

# PARTICIPIAL COMPLEMENTATION IN LITHUANIAN

*Peter M. Arkadiev (Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow)*

## 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

This paper deals with a type of complement clauses attested in Lithuanian, a Baltic language, illustrated in examples (1a) and (1b) from Ambrazas (1997: 367), which involves multifunctional non-finite forms traditionally called ‘participles’.

- (1) a. *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.’
- b. *Tėv-as*      *sak-ė(-si)*      *gerai*      *gyven-q-s*.  
father-NOM.SG say-PST(3)(-RFL) well live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M  
‘Father said he lived well.’

The complementation patterns shown in (1) have been extensively studied from a diachronic point of view (cf. Tangl 1928/1999, and especially Ambrazas 1979 [in Lithuanian] and Ambrazas 1990 [in Russian with a German summary]). Beyond Lithuanian, they are also attested in Latvian (cf. Eiche 1983), and have been documented for early stages of many Indo-European languages (see Ambrazas 1990 for an overview, and Cristofaro [this volume] for a discussion of similar constructions in Ancient Greek). However, from a purely synchronic point of view these constructions present a number of interesting problems which still remain unsolved. The only recent relevant study of them I am aware of, i.e. Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001) — probably the only survey of the rich system of sentential complementation in Lithuanian formulated in contemporary syntactic terms — does not discuss the participial constructions in sufficient detail, though contains many insightful remarks. Another recent study, Giparaitė (2008), presents a discussion of the small clause construction in Lithuanian, but does not extend the analysis to participial complements.

There are several reasons why Lithuanian participial constructions are, in my view, significant for the typology and theory of non-finite complementation. First of all, there is a virtually unconstrained compatibility of participial complements with different types of predi-

cates allowing clausal arguments, including ones which take such arguments only rarely. Second, Lithuanian participial complements, being undoubtedly non-finite, show many properties of full-fledged clauses, such as tense inflection and sensitivity to information structural properties. Third, a detailed investigation of the type of construction illustrated in (1a) may shed new light on some issues of argument-sharing and such widely discussed phenomena as ‘raising’ and ‘exceptional case marking’ (ECM). Finally, the contrast between (1a), where the participle is stripped of its agreement morphology, and (1b), where it agrees with the matrix subject in gender, number and case, suggests a possibly non-trivial connection between co-reference of arguments between the two clauses on the one hand, and morphosyntactic features such as case and agreement, on the other.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, I will provide a brief description of the morphology and distribution of Lithuanian participles. In Section 3, a general overview of the participial complement constructions found in Lithuanian will be given. In Sections 4 and 5, the (morpho)syntactic properties of the two major types of participial constructions illustrated in (1a) and (1b) will be discussed in more detail. The discussion will be cast in mildly generative terms, though I believe that an accurate, theoretically informed analysis of the data could just as well be given in any other reasonable theoretical framework.

The data used in this paper comes from three main types of source: (i) published sources such as articles and monographs; (ii) native speakers (see Note 1); and (iii) internet resources, in particular the Corpora of Contemporary Lithuanian compiled at Kaunas University (*Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstynas* <http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/>; examples taken from these corpora are indicated by “LKT”).

## **2. Lithuanian participles: An overview**

Lithuanian participles are highly polyfunctional non-finite verbal forms combining adjectival agreement morphology with inflection for tense and voice. In this section, I will outline the morphosyntactic properties of Lithuanian participles and exemplify their most important uses, without, however, going into too much detail. For a general overview of Lithuanian participles see, *inter alia*, Ambrazas (1997: 326–371), Ambrazas 1990, and Klimas 1987.

The system of participles found in Lithuanian is very rich in comparison to other modern European languages, and resembles that of Ancient Greek. The major morphosyntactic division is the one between Active and Passive participles, the latter being typologically peculiar in some respects (the problem of the so-called ‘impersonal passive’ in Lithuanian has been widely discussed in the literature, see e.g. Timberlake 1982, Nuñez 1994, Wiemer 2004, 2006a, Lavine 2006, Holvoet 2007: 96–104). The Active participles distinguish all of the four synthetic tenses of Lithuanian (see Ambrazas 1997: 237–254; cf. also Sližienė 1994 and Mathiasen 1996 on the Lithuanian tense system), i.e. Present, Simple Past, Habitual Past, and Future. The participial suffixes are normally added to the respective tense inflections. The Passive participle lacks the Habitual Past form, and its Simple Past form is based on the Infinitive stem rather than on the Simple Past stem.

Passive participles obligatorily exhibit agreement features indicating values for number, gender and case. They also have a special ‘Neuter’ form (segmentally identical to but prosodically distinct from, the Feminine Nominative Singular), which occurs when no suitable agreement controller is available. Active participles distinguish between a Neuter form (now homophonous with the Masculine Nominative Plural) and a ‘non-agreeing’ form, traditionally (though somewhat misleadingly) called ‘Gerund’. The non-agreeing participles consist of a plain participial stem stripped of any agreement inflection, and are associated with special syntactic functions (see below). Finally, the Masculine Nominative Singular and Plural forms of the Active participles are morphologically irregular; in particular, the otherwise clearly distinguishable boundary between the stem and the participial suffix is blurred in these forms.

Table 1 presents the paradigm of the participial forms for the transitive verb *gerti* ‘drink’; for the agreeing participles, only Masculine and Feminine Nominative Singular forms are given.

Table 1. The paradigm of participles in Lithuanian

<i>gerti</i> ‘drink’	Active		Passive
	Agreeing	Non-agreeing	
<b>Present</b>	<i>gerias</i> (m), <i>gerianti</i> (f)	<i>geriant</i>	<i>geriamas, geriamą</i>
<b>Preterite</b>	<i>gėręs</i> (m), <i>gėrusi</i> (f)	<i>gėrus</i>	<i>gertas, gerta</i>
<b>Habitual Past</b>	<i>gėdavęs</i> (m), <i>gėdavusi</i> (f)	<i>gėdavus</i>	—
<b>Future</b>	<i>gersias</i> (m), <i>gersianti</i> (f)	<i>gersiant</i>	<i>gersimas, gersima</i>

Let us now turn to the uses of Lithuanian participles. Both Active and Passive participles may occur in an attributive function as heads of non-finite relative clauses, cf. (2) and (3). Note that, according to Ambrazas (1990: 72), this use is not the most frequent one.

- (2) ... *dėkoj-u* [*skaiči-us-iems* *įvad-o* *tekst-q*] *istorik-ams...*  
 thank-PRS.1SG read-PST.PA-DAT.PL.M preface-GEN.SG text-ACC.SG historian-DAT.PL  
 ‘... I thank the historians who have read the text of the preface’ (LKT)
- (3) [*valstyb-ės* *vard-u* *skelbi-a-m-uose*] *konkurs-uose*  
 state-GEN.SG name-INS.SG announced-PRS-PP-LOC.PL.M competition-LOC.PL  
 ‘in competitions held under the state’s patronage’ (LKT)

Both Active and Passive participles are used in various periphrastic constructions formed with the auxiliary verb *būti* ‘be’, among them the Passive voice, cf. (4a,b), the Perfect-Resultative, cf. (5a,b) (see also Geniušienė and Nedjalkov 1988), and a special Avertive form (called ‘thwarted inceptive’ by Mathiassen 1996: 9), which expresses a situation that was imminent but did not actually occur. These forms are characterised by obligatory prefixation of *be-* (a polyfunctional prefix here glossed ‘Continuative’, see Arkadiev 2009a) to the participle, cf. (6).

- (4) a. *Nam-as* *buv-o* *pa-staty-t-as* *praeit-ais* *met-ais*.  
 house-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) PRV-build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M past-INS.PL.M year-INS.PL  
 ‘The house was built last year.’ (Wiemer 2006a: 277)
- b. *Nam-as* *yra* *stat-o-m-as* *jau* *dvej-us* *met-us*.  
 house-NOM.SG AUX.PRS(3) build-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M already two-ACC.PL year-ACC.PL  
 ‘The house has been being built already for two years.’ (Wiemer 2006a: 277)
- (5) a. *J-is* *yra* *šiltai* *ap-si-reng-es*.  
 he-NOM.SG.M AUX.PRS(3) warmly PRV-RFL-dress-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M  
 ‘He has/is dressed himself warmly.’ (Geniušienė and Nedjalkov 1988: 370)

- b. *J-is buv-o šiltai ap-si-reng-es.*  
 he-NOM.SG.M AUX-PST(3) warmly PRV-RFL-dress-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M  
 ‘He had/was dressed warmly.’ (Geniušienė and Nedjalkov 1988: 370)
- (6) *Ne kart-q buv-o visk-q be-met-a-nt-i ir*  
 not time-ACC.SG AUX-PST(3) everything-ACC.SG CNT-throw-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F and  
*be-leki-a-nt-i galvotrūkčiais namo.*  
 CNT-fly-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F main home  
 ‘At times she even was on the verge of abandoning everything and fleeing home at  
 breakneck speed.’ (LKT)

In both attributive and periphrastic contexts only agreeing participles are allowed.

Participles frequently appear in a so-called ‘semipredicative’ function, serving as heads of tensed non-finite subordinate clauses. This function is characteristic of agreeing as well as non-agreeing Active participles, but Passive participles may also be used in the relevant contexts. There are two types of ‘semipredicative’ participial construction: The first type, where the participle heads a sentential complement of a verb of speech, perception or cognition, cf. (1) above, is the main focus of this study. The second type is constituted by participial adverbial clauses (for a recent analysis see Greenberg and Lavine 2006). In both types of ‘semipredicative’ construction, the presence vs. absence of agreement morphology on the participle essentially functions as a reference tracking device not too different from switch-reference (cf. Fedden this volume). Agreeing participles are used if their subject (which is obligatorily implicit) is identical to the Nominative subject of the main clause (thus, agreeing ‘semipredicative’ participles may appear in the Nominative case only, the other categories such as number and gender being determined by the matrix subject); by contrast, non-agreeing participles generally signal that the subject of the embedded clause is different from that of the matrix clause. In the latter case, the overt embedded subject carries Accusative case in complement constructions, cf. (1a), (7a), and Dative case in adverbial constructions, cf. (7b).

- (7) a. *Išėj-us-i iš mišk-o, j-i 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.’ (Ambrazas 1997: 362)
- b. *Vaik-ams sugriž-us, pra.gyd-o lakštingal-a.*  
 child-DAT.PL return-PST.PA start.singing-PST(3) nightingale-NOM.SG  
 ‘When the children came back, a nightingale burst into singing.’ (Ambrazas 1997: 363)

Finally, agreeing participles in both Active and Passive voice (including the so called ‘Neuter’ participles) may function as main predicates of independent clauses with evidential meaning, which cannot be expressed by verb forms with the ordinary ‘finite’ person-number inflection (see Litwinov 1989, Gronemeyer 1997, Wiemer 1998, 2006b, Holvoet 2001, 2007: Ch. 4, 5; Lavine 2006). This is illustrated in (8) with Active participles in the narrative evidential function and in (9) with an ‘impersonal’ Passive participle in the inferential function (note that the subject of the Passive has Genitive case).

- (8) *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...*  
 leave-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F twelve son-GEN.PL  
 ‘The wife of a lord died and left twelve sons...’ (Ambrazas 1997: 265)

- (9) *Ten      šun-s          bėg-t-a.*  
 there dog-GEN.SG run-PST.PP-N  
 ‘A dog has evidently run there.’ (Ambrazas 1997: 283)

There is also a number of other participial constructions, which are, however, rarely used in contemporary standard Lithuanian.

Whether and in what way the functions of Lithuanian participles outlined above are related to each other synchronically and diachronically is an open question; see Ambrazas (1990) for general discussion, and Wiemer (1998) and Holvoet (2007: Ch. 5) specifically on the rise of the evidential participles, as well as Greenberg and Lavine (2006) on adverbial participles. This issue, however, goes beyond the scope of the present study. In the next section, I will provide a general outline of the participial complement constructions available in Lithuanian, taking into account the distinction between agreeing and non-agreeing Active participles in Lithuanian more generally (see above on the ‘semipredicative’ participles).

### 3. Participial complements: General properties

In this section I will discuss the most important characteristics shared by both types of Lithuanian participial complement clause, viz. the one with an agreeing participle (same subject) and that with a non-agreeing participle (different subject). These properties include the

range of predicates allowing participial complements and the internal syntactic structure of the complement.

### 3.1. Types of matrix predicates

Participial complements in Lithuanian co-occur with a wide range of verbs, and it is likely that the relevant class of predicates is open. Even though, from a purely statistical point of view, the majority of participial complements occurs with a more or less limited set of verbs denoting perception, speech and cognition (see below), it is often possible to find predicates which, strictly speaking, lie outside of these classes, but may nonetheless occasionally take participial complements in suitable contexts. Let us consider two such examples. In (10), taken from a literary rendition of a well-known Baltic folk-tale, the verb of sound-emission *kukuoti* ‘to cuckoo’ is reinterpreted as denoting a speech act and takes a participial complement expressing the information transmitted to the addressee. In (11), the verb *pagauti* ‘to catch’ is metaphorically used in the sense of ‘discovering that someone has done something wrong’, and the participial complement specifies the misdeed.

