

PARTICIPIAL COMPLEMENTATION IN LITHUANIAN: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY

Overview

✦ Accusativus cum participio (Acc+Part)

- (1) *Sak-ia-u tėv-q gerai gyven-a-nt.*
 say-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG well live-PRS-PA
 ‘I said [my] father lived well.’ (Ambrasas 1997: 367)

✦ Nominativus cum participio (Nom+Part)

- (2) *Tėv-as sak-ė(-si) gerai gyven-qs.*
 father-NOM.SG say-PST(3)(-RFL) well live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
 ‘Father said he lived well.’ (ibid.)

➔ Goals of the study:

- ❶ Discern the range of predicates allowing constructions of types (1) and (2).
 - ❷ Understand the syntactic structure of these constructions and better describe their syntactic properties, finding their place in the typology of non-finite complementation.
 - ❸ Try to understand the grammatical role and syntactic position of the Accusative NP in the Acc+Part constructions .
- ➔ The database: ca. 300 googled examples coming from Lithuanian websites of all kinds (from classical literature to chats and advertisements) + a number of elicited examples.

1. General remarks on the system of participles in Lithuanian

➔ In Lithuanian, there is a rich system of participial formations (Ambrasas (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). Non-agreeing participles are traditionally called Gerunds (see Greenberg & Lavine 2006 for a recent discussion of their syntactic properties).

<i>sakyti</i> ‘say’	Active		Passive
	Agreeing	Non-agreeing	
Present	<i>sakąs</i> (m), <i>sakanti</i> (f)	<i>sakant</i>	<i>sakomas</i>
Preterite	<i>sakęs</i> (m), <i>sakiusi</i> (f)	<i>sakius</i>	<i>sakytas</i>
Habitual Past	<i>sakydavęs</i> (m), <i>sakydavusi</i> (f)	<i>sakydavus</i>	—
Future	<i>sakysiąs</i> (m), <i>sakysianti</i> (f)	<i>sakysiant</i>	<i>sakysimas</i>

➔ Participles may be used in various functions:

- ✦ attributive (only agreeing participles), ex. (3);
- ✦ adverbial (presence of agreement signals co-reference between the subject of the participle and the main clause subject), ex. (4a), (4b);

- ✦ main clause predicate with an evidential meaning (only agreeing participles), cf. Grone-meyer 1997, Wiemer 1998, ex. (5);
- ✦ lexical verb in various periphrastic constructions (only agreeing participles), e.g. Perfect, ex. (6), Proximative, ex. (7), or Passive (impersonal Passive put aside), ex. (8);
- ✦ complement with some verbs taking clausal complements (presence of agreement signals co-reference between the null subject of the participle and the main clause subject), ex. (1), (2).

- (3) *Vis-i gerai mat-ė artėj-a-nt-į traukin-į.*
all-NOM.PL.M well see-PST(3) approach-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.M train-ACC.SG
'Everybody could see well the approaching train.' (Ambrasas (ed.) 1997: 353)
- (4) a. *Išėj-us-į iš mišk-o, j-į net stabtelėj-o.*
go.out-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F from forest-GEN.SG she-NOM.SG.F even stop-PST(3)
'Having left the forest, she (suddenly) stopped.' (ibid.: 362)
- b. *Vaik-ams su-griž-us, pra.gyd-o lakštingal-a.*
child-DAT.PL PVB-return-PST.PA start.singing-PST(3) nightingale-NOM.SG
'When the children came back, a nightingale burst into singing.' (ibid.: 363)
- (5) *Vien-o pon-o mir-us-i pat-i ir*
one-GEN.SG.M lord-GEN.SG die-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F wife-NOM.SG and
palik-us-i dvylika sūn-ų ir dar vien-ą dukterėl-ę.
leave-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F twelve son-GEN.PL and also one-ACC.SG.F daughter-ACC.SG
'The wife of a lord died and left twelve sons and a little daughter.' (ibid.: 265)
- (6) *Es-u ap-keliav-ęs vis-ą pasaul-į ir*
AUX.PRS-1SG PVB-travel-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M all-ACC.SG world-ACC.SG and
daug krašt-ų mat-ęs.
a.lot country-GEN.PL see-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
'I have traveled all over the world and have seen many countries.' (ibid.: 249)
- (7) *Vakar Jon-as buv-o be-su-serg-ąs,*
yesterday Jonas-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) CNT-PRV-be.ill-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
bet iš-gėr-ė vaist-ų ir ne-su-sirg-o.
but PVB-drink-PST(3) medicine-GEN.PL and NEG-PVB-be.ill-PST(3)
'Yesterday Jonas had almost fallen ill, but he took medicines and did not fall ill.'¹
- (8) *J-is yra vis-ų myl-i-m-as.*
he-NOM.SG.M AUX.PRS.3 all-GEN.PL love-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
'He is loved by everyone.' (Ambrasas (ed.) 1997: 251)

