

The Status of Lithuanian Compound Past Tenses and Their Equivalents in English

Saulė Petronienė

Abstract. The paper covers quite a controversial subject in Lithuanian linguistics, i.e. Lithuanian compound past tenses (which are also referred to as analytic tenses or analytic predicates). The status of Lithuanian analytic predicate and its relation to finite verb forms was widely discussed in the second half of the 20th century. Therefore, it can be stated that there are three solutions proposed in Lithuanian linguistics: grammars include analytic tenses into the general paradigm of tenses, the authors of the reviews of the grammars claim that those are free phrases. The third opinion states that analytic forms are in a medium position between simple tenses and compound predicates and are adjacent to simple predicates. However, if two words possess the same meaning as one word and perform the same syntactical function, they are to correlate as different forms of expression of the same phenomenon. Thus, the paper provides the analysis of Lithuanian compound inceptive tenses and evaluates the meanings of them with respect to tense and modality. The analysis also covers compound forms with present tense passive and past tense active and passive participles. The grammaticalization of predicative compound constructions is a subject matter as well. The contrastive analysis of Lithuanian and English provides the research with more reliable data.

Key words: *tense; voice; compound tenses; analytic tenses; analytic predicates; participles.*

Introduction

Historic comparative grammar of the second half of the 19th century maintained the idea that grammatical meanings were indicated by inflections and suffixes of formation in morphological languages. It was stated that the grammar of inflectional Indo-European languages is at the end of a word. However, text linguistics allowed searching for the grammar in all the text (Heidolph *et al.*, 1981). Syntactical constructions frequently merge into one grammatical item. Although graphically the elements of it are presented separately, functionally those constructions are one form. Such are analytic tenses both in English and in Lithuanian.

Analytic constructions are formed with participles and tense and mood forms of the auxiliary verb in Lithuanian. The constructions correlate with simple forms in the predicative position. However, there was a discussion about the grammatical status of compound (analytic) constructions in the 20th century. The basis for it was the view on the grammatical form, i.e. it was stated that grammatical form had to be of a morphological type. The discussion was not only about Lithuanian compound tenses but also about English, German and French analytic constructions (Жирмунский, 1965, pp.5-57; Серебренников, 1965, pp.100-104; Guillaume, 1973, pp.73-86).

In Lithuanian Compound tenses (*sudurtiniai laikai*) define supplementary meanings of the time process. The term compound tenses (*sudurtiniai laikai*) was introduced by Jablonskis (Jablonskis, 1957) and in 1985 the term was changed into compound (*sudėtiniai laikai*) tenses (Амбразас, 1985) as the term was translated into Russian by one word only *сложные времена*. After all, it is reasonable to name them compound (*sudėtiniai*) tenses in Lithuanian as well, since they are not a simple morphological form but a combination of two words, i.e. an analytic construction.

The paper aims at defining paradigmatic relations of syntactical constructions (the so called analytic tenses or analytic predicates) with simple tenses in Lithuanian. Therefore, the object of the research is Lithuanian compound tenses. Moreover, the examples of the constructions will be analyzed and compared with their English equivalents and, thus, the status of Lithuanian analytic tenses will be determined.

The method of contrastive analysis (Akhmanova, 1972; Lado, 1976; Hawkins, 1986) is applied in the research. The focus, however, is on the paradigms of Lithuanian compound past tenses and their meanings. The search for the equivalents of Lithuanian compound forms in English enables the emphasis of the features of the investigative language (i.e. Lithuanian). Thus, the analysis does not involve all the potential of English.

The Grammaticalization of Predicative Compound Constructions

Compound forms of tenses and moods are formed by present participles with the affix *be-* and the forms of conjugation of the auxiliary verb *būti* (to be) in Lithuanian. The system of compound tenses is shorter than the one of simple tenses as there are no forms the present tense. Furthermore, the forms of the past simple tense are used more frequent, meanwhile, the forms of other tenses are not common in the standard Lithuanian (with the exception of Samogitian writings) (Амбразас, 2005, p.349).

In 1922 Jablonskis indicated that present participles were used in compound tenses without the prefix *be-* (*bedarąs, bedirbąs*). In addition, he claimed that a participle without a gender *esu, esi, yra* was used for the indicative mood of the present tense (Jablonskis, 1957, pp.311-312). On the other hand, Sližienė noted that there was no such form of participles as *bedirbąs* with the auxiliary verb of the present tense, thus, there could be no compound present tense (Sližienė, 1961, pp.67-73; 1964, pp.81-95; 1969, pp.18-26). Sirtautas objected

the idea and claimed that the system could be formed by the forms of the present tense with the zero auxiliary verb: *berašqs – buvo berašqs – būdavo berašqs – bus berašqs* (Sirtautas, 1968). Although there was a discussion about the issue, the grammaticalization of the constructions and their relation to the conjugated forms was neglected (Girdenis & Žulys, 1973, pp.208-209; Žulys, 1979).

The components of Lithuanian compound tenses are relatively free. Though, even in English or French there may be small insertions between the auxiliary verb and the participle, e.g. *He has secretly written to her. He has already come* (an adverb may be inserted between the auxiliary verb and the participle); *Jean ne l'ai pas vu* (a negative can be inserted between the auxiliary verb and the participle). In Lithuanian, however, the auxiliary verb may both precede or follow the participle (*Jis buvo dirbęs // jis dirbęs buvo*); a number of words may be inserted between the auxiliary verb and the participle (*Ji buvo labiau nei bet kuris iš jų dirbęs*); both the auxiliary verb and the participle may possess a negative (*Jis nebuvo nei nematęs, nei negirdėjęs*); the auxiliary verb may simultaneously connect the participle and the adjective (*Jis buvo užmirštas ir niekam nereikalingas*).

