PARTICIPIAL COMPLEMENTATION IN LITHUANIAN

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

1. Introduction[1]

This paper is devoted to a type of complement clauses attested in Lithuanian, a Baltic language. The constructions focused upon are exemplified in examples (1a) and (1b) taken from Ambrazas (ed.) (1997: 367). Their crucial feature is the use of multifunctional non-finite forms traditionally called participles.

(1) a. *Sak-ia-u*   ***tèv-ą***   *gerai*   ***gyven-a-nt***.
       say-PST-1SG   father-ACC.SG   well   live-PRS-PA
       'I said [my] father lived well.'

    b. ***Tèv-as***   *sak-ė(-si)*   *gerai*   ***gyven-ąs***.
       father-NOM.SG   say-PST(3)(-RFL)   well   live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
       'Father said he lived well.'

Complementation patterns shown in (1) have been much studied from a diachronic point of view, see Tangl 1928/1999, and especially Ambrazas 1979 (in Lithuanian) and Ambrazas 1990 (in Russian with a German summary). Beyond Lithuanian, they are attested also 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 unanswered. The only recent study of them I am aware of, i.e. Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001), which is, by the way, probably the only survey of the rich system of sentential complementation in Lithuanian cast in terms of contemporary syntactic theory, 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 its analysis to participial complements.

There are the following reasons why Lithuanian participial constructions, in my view, are significant for the typology and theory of non-finite complementation. First of all, it is the

virtually unconstrained compatibility of participial complements with different types of predicates allowing (even occasionally) clausal arguments. Second, Lithuanian participial complements, being undoubtedly non-finite, show many properties of full-fledged clauses, such as tense and certain traits of information structure. Third, narrowing down to constructions of the type shown in (1a), Lithuanian data may shed new light on the problem 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 off of any 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.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 I will give a brief overview of the morphology and uses of Lithuanian participles. In section 3, a general overview of the participial complement constructions in Lithuanian will be given. In sections 4 and 5 I will discuss the properties of the two main types of participial constructions, as shown in (1a) and (1b), in more detail. The discussion will be cast in mildly generative terms, though I believe that an accurate theoretically-informed analysis of the data is equally compatible with any reasonable formal or informal framework.

The data used in this paper comes from three main types of source. First, published sources such as articles and monographs, which will be duly acknowledged; second, native speakers whom I have consulted (see endnote 1); third, internet resources, of which the most important one is the Corpora of Contemporary Lithuanian (Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstynas), compiled at Kaunas University (http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/); examples taken from it will be marked by the "LKT" acronym.

2. Lithuanian participles: An overview

Participles in Lithuanian 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, however, without going into any special details. For a general overview of

Lithuanian participles see, *inter alia*, Ambrazas (ed.) (1997: 326–371), Ambrazas 1990, and Klimas 1987.

The system of participles in Lithuanian is quite rich in comparison to other modern European languages, and is similar rather to that of Ancient Greek. The major division goes 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, Nuñes 1994, Wiemer 2004, 2006a, Lavine 2006, Holvoet 2007: 96–104). The Active participles distinguish all the four of the synthetic tenses of Lithuanian (see Ambrazas (ed.) (1997: 237–254), and also Sližienė 1994 and Mathiassen 1996 on the Lithuanian tense system), i.e. Present, Simple Past, Habitual Past, and Future, and the participial suffixes are normally added to the respective tense inflections. The Passive participles lack the Habitual Past form, and their Simple Past is based on the Infinitive stem rather than on the Simple Past stem.

The Passive participles are always inflected for agreement features, viz. Number, Gender and Case; they also have a special 'Neuter' form (segmentally coinciding with but prosodically distinct from, the Feminine Nominative Singular), which appears when no suitable agreement controller is available. The Active participles distinguish between a Neuter form (homophonous now with the Masculine Nominative Plural) and a 'non-agreeing' form traditionally though somewhat misleadingly called 'Gerund'. The non-agreeing participles consist of a pure participial stem stripped of any agreement inflection, and fulfill special syntactic functions (see below). Finally, Masculine Nominative Singular and Plural forms of the Active participles are morphologically irregular; in particular, they blur the otherwise clearly distinguishable participial suffix.

Table 1 presents the paradigm of the participial forms of a 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

gerti 'drink'	Active		Passive
	Agreeing	**Non-agreeing**	
Present	*geriąs* (m), *gerianti* (f)	*geriant*	*geriamas, geriama*
Preterite	*gėręs* (m), *gėrusi* (f)	*gėrus*	*gertas, gerta*
Habitual Past	*gerdavęs* (m), *gerdavusi* (f)	*gerdavus*	—
Future	*gersiąs* (m), *gersianti* (f)	*gersiant*	*gersimas, gersima*

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

(2)   *... dėkoj-u*   [**skaiči-us-iems**   *įvad-o*   *tekst-ą*]   *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 Passive (4a,b), Perfect-Resultative (5a,b) (Geniušienė and Nedjalkov 1988), and a special 'thwarted inceptive' (Mathiassen 1996: 9) form expressing that a situation was about to occur but did not actually happen, and characterised by obligatory prefixation of *be-* (a polyfunctional prefix here glossed 'Continuative') to the participle.

(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 is being built already for two years.' (Wiemer 2006a: 277)

(5) a. *J-is*   *yra*   *šiltai*   **ap-si-reng-ęs**.
       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-ęs**.
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-ą*   *buv-o*   *visk-ą*   **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 the so-called 'semipredicative' function, serving as heads of tensed non-finite subordinate clauses. This function is characteristic of both agreeing and non-agreeing Active participles, but Passive participles may also be thus used. There are two types of 'semipredicative' participial construction. The one, where the participle heads a sentential complement of a verb of speech, perception or cognition, has been exemplified in (1) and is the main focus of this study. The other type is constituted by participial adverbial clauses (for their recent analysis see Greenberg and Lavine 2006). In both types of 'semipredicative' construction, presence vs. absence of agreement morphology on the participle essentially functions as a switch-reference device. Agreeing participles are used if their subject (which is obligatorily zero) is identical to the Nominative subject of the main clause (thus, agreeing 'semipredicative' participles may appear in the Nominative case only, while the other categories such as number and gender are determined by the matrix subject), while 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 is marked Accusative in complement constructions, see ex. (1a), and Dative in adverbial constructions, see ex. (7b) with the non-agreeing participle and (7a) with the agreeing one.

