LONG-DISTANCE GENITIVE OF NEGATION IN LITHUANIAN

Peter Arkadiev
(Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow & Vilnius University,
peterarkadiev@yandex.ru)

1. Introduction[1]

In Lithuanian, the Accusative direct object of transitive verbs changes its case marking to the Genitive when the predicate is negated, cf. examples (1a) vs. (1b):

(1) a. *Jon-as* *per-skait-ė* ***laišk-ą***.
Jonas-NOM.SG PRV-read-PST(3) letter-ACC.SG
'Jonas read the letter.'

b. *Jon-as* ***ne****-per-skait-ė* ***laišk-o***.
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-PRV-read-PST(3) letter-GEN.SG
'Jonas did not read the letter.'

The object Genitive of Negation (further GenNeg) in Lithuanian is characterized by the following general properties:

1) GenNeg is obligatory and does not depend on any properties either of the transitive verb or of the object itself; for instance, proper names, cf. example (2a), and personal pronouns, cf. example (2b), are affected by the rule just as well as common noun phrases like the one shown in example (1); note also that the verb *matyti* 'see' is removed from the semantic prototype of transitivity as formulated by Hopper & Thompson (1980) and Tsunoda (1981), but given that it is syntactically transitive, its object is affected by GenNeg all the same.

(2) a. ***Ne****-mači-au* ***Jon-o*** */ *Jon-ą*.
NEG-see-PST.1SG Jonas-GEN.SG /*ACC.SG
'I did not see Jonas.'

b. ***Ne****-mači-au* ***tav-ęs*** */ *tav-e*.
NEG-see-PST.1SG 2SG-GEN.SG /*ACC.SG
'I did not see you.'

2) GenNeg can affect the direct object of a non-negated Infinitive embedded under a negated matrix verb, cf. example (3). This long-distance GenNeg is not always obligatory to the same extent as the local (clause-bound) GenNeg.

(3) *Jon-as* ***ne****-nor-i* *rašy-ti* ***laišk-o*** */ *laišk-ą*.
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-want-PRS(3) write-INF letter-GEN.SG / *ACC.SG
'Jonas does not want to write a letter.'

[1] I am grateful to the audiences of the workshops "Grammar, Lexicon and Argument Structure in Baltic" (Salos, July 27–August 3 2014) and "Voice and Grammatical Relations in Baltic" (Vilnius, 22–24 January 2015), as well as of the international conference "Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters" (Moscow, 16–18 October 2013) for their feedback, and especially to Axel Holvoet, James Lavine, Ilja Seržant and Björn Wiemer for their many useful and insightful suggestions. I also thank all my Lithuanian consultants, too many to be all listed here, for their patience and generous help, as well as Jurgis Pakerys, Auksė Razanovaitė and Benita Riaubienė for making some of the relevant papers available to me. Special thanks to Anžalika Dubasava and Merilin Miljan for making the Belorussian and Estonian data available to me. All faults and shortcomings are mine.

Moreover, matrix negation can trigger GenNeg on several (potentially all) direct object NPs embedded under it, cf. example (4), as well as on secondary predicates or floating modifiers associated with such objects, cf. example (5).

(4) *Tėv-ai* ***ne**-mok-o* ***vaik-ų*** */ *vaik-us* *dažy-ti* ***tvor-os*** */ ?**tvor-ą***.
father-NOM.PL NEG-teach-PRS(3) child-GEN.PL / child-ACC.PL paint-INF fence-GEN.SG / fence-ACC.SG
'Parents do not teach the children to paint the fence.' (elicited)

(5) ***Ne**-gal-i-m-a* *palik-ti* ***motin-os*** ***vien-os*** */ *vien-ą*.
NEG-can-PRS-PP-DF leave-INF mother-GEN.SG one-GEN.SG.F / one-ACC.SG
'It is impossible to leave one's mother alone.' (elicited)

This article is concerned with the long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian and asks the following questions:

1) Which kinds of matrix predicates allow long distance GenNeg?

2) "How far" can the GenNeg rule triggered by the matrix negation reach into the chain of embedded clauses and what constrains it?

3) Is GenNeg operative in other non-finite contexts besides the Infinitive in Lithuanian, such as participial complements?

4) How can the phenomenon of long-distance GenNeg be interpreted in an areal-typological perspective? This question is important given that it is well known that negation affects case marking of direct objects in other languages geographically close to Lithuanian, e.g. in Polish and Estonian.

By contrast, the following questions will not be addressed in this article: (i) the behavior of accusative measure phrases and temporal adverbials, which is not identical to that of direct objects (cf. some remarks in Kozhanov 2015); (ii) the impact of different types of negation (i.e. contrastive or metalinguistic negation) on GenNeg; this issue requires a separate empirical investigation; (iii) theoretical interpretation of the Lithuanian long-distance GenNeg, beyond some informal speculations in the conclusions. Regarding the last point, my contribution is mainly empirical and theory-neutral, and its aim is to provide a coherent description of the most important facts which should be taken into account by any syntactic framework.

The phenomenon of long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian is both well-known and understudied. It is usually recorded in the grammars of Lithuanian as a prescriptive rule (e.g. Ulvydas (ed.) 1976: 336; Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 669), sometimes with qualifications that in certain (not well-defined) cases the Accusative can also be used; some of the existing formulations are inaccurate, e.g. Mathiassen (1996: 185) states that GenNeg occurs with "auxiliaries" (a notion not defined), giving as an example *norėti* 'want' and possibly implying that GenNeg does not occur with matrix verbs with non-auxiliary-like behaviour, cf. also Šukys (1998: 110–111). I know only a handful of articles specifically dealing with GenNeg (both local and long-distant); thus, Švambarytė (1998, 1999) discusses variation between Genitive and Accusative under negation in Lithuanian standard language and dialects, while Menantaud (2007) compares the extent of GenNeg in Lithuanian and Latvian; Menantaud (1999) is a more theoretically than empirically oriented discussion of the (local) GenNeg in Polish and Lithuanian. The only study discussing long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian from a theoretically-informed perspective is Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 128–129), some of whose claims I will show below to be not fully accurate. Therefore, the present article aims at filling the gap in the description of this aspect of Lithuanian grammar and in particular at unveiling the real extent of both the application of long-distance GenNeg and the variation in its occurrence in present-day Standard Lithuanian.

My empirical data comes from three main sources. First, it is native speakers' judgments of a large number of elicited examples. All in all, I have consulted 18 native speakers of Standard Lithuanian, men and women from 20 to 50 years old; all of them are educated and

most but not all of them are philologists. It should be kept in mind that not all examples have been checked will all speakers; almost all elicited examples in the article are presented together with the figures showing how many of the speakers have accepted them with particular case marking. The second source is the Corpus of Modern Lithuanian (LKT, tekstynas.vdu.lt, ca. 140 mil. tokens); since this corpus lacks any kind of morphological annotation, it was not technically possible to search for all possible combinations of a negated verb with an infinitive, but only for particular matrix verbs. The third source of data is Google, which was mainly used in order to obtain data for statistical analysis. Given the sources available, it is possible that the data presented in this article contains serious lacunae of which the author is not aware.

The article is structured as follows. In section 2 I discuss the occurrence of long-distance GenNeg with different kinds matrix predicates taking infinitival complements. In section 3 I address the question of the optionality of long-distance GenNeg and certain factors which facilitate or inhibit the application of the rule. Section 4 shows that GenNeg is potentially unbounded in its application and investigates possible constraints on it. In section 5 I discuss GenNeg in participial clauses, and section 6 puts the Lithuanian data into the areal context. In the Conclusions I summarize my findings and make some preliminary theoretical observations.

2. Kinds of matrix predicates and GenNeg

In this section I discuss the occurrence of long-distance GenNeg with regard to the matrix predicates (including verbs and larger constructions) which embed the infinitival clause with a direct object. Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 129) claim that long distance GenNeg depends on the type of the matrix predicate: "The genitive of negation usually applies in constructions with raising, subject control ... The genitive of negation does not apply to object control structures".[2] My data (both elicited and naturally occurring) suggest that long-distance GenNeg is perfectly licit with both subject and object control matrix verbs, and that when substantial differences between types of matrix predicates in GenNeg licensing are observed, they have nothing to do with the distinction between various kinds of control. Below I survey different kinds of matrix predicates with respect to GenNeg.

2.1. Same-subject complement matrix verbs

The rubric of "same-subject complement matrix verbs" includes verbs falling under the headings of both "subject control" and "raising to subject" verbs, as well as predicates which can arguably be characterized as modal or phasal auxiliaries; since for Lithuanian distinguishing between subject control and raising-to-subject constructions, on the one hand, and between clearly biclausal constructions and constructions showing some degree of clausal integration, on the other hand, is notoriously difficult (see e.g. Holvoet 2007: 129–152 on the lack of specific grammatical features of modal verbs in Baltic), and since these distinctions so far do not seem to be of great relevance for my purposes, I will further subclassify different same-subject matrix verbs only on the basis of their semantics.

Long-distance GenNeg is attested (and is in fact a preferred if not the only option) with the following subtypes of same-subject complement predicates:

1. Modal predicates with Nominative subjects such as *galėti* 'can' (6), *turėti* 'must' (7):

[2] Note that Gronemeyer & Usonienė exemplify their "raising constructions" by the verb *norėti* 'want', which is clearly an error.

(6) *Vartoj-a-nt-ys antibiotik-us* ***ne****-gal-i ger-ti* ***alkoholi-o / *alkohol-į***.
use-PRS-PA-NOM.PL.M antibiotics-ACC.PL NEG-can-PRS(3) drink-INF alcohol-GEN.SG/ alcohol-ACC.SG
'Those who take antibiotics cannot drink alcohol.' (elicited; Gen: 3, Acc: 0)

(7) *...j-is* ***ne****-tur-i maty-ti* ***tav-ęs*** ***nuog-o***.
3-NOM.SG.M NEG-have-PRS(3) see-INF 2SG-GEN.SG naked-GEN.SG
'He should not see you naked.' (LKT)

2. Modal or aspectual predicates with Dative experiencers (more on the behavior of matrix predicates with Dative experiencers see section 2.6), such as *reikėti* 'need' (8) or *tekti* 'happen' (9).

(8) *Man* ***ne****-reiki-a nu-pirk-ti* ***balt-o*** ***kamuoli-o*** / ***balt-ą*** ***kamuol-į***.
I:DAT NEG-need-PRS(3) PRV-buy-INF white-GEN.SG.M ball-GEN.SG / white-ACC.SG ball-ACC.SG
'I don't need to buy a white ball.' (elicited; Gen: 4; Acc: 0)

(9) *...man* ***ne****-tek-o maty-ti* ***graž-esni-o*** ***žmog-aus*** *už jus*.
I:DAT NEG-happen-PST(3) see-INF beautiful-COMP-GEN.SG.M person-GEN.SG than 2PL:ACC
'I have never seen a person more handsome than you.' (LKT)

3. Phasal verbs, such as *pradėti* 'begin, start' (10) or *baigti* 'finish' (11):

(10) *Jon-as* ***ne****-pradė-jo rašy-ti* ***laišk-o*** / ***laišk-ą***.
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-begin-PST(3) write-INF letter-GEN.SG / letter-ACC.SG
'Jonas did not start writing the letter.' (elicited; Gen: 3; Acc: 0)

(11) *Aš dar* ***ne****-baig-iau staty-ti* ***skalbykl-os***.
I:NOM yet NEG-finish-PST.1SG build-INF laundry-GEN.SG
'I haven't yet finished building the laundry.' (LKT)

4. Speech act verbs such as *prižadėti* 'promise' (12) and mental verbs such as *pamiršti* 'forget' (13), (14), or *norėti* 'want' in (3) above:

(12) *Jon-as* ***ne****-prižadė-jo Aldon-ai nu-pirk-ti*
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-promise-PST(3) Aldona-DAT.SG PRV-buy-INF
nauj-o ***automobili-o*** / ??***nauj-ą*** ***automobil-į***.
new-GEN.SG.M car-GEN.SG / new-ACC.SG car- ACC.SG
'Jonas did not promise Aldona to buy a new car.' (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 0; both: 1)

(13) *Iš-ei-dam-a* ***ne****-pamirš-k uždary-ti* ***lang-o*** / ?***lang-ą***!
PRV-go-CNV-SG.F NEG-forget-INF close-INF window-GEN.SG / window-ACC.SG
'When you go out, don't forget to close the window.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both 2)

(14) *...niekur* ***ne****-pamiršt-a pa-minė-ti* ***Lietuv-os***.
nowhere NEG-forget-PRS(3) PRV-mention-INF Lithuania-GEN.SG
'...he does not forget to mention Lithuania anywhere.' (LKT)

2.2. Different-subject complement matrix verbs

To this class belong object control verbs[3]. The object serving as the antecedent of the zero subject of the Infinitive can be marked by Dative, Genitive, and Accusative cases. With all of these, long-distance GenNeg is always possible, in clear contradiction to Gronemeyer & Usonienė's (2001) statement above.