- (10) ... *gegut-ė*            *j-iems*            ***kukuoj-a***            *netikr-q*            *nuotak-q*  
 cuckoo-NOM.SG he-DAT.PL.M cuckoo-PRS3 fake-ACC.SG bride-ACC.SG  
***be-vež-a-nt...***  
 CNT-carry-PRS-PA  
 ‘... the cuckoo is saying (lit. cuckooing) them that [they] are carrying a fake bride’.  
 (<http://www1.omnitel.net/sakmes/frames.html>)

- (11) *J-ie*                    *tikėj-o-si,*            *kad*    *galė-s*            ***pagau-ti***    *prezident-q*  
 he-NOM.PL.M hope-PST-RFL that can-FUT(3) catch-INF president-ACC.SG  
*Reagan-q*            ***meluoj-a-nt*** *ir*    ***lauž-a-nt***            *kongres-o*            *įsakym-us.*  
 Reagan.-ACC.SG lie-PRS-PA and break-PRS-PA congress-GEN.SG direction-ACC.PL  
 ‘They hoped that they would be able to catch President Reagan at lying and going  
 against the directions of the Congress.’ (LKT)

Even though examples like (10) and (11) are not very frequent, they certainly reveal the productivity of participial complements in Lithuanian. The majority of verbs taking participial complements fall into three main classes.

1. Verbs of perception: *matyti* ‘see’, *girdėti* ‘hear’ and *jausti* ‘feel’; this class is not very large, and in addition to the three mentioned verbs comprises several near synonyms of them.

2. Verbs of communication: *sakyti* ‘say’, *teigti* ‘assert’, *neigti* ‘deny’, *skelbti* ‘claim’, *rašyti* ‘write’, *vaizduoti* ‘depict’, *skųstis* ‘complain’, *grasinti* ‘threaten’, among several others.

3. Verbs of cognition, e.g. *manyti* ‘think, believe’, *tikėti* ‘believe’, *tikėtis* ‘hope’, *žinoti* ‘know’, *įtarti* ‘suspect’, *vaizduotis* ‘imagine’, *suprasti* ‘understand’, among others.

The range of semantic classes of verbs taking participial complements in Lithuanian is quite natural from a cross-linguistic point of view (cf. Cristofaro 2003, Dixon 2006: 10, Serdobolskaya 2009). However, two remarks are in order with respect to the use of participial complement constructions. First, it is necessary to bear in mind that participial complement clauses are not the only means of expressing the dependent proposition with such verbs, and not even the default one. The most common way of coding subordinate complement clauses in Lithuanian is by using of finite indicative or subjunctive clause introduced by one of the nearly synonymous complementisers *kad* and *jog* ‘that’ (cf. Gronemeyer and Usonienė 2001). The use of these complementisers is illustrated in (12).

- (12) *J-is*                      *vis-q*                      *laik-q*                      *kalbėj-o,*                      ***kad*** *gaila,*  
 he-NOM.SG.M    all-ACC.SG    time-ACC.SG    talk-PST(3)    that    pity  
***jog***    *ab-u*                      *sūn-ūs*                      *išvyk-ę.*  
 that    both-NOM.PL.M    son-NOM.PL    leave-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M  
 ‘He said all the time that it was a pity that both his sons were away.’ (Ambrasas (ed.) 1997: 726)

The question of what factors determine the choice between finite and participial complements will not be addressed in this paper, as it deserves a study of its own (cf. Župerka 1969).<sup>2</sup> However, it is worth mentioning that participial complements are apparently more restricted with respect to their possible heads than *kad*-clauses; for example, participial complements do not seem to occur with non-verbal heads such as *gaila* ‘pity’.<sup>3</sup>

Second, as my data show, participial complements are particularly favoured by those verbs which do not impose restrictions on the temporal reference of the subordinate proposition. This is not surprising, considering that Lithuanian participles, as mentioned in Section 2,



inflect for tense (see examples below). Those verbs whose semantics requires a particular temporal interpretation of the subordinate clause, such as verbs of volition (e.g. *norėti* ‘to want’), manipulation (e.g. *prašyti* ‘ask, request’, *liepti* ‘order’), and phasal verbs (e.g. *pradėti* ‘begin’), usually take a tenseless infinitive instead of participles.<sup>4</sup>

Of particular interest in this respect is the behaviour of verbs of perception. According to Cristofaro (2003: 111), these verbs require that the event described in the embedded clause be simultaneous with the act of perception. However, as I have already mentioned, verbs of perception figure in the set of predicates allowing participial complements in Lithuanian. Moreover, as is claimed by Ambrazas (1990: 146–147), it is with perception verbs that the participial complementation strategy has started to spread across different verb types in the history of the Baltic languages. Last but not least, contrary to the expectation suggested by Cristofaro (2003), these verbs allow the participle to express various temporal relations, cf. (13), where the event expressed by the embedded clause precedes the act of perception.

- (13) ... *girdėj-o*      *t-q*              *turėj-us*      *nemalonum-ų*.  
 hear-PST(3)      that-ACC.SG      have-PST.PA      trouble-GEN.PL  
 ‘... he heard that that [person] had had troubles.’ (LKT)

What is at stake here is evidently the distinction between (i) direct perception, which indeed requires simultaneity of the perceived event and the act of perception, and (ii) indirect perception (e.g. hearsay), as in (13), which imposes no such restrictions (cf. Usonienė 2001). It is worth noting in this connection that Present participles expressing simultaneity of the subordinate and the main events are compatible with both types of perception. Compare (14) and (15).

- (14) *Vaikyst-ėje*              *j-is*              *girdėj-o*              *senel-es*              *kalb-a-nt*  
 childhood-LOC.SG      he-NOM.SG.M      hear-PST(3)      old.lady-ACC.PL      speak-PRS-PA  
*tik*      *lietuviškai*.  
 only      Lithuanian  
 ‘In his childhood he heard old ladies speak only Lithuanian.’ (LKT)

- (15) *Aleksandr-as*      *pasiek-ė*      *Vengrij-q* ...      *kur*      *girdėj-o*  
 A.-NOM.SG      reach-PST(3)      Hungary-ACC.SG      where      hear-PST(3)  
*es-a-nt*      *tėv-q*.  
 be-PRS-PA      father-ACC.SG  
 ‘Alexander reached Hungary, where, he heard, [then] was his father.’ (LKT)

Most verbs allowing participial complements take both same subject and different subject complements, e.g. *sakyti* ‘say’ in (1) above, with the exception of a handful of verbs which combine only with a same-subject complement, e.g. *dėtis* ‘to pretend’. Interestingly, I could not find verbs allowing only the different subject participial complement; even such verbs as *matyti* ‘see’ allow same subject complements, as in (16).

- (16) *Mač-ia-u*      *veidrod-yje*      *es-qs*      *ne-si-skut-ės.*  
 see-PST-1SG      mirror-LOC.SG      be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M      NEG-RFL-shave-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M  
 ‘I saw in the mirror that I was unshaven.’

### 3.2 Syntactic properties of participial complements

The fact that participial complements are usually not subject to restrictions on argument (non)identity imposed by the relevant matrix predicates is in line with the observation made above concerning a similar lack of restrictions on the temporal reference of the embedded proposition. This implies that participial complements exhibit a relatively high degree of semantic independence with respect to the main verb (cf. Cristofaro 2003: 251–254), and it raises the question of whether there are concomitant signs of a certain degree of syntactic autonomy, too. As it turns out, Lithuanian participial complements have some properties pointing towards a low degree of structural reduction or ‘deranking’ (cf. e.g. Givón 1980, Lehmann 1988 and Cristofaro 2003 on general issues pertaining to clausal reduction).

As has been mentioned, Lithuanian participles have full-fledged tense inflections, and it is precisely their ‘semipredicative’ usage (see Section 2) which exhibits the largest range of Tense distinctions.<sup>5</sup> Consider the examples of both agreeing (same subject) and non-agreeing (different subject) participial complements in various tenses given below: Simple Past, cf. (17) and (18), Habitual Past, cf. (19) and (20), Future, cf. (21) and (22). Examples of Present participles were already given above, see e.g. (15) and (16). Normally, the tense form in the embedded clause is interpreted relative to the tense of the matrix clause.

- (17) *T-uo*      *met-u*      *sak-o-si*      *dirb-ės*      *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>

- (18) [*J-i*]                    *prisimin-ė*                    *j-į*                    *buvo-us*                    *labdarinę-q*  
 she-NOM.SG.F   remember-PST(3)   he-ACC.SG.M   be-PST.PA   charitable-ACC.SG.M  
*ir*                    *malon-ą.*  
 and                    nice-ACC.SG.M  
 ‘She remembered him to have been nice and charitable.’  
 (<http://www.druskonis.lt/archyvai/2001-02-23/kultura.htm>)
- (19) *Vaikin-as*                    *pasakoj-o*                    *ei-dav-ęs*                    *su*                    *išties-t-a*  
 lad-NOM.SG   tell-PST(3)   go-HAB-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   with   extend-PST.PP-INS.SG.F  
*rank-a*                    *ir*                    *prašy-dav-ęs*                    *pinig-ų.*  
 hand-INS.SG   and   ask-HAB-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   money-GEN.PL  
 ‘The lad told that he used to go cap in hand and beg money.’ (LKT)
- (20) ... *skatin-a*                    *many-ti*                    *j-q*                    *dažnai bū-dav-us*                    *susierzin-usi-q*                    ...  
 induce-PRS(3)   think-INF   she-ACC.SG.F   often   be-HAB-PST.PA   irritate-PST.PA-ACC.SG.F  
 ‘[this] induces one to believe her to have often been irritated...’  
 (<http://alfa.lt/straipsnis/150854>)
- (21) *Šįkart*                    *vairuotoj-as*                    *sak-o*                    *gyven-si-q*                    *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 says that he will live in a house farther from downtown’  
 (<http://www.klaipeda.daily.lt/temp.php?data=2004-01-03&id=1072619337>)
- (22) *Jurg-is*                    *grasin-o*                    *tėv-q*                    *atei-si-ant*                    *ir*  
 J.-NOM.SG   threaten-PST(3)   father-ACC.SG   come-FUT-PA   and  
*j-uos*                    *sumuš-i-ant.*  
 he-ACC.PL.M   beat+FUT-PA  
 ‘Jurgis threatened that his father would come and beat them.’

Periphrastic forms, such as Passive, are also allowed here, cf. (23):

- (23) *Girdėj-a-u*                    *buvo-ęs*                    *kritikuo-t-as.*  
 hear-PST-1SG   AUX-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   criticise-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M  
 ‘I heard that I have been criticised.’

Such freedom in the expression of tense distinctions in Lithuanian participial complements is a clear sign of a high degree of syntactic autonomy, and of a concomitant layer of structure. In generative terms, Lithuanian participial complements are at least TPs, and I will present evidence suggesting that there is even more structure to them, i.e. that they are CPs. As ex. (24) and (25) show, participial complements may contain an overt complementiser (*ar*

‘whether’<sup>6</sup>) or a fronted *wh*-word, which suggests that there is a special position at their left periphery which can be occupied by such elements.

- (24) *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-i skund-q Aukščiausi-ajam*  
 write-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M cassation-ACC.SG.M appeal-ACC.SG higher-DAT.SG.M.DEF  
*Teism-ui.*  
 court-DAT.SG  
 ‘The prosecutor said he did not yet know whether he would write an appeal to the Higher Court.’ (<http://www.londonozinios.com/a-news-2065>)

- (25) *J-is ne-pamirš-dav-o atsiųs-ti ... radiogram-q,*  
 he-NOM.SG.M NEG-forget-HAB-PST3 send-INF radiograms-ACC.SG  
*praneš-dam-as kur es-qs, kaip gyven-qs...*  
 inform-CNV-SG.M where be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M how live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M  
 ‘He would not forget to send ... radiograms informing where he was and how he lived.’  
 (LKT)

Interestingly, overt *wh*-words and complementisers are not allowed in the non-agreeing (different-subject) participles<sup>7</sup>, as is shown by the ungrammaticality of (26a) and (26b).

- (26) a. *\*Ne-žin-a-u ar tėv-q jau atėj-us.*  
 NEG-know-PRS-2SG Q father-ACC.SG already come-PST.PA  
 intended meaning: ‘I don’t know if father has already come.’  
 b. *\*Ne-žin-a-u kur tėv-q išėj-us.*  
 NEG-know-PRS-2SG where father-ACC.SG go.out-PST.PA  
 intended meaning: ‘I don’t know where father has gone.’

