Peter M. Arkadiev, alpgurev@gmail.com
Institute of Slavic Studies, Moscow

MORPHOSYNTAX OF *ACCUSATIVUS CUM PARTICIPIO* CONSTRUCTIONS IN LITHUANIAN

1. Introductory remarks

✦ *Accusativus cum participio (galininkas su (pa)dalyviu,* AcP*)* construction in Lithuanian:

(1) *Sakiau **tėvą** gerai **gyvenant**.*
  'I said [my] father lived well.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 367)

✦ Previous studies (mainly diachronic): Tangl 1928/1999, Ambrazas 1979, Wiemer 1998.

✦ Main goals of this study:

❶ Differentiate between the different types of AcP construction.

❷ Determine the precise syntactic structure of each of the AcP constructions.

❸ Integrate the Lithuanian AcP constructions into the current typology and theory of non-finite complementation.

☞ ❶–❸ are significantly interrelated.

2. Brief overview of the system of participles in Lithuanian

➢ In Lithuanian, there is a rich system of participial formations (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 326–372; Klimas 1987), distinguishing the following grammatical categories:

✦ Tense (Present, Preterite, Habitual Past, Future);

✦ Voice (Active, Passive);

✦ presence vs. absence of Agreement (Case, Gender, Number) – the feature to which the morphological difference between the traditional 'participles' (*dalyviai*) and 'gerunds' (*padalyviai*) ultimately boils down[1].

sakyti 'say'	Active		Passive[2]
	Agreeing	**Non-agreeing**	
Present	*sakąs* (m)*, sakanti* (f)	*sakant*	*sakomas*
Preterite	*sakęs* (m)*, sakiusi* (f)	*sakius*	*sakytas*
Habitual Past	*sakydavęs* (m), *-usi* (f)	*sakydavus*	—
Future	*sakysiąs* (m), *-anti* (f)	*sakysiant*	*sakysimas*

➢ Participles may be used in various functions:

✦ attributive (only agreeing participles), ex. (2);

✦ adverbial (presence of agreement signals coreference between the subject of the participle and the main clause subject), ex. (3a), (3b);

✦ main clause predicate with an evidential meaning, ex. (4);

---

[1] For a recent contrastive and historical analysis of non-agreeing participles in Russian and Lithuanian see Greenberg & Lavine 2006.

[2] Special non-agreeing ('neuter') forms of passive participles (*sakoma*, *sakyta* etc.) are not taken into account here.

✦ lexical verb in various periphrastic constructions, e.g. Perfect, ex. (5), Proximative, ex. (6), or Passive, ex. (7);

✦ complement with some verbs taking clausal complements (presence of agreement signals coreference between the subject of the participle and the main clause subject), ex. (8a) (=1), (8b).

(2) *Visi gerai matė **artėjantį** traukinį.*
'Everybody could well see the approaching train.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 353)

(3) a. ***Išėjusi**$_i$ iš miško, ji$_i$ net stabtelėjo.*
'Having left the forest, she (suddenly) stopped.' (ibid.: 362)

   b. *Vaikams **sugrįžus**, pragydo lakštingala.*
'When the children came back, a nightingale burst into singing.' (ibid.: 363)

(4) *Vieno pono **mirusi** pati ir **palikusi** dvylika sūnų ir dar vieną dukterėlę.*
'The wife of a lord died and left twelve sons and a little daughter.' (ibid.: 265)

(5) *Esu **apkeliavęs** visą pasaulį ir daug kraštų **matęs**.*
'I have traveled all over the world and have seen many countries.' (ibid.: 249)

(6) *Vakar Jonas buvo **besusergąs**, bet išgėrė vaistų ir nesusirgo.*
'Yesterday Jonas had almost fallen ill, but he took medicines and did not fall ill.'[3]

(7) *Jis yra visų **mylimas**.*
'He is loved by everyone.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 251)

(8) a. *Sakiau tėvą$_i$ gerai **gyvenant**$_i$.*   (=1)
'I said [my] father lived well.' (ibid.: 367)

   b. *Tėvas$_i$ sakėsi gerai **gyvenąs**$_i$.*
'Father said he lived well.' (ibid.)