(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 (ed.) 1997: 362)

b. **Vaik-ams**   **sugrįž-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 (ed.) 1997: 363)

Finally, both Active and Passive agreeing participles (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), cf. (8) with an Active evidential participle and (9) showing an 'impersonal' Passive participle in the evidential function (note that the subject of the Passive is marked Genitive).

(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 (ed.) 1997: 265)

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

There is also a number of other participial constructions, which are, however, rarely used in contemporary standard Lithuanian, being restricted either to dialects or to earlier literary texts.

Whether all the functions of Lithuanian participles outlined above are related to each other synchronically and diachronically is an unresolved question; see Ambrazas (1990) for a 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 the adverbial participles. This issue, however, lies outside the core of my interest in the present paper. In the next section I will give the most general outline of the participial complement constructions, and will briefly comment on the role of 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, viz. the one with the agreeing participle (same subject) and that with the non-agreeing participle (different subject). These properties include the

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

Participial complements in Lithuanian co-occur with a wide range of verbs, and it is probable that the relevant class of predicates is open. Though from a purely statistical point of view the majority of the participial complements occur 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 occasionally take participial complements in suitable contexts. 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 'discover that someone has done something wrong', and the participial complement denotes the content of the misdeed.

(10) ... *gegut-ė*   *j-iems*   **kukuoj-a**   *netikr-ą*   *nuotak-ą*
     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 says (lit. cuckooes) 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-ą*
     he-NOM.PL.M   hope-PST-RFL   that   can-FUT(3) catch-INF president-ACC.SG
     Reagan-ą   **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 will be able to catch President Reagan out at lying and going
     against the directions of the Congress.' (LKT)

However, examples like (10) and (11) are not very frequent, though 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 large, and in addition to the verbs listed comprises several lexemes synonymous to them.

2. Verbs of speech, and, more broadly, information transmission: *sakyti* 'say', *teigti* 'assert', *neigti* 'deny', *skelbti* 'claim', *rašyti* 'write', *vaizduoti* 'depict', *skųstis* 'complain', *grasinti* 'threaten' and a number of others.

3. Verbs of cognition: *manyti* 'think, believe', *tikėti* 'believe', *tikėtis* 'hope', *žinoti* 'know', *įtarti* 'suspect', *vaizduotis* 'imagine', *suprasti* 'understand', and a number of others.

The range of semantic classes of verbs taking participial complements in Lithuanian is quite natural from the cross-linguistic point of view, cf. Cristofaro (2003), Dixon (2006: 10), Serdobolskaya (2009). In this connection two remarks are in order. First, it is necessary to bear in mind that participial complement clause is not the only and not the unmarked means of expressing the dependent proposition with such verbs. The most common way of coding subordinate complement clauses in Lithuanian is finite indicative or subjunctive clauses introduced by nearly synonymous complementisers *kad* and *jog* 'that' (cf. Gronemeyer and Usonienė 2001), see example (12) where both complementisers are used.

(12) *J-is   vis-ą   laik-ą   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.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 726)

The question concerning the possible factors determining the choice between finite and participial complements will not be touched upon in this paper, and calls for a separate investigation[2]. However, it must be said that, evidently, participial complements are more restricted with respect to their possible heads than *kad*-clauses; for example, participial complements are generally disallowed with non-verbal heads, such as *gaila* 'pity'[3].

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, since Lithuanian participles, as has been mentioned in section 2, distinguish 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'), instead of participles usually take the tenseless infinitive[4].

Of particular interest in this respect is the behaviour of the 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 the perception verbs that the participial complementation strategy has started spreading across different verb types in the history of the Baltic languages. Last but not least, contrary to the expectation invoked by Cristofaro (2003), these verbs allow the participle to bear different tense values, cf. (13), where the event expressed by the embedded clause precedes the act of perception.

(13) ... ***girdėj-o***   *t-ą*   ***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 direct perception, which indeed requires simultaneity of the perceived event and the act of perception, and indirect perception, for instance, hearsay, as in (13), which poses no such restrictions. It is worth noting in this connection that with Present participles which express simultaneity of the subordinate and the main events, both types of perception may be expressed, 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-ą ...*   *kur*   ***girdėj-o***
      A.-NOM.SG   reach-PST(3) Hungary-ACC.SG   where   hear-PST(3)
      es-a-nt   *tėv-ą.*
      be-PRS-PA   father-ACC.SG
      'Alexander reached Hungary, where, he heard, [then] was his father.' (LKT)

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

(16) ***Mač-ia-u***   *veidrod-yje* ***es-ąs***   *ne-si-skut-ęs.*
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.'

The fact that participial complements usually are not subject to restrictions on argument (non)identity imposed by the matrix predicates is in line with the observation made above concerning the similar lack of restrictions on the temporal reference of the embedded proposition. This implies a relatively high degree of semantic independence of the participial complement with respect to the main verb (cf. Cristofaro 2003: 251–254), and raises the question 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 reduction of their clause structure (cf. e.g. Givón 1980, Lehmann 1988 and Cristofaro 2003 on the general issues pertaining to clausal reduction).

As I have already mentioned, Lithuanian participles have full-fledged Tense inflections, and it is precisely their 'semipredicative' usage (see section 2) which favours the largest range of Tense distinctions[5]. Below I give examples of both agreeing (same subject) and non-agreeing (different subject) participial complements in various tenses: Simple Past (17) and (18), Habitual Past (19) and (20), Future (21) and (22); examples of Present participles have been 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, but nothing more precise can be said on this issue.

(17) *T-uo*   *met-u*   ***sak-o-si***   *dirb-ęs*   *Los Alamos*
that-INS.SG.M   time-INS.SG say-PST(3)-RFL   work-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   L.   A.
Nacionalin-ėje   *laboratorij-oje.*
national-LOC.SG.F   laboratory-LOC.SG
'He says he worked then at the National Laboratory in Los Alamos.'
(http://www.nso.lt/ufo/lazar.htm)

(18) [*J-i*]   *prisimin-ė*   *j-į*   ***buv-us*** *labdaring-ą*
she-NOM.SG.F   remember-PST(3) he-ACC.SG.M   be-PST.PA charitable-ACC.SG.M
ir   *malon-ų.*
and   nice-ACC.SG.M
'She remembered him to have been nice and charitable.'
(http://www.druskonis.lt/archyvai/2001-02-23/kultura.htm)