The nature of analytic constructions is syntactical in all the languages, although, they are not homogeneous in all the languages. The distinction depends on the type of the language, i.e. they are freer and resemble word combinations in some languages, and meanwhile, they approach the form of a compound word in other ones. Zhirmunsky claims that at first it might seem that *word combination* as *word form* is a logical contradiction. However, what might seem as a contradiction from the view of formal logic, it can actually exist as a real linguistic fact. Thus, it should be acknowledged that this contradiction is dialectical. Moreover, he insists that the development of the language should be considered and that one should look into it dynamically but not statically; only then, he claims, the process of syntactic constructions changing into word forms which sustain the particularity of their syntactic formation will be comprehensible (Жирмунский, 1961, p.8; 1976, pp.82-125).

The claim is correct since all compound words originated from syntactic constructions. Historical syntax finds its old models in the morphological composition of a word. For instance, historical grammar explains the insertion of a reflexive affix between the prefix and the root of the word in Lithuanian by claiming that the prefix and the reflexive affix were separate words. Just, the reflexive affix always followed the word and took the 'second place' (the same is even now in Czech). Thus, if the prefix was in the first place in a sentence, the reflexive affix followed it and took the second place; if there was no prefix the reflexive affix still sustained its second place and followed the verb. Hence, after the syntactical constructions had transformed into words, the reflexive affix retained its position between the prefix and the root (in prefix verbs) and remained at the end of the root (after all formation affixes) in case of simple (non-prefix) verbs. It is possible to present more examples when syntactic constructions transform into words, however, it is not the object of the investigation.

The elements of compound sentences are graphically presented as separate segments. Thus, it is possible to receive a

syntactical comment that there are three separate words in the constructions like *he has written*, although functionally that is only one form of the verb.

There are free syntactic constructions which are functionally related to simple forms in Lithuanian. However, it is essential to establish that relation. If they are in the opposition (on the basis of one invariant meaning) to the simple forms of tenses and moods, then they are in the same paradigm. If they are synonymous, then they exist alongside the paradigm and complement it (similarly as prepositional constructions complement the paradigm of the case in the Lithuanian language).

O aš, berneli, manai, jaunas nesu buvęs, mergų nesu mylėjęs, vai ir kaip dar mylėjau.

(Krėvė)

The distinction between the simple form (*buvau, mylėjau*) and the compound form (*nesu buvęs, nesu mylėjęs*) is very subtle. The simple form expresses some distant past action, state, event; meanwhile, the compound forms express some quality or condition because of some past events, experiences, actions (perfective meaning).

Russian, for instance, does not possess the means to express such synonymy:

*А я, паренёк, думаюшь молодым небыл, девушек не любил, ещё как любил.*¹

The forms in the Russian translation are the same and unfortunately the stylistic distinction is lost.

English has means to express such stylistic distinction.

You think I haven't been young and haven't loved girls? No doubt I did love.

In the example above the present perfect tense refers to past actions and events the results of which are relevant at the present moment, meanwhile, the past simple tense is used for past actions and events with no reference to the present moment. The auxiliary verb *did* emphasizes the fact that the situation definitely occurred in the past.

Būti (to be) with Active Participles

Jablonskis, even at the beginning of the 20th century, noticed that compound inceptive tenses (*pradėtiniai sudurtiniai laikai*) are not very widely used in written language; that they are often forgotten even in spoken language (Jablonskis, 1957, p.312). Moreover, there is another question, whether compound tenses are in opposition to simple tenses or, perhaps, they are synonymous.

Assuming, there are compound forms with zero auxiliary verb, Ambrazas claims that such forms are used in the dialects of Samogitia and western upper Lithuania (those are regions the compound tenses emerged from into the standard Lithuanian) and that they are still in use. He also gives their paradigm in his study about participles (Ambrazas, 1979, pp.170-173):

Present tense: *ans yr(a) sergas* 'he is being ill'.

¹ Examples following no reference have been created by the author to illustrate a particular point in the text.

Past tense: *jis buvo šiek tiek sergąs* 'he was being a bit ill'.

Future tense: *kai būsi rūkęs, kvėpės* 'if you are being smoking there will be a smell'.

Thus, there have been forms without a prefix *be-*. Their meaning should be the same as the meaning of the corresponding forms of simple tenses since the meaning expressed by the present participle corresponds with the meaning expressed by the auxiliary verb: *yra sergąs = serga*. Such the construction must be older than the participle with the particle *be-* and with the zero auxiliary verb: *bedirbąs, besergąs, beturįs*. In comparison with the corresponding conjugated verb of the present tense, there could be distinguished a slight difference in modality but not in tense. Moreover, the difference could be compensated with the context or even the intonation, e.g.:

Žiūriu, žiūriu – devynios stimos viena koja bešokančios (= šoka).
(Jablonskis)

Pasirodo ir Barbė jauniki beturinti (= turi).
(Simonaitytė)

Mes pilnas kertes priverkėme, o čia ryto metą, praušus, tik mamytė kyšt – bejeinanti (= įeina) su ryšeliu karštais vėdarais nešina.
(Lazdynų Pelėda)

Rožytė tuojau nubėgo ir atkišo duris, manydama išvysti pavargėlį, bet žiūri – juodas gauruotas lokys bestovįs (= stovi).
(Balčikonis)

Thus, the question is whether the present participle with the particle *be-* alone could be substituted by the simple verb of the present tense (without jeopardizing the accuracy of the information conveyed).

