

Past active participles in Baltic: between evidential and perfect (a LiLa-based study)

Anna Daugavet
(Vilnius University)

Evidential and perfect

- Evidential marks the course of information (firsthand knowledge vs non-firsthand knowledge)
- Perfect refers to a connection between two different points in time (e.g. a current situation and one that precedes it)

Evidential and perfect

- **formal overlap** in Baltic
both expressed by active past participles (PPA) without the auxiliary
- **historically related**
evidential functions developed out of perfect functions
- one cannot be studied without the other!
- **an areal feature** found in Latvian and Lithuanian (Baltic), as well as in the neighbouring Estonian (Finnic)
- **crosslinguistically** salient feature, see Bulgarian
- the current study concentrates on Baltic

Introduction

- makeup of perfect and evidential forms
 - relationship with previous research
- LiLa corpus and corpus search
 - data selection and interpretation

Constructed examples of perfect and evidential

Lith	<i>Ji</i>	<i>(yra)</i>	<i>baig-us-i</i>	<i>mokslus</i>
Latv	<i>Viņa</i>	<i>(ir)</i>	<i>beig-us-i</i>	<i>mācības</i>
	3.noms.f	be.prs.3	finish-ppa-nom.sg.f	study.acc.pl

- 1) 'She has finished her studies'
full-fledged forms and bare participles
- 2) 'It is said that she (has) finished her studies'
bare participles only

Previous research

Daugavet, Anna & Peter Arkadiev (2021) The perfects in Latvian and Lithuanian: A comparative study based on questionnaire and corpus data. *Baltic Linguistics* 12, 73–165.

- a typological questionnaire from Dahl (ed., 2000, 800–809)
- a parallel corpus (LiLa), full-fledged perfect forms in all tenses

cf. **Kapkan, Danguolė (2021)** Perfect in Lithuanian: A case study based on the data from Facebook comments. *Baltic Linguistics* 12, 21–71.

- both full-fledged perfect forms in the present tense and bare participles
- facebook comments

Perfect in other tenses (Lithuanian)

prs? *Ji* *baig-us-i* *mokslus*

- the dropped auxiliary is normally identified with the present tense

prs *Ji* ***yra*** *baig-us-i* *mokslus*

pst *Ji* ***buvo*** *baig-us-i* *mokslus*

fut *Ji* ***bus*** *baig-us-i* *mokslus*

pst.hab *Ji* ***būdavo*** *baig-us-i* *mokslus*

3nom.s.f be.TENSE.3 finish-ppa-nom.sg. study.acc.pl

- Past Habitual is absent from Latvian!

Past Habitual Participles (Lithuanian)

- past habitual stem

baig-dav-o *baig-dav-us-i*
finish-hab-3 finish-hab-ppa-nom.sg.f

Ji ***mokė-dav-us-i*** *priimti*
3.nom.sf **know-hab-ppa-nom.sg.f** take.inf

jvairiausius *pavidalus* <...>
various.super.acc.pl shape.acc.pl

‘It is said that she was able to shift shapes.’

- evidential uses

Other evidential forms (Latvian)

prs	<i>Viņa</i>	<i>beidz-ot</i>	<i>mācības</i>
	3nom.s.f	finish-prs.evid	study.acc.pl
pst	<i>Viņa</i>	<i>beig-us-i</i>	<i>mācības</i>
	3nom.s.f	finish-ppa-nom.sg.f	study.acc.pl
fut	<i>Viņa</i>	<i>beig-šot</i>	<i>mācības</i>
	3nom.s.f	finish-evid.fut	study.acc.pl

- In Lithuanian, similar functions are served by present and future active participles!

Evidential Perfect (Latvian)

- auxiliary in evidential

<i>Viņa</i>	<i>es-ot</i>	<i>beig-us-i</i>	<i>mācības</i>
3.noms.f	be-evid.prs	finish-ppa-nom.sg.f	study.acc.pl

‘It is said that she has finished her studies.’