(19) *Vaikin-as*   *pasakoj-o*   **ei-dav-ęs**   *su*   *iš.ties-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-ą*   *dažnai* **bū-dav-us**   *susierzin-usi-ą*   *...*
     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-ąs**   *nam-e,*
     this.time   driver-NOM.SG say-PRS(3)   live-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M   house-LOC.SG
     tolėliau   *nuo*   *centr-o...*
     farther   from   center-GEN.SG
     'This time the driver says that he will live in a house farther from the downtown'
     (http://www.klaipeda.daily.lt/temp.php?data=2004-01-03&id=1072619337)

(22) *Jurg-is*   **grasin-o**   *tėv-ą*   **atei-si-ant**   *ir*
     J.-NOM.SG   threaten-PST(3)   father-ACC.SG   come-FUT-PA   and
     j-uos   **sumuši-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*   **buv-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 comple-
ments is clearly a sign of a higher degree of syntactic autonomy and of a concomitant layer of
structure. In generative terms, Lithuanian participial complements are no less than TPs, and
now I will present evidence which suggests that there is even more structure to them, i.e. that
they are CPs. Indeed, as ex. (24) and (25) show, participial complements may contain an overt
complementiser (*ar* 'whether'[6]) or a fronted *wh*-word, which is a strong argument for postu-
lating a special position at their left periphery which can be occupied by such elements.

(24) *Prokuror-as   sak-ė   dar ne-žin-ąs,   ar*
prosecutor-NOM.SG say-PST(3) yet NEG-know-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M Q
rašy-si-ąs   *kasacin-į*   *skund-ą*   *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.' (www.londonozinios.com/a-news-2065)

(25) *J-is   ne-pamirš-dav-o   atsiųs-ti ... radiogram-ą,*
he-NOM.SG.M   NEG-forget-HAB-PST3   send-INF   radiograms-ACC.SG
praneš-dam-as   **kur**   **es-ąs**,   **kaip** gyven-ąs*...
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 complementiser are not allowed in the non-agreeing
(different-subject) participles[7], cf. (26a,b).

(26) a. **Ne-žin-a-u*   **ar**   *tėv-ą*   *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-ą*   **išėj-us**.
NEG-know-PRS-2SG   where father-ACC.SG   go.out-PST.PA
intended meaning: 'I don't know where has father gone.'

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

(27) *... ten, **kur**$_i$ *man-ė*   **rasi-ant-i** t_i *ramyb-ę*...
there   where   think-PST(3) find+FUT-PA.NOM.SG.F   peace-ACC.SG
'[go] there, where, she thought, she would find peace... '
(http://www.culture.lt/lmenas/?leid_id=2897&kas=straipsnis&st_id=199)

(28) *... tai,   **k-ą**$_i$ *Bažnyči-a*   *šimtmeči-ais*   *skelb-ė* t_i
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)

It must be noted, however, that *wh*-extraction is possible from other types of non-finite complement in Lithuanian, such as infinitives, cf. (29), so this may be only a weak piece of evidence for the CP status of the participial complements.

(29) **K-ą**   *tu*   *nor-i*   **pasaky-ti** t_i?
     what-ACC.SG   you(NOM.SG)   want-PRS(2SG)   say-INF
     'What do you want to say?'

Another important issue concerns the nature of the distinction between the agreeing and the non-agreeing participles. As it has been already pointed out, agreement in Lithuanian 'semipredicative' participles functions as a switch-reference device: presence of agreement signals coreference between the obligatorily null subject of the participle and the Nominative matrix subject, while in all other contexts the non-agreeing participles appear. It particular, 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 coreferent with a non-subject noun phrase of the matrix clause, cf. (10) repeated here as (30); here the null subject of the participle is coreferent with the Dative noun phrase of the main clause.

(30) *... gegut-ė*   *j-iems$_i$*   **kukuoj-a** $\varnothing_i$ *netikr-ą*   *nuotak-ą*
     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 says (lit. cuckooes) 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* $\varnothing_{gen}$ **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-ą*   *ryt-ą*   *nubud-ęs*   *pro*   *lang-ą*
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 to the matrix subject, compare (33a,b).

(33) a. *Jon-as*   *sak-ė*   ***j-am***   ***es-a-nt***   ***gėd-ą***.
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-ąs***   ***gėd-a***.
J.-NOM.SG   say-PST(3)   be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M   shame-NOM.SG
intended meaning: '=32a'

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

(34) *... žino-ti* **sav-e**   **es-a-nt**   *skurd-ų*   *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-ųjų*   *kiekvien-as*   *kunig-as*ᵢ   *turė-tų*
among   believe-PRS-PA-GEN.PL.DEF   each-NOM.SG.M   priest-NOM.SG   have-SBJ(3)
žino-ti   ∅ᵢ **es-ąs**   *"brol-is*   *tarp*   *broli-ų"*.
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)

     Thus it is evident that the distinction between agreeing and non-agreeing participles is based not just on the discourse parameter of the reference of the subject of the embedded clause, but also on the morphosyntactic notion of Nominative case. Similar observations have been made by Greenberg and Lavine (2006) with respect to the adverbial participial clauses, and now we see that their conclusions are valid for the complement participial clauses as well. 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 appear elsewhere; concomitantly, agreeing participles have extra morphological marking lacking with the non-agreeing ones.

The final remark concerns the usage of the Reflexive marker *-si* on the matrix verb. Though the statement in Ambrazas (ed.) (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* means 'to pretend' while simple *dėti* means '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-ąs   Bellini.
      be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M Bellini
      'Rakhmaninov, who imagined himself being Bellini'
      (http://www.culture.lt/7md/?kas=straipsnis&leid_id=550&st_id=6221)

(37) *... nes   visuomet   **vaizdav-o-si***   *sav-o   tėtuk-ą*
      because always   imagine-PRS(3)-RFL self-POSS   father-ACC.SG
      es-a-nt   *ger-ą*   *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 Reflexive marker, even with same-subject participial complements, cf. (38) and (39)[8]:

(38) *Jurg-is   **pa-(*si-)aiškin-o***   *tėv-ui*
      J.-NOM.SG PRV-(*RFL-)explain-PST(3)   father-DAT.SG
      ein-ąs   *į   mokykl-ą.*
      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-ąs*   *man   laišk-ą.*
      J.-NOM.SG speak-PST(3)(*-RFL)   write-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M   me(DAT)   letter-ACC.SG
      'Jonas was speaking that he was going to write me a letter.'

There is, however, a heterogeneous group of verbs which 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' and a few others. All these verbs take the Reflexive marker optionally, compare (40) and (41) with the verb *jausti(s)* 'fell' and (42) with the verb *už(si)miršti* 'forget'.

