

# Pluractionality in Lithuanian: A tale of two suffixes

---

**KIRILL KOZHANOV**

*Vilnius University*

The paper investigates the use of the two verbal suffixes *-inė-* and *-dav-* in Lithuanian. Both suffixes express pluractionality, but *-inė-* is derivational and tends to express plurality of sub-events within one situation (event-internal pluractionality), whereas *-dav-* is inflectional and designates plurality of situations (event-external pluractionality). The data show that, when the two suffixes are combined within the same verb form, *-dav-* always scopes over *-inė-*, thus, the combination of the two suffixes usually describes the repetition of different situations such as processes, progressive situations, punctual events, delimited processes etc. Most of the data used in the article come from the Web corpus of Lithuanian.

**Keywords:** pluractionality, habituality, iterativity, aspectuality, actionality, Lithuanian

## 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

This paper addresses the issue of verbal pluractionality in Lithuanian expressed by the two suffixes *-inė-* and *-dav-*. Verbal pluractionality is understood as a range of quantitative aspectual meanings describing pluralities of events; see, e.g., Dressler (1968); Cusic (1981); Xrakovskij, ed. (1989; 1997); Šluinskij (2006); Mattiola (2019).

In Lithuanian, plurality of events can be expressed in various ways (Genjušene 1989; Geniušienė 1997): for instance, pluractionality can be embedded in the lexical meaning of the verb, cf. multiplicative verbs *moti* ‘wave’ or *belsti* ‘knock’ which presuppose multiple actions. Pluractional

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Peter Arkadiev, Mikhail Osłon and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. This research has received funding from the European Social Fund (project No. 09.33-LMT-K-712-01-0071) under grant agreement with the Research Council of Lithuania (LMTLT).

interpretation is also available to some tense forms (although with certain lexical restrictions, see more below), cf. (1–2) where the same present form of the verb *keltis* ‘wake up, rise’ allows both for a progressive interpretation, i.e. involving a single event, cf. (1), and a habitual one, i.e. repeated multiple events, cf. (2).

- (1) *Kur Petr-as? Ĵ-is dar keli-a-si.*  
 where Petras-NOM.SG 3-M.SG.NOM still wake.up-PRS.3-RFL<sup>2</sup>  
 ‘Where is Petras? He is still waking up.’<sup>3</sup>
- (2) *Petr-as dažnai keli-a-si anksti*  
 Petras-NOM.SG often wake.up-PRS.3-RFL early  
 ‘Petras often wakes up early.’

The meaning of pluractionality can also be introduced to the semantics of the verb by suffixes, cf. *spirti* ‘kick’ : *spardyti* ‘kick (continuously)’; *rėkti* ‘scream’ : *rėkauti* ‘scream (continuously)’. Lithuanian has a number of such suffixes; however, this paper is only concerned with the derivational suffix *-inė-* (Jakaitienė 1972; Genjušene 1989; Geniušienė 1997), and the inflectional suffix *-dav-* (Roszko & Roszko 1997; 2000; 2006; Sakurai 2015), cf. (3–4) in which they combine with the verb *perjungti* ‘switch’:

- (3) *Man-au daugeli-ui yra atsibod-ę*  
 think-PRS.1SG majority-DAT.SG be.PRS.3 be.tired.of-PA.PST.NA  
***per-jung-inė-ti*** *dain-as, mažin-ti gars-q*  
 PVB-switch-ITER-INF song-ACC.PL decrease-INF volume-ACC.SG  
*ar dary-ti kit-us panaši-us veiksm-us...*  
 or do-INF other-ACC.PL.M similar-ACC.PL.M action-ACC.PL  
 ‘I think most [people] are tired of changing songs, lowering the volume or doing other similar actions...’
- (4) *...ne-keist-a, jog NASA iškart per-jung-dav-o*  
 NEG-weird-NA that NASA immediately PVB-switch-HAB-PST3  
*pokalbi-ų dažn-į, vos tik*  
 conversation-GEN.PL frequency-ACC.SG just only

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the paper, all glosses are given according to the Salos glossing rules, cf. Nau, Arkadiev (2015). This also applies to the suffixes under discussion which are glossed as ITER(ative) = *-inė-* and HAB(itual) = *-dav-*.

<sup>3</sup> In this paper all cited examples, unless stated otherwise, come from the Lithuanian Web corpus (LithuanianWaC v2), available at the SketchEngine platform (<https://www.sketchengine.eu/>).

*astronaut-ai*                      *Mėnul-yje*                      *k-q*                      *nors*  
 astronaut-NOM.PL              Moon-LOC.SG              what-ACC              IDEF  
*atras-dav-o*.  
 find-HAB-PST.3  
 ‘...it is not weird that NASA would change the conversation frequency  
 as soon as the astronauts would find something on the Moon.’

The peculiarity of these two Lithuanian suffixes is not only that they can combine separately with the same lexeme adding potentially different meanings of pluractionality, as can be seen in (3–4), but that they can also co-appear within the same form, cf. (5):

- (5) *...rumpel-į*              *laiky-dav-o*                      *kairi-qja*                      *rank-a*,  
 tiller-ACC.SG              hold-HAB-PST.3              left-DEF.INS.SG.F              hand-INS.SG  
*o*              *dešini-qja*                      *vairuotoj-as*  
 and              right-DEF.INS.SG.F              driver-NOM.SG  
***per-jung-inė-dav-o***                      *pavar-as*,                      *stabdy-dav-o...*  
 PVB-switch-ITER-HAB-PST.3              gear-ACC.PL              stop-HAB-PST.3  
 ‘...[the driver] would hold the tiller with the left hand and would  
 switch gears with the right hand, would stop [it]...’

The contexts in which both suffixes co-appear in one verb form seem to be rather specific. If we have a look at the Corpus of contemporary Lithuanian (*Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstynas*, <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/>), which is subdivided into different genres, we see that the verbs with both suffixes are more frequent in fiction than in non-fiction or journal texts, and are extremely rare in administrative texts, cf. Table 1.

**Table 1.** Counts of verb forms with the combination of suffixes *-inė-* and *-dav-*

	Raw numbers	Corpus size	Normalized (ipm)
Fiction	870	15765554	55.18
Non-Fiction	323	19322341	16.72
Administrative texts	5	13625715	0.37
Journalism	1416	86497837	16.37
Spoken	13	447396	29.06

The exploration of the usage of these two suffixes and their combination is the main goal of this paper.

The study is based on the data from the Lithuanian web corpus (LithuanianWaC v2). The corpus is automatically annotated and consists of over 48 million words. When preparing the dataset for this study, firstly, three distinct samples were extracted: verb forms with i) the suffix *-inė-*, ii) the suffix *-dav-*, iii) combination of the suffixes *-inė-dav-*. When searching for the verb forms with the suffix *-inė-*, all verb forms containing a segment *-inė-* inside the verb form were searched. This yielded a very large sample of over 64 000 examples. A random sample of 1000 examples was automatically created and afterwards manually filtered: the lexeme *minėti* ‘mention’ and its derivations were excluded, as well as examples with the suffix *-dav-* which were analyzed in another sample. In the end, there was a sample of 603 examples. The verbs with the segment *-dav-* were selected the same way: this search yielded an even larger number of examples (almost 100 000). Again, a random sample of 1000 examples was automatically generated and then manually filtered. In the end, there was a sample of 815 examples. There were only 633 examples of verb forms with the segment *-inėdav-*, so all of them were included in the analysis. The filtered sample had 573 examples in it. This also means that the combination of both suffixes is not that rare but appears to be less frequent than either of the suffixes on their own.

