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Background & Proposal: While Lithuanian lacks definite articles, it has suffixes \textit{jis-}/\textit{ji}-associated with definiteness. These definite morphemes appear on a variety of non-NP categories, but for present purposes we will focus on adjectives. Adjectives can appear in a bare short form \textit{graži} “beautiful.SG.F” and a long form with a definite morpheme \textit{gražio-ji} “beautiful.SG.F-DEF”. Traditional grammar books define the short form as indefinite and the long form as definite (Ambrazas et al. 1997). Recent cross-linguistic work identifies two kinds of definites: strong definites based on familiarity and weak definites licensed by uniqueness (Schwarz 2009, 2013; Jenks 2015; Arkoh & Matthewson 2013). In this paper, we argue that short forms can be definite, and in particular are used to express weak article definites associated with uniqueness. Long forms pattern with strong article definites, as evidenced by familiar definite uses and certain bridging contexts parallel to the German data (Schwarz 2009). However, a difference emerges in larger situations: while German licenses only weak articles, Lithuanian allows both short and long forms, which yield two different readings. The short form refers to general knowledge associated with unique individuals while the long form denotes context specific unique individuals – the distinction also observed by Jenks (2005) between bare nous vs. definite demonstratives in Thai.

Evidence:

I) In line with being indefinite, short forms can also be definite. Unique definites occur in part-whole bridging contexts. Lithuanian short adjectives, like German weak articles, are felicitous in this environment (1). The presence of a long form yields a familiarity reading: the listener must have heard about the new engine from before (2).

II) A product-producer bridging pattern is a strong article environment. The long form is available here (3) and the bare form can only be understood as indefinite.

III) Familiarity definites are referential expressions licensed by an anaphoric link to a preceding expression. This is so-called strong familiarity (Roberts 2003), which in German requires a strong article and in Lithuanian a long adjective (4). The short form in the first sentence in (4) introduces a new referent, a typical function of an indefinite, and it cannot be used anaphorically as illustrated in the second sentence (4).

IV) Larger situation environment (Hawkins 1978) licenses weak definites and permit only weak articles in German. Both types of adjectives are available in Lithuanian, but are associated with different readings also present in numeral classifier languages (Jenks 2015). The long form in (5) presents a unique individual in a specific context. The short form stands for a unique individual licensed by general world knowledge (6).

Conclusion: This study provides additional evidence for the distinction between strong versus weak definites showing that this distinction is not necessarily reflected in determiner patterns, and can also be detected in the adjectival system. Lithuanian also distinguishes between long and short demonstratives and personal pronouns. Hence,
further research would be to see what is the nature of the definite interpretation of these forms, and how this can be related to short vs. long adjective variations in Slavic
Examples modeled on the basis of Schwarz (2009, 2013):

(1) Aš nuvežiau savo automobilį į taisyklę pakeisti keletą detalių.
   I brought my car into repair-shop to-change couple parts.
   Naujas variklis dabar dirba puikiai.
   **New** engine now works **great**.
   “I brought my car into repair-shop to change a couple of its parts. The new engine now works great.”

(2) Aš nuvežiau savo automobilį į taisyklę pakeisti keletą detalių.
   I brought my car into repair-shop to-change couple parts.
   Nauja-sis variklis dabar veikia puikiai.
   **New-DEF** engine now looks **great**.
   [Context: Possible only if “new engine” was mentioned to the hearer before.]

(3) Mes nusipirkome naują avangardišką paveikslą. Už nuoplenus avangardui,
   We bought a new avant-garde painting. For merits **avant-garde**
   jaunas-is/??jaunas menininkas buvo apdovanotas premija.
   young-DEF/??young artist was given premium.
   “We bought a new avant-garde painting. For the merits to avant-garde, **the young artist** received a premium.”

(4) Aš nusipirkau naują automobilį. Tačiau, Jonui naujas-is/??naujas automobilis
   I bought **new** car. However, Jonas **new-DEF/??new** car
   nepatiko.
   not-like “I have bought a **new** car. However, Jonas did not like the **new** car.”

(5) Tai ką darė mūsų Prezidentę, tai turės daryti naujas prezidentas.
   This what did our president, this must to-do **new** president
   “The things that our president did must be done by the **new president**.”
   [Context: the sentence uttered by the Prime Minister in the evening of elections]

(6) Po rinkimuų naujas-is prezidentas paskambino miestelio merui.
   After elections **new-DEF** president called city mayor
   “After the elections **the new president** called the city mayor.”
   [Context: everyone already knows who is the new president]