- Here, only examples such as (1) and (2) will be discussed, i.e. participial complements (PCs). Previous studies of these constructions, mainly investigating their historical origin among other types of participial constructions in Lithuanian, include Ambrasas 1979 and Wiemer 1998; cf. also Schmalstieg 1986 specifically on Nom+Part.

¹ Examples with no source indicated come from the native speakers I have consulted.

2. Distribution of PC-taking verbs

Verb class	Only Acc+Part	Only Nom+Part	Both
perception			<i>matyti</i> ‘see’, <i>girdėti</i> ‘hear’, <i>jausti</i> ‘feel’
information transmission		<i>skųstis</i> ‘complain’, <i>prisistatyti</i> ‘introduce oneself’, <i>prisiekti</i> ‘vow’, <i>prasitarti</i> ‘tell (of oneself)’, <i>pareikšti</i> ‘claim’, <i>guostis</i> ‘complain’, <i>grasinti(s)</i> ‘threaten’, <i>dievagotis</i> ‘vow’, <i>dėtis</i> ‘pretend’, <i>atsakyti</i> ‘answer’	<i>sakyti(s)</i> ‘say’, <i>pri(si)pažinti</i> ‘confess, acknowledge’, <i>į(si)rodyti</i> ‘prove’, <i>tvirtinti</i> ‘assert’, <i>teigti</i> ‘assert’, <i>neigti</i> ‘deny’, <i>skelbti(s)</i> ‘announce, declare’, <i>aiškinti</i> ‘explain’, <i>patikinti</i> ‘assure’, <i>rašyti(s)</i> ‘write’, <i>pasakoti</i> ‘tell, narrate’, <i>tarti</i> ‘say’, <i>rodyti</i> ‘show’, <i>vaizduoti</i> ‘depict’, <i>kalbėti</i> ‘talk’
cognition	<i>skaityti</i> ‘consider’, <i>laikyti</i> ‘consider’	<i>sapnuoti</i> ‘dream’	<i>manyti(s)</i> ‘think, believe’, <i>žinoti(s)</i> ‘know’, <i>sužinoti</i> ‘learn’, <i>įtarti</i> ‘suspect’, <i>užmiršti</i> ‘forget’, <i>vaizduotis</i> ‘imagine’, <i>su(si)vokti</i> ‘realize’, <i>pasirodyti</i> ‘seem, appear’, <i>tikėti(s)</i> ‘believe’, <i>su(si)prasti</i> ‘understand, realize’, <i>numanyti</i> ‘guess, understand’, <i>prisiminti</i> ‘to remember’, <i>atrodyti</i> ‘look like, appear’
emotion		<i>džiaugtis</i> ‘rejoice’	

- ✦ The majority of PC-taking verbs allow both constructions (i.e., they impose no restrictions on the reference of the subject of the embedded proposition).
- ✦ Though there is a number of verbs which allow only Nom+Part, i.e. require the subject of the embedded proposition to be identical to the matrix subject, the opposite is only a rare exception.
- ✦ The range of meanings expressed by the PC-taking verbs is well-documented cross-linguistically (cf. Serdobolskaya, to appear).

