

Combination of past participles functioning as adverbials with main verbs in Lithuanian: Aspect and transitivity¹

EIKO SAKURAI

University of Tokyo

This paper is aimed at providing some observations about certain constraints which determine how past participles, functioning as adverbials (in semi-predicative usage), combine with main verbs in Lithuanian. In previous studies (Sakurai 2000; 2003) I presented some remarks on the semantic constraints, in particular those looked upon from the angle of aspect, under which past participles, functioning as adverbials, combine with main verbs. This issue has not yet been addressed to date either in traditional Lithuanian grammar (LKG, DLKG) or in other studies about Lithuanian. Here, by adding to this analysis the viewpoint on transitivity, I am going to emphasize the close linkage between aspect and transitivity in this problem: in <state> type predicate sentences, adjectival past participles and main verbs construct one predicate as a single entity where the combinatory possibilities are strictly constrained by the principle of semantic consistency in stativity and intransitivity.

¹ I wish to thank Tasaku Tsunoda (Tokyo) and Tamio Yanagisawa (Nagoya) for their detailed and valuable comments on earlier versions of the present paper. This is part of the results of my research in Lithuania which is funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) and by the Japanese Ministry of Education. I am grateful to all my Lithuanian consultants, especially, Dalia Švambarytė (Vilnius), Ramutė Bingelienė (Vilnius), and English consultant Mark Roza (Tokyo) for their help, and to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions. I am also much obliged to Aldona Paulauskienė (Vilnius) for providing for my research in Lithuania. My deepest heartfelt thanks go to Renata Petroškevičienė (Tokyo) who always offers me a lot of information on Lithuanian and knowledge about English. All errors and shortcomings are of course my own.

1. INTRODUCTION

Two types of past participles are distinguished in Lithuanian — adjectival participles (*dalyviai*) and adverbial participles, or gerunds (*padalyviai*):

(a) adjectival past participles are declinable according to gender, number, and case, and agree grammatically with the subject. They have active and passive voice. In the active voice, they are divided into past participles and past habitual participles.

(b) adverbial past participles are indeclinable. They have only active voice and no passive voice. The semantic subject is indicated by the dative case.

As a rule, all past participles in Lithuanian have the property of functioning as adverbials. However, as the frequency of usage of past habitual participles of type (a) in adverbial function is very low, they will be left out of consideration in this paper. Also, compared to their active forms, the passive forms of past participles are rarely used in this function.

Depending on the type of time relation they have with main verbs, or predicates, past participles functioning as adverbials have been distinguished so far in Lithuanian studies as possessing the following property:

(i) past participles functioning as adverbials indicate relative < anteriority > in their relation to the predicate verb.

In this regard, Sakurai (2003) refers to the Russian language for a comparative analysis in an attempt to make the following affirmations:

(ii) past participles functioning as adverbials may indicate not only < anteriority > in relation to the predicate verb but also relative time < simultaneity >. The temporal meanings and functions of these past participles are built and determined by the whole of the sentence;

(iii) not only in their forms, but also in their meanings, Lithuanian adjectival past participles show a stronger dependence on the predicate verb as compared both to Russian adverbial past participles with similar properties and to Lithuanian adverbial past participles.

On the other hand, with regard to transitivity, Sakurai (2003) follows traditional grammar when giving definitions of ‘transitive’ and ‘intransitive’ verbs: a verb is defined as ‘transitive’ if it requires a direct object (typically in the accusative case) or ‘intransitive’ if it does not, with neutral verbs not being distinguished. Therefore, in order to give a proper explanation of the

constraints on the combination of past participles functioning as adverbials with main verbs, it is important (1) to approach transitivity not only as a structure of grammatical participants but as a semantic structure as well; (2) instead of drawing a clear-cut line between transitive and intransitive verbs, to aim at viewing them as presenting a matter of continuum/scale, which defines the degree of transitivity. In this regard, by following Hopper & Thompson's (1980) and Tsunoda's (1985) approach, I introduce the idea of the 'prototype' when dealing with the issue of transitivity. The semantic definition of prototypical transitive verbs is adopted from Tsunoda (1985: 387) as follows: 'those verbs which describe an action that not only impinges on the patient but necessarily creates a change in it' (e.g. *užmušti*, *nužudyti* 'kill', *sulaužyti* 'break', *sušaldyti* 'freeze'). Thus, prototypical transitive predicates are defined as 'those predicates which have 2 or more participants, agent and object, and describe an action that not only impinges on the object but necessarily creates a change in it'. Even if there is a grammatical structure of a verb requiring a transitive object, the verb (or verb phrase) will be considered as non-prototypical if the condition stated above has not been met (e.g. *turėti* 'have', *mylėti* 'love', *žinoti* 'know', *žiūrėti* 'look (at)', *prarasti samonę* 'lose consciousness').

2. ADVERBIAL FUNCTION OF PARTICIPLES

It is assumed in this study that the basic adverbial function of participles is 'to express the secondary situation that accompanies the main situation expressed by the main verb (or finite verb predicate)', i. e., to act in the function of secondary predicates in a sentence.