All these examples were coded for: i) Lemma (what stems combine with these suffixes; prefixed<sup>4</sup> and reflexive variants of the same root were treated as different lemmata); grammatical properties of the verb form such as ii) Person (1/2/3); iii) Number (singular/plural); iv) Reflexivity (yes/no); v) Negation (negated/positive); and the semantic feature of vi) Actionality (stative, processual, telic etc.; see below). The sample of the *-inė-*verbs was additionally coded for vii) Tense forms (present, past, future etc.). The following section contains the discussion of the results obtained.

## 2. Pluractional suffixes *-inė-* and *-dav-*: formation

Historically both affixes are iterative verbal suffixes and are attested in Old Lithuanian texts; for a more detailed overview of the historical

---

<sup>4</sup> Verb forms with the prefixes *be-*, *te-* and *ne-* were not treated as distinct lemmata.

development of *-dav-* see Pakerys (2017). In the contemporary standard language, the suffix *-inė-* is usually described as derivational, whereas *-dav-* is viewed as forming a separate tense (hence its inflectional status). Both suffixes are also attested in Lithuanian dialects, however their distribution across dialects is uneven. The suffix *-inė-* is present in different Lithuanian dialects and is reported to be especially frequent in south-eastern Lithuanian dialects, possibly under the influence of the Slavic imperfectivizing suffix *-iva-*. cf. Fraenkel (1936); Vidugiris (1961, 1998); Kardelis & Wiemer (2002; 2003, 64), Pakerys & Wiemer (2007); Kozhanov & Wiemer (2019). The suffix *-dav-*, on the other hand, is only attested in a part of the Lithuanian dialects, namely East and West Aukštaitian and the Žemaitian area bordering on them; cf. Zinkevičius (1966, 356); it is absent in the majority of Žemaitian dialects and is almost never used in South Aukštaitian dialects, cf. Kozhanov & Wiemer (2019, 23).

The first obvious difference between the two suffixes lies in their compatibility with different verb forms: the verbs with the suffix *-inė-* form full verbal paradigms (see Table 2), whereas the suffix *-dav-* is restricted to the past tense.

**Table 2.** *Combinations of the suffix -inė- with different verb forms in the sample.*

Category	Raw numbers	%
Present	176	18.6
Past	190	20
Future	32	3.4
Irrealis	11	1.2
Imperative	16	1.7
Infinitive	322	34
Active participles	86	9
Passive participle	79	8.3
Converb	35	3.7

### 2.1. Allomorphs

In standard Lithuanian, the suffix *-inė-* has two allomorphs *-inė-* and *-dinė-*, whose distribution in most cases is purely phonological. The allomorph *-inė-* combines with the roots ending with a consonant, cf. *grįžti* : *grįžinėti* ‘return, come back’, *rašyti* : *rašinėti* ‘write’, whereas *-dinė-* is attached to the roots with a final vowel, cf. *apeiti* ‘go around, bypass’ : *apeidinėti* ‘circumvent, get around’, *joti* ‘ride’ : *jodinėti* ‘ride’ etc. The allomorph *-dinė-* can also be attached to the roots ending in the consonants *-l-* and *-s-*, cf. *pulti* : *puldinėti* (but also *puolinėti*) ‘attack’, *kelti* : *keldinėti* ‘lift’, *mesti* : *mesdinėti* ‘throw’ etc.

The suffix *-dav-* has no allomorphs.

### 2.2. Source stem

In standard Lithuanian, the suffix *-inė-* is usually attached to the infinitival stem, but, as the corpus data show, occasionally it can also combine with the past stem. This is the case with some verbs whose infinitival stem ends with vowels, cf. *davinėti* ← *duoti* (*duoda*, *davė*) ‘give’, *kliuvinėti* ← *kliūti* (*kliūva*, *kliuvo*) ‘touch; be caught in’ etc.; and with the consonant *-s-*, cf. *siuntinėti* ← *siųsti* (*siunčia*, *siuntė*) ‘send’, *skundinėti* ← *skųsti* (*skundžia*, *skundė*) ‘complain’, *spaudinėti* ← *spausti* (*spaudžia*, *spaudė*) ‘press; print’ etc. Variation is attested with verbs that have the *e/i* (in the infinitival stem) ~ *ė* (in the past stem) alternation: *nuiminėti* ~ *nuėminėti* ← *nuimti* (*nuima*, *nuėmė*) ‘take off’, *apsverinėti* ~ *apsvėrinėti* ← *apsverti* (*apsveria*, *apsvėrė*) ‘cheat in weighing’ etc.

The suffix *-dav-*, on the other hand, is always attached to the infinitive stem with no exceptions, cf. *duoti* (*duoda*, *davė*) ‘give’ → *duodavo* ‘used to give’, *siųsti* ‘send’ → *siųsdavo* ‘used to send’, *eiti* ‘go’ → *eidavo* ‘used to go’, *rašyti* ‘write’ → *rašydavo* ‘used to write’ etc.

### 2.3. Lexical restrictions

It has been suggested that the suffix *-inė-* “attaches freely to the stem of any verb” (Roszko & Roszko 2006, 165), but the corpus data do not support this claim: for instance, iteratives can hardly be derived from some statives like *\*\*norinėti* ← *norėti* ‘want’, *\*\*galinėti* ← *galėti* ‘can, be able’, and there is no way to derive iteratives with the suffix *-inė-* from verbs in

-uo- describing processes, cf. *dainuoti* ‘sing’, *studijuoti* ‘study’, *programuoti* ‘code (in IT)’ etc. There seem to be no lexical restrictions on the use of the suffix -dav-.

When it comes to the combination of these suffixes with different verb roots, the suffix -dav- demonstrates the highest productivity (it is combined with 490 lemmas in our sample of 815 examples), whereas the suffix -inė- and the combination of the two suffixes -inė-dav- appear with approximately the same number of different roots (146 lemmas in the sample of 603 examples, 157 lemmas in the sample of 573 examples respectively).

If we look at the lemmas with which the suffixes combine, it seems to be evident that the most frequent lexemes to which the suffix -inė- is attached are the same that appear with the combination of the two suffixes, whereas the suffix -dav- most commonly combines with other lexemes.