3. The problem of the Reflexive marker *-s(i)*

- ➔ Though some descriptions (e.g. Ambrasas (ed.) 1997: 367) make it seem that the Reflexive marker must always appear in Nom+Part, in reality this is by no means the case (cf. Schmalstieg 1986).
- ➔ The Reflexive marker is actually obligatory only with the “lexical reflexives”, i.e. those verbs which require it irrespective of the occurrence of PCs. Cf. ex. (9a) and (9b) with the lexical reflexive *vaizduotis* ‘imagine’, which allows both types of PC.

(9) a. *Rachmaninov-as, kur-is vaizdav-o-si es-qs Bellini.*
 Rakhmaninov-NOM.SG who-NOM.SG.M imagine-PST(3)-RFL be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M Bellini
 ‘Rakhmaninov, who imagined himself being Bellini’

(http://www.culture.lt/7md/?kas=straipsnis&leid_id=550&st_id=6221)

b. ... *nes visuomet vaizdav-o-si savo tėtuk-q es-a-nt*
 because always imagine-PRS(3)-RFL self father-ACC.SG be-PRS-PA
ger-q žmog-u...
 good-ACC.SG.M man-ACC.SG

‘Because he has always imagined his father to be a good man’

(<http://www.blevyzgos.lt/main.php?1=3&2=putinas>)

⇒ Actually, there are a few verbs which, according to my data, take only Nom+Part, but do not admit the Reflexive marker, cf. (10) and (11):

(10) *Sapnav-a-u es-qs medžiotoj-as.*
 dream-PST-1SG be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M hunter-NOM.SG

‘I dreamt I were a hunter.’ (<http://fotokudra.lt/img.php?img=31867&nav=cat&page=13>)

(11) *rašytoj-a at.sak-ė es-a-nt-i laiming-a gav-us-i*
 writer-NOM.SG answer-PST(3) be-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F fortunate-NOM.SG.F get-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F
Kultūr-os ministerij-os stipendij-q.
 culture-GEN.SG ministry-GEN.SG stipendium-ACC.SG

‘The writer answered she was fortunate to get the Ministry of Culture stipendium.’

(http://www.filosofija.ktu.lt/literatura/lt.php/kronika/naujienos/gintar_adomaityt_erdvus_krybos_pasaulis/614)

⇒ In most cases, the Reflexive marker is optional with Nom+Part; this is not unexpected provided that the form of the participle unambiguously identifies the subject of the embedded proposition, cf. (12a,b):

(12) a. *Es-i provincial-as, jei jaut-ie-si gyven-qs*
 be-PRS.2SG provincial-NOM.SG of feel-PRS.2SG-RFL live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M

‘provincij-oje’.

province-LOC.SG

‘You are a provincial if you feel yourself living in a “province”.’

(<http://www.moteris.lt/00may/moterys/anapus.htm>)

b. *J-is aiškiai jauči-a gyven-qs tūleriop-u būd-u.*
 he-NOM.SG.M clearly feel-PRS(3) live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M various-INS.SG.M way-INS.SG

‘He clearly feels himself living in various ways.’

(<http://www.geocities.com/linasrim/Vyduno/Sveikata.html>)

⇒ However, it remains to be investigated whether the Reflexive marker is really optional or somehow contributes to the semantics and/or pragmatics of the construction.

4. General syntactic properties of Lithuanian PCs

⇒ The participle may freely inflect for tense (usually interpreted relative to the tense of the matrix clause), cf. Present (10)–(12), Preterite (13)–(14), Habitual Past (15)–(16), and Future (17)–(18):

(13) [*J-i*] *prisimin-ė j-į buv-us labdaring-q*
 she-NOM.SG.F remember-PST(3) he-ACC.SG.M be-PST.PA charitable-ACC.SG.M

ir malon-ų.

and nice-ACC.SG.M

‘She remembered him to be nice and charitable.’