The existence of a CP layer in the participial complements is further supported by the fact that *wh*-words may be freely extracted out of them. This is illustrated in (27) with an agreeing participial complement, and in (28) with a non-agreeing one.

- (27) ... *ten, kur<sub>i</sub> man-ė rasi-ant-i t<sub>i</sub> 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](http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=2897&kas=straipsnis&st_id=199))

- (28) ... *tai*, *k-q<sub>i</sub>*      *Bažnyči-a*      *šimtmeči-ais*      *skelb-ė*      *t<sub>i</sub>*  
           that what-ACC.SG church-NOM.SG century-INS.PL proclaim-PST(3)  
*es-a-nt*      *nuodėm-e*  
           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](http://www.culture.lt/satenai/?leid_id=750&kas=straipsnis&st_id=3998))

It must be noted, however, that *wh*-extraction is also possible from other types of non-finite complements in Lithuanian, such as infinitives, cf. (29), so the evidence for a CP status of the participial complements may not be compelling.

- (29) *K-q*      *tu*      *nor-i*      *pasaky-ti*      *t<sub>i</sub>?*  
           what-ACC.SG you(NOM.SG) want-PRS(2SG) say-INF  
           ‘What do you want to say?’

Another important issue concerns the distinction between agreeing and non-agreeing participles. As has been already pointed out, agreement in Lithuanian ‘semipredicative’ participles functions as a reference-tracking device similar to switch-reference: The presence of agreement signals coreference between the null subject of the participle and the Nominative matrix subject, while in all other contexts the non-agreeing participles are used. The contexts where non-agreeing participles occur, in addition to those where the participial clause contains an overt subject referentially distinct from the matrix subject, include the following:

1. The subject of the embedded clause is a null pronoun coreferential with a non-subject noun phrase of the matrix clause, cf. (10) repeated here as (30); in this case the null subject of the participle is coreferential with the Dative noun phrase of the main clause.

- (30) ... *gegut-ė*      *j-iems<sub>i</sub>*      *kukuoj-a*       $\emptyset_i$       *netikr-q*      *nuotak-q*  
           cuckoo-NOM.SG he-DAT.PL.M cuckoo-PRS3      fake-ACC.SG bride-ACC.SG  
*be-vež-a-nt...*  
           CNT-carry-PRS-PA  
           ‘... the cuckoo is saying (lit. is cuckooing) them that [they] are carrying a fake bride’  
           (<http://www1.omnitel.net/sakmes/frames.html>)

2. The subject of the embedded clause is a null pronoun with generic or arbitrary reference, cf. (31).

- (31) *Apie tai nuolat gird-i-m*  $\emptyset_{\text{gen}}$  *kalb-a-nt* *ir raš-a-nt...*  
 about this constantly hear-PRS-1PL speak-PRS-PA and write-PRS-PA  
 ‘We constantly hear [people] speak and write about it.’ (LKT)

3. The embedded clause contains a verb not subcategorising for a subject at all (or, probably, requiring a zero expletive), cf. (32).

- (32) *Vien-q ryt-q nubud-ęs pro lang-q*  
 one-ACC.SG morning-ACC.SG wake-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M through window-ACC.SG  
*pa-mač-ia-u sning-a-nt.*  
 PRV-see-PST-1SG snow-PRS-PA  
 ‘Once, having waken up in the morning, I saw that it was snowing.’ (LKT)

4. The embedded clause contains a predicate with a non-nominative subject coreferential with the matrix subject, compare (33a,b).

- (33) a. *Jon-as sak-ė j-am es-a-nt gėd-q.*  
 J.-NOM.SG say-PST(3) he-DAT.SG.M be-PRS-PA shame-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jonas said he was ashamed.’  
 b. \**Jon-as sak-ė es-qs gėd-a.*  
 J.-NOM.SG say-PST(3) be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M shame-NOM.SG  
 intended meaning: ‘=33a’

5. The subject of the participial clause is an overt pronoun coreferential with the matrix subject, cf. (34) with an overt reflexive and a non-agreeing participle; for comparison, see (35) with an agreeing participle and a null pronoun.

- (34) ... *žino-ti sav-e es-a-nt skurd-u yra diding-a.*  
 know-INF self-ACC be-PRS-PA poor-ACC.SG.M be+PRS(3) grand-N  
 ‘... to know oneself to be miserable is grand.’  
 (<http://www.lksb.lt/straipsniai/straipsnis-554.htm>)

- (35) *Tarp tik-i-nči-ujų kiekvien-as kunig-as<sub>i</sub> turė-tų*  
 among believe-PRS-PA-GEN.PL.DEF each-NOM.SG.M priest-NOM.SG have-SBJ(3)  
*žino-ti*  $\emptyset_i$  *es-qs* “*broli-is tarp broli-u*”.  
 know-INF be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M brother-NOM.SG among brother-GEN.PL  
 ‘Among the believers, each priest would have to know that he is “a brother among brothers”’ ([http://www.lcn.lt/b\\_dokumentai/kiti\\_dokumentai/kunigai\\_tikinciuju.html](http://www.lcn.lt/b_dokumentai/kiti_dokumentai/kunigai_tikinciuju.html))

It is thus evident that the distinction between agreeing and non-agreeing participles is based not just on the reference of the embedded subject (a discourse-based parameter), but

also on the morphosyntactic factor of Nominative case. Similar observations have been made by Greenberg and Lavine (2006) with respect to adverbial participial clauses. It is worth noting that in the opposition between agreeing and non-agreeing participles, the latter constitute the unmarked member, in terms of both their morphology and their functions: It is the licensing of agreeing participles which requires special conditions, whereas the non-agreeing participles are an elsewhere option; concomitantly, agreeing participles exhibit extra morphological marking which is absent from the non-agreeing ones.

### 3.3. Reflexivisation of the matrix verb

A final remark concerns the usage of the Reflexive marker *-si* on the matrix verb. Though the statement in Ambrazas (1997: 367) makes it appear that reflexivisation is a necessary feature of the same-subject participial complements, in reality this is by no means the case (cf. Schmalstieg 1986). First of all, there are verbs which are never used without the Reflexive marker (more precisely, they are lexicalised in the sense that their non-reflexive counterparts have entirely different meanings, e.g. reflexive *dėtis* ‘to pretend’, which is derived from *dėti* ‘put’). However, these verbs are perfectly compatible with both types of participial complement, cf. (36) and (37) with the verb *vaizduotis* ‘imagine’.

- (36) *Rachmaninov-as, kur-is vaizdav-o-si*  
 Rakhmaninov-NOM.SG who-NOM.SG.M imagine-PST(3)-RFL  
*es-qs Bellini.*  
 be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M Bellini  
 ‘Rakhmaninov, who imagined himself as being Bellini’  
 ([http://www.culture.lt/7md/?kas=straipsnis&leid\\_id=550&st\\_id=6221](http://www.culture.lt/7md/?kas=straipsnis&leid_id=550&st_id=6221))
- (37) ... *nes visuomet vaizdav-o-si sav-o tėtuk-q*  
 because always imagine-PRS(3)-RFL self-POSS father-ACC.SG  
*es-a-nt ger-q žmog-ų...*  
 be-PRS-PA good-ACC.SG.M man-ACC.SG  
 ‘Because he always imagined his father to be a good man’  
 (<http://www.blevyzgos.lt/main.php?1=3&2=putinas> )

Most of the verbs simply never admit a Reflexive marker, even with same-subject participial complements, cf. (38) and (39)<sup>8</sup>:

- (38) *Jurg-is pa-(\*si-)aiškin-o tėv-ui*  
 J.-NOM.SG PRV-(\*RFL-)explain-PST(3) father-DAT.SG  
*ein-qs i mokykl-q.*  
 go-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M in school-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jurgis explained to his father that he was going to school.’
- (39) *Jon-as kalbėj-o(\*-si) rašy-si-qs man laišk-q.*  
 J.-NOM.SG speak-PST(3)(\*-RFL) write-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M me(DAT) letter-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jonas was saying that he was going to write me a letter.’

There is, however, a rather heterogeneous group of verbs which do allow the Reflexive marker when combined with the same-subject participial complement. These verbs are *grasinti* ‘threaten’, *jausti* ‘feel’, *manyti* ‘think, believe’, *pasakoti* ‘tell, relate’, *sakyti* ‘say’, *skelbti* ‘declare, announce’, *užmiršti* ‘forget’, *žinoti* ‘know’ as well as a few others. All these verbs take the Reflexive marker optionally, compare (40) and (41) with the verb *jausti(s)* ‘feel’, and (42) with the verb *už(si)miršti* ‘forget’.

- (40) *Es-i provincial-as, jei jaut-ie-si gyven-qs*  
 be-PRS.2SG provincial-NOM.SG if 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>
- (41) *J-is aiškiai jauči-a gyven-qs*  
 he-NOM.SG.M clearly feel-PRS(3) live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M  
*tūleriop-u būd-u.*  
 various-INS.SG.M way-INS.SG  
 ‘He clearly feels himself living in various ways.’  
<http://www.geocities.com/linasrim/Vyduno/Sveikata.html>
- (42) *Jon-as už-(si-)mirš-o serg-qs grip-u*  
 J.-NOM.SG PRV-(RFL-)forget-PST3 be.ill-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M flu-INS.SG  
*ir išėj-o iš nam-u.*  
 and go.out-PST3 from house-GEN.PL  
 ‘Jonas forgot that he was ill with flu and went out.’

It must be added that in these cases, the Reflexive marker does not behave like a reflexive pronoun that has been ‘raised’ from the position of the embedded subject (though historically this was probably the case, see Ambrazas 1990: 128, 138–141 for discussion), but rather looks like a lexical marker altering the meaning of the verb in such a way that it denotes an act of communication or cognition which is directed towards the agent (such ‘indi-



rect reflexives' are widespread in the Baltic languages, cf. Geniušienė 1987: 126–137). This is suggested by the fact that Reflexive verbs such as *sakytis* 'say about oneself' may appear not only with participial complements, but also with finite subordinate clauses introduced by complementisers, cf. (43), which shows also that such clauses may have a subject distinct from the matrix subject.

- (43) *Sak-ė-si, kad tai j-o žmon-os pavard-ė.*  
 say-PST(3)-RFL that this he-GEN.SG.M wife-GEN.SG surname-NOM.SG  
 'He said (lit. 'said about himself') that this was his wife's surname.' (LKT)

All this indicates that the Lithuanian Reflexive marker, at least synchronically, is not relevant to an understanding of the syntactic structure of the participial complement constructions.

#### **4. Participial complements with agreeing participles: A special case of obligatory control**

As has been shown in the previous section, non-finite complements with agreeing participles are used when the subject of the embedded proposition (denoting the perceived event or the content of a speech-act or some other type of propositional attitude) is identical to the subject of the act of perception, speech or cognition. I have also shown that the same-subject participial complement is actually a full-fledged clause with tense and a complementiser position which may be filled by overt elements (in generative terms, a CP). If this is right, then it must also have a subject position which is obligatorily coreferential with the matrix subject. In this section I will argue that this is indeed so, and that agreeing participial complements in Lithuanian constitute a special kind of obligatory control construction (see Davies and Dubinsky 2004 and Landau 2000, 2004, Hornstein 2003 for recent general discussion of control phenomena). Though nothing in my argument actually hinges on any particular formal analysis of control, for the sake of explicitness I will adhere to the generative tradition which postulates a zero pronoun (PRO) in the subject position of control structures.

The claim that agreeing participial complements display obligatory control is based on the following arguments (cf., e.g., Hornstein 2003: 12–14). First, PRO in the subject position must have a c-commanding antecedent, as is evidenced by (44), which is ungrammatical be-

cause an antecedent is lacking altogether, and by (45), which is ungrammatical because the participle agrees in gender not with the matrix subject but with its possessor.

- (44) \**Many-ti* [PRO<sub>arb</sub> *es-qs* *laiming-as*] *yra nesqmon-ė*.  
 think-INF be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M happy-NOM.SG.M be+PRS(3) absurdity-  
 NOM.SG  
 intended meaning: ‘To believe oneself to be happy is foolish.’

- (45) \**Aldon-os<sub>i</sub>* *tėv-as<sub>j</sub>* *man-o* [PRO\*<sub>i/#j</sub> *išvyk-us-ī*].  
 A.(F)-GEN.SG father-NOM.SG think-PRS(3) leave-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F  
 intended meaning: ‘Aldona’s father thinks she has left.’

Second, agreeing participial complements do not allow split antecedents, cf. (46), and under ellipsis show sloppy identity readings, but not strict coreference, cf. (47):

- (46) \**Jon-as<sub>i</sub>* *sak-ė* *Aldon-ai<sub>j</sub>* [PRO<sub>i+j</sub> *es-q* *laiming-ī*].  
 J.-NOM.SG say-PST(3) A.-DAT.SG be-PRS.PA.NOM.PL.M happy-NOM.PL.M  
 intended meaning: ‘Jonas told Aldona that they were happy.’

