpheme. The root morpheme with this suffix not specifically determined. The verb 'to cry out, to shout', riktē is contrasted with another form in -telēti, riktelēti. An example of the use of riktelēti occurs in Petras Cvirka, "Motina riktelējo portą kartą, smarkiai ir skausmingai". (The woman cried out once or twice, vehemently, in pain. PCZM p 26).

The sentence describes an event during the birth of Monica's son. The action is repeated more than once, but it is clear from the context that each 'shout' is of short duration.

2.72. It is possible to collect many pairs of this type from contemporary literature. The following are from Petras Cvirka, the preterites of the non-suffixed forms are given for comparison

27. non-suffixed forms are those which do not have the suffix -telēti. In the above list both krūdojo and kunūgiojo are derivative verbs, the latter from the noun kunūgis 'fist'.
(The numbers in brackets refer to the pages in the novel where these forms occur).

kruptalėjo (75) 'startled': kruptėjo

riktelėjo (26, 60) 'cried out': riko

smilkṣelėjo (16) 'began to ache, sting': smilko

huktelėjo (89) 'shouted': haukė

kumṣtelėjo (75) 'pushed': 'jostled with the fist': kumbėjo

2.721. Hitherto all the examples have been given in the preterite, but they may equally well appear in the frequentative past. For instance on p. 73 we have ḡyptelėdavo; corresponding to this (and also in the frequentative past) is ḡypnodavo. All verbs with the suffix -telōti are perfective since this is implicit in the meaning of the suffix. They may not in every case constitute the only perfective form of a particular verb. A perfective may be formed by prefixation based on the imperfective equivalent of the verb in -telōti. The last mentioned verb ḡyptelėdavo is an example of this; beside the infinitive ḡyptelōti we also find the prefixed form nukṣypoṭi. Similarly rikti has surikti beside riktelōti; here the prefix su-gives this verb an inceptive form, i.e. surikti 'to begin to shout'. It is interesting to note that the Russian-Lithuanian Dictionary gives the following alternatives for ḡzakri̱at: su-rikti, riktelōti; suṣukti, huktelōti. If the forms in -telōti are to be regarded as even near equivalents to the forms in su-, they must be rendered as 'to utter a shout'.

2.722. A statement can be made about the suffix -telōti, namely that it may be added to a verbal root and will make the subsequent
creation perfective. Originally forms in -teléti had a specialised meaning which stressed the lack of duration of a particular action, but it would be more accurate to describe its use in the modern language as a perfectivising suffix which may potentially indicate the instantaneous nature of an action in certain contexts.

2.723. The Slavic form -npti indicated and still does indicate single action. In the course of time it has acquired a purely perfectivising value and has spread to other verbs where the semelfactive meaning is not present. The suffix -teléti, while slightly different in meaning can be said to have undergone the same fate. Both -npti (where -npti stands for all modern reflexes of the suffix) and teléti still retain in part their original meaning.

2.80. Imperfectivising suffixes.

2.81. Like the suffix -teléti, -inéti possessed a specialised meaning - it was an iterative suffix, and when added to a simple imperfective verb no aspectual change will be made though the verb has now become more specialised. At the top of page 43 of Zemé Meitinoja (see bibliography), we find the following example: ‘... smalsumo pagauti klausinájo.’ (... overcome by curiosity they questioned him). An intensive-iterative element is clearly present and this is further confirmed by the first part of the utterance ‘smalsumo pagauti...’. On page 43 of the same work there are two further examples: ‘Tarutis mukinájas miestályjo ir šiūrinéjo,'
kas šia bus.' (Tarutis took a turn about the small town and looked around to see what would happen). The contrast here is between sukti 'to turn': sukinėti(s) 'to turn in several directions', and kiūrėti 'to look': kiūrinėti 'to look around'.

On page 44 there occurs bėginięs opposed to the simple verb bėgo: of. '... kuriose bėginięs žmonės' (in which the people kept running about). Further on pages 23-24 we find the sentence 'jis gaudėsi, puldinėjo.' (He played tag and tumbled about), here puldinėti is an iterative of pulti 'to fall down'. All these verbs show a modification of the verbal action without a change of aspect having taken place; they remain imperfactive throughout. Klausinėti, sukinėti(s), kiūrinėti, bėginėti, puldinėti may be considered Aktionsarten of klausti, sukšt, kiūrėti, bėgti and pulti. As such they are potential aspeectual formants.

2.820. The suffix -inėt with perfective verbs.

2.821. In a passage from Juozas Baltušis we find an instance of this suffix being attached to a prefixed verb: 'Taip prasidėjo mūsų pašintis. Po savaitės ji atidėliai perkiūręjo tyrimų resultatus, skaitė ir perskaitinėjo receptus, suglėbė juos kiūrinė ir stumtelėjo man.' (In this way our acquaintance had begun. After a week she carefully looked through the results of the examinations, she read and read through the prescriptions, gathered them together in a pile and shoved them over to me PTD p 36). The formal contrast between perkiūręjo and perskaitinėjo is striking, the more so that both verbs use the same prefix per- which would normally assign them both to the same aspeectual category. Even had prefixation not been
the principal means of creating perfectives from simple verbs, the meaning of per- (through) would tend to make any verb to which it was joined a perfective one. Thus perkaitė (read through) would normally infer that the act of reading was finished. Here the use of the suffix inėjo suggests that the act of reading was repeated. Moreover, the juxtaposition of skaitė and perkaitinėjo suggests that the prescriptions were not only read, they were read more than once and read thoroughly. In fact the suffix -inėjo stresses the idea of thoroughness which is also a meaning of the prefix per-.

2.822. The addition of -inėjo, whether one attributes to it an intensive or an iterative value, produces a certain modification of the verbal action which makes the choice of the perfective impossible. An intensive value for -inėjo would make the action itself of interest; i.e. the doctor went through the prescriptions thoroughly. It is known that she finished going through them since she made a pile of them and shoved them over to the narrator, but this fact is not of great importance. On the assumption of an intensive value for the suffix inėjo in this example one would assign this verb to the imperfective category. In addition to the intensive value it is also possible to deduce an iterative value for this suffix, which would likewise confirm our choice of the imperfective as the correct category of the verb perkaitinėjo in this example. Thus a firm allocation to one or other of these two Aktionsarten is not necessary since both are sub-categories of the imperfective aspect.

Again in Petras Cvirka there is the sentence: 'Siek tikė suraukęs kakų Juras atsakinėjo, nurodinėjo. (Knitting his brows a little Juras answered her questions and pointed things out to her. PCZM p 76.) In the preceding sentences the amazement of Juras' wife at the
spectacle is described. 'Everything appeared to her as in a dream (Monikai viskas buvo kaip sapne). She is as a result continually asking her husband questions both as to what is happening and also where things are. To these continuous questions he has to keep on answering and he has also to keep on pointing things out to her. From the foregoing it is clear that we are dealing with an iterative verb in both cases. One may then deduce the following aspectual oppositions: atskininti; atsakyti and nuodinti: nuodyti.

A further example of atskinėjo from Petras Cvirka: 'Monika sumušusi atskinėjo ir galvojo,...' (Monica, confused, answered them and thought,... PCZM p 89). Again we are concerned with a repeated action. She answered in effect several requests to be allowed to sit next to her on a bench.

Again in Petras Cvirka we meet the form išdavinėjo: 'Dar tik vakar mūs kunigai iš sakykli viešai išdavinėjo patrioty pavardes žandarams' (Yet only yesterday our priests were openly giving out the names of such patriots to the gendarmes. PCZM p 35). And once more on page 37 of the same novel there is an example with išsisokinėjo: '.... ir prispirtas Monikos, išsisokinėjo kad paslydė ir susimušė.' (.... and compelled by Monica he would tell lies, saying he had slipped and struck against something.) Both verbs suggest an action that took place frequently, repeatedly, i.e. the priests on more than one occasion gave out the names of patriots, and that Juras told lies to several people and on more than occasion. Of the same type is the form neįkalbinėjau: 'As strėžiau, kad jį neįkalbinėjau, o pasakiau, kaip kituos kraštuos ... kad ir darbininkas puikiai žino, ko jam reikia.' (I retorted that I was not encouraging them, and I said that... as in other countries the worker too knew
perfectly well what he needed. PCZM p 53). In this sentence we have three prefixed verbs but a contrast has been established between atęšiau, pasakiau and neikalbinęjau. This contrast is both formal and notional. The verb form neikalbinęjau describes a process and not a result, and this process in marked by the contrastive element -inėjau.

2.90. The Lithuanian Aspect System: Summary.

2.91. A comparison of the Lithuanian system and the aspect systems of the various Slavic languages shows that the former is more complex or not yet finally systemised. One of the most striking features distinguishing the Lithuanian system from the Slavic systems is the existence of a large class of what L. Dambriūnas has called neutral verbs. These verbs correspond to the bi-aspectual verbs of Slavic and it would be possible to use this term to describe this group of Lithuanian verbs. All neutral verbs may occur with prefixes and one may find Slavic bi-aspectual verbs directly corresponding to the Lithuanian verbs: sėdėti, stovėti, gulėti, matyti correspond to Slavic (R) sidět'*, stojat', ležat' and videt'. Though the prefix may not be the same (Lithuanian prefers pamatyti whereas Russian has uvidet') the prefix will tend to suggest, not mere perfectivity (i.e. as contrasted with imperfectivity) but rather one of the perfective Aktionsarten. What is noteworthy about Lithuanian is not the existence of such bi-aspectual forms but their number and distribution. For instance prižti (return) and mirti (die) are bi-aspectual in Lithuanian, whereas the Slavic equivalents are bot (cf. R vosvrášť'sja: vozvratit'sja/vernut'sja and umirat': umeret'). The Lithuanian bi-aspectual verbs may be said to have
resisted the aspectual polarity which has affected the vast majority of Slavic verbs.

2.911. The point action verbs are another group of simple verbs which have resisted this aspectual polarity. While the neutral verbs are bispectual, i.e. the selection of aspect depends uniquely on the context and not on form, the point action verbs are confined to the perfective aspect. Though with regard to aspect they may be compared with verbs in -telėti, all the latter have a corresponding imperfective form which may be a simplex or it may have a suffix other than -telėti. Point action verbs have no imperfective form. If one takes as an example of the point action verbs the verb dingti (disappear) (cf. Petras Čvirka, p 10: "žengus dingo pakalnėja") we find that the act of 'disappearing' is regarded as an instantaneous act and hence the perfective is the only possible aspect. Yet in Russian we find the normal polarisation: isėzat': isėznut'. If one consults a Russian-Lithuanian Dictionary under isėzat', one finds the following Lithuanian equivalents: nykti, dingtī, slėptis, ėtī; again under isėznut' (the perfective form of this verb) dingtī, ėtī, pasialėptī, išnyktī and panyktī etc... Both slėptī and nyktī are normal imperfective verbs and form their perfective in the usual way by prefixation. Neither dingtī nor ėtī form their perfective in this way; dingtī is always perfective while ėtī (at least according to Dambriūnas) is neutral. In meaning they are not dissimilar: dingtī: to disappear, vanish, be lost and ėtī: to perish, die; (of things) to be lost (of people) to be missing. In the military sense of 'to be missing' one may use either verb. Of the two verbs, however, ėtī has more figurative meaning; dingtī
suggests a sudden transition from being visible to being invisible. Such is the meaning of dingo in the example from Petras Cvirka where the man is suddenly lost from view down the slope. It is difficult for that reason to associate dingo with the R imperfective verb except in cases where the act of 'disappearing' took place more than once. Where the act of 'disappearing' was other than instantaneous one would of necessity use a verb meaning 'to fade, to diminish' such as the verb nykto meaning 'to become less, to shrink' or sleptis 'to hide oneself' (cf. R. skryvat'sja). In perfective contexts nykto and sleptis occur as translations of R isčeznut' in situations which differ little if at all from that of dingo in the example from Petras Cvirka (PCZM p 10). Thus 'On isčez v tolpe' is rendered 'Jis pranyko, pasislepe minioje'; and in a more figurative usage: 'streh isčez': 'baime išnyko.' If one substituted dingo in the first example, 'Jis dingo minioje' one would have a similar context to the example of Cvirka: Zmogus dingo pakalnėje. In both cases the disappearance is instantaneous. It is this quality of instantaneousness that is inherent in the verb dingo. It is not marked in any of the substitutes; dingo is perfective and instantaneous; pranyko and pasislepe are marked only for perfectivity.

2.912. As a category the point action group is by its nature

29. No instance of the perfective usage of dingo occurs with a prefix whereas žuti has a purely perfective form pržuti; pržuti is found as a translation of the R perfective pogibnut, though the simple form is also found in this meaning.
restricted to only a few verbs, and some of these may not with absolute certainty be assigned to it. If one takes dingti as the type of verb one certain fact emerges dingti is never pre-fixed. One cannot apply this criterion to the verb rasti 'to find'. Though it is true that the verb rasti is found in the simple form in the majority of perfective contexts the compound form surasti cannot be excluded, cf. in Juozas Baltušis (TKN - 56): Toliname pagiryme surando žmonės mokytojų. "In the distant edge of the woods the men discovered the teacher". Similarly one finds atrasti. As a translation of the Russian 'Obnarušilis' poterjannye den'gi' one would use atsirasti: "Atsirado pamestieji pinigai". Again when some native speakers of Lithuanian translated the sentence "The game-keeper picked up the burnt rags and believed that he had found the cause of the recent fire" - three out of four preferred a compound form to the simple form; the choice was: suradęs; surado; atrado; and one only selected radęs. On the basis of this evidence it would be more appropriate to assign the verb rasti to the class of neutral verbs. Nevertheless the verb rasti will function more often as a point action verb. The use of the prefix will signal the successful completion of a search rather than the mere act of


L2. Girininkas pakėlė apdegusiuosius skudurus ir patikėjosi, kad jis bus suradęs paskutiniojo gaisro priežastį.

L3. Eigulya pakėlė nuo šeimos apdegusiuosius skudurus ir tikėjosi, kad atrado neperreniausiai įvykusio gaisro priežastį.

L4. Zvirininkas pakėlė apdegusiuosius skudurus ir tikėjosi radęs nešenių buvusiojo gaisro priežastį.
finding, which could often be accidental.

2.913. Unlike the two previous groups of verbs whether neutral simplex or point action vbs there exist according to Dambrinunas two groups of prefixed verbs which are either imperfective or neutral. Hitherto we have been concerned with verbs which are normally unprefixed and when the prefixed form is found it is clearly perfective. The prefixed verbs in these two groups are either not used without prefixes or the corresponding unprefixed verb may be totally unrelated in meaning (cf. tarti 'say' and jtarti 'distrust, suspect').

L. Dambrinunas' list contains about forty-five verbs, the largest group again being neutral. Forms of the neutral group are according to Dambrinunas imperfective when they are used figuratively. Thus idaré when it means 'betrayed' and not when it means 'gave out'. They are imperfective when they are iterative (or rather when they are in an iterative context): Darata itaré pëng. "Darata used to suspect the master". It is interesting to note here that Dambrinunas puts forward itarinéjo as an alternative to itaré in this context.

As we shall see, many of these verbs may take this suffix and that we have in effect the opposite tendency to that of the simple neutral verbs. With the simple neutral vbs the perfective was specially marked, here it is the imperfective that is specially marked.

2.92. It is in the use of this suffix -ínëjo (infín, -inèti) and also on occasion -iojo(-ioti) that we can see the growth of a system of aspectual oppositions. Of the two suffixes -inèti is the commoner and seems to have become even more productive of
recent years. As a translation of Russian 'pribyvat' Busy-Lietuviy Kalby Zodynas gives both ataidinati and atykti. Yet atykti certainly exists and one would have expected to find it here. There is, however, still a certain amount of disagreement among native speakers with regard to this form. For instance the sentence, 'He was running to and fro, busying himself now with this, now with that.' has been variously translated by different informants and a fifth on being consulted suggested a further alteration. 'He was running...' was rendered on two occasions by 'Jis laksté...'; the other two informants suggested respectively: Jis béginojo... and Jis bégiojo... The second verb 'busying himself' has been rendered in three cases by the participle in -damas: dirbdamas and (twice) užsiimnéjo (the imperfective form of užsiimti: to busy oneself with). The first 'he was running to and fro' concerns movement which is both repeated and in different directions; 'busying himself now with this, now with that' is an action of a certain degree of intensity though not necessarily of an orderly nature. In neither case are we envisaging the action as completed, though in fact a series of small actions have been completed. The forms bégiojo (ran to and fro) and laksté (flew about) adequately translate the meaning of the first verb, the to and fro is already inherent in the meaning of the vb, though this is also implied by 'iš vienos vietos į kitą'; in the case of laksté (flew, flitted about) this phrase has been rendered by 'šen ū ten'. A further informant suggested that the iterative nature of the first action might be further emphasised by the use of the suffix -inéjo, thus lakstinéjo. All these forms are imperfective: bégiojo, béginéjo laksté, lakstinéjo. The action of the second half of the sentence
is also imperfective and where a finite verb has been used the translator has used the -inejo form of the compound verb 'uūsiinti'. A similar type of sentence is the following: 'The shop door was constantly opening and shutting'. The action of both verbs is continuous and again we find the form in -inèti: krautuvës durys visè laikà atsidarinèjo ir uūsidarinèjo (L1). Two other informants (L2 and L4) use a participial form: Parduotuvës durys buvo nûlat atidarainèjamos ir uūsidarinèjamos. Parduotuvës durys visè laikà buvo atidarainèjamos... The fourth hesitates between the participial usage and the preterite: buvo atidarainèjamos ir uūsidarinèjamos/atsidarainèjo ir uūsidarinèjo.

This sentence may be compared with the following: 'The door shut and she heard somebody coming upstairs.' In this instance there is complete agreement on the use of the perfective in translating the 'The door shut...': durys uūsidarë (L1, L3, and L4) and uūsidarë durys (L2). They are divided on the aspect of heard: girdëjo (twice): iūgirdo (twice). 31

2.23. The evidence which has been considered so far has tended to reinforce the view that the Lithuanian aspect system is newer in relative terms than the Slavic system. The essential feature of the Slavic system is a rigid grammatical polarisation as between imperfective and perfective. Here one finds only a limited number

31. The verb girdëti like matyti may be considered bi-aspectual though possessing a purely perfective component (in this case iūgirsti); girdëti: iūgirsti and matyti: pamatyti are in a similar relationship to that of the R pair vidët': uvidët'.
of bi-aspectual verbs (prefixed and simplex) cited by L. Dambriūnas.

2.24. Lithuanian has had for many centuries very close links with the closely related East Baltic language, Latvian, and it would not be surprising if there were many similarities between them. Both languages have undoubtedly been influenced by Slavic, though, outside the field of lexis, this influence is difficult to define. Moreover in distinguishing between the two aspects both have made use of inherited material. Before passing on to consider the interaction of tense and aspect in these languages and in Slavic we must consider the Latvian aspectual system.
3.0. **Aspect in Latvian**

3.1. The Latvian aspect system shows many similarities with the Lithuanian. We do not find the clear polarisation of the Slavic systems: thus the forms of any Latvian verb may be designated imperfective or perfective, but not every La vb necessarily possesses imperfective and perfective forms. It is in the creation of the perfective that the La system diverges least from the system established for Lithuanian, and it would be better here to consider first the type of marker used to make this distinction.

3.1.20. **The creation of perfective forms from imperfective forms.**

3.1.21. The normal method of deriving p forms from i vb is prefixation. These prefixes may have lost their original spatial meaning and become merely markers of aspect; alternatively the spatial meaning of the prefix may have survived, or the prefixed form may possess some other specialised meaning (i.e., it may be used to render one of the Aktionsarten). Theoretically any prefix may be used to derive a p vb. In fact four prefixes sa-, no-, iz- and pe- (31 s-, ot-, iz and po-) are preponderant in the function of aspect markers. As aspect markers they lose their spatial meaning:

La lasīt : izlasīt
mirt : nomīrt
darīt : padarīt
maksāt: samaksāt

Rūsit': proūsit'
umrit': umērīt'
delat': sdelat'
platit': zaplatit'
Any other prefix may occur in this role though these are less likely to lose their spatial meaning. Thus atrisīnāt (solve): V. Shaltmane in her article *Verb veidi mūsdienu latviešu literatūrā* valodā, p. 14. (Valodas un literatūras inst. rakstī, VII) gives two examples of the use of this verb in either aspect. First in the imperfective: 'Audzinātājiem jāparāda... kā vienābāk atrisīnāt uzdevumus matemātikā... PuSk 1952, 1, 32.

(Teachers have to show... how best to solve problems in mathematics.)

And in the perfective:
'Tīems katram savs neatbildīts un neaizskaidrots jautājums... ko atrisīnāt pašam nobij pa spēkam.' AUPlm, 45. (They each had their own unanswered and unexplained problems... which they found themselves unable to solve).

We also find the following prefixes used as aspect markers:
ai-, aizjūgt (: jūgt, to yoke); par-, pārtulktot (: tulktot, to translate); ar-, aģerbt (: ėrbt, to put on, trans); iz-, iadzelt (: dzelt, to sting).

The basic meaning of the prefix may lead to its selection as an aspect marker with certain verbs: sa- (L su-, Sl s-) denoted union or combination. of. sa-lasīt (to gather)

sa-vākt (to collect)

sa-līšeterēt (to twist or spin).

iz- on the other hand points to a process of selection: iz-lasīt (to select) or result (iz-līšeterēt).

no- is associated with the idea of death or impairment in subject or object, and as a result it is used as a marker for the vb mirt (to die).
pa- (as in Lithuanian or Slavic) frequently points to an action as being of short duration; e.g. zust, but 'to disappear for a short while' is pa-zust.

3.20. Polysemy of perfective aspect prefixes.

3.21. It can be seen from the above examples that a simple vb (in the vast majority of cases the imperfective verb) may correspond to more than one perfective form. One of these perfective forms functions as the normal perfective of the simple verb in question, the other perfective forms impart definition to a particular characteristic of the action. Thus the prefix pa- infers that the action of the verb is of short duration (cf. also L pa-, Slavic po-). Se- and ie- point to the beginning of an action (cf. L su- and R za-). Such abstractions belong to the sub-category of Aktionsarten and in Latvian they are capable of expressing a considerable range of meaning. Since the prefixes have in such instances been de-semanticised the new meaning (of Aktionsart) may have little if any connection with the original meaning of the prefix. The meanings of ie- (in) and aa- (together) are no longer present when these prefixes are used to form inceptive verbs. The prefix in- may mean 'to have ones fill of...' as in the following example. The vb skriet (to run) has the iterative form skraidit, yet the compound form izskraiditiea means 'to have one's fill of running'. Similar is the compound vb nastaveties.

32. i.e. they have lost their original spatial meaning and now have a purely aspectual significance, or serve (as in the case of Aktionsarten) to emphasise some non-spatial meaning.
in the sentence 'VijtS nostaivejas rinda' (He was fed up with queuing).

3.220. The prefixed form retains the basic meaning.

3.224. The use of the prefix as an aspect marker, or within the aspe...
die out), should be looked upon as a new formation, since it has been transferred to a different lexical set. The form izsirt does, however, provide a link with the opposition izjet : ijet. The form izsiet contrasts with iet in respect of its perfectivity, as does izjet, though one must regard the relationship of izsiet : ijet as being on a different level. The relationship here is lexical rather than grammatical. On the lexical level iet is not the imperfective form of izsiet any more than it is the i form of uziet (ascend) or isiet (go in). There is thus in Latvian no comparable aspectual pair to the R vyjti : vyhodit' or B podpisam : podpiša or indeed L išavedžioti : išvesti (deduce).

In Slavic and to more limited extent in Lithuanian i forms of compound verbs have been derived with the aid of iterative suffixes, or in one group of verbs by the substitution of the iterative member of a pair of vbs, i.e. prinesi : prinositi in Russian, where nositi was originally the iterative member of a pair of which the non-iterative was nesti. In this opposition there are traces of an old ablaut distinction as well as an iterative suffix (-iti). With most verbs, the Slavic languages have had recourse to another iterative suffix: i.e. R and Pol/ive/, to form imperfective verbs. Thus to the Russian simple verb pisat' we have the compound zapisat' (to write down, note) and a corresponding new form zapisyva-'. Similarly in Lithuanian we have raštūti: užraštūti: užraš-into-iti. Bulgarian and Macedonian have generalised -va- forms as in E and W Slavic. In Bulgarian one finds -va- and -ueva-, while Macedonian has a majority of -uva- forms. Though the suffixes mentioned above are not the only suffixes used in Slavic or in Lithuanian the derivational process is the same in all cases, i.e. a suffix (originally iterative or intensive) has been
used to mark the imperfective of compound verbs. Moreover, this process is common to Slavic and Lithuanian, but not, as we shall see, to Latvian.