[3] There do not seem to be any uncontroversial raising-to-object verbs with infinitival complements in Lithuanian.

1. Verbs with a Dative object like *liepti* ‘order’ (15) or *leisti* ‘let’ (16):

(15) *Jon-as* ***ne****-liep-ė* *Aldon-ai* *rašy-ti* ***laišk-o*** / ****laišk-ą***.
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-order -PST(3) Aldona-DAT.SG write-INF letter-GEN.SG/ letter-ACC.SG
‘Jonas did not order Aldona to write a/the letter.’ (elicited; Gen: 3, Acc: 0)

(16) *Tai* *k-as* *tau* ***ne****-leidži-a* ***j-o*** *atidary-ti?*
so what-NOM 2SG:DAT NEG-allow-PRS(3) 3-GEN.SG.M open-INF
‘So what does not allow you to open it?’ (LKT)

2. A verb with a Genitive object: *(pa)prašyti* ‘ask’, cf. (17) and (18).

(17) a. *Jon-as* *pa-praš-ė* *Aldon-os* *uždary-ti* *lang-ą*.
Jonas-NOM.SG PRV-ask-PST(3) Aldona-GEN.SG close-INF window-ACC.SG
‘Jonas asked Aldona to close the window.’ (elicited)

b. *Jon-as* ***ne****-praš-ė* *Aldon-os* *uždary-ti*
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-ask-PST(3) Aldona-GEN.SG close-INF
lang-o / ?***lang-ą***.
window-GEN.SG/ window-ACC.SG
‘Jonas did not ask Aldona to close the window.’ (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both 2)

(18) *Niek-as* ***ne****-praš-ė* *Rusij-os* *garantuo-ti*
nobody-NOM NEG-ask-PST(3) Russia-GEN.SG guarantee-INF
Baltij-os *šali-ų* ***saugum-o***.
Baltic-GEN.SG country-GEN.PL safety-GEN.SG
‘Nobody asked Russia to guarantee the safety of the Baltic states.’ (LKT)

3. Verbs with an Accusative object, such as *mokyti* ‘teach’ in (4) above, *priversti* ‘make, force’ (19) and (20) or *įtikinti* ‘persuade’ (21). With such verbs GenNeg obligatorily affects the “local” direct object and can always affect the embedded direct object as well.

(19) *Jon-as* *pri-vert-ė* *Aldon-ą* *uždary-ti* *lang-ą*.
Jonas-NOM.SG PRV-make-PST(3) Aldona-ACC.SG close-INF window-ACC.SG
‘Jonas made Aldona close the window.’ (elicited)

(20) *...gatvi-ų* *demonstracij-os* ***ne****-pri-vert-ė* *j-o*
street-GEN.PL demostration-NOM.PL NEG-PRV-make-PST(3) 3-GEN.SG.M
pakeis-ti ***pozicij-os***.
change-INF position-GEN.SG
‘... the street rallies did not make him change his position.’ (LKT)

(21) *Man-ęs* *nė vien-a* *iš* *keturi-ų* *čigoni-ų* ***ne****-įtikin-o*
I-GEN neither-NOM.SG.F from four-GEN.PL gypsy(F)-GEN.PL NEG-persuade-PST(3)
ati-duo-ti ***šimtin-ės,*** *buv-us-ios* *rankin-ėje.*
PRV-give-INF hundred-GEN.SG be-PST.PA-GEN.SG.F hand.bag-LOC.SG
‘Neither of the four gypsy women persuaded me to give them the hundred litas note that was in my handbag.’ (LKT)

2.3. Verb+noun complexes

On a par with lexical verbs, Infinitival complements can be selected by semi-idiomatic complex predicates consisting of a nominal and a light verb, similar to the English *have right to* or *give consent to*. When the nominal part of the construction itself is case-marked Accusative, it obligatorily takes the Genitive under negation, and this does not preclude the embedded object from also being amenable to GenNeg. Such constructions also fall into same-subject, such as in example (22), and different-subject, as in example (23), ones.

(22) *Prezident-as* ***ne****-tur-i* *teis-ės* *pat-s*
president-NOM.SG NEG-have-PRS(3) right-GEN.SG self-NOM.SG.M
keis-ti ***įstatym-ų /įstatym-us****.*
change-INF law-GEN.PL/ law-ACC.PL
'The president does not have a right to change laws himself.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both: 4)

(23) *Aldor-a* *niek-am* ***ne****-dav-ė* *įsakym-o* *ap-ieško-ti* ***traukini-o****.*
Aldora-NOM.SG nobody-DAT NEG-give-PST(3) order-GEN.SG PRV-search-INF train-GEN.SG
'Aldora did not give anybody an order to search the train.'[4]

The case marking of the embedded object in these constructions is subject to large variation, which will be discussed in sections 3 and 4.

2.4. Lexicalized non-finite verbal forms

Some matrix predicates with modal and evaluative meanings are lexicalized non-finite forms of verbs, such as the Debitive participle, example (24), or the Passive Participle, example (25), cf. also *galima* 'possible' in example (5) above; they also license long-distance GenNeg in their infinitival complements.

(24) *Visai* ***ne****-būtina* *man* ***visk-o*** *saky-ti.*
at.all NEG-necessary(=be.DEB.DF) I:DAT everything-GEN say-INF
'It is not necessary at all to tell me everything.' (LKT: Gen: 24, Acc: 24)

(25) ***ne****-įmanoma* *supras-ti* *Tibet-o* ***kultūr-os***
NEG-possible(=comprehend.PRS.PP.DF) understand-INF Tibet-GEN.SG culture-GEN.SG
'it is impossible to understand the culture of Tibet' (LKT: Gen: 42, Acc: 7)

Interestingly, productive deverbal action nominals with the suffix *-im-*/*-ym-*, like verbs, allow GenNeg (26a), while synonymous action nominals formed by less productive means prohibit it (26b).

(26) a. ***ne****-norėj-im-as* *pri-si-im-ti* ***atsakomyb-ės / atsakomyb-ę***
NEG-want-NML-NOM.SG PRV-RFL-take-INF responsibility-GEN.SG / responsibility-ACC.SG
'not wishing to assume responsibility' (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 1; both: 2)

b. ***ne****-nor-as* *pri-si-im-ti* ***atsakomyb-ę*** */ ?*atsakomyb-ės****.***
NEG-wish-NOM.SG PRV-RFL-take-INF responsibility- ACC.SG / responsibility-GEN.SG
'id.' (elicited; Acc: 4; Gen: 0; both: 2)

2.5. Copula in the perception construction

In Lithuanian there is a special construction involving the copula *būti* 'be' and an infinitive of a perception verb (*matyti* 'see' or *girdėti* 'hear'), with the perceived object appearing in the Nominative case, and not in the expected Accusative (see e.g. Ambrazas 2001: 395–396; Sirtautas 1971), cf. (27a). In these constructions the perceived object assumes Genitive case when the copula is negated, cf. (27b).

(27) a. *Buv-o* *maty-ti* ***kaim-as****.*
be-PST(3) see-INF village-NOM.SG
'One could see a village.'

[4] http://skaitliava.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/astuntas-skyrius.pdf

b. ***Ne**-buv-o* *maty-ti* ***kaim-o***.
NEG-be-PST(3) see-INF village-GEN.SG
'The village could not be seen.'

However, the syntactic structure of this construction, in particular its biclausal status and the grammatical role of the NP denoting the perceived object, is unclear (e.g. Sirtautas 1971 argues that the Nominative noun phrase is the grammatical subject), so I won't discuss it in this paper.

2.6. Verbs with Dative experiencers

Above I noted that Dative experiencer verbs with modal and similar meanings license GenNeg on the object of their infinitival complement. However, there are some verbs with Dative primary arguments which disfavour GenNeg, in contrast to verbs like *reikėti* discussed in section 2.1. Predicates showing a strong preference for the Accusative marking of the embedded object are, for example, *patikti* 'like', see examples (28)–(30), and *pakakti* 'suffice', see examples (31)–(33).

(28) *Man* ***ne**-patink-a* *tikrin-ti* *student-ų* ***darb-us*** */ ?**darb-ų***.
I:DAT NEG-like-PRS(3) check-INF studen-GEN.PL work-ACC.PL / work-GEN.PL
'I don't like checking students' assignments.' (elicited; Gen: 2, Acc: 5, both: 4)

(29) *Jeigu* *j-iems* ***ne**-patink-a* *pirk-ti* ***žaliav-ą*** *iš* *mūs-ų...*
if 3-DAT.PL.M NEG-like-PRS(3) buy-INF stuff-ACC.PL from we-GEN.PL
'If they don't like to buy raw stuff at our place...' (LKT; Acc: 11)

(30) *Man* ***ne**-patink-a* *skriaus-ti* ***ses-ut-ės***.
I:DAT NEG-like-PRS(3) harm-INF sister-DIM-GEN.SG
'I don't like to harm my sister.' (LKT; Gen: 1)

(31) *J-am* ***ne**-pakak-tų* *su-valgy-ti* ***vien-ą*** ***bandel-ę*** */?**vien-os*** ***bandel-ės***,
3-DAT.SG.M NEG-suffice-IRR(3) PRV-eat-INF one-ACC.SG roll-ACC.SG / one-GEN.SG.F roll-GEN.SG
kad *bū-tų* *sot-us.*
that be-IRR(3) satiated-NOM.SG.M
'It won't suffice for him to eat one roll to have enough.' (elicited; Gen: 1, Acc: 3, both: 7)

(32) ***Ne**-pakank-a* *žino-ti* *tik* *partij-os* ***lyder-į***.
NEG-suffice-PRS(3) know-INF only party-GEN.SG leader-ACC.SG
'It is not enough to know only the party leader.' (LKT; Acc: 30)

(33) ***ne**-pakank-a* *analizuo-ti* *vien* *tik* *finansin-ės* ***atskaitomyb-ės***
NEG-suffice-PRS(3) analyze-INF only only financial-GEN.SG.F accountability-GEN.SG
'It is not sufficient to analyze only the financial accounting.' (LKT; Gen: 3)

However, other verbs of this class do not show a robust preference for any of the two cases or even favour the Genitive. Consider, for example, *nusibosti* 'to bore' in (34) and the quantitative data[5] in Table 1, both showing that the Genitive and the Accusative are equally licit options with this verb.

(34) *Ar* *tau* ***ne**-nusibod-o* *žiūrė-ti* ***š-į*** ***film-ą / ši-o*** ***film-o****?*
Q 2SG.DAT NEG-bore-PST(3) watch-INF this-ACC.SG.M film-ACC.SG / this-GEN.SG.M film-GEN.SG
'Haven't you got bored watching this film?' (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 3; both: 6)

[5] The number of relevant examples of this verb in LKT was too small, so I had to revert to Google searches (11.01.2015).

Table 1. Genitive vs. Accusative with *nusibosti* ‘bore’ (Google):

	Acc	Gen
nenusibodo rašyti ‘did not get bored writing’	7	3
nenusibodo žiūrėti ‘did not get bored watching’	1	4
nenusibodo skaityti ‘did not get bored reading’	3	2
Total:	11	9

Yet another Dative experiencer verb *vertėti* ‘be worth’ shows a clear preference for GenNeg, cf. examples (35)–(37).

