Jurgis PAKERYS
Vilnius University

ON THE RESULTATIVE MEANING OF DERIVED STATIVES IN MODERN LITHUANIAN[1]

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, Jaxontov 1988, 6f.). In Lithuanian, the resultative meanings are regularly expressed by periphrastic forms consisting of the auxiliary *bū́ti* '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):[2]

(1) (a) *Ji*   *ap-si-vilk-o*   *palt-ą*
       3SG.NOM.F   PREF–REFL–put.on–PST.3   coat–ACC.SG
       'She put on a coat.'

    (b) *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

       palt-ą
       coat–ACC.SG
       'She has / had a coat on.'

---

[2] Standard abbreviations are used (http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php) with some additions: HAB – habitual, PREF –prefix, STAT – (derived) stative.

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-ė́-ti* 'have sth on, wear' derived from *vil̃k-ti-s* 'put sth on, dress (oneself)' in (2):

(2) *Ji*   *vilk-i / vilk-ėj-o*   *palt-ą*
    3SG.NOM.F   put.on-STAT.PRS.3 / put.on-STAT-PST.3   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).[3]

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.

cussed. 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-ą*
       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.

(4) (a) *Jis*   *šiltai*   *ap–si–reng–ė*
      3SG.NOM.M   warmly   PREF–REFL–dress–PST.3
      'He dressed himself warmly.' (event)

   (b) *Jis*   (*yra*) / *buv–o*   *šiltai*
      3SG.NOM.M   (be.PRS.3) / be–PST.3   warmly

      ap–si–reng–ęs
      PREF–REFL–dress–PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M
      'He is/had dressed (himself) warmly.' (S-resultative)

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 (Servaite 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 (Servaite 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-*[5] to the root of the base verb, e.g.: *av-ė́-ti* 'wear (shoes)' (← *aũ-ti-s* 'put on (shoes)'), *klū́p-o-ti* 'be on one's knees' (← *klaũp-ti-s* 'kneel down'), *dryb-só-ti* 'lie lazily' (← *drìb-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 *ãv-(Ø)-i* 'wear(s) (shoes)', *klū́p-(Ø)-o* 'is/are on his/her/their knees'.[6] The suffix *-so-* alternates with *-s-*

---

[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 *drỹb-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, klū́p-oj-o, dryb-sój-o* and PST. ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M *av-éj-ęs, klū́p-oj-ęs, dryb-sój-ęs*. The derived verbs may retain the root vowel and the tone of the base verb (cf. *grimzd-ė́-ti, grim̃zd-i* 'be immersed, plunged' ← *grim̃z-ti* {*grim̃zd-ti*} 'sink (intr.), plunge') or certain types of root apophony or tone alternations may occur, cf. [u:] ← [ɐʊ] in *klū́p-o-ti* ← *klaũp-ti-s,* [i:] ← [ɪ] in *dryb-só-ti* ← *drìb-ti, lìnd-o-ti* 'be in hiding' (acute tone) ← *lį̃s-ti* {*liñd-ti*} 'get, crawl into' (circumflex tone), *²kloj-ė́-ti, klõj-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-ė-ti* (PRS.3 *skénd-i,* PST.3 *skénd-ėj-o*) 'be sunken' ← *skę̃s-ti* (PRS.3 *skę̃{s}-sta,* PST.3 *skeñd-o*) 'sink, go down, drown (intr.)', the derivative is more complex than its base (there is a suffix -*ė*- 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. *skę̃s-ti* → *nu-/pa-skę̃s-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. *skéndėti* ~ *būti nu-/pa-skendusiam* ('be sunken'). One also has to note that some prefixed "primary" verbs can

---

[7] *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, available at http://www.lki.lt/dlkz/, further referred to as DLKŽ⁴ᵉ. 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-gýs-ti* 'begin to crow', *pa-mìl-ti* 'fall in love', *nu-tìl-ti* 'become silent' alongside *gied-ó-ti, gíed-a* 'chant, crow', *myl-ė́-ti, mýl-i* 'love', *tyl-ė́-ti, tỹl-i* 'be, keep silent', etc. These "primary" verbs are almost never used without the prefixes and it would be unsafe to assume that *gýs-ti, mìl-ti,* and *tìl-ti* are possible bases of *gied-ó-ti, myl-ė́-ti,* and *tyl-ė́-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. A m b r a z a s 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 (U r b u t i s 1978, 195–197), cf. *džiaũg-ti-s* 'rejoice' (reflexivum tantum) → *džiaug-ìmas-is* (action nominal, reflexive affix is inherited and its allomorph *-is* is used) vs. *džiū́g-au-ti* 'exult', *džiaũg-smas* 'joy' (reflexive affix is omitted). The derived statives do not inherit the reflexive affix of their bases, cf. *klaũp-ti-s* 'kneel down' → *klūp-ė́-ti, klū̃p-i* 'be on one's knees'.[8] Sometimes the reflexive verbs compete for the status of the base with corresponding intransitives. In this case both possibilities are accepted and listed, cf. *glūd-ė́-ti, glūd-i* 'be concealed, lie hidden' ← *glaũs-ti-s* (reflexive) 'press oneself (to)' vs. *glùs-ti* 'id.' (intransitive). Sometimes the non-reflexive (transitive) verb cannot be considered as a possible base due to semantic reasons, cf. *vilk-ė́-ti* 'have sth on, wear' which can be formally derived from transitive *vil̃k-ti* 'dress (someone)', but the derivative *vilk-ė́-ti* refers to an action accomplished by the subject him/herself (← *vil̃k-ti-s* 'dress oneself') and opposite cases are very rare and have to be considered as secondary (cf. *Kūdikis vilkėjo švarius drabužėlius* '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 *klūp-ė́-ti, glūd-ė́-ti,* and *vilk-ė́-ti* were derived from (intransitive) *klùp-ti* 'stumble' / *klaũp-ti* 'kneel down', *glùs-ti,* and (transitive) *vil̃k-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 *dengéti-s, deñgi-si* 'be covered (with)' ← *deng-ė́-ti, deñg-i* 'id.' ← *deñg-ti-s* 'cover oneself with' (the non-reflexive *dengéti* is attested in LKŽ^e only).