The question may well be asked whether there are such suffixes in Latvian which could function in this role. Certainly since iterative and intensive verbs do exist; in *Latviešu Valodas Gramatika*, J. Endzelins lists some iterative and intensive verbs of which only a selection is presented here:

a) -āt (LVG 610)

rāvāt, intens (to weed): raut (to jerk, pull)

drābāt, intens (to tear apart)

b) -ēt (LVG 647)

nesāt or nesēt, iter (to carry): neat

traēt, iter (to run to and fro): tactē

c) -ēt (with lengthened grade of the root, LVG p 819)

mētēt, iter (to throw repeatedly): meet

lektēt, iter (to hop, jump): lekt

d) -ēt (with lengthened grade in some stems, LVG 655)

vartēt, iter-intens (to roll, drag about on the ground)

graizēt, iter (to cut repeatedly): griezt

e) -stīt (LVG 659)

destīt, iter, EH., "gabe wiederholt";

karsīt, iter Bielenstein, II, 403; "faase wiederholt".
f) -dīt (LVG 659)

akraidīt, iter (to run): skriet

maudīt, iter (to shoot): Haut.

g) -ināt (LVG 667): the spread of iteratives to this suffix may have been due to the influence of forms in -āt. Similarly some vbs in -ināt may in effect be derived from original forms in -inēt (a suffix now no longer found in the standard language).

Through the forms in -inēt we have a link with L forms in -inēti, and it is noteworthy that many L iteratives in -inēti gloss L iteratives in -ināt; cf. the following examples:

darinēt (Bialenstein, L Spr., I, 424), cf. L darinēti

iterative to daryti (dā)

davinēt

ibid., cf L davinēti: duotī (give);

kāpinēt

ibid., (to raise, increase): kāpt; cf. L kopinēti

(to climb): kōpti (climb); the La vb is also causative whereas L kopinēti is merely iterative, both are transitive.

klaudzinēt (to knock, bang): klaudzēt

klupinēt, Bialenstein, op cit., I 425. (to stumble); cf. L klupinēti; Vilius Feteraitis (LAZ/66) gives klupinduotī in this meaning, corresponding to the non-iter klupti.

lupinēt

(to peel, pare): lupō; cf. L lupinti/lupinēti.

urbinēt (Bialenstein, op cit., I 426), to poke, to prod, to pick; urbt (to bore).

vilcinēt (to delay, drag out, defer): vilkt (to pull, drag);

this is a durative intensive rather than iterative.
virināt (to keep opening and shutting); vērt vaiņā (to open); vērt ciet (to shut). and with inserted -d-:
dzeldināt (to sting), 24548 (LTDs): dzelt (to sting);
dzidināt Bielenstein, op cit., II, 392 and 402, "biežīdzīt" (to drive, chase, often)
jadināt, ibid. I, 423 : L jadinēti (to take a ride, ride about on horseback); LAVTur also gives jādelēt (to ride about);
jadināt and jādelēt: jāt (to ride), of. L jotī.

3.223. The above list is only a selection of the iterative-intensive forms given by biendzels in Latviešu Valodas Gramatika (640,647, 655, 659, 667). Nevertheless from these examples alone it can be seen that Latvian diverges somewhat from Lithuanian in its preference for -ūt/-ūt: -ināt in the function of iterative-intensive marker.

Latvian has seen a reduction in the number of possible derivational formants largely on account of the phonetic changes which occurred in the pre-literate period. L nasal diphthongs have become oral long vowels or oral diphthongs; thus Lithuanian distinguishes -yti (i:ti) and inti, whereas in Latvian both would have coalesced in -āt (-:t). Again certain suffixes have very productive, cf. -ot, which is much more frequent than the corresponding -oti.

On the other hand there is no exact equivalent of the L -inēti. Though La -inēt corresponds in many cases to L -inēti, and in so far as it has replaced forms in -inēt, it corresponds phonetically to inēti, -inēt has not assured the iterative-intensive function to anything like the extent that the Lithuanian suffix has done. The suffix -inēt has retained the polysemy which it is reasonable
to suppose was characteristic of many such suffixes at an earlier stage of the language. Thus -ināt may be denominative, dibināt (to found) from dibens, bottom; it may be causative, audzināt (to educate, train, bring up); aught (to grow). Audzināt corresponds to L auginti with essentially the same range of meaning. An example of the use of audzināt from a translation of George Orwell's Animal Farm will serve to illustrate the suffix -ināt in the causative role. This example occurs on page 15: '... Snowball and Napoleon, whom Mr. Jones was breeding up for sale.' 

Sniegapika un Napoleons, kūrūs Džonss audzināja pārdosanai." (DZF, p 15). With reference to this suffix therefore one may conclude that the causative and denominative verbs are clearly distinguished by their meaning (cf. aught: audzināt or the denominative īsināt 'to shorten' < the adj īss, 'short'). Moreover the causative suffix fulfils a useful role in both Baltic languages as a formant of transitive verbs from intransitives, thereby aiding in the creation of new members of the transitive: intransitive opposition which is so characteristic of the Baltic verbal system.34 Iterative verbs in -ināt are not so clearly defined a role as the causative forms in -ināt.

The iterative-intensive forms in -āt/-Īt are more clearly

34. of Christian Stang, "Dagegen findet man in Balt. die Tendenz eine andere Art von Doppelverba zu schaffen, nämlich transitive und intransitive: ....; dies ist aber nur eine Tendenz, ein Motiv in der Sprachentwicklung. Es handelt sich nicht um ein geschlossenes System, wie bei den slav. perf.-imperf. Paarverba." Das Slavische und Baltische Verbum, p 98
defined, yet even here they are not found in great numbers and the suffixes are of low productivity. It would seem that firstly the iterative-intensive suffix has not been so highly developed as in Lithuanian and that secondly there are areas of doubt as to the iter or intens nature of the suffix in some so-called iteratives or intensives, this factor being particularly marked in the case of vbs in -inat.

3.224. In view of the remarks expressed above (3.223) the Latvian iterative-intensive forms are not adequately marked for these qualities (i.e. iterativeness or intensiveness) or are in insufficient numbers to favour their use in the functional role of aspectual determinants. The existence of iteratives or intensives in the role of aspect marker in Lithuanian has not exerted any influence on Latvian usage despite the fact that the two countries are both geographically contiguous and closely related. In fact, in the grammatical developments (as opposed to the lexical) there is a marked difference between features inherited and those which have developed since the two languages separated. It has not been a case of one language developing and of one standing still (and one would have expected the relatively more archaic Lithuanian to have developed least), but rather of both languages developing along different lines.

Lithuanian is extremely rich in derivational suffixes which have retained their distinctiveness. Latvian on the other hand has fewer suffixes of this kind and, moreover, with its loss of flexions has tended to rely on analytical means. To take an example from the substantival declension, prescriptive grammar has provided Latvian with an instrumental case which serves to bring it into line with East Baltic norms and E and W Slavic norms. Thus,
La ar vīru (by the man) corresponds to L vyr̩u and to Pol ołówkiem and R Šelovakom. However, the form vīru (I) is identical with the form vīnu (A); in the plural paradigm the Dat and the Inst are the same. In diachronic terms the -u is a contraction of -o, which is the normal reflex of -a- in and which corresponds to L vyr̩u. The distinguishing feature in this case is not the suffix -u but the preposition ar which always accompanies the case. The use of discrete lexical elements is also found within the La verbal system. The conditional suffix -tu is attached to the infinitive stem of the verb and remains invariable, while the Lithuanian cognate -ty is 3P only. A new set of personal endings has been evolved by Lithuanian and in this sense it is an innovator when compared to Latvian. The original form in both the Lithuanian and the Latvian paradigm is the 3P and this is the only form which has remained the same both in diachronic and synchronic terms, i.e. the earliest Lithuanian texts show -ty (or -tu), though they exhibit a wide range of divergence in the other persons of the paradigm. The modern literary language has 1P sg -siau, but in Zemaiši for instance we find -sio, while S and E Lithuanian dialects have -tau (see further ChSt p 249). That the 3P should be the same everywhere is not surprising since this form has remained unmarked for number throughout the whole Baltic language area. The diversity of the suffixes marking person and

35. The suffix -a- in posited for the accusative sing of masc e-stems in both proto-Lithuanian and proto-Latvian might equally well have been written -a-m.

36. cf. 2P sg: Daukeša -tumbei; Mažvydas -tumbi; Sūrydas -tumey.
the total absence of person markers in Latvian suggests that the personal endings of Lithuanian arose after the separation of Lithuanian and Latvian from common E Baltic.

Arising out of the use of the personal pronouns with the 3p to mark number is the extension of this usage to other persons in all tenses, though the person may be adequately marked by the verb ending. In the Latvian conditional where the verb form marks only tense this use of the personal pronouns became a permanent feature of the paradigm:

i.e.

1. es būtu (I should be)
2. tu būtu (you would be)
3. viņš būtu (he would be etc)

1. mēs būtu
2. jūs būtu
3. viņi būtu

The personal endings of the relative mood (atstāstījuma IE -o-m, but this form had in any case been reduced to a nasal vowel in the earliest E Baltic written records. izteiksmes) are formed in the same way with the aid of the personal pronouns since the forms in -ot are invariable (-ot was originally the adverbial or indecl form of a participle).³⁸ The present of the relative mood of augt (grow) is

³⁷ of 3P of vb 'to be': L sg: jis, ji yra (estī): pl: jie yra.
³⁸ The forms in -ot are to be regarded as tense in the same way that būtu is a tense, or the R form pīsal is a tense. Stang (ShSt p 243) lays too much stress on the nominal (participial) origin of the form, whereas in modern literary Latvian these forms function as finite verbs and should be considered such. The forms in -ot correspond to Lithuanian indecl participles in -ant.
as follows: es, tu, viņš augot. mēs, jūs, viņi augot. Apart
from the future augot the other tenses of this mood are formed
with the aid of the verb 'to be' (esot, busot) and the past
active participle in -is.

This use of discrete lexical elements is paralleled in
E Slavic where the 1-participle is now a tense form since it has
lost its auxiliary verb. The E Slavic past tense is characterised
by the unusual feature that it marks gender and number but not
person. Polish has on the other hand recreated a secondary
system of endings which indicate person,39 and these are added onto
the 1-participle with truncation of the vowel of the suffix in
certain cases.40 Lithuanian like Polish has developed a secondary
series of suffixes for the conditional and this development
conforms with the Lithuanian norms. Latvian practice on the other
hand shows a tendency towards the use of analytical structures.

By analytical structures is meant the use of separate words to render
syntactical and morphological relationships. Thus Latvian as we
have seen uses prepositions to render case/casual relationships and

39. The Pol personal endings are: -em. -ē, -ēmy, -ēcie. These
are in diachronic terms relics of the verb 'to be', which was in Old
Pol: ješm, ješ, ješmy, ješcie; the 3P forms do not appear in this
tense since the participle is sufficient to express this person.

40. Truncation takes place in the sg when the -e- of the personal
endings -em, -ē is dropped after the -a of the feminine participle:
i.e. pīsaia-s.
personal pronouns to indicate person in the subject. It may be argued that this usage has been dictated by the need to obviate ambiguity. Nevertheless as Lithuanian has shown there is more than one method of avoiding ambiguity and Latvian usage shows a definite preference for the analytical method.

When we come to consider the derivation of imperfective verbs we shall see that Latvian has adopted a similar procedure to that adopted above to express the relationships of person and case. Indeed the creation of imperfective forms for compound perfective verbs has been called the 'analytical construction'. In our analysis of this process we shall have to consider what form the process takes, what restrictions limit the full application of the process, and lastly we shall suggest why this process was adopted in preference to the methods used by neighbouring language groups, and in particular Lithuanian.

3.30. The Analytical Construction.

3.31. If one analyses the following Latvian compound verbs, atvert (open), aizvert (shut), izist (go out), and nolekt (jump down), one finds that they all consist of three components: prefix root (none of these verbs is derived so one may exclude for the moment all derivational suffixes) and finally the infinitive marker -t. It is, however, the prefix which distinguishes any
of the above verbs from the corresponding simple verb vērt, which is not frequently found in this meaning (i.e. to open or shut, since theoretically it may have either meaning). That this is no real difficulty will become clear later. No such complication arises with iet (go) and lēkt (jump); these differ from the compound forms in that movement of a certain type is implied, but no specific direction is inferred for that movement. The prefix in these cases adds the idea or direction of the movement (outward or downward) or in the case of the verbs meaning 'to shut' or 'to open' it points to two different types of action. At the same time the prefixes function grammatically, as aspect markers. They mark these verbs as perfective. Yet these vb forms differ from a form such as padarīt (do) where the pa- is de-semantised and marks merely perfectivity. In the case of padarīt the omission of the prefix makes the verb imperfective; darīt. If one omitted the prefix from the vbs atvērt, aizvērt, iziet or nolēkt, the forms thus obtained would be imperfective but they would also differ lexically from the compound verbs. The use of the analytical construction allows one to retain the lexical value of the prefix while the vb reverts to the simple form. In other words one substitutes for the prefix a free form which has the same meaning. Thus for atvērt one would obtain vērt valē, where valē corresponds to the prefix at-; similarly aizvērt corresponds to vērt oiet, iziet: iet ārā (or lauka) and nolēkt: lēkt zemē.

41. The forms atvērt, aizvērt may be replaced by attaisīt, aistaisīt without change of meaning; the form taisīt 'do' can be used in the analytical construction as can the compounds of vērt, cf. 'Taisi durvis ciet'. 'Shut the door' from Turkina. The forms attaisīt, aistaisīt are strongly reminiscent of the German vbs aufmachen, zumachen.
An analysis of the markers of the analytical construction.

The grammatical status of the free forms vala, ara/lauka, ciet and zeme is not difficult to ascertain; they are all adverbs, though ciet or cieti is the only one derived from an adjective (ciets - firm). Ars (outside), lauks (field) and zeme (earth, land) are all nouns in the locative case. The suffix -a,(-a, -I) here referred to as locative also functions as an allative or illative; thus 'vipa gaja ara' shows ara functioning as an allative, whereas 'ara guleja supii shows ara functioning as a locative, since 'he went out' implies movement outwards. In the second example, however, 'the dogs were lying outside' implies state not movement.

There are a large number of such adverbs and theoretically at least it would be possible to substitute an adverb for any prefix. Moreover, since every prefix has more than one meaning, the meaning 'down' may correspond to more than one adverb: zeme where the movement is more abrupt or in the spatial sense closer to the vertical, lekt/zeme, or where the descent is more gradual, leja/lejup.

The adverbs leja and lejup in allative contexts are interchangeable; lejup with its suffix -p (also found in burlp, turp (here, there)) is purely allative.
as in the example from Jānis Jaunsūdrabītā: "No sētsvidus aiz
zalains celīša lejup,... JJBēr p 14, (The grass path ran down
from the courtyard,... ). Similarly in the sentence 'He ran down
to the gate,...' the following translations were obtained: 'Vipē
nošķēja lejā pie vārtiem,... (La 3); 'Vipē skrēja lejā uz vārtiem...
(La 2). The other two versions differed from the above: one did
not stress the downward movement at all (Vipē skrēja uz vārtiem... La
1) while the other translated 'he ran as far as the gate... (Vipē
aizskrēja līdz vārtiem,, La 5). Two informants (La 3 and La 5)
have provided perfective versions nošķēja and aizskrēja, and the
first of these has further emphasised the downward movement implicit
in the prefix by combining it with the adv lejā. The combination
of a perfective verb and an adv corresponding to the prefix is, as we
shall find, not uncommon. The adverb has in such instances no
grammatical significance but merely serves to give additional
emphasis.

The basic meaning of the prefix no- is 'away from' and the
corresponding adv will be nost. As examples of this concrete
spatial meaning may be cited: nopemt, nogrūst, nopēst 'to take
away, shove off, to tear off); all have corresponding analytical
forms with nost. Nost is the adverb when the prefix no- has the
more abstract meaning of death or impairment (see 3.21.): cf.
noslēpt (to suffocate). V Staltmane cites two examples of this
verb in the perfective and imperfective respectively: (p) '(Aža)
Neļaušu gaiļam noslēpt'. (REILi 70) "I will not allow the cock
to suffocate." and (i), 'Pāroīs es slapstu nost' (AGrije 26)
"At present I just suffocate."

Also with the meaning 'away from' is the prefix aiz-, though
this is only one of its many meanings. In this meaning at- is replaced by several adverbs: nost (away from), prom or projām (away, off); thus atpemt (p) 'to take away': pemt nost; atgaipēt (p) 'to keep away, drive away': gaipēt prom (i). The prefix at- may be attached to verbs of physical activity where movement in a specific direction is not implied. A verb of this type is 'atvērt' (to open) and here, as we have seen (3.31.) the corresponding adv is valā: i.e. atvērt (p): vērt valā. Where the meaning of at- is 'back' the corresponding adv is either atpakal (back, backwards) or pretī (opposite). The verb atrauties (to draw, start back) has an imperfective form rauties atpakal.

There is a not inconsiderable number of compound verbs where the meaning is 'to approach, come nearer', equivalents of which may also be found in Lithuanian with this prefix.43 Such a verb is atstiegties (to come hurrying) and the aspectual opposition of this verb and its imperfective counterpart is clearly illustrated in the following two examples cited by V. Staltmane: '... Tracis auga arvien lielāks līdz kamēr atstiegties pristava palīgs ar... gardavājiem.' (AUP 1m 579) p: "The turmoil grew greater and greater until the local police inspector hurried up with... some constables". And in a descriptive passage: 'Pēdi mežam aiz purva atstiegties ķurpu rīta gaisma' (EBU Izl 44)44 i: "The morning light used to hurry

43. Cf. the following Lithuanian vbs in at-: ateiti (come, arrive); atvesti (bring); atvešti (carry, bring) etc. The corresponding Latvian verbs do not necessarily have imperfective constructions with ķurpu

44. References here to original source in Staltmane's article and not to pages in article.
here across the woods beyond the moor".

3.323. The above analysis of the **analytical construction** is only intended to be an outline. Many more correspondences could be cited. What is basic to the Latvian **aspectual system** is the substitution of an adverb for the prefix of a compound perfective verb. This adverb is **identical in meaning** with the prefix. As a result the pair of verbs thus formed differ **grammatically**, they belong to **different aspects**. For instance **ieiet iekš to enter** (i) can be substituted for **ieiet (p)**, and **kāpt pāri to step over, to cross** (i) for **pākāpt (p)**.

In theory a form in the **analytical construction** could be established for any compound perfective verb, since the means for creating such forms exists and is productive. We shall find, however, that there are various restrictions placed on the use of this construction and we must now consider what these restrictions are.

3.330. **Restrictions on the use of the analytical construction.**

3.331. In the modern language verbs which are found in the **analytical construction** may omit the adverb where its insertion would lead to repetitiveness. In the following example (cited by V. Staltsane) we have three instances of the verb **uzvilkt** (here in the meaning of 'to put on'): **Olga..., pārērusi virsākau, vilku to virsā nevārēdama iedābut roku piedurknē. Juris ievēroja, ka viņa velk otrādi - ar padrēbi uz augšu... Viņa pārēma jaku un palīdzēja uzvilkt. ASPk 17' **Olga..., seized her jacket and put it on but**
without being able to get her arm into the sleeve. Juris noticed that she was putting it on inside out - with the lining uppermost .... He took the jacket and helped her on with it". In the first instance the form vilka ... virsu is in the analytical construction, with virsu replacing the prefix uz-. she is still in the process of putting the jacket on but without success. The form valk is also imperfective since it is the manner in which the jacket is being put on that is being emphasised and not the completion of the process. In the third and final instance the action is successfully completed and we have the prefixed form usvilkt. It would be possible to add virsu to the word valk but this is unnecessary since the context is clearly imperfective and it is also clear from the same context that we are concerned with usvilkt 'to put on' and not merely the simple verb vilkt 'draw'.

3.332. A prefixed verb may already be constructed with an adverb and the whole phrase has the idea of overcoming an obstacle. Verbs with the prefix iz- and the adverb cauri (the adverbial form of the preposition oaur 'through, across') are limited in this way. An example of this usage is the phrase 'iziet cauri mešam (cf. R projti skvos'les). If one were to use the construction oaur meša this would be a neutral statement whereas the use of cauri implies effort needed to overcome an obstacle. The imperfective form of this phrase excludes the analytical construction; consequently we have the aspectual opposition: iziet cauri mešam (p) 'to cross the wood' izet cauri mešam (j). The imperfective might best be translated 'to go across the wood'; as with the perfective the effort needed to overcome this obstacle is present though the successful outcome
is not envisaged. Similarly the prefix *pa* has no suppletive form in the analytical construction: cf. *pa*ist zem gultas, galda (to crawl under the bed, under the table) where the imperfective is *i*st zem gultas, zem galda.

3.333. There are cases where the verb in its prefixed form is unrelated to its simple form. For instance *apcieitināt* 'to arrest' is only connected in the most tenuous way to the simple verb *cieitināt* 'to harden' and here the prefixed form also functions as an imperfective. Also bi-aspectual are: *atriebt* 'to avenge' *retiliate* which has a simple form *riet*, meaning 'to be repulsive' and *nokļūt* 'to arrive, turn up' where the simple form *klūt* means 'to become'.

3.334. The difference between the prefixed form and the simple form of the verb may not be as great as in the above examples: cf. *uzskatīt* 'to consider' and *skatīt* 'to look'. Again there are verbs where the simple form has either been lost or is very rarely used. Examples of the first type are the prefixed verbs *atzīt* 'to recognise (some quality in someone)', cf *R priznāt*; *pasīt* 'to recognise', cf *R uzsnāt*. There is in Latvian no vb-zīt corresponding to the *R znāt*. Corresponding to *R znāt* we find *zināt* (*cognate with L *soznt*) which differs from the compound verbs in that it has acquired a derivational suffix -ā-. The radical of all three vbs (*zināt*, *atzīt*, *pasīt*) is the morpheme *zin-*. As an example of the second type Staltmane puts forward the verb *paliēzēt* 'to help'. This is certainly not the case; Turkina gives three examples of the simple verb, *liēzēt*: 'zāles labi ne liēzē! 'What is the use of
"It's of no use/avail". In certain contexts therefore līdzēt is still productive. The form palīdzēt also occurs in these contexts: of 'zāles man palīdzēja.' "The medicine relieved me". This is a normal perfective context and contrasts with 'zāles labi līdz' above. As an auxiliary used in conjunction with an infinitive one would normally find palīdzēt: palīdzēt kādam nokāpt! "to help somebody down" or palīdzēt kādam užvilkt mēteli' 'to help somebody on with his (or her) overcoat.'

Perhaps the largest class of bi-aspectual vbs consists of verbs where the separate morphemes making up the verb i.e. prefix, root and derivational stems, have lost their original meaning and acquired a more abstract one. Such a vb is izdot 'to publish, issue'. It is likely that such forms as izdot are calques from Slavic, in this case Russian izdat', on chronological grounds. Many such verbs are to be found within the abstract and technical registers: cf. pārbaudīt 'to check' (the simple vb baudīt means 'to enjoy'); iepazīties 'to investigate'; pārvedēt 'to overlook'; pierādīt 'to prove'. The prefix pār- attached to some of the verbs in this group points to an action being performed a second time: of. pārrakstīt 'to copy' (from rakstīt 'to write'); pārsimēt 'to redesign'; pārbuveš 'to rebuild'; pārsūt 'to re-sow'; pārrēsināt 'to recalculate'.

While this class of vbs is characterised by the fact that it cannot form imperfectives by means of the analytical construction, this does not exclude the use of adverbs in the emphatic role, but which do not bring about a change of aspect: cf. the use of note in the following example from Rudolf's Blaumanis, cited by
V. Staltmane: '... Vipē eisvilka Jāni nost no citiem un spieda tam rokā pusriecienu rupjas meizes (EBI Nov 164). ' He drew John away from the others and pressed into his hand a half slice of coarse bread'. Despite the presence of nost eisvilka remains perfective.


3.341. There are perfective verbs where the range of meaning of the prefix and the verb overlap. The verb kaut 'to kill', 'slaughter' forms its perfective with the aid of the prefix nost which as we have seen (3.21 and 3.322) contains within itself the notion of death and impairment (cf. its use with mirt 'to die'). Without the prefix the verb kaut corresponds to the following verbs with related meanings: nogalināt 'to kill, murder, slay'; nodavēt 'to kill, murder'. The prefix nost does not bring to the verb kaut any new lexical meaning. Nokaut is, however, closely related to such verbs as nost 'to kill; nomaitāt 'to kill, exterminate', nokast 'to bite to death' where the meaning of killing is derived from the prefix alone and which consequently require the analytical construction. As a result of the analogy with these verbs we have the forms: kaut nost;sist nost; maitāt nost; kast nost. Such analogous forms occur with verbs where the range of meaning of the prefix and the vb overlaps or does not differ substantially.

3.342. A similar case is that of the vb lasīt; the simple verb means 'to gather' while the prefix sa- of the perfective form salasīt conveys the idea of 'bringing things or people together'.
Cf. '... Velns lasījis, lasījis bet līdz ar gaišiem visu biruam neaspējis salasīt.' AGr līle 25 (quoted by V. Staltmane, page 23).