(40) *Es-i*   *provincial-as,*   *jei* **jaut-ie-si**   **gyven-ąs**
     be-PRS.2SG provincial-NOM.SG of   feel-PRS.2SG-RFL live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
     "provincij-oje".
     province-LOC.SG
     'You are a provincial if you feel yourself living in a "province".'
     (http://www.moteris.lt/00may/moterys/anapus.htm)

(41) *J-is*   *aiškiai*   **jauči-a**   **gyven-ąs**
     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-ąs**   *grip-u*
     J.-NOM.SG PRV-(RFL-)forget-PST3 be.ill-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M   flu-INS.SG
     ir *iš.ėj-o*   *iš*   *nam-ų.*
     and go.out-PST3 from   house-GEN.PL
     'Jonas forgot that he was ill with flu and went out.'

It must be added that the Reflexive marker here does not behave like a reflexive pronoun 'raised' from the position of the subject of the participle (though historically this probably was the case, see Ambrazas (1990: 128, 138–141) for a discussion), but rather as a lexical marker altering the meaning of the verb in such a way that it now denotes a speech or mental act directed by its agent on him/herself (such 'indirect reflexives' are widespread in the Baltic languages, cf. Geniušienė (1987: 126–137)). This is suggested by the fact that such Reflexive verbs 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 for the understanding of the syntactic structure of the participial complement constructions.

In the next sections I will discuss in more detail the individual properties of the agreeing and non-agreeing participial complements in Lithuanian.

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

As has been already shown in the previous section, non-finite complements with agreeing participles are used in situations when the subject of the embedded proposition (the perceived event or the content of a speech-act or another 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 so, then it must also have a subject position, obligatorily coreferential with the matrix subject. In this section I will argue that it is indeed so, and that the 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 discussions of control phenomena). Though nothing in my argument actually hinges upon 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 empirical arguments (cf., e.g., Hornstein 2003: 12–14). First of all, PRO in the subject position must have a c-commanding antecedent, as is evidenced by (44), which is ungrammatical since in this case the antecedent lacks altogether, and (45), which is ungrammatical because the participle agrees not with the matrix subject but rather with its possessor.

(44) *Many-ti PRO$_{arb}$ **es-ąs**   laiming-as   yra   nesąmon-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_i tėv-as_j man-o PRO*_{i/#j} **išvyk-us-i**.

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 (46) and show sloppy identity, but not strict coreference, under ellipsis (47):

(46) *Jon-as_i sak-ė Aldon-ai_j PRO_{i+j} **es-ą** laiming-i.

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_i sak-ė-si PRO_i myl-įs sav-o_i brol-į,

J.-NOM.SG say-PST(3)-RFL love-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M self-POSS brother-ACC.SG

ir Jurg-is_j taip pat ~~sakėsi PRO*_{i/j} mylįs savo*_{i/j} brolį~~.

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 in contexts of variation depending on the aspectual semantics of the construction (see e.g. Timberlake 1990, Holvoet 2004). Though the behaviour of Lithuanian predicate nominals in various non-finite contexts is not described in full detail, it seems legitimate to generalise that case agreement is available only for obligatory control structures (cf. similar observation for Russian in Landau 2008). This is neatly evidenced by (48) where the a) example shows obligatory control and case agreement while the b) example non-obligatory control and default Instrumental.

(48) a. Kiekvien-as žmog-us_i nor-i PRO_i 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_{arb} 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?'

Now, numerous examples like (49), where the predicate nominal in the agreeing participial complement shows agreement with the matrix subject, also speak in favour of the obligatory control analysis of such constructions.

(49) *Tikriausiai   kiekvien-as   žmog-us*ᵢ   *galvoj-a*
      rather   every-NOM.SG.M   man-NOM.SG   think-PRS(3)
      PROᵢ   *es-ąs*   ***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 the obligatory control analysis of the agreeing participial complements. A complication, however, comes from examples like (50), which show disagreement in number (and here also in gender) between the matrix and the embedded subject.

(50) *Švedij-oje   didži-oji   **dal-is**   žmoni-ų*
      Sweden-LOC.SG   large-NOM.SG.F.DEF   part(F)-NOM.SG   people-GEN.PL
      *tvirtin-a   **es-ą**   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 (50) the grammatical subject, being a singular feminine noun phrase, nevertheless triggers plural masculine agreement in the embedded clause. This phenomenon can be subsumed under the notion of 'semantic agreement' (Corbett 1983: 9), whereby the participle reflects the semantic rather than formal features of the matrix subject. Under closer inspection, however, such examples do not seem to pose any problems for the analysis, since semantic agreement is possible even between constituents of a single clause, cf. (51).

(51) *... tik   labai   nedidel-ė   **dal-is**   žmoni-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)

Having established that agreeing participial complements in Lithuanian are obligatory control structures, a question arises about what licenses them. In paradigmatic cases of obligatory control, it is the matrix verb's semantics and subcategorisation which are responsible for the licensing of control (cf. Davies & Dubinsky (2004: 11–12), where a closed class of subject and object control verbs in English is shown, and Culicover and Jackendoff (2003) for an essentially semantic approach to control). Moreover, as Culicover and Jackendoff (2003), following Lasnik and Fiengo (1974), claim, obligatory control hinges upon the notion of voli-

tion: it is generally possible only when the complement clause expresses an action, and the controller is that argument of the matrix predicate which is, due to the semantics of the verb or of the construction, supposed to carry that action out.

The Lithuanian case is entirely different in that, first, the participial complement construction does not impose any constraints on the nature of the embedded situation, in particular, it does not require it to be an action, cf. e.g. (50), (51). Second, the majority of verbs allowing agreeing participial complements on Lithuanian are not prototypical obligatory control verbs from the point of view of their semantics, nor do they behave like obligatory control verbs with respect to their subcategorisation. 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[9].

To conclude this section, agreeing participial complements in Lithuanian are typologically significant (though by no means unique) in that, despite their non-finiteness, they show properties of syntactically full-fledged clauses (CPs), and constitute a special case of obligatory control structure, deviating from the prototype of control both in terms of its semantics and with respect to the mechanisms responsible for its licensing.

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

In section 3 it has been shown that participial complements with non-agreeing participles behave as an elsewhere option, being used in all situations when it is impossible to establish referential identity (further shown to be an instance of obligatory control) between the Nominative subject of the matrix clause and the zero Nominative PRO-subject of the participle. For that 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 characteristics. In this section I will present evidence that there is at least two major subclasses of non-agreeing participial complements calling for different syntactic analyses.