In the system of Lithuanian past participles, adjectival participles functioning as adverbials have the same subject (in the nominative case) as the main verb of the sentence (same subject use) and agree with that subject both in case and in number and gender (see ex. (1)). On the other hand, as has been stated above, adverbial participles are indeclinable. They do not have the same subject as the main verb (different-subject use). The semantic subject is used in the dative case² (see ex. (2)).

² The abbreviations in this paper are used in the following way: ACC accusative; ACT active; ADJ. adjectival; ADV. adverbial; DAT dative; F feminine; GEN genitive;

- (1) *Perskaitęs* *knyga,*
 having finished reading-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM the book-ACC
jis *išėjo* *pasivaikščioti.*
 he-3M-SG-NOM went out-V-PAST-3 for a walk-INF
 ‘Having finished reading the book, he went out for a walk.’
- (2) *Man perskaičius* *knyga,* *jis*
 I-DAT finished reading-ADV.PP the book-ACC he-3M-SG-NOM
tuojau (pat) atėjo *jos* *pasiskolinti.*
 immediately came in-V-PAST-3 it-GEN to borrow-INF
 ‘When I finished reading the book, he immediately came in to borrow it.’

3. VERBAL ASPECT³ IN LITHUANIAN

Before making further observations, we first need to briefly touch upon the aspectual properties of Lithuanian verbs. It is assumed that a system of verbal aspect that employs prefixes and suffixes to serve as markers of aspect has developed in Lithuanian in a similar way as in Russian and in other Slavic languages. However, despite the similarities in the forms of verbs, there are marked differences between Lithuanian and Russian that can be formulated as follows⁴.

INF infinitive; IPFV. imperfective; M masculine; NOM nominative; O object; PASS passive; PFV. perfective; PL plural; PP past participle; PRES present; PRES.P present participle; S subject; SG singular; V verb. The example sentences have been checked by native informants. The symbols (?), (??), (*) indicate the evaluation of the sentences by the informants as being “unnatural”, “very unnatural”, or “grammatically incorrect”.

³ I use the term ‘aspect’ in a wider sense, which covers not only grammatical but also lexical semantic-notional categories. I hold on to the most general definition of ‘perfective’ as a reference to a situation without regard to internal temporal structure, viewing a situation in its entirety, as a single whole and ‘imperfective’ – as a reference to the internal temporal structure of a situation, viewing a situation as part of its entirety (see Comrie 1976). In this paper I use the abbreviations <PFV.> and <IPFV.> to refer to the semantic definition of perfective and imperfective, whereas I use the terms ‘perfective verb’ and ‘imperfective verb’ to refer to the aspectual pair of verbs in Russian (or other Slavic languages). This is largely in order to avoid confusion about the semantic and the grammatical-morphological categories.

⁴ For more detailed observations see in particular Dambriūnas (1960), Galnaitytė

In Russian, verbs basically form aspectual pairs of perfective and imperfective, which are regarded as sufficiently matching the definition of the <PFV./IPFV.> opposition found in the general theory of aspect (general aspectology). In this regard it should be said of Lithuanian that when prefixes and suffixes, which carry the feature of aspect, are attached to a verb, in many cases its lexical meaning is changed and a group of derivative verbs with a fixed semantic feature is formed. Without forming a complete <PFV./IPFV.> opposition, like in Russian, verbal aspect in Lithuanian takes position in between a lexical-semantic category and a grammatical category⁵.

In my opinion, as I have already pointed out (Sakurai 1997, 1999, 2002), in many cases in Lithuanian, the aspectual pairs which are traditionally interpreted as 'perfective/imperfective', should rather be defined as pairs of 'telic/atelic', or 'bounded/nonbounded'⁶. That is the reason why the <PFV./

(1963), Safarewicz (1967), Musteikis (1972), Paulauskienė (1979), Geniušienė (1990), Wiemer (2001) and Holvoet & Čížik (2004).

⁵ I regard that aspect is also a matter of continuum rather than a clear-cut dichotomy, and that aspectual pairs of verbs can be ranked on the aspectual scale. From this point of view, verbal aspect in Lithuanian cannot be classified as typical Aktionsart, as it includes both pairs that have more high-aspectual features and pairs that have fewer high-aspectual features. I will discuss this problem in other papers, as it is beyond the scope of the present paper.

