

Participial complementation in Lithuanian

Peter M. Arkadiev

1. Introduction

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

- (1) a. *Sak-ia-u tėv-q gerai gyven-a-nt.*
say-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG well live-PRS-PA
‘I said [my] father lived well.’
- b. *Tėv-as sak-ė(-si) gerai gyven-ąs.*
father-NOM.SG say-PST(3)(-RFL) well live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
‘Father said he lived well.’

The complementation patterns shown in (1) have been extensively studied from a diachronic point of view (cf. Tangl 1928/1999, and especially Ambrazas 1979 [in Lithuanian] and Ambrazas 1990 [in Russian with a German summary]). Beyond Lithuanian, they are also attested in Latvian (cf. Eiche 1983), and have been documented for early stages of many Indo-European languages (see Ambrazas 1990 for an overview, and Cristofaro this volume for a discussion of similar constructions in Ancient Greek). However, from a purely synchronic point of view these constructions present a number of interesting problems which still remain unsolved. The only recent relevant study of them I am aware of, i.e. Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001) – probably the only survey of the rich system of sentential complementation in Lithuanian formulated in contemporary syntactic terms – does not discuss the participial constructions in sufficient detail, though contains many insightful remarks. Another recent study, Giparaitė (2010), presents a discussion of the small clause construction in Lithuanian, but does not extend the analysis to participial complements.

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

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

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

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

2. Lithuanian participles: An overview

Lithuanian participles are highly polyfunctional non-finite verbal forms combining adjectival agreement morphology with inflection for tense and voice. In this section, I will outline the morphosyntactic properties of Lithuanian participles and exemplify their most important uses, without, however, going into too much detail. For a general overview of Lithuanian participles see, *inter alia*, Ambrazas (1997: 326–371), Ambrazas (1990), Klimas (1987), Petit (1999: 113–134), and Wiemer (2000).

The system of participles found in Lithuanian is very rich in comparison to other modern European languages, and resembles that of Ancient Greek. The major morphosyntactic division is the one between Active and Passive participles, the latter being typologically peculiar in some respects (the problem of the so-called “impersonal passive” in Lithuanian has been widely discussed in the literature, see e.g. Timberlake 1982, Nuñez 1994, Wiemer 2004, 2006a, Lavine 2006, 2010, Holvoet 2007: 96–104). The Active participles distinguish all of the four synthetic tenses of Lithuanian (see Ambrasas 1997: 237–254; cf. also Sližienė 1994 and Mathiassen 1996 on the Lithuanian tense system), i.e. Present, Simple Past, Habitual Past, and Future. The participial suffixes are normally added to the respective tense inflections. The Passive participle lacks the Habitual Past form, and its Simple Past form is based on the Infinitive stem rather than on the Simple Past stem.

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

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

Table 1. The paradigm of participles in Lithuanian

<i>gerti</i> ‘drink’	Active		Passive
	Agreeing	Non-agreeing	
Present	<i>geriās</i> (m), <i>gerianti</i> (f)	<i>geriant</i>	<i>geriamas, geriamo</i>
Preterite	<i>gėręs</i> (m), <i>gėrusi</i> (f)	<i>gėrus</i>	<i>gertas, gerta</i>
Habitual Past	<i>gerdavęs</i> (m), <i>gerdavusi</i> (f)	<i>gerdavus</i>	—
Future	<i>gersiās</i> (m), <i>gersianti</i> (f)	<i>gersiant</i>	<i>gersimas, gersimo</i>

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

- (2) ... *dėkoj-u* [*skaiči-us-iems* *įvad-o* *tekst-ą*]
 thank-PRS.ISG read-PST.PA-DAT.PL.M preface-GEN.SG text-ACC.SG
istorik-ams
 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*]
 state-GEN.SG name-INS.SG announced-PRS-PP-LOC.PL.M
konkurs-uose
 competition-LOC.PL
 ‘in competitions held under the state’s patronage’ (LKT)

Both Active and Passive participles are used in various periphrastic constructions formed with the auxiliary verb *būti* ‘be’, among them the Passive voice, cf. (4a, b), the Perfect-Resultative, cf. (5a, b) (see also Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988), and a special Avertive form (called “thwarted inceptive” by Mathiassen 1996: 9; see Arkadiev 2011), which expresses a situation that was imminent but did not actually occur. These forms are characterised by obligatory prefixation of *be-* (a polyfunctional prefix here glossed “Continuative”, see Arkadiev 2011) to the participle, cf. (6).