tives. For example, in the case of *glūd-ė́-ti*, both bases are still possible, but it is worth noting that *glaũs-ti-s* is much more frequent than *glùs-ti* in Modern Lithuanian (cf. G r u m a d i e n ė, Ž i l i n s k i e n ė 1998, 104f. where only *glaũs-ti-s* is listed). Non-reflexive *klaũp-ti* is also less frequent than *klaũp-ti-s* (the former one is not listed in G r u m a d i e n ė, Ž i l i n s k i e n ė 1998, 165) and *klùp-ti* is less fitting semantically ('stumble' vs. *klaũp-ti-s* 'kneel down'). In the case of *vilk-ė́-ti*, one has to note a possible shift from patient-orientation ('be dressed by someone' ← *vil̃k-ti*) to agent-orientation ('be dressed by oneself' ← *vil̃k-ti-s*), cf. H a s p e l m a t h 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 (N e d j a l k o v, J a x o n t o v 1988, 12; N e d j a l k o v 2001, 929), cf. *smyg-só-ti, smỹg-so* 'be stuck, pierced' alongside *smeĩg-ti* 'pierce (tr.), stick into' (P-stative) and *smìg-ti* '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 (G r u m a d i e n ė, Ž i l i n s k i e n ė 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 (N e d j a l k o v 2001, 933). With about 90 formations, Lithuanian is rather close to Uzbek and Georgian where ca. 60 formations are attested (N a s i l o v 1988, 223; M a č a v a r i a n i 1988, 267), but demonstrates lower productivity compared to Evenki which has around 200 derived statives (N e d j a l k o v 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. N e d j a l k o v, J a x o n t o v 1988, 29f. and G e n i u š i e n ė, N e d j a l k o v 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 -ėti. There are 45 formations in *-ėti, -i* (/ *-a* / *-ėja), -ėjo* 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.: *glūdéti, glū̃di*[9] 'be concealed, lie hidden' ← *glaũs-ti-s / glùs-ti* 'press oneself (to)', *grimzdéti, grim̃zdi* 'be immersed, plunged' ← *grim̃z-ti* 'sink, plunge (intr.)', *guléti, gùli* 'lie' ← *gul̃-ti(-s)* 'lie down', *klūpéti, klū̃pi* 'be on one's knees' ← *klaũp-ti(-s)* 'kneel down', *šiáušéti, šiáuši* 'be bristling' ← *šiáuš-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.: *griūvéti, griũvi* 'lie in ruins' ← *griú-ti* 'fall down, collapse', *kiūréti, kiũri* 'have hole(s)' ← *kiùr-ti* 'get holed', *kriošéti, kriõši* 'be (lie, sit) inactive' ← *kriõš-ti* 'grow decrepit', *niūréti, niũri* 'be gloomy (about a person)' ← *niùr-ti* 'gloom, frown', etc. Some cases can be considered resultatives only if a metaphorical interpretation is accepted ('the result arose as if X'), cf.: *kabéti, kāba* 'be overhanging' ← *kìb-ti* 'cling (to)', *žiojéti, žiõji* 'be wide open' ← *žió-ti-s* 'open one's mouth', etc. One derivative in *-sė-ti* could be also mentioned here, since this is the only stative formation attested with this suffix: *stink-sė́-ti, stìnk-si* (noted as East Aukštaitian dialect verb in DLKŽ[4e]) 'move as if having stiff, numb legs, stalk' ← *stìng-ti* 'get stiff'. If a resultative interpretation is accepted (and a prefixed base verb is actually mentioned in the meaning definition of DLKŽ[4e]), it could be reflected in the orthography as *sting-sė́ti, stìng-si*.