3. General properties of Lithuanian AcP constructions
➢ AcP-taking verbs:

✦ verbs of perception: *matyti* 'see', *girdėti* 'hear', *jausti* 'feel';

✦ verbs of information transmission: *sakyti* 'say', *pripažinti* 'confess, acknowledge', *įrodyti* 'prove', *tvirtinti* 'assert', *teigti* 'assert', *neigti* 'deny', *skelbti* 'announce, declare', *rašyti* 'write', *pasakoti* 'tell, narrate', *tarti* 'say', *rodyti* 'show', *vaizduoti* 'depict' etc.

✦ verbs of cognition: *manyti* 'think, believe', *žinoti* 'know', *sužinoti* 'learn', *įtarti* 'suspect', *vaizduotis* 'imagine', *suvokti* 'realize', *tikėti* 'believe', *suprasti* 'understand, realize', *numanyti* 'guess, understand', *prisiminti* 'to remember', *atrodyti* 'look like, appear', *skaityti* 'consider', *laikyti* 'consider' etc.

➢ (Surface) syntactic properties of AcP construction:

✦ the subjects of the matrix and of the embedded clause are distinct (at least on the surface level), and the latter (hereafter ES = embedded subject) is expressed by an Accusative NP;

---

[3] Examples with no source indicated come from the native speakers I have consulted. I heartily thank all my consultants.

✦ the participle bears no agreement morphology, but may freely inflect for tense (interpreted usually as relative to the tense of the matrix clause): Present (1), Preterite (9), Habitual Past (10), Future (11).

(9) [*Ji*] *prisiminė jį* **buvus** *labdaringą ir malonų.*
 'She remembered him to have been nice and charitable.' (Internet)

(10) *... skatina manyti ją dažnai* **būdavus** *susierzinusią ...*
 '[this] induces one to believe her to have often been irritated...' (Internet)

(11) *"Sanitas" tikisi rugsėjį* **būsiant**   *pelningu.*
 '"Sanitas" [a Lithuanian pharmaceutical company] hopes that September will be profitable.'

➢ **Question 1: What is the syntactic status of the Accusative NP expressing ES?**

4. Accusative NP as the matrix direct object: pro et contra
➢ Arguments for the matrix DO status of ES:

✦ reflexives (12b) and even marginally reciprocals (13b):

(12) a. *Niujorko akvariumo delfinai$_i$ išmoko atpažinti* **save**$_i$ *veidrodyje.*
 'Dolphins from the New York aquarium learned to recognize themselves in the mirror.' (Internet)

 b. *Jie$_i$ suvokia* **save**$_i$ **esant** *grupės dalimi*
 'They consider themselves to be a part of the group.' (Internet)

(13) a. *Abudu$_i$ nustebo,* [**vienas kitą**]$_i$ *pamatę.*
 'The two got surprised when they saw each other.' (J.Biliūnas)

 b. *Rajono politikai$_i$ vis dažniau įtaria* [**vienas kitą**]$_i$ **priimant** *politinius sprendimus.*
 'The district's politicians are still more often suspecting each other of making politically motivated decisions' (Internet)

✦ passivisation (14b):

(14) a. **Jis *yra visų* mylimas**.   (=7)
 'He is loved by everyone.'

 b. **Tėvas** *buvo* **matomas** *pareinąs.*
 'Father was seen coming back.'

✦ Genitive of negation (15b):

(15) a. *Jis* **ne*parašė* laiško**.
 'He did not write a letter.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 503)

 b. *Ar* **ne**matei **tėvo** *parėjus?*
 'Haven't you seen father come back?' (ibid.: 368)

✦ Nominative with infinitive (16b):

(16) a. *Iš toli bus matyti* **dūmai**.
 'You'll be able to see the smoke from afar.'

 b. *Tolumoje matyti* **laivas** *plaukiant.*
 'In the distance you can see a boat sailing.' (ibid.: 368)

✦ word order possibilities (17b):

(17) a. ***Motiną** ta žinia labai sujaudino.*
  'Mother was very excited by the news.' (ibid.: 696)

  b. *Žmogus **išorinius atributus** gali manyti **esant** savo paties dalimi.*
  'A person may think that external attributes are a part of his own self.' (Internet)

➢ However, the actual behaviour of AcP constructions is more complicated.