Current research

- perfect and evidential uses of PPA
- relationship with full-fledged perfect forms in the present and other tenses
- filling the gap left in Daugavet & Arkadiev (2021)

LiLa, its composition and use

- The Parallel Corpus of Lithuanian and Latvian (LiLa) at www.korpuss.lv
- **original** texts in the two Baltic languages and their **translations** into the other Baltic language (indirect translations via English excluded from the data)
- mainly **fiction** and some non-fiction (official documents excluded from the data), mostly narratives, cf. Kaplan (2022)
- comparison **between the original** Latvian and Lithuanian texts
- comparison **between the original texts and their translations** into the other Baltic language

Corpus search

- **automatic search** for all wordforms ending in *-usi*, which corresponds to the finale sequence of PPA, feminine singular, in both Latvian and Lithuanian (Lith *bėg-us-i*, Latv *bēg-us-i* ‘run-PPA-nom.sg.fem’)
- the masculine singular form ends in *-is*, which is also found in numerous other wordforms (*brolis/brālis* ‘brother’ etc.)
- leaves out reflexive (mostly Latvian) verbs, *iekūl-us-ie-s* ‘get.oneself.into-ppa-nom.sf.g-rfl’
- leaves out syncopated Lithuanian PPA forms *bėgusi* > *bėgus*, as the final sequence *-us* is also commonly found elsewhere (Lith *gražus* ‘nice’ etc.)

Corpus search

- **manual selection** of active past participles functioning as main predicates (leaving out modifiers, secondary predicates etc.)
- affirmative forms only, in order to avoid additional issues

Auxiliary drop

- one sentence, one subject, one auxiliary, more than one PPA

<i>Sapnī</i>	<i>biju</i>	<i>ielēkusi</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>desmitmetrīga</i>
dream.loc	be.pst.1sg	in.jump.ppa.nom.sg.f	from	10.meter.gen.sg
<i>torņa</i>	<i>un</i>	<i>nogrimusi</i>	<i>pārāk</i>	<i>dziļi.</i>
tower.gen.sg	and	sink.ppa.nom.sg.f	too	deep

‘Into my dream, I had jumped from a 10 meter high tower and sunk too deep.’

- all PPAs are associated with the auxiliary and identified as full-fledged perfect constructions

Auxiliary drop

- two sentences (also parcellation),
one subject, one auxiliary, more than one PPA

<i>Ārprāts,</i>	<i>viena</i>	<i>pati</i>	<i>biju</i>	<i>runājusi</i>
madness	one.nom.sg.f.	self.nom.sg.f	be.prs.1sg	speak.ppa.nom.sg.f
<i>gandrīz</i>	<i>stundu.</i>	<i>Klāstījusi</i>		<i>ģimenes</i>
almost	hour.acc.sg	reveal.ppa.nom.sg.f		family.gen.sg
<i>noslēpumus,</i>	<i>mājas</i>	<i>meklējumus.</i>		
secret.acc.pl	home.gen.sg	search.acc.pl		

‘That’s madness, she has been speaking alone almost for an hour. He has revealed family secrets and her wonderings in the search of a home.’

Auxiliary drop (past tense)

- past tense auxiliary

<i>Ārprāts,</i>	<i>viena</i>	<i>pati</i>	<i>biju</i>	<i>runājusi</i>
madness	one.nom.sg.f.	self.nom.sg.f	be.prs.1sg	speak.ppa.nom.sg.f
<i>gandrīz</i>	<i>stundu.</i>	<i>Klāstījusi</i>		<i>ģimenes</i>
almost	hour.acc.sg	reveal.ppa.nom.sg.f		family.gen.sg
<i>noslēpumus,</i>	<i>mājas</i>	<i>meklējumus.</i>		
secret.acc.pl	home.gen.sg	search.acc.pl		

‘That’s madness, I had been speaking alone almost for an hour. <I had> revealed family secrets and her wonderings in the seach of a home.’