⁶ Dahl (1981) provided an important contribution on the theory of aspect by introducing the definition of 'telic (bounded) verb' as a verb conveying in itself the notion of boundaries and revealing the situation as moving towards those boundaries; while defining the 'atelic (nonbounded) verb' as a verb not conveying such notion and revealing the situation that doesn't have any boundaries. In our terminology, the terms of 'telic/atelic' are used in a wider sense: telic verbs may denote a situation which is bounded at the start (ingressive, i.e. inchoative), at the end (terminative), or both at the start and at the end (delimitative or punctual); atelic verbs denote a situation which is open at both sides (See Lehman 1994). The terms telic/atelic are used similarly as Russian terms *predel'nyj/nepredel'nyj* here. Note that according to this terminology non-prefixed Lithuanian verbs such as *skaityti (knygą)* 'read (a book)', *rašyti (laišką)* 'write (a letter)' are regarded as atelic, because they do not mean either a terminative process or an event, which should be expressed by prefixed telic verbs such as *per-skaityti* 'read through, finish reading', *pa-rašyti* 'write, finish writing'. Thus, I consider that Lithuanian verbs which are traditionally interpreted as 'neutral' or 'biaspectual' and which express both perfective and imperfective aspect should be regarded as telic verbs. Among them, prefixed verbs such as *at-eiti* 'come', *iš-važiuoti* 'leave (by transport)', *už-mesti* 'throw over' are formally marked members, i.e. their telic meaning is added by prefixes, while non-prefixed (simple) verbs such

(4) and (6), yet it can only be prototypical transitive with a <state> type predicate, as shown in ex. (8).

5. WORD ORDER BETWEEN ADVERBIAL PAST PARTICIPLES AND MAIN VERBS⁸

When the connection between past participles and main verbs is brought into the focus of consideration, it becomes clear that the pattern of the predominant word order changes depending on the type of predicate used. In the following paragraphs (a) and (b) the patterns of word order will be summed up in connection with the relative time reference of past participles.

(a) Adjectival past participles:

(a-i) in <PFV. action> type predicate sentences, these participles refer to <anteriority> of the secondary situation. As is shown in examples (9a, b), the past participle usually stands before the main verb (PP-V), while the reverse order (V-PP) is unnatural in a minimal context, unless used in a particular context.

(a-ii) in <IPFV. action> type predicate sentences, these participles can refer both to <anteriority> of the preceding secondary situation and to <simultaneity> of the resultative state. As in examples (10a, a', b, b'), both PP-V and V-PP are natural.

(a-iii) in <state> type predicate sentences, these participles refer to <simultaneity> of the resultative state of the preceding secondary situation. As in examples (11a, b), the past participle usually comes after the main verb (V-PP)⁹. The reverse order (PP-V) is unnatural in a minimal context, unless used in a particular context.

⁸ Basic word order in Lithuanian is SVO, modifier–modified. Usually, participle functioning as an attributive goes before the noun in the same way as adjective does, whereas participle functioning as a predicate follows the subject. Now, the participles under consideration here, i. e., past participles functioning as adverbials, can either precede or follow the main verb. Moreover, when used together with subordinate words or when preceding the main verb, these participles are often separated by intonation or a pause (by a comma in a written text) and become more independent. Now, according to the orthography, in single occurrence cases when past participles do not have any subordinate words, a comma is not used.

⁹ The combination of an adjectival past participle functioning as an adverbial with a <state> type predicate is similar in structure to the analytic form (*be*-verb + ad-

(b) Adverbial past participles:

(b-i) in <PFV. action> type predicate sentences, these participles refer to <anteriority> of the secondary situation, as is the case with adjectival past participles. As in examples (12a, b), normally they precede the main verb (PP-V). The reverse word order (V-PP) is unnatural in a minimal context, unless used in a particular context.

(b-ii) in <IPFV. action> type predicate sentences, these participles refer to both <anteriority> of the preceding secondary situation and <simultaneity> of the resultative state, as is the case with adjectival past participles. As is shown in examples (13a, b), normally they stand before the main verb (PP-V). The reverse word order (V-PP) is unnatural in a minimal context, unless used in a particular context.

(b-iii) in <state> type predicate sentences, these participles refer to <simultaneity> of the secondary situation. Contrary to the case with adjectival past participles, this type of secondary situation usually coincides with the stative main situation and does not imply any <anteriority>. As is seen in examples (14a, a', b, b') they always stand before the main verb (PP-V). The reverse word order (V-PP) is grammatically incorrect.

- (9) a. *Tėvas* *grįžęs*
 father-M-SG-NOM having come back-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM
iškart *atsigulė.* (PP-V)
 at once lay down-V-PAST-3
 'Having come back, father lay down at once.'
- b. *Užgesinęs* *lempą,*
 having switched off-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM the lamp-ACC
jis *užmigo.* (PP-V)

jectival past participle in nominative case) which has a meaning of so-called stative perfect, or resultative (see Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988).

- cf.) a. *Ji* *ilgai* *buvo praradusi*
 she-3F-SG-NOM for a long time had lost-be-PAST-3 + ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM
sąmonę.
 consciousness-ACC
 'She was unconscious (lit. had lost consciousness) for a long time.'
- b. *Motina* *nuo ryto* *[yra] šiltai apsirengusi.*
 mother-F-SG-NOM since morning has warmly dressed-herself-be-PRES-3 +
 + ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM
 'Mother has been dressed in warm clothes (lit. has warmly dressed-herself) since morning.'