✦ Passivisation of ES is in fact very restricted and is systematically allowed only by the following verbs: *matyti* 'see', *girdėti* 'hear', *įtarti* 'suspect', *vaizduoti* 'describe, depict', *pripažinti* 'acknowledge', *skelbti* 'announce', and *laikyti* 'consider'. Such verbs as *sakyti* 'say', *manyti* 'think', *teigti* 'assert, claim' etc. do not admit passivisation, cf. (18).

(18) **Jonas buvo **manomas // sakomas // teigiamas** esąs gerai mokytas.*
  intended meaning 'Jonas was thought // said // claimed to be well-educated.'

✦ It is possible to generalize that passivisation of the ES is allowed only by those verbs with which this NPs is a **genuine DO**, selected and assigned semantic role by the matrix verb. This is especially evident with verbs of perception, for which the following implication naturally holds:

(19) *Mačiau **tėvą** parėjus.*   →   *Mačiau **tėvą**.*
  'I saw the father come back.'   'I saw the father.'

The situation is more complicated with *laikyti* 'consider', which generally does not select for the type of object which may appear in the ES position, cf. (20), but nevertheless freely allows passivisation, cf. (21):

(20) a. *Kadangi žydai laiko **Izraelį esant** savo istorine tėvyne...*
    'Because Jews consider Israel to be their historical homeland...' (Internet)

  b. *??Žydai laiko **Izraelį**.*

(21) *... žmogus **laikomas esąs** racionali būtybė...*
  '[although] man is considered to be a rational being...' (Internet)

A possible explanation of the occurrence of examples like (21) might lie in the fact that the original (and synchronically available and widely used) meaning of *laikyti* is 'hold', for which the passive is unproblematic.

✦ Negative elements (NPIs) in Lithuanian constructions with infinitival complements may be licensed both by the clause-mate negation (22a) and by the matrix negation (22b):

(22) a. *Noriu* [*rytoj **niekur ne**eiti*].
    Lit. 'I want to go nowhere tomorrow.'

  b. *Nenoriu* [*rytoj **niekur** eiti*].
    'I don't want to go anywhere tomorrow.'

✦ In AcP constructions, NPI in the position of ES may not be licensed neither by the matrix negation (23a), nor by the negation on the embedded predicate (23b):

(23) a. **Jonas **ne**sakė **nieko** parėjus.*
    intended meaning: 'Jonas didn't say that anyone had come back.'

  b. **Jonas sakė **nieką ne**parėjus.*
    intended meaning: 'Jonas said that nobody had come back.'

✦ However, with verbs which allow passivisation of ES, NPIs may be licensed by the matrix negation (24a), but not by the lower negation (24b):

(24) a. *Bėgiojantys toje trasoje sakė, kad dar **nematė niekо** ridinėjant.*
'Those who run on this track said that they had not yet seen anybody roll [there].'

  b. **Jonas matė **nieką ne**praėjus.*
   intended meaning: 'Jonas saw that nobody had passed by.'

➢ At least two types of AcP construction in Lithuanian:

✦ Type I: embedded under verbs of perception, where the Accusative NP serves as the real DO of the matrix verb coindexed with a zero Subject of the participle (cf. Holvoet & Judžentis 2003: 144, ex. (107)):

(25) *Girdėjau **Joną**$_i$ [∅$_i$ su Aldona šnekant]*
'I heard Jonas chatting with Aldona.'

✦ Type II: embedded under verbs of speech-act and cognition, where the Accusative NP stands in a different relation with the matrix verb.