(35) *Tau* ***ne****-vertė-jo* *pirk-ti* ***tok-į*** ***brang-ų*** ***automobil-į*** /
2SG.DAT NEG-be.worth-PST(3) buy-INF such-ACC.SG.M expensive-ACC.SG.M car-ACC.SG
toki-o ***brang-aus*** ***automobili-o****.*
such-GEN.SG.M expensive-GEN.SG.M car-GEN.SG
‘You shouldn’t have bought such an expensive car.’ (Gen: 4, Acc: 0, both: 7)

(36) *Seim-e* *vir-ė* *karšt-os* *diskusij-os* *–* *ar* ***ne****-vertė-jo*
Seym-LOC.SG boil-PST(3) hot-NOM.PL.F discussion-NOM.PL Q NEG-be.worth-PST(3)
lietuvi-ų *taikdari-ų* *dalyvavim-o* *Kroatij-oje* ***klausim-ą***
Lithuanian-GEN.PL peacemaker-GEN.PL participation-GEN.SG Croatia-LOC.SG question-ACC.SG
spręs-ti *referendum-u.*
decide-INF referendum-INS.SG
‘Hot discussions were raging in Seym: should the participation of Lithuanian peace-makers in Croatia be rather decided by referendum?’ (LKT; Acc: 15)

(37) *Ar* ***ne****-vertė-jo* ***ši-o*** ***klausim-o*** *spręs-ti* *referendum-o*
Q NEG-be.worth-PST(3) this-GEN.SG.M question-GEN.SG decide-INF referendum-GEN.SG
būd-u?
means-INS.SG
‘Shouldn’t this question be rather decided by means of referendum?’ (LKT; Gen: 50)

The pronounced preference for GenNeg with *vertėti* might be due to its functioning as a kind of a modal verb partly synonymous to *reikėti* ‘need’. Indeed, there does not seem to be a significant difference between *reikėti* and *vertėti* in their behaviour with respect to GenNeg, cf. the data on the fixed expression *sukti galvą* ‘to puzzle’, lit. ‘turn one’s head’ in Table 2 (Google searches 11.01.2015). It is possible that semantically modal verbs, including *vertėti*, favour GenNeg due to the tighter degree of their syntactic integration with their infinitival complements; however, as has been mentioned above, there do not seem to be many independent reasons to assume so.

Table 2. Genitive vs. Accusative with *vertėti* ‘be worth’ and *reikėti* ‘need’ (Google)

	galvą (Acc)	*galvos* (Gen)
nereikia sukti ‘no need’	21	245
neverta sukti ‘is not worth’	12	116

One might also conjecture that the difference between *reikėti* ‘need’ and *patikti* ‘like’ could be related to their case-assignment possibilities when they take nominal complements, since *reikėti* governs the Genitive (38), while *patikti* governs the Nominative (39). However, this factor does not seem to be relevant, since, first, *tekti* ‘happen’ also governs the Nominative, but patterns with *reikėti* rather than *patikti*, and, second, *nusibosti* ‘bore’ also governs the Nominative, so the difference between *patikti* and *nusibosti* is to be sought elsewhere.

(38) *Man* *reiki-a* ***duon-os***.
I:DAT need-PRS(3) bread-GEN.SG
'I need bread.'

(39) *Man* *patink-a* ***duon-a***.
I:DAT like-PRS(3) bread-NOM.SG
'I like bread.'

The discussion of Dative experiencer matrix verbs can be concluded by stating that the overall degree of availability of long-distance GenNeg with this class of verbs has to be treated as a property of individual lexemes, probably linked to their semantics, but — pending a detailed and extensive investigation of this particular class as a whole, which could not be done in the framework of this study, — not fully predictable.

2.7. Non-verbal matrix predicates

As matrix predicates taking infinitival complements can function not only genuine verbs but non-verbal elements as well; they are accompanied by a copula, which may always be omitted in the present tense, and often by an experiencer in the Dative case. Such complement-taking non-verbal predicates include nouns, e.g. *gėda* 'shame', cf. example (40), and adjectives in the default agreement form, e.g. *įdomu* 'interesting', cf. example (41). When the negative prefix is attached directly to the nominal predicate, GenNeg becomes degraded or impossible.

(40) *Reiki-a* *pa-rašy-ti* *disertacij-ą* *taip*,
need-PRS(3) PRV-write-INF dissertation-ACC.SG so
kad *bū-tų* ***ne**-gėd-a* ***j-ą*** / ??***j-os*** *išleis-ti.*
that be-IRR(3) NEG-shame -NOM.SG 3-ACC.SG.F/3-GEN.SG.F publish-INF
'One should write one's thesis in such a way that one is not ashamed of it being published.' (elicited; Gen: 0; Acc: 11; both: 4)

(41) *Man* *buv-o* ***ne**-įdom-u* *žiūrė-ti* ***š-į*** ***film-ą***
I:DAT be-PST(3) NEG-interesting-DF watch-INF this-ACC.SG.M film-ACC.SG
/*ši-o ***film-o***.
this-GEN.SG.M film-GEN.SG
'It was not interesting for me to watch this film.' (elicited; Acc: 3; Gen: 0)

However, the attachment of the negation to the copula rather than to the nominal predicate slightly increases the acceptability of the Genitive, cf. the contrasts in examples (42) and (43) and the statistics in Table 3 (LKT and Google searches 11.01.2015); the two-tailed version of Fisher's exact test shows that the correlation is at the border of significance ($p = 0.0287$).

(42) a. *Ar* ***ne**-buv-o* *sunk-u* ***j-į*** / ??***j-o*** *įtikin-ti?*
Q NEG-be-PST(3) hard-DF 3-ACC.SG.M / 3-GEN.SG.M convince-INF
'Wasn't it hard to convince him?' (elicited; Gen: 0; Acc: 7; both: 4)

b. *Atrod-o,* *kad* *j-am* *buv-o* ***ne**-sunk-u* ***vis-us*** / ****vis-ų*** *įtikin-ti.*
seem-PRS(3) that 3-DAT.SG.M be-PST(3) NEG-hard-DF all-ACC.PL.M /all-GEN.PL convince-INF
'It seems that it wasn't hard for him to convince everyone.' (elicited: Gen: 0; Acc: 11; both: 0)

(43) a. *Man* ***ne**-buv-o* *gaila* *palik-ti* ***š-į*** ***darb-ą*** / ?***ši-o*** ***darb-o***.
I:DAT NEG-be-PST(3) pity leave-INF this-ACC.SG.M job-ACC.SG / this-GEN.SG.M job-GEN.SG
'It wasn't a pity for me to leave this job.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 3; both: 7)

b. *Man buv-o* ***ne-gaila palik-ti š-į darb-ą*** */* ??***ši-o darb-o***.
I:DAT be-PST(3) NEG-pity leave-INF this-ACC.SG.M job-ACC.SG / this-GEN.SG.M job-GEN.SG
'id..' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 8; both: 2)

Table 3. Genitive vs. Accusative with non-verbal predicates

	Acc	Gen
nebuvo sunku	11	2
(Cop) *nesunku*	20	0
nebuvo įdomu (Google, LKT no hits)	8	3
(Cop) *neįdomu*	21	0
nebuvo gėda (LKT + Google)	26	4
(Cop) *negėda*	12	2
total *nebuvo* + Pred:	**45**	**9**
total Cop + *ne*-Pred	**53**	**2**

It is worth noting that both types of constructions disfavouring GenNeg, i.e. non-verbal predicates and verbs with Dative experiencers, used to allow the (now almost obsolete) Nominative marking of the embedded object (see Ambrazas 1987, 2001; Franks & Lavine 2006), cf. examples (44), (45). However, Nominative objects of the embedded Infinitives were also attested with verbs like *reikėti* and *tekti*, cf. example (46).

(44) *J-am ne-patik-o* [***lauk-el-is*** *ar-ti*].
3-DAT.SG.M NEG-like-PST(3) field-DIM-NOM.SG plough-INF
'He didn't like to plough the field.' (Franks & Lavine 2006: 257)

(45) *J-iems buv-o ne-įdom-u* [***radij-as*** *klausy-ti*].
3-DAT.PL.M be-PST(3) NEG-interesting-DF radio-NOM.SG listen-INF
'It was not interesting for them to listen to the radio.' (ibid.)

(46) *Reiki-a* [***šien-as*** *grėb-ti*].
need-PRS(3) hay-NOM.SG rake-INF
'It is necessary to rake the hay.' (Ambrazas 2001: 391)

The only Nominative-plus-Infinitive construction regularly used in the contemporary language is the one with perception verbs and the copula mentioned above in section 2.5, where the Nominative (object?) NP is obligatorily marked Genitive under negation, so it is hardly plausible that the erstwhile Nominative marking of the object of the infinitive could be a factor contributing to the blocking of the GenNeg rule.

It has been also suggested to me by Axel Holvoet and Björn Wiemer that the low degree of acceptability of the Genitive of the embedded object with non-verbal predicates (even when the negation attaches to the copula) might be connected to the fact that these predicates are factive, since factive presupposition makes the infinitival clause opaque for syntactic operations from outside (cf. Goldberg 2006: 134–137). However, there does not seem to be strong independent evidence for this conjecture, and pending further investigation I prefer to link the strong preference of Accusative marking with nominal predicates to their non-verbal character.

2.8. Interim summary

The discussion above makes it clear that long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian infinitival clauses is available with a wide variety of matrix predicates, the latter being by no means limited to a closed class of "auxiliaries" or auxiliary-like elements, as is implied by some of the previous descriptions of the phenomenon. The only instances where the Genitive is

strongly dispreferred involve non-verbal predicates and verbs with Dative experiencers, of which, as it appears, only those with modal-like semantics and possibly tighter morphosyntactic integration with the infinitival clause allow GenNeg to the same extent as matrix verbs with Nominative subjects.

3. Optionality and variation in long distance GenNeg

In contrast to the local GenNeg, which is obligatory in Lithuanian (at least in the standard language, as represented both by the corpus and by my consultants), long-distance GenNeg is in principle optional. This optionality is reflected in descriptive and prescriptive grammars, but is not described in any detail, and neither are the possible factors affecting the choice of the Genitive or the Accusative of the embedded direct object under matrix negation. In this section I will discuss the patterns of variation in object case marking under non-local negation emerging from my data, as well as some of the possible factors exerting influence on the choice of case.

Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 128–129) claim that long-distance GenNeg is always optional and correlates with the definiteness of the embedded direct object. According to them, in (47) "the accusative is also grammatical when referring to a specific, definite letter":

(47) ***Ne**-gal-i* *pa-rašy-ti* ***laišk-o / laišk-ą***.
NEG-can-PRS(3) PRV-write-INF letter-GEN.SG / ACC.SG
'They cannot write a (any) letter / the letter.' (Gronemeyer & Usonienė 2001: 128)

However, my consultants unanimously reject the Accusative in constructions like (47) as outright ungrammatical; neither can such examples be found in Google (for the exact example, search on 29.06.2014 yielded 5 different contexts with the Genitive vs. 0 contexts with the Accusative; for *negali parašyti* in the first 120 examples of the Google output, only 2 were with the Accusative vs. dozens with the Genitive).

According to the judgments of my consultants, the variation between the Genitive and the Accusative is subject to the following tendencies:

1) GenNeg is obligatory in all environments if the embedded object contains a negative pronoun *niekas* 'nothing, nobody' or *joks* 'any', cf. (48). Notably, in LKT the Accusative form of these pronouns occurs only after prepositions. The emphatic negative particle *nė* 'not any' also unconditionally requires the Genitive, cf. (49).

(48) a. *Tėv-ai* ***ne**-leidži-a* *vaik-ui* ***niek-o / *niek-ą*** *dary-ti*.
father-NOM.PL NEG-allow-PRS(3) child-DAT.SG nothing-GEN / nothing-ACC do-INF
'The parents don't allow the child to do anything.' (elicited)

b. *Man-ęs* *niek-as* ***ne**-praš-ė* *pa-rody-ti* ***joki-ų*** ***dokument-ų*** /
I-GEN nobody-NOM NEG-ask-PST(3) PRV-show-INF any-GEN.PL document-GEN.PL / ACC.PL
****jok-ius*** ***dokument-us***.
any-ACC.PL document-ACC.PL
'Nobody asked me to show any documents.' (elicited)

(49) *Iš tiesų* ***ne**-galė-čiau* *pa-niūniuo-ti* ***nė*** ***vien-os***
in fact NEG-can-IRR.1SG PRV-hum-INF not.any one-GEN.SG.F
muzikin-ės ***tem-os***...
musical-GEN.SG.F subject-GEN.SG
'In fact, I wouldn't be able to hum any musical subject...' (LKT)

2) With same-subject matrix predicates, excluding some verbs with the Dative experiencer (see above), the Genitive is always possible and in most cases obligatory.