(<http://www.druskonis.lt/archyvai/2001-02-23/kultura.htm>)

- (14) *T-uo met-u sak-o-si dirb-ęs Los Alamos*
 that-INS.SG.M time-INS.SG say-PST(3)-RFL work-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M L. A.
Nacionalin-ėje laboratorij-oje.
 national-LOC.SG.F laboratory-LOC.SG
 ‘He says he worked then at the National Laboratory in Los Alamos.’
<http://www.nso.lt/ufo/lazar.htm>
- (15) ... *skatin-a many-ti j-q dažnai bū-dav-us su-si-erzin-usi-q ...*
 induce-PRS(3) think-INF she-ACC.SG.F often be-HAB-PST.PA PVB-RFL-irritate-PST.PA-ACC.SG.F
 ‘[this] induces one to believe her to have often been irritated...’
<http://alfa.lt/straipsnis/150854>
- (16) *Jaunėl-is brol-is ... sak-ė ei-dav-ęs*
 younger-NOM.SG.M brother-NOM.SG say-PST(3) go-HAB-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
į mišk-q mėlyniau-ti.
 in forest-ACC.SG gather.blackberries-INF
 ‘The younger brother said he used to go to the forest to gather blackberries.’
<http://www.lrytas.lt/?id=11573213161155170854&view=4>
- (17) “*Sanit-as*” *tik-i-si rugsėj-į bū-si-ant pelning-u.*
 “Sanitas”-NOM.SG hope-PRS(3)-RFL September-ACC.SG be-FUT-PA profitable-INS.SG.M
 ‘“Sanitas” [a Lithuanian pharmaceutical company] hopes that September will be profitable.’
<http://www.biznews.lt/?psl=naujiena&id=6802>
- (18) *Šįkart vairuotoj-as sak-o gyven-si-ąs nam-e,*
 this.time driver-NOM.SG say-PRS(3) live-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M house-LOC.SG
tolėliau nuo centr-o...
 farther from center-GEN.SG
 ‘This time the driver said he would live in a house farther from the downtown’
<http://www.klaipeda.daily.lt/temp.php?data=2004-01-03&id=1072619337>

➔ Presence vs. absence of Agreement on the participle is strictly correlated with the referential identity vs. non-identity of the embedded and the matrix subjects; the only exception is the reflexive pronoun *save* ‘self’, which is allowed in Acc+Part, cf. (19):

- (19) *Bet save j-ie suvok-ė es-a-nt lietuvi-ais,*
 but self he-NOM.PL.M consider-PST(3) be-PRS-PA Lithuanian-INS.PL
buv-o Lietuv-os patriot-ai.
 be-PST(3) Lithuania-GEN.SG patriot-NOM.PL
 ‘But they considered themselves to be Lithuanians, they were Lithuanian patriots.’
<http://www.lrytas.lt/?id=11807660711178504401&view=4>

✦ Overt subject is not obligatory in Acc+Part, though examples like (20) are rare:

- (20) ... *nes nuo 1987 m. žmon-ės ne-girdėj-o kalb-a-nt*
 because from man-NOM.PL NEG-hear-PST(3) speak-PRS-PA
apie niek-q kit-q.
 about nothing-ACC.SG.M other-ACC.SG.M
 ‘... because from 1987 on people have not heard anyone speak of anything else.’
<http://www.bernardinai.lt/index.php?url=articles/70821>

✦ Nom+Part (but not Acc+Part) may constitute an embedded question with a wh-word (21) or an overt complementizer (22):

- (21) *ne-su.si.voki-a, kur gyven-ąs.*
 NEG-realize.RFL-PRS(3) where live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
 ‘[He] does not realize where he lives.’ <http://www.alfa.lt/straipsnis/126715>

- (22) *Prokuror-as sak-ė dar ne-žin-qs, ar*
 prosecutor-NOM.SG say-PST(3) yet NEG-know-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M Q
rašy-si-qs kasacin-į skund-q Aukščiausiaj-am Teism-ui.
 write-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M cassation-ACC.SG.M appeal-ACC.SG higher-DAT.SG.M court-DAT.SG
 ‘The prosecutor said he did not yet know whether he would write an appeal to the
 Higher Court.’ (www.londonozinios.com/a-news-2065)