- (47) *Jon-as<sub>i</sub>* *sak-ė-si* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *myl-īs* *sav-o<sub>i</sub>* *brol-ī*],  
 J.-NOM.SG say-PST(3)-RFL love-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M self-POSS brother-ACC.SG  
~~*ir Jurg-is<sub>j</sub>* *taip pat sakė-si* [PRO\*<sub>i/j</sub> ~~*myl-īs savo\*<sub>i/j</sub>*~~ ~~*brol-ī*~~].~~  
 and J.-NOM.SG so too  
 ‘Jonas said that he loved his brother, and Jurgis, too [said that he loved his own brother / \*Jonas’s brother]’

Finally, an important piece of evidence comes from the behaviour of predicate nominals. In Lithuanian, predicate nominals may either agree with the local subject or appear in the default Instrumental case, the choice depending on the aspectual semantics of the construction (see e.g. Timberlake 1988, 1990, Holvoet 2004). Though the behaviour of Lithuanian predicate nominals in various non-finite contexts is not yet described in full detail, it seems legitimate to make a generalisation that case agreement is available only for obligatory control structures (cf. similar observation for Russian in Landau 2008). This is neatly illustrated by (48): the a-example shows obligatory control and case agreement while the b-example exhibits non-obligatory control and Instrumental case marking.

- (48) a. *Kiekvien-as* *žmog-us<sub>i</sub>* *nor-i* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *bū-ti* *laiming-as*].  
 every-NOM.SG.M man-NOM.SG want-PRS(3) be-INF happy-NOM.SG.M  
 ‘Everyone wants to be happy.’

- b. *Ar sunk-u* [PRO<sub>arb</sub> *bū-ti laiming-u* / \**laiming-as*]?  
 Q hard-N be-INF happy-INS.SG.M / \*happy-NOM.SG.M  
 ‘Is it hard to be happy?’

Numerous examples of the type shown in (49), where the predicate nominal in the agreeing participial complement shows agreement with the matrix subject, also speak in favour of an obligatory control analysis for such constructions.

- (49) *Tikriausiai kiekvien-as žmog-us<sub>i</sub> galvoj-a*  
 rather every-NOM.SG.M man-NOM.SG think-PRS(3)  
 [PRO<sub>i</sub> *es-qs išskirtin-is*].  
 be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M exceptional-NOM.SG.M  
 ‘Rather, every man thinks he is exceptional.’ (LKT)

All these properties point towards an obligatory control analysis of the agreeing participial complements<sup>9</sup>. Having established this, the question arises about what licenses these obligatory control structures. In paradigmatic cases of obligatory control, it is the matrix verb’s semantics and subcategorisation frame which are responsible for the licensing of control (cf. Davies & Dubinsky 2004: 11–12, where closed classes of subject and object control verbs in English is identified; see Culicover and Jackendoff 2003 for an essentially semantic approach to control). Moreover, Culicover and Jackendoff (2003), following Lasnik and Fiengo (1974), claim that obligatory control requires a notion of volition: it is generally possible only when the complement clause expresses an action, and the controller is that argument of the matrix predicate which, due to the semantics of the verb or of the construction, is supposed to carry out that action.

The Lithuanian case is entirely different in two respects: First, the participial complement construction does not impose any constraints on the nature of the situation denoted by the embedded clause. In particular, it does not require that situation to be an action, cf. (49). Second, the majority of verbs allowing agreeing participial complements in Lithuanian are not prototypical obligatory control verbs from a semantic point of view, nor do they behave like obligatory control verbs with respect to their subcategorisation frames. Rather, the control relation established between the subject of the matrix verb and the null pronoun in the subject position of the embedded clause is licensed by the participial complement construction itself.<sup>10</sup>

To conclude this section, agreeing participial complements in Lithuanian are interesting from a typological point of view (though by no means unique) insofar as – despite their non-finite nature – they exhibit properties of syntactically full-fledged clauses (CPs), and constitute a special case of obligatory control, deviating from the prototype of control both in terms of their semantics and with respect to their licensing conditions.

### 5. Participial complements with non-agreeing participles: Beyond raising

In Section 3, it was shown that participial complements with non-agreeing participles constitute an “elsewhere option”, being used in all situations where it is impossible to establish referential identity (an instance of obligatory control, according to the analysis presented above) between the Nominative subject of the matrix clause and the zero subject of the participle. For this reason, it is not surprising that on closer examination non-agreeing participial complements turn out not to form a uniform construction, but rather to constitute a family of related constructions sharing some properties but diverging in a number of important respects. In this section I will present evidence that there are at least two major subclasses of non-agreeing participial complements, each of them calling for a different syntactic analysis.

With regard to non-finite complements such as Lithuanian non-agreeing participial constructions, the question of the grammatical status of the subject in the embedded clause is among the most important problems. Since the early days of generative grammar (cf. Postal 1974 vs. Chomsky 1973, 1981 and an extensive historical survey in Davies and Dubinsky 2004) there have been two major lines of analysis for such constructions in different languages. The so-called ‘raising’ approach involves a movement operation which extracts the subject of the embedded clause and converts it into the (direct) object of the matrix clause, cf. (50b). The so-called ‘Exceptional Case Marking’ (ECM) approach, by contrast, postulates that the embedded subject receives its Accusative case *in situ*, i.e. directly from the matrix verb, which thus assigns case across a clause boundary, cf. (50c).

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

b. a raising analysis

*Sakiau tēvq<sub>i</sub> [t<sub>i</sub> gerai gyvenant]*  
 |\_\_ACC\_\_↑    ↑\_\_\_\_\_|

c. an ECM analysis

*Sakiau [tēvq gerai gyvenant]*  
 |\_\_ACC\_\_↑

In this section empirical arguments for and against the two analyses sketched above will be considered. I will eventually argue that Lithuanian constructions are problematic for both approaches. In particular, I will show that – even though in some cases, the Accusative noun phrase corresponding to the subject of the participle (for brevity’s sake called ‘embedded subject’ or ‘ES’ in the following) behaves like the direct object of the matrix verb – there is in fact no reason to assume that it is a raising operation which is responsible for this behaviour. Second, I will present evidence that in most cases the subject of the participial complement does not behave as a constituent of the matrix clause, which makes a raising analysis implausible. Finally, I will specifically deal with the question of case marking of the ES, and I will show that an analysis alternative to the classic ECM must be called for. Informally speaking, I will argue that case is assigned to ES not by the matrix verb but by the whole participial complement construction.

### 5.1. Is the embedded subject a direct object?

The embedded subject of the participial complement is indeed in many respects similar to an ‘ordinary’ direct object governed by the matrix verb (see also Ambrazas 1997: 367–368). There are several diagnostics pointing in this direction. I will discuss them in turn, showing that they are inconclusive with respect to the actual syntactic position of the ES.

First, reflexive, cf. (51), and reciprocal, cf. (52), pronouns are licensed in the ES position, cf. (53a,b) where these elements occur in the position of an ‘ordinary’ direct object.

- (51) ...*aš<sub>i</sub> pasipasakoj-us*      *daktar-ui*      *apie*      *sav-o*      *sapn-q*,  
 I tell-PST.PA(NOM.SG.F) doctor-DAT.SG about self-POSS dream-ACC.SG  
*kuri-ame*      *sapnav-a-u<sub>i</sub>*      *sav-e<sub>i</sub>*      *stov-i-nt*      *operacin-ėje...*  
 which-LOC.SG.M dream-PST-1SG self-ACC stand-PRS-PA operating.theatre-LOC.SG  
 ‘... I told the doctor about my dream, in which I saw myself standing in the operation theatre...’ (<http://medikai.org/19>)
- (52) *Rajon-o*      *politik-ai<sub>i</sub>*      *vis*      *dažniau*      *įtari-a*  
 district-GEN.SG politician-NOM.PL still more.often suspect-PRS(3)  
 [*vien-as*      *kit-q*]<sub>i</sub>      *priim-a-nt*      *politini-us*      *sprendim-us*.  
 one-NOM.SG.M other-ACC.SG.M take-PRS-PA political-ACC.PL.M decision-ACC.PL  
 ‘The district’s politicians are ever more often suspecting each other of making politi-  
 cally motivated decisions’ (<http://www.gargzdai.lt/?lt=1148888566>)
- (53) a. *J-is<sub>i</sub>*      *gerbi-a*      *sav-e<sub>i</sub>*.  
 he-NOM.SG.M respect-PRS(3) self-ACC  
 ‘He respects himself.’
- b. *J-ie<sub>i</sub>*      *gerbi-a*      [*vien-as*      *kit-q*]<sub>i</sub>.  
 he-NOM.PL.M respect-PRS(3) one-NOM.SG.M other-ACC.SG  
 ‘They respect each other.’

However, reflexives and reciprocals in Lithuanian may be long-distance bound in non-finite configurations like (54)–(56), so examples like (51) and (52) actually tell nothing about the syntactic status of the ES.

- (54) *Algird-as<sub>i</sub>*      *liep-ė*      *Jurgi-ui<sub>j</sub>*      *griž-ti*      *į*      *sav-o<sub>i/j</sub>*      *kambar-į*.  
 A.-NOM.SG order-PST(3) J.-DAT.SG return-INF in self-POSS room-ACC.SG  
 ‘Algirdas ordered Jurgis to return to his (=Algirdas’s or Jurgis’s) room’.
- (55) *Jon-as<sub>i</sub>*      *įrod-ė*      *Algird-q<sub>j</sub>*      *buvo-us*      *sav-o<sub>i/j</sub>*      *kambar-yje*.  
 J.-NOM.SG prove-PST(3) A.-ACC.SG be-PST.PA self-POSS room-LOC.SG  
 ‘Jonas proved that Algirdas had been in his (Jonas’s or Algirdas’s) room.’
- (56) *Du*      *filosof-ai<sub>i</sub>*      *man-ė*      [*vien-as*      *kit-o*]<sub>i</sub>  
 two:NOM.M philosopher-NOM.PL think-PST(3) one-NOM.SG.M other-GEN.SG.M  
*knyg-ose*      *es-a-nt*      *daug*      *nesąmoni-ų*.  
 book-LOC.PL be-PRS-PA many nonsense-GEN.PL  
 ‘Each of the two philosophers thought that the other’s books contained much nonsense.’  
 (lit. ‘The two philosophers though that in each other’s books there was a lot of nonsense.’)

The second diagnostic relates to the Genitive of negation. If the negative prefix is attached to the verb, the Accusative case on the direct object is obligatorily replaced by the

Genitive, cf. (57); as (58) shows, this apparently applies to the ES of the participial complement, too.

- (57) *Jon-as*      *ne-paraš-ė*      *laišk-o* // *\*laišk-q*.  
 J.-NOM.SG    NEG-write-PST(3)   letter-GEN.SG // \*letter-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jonas did not write the letter.’

- (58) *Policij-a*      *ne-įtari-a*      *Jon-o* // *\*Jon-q*  
 police-NOM.SG   NEG-suspect-PRS(3)   J.-GEN.SG // \*J.-ACC.SG  
*užmuš-us*    *sav-o*      *žmon-q*.  
 kill-PST.PA   self-POSS   wife-ACC.SG  
 ‘The police does not suspect Jonas of having killed his wife.’

However, as (59a+b) show, the Genitive of negation is not clause-bound in Lithuanian, so it is only a very weak indicator of the syntactic position of the ES. However, the **absence** of the Genitive of negation effect can be a strong diagnostic **against** the direct object status of an NP, and below we will see that it works for a subtype of participial complements.

- (59) a. *Jurg-is*      *ne-nor-i*      [*pabandy-ti*    [*pradė-ti*    [*skaity-ti*  
 J.-NOM.SG   NEG-want-PRS3   try-INF        begin-INF   read-INF  
*ši-os*            *knyg-os* // *\*ši-q knyg-q*]].  
 this-GEN.SG.F   book-GEN.SG // \*this-ACC.SG.F book-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jurgis does not want to try to start reading this book.’

- b. *Jurg-is*      *ne-nor-i*      [*liep-ti*      *Aldon-ai*    [*per-skaity-ti*  
 J.-NOM.SG   NEG-want-PRS3   order-INF    A.-DAT.SG   PRV-read-INF  
*ši-os*            *knyg-os* // *\*ši-q knyg-q*]].  
 this-GEN.SG.F   book-GEN.SG // \*this-ACC.SG.F book-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jurgis does not want to order Aldona to read this book.’

The third argument comes from word order. Word order of major clausal constituents in Lithuanian is basically SVO, but there are various movement operations driven by information structure that lead to different orderings. In particular, the direct object may be fronted from its basic post-verbal position, cf. (60), and a similar operation is perfectly licit with the ES, too, as is illustrated by (61).

