ON THE RESULTATIVE MEANING OF DERIVED STATIVES IN MODERN LITHUANIAN

1. Introduction. Resultatives are defined as verb forms or derivatives of terminative (telic) verbs that express states resulting from previous events, cf. *he has gone* (event) vs. *he is (still) gone* (resultative) (Nedjalkov 2001, 928; cf. Nedjalkov, Jaxonov 1988, 6f.). In Lithuanian, the resultative meanings are regularly expressed by periphrastic forms consisting of the auxiliary *būti* ‘be’ (optional in the present tense) and the past active or passive participles (Geniušienė, Nedjalkov 1988, 369f.), cf. an event in (1a) and a corresponding resultative in (1b): 

(1) (a) 
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Ji & ap-si-vilk-o & palt-q \\
3SG.NOM.F & PREF-REFL-put.on.PST.3 & coat-ACC.SG
\end{array}
\]

‘She put on a coat.’

(b) 
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Ji & (yra) / buv-o & ap-si-vilk-us-i \\
3SG.NOM.F & (be.PRS.3) / be-PST.3 & PREF-REFL-put.on-PST.ACT.PTCP-NOM.SG.F
\end{array}
\]

*palt-q*

coat-ACC.SG

‘She has / had a coat on.’

---

1 The paper is based on a poster presentation prepared for the conference *Universals and Typology in Word-Formation*, P. J. Šafárik University in Košice, August 16–18, 2009. An earlier version of the paper was also presented at Salos summer school of linguistics (*Academia Grammaticorum Salensis Sexta*) on August 7, 2009. I would like to thank the participants of the conference and the summer school as well as the reviewers of the paper for useful comments and suggestions which led to important revisions and corrections. I am also sincerely grateful to Emma Geniušienė for pointing out a number of problems in my analysis, some of which are unfortunately still left unsolved in the present version of the paper. Needless to say, all possible misinterpretations and errors are mine.

In this paper, I will present some data to demonstrate that Lithuanian also has an unproductive derivational category of deverbal statives with resultative meanings similar to those expressed by the periphrastic forms, cf. *vilk-é-ti* ‘have sth on, wear’ derived from *vilk-ti-s* ‘put sth on, dress (oneself)’ in (2):

(2)  
\[ \text{Ji } \text{vilk-i / vilk-ėj-o} \quad \text{palt-q} \]  
\[ 3\text{sg.nom.f} \quad \text{put.on-stat.prs.3} / \text{put.on-stat.pst.3} \quad \text{coat-acc.sg} \]  
‘She has / had a coat on.’

The main semantic difference between derived statives and resultative periphrastic forms is that derived statives do not necessarily imply previous events in all contexts and a non-resultative interpretation of (2) is also possible, whereas the periphrastic forms almost always explicitly refer to earlier events. On the other hand, the derivational (i.e. primary) interpretation of derived statives can only be resultative and the loss of derivational meaning is secondary. In this context, one can note that the term *derived stative* is far from perfect: the statives are defined as verb forms expressing states without the implication of previous events (Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 6; Nedjalkov 2001, 928), but the derived statives actually may refer to them (and thus are resultative in this case). This contradiction is solved by acknowledging that stative and resultative meanings share a number of properties and are not always easily distinguished, and by proposing a broader definition of resultative that covers both stative and resultative proper (Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 7; Jaxontov 1988, 101f.; Nedjalkov 2001, 928), cf.:

“a broader notion of resultative would be a verb form denoting a state which is derived from a dynamic verb whose result the state could be” (Haspelmath 1992, 191, emphasis added).

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, three syntactic types of resultatives are briefly discussed, followed by a general overview of derived statives in Modern Lithuanian in section 3. In section 4, derived statives are classified according to the suffixes and their resultative meanings are dis-

---

3 To reflect the status of formations discussed in this paper, one could also employ terms like *derivational resultative* (i.e. derived stative) vs. *grammatical resultative* (i.e. resultative periphrastic form), cf. Servajte 1985, 63 where a possibility of term *lexical resultative* is also considered; note that *derivational resultative* was also used in the conference presentation mentioned above. To avoid any possible misunderstanding, I chose to use the term *derived stative* in this paper following the tradition of studies presented in Nedjalkov 1988.
discussed. In section 5, some examples of parallel derived statives and periphrastic resultatives are given. In section 6, the position of Modern Lithuanian in the typology of resultatives is considered and in section 7, the main findings are summarized.

2. Syntactic types of resultatives. The syntactic types of resultatives are defined by comparing the argument structure of the base construction denoting an event with that of the resultative (Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 7–11; Nedjalkov 2001, 928f.). In Modern Lithuanian, three syntactic types of periphrastic resultatives may be distinguished: the object-oriented, the subject-oriented intransitive and the subject-oriented transitive (the possessive) resultative (Geniušienė, Nedjalkov 1988, 369f.). The same set of types will be used in section 4 to describe the resultative meanings of the derived statives (cf. Nasilov 1988, 223–226 on objective stative in Uzbek, Nedjalkov 1988, 249–252 on objective, subjective, and possessive statives in Evenki, Mačavariani 1988, 267f. on objective statives in Georgian, Perel’muter 1988, 280f. on objective and subjective statives in Ancient (Homeric) Greek, and Polinskaja 1988, 292–294 on subjective and objective statives in Tongan).

In the case of object-oriented resultative (or P-resultative), the subject of the resultative construction corresponds to the direct object (patient) of the base construction, cf. (3a) and (3b):^4

(3) (a) *Jis uždar-ė lang-q*

3SG.NOM.M close-PST.3 window-ACC.SG

‘He closed the window.’ (event)

(b) *Lang-as (yra) / buv-o uždary-t-as*

window-NOM.SG (be.PRS.3) / be-PST.3 close-PST.PASS.PTCP-NOM.SG.M

‘The window is/was closed.’ (P-resultative)

If the subject of the base construction and the resultative construction remains the same, one deals with the subject-oriented resultative. In this case, two subtypes are possible depending on the transitivity of the base verb: the transitive (the possessive, or A-resultative), when the object of the base construction is also retained in the resultative construction, cf. (1a) and (1b) above, and the intransitive (or S-resultative), cf. (4a) and (4b):

---

^4 The examples (1), (3) and (4) are taken from Geniušienė, Nedjalkov 1988, 369f. with slight modifications.
To make a distinction between periphrastic resultative forms and derived statives, the latter ones will be referred to as P-, S-, and A-statives (the abbreviations P-, S-, and A- are adopted following Nedjalkov 2001).