Auxiliary drop (evidential present)

<i>Kosmētiskais</i>		<i>remonts</i>		<i>esot</i>		<i>bijis</i>
cosmetic.nom.sg.m.def		repair.nom.sg		be.evid.prs		be.ppa.nom.sg.m
<i>viegls.</i>		<i>Mazliet</i>		<i>laiku</i>		<i>aizņēmusi</i>
easy.nom.sg.m		little		time.acc.sg		require.ppa.nom.sg.f
<i>vannas</i>		<i>istabas</i>		<i>iekārtošana</i>		
bath.gen.sg		room.gen.sg		installation.nom.sg		
<i>un</i>		<i>siltās</i>		<i>grīdas</i>		<i>ielikšana.</i>
and		warm.gen.sg.f.def		floor.gen.sg		installation.nom.sg

‘Refurbishing has been easy, he says. It only took some time to add a bathroom and install the floor heating.’

Outline

- introduction
- PPA frequencies in LiLa (both evidential and perfect uses)
- perfect uses of PPAs
- evidential uses of PPA
- links between perfect and evidential
- Latvian vs Lithuanian

PPA FREQUENCIES IN LILA (EVIDENTIAL AND PERFECT USES)

PPAs (both perfect and evidential uses)

- two subcorpora of different size, containing original texts in Latvian (1,7 mln) and Lithuanian (3,5 mln)
- full-fledged perfect constructions vs bare PPAs (perfect and evidential uses combined) are also shown as items per million

	Latvian		Lithuanian	
	corpus	ipm	corpus	ipm
aux + ppa	1171	689	572	163
bare ppa	<i>1082</i>	634	327	93

PPAs (both perfect and evidential uses)

- full-fledged perfect constructions are much more frequent in Latvian than in Lithuanian (689 vs 163 ipm), see Daugavet & Arkadiev (2022)
- bare PPAs (**both perfect and evidential uses**) show the same tendency (634 vs 93)
- the frequency of bare PPAs (**both perfect and evidential uses**) in Latvian is comparable to the frequency of full-fledged constructions (689 vs 634)
- in Lithuanian, bare PPAs (**both perfect and evidential uses**) are almost twice more frequent (163 vs 93) than full-fledged perfect constructions

Evidential vs perfect uses of PPAs in original texts

	Latvian	Lithuanian
perfects	615 (57%)	160 (49%)
evidentials	461 (43%)	157 (48%)
other	6 (1%)	10 (3%)
total	1082 (100%)	327 (100%)

“other” is a special construction (bare participles preceded by wh-words)

Present Perfect with vs without auxiliary

- dropped PPAs in perfect uses are interpreted as present tense, in contradiction to the actual meaning of some examples (see above)

	Latvian	Lithuanian
bare ppa	615 (50%)	160 (62%)
prs aux + ppa	620 (50%)	99 (38%)
all prs prf	1235	259 (100%)

Present Perfect with vs without auxiliary

- the Lithuanian Present Perfect forms are more frequently found as bare participles than as full-fledged constructions with the auxiliary in LiLa (=contemporary literary works)
- the same tendency to prefer bare participles in the Lithuanian Present Perfect is also found by Kapkan (2022) in the informal language
- no such tendency is found in Latvian

Perfect uses of PPAs vs full-fledged forms

- the overall number of perfect uses in the original texts of LiLa, including bare participles used as perfects
- the auxiliary is found in **any of the three tenses**

	Latvian	Lithuanian
aux + ppa	1171 (66%)	572 (78%)
bare ppa	615 (34%)	160 (22%)
total	1786 (100%)	732 (100%)

Distribution of full-fledged perfect tenses

- Daugavet & Arkadiev (2022) reveal the disbalance between the frequencies of different perfect tenses (**with the auxiliary**) in Lithuanian

	Latvian	Lithuanian
prs aux + ppa	620 (53%)	99 (17%)
pst aux + ppa	505 (43%)	451 (79%)
fut aux + ppa	46 (4%)	22 (4%)
total	1171 (100%)	572 (100%)

Distribution of perfect tenses plus PPAs

- dropped PPAs in perfect uses are always interpreted as present tense, in contradiction to the actual meaning of some examples (see above)