- (60) *Tik*    *patirt-is*                    *ir*    *kanči-a*                    *žmog-u<sub>i</sub>*  
 only   experience-NOM.SG   and   suffering-NOM.SG   man-ACC.SG  
*padar-o*   *t<sub>i</sub>*      *žmog-umi...*  
 make-PRS(3)   man-INS.SG  
 ‘Only experience and suffering make man a man.’ (LKT)

- (61) *Žmog-us            [išorin-ius            atribut-us]<sub>i</sub>            gal-i            many-ti   t<sub>i</sub>*  
 man-NOM.SG    external-ACC.PL   attribute-ACC.PL   may-PRS(3)   think-INF  
*es-a-nt            sav-o            pat-ies            dal-imi.*  
 be-PRS-PA    self-POSS    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](http://www.porteris.com/shapoka/mados%20psichologija.doc))

Again, however, constituents of non-finite complement clauses may be freely extracted in Lithuanian, as in (62), which contains a direct object that has been scrambled out of an infinitival clause, and (63), where a locative phrase has been moved out of a participial complement clause. Thus, examples such as (61) may well be instances of long-distance scrambling, rather than clause-bound scrambling.

- (62) *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-q            knyg-q]<sub>i</sub>            liepi-a            skaity-ti   t<sub>i</sub>*  
 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>)
- (63) *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]<sub>i</sub>            suvok-ti            t<sub>i</sub>*  
 highest-LOC.SG.F   hierarchy-GEN.SG   level-LOC.SG   conceive-INF  
*es-a-nt            Diev-q.*  
 be-PRS-PA    God-ACC.SG  
 ‘Such an agnostic position does not prevent one from conceiving that at the highest level of the hierarchy there is a God.’  
 ([http://ct.svs.lt/lmenas/?leid\\_id=3053&kas=straipsnis&st\\_id=6983](http://ct.svs.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=3053&kas=straipsnis&st_id=6983))

Furthermore, direct objects in Lithuanian can be promoted to subjects in passive constructions, and so can the ES, cf. (64). As in this case the ES becomes the subject of the matrix clause, the construction shows an agreeing participle.

- (64) *Vaikin-as            buv-o            įtari-a-m-as ...            iš            šešiolikmeči-o*  
 guy-NOM.SG   AUX-PST(3)   suspect-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M   from   sixteen.year.old-GEN.SG.M  
*berniuk-o            atėm-ęs            dvirat-į.*  
 boy-GEN.SG   take.away-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   bicycle-ACC.SG  
 ‘The guy was suspected of having taken away a bicycle from a sixteen-year-old boy’  
 (LKT)



Finally, among the verbs allowing participial complements there is at least one, namely *laukti* ‘to wait’, which assigns Genitive rather than Accusative case to its object, cf. (65); when this verb combines with a participial complement, its subject surfaces in the Genitive, too, cf. (66)<sup>11</sup>.

- (65) *Lauki-u*            *Aldon-os* // \**Aldon-q*.  
 wait-PRS.1SG    A.-GEN.SG // \*A.-ACC.SG  
 ‘I am waiting for Aldona.’
- (66) *Lauk-si-u*        *aš*        *tav-ęs*        *atein-a-nt*.  
 wait-FUT-1SG    I:NOM    you-GEN.SG    come-PRS-PA  
 ‘I will wait for you to come.’ (LKT)

To summarise, three of the possible diagnostics of direct objecthood of the ES, i.e. binding, word order, and genitive of negation turn out to be inconclusive. Thus, there actually remains the only fully reliable diagnostic of direct objecthood, viz. passivisation. In the next section I will discuss it in more detail.

## 5.2. Passivisation and two types of non-agreeing participles

The question which it is legitimate to ask with respect to the ability of the ES to be promoted to the subject position of the matrix clause by passivisation, is how did the ES come to occupy the position from which it may be promoted? The answer to this question crucially depends on the range of matrix verbs which allow passivisation when combined with the participial complement. Under closer examination it turns out that only a minority of verbs taking participial complements in fact allow passivisation in this construction. Here is a list of such verbs:<sup>12</sup> *girdėti* ‘hear’, *matyti* ‘see’, *vaizduoti* ‘depict’, *pristatyti* ‘introduce’, *įtarti* ‘suspect’, *vaizduotis* ‘imagine’, *skųsti* ‘complain’, *suvokti* ‘consider’, *pripažinti* ‘acknowledge’. The majority of verbs taking participial complements do not allow passivisation in this construction, cf. (67)–(68). However, as is shown by examples (69)–(70), this is not a consequence of an inherent constraint on passivification associated with the relevant verbs.

- (67) \**Kaltinam-asis*            *buvo*        *įrody-t-as*            *es-qs*  
 defendant-NOM.SG.M.DEF    AUX-PST(3)    prove-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M    be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M  
*nekalt-as*.  
 innocent-NOM.SG.M  
 intended meaning: ‘The defendant was proved to be innocent.’

- (68) \**Kurši-ai*                      *buv-o*                      *suprant-a-m-i*                      *es-q*  
 Kuronian-NOM.SG                      AUX-PST(3)                      understand-PRS-PP-NOM.PL.M                      be-PRS.PA.NOM.PL.M  
*vien-a*                      *iš*                      *latvi-ų*                      *potauči-ų.*  
 one-NOM.SG.F                      of                      Latvian-GEN.PL                      tribe-GEN.PL  
 intended meaning: ‘Kuronians were considered to be one of Latvian tribes.’

- (69) ...*nes*                      *ne-buv-o*                      *įrody-t-as*                      *kyši-o*  
 because                      NEG-AUX-PST(3)                      prove-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M                      bribe-GEN.SG  
*ėmim-o*                      *fakt-as.*  
 taking-GEN.SG                      fact-NOM.SG  
 ‘... because the fact of receiving the bribe has not been proven.’ (LKT)

- (70) *Jėz-aus*                      *asmuo*                      *ir*                      *J-o*                      *misij-a*                      *yra*  
 J.-GEN.SG                      face:NOM.SG                      and                      he-GEN.SG                      mission-NOM.SG                      AUX+PRS(3)  
*suprant-a-m-i*                      *ir*                      *be*                      *stebukl-ų.*  
 understand-PRS-PP-NOM.PL.M                      and                      without                      miracle-GEN.PL  
 ‘The face of Jesus and His mission can be understood (lit. are being understood) even without miracles.’ (LKT)

Let us now take a closer look at those verbs which do allow passivisation in the participial complement construction. Almost all of them share the following property: the interpretation of their combination with a participial complement entails the interpretation of a simple clause with the direct object, cf. (71a+b). By contrast, the implication (71a) is not valid with the majority of verbs not allowing passivisation, cf. (71c), often for the simple reason that they are ungrammatical with such types of objects.

- (71) a.  $V \text{ NP}_{\text{ACC}} \text{ V}_{\text{PART}} \rightarrow V \text{ NP}_{\text{ACC}}$

- b. *Mač-ia-u*                      *tėv-q*                      *parein-ant.*                       $\rightarrow$                       *Mačiau tėv-q.*  
 see-PST-1SG                      father-ACC.SG                      come.back-PRS.PA  
 ‘I saw [my] father coming back.’                      ‘I saw [my] father.’

- c. *Sak-ia-u*                      *tėv-q*                      *gerai*                      *gyven-a-nt.*                      vs. \**Sakiau tėv-q*  
 say-PST-1SG                      father-ACC.SG                      well                      live-PRS-PA  
 ‘I said [my] father lived well.’                      \*‘I said my father.’

When passivised, the relevant verbs show a similar implication, cf. (72).

- (72) a.  $\text{NP}_{\text{NOM}} \text{ V}_{\text{PASS}} \text{ V}_{\text{PART}} \rightarrow \text{NP}_{\text{NOM}} \text{ V}_{\text{PASS}}$

- b. *Tēv-as*      *buv-o*      *mat-o-m-as*      *parein-qs.* → *Tēvas buvo matomas.*  
 father-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) see-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M come.back-PRS.PA-NOM.SG.M  
 ‘Father was seen coming back’ → ‘Father was seen.’

This suggests that passivisation of the participial complement construction is mainly available in combination with those verbs where the Accusative noun phrase corresponding to the subject of the embedded clause is simply the direct object of the matrix verb: not a derived object but rather an object that is base-generated and assigned a thematic role in the matrix clause. The syntactic structure of examples like (73a) is, accordingly, as shown in (73b), with the subject of the participial complement being linked to the thematic subject of the main clause via a control relation<sup>13</sup>, rather than in (73c), resulting from raising operation.

- (73) a. *Jurg-is*      *buv-o*      *pristaty-t-as*  
 J.-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) introduce-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M  
*es-qs*      *žurnalist-as.*  
 be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M journalist-NOM.SG  
 ‘Jurgis was introduced as a journalist (lit. being a journalist).’

- b.  $NP_{NOMi} \ V_{PASS} \ t_i \ [PRO_i \ V_{PART}]$

- c.  $NP_{NOMi} \ V_{PASS} \ t_i \ [t_i \ V_{PART}]$

Extending this analysis to the active counterparts of such passive clauses, cf. (74a), we might argue that with this set of verbs the non-agreeing participial complement displays an object control structure shown in (74b) rather than a raising structure as in (74c).

- (74) a. *Pristači-a-u*      *Jurg-i*      *es-a-nt*      *žurnalist-u.*  
 introduce-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG be-PRS-PA journalist-INS.SG  
 ‘I introduce Jurgis as a journalist (lit. being a journalist).’

- b.  $V \ NP_{ACCi} \ [PRO_i \ V_{PART}]$

- c.  $V \ NP_{ACCi} \ [t_i \ V_{PART}]$

This is supported by the fact that adverbs modifying the participle cannot precede the ES with verbs of this group, cf. (75a+b), which means that the ES is a constituent of the matrix rather than of the embedded clause.

- (75) a. *Mat-a-u Jurg-ĩ [lètai vaikščioj-a-nt park-e].*  
 see-PRS-1SG J.-ACC.SG slowly walk-PRS-PA park-LOC.SG  
 ‘I see Jurgis slowly walking in the park.’
- b. \**Mat-a-u lètai Jurg-ĩ [vaikščioj-a-nt park-e].*  
 see-PRS-1SG slowly J.-ACC.SG walk-PRS-PA park-LOC.SG  
 intended meaning ‘=(75a)’

Similarly, the ‘restrictive’ prefix *te-* meaning ‘only’ (see Arkadiev 2009b) can have scope over the ES with verbs allowing passivisation only when it is attached to the matrix verb (76a), but not to the participle (76b), again suggesting that the ES in such examples belongs to the matrix clause.

- (76) a. *Te-mač-ia-u Jon-q [atėj-us].*  
 RSTR-see-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG come-PST.PA  
 ‘I saw that only Jonas came.’
- b. \**Mač-ia-u Jon-q [te-atėj-us].*  
 see-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG RSTR-come-PST.PA  
 intended meaning ‘=(76a)’

This analysis, however, is not without problems. First of all, as was pointed out with respect to participial complements by Holvoet and Jadeites (2003: 144; see also Section 3.1 above), verbs of perception allow not only a direct perception interpretation for which implication (71a) is valid, but also other interpretations involving no such implications, cf. ex. (13) and (15) in Section 3.1. Moreover, even with the direct perception interpretation, verbs of the class under discussion allow participial complements with no reasonable thematic subject, cf. (32), repeated here as (77).

- (77) *Vien-q ryt-q nubud-ęs pro lang-q*  
 one-ACC.SG morning-ACC.SG wake-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M through window-ACC.SG  
*pa-mač-ia-u sning-a-nt.*  
 PRV-see-PST-1SG snow-PRS-PA  
 ‘Once, having woken up in the morning, I saw that it was snowing.’ (LKT)

Thus, constructions with verbs of perception and possibly with other matrix verbs allowing passivisation in the presence of the participial complement are actually ambiguous between the two analyses, one with object control, cf. (74b), and another that is yet to be determined (as I will show, the raising analysis as shown in [74c] is not feasible). However, it may

be argued that at least the passive structures like (64), (72b) and (73a) are derived only from the object control structure; evidence for this comes from their semantics as well as from the fact that those verbs for which the object control analysis is impossible do not allow passivisation.<sup>14</sup>

### 5.3. The embedded subject is indeed embedded

Whichever analysis we assume for the minority of verbs allowing passivisation in participial complement constructions, the “unpassivisability” of the other matrix verbs strongly suggests that the embedded subject of participial complements they introduce does not in fact occupy the position of a direct object. The strongest piece of evidence for this conclusion comes from the Genitive of negation. Consider the examples in (78)–(80).