3. An overview of derived statives in Modern Lithuanian. The category of derived statives referred to as derivatives of “resultative state” is briefly described in Ambrazas 2006, 399f. (cf. also short notes in Ulvydas 1971, 241, 243 and Jakaitienė 1973, 11, 33) and some lists of the derivatives are given in Otrębski 1965, 340, 344f., 360f. More details can be found in a larger study of Lithuanian stative and resultative meanings by Laimutė Servaitė (Servajte 1985) where the main groups of lexical statives (which include the derived statives) were described and some parallels between periphrastic resultative forms and derived statives were noticed (Servajte 1985, 63f., 75–78, 110, 131, 151f.). Some important remarks on the history of derived statives are presented in Stang 1942, 147, 152ff., 1966, 320–325, Otrębski 1965, 341, 345, and Schmalstieg 2000, 115ff., 126ff. (note that some statives in Lithuanian are possibly lexicalized perfect and aorist forms of Indo-European origin).

The statives in Modern Lithuanian are derived by adding the suffixes -ė-, -o-, and -so- to the root of the base verb, e.g.: av-ė-ti ‘wear (shoes)’ (← aũ-ti-s ‘put on (shoes)’), klūp-o-ti ‘be on one’s knees’ (← klaũp-ti-s ‘kneel down’), dryb-só-ti ‘lie lazily’ (← drib-ti ‘tumble, fall down’). The suffixes -ė- and -o- are absent in the present stem, but the verbs have specific types of this stem in -i and -o correspondingly, cf. prs.3 āv-(Ø)-i ‘wear(s) (shoes)’, klūp-(Ø)-o ‘is/are on his/her/their knees’. The suffix -so- alternates with -s- in section 4.1, one possible formation in -sė-ti is also discussed.

Few verbs have two possible present stem types (-ėti, -i/-ėja and -oti, -o/-oja) or just one type which is quite uncommon for the derived statives (-ėti, -a, -ėti, -ėja, and -oti, -oja). All present stem types mentioned here and above are not restricted to statives and are “specific” in a sense that they define certain inflection classes.

---

5 In section 4.1, one possible formation in -sė-ti is also discussed.

6 Few verbs have two possible present stem types (-ėti, -i/-ėja and -oti, -o/-oja) or just one type which is quite uncommon for the derived statives (-ėti, -a, -ėti, -ėja, and -oti, -oja). All present stem types mentioned here and above are not restricted to statives and are “specific” in a sense that they define certain inflection classes.
in the present stem which belongs to the type in -o, cf. prs.3 drỳb-s-o ‘lie(s) lazily’. In the past stem, all suffixes have /j/ before the inflectional markers of finite and non-finite forms, cf. pst.3 av-éj-o, klùp-oj-o, dryb-sój-o and pst. act.ptcp.nom.sg.m av-éj-ęs, klùp-oj-ęs, dryb-sój-ęs. The derived verbs may retain the root vowel and the tone of the base verb (cf. grimzd-é-ti, grimzd-i ‘be immersed, plunged’ ← grimz-ti {grimzd-ti} ‘sink (intr.), plunge’) or certain types of root apophony or tone alternations may occur, cf. [u:] ← [eu] in klùp-o-ti ← klaup-tis, [i:] ← [i] in dryb-só-ti ← drib-ti, lind-o-ti ‘be in hiding’ (acute tone) ← lį̄s-ti {liınd-ti} ‘get, crawl into’ (circumflex tone), 2kloj-é-ti, kloj-i ‘stretch out, extend’ (circumflex tone) ← kló-ti ‘spread, lay’ (acute tone), etc. (a full list of all possible alternations is not relevant and will not be discussed here for the sake of brevity). The array of possible bases for derived statives is morphologically quite restricted as these formations can be only derived from the so-called “primary” (i.e. non-suffixed) verbs.

The material presented in this paper was collected in 2009–2011 using the on-line edition of the Dictionary of Modern Lithuanian.7 The aim was to compile a list of synchronically transparent derivatives, although in some cases the derivational status and (or) the resultative interpretation can be disputed. For a verb to be recognized as a derived stative, the following conditions have to be met. First, the derivative has to refer to a state arising as a result when the telic process denoted by the base verb reaches its limit and, secondly, the derivative has to be morphologically more complex than the base. For example, in the case of skénd-é-ti (prs.3 skénd-i, pst.3 skénd-éj-o) ‘be sunken’ ← skèš-ti (prs.3 skèš{s}-sta, pst.3 skeñd-o) ‘sink, go down, drown (intr.),’ the derivative is more complex than its base (there is a suffix -é- in the infinitive and the past stems and a specific type of the present stem is assigned) and it denotes a state which arose when the telic process reached its limit. The limit of the telic process is marked by various prefixes added to the stem of the base verbs (cf. skèš-ti → nu-/pa-skèš-ti), but is not morphologically marked in the derived stative. On the other hand, if the derived stative has to be paraphrased, the most natural choice would be to use a prefixed verb in a periphrastic resultative form, cf. skéndëti ~ bûti nu-/pa-skendusiam (‘be sunken’). One also has to note that some prefixed “primary” verbs can

---

7 Dabartinës lietuvių kalbos žodynas, available at http://www.lki.lt/dlkz/, further referred to as DLKŽe. In some cases, the on-line edition of Dictionary of Lithuanian (Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, LKŽe, available at http://www.lkz.lt/) was also consulted.
mark the beginning of an action or entry into a state alongside the so-called “mixed” verbs, some of which are structurally similar to derived statives, cf. pra-gyš-ti ‘begin to crow’, pa-mil-ti ‘fall in love’, nu-tiš-ti ‘become silent’ alongside gied-ó-ti, gied-ad ‘chant, crow’, myl-é-ti, myl-i ‘love’, tyl-é-ti, tyl-i ‘be, keep silent’, etc. These “primary” verbs are almost never used without the prefixes and it would be unsafe to assume that gyš-ti, mil-ti, and til-ti are possible bases of gied-ó-ti, myl-é-ti, and tyl-é-ti. In these cases, an opposite direction of derivation is at work, i.e. ‘action / state’ → ‘beginning of an action / entry into a state’ (cf. Ambrazas 2006, 405).