3) With different-subject matrix predicates, the Genitive is also always possible and in most cases preferable. Interestingly, the acceptability of the Accusative is influenced by the case of the matrix object: with verbs with the Dative object the embedded Accusative is marginal, whereas with verbs with the Genitive or Accusative object the embedded Accusative is acceptable and is sometimes even judged as good as the Genitive.

4) Finally, with complex verb+noun constructions discussed in section 2.3 there is considerable and yet poorly understood variation in case-marking, some of the aspects of which will be discussed in the next section.

The quantitative data underlying the above generalizations is given in Table 4. The difference between same-subject and different-subject matrix verbs in the acceptability of the Accusative marking of the embedded object is statistically significant (two-tailed version of Fisher's exact test p = 0.0327). Note that *reikia* with a Dative experiencer behaves similarly to the object control verbs, and if it is excluded, the correlation becomes much more significant (p = 0.0002). Among the object control verbs, the difference between the verbs with a Dative object and those with the Genitive and Accusative objects is also statistically significant (two-tailed version of Fisher's exact test p = 0.0265).

Table 4. Corpus data on variation in embedded object case under negation.

		Gen	Acc
same-subject matrix verbs (Google data as of 08.10.2013)	*nenori uždaryti* 'do(es) not want to close'	23	2
	nereikia uždaryti 'do(es) not need to close'	62	17
	nepamiršk uždaryti 'don't forget to close'	23	0
	nepradėjo rašyti 'did not start writing'	14	0
	total:	**122**	**19**
different-subject matrix verbs (LKT)	*neleidžia* + Dat + Inf 'do(es) not let'	37	5
	nepadėjo + Dat + Inf 'did not help'	18	6
	neprašo/neprašė + Gen + Inf 'do(es)/did not ask'	15	8
	neprivertė + Acc + Inf 'did not make'	14	8
	total:	**84**	**27**
verb+noun complex predicates (LKT + Google data as of 08.10.2013)	*neturi teisės* + Inf 'do(es) not have right'	35	4
	nedavė įsakymo + Inf 'did not give order'	10	8
	nėra reikalo + Inf 'there is no need'	53	54
	total:	**98**	**68**

Importantly, in cases where both the Genitive and the Accusative are acceptable, I have found no indication of referentiality or definiteness of the embedded object playing any significant role in its case marking. For example, it is easy to find minimal pairs like the following:

(50) a. ... ***ne**-pri-vert-ė* *man-ęs* *nu-leis-ti* ***rank-ų***
NEG-PRV-make-PST(3) I-GEN PRV-let-INF arm-GEN.PL
'... did not make me lose heart' (lit. let down the arms) (LKT)

b. ***ne**-pri-vert-ė* *Algimant-o* *nu-leis-ti* ***rank-as***.
NEG-PRV-make-PST(3) Algimantas-GEN.SG prv-let-INF arm-ACC.PL
'did not let Algimantas lose heart' (LKT)

(51) a. *Hitler-is* ***ne****-dav-ė* *įsakym-o* *pul-ti* ***angl-ų***.
Hitler-NOM.SG NEG-give-PST(3) order-GEN.SG attack-INF English-GEN.PL
'Hitler did not give an order to attack the English.'[6]

b. *Tačiau* *Bela IV* ***ne****-dav-ė* *įsakym-o* *pul-ti* ***mongol-us***.
however Bela IV NEG-give-PST(3) order-GEN.SG attack-INF Mongol-ACC.PL
'However, Bela IV did not give an order to attack the Mongols.'[7]

Though some of my consultants indeed claim that there is a difference in referentiality accompanying the case choice in some examples, no coherent picture emerges out of these sporadic observations. This question should be left for further research, though the corpus data at hand makes me skeptical with respect to the possible significance of definiteness as a factor affecting case choice under negation.

Interestingly, it turned out that, at least for some consultants, word order may affect the acceptability of the Genitive vs. Accusative on the embedded object. Long-distance fronting of the embedded object alone enhances the Genitive, cf. example (52b), while fronting of the entire infinitival clause, by contrast, makes the Accusative more acceptable, cf. example (52c). However, it must be kept in mind that these are statistical preferences, not robust constraints.

(52) a. *Tėv-as* ***ne****-uždraud-ė* *vaik-ams* *žiūrė-ti*
father-NOM.SG NEG-forbid-PST(3) child-DAT.PL watch-INF
š-į ***film-ą / ši-o*** ***film-o***.
this-ACC.SG.M film-ACC.SG / this-GEN.SG.M film-GEN.SG
'The father didn't forbid the children to watch this film.' (Gen: 3; Acc: 0; both: 5)

b. [***Šį filmą / šio filmo***]$_i$ *tėvas* ***ne****uždraudė vaikams žiūrėti* ___ $_i$.
'As to this film, the father didn't forbid the children to watch it.' (Gen: 5; Acc: 0; both: 3)

c. [*Žiūrėti* ***šį filmą / šio filmo***]$_i$ *tėvas vaikams* ***ne****uždraudė* __ $_i$.
'As to watching this film, the father didn't forbid the children to watch it.' (Gen: 0; Acc: 1; both: 7)

The quantitative data regarding the relevant part of my corpus of elicited examples is given in Table 5. Of the pairwise oppositions shown in Table 5, all but the one between the regular word order and InfP fronting are highly statistically significant (chi-square test $p < 0{,}00001$); the opposition between the regular word order and InfP fronting is also significant, though much less so, with $p = 0{,}01$. Testing the impact of word order on non-elicited data is impossible, because LKT is not annotated.

Table 5. Case marking and word order.

	Gen	Acc	both
regular order	132	67	319
object fronting	45	0	31
InfP fronting	18	25	84

A separate question is how this non-trivial effect of word order on case marking can be explained. Leaving aside generative considerations regarding the interplay of case marking and different kinds of phrasal movement, one should note that mere surface distance from ne-

[6] http://www.oocities.org/tqxybg/hess/h_09.htm
[7] http://lt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohi_sl%C4%97nio_m%C5%AB%C5%A1is

gation does not seem to play a decisive role here, especially in examples such as (52). With respect to InfP fronting, this operation seems to be able to put the dependent clause out of the (syntactic) scope of the matrix negation, which is evidenced by the behaviour of negative polarity items (NPIs) such as *niekas* 'nothing', which exhibit a distributional pattern similar to that of GenNeg, cf. example (53).

(53) a. *Jon-as* ***ne**-liep-ė* *Aldon-ai* ***niek-o*** *rašy-ti*.
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-order-PST(3) Aldona-DAT.SG nothing-GEN write-INF
'Jonas didn't order Aldona to write anything.' (elicited)

b. *Jon-as* ***niek-o***$_i$ ***ne**-liep-ė* *Aldon-ai* __$_i$ *rašyti.*
Jonas-NOM.SG nothing-GEN NEG-order-PST(3) Aldona-DAT.SG write-INF
'=(53a)' (elicited)

c. [*Rašy-ti* ****niek-o / k-ą nors***]$_i$ *Jon-as* *Aldon-ai* ***ne**-liep-ė* __$_i$.
write-INF nothing-GEN / anything-ACC Jonas-NOM.SG Aldona-DAT.SG NEG-order-PST(3)
lit. 'Writing anything, Jonas did not order Aldona to.' (elicited)

I leave the precise theoretical interpretation of these data for further research.

I conclude this section by a general observation that native speakers differ quite widely in their judgments regarding GenNeg. Purely statistically, the acceptance rate of the Genitive varies from just below 60% to almost 90% with the average of 75%, and the acceptance rate of the Accusative is largely similar. There are speakers who prefer either of the two cases in more contexts than other speakers, just as there are speakers who tend to allow both options in the majority (up to 60%) of the cases investigated. So far, there seem to be no clear sociolinguistic or other factors correlating with the observed preferences.

4. How distant is long distant GenNeg and what constrains it?

Given a successive embedding of infinitival clauses, the scope of GenNeg in Lithuanian is potentially unbounded. Any combination of same- or different-subject matrix verbs is "transparent" to GenNeg, as the following examples, both elicited and naturally occurring, illustrate.

– same-subject verb + same-subject verb:

(54) *Jon-as* ***ne**-galė-jo* *nu-sto-ti* *skaity-ti* ***knyg-ų*** *nakt-imis*.
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-can-PST(3) PRV-stop-INF read-INF book-GEN.PL night-INS.PL
'Jonas could not stop reading books at night.' (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 0; both: 1)

(55) *Todėl* *j-ie* ***ne**-nor-i* *pradė-ti* *naudo-ti* ***ši-os*** ***paslaug-os***.
therefore 3-NOM.PL.M NEG-want-PRS(3) begin-INF use-INF this-GEN.SG.F service-GEN.SG.F
'Therefore they do not want to start using this service.'[8]

– Dative experiencer verb + same-subject verb:

(56) *... kad* ***ne**-vertė-jo* *steng-ti-s* ***j-ų*** *supras-ti*.
that NEG-be.worth-PST(3) try-INF-RFL 3-GEN.PL understand-INF
'[there were so many inexplicable things in our homes] that it was not worth trying to understand them' (LKT)

[8] http://forum.ovh.lt/archive/index.php/t-296.html

– same-subject verb + same-subject verb + same-subject verb:

(57) *Jon-as* ***ne-galė-jo*** *net* *pa-bandy-ti* *nu-sto-ti*
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-can-PST(3) even PRV-try-INF PRV-stop-INF
skaity-ti ***knyg-ų*** *nakt-imis.*
read-INF book-GEN.PL night-INS.PL
'Jonas could not even try to stop reading books at night.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both: 3)

– same-subject verb + different-subject verb:

(58) *Jon-as* ***ne-galė-jo*** *pri-vers-ti* *Aldon-os* *uždary-ti* ***lang-o***.
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-can-PST(3) PRV-make-INF Aldona-GEN.SG close-INF window-GEN.SG
'Jonas could not make Aldona close the window.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both: 4)

(59) *Program-a* ***ne-tur-i*** *prašy-ti* *vartotoj-o*
software-NOM.SG NEG-have-PRS(3) ask-INF user-GEN.SG
įves-ti ***papildom-ų*** ***duomen-ų***.
enter-INF additional-GEN.PL data-GEN.PL
'The software should not ask the user to enter additional data.'[9]

– same-subject verb + different-object verb + same-subject verb:

(60) *Pirminink-ė* ***ne-nor-i*** *leis-ti* *sekretori-ui* *pradė-ti*
chairwoman-NOM.SG NEG-want-PRS(3) let-INF secretary-DAT.SG begin-INF
skaity-ti ***pasveikinim-o***.
read-INF greeting-GEN.SG
'The chairwoman does not want to let the secretary read out the greeting.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 1; both: 2)

– different-subject verb + same-subject verb:

(61) *Pirminink-ė* ***ne-pa-praš-ė*** *sekretori-aus* *pradė-ti*
chairwoman-NOM.SG NEG-PRV-ask-PST(3) secretary-GEN.SG begin-INF
skaity-ti ***pasveikinim-o***.
read-INF greeting-GEN.SG
'The chairwoman did not ask the secretary to start reading out the greeting.' (elicited; Gen, Acc: 0; both: 3) + a similar example with *įtikinti* 'pursuade': Gen: 0; Acc: 1; both: 7.

(62) *...bendruomen-ė* ***ne-leid-o*** *j-am* *pradė-ti* *staty-ti-s* ***nam-o***...
commune-NOM.SG NEG-let-PST(3) 3-DAT.SG.M begin-INF build-INF-RFL house-GEN.SG
'The community did not let him start building a house for himself...'[10]

– different-subject verb + different-subject verb:

(63) *Tėv-as* ***ne-leid-o*** *motin-ai* *moky-ti* *vaik-ų*
father-NOM.SG NEG-let-PST(3) mother-DAT.SG teach-INF child-GEN.PL

[9] http://www.neurotechnology.com/konkursas-pesciuju-pereja-2013.html
[10] http://followtheroad.com/lt/susitikimas-su-zmonemis-is-praeities/

dažy-ti ***tvor-os / tvor-ą***.
paint-INF fence-GEN.SG / fence-ACC.SG
'Father did not let mother teach the children to paint the fence.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both: 3)

There are several factors blocking GenNeg, besides the most trivial one, i.e. a finite clause boundary, as in example (64).