✦ Wh-extraction is possible both from Nom+Part (23) and Acc+Part (24):

- (23) ...*ten, kur_i man-ė rasi-ant-i t_i ramyb-ę...*
 there where think-PST(3) find:FUT-PA-NOM.SG.F peace-ACC.SG
 ‘[go] there, where, she thought, she would find peace...’
 (http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=2897&kas=straipsnis&st_id=199)
- (24) ... *tai, k-q_i Bažnyči-a šimtmeči-ais skelb-ė t_i es-a-nt nuodėm-e*
 that what-ACC.SG church-NOM.SG century-INS.PL proclaim-PST(3) be-PRS-PA sin-INS.SG
 ‘things which the Church has been for centuries proclaiming to be sinful’
 (http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid_id=750&kas=straipsnis&st_id=3998)

5. The Syntax of Nominativus cum Participio

✦ Examples (21) and (22) suggest that Nom+Part forms a full-fledged clause structure (in generative terms, a CP). This in fact argues against Schmalstieg’s (1986) claim that in this construction the Participle modifies the matrix subject; such modification (e.g. via a relation of predication, Williams 1980) is usually possible only with structures smaller than clauses (e.g. VPs).

✦ The important question concerns the relation between the understood subject of the participle and the matrix subject: which mechanism is responsible for their referential identity?

⇒ Quantified contexts like (25) suggest the relation between the two subjects is that of **binding** rather than of simple co-reference (cf. Büring 2005):

- (25) *Kiekvien-as man-o-si es-qs tarp išrinkt-ųjų.*
 each-NOM.SG.A believe-PRS(3)-RFL be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M among selected-GEN.PL.DEF
 ‘Everyone_i believes he/she_i is among the selected.’
 (<http://www.bernardinai.lt/index.php?url=articles/52346>)

⇒ Nom+Part is a **control** construction, where the embedded subject is construed as a variable bound by the matrix subject.

✦ Whether the control relation is established at a level of semantic or conceptual structure (cf. Culicover & Jackendoff 2003) or via a null pronoun (PRO) in the syntax is largely a matter of formalism. However, ‘semantic’ agreement possible in Nom+Part, cf. (26) and (27), suggests a semantic rather than a purely syntactic mechanism:

- (26) *Ar man-o-te teising-u keli-u ein-qs?*
 Q think-PRS-2PL right-INS.SG.M way-INS.SG go-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
 ‘Do you <honorific plural> think you are going the right way?’
 (http://dialogas.com/index.php?lng=lt&content=pages&page_id=23&news_id=2138)
- (27) *Daugum-a bulgar-u man-o gyven-q skurdžiai.*
 majority-NOM.SG Bulgaria-GEN.PL think-PRS(3) live-PRS.PA.NOM.PL.M poorly
 ‘The majority of Bulgarians think they live poorly.’
 (<http://www.ruslana.com.ua/forum/index.php?action=vthread&forum=7&topic=2379&page=38>)

6. The syntax of *Accusativus cum Participio*

➤ Is the Accusative NP (further: Embedded Subject, ES) a direct object of the matrix verb?

✦ ES may be ‘substituted’ by a reflexive (19) or a reciprocal (28) pronoun:

- (28) *Rajon-o politik-ai_i vis dažniau įtari-a*
 district-GEN.SG politician-NOM.PL still more.often suspect-PRS(3)
 [*vien-as kit-ą_i*]; *pri.im-a-nt politini-us sprendim-us.*
 one-NOM.SG.M other-ACC.SG.M PRV.take-PRS-PA political-ACC.PL.M decision-ACC.PL
 ‘The district’s politicians are still more often suspecting each other of making politically motivated decisions’ (<http://www.gargzdai.lt/?lt=1148888566>)

✦ Under negation, Accusative changes into Genitive (29):

- (29) *Neįmanoma iš-spręs-ti problem-os ten, kur žmon-ės*
 impossible PRV.solve-INF problem-GEN.SG there where man-NOM.PL
ne-mat-o j-os es-a-nt.
 NEG-see-PRS(3) it-GEN.SG.F be-PRS-PA
 ‘It is impossible to solve a problem there, where the people do not see it’ (lit. “do not see it being”) (<http://www.jaunasvejas.lt/?p=62>)