In a number of instances the reflexivity of the base verb also has to be considered. In the derivational system of Lithuanian, the reflexive affix of the base verb can be either inherited or omitted (Urbutis 1978, 195–197), cf. džiaug-ti-s ‘rejoice’ (reflexivum tantum) → džiaug-imas-is (action nominal, reflexive affix is inherited and its allomorph -is is used) vs. džiug-au-ti ‘exult’, džiaug-smas ‘joy’ (reflexive affix is omitted). The derived stative verbs do not inherit the reflexive affix of their bases, cf. klaup-ti-s ‘kneel down’ → klup-é-ti, klup-i ‘be on one’s knees’. Sometimes the reflexive verbs compete for the status of the base with corresponding intransitives. In this case both possibilities are accepted and listed, cf. glud-é-ti, glud-i ‘be concealed, lie hidden’ ← gluš-ti-s (reflexive) ‘press oneself (to)’ vs. gluš-ti ‘id.’ (intransitive). Sometimes the non-reflexive (transitive) verb cannot be considered as a possible base due to semantic reasons, cf. vilk-é-ti ‘have sth on, wear’ which can be formally derived from transitive vilk-ti ‘dress (someone)’, but the derivative vilk-é-ti refers to an action accomplished by the subject him/herself (← vilk-ti-s ‘dress oneself’) and opposite cases are very rare and have to be considered as secondary (cf. Kūdiķis vilkējo švarus drabužēlius ‘The baby had clean clothes on’). On the other hand, one has to keep in mind that the historical relation between the derived statives and their base verbs could have been different. It is quite possible that at an earlier stage the statives had no direct relation to the reflexive verbs, and klup-é-ti, glud-é-ti, and vilk-é-ti were derived from (intransitive) klup-ti ‘stumble’ / klaup-ti ‘kneel down’, gluš-ti, and (transitive) vilk-ti. Over the course of time the reflexives started to compete with non-reflexives for the status of the base for the derived sta-

8 The reflexive affix can be added later, cf. the case of dengēti-s, deŋi-si ‘be covered (with)’ ← deng-é-ti, deŋg-i ‘id.’ ← deŋg-ti-s ‘cover oneself with’ (the non-reflexive dengēti is attested in LKŽ only).
tives. For example, in the case of glūd-ė-ti, both bases are still possible, but it is worth noting that glaūs-ti-s is much more frequent than glūs-ti in Modern Lithuanian (cf. Grumadienė, Žilinskienė 1998, 104f. where only glaūs-ti-s is listed). Non-reflexive klaūp-ti is also less frequent than klaūp-ti-s (the former one is not listed in Grumadienė, Žilinskienė 1998, 165) and klūp-ti is less fitting semantically (‘stumble’ vs. klaūp-ti-s ‘kneel down’). In the case of vilk-ė-ti, one has to note a possible shift from patient-orientation (‘be dressed by someone’ ← vilk-ti) to agent-orientation (‘be dressed by oneself’ ← vilk-ti-s), cf. Haspelmath 1992, 214 on active perfect in classical Greek. Therefore the relation between derived statives and reflexive base verbs has to be regarded as historically secondary, but synchronically quite strong in some cases.

There are also some instances when derived statives can be related to both intransitive and transitive verbs and have two different resultative readings (Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 12; Nedjalkov 2001, 929), cf. smyg-só-ti, smỳg-so ‘be stuck, pierced’ alongside smeïg-ti ‘pierce (tr.), stick into’ (P-stative) and smig-tì ‘pierce (intr.), go into’ (S-stative).

It is also worth noting that some derived statives included in the Dictionary of Modern Lithuanian are quite rare and thus the data from a frequency dictionary (Grumadienė, Žilinskienė 1998) was added in the lists of verbs presented in the appendix of the paper. As far as the total number of derived statives is concerned, it has been noted that they tend to be a closed class in languages with different markers of resultatives and statives (Nedjalkov 2001, 933). With about 90 formations, Lithuanian is rather close to Uzbek and Georgian where ca. 60 formations are attested (Nasilov 1988, 223; Mačavariiani 1988, 267), but demonstrates lower productivity compared to Evenki which has around 200 derived statives (Nedjalkov 2001, 933).

4. Derived statives and their resultative meaning in Modern Lithuanian. All three suffixes (-ė-ti, -i; -o-ti, -o; -so-ti, -so) are used to derive S- and P-statives, but A-statives are attested with -ė-ti, -i only. The majority of formations denote visually perceivable reversible or irreversible states, and typical semantic groups of the base verbs of S-statives are verbs of movement, change of location or body posture and usually involve physical contact between the objects, while A-statives are mostly derived from bases related to dressing (cf. Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 29f. and Geniušienė, Nedjalkov 1988, 380, 382). The cases of P-statives are too rare to provide any generalization.
It has to be noted that in some cases discussed below, a metaphorical use of the resultative is accepted, i.e. the situation is interpreted as if it occurred as a result of the previous action denoted by the base verb, cf. (5) and similar examples discussed in Kozinskij 1988, 514–516:

(5) *The South-West Pacific is generously sprinkled with islands*

### 4.1. Derived statives in -ēti.

There are 45 formations in -ēti, -i (/ -a / -ēja), -ējo with the resultative meaning, and 28 of them are S-statives, while 14 belong to A-stative type, and only 3 are P-statives.

S-stative formations typically refer to the states arising due to changes of location, body posture or other visually perceivable transformation (cf. Servajte 1985, 75f.), e.g.: glūdēti, glūdi⁹ ‘be concealed, lie hidden’ ← glaūs-ti-s / glūs-ti ‘press oneself (to)’, grimzdēti, grimždi ‘be immersed, plunged’ ← grimž-ti ‘sink, plunge (intr.)’, gulēti, gūli ‘lie’ ← guūl-ti(-s) ‘lie down’, klūpēti, klūpi ‘be on one’s knees’ ← klaūp-ti(-s) ‘kneel down’, šiūsēti, šiūsī ‘be bristling’ ← šiūus-ti-s ‘bristle up (intr.)’, etc. Some derivatives denote states as results of destruction, degradation or some other kind of deterioration, including psychological states (cf. Servajte 1985, 63), e.g.: griūvēti, griūvi ‘lie in ruins’ ← griū-ti ‘fall down, collapse’, kiūrēti, kiūri ‘have hole(s)’ ← kiūr-ti ‘get holed’, kriošēti, krioši ‘be (lie, sit) inactive’ ← krioš-ti ‘grow decrepit’, niūrēti, niūri ‘be gloomy (about a person)’ ← niūr-ti ‘gloom, frown’, etc. Some cases can be considered resultatives only if a metaphorical interpretation is accepted (‘the result arose as if X’), cf.: kabēti, kāba ‘be overhanging’ ← kūb-ti ‘cling (to)’, žiojēti, žiōji ‘be wide open’ ← žio-ti-s ‘open one’s mouth’, etc. One derivative in -sē-ti could be also mentioned here, since this is the only stative formation attested with this suffix: stink-sē-ti, stink-si (noted as East Aukštaitian dialect verb in DLKŽ⁴e) ‘move as if having stiff, numb legs, stalk’ ← stīng-ti ‘get stiff’. If a resultative interpretation is accepted (and a prefixed base verb is actually mentioned in the meaning definition of DLKŽ⁴e), it could be reflected in the orthography as stīng-sēti, stīng-si.