Let us analyse the past simple tense as there are no examples of the past frequentative tense: all the examples provided in the contemporary Lithuanian grammars are borrowed from Jablonskis (maybe even created by Jablonskis himself according to the analogy with the past simple tense). Consider:

Vėlai jie ateidavo mūsų kviesti: būdavom beeing ir patys iš namų, kai ateidavo prašyti.
(Ulvydas, 1971, p.146)

Compound forms of the past simple tense are formed with the verb *buvo* (was, were) + *be* + present participle: *buvo beeing, beimąs, buvo bestovįs* and have the following meanings:

1) to express some intended action or the action in the progress but interrupted by some other action:

Ir Vilius buvo besukąs (= suko = ketino sukti) *karčemos link, kai Amoras prisėdo Viliaus kojas.*
(Simonaitytė)

Jis atsisėdo patogiai ir buvo bepradedąs (= rengėsi) *sakyti, bet šeimininkė patraukė ratelį į šalį ir priėjo prie svečių.*
(Balčikonis)

With regard to time, the compound forms coincide to the forms of the present simple tense. There is only an additional meaning of intended action along to another action which interrupts it. Consider:

Buvau jau berašanti jam laišką, bet pamačiau jį patį ateinant.
= *Jau rengiausi jam rašyti laišką, bet pamačiau jį patį ateinant.*

English does not possess special forms to express the meaning; however, it may be conveyed lexically (e.g. with the verb *intend* or *was about to*): *I intended to write // was about to write him a letter when I saw him coming.*

2) to express an action which was in progress when some other action started:

Kai įėjome į klasę, vaikai jau buvo suoluose besėdį (= sėdėjo).

When we entered the classroom the children were already sitting.

Kai mes nuėjome jų kviesti, jie patys jau buvo being (=ėjo) *iš namų.*

When we went to invite them they were already leaving the house.

In this case the past continuous tense expresses the meaning of the action in progress. The constructions (*buvo being, buvo besėdį*) may be replaced by the forms of the past simple tense (*ėjo, sėdėjo*) in Lithuanian. Both, compound forms and the past simple tense have the same equivalent in English and are translated the same. Moreover, there are not many examples of this type; they are found only in the grammar of Lithuanian (Ulvydas, 1971, p.146).

Hence, it can be stated that the equivalents in brackets demonstrate that compound past tense forms can be replaced by simple past tense forms. Consequently, restricted usage of the compound forms in respect of the area (only in the region of Samogitia) and regular synonymy with the simple forms (after mingling and fading of dialects) are some of the major inner causes resulting in the disappearance of the compound form from active contemporary usage in Lithuanian.

Unfortunately, the compound forms were not sustained by the Russian language during Soviet times; instead, the simple form was supported. Consider:

Kai buvau beeinanti iš namų, suskambo telefonas.

Когда уже выходила из дома, зазвенел телефон.

Moreover, the forms will not be supported by the bilingualism with English, since they are translated as the past continuous tense into English which corresponds the past simple tense in Lithuanian (or with the help of lexical means), e.g.:

Kai buvau beeing (=ėjau) *iš namų, suskambo telefonas.*

When I was leaving the house the phone rang.

Kai įėjau į auditoriją, studentai jau buvo besėdį (= sėdėjo).

When I came into the class the students were already sitting.

Buvau beišeinanti (=jau rengiausi išeiti) *iš namų, kai prisiminiau jo prašymą.*

I was about to leave when I remembered his request.

In order to explore the current usage of such compound forms, a survey has been rendered. Sixty seven students of Humanities (from Vytautas Magnus University and Kaunas University of Technology) have participated in the research (age range 19-23). They have been asked to recognize the compound forms and indicate their meanings (the presumption has been that the students should use the forms since they are found in Lithuanian classical literature and are included in Lithuanian grammars as a standard). The results of the survey indicate that 75% of the respondents acknowledge the forms; nevertheless, they never apply them.

Moreover, the analysis of modern Lithuanian literature has been performed. Modern texts of various authors² have been analysed. The results of the analysis of modern Lithuanian literature confirm that the authors use the forms sporadically (there have been found only 10 compound inceptive tenses in the analyzed 1433 pages). In some texts (e.g. by Ivanauskaitė) the constructions have not been found at all. In other sources only one type of constructions has been found (with the meaning of an intended action interrupted by some other action). Consider:

Buvo beketinas vytis Morkūnas, bet pasiliko (Aputis, p.68); Šiaip jaučiai bešnekanč vyras jam pakišo pasirašyti lapą, vaikas jau paėmė kotelį ir buvo bėmerkiąs į violetinę rašalinę, bet liko taip stovėti, pakėlęs į orą šitą violetinę pokarinę poezijos plunksną (Aputis, p.83).

Gaučys buvo benoris nusivilti ir pasikabinti savo drėgną nuo šlapdribos bulatą, bet atsiminė komendantės žodžius ir nusileido žemyn į gatvę (Granauskas, p.74); Tris stiklines Kolia susistatė priešais save į eilę, pripylė į visas lygiai iki pusės, buvo betiesiąs ranką į alų, bet apsigalvojo (...) (Granauskas, p.80); Ji prisitraukė stiklinę arčiau, buvo bekelianti, persigalvojo, nustumė į šoną (Granauskas, p.117).

Kitąryt, kai mudu su Cezare, apsitaisę pandžabiais, jau buvome beišeina, jis psumirkom sudėbčiojo (Bubnys, p.8); Vos spėjęs pasidžiaugti Egono nuoširdumu, turėjau nusivilti ir jau buvau bekylas išeiti iš kambario, bet tuomsyk pro duris įpuolė Čezarė, pasienin nubloškė brezentinę kėdutę su pagalvėle, apsižvalgė (Bubnys, p.27); Žengtelėjo atatupsčia ir jau buvo beužverias duris, tačiau sulaikė pro skaudžią raudą tariami žodžiai: „Nuodėmės drasko, plėšo... Viešpatie, tu leidai mus į pasaulį ne tam, kad nuodėmių kalnus susipiltume...“ (Bubnys, p.79).