	Latvian		Lithuanian	
bare ppa	615 (34%)	1235 (69%)	160 (22%)	259 (35%)
prs aux + ppa	620 (35%)		99 (14%)	
pst aux + ppa	505 (28%)		451 (62%)	
fut aux + ppa	46 (3%)		22 (3%)	
total	1786 (100%)		732 (100%)	

Distribution of perfect tenses plus PPAs

- the relationship between the Present and the Past Perfect becomes slightly more balanced in Lithuanian (36% vs 62%)
- the Present Perfect is still twice less common than the Past Perfect
- the ratio is reversed in Latvian where the Present Perfect is more frequent than the Past Perfect

PERFECT USES OF PPAs

Perfect uses

a simplified version of the classification in Daugavet & Arkadiev (2022) where it is only applied to full-fledged perfect constructions; applying it to bare PPAs is new research

- stative
- resultative
- current relevance
- experiential

Perfect uses of full-fledged forms in Baltic

a simplified classification of full-fledged perfect constructions from Daugavet & Arkadiev (2022)

	Latvian	Lithuanian
stative	25 (4%)	33 (33%)
resultative	160 (26%)	29 (29%)
current relevance	296 (48%)	12 (12%)
experiential	139 (22%)	25 (25%)
total	620 (100%)	99 (100%)

Perfect uses of PPAs in Baltic

analysis of Lithuanian PPAs from Daugavet (2022, Salos presentation)
classification of Latvian PPAs is new research

	Latvian	Lithuanian
stative	5 (1%)	59 (37%)
resultative	285 (46%)	89 (56%)
current relevance	246 (40%)	4 (3%)
experiential	78 (13%)	8 (5%)
total	615 (100%)	160 (100%)

+ 1 Latvian example of discontinuous past

Statives

- perfect-like combinations of the copula 'be' with a lexicalised participle
- source construction for the Baltic Perfect
- implies no previous action, see Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988, 5–7)

Statives (full-fledged form vs PPA)

Latv	<i>Esmu</i>	<i>nosarkusi</i>	<i>un</i>	<i>dusmīga</i> <...>
Lith	<i>Esu</i>	<i>išraudusi</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>supykusi</i> <...>
	be.prs.1sg	red-faced	and	angry

‘I’m red-faced and angry <...>’

Lith	<i>Ką ji moka,</i>	<i>prie</i>	<i>ko</i>		<i>jpratusi?</i>
Latv	<i>Ko viņa māk,</i>	<i>pie</i>	<i>kā</i>	<i>viņa</i>	<i>pieradusi?</i>
		at	what.gen	3.nom.sg.f	familiar

‘What skills does she have? What is she familiar with?’

Statives

	Latvian	Lithuanian
aux+ppa	25 (4%)	33 (33%)
bare ppa	5 (1%)	59 (37%)

often translated by adjectives or passive past participles into Latvian (and English); see also the translation from Latvian into Lithuanian above

Lith *Ko tokia išbalusi?*
why such.nom.sg.f **pale.ppa.sg.f**

Latv *Kāpēc tik bāla?* ‘Why are you so pale?’
why so **pale.nom.sg.f**

Perfect uses

a simplified version of the classification in Daugavet & Arkadiev (2022) where it is only applied to full-fledged perfect constructions; applying it to bare PPAs is new research

- stative
- **resultative**
- current relevance
- experiential

Resultatives (full-fledged form vs PPA)

State brought about by a preceding event (Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988, 6)

Litv	<...> <i>Seime</i>	<i>yra</i>	<i>susidariusi</i>
Latv	<...> <i>Seimā</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>izveidojies</i>
	parlament.loc.sg	be.prs.3	develop.ppa.nom.sg

<i>nauja</i>	<i>dauguma.</i>
<i>jauns</i>	<i>vairākums.</i>
new.nom.sg	majority.nom.sg

‘A new majority has developed in the parliament’

Lith	<i>Seimą</i>	<i>apėmusi</i>	<i>sumaištis.</i>
Latv	<i>Seimu</i>	<i>pārņėmusi</i>	<i>panika.</i>
	parliament.nom.sg	overtake.ppa.nom.sg.f	panic.nom.sg