The majority of A-stative formations refer to situations as results of dressing, putting something on (cf. Servajte 1985, 63), e.g.: avēti, āvi ‘wear (shoes)’ ← aū-ti-s ‘put on (shoes)’, ryšēti, rūši ‘wear something tied (a kerchief, a tie)’ ← riš-ti-s ‘tie (sth for oneself)’, vilkēti, vilki ‘wear (clothes)’ ←

---

⁹ Alongside the infinitive stem, the present stem will be always listed to provide information about the inflection type of it and the tone of the root (when the stress falls on the suffix in the infinitive and the past stems).
višk-ťi-s ‘dress oneself’, etc. Two verbs in this group describe situations of being covered (dengėti-s, deñgi-si ‘be covered (with)’ ← deng-ė-ťi, deñg-ť ‘id.’ (attested in LKŽ\(^{e}\) only) ← deñg-ťi-s ‘cover oneself with’, \(^{1}\)klojėti, klojėja / klöji ‘be covered (with a blanket, etc.)’ ← kló-ťi-s ‘cover oneself’), while one does not imply contact with the subject: \(^{3}\)klojėti, klojėja / klöji ‘keep (flax) spread out’ ← kló-ťi ‘spread, lay’.\(^{10}\)

P-statives are rare in general, and the ones attested in -ęti are also rarely (if at all) used in Modern Lithuanian: \(^{2}\)klojėti, klojėja / klöji ‘stretch out, extend’ ← kló-ťi ‘spread, lay’, spūdėti, spūdi ‘be under pressure, be squeezed ← spáus-ťi ‘press, squeeze’, vožėti, vůži ‘be covered (under sth)’ ← vůž-ťi ‘put the lid/cover on’.\(^{11}\) In some cases described as S-statives above (more examples can be found in the appendix), a P-stative interpretation would also seem possible, cf. šiaušėti, šiauši ‘be bristling’, \(^{1}\)klojėti, klojėja / klöji ‘be covered’, etc. However, the meaning definitions and examples given in DLKŽ\(^{4\text{e}}\) and LKŽ\(^{e}\) provide little support for a P-stative reading and Lithuanian paraphrases with the past passive participles of prefixed transitive verbs (cf. būti pa-šiauštam, būti ap-/už-klotam) sound much less adequate than the ones with the past active participles of the prefixed reflexive verbs (cf. būti pa-si-šiaušusiam, būti ap-/už-si-klojusiam).

4.2. **Derivational resultatives in -oti.** There are 18 formations in -oti, -o (-őja), -ojo, and the S-stative type is predominant (16 verbs vs. one P-stative and one case allowing two interpretations).

The majority of S-statives in -oti refer to the same types of situations mentioned in the beginning of section 4.1, e.g.: brýdoti, brýdoja ‘stand in water’ ← bris-ťi ‘go, wade in(to) water’, kniūboti, kniūbo ‘be in a position with one’s head lowered on crossed arms’ ← kniaūb-ťi-s ‘lower one’s head on crossed arms, hide one’s face’, sprūdoti, sprūdo (sprūdoti, sprūdo) ‘be squeezed into, hide somewhere’ ← spráus-ťi-s ‘squeeze one’s way’, týsoti, týso ‘lie stretched out’ ← tiẽs-ťi-s ‘stretch oneself’, etc. It is also worth noting that there is a group of verbs attested both in -ė-ťi and -o-ťi without any significant semantic difference, e.g.: glūdėti, glūdi / glūdoti, glūdo ‘be concealed, lie hidden’, gūžėti,

\(^{10}\) DLKŽ\(^{4\text{e}}\) lists three meanings of klojėti, but it makes sense to treat them as separate verbs due to different syntactic types of statives. The numbering given here corresponds to the order of meanings in DLKŽ\(^{4\text{e}}\), and the third klojėti is mentioned further as P-stative.

\(^{11}\) The prefixed reflexive už-si-vőž-ťi used in the meaning definition of DLKŽ\(^{4\text{e}}\) would suggest a possibility of S-stative interpretation, but the examples given in DLKŽ\(^{4\text{e}}\) and also in LKŽ\(^{e}\) only support P-stative interpretation.
gūži / gūžoti, gūžo ‘be cowered’ (← gūž-ti-s ‘cower, shrink back’), klūpéti, klūpit / klūpoti, klūpo (klūpoja) ‘be on one’s knees’, niūrēti, niūri / niūroti, niūro ‘be gloomy’ (niūroti can be also used impersonally referring to gloomy weather conditions, cf. Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 10 on subject-impersonal resultatives).

P-statives in -oti can be exemplified by kīmšoti, kīmšo ‘be stuck, stand blocking sth’ (← kīmš-ti ‘push, cram, squeeze in(to)’), while the case of kīšoti, kīšo ‘be sticking out’ seems to have two possible readings (cf. Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 12; Nedjalkov 2001, 929 on two-diathesis/ambiguous resultatives). An S-stative interpretation is based on the relation of kīšoti to the reflexive kīš-ti-s ‘go out, protrude (intr.)’, cf. an example from DLKŻ⁴ᵉ (implying a metaphorical interpretation):

(5) Pro medži-ų viršūn-es kyš-oj-o nam-ų stog-ai
Through tree-gen.pl top-acc.pl protrude-stat-pst.3 house-gen.pl roof-nom.pl
‘The roofs of the houses were sticking out through the treetops.’