With regard to non-finite complements such as Lithuanian non-agreeing participial constructions, the problem of the grammatical status of the subject of the embedded clause is

among the most important ones. 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 of such constructions in different languages. The so-called Raising approach involves a movement operation which converts the subject of the embedded clause into the (direct) object of the matrix clause, cf. (52b). The so-called Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) approach, by contrast, postulates that the embedded subjects gets its Accusative case *in situ* directly from the matrix verb, which thus assigns case across a clause boundary, cf. (52c).

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

   b. *Sakiau   tėvą*$_i$ [t$_i$ *gerai gyvenant*]
        |__ACC_↑ ↑_____|

   c. *Sakiau   [tėvą gerai gyvenant]*
        |___ACC_↑

In this section I will be concerned with empirical arguments for and against analysing different instances of Lithuanian non-agreeing participial complements along the lines of either Raising or ECM, and will eventually argue that Lithuanian constructions are problematic for both approaches. In particular, I will show that though in some cases the Accusative noun phrase corresponding to the subject of the participle (for the sake of abbreviation, I will hereafter call this noun phrase 'embedded subject' or ES) behaves like the direct object of the matrix verb, there are in fact no reasons to assume that it is a raising operation which is responsible for its 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, the Raising analysis thus becoming implausible. Finally, I will specifically deal with the question of case marking of the ES and will show that an analysis alternative to the classic ECM must be called for.

5.1. Is the embedded subject a direct object?

Let us start with showing that the ES of the participial complement is indeed in many respects similar to the ordinary direct object of the matrix verb (see also Ambrazas (ed.)

(1997: 367–368)). This may be proven by several diagnostics. First of all, reflexive (53) and reciprocal (54) pronouns may be licensed in the ES position, compare (55a,b) with these elements featuring in the ordinary direct object function.

(53) ...*aš*ᵢ *pasipasakoj-us*   *daktar-ui*   *apie*   *sav-o*   *sapn-ą,*
    I   tell-PST.PA(NOM.SG.F)   doctor-DAT.SG   about   self-POSS   dream-ACC.SG
    kuri-ame   *sapnav-a-u*ᵢ   **sav-e**ᵢ   **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)

(54) *Rajon-o*   *politik-ai*ᵢ   *vis*   *dažniau*   *įtari-a*
    district-GEN.SG politician-NOM.PL still   more.often   suspect-PRS(3)
    [**vien-as**   **kit-ą**]ᵢ   **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 still more often suspecting each other of making politically
    motivated decisions' (http://www.gargzdai.lt/?lt=1148888566)

(55) a. *J-is*ᵢ   *gerbi-a*   **sav-e**ᵢ.
       he-NOM.SG.M   respect-PRS(3)   self-ACC
       'He respects himself.'

    b. *J-ie*ᵢ   *gerbi-a*   [**vien-as**   **kit-ą**]ᵢ.
       he-NOM.PL.M   respect-PRS(3)   one-NOM.SG.M   other-ACC.SG
       'They respect each other.'

The second diagnostic comes from such feature of Lithuanian as Genitive of negation. If the negative prefix is attached to the verb, the Accusative case on the direct object is mandatory replaced by the Genitive, cf. (56); as (57) shows, this apparently must happen with the ES of the participial complement, too (however, below we will see that the picture is much more complicated).

(56) *Jon-as*   **ne**-*paraš-ė*   **laišk-o** // ****laišk-ą**.
    J.-NOM.SG   NEG-write-PST(3)   letter-GEN.SG // *letter-ACC.SG
    'Jonas did not write the letter.'

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

The third argument comes from word order. Word order of major clausal constituents in Lithuanian is basically SVO, but various movements driven by information structure considerations are abundant. In particular, the direct object may be fronted from it basic postverbal position, cf. (58), and similar operation is perfectly licit with the ES, too, cf. (59).

(58) *Tik   patirt-is   ir   kanči-a   **žmog-ų**ᵢ*
     only   experience-NOM.SG and   suffering-NOM.SG   man-ACC.SG
     padar-o   tᵢ   žmog-umi...
     make-PRS(3)   man-INS.SG
     'Only experience and suffering make man a man.' (LKT)

(59) *Žmog-us   [**išorin-ius   atribut-us**]ᵢ   gal-i   many-ti tᵢ*
     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)

Further, direct objects in Lithuanian passivise, and so may the ES, cf. (60); since now the ES becomes the subject of the matrix clause, the construction looks like that with the agreeing participle.

(60) *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 marks its object Genitive rather than Accusative, cf. (61); when this verb combines with a participial complement, it subject surfaces in the Genitive, too, cf. (62)[10].

(61) *Lauki-u   Aldon-os // *Aldon-ą.*
     wait-PRS.1SG   A.-GEN.SG // *A.-ACC.SG
     'I am waiting for Aldona.'

(62) *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)

The evidence presented above seems to allow us to conclude that the embedded sub-ject of non-agreeing participial complements occupies the position of the direct object of the matrix verb. However, there are at least three further questions: first, is this evidence indeed sufficient for this conclusion? Second, if the noun phrase in question is actually a direct ob-ject, is it through raising from the embedded clause that it came to occupy this position? And third, do all non-agreeing participial complements show uniform behaviour with respect to the above discussed diagnostics? As we will see in the next subsection, the answers to these ques-tions turn out to be problematic for the uniform raising analysis.

5.2. Evidence against direct objecthood

As regards the first of the three questions posed in the last paragraph of the previous subsection, when further data is taken into account, it turns out that not all diagnostics of ma-trix direct objecthood are indeed very reliable. This is especially true of the word order, since in Lithuanian constituents of non-finite complement clauses may be freely extracted, cf. (63) showing the direct object scrambled out of an infinitival clause and (64) with a locative phrase moved out of a participial complement. Thus, examples such as (59) may well be in-stances of long-distance rather that clause-bound scrambling.

(63) *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-ą   knyg-ą*]ᵢ   *liepi-a   skaity-ti*   tᵢ
this-ACC.SG.F book-acc.sg order-PRS(3) read-INF
'I have heard that in some schools they order [students] to read this book...'
(http://skaityta.lt/review/get/78)

(64) *Toki-a   agnostin-ė   pozicij-a   ne-trukd-o*
such-NOM.SG.F agnostic-NOM.SG.F position-NOM.SG   NEG-prevent-PRS(3)
[*aukščiausi-oje hierarchij-os   pakop-oje*]ᵢ   *suvok-ti*   tᵢ
highest-LOC.SG.F hierarchy-GEN.SG   level-LOC.SG   conceive-INF
es-a-nt   Diev-ą.
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)

Genitive of negation is also problematic, since, as (65a,b) show, this phenomenon is not clause-bound in Lithuanian, either.