Buvau beišjungianti, kai balsas staiga nutilo, o ekrane – lyg tarp kitko – vieną sekundės dalį, užsitęsusių iki amžinybės, šmėstelėjo mano mielas muzikos mokytojas (Šerelytė, p.53); – Matai, dukra mano...– buvo bepradedas, bet susigriebė, atsikrenkštė ir rūščiai suraukė antakius (Šerelytė, p.104).

Thus, as it has already been mentioned, compound inceptive tenses are not sustained by Russian. Equally, they are not sustained by English since they are translated by the past continuous tense (with no meaning of an inceptive tense) or with the help of lexical means. Therefore, it can be claimed that compound inceptive tenses are included in Lithuanian grammars, they are observed in folklore, classics, however, the forms are not used in practice. Furthermore, facts indicate gradual decline in the use of compound inceptive forms in Lithuanian.

Compound Forms with Present Tense Passive Participles

The particularity of present tense is reflected in the compound forms (or the forms of syntactical origin) with the present tense passive participles. That means an action or a state coincides with the moment of speech or with any other moment. The past is expressed by the past simple or the past frequentative tense of the auxiliary verb, whereas, the

present tense of the passive participle means the concurrence of an action or a state and the tense of the auxiliary verb. Thus, the compound passive forms differ from the adequate simple forms in respect of voice but not tense. Consider:

mylėjo (active voice) // loved – buvo mylimas (passive voice) // was loved

suko (active voice) // turned – buvo sukamas (passive voice) // was turned

mušė (active voice) // beat – buvo mušamas (passive voice) // was beaten

Jablonskis notices and defines this distinction of Lithuanian from classical languages. He claims that passive voice is formed with passive participles in Lithuanian and that the passive voice cannot be made without those participles. According to Jablonskis, there are no simple verbs which can form the voice. He notes that passive participles cannot be replaced with simple passive verbs in the expressions like *medis buvo skeliamas, jo skeliamas, sveriamas, skeldinamas; tas vaikelis mūsų visų mylimas*. If we use simple verbs, he claims, for such expressions, we only employ verbs of active voice, thus, it is possible to say: *medį skėlė, medį jis skėlė, svėrė, skeldino; tą vaikelį mes visi mylim*. Moreover, Jablonskis notices that Latin sentence *liberi a parentibus educantur* (where *educantur* is a simple active verb) can be translated into Lithuanian as follows (active or passive): *vaikai (yra) tėvų auklėjami; vaikus tėvai auklėja* (Jablonskis, 1957, p.297).

Thus, Lithuanian possesses no simple passive tenses; obviously, English does not have them as well. The forms of passive voice are very strongly incorporated into the system of tenses in English.

Considering the status of voice in Lithuanian grammars, it is possible to draw a conclusion that voice is a morphological category since it is included into the chapter *Morphological Categories of Verbs*. However, the category of voice is defined as follows: the voice of verbs is distinguished according to relation of the action to the agent, which is expressed by the subject in a sentence (Ambrasas, 2005, p.317). Except it is syntax and not morphology. Morphological category of voice can be considered while comparing the forms of declension and the forms in agreement since they are composed with special formants (suffixes) which indicate voice distinction: active voice is formed with the suffixes – *nt-* and –*us-* (*dirba-nt-is, -i, dirb-us-i, dirb-usi-o*), passive voice is formed with the suffixes –*m-* and –*t-* (*dirb-a-m-as, -a, dirb-t-as, -a*).

If the voice is defined syntactically, there is the following opposition: all simple finite forms of the verb, active participles, compound inceptive and perfect tenses with active participles can be used in the active voice, e.g. *nešu, nešiau, nešdavau, nešiu; buvau/ būdavau/ būsiu benešąs; esu/ buvau/ būdavau/ būsiu nešęs; nešąs, nešęs, nešdavęs, nešiąs*. Passive participles and compound forms with passive participles can be used in the passive voice, e.g. *esu/buvau/būdavau, būsiu nešamas, neštas; nešamas, neštas* (Ambrasas, 2005, pp.317-318). The definition is not accurate, since it is mentioned that passive participles are used in the passive voice, however, active participles are not mentioned at all. Moreover, half-participles are not mentioned as well, although, the actions they express

² The age and origin of the authors varies: Šerelytė Renata, born in 1970 in the region of Kupiškis: 'Vardas tamsoje' (2004, p.204), Ivanauskaitė Jurga, born in 1961 in Vilnius: 'Placebas' (2003, p.386), Granauskas Romualdas, born in 1939 in Mažeikiai: 'Duburys' (2003, p.257), Aputis Juozas, born in 1936 in the region of Raseiniai: 'Smėlynuose negalima sustoti' (1996, p.277), Bubnys Vytautas, born in 1932 in the region of Prienai: 'Balandžio plastėjime' (2002, p.309).

are related to the subject. Half-participles are defined as special forms of active present tense participles which indicate a subordinate action performed by the same agent performing an action in the main clause (Ambrazas, 2005, p.361).

Voice is distinguished as a form of a verb indicating the relation between the participants in a narrated event (subject, object) and the event itself in the English language. Common distinctions of voice found in languages are those of active, passive, and middle voice. These distinctions may be made by inflection, as in Latin, or by syntactic variation, as in English (Shibatani, 1999, p.406; 2004, pp.1145-1148; Carter & McCarthy, 2006, p.929).

According to definitions of voice in all modern Lithuanian grammars, the morphological category of mood is based on foundation of the syntactical opposition. Maybe the aim was to 'defend' the compound constructions as tense forms in Lithuanian.