- (78) a. *Mit-ai atskleidži-a žmog-ui pači-q gili-ajq*  
 myth-NOM.SG reveal-PRS(3) man-DAT.SG very-ACC.SG.F deep-ACC.SG.F.DEF  
*ties-q, bet tik tada, kai j-is ne-žin-o*  
 truth-ACC.SG but only then when he-NOM.SG.M NEG-know-PRS(3)  
*j-uos es-a-nt mit-ais.*  
 it-ACC.PL.Mbe-PRS-PA myth-INS.PL  
 ‘Myths reveal the deepest truths to man, but only when he does not know that they are myths.’  
 ([http://aidai.us/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=6926&Itemid=471](http://aidai.us/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=6926&Itemid=471))

- b. *Kaip juoking-a, juk net ne-žin-o j-o vard-o.*  
 how funny-N PTCL even NEG-know-PRS(3) he-GEN.SG.M name-GEN.SG  
 ‘How funny, [she] even does not know his name.’ (LKT)

- (79) a. *Mokslinink-ai ne-įrod-ė rūkym-q // \*rūkym-o*  
 scientist-NOM.PL NEG-prove-PST3 smoking-ACC.SG // \*GEN.SG  
*es-a-nt žaling-u.*  
 be-PRS-PA unhealthy-INS.SG.M  
 ‘Scholars have not proved smoking to be harmful.’

- b. *...niek-as ne-įrod-ė koki-os nors mūs-ų kalt-ės.*  
 nobody-NOM.SG.M NEG-prove-PST(3) which-GEN.SG.F any we-GEN guilt-GEN.SG  
 ‘... nobody has proved any guilt of ours.’ (LKT)

- (80) a. *Ne-suprat-a-u tėv-q // \*tėv-o išvyk-us.*  
 NEG-understand-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG / \*GEN.SG leave-PST.PA  
 ‘I did not understand that father had left.’

- b. *Apsimeči-a-u, kad ne-suprat-a-u j-o metafor-ų.*  
 pretend-PST-1SG that NEG-understand-PST-1SG he-GEN.SG.M metaphor-GEN.PL  
 ‘I pretended to have not understood his metaphors.’ (LKT)

As a comparison of the a-examples (involving participial complements), and the corresponding b-examples (with ordinary direct objects of the same verbs) shows, there are instances where the otherwise mandatory Genitive of negation rule does not operate on the embedded subject of the participial complement. The only explanation for this is that in such examples the Accusative noun phrase does not function as a direct object of the matrix verb, and is not a constituent of the matrix clause.

Although the case marking of the ES in participial complement constructions with a negated matrix verb is not an entirely clear-cut phenomenon (different speakers sometimes provide contradictory judgments, and there are matrix verbs for which both Accusative and Genitive seem to be grammatical under negation), the data suggest that there is a robust, though not absolute, correlation between passivisation, on the one hand, and the Genitive of negation, on the other. Indeed, the sets of verbs which simultaneously allow passivisation and require the Genitive of negation in the participial complement construction are very similar. By contrast, those verbs which do not passivise in the participial complement construction tend to allow, or even require, Accusative case under negation.

The anaphora facts point in the same direction. As we have seen above, reflexives in the position of the embedded subject can be bound by the matrix subject, cf. (34), (51), and long-distance binding of reflexives is possible in these constructions, too, cf. (55). However, this only tells us something about the properties of Lithuanian reflexive pronouns, but is not particularly revealing with respect to the syntactic structure of the participial complement construction. Now, consider examples (81a) and (81b).

- (81) a. *Jurg-is<sub>i</sub> myl-i j-o\*<sub>i/j</sub> žmon-q.*  
 J.-NOM.SG love-PRS(3) he-GEN.SG.M wife-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jurgis loves his (someone else’s // \*Jurgis’s) wife.’
- b. *Jurg-is<sub>i</sub> įtari-a j-o<sub>i/j</sub> žmon-q j-į apgaun-a-nt.*  
 J.-NOM.SG suspect-PRS(3) he-GEN.SG.M wife he-ACC.SG.M deceive-PRS-PA  
 ‘Jurgis suspects that his (Jurgis // someone else’s) wife deceives him.’

As (81a) shows, the third person pronoun *jis* cannot be bound by the subject of the local verb; by contrast, when the same pronoun appears in the ES of the participial complement, as in (81b), binding by the matrix subject becomes possible, which suggests that the embedded subject and the matrix subject are located in different clauses.

The three facts pointed out above – that in a subtype of participial complement (i) the ES cannot be passivised, (ii) does not obey the Genitive of negation rule, and (iii) may contain a pronominal coreferential with the matrix subject – jointly speak in favour of treating the ES of this subclass of participial complement as being separated from the matrix verb by a clause boundary. And, in fact, there is quite robust further evidence for treating the ES as a constituent of the embedded clause rather than the matrix clause. First, the embedded subject and the participle may behave as a single constituent with respect to the syntactic operations of pied-piping, cf. (82), topic fronting, cf. (83), and ellipsis, cf. (84).

- (82) ... *toliau perskait-a-u apie T-q, [kur-i atei-si-ant]<sub>i</sub>*  
 further read-PRS-1SG about that-ACC.SG.M which-ACC.SG.M come-FUT-PA  
*Jon-as skelb-ė t<sub>i</sub>...*  
 J.-NOM.SG announce-PST(3)  
 ‘... further I read about Him, Whose future coming John had announced’  
 ([www.bernardinai.lt/parapija/laikrastelis/archyvas/lankstinukas%20nr\\_105.pdf](http://www.bernardinai.lt/parapija/laikrastelis/archyvas/lankstinukas%20nr_105.pdf))

- (83) [*Jurg-i gyven-a-nt Viln-yje*]<sub>i</sub> *ne-žinoj-a-u t<sub>i</sub>.*  
 J.-ACC.SG live-PRS-PA V.-LOC.SG NEG-know-PST-1SG  
 ‘That Jurgis lived in Vilnius, I didn’t know.’

- (84) *Tėv-as jau žin-o [Jurg-i atvyk-us],*  
 father-NOM.SG already know-PRS(3) J.-ACC.SG arrive-PST.PA  
*o motin-a dar ne-žin-o [Jurg-i atvykus].*  
 but mother-NOM.SG yet NEG-know-PRS(3)  
 ‘Father already knows that Jurgis has arrived, but mother does not yet know it.’

Second, in contrast to the participial complements taken by verbs of the ‘passivising’ type, cf. (75), with the majority of matrix predicates there is normally no restriction on the relative ordering of the ES and lower adverbs, cf. (85).

- (85) a. *Sak-ia-u [Jurg-i rytoj atvyk-si-ant].*  
 say-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG tomorrow arrive-FUT-PA  
 ‘I said that Jurgis would arrive tomorrow.’

- b. *Sak-ia-u*      [*rytoj*      *Jurg-i*      *atvyk-si-ant*].  
 say-PST-1SG    tomorrow    J.-ACC.SG    arrive-FUT-PA  
 ‘=(85a)’

Third, with these verbs, the restrictive prefix *te-* attached to the participle can have scope over the embedded subject, cf. (86), which was impossible with the other type of matrix verbs, cf. (76).

- (86) *Sak-ia-u*      [*Jon-q*      *te-atėj-us*].  
 say-PST-1SG    J.-ACC.SG      RSTR-come-PST.PA  
 ‘I said that only Jonas came.’

Fourth, there is a further subtype of participial complement where the ES does not occupy the leftmost position in its clause but rather appears post-verbally; this normally happens when the ES contains new information, cf. examples (87)–(89). Note that example (88) shows that such word order is permitted with matrix verbs of the type allowing passivisation and the Genitive of negation, and that in (89) the postverbal embedded subject is assigned Genitive case by the verb *laukti* ‘wait’.

- (87) *Jurg-is*      *neig-ė*      [*savo*      *nam-uose*      *buv-us*      *šautuv-q*].  
 J.-NOM.SG    deny-PST(3)    self-POSS    house-LOC.PL    be-PST.PA    gun-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jurgis denied that there was a gun in his house.’

- (88) ...*ir*      *mat-o*      [*nuo mišk-o*      *atein-a-nt*      *kareiv-i* ...]  
 and    see-PRS(3)    from forest-GEN.SG    come-PRS-PA    soldier-ACC.SG  
 ‘...and he sees there comes a soldier from the forest...’ (LKT)

- (89) *Todėl*      *daugel-is*      *nekantriai*      *lauk-ė*  
 therefore    many-NOM.SG    impatiently    wait-PST(3)  
 [*pasirod-a-nt*      *nauj-ojo*      *darb-o*].  
 appear-PRS-PA    new-GEN.SG.M.DEF    job-GEN.SG  
 ‘Therefore many people are impatiently waiting for a new job to appear.’ (LKT)

That the postverbal embedded subject in the participial complements in (86)–(88) is located inside the embedded clause can be shown by using several diagnostics. First, it must appear in the Genitive case when the embedded predicate is a negative existential, cf. (90).

- (90) *Tiki-uo-si*      *man-o*      *straipsn-yje*      *ne-s-a-nt*      *klaid-ų* // \**klaid-as*.  
 hope-PRS.1SG-RFL    I-POSS    article-LOC.SG    NEG-be-PRS-PA    error-GEN.PL // \*ACC.PL  
 ‘I hope there are no errors in my article.’



Second, interestingly enough, for some speakers the participial complement with a postverbal subject is the only type of non-agreeing participial complement allowed with particular verbs, cf. (91a,b); this may be due to the fact that constructions like (91a), but not ones of the type shown in (91b), can be parsed as involving a direct object with an intransitive verb.

- (91) a. \**Birut-ė*    *apsimet-ė*    *sav-o*    *vaikel-į*    *serg-a-nt*.  
 B.-NOM.SG    pretend-PST(3)    self-POSS    child-ACC.SG    be.ill-PRS-PA  
 intended meaning: ‘Birute pretended as if her child was ill.’

- b. *Birut-ė*    *apsimet-ė*    *sav-o*    *nam-uose*    *ne-s-a-nt*    *pinig-ų*.  
 B.-NOM.SG    pretend-PST3    self-poss    house-LOC.PL    NEG-be-PRS-PA    money-GEN.PL  
 ‘Birute pretended as if she had no money at home.’

Finally, pronominals coreferential with the matrix subject are allowed in this position, on a par with reflexives, cf. (92a,b)

- (92) a. *Jon-as<sub>i</sub>*    *įrod-ė*    *Algird-o*    *kambar-yje*    *buv-us*    *sav-o<sub>i</sub>*    *šautuv-q*.  
 J.-NOM.SG    prove-PST(3)    A.-GEN.SG    room-LOC.SG    be-PST.PA    self-POSS    gun-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jonas proved that there was his gun in Algirdas’s room.’

- b. *Jon-as<sub>i</sub>*    *įrod-ė*    *Algird-o<sub>j</sub>*    *kambar-yje*  
 J.-NOM.SG    prove-PST(3)    A.-GEN.SG    room-LOC.SG  
*buv-us*    *j-o<sub>i/j</sub>*    *šautuv-q*.  
 be-PST.PA    he-GEN.SG.M    gun-ACC.SG  
 ‘Jonas proved that there was his gun in Algirdas’s room.’

All this points towards the conclusion that apart from object control constructions with a special class of verbs discussed in section 5.2, the subject of the non-agreeing participial complement is not a constituent of the matrix verb, neither base-generated, nor derived by raising. Having said this, we now have to answer the last important question, i.e. the one concerning the mechanism which is responsible for the case marking of the embedded subject. Though an obvious hypothesis might look like “if not raising, then ECM”, in the next section I will show that such an analysis is also problematic.

#### 5.4. Where does the embedded subject get case from?

As has been seen, there is quite robust evidence against a raising analysis of Lithuanian non-agreeing participial complements. It has been shown that, with a subclass of matrix predicates (verbs of direct perception and certain other verbs, such as *laukti* ‘wait’, *įtarti* ‘suspect’, *vaizduoti* ‘depict’ etc.), the ES of the participial complement may be analysed as being base-generated as a direct object of the matrix verb. By contrast, with the majority of matrix predicates the ES can be shown to be a constituent of the participial complement itself. When we ask how the ES gets its case marking, the answer for the first subclass of participial complements is clear: being a direct object of the matrix verb, this noun phrase is assigned case by this verb. Indeed, we have seen that the verb *laukti* ‘wait’, in accordance with its lexical specifications, assigns Genitive rather than Accusative case to the ES<sup>15</sup>, and that negation on the matrix verb requires the ES to be in the Genitive case with this class of matrix verbs.

When we now turn to the other subclass of non-agreeing participial complements, i.e. the one where the ES is located in the participial clause itself, the question of its case marking becomes much more problematic. It has been mentioned that among the possible approaches to such constructions in current grammatical theory there is the so-called ‘Exceptional case marking’ (ECM) analysis, which allows the matrix verb to assign case to the noun phrase in the embedded clause under the condition that it is, syntactically speaking, sufficiently ‘close’ to the matrix verb.<sup>16</sup> However, as I will try to show, this analysis does not work for the Lithuanian data, since unless special technical stipulations are made, it is not plausible that the embedded subject indeed gets its case from the matrix verb.