On the other hand, if another DLKŻ⁴ᵉ example in (6) is considered, a P-stative interpretation also seems possible, as the key had to be inserted into the door lock and kīšoti can be related to the transitive kīš-ti ‘insert’:

(6) Rakt-as kyš-o dur-yse
Key-nom.sg insert-stat-prs.3 door-loc.pl
‘A key is inserted into the door [lock].’ (P-stative) alongside ‘A key is sticking out of the door [lock].’ (S-stative)

Note that there is a derived stative based on the same root in -ēti (‘kyšēti, kūši ‘be sticking out’ ← kīš-ti-s ‘go out, protrude (intr.)’), but no examples were found in DLKŻ⁴ᵉ and LKŻ to support a P-stative interpretation. The definitions of some S-statives like sprūdoti, sprūdo ‘be squeezed into’ or tūsoti, tūso ‘lie stretched out’ mentioned earlier also hint at a possibility of P-stative reading, but their relation to the reflexive verbs seems stronger.¹²

¹² Possibly due to semantic similarity, there is some orthographic inconsistency between tūsoti and tūsoti. DLKŻ⁴ᵉ lists them both (‘lie, be stretched out’ vs. ‘be stretched’), while in LKŻ only tūsoti is included, but its first meaning is explained by referring to prefixed reflexive iš-si-tēs-ti ‘stretch oneself’ (S-stative interpretation, cf. DLKŻ⁴ᵉ), whereas the definition of the second meaning (not listed in DLKŻ⁴ᵉ) includes transitive iš-tēs-ti and could confirm a possibility of P-stative reading. The problem is that LKŻ does not list tūsoti, but one might guess that at least some examples of tūsoti could have been presented as tūsoti.
4.3. Derived statives in -soti. 26 formations with resultative meanings in -soti, -so are attested. The S-stative type is predominant again (24 cases) vs. one P-stative and one ambiguous case (S-/P-stative).

Typical S-statives in -soti refer to similar states as those marked by the formations in -eti and -oti, e.g.: dūbsotì, dūbso ‘be hollow, sunken’ ← dūbuti ‘sink in, become hollow’, klimpsothì, klinpsso ‘be stuck (in mud)’ ← klīmp-ši ‘sink, stick (in mud)’, timpsotì, tiṃpso ‘lie stretched out’ ← temp-ši-s ‘stretch out (intr.)’, žirgsotì, žirgso ‘be standing with the legs wide apart’ ← žeig-ši-s ‘spread one’s legs’, etc. Some verbs refer to less common resultative situations, such as the one arising due to change in contrast (blykšòti {blykš-šo-ti}, blýkšo {blýkš-so} ‘shine dimly, show white’ ← blýkš-ši ‘turn pale’) or movement of liquids (tykšòti {tykš-šo-ti}, týkšo {týkš-so} ‘lie stagnant (about water)’ ← tikš-ši-s ‘splash (intr.)’), cf. Ser vajte 1985, 78. There are some verbs in this group which can be derived by adding the suffix -oti, -soti or -sēti, cf. kniüb-o-ti, kniúb-o / kniūb-so-ti, kniūb-so / kniaub-so-ti, kniaub-so ‘be in a position with one’s head lowered on crossed arms’ ← kniaub-ši-s ‘lower one’s head on crossed arms, hide one’s face’, sting-sō-ti, stīng-so ‘be stiff’ / stink-sē-ti, stīnk-si ‘move as if having stiff, numb legs, stalk’ ← stīnk-ši ‘get stiff’.

The formations of P-stative type need to be commented upon again. The meaning definition of 'mirksotì, mīrkso given by DLKŽ²⁴ allows a P-stative interpretation (‘be immersed, soaked’ ← mērk-ši ‘soak (tr.)’) alongside the durative (!) reading (‘soak (for a longer time)’ ← mērk-ši ‘soak (intr.)’), while smygsotì, smīgso ‘be stuck’ can be interpreted as P-stative (← smēg-ši ‘pierce (tr.), stick into’) and S-stative (← smig-ši ‘pierce (intr.), go into’).

5. Derived statives and periphrastic resultatives side-by-side

In some cases, derived statives and periphrastic resultative forms (with the corresponding participles of the prefixed base verbs of derived statives) can be found used side-by-side with very close meanings (cf. Ser vajte 1985, 110, 115, 131, 151f. on the possibility to paraphrase the lexical (derived) statives by using resultative forms). The Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian (http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/index_en.php, accessed in 2009) was used to locate some examples of this type, cf. (7) and (8):

(7) l į būd-q buv-o j-lind-us-i lap-ē.
     Into kennel-acc.sg be-pst.3 pref-get.in-pst.act.ptcp-nom.sg.f fōx-nom.sg
‘A fox had got into the kennel. It kept hiding huddled up in the corner [i.e. it got into the corner and kept hiding huddled up there]’

(8) Mokytoj-\textit{a} \textbf{buv-o} \textbf{ap-si-vilk-us-i} \textit{įstrižai}
Teacher-NOM.SG be-PST.3 put.on-PST.ACT.PTCP-NOM.SG.F crosswise

languot-\textit{q} suknel-\textit{q}, kur-\textit{iq} \textbf{vilk-\textit{\textbar{e}}-dav-o} \textit{tik}
dress-ACC.SG which-ACC.SG.F put.on-STAT-HAB-PST.3 only

mokykl-\textit{oj} – tokiq nuotrauk-\textit{oj} \textit{vilk-\textit{i}} Salomėja-\textit{a}
school-LOC.SG such-ACC.SG.F photo-LOC.SG put.on-STAT.PRS.3 Salomėja-NOM.SG

Nėris

Nėris-NOM.SG

‘The teacher had a dress in a crosswise check pattern on, which she used to wear only at school and the one Salomėja Nėris wears in a [well-known] photo.’

It is clear that in these and other similar cases periphrastic resultatives and derived stative can convey almost synonymous meanings, but it is also evident that the statives tend to lose the implication of previous event and adopt simple stative meanings (cf. Servajte 1985, 152, 179). Therefore, \textit{lindėti} and \textit{vilkėti} in (7) and (8) do not necessarily refer to the earlier events \textit{i-įlį̃s-ti} ‘get into’ and \textit{ap-si-vilk-ti} ‘put sth on, dress oneself’ and can be interpreted as non-resultative. This would not hold true for the resultative forms \textit{buvo įlindusi / apsivilkus} which imply a previous action and do so with a much stronger emphasis than the derived statives.