The majority of A-stative formations refer to situations as results of dressing, putting something on (cf. Servajte 1985, 63), e.g.: *avéti, ãvi* 'wear (shoes)' ← *aũ-ti-s* 'put on (shoes)', *ryšéti, rỹši* 'wear something tied (a kerchief, a tie)' ← *rìš-ti-s* 'tie (sth for oneself)', *vilkéti, vil̃ki* '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).

vil̃k-ti-s 'dress oneself', etc. Two verbs in this group describe situations of being covered (*dengéti-s, deñgi-si* 'be covered (with)' ← *deng-é-ti, deñg-i* 'id.' (attested in LKŽᵉ only) ← *deñg-ti-s* 'cover oneself with', ¹*klojéti, klojéja / klõji* 'be covered (with a blanket, etc.)' ← *kló-ti-s* 'cover oneself'), while one does not imply contact with the subject: ³*klojéti, klojéja / klõji* 'keep (flax) spread out' ← *kló-ti* 'spread, lay'.[10]

P-statives are rare in general, and the ones attested in *-éti* are also rarely (if at all) used in Modern Lithuanian: ²*klojéti, klojéja / klõji* 'stretch out, extend' ← *kló-ti* 'spread, lay', *spūdéti, spū̃di* 'be under pressure, be squeezed ← *spáus-ti* 'press, squeeze', *vožéti, võži* 'be covered (under sth)' ← *vóž-ti* '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. *šiáušeti, šiáuši* 'be bristling', ¹*klojéti, klojéja / klõji* 'be covered', etc. However, the meaning definitions and examples given in DLKŽ⁴ᵉ and LKŽᵉ 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* (*-oja*), *-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' ← *brìs-ti* 'go, wade in(to) water', *kniū́boti, kniū́bo* 'be in a position with one's head lowered on crossed arms' ← *kniaũb-ti-s* 'lower one's head on crossed arms, hide one's face', *sprū́doti, sprū́do* (*sprū̃doti, sprū̃do*) 'be squeezed into, hide somewhere' ← *spráus-ti-s* 'squeeze one's way', *týsoti, týso* 'lie stretched out' ← *tiẽs-ti-s* 'stretch oneself', etc. It is also worth noting that there is a group of verbs attested both in *-é-ti* and *-o-ti* without any significant semantic difference, e.g.: *glūdéti, glū̃di / glū́doti, glū́do* 'be concealed, lie hidden', *gū́žéti,*

---

[10] DLKŽ⁴ᵉ lists three meanings of *klojéti*, 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 DLKŽ⁴ᵉ, and the third *klojéti* is mentioned further as P-stative.

[11] The prefixed reflexive *už-si-vóž-ti* used in the meaning definition of DLKŽ⁴ᵉ would suggest a possibility of S-stative interpretation, but the examples given in DLKŽ⁴ᵉ and also in LKŽᵉ only support P-stative reading.

gū̃ži / gū́žoti, gū́žo 'be cowered' (← *gū̃ž-ti-s* 'cower, shrink back'), *klūpéti, klū̃pi / klū́poti, klū́po* (*klū́poja*) 'be on one's knees', *niūréti, niū̃ri / niū́roti, niū́ro* 'be gloomy' (*niū́roti* can be also used impersonally referring to gloomy weather conditions, cf. N e d j a l k o v, J a x o n t o v 1988, 10 on subject–impersonal resultatives).

P-statives in *-oti* can be exemplified by *kìmšoti, kìmšo* 'be stuck, stand blocking sth' (← *kim̃š-ti* 'push, cram, squeeze in(to)'), while the case of *ký̃šoti, ký̃šo* 'be sticking out' seems to have two possible readings (cf. N e d j a l k o v, J a x o n t o v 1988, 12; N e d j a l k o v 2001, 929 on two-diathesis/ambiguous resultatives). An S-stative interpretation is based on the relation of *ký̃šoti* to the reflexive *kìš-ti-s* 'go out, protrude (intr.)', cf. an example from DLKŽ⁴ᵉ (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 DLKŽ⁴ᵉ example in (6) is considered, a P-stative interpretation also seems possible, as the key had to be inserted into the door lock and *ký̃šoti* can be related to the transitive *kìš-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 *-ėti* (*¹kyšéti, ký̃ši* 'be sticking out' ← *kìš-ti-s* 'go out, protrude (intr.)'), but no examples were found in DLKŽ⁴ᵉ and LKŽᵉ to support a P-stative interpretation. The definitions of some S-statives like *sprū́doti, sprū́do* 'be squeezed into' or *tý̃soti, tý̃so* '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 *tý̃soti* and *týsoti*. DLKŽ⁴ᵉ lists them both ('lie, be stretched out' vs. 'be stretched'), while in LKŽᵉ only *tį́soti* is included, but its first meaning is explained by referring to prefixed reflexive *iš-si-tiẽs-ti* 'stretch oneself' (S-stative interpretation, cf. DLKŽ⁴ᵉ), whereas the definition of the second meaning (not listed in DLKŽ⁴ᵉ) includes transitive *iš-tiẽs-ti* and could confirm a possibility of P-stative reading. The problem is that LKŽᵉ does not list *týsoti*, but one might guess that at least some examples of *týsoti* could have been presented as *tį́soti*.