*Table 3. Most common roots in the samples*

-inė- (total 603)		-dav- (total 815)		-inė-dav- (total 573)	
Lexeme	Frequency	Lexeme	Frequency	Lexeme	Frequency
<b>nagrinėti</b> ‘research, explore’	117 (19.4%)	<b>būdav-</b> ‘be’	87 (10.7%)	<b>važinėdav-</b> ‘used to drive’	67 (11.7%)
<b>tyrinėti</b> ‘study, research’	37 (6.1%)	<b>sakydav-</b> ‘say’	14 (1.7%)	<b>klausinėdav-</b> ‘used to ask’	33 (5.8%)
<b>važinėti</b> ‘drive’	36 (6%)	<b>galėdav-</b> ‘be able’	10 (1.2%)	<b>pardavinėdav-</b> ‘used to sell’	32 (5.6%)
<b>išnagrinėti</b> ‘investigate’ (pf)	31 (5.1%)	<b>gaudav-</b> ‘receive, get’	10 (1.2%)	<b>atsakinėdav-</b> ‘used to answer’	15 (2.6%)
<b>pardavinėti</b> ‘sell’	31 (5.1%)	<b>ateidav-</b> ‘come’	7 (0.86%)	<b>jodinėdav-</b> ‘used to ride’	14 (2.4%)
<b>įrodinėti</b> ‘convince, prove’	15 (2.5%)	<b>pasiekdav-</b> ‘reach’	7 (0.86%)	<b>pasirašinėdav-</b> ‘used to sign’	14 (2.4%)
<b>aptarinėti</b> ‘discuss’	13 (2.2%)	<b>praleisdav-</b> ‘spend’	7 (0.86%)	<b>šokinėdav-</b> ‘used to jump’	14 (2.4%)
<b>atsakinėti</b> ‘answer’	12 (2%)	<b>reikėdav-</b> ‘need’	7 (0.86%)	<b>atlikinėdav-</b>	12 (2.1%)

Lexeme	Frequency	Lexeme	Frequency	Lexeme	Frequency
<i>-inė-</i> (total 603)		<i>-dav-</i> (total 815)		<i>-inė-dav-</i> (total 573)	
<i>panagrinėti</i> 10 (1.7%) 'study for a while'		<i>turėdav-</i> 6 (0.74%) 'have'		<b><i>nagrinėdav-</i></b> 11 (1.9%) 'used to study'	
<i>priiminėti</i> 10 'accept, receive'				<i>vaikštinėdav-</i> 11 (1.9%) 'used to walk'	
<b><i>šokinėti</i></b> 10 'jump, dance'					

The table shows that the suffix *-inė-* tends to combine with certain lexemes more often than with others,<sup>5</sup> whereas *-dav-* simply combines with the most frequent verbs in Lithuanian, namely *būti* 'be', *galėti* 'can, be able', *turėti* 'have', *reikėti* 'need', cf. (Utka 2009). Lexical compatibility of the verb forms with the two suffixes demonstrates that it is not just verb forms with two suffixes but rather the suffix *-dav-* is attached to the *-inė-*verbs.

Similar results come from the analysis of the hapaxes, i.e. the lexemes that appeared only once in the sample: the number of hapaxes in the *-dav-* sample is significantly higher than in the samples with the suffix *-inė-* both tokenwise and typewise. This tells us that the combinations with *-inė-* are more lexicalized than with *-dav-* and tend to appear more often with specific lexemes.

**Table 4.** *Hapaxes in the samples*

	<i>-inė-</i>	<i>-dav-</i>	<i>-inė-dav-</i>
tokens	75 of total 603 (12%)	372 of total 815 (46%)	83 of total 573 (15%)
types	75 of total 146 (51%)	372 of total 486 (77%)	83 of total 156 (53%)

The two suffixes do not show any significant difference in their distribution across verb forms of different person and number. Also, the parameters

<sup>5</sup> Among the most frequent verbs is *vazinėti* 'drive', which is the dominant verb with the suffix *-inė-* in Lithuanian dialects, cf. Kozhanov & Wiemer (2019).



of negation and reflexivity do not seem to reveal any non-trivial features. The last feature worth checking is the presence of a prefix, cf. Table 5.

**Table 5.** Prefixes in the samples by types

	<i>-inė-</i>	<i>-dav-</i>	<i>-inė-dav-</i>
<i>ap-</i>	13 (8.9%)	10 (2.1%)	12 (7.7%)
<i>at-</i>	16 (11%)	21 (4.3%)	16 (10.3%)
<i>iš-</i>	13 + 1 (9.6%)	34 (7%)	20 (12.8%)
<i>į-</i>	9 (6.2%)	24 (4.9%)	9 (5.8%)
<i>nu-</i>	9 (6.2%)	18 (3.7%)	6 (3.9%)
<i>pa-</i>	18 (12.3%)	72 (14.8%)	11 (7.1%)
<i>par-</i>	1 (0.7%)	2 (0.4%)	1 (0.6%)
<i>per-</i>	8 (5.5%)	7 (1.4%)	10 + 1 (7.1%)
<i>pra-</i>	3 (2.1%)	9 (1.9%)	6 (3.9%)
<i>pri-</i>	6 (4.1%)	18 (3.7%)	6 (3.9%)
<i>su-</i>	7 (4.8%)	43 (8.9%)	8 + 1 (5.8%)
<i>už-</i>	6 (4.1%)	16 (3.3%)	13 (8.3%)
<i>be-</i>	6 + 2 (5.5%)	2 (0.4%)	1 (0.6%)
<i>te-</i>	—	2 (0.4%)	1 (0.6%)
no prefix	36 (24.6%)	212 (43.6%)	37 (23.7%)
Total	146	486	156

The most interesting part of the data is that simplex (i.e. without prefix) forms (tokenwise) appear significantly more often in the *-dav-* formations, and that *-inė-* tends to combine with prefixed verbs more often. A putative explanation to this fact is given in the next section.

### 3. Pluractional suffixes *-inė-* and *-dav-*: semantics

#### 3.1. Actionality and aspectuality

Pluractionality is closely related to the notions of actionality and aspectuality in general. The term actionality refers to the lexical-semantic

properties of the verb such as stativity vs. dynamicity, telicity vs. atelicity etc., whereas aspect or aspectuality is used as a broader term which also includes aspectual viewpoint (perfective vs. imperfective), cf., e.g., Arkadiev (2011; 2012). By finding out which elementary actional meanings are present in the verb's semantics under imperfective and perfective viewpoints, one can distinguish various actional classes; for more detailed information about the typology of actional meanings see Tatevosov (2002; 2005; 2016). The classification of actional classes of Lithuanian verbs was proposed by Arkadiev (2009; 2011; 2012).

Lithuanian demonstrates a peculiar system in which the aspectual interpretation of a verb depends on the type of verb form (different tenses, moods and non-finite forms) and the actional characteristics of the verb; see Table 6.

**Table 6.** *Aspectual interpretations available to actional classes across verb forms*

Actional class	Present	Past	Future	Irrealis	Infinitive	Imperative
Stative	imperfective and progressive					
Processual	imperfective and progressive					
Telic	imperfective progressive	perfective				
Weak telic	imperfective progressive	imperfective, progressive, and perfective				

Importantly, telic verbs can only have a perfective interpretation (with the exception of present conjugated verbs), cf. (6–7) with the processual verb *dirbti* ‘work’ and (8–9) with the telic verb *išdirbti* ‘work through’ (derived from the former with the prefix *iš-*):

- (6) *Bank-ai*                    ***dirb-a***                    *nuo*                    *9:00*                    *iki*                    *15:00*  
 bank-NOM.PL                    work-PRS.3                    from                    9.00                    till                    15.00  
*nuo*                    *pirmadieni-o*                    *iki*                    *penktadieni-o...*  
 from                    Monday-GEN.SG                    till                    Friday-GEN.SG  
 ‘Banks are open (lit. work) from 9 am till 3 pm from Monday till Friday...’
- (7) *Mano*                    *tėv-ai*                    ***dirb-o***                    *teatr-e* —  
 my                    father-NOM.PL                    work-PST.3                    theatre-LOC.SG

*buv-o muzikant-ai.*  
 be-PST.3 musician-NOM.PL  
 ‘My parents worked in the theatre—they were musicians.’