Considering expression of past in Lithuanian, it is logical to refer to Jablonskis again. He claims that there is no opposition of active and passive voice in the system of tenses. English, however, possesses equal forms of active and passive voice expressing past (*we built the house / the house was built*). Whereas, the forms of active and passive voice are not equal morphologically: the forms of active voice are simple and do not possess any special indicator of voice (*dirbo*), the forms of passive voice are syntactical constructions with the participle possessing the suffix which indicates the passive voice (*buvo dirb-a-m-as*) in Lithuanian.

The members of the opposition may be of equal value on the syntactical level (*buvo dirbęs – buvo dirbtas*); however, the passive construction in this case can possess only the participle of the past tense.

Thus, the grammatical 'picture' in the Lithuanian language is quite complicated here and it definitely differs from English. Theoretically, it is not possible to integrate the constructions into the system of conjugation paradigms of simple morphological tenses. Simple and compound forms could be included into the same general paradigm if only it was possible to reject the so called 'constricted morphologism' and understand the grammar more broadly, not identifying it with the morphology. Furthermore, the basis for more broad understanding of grammar is provided by analytic languages where a syntactic construction turns into a form of a word.

Syntactic constructions contact with morphological ones and occupy some medium position in Lithuanian; they are detached from absolutely free word combinations; however, they are not included into the paradigms of morphological forms. If they were included into the paradigms of conjugated forms, they would be opposite to the conjugated forms, but not synonymous; and only in some cases of neutralisation they could become synonymous. Thus, analytic constructions (called compound tenses and moods in Lithuanian grammars) are mainly synonymous with simple morphological forms possessing adequate meanings.

Compound Forms with Past Tense Active and Passive Participles

The relation of the past simple tense with compound forms (or constructions) with past tense active and passive participles is different than the relation with the constructions with present tense participles. It is necessary to refer to the principle of privative oppositions which was applied in morphology to create the theory of the paradigm of cases by Jakobson (the theory was not created only by Jakobson, however, it was generated during a linguistic discussion as Jakobson's conclusion (Якобсон, 1985). It states that two basic features are characteristic to grammatical paradigm:

1. there has to be one invariant meaning common to all members;
2. members of the paradigm have to distinguish each other on the basis of the common meaning (i.e. to be in the opposition) and only in some contexts or situations the opposite members of the paradigm may approach each other and become synonyms (the case of neutralization; Якобсон, 1985; Fanning, 1991, pp.52-57).

How to apply the principle of oppositions to the paradigm of forms expressing past? All modern Lithuanian grammars claim that compound forms with past participles belong to the general paradigm of tense forms since they have specific meanings of time. The forms (or syntactic constructions) are defined as the compound perfect tenses which are used to 'denote a state resulting from a previous action which is relevant at a certain moment in the present, past or future' (Ambrazas, 2005, p.300; 2006, p.248). There is common invariant meaning with the forms of the past simple tense; however, it is important to clarify if there is an opposition based on that meaning. Lithuanian compound forms of with the past participle possess two meanings of past tenses: the perfective and the plusquamperfective meaning. Though, it is reasonable to state that if the simple form of the past simple tense did not possess those meanings then the compound forms with the past tense participles would really be opposite to the simple forms and would be included into the same paradigm. However, the past simple tense possesses both the perfective and the plusquamperfective meaning (Ambrazas, 2005, pp.297-298).

Hence, the compound forms of the perfective and the plusquamperfective meaning cannot be in the opposition (based on those meanings) to the simple tense forms. They are synonymous with the simple forms and exist near the paradigm. Their only difference from the past simple tense forms is that the same construction can not obtain two meanings. The simple form of the past simple tense *gyvenau//lived* can have (1) the meaning of a fact which is isolated from the moment of speech (e.g. *Kadaise gyvenau geriau negu dabar //Before I lived better then now*) or (2) the meaning of a result (*Ir aš ten gyvenau (=esu gyvenęs, puikiai pažįstu šį kraštą) //I also have lived there (=I know the place)*). In English, however, there are two different tenses (the past simple tense (1) and the present perfect tense (2) which are opposite but not synonymous in their meanings. The past simple tense refers to an action in the past (past time is clearly separated from the moment of speaking) and the present perfect tense refers to an action which happened in

the past, however, the past time-frame is connected with the present as the result is relevant *now*.

It is logical to analyse the relation of Lithuanian simple past tense forms with the forms of analytic constructions in the context. Consider:

Aš nesuprantu, į ką jie atsigimė (=yra atsigimė). Visų vaikai kaip vaikai ir žmonės kaip žmonės, o pas mus vis kitaip.
(Vienuolis)

I have no idea who they take after! The children of all people are all like others and ours are like no one else's.

Viskas nutilo (=yra nutilė), viskas nurimo (=yra nurimė), vienos tik žvaigždės mirkčioja, dega.
(Maironis)

Everything around has become quiet and calm, only stars are twinkling and burning.

The synonyms in the examples above are essential part for the present tense situation where simple forms of the past simple tense are used synonymously with more or less free analytic constructions with auxiliary verbs and past participles.

– Turbūt pavargęs esi iš kelio? – O, be galo pavargau!
(Balčikonis)

'You must be tired from the journey'.

'Oh, yes, am very tired.'

Į amžiną tinginį pavirtai, pasileidęs (=esi) ant miego, ar tai prideda tokiam jaunam?
(Žemaitė)

You have become a real slob and sleepyhead. Does that become a young man?

The examples above have the equivalents of the present perfect and sometimes of the present simple tense in English. They are translated the same as the forms of the past simple tense with the perfective meaning. Moreover, it is claimed that compound forms are relatively rare in everyday usage, the simple past forms 'being the dominant item in the simple past stratum' in Lithuanian (Johanson, 2000, p.105).