"The devil gathered them up and gathered them up until cock-crow, but he couldn't collect all that were astray". In this example the contrast is made between salasīt and lasījis, and the imperfective form is the simple verb. However, in the following example (also from Staltmane, p 23) the imperfective aspect is marked by the use of the analytical construction, though this is in fact redundant since the relationship of sa- to lasīt is a purely formal one, i.e. does not add any new meaning to the verb. The quotation is from Stašti of Birznieks-Ūpītis: 'Māte lasīja kopā sikas stikla drumstalas un mums parmieta ... EBUSt 8' "Mother gathered together the small bits of broken glass and reproached us ..." Here the adverb appropriate to the analytical construction is used. The forms kaut nost and lasīja kopā can only be considered pleonasms. Two possible suggestions as to why these forms are used have been put forward by Staltmane (pp23-24): firstly the use of the analytical construction may have arisen through analogy with forms where the prefix was not a formal one, i.e. where an additional nuance of meaning derived from the prefix: for instance, the simple verbs sist and maitāt mean 'to beat' and 'to damage'; the compound verbs could then be rendered 'to beat to death' and 'to damage fatally'. Alternative this usage may have arisen through a desire to give to the imperfective form expressive colouring which would be absent from the original simple form.

Neither explanation need exclude the other, in fact such a usage would be more likely to develop should the stimulus for change have more than one cause.
3.350. The origins of the analytical construction.

3.351. It is the use of adverbial elements such as nost with the verb kaut where they are redundant that may explain the rise of the analytical construction as a marker of the imperfective aspect of compound verbs. In the first place kaut is not a compound verb, it only becomes one on being perfectivised with the aid of the prefix no-. Since kaut means 'to kill' and nost contains the same idea kaut nost can only show added emphasis; the idea of 'killing' has become more intensive. In other words it stresses the action rather than the completion of the action. In the compound vb on the other hand the prefix no- does point to the completion of the action, though the selection of no- as the marker of the perfective may have depended to a certain extent on the fact that they share the same content, which may also be said of kaut and nost. Nevertheless in the compound form no- kaut the ideational content has been neutralised in favour of the grammatical role which the prefix has to play.

3.352. We are faced with a totally different situation when the prefix no- is used with such verbs as sist 'to beat' or maitat 'to damage'; here it is only in conjunction with no- or nost that these verbs contain the idea of 'killing'. In fact it might even be said that with the verbs nosist and nomaitat the idea of 'killing' contained in the prefix has neutralised the original meanings inherent in the simple verbs sist and maitat.

3.353. The imperfective forms of nosist and nomaitat conforms to
the rules of the analytical construction where in the case of nokaut and salasīt there is a fluctuation between the simple verbs kaut and lasīt and the new pleonastic analytical forms kaut nost and lasīt kopā. The very existence of this fluctuation tends to suggest that the use of adverbial elements to replace prefixes is a fairly recent one, i.e. in the role of aspect markers. Since adverbs are found in conjunction with prefixed verbs without any change of aspect taking place, it is not the combination of verb and adverb that is recent but rather the use of this construction to mark aspect. In fact the combination of verb and adverb is a characteristic feature both of modern literary Latvian, also of Latvian folk-lore. Folk-lore studies have revealed the existence of what have been called polyptota, i.e. adverbs derived from verbs which are used in conjunction with the verb from which they are derived. An example of such a polyptoton is the adverb leķķus translated by Turkina as 'at a gallop'. It has been found, however, in conjunction with the verb lekt 'to jump', leķķus lekt intensifying the idea of 'jumping'. The form leķķus (and the verb leķķot to which it is directly related) are derived ultimately from lekt, and the association of the two forms recalls the association of kaut and nost in that both constructions imply an intensification of the verbal action.

3.3531. Here one may also mention other stylistic modes which are used to emphasise certain sub-categories of the imperfective. Perhaps the commonest of these is reduplication which is, moreover, not confined to Latvian or even to Baltic. A Latvian example of the durative use of reduplication is cited by Erich Hofmann in
his study ‘Ausdrucksverstärkung’ \(^45\) ‘ist, ist, kamer seiast majifu’ \(^46\) which he translated "ging, ging, bis er das Häuschen erreichte".

And a similar example in Lithuanian: ‘gražino, gražino ir praži-gražino savo drabužius’. \(^47\) In both examples the reduplication of the simple verb ist or gražino serves to underline the duration of the action of these verbs, while the perfective verb in the second half of the utterances points to the eventual result of these actions. Hofmann in this study gives many more examples of this type of usage both in durative contexts and iterative contexts.

One feels, however, that such modes of expression may be adequate to stress the imperfectivity of simple verbs which are already imperfective; they cannot, however, serve as markers of aspect.

The same criticism may be levelled at the polyptota mentioned above (3.353.). In this respect the only construction which can be said to have achieved the status of a system remains the analytical construction.


45. Ausdrucksverstärkung, Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, Erganzungshefte, 7-10, p 27.


47. Litauische Volkslieder und Märchen... gesammelt A. Leskien and K. Brugman, Strassburg, 1882 181, 33.
3.41. In the last two chapters we have examined the aspect system of both Lithuanian and Latvian. Both systems show a similarity in the distribution of verbs within the aspectual system and at the same time they differ in the formants they use to make the distinction.

3.42. A characteristic feature of both Baltic languages and a feature in which they differ from Slavic is the existence of a large class of bi-aspectual verbs. Bi-aspectual verbs in themselves are not in themselves an unusual feature of any language which possesses the aspect distinction; what is unusual is the large size of this class in Baltic and the range of meaning which it covers. As one might expect it contains certain verbs which are also to be found in Slavic with this characteristic.

3.421. For instance it would be surprising if statal verbs were not to show this characteristic since no movement or transition from one state to another is implied. Thus La sēdēt, L sēdēti and R sīdet' all mean 'to be sitting' and will most frequently be found in the simple form. Prefixation and hence perfectivisation points to short duration of the act of 'sitting'. The utterance 'He sat for a short time' is translated: La 'Viņš pasēdēja drusu'; L 'Jis pasēdējo trumpušā'; R On posidel nemanogo'.

3.422. Another group of bi-aspectual verbs is that of verbs of perception. This is logical since the act of perceiving infers duration and the absence of the prefix will tend to underline this fact. Where the time elapsed is very short or approximated to a
point, we are concerned with an Aktionsart of the act of perceiving, yet one that will naturally belong to the perfective aspect. In these circumstances in Baltic as in Slavio a prefix will be attached to the verb, cf. R uvidet' 'to see'; uvidet' 'to catch sight of'; La redēt; paredēt; L matyti; pamatyti. The parallelism is not, however, quite exact; R uvidet' is more restricted than pamatyti or paredēt.

3.423. The Baltic languages are also in agreement on another group of bi-aspectual verbs, and here the comparison with Slavio breaks down. This group is prefixed and the distinguishing feature is the fact that the simple verb which would normally correspond to these prefixed forms is either not found or rare, or it may have a totally different meaning. Such is L vykti 'to go, betake oneself' compared to atvykti 'to arrive, to come'. Though vykti with the meanings given above is found in the dictionary (LA260) it is far from common according to a Lithuanian speaking informant. In Latvian the verb nokļūt 'to arrive' is totally unrelated to klūt 'to become', often used as a passive auxiliary. Many such verbs in Lithuanian may be imperfectivised with the aid of the suffix -inėti. In Latvian, however, the analytical construction is excluded with verbs of this group. It would not be possible to substitute klūt nost for nokļūt. To the Lithuanian speaker also the form atvyktinėti is essentially characterised as iterative. The imperfective of atvykti would thus consist of two possible forms: atvykti where iterativeness is not particularly stressed and atvyktinėti where iterativeness is the main consideration.
3.4.24. Another group of verbs which is more often found in the simple form are vbs of speaking: cf. L sakyti, tarti and La sacit, teikt. This use of the non-prefixed forms in both imperfective and perfective contexts is a characteristic feature of these verbs when they serve to introduce another utterance, whether in indirect or direct speech: cf the following Latvian examples: La 'In that oilveks ierumājas Vip teiža: Es aizeju. 'Lie, 4, 69, p 20): "And then the man began to speak. He said: 'I am going away'". The context here is perfective, while in the next utterance the context is imperfective: 'Marta iznāk laukumā. - Ko jus teicat, Šef?' (Lie, 3, 69, p 28): "Martha came out onto the square. - What did you say Chief". The perfective form of this verb, nateikt is used when what is being said is defined more exactly: cf. 'To es nevaru nateikt' (Lie, 3, 69, p 28): "I cannot tell you that". The word that delimits the act of telling. The Lithuanian usage in this respect has already been discussed above (Chap. 2).

Compound verbs of 'saying' share this bi-aspectualism. The verbs 'to answer' atsakāt (also 'to refuse'), atbildēt, 'to add', 'to remark', 'naislāt' are always found in the compound form: the analytical form is excluded. This usage recalls that of other compound abstract verbs, but diverges from Lithuanian usage. The L vb atskakāt is, it is true, more often found in this form, but the imperfective atskakinti is not excluded.

3.4.25. Certain Lithuanian verbs which L Dambriunas claimed were perfective only, (he allocated them to the category of point action verbs) must in many cases be considered bi-aspectual, but with a definite preference for the perfective aspect. A vb of this type
is rasti. 'to find, discover'. In sentence 'Te tilte jie rado,...' (ALLL p3) it is clear that the action is of extremely short duration, the three deserters are walking through the forest when they suddenly come upon the bridge. It is comparable, in fact, to the form pamate in the sentence: jis pamate ja akysirksnui traukinio lange' (L 1) "He caught sight of her momentarily at the train window."

Hence the feature of short duration is inherent in the basic verb and this will account for the frequency of the simple vb rasti in perfective contexts. Yet the form atrasti does exist with the meaning of 'to find again, to find out (the truth)'; the difference between the simple form and the compound atrasti is not very great. In Latvian, however, the simple verb rast is not bi-aspectual or even a point action verb, but is in contrastive opposition with atrast. Since the action of 'finding, coming upon' is normally a sudden action or one of short duration one finds atrast more frequently than corresponding simple form, i.e. in the meaning of 'to find'. The simple verb rast also means 'to become accustomed' as in the example, 'Viņš ir radis agri celties': "He is accustomed to getting up early". The reflexive form rasties has the meaning of 'to arise', 'spring up (unexpectedly)'. Conversely atrasties of which the basic meaning is 'to be found', 'to be' (of R nahodit'sja, Ir se trouver etc.,) has a secondary meaning of 'to turn up' (something which has been lost). The first meaning is also shared by Lat vairasti.

3.425. Latvian and Lithuanian usage is in general agreement in preferring the simple form or a bi-aspectual compound form for auxiliary verbs such as L galēti, La varet 'to be able' and L imti,
pradėti La sakt 'to begin, etc. When used as auxiliary vbs these forms are neutral with regard to aspect. Thus one may use L pradėti or imti followed by an infinitive in both imperfective or perfective contexts. The fact that pradėti is prefixed does not preclude its appearance in imperfective contexts any more than the fact that imti is in the simple form precludes its use in perfective contexts. The La vb sakt again shows preference for the simple form: in a list of eleven examples sakt is to iesakt in a proportion of 8 : 3. A questionnaire which was sent out to four Lithuanian, five Latvian and two Bulgarian informants contained the following sentence: 'It has started', the people shouted when the earth began to tremble.' Here started and began show the verb functioning in both the non-auxiliary and the auxiliary role. The form 'started' was translated into Lithuanian in all cases by praside.io whereas 'began' appeared once as ėmė and three times as pradėjo. For 'started' the Latvian versions had: sākas (twice) ir sācies (twice) and sācies (once); 'began' was in all cases sāka. The two Bulgarian informants used the perfective form zapošna in all cases.

Latvian also possesses the perfective form uzsākt (in addition to iesākt) and this is not found in the auxiliary role. It is found in such locutions as uzsākt sarakšanos 'to enter into correspondence', uzsākt kara darbību 'to open hostilities', uzsākt dziesmu 'begin (to strike up) a song', and uzsākt strīdu 'to raise (pick) a quarrel'. It is possible to regard this form as a separate lexeme or as an Aktionsart. In all the above mentioned examples we are concerned with the moment when an action commences. The act of 'beginning' is not characterised by duration. There is
an obvious link here with these inceptive verbs which are marked by a prefix rather than the use of an auxiliary.

The main characteristic of a verb functioning as an auxiliary is the fact of its dependence. It is not a totally free form but is always found in conjunction with another verb (usually in the infinitive or a suppletive of the infinitive). It is possibly from the fact that it is dependent on another verb that the auxiliary verb has passed into the bi-aspectual class.

3.50. **The aspectual system in Baltic.**

3.51. Though it can be established without difficulty that an aspectual system exists in Baltic comparable to the Slavic system, certain features stand out as being peculiar to Baltic. The first and most noteworthy is the existence of a large class of bi-aspectual verbs. This class includes not only simple verbs which by their nature show a preference for one aspect, i.e. statal verbs, but also prefixed verbs which have no simple or imperfectivised forms.

3.52. The importance of the restrictions which speakers of these languages impose on the use of markers of imperfectivisation is central to our understanding of this problem. These restrictions would seem - at least in part - to be based on the retention of the original meaning of these markers. For instance the L imperfective formant -inéti is still felt as iterative or intensive. A verb such as atvykti 'to come, arrive' appears unchanged in imperfective contexts which do not stress either of these values.
There exists the form atvykdit which stresses the iterative value of this suffix. Thus the aspectual pattern of this verb is: atvykti (p); atvykti (i) and atvykdit (i and iter). Hence the Baltic languages show an incomplete aspectual system. It is this lack of polarity which is characteristic and which tends to suggest that these languages show an intermediate stage between the existence of aspectual features side by side with a tense system which stresses anteriority and non-anteriority and the Slavic system where aspect is hierarchically superior to tense.

3.53. The next problem which must be considered is the existence of certain tense forms which in themselves convey differences of aspect. Such tense forms are, of course, also to be found outside Slavic and Baltic, but there they form separate elements within a tense system; they do not interact with an aspectual category which subsumes within it an entire verbal paradigm. The tenses in question are the aorist and the imperfect and they are to be the subject of the following chapter.
4.10. The time has come to define more fully the terms aorist and imperfect. In the first instance the terms refer in all circumstances to those tenses which are so named in all those modern Slavic languages which still possess simple past tenses. Secondly these terms will include tenses corresponding to the Slavic forms in Baltic, though throughout the text the Baltic names for these tenses will be used. Thus the Slavic imperfect is compared with the Lithuanian frequentative past or the frequentative forms in Latvian. Since the range of these tenses is not always directly comparable a Baltic preterite may on occasion be compared with a Slavic imperfect.

4.11. Both the aorist and the imperfect in Slavic are past tenses and in this sense they both form contrastive oppositions with the present which is non-past. Again a contrast exists between them in so far as an utterance containing an aorist refers to a specific point in time; the imperfect is not so marked, but is dependent in this respect on the aorist. An action in the imperfect can be considered to be taking place at the same time as an action in the aorist. The imperfect shares with the present the notion of duration. Both aorist and imperfect tense may be used to describe repeated actions; the imperfect stresses here the repetitive or habitual nature of the action whereas the aorist points to a series of short term actions envisaged as one whole. In this respect the time elapsed between each action is important; when the aorist is used it will be very short. If, for instance,
one were shearing sheep and one sheared one sheep after the other the verb form would be aorist, since each action is short and is completed before the next one is commenced. Moreover the whole series of actions is regarded as being completed. The lapse of time between repeated actions in the imperfect can be much longer.

For instance one could say of a farmer that he went to market every Thursday. Here a full week has elapsed between each visit and what is more important the series of visits is not regarded as closed. It will be seen that many of these notions are shared by the corresponding Baltic forms and the comparison between the two language groups will be studied in greater detail in the next chapter.

4.12. Reference was made to those Slavic languages which still possess simple past tenses (4.10.) and it is a fact that the number of languages which still possess these tenses as living forms is now quite small. With the exception of splinter groups (such as Upper Lusatian) the aorist and imperfect has been eliminated totally from the East and West Slavic groups. The simple tenses in these groups have been replaced by the compound tenses; these are compound tenses, of course, only in diachronic terms since East Slavic has lost the auxiliary completely, while in West Slavic only Czech retains the auxiliary; in Polish the auxiliary has been reduced to a set of personal endings which resemble other clitics in that they are semi-free morphemes (they may be attached to other parts of speech).

In the South Slavic area Slovene and SCr largely resemble Czech in that they retain the auxiliary. Serbo-Croat retains the
aorist and imperfect as part of the verbal paradigm, but they are less and less used, being replaced elsewhere by the compound perfect tense. In fact it is only in Bulgarian and Macedonian that we find these two simple tenses as living forms. Henceforth our examples will be drawn from this source.

4.13. Several factors have played a part in the disappearance of the simple past tenses from the greater part of the Slavic area. Perhaps the most important factor is phonological change. Phonological changes have affected all parts of the verbal paradigm, but the most significant from our point of view are those changes which have affected the simple past tenses. The distinctiveness of these two tenses stemmed from the fact that they possessed a) different stems and b) different sets of personal endings. Even in the OCS period, however, they shared certain endings (-ni of the 1P sg, 1P pl -mi, I, 2, 3P du -vë, -ta, -te, and the 2P pl -te) and it was a difference of both stem and ending combined which distinguished imperfect from aorist. In theoretical terms even if the endings of both paradigms were identical the thematic differences would be sufficient to keep the two paradigms apart.

The imperfect has the same stem as the present while the aorist has a non-present stem. This is apparent in the 3P sg of the B verb pëla to write. pres: pëla/imperfect pëla-ë: aor pësa. The Bulgarian example cited shows a present stem pëla in contrastive opposition with the non-present stem pësa; both aor and present show a zero suffix. The fusion of stems resulting from contraction led to decrease in the number of distinctive features until with many modern Bulgarian verbs the distinctive feature of the imperfect
remains the formant -ke of the 2/3P sg.

The phonological changes which affected the aor and imp so strongly were accompanied by an increasing use of the perfect (a compound tense) to replace the aorist. The perfect had the supreme advantage that it was very different in form from the imperfect. The ultimate replacement of the imperfect by the same compound past tense must in some way have been favoured by the close association between the concepts of imperfective and perfective.
A close association had always existed between tense and aspect, and it is maintained that at least in the minds of the speakers of those Slav languages which have lost the simple past tenses, the following relationship had arisen: aor: perfective - imperfect: imperfective. The fluctuation between the use of a simple past tense (aor) and a compound past tense (perfect) has also been observed in Baltic. The utterance: "It has begun,"... was translated into Latvian by the preterite (twice) jākās, and three times by the perfect: Ir vācīes (2 X) and vācīes. Yet all the Lithuanian informants preferred a preterite: prasidėjo. The two Bulgarian informants likewise preferred a perfective aor: započe.

It is in effect with the interaction of tense and aspect that we shall be concerned. In the first instance we shall discuss briefly in the following section the way in which this interaction is reflected in Bulgarian and Macedonian. Subsequently it is intended to discuss in greater detail the tense/aspect relationships which are to be found in the Baltic languages.

4.20. The interaction of tense and aspect in Bulgarian and Macedonian.
4.21. **Bulgarian.**

4.211. The relationship between tense and aspect in Bulgarian is governed by the characteristic features of the actions described. Hence, since both the imperfect tense and the imperfective aspect may express duration, in a context where duration is implied to the exclusion of other types of action the vb form would be imperfect and the aspectual category selected the imperfective: the aorist, which is not marked for duration, would be excluded. Where the action is clearly limited in time and, moreover, forms part of a sequence the imperfective aorist is used. Cf. the following example taken from the already mentioned questionnaire: 'He continued on his way and walked for two hours. In all that time he saw only two people.' The two versions submitted were in complete agreement as to the vb form and the aspect to be used: (B1) Toj prodălēti pătja si i vărvja 2 časa. Pres cjaloto vreme vidjamo dvama duži; (B2) Toj prodălēti pătja si i vărvja dva časa. Pres cjaloto tova vreme vidjamo dvama duži. The narrative sequence requires the aorist for all three verbs of the sequence. The second aorist vărvja is imperfective since it is characterised by the additional nuance of time elapsed, though here clearly limited: dva časa (two hours).

4.212. The aorist is above all the narrative tense and it is in this function that it can be compared with narrative tenses in other languages. Since narration exhibits a linear scale it follows that the aorist too follows this pattern. This sequential linear pattern is a feature too of the perfective aspect and any
sequence of events will consequently be rendered by the perfective aorist unless, as on the example quoted above (4.211) other factors exist to modify this process. The imperfect on the other hand never appears in a linear sequence of this type. The example which follows shows that we must use different terminology to describe actions in the imperfect which closely follow one another. Cf. 'The shop door was constantly opening and shutting'. The two variants were: (B1) Vratata na magazina neprekášnato se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše; (B2) Vratata na magazina se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše postojanno. The actions described by the verbs otvarjaše and zatvarjaše are not to be regarded as occurring in sequence but as being part of a continuous process. This opinion is confirmed by the use of the adverbs neprekášnato (without interruption) and postojanno (constantly).

4.213. In the last example the function of the imperfect was to describe a continuous process. This process was not itself to be regarded as one of the events in the narration but as taking place at the same time as an unspecified action in the aorist. More than one imperfect action may occur side by side, cf. 'He was running to and fro, busying himself now with this, now with that.' (B1) Toj tičaše nasam-natah, kato se zanimavaše tu s tova, tu s onova; (B2) Toj tičaše nasam-natah, kato se zanimavaše tu s tova tu s onova. In fact, since the imperfect tense does not possess the narrative function of the aorist there is no restriction on the number of imperfect actions occurring simultaneously.

4.214. The imperfect tense has as we have seen been closely
associated with the imperfective aspect. This relationship derives from the similarity of roles which this tense and aspect have assumed. Certain relationships may be briefly summarised as follows: actions looked upon as processes, durative actions, habitual actions, iterative actions where the series of repeated actions is regarded as unlimited though each action may very well be completed. The aorist too may appear in iterative contexts, but here the series of actions is regarded as one whole and forms part of a larger series.

If one takes the aorist to be the marked member in relation to the narrative sequence then the imperfect is the unmarked member of this opposition. Yet at the same time the imperfect is dependent on this narrative sequence; it provides the environment, the background to the sequence. The elimination of the opposition between the simple tenses which has taken place in East and West Slavic does not alter this basic concept. Here the perfective is the marked member and the imperfective the unmarked. The imperfective verbs in a narrative sequence are dependent on the perfective vbs. The above statement does not, of course, cover all the functional roles of tense and aspect in the modern Bulgarian literary language. It is merely intended to point to the following basic tendency: the tendency for the vast majority of imperfects to be found in imperfective contexts and for aorists to be found in perfective contexts.

4.215. The phonological reductions which have reduced the differences between the stem and suffixal morphemes which formerly separated these two tenses on the formal level may, it is believed, have
contributed to an even closer relationship between tense and aspect than would be allowed by prescriptive grammarians. This point has been noted by Howard I Aronson when he says: 48 "At this point mention should be made of an evergrowing tendency in the development of the Bulgarian verbal system. There is a tendency to form the imperfect tense only from imperfective stems and the aorist only from perfective stems. This is especially true of verbs where the underlying form is perfective, and less true where the underlying form is a non-prefixixed imperfective (not derived from an underlying perfective). This has as a result the formal differentiation of the imperfect and the aorist in those forms where in the older system they might have been homonymous. In this system truncation on the level of imperfectivization fulfills the same role as it does between the non-past and the aorist stems..." The older system shows a theoretical differentiation between the aorist and the imperfect in both aspects, but as can be seen from the paradigm (from Aronson) below it is only in the 2/3P sg that the two tenses are distinguished:

**OLDER SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aorist imperfect</td>
<td>aorist imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došakvax</td>
<td>došakax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došakva došakvaše</td>
<td>došaka došakaše</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došakvaxme</td>
<td>došakaxme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došakvaxte</td>
<td>došakaxte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došakvaza</td>
<td>došakaza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what Aronson has called the innovating system no such ambiguity can arise:

**INNOVATING SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aorist (Perfective)</th>
<th>Imperfect (Imperfective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>došakax</td>
<td>došakvax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došaka</td>
<td>došakvaše</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došakaxme</td>
<td>došakvaxme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došakaxte</td>
<td>došakvaxte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>došakaxa</td>
<td>došakvaxa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those alternations between aorist and imperfect which are still distinctive would be imperilled by the spread of this system. Such is the alternation 3-5 which appears in the verb opisah (p) to describe, cf. aorist opisah: imp opišeh.

The corresponding imperfective opposition is: 1P opisvah (aor): opisvah (imp); 2-3P opisva: opisvaše. The innovating system would lead to the loss of the imperfective aorist opisvah, but also the perfective imperfect opišeh, and would leave us with the following opposition: imperfect opisvah (i): aorist opisah (p).

