The Lithuanian mirative present and its history

Axel Holvoet & Gina Kavaliūnaitė
Vilnius University

Abstract

The article deals with a Lithuanian mirative construction based on the present active participle with the continuative and progressive prefix *be-*. In Lithuanian grammar it has been described as a tense form or (more recently) as a member of the evidential system, but it is here dealt with as a construction in its own right. On the basis of a corpus search the authors attempt to define the place of the mirative present among constructions containing the present active participle with the prefix *be-*, as well as its formal and functional properties and lexical input. In the diachronic section of the article it is suggested that the rise of the construction under discussion could have been, at least partly, the outcome of a distinct path of grammaticalisation (involving a post-nominal participial modifier in a presentative construction), different from that of both the progressive-proximative tense forms containing the participle with *be-* and the evidential forms based on participles. This, however, was not necessarily the only source of the construction: the pragmatic and emotive overtones developed by present progressives have probably also contributed to it. Mirativity has hitherto been known as one of the cluster of meanings characteristic of the Lithuanian evidential, but the analysis carried out in the article suggests that Lithuanian also has mirativity as a category in its own right, distinct from evidentiality.

Keywords: Lithuanian, mirativity, evidentiality, progressive, presentative construction

1. Introduction[1]

In this article we will discuss a Lithuanian mirative construction in which the main sentential predicate is expressed by a present active participle with the prefix *be-*. This prefix will here be glossed as continuative, as

---

this is one of its main functions, though the function of *be-* in the forms we will be discussing here can be considered construction-specific. The construction is illustrated in (1):

(1) *Žiūriu*   *ir*   *negaliu*   *patikėt* —
    look.PRS.1SG   and   NEG.be_able.PRS.1SG   believe.INF
    ant   *neštuvų*
    on   stretcher[PL].GEN
    be-gulįs   *anas*   *mano*
    CNT-lie.PPRA.NOM.SG.M   that.NOM.SG.M   my
    bendrakeleivis.
    travel.companion.NOM.SG
    [*nors vos jį atpažinau.*]
    'I look and cannot believe [my eyes]—it's that travel companion of mine who is lying on the stretcher, [though I barely recognise him.]'
    (Gasparas Aleksa, 2001, CCLL)

Lithuanian grammar has more than one form containing, as their main constituent part, the present active participle with the prefix *be-*, but in the remaining instances this participle occurs with the auxiliary *būti* 'be'. The most prominent among these forms is the past-tense variety, which has been dealt with as a construction in its own right by Arkadiev (2011, 2019; for an earlier study see Sližienė 1961). Its function is predominantly avertive, that is, it usually denotes an event that was about to occur at some point in the past but failed to occur due to external circumstances, a change of mind on the part of the agent etc. (the term is taken from Kuteva 1998). In addition to the avertive function, however, this construction may also have progressive and proximative uses. The avertive use is illustrated in (2):

(2) **Buvau**   **be-si-pilanti**   *sau*   *trečią*
    be.PST.1SG   **CNT-RFL-pour.PPRA.NOM.SG.F**   self.DAT   third.ACC.SG
    taurę   *šampano,*
    glass.ACC.SG   champagne.GEN
    [*kai staiga Zuzana suriko vairuotojui stabtelėti.*]
    'I was about to pour myself a third glass of champagne, [when suddenly Zuzana shouted ordering the driver to stop.]'
    (cited from Arkadiev 2019)

The form in (2) belongs to the aspecto-temporal domain, and in the earlier grammatical tradition of Lithuanian the mirative construction in (1) had

also been associated with it as part of a putative system of 'inceptive' tenses (for details see below, Section 2). In virtue of its mirative function the type in (1) is, however, more closely related to the evidential system, which, in Lithuanian, is also based on participles (on the use of participles in evidential function cf., among others, Ambrazas 1979, 188–218 and the discussion in Arkadiev, Holvoet & Wiemer 2015, 27, 30–31, with literature). It is with the evidential system that the constructions at hand are classified in more recent Lithuanian grammars, which appears justified in view of the broadly accepted connection of mirativity with evidentiality. In this article, however, we will describe this mirative present as a construction in its own right, and we will furthermore argue that it might be at least partly different in origin both from the past-tense construction illustrated in (2) and from the evidential constructions based on present active participles.

The structure of the article is as follows. First, in Section 2, we will discuss the grammatical context of the construction at hand by outlining the history of the treatment of this construction in the tradition of Lithuanian grammar. Next, in Section 3, we will give a brief overview of the other functions of the present active participle with *be-*. In Section 4 we will present the results of a search in the corpora of contemporary Lithuanian, the aim of which was to clarify the relationship of the constructions under discussion to other forms based on the active participle with the prefix *be-* in the contemporary language. Section 5 deals with diachrony.

2. The mirative present in Lithuanian grammars

The treatment of the form interesting us here in Lithuanian grammar has undergone several changes in the course of time. Apparently the first mention of it can be found in Baranauskas' Lithuanian grammar, published anonymously in Tilsit (East Prussia) due to the Lithuanian press ban then in force in Russia (Baranauskas 1896, 80).[2] Baranauskas keeps the constructions illustrated in (1) and (2) apart, describing the past-tense forms as *praėjęs pradėtas laikas* 'past inceptive tense' whereas present-tense forms as in (1) are classified with the oblique mood or evidential (called

---

[2] Neither Schleicher (1856) nor Kurschat (1876) mention the constructions discussed here.

girtaikis in Baranauskas' highly individual terminology). In Jablonskis' 1901 grammar a similar distinction is made, but the past-tense forms are now called *pereitas mėgintasis laikas* 'past conative tense' or *praeteritum de conatu* (1901, 31), while present-tense forms as in (1) are still classified with what we would now call the evidential; Jablonskis uses the term *nestačioji kalba* or oblique mood (Jablonskis 1901, 77). But in his 1919 grammar Jablonskis introduces a system of 'inceptive tenses' (*pradėtiniai laikai*), apparently meant to consolidate the functionally disparate forms based on the present active participle with the prefix *be-* into one system. The common denominator was thus identified as tense, which appeared logical as the language also had a system of anterior tenses (perfect, pluperfect and future perfect) consisting of a form of the auxiliary 'be' and a participle; Jablonskis therefore opted for defining a second system of compound tense forms. As Nijolė Sližienė, the author of the relevant chapter of the Academy Grammar (Ulvydas, ed., 1971, 147–148) points out, the term 'inceptive' was probably inspired by the conative character (or, as we would now say, avertive character) of the past-tense forms referring to an event that was initiated but not brought to a conclusion. As mentioned above, Baranauskas had used his term *pradėtas laikas* 'inceptive tense' for the preterite only. Jablonskis himself explains in his 1919 grammar that the forms thus characterised refer to an action that was begun and is still in course, bringing the notion closer to that of a progressive tense.