Simple and compound forms of the past simple tense with the plusquamperfective meaning are used synonymously very similarly. However, a broader context is required to foreground the concurrence of the state resulting from the previous past action and the indicated moment in the past. Lithuanian grammars define the past simple tense with the plusquamperfective meaning as the tense the forms of which refer to the result related to some other past action or situation. Thus, the forms of the past simple tense with the plusquamperfective meaning often come together with other forms of past tenses (Ulvydas, 1971, pp.98-99).

Išdžiūvęs gomurys aitriai degė, galva sukosi. Nuo prakaito ji beveik apako (=buvo apakusi). Plušėjo kaip apdėjusi nieko aplink nebematydama.
(Baltušis)

Her dry throat was burning, her head was spinning. She had almost got blind from the sweat. She saw nothing around as she was working like dizzy.

Šeštadienio vakarą Petras, grįžęs su dėde namo, rado netikėtą svečių: atvažiavo (=buvo atvažiavęs) brolis.
(Putinas)

Saturday night Petras came home and found an unexpected guest as his brother Vincas had came.

Simple forms are used synonymously with the analytic forms in the texts above (the same as with the perfective meaning). Analytic forms change simple ones and vice versa, e.g.:

O ką čia taip šunys buvo užpuolė (=užpuolė)?
(Vienuolis)

Who had been attacked by the dogs?

Buvau manęs (=maniau) į gegužinę neiti, bet kad taip, tai būtinai eisiu.
(Binkis)

I had decided not to go to the festival, but then I decided I had to go.

In English the situation is less 'complicated'. There are perfect tenses with clear meanings and reference points. As it is possible to notice from the English equivalents of the examples above, the simple tense or the compound forms are translated into English according to their meanings, i.e. if it is a plusquamperfective meaning then the past perfect tense (which refers to the time-frame leading up to the point in the past or to 'the time up to then') is used.

Synonyms differ in meaning; however, the difference is not a direct opposition (in case one form can be replaced by some other form). Nevertheless, there are cases when the past simple tense cannot be replaced by an analytic form in Lithuanian. Analytic forms cannot be used instead of simple forms of the past simple tense when it refers to past which is not related to any specific time reference (the moment of speech, the present moment, the past moment, a past action etc.), when only past events with no resultative states are referred to.

Nulenkę žemai žemai žilą galvą, kaip ir slėpdamas nuo manęs savo veidą, padėkojo drebančiu balsu ir drebančiom rankom paėmė duoną, peržegnojo ją ir idėjo krepšin.
(Biliūnas)

The man bent his white-haired head extremely low as if hiding his face, thanked me with his trembling voice, took bread with his shaking hands, made the sign of the cross on it and put it away in his sack.

Aplinkui dar tebuvo naktis, bet rytų pusėje blyško ir raudo dangus.
(Biliūnas)

The night was still all around, only the sky was getting pale and red in the east.

Plačios smailaviršūnės eglės atsargiai laikė ant savo palinkusių garbanotų šakų minkštas sniego gniūžtes.
(Putinas)

Wide high firs with spiky tops were cautiously bearing soft snow wisps on their leaning wavy branches.

Bėgiojo viena pas kitą, šnibždėjos, stovinėjo pavartėse, priemenių duryse, prie šulinių ir narstė jaunosios Pečiūrienės kaulelius.
(Vienuolis)

They were all running one after other, whispering and standing at the gates, doors, wells and all were gossiping about Pečiūrienė.

As it has already been mentioned, the examples with the forms of the past simple tense above possess the meaning of the past tense with no relation to the present or any other

moment. Those are the examples referring to the past actions which took place in the past with no time reference, they are used to tell about past, to express successive past actions etc. English employs the past simple tense to tell about past events with no reference to present or successive past actions. Also, if it is important to emphasize the duration of the action, the past continuous tense is used. Thus, the examples above are translated as past simple and past continuous tense in English.

However, analytic narrative forms with resultative qualitative meaning are not usually replaced by simple forms. Consider:

– *O man iš tiesų negera mintis buvo galvon atėjusi, - tariau seneliui.*

(Biliūnas)

'I have had a bad thought' I said to my grandpa.

Po insulto kurį laiką jis buvo viską užmiršęs, dabar pamažu pradeda atsiminti.

He has lost his memory after the stroke. Now he is getting it back.

Moreover, even in such cases the synonymy with simple forms is possible. Consider:

Nors toliau nuo miestelio nebuvo nuėjęs (=nenuėjo), o apie pasaulio ir žmonių reikalus nedaug teišmanė, tačiau žodžiai laisvė ir lygybė jam buvo suprantami ir brangūs.

(Biliūnas)

Even though he hadn't seen the world, such words as freedom and equality were valued and well understood to him.

Lithuanian analytic forms have the equivalents of analytic perfect tenses in English. The past perfect tense is used when the results of the action are related to some past situation, time or action, and the present perfect tense is used when the results of the past action are related to the present.

If the resultative meaning of analytic constructions is strong, the participle becomes adjectival and the verbal meaning of the construction disappears. Consider:

Kai mes nuėjome lankyti, ligonis jau buvo miręs (=negyvas).

When we came on a visit the patient had died.

Analytic forms of the past frequentative tense sometimes can be replaced with the simple forms; however, some stylistic damage is observed. Consider:

Juk mama Barbikę taip pat visada nurengdavo, kai jinai būdavo sušlapusi (=sušlapdavo), ir paguldėdavo į lovą.

(Simonaitytė)

Every time Barbikė got wet, Mom used to undress and put her into bed.

English employs the same equivalent (*used to*) to convey the meaning of the simple form of the past frequentative tense. Thus, English does not distinguish between simple or compound forms in Lithuanian.