It is likely that the growth of homonymous forms was a contributory factor in the development of this process. It is believed that the factor of homonymy alone would not be sufficient to explain this development, were it not for the close association

49. Aronson, op cit., p 156

50. Here we have replaced -x- by the usual transliteration used in this study -h-.
already noted between tense and aspect. It is idle to speculate on the eventual outcome of this development, nevertheless the present tendencies suggest a re-alignment of the tense-aspect relationship on the basis of a one to one opposition of tense and aspect, i.e. imperfect: imperfective - aorist: perfective.

4.30. Macedonian.

4.51. In the previous section reference was made to the subordination of tense to aspect. The closely related Macedonian language has travelled some distance along this path. Horace G Lunt in his *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language* defines the imperfect (p 87): "General meaning: action viewed as contemporaneous with another moment in the past and non-distanced.... and further (foot p 87 - top p 88)... in the course of a narrative there is frequently a contrast of aorist (terminative)\(^51\) and imperfect (interminative)\(^51\) verbs. The aorists mark simple points in past time. They build a chain of events and actually tell the story, while the imperfects denote actions coordinated with the aorists. The imperfects paint the background against which the aorists take place." An example of a narrative sequence of aorists from V. Maleski-Tale’s story "Kladista na Frosina" (from Lunt, op cit, pp 140-151) shows how this tense provides the skeleton of the story: cf. 'Taа gi prodada dvata zagona kaj "Sarkinica", kupi obleka za umiradka i ne potera ni tri mesecii - umre. "She sold two measures of land near "Sarkinica", bought some grave clothes and before three months were up - died" (Lunt, p 143). Conversely

51. Lunt uses *terminative* and *interminative* rather than the conventional *perfective* and *imperfective*. 
The years passed. Jane came every winter, stayed for a month or so and then returned to Bucharest. Frosina bore children, and when she had raised them a bit, they died. She bore five, and they all died.' The imperfect actions in this action are - to quote Lunt - "presented in the process of happening". They are also repeated. What is more important they are all dependent on the two aorists rodi, umira which end the extract.

All the imperfects are imperfective with the exception of the form ke ... podrasteše and the important element here is the particle ke, which also functions as a marker of the future tense. The perfective imperfect as indeed the perfective present only occurs with certain modal particles - notably ke and da. The particle ke is interesting since it may render iterative actions in addition to the future in the past, and potential actions.

4.32. The imperfective aorist is rare. With the repetition of the verb the use of the imperfective may merely point to the intensity of the action. More frequently such forms are found when it is a question of an action covering a specific period of time, as in the example (Lunt, op cit, p 95): 'Dva i pol meseca toj sede bez robota.' "For two and a half months he sat around without work". The use of the imperfective aorist in such constructions arises from the fact that the aorist itself cannot express intensity or even limited duration, and one must have
4.4. **Summary.**

4.41. Both South Slavic languages are in agreement on the role of the aorist as the narrative form. As a narrative form it is linked with the perfective aspect, yet its functional load is inherent. This is clear from the presence in a narrative sequence of aorists in the imperfective. There the properties which allow an aorist to function as the marker of individual moments in a narrative are still present since they derive from the tense and not from the aspect. The imperfective aorist, however, has acquired the additional nuances of intensity or duration and these features derive from the aspect and not from the tense.

4.32. The imperfective imperfect is the normal form and the appearance of this tense in perfective contexts is restricted in the two languages. In Macedonian in particular the perfective imperfect is only found in conjunction with certain modal particles.

4.43. A contributory factor which has lead to the redistribution of tense and aspect in both languages has been the reduction of effectiveness of those stem and suffixal morphemes which formerly (either in isolation or in combination) distinguished the two tense forms. This has resulted in the restriction in Macedonian of the perfective imperfect to the use with modal particles, and in Bulgarian in a tendency to form the imperfect exclusively from imperfective stems and the aorist from perfective stems.
4.44. It is now proposed to compare the past tense usage (i.e. aorist and imperfect) in Bulgarian with similar usage in Lithuanian and Latvian. For this purpose a questionnaire was prepared consisting of sentences in English; each informant was required to provide a version in his own language. It is hoped that by comparing the two Baltic languages with Bulgarian we shall obtain an insight into the development of these tense forms in Baltic.
5.0. A comparison of the simple past tense forms of Bulgarian, Lithuanian and Latvian.

5.1. In Bulgarian and Macedonian, as we have seen, the opposition of two simple past tense forms is an inherited feature, fully developed in OCS, and clearly of common Slavic origin. It must be stated here that no such opposition existed in the Common Baltic period, and therefore, such tense oppositions that do exist in the individual Baltic languages are the result of internal development within these languages.

5.2. The simple past tenses in Lithuanian are respectively the preterite and the frequentative past. The thematic morpheme marking the preterite consists of two alternants -ė and -ė; to these thematic vowels the endings are added for person and number: 1 sg -u, 2 sg -i, 3p -ė, 1 pl -me, 2pl -te, giving the following paradigms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sg</td>
<td>-su</td>
<td>-ieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sg</td>
<td>-ai</td>
<td>-ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>-ė</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1pl  -ome  -ėme
2pl  -ote  -ėte

The distribution of the two classes need not concern us. Type II

52. Lithuanian also retains dual endings: 1 -va, 2 -ta.
is purely preterital while type I is also found functioning as a present (i.e. matyti : 3P pres mato, žinoti, 3P pres žino).
There is, however, no possibility of confusion between past and non-past since -o never occurs in the same role within one paradigm: i.e. 3P pres mato: 3P pret matu; 3P pres žino: 3P pret žinojo).

5.21. The frequentative past in Lithuanian differs from the preterite in that it belongs exclusively to type I, and the endings of type I are added onto the tense formant -dav: the full form -davo (the 3P is used here for convenience) is then attached directly to the infinitive stem of the verb: eiti 'to go' fp eidavo; vesti 'to lead': vesdavo; sekyti 'to say': sakydavo.

Though the frequentative past forms part of the Lithuanian literary standard it is not a common Lithuanian feature but is confined to the Aukštaitiški dialect area. It is from this dialect that the standard language has acquired the tense. Since the fp is a relatively recent development and was originally confined to the Aukštaitiški area and those Laimiški speakers at the common frontier of the two dialect areas it has not spread beyond Lithuanian. Latvian as we shall see responds to the need for a past tense expressing habitual action in a totally different way.

5.3. The simple past tense in Latvian.

5.31. If the Literary Latvian language has not followed Lithuanian in developing a special suffix to express habitual or frequentative action in the past there can be no doubt that the preterite is of the same common Baltic origin as in Lithuanian. The marker of
the preterite in Latvian is -a. On account of the heavy stress on
the first syllable in Latvian the original long vowel of this
suffix has been shortened: the former long vowel is reinstated
in reflexive forms of the past tense; cf. nestī 'to carry', pret
nessī: refl nesīs. There were originally two forms -ā and -ē as
in Lithuanian, but -ā has everywhere been generalised in the
standard language. In dialects the form nese has been retained
beside the standard nesa.53 These dial forms show the same relation¬
ship to the trans-intrans opposition that is found with the
Lithuanian -o/-ė: of dega 'burned' (intr): dedse (trans)...54

5.32. The Latvian frequentative past.

Though there is no suffix in Latvian to indicate frequentative
action that does not mean that Latvian has no means at its
disposal to express this nuance. In the third chapter the aspect
system in Latvian was discussed and the tendency towards analytical
modes was observed. That this tendency should spread to the
expression of other verbal nuances is to be expected. In the place
of the Lithuanian suffix -davo appears a free or semi-free form.
This free or semi-free form possesses the same functional load
as the Lithuanian suffix. In this instance Latvian has made use
of an auxiliary verb.

5.321. The vb mēst.


54. ChrSt., p 189.
If one looks up the verb *mēgt* in Mühlenbach's *Lettisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, vol II, under *mēgt* (2) one finds the following explanation: "gewohnt sein, pflegen (mit abhäng. Infin)... This can be glossed in English by 'to be used to' and the construction of *used* followed by a dependent infinitive closely parallels the Latvian usage. Cf. the English sentence: 'Every year the used to travel to Europe to visit friends.' The Latvian versions of this sentence all substitute the preterite of *mēgt* for the English words *used to*: Lat: Katru gadu vēpi mēdzē cēlot uz Eiropu, lai apmeklētu draugus. All versions agree on the use of *mēdzē cēlot.*

The Lithuanian versions of the same sentence have *vašiuodavo* (2 X), *kelisudavo* (1 X) and finally *keliave* (1 X), thus showing a preference for the frequentative past in this context. Similarly the Bulgarian versions both have the imperfect *pātuvaha*.

The construction *mēdzē* followed by a dependent infin in the above example bore the same functional load as the Lithuanian vb form in *-davo*, or the Bulgarian imperfect *pātuvaha*; i.e. this construction served to convey the notion of *past habitual action*. It is important to examine the range of meaning of this construction and also of the Lithuanian fp in *-davo*.

5.322. As important as the range of meaning of these forms is the regularity of distribution. If the regularity of distribution is low it may be impossible to establish an effective opposition between these forms and the preterite. Again the preferences of individual informants is to be regarded as idiosyncratic unless they are confirmed by other informants or from other sources.
5.33. Initially it was decided to take as a basis for comparison the Lithuanian versions. The reason for this choice was the fact that Lithuanian seemed to occupy an intermediate position between the well established Bulgarian position and the less well defined Latvian usage of mögt. Moreover the Lithuanian fp forms a part of the normal Lithuanian vb paradigm whereas no prescriptive grammar of Latvian allots such a place to the construction with mögt.

5.34. There can be no doubt that the Lithuanian fp has a high frequency and it bears a similar relationship to the preterite that we find between the Bulgarian imperfect and aorist. In a narrative sequence it is the preterite that tells the story while the fp is dependent on the other events or else provides a background against which the main events unfold. In the following example from Juozas Baltušis (TKN p 64) the dead teacher's wife Zilaitienė is not sure what to think of the man Jonas Kaupys who has entered her life: 'Mašai ir tepažistami buvo, tik iš tolo pasisveikindavo.' "They were only slightly acquainted, they had only been in the habit of exchanging greetings". The form pasisveikindavo is dependent on the first part of the sentence tepažistami buvo since it elaborates on the type of relationship that existed between Zilaitienė and Jonas Kaupys; secondly it stresses the habitual nature of the act of 'exchanging greetings'; thirdly it is perfective and the series of habitual action is looked upon as being already completed before the moment of utterance.

5.34.1. Verbs in the frequentative past may occur simultaneously
or virtually at the same time. Again from Juozas Baltušis (TKN p55):

"Nešinojo, kad rytais Jonas Kaupys rasdavo prie durų prismeigtų, nuplišė su keikamais ir grūmijais. Jis suplébydavo tylėdamas imesdavo pakurton krosnių, o kita naktį, vél skubėjo pirma prie durų - nuplišė popieriai, kol Zilaitienė nepasikilo, nepastebejo niesko. "She didn't know that in the morning Jonas Kaupys used to find stuck to the door a slip of paper with curses and threats on it. He would tear it up, and without speaking throw it into the stove which he had lit, and yet another morning he hurried first to the door to tear the paper up before Zilaitienė got up and noticed it". The series of frequentative past tenses depends initially on the verb nešinojo (She didn't know). The actions of the vbs rasdavo, suplébydavo, imesdavo are all very short and for this reason are perfective. Because they are so short they may be regarded as happening virtually at the same time. They are in contrastive opposition to the verb skubėjo which refers to one specific event and represents a resumption of the narrative.

5.342. The common feature to be found in all the examples cited above is frequentativeness. Moreover not only are the actions frequent but they are characterised by regularity. When Jonas Kaupys found the slip of paper, tore it up and threw it into the stove that had been lit, the actions form a regular pattern.

Similar are the fp actions in a further example from Juozas Baltušis (PTD p 41): Vakarais įjungdavo radiją arba televizorių ir tuoj pasiimdavo į rankas japonišką dramblio kaulo liūtą! "In the evenings she would turn on the radio or television and straight-
away take into her hand the ivory Japanese lion." The regularity of these actions is confirmed by the use of the adverbial element Vakarais 'in the evenings'. Again on page 45 of the same story:

Nuo to laiko aš visada rasdavau kavę jau paruoštą. "From that time on I always found the coffee already prepared." This sentence is followed by other verbs in the same tense, all referring to the habitual nature of the preparations made to receive the narrator when he called. Yet in the same paragraph: Apie viską ji kalbėjo laisvai,... "She talked on every subject freely,... Here the emphasis does not lie on the repetitive of habitual nature of the action but rather on the fact that it is a general statement. This statement refers to a time prior to the moment of utterance but is valid both then and subsequently.

5.40. If one may posit the habitual-iterative role for the Lithuanian frequentative past it would be logical to suppose that the Latvian mēgt would play the same role. Nevertheless it is important to establish the range of meaning and distributional range of this form. In the following example which is taken from a translation (1954) of George Orwell's Animal Farm we find the construction with mēgt used to translate a habitual past action (DzF p 12) pirmas daudz gadiem, kad es vēl biju mazs sīvēns, mana māte un pārejas oņenes mēdz dziedāt vecu dziesmu, no kurās tās zināja tikai meldju pirmos trīs vārdus. (Orwell's original version: Many years ago when I was a little pig, my mother and the other sows used to sing a song of which they knew only the tune and the first three words). And from the same text: (AF p 48) 'It was noticed that they wagged their tails to him in
The same way as the other dogs had been used to do to Mr. Jones. "The vicināja savas astes, viņam klātesot, tāpat kā citi supi to medze darīt ar Džonsu." And further from an original Latvian source, Jānis Jaunssudrabīčs from Balta Grāmata (p 135) 'Dāti to medze darīt tikai Lieldienās rītā.': "Some would do this only on Easter morning."

The next group of examples is taken from the answers to the questionnaire. The first sentence was: Every year they used to travel to Europe to visit friends. Since all the answers were in agreement here one version should suffice: "Katru gadu viņi medze oelot uz Eiropu, lai apgrietinātu draugus." And sentence 13: 'He handed over a book to each of the children; every birthday they used to receive a new book'. Four out of five informants agreed on the use of medze in this example, thus: (La 2) "Viņi pasniedza grāmatu katram no berniem; katra dzimšanas diena viņi medze sapemā pa jaunai grāmatai. The fifth informant used the preterite in his version (vīpi sapēma), and indeed it could be argued that the habitual nature of the action is already self-evident from the use of the adverbial phrase katra dzimšanas diemā (on every birthday). Nevertheless the Lithuanian version has: "Jis įteikė po knygg kiekvienam vaikui; kiekvieno gimtadienio proga jie gaudavo po knygą." Whatever differences exist between the four versions all are agreed on the use of the frequentative past gaudavo. Again in sentence 27, 'He always wrote to his parents when he was away from home', three out of four Lithuanian informants prefer the fp, and one of the three even used ražinédavo, thereby doubly stressing the regularity and frequency of the action. Four of the Latvian informants, however, use the preterite
rakšīt. Only one (La 2) emphasises the habitual nature of the action: mēda rakstīt. Again in sentence 28: 'He threw the logs onto the fire which soon burnt more brightly. Then from time to time he would throw another log on to keep the fire in.' The Lithuanian versions have rendered would throw by įmėsdavo (twice) and uimėsdavo (once). The Latvian versions are: piemeta (La 5 and La 2), iemeta (La 1) meta (La 4) and medza iezviest (La 3). Only one informant has used medza; it is, however, not the same as in sentence 27, (La 2); he admitted in a conversation about the use of mēda that he showed a preference for the form.

5.41. An examination of the above examples leads one to suspect that potentially the construction of megt followed by a dependent infinitive is more widespread than a quantitative analysis would suggest. It is true that a certain amount of controversy surrounds the construction with megt. One informant (La 5) maintained that the construction was obsolescent and he used medza only in sentence 1. Another informant (La 1), a schoolgirl from Soviet Latvia used the form twice (sentence 1 and sentence 13). The highest count is La 2 with five examples (sentences 1, 13, 20 and 27). Next in order comes La 3 with three examples (sentences 1, 13, and 28). La 4 agrees with La 1 both in the number of examples (2) and in the particular examples chosen (sentences 1 and 13). It is interesting that age appears to have had little influence: La 1 is very much younger than La 4. Moreover in view of her origins one would expect to find here the most recent usage.

5.42. If one arbitrarily selects the four examples - sentences
1, 13, 20 and 27 as a normal potential distribution, one factor stands out: three contain some form of the word *katra* (every): *katru gadu* (1) *katra dzimšanas diena* (13); *katru nedēju* (20). Sentence 27 contains the adverb *viennēr* (always, constantly, perpetually, LatTur), but here too one could re-phrase the sentence: 'Every time he was away from home he used to write to his parents'. All these verbal actions show not only a high degree of frequency but also of consistency. They take place at regular intervals: *katru gadu; katra dzimšanas diena; katru nedēju*. Similar is the example from Jēnis Jaunsudrabīšš: *Daži to mēdu darīt tikai Lieldienas rītā.* (JJBGr p 132). Here the action *mēdu darīt* has as a referent the phrase *tikai Lieldienas rītā*.

5.421. The referent need not always be such a clearly defined period of time. The two examples from Dzīvnieku Farma refer to less well-defined periods. In the first example the lapse of time is quite extensive: (DzF p 12) 'Pirms daudz gadiem, kad es vēl biju maza sivēns, mana māte ... mēdu dzied... Here *mēdu dzied* refers to the clause *kad es vēl biju maza sivēns*. In the second sentence, the dogs wag their tails as other dogs used to do with Jones ... tāpat ka oiti supi mēdu darīt ar Džonsu.' The period referred to is limited only at the upper end by the revolt of the animals.

5.4211. A comparison with the Lithuanian versions of certain sentences from the questionnaire show that all the time referents may be present and yet the Latvian informants do not use *mēgt*. One such sentence is number two: The farmer drove into the market

---
regularly; there he bought what he needed and sold his produce. Once a year he sold a bull.' All the Lithuanian forms use the fp throughout and this is what one might expect. All the actions are habitual even though the time elapsed in the case of the last verb sold is longer than with the other verbs. Since all are in agreement one example should suffice: "Jokininkas regulariai vakarodavo į turgę; šia jaus pirkdavo kas jam reikalinga ir pardodavo savo gaminius. Kartą metuose jis pardodavo buliu." (L3). And a corresponding Latvian version is: "Lauksaimnieks braucn ēs turgu regulāri; tur viņš pirk ta ko viņam vajadzēja un pārdod savus ražojumus. Reizi gada viņš pārdod buli." (L4). Potentially the Latvian version could substitute forms with mēgt for all the simple preterites which depend on regulāri and reizi gada. Thus, mēra, braukt, mēra pirk t and mēra pārdot (twice). It could be remarked that this is not necessary since the habitual nature of the action is adequately marked by the presence of the adverbs regulāri and reizi gada. Nevertheless the habitual construction is used with mēgt in other instances where the habitual nature of the action is indicated by adverbs: cf. sentences 1, 13, 20, 27 and 28.

5.430. The emphatic nature of mēgt.

5.431. Though potentially the construction with mēgt could form the basis for an habitual past, in opposition with the simple preterite, the potentiality of this form has not been realised. Its low frequency when compared with the Lithuanian frequentative past in -davo must be put down to the emphatic colouring of the
lexeme mögt. When mögt is found with such adverbs as katru gādu, katru nedēļu, katrā dzimšanas dienā, laiku pa laikam etc., it emphasises the habitual nature of the action, but that the action is habitual is clear from the adverbs used. Where the time referent does not possess this habitual colouring mögt is more likely to be used.

5.4.32. Whenever the Latvian speaker uses mögt in Lithuanian a form in -davo is used. The exceptions to this are few. If we take the maximum number of sentences where mēdzā is present and analyse them the relationship between the two forms will become clear: sentence 1 - vārdavodavo (L 1 and 3), keliaavo (L 4), keliaudavo (L 2); mēdzā sapast (La 1, 2, 3 and 4), sapėma (La 5); pareidinéjei (L 2), present (L 1), griždavai (L 3 and 4): atgriezies/nāci (La 1), mēdzat atgriezies/nākt/brēukt (La 2), parbraucēt (La 3), present (La 5); S 27 - ražydamo (L 1 and 3), rašinėdavo (L 4), rašē (L 2); rašēja (La 1, 3, 4 and 5), mēdzā rakstīt (La 2); S 28 - įmesdavo (L 3 and 4), užmesdavo (L 1), omitted (L 2): mēdzā iesviecit (La 3), piemeta (La 2 and 5) iemeta (La 1), meta (La 4).

If we attempt to quantify these results by giving a plus to all forms of the habitual past and a minus to all preterites (and inaccurate renderings in other than past tenses) the following pattern arises:
The Lithuanian totals are: plus 15 and minus 4; the Latvian: plus 12 and minus 13. Even when one allows for the fact that the minus totals include errors in the rendering of the English sentences (including in one case omission) the differences are quite striking. The preference shown for the fp in contexts where the action is habitual shows a proportion of over 3:1. In the Latvian versions the proportions are nearer 45–50. The above quantification is not absolutely accurate but does, it is hoped show the general tendencies of the two languages.

5.433. The above comparison of Lithuanian and Latvian usage shows how Lithuanian has travelled further along the road taken by the Slavic languages (albeit at a considerably later date) in the creation of a contrastive opposition between simple past tenses. The Latvian construction with the appropriate tense of mēgt followed by a dependent infinitive is not used sufficiently frequently to form the basis of such an opposition. The factor that has prevented this construction from assuming the functional load of the Lithuanian frequentative past is assuredly not the analytical form of the construction since both Baltic languages tolerate compound tenses, for instance the tenses of the Latvian relative mood. Moreover the more conservative Lithuanian exhibits a
frequentative variant of the remote past (pluperfect), formed with the aid of the fp form of the vb 'to be', cf. s 27: (L 3) 'Jis
vīzuonēt raždavo tēvams, kai būdavo išvokavo iš namy' (He always wrote to his parents when he was away from home). In fact
Lātvian shows a preference for the analytical rather than the synthetic
type of construction (cf. the analytical construction used to create
imperfective equivalents for prefixed perfective vbs). The real
cause is to be found in the fact that the construction with mēt
has not attained grammatical status but has remained a stylistic
variant of the preterite.

It is true that the construction with mēt is more highly
specialised than the preterite which, at least in the imperfective
aspect, contains a habitual frequentative nuance. Yet the preterite
used to describe habitual past action is not itself characterised
by this nuance to the exclusion of all other shades of meaning: it
is arguable that the frequentative-habitual nuances are in fact
derived from the aspect rather than the tense. The habitual nature
of the action is in any case indicated externally, i.e. by adverb-
ial elements. Though the construction with mēt may be and often
is accompanied by the same adverbial elements the habitual nature
of the action is inherent in the vb mēt and the adverbial markers
are here redundant.

5.4.34. The relationship of the construction with mēt to the aspect
system is rather complicated. One informant on being consulted
(La 2) stated that in his opinion the forms with mēt are automatically
imperfective despite the forms of the infinitive. Thus sapant
(s 13) and ieavies (s 28) are technically perfective vbs, yet
the combination mēdza sapant and mēdza ieavies are to be re-
garded as imperfective. It is true that, while iterative vb forms can occur in the perfective aspect habitual verbs are by their very nature excluded from this aspect. In Lithuanian too according to L. Dambriūnas the fp (imperfectum consuetudinis) "... is less perfectivising than the past-tense form. For this reason some of these forms are neutral while the corresponding past-tense forms are perfective. For instance, the past-tense forms atėjo, atidarytė, išėjo, pardavė, atidavė are perfective while atėidavo, atidarydavo, išėidavo, parduosdavo, atiduosdavo are neutral. (LP 7 p 258)\(^{55}\)

The neutral forms, of course, derive their aspect from their context. In sentence 2, for instance, all the vb in the fp are imperfective: Ūkininkas regulariai vakiuodavo ir turgy; jis pirkėjo kas jam reikalinga ir parduosdavo savo gamindus. Kartą metuose jis parduosdavo bulį. (The farmer drove into market regularly; there he bought what he needed and sold his produce. Once a year he sold a bull). Each action in this sentence may be regarded as completed on each specific occasion. Nevertheless the series of actions whether it be 'driving into market', 'buying what he needed', 'selling his produce' and 'selling a bull', is not envisaged as completed. In purely formal terms, however, vakiuodavo and pirkėjo are imperfect while parduosdavo (2 X) are perfective.

Similarly in sentence 29 we have an opposition between išėjo preterite and išėidavo fp where the aspectual and temporal differences between the two forms of išėti is explicit from the

\(^{55}\) atėiti 'to come'; atidaryti 'to open'; išėiti 'to go out'; parduoti 'to sell'; atiduoti 'to give back'.
context. 'Nustojo lyti ir du broliai išėjo į kaimo gatvę. Paprastai jie visuomet maždaug ūnai lai ku išeidavo lauk.' (The rain stopped and the two brothers went out into the village street. They usually went out at about this time). In the first sentence išėjo and nustojo are on the same grammatical level: both are perfective, formally and from the context, where they point to two separate moments in a narrative sequence. The form išeidavo on the other hand is imperfective and the context is imperfective. The two vbs nustojo and išėjo refer to specific single actions while išeidavo refers to a series of actions, each one of which is finished but not the series.