In more recent grammars of Lithuanian the description is changed once again. The volume on morphology in the Lithuanian Academy Grammar (Ulvydas, ed., 1971, 145–148) retains the notion of a system of inceptive tenses, but excludes the present-tense forms as illustrated in (1) from this system, leaving only past-tense forms as in (2), as well as future and conditional forms, as members of the inceptive paradigm. This is done on the grounds that the inceptive forms are conceived as a system of compound verb forms containing the auxiliary 'be', whereas there is no evidence that the form in (1) contains a zero form of an auxiliary. The present-tense form interesting us here is thus transferred again to the evidential system. The 1994 one-volume grammar of Lithuanian (Ambrazas, ed., 1994, 349–350) repeats the description contained in the Academy Grammar: a system of inceptive tenses is retained, but without present tense. In the 1997 English-language grammar of Lithuanian (Ambrazas, ed., 1997, 250–251, 321–323) the description is basically the same, but the term 'continuative tenses'

is introduced, while 'inceptive' would have been an exact equivalent of the Lithuanian term *pradėtinis*. The choice of this term (rather than the more obvious term 'continuous tenses', known from English grammar) is perhaps motivated by the fact that the prefix *be-* can have, when combined with finite verb forms, a continuative function, that is, it can encode the continuation of a state of affairs in spite of the expectation that it could have been discontinued. This function of the prefix *be-* is attested in the older language:

(3) *Aß*   *Swiete*   *dar*   *juk*   **be-kruttu,**
     1SG.NOM   world.INE.SG   still   PTC   **CNT-move.PRS.1SG**
     ir   *grießna*   *Kuna*   *dar*   *neßoju.*
     and   sinful.ACC.SG   body.ACC.SG   still   carry.PRS.1SG
     Mertikaitis 1825, 312.6
     'I am still walking this earth, and carrying about my sinful body.'

Nowadays *be-* occurs in this function only when combined with *te-* (which, by itself, has the restrictive meaning 'just, only') as shown in (4); *be-* alone is still used with the negation *ne-* as well as in other negative polarity contexts, as seen in (5):

(4) *Tačiau*   *nemažai*   *įmonių*   *iki*   *šiol*
     yet   many   business.GEN.PL   until   now
     tebe-dirba   *minimaliu*   *pajėgumu.*
     CNT-work.PRS.3   minimal.INS.SG.M   capacity.INS.SG
     'Yet many businesses are still working at minimal capacity even now.'
     (CCLL, from *Kauno diena*)

(5) *Dabar*   *toje*   *gatvėje,*   *kurioje*   *turėjo*
     now   that.LOC.SG.F   street. LOC.SG   REL.LOC.SG.F   have.PST.3
     butą,   *Klara*   *jau*   **ne-be-gyvena.**
     flat.ACC.SG   PN.NOM   already   **NEG-CNT-live.PRS.3**
     'Nowadays Klara no longer lives in the street where she used to have a flat.'
     (CCLL, from *Valstiečių laikraštis*)

Apart from this, *be-* is also used as an approximate negator (for this notion cf. Huddleston & Pullum, eds., 2002, 815–821) more or less corresponding to English *hardly* or *barely*:

(6) *Pasirašau,*   *bet*   *sunkiai*   **be-tikiu,**
     sign.PRS.1SG   but   difficult.ADV   **APNEG-believe.PRS.1SG**

kad	*šitokiom*	*priemonėm*	*ką nors*
that	such.INS.PL.F	means.INS.PL	anything.ACC

pakeisi.
change.FUT.2SG

'I'm signing [sc. the petition] but I can hardly believe you can change anything by such means.'[3]

In combination with participles, and also in the compound verb forms containing participles, the function of *be-* could be called progressive rather than continuative, but for the sake of uniformity we will here consistently gloss *be-* as continuative (similarly Arkadiev 2011, 2019). The progressive function is illustrated in a converbal construction in (7):

(7) | *Jam* | **be-kalbant,** | *ponas* | *Komisare,* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3.DAT.SG.M | **CNT-speak.CVB** | Mr.NOM.SG | chief.constable.VOC.SG |
| *Sokratas* | *sėdėjo* | *nejudėdamas* | *savo* | *vietoje* [...] |
| PN.NOM | sit.PST.3 | NEG.move.CVB | RPO | place.LOC.SG |

'While he was talking, Mr. Chief Constable, Socrates was sitting motionless in his place.'
(Andrius Jakučiūnas, 1999, CCLL)

The conclusion reached in the more recent grammars of Lithuanian is thus that there is indeed a system of inceptive or continuative tenses, but the present-tense variety illustrated in (1) does not belong to it, being part of the evidential system instead. Though in this article we will be concentrating on the mirative construction as in (1), we should mention here that the corpus search which we have carried out, and the results of which will be discussed in Section 4, presents a slightly different picture. First of all, modern Lithuanian texts actually do attest, though only marginally, the existence of present-tense forms with non-zero forms of the auxiliary 'be'. They are clearly progressive rather than mirative in meaning:

(8) [*Taip vertinant mūsų dabartinę būklę,*]
galima	*sakyti,*	*kad*	**esam**
possible.N	say.INF	that	**be.PRS.1PL**

be-prarandą *sąmonę.*
CNT-lose.PPRA.NOM.SG.PL consciousness.ACC

'[When thus assessing our present situation,] we can say we are on our way towards losing our consciousness.' (Romualdas Ozolas, 2002, CCLL)

In what we are here referring to as the mirative present, in contrast, the present-tense auxiliary never occurs:

(9)   *Ant*   *neštuvų*   **yra**   **be-gulįs**
       on   stretcher[PL].GEN   **be.PRS.3**   **CNT-lie.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
       mano   *bendrakeleivis.*
       my   travel.companion.NOM.SG
       Intended meaning: as in (1)

The corpus search also yielded a number of instances of future and conditional continuative forms, but their frequency is not noticeably higher than that of present-tense forms as in (8); in fact, all three types of forms mentioned here are marginal, whereas the progressive-proximative-avertive past-tense and the mirative present are well represented and seem to be well-established constructions, of which the remaining varieties appear to be occasional extensions. Attempts at squeezing the forms based on the present active participle with *be-* into a neat paradigm are therefore not quite convincing.