Sometimes analytic forms of the past frequentative tense cannot be replaced by simple ones. Consider:

Lyg mažutę savanoris Moniką tuojau sodindavo ant kelių, įdėdavo į rankas cukrainį ar šiaip niekutį, o jeigu ji būdavo atsigulusi – išplėšdavo iš lovos.

(Cvirka)

The volunteer used to put Monika in his lap, give her a sweet or a trinket; and if she had gone to bed, he would wake her up and snatch her away from it.

The analytic form of the past frequentative tense above has the equivalent of the past perfect in English which is used to refer to past actions or situations that occurred before a particular time in the past.

Lithuanian grammars claim that sometimes simple forms of the past frequentative tense possess the meaning of compound forms of the past frequentative tense (Ulvydas, 1971, p.158), e.g.

Užtat vidurvasarį, kada aptirpdavo (=būdavo aptirpęs) žemesniųjų kalnų sniegas ir nuslūgdavo (=būdavo nuslūgęs) ledynų upeliai, vienuolyną aplankydavo daugybė žmonių ir sunešdavo daug pinigų ir maisto.

(Vienuolis)

In summer, when the snow of smaller mountains used to melt away and the streams of glaciers used to run low, many people would visit the monastery and bring much money and food.

As it is seen from the examples above, English employs the same means to convey repeated actions in the past no matter if they are expressed by simple or compound forms of the past frequentative tense in Lithuanian (*used to* in this particular case which is referred to past repetitive actions).

English equivalents demonstrate that compound forms of the past frequentative tense may refer to two distinct meanings although the form of expression is the same: when synonymous to the forms of the past frequentative tense they possess the equivalent of the past frequentative tense in English (*used to*); meanwhile, when they cannot be replaced by the forms of the past frequentative tense they obtain the meaning of pluperfect and the equivalent is the past perfect tense in English.

Since the forms of simple and analytic past tenses are often synonymous in Lithuanian, the paradigmatic relation between analytic constructions and simple forms is quite tenuous. Thus, it is reasonable to state that simple forms are in opposition with analytic forms only in the cases when simple forms possess some specific meanings which cannot be conveyed by analytic forms.

There is only voice distinction between the analytic tense forms with passive participles and the forms with active participles. Consider:

Šitie jo bruožai yra paveldėti iš tėvo. // Šiuos bruožus jis yra paveldėjęs / paveldėjo iš tėvo.

These features have been inherited from his father. // He has inherited these features from his father.

The translation to English demonstrates that there is distinction in voice but not tense as well. Using a form of a verb gives us the option of not mentioning the person (or thing) responsible for the action (the agent of the action). This is applicable both to English and Lithuanian. Sometimes it is simply impossible to use active voice since the agent of the action cannot be indicated as it is unknown (*He's almost certainly been murdered*); or it is not important who or what the agent is (*I had been told that it would be perefily*

quiet.); or it is obvious who or what it is (*More people have been treated in hospital this year than at any time since the start of the Health Service.*) etc. (Sinclair, 1990, p.404).

A more thorough analysis of passive analytic constructions would lead the researcher from the study of tense expression into the analysis of the category of voice, into its purpose to depersonalize the statement, to eliminate the agent or to make it less defined. When the agent is not well-defined but implied, the analytic passive voice form may be replaced by the simple one in an undefined personal sentence in Lithuanian. Consider:

Ta byla buvo svarstyta ir Strasbūre// Tą bylą svarstė ir Strasbūre.

The case was also argued in Strasbourg.

In English when the agent is unknown the passive voice is always employed. Thus, there is only one way to express such depersonalized statements in English. Thus, there is no tense but only voice distinction in the opposition of active/passive voice in English.

Conclusions

Lithuanian analytic forms differ from the corresponding English tenses in respect of free order of the components: in English only an adverb can be inserted between the auxiliary verb and the participle; the auxiliary verb cannot follow the participle; there can be only one negative in the sentence; thus, the auxiliary verb and the participle cannot be negated at the same time; the auxiliary verb cannot connect the participle and the adjective at the same time. However, a relatively free word order in Lithuanian enables to perform all the referred actions with Lithuanian analytic constructions. Moreover, Lithuanian analytic forms are less grammaticalized than English compound tenses.

The contrastive analysis of Lithuanian and English demonstrates that Lithuanian compound constructions are synonymous with simple tenses. Lithuanian analytic constructions with active present tense participles are synonymous to the simple tense forms. The difference between analytic constructions and simple tense forms indicates the distinction in modality but not in tense; moreover, they possess one and the same equivalent in English. Therefore, regular synonymy with the simple forms and the influence of neighbouring languages may be the most significant factor for the decline of the forms.

Analytic forms of past tenses with past participles supplement simple forms similarly as prepositional constructions complement the paradigm of case in Lithuanian: performing additional functions they approach the paradigm of simple tenses differently. Analytic forms which are in opposition to simple ones and, thus, do not relate synonymously, and which cannot be replaced by simple forms (unless there is a change in meaning and the destruction of the sentence) are closest to the paradigm of simple tenses. The analytic form expressing an action of a distant past which took place before some other indicated past action cannot be replaced by a simple form. The past perfect tense is used to refer to past actions which occur before a particular time in the past, thus, it is the equivalent of those forms in English.

Analytic (or compound) forms (especially of perfective meaning) are synonymous with the forms of the past simple tense in all other cases. English, however, does not distinguish between Lithuanian simple and compound forms and, thus, the both forms have one equivalent, the present perfect tense (which is used to refer to actions of perfective meaning), in English.