- he-3M-SG-NOM fell asleep-V-PAST-3
 ‘**Having switched off** the lamp, he fell asleep’.
- (10) a. *Ji nusigrėžusi*
 she-3F-SG-NOM having turned away-ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM
rovė žolę. (PP-V)
 was pulling-V-PAST-3 the grass-ACC
- a’. *Ji rovė žolę*
 she-3F-SG-NOM was pulling-V-PAST-3 the grass-ACC
nusigrėžusi. (V-PP)
 having turned away-ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM
 ‘**With her back turned** (lit. **Having turned away**), she was pulling the grass.’
- b. *Sūnus, prisileidęs*
 the son-M-SG-NOM having filled-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM
dubenį vandens, žaidė
 the bowl-ACC with water-GEN was playing-V-PAST-3
su laiveliais. (PP-V)
 with toy ships
- b’. *Sūnus žaidė su laiveliais*
 the son-M-SG-NOM was playing-V-PAST-3 with toy ships
prisileidęs dubenį vandens. (V-PP)
 having filled-ACT.ADJ.PP- the bowl-ACC with water-GEN
 -M-SG-NOM
 ‘**Having filled** the bowl with water, the son was playing with toy ships.’
- (11) a. *Berniukas sėdėjo*
 the boy-M-SG-NOM was sitting-V-PAST-3
susigūžęs. (V-PP)
 having crouched-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM
 ‘The boy was sitting **crouching** (lit. **having crouched**).’
- b. *Motina gulėjo lovoje*
 mother-F-SG-NOM was lying-V-PAST-3 in bed
šiltai apsirengusi. (V-PP)
 warmly having dressed-herself-ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM
 ‘Mother was lying in bed **dressed in warm clothes** (lit. **having warmly dressed-herself**).’

- (12) a. *Broliui grižus, jis iškart*
 his brother-DAT returned-ADV.PP he-3M-SG-NOM at once
atsigulė. (PP-V)
 lay down-V-PAST-3
 ‘When his brother **returned**, he at once lay down.’
- b. *Balsui pasigirdus, ji*
 the voice-DAT was heard-ADV.PP she-3F-SG-NOM
stabtelėjo. (PP-V)
 stopped-V-PAST-3
 ‘When the voice **was heard**, she stopped.’
- (13) a. *Jonui atėjus, mes*
 Jonas-DAT came-ADV.PP we-1PL-NOM
visi džiaugėmės. (PP-V)
 all rejoiced-V-PAST-1PL
 ‘When Jonas **came**, we all rejoiced.’
- b. *Žinioms pasibaigus, vaikai*
 the news-DAT ended-ADV.PP the children-M-PL-NOM
ėjo miegoti. (PP-V)
 were going-V-PAST-3 to sleep-INF.’
 ‘When the news **ended**, the children were going to sleep.’
- (14) a. *Žinioms pasibaigus, motina*
 the news-DAT ended-ADV.PP mother-F-SG-NOM
gulėjo lovoje. (PP-V)
 was lying-V-PAST-3 in bed
- a’. **Motina gulėjo lovoje*
 mother-F-SG-NOM was lying-V-PAST-3 in bed
žinioms pasibaigus. (V-PP)
 the news-DAT ended-ADV.PP
 ‘When the news **ended**, mother was lying in bed.’
- b. *Balsui pasigirdus, ji*
 the voice-DAT was heard-ADV.PP she-3F-SG-NOM
stovėjo gatvėje. (PP-V)
 was standing-V-PAST-3 on the street
- b’. **Ji stovėjo gatvėje*
 she-3F-SG-NOM was standing-V-PAST-3 on the street

balsui *pasigirdus*. (V-PP)
 the voice-DAT was heard-ADV.PP
 ‘When the voice **was heard**, she was standing on the street.’

6. LEXICAL-SEMANTIC CONSTRAINTS ON PAST PARTICIPLES FUNCTIONING AS ADVERBIALS

6.1. Adjectival past participles

The combination of adjectival past participles with main verbs is subject to lexical-semantic constraints, which differ depending on the type of a predicate. As is shown in examples (15, 16, 17), those constraints are loosest in <PFV. action> type predicate sentences and tightest in <state> type predicate sentences¹⁰.

- (15) a. *Užgesinęs lempą, jis {užmigo / atsigulė ant sofos / *klausėsi muzikos}*. (PP-V)
 ‘**Having switched off** the lamp, he {fell asleep / lay down on the sofa <PFV. action> / *was listening to music <IPFV. action>}.’
- b. *Jis {*miegojo / *gulėjo ant sofos} užgesinęs lempą*. (V-PP)
 ‘**Having switched off** the lamp, he {*was sleeping / *was lying on the sofa <state>}.’
- (16) a. *Motina, uždariusi langą, {atsisėdo / ??sėdosi} ant sofos*. (PP-V)
 ‘Mother, **having closed** the window, {sat down <PFV. action> / ??was about to sit down <IPFV. action>} on the sofa.’
- b. *Motina {*miegojo / *sėdėjo ant sofos} uždariusi langą*. (PP-V)

¹⁰This may be not only an intra-linguistic phenomenon in Lithuanian, but also a cross-linguistic tendency. For example, the English, Russian, or Japanese correspondents of ex. (15a) are considered to be more natural than ex. (15b).

cf) (15a) English. *Having switched off the lamp, he fell asleep.*

Russian. *Potušiv lampu, on zasnul.*

Japanese. *Rampu o keshite, kare wa nemurikonda.*

(15b) English. *Having switched off the lamp, he was sleeping.*

Russian. *On spal, potušiv lampu.*

Japanese. *Rampu o keshite, kare wa nemutteita.*

‘Mother {*was sleeping / *was sitting on the sofa <state>}, **having closed** the window.’