What is clear is that the mirative present as illustrated in (1) stands apart from all the other forms both by its mirative meaning and by its form (it never contains an auxiliary). The relationship of the forms under discussion to the evidential system is, however, not as obvious as might be supposed. It is a fact that the Lithuanian evidential, traditionally known as the oblique mood, is characterised by a cluster of three functions—reportive, inferential and mirative (cf. Ambrazas, ed., 1994, 311–312, Ambrazas, ed., 1997, 263–266). Evidentiality is marked in Lithuanian (as in Latvian) by the use of participles instead of finite verb forms. It is therefore tempting to integrate the mirative present into the evidential system, as is actually practised in the grammars. But there is a difficulty with this as the mirative form consisting of the present active participle obligatorily preceded by the prefix *be-* would stand alongside a similar participial form without this prefix, and displaying the usual array of evidential meanings, that is, reportive, inferential and mirative. In the following example it has the reportive function, additionally marked by the lexical evidentiality marker *esą*, which, however, is not obligatory:

(10)   *Rankraštis*   *esą*   *jau*   *seniai*
        manuscript.NOM.SG   EVID   already   for_a_long_time
        gulįs   *leidykloje,*
        lie.PPRA.NOM.SG.M   publishing_house.LOC.SG

[*gautos dvi viena kitai prieštaraujančios recenzijos.*]
'The manuscript has reportedly been lying at the publisher's for a
long time, [and two mutually contradictory reviews have come in.]'
(Albertas Zalatorius, 1997, CCLL)

The assumption that the construction we are dealing with here is a kind
of specialised extension of the evidential construction exemplified in (10),
with addition of the prefix *be-* and restriction of the meaning to mirativ-
ity, is not obvious. Since DeLancey (1997) it has been widely accepted that
mirativity can also appear as a category in its own right, even though
mirative meanings often originate as extensions of evidential meanings
(Aikhenvald 2004, 195–215, Aikhenvald 2012). In view of its specifically
mirative function and the obligatory presence of the suffix *be-*, it is pos-
sible that the construction under discussion here has a different gram-
maticalisation source, and this is actually what we will explore in Section
4. Before presenting the corpus data we will give a brief overview of the
other functions the participle with *be-* can have in modern Lithuanian.

3. Other functions of the present participle with *be-*

In order to provide a broader context for the participial forms with the
prefix *be-* discussed here, we will briefly mention the main alternative
types of use of these participles in modern Lithuanian (as we will see,
they are already represented in Old Lithuanian). This brief overview is,
however, not exhaustive. The present active participle with the prefix
be- can occur:

(a) as head of an adnominal participial construction, now usually, though
not always, in prenominal position:

(11) *Vidurinę*   *mokyklą*   ***be-baigianti***
      middle.ACC.SG.F   school.ACC.SG   CNT-finish.PPRA.NOM.SG.F
      mergina   *išgarsėjo*   *visame*   *Vietname,*
      girl.NOM.SG   become_famous.PST.3 all.LOC.SG.M   Vietnam.LOC.SG
      [*pernai laimėjusi komunistinės valdžios „reabilituotą" grožio konkursą.*]
      'The girl, who is now finishing secondary school, became famous
      all over Vietnam [when last year she won a beauty contest 'rehabili-
      tated' by the communist rulers.]'
      (*Amerikos lietuvis* 2003, CCLL)

(b) as head of the complement of a verb of perception or acquisition of knowledge, if the subjects of matrix and complement clause are coreferential and the event described in the complement clause is interpreted as simultaneous with the act of perception:

(12) *Staiga* **susivokiau** **be-stovįs** *tiesiai*
suddenly **realise.PST.1SG** **CNT-stand.PPRA.NOM.SG.M** right
prieš *jau* *pažįstamą* *afišą.*
in_front_of already familiar.ACC.SG poster.ACC.SG
'Suddenly I realised I was standing right in front of the already familiar poster.'
(Jaroslavas Melnikas, 2004, CCLL)

(c) as head of a participial phrase functioning as a predicative complement with the verbs *likti* and *pasilikti* 'remain':

(13) [*Priblokštas taikaus jo elgesio ir kalbos,*]
Arvydas **liko** **be-sėdįs**
PN.NOM **remain.PST.3** **CNT-sit.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
po *ąžuolu* […]
under oak.INS.SG
[*su nauja mįsle prieš akis.*]
'[Nonplussed by his conciliatory behaviour and words,] Arvydas remained sitting under the oak, [faced with a new riddle.]'
(Jurgis Buitkus, 2008, CCLL)

In our corpus search, these constructions have been eliminated, and we have concentrated on those where the participle performed a predicative function with or without the auxiliary 'be'. Functionally, however, there is perhaps no rigid line of division between the two domains. Present participles in the participial complements of the raising verb *pasirodyti* 'turn out' very often have the prefix *be-* (though it is not strictly required here), apparently to convey a nuance of unexpectedness. On the other hand, *pasirodo* 'as it turns out' is often used parenthetically, followed by what we can then identify as the mirative present dealt with in this article. In working with the corpus material we have discarded examples where punctuation clearly pointed to a complementation construction, as in (14), whereas those where *pasirodo/pasirodė* was followed by a comma or occurred between commas, as in (15), were counted as instances of the mirative present.

(14) [*Kamerai atsitraukus,*]
      gyvūnas   ***pasirodo***   ***b-esąs***
      animal.NOM.SG   **turn_out.PRS.3**   **CNT-be.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
      Reksas
      Rex.NOM
      [— *žalias dinozauras iš „Žaislų istorijos"*].
      '[When the camera moves away,] the animal turns out to be Rex, [the
      green dinosaur from *Toy Story*.]'
      (*Kauno diena*, date unknown, Corpus)

(15) *Tolminkiemio*   *muziejus,*   *pasirodo,*
      PLN.GEN   museum.NOM.SG   turn_out.PRS.3
      b-esąs   *rentabili*   *įstaiga.*
      CNT-be.PPRA.NOM.SG.M   profitable.NOM.SG.F   institution.NOM.SG
      'The Tolminkiemis museum is, as it turns out, a profitable institution.'
      (CCLL, Kauno diena 1997)

4. The corpus data

In this section we discuss the results of a search in the Corpus of the
Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL) and the morphologically an-
notated subcorpus at http://corpus.vdu.lt. All nominative forms of present
active participles with the prefix *be-* were collected and subsequently
manually filtered, eliminating adnominal participial constructions, re-
portive constructions where *be-* is used as an approximate negator, and
constructions with verbs like 'remain'. This was done in order to ensure
that only constructions with the participle in predicative position were
left. After checking for repetitions, homonymous forms not relevant to
our topic etc., the remaining forms were classified according to absence
or presence of the auxiliary 'be', and, in those cases where the auxiliary
occurred, according to its grammatical form.

The corpus data reveal, first of all, that the mirative present is much
less frequent than the progressive-proximative-avertive past-tense con-
struction. The corpora yielded 1056 constructions with the past-tense
form of the auxiliary and only 269 instances of the mirative present. We
furthermore found 9 instances of forms with the present-tense auxiliary
yra. This type, illustrated in (8) above, has none of the characteristics of the
mirative present and appears to be purely progressive. It seems therefore

that this rare extension[4] of the progressive-proximative construction can be formally and functionally clearly set apart from the mirative present.