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 -*ėti* and -*oti*, e.g.: *dūbsóti, dũbso* 'be hollow, sunken' ← *dùb-ti* 'sink in, become hollow', *klimpsóti, klim̃pso* 'be stuck (in mud)' ← *klim̃p-ti* 'sink, stick (in mud)', *timpsóti, tim̃pso* 'lie stretched out' ← *tem̃p-ti-s* 'stretch out (intr.)', *žirgsóti, žir̃gso* 'be standing with the legs wide apart' ← *žer̃g-ti-s* 'spread one's legs', etc. Some verbs refer to less common resultative situations, such as the one arising due to change in contrast (*blykšóti {blykš-só-ti}, blýkšo {blýkš-so}* 'shine dimly, show white' ← *blỹkš-ti* 'turn pale') or movement of liquids (*tykšóti {tykš-só-ti}, týkšo {týkš-so}* 'lie stagnant (about water)' ← *tìkš-ti* 'splash (intr.)'), cf. S e r v a j t e 1985, 78. There are some verbs in this group which can be derived by adding the suffix -*oti, –soti* or -*sėti*, cf. *kniúb-o-ti, kniúb-o / kniúb-so-ti, kniúb-so / kniaub-só-ti, kniaũb-so* 'be in a position with one's head lowered on crossed arms' ← *kniaũb-ti-s* 'lower one's head on crossed arms, hide one's face', *sting-só-ti, stiñg-so* 'be stiff ' / *stink-sė́-ti, stìnk-si* 'move as if having stiff, numb legs, stalk' ← *stìng-ti* 'get stiff '.

The formations of P-stative type need to be commented upon again. The meaning definition of [1]*mirksóti, mir̃kso* given by DLKŽ[4e] allows a P-stative interpretation ('be immersed, soaked' ← *mer̃k-ti* 'soak (tr.)') alongside the durative (!) reading ('soak (for a longer time)' ← *mir̃k-ti* 'soak (intr.)'), while *smygsóti, smỹgso* 'be stuck' can be interpreted as P-stative (← *smeĩg-ti* 'pierce (tr.), stick into') and S-stative (← *smìg-ti* '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. S e r v a j t e 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) Į   būd-ą   **buv-o**   **į-lind-us-i**   lap-ė.
    Into   kennel-ACC.SG   be-PST.3   PREF-get.in-PST.ACT.PTCP-NOM.SG.F   fox-NOM.SG

Ji	**lind-ėj-o**	*kamp-e*
3SG.NOM.F	get.in-STAT-PST.3	corner-LOC.SG

su-si-riet-us-i
PREF-REFL-huddle.up-PST.ACT.PTCP-NOM.SG.F

'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-a* | **buv-o** | **ap-si-vilk-us-i** | *įstrižai* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher-NOM.SG | be-PST.3 | PREF-put.on-PST.ACT.PTCP-NOM.SG.F | crosswise |

languot-ą	*suknel-ę,*	*kur-ią*	**vilk-ė-dav-o**	*tik*
checkered-ACC.SG.F	dress-ACC.SG	which-ACC.SG.F	put.on-STAT-HAB-PST.3	only

mokykl-oj –	*tokią*	*nuotrauk-oj*	**vilk-i**	*Salomėj-a*
school-LOC.SG	such-ACC.SG.F	photo-LOC.SG	put.on-STAT.PRS.3	Salomėja-NOM.SG

Nėr-is
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 statives 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, *lindéti* and *vilkéti* in (7) and (8) do not necessarily refer to the earlier events *į-lĩs-ti* 'get into' and *ap-si-viĩk-ti* 'put sth on, dress oneself' and can be interpreted as non-resultative. This would not hold true for the resultative forms *buvo įlindusi / apsivilkusi* 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).