- (17) a. {*Užsimerkęs* / *sunėręs rankas ant krūtinės* / *praradęs sąmonę* / *viską suvalgęs* / *perskaitęs knygą* / *atsivertęs knygą*}, *jis atsigulė ant lovos*. (PP-V)

‘{**Having closed** his eyes / **having folded** his arms on his chest / **having lost** consciousness / **having eaten up** everything / **having finished reading** the book / **having opened** the book}, he lay down on the sofa <PFV. action>.’

- b. *Jis gulėjo lovoje* {*užsimerkęs* / *sunėręs rankas ant krūtinės* / *praradęs sąmonę* / ??*viską suvalgęs* / **perskaitęs knygą* / **atsivertęs knygą*}. (V-PP)

‘He was lying in bed <state> {with his eyes **closed** (lit. **having closed** his eyes) / with his arms **folded** on his chest (lit. **having folded** his arms on his chest) / unconscious (lit. **having lost** consciousness) / ??**having eaten up** everything / ***having finished reading** the book / ***having opened** the book}.

Following below is an analysis of lexical-semantic constraints that adjectival past participles are subject to. It will be done in the following order: section 6.1.1 deals with <state> predicate sentences, section 6.1.2 with <IPFV. action> predicate sentences, and section 6.1.3 with <PFV. action> predicate sentences.

6.1.1. <State> predicate sentences

In <state> predicate sentences, co-occurring adjectival participles functioning as adverbials can be formed only from telic verbs. As a rule, adjectival past participles in the active voice cannot be formed from prototypical transitive verbs. They can be formed only from intransitive or non-prototypical transitive verbs and are restricted only to those that have lexical-semantic meanings as illustrated in the following examples I and II:

I. formed from intransitive verbs: some kind of change in the subject (agent), e.g. changes in the condition of the human body or a person’s psychological state, the emergence or disappearance of things, changes in outward appearance or in position or placement, etc. (ex. (18 a, b)).

- b. *Jis* *stovėjo*
 he-3M-SG-NOM was standing-V-PAST-3
nutolęs
 having moved away-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM
nuo kranto. (V-PP)
 from the shore
 ‘He was standing **further away** (lit. **having moved away**)
 from the shore.’
- (19) a. *Berniukas* *stovėjo*
 the boy-M-SG-NOM was standing-V-PAST-3
apsirengęs *paltą.* (V-PP)
 having dressed-himself-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM a coat-ACC
 ‘The boy was standing **in his coat** (lit. **having dressed-himself**
 a coat).’
- b. *Jis* *sėdi* *tvoros viršuje*
 he-3M-SG-NOM is sitting-V-PAST-3 on top of a fence
nuleidęs *kojas.* (V-PP)
 having hung-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM legs-ACC
 ‘He is sitting on top of a fence **with** his legs **dangling** (lit. **hav-**
ing hung legs).’
- (20) a. *Dvi mergaitės* *sėdėjo*
 two girls-F-PL-NOM were sitting-V-PAST-3
išpuoštos, *kaip lėlės.* (V-PP)
 dressed up-PASS.ADJ.PP-F-PL-NOM like dolls
 ‘Two girls were sitting **dressed up** like dolls.’
- b. *Jis* *stovėjo*
 he-3M-SG-NOM was standing-V-PAST-3
apimtas *siaubo.* (V-PP)
 gripped-PASS.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM by fear-GEN
 ‘He was standing **gripped** by fear.’

The examples below show the types of co-occurring aspectual adverbials of duration, or continuity:

- (21) a. *Ji* *ILGAI* *gulėjo*
 she-3F-SG-NOM for a long time was lying-V-PAST-3
praradusi *sąmonę.* (V-PP)

having lost-ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM consciousness-ACC
 ‘She was lying FOR A LONG TIME **unconscious** (lit. **having lost consciousness**).’

- b. *Motina* *NUO RYTO* *guli* *lovoje*
 mother-F-SG-NOM since morning is lying-V-PAST-3 in bed
šiltai *apsirengusi*. (V-PP)
 warmly having dressed-herself-ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM
 ‘Mother is lying in bed SINCE MORNING **dressed in warm clothes**
 (lit. **having warmly dressed-herself**).’

6.1.2. <IPFV. action> predicate sentences

In case of <IPFV. action> type predicate sentences, co-occurring adjectival past participles functioning as adverbials are formed only from telic verbs. Even though their lexical-semantic constraints are somewhat looser than in <state> type predicate sentences, in general they have in many cases similar meanings as described in paragraphs I and II of section 6.1.1 in connection with <state> predicate sentences. Following below in (22a, b) are example sentences with adjectival past participles in the active voice formed from intransitive verbs, and in (23a, b) from transitive verbs. (24a, b) are example sentences with adjectival past participles in the passive voice.