‘Panic has overtaken the parliament’

Resultatives

	Latvian	Lithuanian
aux + ppa	160 (26%)	29 (29%)
bare ppa	285 (46%)	89 (56%)

Perfect uses

a simplified version of the classification in Daugavet & Arkadiev (2022) where it is only applied to full-fledged perfect constructions; applying it to bare PPAs is new research

- stative
- resultative
- **current relevance**
- experiential

Current relevance

- a previous situation having effect on the current one
- developed from the resultative use, the effect of the previous situation 'not directly derivable from the meaning of the verb' (Dahl & Hedin 2000, 389)

Current relevance (full-fledged form)

Latv	<i>Vai</i>	<i>tiešām</i>	<i>esmu</i>	<i>runājusi</i>		
	Q	really	be.prs.1sg	talk.ppa.nom.sg.f		
		<i>vienpadsmit</i>	<i>stundas?</i>			
		11	hours			
Lith	<i>Argi</i>	<i>iš tiesų</i>	<i>iškalbėjau</i>	<i>vienuolika</i>	<i>valandų?</i>	
	Q	really	prf.talk.pst.1sg	11	hour.gen.pl	

‘Is it true that I have been talking for eleven hours?’

(Talking for eleven hours means that a lot has been said.)

Current relevance (PPA)

Latv	<i>Emīlija</i>	<i>saņēmusi</i>	<i>vēstuli</i>	<i>no</i>
	pn	get.ppa.nom.sg.f	letter.acc.sg	from
	<i>vecākā</i>		<i>dēla.</i>	
	older.gen.sg.m.def		son.gen.sg	
Lith	<i>Emilija</i>	<i>gavo</i>	<i>laišką</i>	<i>iš</i>
	pn	get.pst.3	letter.acc.sg	from
	<i>vyresniojo</i>		<i>sūnaus.</i>	
	older.gen.sg.m.def		son.gen.sg	

‘Emilija has received a letter from her older son.’ (Its contents follow.)

Current relevance

	Latvian	Lithuanian
aux + ppa	296 (48%)	12 (12%)
bare ppa	246 (40%)	4 (3%)

often translated by Simple Past into Lithuanian, see the previous slide

Perfect uses

a simplified version of the classification in Daugavet & Arkadiev (2022) where it is only applied to full-fledged perfect constructions; applying it to bare PPAs is new research

- stative
- resultative
- current relevance
- **experiential**

Experiential (full-fledged form)

- certain type of situation occurring at least once in the past (Dahl 1985, 141)

Latv	<i>Vai</i>	<i>kādreiz</i>	<i>esat</i>	<i>bijusi</i>	<i>laimīga?</i>
Lith	<i>Ar</i>	<i>kada nors</i>	<i>esate</i>	<i>buvus</i>	<i>laiminga?</i>
	Q	ever	be.prs.2pl	be.ppa.nom.sg.f	happy.nom.sg.f

‘Have you ever been happy?’

Experiential (PPA)

Latv	<i>Tādas</i>	<i>sētas</i>	<i>viņa</i>	<i>redzējusi</i>
Lith	<i>Tokias</i>	<i>sodybas</i>	<i>ji</i>	<i>mačiusi</i>
	such.acc.pl	homestead.acc.pl	3.sg.nom.f	see.ppa.nom.sg.f

<i>vienīgi</i>	<i>Krievijā.</i>
<i>tik</i>	<i>Rusijoje.</i>
only	Russia.loc.sg

‘She has only seen such homesteads in Russia.’