(65) 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-ą knyg-ą*]]].
      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-ą knyg-ą*]]].
      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 reflexive facts are at best inconclusive, too, since reflexive in Lithuanian may be long-distance bound in non-finite configurations like (66) and (67).

(66) *Algird-as*$_i$ *liep-ė*   *Jurgi-ui*$_j$ ***griž-ti***   *į*   ***sav-o***$_{i/j}$ *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'.

(67) *Jon-as*$_i$ *įrod-ė*   *Algird-ą*$_j$ ***buv-us***   ***sav-o***$_{i/j}$ *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.'

Thus, there actually remains the only fully reliable diagnostic of direct objecthood, viz. passivisation. However, let us ask with respect to it our second question, i.e. how did the ES come to occupy the position from which it may passivise? The answer to this question crucially hinges 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[11]: *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. (68)–(69), though, as is clear from examples (70)–(71), this is not a consequence of their inherent unpassivisability.

(68) *Kaltinam-asis* **buv-o** *įrody-t-as* **es-ąs**
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 the defendant was proved to be innocent.'

(69) *Kurši-ai* **buv-o** **suprant-a-m-i** **es-ą**
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.'

(70) *...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)

(71) *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 cast a more detailed look on those verbs which reliably allow passivisation in
the participial complement construction. Almost all of them share the following characteristic:
the interpretation of their combination with a participial complement entails the interpretation
of a simple clause with the direct object, cf. (72a,b). By contrast, the implication (72a) is not
valid with the majority of verbs not allowing passivisation, cf. (72c), often for the simple rea-
son that they are ungrammatical with such type of object.

(72) a. V NP$_{\text{ACC}}$ V$_{\text{PART}}$ → V NP$_{\text{ACC}}$

    b. *Mač-ia-u* **tėv-ą** **parein-ant.**   →   *Mačiau tėv-ą.*
      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-ą** *gerai* **gyven-a-nt.** vs. *Sakiau tėvą*
      say-PST-1SG   father-ACC.SG well   live-PRS-PA
      'I said [my] father lived well.'   *'I said my father.'

      When passivised, these verbs show a similar implication, cf. (73).

(73) a. NP$_{NOM}$ V$_{PASS}$ V$_{PART}$ → NP$_{NOM}$ V$_{PASS}$

b. ***Tėv-as***   *buv-o*   *mat-o-m-as*   ***parein-ąs***. → ***Tėvas*** *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 with those verbs with which 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 base-generated an assigned a thematic role in the matrix clause. The syntactic structure of examples like (74a) is then (74b), with the subject of participial complement linked to the thematic subject of the main clause via a control relation, rather than (74c) created by a raising operation.

(74) a. *Jurg-is*   *buv-o*   *pristaty-t-as*
J.-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3)   introduce-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
es-ąs   *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$_{PASS}$ [PRO$_i$ V$_{PART}$]

c. NP$_{NOMi}$ V$_{PASS}$ [t$_i$ V$_{PART}$]

Extending this analysis to the active counterparts of such passive clauses (75a), it could be possible to argue that with this set of verbs the non-agreeing participial complement displays an object control structure shown in (75b) rather than a raising structure (75c).

(75) a. *Pristači-a-u*   ***Jurg-į***   ***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 corroborated by the fact that adverbs modifying the participle cannot precede the ES with verbs of this group, cf. (76a,b).

(76) a. *Mat-a-u*   **Jurg-į**   [**lėtai**   **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*   **lėtai**   **Jurg-į**   [**vaikščioj-a-nt**   *park-e*].
       see-PRS-1SG   slowly   J.-ACC.SG   walk-PRS-PA   park-LOC.SG
       intended meaning '= (76a)'

This analysis, however, is not unproblematic. First of all, as it was pointed out with re-
spect to participial complements by Holvoet and Judžentis (2003: 144; see also section 3
above), verbs of perception allow not only a direct perception interpretation for which impli-
cation (72a) is valid, but also other interpretations involving no such implications, cf. ex. (13)
and (15) in section 3. Moreover, even with the direct perception interpretation, verbs of the
class now discussed allow participial complements with no reasonable thematic object, cf.
(32), repeated here as (77).

(77)   *Vien-ą*   *ryt-ą*   *nubud-ęs*   *pro*   *lang-ą*
       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)

Thus, these constructions are actually ambiguous between the two analyses, one with
object control (75b) and another not yet determined (as I will show, the raising analysis as
shown in (75c) is not valid). However, it may be argued that at least the passive structures like
(60), (73b) and (74a) are derived only from the object control structure; evidence for this
comes from the semantics and from the fact that the verbs for which the object control analy-
sis is impossible do not allow passivisation, either[12].

5.3. Does the embedded subject belong to the matrix clause?

Whichever analysis we assume for the minority of verbs allowing passivisation in par-
ticipial complement construction, the unpassivisability of the other verbs strongly suggests
that the embedded subject does not in fact occupy the matrix direct object position. The
strongest piece of evidence for this conclusion comes from the Genitive of negation. Consider
examples (78)–(80).

(78) a. *Mit-ai   atskleidži-a žmog-ui   pači-ą   gili-ąją*
    myth-NOM.SG reveal-PRS(3) man-DAT.SG very-ACC.SG.F deep-ACC.SG.F.DEF
    ties-ą,   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.M be-PRS-PA myth-INS.PL
    'Myths reveal the deepest truths to the 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)

    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-ą // *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-ą // *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 the comparison of the examples (78–80a), involving participial complements, and the examples (78–80b) with ordinary direct objects of the same verbs shows, there are instances when 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 is not the direct object of the matrix verb, and is not a constituent of the matrix clause.

Though the case marking of the ES in participial complement constructions with the negated matrix verb is not an entirely clear-cut phenomenon (different speakers show sometimes mutually contradicting judgments, and there are matrix verbs for which both Accusative

and Genitive seem to be grammatical under negation), the data suggests that there is a robust though non-absolute correlation between passivisation, on the one hand, and Genitive of negation, on the other. Indeed, the sets of verbs which simultaneously allow passivisation and require 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 and even require Accusative under negation.