- (22) a. *Padavēja* *pasistiebusi*
 the waitress-F-SG-NOM having stood on tiptoe-ACT.ADJ.PP-F-
 -SG-NOM
servetėle *šluostė* *jo veidą*. (PP-V)
 with a napkin was wiping-V-PAST-3 his face-ACC
 ‘**Standing** (lit. **Having stood**) **on tiptoe**, the waitress was wiping his face with a napkin.’
- b. *Susimąstęs,* *jis*
 having become lost in thought- he-3M-SG-NOM
 ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM
glostė *vaikui* *galvą*. (PP-V)
 was stroking-V-PAST-3 child-DAT head-ACC
 ‘**Thoughtfully** (lit. **Having become lost in thought**), he was stroking the child’s head.’

- (23) a. *Jis* *bėgo*
 he-3M-SG-NOM was running-V-PAST-3
iškėleš *uodegą. (V-PP)*
 having raised up-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM his tail-ACC
 'He was running **with** his tail **raised up** (lit. **having raised up** his tail).'
- b. *Ji* *ėjo* *gatve*
 she-3F-SG-NOM was walking down-V-PAST-3 the street
sugniaužusi *kumštyje*
 having clenched-ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM in her fist
popierėlį. (V-PP)
 a small piece of paper-ACC
 'She was walking down the street **clenching** (lit. **having clenched**) in her fist a small piece of paper.'
- (24) a. *Ijungtas* *nuo pat ryto*
 having been turned on-PASS.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM since morning
radijas *skleidė*
 the radio-M-SG-NOM was emitting-V-PAST-3
keistus garsus. (PP-V)
 strange sounds
 'Having been turned on since morning, the radio was emitting strange sounds.'
- b. *Jos burna* *drebėjo*
 her mouth-F-SG-NOM was quivering-V-PAST-3
užspausta *jo kita ranka. (V-PP)*
 pressed tightly-PASS.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM under his hand
 'Her mouth was quivering **pressed tightly** under his hand.'

The examples below show the types of co-occurring aspectual adverbials of duration, or continuity:

- (25) a. *Mergina* *ILGAI* *žiūrėjo*
 the young woman-F-SG-NOM for a long time was staring-V-
 -PAST-3
į ją *išsigandusi. (V-PP)*
 at her having frightened-herself-ACT.ADJ.PP-F-SG-NOM

the duration or continuity type, whereas the main verbs can be used with co-occurring adverbial words expressing punctual time (ex. (30)).

- (29) *Pamąstęs* *AKIMIRKA,*
 having thought-ACT.ADJ.PP-M-SG-NOM for a split second
jis *atsakė.* (PP-V)
 he-3M-SG-NOM answered-V-PAST-3
 ‘After thinking (lit. Having thought) FOR A SPLIT SECOND, he gave the answer.’
- (30) a. *ILGAI* *žygiavę* *per smėlį,*
 for a long time having walked-ACT.ADJ.PP- on the sand
 -M-PL-NOM
jie *PAGALIAU PO PENKIŲ VALANDŲ*
 they-3M-PL-NOM finally after five hours
atrado *kelią.* (PP-V)
 found-V-PAST-3 the way-ACC
 ‘Having walked FOR A LONG TIME on the sand, they FINALLY AFTER FIVE HOURS found the way.’
- b. *NUO RYTO* *ėjęs,* *jis*
 since morning having walked-ACT.ADJ.PP- he-3M-SG-NOM
 -M-SG-NOM
priėjo trobelę *TREČIĄ VALANDĄ.* (PP-V)
 reached-V-PAST-3 a wooden cabin-ACC at three
 ‘Having walked since morning, he reached a wooden cabin AT THREE.’

6.2. Adverbial past participles

Both from the standpoint of aspect and transitivity, the combination of adverbial past participles with main verbs is not subject to the constraints observed with adjectival past participles (refer to examples (2), (12a, b), (13a, b), (14a, a’, b, b’)). Moreover, in contrast to adjectival past participles, adverbial past participles can have co-occurring adverbials expressing punctual time even in cases of <state> predicate.

- (31) a. *Jam* *atskridus* *LYGIAI TREČIĄ VALANDĄ,*
 he-DAT arrived by plane-ADV.PP at three o’clock sharp

Table 1: The semantic dependency of past participles functioning as adverbials on main verbs in Lithuanian

Degree of dependency:	high (tight constraints) ←————→ low (loose constraints)			
	Adjectival past participles (active/passive voice) (same-subject use)		Adverbial past participles (different-subject use)	
Types of predicates	<state>	<IPFV. action>	<PFV. action>	
(a) relative time reference	<simultaneity>	←————→	<anteriority>	(same as adjectival past participles)
(b) predominant word order	V-PP	V-PP / PP-V	PP-V	PP-V
(c) atelic (nonbounded) verbs	-	-	+	+
(d) active voice: prototypical transitive verbs	-	(-)	+	+
(e) passive voice: non-prototypical transitive verbs	-	(-)	+	(no passive voice)

The close link between aspect and transitivity is already suggested in Hopper & Thompson's transitivity hypothesis (1980). However, the problem of participles functioning as adverbials has not yet been discussed from that point of view to date. So it is predicted that my interpretation can give a new perspective on the issue of correlation between aspect and transitivity.