Yet the basic ideational content of these actions in the fp are frequentative-habitual with perhaps slightly more stress on the habitual nuance. The next task is to decide on the range of meaning that can be assigned to the fp. That it possesses a high frequency count (in one paragraph of Petras Cvirka's Zemė Maitintoja, p 52 - 3, it occurs no fewer than twelve times) is self-evident. Does it, however, possess the range of the Bulgarian imperfect? This is the problem we shall study in the next section, comparing the Lithuanian past tenses not with Latvian but with Bulgarian.

5.50. A comparison of past tense usage in Lithuanian and Bulgarian.

5.51. Again it seemed more convenient to take those sentences where Lithuanian uses the fp and subsequently consider those sentences where Bulgarian uses the imperfect, but Lithuanian
does not use the fp. Despite the relatively high frequency in
the texts studied the fp was only used in seven sentences (1, 2,
13, 20, 27, 28 and 29), two more than the outside total for
Latvian. As a result it is not proposed to study these in detail.
Suffice it to say that in all cases the fp corresponded to the
Bulgarian imperfect. On the other hand not every sentence showed
a choice of the fp which was 100%. In sentence 27, for instance,
two informants used ražydašvo, one ražménedavo, i.e. a frequentative
habitual suffix added to an iterative-intensive stem. It must
be borne in mind then that the marker of the frequentative past
is in certain sense in competition with the derivational suffixes
-inēti and -ieti which with simple verbs are markers of iterative-
intensive action. Of sentence 25: 'He was running to and fro,
busying himself now with this, now with that.' - (L1) Jis bėgino,jo
iš vienos vietas į kitą, dirbdamas įj bei tą." or (L2) "Jis
bėgimėjo pirmauj atgal, įia šiuo, įia tuo užsiimdamas." L3 and
L4 used the preterite lakstėjo. A fifth informant who was consulted
suggested that the iterative-intensive form of this vb should be used:
lakstėjo, though it must be admitted that the basic meaning of
this vb is 'to flit about'. Nevertheless the contexts suggests
that we are concerned with an intensive type of action. There is
a general impression of "busyness" - if somewhat ill-directed -
and the intensive form of these vbs would give the most accurate
translation.

We are concerned here with one particular series of actions
and not an habitual series, thus excluding the frequentative past.
The Bulgarian versions of this sentence are: 'Toj tišače nasam-natom
kato se žanimavaže tu s tova, tu s onova (L1 and 2). From the
presence in these versions of the imperfect one may conclude that the Bulgarian imperfect is capable of expressing intensiveness in a past action. The Lithuanian ip on the other hand is not capable of expressing this kind of verbal action. In such instances the preterite is used. The preterite, moreover, is likely to be formed on one of the two iterative-intensive stems.

Another example of the iterative-intensive usage is to be found in sentence 23: 'The shop door was constantly opening and shutting' (B2) "Vratata na magazine se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše postojamo". (B1) "Vratata na magazine neprekšano se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše". In fact the action here described is not purely iterative-intensive but is merging into the continuous process, so close are the individual action of opening and shutting to one another. From a sequence of points on the time scale they are being transformed into a straight line.

The Lithuanian versions all use the imperfective form of the verbs 'to open' and 'to shut'. Thus, (L1): 'Krautuvės durys visą laiką atidarinėjo ir užidarinėjo.' Other versions prefer the participial construction: (L4) Parduotuvės durys visą laiką buvo atidarinėjamos ir užidarinėjamos. The choice of the vb forms in -inėt̆i is significant. Since the tense is preterite and not frequentative past the iterative-intensive nature of the action is indicated by the use of the imperfective aspect.

The Latvian versions of this sentence are not so consistent: two informants (La 3 and 4) use the formally perfective verbs: Veikala durvis pastavigi atverē un aizverē; La 5 uses the imperfective form of these verbs( the analytical construction): Veikala durvis visu laiku vērē cist un valē; La 1 and 2 use the
iterative-intensive verb virināt(ies) 'to keep opening and shutting':

(La 1) Veikala durvis virinājās nepartraukti; La 2 has: Veikala durvis tika virinātas nepartraukti. The last two translations are of course, the most exact. The imperfective version of La 5 is also good in that the intensiveness of the action is carried not by the vb virināt but by the adverbs clet and veļu. The first two examples are not as emphatic as the other three.

Sentence 25 also shows the use of an intensive-iterative vb, the vb skraidīt 'to run, scurry about' (particularly with the adverbs of place - burp and turp). Four of the five informants have shown a preference for skraidīt (La 1 - 4) while La 5 uses the non-iterative verb skriet. Cf. La 1: 'Vigš skraidīja burp un turp, un darīja te So, te to.' The form skraidīt can be compared with the L forms bērieti and bēsinēti. It is interesting too to note that the Bulgarian imperfect tīšane is also an iterative: tīšan 'to run about' (i) beside the normal imperfective tēka 'to run'.

5.52. Hitherto we have considered the Bulgarian imperfect (or its equivalents in the Baltic languages) as a means of expressing habitual-frequentative or iterative-intensive actions.

56. The use of the hyphen in the terms habitual-frequentative and iterative-intensive is deliberate. It is rare to find a habitual action that is not at the same time frequentative (or iterative). Similarly a thematic suffix which is described as iterative may also function in intensive contexts. In fact the range of meaning from habitual to intensive is to be looked on rather as a continuum though as we have seen the means by which these nuances are expressed is different.
The imperfect may be, and often is used to describe continuous processes, processes which are not the result of a series of actions but continue without interruption from one moment of time to another. A good example of this use of the imperfect is found in the Bulgarian version of the Communist Manifesto of 1848. (CMB) (p 42) "No vse poveze se razrastvaha pazarite, vse poveze rastjahe potrebnostite. I manufakturata vese ne moze da gi zadovoli." "Mean time the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. And the industry was no longer able to satisfy them." (CME p 44). The verb mozece (not underlined) in the last sentence represents a different type of action from that of the verbs razrastvaha and rastjahe but all three are in contrastive opposition to the series of aorists which follow: 'Togava parata i masinata izvcsita rivaljucija v promiilnenoto proizvodstvo. Na mjastoto na manufakturata dojde sivremennata sgra industrija, na mjastoto na promiilnenoto sredno sivalovia dojaha industrialcove milioneri, sefovote na celi industrialni armii, sivremenite burkoa." "Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, and the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois." (ME p 44). The relationship between the three imperfects and the aorists which follow is clear. All three provide the conditions, the background favouring the changes which were to take place.

The Baltic texts show a similar relationship between the processes of the first sentences of this paragraph and the events in the second half. Only here the opposition is an aspevtual one since the tense used throughout is the preterite. Cf. (CML p 30): Bet rinkos vis augo, paklausa vis kilo. Ir manufaktura jau
The Latvian version does not differ substantially from the Lithuanian: Bet tirgi arvien *nieauga*, pieprasījums *palielinājas*. Arī manufaktūra *nesnieja vaisus, sapnērinnāt*. *(CML p 40)* The forms *nieauga* and *palielinājas* appear to be perfective, but are not in fact. The form *nieaugt* is not the perfective of the simple verb *augt* but has a slightly different range of meaning, *augt* is usually 'to grow' in the literal sense, though it does have a secondary meaning comparable to that of *palielināties*: *nieaugt* is in general more abstract. The second verb *palielināties* does not appear to possess a simple form. Abstract verbs of this kind do *not* appear in the analytical form.

The second half of the paragraph does not present any problems of this type: *(CML pp 30–31)* Tuvoj galais ir mašīna *padarē* revoliucijā pramonē. Manufaktūros vietā *užēmē* ūkolaikinā stambioji pramonē, ī pramonēs viduriniejo luomo vietā *stojo* pramonininkai- miljonomai, iktīs pramonēs armijā vadovai, ūkolaikiniem buršu. And the Latvian: *(CML pp 40–41)* Tad tvaiks un mašīnas izdarīja revoliuciju rūpnieciskajā ražošanā. Manufaktūras vietā *stājas* modernā lielrūpniecība, rūpnieciskās viduskārtas vietā *stājas* industriabas miljonomi, veselu rūpniecisku armiju pavēlnieki, modernie burši. In the Lithuanian version there is a series of completed actions: *padarė* revoliuciją..., *vieta užėmė*..., *vieta stoja*. Both *padarė* and *užėmė* are clearly perfective while *stoja* is bi-aspectual though perfective
in this context. In this context stoti is being used idiomatically; viete užimti and viete užimti both mean 'to take the place of', but it is from its original meaning 'to stand' (intr) that one can deduce its bi-aspectuality. The same point may be made of the Latvian stāties vieta 'to stand or be in the place of'. The first verb of the Latvian series izdarīša (revolūciju) is indubitably perfective. All three verbs function as markers of narrative events while the first three vbs in the imperfective are dependent on the second group. The Bulgarian version makes this distinction both through a difference of tense (aor: imp) and by a difference of aspect: the first three vbs in the imperfect are all imperfective while the last three in the aorist are perfective.

5.53. Another characteristic of the Bulgarian imperfect is its ability to express duration of an action. An example of this type of imperfect action comes from a Bulgarian translation of Solohov's Sud'ba Seloveka: 'Cite dokato pulehme mūsūlivo, az razgležda skristom baltata i sinėito i s ušdvaņe si otheljazah edno stranno spored mene obstojatelstvo'. (SnC p 12) "While we were still smoking in silence I looked covertly at the father and son and to my astonishment I noticed what was in my opinion a strange circumstance." The vb pulehme is formally imperfect, and the use of this tense points to the duration of the action - 'while we were smoking'; there is no clear limitation imposed on this action. The form razgleždah.  57

57. The formal distinctions which separate the aorist from the imperfect are often only vestigial (i.e. the -še of the 2/3P sg) and it is only from distributional criteria that one can decide which tense is being used. In the example cited above two factors decide: 1) the lack of limitation of the action and 2) the simultaneity of.
again points to an action of some duration which takes place simultaneously to the action of 'smoking'. The bast vb otbeljazah is, however, aorist: here we are concerned with an action of very short duration which took place at a moment as yet undefined within the longer period covered by the other verbs. Moreover, this action was definitely completed before the moment of utterance, hence the aspect (perfective) of otbeljazah.

Another example of the durative use of the imperfect from the same source (SnCp 12): "We began to smoke the stronger of home-grown tobacco..." Here we have an inceptive aorist: again there is a contrast of both tense and aspect. Further up the same page there is a perfective aorist from the verb mlXa 'to be silent': Toj mlXna za malko, posle zapita:... "He fell silent for a short while and then asked:..." The external criteria influencing the choice of tense are respectively the adverbial elements dligo 'for a long time' and za malko 'for a short while', but more important is the fact that the aorist is the tense of narration. In the utterance 'Toj mlXna za malko, posle zapit: the two aorists refer specifically to moments in a narrative: moreover they follow one another. The utterance i dligo mlXahme refers to an action which took place simultaneously with the main event.
as described by the inceptive sorit ἀγωγικα... 

5.54. There remain more generalised imperfects: i.e. those which are not accompanied by any specific referents either to time or to manner. The following examples are taken from Стихата на Човека (SnC p 12): - възко показваха жена грижовност, умени майчини ръце'... all of which pointed to a woman's care, the skillful hands of a mother; 'А много изглежда друго... 

'But the father looked different:...; 'той носеше по-старо военни обувки,...' "he was wearing almost new military footwear". The actions described by the imperfects показваха, изглежда, носеха are purely descriptive. They tell us something about the dramatic personal or about the milieu in which the actions take place. In the sense that they are static and not dynamic they may be compared to statal verbs (леха 'to lie', стоја 'to stand, stay'). Another example of this type of usage is taken from Kolchov: 'Възки работеха в каменни кареiri, дълбоко ръко, ръкоя, дробеха германска камъни.' "They all worked in stone quarries, dug (it) out by hand, cut, crushed the German stone." (SnC p 35).

5.55. It is not intended to study in detail the uses of the Bulgarian imperfect, which has moreover been covered recently by the Bulgarian linguist V. Stankov in his Имперфектът в съвременна български книжовен език. Nevertheless it can be seen already that the Bulgarian imperfect has a much wider range of meaning than the corresponding Baltic forms. In fact it is only in habitual-intensive and habitual-frequentative contexts that one finds
direct correspondences between the Bulgarian imperfect and the Lithuanian fp and in the latter case the La nešt construction where this is used.

5.551. It is in those instances where the Baltic languages use the preterite that aspect plays a significant role. Thus a formal statement of the relationship between the B imperfect and the Lithuanian fp might be formulated as follows: \( B \text{imp} = L \text{fp} + \text{pret (asp)}. \) Here the significance of the factor of aspect which is additional to the preterite lies in the fact that the aspect possesses those additional nuances which are not clearly marked in the preterite tense itself. The Lithuanian preterite is not specifically marked for duration since it may also play a narrative role. This narrative role belongs to the aorist in Bulgarian and other nuances are attributes of the imperfect. Though in many cases the Bulgarian imperfect will also be imperfective in terms of aspect the overlap in function between tense and aspect deprives the aspect of the major part of its significance.

In the following sentence from the translation of the Communist Manifesto an imperfect (i) is contrasted with an aorist (p):

\[ \text{Tja bezmilostno razkäše päästrite feudalni okovi, koito vrëszvabë } \]
\[ \text{çoveka za negovite 'estestveni povelitelii',... (CMN p 43). The Lithuanian version has a preterite in the second clause corresponding to the Bulgarian imperfect: } \]
\[ \text{Kargue feodalinius päästric, kurie } \]
\[ \text{rišë irsgy pric jo 'prigimtiniy višëpašiy', } \]
\[ \text{ji negaištingai } \]
\[ \text{atruškë... (CMN p 9). The Lithuanian preterite is imperfective and this use of the aspect outlines the general nature of the action ('It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties} \]
that bound man to his "natural superiors", ... GME p 46). This function of aspect is not so clear in the Latvian version which in this instance has not used the analytical construction: Ta 

stilebas saravusi tēs raibās feodālās saites, kas cilveku 
piesaistīja viņa "dabiskajiem pavēlniekiem", ... (GMLa p 42)58

The weighting that must be given to the use of the imperfective aspect in the Lithuanian version is obviously greater than in the Bulgarian.

5.552. The situation is different when we come to consider the aorist. There aspect will play a more significant role. Whereas the imperfect in Bulgarian is normally associated with the imperfective aspect, a tendency which is becoming more strongly established, the aorist in its turn is associated with the perfective aspect. Where the aorist appears in the imperfective aspect it possesses some additional nuance of meaning which is not normally proper to the aorist as a tense but derives from the use of the imperfective aspect.

5.553. The tense corresponding to the aorist in the two Baltic languages is the preterite. In these languages too the preterite

58. The use of the analytical form is restricted in Latvian by several factors. In this instance the compound verb piesaistīt is used in a context of high abstraction. These are not direct links of some material joining a man to his superiors but ties based on centuries of tradition and usage.
when used in the functional role of marker of the moments of a narrative will be in the perfective. However, imperfective preterites will be found, just as imperfective aorists are found, and the attempt will be made to analyse these departures from the norm. Mention must also be made here of the use of the perfect in place of the preterite. This usage is more frequent in Latvian than in Lithuanian, which tends to suggest that the original meaning of the perfect - a present state resulting from an action completed before the moment of utterance - has been much weakened.

5.60. The relationship of the aorist and the preterite in Bulgarian and Baltic.

5.61. It is more convenient to consider first the normal usage of these tenses, so let us look at some examples of the perfective aorist and preterite. Here are two examples from the questionnaire, the English version being given first: 'Few came to the meeting though many invitations were sent out'. The Bulgarian versions differ in the rendering of the word 'meeting' and in the arrangement of the clauses: (B1) Văpreki șe bjaha rasprateni mnogo pokani, malko hora dojdoha no sâbraniste; Malko hora dojdoha na sreštata, văpreki șe bjaha rasprateni mnogo pokani. The aorist used in both cases, dojdoha is perfective, and we are clearly concerned with an action that is finished 'Few came to the meeting' .... and which forms part of a narrative sequence, even though in this example the sequence is understood.

The Baltic versions of this sentence agree with the Bulgarian in the choice of aspect and tense (preterite and perfective). A couple of examples of either language should suffice. First
the Lithuanian: (L3) Mažai atsilankė ir susirinkė, nors buvo
išsiuntinėta daugelis pakvietimų; (L4) Mažai atvyko ir susirinkė,
nors buvo išsiusta daug pakvietimų. And the Latvian: (La 11)
Nediaudzi apmeklēja samāki, kaut gan jis izsūtīt daudz ielūgumu;
(La 4) Maz atmēca uz samāki, kaut gan daudz ielūgumu jis izsūtītī.
The Baltic versions show some variation in the choice of verb (L:
atsilankė, atvyko, atēja, testējo; La apmeklēja, atmēca, ieradās)
though these differences are not significant, yet all are agreed
on the choice of aspect and tense.

The second sentence (Q5) is longer and contains a larger
number of verbs, and consequently the divergences are greater in
the Baltic versions. The English version of this sentence is:
"What has happened?" he asked. "Nobody knows", replied the
bystanders. La 1 has the following version: "Kas noticis?"
vīpē jautāja. "Neviens nezin", atbildeja klātesošie. La 2 has:
"Kas noticis?" vīpē jautāja (veicāja). "Neviens nezin(a)", atbildeja
klāstavosie.59 The other three Latvian versions agree closely with
the above; La 3, 4 and 5 use the filler form of the perfect for
the first vb "Kas ir noticis?". The Lithuanian versions are
virtually identical and thus one version will suffice: (L1) "Kas
atsitiko?" jus paklausē. Niekas nežino, atsakė šalia stovintieji.
And finally the Bulgarian versions: (B 1) Kakvo se e slušilo?
povita toj. Nikoj ne znae - otgovorina horata, koito stoeba
naokolo; (B 2) Kakvo se slušit? "povita toj." Nikoj ne znae
otgovorina stokaštite. The first point that arises from a study
of these versions is the presence of a perfect in the translation of
the question "What has happened?" in B 1 and in all the Latvian
versions. The Lithuanian versions on the other hand show a

59. Colloquial usage often omits the final -a in zina (knōw/knows).
preference for the preterite. This is a confirmation of what was stated earlier (5.553) about the relative frequency of the perfect in Latvian in place of the preterite. Bulgarian shows a certain hesitancy in this respect: B 1 uses the perfect while B 2 uses the aorist.

5.611. The use of the perfect in place of the preterite is a not uncommon feature of modern Latvian. There is another instance of this usage in Q 15: "It has started", the people shouted when the earth began to tremble. It may be argued here that the use of the perfect is consistent with the original meaning of this tense at least in these instances: i.e. the perfect is to be viewed as a present state resulting from a past action. Yet in the second example two out of the five informants use the preterite. La 1 and 4 use 'Ir sācīs', La 2 'Sācies'; La 3 and 5 use the preterite Sākas. The Lithuanian versions of this sentence all use the preterite prasidėjo or in one instance jau prasidėjo. The Bulgarian versions agree with the Lithuanian in using a simple past tense, the aorist: zaspēna. Nevertheless there is no essential difference between the two contexts. In fact the utterance 'It has started" could serve as a reply to the question in Q 5 "What has happened?" The use of the perfect in these sentences cannot therefore be considered as a purely grammatical response but is a matter of register. In this respect the greatest frequency in the use of the perfect as a substitute for the preterite belongs to Latvian. An earlier example of this usage was cited above (p 154) where the Latvian version of a sentence from the Communist Manifesto (CMLa p 42) contained the perfect saravusi (has... torn asunder) as
opposed to the Lithuanian preterite *autraukė* and the Bulgarian aorist *raskàsa*.

5.62. The verbs of speaking (he asked, replied the bystanders) in O 5 shows a further lack of consistency in the Baltic forms. The Bulgarian versions use the aorist in both cases: *ponita* to j and *stevoriha*... Moreover both aorists are in the perfective aspect. The Lithuanian version has respectively *paklausë jis* and *atsakë*... perfective and preterite. The Lat versions have *jautàja* and *atbildeja*; preterite and imperfective and preterite and perfective. The attribution of aspect to the Latvian version is, of course, on a formal basis-*jautàja* (one version gives an alternative *vaicàja*) is simple and hence imperfective while *atbildeja* is compound and perfective. This divergence between *jautàja* and *atbildeja* is capable of being explained if we take the two vbs separately. The vb *atbildët* is always found in the prefixed form and possesses no analytical imperfective form. Its aspect then depends on the context. In this context it is perfective.

The vb *jautët* (or *vaicat*, they are virtually interchangeable) is normally found in the simple form, though prefixed and perfective forms do exist: *pajautët, izjautët*. These forms add definition to the basic meaning *ask* of the simple vb: *pajautët* 'to ask (smb about smth), to inquire (of smb about smth or after smth) and *izjautët*; to question, to examine, to enquire of. In other words the vb *jautët* is used in most contexts where it is merely a question of *'asking'*. The derivative forms *pajautët*
and izlautät would be more correctly termed Aktionsarten since no real change in meaning has taken place.

There is less dubiety about the aspectual category of the L forms paklausē and atsakē, which are perfective in terms of context and also from the fact that there exist for both words imperfective forms: paklausinēti paklausē; atsakinēti; atsakētī. Again the point must be made that in terms of distribution paklausēti and atsakētī are commoner than their imperfective forms.

5.621. The verb 'shouted' in Q 15 is rendered with greater consistency in the Baltic versions than the vbs of 'saying' in Q 5. The Lithuanian versions all have sauktē while the La versions have sauca (and twice kliedzā). All are in the simple form. As was the case with jautāt (veidēt) formally perfective forms L - sauktē 'to call, cry': pakauktē 60 La - saukt 'to call, shout, cry': pasaukt (to call); kliegt 'to cry, yell, etc. . . .': nokliegt 'to shout'. In both languages, however, the simple forms are commoner in both imperfective and perfective contexts.

In this sentence the context is clearly perfective and this is the category to which all the verbs in the Baltic versions are to be attributed. And this attribution is derived exclusively from distributional criteria rather than formal criteria. The Bulgarian versions show one perfective, sakreštēha, and one imperfective: vikaha. It is the imperfective form vikaha which is unexpected. One would have expected the perfective vikaha. It is possible that the act of shouting is to be regarded as a

60. More frequent than pasauktē is the form which refers to actions of very short duration: nuklūtēti.
process and not a moment in the narrative, at any rate as an
action whose completion is not envisaged.

The last verb in this sentence 'when the earth began to
tremble' is again perfective aorist in both the Bulgarian versions
zapoftna. In the Baltic languages the verb 'to begin', as indeed
other auxiliary verbs, is neutralised with respect to aspect: i.e.
where the simple form exists (Litši, La sēkt) it will remain
formally imperfective. Conversely a prefixed form like predėti
may also function in imperfective contexts.

5.63. The previous examples show a lack of consistency in respect
of aspect. The Lithuanian and Latvian preterites examined, though
perfective in distributional terms, i.e. they function as perfectives
in these contexts, do not exhibit the formal criteria of this
category. Certain factors have therefore intervened to inhibit
this formal realisation of the perfective category.

5.631. Among these factors is the characteristic neutralisation
of the formal markers of perfectivisation and imperfectivisation
found with auxiliary verbs (in this instance La ėmke, L pradėjo/
ēmē). This factor appears to derive from the dependent character
of the vb when it functions as an auxiliary.

5.632. The second group of vbs where this inhibition appears
consists of vbs of saying and perceiving. An example of a verb
of perception is to be found in Q 7: 'We heard he came back on
Thursday'. The L and La versions use the simple form of the vb
Cf L - 'Mes stūdėjome, kad jis gūrė ketvirtadienį', and the La
The Bulgarian versions, however, both use the perfective aorist in this example: Cf (B 1) "Cuhae, ce se e varnal v cetvàrták."

The same factors operate in the case of the preterites: L saukte la sauce/kliedsa. In other words the normal form is the simple form and compound forms of these words possess additional nuances.

5.633. It can be seen that the emphatic values of the Aktionsarten have not been entirely lost when the elements used to mark these Aktionsarten have been adapted to another purpose, to mark aspect. And this may be the reason why the doublets, L atsakineti : atsakyti, paklausineti : paklausiti are not in a 1 : 1 relationship in terms of aspect. Conversely with the bi-aspectual forms griðti: sugriðti 'to return); matyti: pamatyti (to see) and also equivalent La forms: redzēt: parodzet (to see) etc., the simple forms are more frequently to be found than the compound forms.