6. Modern Lithuanian and the typology of resultatives. In Nedjalkov 1988, Lithuanian is typologically classified together with Russian as a language with P-resultatives expressed by the passive constructions (group C2). If derived statives are taken into account, Lithuanian could be also typologically classified together with the languages that have two or three types of derived statives and the resultatives sharing their form with the active or passive perfect (cf. Evenki and Tongan from group B in Nedjalkov 1988) and with the ones having both resultatives and statives with separate markers (group (1) in Nedjalkov 2001, 933).
In Evenki, there are non-combined (non-polysemous) S-, P-, and A-type derived statives, and the P-resultative is combined with the passive perfect (Nedjalkov, Nedjalkov 1988, 241; cf. Nedjalkov 2001, 937 where Evenki is already classified together with Lithuanian based on the latter feature). In Tongan, there are non-combined (non-polysemous) S- and P-type derived statives and resultatives of four types (S-, P-, A-, and oblique object resultatives) combined with the active and passive perfect (Polinskaja 1988, 290). The main difference between the derived statives in Evenki, Tongan and Lithuanian is that in the former two languages P-type statives are well-attested, whereas in Lithuanian they are quite rare and some cases are ambiguous.

7. Conclusions
1. Derived statives constitute a non-productive derivational category in Modern Lithuanian consisting of ca. 90 formations, some of which are very rarely used. The verbs are formed by adding the suffixes -ėti (-i (-a / -ėja), -ėjo), -oti (-o (-oja), -ojo), -soti (-so, -sojo) and in some cases root vowel and tone alternations occur. The derived statives can express the same three types of resultative meanings (S-, A-, and P-oriented) just as the periphrastic resultative forms do, but only S-statives are more common (up to 70 formations), whereas A-statives are restricted to the suffix -ėti (14 formations) and P-statives are rare (up to 7 formations) and their interpretation sometimes can be ambiguous.

2. Compared to the periphrastic resultative forms, the usage and productivity of derived statives is limited by a number of factors. Derived statives are formed from non-suffixed (primary) verbs only, the meanings of A- and P-statives can be only rarely expressed, and there is a strong tendency for the derived statives to lose the implication of previous event.

3. If derived statives are taken into account, Modern Lithuanian can be typologically classified together with the languages having separate forms for the resultatives and the statives as well as with the ones having two or three types of derived statives alongside the resultatives that share their form with the active or passive perfect (cf. Evenki and Tongan).
APPENDIX: List of derived statives in Modern Lithuanian

-ē-ti

**S-stative:** glūdėti, glūdi ‘be concealed, lie hidden’ (29/27)\(^{13}\) ← glaũs-ti-s, glūs-ti ‘press oneself (to)’; grimzdėti, grimždi ‘be immersed, plunged’ (0) ← grimz-ti ‘sink, plunge (intr.)’; griuštėti, griuši ‘lie in ruins’ (0) ← griū-ti ‘fall down, collapse’; gulėti, guli ‘lie’ (193/122) ← gul-ti(-s) ‘lie down’; gūžėti, gūži ‘be cowered’ (0) ← gūž-ti-s ‘cower, shrink back’; kabėti, kaba ‘be overhanging’ (22/18) ← kib-ti ‘cling (to)’; kiūrėti, kiūri ‘have hole(s)’ (0) ← kiūr-ti ‘get holed’; kylėti, kūli ‘be elevated’ (0) ← kūl-ti ‘rise’; kyšėti, kyši ‘be sticking out’ (0) ← kūš-ti-s ‘go out, protrude (intr.)’; klupėti, klūpi ‘be on one’s knees’ (2/2) ← klaup-ti(-s) ‘kneel down’; kriošėti, kriūši ‘be (lie, sit) inactive’ (0) ← krioš-ti ‘grow decrepit’; lindėti, liñdi ‘be in hiding’ (11/10) ← ės-ti ‘get, crawl (into)’; niūrėti, niūri ‘be gloomy (about a person)’ (0) ← niūr-ti ‘grow gloomy’; nyrėti, nyrī ‘be under the water’ (0) ← nūr-ti / nēr-ti ‘dive’; plytėti, plytī ‘stretch, extend’ (4/4) ← plūs-ti ‘spread (intr.)’; rytėti, rūti (East Aukštaitian dialect) ‘be, lie huddled up’ (0) ← riēs-ti-s ‘huddle up’; sēdėti, sēdi ‘sit’ (390/221) ← sēs-ti(-s) ‘sit down’; syjėti, syjī ‘have relation, be related’ (0) ← sėt-ti-s (się-ti-s) ‘get / be (!) related’ / sū-ti ‘get related’ (very rare, cf. su-sū-ti ‘get into relation’ which is typically used only in resultative construction būti susijus(-iam /-iai) ‘be related’); skėndėti, skėndi ‘be sunken, submerged (without reaching the bottom); be steeped in sth’ (15/14) ← skēs-ti ‘sink, go down, drown (intr.)’; slypėti, slūpi ‘be hiding, hidden, concealed’ (38/35) ← slēp-ti-s ‘hide oneself’; styrėti, styrī ‘stand stiff (with cold); stick out, protrude’ (1/1) ← stūr-ti ‘grow / become stiff (with cold)’; stovėti, stōvi ‘stand, be in an upright position; be at standstill’ (419/242) ← stō-ti(-s) ‘stand up’, stō-ti ‘stop (intr.)’; svyrėti, svyrī ‘be hanging down, leaning’ (0) ← svūr-ti ‘hang down, droop, lean’; šiauši, šiauši ‘be bristling’ (0) ← šiaušt-ti-s ‘bristle up (intr.)’; tįsėti, tīsi ‘be stretched, lie’ (0) ← tūs-ti / tēs-ti-s ‘stretch (intr.)’; tupėti, tupī ‘be perched, sit, squat’ (39/30) ← tūp-ti(-s) ‘perch, squat down’; virtėti, vīrti ‘lie fallen down’ (0) ← vīrš-ti ‘fall, tumble down’; žiojęti, žiojī ‘be wide open’ (9/9) ← žio-ti-s ‘open one’s mouth’.