	Type I	Type II
Genitive of negation	+	+
Nominative with Inf	+	−[4]
Reflexivisation	+	+
Passivisation	+	−
NPI licensing	+	−

➢ **Question 2: What is the syntactic status of the ES in AcP-s of Type II?**

5. Raising vs. Exceptional Case Marking

➢ Similar constructions in English (26a) and other languages (cf. Davies & Dubinsky 2004):

(26) a. *I believe **him** to be honest.*

  Two kinds of analysis:

✦ Raising to the position of the matrix DO (cf. Postal 1974), (26b):

✦ 'Exceptional' case marking of the embedded subject by the matrix verb (cf. Chomsky 1981), (26c):

(26) b. *I believe **him**$_i$ [__$_i$ to be honest].*
  c. *I believe [**him** to be honest].*

➢ There is evidence that in the Type II AcP constructions in Lithuanian the ES is a constituent of the embedded clause:

✦ non-availability of passivisation (cf. above);
✦ non-availability of NPI-licensing from the matrix clause (23a);
✦ partitive Genitive clearly assigned not by the matrix verb, ex. (27)–(28):

(27) *Tačiau žino **jų** esant Vokietijoje.*
'However, [they] know that some of these things are in Germany.' (Internet)

(28) *Maisto produktuose tikrai ne tiek yra vitaminų kiek mes įsivaizduojame **jų** esant.*
'There is perhaps not as many vitamins in food as we believe there to be [lit. "of them"]' (Internet)

---

[4] This construction is available with verbs of perception only.

✦ verbs with non-nominative subjects are marginally accepted in AcP constructions:

(29) $^?$*Jonas sakė **tėvui** reikiant pagalbos.*
'Jonas said that his father needed help.'

✦ Moreover, the fact that the matrix negation may trigger Genitive on ES (15b) does not imply that the ES necessarily occupies a position in the main clause, since Genitive of negation in Lithuanian is not clause-bound, cf. (30a,b) with infinitival complement clauses:

(30) a. *Jonas **ne**nori [rašyti **laiško** // *laišką].*
'Jonas doesn't want to write a letter.'

   b. *Jonas **ne**liepė Aldonai [rašyti **laiško** // *laišką].*
'Jonas didn't order Aldona to write a letter.'

✦ The fact that ES may occur before the matrix verb and mix with the elements of the main clause (17b) is inconclusive, too, since extraction from non-finite complements is possible in Lithuanian anyway, cf. (31):

(31) *...kad kai kuriose mokyklose šią **knygą**$_i$ liepia [skaityti __$_i$]...*
'...that in some schools they order [students] to read this book...' (Internet)

✦ Moreover, the embedded predicate and its subject may undergo movement together, which implies that they form a constituent, cf. (32), (33):

(32) *Filme yra tokių kadrų, [**kuriuos esant**]$_i$ neįtarė __$_i$ net ir patys grupės nariai.*
'In the film there are some shots which the members of the team themselves did not suspect to be there.' (Internet)

(33) *... tokių problemų, [**kurių esant**]$_i$ tėvai nė nenumanė __$_i$.*
'[of] problems such that the parents did not even surmise that they existed.'

✦ Finally, there is a class of AcP constructions where the surface position of ES is clearly in the embedded clause: <u>existential</u> AcP constructions.

➢ In Lithuanian, word order in existential clauses is usually (Loc)VS, ex. (34):

(34) *Sode auga **didelė liepa**.*
'There is growing a large lime-tree in the garden.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 694)

➢ Existential clauses of the type of (34) may be freely embedded under AcP-taking verbs, cf. (35), (36); the only overt difference between 'normal' and existential AcP constructions concerns the position of the ES: it remains in its original position, i.e. after the embedded predicate, but is still case-marked Accusative:

(35) *Profesorius prisiminė [buvus ant vargonų angelų **skulptūras**].* (Internet)
'The professor recalled there to have been statues of angels on the organ.'