54

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

-ė̃-ti

S–stative: *glūdéti, glū̃di* 'be concealed, lie hidden' (29/27)[13] ← *glaũs-ti-s, glùs-ti* 'press oneself (to)'; *grimzdéti, grim̃zdi* 'be immersed, plunged' (0) ← *grim̃z-ti* 'sink, plunge (intr.)'; *griūvéti, griũvi* 'lie in ruins' (0) ← *griũ-ti* 'fall down, collapse'; *guléti, gùli* 'lie' (193/122) ← *gul̃-ti(-s)* 'lie down'; *gūžéti, gū̃ži* 'be cowered' (0) ← *gū̃ž-ti-s* 'cower, shrink back'; *kabéti, kā̃ba* 'be overhanging' (22/18) ← *kìb-ti* 'cling (to)'; *kiūréti, kiũri* 'have hole(s)' (0) ← *kiùr-ti* 'get holed'; *kyléti, ký̃li* 'be elevated' (0) ← *kìl-ti* 'rise'; [1]*kyšéti, ký̃ši* 'be sticking out' (0) ← *kìš-ti-s* 'go out, protrude (intr.)'; *klūpéti, klū̃pi* 'be on one's knees' (2/2) ← *klaũp-ti(-s)* 'kneel down'; *kriošéti, kriõši* 'be (lie, sit) inactive' (0) ← *kriõš-ti* 'grow decrepit'; *lindéti, liñdi* 'be in hiding' (11/10) ← *lį̃s-ti* 'get, crawl (into)'; *niūréti, niũri* 'be gloomy (about a person)' (0) ← *niùr-ti* 'grow gloomy'; *nyréti, ný̃ri* 'be under the water' (0) ← *nìr-ti / nér-ti* 'dive'; *plytéti, plý̃ti* 'stretch, extend' (4/4) ← *plìs-ti* 'spread (intr.)'; *rytéti, rý̃ti* (East Aukštaitian dialect) 'be, lie huddled up' (0) ← *riẽs-ti-s* 'huddle up'; *sėdéti, sė́di* 'sit' (390/221) ← *sė́s-ti(-s)* 'sit down'; *syjéti, sý̃ji* 'have relation, be related' (0) ← *síe-ti-s (siẽ-ti-s)* 'get / be (!) related' / *sý-ti* 'get related' (very rare, cf. *su-sý-ti* 'get into relation' which is typically used only in resultative construction *būti susijus(-iam /-iai)* 'be related'); *skéndėti, skéndi* 'be sunken, submerged (without reaching the bottom); be steeped in sth' (15/14) ← *skę́s-ti* 'sink, go down, drown (intr.)'; *slypéti, slý̃pi* 'be hiding, hidden, concealed' (38/35) ← *slė̃p-ti-s* 'hide oneself'; *styréti, stý̃ri* 'stand stiff (with cold); stick out, protrude' (1/1) ← *stìr-ti* 'grow / become stiff (with cold)'; *stovéti, stóvi* 'stand, be in an upright position; be at standstill' (419/242) ← *stó-ti(-s)* 'stand up', *stó-ti* 'stop (intr.)'; *svyréti, svý̃ri* 'be hanging down, leaning' (0) ← *svìr-ti* 'hang down, droop, lean'; *šiáušéti, šiáuši* 'be bristling' (0) ← *šiáuš-ti-s* 'bristle up (intr.)'; *tįséti, tį̃si* 'be stretched, lie' (0) ← *tį̃s-ti / tę̃s-ti-s* 'stretch (intr.)'; *tupéti, tùpi* 'be perched, sit, squat' (39/30) ← *tū̃p-ti(-s)* 'perch, squat down'; *virtéti, vir̃ti* 'lie fallen down' (0) ← *vir̃s-ti* 'fall, tumble down'; *žiojéti, žiõji* 'be wide open' (9/9) ← *žió-ti-s* 'open one's mouth'.

---

[13] The word frequency data given in brackets is taken from G r u m a d i e n ė, Ž i l i n s - k i e n ė 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 (G r u m a d i e n ė, Ž i l i n s - k i e n ė 1998, IX).

A-stative: *avéti, ãvi* 'wear (shoes)' (7/6) ← *aũ-ti-s* 'put on (shoes)'; *dengéti-s, deñgi-si* 'be covered (with)' (0) ← *deng-é-ti, deñg-i* 'id.' (LKŽᵉ) ← *deñg-ti-s* 'cover oneself with'; *gaubéti, gaũbi* 'wear (a kerchief over one's head)' (0) ← *gaũb-ti-s* 'cover oneself (with a kerchief)'; *gobéti, gõbi* '= gaubéti' (0) ← *gób-ti-s* 'cover oneself (with a kerchief)'; *juoséti, juõsi* 'wear (a belt)' (0) ← *juõs-ti-s* 'put on (a belt)'; *²kyšéti, kỹši* 'wear (an apron)' (0) ← *kìš-ti-s* 'put, thrust sth (for oneself)' (cf. *pri-si-kìš-ti* 'put on (an apron)', the meaning is listed in LKŽᵉ only); *¹klojéti, klojéja / klõji* 'be covered (with a blanket, etc.)' (0) ← *kló-ti-s* 'cover oneself'; *³klojéti, klojéja / klõji* 'keep (flax) spread out' (0) ← *kló-ti* 'spread, lay'; *movéti, mõvi* (0) */ mūvéti, mũvi* (0) 'have sth on, wear (gloves, pants, ring, etc.)' ← *máu-ti-s* 'put, pull on'; *pynéti, pỹni* 'have sth in one's hair (as a result of plaiting it in)' (1/1) ← *pìn-ti-s* 'plait sth into one's hair'; *ryšéti, rỹši* 'wear sth tied (a kerchief, a tie)' (1/1) ← *rìš-ti-s* 'tie (sth for oneself)'; *segéti, sẽgi* 'wear (a skirt); have sth pinned' (2/2) ← *sèg-ti-s* 'put on (a skirt); pin (sth to one's clothes, hair, etc.)'; *vilkéti, vил̃ki* 'wear, have sth on' (19/15) ← *vил̃k-ti-s* 'put on, dress oneself'.

P-stative: *²klojéti, klojéja (klõji)* 'stretch out, extend' (0) ← *kló-ti* 'spread, lay'; *spūdéti, spũdi* 'be under pressure, be squeezed (0) ← *spáus-ti* 'press, squeeze'; *vožéti, võži* 'be covered (under sth)' (0) ← *vóž-ti* 'put the lid/cover on'.

–sė̇-ti

S-stative: *stinkséti, stìnksi / stingséti, stìngsi* (East Aukštaitian dialect) 'move as if having stiff, numb legs, stalk' (0) ← *stìng-ti* 'get stiff '.