The corpus furthermore contained 12 combinations with the future auxiliary *bus* (*būsiu...*) and 10 with the conditional *būtų* (*būčiau...*). The conditional uses, illustrated in (16), are, again, progressive, like the present-tense variety illustrated in (8):

(16)   *Gerai,*   *kad*   *tu*   *senas.*   ***Būtum***
          good.ADV   that   2SG.NOM   old.NOM.SG.M   **be.COND.2SG**
          paskui   *tą*   *mergaičiukę*
          after   that.ACC.SG.F   chit_of_a_girl.ACC.SG
          be-lakstąs . . .
          CNT-run.PPRA.NOM.SG.M
          'It's a good thing you're old, [otherwise] you would be running after that chit of a girl.' (Juozas Aputis, 2004, CCLL)

The future tense uses do not form a functionally homogeneous group, as already noted in the Academy Grammar (Ulvydas, ed., 1971, 147). While most of the 12 instances found in the corpora express likelihood, two of them have real future reference. An example of this is (17):

(17)   *Kai*   *darbą*   *jau*   ***bus***
          when   work.ACC.SG   already   **be.FUT.3**
          be-baigią   *ar*   *net*   *pabaigę,*
          CNT-finish.PPRA.NOM.PL.M   or   even   finish.PPA.NOM.PL.M
          [*kai jau, vieną akį primerkę, žiūrės į tą savo kūrinį, tik kyšt iš vieno žodžio klaida.*]
          'When they will already be completing their work, or will even have completed it, [when, screwing up one eye, they will be looking at their achievement, a mistake will suddenly peek out from behind some word.]' (Henrikas Algis Čigriejus, 1995, CCLL)

This use seems purely progressive-proximative. The uses referring to the present are somewhat different from the typical use of the mirative present, which is to express astonishment at some actually observed event. When the event referred to is in the sphere of conjecture, properly

---

[4] We use the term 'extension' because there is no apparent continuity with similar constructions sporadically attested in Old Lithuanian (see Section 5). The Academy Grammar, for instance, does not acknowledge their existence.

miriative meaning in the sense just formulated does not apply. The meaning is rather inferential here, with possibly a mirative element in that an inferred new insight may be accompanied by a feeling of surprise. This inferential-mirative use can clearly be set apart from the progressive type in that it can be applied to verbs that are not eligible for use in a progressive construction, like *norėti* 'want' in (18):

(18) [*Nelyja, gražu, jau po pusiaudienio.*]
  Tai   *jie*   **bus**   **be-norį**
  then   3.NOM.PL.M   **be.FUT2**   CNT-want.PPRA.NOM.PL.M
  pasidairyti,   *pasiklausyti*   *smagių*
  look_about.INF   listen.INF   merry.GEN.PL
  vieversių.
  skylark.GEN.PL
  '[It's not raining, the weather's fine, it's already past noon.] So they probably want to have a look about and listen for a while to the merry skylarks.'
  (Juozas Kralikauskas, 2002, CCLL)

The small numbers of instances with present-tense and future-tense forms suggest there is no need to set up the kind of tense paradigm Jablonskis envisaged in introducing the system of 'inceptive' tenses. There are two basic constructions: the past-tense progressive-proximative-avertive, and the mirative present, and there are occasional extensions into other parts of the TAME domain, linked to both constructions singled out here by common features either along the progressivity or along the mirativity dimension.

The mirative present is thus basically a present in the sense that in its basic use it refers to an unusual or unexpected event observed at the moment of speaking. This does not mean it can refer only to events in the present. As pointed out in the preceding paragraph, it does not naturally extend to the future because it expresses astonishment at an actually observed event. But it can refer, in a narrative text, to an event located in the past; it will then occur in the vicinity of past-tense forms. In (19) the opening sentence contains the mirative present but the distal demonstrative *tas* 'that' locates it in the past; the past tense then surfaces in the follow-up sentence. In (20) the subordinate clause is in the past tense while the main clause contains the mirative present:

(19) *Priešais*   **be-einąs**   *pats*
      opposite   **CNT-walk.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**   very.NOM.SG.M
      didžiausias   *to*   *laiko*   *poetas.*
      greatest.NOM.SG.M   that.GEN.SG.M   time.GEN.SG   poet.NOM.SG
      Jis   *buvo*   *gerai*   *nusiteikęs.*
      3.NOM.SG.M   be.PST.3   well   disposed.NOM.SG.M
      'And behold the greatest poet of those days was approaching from
      the other side. He was in a good mood [...].'
      (Juozas Aputis, 2004, CCLL)

(20) *Kai*   *mudvi*   *palypėjom*   *laiptais,*   *dėdė*
      When   1DU.NOM.F   climb.PST.1PL   stairs.INS.PL   uncle.NOM.SG
      Jonas   *jau*   **be-laukiąs**.
      John.NOM   already   **CNT-wait.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
      [*Jis duris atidarė...*]
      'When the two of us mounted the stairs, Uncle John was already wait-
      ing. [He opened the door...]'
      (Jonas Ruzgys, 2001, CCLL)

The identification of the mirative present-tense construction is facilitated
by the presence of attention-directing and presentative verbal forms such
as *žiūrėk* 'look' (and the shortened form of the same meaning *žiū*), *štai*,
antai '(look) there, behold', *ogi (va)* 'well if it isn't ...' and the like; the
construction also naturally occurs in the vicinity of verbs of perception
like *žiūriu* 'I look', *žiūri* 'you look' etc.:

(21) *Tiedu*   *atsisuko:*   *ogi*   *tarpdury*
      DEM.NOM.DU.M   turn_around.PST.3   PTC   doorway.LOC.SG
      be-stovinti   *Kotryna*   *su*   *Girininku...*
      CNT-stand.PPRA.NOM.SG.F   PN.NOM   with   forester.INS.SG
      'The two of them turned around: well if it wasn't Kotryna standing
      in the open doorway together with the forester...'
      (Jurgis Kunčinas, 2004, CCLL)

(22) *Žiūriu —*   *ant*   *kelmo*   **be-sėdįs**
      look.PRS.1SG   on   tree_trunk.GEN.SG   **CNT-sit.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
      Otonas.
      PN.NOM
      'I look and there is Otto sitting on a tree-trunk.'
      (Gasparas Aleksa, 2001, CCLL)

As far as the lexical input is concerned, the corpus data show no clear preferences or restrictions. The only regularity that can be observed is a consistent restriction to imperfective verbs. It does not seem likely that this could be explained by the aspectual properties of the continuative prefix *be-*: though in its original function *be-* entails durativity, it does not necessarily do so in every construction of which it is part (in the avertive past-tense construction it combines with perfective verbs, cf. Arkadiev 2019, 80–81). We could rather say that this feature is connected with the prototypical use of the mirative present, which refers to the fact of a certain state of affairs being discovered by a participant and causing surprise, the state of affairs being at least minimally preexistent with regard to the act of discovery. But the aspectual properties of the participle itself must have been a factor in the rise of this prototypical constructional meaning.