✦ ES may freely scramble with the elements of the matrix clause (30):

- (30) *Žmog-us [išorin-ius atribut-us]; gal-i many-ti t_i es-a-nt*
 man-NOM.SG external-ACC.PL attribute-ACC.PL may-PRS(3) think-INF be-PRS-PA
savo pat-ies dal-imi.
 self self-GEN.SG part-INS.SG
 ‘A person may think that external attributes are a part of his own self.’
 (www.porteris.com/shapoka/mados%20psichologija.doc)

➤ However, passivization of the ES is restricted to a small subset of matrix predicates: *matyti* ‘see’ (31), *girdėti* ‘hear’, *įtarti* ‘suspect’ (32), *vaizduoti* ‘describe, depict’ (33), *pripažinti* ‘acknowledge’, *skelbti* ‘announce’, and *laikyti* ‘consider’.

- (31) *Tėv-as buv-o mat-o-m-as parein-ąs.*
 father-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) see-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M come.back-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
 ‘Father was seen coming back.’
- (32) *du švirkšt-us su skysči-u, kur-is įtari-a-m-as*
 two syringe-ACC.PL with liquid-INS.SG which-NOM.SG.M suspect-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
es-ąs narkotin-ė medžiag-a
 be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M narcotic-NOM.SG.F substance-NOM.SG
 ‘two syringes with liquid which is suspected to be a narcotic substance’
 (http://www.nkd.lt/files/spauda_raso/20070717_Spaudos_apzvalga.htm)
- (33) *Kur-ie istorini-ai asmen-ys vaizduoj-a-m-i*
 which-NOM.PL.M historic-NOM.PL.M personage-NOM.PL depict-PRS-PP-NOM.PL.M
groj-a-nt-ys fortepijon-u?
 play-PRS-PA-NOM.PL.M piano-INS.SG
 ‘Which historic personages are being depicted playing piano?’
 (<http://www.istorikas.lt/skiltis/karikatura/3>)

✦ Other verbs do not allow passivization, either at all or at least in the Acc+Part construction: no examples have been found in the Internet, and some constructed examples have been rejected by the native speakers, cf. (34):

- (34) **Jon-as* *buv-o* *man-o-m-as* // *sak-o-m-as* //
 Jonas-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) think-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M say-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
teig-ia-m-as *es-as* *gerai* *moky-t-as*.
 claim-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M well learn-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
 intended meaning ‘Jonas was thought // said // claimed to be well-educated.’

➔ Two types of Acc+Part construction (cf. Schoof 2004 on Latin):

- ❶ Those where the accusative NP is indeed the direct object selected and assigned semantic role by the matrix verb (cf. the implicational relation in (35), hence passivizability. The relation between this NP and the subject of the participle is probably **object control**.
 ❷ Those where the accusative NP does not enter into a direct semantic relation with the matrix verb (cf. the lack of an implicational relation in (36)), hence lack of passivizability.

- (35) *Mač-ia-u* *tėv-q* *parėj-us.* → *Mač-ia-u* *tėv-q*.
 see-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG come.back-PST.PA see-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG
 ‘I saw the father come back.’ ‘I saw the father.’

- (36) *Sak-ia-u* *tėv-q* *gerai gyven-a-nt.* (=1) vs. **Sak-ia-u* *tėv-q*
 say-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG well live-PRS-PA say-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG
 ‘I said [my] father lived well.’ (Ambrasas 1997: 367)

✦ What is the syntactic status of the ES in this type of Acc-Part?