- (8) *Per savait-ę j-ie iš-dirb-a*  
 through week-ACC.SG 3-PL.NOM.M PVB-work-PRS.3  
*po 48 val.*  
 for 48 hour  
 ‘They work 48 hours a week.’

- (9) *Šaki-uose Kudirk-a iš-dirb-o*  
 Šakiai-LOC.PL Kudirka-NOM.SG PVB-work-PST.3  
*trej-us met-us.*  
 three-ACC.PL year-ACC.PL  
 ‘In Šakiai Kudirka had worked for three years.’

In terms of actionality, the main function of the suffix *-inė-* in Lithuanian is to make a verb processual, cf. (10) where the same verb *išdirbti* combined with the suffix *-inė-* becomes processual and can have imperfective interpretation in the past form:

- (10) *Tėv-uk-as Vinc-as, pasak Vyt-o*  
 father-DIM-NOM.SG Vincas-NOM.SG according.to Vytas-GEN.SG  
*Jakavoni-o, ne tik arkli-us kaust-ė,*  
 Jakavonis-GEN.SG NEG only horse-ACC.PL shoe-PST.3  
*od-as iš-dirb-inėj-o, bet ir nam-us*  
 skin-ACC.PL PVB-work-ITER-PST.3 but also house-ACC.PL  
*stat-ė...*  
 build-PST.3  
 ‘Father Vincas, according, to Vytas Jakavonis, not only shoed horses and cured leather, but also built houses...’

This ability of the suffix *-inė-* to turn telic verbs into atelic, namely processual, does not mean it cannot combine with other actional classes of verbs, cf. (11) with the stative simplex verb *sėdėti* ‘sit’.

- (11) *Taip ir stūm-ė laik-q. Šnekučiav-o-si,*  
 this.way also push-PST.3 time-ACC.SG chat-PST.3-RFL  
*sėd-inėj-o, niek-o dor-a ne-veik-dam-i.*  
 sit-ITER-PST.3 nothing-GEN decent-NA NEG-do-CVB-NOM.PL.M  
 ‘That’s how [they] killed time. [They] would chat, sit, doing nothing special.’

In the sample there are three stative verbs that combine with this suffix, namely *sėdinėti* ‘sit around’, *tupinėti* ‘sit around’ (describing a position in space, cf. also *gulinėti* ← *gulėti* ‘lie’ which does not appear in the sample), *žiūrinėti* ‘look around’, all of which have an additional diminutive meaning with the connotation of insignificance of the action. As was mentioned before, it seems that lexical restrictions with stative verbs are especially prominent.

When attached to simplex processual verbs (24 lemmas in the sample), the suffix *-inė-* has a few semantic functions, for instance with verbs of motion, it usually adds the meaning of multidirectional movement, cf. (12) (other verbs of motion in the sample: *čiuožinėti* ‘skate’, *slidinėti* ‘ski’, *vaikštinėti* ‘walk around’). Similarly to the situation with statives, when combined with processual verbs *-inė-* can have additional attenuative meaning, cf. *skaitinėti* ‘read (a bit, not seriously)’, *rašinėti* ‘write (not seriously)’, although it is difficult to predict with which verbs this meaning becomes prominent. Genjušene [= Geniušienė] (1989) singles out ‘diminutive’ as a distinct meaning of the suffix *-inė-*, even though it seems to be a ‘by-product’ of iterativity, i.e. the process is subdivided into shorter repeated actions. The interaction between diminution and iterativity in verbal semantics is attested cross-linguistically, cf. Audring *et al.* (2021). Finally, with some originally processual verbs, the addition of the suffix *-inė-* adds a specialized meaning that has nothing to do with iterativity, cf. the pair *siūti* ‘sew’ vs. *siuvinėti* ‘embroider’ (also discussed by Galnaitytė 1966, 153). In our sample, similar ‘professional’ verbs are *kasinėti* ‘dig, excavate’ (in contexts of archeological excavations) and *drožinėti* ‘carve on wood’.

- (12) *Cel-ės*                      *apylink-ės*                      *mėgst-ant-iems*  
 Celle-GEN.SG              surroundings-NOM.PL              like-PA.PRS-DAT.PL.M  
*iškylau-ti,*      *plaukio-ti*      *baidar-ėmis,*              ***jod-inė-ti***  
 picnic-INF      swim-INF      canoe-INS.PL              ride-ITER-INF  
*ar*      ***važ-inė-ti***              *dvirači-ais—*              *tikr-as*  
 or      drive-ITER-INF              bicycle-INS.PL              real-NOM.SG.M  
*roj-us.*  
 paradise-NOM.SG  
 ‘For those who like to picnic, canoe, ride [horses] and ride bicycles,  
 the surroundings of Celle are a true heaven.’

However, in the sample, the largest number of verbs to which the suffix *-inė-* is attached belong to the group of telic or weak telic verbs, cf.

(13). As these verbs are often prefixed, the smaller percentage of simplex verbs the suffix *-inė-* combines with (compared to *-dav-*) can be explained by the same aspectual function of the suffix *-inė-*.

- (13) *Daugel-į*            *amži-ų*            *kin-ų*            *protėvi-ai*  
 many-ACC.SG    century-GEN.PL    Chinese-GEN.PL    ancestor-NOM.PL  
***per-dav-inėj-o***            *š-į*            *mokym-q*  
 PVB-give-ITER-PST.3SG    this-ACC.SG.M    teaching-ACC.SG  
*iš*    *kart-os*            *į*    *kart-q...*  
 from    generation-GEN.SG    in    generation-ACC.SG  
 ‘For many centuries the ancestors of the Chinese passed this teaching from one generation to another...’

Although most verbs with the suffix *-inė-* are atelic, the corpus data show that some verbs with this suffix can also be telic, cf. (14).

- (14) *Š-is*            *nuodugniai*    *j-į*            ***iš-klaus-inėj-o***  
 this-NOM.SG.M    thoroughly    3-M.SG.ACC    PVB-ask-ITER-PST.3  
*ir*    *ne-rad-o*            *prieštaravim-ų*            *j-o*  
 and    NEG-find-PST.3    contradiction-GEN.PL    3-M.SG.GEN  
*pasakojim-e*.  
 story-LOC.SG  
 ‘This [bishop] interrogated him thoroughly and didn’t find any contradictions in his story.’