Experiential

	Latvian	Lithuanian
aux + ppa	139 (22%)	25 (25%)
bare ppa	78 (13%)	8 (5%)

Perfect uses of full-fledged forms in Baltic

a simplified classification of full-fledged perfect constructions from Daugavet & Arkadiev (2022)

	Latvian	Lithuanian
stative	25 (4%)	33 (33%)
resultative	160 (26%)	29 (29%)
current relevance	296 (48%)	12 (12%)
experiential	139 (22%)	25 (25%)
total	620 (100%)	99 (100%)

Perfect uses of PPAs in Baltic

analysis of Lithuanian PPAs from Daugavet (2022, Salos presentation)
classification of Latvian PPAs is new research

	Latvian	Lithuanian
stative	5 (1%)	59 (37%)
resultative	285 (46%)	89 (56%)
current relevance	246 (40%)	4 (3%)
experiential	78 (13%)	8 (5%)
total	615 (100%)	160 (100%)

+ 1 Latvian example of discontinuous past

Perfect uses of PPAs vs full-fledged forms

- PPAs retain the same set of perfect functions as found in full-fledged perfect constructions in each of the languages
 - the meaning of current relevance is much more prominent in Latvian with both full-fledged forms and PPAs
- in both languages, PPAs are associated with increased use of resultatives and decreased use of experientials, see the same tendency in Kaplan (2022, 57)

PPA sequences with perfect meaning

- PPAs line up, together with full-fledged perfect forms, to form longer fragments of texts

*Vai tiešām tāpat kā man smeldz rēta un nebeidz čulgot? Viņa **pieteikusies** angļu valodas kursos, **sākusi** nodarbības aerobikā, **peldējusi** baseinā, **vingrojusi**, **filmējusi** kāzas, bēres un krustības ar personīgo videokameru. Viņa **bija dzīvojusi** par spīti. Protams, viņa **bija cerējusi**, ka studiju likvidēs civilizēti, nevis tā vienkārši – nav un jūs neviens vairs neesat vajadzīgi. **Domājusi**, ka izveidos līgumu sistēmu, organizēs konkursus par filmu tēmām, meklēs maksātspējīgus mecenātus, lai veidotu konkrētas kultūras filmas. Nekas tamlīdzīgs nenotika.*

Auxiliary drop (past tense)

'Is her wound hurting and still blistering, the same as mine? She **has registered** for English courses, **started** a program of physical fitness, **swum** in a pool, **done** gymnastics, **filmed** weddings, funerals and baptism ceremonies with her own camera. She **had lived** in spite of everything. Of course, she **had hoped** that the studio would be closed in a civilized way instead of simply shutting it down – it's over and none of you is required. She **had thought** that they would introduce a contract system, organize competitions to chose topics for films, look for capable sponsors in order to shoot individual films about culture. Nothing of the kind happened.'

EVIDENTIAL USES OF PPAs

Evidential vs perfect uses of PPAs in original texts

	Latvian	Lithuanian
perfects	615 (57%)	160 (49%)
evidentials	461 (43%)	157 (48%)
other	6 (1%)	10 (3%)
total	1082 (100%)	327 (100%)

“other” is a special construction (bare participles preceded by wh-words)

Source of information (Aikhenvald 2018)

- Visual
- Non-visual sensory
- Inference based on visible or tangible result
- Assumption based on information other than visible result: this may include logical reasoning, assumption or simply general knowledge
- Reported, for reported information with no reference to who it was reported by
- Quotative, for reported information with an overt reference to the authorship of the quoted source

Verbal vs non-verbal source

- someone says so (quotative)
everybody says so (reportative)
general knowledge/traditional lore
- there are physical traces
there are logical connections

Source of information in Baltic (PPAs only)

	Latvian	Lithuanian
quotative	368 (80%)	103 (66%)
reportative	40 (9%)	21 (13%)
general knowledge	24 (5%)	1 (1%)
traditional lore	13 (3%)	27 (17%)
inferential	11 (2%)	2 (1%)
assumption	3 (1%)	0 (0%)
other uses	2 (0%)	3 (2%)
total	461 (100%)	157 (100%)