REFERENCES

- ABRAHAM, W. & L. KULIKOV, eds., 1999: *Tense-Aspect, Transitivity and Causativity: Essays in Honor of Vladimir Nedjalkov*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- AMBRAZAS, V., 1966: Dalyvinių, pusedalyvinių ir padalyvinių konstrukcijų skyrybos klausimu. *Kalbos kultūra* 11: 64–68.
- AMBRAZAS, V. 1984: Del lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžio morfologinių kategorijų. *Baltistica* 20.2, 100–110.
- AMBRAZAS, V. 1990: *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- AMBRAZAS, V., ed., 1997: *Lithuanian grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- BONDARKO, A. V. 1987: Vvedenie. Osnovanija funkcional'noj grammatiki. In: Id., *Teorija funkcional'noj grammatiki. Vvedenie. Aspektual'nost'. Vremennaja lokalizovannost'. Taksis*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- BONDARKO, A. V. 1996: *Problemy grammatičeskoj semantiki i ruskoj aspektologii*. St Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta.
- ČEREMISINA, M. I. 1977: Deepričastie kak klass form glagola v jazykax raznyx sistem. In: M. I. ČEREMISINA, ed., *Složnoe predloženie v jazykax raznyx sistem*, Novosibirsk: Nauka, 3–28.
- COMRIE, B. 1976: *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COMRIE, B. & G. G. CORBETT, eds., 1993: *The Slavonic languages*. London/New York: Routledge.
- DAHL, Ö. 1981: On the definition of the telic-atelic (bounded-nonbounded) distinction. In: Ph. J. TEDESCHI & A. ZAENEN, eds., *Tense and aspect. Syntax and Semantics* 14. New York: Academic Press, 79–90..
- DAHL, Ö. 1985: *Tense and Aspect systems*. Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell.
- DAHL, Ö. 1994: Aspect. In: R. E. ASHER *et al.*, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 1, 240–247.
- DAMBRIŪNAS, L. 1960: *Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių aspektai*. Boston: Lietuvių enciklopedijos leidykla.
- DAMBRIŪNAS, L. 1962: Glagol'nye vidy v litovskom jazyke. In: MASLOV, ed., 1962, 365–381.
- DAMBRIŪNAS, L. 1975: Kelios pastabos dėl veikslų sampratos. *Baltistica* 11.2, 171–180.

- DLKG — V. AMBRAZAS, ed., *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1994.
- ENDZELIN, J. 1971: *Comparative Phonology and Morphology of Baltic Languages*, trans. W. R. SCHMALSTIEG & B. JEGERS. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- GALNAITYTĖ, E. 1966: K voprosu ob imperfektivacii glagolov v litovskom jazyke. *Baltistica* 2, 147–158.
- GALNAITYTE, E. 1963: Osobennosti kategorii vida glagolov v litovskom jazyke (v sopostavlenii s russkim jazykom). *Kalbotyra* 7, 123–143.
- GENIUŠIENE, E. 1987: *The Typology of Reflexives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GENIUŠIENE, E. Š. 1974: Diatezy i zalogi v sovremennom litovskom jazyke. In: A. A. CHOLODOVIČ, ed., *Tipologija passivnyx konstrukcij. Diatezy i zalogi*. Leningrad: Nauka, 203–230.
- GENIUŠIENE, E. Š. 1990: Perfekt i vid v litovskom jazyke. V. S. XRAKOVSKIJ, ed., *Tipologija i grammatika*. Moscow: Nauka, 135–140.
- GENIUŠIENE, E. Š. & V. P. NEDJALKOV 1988: Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian. In: NEDJALKOV, ed., 1988, 369–386.
- HEWSON, J. & V. BUBENIK 1997: *Tense and aspect in Indo-European languages (Theory, typology, diachrony)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- HOLVOET, A. 1991: *Transitivity and Clause Structure in Polish: A Study in Case Marking*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.
- HOLVOET, A. & V. Čižik 2004: Veikslo priešpriešos tipai. In HOLVOET & SEMĖNIENE, eds., 2004, 141–162.
- HOLVOET, A. & A. JUDŽENTIS, eds., 2003: *Sintaksinių ryšių tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. (Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai, 1.)
- HOLVOET, A. & L. SEMĖNIENE, eds., 2004: *Gramatinių kategorijų tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. (Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai, 2.)
- HOPPER, P. J. & S. A. THOMPSON 1980: Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56, 251–299.