This has to do with the ordering of derivations, cf. (10), where *-inė-* is added to the telic prefixed verb *išdirbti* ‘work’ and makes it processual, and (14), where the prefix *iš-* is added to the atelic verb *klausinėti* ‘ask’ and makes it telic. The difference in derivational order can be summarized in the following way:

*dirbti* (processual) → ***išdirbti*** (telic) → *išdirbinėti* (processual)  
*klausti* (weak telic) → ***klausinėti*** (processual) → ***išklausinėti*** (telic)

In the sample, there are a few verbs derived with the suffix *-inė-* that can be further telicized by a prefix (especially often by *iš-*), namely: *klausinėti* (*iš-*) ‘ask, interrogate’, *nagrinėti* (*iš-*) ‘study’, *važinėti* (*su-*) ‘drive’, *tyrinėti* (*iš-*) ‘study’, *siuvinėti* (*iš-*) ‘embroider’ etc.

Iterative verbs with the suffix *-inė-* can be not only further telicized by verbal prefixation, but also delimited. The function of delimitation is expressed by the preverb *pa-*, cf. (Galnaitytė 1959; Arkadiev 2012, 66–67). In the sample, there were 13 examples of delimited iteratives:

- (15) *Vien-q*                    *šeštadieni-o*                    *vakar-q,*  
 one-ACC.SG                    Saturday-GEN.SG                    evening-ACC.SG  
*j-is*                                *pa-kviet-ė*                        *j-uos*  
 3-M.SG.NOM                    PVB-invite-PST.3                    3-ACC.PL.M  
*pa-jo-dinė-ti.*  
 PVB-ride-ITER-INF  
 ‘One Saturday evening he invited them for a horse ride’

Unlike *-inė-*, the suffix *-dav-* does not affect the verb’s actional characteristics. The suffix *-dav-* can be attached to essentially any verb of any actional class. There are no lexical restrictions.

Table 7 shows that, compared to the suffix *-dav-*, the suffix *-inė-* is attached more often to telic verbs and less often to other actional classes.

*Table 7. Distribution of suffixes over actional class (by type)*

Actional class	<i>-inė-</i>	<i>-dav-</i>	<i>-inė-dav-</i>
Stative	3 (2.3%)	29 (5.9%)	2 (1.3%)
Processual	24 (18.6%)	135 (27.7%)	24 (15.8%)
Telic	97 (75.2%)	291 (59.6%)	117 (77%)
Weak telic	5 (3.9%)	33 (6.8%)	9 (5.9%)
Total	129 (100%)	488 (100%)	152 (100%)
Delimitative	8	—	3
Perfective	8	—	2

### 3.2. Types of pluractionality

The suffix *-inė-* is usually referred to as ‘iterative’ (Dambriūnas 1960; Galnaitytė 1966, 148; Ambrazas 2006, 237), and the suffix *-dav-* is referred to either as ‘habitual’, cf. Arkadiev (2012); Sakurai (2015), or ‘past frequentative’<sup>6</sup> (Ambrazas 2006, 246; Roszko & Roszko 2006). Even though traditionally verbal forms with *-dav-* are treated as a separate tense (Lit. *būtašis dažninis*

<sup>6</sup> Strictly speaking, this term is inadequate, as this form does not presuppose any kind of frequency of the events; see the distinction made between frequentative and raritive (Bertinetto & Lenci 2012, 853).

*laikas*), it has been noticed that the opposition between simple past and *-dav-* forms are of aspectual nature; cf. Holvoet, Pajėdienė (2004, 124).

The semantics of the two suffixes under analysis can be distinguished in terms of two main types of pluractionality: event-internal and event-external, cf. Cusic (1981); Xrakovskij (1989); Šluinskij (2006); Bertinetto & Lenci (2012). The event-internal (or in Xrakovskij's terms 'multiplicative') pluractionality refers to the situations when the event consists of more than one sub-event occurring in one and the same situation, cf. the following English sentence.

- (16) *Yesterday at 8 a.m. Peter knocked fiercely at the door*

The event-external pluractionality, on the other hand, describes the same event being repeated in a number of different situations; cf. (17).

- (17) *In the summer Peter ran daily in the morning.*

Following this distinction, I would argue that the suffix *-inė-* tends to express event-internal pluractionality, whereas *-dav-* operates within the realm of event-external pluractionality. This semantic difference between the two suffixes is supported by the following syntactic tests. Firstly, verbs with the suffix *-(d)inė-* can be used in contexts with a defined time period, whereas verbs with the suffix *-dav-* cannot, cf. constructed examples (18–19) with the verb *važinėti* 'drive': in (18) the form *važinėjome* can be replaced by *važiuodavome*, but in (19) where the event is limited by a defined period of time the formation with *-dav-* is impossible:

- (18) *Kasdien*      *važ-inėj-ome* /      *važiuo-dav-ome*      *i*  
 every.day      drive-ITER-PST.1PL      drive-HAB-PST.1PL      to  
*susitikim-us.*  
 meeting-ACC.PL  
 'Every day we would go to the meetings.' (constructed)
- (19) *Važ-inėj-au* /      \**važiuo-dav-au*      *aplink*      *daugiau*  
 drive-ITER-PST.1SG      drive-HAB-PST.1SG      around      more  
*nei*      *dvi*      *valand-as*  
 than      two      hour-ACC.PL  
 'I was driving around for more than two hours' (constructed)

Secondly, only the verbs with *-dav-* can be used in 'when/if x..., then y...' sentences, whereas verbs derived with the suffix *-inė-* cannot, cf. (20) where the form *gaudavo* cannot be replaced by *gaudinėti*:

- (20) *Tailand-e*                      *karali-aus*                      *žmon-a*                      *karalien-ės*  
 Thailand-LOC.SG      king-GEN.SG      wife-NOM.SG      queen-GEN.SG  
*titul-q*                      ***gau-dav-o***                      *tik*                      *tada,*                      *jei*  
 title-ACC.SG      receive-HAB-PST.3      only                      then                      if  
*j-i*                      ***bū-dav-o***                      *karali-ų*                      *gimin-ės.*  
 3-F.SG.NOM      be-HAB-PST.3      king-GEN.PL      relative-NOM.PL  
 ‘In Thailand the king’s wife would receive the title of queen only  
 when she was a relative of the king.’

This shows that the two suffixes operate on different levels: *-inė-* describes a repetition of events within one situation, whereas *-dav-* refers to repetition of similar situations.

The same difference between the two suffixes can also be observed in their combination with lexically multiplicative verbs: *-inė-* shows lexical restrictions, regularly combining only with the verb *šokti* ‘jump’: *šokinėti* ‘jump around; jump multiple times’, cf. (21).

- (21) *J-is*                      ***šok-inėj-o***                      *per*                      *bėgi-us,*                      *per*  
 3-M.SG.NOM      jump-ITER-PST.3      over                      rail-ACC.PL                      over  
*kupst-us,*                      *o*                      *paskui*                      *pa-si-leid-o*                      *per*  
 bump-ACC.PL      and                      then                      PVB-RFL-let-PST.3                      through  
*plyn-q*                      *lauk-q.*  
 flat-ACC.SG      field-ACC.SG  
 ‘He was jumping over the rails, the bumps, and then he broke into a  
 run across the flat field’

However, this verb is not an iteration of a multiplicative process, whereas combinations with the suffix *-dav-* are, cf. (22) where forms with *-dav-* describe a repetition of punctual situations (*užsirakindavau*), states (*stovėdavo*) and multiplicative processes (*belsdavo*):

- (22) ***Už-si-rakin-dav-au***                      *dur-is*                      *o*                      *j-i*  
 PVB-RFL-lock-HAB-PST.1SG      door-ACC.PL      but                      3-F.SG.NOM  
***stovė-dav-o***                      *ir*                      *į*                      *j-as*                      ***bels-dav-o...***  
 stand-HAB-PST.3      and                      in                      3-ACC.PL.F                      knock-HAB-PST.3  
 ‘I would lock the door and she would stand and knock on it...’