Quotative

Latv	<i>Bet</i>	<i>kālabad</i>	<i>tad</i>	<i>viņa</i>	<i>skrējusi</i>	<i>ar</i>
	but	why	then	3.sg.nom.f	run.ppa.nom.sg.f	with
	<i>tām</i>		<i>dakšām,</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>pabrīnījos.</i>	
	dem.dat.pl.f		fork.dat.pl	1.sg.nom	wonder.pst.1sg.rfl	
Lith	<i>O</i>	<i>dėl ko</i>	<i>ji</i>	<i>taip</i>	<i>lėkusi</i>	<i>su</i>
	but	why	so	3.sg.nom.f	run.ppa.nom.sg.f	with
	<i>tom</i>		<i>šakėm,</i>	<i>nusistebėjau.</i>		
	dem.inst.pl.f		fork.dat.pl	wonder.pst.1sg		

‘But why did she run with that fork, I wondered’

Reportative

Latv *Runā,* *ka no viņa tādēļ*
talk.prs.3 that from 3.sg.gen.m for.that.reason

aizgājusi *sieva* <...>
away.go.ppa.nom.sg.f wife.nom.sg

Lith *Kalbama,* *jog todėl ji*
talk.prs.imprs that for.that.reason 3.sg.acc.m

palikusi *pati.*
leave.ppa.nom.sg.f wife.nom.sg

‘It is said that his wife left him for that particular reason’

General knowledge

Latv *Piemineklis komjaunietei,
kura šajā ielejā **ieradusies** ar vienu no pirmajām ekspedīcijām
un **gājusi** bojā, veicot dienesta pienākumus.*

Lith *Paminklas komjaunuolei,
kuri šiame slėnyje **radusis** su viena iš pirmųjų ekspedicijų
ir **žuvusi** eidama tarnybos pareigas.*

‘A monument to a Komsomol girl who came to this valley together with one of the first expeditions and perished while she was carrying out her professional duty.’

= a girl who is known to have come to the valley and perish there

Traditional lore

Lith	<i>Jame gyvenusi</i>	<i>kraugerė</i>	<i>demonė</i>	<i>Kasmali.</i>
Latv	<i>Tajā dzīvojusi</i>	<i>asinsdzērāja</i>	<i>dēmone</i>	<i>Kasmale.</i>
	there live.ppa.nom.sg.f	bloodthirsty.nom.sg	demon	pn

‘There (in the graveyard) lived a bloodthirsty demon called Kasmale.’

Sequences of evidential PPAs

- instances of quotative and reportative, as well as general knowledge and traditional lore, can form long (narrative) sequences

*Ji aprašė vieną ypatingą savo regėjimą. Smulkiai nupasakojo, kaip **nėrusi** į ilgą siaurą skersgatvį, lyg į krosnį, tamsią, žemą, ankštą... <...> Liovusis kristi ji **atsidūrusi** priešais sieną. O sienoje **buvusi** maža ertmė, panaši į indaują. Nežinoma jėga **surietusi** šventąją ir **jgrūdusi** į tą ertmę <...>*

‘She (Saint Teresa) described her special vision. She told in detail how she **dived** into a long narrow lane, like a dark, low, cramped furnace... <...> When her fall ended, she **found** herself facing a wall. And the wall **contained** a small cavity, like a cupboard. An unknown force **twisted** the saint and **pushed** her into the cavity <...>’

Inferential

Latv *Viņa riteņa riepu nospiedumus uz smilšainā ceļa aizpūš vējš, aizskalo lietus. Noslēpj pēdas, lai nav redzams, kādi bijuši ziņas ceļi. Kā tā **sasniegusi** adresātu.*

Lith *Jo dviračių padangų žymes žvyruotame kelyje užneša vėjas, nuplauna lietus. Kad nebūtų žinomi žinios atnešimo keliai. Kaip jie **pasiekę** adresatą.*

‘The traces of tyres left by his bicycle are destroyed by wind and rain. They are hidden so that one cannot know how the message has travelled. How it has **reached** the addressee.’