With regard to aspectual class, a striking feature of the mirative present is the prominent position of stative verbs like *būti* 'be' and *turėti* 'have', which are barred from occurrence in the progressive-proximative-avertive past-tense construction. 'Be' occurs both as a copula and as an existential verb:

(23) [*Apstulbęs griebėsi už ausų —*]
ir *iš tikrųjų* *jos* **b-esančios**
and indeed 3.NOM.PL.F CNT-be-PPRA.NOM.PL.F
ilgumo *per* *pusę* *uolekties*
length.GEN over half.ACC.SG ell.GEN.SG
'[Bewildered he grabbed himself by the ears] and indeed they turned out to be more than half an ell in length.'
(Alfonsas Tekorius, translation of Hauff's fairy tales, Corpus)

(24) *Nubėgom* *į* *parduotuvę,* *o* *ten*
run.PST.1PL to shop.ACC.SG and there
pigaus *vynelio* **b-esą,**
cheap.GEN.SG wine.GEN.SG CNT-be.PPRA.NOM.SG.N
natūralaus, *tokiuose* *buteliuose.*
natural.GEN.SG.M such.LOC.PL.M bottle.LOC.PL
'We ran to the shop and it turned out they had cheap wine there, natural wine in these bottles.'
(*Vakarinės naujienos* 1996, CCLL)

Posture verbs like *stand*, *sit*, *lie* are naturally also frequent:

(25) *Po*   *kurio*   *laiko*   *žiūrim —*
after   some.GEN.SG.M   time.GEN.SG   look.PRS.1PL
prie   *mano*   *trobikės*   **be-stovį.**
next_to   my   cottage.GEN.SG   **CNT-stand.PPRA.NOM.PL.M**
'A bit later we look up and behold—we are standing close to my cottage.'
(Juozas Erlickas, Corpus)

5. Diachrony

16th-century Lithuanian texts show clear examples of the past-tense variety illustrated in (2), with an apparently progressive function:

(26) *Kaip*   *dabar*   *taip*   *buwo*   **be-kalbąs,**
as   now   so   be.PST.3   **CNT-speak.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
ataio   *nekurie*   *nůg*   *ßeiminos*
come.PST.3   some.NOM.PL.M   of   household.GEN.SG
Wiriaufio   *Ifkalos* [...]
elder.GEN.SG   school.GEN.SG
'While he yet spake, there came from the ruler of the synagogue's
house certain ...'
Luther: *da er noch also redet / kamen etliche vom Gesinde des Obersten der schule*
Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου
(Bretke, Mk 5.35)

The Lithuanian Academy Grammar (Ulvydas, ed., 1971, 148) points out that Old Lithuanian texts also contain attestations of a similar construction with a present active participle without the prefix *be-*; they cite an example from Daukša's 1599 Postil (rendering Polish *był chrʒcʒacy*):

(27) *Sʒitie*   *dáiktai*   *ftôios*   *Bethanioy*
DEM.NOM.PL.M   thing.NOM.PL   happen.PST.3   Bethania.INE
vʒ   *Iordôno /*   *kur*   *Iônas*
across   Jordan.GEN   where   John.NOM
bů   **kríkßtiiąs.**
be.PST.3   **baptise.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
'These things happened in Bethania, across the Jordan, where John was baptising.'   (DP 21.35)

But there seem to be no attestations of the mirative present-tense construction. Apparently the first text in which we find attestations of the mirative present is Chyliński's Bible translation, of which the Old Testament was partly printed in 1660 and the New Testament is extant in the manuscript. In contrast to Bretke's text, Chyliński's translation contains no convincing attestations of the past-tense progressive. There are several instances of be-PPRA with the past-tense form *buvo*, but all of them render Greek constructions in which a participle is adjoined to a construction with existential or local 'be':

(28) *Bet   ghis   buwo   uzpakaliy   eldyos*
     but   3.NOM.SG.M   be.PST.3   rear.INE.SG   ship.GEN.SG
     be-miegans   and   priegalwia,   ó   aniσ[12]
     CNT-sleep.PPRA.NOM.SG.M   on   pillow.GEN.SG   and   they
     prÿkiełe   ghi [...]
     awake.PST.3   3.ACC.SG.M
     καὶ ἦν αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων· καὶ διεγείρουσιν αὐτὸν
     'And he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow: and they awake him [...]' Chyl NT, Mk 4.38

Examples similar to (26) from Bretke, where the compound form of Lithuanian has no basis in the Greek or German texts, cannot be found. Still, Bretke's evidence shows that the past-tense progressive existed in the language, though in Chyliński's case an external stimulus in the form of an analogous Greek construction was apparently needed to prompt its use. On the other hand, three examples of mirative presents more or less exactly corresponding to the contemporary forms are attested in Chyliński's text. We will discuss them all.

(29) [*Ó Anjełas WIESZPATIES pasirode jam liepſnoy ugnies iſz widuries kiałmo: ir dabojos,*]
      *ó   sztey   kiałmas   **be-degąs***
      and   behold   bush.NOM.SG   **CNT-burn.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
      ugniy
      fire.INE.SG
      Hebr. *wəhinnê hassənê bōʾēr bāʾēš*
      Sept. καὶ ὁρᾷ ὅτι ὁ βάτος καίεται πυρί,
      Vulg. *et videbat quod rubus arderet*
      Dutch StV *ende siet de braem-bosch brandde in 't vyer*
      Polish Danzig Bible *á oto kierz gorzał ogniem*

'[And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked,] and, behold, the bush burned with fire.' (Chyl ОТ, Exod. 3.2)

(30) [*Atejau priepolu, and kałna Gilboa,*]

ó	*sztey*	*Saul*	***be-gulins***	*and*
and	behold	Saul	CNT-lie.PPRA.NOM.SG.M	on

rahotynes	*sawo*
spear.GEN.SG	RPO

Hebr. *wəhinnê šāʾûl nišʿān ʿal-ḥănîtô*
Sept. καὶ ἰδοὺ Σαοὺλ ἐπεστήρικτο ἐπὶ τὸ δόρυ αὐτοῦ
Vulg. *et Saul incumbebat super hastam suam*
Dutch StV *ende siet Saul leende op sijne spiesse*
Polish Danzig Bible *á oto Saul tkwiał ná włoczni swojey*
'[As I happened by chance upon mount Gilboa,] behold, Saul leaned upon his spear.'
(Chyl ОТ, 2 Sam. 1.6)

These examples contain the presentative particle *štai*, rendering the Hebrew *hinnê* and corresponding to the English Biblical *lo* (for the notion of presentative particle see Petit 2010). This particle is followed by a noun phrase followed by the present active participle. This participle could therefore be interpreted as a postnominal modifier, but the translators, starting with the Septuagint, use finite verb forms, a perfectly natural strategy considering that the Hebrew active participle is frequently used as a present tense. The Dutch translators, whom Chyliński followed closely, are no exceptions.[5]

In one case, the participle is separated from the noun by a comma; the Dutch text has, in this case, not a finite form but a participle in the function of postnominal modifier, in accordance with the rendering of the Septuagint, which has ὠρυόμενος 'roaring':

(31) [*Teypo nuejo Simſon ſu tewu ſawo, ir motyna ſawo, Thimnathoń: ó kad atajo iki wino-darźams,*]

sztey	*tęn*	*jaunas*	*lawas,*
behold	there	young.NOM.SG.M	lion.NOM.SG

---

[5] Chyliński, who began translating the Bible into Lithuanian in the Netherlands and finished it in London, used the Dutch Calvinist Bible translation known as the *Statenvertaling* (the translation commissioned by the Estates General of the Netherlands, here abbreviated as StV) as his main translation source. The *Statenvertaling* is known for adhering closely to the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts.