(64) a. *Tėv-ai* ***ne**-nor-i,* *kad* *vaik-as*
father-NOM.PL NEG-want-PRS(3) that child-NOM.SG
skaity-tų ***šit-ą*** ***knyg-ą /*šit-os knyg-os***.
read-IRR(3) this-ACC.SG book-ACC.SG/*GEN.SG
'The parents don't want the child to read this book.' (elicited)

b. *Jon-as* ***ne**-žin-o,* *ar* *Aldon-a* ***j-į /*j-o*** *myl-i.*
Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-know-PRS(3) Q Aldona-NOM.SG 3-ACC.SG.M/*GEN.SG.M love-PRS(3)
'Jonas does not know whether Aldona loves him.' (elicited)

A non-trivial case is constituted by infinitival clauses with interrogative/relative pronouns. Here the case marking of the embedded object depends on the type of construction: when the matrix verb takes an infinitival clause as its propositional complement, as in (65), only Accusative is possible. By contrast, when the InfP serves as a headless relative clause with a verb normally taking nominal complements, the Genitive becomes acceptable or even preferable, cf. examples (66) and (67).

(65) a. ***Ne**-žin-au,* ***koki-ą*** ***knyg-ą / *koki-os*** ***knyg-os***
NEG-know-PRS.1SG which-ACC.SG book-ACC.SG/*which-GEN.SG book-GEN.SG
nu-si-pirk-ti.
PRV-RFL-buy-INF
'I don't know which book to buy.' (elicited; Acc: 3; Gen, both: 0)

b. ***Ne**-žin-au,* *kaip* *pa-taisy-ti* ***televizori-ų / *televizori-aus***.
NEG-know-PRS.1SG how PRV-repair-INF tv.set-ACC.SG/* tv.set-GEN.SG
'I don't know how to repair the TV-set.' (elicited; Acc: 3; Gen, both: 0)

(66) ***Ne**-turė-jau,* ***k-ą / k-o*** *valgy-ti*.
NEG-have-PST.1SG what-ACC / what-GEN eat-INF
'I had nothing to eat.' (elicited; Gen: 0; Acc: 1; both: 10)

(67) ***Ne**-turė-jau,* *kur* *padė-ti* *savo* ***skėt-į / skėči-o***.
NEG-have-PST.1SG where put-INF RFL.POSS umbrella-ACC.SG / umbrella-GEN.SG
'There wasn't a place for me to put my umbrella in.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both: 7)

In the corpus there is much variation in case marking with *turėti* 'have', cf. the following examples and quantitative data:

(68) *Vis tiek* *j-is* ***ne**-tur-i* ***k-o*** *slėp-ti* *nuo* *man-ęs*.
all.the.same 3-NOM.SG.M NEG-have-PRS(3) what-GEN hide-INF from I-GEN
'All the same he doesn't have anything to conceal from me.' (LKT; Gen: 170)

(69) *Jei* *žmog-us* ***ne**-tur-i* ***k-ą*** *slėp-ti,* *k-o* *j-am* *bijo-ti?*
if man-NOM.SG NEG-have-PRS(3) what-ACC hide-INF what-GEN 3-DAT.SG.M fear-INF
'If a man doesn't have anything to conceal, what should he be afraid of?' (LKT; Acc: 270)

(70) *tėv-eli-ai* *dirb-a* *ir* ***ne**-tur-i* *kur* *palik-ti* *savo*
father-DIM-NOM.PL work-PRS(3) and NEG-have-PRS(3) where leave-INF RFL.POSS
maž-ųjų ***atžal-ų***.
small-GEN.PL.DEF sprout-GEN.PL
'...parents work and don't have a place where they could leave their little offsprings' (LKT; Gen: 21)

(71) *gyventoj-ai* ***ne**-tur-i* *kur* *investuo-ti* *savo* ***pinigini-us***
inhabitant-NOM.PL NEG-have-PRS(3) where invest-INF RFL.POSS monetary-ACC.PL.M
ištekli-us.
reserve-ACC.PL
'...people don't have a place where they could invest their monetary reserves.' (LKT; Acc: 4)

However, it looks like *turėti* 'have' is the only verb allowing GenNeg in this kind of construction (besides the negative existential copula *nėra*, see e.g. Kalėdaitė 2008), since other verbs semantically compatible with an infinitival headless relative either show a pronounced preference for the Accusative, like *rasti* 'find' in examples (72) and (73), or do not attest this construction at all. In LKT, negative forms of *turėti* 'have' and *būti* 'be' are the only verbs after which *ko* 'what.GEN' followed by an Infinitive is systematically attested.

(72) *Moz-ė* ***ne**-rad-o* ***k-ą*** *atsaky-ti*.
Moses-NOM.SG NEG-find-PST(3) what-ACC answer-INF
'Moses didn't find what to answer.' (LKT; Acc: 6)

(73) *O* *aš* *pa-varči-au* *t-ą* *tavo* *„Per suklestėjimą…“*
and I.NOM PRV-go.through-PST.1SG that-ACC.SG 2SG.POSS proper.name
ir ***ne**-rad-au* ***k-o*** *pa-brauk-ti.*
and NEG-find-PST.1SG what-GEN PRV-underline-INF
'I went through this "During the heyday" of yours and didn't find anything I could underline there.' (LKT; Gen: 1)

Another factor which might potentially block GenNeg is the noun phrase boundary; however, as has already been mentioned above, this is an area of variation. It seems that the choice of the case marking of the direct object of infinitival clauses embedded under nominals is at least partly dependent on the distinction between full DPs, which are opaque for case transmission, vs. bare NPs ("small nominals", Pereltsvaig 2006; Lyutikova 2010), which are transparent to external case marking. A potential minimal pair is given in the following examples; in (74) the noun "order" is definite and the embedded object is preferably encoded by the Accusative, while in (75) the nominal is arguably indefinite and the Genitive becomes more acceptable.

(74) *Policinink-ai* ***ne**-pa-klus-o* *įsakym-ui* *iš-vaiky-ti*
police.officer-NOM.PL NEG-PRV-obey-PST(3) order-DAT.SG PRV-drive-INF
demonstracij-ą / ?demonstracij-os.
demonstration-ACC.SG / demonstration-GEN.SG
'Police officers did not obey the order to disperse the demonstration.' (elicited; Gen: 0; Acc: 2; both: 2)

(75) *Ministr-as* ***ne****-dav-ė* *įsakym-o* *iš-vaiky-ti*
minister-NOM.SG NEG-give-PST(3) order-GEN.SG PRV-drive-INF
demonstracij-ą / demonstracij-os*.*
demonstration-ACC.SG/demonstration-GEN.SG
'The minister didn't give order to disperse the demonstration.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 1; both: 1)

This correlation can be further tested by comparing the case marking of the object of infinitival clauses embedded under nominals with and without overt determiners. As the corpus data shown in Table 6 indicates, the presence of overt determiners with such nouns or their definite interpretation arising with verbs like *paklusti* 'obey' in most cases do not make the Genitive ungrammatical, but only reduce its frequency. However, the correlation turns out to be highly statistically significant (two-tailed version of Fisher's exact test $p < 0{,}0001$).

Table 6. DP vs. NP and GenNeg

	Gen	Acc
neturi teisės 'does not have right'	35	4
neturi jokios teisės 'does not have any right'	7	11
nėra reikalo lit. 'there isn't need'	53	54
nėra jokio reikalo lit. 'there is no need'	21	47
nedavė įsakymo 'did not give and order' (Google data as of 08.10.2013)	10	8
nepakluso įsakymui 'did not obey the order' (Google data as of 14.01.2015)	0	6

Finally, coordination of infinitival clauses does not block GenNeg, though sometimes improves the acceptability of the Accusative; there is no difference whether the first of the coordinated VPs is intransitive, as in example (76), or transitive, as in example (77).

(76) ***Ne****-nor-iu* *važiuo-ti* *į* *konferencij-ą*
NEG-want-PRS.1SG drive-INF in conference-ACC.SG
<u>ir</u> *skaity-ti* ***pranešim-o/?pranešim-ą****.*
and read-INF report-GEN.SG/?ACC.SG
'I don't want to go to the conference and deliver my talk.' (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 0; both: 1)

(77) *J-is* ***ne****-mėgst-a* *lanky-ti* *draug-ų*
3-NOM.SG.M NEG-like-PRS(3) visit-INF friend-GEN.PL
ir *priim-ti* ***sveči-us / sveči-ų****.*
and receive-INF guest-ACC.PL / guest-GEN.PL
'He doesn't like to visit friends and receive guests.' (elicited; Gen: 7; Acc: 0; both: 3)

Both the Genitive, examples (78), (79), and the Accusative, example (80), are found with coordinated infinitives in the corpora, but the data is too scarce to allow a statistical analysis.

(78) ***ne**-nor-i* *sėdė-ti* *ir* *valy-ti* ***kompiuteri-o*** *nuo* *virus-ų*
NEG-want-PRS(3) sit-INF and clean-INF computer-GEN.SG from virus-GEN.PL
'they don't want to sit and remove viruses from the computer'[11]

(79) ***Ne**-vertė-jo* *dėl* *t-o* *laužy-ti* ***kaul-ų***
NEG-be.worth-PST(3) for that-GEN.SG break-INF bone-GEN.PL
ir *sprinteri-o* *greiči-u* *bėg-ti* ***maraton-o***.
and sprinter-GEN.SG speed-INS.SG run-INF marathon-GEN.SG
'That was not worth of breaking bones and running the marathon with a sprinter's speed.' (LKT)

(80) *...nes* ***ne**-vertė-jo* *rizikuo-ti* *ir* *atidary-ti* ***liuk-ą***...
because NEG-be.worth-PST(3) take.risk-INF and open-INF hatch-ACC.SG
'... because it was not necessary to take risk and open the hatch...' (LKT)

To conclude this section, the only factor absolutely blocking GenNeg, besides the finiteness of the embedded clause, is the "active" left periphery of the infinitival clause manifested by the presence of wh-words. Even this restriction, as has been shown above, is violated in the presence of the existential/possessive matrix verb *turėti* 'have'.

5. GenNeg in participial clauses

Since in Lithuanian clausal complements can be headed not only by Infinitives but also by Participles (see Arkadiev 2012), it is legitimate to ask whether GenNeg can reach into participial clauses as well. Here the situation is fairly complex, and different kinds of participial constructions have to be distinguished.

First of all, GenNeg is obligatory in periphrastic Perfect constructions with an auxiliary (both the regular *būti* 'be' and the less grammaticalized *turėti* 'have') and a past active participle, cf. examples (81) and (82).

(81) *Niekada* ***ne**-s-u* *žiūrėj-ęs* ***ši-o*** ***film-o /***
never NEG-AUX-PRS.1SG watch-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M this-GEN.SG.M film-GEN.SG /
****š-į*** ***film-ą***.
this-ACC.SG.M film-ACC.SG
'I have never watched this film.' (elicited)

(82) ***Ne**-tur-iu* *su-si-dar-ęs* ***pastov-aus*** ***požiūri-o***
NEG-have-PRS.1SG PRV-RFL-do-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M constant-GEN.SG.M view-GEN.SG
į *literatūr-ą...*
in literature-ACC.SG
'I have not yet formed for myself a constant conception of literature.' (LKT; numerous examples with Gen, 0 with Acc)

Note that there is virtually no empirical evidence for treating such constructions as biclausal, but probably for the fact that the Past Participle in the Perfect can have its own negation (see Bohnemeyer et al. 2007: 500–501 for the criterion "of independent negation as a crosslinguistically applicable test for clausehood"), which, just as the negation on the auxiliary, triggers obligatory GenNeg, cf. example (83).

[11] http://www.technologijos.lt/diskusijos/viewtopic.php?p=295667

(83) *Ne-žin-au, gali-u ir klys-ti,*
NEG-know-PRS.1SG can-PRS.1SG and err-INF
nes dar es-u ***ne****-žiūrėj-ęs* ***ši-o*** ***film-o****.*
since still AUX-PRS.1SG NEG-watch-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M this-GEN.SG.M film-GEN.SG
'I don't know, I may be wrong, since I have not yet seen this film.'[12]

GenNeg is always possible and usually preferable in constructions with the phasal verb *liautis* 'cease', which takes a past active participle as its complement, cf. examples (84), (85); however, the Accusative is a salient option here as well, cf. example (86).