–o-ti

S-stative: *brýdoti, brýdoja* 'stand in water' (0) ← *brìs-ti* 'go, wade into water'; *glūdoti, glū́do* 'be concealed, lie hidden' (0) ← *glaũs-ti-s, glùs-ti* 'press oneself (to)'; *gū́žoti, gū́žo* 'be cowered' (0) ← *gũž-ti-s* 'cower, shrink back'; *kabóti, kãbo* 'be overhanging' (18/15) ← *kìb-ti* 'cling (to)'; *klū́poti, klū́po (klū́poja)* 'be on one's knees' (10/9) ← *klaũp-ti(-s)* 'kneel down'; *kniū́boti, kniū́bo* 'be in a position with one's head lowered on crossed arms' (0) ← *kniaũb-ti-s* 'lower one's head on crossed arms, hide one's face'; *kniū́poti, kniū́po* '= kniū́boti' (0) ← *kniaũp-ti-s* '= kniaũbtis'; *kýboti, kýbo* '= kabóti' (7/5) ← *kìb-ti* 'cling (to)'; *lìndoti, lìndo (lìndoja)* 'be in hiding' (0) ← *lį̃s-ti* 'get, crawl (into)'; *niū́roti, niū́ro* 'be gloomy (about a person/weather [impersonal S-stative])' (0) ← *niur-ti* 'grow gloomy'; *rýmoti, rýmo* 'rest (on), remain leaning (on)' (8/8) ← *reм̃-ti-s* 'lean, rest (on, upon)'; *sprū́doti, sprū́do (sprū̃doti, sprū̃do)* 'be squeezed into, hide somewhere' (0) ← *spráus-ti-s* 'squeeze one's way'; *stýroti, stýro* 'stand stiff (with cold); stick out, protrude' (0) ← *stìr-ti* 'grow stiff (with cold)';

svýroti, svýro 'be hanging down, leaning' (0) ← *svìr-ti* 'hang down, droop, lean'; *tį́soti, tį́so* 'be stretched' (3/3) ← *tį̃s-ti / tę̃s-ti-s* 'stretch (intr.)'; *týsoti, týso* 'lie stretched out' (4/4) ← *tiẽs-ti-s* 'stretch oneself'.

P-stative: *kìmšoti, kìmšo* 'be stuck, stand blocking sth' (0) ← *kim̃š-ti* 'push, cram, squeeze in(to)' (0).

S-/P-stative: *ký̃šoti, ký̃šo* 'be sticking out' (16/14) ← *kìšti-s* 'go out, protrude (intr.)' (S-stative reading) / ← *kìš-ti* 'insert' (P-stative reading).

–so-ti

S-stative: *blykšóti {blykš-só-ti}, blýkšo {blýkš-so}* 'shine dimly, show white' (0) ← *blỹkš-ti* 'turn pale'; *drybsóti* 'lie lazily' (5/5) ← *drìb-ti* 'tumble, fall down' / *drẽb-ti-s* 'plunk (intr.)'; *dryksóti, drỹkso* 'spread, lie' (0) ← *drìk-ti* 'disperse, scatter (intr.)' / *driẽk-ti-s* 'spread, stretch out (intr.)'; *dūbsóti, dũbso* 'be hollow, sunken' (0) ← *dùb-ti* 'sink in, become hollow'; *klimpsóti, klim̃pso* 'be stuck (in mud)' (0) ← *klim̃p-ti* 'stick, sink (in mud)'; *kniaub-só-ti, kniaũb-so* (0) / *kniúb-so-ti, kniúb-s-o* (1/1) 'be in a position with one's head lowered on crossed arms' ← *kniaũb-ti-s* 'lower one's head on crossed arms, hide one's face'; *krypsóti, krỹpso* 'be leaning over' (0) ← *krỹp-ti* 'bend, lean'; *kumpsóti, kum̃pso* 'be crooked; bulge, lie puffed' (0) ← *kum̃p-ti* 'become crooked'; *linksóti, liñkso* 'be leaning over' (0) ← *liñk-ti* 'bend (down) (intr.)' / *leñk-ti-s* 'lean (over)'; ²*mirksóti, mir̃kso* 'be with one's eyes almost shut, become sleepy' (0) ← *mérk-ti-s* 'screw up one's eyes'; *niūksóti, niũkso* 'be cloudy; be gloomy (about a person)' (1/1) ← *niùk-ti / niáuk-ti-s* 'gloom, grow cloudy'; *pampsóti, pam̃pso* 'lie bloated; be expanded, exposed' (0) ← *pam̃p-ti* 'swell, expand, bloat'; *stingsóti, stiñgso* 'be stiff' (0) ← *stìng-ti* 'harden, get stiff'; *stypsóti, stỹpso* 'be sticking out, stand on tiptoe; be standing in a wrong place' (12/10) ← *stỹp-ti* 'shoot up, grow'; *strygsóti, strỹgso* 'be stuck' (0) ← *strìg-ti* 'stick (intr.)'; *šiurpsóti, šiur̃pso* 'be standing shabby' (0) ← *šiur̃p-ti* 'become rough'; *tykšóti {tykš-só-ti}, týkšo {týkš-so}* 'lie stagnant (about water)' (0) ← *tìkš-ti* 'splash (intr.)'; *timpsóti, tim̃pso* 'lie stretched out' (1/1) ← *tem̃p-ti-s* 'stretch out (intr.)'; *vepsóti, vẽpso* 'be lowered (about the lower lip, jaw), gape' (3/3) ← *vìp-ti* 'become protruded (about the lower lip)' / *vẽp-ti(-s)* 'open (one's mouth)'; *vypsóti, vỹpso* 'gape, smirk' (1/1) ← *viẽp-ti-s* 'open one's mouth'; *žirgsóti, žir̃gso* 'be standing with the legs wide apart' (0) ← *žer̃g-ti-s* 'spread one's legs'; *žliugsóti, žliùgso* (0) / *žliūgsóti, žliũgso* (0) 'be wet, lie in water' ← *žliùg-ti* 'grow wet'.