➔ The embedded subject does not always receive case from the upper clause, cf. examples with the partitive Genitive (37) and with a Dative subject (38):

- (37) ... *kai kur-ie tyrinėtojų-ai man-o [j-ų es-a-nt*
 some which-NOM.SG.M researcher-NOM.PL think-PRS(3) it-GEN.PL be-PRS-PA
kel-is milijard-us ton-ų].
 several-ACC.PL.M billion-ACC.PL ton-GEN.PL
 ‘Some researchers think that there are several milliard tons of them [of sapropel]’
<http://ausis.gf.vu.lt/mg/nr/99/2/2kadun.html>

- (38) *Jurg-is mat-ė // man-ė [tėv-ui reiki-a-nt pagalb-os]*.
 J.-NOM.SG see-PST(3) think-PST(3) father-DAT.SG need-PRS-PA help-GEN.SG
 ‘Jurgis saw // thought that his father needed help.’

➔ ES forms a constituent with the rest of the participial clause, as shown by pied-piping in (39), (40) (cf. (24) where ES is extracted alone):

- (39) *Film-e yra tok-ių kadr-ų, [kur-iuos es-a-nt]_i ne-įtar-ė t_i*
 film-LOC.SG be:PRS.3 such-GEN.PL shot-GEN.PL which-ACC.PL be-PRS-PA NEG-suspect-PST(3)
net ir pat-ys grup-ės nar-iai.
 even and self-NOM.PL group-GEN member-NOM.PL
 ‘In the film there are some shots which the members of the team themselves did not suspect to be there.’ (<https://www.level.lt/lt/dvd/visa-tiesa-apie-zas/>)

- (40) ... *toki-ų problem-ų, [kuri-ų es-a-nt]_i tėv-ai*
 such-GEN.PL problem-GEN.PL which-GEN.PL be-PRS-PA father-NOM.PL
nė ne-numan-ė t_i.
 even NEG-surmise-PST.3
 ‘[of] problems such that the parents did not even surmise that they existed.’
www.dazy.sk/t2/lithuahia.aspx

➔ Furthermore, there is a subtype of Acc+Part where the surface position of the Accusative-marked ES is unambiguously inside the participial clause: rhematic ES (especially

in embedded existential clauses) tend to occupy the post-participial position, cf. (41)–(42):

- (41) *Profesori-us Paulius Galaunė dar prisimin-ė*
 professor-NOM.SG P.-NOM.SG G.-NOM.SG even remember-PST(3)
 [*buv-us ant vargon-ų angel-ų skulptūr-as*].
 be-PST.PA on organ-GEN.PL angel-GEN.PL sculpture-ACC.PL
 ‘Professor Paulus Galaunė even recalled there to have been statues of angels on the organ.’ (<http://www.bernardinai.lt/index.php?url=articles/68804>)

- (42) *Teig-ia [pasaul-yje es-a-nt tvark-a]*.
 claim-PRS(3) world-LOC.SG be-PRS-PA order-ACC.SG
 ‘[He] claims that there is order in the world.’ (<http://www.spauda.lt/plato/panteism.htm>)

✦ In this subtype of Acc+Part, Genitive on the ES may be triggered both by the matrix negation (43) and by the lower negation (44):

- (43) *Niekas nežinojo esant čia bunkerio.*
 no.one-NOM.SG NEG-know-PST(3) be-PRS-PA here bunker-GEN.SG
 ‘No one knew there was a bunker here.’
 (<http://kaunas.lcn.lt/parapijos/ariogala/enciklopedija.php?nid=442>)

- (44) ... *teig-ti [nesant jokio sugedimo] — tai ir yra*
 claim-INF NEG.be-PRS-PA no-GEN.SG.M damage-GEN.SG this and is
galvos kišimas į smėlį.
 head-GEN.SG sticking-NOM.SG in sand-ACC.SG
 ‘To claim that there is no damage is to stand in a head-in-the-sand position.’
 (<http://www.bernardinai.lt/index.php?url=articles/63692/DESC/1>)

➤ All this suggests that ES in the second (non-passivizable) type of Acc+Part construction occupies a position inside the participial clause, and, specifically, is not raised into the matrix clause.

✦ That ES and the other constituents of the participial clause may scramble with the elements of the matrix clause (30), (45) is not a problem for this analysis, since movement out of non-finite complement clauses is a general option in Lithuanian, cf. (46) with an object extracted out of an infinitival clause.