> ***be-rekiąs***   *priesz*   *ghi*
> **CNT-roar.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**   against   3.ACC.SG.M
> Hebrew: *wəhinnê kəpîr 'ărāyôt šō'ēg liqrā'tô*
> Sept. καὶ ἰδοὺ σκύμνος λέοντος ὠρυόμενος εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῦ·
> Vulg. *apparuit catulus leonis saevus rugiens et occurrit ei*
> Dutch StV: *siet daer, een jonge leeuw brullende hem tegemoete*
> Polish Danzig Bible: *oto Lew młody ryczący zábieżał mu*
> '[Then went Samson down, and his father and his mother, to Timnath, and came to the vineyards of Timnath:] and, behold, a young lion roared against him.'
> (Chyl ОТ, Judg. 14.5)

This does not reflect a difference in the Hebrew text; it is merely a question of interpretation on the part of the translators. It is possible that the Dutch translators had a look at the Septuagint here and therefore decided to use a participle in apposition to the noun. The Authorised Version has a past tense form as in the earlier examples.

This brings us to one more type of use of the present active participle prefixed with *be-*, occurring in context similar to those illustrated above, viz. preceded by the presentative *sztey*, but with a posture verb like 'lie' or 'stand'.

(32) [*Teypo atajo Dowidas ir Abiſai źmoniump naktiy,*]
    ó   *ſztey*   *Saul*   *gułejo*   ***be-miegąs***
    and   behold   Saul   lie.PST.3   **CNT-sleep.PPRA.NOM.SG.M**
    tabore
    wagon_fort.INE
    Hebrew: *wəhinnê šā'ûl šōkēb yāšēn bamma'gāl*
    Sept. καὶ ἰδοὺ Σαοὺλ καθεύδων ὕπνῳ ἐν λαμπήνῃ
    Dutch StV *...ende siet / Saul lach te slapen in den wagen-burch*
    Polish Danzig Bible *á oto Saul leżąc spał w oboźie*
    [So David and Abishai came to the people by night:] and, behold, Saul lay sleeping within the trench.'
    (Chyl OT 1 Sam. 26.7)

The use of the present active participle with *be-* in this example is not specifically connected with the mirative context suggested by the presentative particle. It is characteristic of verbs expressing stability of posture or position, such as *likti* 'remain, stay' (it renders Dutch *liggen* 'lie', which has no correspondence in the Hebrew original), and it is obviously the same type of use that is observed in (13) above and is used with posture verbs in Chyliński as well:

(33) *Kodel*   *atlikey*   **be-fedyns**   *terp*
      why   stay.PST.2SG   CNT-sit.PPRA.NOM.SG.M   between
      dwieju   *kaniukſzcziu* [...]?
      two.GEN   sheepfold.GEN.PL
      Dutch StV *Waerom bleeft ghy fitten tuffchen de ftallingen*
      'Why abodest thou among the sheepfolds?'
      (Chyl OT, Judg. 5.16)

Most uses of the present active participle in Chyliński are postnominal, and the nouns to which they are adjoined are not in presentative constructions:

(34) *Ir*   *regietas*   *buwo*   *nog*   *jo*
      and   see.PPP.NOM.SG.M   be.PST.3   from   3.GEN.SG.M
      Anjełas   *Wießpaties,*   **be-stowins**   *po*
      angel.NOM.SG   Lord.GEN.SG   CNT-stand.PPRA.NOM.SG.M   on
      deßiney   *Altoriaus* [...]
      right.DAT.SG   altar.GEN.SG
      Chyl NT, Lk 1.11
      ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἑστὼς ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ θυμιάματος.
      'And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar [of incense].'

The syntax of the participle is basically the same as in (31) here, the difference being that in (30) the noun is in a presentative construction. The Hebrew original has a sentential construction that is introduced by the presentative *hinnê* and contains an active participle in predicative function (this is mentioned by Gesenius-Kautzsch 1909, 374 as one of the contexts in which the active participle often occurs in the function of a present tense), but *hinnê* can also be understood as just introducing the noun, to which the participial phrase is added as a postnominal modifier. This gave the translators two possibilities of rendering (29), (30) and (31). The interesting thing about Chyliński's renderings is that though he certainly had the Dutch translation before his eyes, and possibly looked at other authoritative translations as well, he basically chose the same constructions, identical but for the comma, for (29), (30) and (31). The varieties in (29) and (30), which render finite forms of the Dutch (and Greek) text, are indisputable instances of the mirative present as we find it in modern Lithuanian, the main difference being the presence of the presentative particle in Chyliński's text. Their similarity to (31) is striking and hardly

coincidental. Considering that the active participle with *be-* is elsewhere used postnominally, it is tempting to assume that a structure as in (31), with the participle postnominally modifying a noun used in a presentative construction, could have, to a certain extent, provided the basis for the structure in (29) and (30). The Lithuanian particle *štai*, like its counterparts in Hebrew and many other languages, could and still can have two types of linguistic units in its focus: noun phrases and sentences. These varieties are illustrated, for Chyliński's language, by (35) and (36) respectively:

(35) *Sztey   ugnis,   ir   małkos,*
     behold   fire.NOM.SG   and   firewood[PL].NOM
     [*bet kame ira awinelis and degamos-afieros?*]
     'Behold the fire and the wood: [but where *is* the lamb for a burnt offering?]'
     (Chyl от Gen. 22.7)

(36) [*Nudejo tada Noach woką Karoblies, ir dabojoś,*]
     a   sztey   źiame   iździuwo.
     and   behold   earth.NOM.SG   dry_up.PST.3
     '[And Noah removed the covering of the ark, and looked,] and, behold, the face of the ground was dry.'
     (Chyl от Gen. 8.14)

These Biblical constructions reflect, of course, original Hebrew constructions with the presentative particle *hinnê*, but the presentative particle itself was evidently as fully alive in the spoken language as it is now. The twofold syntactic use still exists in the contemporary language, as can be seen from the following examples;