5.634. The Baltic prefixes have in many cases retained a full meaning together with their grammatical function as markers of the perfective aspect. A prefix of this type is L mu- (La no-) when used with vbs meaning 'to kill' or 'to confer some serious disability on some person or object' (of the use above of no- and next with the La vb kaut 'to kill', 3.340)

The vb 'to shoot': L hauti (sàudyti), La haut, is commonly used without a prefix. Cf 99. 'The silence was interrupted by a shot. Somebody had no doubt been shooting at a wolf'. In this example all the La form versions use the non-prefixed form of the vb; cf. La 2: "Säviens partrauce klusumu. Acimredsâmi kāds šava"
though the actions of shooting are completed (they are followed directly by another action, went out), they are not followed by fatal results. Were the action of 'shooting' to end in the death of the person or animal shot at, the vb would have the prefix nu-, thus nušauti. An example of 'to shoot dead' occurs in the same source, but this time in the future; here Mrs. Zilaitytė warns Jonas Kaupys, a neighbour, who has come to stay with her, that the same bandits who murdered her husband will shoot him too: "Nušaus tave" (They'll shoot you dead). "Gal nušaus, atsakė jis. (And maybe they won't - he replied).

Unlike the examples from Juozas Baltušis the preterite I šauč and Le šauč in Q 9 are imperfective. They do not form part of the main narrative sequence. The main event is in the first sentence "The silence was interrupted by the shot." Thus the second sentence adds information about the shot mentioned in the first sentence and is in this sense dependent on it. B 1 marks this dependence by the use of an imperfective imperfect: "Tikinata be narušeno ot izstrel. Nesmėjeno, nėkajų atšaltieji po vilk." B 2 on the other hand used a pluperfect: "Tikinatę
beše prikănata ot izstrel. Beskaľrene, ajako beša streljal po vălk." The use of the pluperfect will tend to suggest that the act of shooting took place some time before the moment of speaking. Some La versions (La 3, 4) also favour the pluperfect but the participle is imperfective (i.e. ūvis not moūvis).

5.635. There are, however, many instances where the prefix in Baltic has a purely grammatical significance: i.e. it is a marker of perfectivity. Examples of the grammatical use of the prefix are Q 12 and Q 15. Let us first examine Q 12: "What have I done?" he exclaimed when he saw the floor all covered with water. L 3 renders this sentence as follows: "Kę gi aš padariau?" sušuko jis, kai nematę kai ant grindų yra pilna vandens. All three verbs padariau, sušuko and nematę are perfective and are appropriately marked. This use of the perfective finds its parallel in the Bulgarian versions: (B 1) "Kakvo napravili?" wāsklikma toj, kogato vidja, še celijat pod e pokrit s voda; (B 2) "Kakvo napravili?" wāsklikma toj, kogato vidja, še celijat pod beše pokrit s voda. Of the three verbs he saw, L nematę. B vidja precedes in time the first two verbs since they represent a response to this action: On seeing the floor covered with water 'he exclaimed'. The prefix pa- in nematę infers an action of extremely short duration, i.e. 'he caught sight of'. This nuance is not present in the B vidja. Or to put it another way, vidja is marked as a perfective, but not as a perfective with a special nuance of short sudden action.

The L padariau and sušuko are on the same level since a speech sequence and the method by which it is expressed are obviously simultaneous. The form padariau calls for no special
comment since it is the normal perfective form of dairiu 'did';
the prefix here is purely grammatical. The same cannot be said
for mëhukë 'exclaimed' which may be considered a perfective of
Lukë yet with a higher degree of specialisation. Moreover it
is the same type of specialisation that is present in namatë. Again
we are concerned with a short sudden action which can scarcely
be measured in terms of time elapsed. In this respect it closely
resembles the suffixed form suktäla. The Bulgarian vbs nayrarë
and biklikra are normal perfective aorists without any special
nuances.

The La versions are closer to the Lithuanian in that they
lay greater stress on the type of perfective action. Cf. La 5
"Ko es izdarëjus, vypë iesaucës, kad ieraudëja, ka visu grīdu bija
appludinata. The version offered by La 4 agrees with La 5 in
the choice of the first two vbs: "Ko es esmu izdarëjus?" vypë
iesaucës, kad vypë redzeja visu grīdu apklatu ar ūdeni. In
common with La 1, 2 and 3 he used the perfect for the first verb.
More significant is his choice of redzeja; the choice of redzeja
suggests that the informant in question regards the act of seeing
as a process which is not limited by a time referent.

There is a similar response on the part of informants La 1
and 3: "Ko esmu izdarëjus?" vypë iesaucës, kad redzeja, ka grīdu
klaja; ūdeni; "Ko es esmu izdarëjus?" vypë iesaucës, kad vypë
redzeja, ka visu grīdu parpluduse ar ūdeni. And indeed the
sequence 'he saw' may be looked upon as an act without a specific
time reference, or conversely attention may be drawn to the
instantaneous nature of the act. La 5 uses iesaucës instead of
iesaucës and in this context there is no difference between the
two forms.

The informant who gives the widest range of alternatives is
La 2: "Ko es esmu nedarīja/ pedarīja/ nemestrāja, vispājau nasu ana ieraudādam, ka visu grīda parlkate ar ādi... Nedarīt is more
specific than either izdarit or pedarīt in that it implies some
harmful outcome. The form pedarīja is neutral while nemestrāja
in this context equates with izdarīja, though the basic meaning
of the vb strēdēt is 'to work'.

5.63. Both La and L versions of Q 12 show a highly characteristic
tendency to mark certain emphatic nuances in their use of
the perfectivising prefixes. This tendency is to be contrasted
with their lack of consistency in marking the aspectual polarity.
The action in Q 13 is neutral in terms of emphasis and consequently
there is a greater consistency of response. The La versions
use either izdat or nasniest, simple perfectives. Cf La 1: Vīpā
nasnedze (iedava) katram bērnam grimatu; ... The L versions too
show a greater measure of agreement. Cf L 1: Jis iteika knyga
kiekvienam vaikum; ... (He handed over a book to each of the
children;...) or L 4: Kiekvienam vaikum jis pedarē po knygā;...
L 2 diverges sharply from this pattern: Jis dainēsā kiekvienam
vaikum po knyga; ... In a perfective context the form dainēsā
is anomalous since it is not only imperfective but iterative-
intensive. It is difficult to read either of these notions into
this context. Moreover the verb here describes the main event
of a narrative sequence, contrasting with the habitual-frequentative
vb in the second sequence: every birthday they used to receive a
new book. The Bulgarian versions recognise this fact when they
use the perfective aorist: (B2) Toj pešade po edn. kniga na vsjako dete; (B 1) Toj pedade kniga na vsjako dete;...

5.698. If one briefly summarises the foregoing one may arrive at the following conclusions: (1) The B aorist equates with the Baltic preterite or in some instances with the Baltic perfect. Latvian shows a stronger preference for the perfect than Lithuanian. Nevertheless the perfect has the same functional load as the preterite since the latter may be substituted for it. (2) The aspectual relationship is complicated by the large number in Baltic of bi-aspectual vbs: these vbs may appear as simplex or compound; many of these forms possess perfective and imperfective forms but the distributional frequency of these last is relatively low. (3) Lithuanian and Latvian make a greater use than Bulgarian of perfective Aktionssarten, i.e. of those prefixed forms where the verb is both perfective and endowed with a particular nuance of meaning appropriate to that aspect.

Hitherto we have been considering examples where the Bulgarian versions contain a perfective aorist. It is now time to turn briefly to a few instances where Bulgarian uses the imperfective aorist and study the reflexes in Baltic of this phenomenon.

5.70. The imperfect aorist in Bulgarian.

5.71. The aorist in Bulgarian is normally associated with the perfective aspect and hence the aspect selected does not add any further nuance to the aorist, which itself refers to a completed action. The main functional characteristic of the aorist is that
of marking the moments in a narrative sequence and for this reason the imperfective aspect is also possible with this tense. Cf Q 10: "He continued on his way and walked for two hours. In all that time he saw only two people." Since B 1 and B 2 are in agreement the version offered by B 1 should suffice: Toj prodėli pėtė ai i varva dva časa. Prez cjaloto vreme vidja samo dvama duši.

In the above example the imperfective aorist varva is in effective contrast with the other aorists in the sentence prodėli and vidja which are perfective. All three form part of the narrative sequence and hence each one marks a particular event or moment. One must therefore look outside this criterion if one wants to explain this difference in aspect. It will be noted that prodėli and vidja are not marked for time elapsed whereas varva bears the referent dva časa 'two hours' and the task of the imperfective is to point to this lapse of time. The time elapsed in such constructions will always be clearly delimited. Though the marking of unlimited or undefined duration is a function of the imperfective aspect, lack of limitation or definition would not be consistent with the use of the aorist.

5.711. The Lithuanian versions do not show this contrast at all. Cf. L 1: Jis tėgę savo kelione ir ėjo dvi valandas. Per vais tė laika jis matė tik du laikus. All the verbs are imperfective preterites and, while ėjo is justified on the grounds that it represents a lapse of time of fixed duration, another must be sought for tėgę and matė. The form matė does not present great difficulty: it is bi-aspectual and the nuance attributed to the perfective form matė of an action which is sudden and of short
duration is not appropriate in this context. It could not, however, be absolutely excluded. The subject of the action might have only caught a glimpse of the two people seen in the course of the two hour walk.

The form testi unlike matė does not possess a prefixed form with the meaning of 'to continue'. LAZ/60 gives įštesti 'to lengthen, protract, set on slowly with', uštesti 'to lengthen, protract'. While these meanings are obviously related to that of the simple vb they are not appropriate in this context. It seems more realistic in this instance to consider testi a bis-aspectual vb like matyti but with a strong bias towards the imperfective. Moreover it is the sequence ėjo dvi valandas which dominates the two sentences and for the Lithuanian speaker this is more important than the mechanical allocation of a vb to the appropriate aspect.

The La versions show a similar tendency. Cf La 3: Vipė turpinėja savu ceju un gėja divas stundas. Pa visu šio laiku vipė redėja tikai divus cilvėkus. This version closely parallels L 1 above. The same remarks apply to redėja as to matė in L 1 and turpinėt like the L testi does not possess a perfective form. It is possible to render he continued by a vb form which is both contextually and formally perfective, by using atjaunoja (lit 'resumed'); the form atjaunoja was put forward as an alternative by La 2. Similarly redėja may be replaced by the perfective satike (lit met, came across), an alternative offered by La 1.

Perhaps the most interesting variant on the above version of La 3 is that offered by La 5. He agrees with La 3 in using turpinėja and redėja, however, for gėja he substitutes nogoja
which has the meaning of 'covering a fixed distance', of viņš nogāja desmit kilometrus - he covered ten kilometres, LaoTur. Here the distance covered is not given in spatial terms but in terms of the time taken to cover the distance. This is a perfective concept and it is appropriately signalled by the use of the prefix no-.

The contrast here is between a limited action (in terms of time) and actions which do not have any specific limitation. This interpretation is totally at variance with that put forward by the two Bulgarian informants.

5.712. Before further analysing such idiosyncratic versions let us consider a further example of the Bulgarian use of the imperfective aorist: again the use of the imperfective is conditioned by the duration of the action. Cf. Q 17: (B2) Ubūtējat govorē polovin čas za naj-novite postiženija v tehnologijata. Pošte toj objasni edna-dve ot trudnostite, sreštnati v poslednato upražnienie. As in Q 10 both govorē and objasni are aorist, forming successive steps in a narrative sequence. Yet govorē is imperfective and objasni is perfective. The reason for the choice of the imperfective aorist in the case of the first verb is the same as in Q 10. The action expressed by govorē is durative, but the duration of the action is specifically limited by the phrase polovin čas 'half an hour'. The action of objasni on the other hand is not marked as durative.

5.713. The Lithuanian informants in this instance show no great divergence among themselves, nor do they differ from the Bulgarian in choice of aspect. Cf L 1: Mokystojas per pusę valandos kalhėjo
apie veliausius pasiekimus technologijoje; poto paaiškino vieną ar du sunkumus, kutie iškilo pasakotiniuose pratimuose. Let us ignore for the moment the third verb in the L version corresponding to the B participle *sprektnāti*. This verb does not form part of the narrative sequence since it occurs in a dependent clause.

If we take the verbs in succession we find an imperfective preterite *kalbāja*. Like the B form *govori* this verb is durative, the limiting phrase being *per pusę valandos* 'half an hour'. The second verb *paaiškino* is not durative and is consequently perfective. L 2 use *išaiškino* but the difference of the prefix here is not of great significance since the verbs *paaiškinti* and *išaiškinti* are virtual synonyms.

5.714. The Latvian versions show the same aspectual contrasts that are to be found in both the L and B versions. Cf La 5:

Skolotāja *runāja* (stāstīja) pusstundu par jaunākiem sasniegumiem technologijā; pēc tam viņā *izskaidroja* dažas neaizraujamās pedojā vingrinājumā. The only fluctuation that occurs among the various versions is between *paskaidroja* (La 3) and *izskaidroja* (La 1, 2, 4 and 5). Again the differences between the forms is minimal, or rather they possess a high degree of identity over most of the range of meaning.

In the La version we can see the same processes operating as in the L and B versions. The choice of imperfective or perfective aspect has been conditioned by the presence or absence of duration.

5.715. The verb in the dependent clause 'which had appeared in the last exercise' is rendered as a perfective preterite by
three of the Lithuanian informants (L 2 uses a passive construction here). The B version as we have seen do not use a finite verb but the participle *srektnati*. In the versions of La 1 and 5 no vb is present; La 2 and La 4 use the perfective pluperfect: (La 2) ... kas bija atsadījušās pēdejā rākstdarbā; (La 4) ... kas bija parādījušās pēdejā udevumā. La 3 on the other hand also uses the pluperfect but this time it is in the imperfective: Kuri bija radušies.

5.72. The interrelationship of tense and aspect in Bulgarian shows the systematisation of these two phenomena. On one level we have an opposition which permeates a whole verbal paradigm, i.e. aspect. On the other level aorist (and in some instances perfect, of B 1’s answer to Q 5) is opposed to imperfect. Theoretically the aorist and the imperfect may appear in either aspect but this theoretical picture has become distorted by the tendency (at present only a tendency) to form imperfects only from the imperfective stems of prefixed verbs.

The tense alterations may be briefly described as follows: the functional role of the aorist is to express the moments of a narrative sequence. The aorist does not usually show duration, hence its association with the perfective aspect. When duration, however limited, is implied the imperfective aorist is used.

5.721. The Baltic preterite is used in all cases where the aorist occurs in Bulgarian. Again Latvian shows a tendency to use the perfect in place of the preterite. Lithuanian too may use the perfect for the preterite but the usage is less frequent than in
the other East Baltic language.

5.722. It is when we come to consider the interrelationship of aspect and tense that the picture becomes more complicated. The complications arise from the tendencies which are inherent in the Baltic verbal system. In examples where concrete actions are concerned the response of Baltic is similar to that of Bulgarian. Cf Q 16: They came out together from the cinema, which was showing the latest French film. L 4: Jie kartu atējo iš kino, kuris 

rodė paskutinį prancūziską filmą. All L versions agree in expressing 'They came out together...' by a perfective preterite. The second verb 'was showing' is imperfective since there is no limit imposed on the act of showing. This action has been going on before the moment when 'They came out...' and is likely to continue to be shown after this event has finished. L 2 also has rodė while L 1 and L 3 use the participial forms rodoma (L 1) and buvo rodome (L 3).

The Latvian versions show a preponderance in favour of the perfective preterite. Cf La 5: Vipi kopa iznāca no kinosēles, kura rodīja jaunu frāņu filmu. La 2 and 3 agree with La 5 in using iznāca: La 1 differs slightly from the above: Vipi atstāja kino reise,... Only La 4 has the imperfective: Vipi kopa nāca āra no kino,... The use of the analytical here does not infringe Latvian norms where there is a tendency to use the imperfective to emphasise an action.

There is almost general agreement on the use of the imperfective for the verb in the second part of the sentence. In the matter of tense, however, we find more fluctuation. La 4, for instance,
uses the pluperfect: 'kas bija rādīja pedējo franšu filmu'. La 2 uses the passive: kur tika rādīta jaunā franšu filma. La 3 has the following version: kurā demonstrāja jaunāko franšu filmu. The differences between these versions is not significant: all regard the action as a process which has not finished at the time of speaking. Even the use of the pluperfect merely sets back in time the period when this action was happening. The exception to the above is La 1 who uses the apparently perfective form izrādīja: It is possible to explain this exception since the verb izrādīt possesses the specific meaning of 'to perform, to represent, to show'. The vb izrādīt is a separate lexeme from rādīt, and, since izrādīt has no equivalent form in the analytical construction izrādīja is here functionally imperfective.

5.7221. A comparison with the Bulgarian version shows the same distribution of aspect: perfective for the first vb and imperfective for the second. Cf B 2: Te izljazohā saedno ot kinoto, v koeto davaha naj-novija frenski film. The tense of the first vb izljazohā is aorist and requires no comment. The form davaha, however, is not aor but imperfect. The B usage here differs from the usage of Lithuanian and Latvian, but as we found (see above 5.52) Bulgarian uses the imperfect tense to describe actions which are processes of unspecified duration. Moreover the vb here is not part of the narrative sequence but is part of the background.

5.723. Q 19 is another example where one would expect agreement between Bulgarian and the Baltic languages. Cf. 'Suddenly she
came into the room. In an utterance of this type the perfective aspect is alone possible, and this is what we find. Such is the measure of agreement among all the informants that it will suffice to give one example of each language. Cf. first L 1: Staiga ji įėjo į kambarį. La 2: Vipa įėjo (negaidėti) išėjo į kambarį.

And finally the Bulgarian, (E 1): Izvedna tja vleze v stajata. It is in utterances of this type that we obtain the highest measure of agreement and it would be instructive to see which factors are present here which are not present in the other types of utterance. Firstly we are concerned with a sudden or unexpected action. Secondly (and this also the case in Q 16) the vb describes a concrete action: the greater the degree of abstraction of the verbal lexeme the greater the likelihood that the Baltic vb will use one form for both aspects. This is less true of Lithuanian than of Latvian, where the suffixes -nēti and -ioti are more productive than the corresponding analytical forms in Latvian.

5.80. In this chapter we have studied in some detail the interaction of aorist and imperfect in Bulgarian and the corresponding tenses in the two Baltic languages. The Bulgarian tenses are clearly contrasted in terms of function. The aorist is the tense used to describe the events in any narrative sequence. The imperfect on the other hand is the tense used to set the scene, to describe the background against which the main events in the story take place.

5.81. An opposition of this kind exists in Baltic too but
this fact is complicated by the more restricted range of meaning of the Lithuanian frequentative past or, where it occurs, the most construction in Latvian. As a result the preterite has a much wider role to play in Baltic than the aorist in Bulgarian: it is substituted for the frequentative forms in those contexts where these tenses are not appropriate, and in those contexts it is equivalent to the Bulgarian imperfect.

5.82. Aspect too, as we have seen, plays a part in defining an action described by the simple tenses. The perfective is normally associated with the aorist or in Baltic with the preterite where this tense has the same functional load as the aorist. In Baltic, however, the relationship is further complicated by the existence of verbs which do not possess the formal criteria for marking aspect. The determining factor in these cases is context and not the formal criteria normally associated with this phenomenon.

Bulgarian in this respect presents a much simpler picture since aspect is always clearly marked by formal criteria. The functional role of aspect in this language - and the same may be said of Baltic - is to mark those nuances which are additional to those inherent in the respective tense forms. For instance the use of the imperfective aspect will serve to mark duration, which is not a feature of the aorist (cf § 10). Conversely the use of the perfective with the L fp stresses that the actions are all of short duration; cf from Zemē Meitintojas: Tik retkertiais ji pakeldavo galvą ta pašia ranka, kur laikė širkles, nubreikdama mus akį plaukus, giliai atsikvėpdavo... PCLM pp 6 - 7. (Only occasionally she would raise her head, and, brushing away
the hair from her eyes with the same hand in which she was holding
the clippers, she would take a deep breath... The above example
also illustrates the difference between the action of the frequen-
tative past and the simple past; here laikė is imperfective and
represents a constant process which accompanies the other actions,
i.e. she was holding the clippers in her hand throughout the
whole operation of shearing the sheep.

5.90. In the next chapter it is proposed to summarise the
questions discussed in the earlier chapters (2, 3, 4 and 5).
There are in effect two questions to be answered. Firstly to
find out if the Baltic languages exhibit the same aspectual
polarity that we find in the Slavic languages. It may be possible
in the course of the discussion to throw some light on the
development of the aspectual system in Slavic. The second
polarity is that of tense, the polarity between the aorist and
the imperfect tenses. These tenses complement each other just
as the perfective and imperfective aspects complement each other.
Thirdly there is the interrelationship of tense and aspect,
and finally we must discuss the possibility of influences outside
Baltic on Baltic both in the earlier period and at the present
day.
6.0. Conclusions.

6.1. It is convenient to begin this discussion of aspect in Baltio with a quotation from a doyen of Baltio linguistics, Alfred Senn. The quotation is taken from his article Zum Gebrauch der Aktionsarten im Litauischen (Studi Baltici, vol III, 1933) and it must be noted that this was a view that Senn expressed in 1933, and cannot be held to represent the view he holds today. Nevertheless it provides a useful point of departure. Cf. pp 85-6.

"In der historischen Entwicklung des litauischen zeigt sich als einer der mächtigsten Faktoren eine starke Neigung zum Schematisieren, besonders aber zu polarer Anordnung der Sprachformen (refers to footnote in Senn's text). Der Tendenz zu schematisieren verdankt die Sprache u. a. die Vereinfachung der Steigerung des Adjektivs... Dem Trieb nach polarer Anordnung entsprang auch ein auf die Spitze getriebenes System der Aktionsarten. Die Regel, dass einfache, d.h. nicht zusammengesetzte Verba durch Verbindung mit einer Präposition perfektiv werden, würde dahin verschärft, dass überhaupt für perfektive Aktionsart Verbindung mit einer Präposition notwendig sei." Two points concerning terminology arise straightaway. Senn uses 'Aktionsart' throughout when nowadays we would use 'aspect'. In addition he uses 'Präposition' in place of 'prefix'. Despite these superficial blemishes Senn does stress the essential point in any consideration of the system, namely the existence of a strict polarity between the two members of the opposition.

6.20. The formal criteria marking aspect.
6.21. The existence of an aspect system depends on the opposition being adequately marked. Ideally the morphemes marking this opposition should have only this function. Even in Slavic the prefix can mark a change of meaning as well as a change of aspect. As an example of prefixes which mark only aspect there is na- in the R napisat' or B 'napravja; the prefixed forms correspond to simple forms - pisat' (R) and pravja (B). This is not to say that na- is exclusively a marker of aspect, but that in conjunction with the vbs (R) pisat' and (B) pravja it marks only aspect.

6.211. The prefix then has been specialised in the role of marker of the perfective aspect. This is a feature shared by Baltic and Slavic. Again in theory any prefix may play the part of aspect marker. In practice, though one may find examples of all the prefixes, certain prefixes have been specialised in this role. The commonest of these is Baltic pa- (Sl po-); cf. L padaryti (p): daryti and Lat padarīt (p): darīt. The simple (i) forms mean "to do" in both Baltic languages.

6.212. The markers of the perfective may also be suffixes. Here again we find common ground between Lithuanian and Slavic. The Lithuanian suffixes -telėti and -terėti serve to mark a vb as perfective; cf. Švelgti (i) 'to look': (p) Švilgterėti. This suffix which indubitably marks the root Švilg- as perfective is, however, specialised in the meaning of an action of very short duration. In respect of their degree of specialisation they recall the Slavic semelfactive suffix -nūt; cf R stuknut' (p) stučat'. Nevertheless forms in -terėti/ -telėti are of high
productivity. Beside perfective forms in -terēti/ -telēti there are normal prefixed perfectives to the same simple form: the vb švelgti (i) 'to look' has pašvelgti beside švilgterēti. Latvian does not use suffixation to form perfectives.

6.213. There exist in Lithuanian as in Slavic simple vbs which are perfective. Semn in his article mentioned above quotes a few of these forms: rasti to find, griebti etc. (p 86). (It is true he mentions these verbs in connection with the phenomenon of hyperperfectivisation, i.e. the prefixation and hence perfectivisation of vbs already perfective.) The Lithuanian forms are all characterised by the fact that they are of extremely short duration, what L Dambriūnas calls 'point action' vbs. These may be compared with the suffixed forms in terēti/ -telēti.

6.22. A characteristic feature of Baltic is the existence of a large class of bi-aspectual verbs. These verbs have a wide semantic range, containing on the one hand the vb L griēti 'to return' and on the other the vbs of perception. All the above are simple verbs, the class also contains prefixed forms which either do not possess a simple form or the corresponding simple form is unconnected in meaning; cf. L dėti 'to put': (p) padėti or pradėti (n) 'to begin' (n - here neutral or bi-aspectual).

The examples cited above have all been Lithuanian but the remarks could equally well have been applied to Latvian; not surprisingly there are differences of detail. For instance, L griēti corresponds to a prefixed form in Latvian, atgrieīt (ies); it is still bi-aspectual. There is, however, a greater measure of agreement than disagreement.
6.30. Marking the imperfective.