\(^{13}\) The word frequency data given in brackets is taken from **Grumadienė, Žilinskienė** 1998. The first number reflects token frequency, while the second one indicates the number of text samples in which the verb occurs. The frequency dictionary is based on a 1.2 million word corpus of written Modern Lithuanian (**Grumadienė, Žilinskienė** 1998, IX).
A-stative: aštēti, āvi ‘wear (shoes)’ (7/6) ← aũ-ti-s ‘put on (shoes)’; dungēti-s, deŋgį-si ‘be covered (with)’ (0) ← deng-ė-ti, deŋ-gį ‘id.’ (LKŽ) ← deŋ-g-ti-s ‘cover oneself with’; gaubēti, gaũbi ‘wear (a kerchief over one’s head)’ (0) ← gaũb-ti-s ‘cover oneself (with a kerchief)’; gobēti, göbi ← gaubēti’ (0) ← göb-ti-s ‘cover oneself (with a kerchief)’; juosēti, juösi ‘wear (a belt)’ (0) ← juös-ti-s ‘put on (a belt)’; kyšēti, kyși ‘wear (an apron)’ (0) ← kiš-ti-s ‘put, thrust sth (for oneself)’ (cf. pri-si-kįš-ti ‘put on (an apron)’, the meaning is listed in LKŽ only); klōjēti, klōjėja / klōjį ‘be covered (with a blanket, etc.)’ (0) ← klō-ti-s ‘cover oneself’; klojti, klojja / kloji ‘keep (flax) spread out’ (0) ← klō-ti ‘spread, lay’; movēti, mōvi (0) / mūvēti, mūvi (0) ‘have sth on, wear (gloves, pants, ring, etc.)’ ← máu-ti-s ‘put, pull on’; pynēti, pỳni ‘have sth in one’s hair (as a result of plaoting it in)’ (1/1) ← pin-ti-s ‘plait sth into one’s hair’; ryšēti, rỹši ‘wear sth tied (a kerchief, a tie)’ (1/1) ← riš-ti-s ‘tie (sth for oneself)’; segēti, sēgi ‘wear (a skirt); have sth pinned’ (2/2) ← sèg-ti-s ‘put on (a skirt); pin (sth to one’s clothes, hair, etc.)’; vilkēti, vilki ‘wear, have sth on’ (19/15) ← vilk-ti-s ‘put on, dress oneself’.

P-stative: klojēti, klōjėja (kloji) ‘stretch out, extend’ (0) ← klō-ti ‘spread, lay’; spūdēti, spûdi ‘be under pressure, be squeezed (0) ← spáus-ti ‘press, squeeze’; vožēti, vûži ‘be covered (under sth)’ (0) ← vûž-ti ‘put the lid/cover on’.

-sê-ti

S-stative: stinksēti, stînksi / stingsēti, stîngsi (East Aukštaitian dialect) ‘move as if having stiff, numb legs, stalk’ (0) ← stîng-ti ‘get stiff’.

-o-ti

S-stative: brýdoti, brýdoja ‘stand in water’ (0) ← brûs-ti ‘go, wade into water’; glûdoti, glûdo ‘be concealed, lie hidden’ (0) ← glaûs-ti-s, glûs-ti ‘press oneself (to)’; gûzotì, gûžo ‘be cowered (0) ← gûž-ti-s ‘cower, shrink back’; kabôti, kâbo ‘be overhanging’ (18/15) ← kîb-ti ‘cling (to)’; klûpōti, klûpo (klûpoja) ‘be on one’s knees’ (10/9) ← klaûp-tî(-s) ‘kneel down’; kniûboti, kniûbo ‘be in a position with one’s head lowered on crossed arms’ (0) ← kniaûb-ti-s ‘lower one’s head on crossed arms, hide one’s face’; kniûpoti, kniûpo ‘= kniûboti’ (0) ← kniaûp-tî-s ‘= kniaûbtis’; kîyotî, kîyo ← kabôti’ (7/5) ← kîb-ti ‘cling (to)’; lîndotî, lûndo (lûndojà) ‘be in hiding’ (0) ← lês-ti ‘get, crawl (into)’; niûroti, niûro ‘be gloomy (about a person/weather [impersonal S-stative])’ (0) ← niûr-ti ‘grow gloomy’; rûmotî, rûmo ‘rest (on), remain leaning (on)’ (8/8) ← reûn-ti-s ‘lean, rest (on, upon)’; sprûdotî, sprûdo (sprûdoti, sprûdo) ‘be squeezed into, hide somewhere’ (0) ← sprûus-ti-s ‘squeeze one’s way’; stûroti, stûro ‘stand stiff (with cold); stick out, protrude’ (0) ← stîr-ti ‘grow stiff (with cold)’;
svýroti, svýro ‘be hanging down, leaning’ (0) ← svíř-ti ‘hang down, droop, lean’; tísotí, tís ‘be stretched’ (3/3) ← tīš-ti / těš-ti-s ‘stretch (intr.’); týsotí, týso ‘lie stretched out’ (4/4) ← těš-ti-s ‘stretch oneself’.

P-stative: kímšotí, kímšo ‘be stuck, stand blocking sth’ (0) ← kímš-ti ‘push, cram, squeeze in(to)’ (0).

S-/P-stative: kýšotí, kýšo ‘be sticking out’ (16/14) ← kíš-ti-s ‘go out, protrude (intr.’) (S-static reading) / ← kíš-ti ‘insert’ (P-static reading).

-so-ti

S-static: blykšotí {blykš-só-ti}, blykšo {blykš-so} ‘shine dimly, show white’ (0) ← blýkš-ti ‘turn pale’; drybsotí ‘lie lazily’ (5/5) ← dříb-ti ‘tumble, fall down’ / drěb-ti-s ‘plunk (intr.)’; drykšotí, drýko ‘spread, lie’ (0) ← dřík-ti ‘disperse, scatter (intr.)’ / dříěk-ti-s ‘spread, stretch out (intr.)’; důbsotí, důbso ‘be hollow, sunken’ (0) ← důb-ti ‘sink in, become hollow’; klimpsotí, klímposo ‘be stuck (in mud)’ (0) ← kliňp-ti-s ‘stick, sink (in mud)’; kniaub-só-ti, kniaub-só-so (0) / kniǔb-so-ti, kniǔb-s-o (1/1) ‘be in a position with one’s head lowered on crossed arms’ ← kniaub-só-ti-s ‘lower one’s head on crossed arms, hide one’s face’; krypsotí, krypsóso ‘be leaning over’ (0) ← křýp-ti-s ‘bend, lean’; kumpsotí, kumpso ‘be crooked; bulge, lie puffed’ (0) ← kump-ti ‘become crooked’; linksotí, liňkso ‘be leaning over’ (0) ← liňk-ti-s ‘bend (down) (intr.)’ / leňk-ti-s ‘lean (over)’; mirksotí, mirkso ‘be with one’s eyes almost shut, become sleepy’ (0) ← měrk-ti-s ‘screw up one’s eyes’; niúksotí, niúkso ‘be cloudy; be gloomy (about a person)’ (1/1) ← niůk-ti / niūk-ti-s ‘gloom, grow cloudy’; pampsotí, paňpso ‘lie bloated; be expanded, expanded’ (0) ← paňp-ti ‘swell, expand, bloat’; stingsotí, stĩgso ‘be stiff’ (0) ← stíng-ti ‘harden, get stiff’; stypso, stĩpso ‘be sticking out, stand on tiptoe; be standing in a wrong place’ (12/10) ← stỹp-ti-s ‘shoot up, grow’; strygsotí, strỹgso ‘be stuck’ (0) ← strığ-ti-s ‘stick (intr.)’; šiurpsotí, šiurpso ‘be standing shabby’ (0) ← šiurp-ti ‘become rough’; tykšotí {tykš-só-ti}, tĩkšo {tỹkš-so} ‘lie stagnant (about water)’ (0) ← tıkš-ti ‘splash (intr.)’; tǐmpso, tĩmpso ‘lie stretched out’ (1/1) ← teřp-ti-s ‘stretch out (intr.)’; věpsotí, vępso ‘be lowered (about the lower lip, jaw), gape’ (3/3) ← věp-ti-s ‘become protruded (about the lower lip)’ / věp-ti-s ‘open (one’s mouth)’; vypso, vỹpso ‘gape, smirk’ (1/1) ← viěp-ti-s ‘open one’s mouth’; žirgsotí, žirgso ‘be standing with the legs wide apart’ (0) ← žeřg-ti-s ‘spread one’s legs’; žliugsotí, žliugso (0) / žliǔgsotí, žliǔgso (0) ‘be wet, lie in water’ ← žliǔg-ti-s ‘grow wet’.