The example (22) shows that sub-events within event-external pluractionality can have different aspectual interpretations, cf. Sakurai’s (2015, 391) discussion of aspect in macro- and micro-situations in Lithuanian, which follows similar ideas with a typological background in Comrie (1976), cf. the discussion of ‘nested aspects’ on the Slavic data by Lindstedt (1984).



The repetition of events expressed by the suffix *-inė-* is closely related to the notion of distributivity, cf. (23), where plurality of events has to do with the distribution across plural direct objects, and (24), where the same subject repeats the same action with the same object across different locations expressed here by the prepositional phrase:

- (23) *Man-au, kad j-is ne-pa-si-raš-inėj-o*  
 think-PRS.1SG that 3-M.SG.NOM NEG-PVB-RFL-write-ITER-PST.3SG  
*joki-ų sutarči-ų.*  
 no-GEN.PL contract-GEN.PL  
 ‘I think that he didn’t sign any contracts.’
- (24) *...bet norėj-o-si kaž-k-o daugi-au:*  
 but want-PST.3-RFL IDEF-what-GEN a.lot-COMP  
*prasm-ės savo būči-ai, nors*  
 meaning-GEN.SG own existence-DAT.SG albeit  
*trump-am.. Ir j-is j-q sau*  
 short-DAT.SG.M and 3-NOM.SG.M 3-ACC.SG.F self.DAT  
*suteik-ė: iš-siunt-inėj-o kūrin-į*  
 give-PST.3 PVB-send-ITER-PST.3SG work-ACC.SG  
*elektronini-u pašt-u į leidykl-as,*  
 electronic-INS.SG.M mail-INS.SG in publisher-ACC.PL  
*laikrašči-us.*  
 newspaper-ACC.PL  
 ‘but [he] wanted something more: sense for his existence, even just for a short while... And he gave it to himself: he sent the manuscript by e-mail to publishing houses, newspapers.’

The suffix *-inė-* can thus refer to repetition of completed events, as in (24), i.e. the manuscript was sent multiple times to plural publishing houses, or one incomplete event, cf. (25), where the process of recording took place in a defined period of time and consisted of multiple fragments of recording, but the whole process was not completed:

- (25) *Nuo 2003 iki 2005 L. Lopez į-raš-inėj-o*  
 from 2003 till 2005 L. Lopez PVB-write-ITER-PST.3SG  
*Disc katalog-q Indie Guitar ženkl-ui*  
 Disc catalogue-ACC.SG Indie Guitar brand-DAT.SG  
*Grooveyard Records, įsikūr-usi-am Niujork-e.*  
 Grooveyard Records be.based-PA.PST-DAT.SG.M New-York-LOC.SG  
 ‘From 2003 till 2005 L. Lopez was recording Disc catalogue Indie Guitar for the label Grooveyard Records, based in New York.’

The verbs with the suffix *-inė-* whose main meaning is a durative process and has little to do with pluractionality were noticed by Galnaitytė (1966, 156). What she did not discuss is that they seem to be able to function entirely outside of the realm of pluractionality, describing progressive events (especially when derived from telic verbs), cf.

- (26) *Kai iš-rink-inėj-ome ir su-rink-inėj-ome*  
 when PVB-collect-ITER-PST.1PL and PVB-collect-ITER-PST.1PL  
*automat-q „Kalašnikov“, subėg-o daugyb-ė*  
 rifle-ACC.SG Kalashnikov run-PST.3 great.number-NOM.SG  
*aplink zuj-usi-ų vaik-ų, j-iems*  
 around scurry-PA.PST-GEN.PL child-GEN.PL 3-DAT.PL.M  
*tai buv-o smag-i atrakcij-a.*  
 this be-PST.3 fun-NOM.SG.F entertainment-NOM.SG  
 ‘When we were disassembling and reassembling the Kalashnikov  
 rifle, many children who were around ran [to us], for them it was an  
 interesting entertainment’

It is noteworthy that *-inė-*verbs can have progressive aspectual interpretation in interval-bounded contexts:

- (27) *Ne-daug trūk-o, kad laimė-tume prieš*  
 NEG-a.lot lack-PST.3 that win-SBJV.1PL against  
*turk-us — iki mači-o pabaig-os*  
 Turk-ACC.PL till game-GEN.SG end-GEN.SG  
*lik-us šeši-oms minut-ėms*  
 remain-PA.PST.NA six-DAT.PL.F minute-DAT.PL  
*pra-loš-inėj-ome tik tr-imis task-ais.*  
 PVB-lose-ITER-PRS.1PL only three-INS point-INS.PL  
 ‘We were about to win against the Turks—when there were six mi-  
 nutes left till the end of the game, we were losing by only three points.’

Such usage of *-inė-*verbs is however considered by language purists to be ‘incorrect’, cf. Zavjalova (2013, 258). In our sample, which comes from the Internet and potentially can include more examples of non-standard Lithuanian, there are 13 instances which can be interpreted as progressive usage of *-inė-* verbs (around 2% of the sample).

When it comes to the other suffix *-dav-*, it seems to describe event-external pluractionality in all examples in the sample.

Despite these differences between the suffixes, there is a ‘grey’ area, namely ‘repeated action in the past’ where they do not make a clear dif-

ference, cf. (28) where a form with the suffix *-dav-* (*įsiteikdavo*) is used alongside verbs with the suffix *-inė-*:

- (28) *Ĵ-i*                      *dirb-o*                      *ne-pa-varg-dam-a* —  
 3-F.SG.NOM              work-PST.3              NEG-PVB-get.tired-CVB-NOM.SG.F  
***pa-pirk-inėj-o***                      *sargybini-us,*                      ***į-si-teik-dav-o***  
 PVB-buy-ITER-PST.3              guard-ACC.PL              PVB-RFL-hand-HAB-PST.3  
*j-iems,*                      *j-uos*                      ***ap-gau-dinėj-o.***  
 3-DAT.PL.M              3-ACC.PL.M              PVB-catch-ITER-PST.3  
 ‘She worked without rest—bribed the guards, ingratiated herself  
 with them, tricked them.’

As was shown above, all verbs with the two suffixes *-inė-dav-* are derived from *-inė-*verbs with the suffix *-dav-*. In terms of semantics of these verbs, it means that *-dav-* describes repetition of several situations denoted by *-inė-*verbs. As was previously shown, the *-inė-*verbs can describe several types of situations, all of which can be iterated by the suffix *-dav-*: i) process, cf. (29); ii) progressive, cf. (30); iii) punctual, cf. (31); and iv) delimited situations, cf. (32).