(37) *O   štai   mano   šeima: broliai*
     and   PRES   my   family.NOM.SG   brother.NOM.PL
     ir   seserys.
     and   sister.NOM.PL
     'And here is my family—my brothers and sisters.'
     (Viktoras Katilius, 1996, CCLL)

(38) *Ir   štai   jis   keliauja   į   jubiliejų*
     and   PRES   3.NOM.SG.M   travel.PRS.3   to   celebration.ACC.SG
     saulėtoje   Baisogaloje.
     sunny.LOC.SG.F   PLN.LOC.SG
     'And here he is on his way to a celebration in sunny Baisogala.'
     (Jurgis Kunčinas, 2003, CCLL)

The mirative present might have arisen due to a presentative construction with a postmodified noun phrase in its focus being reanalysed as a presentative construction with a sentence in its focus. In the course of this reanalysis, the participle, which had originally encoded a postnominal modifier, came to function as the main sentential predicate.[6] What adds plausibility to this explanation is that it accounts for the consistent absence of the auxiliary 'be' in the mirative construction: in the presentative construction it was absent because the participle was originally a postnominal modifier, not a main clause predicate.

But presentative constructions like that in (31) were probably not the only source for the mirative present. In Old Lithuanian, the present active participle occurred in a range of constructions: as a postnominal modifier, as illustrated in (34); in combination with posture verbs and certain other state verbs like 'remain', as illustrated in (33); and in combination with 'be' as a progressive form. The constructions with the present participle as a postnominal modifier had a variety in which the noun occurred in a presentative construction, and this variety apparently played a certain part in the rise of the mirative construction as a result of the syntactic shift referred to above. But all these constructions must have somehow interacted. Particularly relevant here is the relationship between past-tense and present-tense varieties. Could the mirative overtones characteristic of the present-tense variety originally have occurred in the past tense as well? A few instances seem to suggest this. One is (32) above, but there the participle occurs with *gulėti*, so it does not really belong to our construction. Another has the verb *buwo*, and the mirative reading is, again, suggested by the presentative *sztey*, admittedly occurring not immediately before the construction *buwo* + *be*-PPRA, but in the preceding verbless clause.

(39) [*Jr dabojaus, ó sztej balta debesis,*]

ó	*and*	*debesies*	***buwo***		
and	on	cloud.GEN.SG	**be.PST.3**		
be-sedins			*ligus*		*Sunuj*
CNT-sit.PPRA.NOM.SG.M			alike.NOM.SG.M		Son.DAT.PL

---

[6] A reviewer points out further examples of the involvement of presentative particles in various processes of reanalysis, such as that of Latin *ecce* in the rise of demonstrative pronouns in Romance, cf. Italian *cotale* 'such, of that kind' < *eccu(m) talis*.

> *zmogaus.*
> human.GEN.SG
> 'And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man.'
> Cf. *ende op de wolcke was een geseten des menschen Sone gelijck,*
> (Greek: καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν νεφέλην καθήμενος ὅμοιος υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου)
> (Chyl NT, Revelation 14.14)

This is what we could call a mirative context, though it is, so to speak, 'displaced mirativity': miratives normally presuppose a short time distance between the act of knowledge acquisition and the speech act (as emphasised by Rett & Murray 2013), and they are not readily compatible with past tense except in the case of an indirect information source (as pointed out by DeLancey 2001). Narratives, however, are different: the effect of surprise may be shifted to the past as a narrative device, and this is done in this example by the presentative particle. But this *sztey* ultimately copies Hebrew *hinnê*, and in the living languages the mirative source contexts with *štai* were probably basically present-tense. So the conclusion from these few examples should probably be that the preconditions for the rise of our mirative construction were found in past-tense constructions as well, but it was in the present tense that they were grammaticalised because of the inherent features of mirativity as such.

On the other hand, alongside past-tense progressive constructions of the type *buvo* + *be*-PPRA, Old Lithuanian had analogous present-tense forms, comparable to (8) above:

(40) *Saka   ghiems   ſu   dʒauxmu   didʒu*
      tell.PRS.3   3.DAT.PL.M   with   joy.INS.SG   great.INS.SG.M
      / Iog   eſt   be-gulis   edʒoſu
      that   be.PRS.3   CNT-lie.PPRA.NOM.SG.M   manger[PL].INE
      Kudikis   pilns   wargu.
      babe.NOM.SG   full.NOM.SG.M   sorrow.GEN.PL
      'He tells them with great joy that a babe full of sorrow is lying in a manger.'
      Mažvydas, G I C7v(193),11

Alongside the variety with overt present tense auxiliary as in (40), there is also a variety without auxiliary:

(41) *Amßina*   *Tewa*   *funelis /*   *Edʒofu*
      eternal.GEN.SG.M   father.GEN.SG   son.NOM.SG   manger[PL].INE
      nu   *be-gulis.*
      now   CNT-lie.PPRA.NOM.SG.M
      'The little son of the eternal Father is now lying in a manger.'
      Mažvydas, G I C1v(181), 5[7]

Compared with (40), (41) looks like a mere variety of the same progressive con-
struction with deletion of the auxiliary. Non-expression of the present-tense
3rd person auxiliary is a feature frequently attested in other circumstances
as well, e.g. in the modern language the auxiliary of the perfect is frequently
omitted in the 3rd person. We may assume, then, that 16th-century Lithu-
anian as instantiated in Mažvydas still had progressive forms in the present
tense alongside the past-tense forms still existing in modern Lithuanian (it is
not clear whether the occasional forms with overt auxiliary in modern Lithu-
anian are a direct continuation of the Old Lithuanian forms). This present
progressive may also have played a role in the rise of the mirative present. It
has been pointed out in the literature that progressives, and present progres-
sives in particular, are often not purely progressive in aspectual terms, but
may carry pragmatic and emotive overtones. Comrie (1976, 37–38) notes the
use of the English progressive beyond its proper functional domain to express
annoyance (*She is always buying more vegetables than they can possibly eat*),
and he cites the use of the Icelandic progressive (derived from verbs that do
not normally occur in the progressive) to express surprise or disgust. De Wit,
Petré & Brisard (2020) invoke the notion of 'extravagance' to characterise the
use of a progressive form in contexts where it is not motivated in terms of
aspect with the aim of drawing the hearer's attention to the non-canonical
character of the situation that is being referred to. Güldemann (2003) notes
the use of progressive forms to mark predication focus (i. e., the focusing of
the predicate itself rather than one of its arguments) in Bantu, which points
to a link between progressive and saliency of the verbal predicate, a feature
that can be viewed as related to mirativity.