First of all, the embedded subject of non-agreeing participial complements can be in the Accusative case even in the presence of a “genuine” direct object already so marked, see (93);<sup>17</sup> however, no Lithuanian verb can assign Accusative case twice, to noun phrases with different semantic and syntactic functions.<sup>18</sup> This suggests that the Accusative on *tėvą* ‘father’ in (93) does not come from the verb *patikino* ‘assured’.

- (93) *Jurg-is patikin-o policinink-q [sav-o tėv-q*  
 J.-NOM.SG assure-PST(3) policeman-ACC.SG self-POSS father-ACC.SG  
*gim-us kaim-e].*  
 be.born-PST.PA village-LOC.SG  
 ‘Jurgis assured the policeman that his father had been born in the countryside.’

Second, as is pointed out by Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 117), non-agreeing participial complements containing Accusative-marked subjects are allowed with matrix predicates which otherwise do not assign Accusative case at all. Consider the verb *tikėti* ‘believe’, which can normally be combined with an Instrumental, but not with an Accusative noun phrase, cf. (94a). This pattern of case marking, however, is not retained when the same verb co-occurs with a participial complement, cf. (94b).

- (94) a. *Ar tik-i t-uo // ??t-q, k-q kalb-u?*  
 Q believe-PRS.2SG that-INS.SG.M // \*-ACC.SG what-ACC.SG say-PRS.1SG  
 ‘Do you believe what I am saying?’
- b. *J-ie tikėj-o [valstyb-ę // \*valstyb-e j-iems padė-si-ant].*  
 he-NOM.PL.M believe-PST(3) state-ACC.SG // \*-INS.SG he-DAT.PL.M help-FUT-PA  
 ‘They believed the state would help them.’

Similarly, non-agreeing participial complements are allowed with matrix predicates having the form of impersonal passives, cf. (95).

- (95) ...*kai man-o-m-a [privači-q iniciatyv-q šal-ies*  
 when think-PRS-PP-N private-ACC.SG.F initiative-ACC.SG country-GEN.SG  
*ūki-ui bū-si-ant veiksmingesn-ę už valdišk-q].*  
 economy-DAT.SG be-FUT-PA more.effective-ACC.SG.F than state-ACC.SG.F  
 ‘... when it is thought that private initiative will be more effective for the country’s economy than the state one.’ (LKT)

This evidence is sufficient to cast doubt on the possibility of an ECM-style analysis for the Lithuanian participial complements. So, the question remains how the ES gets its assigned case. Given that, as has just been shown, it cannot get case from the matrix verb, two options remain: 1) the ES gets case from its own local predicate, i.e. the participle itself; 2) the Accusative case is assigned to the ES by the participial construction as a whole or, in generative terms, by some case-marking functional head. Below I will explore these options, and I will show that actually both of them are involved in the Lithuanian participial complement construction.

First of all, there are clear instances where the subject of the participial complement is assigned case by the embedded verb, e.g. when there is a participle of a predicate requiring a Dative subject, cf. (96a,b).

- (96) a. *Tėv-ui*            *reiki-a*            *pagalb-os*.  
 father-DAT.SG need-PRS(3) help-GEN.SG  
 ‘Father needs help.’
- b. *Suprat-a-u*            [*tėv-ui*            *reiki-a-nt*    *pagalb-os*].  
 understand-PST-1SG father-DAT.SG need-PRS-PA help-GEN.SG  
 ‘I understood that father needed help.’

Similarly, the embedded subject may appear in the Genitive case required by negation on the participle, cf. (90), (91b), and in the partitive Genitive licensed by an existential embedded predicate, cf. (97a,b).

- (97) a. *Net kai rezerv-u*            *nėra*    –    *j-u*            *yra*.  
 even when reserve-GEN.PL NEG+be:PRS(3) it-GEN.PL be+PRS(3)  
 ‘Even when there are no reserves, there are some.’  
<http://www.manokarjera.lt/Default4.aspx?ArticleID=60ea74ab-faad-42f0-a47d-8ae3f782cbfe>
- b. ... *kai kur-ie*            *tyrinėtoj-ai*            *man-o*            [*j-u*            *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-u*].  
 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>

These are instances of what may be called ‘quirky’ or ‘semantic’ (‘inherent’) case assigned by the embedded verb via a lexical specification or, as in the case of negation, by a higher functional head. Let us return to the Accusative now, which is the default option both for objects and for the ES, and looks more like a ‘configurational’ or ‘structural’ case. If we assume that in Lithuanian subjects are assigned case by T (which is the least controversial option under current generative assumptions), we meet with the following difficulty. On the one hand, it is tempting to propose that just as the finite T assigns Nominative case, the non-agreeing participial T assigns Accusative in Lithuanian. On the other hand, this proposal is not feasible for the simple reason that, as was shown in Section 2, the same participial mor-



To conclude, whichever formal implementation of the case-marking mechanism in the Lithuanian participial complements is chosen, the following two groups of facts have to be taken into account:

1) Case-marking on the embedded subject is different from the kind of case marking appearing on ordinary objects of Lithuanian verbs, especially insofar as (with the exception of *laukti* ‘wait’) the presence of Accusative case on the embedded subject is independent of the matrix verb’s ability to assign this case.

2) Case-marking on the embedded subject is, at least as far as the data available are concerned, independent of its surface syntactic position, and, in particular, of the locality restrictions usually assumed for long-distance agreement/case-marking phenomena.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper has provided a description as well as an attempt of a theoretical interpretation of two main types of participial complements in Lithuanian, based on both elicited and corpus data. Let us recapitulate the most important properties of these constructions and the main points of theoretical interest.

1) In Lithuanian, participial complements provide a salient means of expressing the embedded proposition with a wide (probably open) range of predicates denoting (or at least able to denote) perception, speech and cognition. In this respect they are similar to infinitival and gerund constructions in such languages as Ancient Greek (Cristofaro, this volume), Latin (Schoof 2004), and English (Quirk et al. 1985: 1187–1196).

2) There are two main types of participial complement in Lithuanian: one involving an agreeing participle and requiring its implicit subject to be coreferential with the Nominative subject of the matrix clause; and one, appearing elsewhere, which is based on a non-agreeing participle and allows an overt subject, mostly encoded as a noun phrase in the Accusative case. Most relevant verbs combine with both agreeing and non-agreeing participial comple-

ments. Both kinds of participial complements exhibit full clausal structure, including tense and left peripheral syntactic positions, and may thus best be analysed as non-finite CPs.

3) The agreeing participial complements were shown to constitute a typologically not very common instance of an obligatory control construction. They are singular insofar as they are not subject to any kind of volitionality restrictions characteristic of prototypical obligatory control structures, and also insofar as the control relation between the matrix subject and the embedded subject is licensed not by the matrix verb but by the participial complement construction itself.

4) The class of non-agreeing participial complements falls into two subtypes. The first subtype is allowed with a limited set of verbs and can best be analysed as involving a participial clause with a null subject co-indexed with the base-generated direct object of the matrix verb. Only in this type of construction may the ‘embedded subject’ of the participial clause be promoted in passivisation and undergo the Genitive of negation rule. The other type of non-agreeing participial complement, as I have argued, cannot be analysed as a raising construction, since its subject does not in fact exhibit the relevant features of a matrix direct object, i.e. it cannot be promoted in passivisation, does not undergo the Genitive of negation rule, and behaves as a constituent of the embedded clause with respect to various tests. Furthermore, it has been shown that this construction is not an instance of ‘Exceptional Case Marking’ either, since the case marking of the embedded subject cannot be naturally analysed as coming from the matrix clause. A mechanism of ‘construction-internal’ case assignment has been proposed to account for this.

To conclude, I hope not only to have presented a detailed description of a specific type of non-finite complementation in Lithuanian, but also to have succeeded in showing that the relevant data may be of importance for the typology of non-finite complementation more generally, and prove significant for the discussion of several issues on the agenda of current grammatical theorizing, e.g. control, raising and long-distance case marking.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The research has been funded by the Department of History and Philology of the Russian Academy of Sciences and by the Russian Foundation for the Humanities, Grant No. 09-04-00297a. The travel grant of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research which allowed me to attend the Syntax of the World's Languages–III in Berlin is also gratefully acknowledged.

I am grateful to Volker Gast, Sergei Minor, Jurgis Pakerys, Yakov Testeleis, Aurelija Usonienė, Vitaly Volk, Anton Zimmerling and especially to Natalia Serdobolskaya for valuable comments and help on various stages of the research, and to Axel Holvoet (Institute of Lithuanian Language of Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Vilnius) and Antanas Smetona (Philological Faculty of the University of Vilnius) for help during my stay in Lithuania in October 2008 and May 2009. Special thanks go to my Lithuanian consultants: Aurelija Genelytė, Valdemaras Klumbys, Vidmantas Kuprevičius, Sigita Lisauskaitė, Jurga Narkevičiūtė, Rolandas Rudomanskis, Audrius Sruogis and Justinas Žilinskas. All faults and shortcomings are mine.

<sup>2</sup> This question raises not only grammatical but also sociolinguistic problems. Almost all native speakers I have consulted say that participial complements sound bookish and old-fashioned, and some of the native speakers even refused to give their judgments on these constructions saying that they do not use them in their speech at all. On the other hand, participial complements of different kinds are quite frequent in the texts found on the internet, and, notably, their distribution is by no means restricted to official or high-brow genres. It is possible to find numerous examples of participial complements on popular websites, and even in blogs and chats. Besides that, among my consultants there were two undergraduate students, who acknowledged that participial complements are not quite the way they speak in their everyday communication, but showed no reluctance towards the very idea of working with such examples and proved able to give systematic and subtle judgments. Thus, it is definitely premature to say that participial complement is an obsolete type of construction in Lithuanian.

<sup>3</sup> Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 117) provide (i) as an example of participial complement selected by a noun. However, this is not confirmed by corpus data.

- (i) *Ne naujien-a j-i es-a-nt kvail-q.*  
 not news-NOM.SG he-ACC.SG.M be-PRS-PA foolish-ACC.SG  
 'It is not news that he is foolish.'

<sup>4</sup> However, the verb *liautis* 'to stop' is exceptional in allowing same-subject participial complement on a par with the infinitive, the tense of the participle being always the Simple Past.

<sup>5</sup> By contrast, in the attributive position, participles with tenses other than Present and Simple Past appear only marginally, and in the auxiliary constructions all tenses but these two are strictly excluded. The only other construction which allows all tenses on the participles is the evidential clause type.



<sup>6</sup> Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 126) provide (ii) as an example of a participial complement introduced by the complementiser *kad* ‘that’. However, in my view (ii) can rather be analysed as an embedded evidential clause with a zero pronominal subject, on a par with examples such as (iii), where the subject is overt. It is worth noting that in sentences similar to (iii) the overt subject does not have to be coreferential with the matrix subject.

- (ii) *J-i minėj-o kad turėj-us-i Marij-q sveči-uose.*  
 he-NOM.SG.F mention-PST(3) that have-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F Maria-ACC.SG guest-LOC.PL  
 ‘She mentioned having Maria as a guest.’

- (iii) ... *sak-ė-si, kad j-i es-a-nt-i niek-uo nekalt-a.*  
 say-PST(3)-RFL that he-NOM.SG.F be-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F nothing-INS.SG.M not.guilty-NOM.SG.F  
 ‘[she<sub>i</sub>] said that she<sub>i</sub> was not guilty of anything.’ (<http://anthology.lms.lt/texts/34/tekstas/50.html>)

<sup>7</sup> Again, Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 119) mention examples where the non-agreeing participle appears in an embedded question structure. However, as they themselves acknowledge, this is a different construction characterised (i) by obligatory coreference of the embedded subject with the matrix subject (contrary to the different subject restriction of non-agreeing participles), and (ii) by a modal meaning of necessity.

<sup>8</sup> The Reflexive marker in Lithuanian surfaces as a suffix when the verb has no prefixes, but ‘jumps’ into the pre-stem position when a prefix is attached, cf. Ambrazas (1997: 222–223).

<sup>9</sup> An apparent complication arises in examples like (iv), which show a lack of agreement in number (and here also in gender) between the matrix subject and the embedded subject.

- (iv) *Švedij-oje didži-oji dal-is žmon-i-ų*  
 Sweden-LOC.SG large-NOM.SG.F.DEF part(F)-NOM.SG people-GEN.PL  
*tvirtin-a es-q laiming-i.*  
 affirm-PRS(3) be-PRS.PA-NOM.PL.M happy-NOM.PL.M  
 ‘In Sweden, a large part of the people affirm that they are happy.’  
 (<http://gaivenyte.blogas.lt/384472/psichologas-rpovilaitis-buti-laimingais-reikia-mokytis.html>)

In (iv) the grammatical subject – a singular feminine noun phrase – triggers plural masculine agreement in the embedded clause. This phenomenon can be subsumed under the notion of ‘semantic agreement’ (Corbett 1983: 9), where the participle reflects the semantic rather than formal features of the matrix subject. If examples like (iv) are regarded as instances of semantic agreement, they do not pose any problems for the analysis put forward above, since semantic agreement is possible even between constituents of the same clause, cf. (v).