Assumption

(about the return of a person earlier believed dead)

Latv	<i>Toreiz tajā</i>	<i>rakstā</i>	<i>bijusi</i>	<i>kļūda.</i>
	then dem.loc.sg	text.loc.sg	be.ppa.nom.sg.f	mistake.nom.sg
Lith	<i>Aname</i>	<i>rašte</i>	<i>tada buvusi</i>	<i>klaida.</i>
	dem.loc.sg	text.loc.sg	then be.ppa.nom.sg.f	mistake.nom.sg

‘There was a mistake back then in that document’

Other uses of PPAs

- “the firsthand evidential may have overtones of speaker’s control and participation, and the non-firsthand term may imply the opposite” (Aikhenvald 2018)

Latv *Bailes lēnām **aptinās** ap kājām, **rāpās** augšā pa bikšu starām, **atslābināja** kājstarpi un **apvijās** ap vidukli. **Snaikstījās** gar krūtīm un dzelžaini **sagrāba** sirdi un rīkli. Tā kā **iedžinkstējies** ausīs, acīs gaisma **sākusi** trīsuļot kā bites, bet pašam **šķītis**, ka stāv kādas kraujas malā.*

‘Fear wrapped slowly around his feet, crept up his trousers, weakened his crotch and wrapped up around his waist. Then it spread in his breast and seized his heart and throat in an iron grip. His ears **were ringing**, he **was seeing stars** hovering like bees before his eyes, and he **felt** as if he were standing on the edge of a cliff.’

LINKS BETWEEN PERFECT AND EVIDENTIAL

Links between perfect and evidential

- inferential and quotative uses are marginally found with full-fledged perfect forms

- quotative in Nau (2005, 149)

Bet citi saka,

ka klasē

tu

esi

varējis

that class.loc.sg 2sg.nom

be.prs.2sg can.ppa.nom.sg.m

būt

arī

diezgan

neciešams.

be.inf

also

rather

unbearable.nom.sg.m

‘But others say that you could be rather unbearable in class’

- see Nau (2005, 148–150) also for differentiating criteria

Links between perfect and evidential

- inferential and quotative uses are marginally found with full-fledged perfect forms

- inferential use of past perfect in LiLa

<...> *bet vēlāk, iegājusi virtuvē,*

es redzēju, ka Solvita

bija

raudājusi.

1sg.nom see.pst.1sg that pn

be.pst.3

cry.ppa.nom.sg.f

‘But when I entered the kitchen later, I saw that Solvita had cried.’

From perfect to evidential

- “The evidential uses of perfects develop because the perfect is used to describe past actions or events with present results. If the focus of the meaning is on the idea that the present results are connected to and perhaps attest to past actions or events, then **the notion of an action known by its results can be extended to actions known by other indirect means, such as by inference** (from reasoning in addition to inference from results) **and by reports from other parties.**” (Bybee & Dahl 1989, 74)
- For Baltic, see Holvoet (2004): the initial inferential use of PPAs is replaced with quotative and reportative uses

LATVIAN VS LITHUANIAN

Frequencies and grammaticalization

- Latvian and Lithuanian use PPAs similarly, both as perfects and evidentials.
- These differences are associated with a different degree of grammaticalization of both categories.
- It is interesting that the lower degree of grammaticalization doesn't prevent the Lithuanian Perfect from developing evidential uses!

Frequencies and grammaticalization

- Both full-fledged perfect forms and PPAs are much more frequent in Latvian than Lithuanian. In both languages, half of PPAs are used as perfects, another half as evidentials.
- If perfect PPAs are counted as instances of Present Perfect, the most frequent perfect tense in Latvian is Present Perfect, but in Lithuanian it is Past Perfect.

Frequencies and grammaticalization

- All main uses of perfect are found with both full-fledged forms and PPAs, but their distribution is different in Latvian and Lithuanian.
- The frequency of resultatives and current relevance examples are higher with PPAs.
- The frequency of experientials are higher with full-fledged forms, for both languages.
- This might point to a tendency towards differentiating the experiential construction from the resultative construction.

Frequencies and grammaticalization

- Most evidential PPAs in both languages are quotative and reportative, joined by instances conveying general knowledge and traditional lore.
- A small number of instances represents inferential uses. But they are important as they reflect the historical link between perfects and evidentials, together with an even smaller number of perfects used in inferential and quotative meanings.