   Presentative constructions and the emotive overtones of the progressive
could thus have worked together to produce what is now the mirative pre-

---

[7] Here the Lithuanian text diverges from Luther's German original, which has *Des ewigen
Vaters einig kind / itzt man in der krippen find* (Michelini 2000, 243); the form used here is
clearly a present progressive.

sent. The contribution of the presentative construction provides a natural explanation for the absence of the auxiliary 'be' in our construction, as there was obviously no auxiliary in the postnominal participial construction involved in this diachronic path. The frequent use of mirative presents derived from stative verbs like *būti* 'be' and *turėti* 'have', which are barred from occurrence in the progressive-proximative-avertive past-tense construction, is consistent both with the hypothesis of a presentative source in which the participle was originally postnominal, and with the emotive and pragmatic overtones of progressives occurring beyond their proper domain of use. Because of the scarcity of texts and the fragmentary character of the diachronic evidence it is impossible to give an accurate reconstruction of the process of its rise, but future research might bring more clarity.

6. In conclusion

In this article we have argued that the Lithuanian construction consisting in predicative use of a present active participle with the prefix *be-* and without the auxiliary 'be' is a mirative construction in its own right, distinct both from the progressive-proximative (and, in the past tense, avertive) compound verb forms with the same participial form and the auxiliary 'be' and from the evidential system based on participles. It is also suggested, on the basis of diachronic data, that this construction may have its own distinct grammaticalisation source, viz. constructions with post-nominal participle in a presentative construction, though the mirative overtones that have been noted to accompany the use of progressives may also have been a factor contributing to its rise. The Lithuanian mirative present thus appears to be one more example showing that mirativity is, in principle, a *sui generis* type of linguistic marking rather than an extension of evidentiality, even though the two domains of marking overlap. It is also one more instance of a specifically mirative construction in Lithuanian alongside the mirative imperative discussed in Holvoet (2018).

Axel Holvoet
Gina Kavaliūnaitė

Vilnius University
Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic
Universiteto 5, LT-01131 Vilnius
axel.holvoet@flf.vu.lt
gina.holvoet@flf.vu.lt

Abbreviations

ACC — accusative, ADV — adverb, APNEG — approximate negator, CNT — continuative, CVB — converb, DAT — dative, DEM — demonstrative, DU — dual, EVID — evidential marker, F — feminine, FUT — future, GEN — genitive, INE — inessive, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, LOC — locative, M — masculine, N — neuter, NEG — negation, NOM — nominative, PL — plural, PLN — place name, PN — personal name, PPA — past active participle, PPP — past passive participle, PPRA — present active participle, PRES — presentative particle, PRS — present, PST — past, PTC — particle, REL — relative pronoun, RFL — reflexive, RPO — reflexive possessive, SG — singular, VOC — vocative

Sources

CCLL – Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language at tekstynas.vdu.lt

Corpus – Morphologically Annotated Lithuanian Corpus at corpus.vdu.lt

Bretke NT – *Die Bibel* […] *litauisch übersetzt von Johann Bretke* […] *Textedition des Bandes 7 der Handschrift: Das Neue Testament. Evangelien und Apostelge-schichte.* Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2017.

Chyl OT – *Vetus Testamentum Lithvanica Lingva donatum a Samuelo Boguslao Chylinski, una cum texto belgico*, ed. G. Kavaliūnaitė. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2008

Chyl NT – Chyliński's New Testament at http://www.chylinskibible.flf.vu.lt/

DP – Daukša's *Postil*, in: Jonas Palionis, *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų „Postilė" ir jos šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2001; see also the electronic version at http://seniejirastai.lki.lt/db.php?source=2

Mažvydas – *Gefmes Chrikfcʒoniskas,* Königsberg 1566, in: Guido Michelini, *Martyno Mažvydo raštai ir jų šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidy-bos institutas, 2000; see also the electronic version at http://seniejirastai.lki.lt/db.php?source=85

Mertikaitis – *Wiffokies Naujes Giefmes arba Ewangelißki Pfalmai*, 1825, at http://seniejirastai.lki.lt/db.php?source=84

References

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16, 435–485.

Ambrazas, Vytautas. 1979. *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė* [Historical Syntax of Lithuanian Participles]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Ambrazas, Vytautas, ed., 1994. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika* [A Grammar of Contemporary Lithuanian]. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Ambrazas, Vytautas, ed., 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2011. On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2, 37–78.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2019. The Lithuanian "*buvo* + *be*-present active participle" construction revisited. *Baltic Linguistics* 10, 65–108.

Arkadiev, Peter, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer. 2015. Introduction: Baltic linguistics — State of the art. In: Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer, eds., *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics*. Berlin etc.: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–109.

Baranauskas, Antanas. 1896. = *Kalbomokslis lëtuviszkos kalbos* [Lithuanian Grammar]. *Sine auctore*. Tilsit: E. Jagomast.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1, 33–52.

DeLancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33.3, 369–382.

de Wit, Astrid, Peter Petré & Frank Brisard. 2020. Standing out with the progressive. *Journal of Linguistics* 56.3, 479–514.

Gesenius, Wilhelm & Emil Kautzsch. 1909. *Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräische Grammatik, völlig umgearbeitet von E. Kautzsch*. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel.

Güldemann, Tom. 2003. Present progressive vis-à-vis predication focus in Bantu. *Studies in Language* 27.2, 323–360.

Holvoet, Axel. 2018. Sources for historical imperatives. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 50.1, 2018, 36–51.

Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey Pullum, eds. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jablonskis, Jonas [Petras Kriaušaitis]. 1901. *Lietuviškos kalbos gramatika. Rašytojams ir skaitytojams vadovėlis* [Lithuanian Grammar. A Guide for Writers and Readers]. Tilsit: Otto von Mauderode.

JABLONSKIS, JONAS. 1919. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika* [Lithuanian Grammar]. Cited from the 2nd edition, Kaunas 1922, reprinted in: Jonas Jablonskis, *Rinkiniai raštai* Vol. 1, edited by Jonas Palionis. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1957, 183–433.

KURSCHAT, FRIEDRICH. 1876. *Grammatik der litauischen Sprache.* Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

KUTEVA, TANIA. 1998. On identifying an evasive gram: Action narrowly averted. *Studies in Language* 22.1, 113–160.

PETIT, DANIEL. 2010. On presentative particles in the Baltic languages. In: Nicole Nau & Norbert Ostrowski, eds., *Particles and Connectives in Baltic.* Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 151–170.

RETT, JESSICA & SARAH E. MURRAY. 2013. A semantic account of mirative evidentials. *Proceedings of SALT 23*, 453–472.

SCHLEICHER, AUGUST. 1856. *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache. I. Grammatik.* Prague: J. G. Calve.

SLIŽIENĖ, NIJOLĖ. 1961. Apie sudurtines pradėtines veiksmažodžių formas [About the compound inceptive forms of the verb]. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 4, 67–72.

ULVYDAS, KAZYS, ed. 1971. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika. II. Morfologija* [Lithuanian Grammar Vol. II. Morphology]. Vilnius: Mintis.