The anaphora facts pull in the same direction. As we have seen above, reflexive in the position of the embedded subject can be bound by the matrix subject (34), (53), and long-distance binding of reflexives is possible in these constructions, too (67). However, this only speaks 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,b).

(81) a. *Jurg-is*$_i$ *myl-i*   ***j-o***$_{*i/j}$ *žmon-ą.*
     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*$_i$ *įtari-a*   ***j-o***$_{i/j}$ *žmon-ą 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 example (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 (82b), binding by the matrix subject becomes possible, which suggests that the embedded and the matrix subjects are located in different clauses.

The facts that in a subtype of participial complement the ES cannot be passivised, does not undergo Genitive of negation rule, and 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 rather than of the matrix clause.

First, the embedded subject and the participle may behave as a single constituent with respect to such syntactic operations as pied-piping (82), topic fronting (83), and ellipsis (84).

(82) *... toliau   perskait-a-u   apie   T-ą,*   [*kur-į*   *atei-si-ant*]ᵢ
     further   read-PRS-1SG   about   that-ACC.SG.M   which-ACC.SG.M   come-FUT-PA
     Jon-as   skelb-ė   tᵢ...
     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)

(83) [*Jurg-į   gyven-a-nt   Viln-yje*]ᵢ   *ne-žinoj-a-u*   tᵢ.
     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-į   atvyk-us*],
     father-NOM.SG   already   know-PRS(3)   J.-ACC.SG   arrive-PST.PA
     o   motin-a   dar   ne-žin-o   [~~*Jurgį 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 with verbs of the 'passivising' type, cf. (76), with the majority of matrix predicates there is normally no restrictions on the mutual position of the ES and the lower adverbs, cf. (85)

(85) a. *Sak-ia-u   [Jurg-į   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-į   atvyk-si-ant*].
       say-PST-1SG   tomorrow   J.-ACC.SG   arrive-FUT-PA
       '=(85a)'

Third, 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 constitutes new information, consider examples (86)–(88). Note that example (87) shows that such word order is permitted with matrix verbs of the type allowing passivisation and Genitive of negation, and that in (88) the postverbal embedded subject is assigned 'quirky' Genitive by the verb *laukti* 'wait'.

(86) *Jurg-is   neig-ė*   [*savo   nam-uose   buv-us   šautuv-ą*].
     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.'

(87) ...*ir*   *mat-o*   [*nuo mišk-o*   **atein-a-nt**   **kareiv-į** ...]
       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)

(88) *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 several diagnostics. First, it must appear in the Genitive when the embedded predicate is a negative existential, cf. (89).

(89) *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, for some speakers the participial complement with a postverbal subject is the only type of non-agreeing participial complement allowed with particular verbs, cf. (90a,b); this may be due to the fact that constructions like (90a), but not like (90b), can be parsed as involving a direct object with an intransitive verb.

(90) 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. (91a,b)

(91) a. *Jon-as*ᵢ   *įrod-ė*   *Algird-o kambar-yje buv-us*   **sav-o**ᵢ   **šautuv-ą**.
       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*_i   *įrod-ė*   *Algird-o*_j *kambar-yje*

   J.-NOM.SG prove-PST(3) A.-GEN.SG room-LOC.SG

   buv-us   ***j-o***_{i/j}   *šautuv-ą.*

   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 subsection 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. This said, we now have to answer the last important question, i.e. about 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 subsection I will show that such an analysis is also problematic.

5.4. Where does the embedded subject get case from?

As we have already seen, there is quite robust evidence against assuming 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 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 the direct object, this noun phrase is assigned case by the verb. Indeed, we have seen that the verb *laukti* 'wait', in accordance with its lexical specifications, assigns ES Genitive rather than Accusative[13], and that negation on the matrix verb requires the ES to be put into Genitive with this class of matrix verbs.

When we now turn to the other subclass of the non-agreeing participial complement, i.e. that where the ES is located in the participial clause itself, the question of its case marking becomes much more problematic. It has been already 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 sufficiently 'close' in syntactic

structure to the matrix verb[14]. However, as I will try to show, this analysis does not work for the Lithuanian data, since unless special technical stipulations are assumed, it is not plausible that the embedded subject indeed gets its case from the matrix verb.

First of all, the embedded subject of the non-agreeing participial complement can be marked Accusative even in the presence of a genuine direct object already so marked, see (92)[15]; however, no verb in Lithuanian can assign Accusative case twice to noun phrases with different semantic and syntactic functions[16], which suggests that the Accusative on *tėvą* 'father' in (90) does not come from the verb *patikino* 'assured'.

(92) *Jurg-is*   *patikin-o*   **policinink-ą**   [**sav-o**   **tėv-ą**
    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 indicated 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 (93a). This pattern of case marking, however, is not retained when the same verb co-occurs with a participial complement (93b).

(93) a. *Ar*   *tik-i*   **t-uo** // [??]**t-ą**   *k-ą*   *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. (94).

(94) ...*kai* **man-o-m-a** [**privači-ą** **iniciatyv-ą** *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-ą*].
 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 of the Lithuanian participial complements. So, the question remains where the ES gets its case from. Since, as it has been just shown, it cannot get it 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 will show that actually both are involved in the Lithuanian participial complement construction.

First of all, there are clear instances of the subject of the participial complement being assigned case by the embedded verb, e.g. when there is a participle of a predicate with a Dative subject, cf. (95a,b).

(95) 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 assigned by negation on the participle, cf. (89), (90b), and in the partitive Genitive licensed by an existential embedded predicate, cf. (96a,b).

(96) a. *Net kai rezerv-ų* *nėra* – **j-ų** *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-ų   es-a-nt***
  some which-NOM.SG.M researcher-NOM.PL think-PRS(3) it-GEN.PL be-PRS-PA
kel-is   milijard-us   ton-ų].
  several-ACC.PL.M billion-ACC.PL ton-GEN.PL
'Some researchers think that there are several milliard tons of them [of sapropel]'
(http://ausis.gf.vu.lt/mg/nr/99/2/2kadun.html)

These were the 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 turn again to the Accusative, which is the default option
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 genera-
tive assumptions), we arrive at the following difficulty. On the one hand, it is tempting to pro-
pose that just as the finite T assigns Nominative, the non-agreeing participial T assigns Accu-
sative 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 morphology occurs with a Dative subject in
the adverbial participles, compare ex. (97a,b):

(97) a. *Tėv-as   sak-ė   [**vaik-us   sugrįž-us**]*.
    father-NOM.SG   say-PST(3) child-ACC.PL return-PST.PA
    'Father said that the children had returned.'