(36) *Teigia [pasaulyje esant **tvarką**].*
'[He] claims that there is order in the world.' (Internet)

✦ Matrix verb negation may trigger Genitive on the ES, supporting the generalization that non-finite complements are not opaque with respect to this process:

(37) *Ekspertai **ne**mano [esant **problemų**].*
'The experts do not believe there to be any problems.' (Internet)

➢ That the ES is indeed inside the embedded clause is supported by the fact that negation on the embedded verb may license NPIs (and genitive, too), cf. (38) vs. (23b):

(38) [*T*]*eigti* [***nesant jokio sugedimo***] — *tai ir yra galvos kišimas į smėlį.* (Internet)
    'To claim that there is no damage is to stand in a head-in-the-sand position.'

➢ This evidence suggests that the Type II AcP show characteristics of ECM rather than of Raising:

(39) *Sakiau*   [***tėvą*** *gerai gyvenant*].   (=1)
    └─ACC─┘   'I said my father lived well.'

(40) *Sakiau*   [*sode esant **vogį***]
    └─────────ACC──────┘   'I said there was a thief in the garden.'

➢ This account explains the following properties of Type II AcP:

✦ unavailability of passivisation;
✦ possibility of 'lexical' case-assignment to ES in the embedded clause;
✦ constituency, i.e. the fact that ES may undergo movement together with the participle;
✦ behaviour of embedded existentials.

➢ The ECM account is at least consistent with the following properties:

✦ possibility of movement of ES; incidentally, locative phrases may move out of embedded existentials (41), which shows that ability to move is orthogonal w.r.t. case-assignment from the matrix verb.
✦ impossibility of NPI-licensing from the matrix negation.

(41) *Tokia agnostinė pozicija netrukdo* [***aukščiausioje hierarchijos pakopoje***]$_i$ *suvokti*
    [_$_i$ *esant Dievą*].
    'Such an agnostic position does not prevent one from conceiving that at the highest level of the hierarchy there is a God.' (Internet)

➢ The following facts remain problematic for the ECM analysis:

✦ possibility of reflexives appearing in the ES position, since reflexives are banned from subject position in Lithuanian and cross-linguistically. However, such facts are problematic for ECM analysis in general, cf. English:

(42) *John*$_i$ *considers* [$_{??}$ ***himself***$_i$ *to be intelligent*].

✦ impossibility of NPI-licensing by the embedded negation; this may imply that ES may occupy a special position in the participial clause which is 'higher' than the ordinary subject position.
✦ Anyway, the properties of reflexive pronouns and NPIs in Lithuanian are to be studied more deeply in order to draw solid conclusions about their behaviour in AcP constructions.

6. Conclusions

➢ *Accusativus cum participio* constructions in Lithuanian, despite superficial unity, in fact show quite divergent behaviour with respect to various syntactic properties, and fall into two groups:

Type I, involving object control, and available with a restricted set of matrix verbs.

Type II, involving case marking of the embedded subject by the matrix verb; a special subtype of these constructions, i.e. existential complements, allow this case marking to proceed in a clearly non-local fashion.

References

Ambrazas, Vytautas (1979). *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė*. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.) (1997). *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.

Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Davies, William D. & Stanley Dubinsky (2004). *The Grammar of Raising and Control. A Course in Syntactic Argumentation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Greenberg, Gerald & James E. Lavine (2006). New syntax in Russian and Lithuanian: The case of the adverbial participle. In: R. Rothstein, E. Scatton & Ch. Townsend (eds.), *Studies in Slavic Linguistics and Folklore*. Bloomington (IN): Slavica.

Holvoet, Axel & Arturas Judžentis. 2003: Sudėtinio prijungiamojo sakinio aprašymo pagrindai. In: A. Holvoet, A. Judžentis (red.), *Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai. 2. Sintaksinių ryšių tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 115–172.

Klimas, Antanas (1987). The Lithuanian participles: Their system and functions. *Lituanus* 33 (1), 38–73.

Postal, Paul M. (1974). *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and its Theoretical Implications*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.

Tangl, Eberhard. 1928: *Der Accusativus und Nominativus cum Participio im Altlitauischen*. Doctoral Dissertation, Berlin. (reprinted in *Res Balticae*, 5 (1999), 151–209.)

Wiemer, Björn. 1998: Pragmatical inferences at the threshold to grammaticalization. The case of Lithuanian predicative participles and their functions. *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 229–243.