- (45) *Toki-a agnostin-ė pozicij-a ne-trukd-o*
 such-NOM.SG.F agnostic-NOM.SG.F position-NOM.SG NEG-prevent-PRS(3)
 [*aukščiausi-oje hierarchij-os pakop-oje*]_i *suvok-ti* [_i *es-a-nt Diev-a*].
 highest-LOC.SG.F hierarchy-GEN.SG level-LOC.SG conceive-INF be-PRS-PA God-ACC.SG
 ‘Such an agnostic position does not prevent one from conceiving that there is a God at the highest level of the hierarchy.’ (http://ct.svs.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3053&kas=straipsnis&st_id=6983)

- (46) *Es-u girdėj-ęs, kad kai kuri-ose mokykl-ose*
 AUX-PRS.1SG hear-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M that some which-LOC.PL.F school-LOC.PL
ši-a knyg-a liepi-a skaity-ti....
 this-ACC.SG.F book-acc.sg order-PRS(3) read-INF
 ‘I have heard that in some schools they order [students] to read this book...’
 (<http://skaityta.lt/review/get/78>)

➤ However, a certain degree of syntactic integration of the participial clause into the main clause is indicated by the fact that the matrix subject may bind a reflexive pronoun in the participial clause (47):

- (47) *Advokat-as_i teis-ės termin-ų aiškinim-q man-o es-a-nt savo_i darb-q.*
 lawyer-NOM law-GEN term-GEN.PL interpretation-ACC think-PRS(3)be-PRS-PA self job-ACC.SG
 ‘The lawyer believes the interpretation of legal terms to be his job.’
 (www.leidykla.vu.lt/inetleid/teise/56/straipsniai/str1.pdf)

Conclusions

- ⇒ Participial complements (PCs) in Lithuanian show considerable variation of syntactic properties depending on such factors as
 - ❶ type of the matrix predicate,
 - ❷ referential identity vs. non-identity of the matrix and the embedded subjects,
 - ❸ thematic vs. rhematic status of the embedded subject etc.
- ⇒ Despite surface similarity, Nom+Part and Acc+Part constructions are not symmetrical in their behaviour; moreover, there are at least two types of Acc+Part constructions with different semantic and syntactic properties.
- ⇒ The exact syntactic structure of Acc+Part remains problematic, since this construction shows properties suggesting both a type of clause union (word order freedom, case marking of the subject by the matrix verb, transparency to binding) and a clause boundary (availability of matrix-independent case marking on the ES, post-participial position of the ES in existential PCs, pied-piping).
- ⇒ Further study involving both corpus and elicited data should both clarify the already raised syntactic issues, and shed light on the functional differences between Lithuanian PCs and their full-clause ‘equivalents’ with complementizers.

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative, AUX – auxiliary, CNT – continuative, DAT – dative, DEF – definiteness, F – feminine, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, HAB – habitual, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, LOC – locative, M – masculine, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PA – active participle, PL – plural, PP – passive participle, PRS – present, PST – past, PVB – preverb, Q – question particle, RFL – reflexive, SG – singular

References

- Ambrazas, Vytautas (1979). *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė* [*Historical Syntax of Lithuanian Participles*]. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.) (1997). *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
- Büring, Daniel (2005). *Binding Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culicover, Peter & Ray Jackendoff (2003). The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79 (3), 517–556.
- 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.
- Gronemeyer, Claire (1997). Evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Working Papers* 46, Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics, 93–112.
- Klimas, Antanas (1987). The Lithuanian participles: Their system and functions. *Lituanus* 33 (1), 38–73.
- Schmalstieg, William R. (1986). Lithuanian participles in the nominative case as the modifier of the phrase subject. *Lituanus* 32 (2).
- Schoof, Susanne (2004). *An HPSG Account of Nonfinite Verbal Complements in Latin*. Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics 51.
- Wiemer, Björn (1998). Pragmatical inferences at the threshold to grammaticalization. The case of Lithuanian predicative participles and their functions. *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 229–243.
- Williams, Edwin (1980). Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 11, 203–238.