S-stative/P-stative: *smygsóti, smỹgso* 'be stuck' (0) ← *smìg-ti* 'pierce (intr.), go into' (S-stative reading), ← *smeĩg-ti* 'pierce (tr.), stick into' (P-stative reading).

P-stative/durative: [1]*mirksóti, miȓkso* (0)'be immersed, soaked' ← *meȓk-ti* 'soak (tr.)' (P-stative reading), 'soak (for a longer time)' ← *miȓk-ti* 'soak (intr.)' (durative reading).

APIE REZULTATYVINĘ DABARTINĖS LIETUVIŲ KALBOS IŠVESTINIŲ STATYVŲ REIKŠMĘ

Santrauka

Rezultatyvu laikoma veiksmažodžio forma arba vedinys, nusakantis būseną, atsiradusią kaip ankstesnio ribinio veiksmo rezultatas (N e d j a l k o v, J a x o n t o v 1988, 6t.; N e d j a l k o v 2001, 928). Dabartinėje lietuvių kalboje rezultatyvas gramatiškai perteikiamas sudėtinėmis veiksmažodžio formomis, sudarytomis iš pagalbinio veiksmažodžio *būti* ir būtojo laiko veikiamojo arba neveikiamojo dalyvio ir, žiūrint sintaksinių šių formų tipų (N e d j a l k o v, J a x o n t o v 1988, 7–11; N e d j a l k o v 2001, 928t.), gali būti skiriami objektiniai, subjektiniai ir posesyviniai rezultatyvai (G e n i u š i e n ė, N e d j a l k o v 1988, 369t.), plg.: *Jis uždarė langą → Langas (yra) / buvo uždarytas* (objektinis rezultatyvas: tiesioginis įvykio konstrukcijos objektas tampa rezultatyvinės konstrukcijos subjektu); *Jis šiltai apsirengė → Jis (yra) / buvo šiltai apsirengęs* (subjektinis rezultatyvas: abiejose konstrukcijose subjektas tas pats); *Ji apsivilko paltą → Ji (yra) / buvo apsivilkusi paltą* (posesyvinis tipas: rezultatyvinėje konstrukcijoje išlaikytas ne tik įvykio konstrukcijos subjektas, bet ir tiesioginis objektas).

Šalia šių sudėtinių rezultatyvo formų lietuvių kalboje turima ir neproduktyvi išvestinių statyvų (arba rezultatinės būsenos, A m b r a z a s 2006, 399t.) kategorija, leidžianti perteikti panašaus pobūdžio reikšmes, plg. *Ji (yra) / buvo apsivilkusi paltą* ir *Ji vilki / vilkėjo paltą*, kur *vilk-ė́-ti* 'būti apsivilkusiam' ← *vìlk-ti-s*. Pagrindinis semantinis sudėtinių rezultatyvų formų ir išvestinių statyvų skirtumas yra tas, kad pirmieji iš esmės visada turi aiškią ankstesnio įvykio implikaciją (tai „tikrieji" rezultatyvai), o antrieji ją tik *gali* turėti (kitaip tariant, jie priklauso rezultatyvams „plačiąja prasme"), plg.: N e d j a l k o v, J a x o n t o v 1988, 7; J a x o n t o v 1988, 101t.; H a s p e l m a t h 1992, 191; N e d j a l k o v 2001, 928.

Apie lietuvių kalbos išvestinių statyvų semantiką ir jų ryšį su sudėtinėmis rezultatyvų formomis jau yra kalbėta (S e r v a j t e 1985, 63t., 75–78, 110, 131, 151t.), bet šie vediniai kol kas dar nebuvo skirstyti pagal minėtuosius sintaksinius tipus ir nevertinti tipologiniu požiūriu. Straipsnyje remiamasi maždaug 90 iš DŽ[4e] atrinktų sinchroniškai skaidžių darinių, tad kalbamoji kategorija, kaip matyti, negausi, ir nemaža dalis jos vedinių dabartinėje kalboje retai tevartojami (žr. straipsnio priede teikiamą veiksmažodžių sąrašą ir jų dažnio duomenis iš G r u m a d i e n ė, Ž i l i n s k i e n ė 1998). Kaip jau žinoma, išvestiniai statyvai sudaromi su priesagomis *-ėti* (*-i* (*-a/-ėja*), *-ėjo), -oti* (*-o* (*-oja*), *-ojo), -soti* (*-so,*