(84) *Jon-as dar* ***ne****-si-liov-ė* *raš-ęs* ***laišk-o / laišk-ą****.*
Jonas-NOM.SG yet NEG-RFL-stop-PST(3) write-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M letter-GEN.SG / letter-ACC.SG
'Jonas has not yet stopped writing the letter.' (elicited: Gen: 2; Acc: 1; both: 2)

(85) *Kad ir koks juokingas galėtų atrodyti bandymas pastatyti bokštą iki dangaus,*
žmon-ės niekad ***ne****-si-liov-ė* *mėgin-ę* ***šit-o*** *dary-ti.*
people-NOM.PL never NEG-RFL-stop-PST(3) attempt-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M this-GEN.SG.M do-INF
'However ridiculous the attempt to build a tower up to the sky, people never ceased attempts to do that.' (LKT; Gen 44)

(86) *Kryžiuoči-ai ir vėliau* ***ne****-si-liov-ė* *šmeiž-ę*
crusader-NOM.PL and later NEG-RFL-stop-PST(3) slander-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M
Vytaut-ą *ir* ***Jogail-ą****.*
Vytautas-ACC.SG and Jogaila-ACC.SG
'The crusaders did not cease slandering Vytautas and Jogaila later as well.' (LKT; Acc 26)

In the same-subject participial complements of verbs of perception, speech and cognition investigated in Arkadiev (2012), direct objects normally retain the Accusative case marking, cf. example (87), though the Genitive is also marginally attested, cf. example (88).

(87) *Nepaisant to, solist-as* ***ne****-man-o* *pa-dar-ęs*
nevertheless soloist-NOM.SG NEG-think-PRS(3) PRV-do-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
įspūding-ą ***karjer-ą****.*
impressive-ACC.SG career-ACC.SG
'Nevertheless, the soloist does not think he has made an impressive career.' (LKT; Acc: 7; Gen 1)

(88) *Žmog-us* ***ne****-prisipažin-o* *pa-dar-ęs* ***nusikaltim-ą / nusikaltim-o****.*
man-NOM.SG NEG-confess-PST(3) PRV-do-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M crime-ACC.SG / crime-GEN.SG
'The man did not confess having committed a/the crime' (LKT: Acc 22, Gen 4)

According to my consultants, at least one verb taking same-subject participial complement, *jaustis* 'feel oneself', clearly favours GenNeg, cf. examples (89) and (90); the latter even contains an intervening Infinitive.

(89) ***Ne****-si-jauči-u* *prarad-ęs* ***savigarb-os / savigarb-ą****.*
NEG-RFL-feel-PRS.1SG lose-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M self.esteem-GEN.SG / self.esteem-ACC.SG
'I don't feel I have lost self-esteem.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 3; both: 11)

(90) ***Ne****-si-jauči-u* *gal-įs* *vertin-ti* *kit-o* *žmog-aus*
NEG-RFL-feel-PRS.1SG can-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M evaluate-INF other-GEN.SG.M man-GEN.SG

[12] http://www.obuolys.lt/labas/naujiena/8248-aktor-lietuviskai-prakalbo-dvi-savaites/komentarai.html

tekst-o / ?tekst-ą.
text-GEN.SG / text-ACC.SG
'I don't feel being able to evaluate another person's text.' (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 1; both: 1)

However, in the corpus, both the Accusative and the Genitive are attested with *jaustis*, and the former is evidently more frequent (Acc: 23, Gen: 11), cf. examples (91) vs. (92). Note that in (92) the matrix negation licenses a NPI *joks* in the participial clause, which, as has already been discussed above, is a feature correlating with GenNeg.

(91) ***Ne**-si-jaus-i* <u>*dar-ąs*</u> ***k-ą** nors* *blog-o...*
NEG-RFL-feel.FUT-2SG do-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M anything-ACC bad-GEN.SG.M
'You won't feel doing anything bad...'

(92) ***Ne**-si-jauči-u* <u>*pa-dari-us-i*</u> ***joki-o*** ***nusikaltim-o***...
NEG-RFL-feel-PRS.1SG PRV-do-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F any-GEN.SG.M crime-GEN.SG
'I don't feel I have committed any crime...'

Other kinds of matrix verbs taking same-subject participial complements vary in their acceptance of GenNeg as an option by the consultants, but do not attest it at all in the actual usage as reflected by LKT, cf. table 7. There does not seem to be any correlation between the acceptance of GenNeg and such semantic features of the construction as factivity: both the factive verb *suprasti* 'understand' and the clearly non-factive *tikėtis* 'hope' show identical non-acceptability of the Genitive, while the factive *neigti* 'deny' and the non-factive *atrodyti* 'seem' both marginally allow it.

Table 7. GenNeg in same-subject participial clauses.

	LKT		elicited		
	Acc	Gen	Acc	Gen	both
gailėtis 'regret'	27	0	6	1	3
atrodyti 'seem'	2	0	7	0	4
neigti 'deny'	31	0	7	0	4
teigti 'claim'	4	0	8	0	3
suprasti 'understand'	3	0	11	0	0
tikėtis 'hope'	2	0	11	0	0

In different-subject participial clauses with Accusative subjects matrix-induced GenNeg is never possible on the embedded direct object, even in those cases when the embedded "logical subject" (arguably, in such cases the matrix object) is affected by it (see Arkadiev 2012: 310–311 for more details), cf. examples (93) and (94).

(93) *Policij-a* ***ne**-įtari-a* ***Jon-o*** <u>*užmuš-us*</u> *savo* ***žmon-ą / *žmon-os***.
police-NOM.SG NEG-suspect-PRS(3) Jonas-GEN.SG kill-PST.PA RFL.POSS wife-ACC.SG /*wife-GEN.SG
'Police does not suspect Jonas of murdering his wife.' (elicited)

(94) *... policij-a* ***ne**-mat-ė* ***j-o*** <u>*vairuo-ja-nt*</u> ***automobil-į***.
police-NOM.SG NEG-see-PST(3) 3-GEN.SG.M drive-PRS-PA car-ACC.SG
'The police didn't see him drive the car.' (LKT)

From the discussion above it may be concluded that, with the peculiar exception of *jaustis* 'feel oneself', the object of the Participle can be affected by the matrix negation only in those cases when there is some degree of clausal integration between the main verb and the

participle, like with the Perfect and, arguably, with the phasal verb *liautis* ‘stop’. Otherwise the participial clause is just as opaque to GenNeg as finite clauses.

6. An areal perspective

Counterparts of the Lithuanian Genitive of negation, both local and long-distant, are attested in the other languages of Eastern Europe as well. The phenomena in question are the Genitive of negation in the other Baltic languages (Latvian and especially Latgalian), in the Slavic languages, as well as the Partitive of negation in the Baltic Finnic languages. For a more general overview of the case marking of objects (and subjects) in the languages of the Circum-Baltic area see Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli (2001: 646–660); a more general typological overview of the interaction between partitive/genitive cases and negation can be found in Miestamo (2014).

6.1. The other Baltic languages

In sharp contrast to Lithuanian, modern Latvian does not have GenNeg out of emphatic contexts (Berg-Olsen 2004: 125; Menantaud 2007; Holvoet & Nau 2014: 7–9), in which it is attested both with local, cf. example (95), and non-local, cf. example (96), negation.

LATVIAN: local GenNeg with emphatic negation

(95) *viņ-š* ***ne****-sak-a* ***ne*** ***vārd-a***
3-NOM.SG.M NEG-say-PRS(3) not.even word-GEN.SG
‘He does not say a single word.’ (Menantaud 2007: 95)

LATVIAN: non-local GenNeg with emphatic negation

(96) ***nek-ā*** *vairs* ***ne****-spēj* *pa-darī-t*
nothing-GEN more NEG-be.able.PRS(3) PRV-do-INF
‘S/he can do nothing more.’ (ibid.: 93)

In non-emphatic contexts the Accusative is the predominant option in contemporary language (see e.g. Nitiņa & Grigorjevs (eds.) 2013: 348–349), cf. examples (97) and (98), and is attested even in emphatic contexts (cf. Holvoet & Nau 2014: 8), cf. example (99).

LATVIAN: Accusative under local negation

(97) *viņ-š* ***ne****-sak-a* ***vārd-u***
3-NOM.SG.M NEG-say-PRS(3) word-ACC.SG
‘He does not say a/the word.’ (Menantaud 2007: 96)

LATVIAN: Accusative under non-local negation

(98) *es* ***ne****-var-u* *ēs-t* ***nemazgāt-us*** ***augļ-us***...
I:NOM NEG-can-PRS.1SG eat-INF unwashed-ACC.PL.M fruit-ACC.PL
‘I can’t eat unwashed fruits.’[13]

LATVIAN: Accusative with emphatic negation

(99) *Jūs* ***ne****-es-at* ***nek-o*** ***slikt-u*** *izdarīj-uš-i*.
2PL.NOM NEG-AUX-PRS.1PL nothing-ACC bad-ACC.SG perform-PST.PA-NOM.SG.M
‘You haven’t done anything bad.’ (Nau 1998: 59)

The demise of the GenNeg is an innovation in standard Latvian; both Bielenstein (1863: 284–285) and Endzelin (1922: 419–420) describe GenNeg as a pervasive phenomenon, though mention both dialectal variation and a tendency to supplant the Genitive by the

[13] http://sinteetika.blogspot.ru/2011_10_01_archive.html

Accusative. See, however, Berg-Olsen (2000 and references therein) for a detailed historical investigation of the use of the Genitive in Latvian, showing, among other things, that the Accusative was the prevailing option already in the oldest Latvian texts.

In contrast to standard Latvian, Latgalian has preserved GenNeg to a much greater extent (Nau 2011: 78, 91), though the actual situation as described in Nau (2014: 218–225) is much more complex than a simple prescriptive rule might suggest. Both local (100) and non-local GenNeg (101) is amply attested.

LATGALIAN: local GenNeg

(100) *J-is* ***taid-u*** ***slykt-u*** ***drēb-u*** *nikod* ***na**-beja*
3-NOM.SG.M such-GEN.PL bad-GEN.PL cloth-GEN.PL never NEG-AUX.PST(3)
nusuoj-is.
wear-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
'He had never worn such bad clothes.' (Nau 2014: 218)

LATGALIAN: non-local GenNeg

(101) *Es* ***na**-muoku* ***durov-u*** *attaisē-t!*
I:NOM NEG-can.PRS.1SG door-GEN.PL open-INF
'I can't open the door.' (ibid.: 221)

These differences in GenNeg between Latvian, on the one hand, and Lithuanian and Latgalian, on the other, are part of the more general trend regarding the adverbal use of the Genitive in general, see Berg-Olsen (2000) and Nau (2014). Both internal evidence and especially comparison with the Slavic languages (see next section) suggest that Lithuanian and Latgalian are closer to the original common-Baltic situation than Latvian. This divergence can be at least partly due to the fact that Lithuanian and Latgalian (and High Latvian dialects in general) have been in a prolonged contact with Polish, which could have contributed to the stability of the GenNeg pattern in these languages, while the western parts of the Latvian area have been under the comparable German influence, which may have led to the demise of the non-prepositional Genitive in general and GenNeg in particular. Such influence has probably also affected the Western Lithuanian dialects as well, though the few relevant studies (Švambarytė 1998, 1999) do not show this clearly.

6.2. Slavic languages

By the features of GenNeg outlined in section 1 Lithuanian patterns with Polish (Przepiórkowski 2000; Błaszczak 2003; cf. also Menantaud 1999 where only the local GenNeg is discussed), see examples (102) and (103).

POLISH: local GenNeg

(102) a. *Lubi-ę* ***Mari-ę***.
like-PRS.1SG Mary-ACC.SG
'I like Mary.' (Przepiórkowski 2000: 120)

b. ***Nie*** *lubi-ę* ***Mari-i*** / ****Mari-ę***.
NEG like-PRS.1SG Mary-GEN.SG / *Mary-ACC.SG
'I don't like Mary.' (ibid.)

POLISH: long-distance GenNeg

(103) a. ***Nie*** *chcia-ł-em* *pisa-ć* ***list-ów***.
NEG want-PST(SG.M)-1SG write-INF letter-GEN.PL
'I didn't want to write letters.' (Przepiórkowski 2000: 123)

b. *Janek* ***nie*** *uczy-ł* ***Mari-i*** *lepi-ć* ***garnk-ów***.
John(NOM.SG) NEG teach-PST(SG.M) Mary-GEN.SG mold-INF pot-GEN.PL
'John didn't teach Mary how to make pottery.' (ibid.: 128)

Another Slavic language closely resembling Lithuanian in the distribution of GenNeg is Slovene (Ilc 2011), cf. example (104). Long distance GenNeg in both Polish and Slovene is reported to be optional probably to the extent similar to that in Lithuanian, see the works cited.