6.31. Though it is customary to speak of the perfective as being the marked member of the opposition, the unmarked imperfective must also be clearly differentiated. To take an extreme example dat' (p) 'to give' is formally marked as perfective since it possesses a syllable less than the unmarked imperfective davat', and yet davat' is newer than dat'. In most cases the perfective form of a simple verb will be marked by the prefix; thus, R pisat' (i) but (p) napisat'.

6.32. The perfective is here unambiguous since the prefix ne- has the purely grammatical function of marking perfectivity. A prefix may, however, function on two levels: 1. it functions grammatically, changing the simple imperfective vb into a perfective, and 2. the meaning of the simple verb may be changed. If instead of ne- one uses the prefix o-, the compound form opisat' is a) perfective and b) a different vb from the simple form pisat'; it now means not 'to write', but 'to describe'. The creation of the form opisat' has created a new requirement: for secondary imperfectives, creating a new pair opisat' (p): opisvlat'. This new form opisvlat' shows one of the means used to create new imperfectives, the suffix -vlat'.

6.321. The Lithuanian response to this problem resembles the Slavic; the suffixes in this case are the original iteratives -inäti and -ioti. The prefixed form ukrät' (p) 'to make a note of' (simple vb ražyti, 'to write') corresponds to ukrakinäti with the
same meaning; ateiti 'to come': ateidinéti. There are restrictions on the formations of such aspectual pairs which will be analysed in a later section.

6.322. The system of imperfectivisation in Latvian differs considerably from that used in Lithuanian and Slavic in that it does not make use of such imperfectivising suffixes. The Latvian system - the analytical construction - consists of substituting for a prefix an adverb which is identical in meaning; the adverb accompanies the simple form of the verb. Cf. iznakt (p) 'to come out': nakt āra (or lauka); nosviešt (p) 'to throw away': sviesot nost.


6.331. One of the essential differences between the Baltic and Slavic aspectual systems is the fact that just as not every Baltic verb may be perfectivised (a restricted number) many perfective verbs have no imperfective forms. In point of fact these verbs can and do operate in imperfective contexts and are thus distributionally imperfective but there is no overt realisation of the imperfective aspect. Others again have specifically imperfective forms but they are used much less frequently than the prefixed ostensibly perfective form. If one excludes external factors one possible reason is the existence of distinctive Aktionsarten. The iterative-intensive Aktionsart is at the basis of the two imperfectivising formants in Lithuanian -inéti and ioti; the perfectivising Aktionsarten are in the main marked by prefixes.
Thus the prefix pa- in L pamatyti 'to see' or the La paredet (idem) points to the shortness and suddenness of the action described. Similarly La ize- and even da- (from R do-) points to the completion of an action but stress either the thoroughness of the achievement (ize-) or the effort expended in achieving a goal, cf. iziet 'to go through' (accompanied by the adv cauri). Aktionsarten are, of course, found in Slavio but there they do not play so extensive a role in the aspect system.

6.332. Paradoxical though it may seem, the other contributory factors are the size of the bi-aspectual group and, of course, its range, which inhibited the full development in Baltic of an aspect system comparable to the Slavio. The two factors complement each other: the Lithuanian mattyti is bi-aspectual and the overt realisation of aspectual polarity has been neutralised in this word. Though the L word has been used, this is merely for convenience, the La form redzet possesses the same characteristics. A perfective form exists for matyti - pamatyti, but this form should more properly be called an Aktionsart since it stresses the shortness and suddenness of an action. The form pamatyti approximates to what Senn referred to as "hyperperfectives" since the simple form is already perfective when it occurs in perfective contexts: the pa- does not make it perfective but a special type of perfective.

6.333. Conversely one may speak of "hyperimperfectives" where there exists an imperfective (usually in -išti) for prefixed bi-aspectual verbs. An example of this is the form steiškinėti.
to answer' beside atsakyti the normal form. In Latvian such forms as atsakīnēti are not found, there is no overtly imperfective form for atsākt (or atbildīt). This arises from a limitation on the analytical construction, which is less frequently found with abstract verbs. This is particularly true with lexemes where the simple form is not found (or is rare) or whose meaning differs considerably from that of the compound form.

6.334. Specialised imperfectives have in common with the Aktionsarten of normally paired verbs that their function is emphatic. This desire to express emphasis is characteristic of both Baltic languages. This has led at times to the selection of the imperfective in preference to the perfective in contexts which do not normally bear this interpretation. Such is an example from the La translation of Orwell's Animal Farm, here the analytical construction is used where one would normally expect the perfective: Četri jauni barokļi priekšēja rūda laida valē spalgs kviecienus, tā izsākāsā savu neapmierinatību. (DzF p 47):"Four young porkers in the front row uttered shrill squeals of disapproval,..." (AF p 49). The use of laida valē instead of atlaida draws attention to the emphatic nature of the vb uttered. The compound form atlaida is neutral in terms of emphasis.

6.335. It is the emphatic nature of the aspectual formants (whether perfectivising or imperfectivising) which must have led to their selection for their present function. Yet side by side we find prefixes which are neutral - having only a grammatical function - and prefixes which are emphatic. The remarks made
above about prefixes may equally well be applied to the formants of imperfectivisation.

6.34. There are two ways of looking at the Baltic aspect system. Firstly one may take the view that the Baltic system first approximated to that of Slavic and then diverged along paths of its own. Secondly one may consider the Baltic system as being in an intermediate position, i.e. that it has not reached the position already attained by Slavic in the OCS period. The material studied tends indeed to suggest that the second conclusion is the right one. The factors leading to this conclusion are respectively: the existence of many bi-aspectual verbs, the characteristic polysemy of the perfectivising prefixes and the retention of emphatic nuances by the formants of imperfectivisation. All these factors taken together tend to suggest the incomplete realisation of the aspectual polarity. There is still a very great element of personal choice in the aspectual decisions made by Baltic speakers and writers.

6.40. The problem of influence.

6.41. It is intended here to put forward only some very tentative suggestions. That the Balts were exposed to influence from outside Baltic is not really in doubt, but the evidence for influence is mainly to be found in the domain of lexis. Cf L dial ale 'but' (from Polish), La un 'and' from Gar und; L knyga 'book' from R kniga (or possibly White Russian). The reason the Latvians adopted the German und is fairly clear: it avoided the homonymy of La il 'and' from CBalt ir and ir from CBalt ir (cf. L yra) 'is/are'.
6.42. The few loan words cited above show clearly the principal
directions from which influence has come. In the case of Lithuanian
it was indubitably Slavio, whether Polish during the period of
the Lituanio-Polish Jagellonian dynasty (1386 - 1572) or WR both
before and during the above period. Latvian on the contrary
has been strongly influence by German.

6.421. The influence of Slavio on Baltic is more likely to have
impinged on Lithuanian with its long association with Slavio
speakers: from this long association must have arisen a period
of bi-lingualism which occurred at several levels. The influences
on Latvian were predominantly German dating from the founding of
the German bishopric in Riga in the 13th century (Riga itself
was founded in 1201) Despite the fact that the influences were
so diverse the two languages have much in common. Both share the
concept that prefixes perfectivise. They differ not in recognising
the concept of the imperfective but in the means used to
differentiate this aspect from the perfective. This fact tends
to suggest that such influence as there has been - at least in
respect of the major grammatical features - has been marginal.

6.43. The development of the Baltic aspect system exhibits
three chronological stages (i.e. in relative terms). Prefixation
is an inherited feature of which there is ample documentation
in the other IE languages. It is possible that the use of pre-
fixation as a means of distinguishing the Aktionsarten is also
an early feature of Baltic: examples of this feature are also
to be found in Germanio, e.g. ge- which originally had only
emphatic value (cf. Semm, op cit, p 86). This first stage can still be called Common East Baltic since it is shared by Latvian. The second stage is the use of prefixes to mark the perceptive aspect and not merely Aktonsarten. This stage is also common to Latvian and Lithuanian.

The third and final stage is when other formants are used to differentiate the imperfective. Here the means used to achieve this end differ. Lithuanian uses suffixation while Latvian uses separable adverbial elements. The use of the analytical construction by Latvian rather than suffixation - the means adopted by Lithuanian and Slavic - is evidence of the separate development of this construction. At this period Latvian and Lithuanian must be considered separate languages. One can no longer speak of Common East Baltic.

It was suggested in chapter 3 that Latvian rejected suffixation as an imperfectivising formant on account of the lack of distinctiveness that existed within the stock of derivational suffixes. The phonological process which led to the lack of distinctiveness of certain suffixes inherited from Common Baltic can be tentatively dated to the 13th - 14th centuries. At this time the group 'vowel plus nasal plus consonant' became 'oral vowel plus consonant'. It is suggested that it was at this period that the Baltic languages began to develop separate imperfective forms for prefixed verbs. Unfortunately the Balts were still in what has been referred to elsewhere as the pre-literate period. Since there are no written documents for this period we will never have any definite proof. All that one can say is that the third stage was considerably later than the first and second stages.
6.50. **The tense opposition in Baltic.**

6.51. The tense opposition that one finds in Lithuanian between the preterite and the frequentative past cannot be Common Baltic. The only simple past tense that can with confidence be assigned to the Common Baltic period is the preterite. In this respect one can take Latvian as being more typical of Common Baltic. Despite the considerable modifications that have taken place as a result of the phonological process cited above (p 174) the Latvian verb is more conservative than the Lithuanian.

6.52. The frequentative past is a separate development of Lithuanian. As the name suggests its functional load embraces the following modes of action: frequentative-habitual and frequentative-intensive. It is also characterised by a high frequency of occurrence, unlike the Latvian equivalent. At 5.40 et seq we examined the possibility that a similar role might exist for the Latvian construction of *nest* followed by a dependent infinitive. In terms of function this construction could have filled the rule to which it was to have been assigned it suffered from one serious disadvantage, of with the Latvian its frequency was low both in the literature and in the replies of the informants.

6.53. Like the Lithuanian forms in *davo* this construction is the result of independent development. It was superficially attractive because it conformed to the tendency of Latvian to rely on analytical rather than synthetic modes. This is paralleled elsewhere by the use of the analytical construction to mark the
imperfective of prefixed verbs where the prefix is not a purely formal one but indicates a change of meaning. (see further chap 3). Despite the factors in its favour its low productivity meant that it could not provide an effective opposition to the preterite. It was noted that all informants used it at least once but the distribution indicated that it possessed an emphatic value rather than a grammatical one.

6.53. The L forms in -davo cover the same range of meaning as the La form, but they appear very frequently both in the literature studied and also in the replies of the informants. Unlike the La forms they are fully grammaticalised.

6.54. Both the La and L forms were compared with the B imperfect and it was found that the B imperfect also appeared in frequentative-habitual and frequentative-intensive contexts. Its ultimate range of meaning, however, was much wider than the Baltic tenses (if one may use this word for the La construction), and, for this reason its frequency exceeded that of Lithuanian. Like the L tense it could appear in either aspect though with different nuances of meaning according to aspect.

6.55. The Baltic imperfect and the corresponding Baltic tenses are excluded when it is a question of an event in a narrative sequence, since they are confined to a dependent role. The role of marking events in a narrative sequence belongs to the aorist in Bulgarian. In the Baltic languages on the other hand the preterite may appear in either role, i.e. it may equate with B aor
or imperfect. This duality of role originates in the fact that the preterite replaces the frequentative tenses (or constructions) where these are excluded on account of their restricted range of meaning.

6.56. The Baltic tense opposition (here we are speaking mainly of Lithuanian) resembles the aspectual opposition in these languages in that the opposition has been incompletely realised in grammatical terms (i.e. the preterite is still used suppletively where these forms are inappropriate). Moreover the emphatic nature of the formants marking these tenses is still felt by the users.

6.561. Some light may be shed on the status of the fp in Lithuanian if one considers that the Lithuanian literary language is still a fairly recent creation. The early documents in Lithuanian (from the end of the 16th century) do not represent a standard language but are orientated to the dialect of the writer. The literary language as we know it is an amalgam of the two main language groups, Zemaičiai and Aukštaitišiai. The frequentative past is a feature of Aukštaitišiai and is absent from Zemaičiai.

6.6. The picture presented by the Slavic languages is of a series of oppositions which appear to operate automatically. Thus for every simple vb there exists a perfective verb (prefixed). Where prefixes change the meaning of a simple verb as well as changing its aspect a new imperfective is created by suffixation. The aspect system has been fully grammaticalised. In Baltic
on the other hand grammaticalization has not been attained to this extent. Many of the forms used, whether suffixal or free forms, are still imbued with the emphatic character they possessed when they served as markers of *Aktionsarten* rather than *aspect*. The situation of the Baltic groups is not to be regarded as innovatory but rather as an intermediate stage. The failure of the Baltic languages to reach the Slavio stage of development is not to be ascribed to a lack of the appropriate derivational apparatus, but rather to their slow development.

6.61. As literary languages they originated in the nineteenth century and here again they faced opposition on the unofficial and the official level, and it is the latter that is more significant.

To communicate outside the Baltic area a second language was essential (according to area this would be either Russian, Polish or German). It is of interest in this connection that the greatest Polish poet of the nineteenth century, Adam Mickiewicz, was born in what is now called Vilnius, the capital of the Lithuanian Socialist Soviet Republic. The use of a second language as a lingua franca has always inhibited the growth of vernacular into a literary language (cf. the effects of the use of Latin in Poland).

6.62. The situation of the Baltic languages contrasts unfavourably with that of Slavio, where one can observe a steady development from the Xth century. Moreover the language at this date already

61. The opening line of Pan Tadeusz is: 'Litwo ojczyzno moja...' 'Lithuania, my native land'.

possessed an aspectual system and a fully developed temporal opposition. Thereafter the development of the individual Slavic languages was uneven. Most have lost or are in the process of losing the simple past tenses, but the aspectual opposition still remains. This opposition is between original perfects - other compound tenses (future perfect, conditional perfect and pluperfect) are rare or have disappeared. The most advanced in this respect are the E. Slavic languages. West Slavic still retains the pluperfect, though it is rare; Polish has also innovated in creating a series of personal endings for the past tense.

6.621. Perhaps the fundamental difference separating Slavic from E and W Slavic lies in the retention in S. Slavic of a form that has purely future significance. For instance, the present tense in the imperfective aspect in E and W Slavic functions as a future in the perfective. The S Slavic future is only future (with the corollary that the present functions as a present in the perfective). Similarly the S. Slavic future is derived in the main from OCS *хотелъ* to want (with the exception of the neg futures in B and M). With regard to the temporal oppositions within the simple past this feature of OCS has been totally lost in Slovene and is less and less used in spoken SCR. Only Bulgarian and Macedonian have preserved this opposition. Except for their retention of this OCS opposition the B and M systems are essentially innovatory. Though highly sophisticated, their systems do not resemble closely the OCS system. Perhaps the greater part of their complexity is to be traced to the re-narrative system of tenses. It cannot be said that they have retained the
OCS future perfect since the means used to mark this tense are new creations.

6.622. Curious though it may seem, the Baltic tense system resembles most that found in B and M. Baltic possesses a separate future formant (the suffix -s-, originally desiderative, of also Gk and Skt). Consequently the present may be found in either aspect. The Baltic relative mood corresponds to the B and M renarrative system. This mood is most strongly developed in Latvian. It will be seen that unevenness of development is characteristic of Baltic as of Slavic. Latvian has a highly developed relative mood while on the other hand Lithuanian has developed the opposition between two simple past tenses.

6.623. The similarities between B and M and the two Baltic languages are, of course, typological since neither can be said to have influenced the other. Moreover the inherited features are not the same in both groups: e.g. the Baltic future in -s- is an inherited feature, the S Slavic future forms are innovating. The L and La presents have all been normalised on the basis of the thematic type (curiously enough the La 1P sg of the vb to be, esmu is a hybridisation of the two types of present). Traces of the athematic type are much more strongly represented in Slavic.

6.624. It is possible to regard the creation of the fp in Lithuanian as the result of what archeologists have called stimulus diffusion, i.e. that the idea of a tense opposition was borrowed,
but not the forms. The only source from which this idea could have come is the Slavic peoples in close contact with the Lithuanians, i.e. the WR or the Poles. Yet by the fourteenth century this tense opposition was giving way to the perfect. Two possible solutions may be posited: 1) the idea of a tense opposition was borrowed much earlier, or 2) we must come back to the notion that it was an independent development of the Aukštaitišių dialect of Lithuanian.

6.625. The elements going to make up the L fp are all clearly explicable in Baltic terms (for a detailed description see Christian Stang, Das slavische und baltische Verbem, p 172 et seq) but it is their use in combination that can be described as innovating. Despite its conservatism in the substantival declension Lithuanian is not averse to innovation and it would not be beyond the bounds of possibility that the fp should be an independent invention of Lithuanian.

6.626. The picture presented by Latvian is somewhat different. Latvian has tended rather to react to changes resulting from phonological processes. These processes were in all probability brought about by the interaction between Baltic speakers and a non-Baltic (Finnic) substratum. The one change which may without doubt be ascribed to this substratum is the shift of the stress accent onto the first syllable (a Finno-Ugrian feature). This shift of stress brought about further changes: the contraction of final vowels in many cases: of the locatives -ē, -ī and -u. These locatives can be compared with the L forms -ēje, -yje, -uje.
None of these changes can be described as innovating, though the term may be applied to the analogical extension of *loc sg -ā (L -oje) to the masc o-stems (L -e). In this respect then Latvian may be looked on as more conservative than Lithuanian in that it does not so readily resort to innovation.

6.627. Where it is a question of the tense opposition the situation in Latvian may be considered the Baltic norm: i.e. no true tense opposition existed. The use of the *met construction is still too sporadic in its distribution to be considered a true opposition. Here Lithuanian innovates. In the case of aspect too the Lithuanian suffixed imperfectives *inīti and ioti are less restricted in their distribution than the La analytical construction.

6.70. Final remarks.

6.74. A typological comparison shows that the Baltic languages are essentially of the aspectual type rather than the type found in Western Europe, where the opposition is between anteriority and non-anteriority. The aspectual nature of the Baltic languages is to a certain extent concealed by the presence of an elaborate tense system. That this point is not significant is proved by the even more elaborate tense system of Bulgarian which we have used as our model in the latter part of this work.

6.72. The aspectual system of Baltic is less evolved than that of Slavio, which points to the slower development of the Baltic
system. Both the Slavic and the Baltic aspect systems are innovatory: they differ from the aspeotual system attributed to IE, which distinguished between verbal bases. Both Baltic and Slavic use prefixes to mark the perfective. Lithuanian, like Slavic, uses suffixes to mark new imperfectives. Latvian differs here in using adverbial elements (the analytical construction).

6.73. Lithuanian has in the suffix -davo the beginnings of a tense opposition comparable to the B opposition between the aor and the imperfect. The L fp resembles the La construction (met and dependent infin) in its range of meaning and is therefore more restricted in its distribution than the B imperfect. Nevertheless they (the B and L tenses) have in common the fact that they can be used in either aspect, though with a preference (particularly in modern B) for the imperfective.

6.74. The tense with the heaviest functional load in the Baltic languages is the preterite. It corresponds at times to both the B aor and B imperfect. In the latter case the B imperfect has neither a frequentative-habitual or a frequentative-intensive function. The tendency exists in all three languages for the perfect to act suppletively for the preterite (or aor B). This tendency is more highly developed in Latvian than in either L or B.

6.75. Comparisons between Baltic and Slavic tend to suggest that Baltic occupies an intermediate position. The two languages in question have neither attained the regularity of modern
Bulgarian or Macedonian in the two oppositions mentioned—p: i and aor: imp—nor have they eliminated the simple past tenses (and reduced the number of compound tenses) and constructed a purely aspectual opposition. What will be the result of the intensification of the influence of Russian which has been a feature of the last twenty-five years is a matter for speculation, and it is too early yet to express any definite opinions on this matter.
Questionnaire on the use of tense and aspect:

1. Every year they used to travel to Europe to visit friends.

2. The farmer drove into market regularly; there he bought what he needed and sold his produce. Once a year he sold a bull.

3. Few came to the meeting though many invitations were sent out.

4. The ground outside was covered with snow. In places it was so deep that only a tractor could get through.

5. "What has happened?" he asked. "Nobody knows", replied the bystanders.

6. It has been reliably reported that all the crew of the aircraft that crashed survived.

7. We heard he came back on Thursday.

8. He began to speak but after the first five minutes he was constantly interrupted.

9. The silence was interrupted by a shot. Somebody had, no doubt been firing at a wolf.
10. He continued on his way and walked for two hours. In all this time he saw only two people.

11. The gamekeeper picked up the burnt rags and believed he had found the cause of the recent fire.

12. "What have I done?" he exclaimed, when he saw the floor all covered with water.

13. He handed over a book to each of the children; every birthday they used to receive a new book.

14. John was never able to discover who had left the letter, - it had obviously not come through the post.

15. "It has started", the people shouted when the earth began to tremble.

16. They came out together from the cinema, which was showing the latest French film.

17. The teacher spoke for half an hour about the latest achievements in technology; then he explained one or two difficulties which had appeared in the last exercise.

18. They were abruptly told to run away and amuse themselves elsewhere.

19. Suddenly she came into the room.
20. "Did you come home every week?"

21. I took a newspaper from the shelf and opened it at the middle page.

22. The door shut and she heard somebody coming upstairs.

23. The shop door was constantly opening and shutting.

24. He ran down to the gate to let them in.

25. He was running to and fro, busying himself now with this, now with that.

26. He had spent most of his life abroad. At the age of fifty he suddenly decided to come home.

27. He always wrote to his parents when he was away from home.

28. He threw the logs onto the fire which soon burnt more brightly. Then from time to time he would throw another log on to keep the fire in.

29. The min stopped and the two brothers went out into the village street. They usually went out at about this time.

30. He caught sight of her momentarily at the train window.
Replies to the questionnaire:

1. Kiekvienais metais jie važiuodavo į Europą aplankyti draugą.

2. Okininkas pastoviai važiuodavo į turgą; ten jis pirkdavo kas ją mažiausiai ir parduodavo savo gaminius. Vieną kartą jis atėjo į turgą ir jis parkuodavo jautį.

3. Mažai stovėjo į susirinkimą, nors kvietimai buvo išsiysta daug.


6. Įvyko pasakovos, kad visos gaisro aplinkybės įgula liko gyva.


8. Jis pradėjo kalbėti, bet po pirmųjų penkių minučių buvo nuolatos pertraukiamas.

10. Jis tēsē savo kelionē ir ējo dvi valandās. Per vispār tē laikā jis matē tik du zmones.


12. "Kā aš padarītu?" jis suņīko, kai pamatē visas grādīs apseotas vandenīlu.

13. Jis ļietikā kruģā kiekvienam vaikam; kiekvienam gintsdienā jis gaudavo po naujā kruģā.


16. Jis kartu iējo īsi kino, kurāsāpo buvo rodoma naujās Francūziskā films.

17. Mokytojas per pusē valandās kalbājo apīe vēliausus pasiekimus technoloģijā; po to pārdzābino viens ar du sunkumus, kurie iškilo paskutiniose prātīmose.

18. Staiga jiems buvo pasažēta bēgti ir linksmitis kur nora kitur.

19. Staiga ji īējo ī kambars.

21. Aš paėmiau laikraštį nuo lentynos ir atskleidžiau vidurinį puslapį.

22. Durys užsidarė ir ji išėjo kaip lipant laiptais aukštyn.

23. Krautuvės durys viš laikė atsidarinėjo ir užsidarinėjo.

24. Jis nubėgo prie vartų juos įleisti.

25. Jis bėgiojo iš vienos vietos į kitą, dirbdamas ji bei tą.


27. Jis visuomet reikėdavo savo tėvams, kada jis buvo užvykęs iš namų.

28. Jis užmetė malą ant ugnies, kurie greitai degė šviežiai.
Po to laikas nuo laiko jis užmesdavo pagalbą, kad palaikius ugnį degant.

29. Lietus sustojo/mustojo ir du broliai išėjo į kaimo gatvę.
Jie paprastai išsidavo apie tą laiką.

30. Jis pamatė ju akymirkšniui traukinio lange.
1. Kiekvienais metais jis keliaudavo į Europą lankyti draugą.

2. Ūkininkas vis nuvažiudavo į turėjęs ten jis nusipirkdavo, ko jam reikia, ir paruošdavo savo gaminius. Kartą per metus jis paruošdavo bulių.

3. Į susitinkimą teatėjo tik keletas, nors daug pakvietimų buvo išsiuntintėta.

4. Žemė lauke buvo apklotas sniegas. Vietomis jis buvo toks gilus, kad tik traktorius galėjo pravažiuoti.


6. Kaip tikras dalykas buvo pranešta, kad išliko gyva visą išgula to lėktuvo, kuris sudužo.


8. Jis pradėjo kalbėti, bet po pirmųjų penkių minučių jis jau nuolat buvo pertaukinėjamas.


10. Jis toliau tęsė savo kelionę dvejetą valandą. Per visą šį laiką jis tematė tik du žmones.


14. Jonas niekada nepajėgo išsireikštinti, kas paliko likę, likę, kad jis ne paštu atėjo.


17. Mokytojas pasakė, kad kalbo apie naujausius technologijos pasiekimus; paskui jis išakėkino vieną kito klintį, su kuria susidurėta paskutiniame prateime.