-sojo), o jų šaknyse gali vykti balsių ir priegaidžių kaitos. Išnagrinėjus surinktą medžiagą paaiškėjo, kad išvestiniai statyvai gali perteikti tuos pačius tris sintaksinius rezultatyvų tipus kaip ir sudėtinės formos, bet tik subjektiniai vediniai yra bent kiek dažnesni – jų esama iki 70, pvz.: *gul-é-ti, gùl-i* 'būti atsigulusiam' ← *gulˉ-ti(-s)*; *lìnd-o-ti, lìnd-o* 'būti įlindusiam' ← *lį̃s-ti*; *dūb-só-ti, dū̃b-so* 'būti įdubusiam' ← *dùb-ti*. Posesyvinių vedinių nedaug (iki 14) ir jie sudaromi tik su priesaga *-ėti* (pvz.: *av-é-ti, ãv-i* 'būti ką apsiavusiam' ← *aũ-ti-s*; *mūv-é-ti, mū̃v-i* 'būti ką apsimovusiam' ← *máu-ti-s*), o štai objektiniai vediniai dar retesni (iki 7 veiksmažodžių) ir jų interpretacija kartais gali būti dvejopa, plg. *smyg-só-ti, sm̃yg-so*:'būti įsmeigtam' (objektinis tipas) ← *smeĩg-ti* arba 'būti įsmigusiam' (subjektinis tipas) ← *smìg-ti*.

Lyginant su sudėtinėmis rezultatyvų formomis, akivaizdu, kad rezultatyvinė išvestinių statyvų vartosena labai ribota: šie vediniai daromi tik iš nepriesaginių (pirminių) veiksmažodžių, jie gana retai perteikia posesyvines ir objektines reikšmes ir, maža to, yra linkę prarasti ankstesnio įvykio implikaciją, kuri sudėtinėse rezultatyvų formose labai aiški. Žiūrint tipologiškai, išvestiniai statyvai dabartinę lietuvių kalbą leidžia priskirti tokioms kalboms, kuriose turimos skirtingos rezultatyvų ir statyvų raiškos priemonės (N e d j a l k o v 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 e d j a l k o v, N e d j a l k o v 1988, 241; P o l i n s k a j a 1988, 290).

DICTIONARIES

DLKŽ[4e] – Stasys Keinys (red.), *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, 4 leid., elektroninis variantas, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2003 (http://www.lki.lt/dlkz/).
LKŽ[e] – Gertrūda Naktinienė (red.), *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20 (1941–2002), elektroninis variantas, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005 (http://www.lkz.lt/).

REFERENCES

Ambrazas, Vytautas (red.) 2006, *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, 4 leid., Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
Geniušienė, Emma Š., Vladimir P. Nedjalkov 1988, Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian, in Nedjalkov 1988, 369–386.
Grumadienė, Laima, Vida Žilinskienė 1998, *Dažninis dabartinės rašomosios lietuvių kalbos žodynas (abėcėlės tvarka)*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Matematikos ir informatikos institutas.
Haspelmath, Martin 1992, From resultative to perfect in Ancient Greek, in José Luis Iturrioz Leza (ed.), *Nuevos estudios sobre construcciones resultativos* (*Función* 11–12), Guadalajara: Centro de Investigación de Lenguas Indígenas, 187–224.

Jakaitienė, Evalda 1973, *Veiksmažodžių daryba (priesagų vediniai)*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Kozinskij, Isaak Š. 1988, Resultatives: results and discussion, in Nedjalkov 1988, 497–525.

Mačavariani, Maja V. 1988, Stative, resultative, passive, and perfect in Georgian, in Nedjalkov 1988, 259–275.

Nasilov, Dmitrij M. 1988, Stative, resultative, and perfect in Uzbek, in Nedjalkov 1988, 221–230.

Nedjalkov, Igor' V., Vladimir P. Nedjalkov 1988, Stative, resultative, passive, and perfect in Evenki, in Nedjalkov 1988, 241–257.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.) 1988, *Typology of resultative constructions*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 2001, Resultative constructions, in Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, Wolfgang Raibe (eds.), *Language typology and language universals* 2 (= *Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science* 20.2), Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 928–940.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P., Sergej Je. Jaxontov 1988, The typology of resultative constructions, in Nedjalkov 1988, 3–6.

Otrębski, Jan 1965, *Gramatyka języka litewskiego* 2: *Nauka o budowie wyrazów*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Perel'muter, Ilja A. 1988, The stative, resultative, passive, and perfect in Ancient Greek (Homeric Greek), in Nedjalkov 1988, 277–287.

Polinskaja, Marija S. 1988, Stative, resultative, perfect, and passive in Tongan, in Nedjalkov 1988, 289–301.

Schmalstieg, Willliam R. 2000, *The historical morphology of the Baltic verb*, Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.

Servajte, Lajmute [Servaitė, Laimutė] 1985 – Лаймуте Сервайте, *Статив и результатив в системе литовского глагола*, Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Вильнюс: Вильнюсский государственный университет (The Manuscript Department of Vilnius University Library, call number F76–2822).

Stang, Christian S. 1942, *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*, Oslo: I kommisjon hos Jacob Dybwad.

Stang, Christian S. 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsö: Universitetsforlaget.

Ulvydas, Kazys (red.) 1971, *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika* 2, Vilnius: Mintis.

Urbutis, Vincas 1978, *Žodžių darybos teorija*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Jurgis PAKERYS
Baltistikos katedra
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania
[*jurgis.pakerys@flf.vu.lt*]