References

1. Akhmanova, O. et al., 1972. *Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics*. Moscow: MGU.
2. Ambrazas, V., 1979. *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė*. Vilnius: Mokslo.
3. Ambrazas, V. red., 2005. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
4. Ambrazas, V. ed., 2006. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
5. Carter, R. & McCarthy, M., 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Fanning, B. M., 1991. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
7. Guillaume, G., 1973. *Langage et science du langage*. Paris: Librairie A.-G. Nizet, Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
8. Girdenis, A., Žulys, V., 1973. Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, 1-2 tomai. Recenzija. *Baltistica*, 9 (2). Vilnius: Mintis, pp.203-214.
9. Heidolph, K. E., Flämig, W. & Motsch, W., 1981. *Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
10. Hawkins, J., 1986. *A Comparative Typology of English and German: Unifying the Contrasts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Jablonskis, J., 1957. *Rinkiniai raštai*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
12. Johanson, L., 2000. Viewpoint Operators in European Languages. In: Ö. Dahl, ed. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp.27-188.
13. Lado, R., 1976. *Linguistics across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
14. Shibatani, M., 1999. Voice. In: K. Brown, ed. *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp.406-412.
15. Shibatani, M., 2004. Voice. In: G. E. Booij, Ch. Lehmann, J. Mugdan eds. *Morphologie: ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung : Morphology. An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, Vol. 2. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp.1145-1165.
16. Sinclair, J., 1990. *Collins Cobuild English Grammar*. London and Glasgow: Collins.
17. Sirtautas, V., 1968. *Veiksmažodinis tarinys dabartinėje lietuvių literatūrinėje kalboje* (doctoral thesis). Šiauliai: s.n.
18. Slizienė, N., 1961. Apie sudurtines pridėtines veiksmažodžių formas. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*, nr. IV. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, pp.67-73.
19. Slizienė, N., 1964. Apie sudurtines atliktines veiksmažodžio laikų ir nuosakų formas lietuvių literatūrinėje kalboje. *Lietuvių kalbos morfologinė sandara ir jos raida. Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, pp.81-95.
20. Slizienė, N., 1969. Sudurtinių atliktinių veiksmažodžio laikų reikšmės ir vartojimas. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos tyrinėjimai*, nr. XI. Vilnius: Mintis, pp.17-38.
21. Ulvydas, K. red., 1971. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, 2. Vilnius: Mintis.
22. Žulys V., 1979. Analitinė (sudurtinė) forma metateoriniu atžvilgiu *Aktualiosios kalbotyros problemos. Mokslinės konferencijos pakvietimas – programa ir tezės*. 1979 m. kovo 28–29d. Vilnius: s.n.
23. Амбразас, В. ред., 1985. *Грамматика литовского языка*. Вильнюс: Мокслас.
24. Серебренников, Б. А., 1965. К вопросу о "морфологизме". *Аналитические конструкции в языках различных типов*. Москва: Ленинград: Наука, сс.100-104.

25. Жирмунский, В. М., 1961. О границах слова. *Вопросы языкознания*, 3. Москва: Наука.
26. Жирмунский, В. М., 1965. Об аналитических конструкциях. *Аналитические конструкции в языках различных типов*. Москва: Ленинград: Наука, сс.5-57.
27. Жирмунский, В. М., 1976. Общее и германское языкознание. *Избранные труды*. Москва: Наука, pp.82-125.
28. Якобсон, Р. О., 1985. *Избранные работы*. Москва: Прогресс.

Saulė Petronienė

Lietuvių kalbos būtyjų sudėtinių laikų statusas ir atitikmenys anglų kalboje

Summary

Lietuvių kalbotyroje daug diskutuota dėl sudėtinių konstrukcijų su dalyviais statuso: ar tai žodžių junginiai (sudurtiniai tariniai), ar asmenuojamosios veiksmažodžio formos (vientisiniai tariniai), ar kažkoks tarpinis reiškinys tarp vientisinio ir sudurtinio tarinio. Šios konstrukcijos su dalyviais vadintos *sudurtiniais pridėtiniais* ir *sudurtiniais atliktiniais laikais ir nuosakomis*. Dabartinėse lietuvių kalbos gramatikose turime sudėtinius laikus su veikiamaisiais ir neveikiamaisiais esamojo ir būtojo laiko dalyviais. Straipsnyje mėginama nustatyti jų santykius su atitinkamomis asmenuojamomis formomis. Ypač daug XX a. antrojoje pusėje diskutuota dėl lietuvių kalbos analitinio tarinio statuso ir santykio su asmenuojamosiomis veiksmažodžio formomis: akademinės lietuvių kalbos gramatikos laikosi nuomonės, kad analitiniai laikai priklauso bendrai laikų paradigmam, gramatikų recenzentai teigia, kad tai laisvieji žodžių junginiai. Taip pat teigiama, kad analitinės laikų formos užima tarpinę vietą tarp vientisinių laikų ir sudurtinio tarinio. Straipsnyje bandoma įrodyti, kad analitinės konstrukcijos lietuvių kalboje yra ne bendros morfologinės laiko kategorijos nariai, bet labai artimos, sinoniminės ir padeda išreikšti įvairius papildomus minties niuansus. Ieškojimas atitikmenų anglų kalboje padeda geriau nustatyti analitinių konstrukcijų reikšmes ir gramatiškumą.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2009 11

Parengtas spaudai 2009 11

About the author

Saulė Petronienė, Dr., Lecturer, Kaunas University of Technology, Faculty of Humanities, Centre of Foreign Languages.

Research interests: translation studies, linguistics.

Address: Kaunas University of Technology, Faculty of Humanities, Centre of Foreign Languages, Gedimino Str. 43, LT-44240 Kaunas, Lithuania

E-mail: saule.petroniene@ktu.lt

DOI: 10.5755/j01.sal.1.15.43342