S-static/P-static: smygsotí, smỹgso ‘be stuck’ (0) ← smíg-ti ‘pierce (intr.), go into’ (S-static reading), ← smeģ-ti ‘pierce (tr.), stick into’ (P-static reading).
**P-stative/durative:** 'mirksótí, miřkso (0)‘be immersed, soaked’ ← meřk-
	ti ‘soak (tr.)’ (P-stative reading), ‘soak (for a longer time)’ ← miřk-
	ti ‘soak (intr.)’ (durative reading).

**APIE REZULTATYVINĖ DABARTINĖS LIETUVIŲ KALBOS IŠVESTINIŲ STATYVŲ REIKŠMĘ**

**Santrauka**

Rezultatyvų laikoma veiksmažodžio forma arba vedinys, nusakantis būseną, atsira-
dusią kaip ankstesnio ribinio veiksmo rezultatas (Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 6t.;
Nedjalkov 2001, 928). Dabartinėje lietuvių kalboje rezultatyvas gramatiškai pertei-
kiamas sudėtiniams veiksmažodžio formomis, sudarytomis iš pagalbinio veiksmažodžio
būtų ir būtojo laiko veikiamojo arba veikiamojo dalyvio ir, žiūrint sintaksinių šių formų
tipų (Nedjalkov, Jaxontov 1988, 7–11; Nedjalkov 2001, 928t.), gali būti skiriami
objektiniai, subjektiniai ir posesyviniai rezultatyvai (Geniūšienė, Nedjalkov 1988,
369t.), plg.: *Jis uždarė langą → Langas (yra) / buvo uždarytas (objektinis rezultatyvas:
tiesioginis įvykio konstrukcijos objektas tampa rezultatyvinės konstrukcijos subjektu);*

*Jis šiltai apsurengė → Jis (yra) / buvo šiltai apsurengęs (subjektinis rezultatyvas: abiejose
konstrukcijose subjektas tas pats);* *Ji apsivilko paltą → Ji (yra) / buvo apsivilkusios paltą
(posesyvinis tipas: rezultatyvinėje konstrukcijoje išlaikytas ne tik įvykio konstrukcijos
subjektas, bet ir tiesioginis objektas).*

Šalia šių sudėtinių rezultatyvo formų lietuvių kalboje turima ir neprodukti
vių išvestinių statyvų (arba rezultatinės būsenos, Ambrazas 2006, 399t.) kategorija, leidžianti
perteikti panašaus pobūdžio reikšmes, plg. *Ji (yra) / buvo apsivilkusios paltą ir Ji vilki / vil-
kėjo paltą, kur vilk-ė-ti ‘būti apsivilkusiam’ ← vilk-ė-tis [pagrindinis semantinis sudėtinių
rezultatyvų formų ir išvestinių statyvų skirtumas yra tas, kad pirmieji iš esmės visada
turi aškią ankstesnį įvykio implikaciją (tai „tikrieji“ rezultatyvai), o antrieji ją tik gali
terėti (kitais tariant, jie priklauso rezultatyvams „plačiaja prasme“)*, plg.: Nedjalkov,

Aplie lietuvių kalbos išvestinių statyvų semantiką ir jų ryšį su sudėtiniams rezultatyvų
formomis jau yra kalbėta (Servajte 1985, 63t., 75–78, 110, 131, 151t.), bet šie vediniai
kol kas dar nebuvo skirtysti pagal minėtusios sintaksinius tipus ir nevertinti tipologiniu
požiūriu. Straipsnyje remiamasi maždaug 90 iš DŽ atrinktų sinchroniškių skaidžių da-
rinių, tad kalbamoji kategorija, kaip matyti, negausi, ir nemaža dalis jos vedinių dabar-
tinėje kalboje retai tvartojami (žr. straipsnio prieš galus). Nutrauktų ir užsakomų
veiksmažodžių sąrašą ir jų dažniausiasis iš Grumadienė, Žilinskienė 1998). Kaip jau žinoma, išvestinių
statyvai sudaromi su priesagomis -ėti (-i (-a/ėja), -ėjo), -oti (-o (-oja), -ojo), -soti (-so,

Lyginant su sudėtinėmis rezultatyvų formomis, akivaizdu, kad rezultatyvinė išvestinių statyvų vartosena labai ribota: šie vėdiniai daromi tik iš nepriesaginių (pirminių) veiksmažodžių, jie gana retai perteikia posevyvines ir objektines reikšmes ir, maža to, yra linkę prarasti ankstesnio jvykio implikaciją, kuri sudėtinėse rezultatyvų formose labai aiški. Žiūrėtų tipologiškai, išvestiniai statyvai dabartinę lietuvių kalbą leidžia priskirti tokioms kalboms, kuriose turimos skirtingos rezultatyvų ir statyvų raiškos priemonės (N edjalkov 2001: 933), ir taip pat tokioms, kur esama dviejų ar trijų sintaksinių tipų išvestinių statyvų ir vartojami rezultatyvai, kurių forma sutampa su veikiamojo arba neveikiamojo perfekto, plg. evenkų ir tonga kalbas (N edjalkov, N edjalkov 1988, 241; Pol inskaja 1988, 290).
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