SLOVENE: local and long-distance GenNeg

(104) a. *Janez* ***ni*** *bra-l* ***časopis-a***.
Janez(NOM.SG) NEG.AUX.3SG read-PST(SG.M) newspaper-GEN.SG
'Janez didn't read the newspaper.' (Ilc 2011: 196)

b. *Nataš-a* ***ni*** *hote-l-a* *čita-ti* ***knjig-e***.
Natasha-NOM.SG NEG.AUX.3SG want-PST-SG.F read-INF book-GEN.SG
'Natasha didn't want to read a book.' (ibid.: 197)

c. *Učitelj* ***ne*** *sil-i* ***študent-ov*** *reševa-ti*
teacher(NOM.SG) NEG force-PRS.3SG student-GEN.PL solve-INF
takšn-ih ***problem-ov***.
such-GEN.PL problem-GEN.PL
'The teacher does not force the students to solve such problems.' (ibid.)

In contrast to Polish and Slovene, where GenNeg is largely an across-the-board syntactic rule, in modern Russian GenNeg in local contexts is optional and determined by a complex interplay of semantic, pragmatic and stylistic factors (see e.g. Timberlake 1986; Padučeva 2006; Raxilina (red.) 2008; Kagan 2012; see also a useful historical overview by van Helden 2008), cf. example (105), where the choice of case under local negation affects semantics.

RUSSIAN: Genitive vs. Accusative under local negation

(105) a. *Ja* *by-l* *v* *London-e,* *no* ***ne*** *vide-l* ***Maš-u***.
I:NOM be-PST(SG.M) in London-LOC.SG but NEG see-PST(SG.M) Mary-ACC.SG
'I've been to London but didn't meet (lit. see) Mary.' (Padučeva 2006: 27)

b. *Ja* *by-l* *v* *London-e,* *no* ***ne*** *vide-l* ***Maš-i***.
I:NOM be-PST(SG.M) in London-LOC.SG but NEG see-PST(SG.M) Mary-ACC.SG
'I've been to London but didn't see Mary there (she might have not been there at that time).' (ibid.)

Non-local GenNeg in Russian is largely obsolete. According to Krasovitsky et al. (2011: 588), the frequency of the Accusative objects of non-locally negated infinitives in contemporary Russian is close to 90%, cf. example (106). However, rare instances of long-distance GenNeg are nevertheless still attested, cf. example (107).

RUSSIAN: Accusative vs. Genitive under non-local negation

(106) *Potomu čto* *ja* ***ne*** *xoč-u* *poterja-t'* ***svoj-u*** ***doč'***.
since I:NOM NEG want-PRS.1SG lose-INF RFL.POSS-ACC.SG.F daughter(ACC.SG)
'Since I don't want to lose my daughter.' (fiction, 2002, www.ruscorpora.ru)

(107) *Ljud-i* ***ne*** *xot-jat* *vide-t'* ***neprigljadn-oj*** ***real'nost-i*** *fakt-ov...*
people-NOM.PL NEG want-PRS(3)PL see-INF unattractive-GEN.SG.F reality-GEN.SG fact-GEN.PL
'People do not want to see the unattractive reality of the facts.' (non-fiction, 2002, www.ruscorpora.ru)

The situation in Belorussian, another language with which Lithuanian has been in prolonged contact, is most probably similar to that in Russian. Local GenNeg is recorded in prescriptive grammars as a default, though non-obligatory, rule (see e.g Krivickij & Podlužnyj 1994: 159), while non-local GenNeg is virtually unattested in contemporary usage, at least as evidenced by 14 native speakers I have consulted[14]. However, there are some examples attested in the parallel Belorussian-Russian corpus, cf. (108) vs. (109).

BELORUSSIAN: Genitive vs. Accusative under non-local negation

(108) *Ja* *ne* *veda-ju* *i* ***ne*** *xač-u* *veda-c'*
I:NOM NEG know-PRS.1SG and NEG want-PRS.1SG know-INF
inš-aj ***mac-i****!*
other-GEN.SG.F mother-GEN.SG
'I don't know and don't want to know another mother!' (fiction, 1987, www.ruscorpora.ru)

(109) *Adnak* *jon* ***ne*** *ŭspe-ŭ* *skaza-c'* ***gèt-yja*** ***slov-y****,*
however 3SG.M.NOM NEG have.time-PST(SG.M) say-INF this-ACC.PL word-ACC.PL
jak *zagavary-ŭ* *čužazemec:*
as start.speaking-PST(SG.M) foreigner(NOM.SG)
'However, before he managed to utter these words, the foreigner spoke:' (1994 translation of the Bulgakov's "Master i Margatita", www.ruscorpora.ru; the original has the Genitive)

Unfortunately, the data from the Belorussian dialects is entirely lacking.

Long-distance GenNeg is a common Slavic phenomenon, see Willis (2013: 349–368), as is evidenced not only by a striking Polish-Slovene parallel hardly explainable but as a common retention, but most importantly by Old Church Slavonic, cf. example (110), and earlier stages of those languages where it has become obsolete, such as Czech, cf. examples (111) vs. (112). In the history of Russian, Accusative is said to have started replacing the Genitive under negation only in the 15th century (van Helden 2008: 147 and references therein).

OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC: long-distance GenNeg

(110) ***Ne*** *ubo-i* *sę* *prije-ti* ***žen-y*** ***tvo-eję*** ***Marij-ę****.*
NEG fear-IMP.2SG RFL.ACC take-INF wife-GEN.SG your-GEN.SG.F Mary-GEN.SG
'Do not be afraid to take your wife Mary.' (*Evangeliarium Assemani*, 11th cent., Matt. 1:20, quoted after Willis 2013: 353)

OLD CZECH: long-distance GenNeg

(111) ***ne****-kazu-j* *nám* *přejí-ti* ***Jordan-a***
NEG-order-IMP.2SG we:DAT cross-INF Jordan-GEN.SG
'Do not make us cross the Jordan.' (*Bible Olomoucká*, Nos. 32:5, 1417, quoted after Willis 2013: 361)

MODERN CZECH: Accusative under negation

(112) *...****ne****-chc-i* *jís-t* ***zabit-á*** ***zvířat-a****.*
NEG-want-PRS.1SG eat-INF killed-ACC.PL.N animal-ACC.PL
'I don't want to eat killed animals.'[15]

[14] I express my sincere gratitude to Anžalika Dubasava and Anton Somin for their invaluable help with devising the questionnaire and accessing the native speakers.

[15] http://www.vegetarian.cz/diskuse/dproc/dproc118.html

As has been already mentioned above, the combined Baltic and Slavic evidence suggests that the (at least partly) obligatory GenNeg is a common Balto-Slavic phenomenon, while the decay of GenNeg in Latvian and most modern Slavic languages are innovations due to both language-internal and contact influences. It is hardly a coincidence that in those Slavic languages which have experienced particularly strong influence from German (e.g. Czech and Sorbian) GenNeg has become obsolete like in Latvian, see e.g. Scholze (2007: 66) regarding the demise of GenNeg in colloquial Upper Sorbian. On the other hand, contact with German can hardly be the main conditioning factor for the loss resp. retention of GenNeg, as show the East Slavic languages, which have largely restructured or eliminated GenNeg without any influence from German, and Slovene, which has experienced hardly a weaker contact influence from German than Czech (see e.g. Reindl 2008), but has kept its GenNeg intact (though an investigation of the situation in the dialects would be of course welcome in order to shed more light on this issue).

6.3. The Baltic Finnic languages

The Baltic Finnic analogue of the Baltic and Slavic GenNeg is the use of the Partitive case for the direct object of a negated verb. This is an obligatory rule in local as well as non-local contexts both in Estonian (Erelt (ed.) 2003: 96, 111)[16], cf. example (113), and Finnish (Brattico 2012), cf. example (114); in Finnish the latter include different-subject complements or perception and attitude verbs, in sharp contrast to Lithuanian, cf. example (114b).

ESTONIAN: long-distance partitive of negation

(113) a. *President* *andis* *ta-lle* ***medali/*medalit***.
president(NOM.SG) give:PST(3)SG 3SG-ALL medal:GEN.SG/*medal:PTV.SG
'The president gave him a medal.' (Merilin Miljan, p.c.)

b. *President* ***ei*** *käski-nud* *ta-lle* ***medalit/*medali*** *anda.*
president(NOM.SG) NEG order-PST.PA 3SG-ALL medal:PTV.SG/*medal:GEN.SG give:INF
'[The] president did not order to give him a medal.' (Merilin Miljan, p.c.)

FINNISH: long-distance partitive of negation

(114) a. *Minä* ***en*** *halun-nut* *näh-dä* ***häntä / *hänet***.
I:NOM NEG.1SG want-PST.PA see-INF 3:PTV.SG / *3:ACC.SG
'I did not want to see her.' (Brattico 2012: 253)

b. *Me* ***ei*** *näh-ty* *Peka-n* *syö-vä-n* ***leipää / *leivä-n***.
we:NOM NEG see-PST Pekka-GEN.SG eat-PRS.PA-GEN.SG bread:PTV.SG/*bread-GEN.SG
'We did not see Pekka eating the/some bread.' (ibid.: 247)

Interestingly, in the now extinct Livonian the situation was different; as is reported by Sjögren (1861: 65; 241–242), the use of the Partitive with negated verbs was not obligatory and depended largely on the same semantic parameters (degree of affectedness and aspect) as its use in non-negated sentences. Still in another minor Baltic Finnic language, Votic, the Partitive of negation is reported to be obligatory (Markus & Rožanskij 2011: 229). No data on the influence of non-local negation on the case marking of the object is available either for Livonian or for Votic.

6.4. Summary

The distribution of local and non-local GenNeg or its analogues in the Baltic, Slavic and Baltic Finnic languages is shown in Table 8.

---

[16] I express my gratitude to Merilin Miljan for providing me with comprehensive data on Estonian.

Table 8. Areal distribution of local and long-distance GenNeg

Language	**Local GenNeg**	**Long-distance GenNeg**
Estonian	obligatory	obligatory
Finnish	obligatory	obligatory
Lithuanian	obligatory	regular
Polish	obligatory	regular
Slovene	obligatory	regular
Latgalian	obligatory?	regular
Russian	optional and meaningful	rare
Belorussian	optional	rare
Latvian	only emphatic	only emphatic
Czech	no	no

Two implicational "universals" emerge from Table 8; the first one given in (115) is quite expected while the second one in (116) is less trivial.

(115) If a language allows at least rare instances of case alternation on the object determined by non-local negation, it allows the same alternation determined by the local negation to the same or greater extent.

(116) If a language has obligatory rules of case alternation on the object determined by the local negation, it allows the same alternation in at least some embedded contexts, probably as a less rigid rule.

Indeed, in (115) the implication goes from a larger syntactic domain to a smaller one, but in (116) the direction of the implication is the opposite. The generalizations in (115) and (116) should be tested on a larger cross-linguistic sample with respect to other phenomena related to negation, such as NPI licensing; currently, I have no explanations for the unexpected implication in (116).

7. Conclusions

Let me summarize my principal observations on the properties of the long-distance Genitive of Negation in Lithuanian.

First, GenNeg in Lithuanian is a purely syntactic phenomenon in general independent of semantic or pragmatic features. Long-distance GenNeg in infinitival clauses is potentially unbounded, being possible with all kinds of matrix predicates (save for a number of verbs with Dative experiencers, which, anyway, do not ban GenNeg altogether) and able to reach into deeply embedded infinitival clauses and affect all accusative objects on its way.

Second, long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian is subject to large and as yet not well-understood variation across different subtypes of constructions and different native speakers. Only some statistical preferences can be discerned:

– GenNeg is more often use with same-subject complement matrix verbs than with different-subject complement matrix verb;

– with same-subject complement matrix verbs, GenNeg is more often used with verbs with Nominative subjects that with verbs with Dative experiencers, and among the latter GenNeg is favoured by verbs with modal and aspectual semantics;

– with different-subject complement matrix verbs, GenNeg is more frequent with verbs taking Dative objects than with verbs taking Genitive or Accusative objects;

– with matrix predicates consisting of a light verb and a nominal, GenNeg is more frequent when the nominal does not contain a determiner and is semantically indefinite, while the presence of an overt determiner or a definite interpretation favours the Accusative;

– with non-verbal matrix predicates GenNeg is possible when the negation attaches to the copula and becomes degraded, though not altogether impossible when the negation is attached to the nominal or adjectival predicate itself.