- (29) *Tuomet*                      *man*                      *buv-o*                      *dešimt*                      *met-ų*  
 at.that.time                      1.DAT.SG                      be-PST.3                      ten                      year-GEN.PL  
*ir,*                      *žinoma,*                      *aš*                      *smalsi-ai*  
 and                      of.course                      1SG.NOM                      curious-ADV  
***ap-žiūr-inė-dav-au***                      *kiekvien-ą*                      *gyvenim-e*  
 PVB-look-ITER-HAB-1SG.PST                      every-ACC.SG                      life-LOC.SG  
*su-tik-t-ą*                      *užsieniet-į.*  
 PVB-meet-PP.PST-ACC.SG                      foreigner-ACC.SG  
 ‘At that time I was ten years old and, of course, I would study with  
 curiosity every foreign person I would meet.’

- (30) *...savo*                      *laik-u*                      *j-is*                      *net*                      *su*  
 own                      time-INS.SG                      3-NOM.SG.M                      even                      with  
*ši-ų*                      *laik-ų*                      *įžymyb-e* —                      *Triple H (HHH)*  
 this-GEN.PL                      time-GEN.PL                      celebrity-INS.SG                      Triple H (HHH)  
*kov-ė-si,*                      *kur-is*                      *tuo metu*                      *į*  
 fight-PST.3-RFL                      which-NOM.SG.F                      at.that.time                      into  
*ring-ą*                      ***į-ei-dinė-dav-o***                      *skamb-ant*  
 ring-ACC.SG                      PVB-go-ITER-HAB-PST.3                      sound-PA.PRS.NA  
*Europ-os*                      *Sąjung-os*                      *himn-ui:)*  
 Europe-GEN.SG                      union-GEN.SG                      anthem-DAT.SG

‘...at some point he even fought with the celebrity of these times Triple H (HHH), who at the time would be entering the ring to the sounds of the EU anthem.’

- (31) [*Tokius kaip Naglis*]  
*sovietini-ais laik-ais netyčia*  
 Soviet-INS.PL.M time-INS.PL accidentally  
***su-važinė-dav-o*** *sunkvežim-is arba j-ie*  
 PVB-drive-ITER-HAB-PST.3 truck-NOM.SG or 3-PL.NOM  
*ding-dav-o KGB rūsi-uose.*  
 disappear-HAB-PST.3 KGB basement-LOC.PL  
 ‘[Such people as Naglis] in Soviet times would be accidentally run over by trucks or they would disappear in KGB basements.’
- (32) *Laiks nuo laiko vis pa-si-žiūrė-dav-au*  
 time from time still PVB-RFL-look-HAB-PST.1SG  
*į skrydži-ų kain-as, pa-si-skait-inė-dav-au*  
 into flight-GEN.PL price-ACC.PL PVB-RFL-read-ITER-HAB-PST.1SG  
*pasakojim-us.*  
 story-ACC.PL  
 ‘From time to time I would look at flight prices, would read stories for a while.’

#### 4. Conclusions

Even though both suffixes *-inė-* and *-dav-* are employed to express the meaning of verbal pluractionality, the difference between them in standard Lithuanian is striking. The main aspects of this difference are summarized in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Differences between *-inė-* and *-dav-*

<i>-inė-</i>	<i>-dav-</i>
can be used with any tense and mood	only in the past tense
has two allomorphs <i>-inė-</i> and <i>-dinė-</i> whose distribution is phonologically predictable	no allomorphs
can be attached either to the infinitival or to the past stem	is always attached to the infinitival stem
shows lexical restrictions	can be attached to any lemma

<i>-inė-</i>	<i>-dav-</i>
some verbs are lexicalized	combines with any verb with no signs of lexicalization
changes actional characteristics of the verb (making them processual)	does not affect actional characteristics of the verb
verbs with the suffix <i>-inė-</i> can be further telicized or delimited by a prefix	no semantic modifications are possible over the formations with the suffix <i>-dav-</i>
tends to express event-internal pluractionality	expresses event-external pluractionality
has meanings outside of the realm of pluractionality	has strong connection with the semantics of pluractionality

These differences clearly confirm the derivational status of the suffix *-inė-* and the inflectional status of *-dav-*.

The combination of the two suffixes *-(d)inė-dav-* is frequent, although rarer than formations with just one suffix. When combined, the meaning of *-dav-* scopes over the meaning of *-inė-* and thus expresses repetition of different situations denoted by the *-inė-* verbs (processes, progressive situations, punctual events, delimited processes). Nevertheless, often the semantics of the two suffixes is not easily distinguished, especially when they denote repeated events in the past. This ‘grey’ area allows for interchangeability of the two suffixes or even coappearance of different forms within one sentence.

**Kirill Kozhanov**

*Vilnius University*

*Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic*

*Universiteto 5, LT-01131 Vilnius*

*kirill.kozhanov@flf.vu.lt*

## ABBREVIATIONS

ACC — accusative, ADV — adverb, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, DIM — diminutive, F — feminine, GEN — genitive, HAB — habitual, IDEF — indefinite, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, ITER — iterative, LOC — locative, M — masculine, NA — non-agreeing form, NEG — negative, NOM — nominative, PA — active participle, PL — plural, PP — passive participle, PRS — present, PST — past, PVB — preverb, RFL — reflexive, SBJV — subjunctive, SG — singular.

## REFERENCES

- AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS, ed. 2006. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- ARKADIEV, PETER [Arkad'ev, Petr M.]. 2009. Teorija akcional'nosti i litovskij glagol [The theory of actionality and the Lithuanian verb]. *Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija* 18, 72–94.
- ARKADIEV, PETER. 2011: Aspect and actionality in Lithuanian on a typological background. In: Daniel Petit, Claire le Feuvre & Henri Menantaud, eds., *Langues baltiques, langues slaves*. Paris, CNRS Editions, 61–92.
- ARKADIEV, PETER [Arkad'ev, Petr M.]. 2012. Aspektual'naja sistema litovskogo jazyka (s privlečeniem areal'nyx dannyx) [The aspectual system of Lithuanian (with areal data taken into account)]. In: Vladimir A. Plungjan, ed., *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki 6: Tipologija aspektual'nyx sistem i kategorij* [Investigations in Grammatical Theory 6: Typology of Aspectual Systems and Categories]. (= *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* Vol. VIII, part 2). St Petersburg: Nauka, 45–121.
- AUDRING, JENNY, STERRE LEUFKENS & EVA VAN LIER. 2021. Small events. Verbal diminutives in the languages of the world. *Linguistic Typology at the Crossroads* 1.1, 223–256.
- BERTINETTO, PIER MARCO & ALESSANDRO LENCI. 2012. Habituality, pluractionality, and imperfectivity. In: Robert Binnick, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. New York: Oxford University Press, 852–880.
- COMRIE, BERNARD. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CUSIC, DAVID DOWELL. 1981. *Verbal Plurality and Aspect*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Stanford.
- DAMBRIŪNAS, LEONARDAS. 1960. *Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių aspektai* [The Aspects of Verbs in Lithuanian]. Boston: Lietuvių enciklopedijos spaustuvė.
- DRESSLER, WOLFGANG U. 1968. *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

FRAENKEL, ERNST. 1936. Der Stand der Erforschung des im Wilnagebiete gesprochenen Litauischen. *Balticoslavica* 2, 14–107.