18. Staiga jiems buvo pasakyta bėgti šalin ir kur kur susirasti jusky.

19. Staiga ji jėjo į kambari.

20. "Ar tu kas savaitę paradinėjai namo?"

22. Užsidarė durys ir ji išgirdo, kad kažkas ateina laiptais (... išgirdo kažką ateinant laiptais.)

23. Parduotuvės durys buvo nuolat atidarėjamos ir uždarėjamos.

24. Jis pabėgėjo (nubėgo) iki vartų ir įlėido juos.

25. Jis bėgindavo pirmyn ir atgal, šiašiuo, šia tuo užsiimdamas.


27. Jis visada rase tėvams, kai būdavo išvažiavęs.

28. Jis metė rastigalius į ugnį, kuri netrukus sviesiau suliepsnojo... (omitted).


30. Jis uzmirksniui sugavo jos ėvilganį prie traukinio langos.
1. Kasmet jie važiuodavo į Europą aplankyti draugą.

2. Ŭkininkas regulariai važiuodavo į turgą; čia jis pirkdavo kas jam reikalinga ir parduodavo savo gaminius. Kartą metuose jis parduodavo bulį.


4. Lauke žemė buvo nuklosta sneigu. Vietomis buvo taip gilų, kad tik traktorus buvo galima pravažiuoti.


6. Pagal patikimus ųaltinius buvo pranešta, kad visa nukrituojo áktuvo įgula išsigelbėjo.

7. Mes girdėjome, kad jis sugrįžo detvirtadienį.

8. Jis pradėjo kalbėti, bet jau po pirmyjy minušiy buvo nuolatos pertraukimas.


11. Eigulys pakėlė nuo žemės apdegusiusius skudurus ir tikėjo, kad atrado neperseniausiaį įvykusiojo gaisro priežastį.


13. Jis įėkė po knygą kiekvienam vaikui; kiekvieno gimtadienio proga jie gaudavo po knygą.

14. Jonui niekad nepasisekė išliekinti kas paliko laišką; be abejo, jis nebuvo siystras paštu.


16. Jie kartu išejo iš kino, kuriame rodoma paskutinis Prancūziškas filmas. (filma and filmas are both found)

17. Moktojas kalbėjo pusė valandos apie naujausius technologijas atsiekimus; tuomet jis paaškino vieną kitą sunkumą, kuris iškilo paskutinėjame uždavinyje.

18. Jiems staiga buvo pasakyta bėgt ir linksmintis kitur.

19. Staiga, jinai ėjo į kambary.

20. "Ar tu grieždavai namo kas savaitę?"

22. Duris užsiderė or ji girdėjo kažką lipant laiptais į viršų.

23. Krautuvės duris nuolatos buvo atdarinėjamos ir uždarinėjamos.

24. Jis nuego prie vertų ir įleido juos vidun.

25. Jis lakstė šen ir ten, vis užsiimdamas save tai su šiuo, tai su tuc.


27. Jis visuomet rašydavo tėvams, dai buдавo išvažiavęs. iš namų.

28. Jis jmetė rastus į ugnį, kuri tuo amėsparčius degti. Veliau, kartas nuo karto, jis vis jmesdavo po rasty, kad ugnis neišblėstų.


30. Jis akimirkai pamatė ją traukinio lange.
1. Kiekvienais metais jie keliavo į Europą aplankyti draugą.

2. Ūkininkas į turgų vežiavo regulariai/ veikė jėgą pasitvarkant; jis ten musi parduodavo ko reikėjo, ir parduodavo savo gaminius. Kartą metuose jis parduodavo jaustį.

3. Mažai atvyko į susirinkimą, nors buvo išsiysta daug pakvietimų.

4. Žemė lauke buvo apanigusi. Vistomis sniegas buvo toks gilus, kad tik traktorius galėjo pravažiuoti.

OR

Žemė lauke buvo apdengta sniego. Vietopis jis buvo toks gilus, kad tik traktorius galėjo pravažiuoti.


6. Patikimi baltiniai pranešė, kad visa sudužusiojo lėkstuvo įgula išsigelbėjo.


8. Jis pradėjo kalbėti, tačiau po pirmajį penkiu, mimičių jis buvo nuolatos pertraukinėjamas.

10. Jis ejo savo keliu ir krintiavo dvi valandas. Per visą
tų laiką jis tematė tik du žmones.

11. Žvėrininkas pakėlė apdegusiusius skudurus ir tikėjosi
radojus nesenini buvusiojo gaisro priežastį.

12. "Ka aš padariau?" jis sušuko, pamatęs visas grindis apsantas
vandeniu.

13. Kiekvienam vaikui jis padavė po knygą; kiekvieną gmtadienį
jie gaudavo po naują knygą.

14. Jonas niekados negalėjo sužinoti, kas paiko laiką - buvo
aišku, kad jis neatėjo paštą.


16. Jis kartu išejo iš kino, kuris rodė paskutinį prancūziškų
filmai.

17. Mokytojas pusė valandos pasakė apie paskutiniusius
technologijos laimėjimus; po to jis pasekino vieną
kitą sunkumą, kurie pasitaikė paskutinėje pramogos
pratime.

18. Jiems griežtai liepė dingti ir žeisti kur kitur.

OR

Jiems griežtai liepė bėgti ir susirasti pramogų kur nors
kitur.
19. Staiga ji įejo į kambary.

20. Ar grįždavai namo kiekvieną savaitę?


22. Durys užsidarė, ir ji girdėjo kažka lipant laiptais.

23. Parduotuves durys visą laiką buvo atidarinėjamos ir uždarinėjamos.

24. Jis nubėgo prie verty ir juos įleido.

25. Jis lekstė žen ir ten, kartais užsiiminėjo šiuo, kartais tuo.

Sulaikės penkiadsėmitis, jis staiga nutarė grįžti namo.

27. Jis visuomet rašinėdavo tėvams, kai būdavo išvykęs iš namų.

28. Jis sumetė rastus į ugnį, kuri bematant suliepsnojo skaidriaus.
Po to jis retkardiais įmesdavo po rastą liepsna palaikyti.

29. Nušoko lyti, ir abu broliai išėjo į kaimo gatvę. Apie
į laiką jie paprastai išeidavo lauk.

30. Jis jį pamatė akimirkai traukinio lange.
1. Katru gadu viņi mēda ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apmeklētu draugus.

2. Saimnieks brauc uz tirgu regulāri; tur viņš pirka ko viņam vajadzēja un pārdeva savus ražojumus. Reiz gada viņš pārdeva pa bulim (vērsim).


7. Mes dzirdējam, ka viņš esot atgriezies asturdieni.

8. Viņš iesaka runāt, bet pēc pirmajām piecām minūtēm viņu nepārtraukti pārtrauca.


11. Mezsargs atrada *(paešla)* sadegušs kupātas un domājis arīdās nešenā ugunsgrēka cēloni.

* if he had been out looking for the cause;
** if casually out walking.

12. "Ko esmu izdarījis?" viņš izsauca, kad redzēja ka grīdu klāja ūdens.

13. Viņš pasniedza (iedeva) katram bērnam grāmatu; viņš medza sapņu jaumi grāmatu katrā dzimšanas dienā.

14. Jānim nekad neizdevās noskaidrot, kas bij ilstājis vēstuli; bija skaidrs, ka tā nebija nakusi pa pastu.

15. "Ir sācis!" Jauds sauc, kad zeme saka drebēt (trioš).

16. Viņš atstāja kino reizi, kur izradīja jaunu (pēdeoja) franču filmu.

17. Skolotājs runa ja pusdienā par pēdeoju sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā; pēc tam viņš izskaidroja dažas grūtakas vietas iepriekšējā uzdevumā.

18. Viņiem strupi lika iet prom un prisatāties (if children - notalatāties) kaut kur (can be omitted) citur.

19. Pēkšņi viņa iemaņa istabā.
20. Vai tu atgriezies (or nāci) mājas katru nešu?

21. Es papēmu laikrastu no plaukta un atvēru to vidū.

22. Durvis aizvērās, un vipṣ dzirdēja kādu nākam augšā

(... vipṣ dzirdēja, ka kāds nāca augšā)

23. Veikala durvis virinājās nepārtraukti.

24. Vipṣ skrēja uz vertiem, lai vipus ielaistu.

25. Vipṣ skraidīja šurp un turp, un darīja te šo te to.

Piecdesmit gadu vecumā vipṣ pēkšņi nolēma atgriezties mājās.

27. Vipṣ vienmēr rakstīja saviem vecākiem, kad vipṣ bij prom
(no mājās).

28. Vipṣ iemeta pagales ugunī, kaš drīz iedešas gaisāki. Tad
laiku pa laikam vipṣ iemeta pa pagales, lai usturetu uguni.

29. Lietus apstājās, un abi braļi izgāja uz (ciema) ielas.

Vipi parasti izgāja šai laikā.

30. Vipṣ uz acimirkli ieraudzīja vipu pie vielcienu laga.
La 2.

1. Katru gadu viņi medza celot uz Eiropu, lai apsaimnotu draugām.


3. Tikai daži atnosa uz sapulci/ ieradā sapulces (OR iter: medza ierasties..), kaut gan daudzi ielūgumi bija/tika issūtīti.

4. Zeme bij sniega klāta. (Sniega klāja zeme) Vietumā (dažur, dažviet, šur–tur) tas bija tik dziļā, ka tikai ar traktoru varēja tikt cauri.

5. "Kas noticis?" viņš jautāja (vaicāja). "Neviens nezin (a)", atbildeja klāstāvkošie (acu liecinieki).

6. Tikai ticami apgalvots (No ticamīm avotiem zipots), ka katastrofa cietušās (nokritušās, saritušās) lidmašīnas apkalpe bij iezīvojusi (pārslīvojusi katastrofu).

7. Mēs dzirdējam, ka viņš atgriezas oasturdienā.

8. Viņš saka runāt, bet pēc minūtēm piecām (pēc pirmām piecām minūtēm; better: jau pašā sakumā, pēc minūtēm piecām) viņu trauktin pārtrauca (notrūkus traucēja).


11. Mežsargs pacēla apdegūšās lupatas un ūsja pārliecība (noticēja), ka vipš atradis nesenā ugunsgrēka cēloni.

*If he subsequently changed his opinion, if another cause came forward.


13. Vipš pasniedza grāmatu katram no bērniem: katrā dzimšanas diena (not so fashionable - dzimšadiena) vipš mēdza saprst pa jaunai grāmatai.

14. Jānis (Blons) nekad nespeja atklāt, kas bij atsājīšis (to) vēstuli - acimredzami tā nebija nakusi pa pastu.


16. Vipš kopa iznāca no kino(-teatra), kur tika rādīta jaunā franču filma.
17. Skolotajs runāja (stāstīja) pusstundu par pēdējiem (jaunākiem) saņēmumiem tehnoloģijā un tad viņš izskaidroja dažas grūtības, kas biji atgadījušas pēdējā rakstdarbā.

18. Viņš strupāji tika pateikts doties (idiom.) lasīties (unidiom.) skriet prom un notajāties (spēlēties) kaut kur citur.

19. Viņa pēkšņi (negraidīti) iemāca iestabē.

20. "Vai jūs mēdžat atgriesies mājas (mākt, braukt) katru nedēļu?"

21. Es papēru aviži no plaukta un to attaisīju videjā lappusē.

22. Durvis aizcirās un viņa dzirdēja Māju mākam (pa trepēm) uz augšu.

23. Veikala durvis tika virinātas nepārtrauktī.

24. Mēs skrejām lejā uz vārtiem lai vīpus (tos) ielaistu iekšā.

25. Viņš skraidāja krustošā ķērēm nododamies te ar to, te ar to.


27. Viņš vienmēr mēdza rakstīt vecākiem kad bija (atradās) prom no mājā.

29. Lietus apstājas un abi brūji izgāja ārā sādžas ielā (ielipā) Vipi parasti mēdz iziet ap šo(dienas) laiku.

30. Vipš uz vietas vipu ieraudzīja kad vilciens apstājas.
La 3.

1. Katru gadu viņi mēdana ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apciemotu draugus.

2. Fermeris regulāri brauc uz tirgu; tur viņš pirkš visu vajadzīgo un pārdeva savus produktus. Reizi gadā viņš pārdeva bulli.

3. Uz sanākami ierosās nedaudz; lai gan daudzi ilgūgami bija izsūtīti.

4. Ārē seme bija pārklāta ar smēru. Vietēm tas bija tik dziļa, ka tikai traktors varēja inklūt cauri.


6. Ir drošas zīpas ka avāriju cietuša lidmašīnas visa apkalpe ir pelikusī dzīva.

7. Mēs dzirdējam, ka viņš ceturtdien atgriezies.

8. Viņš sāka runāt, taču pēc pirmajām piecem minūtēm viņš tikā paslīdā ka partraukts.


* Most spell *minute* with a short *u*.*

11. Mezsargs pacēla spēkušās akrandas un noticēja, ka vipš atradis nesen notikušā ugunskrūvu ožoni.


13. Vipš pasniedza grāmatu katram bērnam; katrā dzimšanas dienā vipš mēdza sapemt jaunu grāmatu.


15. "Sākās" kliedza cilvēki, kad zeme saka trīcot.

16. Vipš kopā izmēca no kinoteātra, kurā demonstrēja jaunāko franču filmu.

17. Skolotājs pusstundu runāja par jaunākajiem saņēmumiem tehnoloģijā; pēc tam vipš paskaidroja vienu vai divus saņemtus jautājumus, kuri bija radušies pedējā vingrinājumā.


20. "Vai jūs pārbraucat mājas katru nedēļu?"

21. Es papēsu avīzi no plaukta un atveru to videjā lapuās.

22. Durvis aizvēras, un viņa dzirdēja kadu nēkam augšup pa kāpnu.

23. Veikala durvis pastāvīgi atveras un aizvēras.

24. Viņš skraidāja uz priekšu un atpakāj, nodarbinādamies sevi ar ko un to.

26. Savas dzīves līdzīko daļu viņš bija parādījis ārheimēs. 
Piekedesmit gadu vecumā viņš pēkšā noēma doties uz mājām.

27. Viņš vienmēr rakstīja savām vecākiem, kad viņš bija projām no mājām.

28. Viņš svidē pagales kamūnā, kas drīz vien dega ar spožu līemā. Tad laiku pa laikam viņš medza iesveist vēl vienu pagali, lai uguns nenodristu.

29. Lietus pārstāja lūt, un abi braji izgāja uz cietuma ielas.
Viņš parasti gāja ārā ap ko laiku.

30. Viņš tobrīd ieraudzīja viņu pie vienāda loga.
1. Katru gadu viņš mēdza ceļot uz Eiropu apoloemot draugus.

2. Lauksaimnieks brauc uz tirgu regulāri; tur viņš pirka ko viņam vajadzēja un pārdova savus ražojumus. Reizi gada viņš pārdova bulli.


6. Tika ticami zipots, ka visa nogāzušas lidmašīnas apkalpe isglabād.

7. Mes dzirdējam, ka viņš atnāca atpakaļ ceturtā dienā.

8. Viņš saka runāt, bet pēc pirmām piecām minūtēm viņš tika pastāvīgi pārtraukts.


11. Medību pārvinīš pāaseja apdegšāslupatā un domāja ka vipš ir atradis oeloni nesenam ugunsgrēkam.

12. "Ko es esmu izdarījis?" vipš issausās, kad vipš redzēja visu grīdu apklātu ar ūdeni.

13. Vipš pasniedza katram bērnam grāmatu; katrā dzimšanas dienā vipš mēsza sapemt jaunu grāmatu.


15. "Ir sācies", laudis saucā, kad seme sāka triecēt.

16. Vipš kopā mēsa ārā no kino, kas bija radījis pēdejo franču filmu.

17. Skolotajs runāja pusstundu par pēdejiem sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā; vipš tad izskaidroja dažas grūtības, kas bija parādījušās pēdeļa uzdevumā.

18. Vipšam tika strupi pateikts lei iet projām un uzjautrinās kādā citā vietas.

19. Pēkspi vipš iemāca istabā.

20. "Vai jūs nāca t mājas katru nedēļu?"
21. Es pāpāmu laikrakstu no plaukta un atvēru to videjā lapas pusei.

22. Durvis aizvēras in viņa dzirdēja kadu nākam pa turem uz augšu.

23. Veikala durvis pastāvīgi atvērās un aizvērās.

24. Viņš skrēja lejāpie vārtiem lai viņus ielaistu iekšā.

25. Viņš skraidīja hurb un turp, nodarbinādams sevi gan ar to.

26. Viņš bija pavadījis savas dzīves liełāko daļu ķermeņā.
Piecedesmit gadi vecumā viņš pēkši nolēma nakt mājas.

27. Viņš vienmēr rakstīja saviem vecākiem, kad viņš bija projam no mājām.

28. Viņš mata malkas pagales uguns, kas drīz dejo daudz gaišāki.
Tad laiku pa laikam viņš metas citas pagales, lai uguns neizdziest.

29. Lietus apstājas un abi braļi izgāja āra uz ciema ielas.
Viņš parasti gaja āra ap to laiku.

30. Viņš pamanīja viņu momentāli pie vilciena loga.
1. Katru gadu viņi mēda ceļot uz Eiropu, lai apciemotu draugus.


3. Tikai nedaudzi atnāca uz sapulci, kaut gan daudzi tika aicināti.

4. Āra visa bija apsnaidžis. Vietām sniegs bija tik dzīļs, ka tikai ar traktoru varēja izbraukt cauri.


6. No drokēm avotiem zīplo, ka visa lidmašīnas apkalpe, kas avarēja, izglābās.

7. Mēs dzirdējam, ka viņš atgriežas octurdien.

8. Viņš saka runāt, bet jau pēc piecām minūtēm viņu pastāvīgi pārtrauc.

9. Sāviens pārtrauc klausumu; nebij šaubu, ka kāds šāva vilku.

11. Mezsargs pacēla apdegusās lupatas un bija parliecināts, ka atrada unguegrēka cēloni.


13. Katram bērnam viņš iedeva pa grāmatā; katru (ik) dzimšanas dienu viņš sapēma jaunu grāmatu.


15. "Nu, jau sākās", kliedza laudis, kad zeme sāka drēbet.

16. Viņi kopā iznāca no kinosēles, kuri rūdīja jaunako franšū filmu.

17. Skolotāja runāja (stāstīja) puseslīdā par jaunakiem sasniegumiem tehnoloģijā; pēc tam viņš izskaidroja dažas neskaidrības pēdējā vingrinājumā.

18. Pēkšņi viņiem lika lasīties prom un spēlēties kur citur.


20. "Vai jūs katru nedēļu nakat mājās?"

21. Es papāsmu no plaukta avīzi un atvēru videjo lapu.
22. Durvis aizveras, un viņš dzirdēja, ka kāds nāca (kapa) augšā (pa trepēm).

23. Veikala durvis visu laiku vērās ciet un valē.

24. Viņš aizskreja līdz vārtiem un lēlaida viņus iekšā.

25. Viņš skreja žūrp un turp, darīdam gaa šo, gaa to.


27. Prombūtnē no mažām, viņš vienmēr rakstīja saviem vecākiem.

28. Viņš iemeta pagales ugund, kas ārīzī vien saka degt ar gaišāku liēsmu. Fēc tam viņš pa laikam piemeta pa pagalei, lai uguns neatpūstu.

29. Lietus pārgāja un abi braļi izgāja ārā ciema ielās.
Viņi parasti izgāja ārā ap šo laiku.

30. Viņš pēkšņi ieraudzīja viņu vilcienu logā,
1. Vsjaka godina te pâtuvaha v Evropa na gosti na prijatelite.

2. Përmeriht redovno hodaše s kolata si na pasar, tam kupuvaše kakovoto mu e muqno i prodavaše kakovë beše proizvel. Vedna v godinata prodavaše bik.

3. Vëpreki òja ha ispratëni mnogo pokani, malko hora dojdoha na sâbraniëto.


7. Çuhme, òje se e vërmal v òetvârtak.

8. Toj započna da govoři, po sëld përvite 5 minuti postojamno go prekâsvaha.


10. Toj prodâlí pëtja si i vârvja 2 òasa. Pres sjaloto vreme òidja samo dvama duhi.
11. Podarjat vse izgorešite parštali i misleši če e otkril

12. "Kakvo napravih", vžuklikna toj kato vidja, če celijat pod

e pokrit s voda.

13. Toj padate kniga na vsako dete - po sveki rečden den, to

polučaveha nova kniga.

14. Džen nikoga ne moža da razbere Koj e (ba) ostavil pismoto -

čevidne trome bo došlo z poštate.


16. Te izljazoha zasedno ot kinoto, kādeto davaha naj-novija

frenski film.

17. Ušiteljat govori polovin čas za naj-novite postiženija v

tehnikata, posle objasni ednadve ot trudnite mesta, srešntati

v poslednoto upražnere.

18. Rjasko im kazaha da se malat i da se zabavljavat njakade

drugade.

19. Izvednaž tha vloze v stajata.

20. Vrštahte li se vkišti vsajaka sednica?
21. Vzeh vestnika ot rauta i go otvorih na stranicata v sredata.

22. Vratata se zatvori i tja ću, će njakoj idva gore.

23. Vratata na magazine neprekăsnato se otvarjaše i zatvarjaše.


25. Toj tišaše nasam-natam, kato se zanimavaše tu s tova, tu s onova.


27. Vinagi pišeše na roditekite si, kogato beše daleč ot kásti.

28. Toj hrârli dârvata v ogâanja, kojto skoro se razgorja jarko.
    Pocal otvreme-navreme toj hvârljaše po njako dârvo da go poddârkâ.

29. Dâbšt sprja i dvaanta bratja isljezona na selakata ulica.
    Obiknoveno islizaha po tova vreme.

30. Toj je vidja za moment ot prozoreca na vlaka.
1. Vsjaka godina te obiknoveno pâtuvala v Evropa na gosti na svoi prijateli.

2. Američk hodole na pazar redovno; tam toj kupuješ, tova kosto mu beše mnogo i prodavaše stokata si. Eden pât v godinata toj prodavaše po edin bik.


7. Cuhme, çe se vârna v četvårtîk.

8. Toj zapoâna da govori, no sled pet minuti toj beše postojanno prekâvan.

10. Toj prodžšči pätja si i värjva dva časa. Prez ojaloto tova vreme vidja samo dvama duši.


12. Toj razdale po edna kniga na vsako dete; za vsaki rožden den te obiknoveno polušavaha po edna nova kniga.


14. Džon nikoga ne moža da otkrie koj beše ostavil pismoto - javno beše, če to ne beše došlo po poštata.

15. "Zapošna - zakreštjaha horata, kogato zemjata zapošna da se trese.


18. Napravo im beše kasano da zapusanat i se sabavljavat drugade.

19. Isvednás tja vleze vstajata.
20. "Vajaka sedmica li se vršiše v kasti.

21. Az vseh vestnika ot policata i go otvorih na srednata stranica.

22. Vratata na magasina se otvarjaše i satvarjaše postojanno.


25. Toj tistiše nasam-natam, kato se zanimavaše tu s tova, tu s onova.

26. Toj beše prekaral po goljamata čast ot života si v čušbina. Na petdesetgodisna vâsrast toj izvedneš reši da se vârne v rodnata se.

27. Toj vinagi pišeše na roditelite se, kogato ne beše v kâšti.


29. Čâškât sprja, i dvamača bratja izljaša na selakata uliška. Te obiknovenno islizaha po tova vreme.

30. Toj ja zârnja za mig na prosoreca na vlaka.
Appendix C

Notes on alphabets and transliteration systems.

1. **Roman**

   The standard orthography of those languages which use Roman is used with modifications in a few places.

   **Lithuanian**

   /ə/ - ę;

   Nasalisation is indicated by a subscript comma.

   **Latvian**

   Palatalisation as in standard orthography indicated by comma, superscript comma replaced by acute accent.

   **Serbo-Croatian**

   Croatian orthography used without modification.

   **Polish**

   Nasalisation indicated by subscript comma.

   **Turkish**

   Back variant of /i/ - ĭ

2. **Transliteration from Cyrillic**

   With certain modification is based on transliteration of OCS.
**OCS**

Front and back jers - ʲ and ʲ̑.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Russian</strong></th>
<th><strong>Bulgarian</strong></th>
<th><strong>Macedonian</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>k, Կ rendered as in Cyrillic with acute, i.e. k', գ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>у</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е, ё</td>
<td>х</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>ш</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>ть</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л</td>
<td>м</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>м</td>
<td>в</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н</td>
<td>э</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о</td>
<td>и</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>я</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḃ</td>
<td>Ń</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ё (here a reduced vowel) - Ѣ.

ё (here a reduced vowel) - Ѣ.

ё (here a reduced vowel) - Ѣ.
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