Impressionistically, Accusative becomes the more felicitous, the longer the syntactic difference between the negation and the targeted object NP, however, it has to be stressed once again that this is only a (hard to test) statistical preference.

Third, factors blocking GenNeg include familiar barriers of syntactic operations such as finite clause boundary and presence of overt complementizers or relativizers (with the notable exception of headless relative infinitival clauses with the existential *turėti* 'have'). GenNeg is also mostly unavailable in participial clauses, with the exception of certain constructions which do not seem to have much in common, such as Perfect periphrases with the auxiliary, where GenNeg is obligatory as in clauses headed by synthetic verb forms, and constructions with matrix verbs *liautis* 'stop' and *jaustis* 'feel oneself', where GenNeg is a salient option alongside with the regular Accusative. It is also worth noting that testing the behaviour of GenNeg in adjunct infinitival clauses of the kind investigated in Franks & Lavine (2006) and Arkadiev (2014) proved to be impossible since these constructions peculiarly consistently reject matrix negation.

Fourth, from an areal perspective, Lithuanian patterns with Latgalian and the more conservative Slavic languages (Polish and Slovene) and the Baltic Finnic languages, rather than with Latvian, which, like Czech, has abolished GenNeg almost altogether, probably not without German influence.

In conclusion I would like to make some speculations regarding the theoretical interpretation of long-distance Genitive of Negation (see e.g. Błaszczak 2003 regarding Polish and Brattico 2012 on Finnish, and Arkadiev 2014: 80–81 for a preliminary analysis of the Lithuanian facts). Most importantly, the data from Lithuanian as well as the similar patterns attested in other languages suggest that we are dealing with a *prima facie* instance of cross-clausal case assignment, a phenomenon often believed to be non-existent (see e.g. McFadden 2010 for a recent discussion). The properties of long-distance GenNeg problematic for most current theories of case assignment include the following (its optionality and variation left aside):

1) GenNeg is not constrained by locality considerations commonly assumed to work for the mechanisms of case assignment; indeed, as Brattico (2012: 280–281) argues for Finnish, the Baltic Finnic Partitive of Negation is a sort of an A'-dependency akin to cyclic wh-extraction from embedded non-finite clauses; it is an empirical question to what extent this reasoning can be applied to Lithuanian or Polish;

2) most notably, GenNeg is not just a non-local dependency, but a dependency insensitive to various "intervention effects" (Chomsky 2000: 123) such as the presence of Dative or Genitive case-marked objects of the matrix verb or even of intervening Accusative objects, as schematically shown in (117).

(117) a. *ne*-V $NP_{DAT\text{-}i}$ $[\varnothing_i$ V_{INF} $NP_{\sout{ACC}GEN}]$

b. ne-V $NP_{\sout{ACC}GEN\text{-}i}$ $[\varnothing_i$ V_{INF} $NP_{\sout{ACC}GEN}]$

Therefore, any theory of case able to account for GenNeg should incorporate a mechanism of **non-local multiple** case assignment. The technical and conceptual details of such a mechanism may vary in accordance with the requirements of particular theoretical frameworks.

Abbreviations

ACC — accusative; ALL — allative; AUX — auxiliary verb; CNT — continuative; CNV — converb; COMP — comparative; DAT — dative; DEB — debitive; DEF — definite; DF — default form; DIM — diminutive; F — feminine; FUT — future; GEN — genitive; IMP — imperative; INF — infinitive; INS — instrumental; IRR — irrealis; LOC — locative; M — masculine; N — neuter; NEG — negation; NML — nominalization; NOM — nominative; PA — active participle; PL — plural; POSS — possessive; PP — passive participle; PRS — present; PRV — preverb; PST — past; PTV — partitive; Q — question particle; RFL — reflexive; SG — singular.

References

Ambrazas, Vytautas. 1987. Die indogermanische Grundlage des Dativus und Nominativus cum infinitivo im Baltischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 92: 203–219.

Ambrazas, Vytautas. 2001. On the development of the nominative object in East Baltic. In: *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact. Vol. 2. Grammar and Typology*, Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), 391–412. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.). 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2012. Participial complementation in Lithuanian. In: *Clause Linkage in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Data-Driven Approaches to Cross-Clausal Syntax,* Volker Gast & Holger Diessel (eds.), 285–334. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2014. Case and word order in Lithuanian infinitival clauses revisited. In: *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic,* Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), 43–95. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Berg-Olsen, Sturla. 2000. The Latvian non-prepositional genitive — a case losing ground. *Res Balticae* 6: 95–146.

Berg-Olsen, Sturla. 2004. *The Latvian Dative and Genitive: A Cognitive Grammar Account*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oslo.

Bielenstein, August Johann Gottfried. 1863. *Lettische Grammatik*. Mitau: Fr. Lucas' Buchhandlung.

Błaszczak, Joanna. 2003. Genitive of negation constructions in Polish: A challenge to Chomsky's *Minimalist Inquiries*? Ms., University of Potsdam.

Bohnemeyer, Jürgen, Enfield, Nicholas J., Essegbey, James, Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide, Kita, Sotaro, Lüpke, Friederike, & Ameka, Felix K. 2007. Principles of event segmentation in language: The case of motion events. *Language* 83(3): 495–532.

Brattico, Pauli. 2012. Long-distance case assignment in Finnish. *Studia Linguistica* 66(3): 245–285.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In: *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik,* Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), 89–115. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Endzelin, Jānis. 1922. *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: A. Gulbis.

Erelt, Mati (ed.). 2003. *Estonian Language*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Sciences.

Franks, Stephen & Lavine, James E. 2006. Case and word order in Lithuanian. *Journal of Linguistics* 42(1): 239–288.

Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at Work. The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gronemeyer, Claire & Usonienė, Aurelija. 2001. Complementation in Lithuanian. In: Claire Gronemeyer. *Laying the Boundaries of Syntax: Studies in the Interfaces between Syntax, Semantics and Lexicon*, 105–135. Lund: Lund University.

Holvoet, Axel & Nau, Nicole. 2014. Argument marking and grammatical relations in Baltic. An overview. In: *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic,* Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), 1–41. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hopper, Paul J. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2): 251–299.

Ilc, Gašper. 2011. Optionality of the Genitive (of Negation) in Slovene. In: *Formalization of Grammar in Slavic Languages. Contributions of the Eighth International Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages - FDSL VIII 2009 University of Potsdam, December 2-5, 2009,* Peter Kosta & Lilia Schurcks (eds.), 193–206. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Kagan, Olga. 2012. *Semantics of Genitive Objects in Russian. A Study of Genitive of Negation and Intensional Genitive Case*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Kalėdaitė, Violeta. 2008. Language-specific existential sentence types: A case study of Lithuanian. *Kalbotyra* 59(3): 128–137.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria & Wälchli, Bernhard. 2001. The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach. In: *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact,* Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), V. 2, 615–750. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kozhanov, Kirill. 2015. Prefixation and argument structure in Lithuanian: Transitivization. Presentation at *Grammar, Lexicon and Argument Structure in Baltic*, Salos, July 27 – August 3 2014.

Krasovitsky, Alexander, Baerman, Matthew, Brown, Dunstan & Corbett, Greville G. 2011. Changing semantic factors in case selection: Russian evidence from the last two centuries. *Morphology* 21(2): 573–592.

Krivickij, Aleksandr A. & Podlužnyj, Aleksandr I. 1994. *Učebnik belorusskogo jazyka. Dlja samoobrazovanija* (A Manual of Belorussian for Self-Learning). Minsk: Vyšèjšaja škola.

Lyutikova, Ekaterina A. 2010. K voprosu o kategorial'nom statuse imennyx grupp v russkom jazyke [Towards the categorial status of Russian noun phrases]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta*. Ser. 9. *Filologija* 6: 36–76.

Markus, Elena & Rožanskij, Fedor. 2011. *Sovremennyj vodskij jazyk. Teksty i grammatičeskij očerk. T. II*. (Modern Votic. Texts and Grammatical Sketch. Vol. 2) Saint-Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija.

Mathiassen, Terje. 1996. *A short grammar of Lithuanian*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

McFadden, Thomas. 2010. Structural case, locality and cyclicity. In: *Explorations of Phase Theory: Features and Arguments,* Kleanthes K. Grohmann (ed.), 107–130. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Menantaud, Henri. 1999. La négation comme catégorie grammaticale en polonais et en lituanien. *Cahiers de Linguistique de l'INALCO* 1-2: 43–57.

Menantaud, Henri. 2007. Note sur une alternance morphologique induite par la négation dans les langues baltes modernes (letton et lituanien). In: *La négation*. (Travaux du Cercle linguistique d'Aix-en-Provence), Christian Touratier & Charles Zaremba (éds.), 91–99. Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence.

Miestamo, Matti. 2014. Partitives and negation: A cross-linguistic survey. In: *Partitive Cases and Related Categories,* Silvia Luraghi & Toomas Huumo (eds.), 63–86. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.

Nau, Nicole. 1998. *Latvian*. München & Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.

Nau, Nicole. 2011. *A Short Grammar of Latgalian*. München, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.

Nau, Nicole. 2014. Differential object marking in Latgalian. In: *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic,* Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), 207–255. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nītiņa, Daina & Grigorjevs, Juris (red.). 2013. *Latviešu valodas gramatika* [A Latvian Grammar]. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.

Padučeva, Elena V. 2006. Genitiv dopolnenija v otricatel'nom predloženii [The genitive of the object in negative sentences]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 6: 21–43.

Pereltsvaig, Asia. 2006. Small nominals. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24(2): 433–500.

Przepiórkowski, Adam. 2000. Long distance genitive of negation in Polish. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8: 119–158.

Raxilina, Ekaterina V. (red.). 2008. Ob''ektnyj genitiv pri otricanii v russkom jazyke [The Object Genitive of Negation in Russian]. Moscow: Probel-2000.

Reindl, Donald F. 2008. *Language Contact: German and Slovenian*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Scholze, Lenka. 2007. *Das grammatische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Sprachkontakts*. PhD Dissertation, Universität Konstanz.

Sirtautas, Vytautas. 1971. Konstrukcijų *buvo matyti, girdėti* ... struktūra. *Kalbotyra* 22(1): 71–79.

Sjögren, J. Andreas. 1861. *Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben*. (Gesammelte Schriften. Bd. II. Th. I.) St. Petersburg: Commisionäre der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Šukys, Jonas. 1998. *Lietuvių kalbos linksniai ir prielinksniai: vartosena ir normos* [Lithuanian Cases and Prepositions: Usage and Norms]. Kaunas: Šviesa.

Švambarytė, Janina. 1998. Objekto galininko ir kilmininko linksnių kaita prie neiginio J. Basanavičiaus publikuotuose pasakojamosios tautosakos rinkiniuose [The alternation of genitive and accusative under negation in the folklore collections published by J. Basanavičius]. *Lituanistica* 3(35): 53–60.

Švambarytė, Janina. 1999. Neiginio objekto raiška: genityvas ar akuzatyvas [The expression of the object under negation: Genitive or accusative]. *Linguistica Lettica* 5: 72–82.

Timberlake, Alan. 1986. Hierarchies in the genitive of negation. In: *Case in Slavic*, Richard Brecht & James Levine (eds.), 338–360. Columbus (OH): Slavica.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1981. Split case-marking patterns in verb-types and tense/aspect/mood. *Linguistics* 19(5/6): 389–438.

Ulvydas, Kazys. (red.). 1976. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika. T. 3. Sintaksė*. [Lithuanian Grammar. Vol. 3. Syntax] Vilnius: Mokslas.

van Helden, W. Andries. 2008. Vicissitudes of the genitive rule. In: *Dutch Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid, September 10–16 2008. Linguistics,* Peter Houtzagers, Janneke Kalsbeek & Jos Schaeken (eds.), 145–216. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Willis, David. 2013. Negation in the history of the Slavonic languages. In: *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean,* David Willis, Christopher Lucas & Anne Breitbarth (eds.), 341–398. Oxford: Oxford University Press.