GALNAITYTĖ, ELŽĖ. 1959. Leksišeskie značienija glagol'noj pristavki *po-* v sootvetstvii s litovskoj pristavkoj *pa-* [Lexical meanings of the verbal prefix *po-* in comparison with the Lithuanian prefix *pa-*]. In: V. V. Vingoradov, ed., *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie: Sbornik statej* [Slavic Linguistics: A Collection of Articles]. Moscow, *Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk sssr*, 59–71.

GALNAITYTĖ, ELŽĖ. 1966. K voprosu ob imperfektivacii glagolov v litovskom jazyke [On the imperfectivization of verbs in Lithuanian]. *Baltistica* 2.2, 147–158.

GENJUŠENĖ [= GENIUŠIENĖ], EMMA Š. 1989. Mul'tiplikativ i iterativ v litovskom jazyke [The multiplicative and the iterative in Lithuanian]. In: Viktor S. Xrakovskij, ed. *Tipologija iterativnyx konstrukcij* [Typology of iterative constructions]. Leningrad: Nauka, 122–132.

GENIUŠIENĖ, EMMA. 1997. The multiplicative and the iterative in Lithuanian. In: Viktor S. Xrakovskij, ed., *Typology of Iterative Constructions*. Munchen, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa, 220–240.

HOLVOET, AXEL & JŪ RATĖ PAJĖDIENĖ. 2004. Laiko kategorija ir laiko formos [The category of tense and tense forms]. In: Axel Holvoet & Loreta Semėnienė, eds. *Gramatinių kategorijų tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 121–140.

JAKAITIENĖ, EVALDA. 1972. Dėl priesaginių veiksmažodžių darybinių reikšmių [On the derivational meanings of suffixed verbs]. *Baltistica* 8.1, 49–54.

KARDELIS, VYTAUTAS & BJÖRN WIEMER. 2002. Ausbildung von Aspektpaarigkeit in litauischen Grenz- und Inseldialekten (am Beispiel von Sprechverben). *Linguistica Baltica* 10, 51–80.

KARDELIS, VYTAUTAS & BJÖRN WIEMER. 2003. Kritische Bemerkungen zur Praxis der Erstellung litauischer Wörterbücher, insbesondere von Mundarten—am Beispiel des slavischen Lehnguts und des 'veikslas'. In: Norbert Ostrowski & Ona Vaičiulytė-Romančuk, eds., *Prace baltystyczne. Język, literatura, kultura*. Warszawa: Wydział Polonistyki UW, 45–72.

KOZHANOV, KIRILL & BJÖRN WIEMER. 2019. A token-based investigation of verbal plurality in Lithuanian dialects. *Kalbotyra* 72, 7–31.

LINDSTEDT, JOUKO. 1984. Nested aspects. In: Casper de Groot & Hannu Tammola, eds., *Aspect Bound: A Voyage into the Realm of Germanic, Slavonic and Finno-Ugrian Aspectology*, Dordrecht: Foris, 177–192.

- MATTIOLA, SIMONE. 2019. *Typology of Pluractional Constructions in the Languages of the World*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- NAU, NICOLE & PETER ARKADIEV. 2015. Towards a standard of glossing Baltic languages: The Salos Glossing Rules. *Baltic Linguistics* 6, 195–241.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2017. On the development of past habitual from iterative in Lithuanian. *Baltistica* 52.2, 295–323.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS & BJÖRN WIEMER. 2007. Building a partial aspect system in East Aukštaitian Vilnius dialects of Lithuanian (Correlations between telic and activity verbs). *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 57, 45–97.
- ROSZKO, DANUTA & ROMAN ROSZKO. 1997. Litewskie formy typu *dirbdavo* [Lithuanian forms of the type *dirbdavo*]. In: Jadwiga Zieniukowa, ed., *Obraz językowy słowiańskiego Pomorza i Łużyc (Pogranicza i kontakty językowe)* [A Linguistic Picture of Slavic Pomerania and Lusatia: Borderlands and Language Contacts]. Warszawa: SOW, 391–395.
- ROSZKO, DANUTA & ROMAN ROSZKO. 2000. Litovskie glagol'nye formy s suffiksom *-dav-* [Lithuanian verbal forms with the suffix *-dav-*]. *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 25, 37–49.
- ROSZKO, DANUTA & ROMAN ROSZKO. 2006. Lithuanian frequentativum. *Études cognitives*, 7, 163–172.
- SAKURAI, EIKO. 2015. Past habitual tense in Lithuanian. In: Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer, eds., *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 383–436.
- ŠLUINSKIJ, ANDREJ B. 2006. K tipologii predikatnoj množestvennosti: organizacija semantičeskoj zony [On the typology of predicate plurality: The organization of the semantic zone]. *Voprosy jaztkoznanija* 2006.1, 46–75.
- TATEVOSOV, SERGEJ G. 2002. The parameter of actionality. *Linguistic Typology* 6.3, 317–401.
- TATEVOSOV, SERGEJ G. 2005. Akcional'nost': tipologija i teorija [Actionality: typology and theory]. *Voprosy jaztkoznanija* 2005.1, 108–141.
- TATEVOSOV, SERGEJ G. 2016. Glagol'nye klassy i tipologija akcional'nosti [Verb classes and the typology of actionality]. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- UTKA, ANDRIUS. 2009. Dažninis rašytinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas 1 milijono žodžių morfologiškai anotuoto tekstyno pagrindu. [A Frequency Dictionary of Written Lithuanian Based on an Annotated 1 Million Words' Corpus.] Kaunas: VDU.



VIDUGIRIS, ALOYZAS. 1961. Veiksmažodžiai su priesagomis *-inėti* ir *-dinėti* Zietelos tarmėje [Verbs with the suffixes *-inėti* and *-dinėti* in the dialect of Zietela]. *Lietuvos TSR MA darbai*, Serija A, 2 (11), 219–231.

VIDUGIRIS, ALOYZAS. 1998. Dėl daugkartinio veiksmo raiškos pietrytinėse lietuvių kalbos tarmėse [On the marking of pluractionality in South-East Lithuanian dialects]. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 39, 183–191.

XRAKOVSKIJ, VIKTOR S., ed., 1989. *Tipologija iterativnyx konstrukcij* [The Typology of Iterative Constructions]. Leningrad: Nauka.

XRAKOVSKIJ, VIKTOR S., ed. 1997. *Typology of Iterative Constructions*. Munich, Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

ZAVJALOVA, MARIJA V. 2013. Mexanizmy adaptacii slavjanskix zaimstvovaniij v litovskom jazyke (na sovremennom etape) [Means of adaption of Slavic loans in Lithuanian (at the current stage)]. In: V. V. Ivanov & P. M. Arkadiev, eds., *Issledovanija po tipologii slavjanskix, baltijskix i balkanskix jazykov* [Studies in the Typology of Slavic, Baltic and Balkan Languages]. St Petersburg: Aletheia, 247–265.

ZINKEVIČIUS, ZIGMAS. 1966: *Lietuvių dialektologija (Lyginamoji tarmių fonetika ir morfologija)* [Lithuanian Dialectology: Comparative Dialectal Phonetics and Morphology]. Vilnius: Mintis.