- (v) ... *tik labai nedidel-ė dal-is žmon-i-ų*  
 only very small-NOM.SG.F part(F)-NOM.SG people-GEN.PL  
*yra laiming-i.*  
 be+PRS(3) happy-NOM.PL.M  
 ‘Only a very small part of the people are happy.’  
 (<http://www.mokslai.lt/referatai/referatas/teigiamos-emocijos.html>)

<sup>10</sup> Somewhat similar observations can be made about the behaviour of English clausal gerunds, cf. examples such as *Susan worried about PRO being late for dinner* vs. *Susan worried about John being late for dinner*, which are also problematic for the classic theory of control, see Pires (2006). For an interesting discussion of similar phenomena cross-linguistically see Sundaresan & McFadden (2009).

<sup>11</sup> Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 116) call the Genitive assigned by *laukti* ‘structural’; this, however, seems unjustified given the semantic motivation for this pattern of case marking: in Lithuanian, Genitive is assigned to their objects mainly by intentional verbs, such as *ieškoti* ‘search’, *norėti* ‘want’ etc.

<sup>12</sup> The list includes only those verbs with which passivisation was allowed at least by three of my consultants; there is also a handful of verbs which allow passivisation only marginally and on which different native speakers disagree. It might be of interest that it seems that younger native speakers are more liberal with respect to passivisation of the participial complement construction, which they, however, consider rather bookish and old-fashioned. However, I have not got enough data for reliable conclusions.

<sup>13</sup> An alternative analysis in terms of attributive modification or secondary predication, though applicable to the earlier stage of the historical development of the constructions in question (cf. Ambrazas 1990: 141–143), is not possible for the non-agreeing participial complements in contemporary Lithuanian for the simple reason that in this language attributes must agree with their heads, while secondary predicates either must agree or appear in the Instrumental case, see Timberlake 1988, 1990, Holvoet 2004, Giparaite 2008. I thank Volker Gast for pointing out the necessity to touch upon this issue.

<sup>14</sup> A possible exception is provided by the verb *pripažinti* ‘acknowledge, recognise’, which is frequently used in examples like (vi); however, it seems that this usage is more or less restricted to the juridical meaning of this verb and to the corresponding bureaucratic style with a higher frequency of passives.

(vi) ... *asmuo*                      *gal-i*                      *bū-ti*                      *pripažin-t-as*                      *netek-ęs*  
          person(NOM.SG)    can-PRS(3)    be-INF    recognise-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M    lose-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M  
          *Lietuv-os*                      *Respublik-os*                      *pilietyb-ės* ...  
          Lithuania-GEN.SG    Republic-GEN.SG    citizenship-GEN.SG  
          ‘... a person may be recognised as having lost the citizenship of Lithuanian Republic...’ (LKT)

<sup>15</sup> Note that *laukti* ‘wait’ is able to assign Genitive even in contexts like (89), where the subject of the participial complement is located in the embedded rather than in the matrix clause.

<sup>16</sup> See Chomsky (1973, 1981), and, for more recent proposals, *inter alia*, Chomsky (2001), Bruening (2001); see also Haspelmath (1999), Comrie and Polinsky (1999), Polinsky and Potsdam (2001), Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2004) for an analysis of a related phenomenon of long-distance agreement (LDA).

<sup>17</sup> Examples like (93) are judged by my informants as strange but not ungrammatical.

<sup>18</sup> The only context where ‘double Accusative’ is allowed in Lithuanian is the small clause construction, see Giparaitė (2008).

<sup>19</sup> Another kind of analysis, opted for by Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001), follows the lines of a ‘default’ accusative assignment proposed on different grounds for Russian by Franks (1995: 35). As Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 117) state it, “accusative is a default case assigned configurationally ... under the circumstances that the subject of the gerund [non-agreeing participle in our terms — *P.A*] is found in a specifier position of a projection which is sister to the matrix verb”. The feasibility of this analysis, as far as I may judge, essentially hinges on the locality condition on ECM which seems to be problematic for Lithuanian in the light of the data presented by postverbal embedded subjects.

<sup>20</sup> See Aarts (2008) and Gisborne (2008) for a constructional analysis of English non-finite clauses.

### Abbreviations

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

### References

- Aarts, Bas      2008    Approaches to English gerund. In: Graeme Trousdale and Nikolas Gisborne (eds.), *Constructional Approaches to English Grammar* (Topics in English Linguistics, 57), 11–32. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas    1979    *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė* [*Historical Syntax of Lithuanian Participles*]. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas    1990    *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis prichastij baltijskikh jazykov* [Comparative Syntax of Participles in Baltic Languages]. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.)    1997    *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
- Arkadiev, Peter      2009a    Aspectual uses of prefix *be-* in Lithuanian. Talk at *Chronos 9*, Paris.
- Arkadiev, Peter      2009b    *Only* in Lithuanian: At the morphology-syntax-semantics interface. Poster presented at *Moscow Syntax and Semantics*.

- Bobaljik, Jonathan and Susi Wurmbrand 2004 Long distance object agreement, restructuring and anti-reconstruction. *Proceedings of NELS 33*, 67–86.
- Bruening, Benjamin 2001 Syntax at the Edge: Cross-Clausal Phenomena and the Syntax of Passamaquoddy. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Chomsky, Noam 1973 Conditions on transformations. In: Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky (eds.), *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, 232–286. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Chomsky, Noam 1981 *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam 2001 Derivation by phase. In: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: Life in Language*, 1–73. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Comrie, Bernard and Maria Polinsky 1999 Agreement in Tsez. *Folia Linguistica* 33: 109–130.
- Corbett, Greville G. 1983 *Hierarchies, Targets and Controllers. Agreement Patterns in Slavic*. University Park: The Pennsylvania University Press.
- Cristofaro, Sonia 2003 *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Culicover, Peter and Ray Jackendoff 2003 The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79: 517–556.
- Davies, William D. and Stanley Dubinsky 2004 *The Grammar of Raising and Control. A Course in Syntactic Argumentation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dixon, Robert M.W. 2006 Complement clauses and complementation strategies in typological perspective. In: Robert M.W. Dixon and Alexandra Aikhenvald (eds.), *Complementation: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 1–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eiche, Aleksandra 1983 *Latvian Declinable and Indclinable Participles. Their Syntactic Function, Frequency and Modality*. (Stockholm Studies in Baltic Languages 1) Stockholm: Almqvist and Wikseel.
- Franks, Stephen 1995 *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geniušienė, Emma 1987 *The Typology of Reflexives*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Geniušienė, Emma, and Vladimir P. Nedjalkov 1988 Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. (Typological Studies in Language 12), 369–386. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Giparaitė, Judita 2008 Non-verbal Small Clauses in English and Lithuanian. Doctoral Dissertation, Vilnius University.

- Gisborne, Nikolas 2008 Dependencies as constructions: A case study in predicative complementation. In: Graeme Trousdale and Nikolas Gisborne (eds.), *Constructional Approaches to English Grammar* (Topics in English Linguistics, 57), 219–256. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Givón, Talmy 1980 The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements. *Studies in Language* 4: 333–377.
- Goldberg, Adele 1995 *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele 2006 *Constructions at Work. The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greenberg, Gerald and James E. Lavine 2006 New syntax in Russian and Lithuanian: The case of the adverbial participle. In: Robert Rothstein, Ernest Scatton, and Charles 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.
- Gronemeyer Claire and Aurelija Usonienė 2001 Complementation in Lithuanian. In: Claire Gronemeyer. *Laying the Boundaries of Syntax: Studies in the Interfaces between Syntax, Semantics and Lexicon*, 105–135. Lund University.
- Haspelmath, Martin 1999 Long distance agreement in Godoberi (Daghestanian) complement clauses. *Folia Linguistica* 33: 131–151.
- Holvoet, Axel 2001 On the paradigm of the oblique mood in Lithuanian and Latvian. *Linguistica Baltica* 9: 69–86.
- Holvoet, Axel 2004 On the marking of predicate nominals in Baltic. In: Philip Baldi and Pietro Umberto Dini (eds.), *Studies in Baltic and Indo-European Linguistics*, 75–90. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Holvoet, Axel 2007 *Mood and Modality in Baltic* (Baltica Varsoviensia, T. 6). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Holvoet, Axel and Arturas Judžentis 2003 Sudėtinio prijungiamojo sakinio aprašymo pagrindai [Basics of the study of complex subordinate constructions]. In: Axel Holvoet and Arturas Judžentis (eds.), *Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai. 2. Sintaksinių ryšių tyrimai*. [Studies in Lithuanian Grammar, 2. Studies in Syntactic Structures], 115–172. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Hornstein, Norbert 2003 On control. In: Randall Hendrick (ed.), *Minimalist Syntax*, 6–81. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Klimas, Antanas 1987 The Lithuanian participles: Their system and functions. *Lituanus* 33: 38–73.
- Landau, Idan 2000 *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Landau, Idan 2004 The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811–877.
- Landau, Idan 2008 Two routes of control: Evidence from case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 877–924.
- Lasnik, Howard and Robert Fiengo 1974 Complement object deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 5: 535–571.
- Lavine, James E. 2006 Is there a passive evidential strategy in Lithuanian? *Papers from the 42<sup>nd</sup> Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.
- Lehmann, Christian 1988 Towards a typology of clause linkage. In John Haiman and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse* (Typological Studies in Language 18), 181–226. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Litvinow, V. P. 1989 Der modus relativus baltischer Sprachen aus typologischer Sicht. *Baltistica* 35: 146–154.
- Mathiassen, Terje 1996 *Tense, Mood and Aspect in Lithuanian and Latvian*. (Meddelelser av Slavisk-baltisk avdeling, Universitetet i Oslo, Nr. 75)
- Nuñez, Jairo 1994 Another look at Lithuanian impersonal passives. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 24: 347–360.
- Pires, Acrisio 2006 *The Minimalist Syntax of Defective Domains. Gerunds and Infinitives*. (Linguistik Aktuell 98) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Polinsky, Maria and Eric Potsdam 2001 Long distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 583–646.
- Postal, Paul M. 1974 *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and its Theoretical Implications*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik 1985 *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, New York: Longman.
- Schmalstieg, William R. 1986 Lithuanian participles in the nominative case as the modifier of the phrase subject. *Lituanus* 32.
- Schoof, Susanne 2004 An HPSG Account of Nonfinite Verbal Complements in Latin. Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics 51.

- Serdobolskaya, Natalia      2009    Towards the typology of raising: A functional approach. In: Alexander Arkhipov, Patience Epps (eds.), *New Challenges for Typology*, 245–270. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sližienė, Nijolė      1995    The tense system of Lithuanian. In: Rolf Thieroff (ed.), *The Tense Systems in European Languages*, Vol. II, 215–232. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya and Thomas McFadden      2009    DP distribution, finiteness and control in Tamil and other languages: selection vs. Case. Ms.
- Tangl, Eberhard      1928    Der Accusativus und Nominativus cum Participio im Altlitauischen. Doctoral Dissertation, Berlin. (reprinted in *Res Balticae* 5 (1999): 151–209.)
- Timberlake, Alan      1982    The impersonal passive in Lithuanian. *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 508–524.
- Timberlake, Alan      1988)    Case agreement in Lithuanian. In: M. Barlow, Ch.A. Ferguson (eds.), *Agreement in natural language: Approaches, theories, descriptions*, 181–199. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Timberlake, Alan      1990    The aspectual case of predicative nouns in Lithuanian texts. In: Nils B. Thelin (ed.), *Verbal Aspect in Discourse*, 325–347. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Usonienė, Aurelia      2001    On direct/indirect perception with verbs of seeing and seeming in English and Lithuanian. *Working Papers*, Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics 48: 163–182.
- Wiemer, Björn      1998    Pragmatical inferences at the threshold to grammaticalization. The case of Lithuanian predicative participles and their functions. *Linguistica Baltica* 7: 229–243.
- Wiemer, Björn      2006a    Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian. In: Werner Abraham and Larisa Leisiö (eds.), *Passivisation and Typology. Form and Function*, 274–309. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wiemer, Björn      2006b    Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (A typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41: 33–49.
- Župerka, K.      1969    Sinonimija pridatočnyx predloženíj i pričastnyx, polupričastnyx, deepričastnyx oborotov v sovremennom litovskom jazyke. [Synonymy of subordinate finite clauses and participial and gerundive clauses in contemporary Lithuanian.] Doctoral dissertation abstract. Vilnius.