  b. [***Vaik-ams   sugrįž-us***]*,   pra.gyd-o   lakštingal-a.*   (=7a)
    child-DAT.PL return-PST.PA start.singing-PST(3)   nightingale-NOM.SG
    'When the children came back, a nightingale burst into singing.' (Ambrazas (ed.)
    1997: 363)

It does not seem to be justified to claim that there are in fact two kinds of non-finite T
heads, one reserved for the complement clauses and assigning Accusative, and the other ap-
pearing in the adverbial clauses and assigning Dative, both of them being always realised by
identical morphology. Rather, I propose an analysis where the non-agreeing participial T in
Lithuanian is unable to assign case at all (or, at least, its case-assigning potential is overridden
in the constructions in question), and the subject of the participle, be it complement or adver-
bial, gets its case from a higher functional head, namely C (see Landau 2008: 898 for a claim
based on entirely different material that C must be able to assign case)[17].

Thus examples (97a) and (97b) can be analysed as follows:

(98) a. ... [$_{VP}$ V [$_{CP}$ C$_{[acc]}$ [$_{TP}$ NP$_{ACC}$ ... V$_{part}$]]]
                   └____ACC___↑

   b. [$_{CP}$ C$_{[dat]}$ [$_{TP}$ NP$_{DAT}$ ... V$_{PART}$]] [$_{TP}$ ...]
            └____DAT___↑

This analysis has the following advantages. First, it allows us to make a broader generalisation about the case assignment in non-agreeing participial clauses, comprising both the complement and adverbial types. Second, since the case assignment is now realised clause-internally, possible problems with the postverbal embedded subject being inaccessible to the matrix verb are obviated. Third, this model of case assignment is compatible with non-generative constructional approaches (e.g. in the spirit of Goldberg 1995, 2006) which would analyse both Dative and Accusative case marking of the subject of participial clauses as a dedicated feature of the respective constructions[18].

To conclude, whichever formal implementation of the case-marking mechanism in the Lithuanian participial complements is opted for, it has to be take into account the following two groups of facts:

1) Case-marking on the embedded subject is different from the kind of case marking appearing on ordinary objects of verbs in Lithuanian, especially in that (with the exception of *laukti* 'wait') the presence of Accusative 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 can tell, 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 been devoted to the empirical description and an attempt of a theoretical interpretation of two main types of participial complements in Lithuanian based both on elicited and corpus data. Let us recapitulate the most important features of these constructions and the principal points of their analysis.

1) Participial complement in Lithuanian is a salient means of expressing the embedded proposition with a wide and probably open range of predicates denoting (or only potentially 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.

2) There two main kinds of participial complement in Lithuanian: the one involves the agreeing participle and requiring its non-expressed subject to be referentially identical to the Nominative subject of the matrix clause, while the other, appearing elsewhere, is based on the 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 complements. Both kinds of participial complements show full clausal structure, including tense and left periphery, and thus may best be analysed as nonfinite CPs.

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

4) The non-agreeing participial complements fall into two subtypes. The first subtype is allowed with a limited set of verbs and can be best analysed as involving a participial clause with a null subject co-indexed to the base-generated direct object of the matrix verb. Only in this type of construction the 'embedded subject' of the participial clause may be passivised 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 show the relevant features of a matrix direct object, i.e. cannot be passivised, does not undergo Genitive of negation rule, and behaves as a constituent of the embedded clause with respect to various tests. It has been further shown that this constructions 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 that I have not only presented a detailed description of a kind of non-finite sentential complement in Lithuanian, but that I also succeeded in showing that this data may be of importance for the typology of nonfinite complementation and prove significant for the discussion of such issues on the agenda of current grammatical theory as control, raising and long-distance case marking.

Notes

[1] The research has been funded by the Department of History and Philology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. 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 Sergei Minor, Jurgis Pakerys, Yakov Testelets, Aurelija Usonienė, Vitaly Volk, 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. 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.

[2] 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.

[3] Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 117) adduce (i) as an example of participial complement selected by a noun. However, this is not confirmed by corpus data.

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

---

[4] However, the verb *liautis* 'to stop' is exceptional in that it allows same-subject participial complement on a par with the infinitive, the tense of the participle being always the Simple Past.

[5] 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.

[6] Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 126) give (ii) as an example of participial complement introduced by the complementizer *kad* 'that'. However, in my view (ii) can be analysed rather 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 to the matrix subject.

(ii)   *J-i*   *minėj-o*   **kad**   **turėj-us-i**   *Marij-ą*   *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$_i$] said that she$_i$ was not guilty of anything.' (http://anthology.lms.lt/texts/34/tekstas/50.html)

[7] Again, Gronemeyer and Usonienė (119) mention examples where the non-agreeing participle appears in an embedded question structure. However, as they themselves acknowledge, this is a different construction characterized (1) by the obligatory coreference of the embedded and the matrix subjects (contrary to the different subject restriction of the non-agreeing participles), and (2) by a modal meaning of necessity.

[8] 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 (ed.) (1997: 222–223).

[9] 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.

[10] 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: intentional verbs in Lithuanian, such as *ieškoti* 'search', *norėti* 'want' assign Genitive to their objects.

[11] The list includes only those verbs with which passivization was allowed at least by three of my consultants; there is also a handful of verbs which allow passivization 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 passivization of the participial complement construction, which they, however, consider rather bookish and old-fashioned. However, I have not got enough data for reliable conclusions.

[12] A possible exception comes form the verb *pripažinti* 'acknowledge, recognize', which is frequently used in examples like (iv); 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.

(iv) ... *asmuo* *gal-i* *bū-ti* ***pripažin-t-as*** ***netek-ęs***
  person(NOM.SG) can-PRS(3) be-INF recognize-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)

[13] Note that *laukti* 'wait' is able to assign Genitive even in contexts like (88), where the subject of the participial complement is located in the embedded rather than in the matrix clause.

[14] 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).

[15] Examples like (92) are judged by my informants as strange but not ungrammatical.

[16] The only context where 'double Accusative' is allowed in Lithuanian is the small clause construction, see Giparaitė 2008.

[17] 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.

[18] 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 − pre-

sent, PST – past, PTCL – particle, PVB – preverb, Q – question particle, RFL – reflexive, 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.

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 Indeclinable 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: Clayre 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 42nd 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)

Nuñes, 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.

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.

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 8th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 508–524.

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.

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.), *Passivization 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.