- JAKOBSON, R. 1957: Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb. In: Id., *Selected writings* vol. 2, The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 130–147.
- JOKOJAMA, O. 1983: V zaščitu zapretnyx deepričastij. *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists, vol.1, Linguistics*, 373–381. Slavica: Columbus, OH.
- KÖNIG, E. & J. VAN DER AUWERA 1990: Adverbial participles, gerunds and absolute constructions in the languages of Europe. In: J. BECHERT, G. BERNINI & C. BURIDANT, eds., *Toward a Typology of European languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 337–355..
- LEHMAN, Ch. 1994: Predicates: aspectual types. In: R. E. ASHER *et al.*, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 6. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 3297–3302.
- LKG — K. ULVYDAS, ed., *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vol. 2. Vilnius: Mintis, 1971.
- MASLOV, Ju. S. 1962: Voprosy glagol'nogo vida v sovremennom zarubežnom jazykoznanii. In: MASLOV, ed., 1962, 7–32.
- MASLOV, Ju. S., ed., 1962. *Voprosy glagol'nogo vida*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo inostranoj literatury.
- MASLOV, Ju. S. 1978: K osnovanijam sopostavitel'noj aspektologii. In: Ju. S. MASLOV, ed., *Voprosy sopostavitel'noj aspektologii*. Leningrad: Nauka, 4–44.
- MASLOV, Ju. S. 1984: Ob osnovnyx ponjatijax aspektologii. In: Id., *Očerki po aspektologii*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 5–47.
- MUSTEIKIS, K. 1972: *Sopostavitel'naja morfologija russskogo i litovskogo jazykov*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- NEDJALKOV, V. P., ed., 1988: *Typology of resultative constructions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- PADUČEVA, E. V. 1996: *Semantičeskie issledovanija (Semantika vremeni i vida v russskom jazyke; Semantika narrativa)*. Moscow: Jazyki russskoj kul'tury.
- PAULAUSKIENE, A. 1979: *Gramatinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmožodžio kategorijos*. Vilnius: Mokslas.

- PAULAUSKIENE, A. 1994: *Lietuvių kalbos morfologija*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- POLS, A. 1993: *Varianty pristavočnyx glagolov nesoveršennogo vida v russkom jazyke*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- SAFAREWICZ, J. 1967: Stan badań nad aspektem czasownikowym w języku litewskim. In: Id., *Studia językoznawcze*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 339–361
- SAKURAI, E. 1997: Verbal aspect and meanings-functions of compound tenses in Lithuanian. *Gengo Kenkyū: Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* 112, 98–131.
- SAKURAI, E. 1999: Sopostavitel'nyj analiz vidovyx sistem russkogo i litovskogo jazykov. *Bulletin of Japan Association for the Study of Russian Language and Literature* 31, 82–97.
- SAKURAI, E. 2000: Adverbial (semi-predicative) functions of the past participles in Lithuanian: Relative time reference. *Nagoya Working Papers in Linguistics* 16, 147–174.
- SAKURAI, E. 2002: Tense, aspect and temporal expressions in Baltic: An analysis by comparison with Slavic. *Jinbun* 1, 55–72.
- SAKURAI, E. 2003: Adverbial'nye (polupredikativnye) funkcii pričastij i deepričastij prošedšego vremeni v litovskom i russkom jazykax. *Bulletin of Japan Association for the Study of Russian Language and Literature* 35, 1–9.
- SCHUYT, R. 1990: *The morphology of Slavic verbal aspect: A descriptive and historical study*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- SENN, A. 1949: Verbal aspects in Germanic, Slavic, and Baltic. *Language* 25.4, 402–409.
- SHIBATANI, M. 1997: Linguistic function, structure and typology. *Gengo Kenkyū: Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* 112, 1–32.
- SLIŽIENE, N. 1969: Sudurtinių atliktinių veiksmažodžio laikų reikšmės ir vartojimas. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 11, 19–40.
- SLIŽIENE, N. 1974: Sudurtinių neveikiamųjų veiksmažodžio formų reikšmės ir vartojimas. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 15, 77–89.

- SLIŽIENĖ, N. 1995: The tense system of Lithuanian. In: THIEROFF & BALLWEG, eds., 1995, vol. 2, 215–232.
- STANG, Chr. S. 1942: *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad.
- STEPANOV, Ju. S. 1976: Vid, zalog, perexodnost' (balto-slavjanskaja problema 1). *Izvestija AN SSSR. Serija literatury i jazyka* 35.5, 408–420.
- THELIN, N. B. 1978: *Toward a theory of aspect, tense and actionality in Slavic*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- THIEROFF, R. & J. BALLWEG, eds., 1994–95: *Tense systems in European languages*. vol. 1–2. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- TSUNODA, T. 1985: Remarks on transitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 21, 385–396.
- TSUNODA, T. 1994: Transitivity. In: R. E. ASHER et al., eds., *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol.9, 4670–4677. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- WIEMER, B. 2001: Aspektual'nye paradigmy i leksičeskoe značenie russkix i litovskix glagolov (Opyt sopostavlenija s točki zrenija leksikalizacii i gramatikalizacii). *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2001–2002, 26–58.

Eiko Sakurai

The University of Tokyo

7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, JAPAN

sakurainek2@ybb.ne.jp