- (4) a. *Nam-as* *buv-o* *pa-staty-t-as*
 house-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) PRV-build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
praeit-ais *met-ais*.
 past-INS.PL.M year-INS.PL
 ‘The house was built last year.’ (Wiemer 2006a: 277)
- b. *Nam-as* *yra* *stat-o-m-as*
 house-NOM.SG AUX.PRS(3) build-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
jau *dvej-us* *met-us*.
 already two-ACC.PL year-ACC.PL
 ‘The house has been being built already for two years.’
 (Wiemer 2006a: 277)

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

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

Participles frequently appear in a so-called “semipredicative” function, serving as heads of tensed non-finite subordinate clauses. This function is characteristic of agreeing as well as non-agreeing Active participles, but Passive participles may also be used in the relevant contexts. There are two types of “semipredicative” participial construction: The first type, where the participle heads a sentential complement of a verb of speech, perception or cognition, cf. (1) above, is the main focus of this study. The second type is constituted by participial adverbial clauses (for a recent analysis see Greenberg & Lavine 2006). In both types of “semipredicative” construction, the presence vs. absence of agreement morphology on the participle essentially functions as a reference tracking device not too different from switch-reference (cf. Haiman & Munro 1983; Striling 1993; Fedden this volume). Agreeing participles (cf. (7a)) are used if their subject (which is obligatorily implicit) is identical to the Nominative subject of the main clause (thus, agreeing “semipredicative” participles may appear in the Nominative case only, the other categories such as number and gender being determined by the matrix subject); by contrast, non-agreeing participles (cf. (7b)) generally signal that the subject of the embedded clause is different from that of the matrix clause. In the latter case, the overt embedded subject carries Accusative case in complement constructions, cf. (1a) and Dative case in adverbial constructions, cf. (7b).

- (7) a. *Išėj-us-i* *iš mišk-o,* *j-i* *net*
 go.out-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F from forest-GEN.SG she-NOM.SG.F even
stabelėj-o.
 stop-PST(3)
 ‘Having left the forest, she (suddenly) stopped.’ (Ambrazas 1997: 362)
- b. *Vaik-ams sugriž-us,* *pra.gyd-o* *lakštingal-a.*
 child-DAT.PL return-PST.PA start.singing-PST(3) nightingale-NOM.SG
 ‘When the children came back, a nightingale burst into singing.’
 (Ambrazas 1997: 363)

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

- (8) *Vien-o* *pon-o* *mir-us-i* *pat-i*
 one-GEN.SG.M lord-GEN.SG die-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F wife-NOM.SG
ir palik-us-i *dvylika sūn-ų ...*
 and leave-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F twelve son-GEN.PL
 ‘The wife of a lord died and left twelve sons ...’ (Ambrazas 1997: 265)
- (9) *Ten šun-s* *bėg-t-a.*
 there dog-GEN.SG run-PST.PP-N
 ‘A dog has evidently run there.’ (Ambrazas 1997: 283)

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

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

constructions available in modern Lithuanian, taking into account the distinction between agreeing and non-agreeing Active participles in Lithuanian more generally (see above on the “semipredicative” participles).

3. Participial complements: General properties

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

3.1. Types of matrix predicates

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

- (10) ...*gegut-ė* *j-iems* *kukuoj-a* *netikr-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 is saying (lit. cuckooing) them that [they] are carrying
 a fake bride’
 (<http://www1.omnitel.net/sakmes/frames.html>)

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

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

1. Verbs of perception: *matyti* ‘see’, *girdėti* ‘hear’ and *jausti* ‘feel’; this class is not very large, and in addition to the three mentioned verbs comprises several near synonyms of them.
2. Verbs of communication: *sakyti* ‘say’, *teigti* ‘assert’, *neigti* ‘deny’, *skelbti* ‘claim’, *rašyti* ‘write’, *vaizduoti* ‘depict’, *skųstis* ‘complain’, *grasinti* ‘threaten’, among several others.
3. Verbs of cognition, e.g. *manyti* ‘think, believe’, *tikėti* ‘believe’, *tikėtis* ‘hope’, *žinoti* ‘know’, *įtarti* ‘suspect’, *vaizduotis* ‘imagine’, *suprasti* ‘understand’, among others.

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

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

The question of what factors determine the choice between finite and participial complements will not be addressed in this paper, as it deserves a study of its own (cf. Župerka 1969).¹ However, it is worth mentioning that participial complements are apparently more restricted with respect to their possible heads than *kad*-clauses; for example, participial complements do not seem to occur with non-verbal heads such as *gaila* ‘pity’.²

Second, as my data show, participial complements are particularly favoured by those verbs which do not impose restrictions on the temporal reference of the subordinate proposition. This is not surprising, considering that Lithuanian participles, as mentioned in Section 2, inflect for tense (see examples below). Those verbs whose semantics requires a particular temporal interpretation of the subordinate clause, such as verbs of volition (e.g. *norėti* ‘to want’), manipulation (e.g. *prašyti* ‘ask, request’, *liepti* ‘order’),

¹ 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.

² Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 117) provide (i) as an example of a participial complement selected by a noun. However, this is not confirmed by corpus data.

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

and phasal verbs (e.g. *pradėti* ‘begin’), usually take a tenseless infinitive instead of participles.³

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

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

What is at stake here is evidently the distinction between (i) direct perception, which indeed requires simultaneity of the perceived event and the act of perception, and (ii) indirect perception (e.g. hearsay), as in (13), which imposes no such restrictions (cf. Usonienė 2001; see also Enghels 2009 on asymmetries between visual and auditory perception verbs). It is worth noting in this connection that Present participles expressing simultaneity of the subordinate and the main events are compatible with both types of perception. Compare (14) and (15).

- (14) *Vaikyst-ėje* *j-is* *girdėj-o* *senel-es*
 childhood-LOC.SG he-NOM.SG.M hear-PST(3) old.lady-ACC.PL
kalb-a-nt *tik* *lietuviškai*.
 speak-PRS-PA only Lithuanian
 ‘In his childhood he heard old ladies speak only Lithuanian.’ (LKT)
- (15) *Aleksandr-as* *pasiek-ė* *Vengrij-a...* *kur* *girdėj-o*
 A.-NOM.SG reach-PST(3) Hungary-ACC.SG where hear-PST(3)
es-a-nt *tėv-a*.
 be-PRS-PA father-ACC.SG (LKT)
 ‘Alexander reached Hungary, where, he heard, [then] was his father.’

³ However, the verb *liautis* ‘to stop’ is exceptional in allowing same-subject participial complement on a par with the infinitive, the tense of the participle being always the Simple Past.

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

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

3.2. Syntactic properties of participial complements

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

As has been mentioned, Lithuanian participles have full-fledged tense inflections, and it is precisely their “semipredicative” usage (see Section 2) which exhibits the largest range of Tense distinctions.⁴ Consider the examples of both agreeing (same subject) and non-agreeing (different subject) participial complements in various tenses given below: Simple Past, cf. (17) and (18), Habitual Past, cf. (19) and (20), Future, cf. (21) and (22). Examples of Present participles were already given above, see e.g. (15) and (16).

⁴ 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.

Normally, the tense form in the embedded clause is interpreted relative to the tense of the matrix clause.

- (17) *T-uo met-u sak-o-si dirb-ęs*
 that-INS.SG.M time-INS.SG say-PRS(3)-RFL work-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
Los Alamos Nacionalin-ėje laboratorij-oje.
 L. A. 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*
 she-NOM.SG.F remember-PST(3) he-ACC.SG.M be-PST.PA
labdaring-q ir malon-ų.
 charitable-ACC.SG.M 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*
 lad-NOM.SG tell-PST(3) go-HAB-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M with
išties-t-a rank-a ir prašy-dav-ęs
 extend-PST.PP-INS.SG.F hand-INS.SG and ask-HAB-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
pinig-ų.
 money-GEN.PL
 ‘The lad told that he used to go cap in hand and beg money.’ (LKT)
- (20) ...*skatin-a many-ti j-q dažnai bū-dav-us*
 induce-PRS(3) think-INF she-ACC.SG.F often be-HAB-PST.PA
susierzin-usi-q ...
 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-qš*
 this.time driver-NOM.SG say-PRS(3) live-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M
nam-e, tolėliau nuo centr-o ...
 house-LOC.SG farther from center-GEN.SG
 ‘This time the driver says that he will live in a house farther from
 downtown ...’
 (<http://www.klaipeda.daily.lt/temp.php?data=2004-01-03&id=1072619337>)

- (22) *Jurg-is grasin-o tėv-q atei-si-ant ir*
 J.-NOM.SG threaten-PST(3) father-ACC.SG come-FUT-PA and
j-uos 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 complements is a clear sign of a high degree of syntactic autonomy, and of a concomitant layer of structure. In generative terms, Lithuanian participial complements are at least TPs, and I will present evidence suggesting that there is even more structure to them, i.e. that they are CPs. As examples (24) and (25) show, participial complements may contain an overt complementiser (*ar* ‘whether’⁵, also forming matrix yes-no questions) or a fronted *wh*-word, which suggests that there is a special position at their left periphery which can be occupied by such elements.

⁵ Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 126) provide (ii) as an example of a participial complement introduced by the complementiser *kad* ‘that’. However, in my view (ii) can rather be analysed as an embedded evidential clause with a zero pronominal subject, on a par with examples such as (iii), where the subject is overt. It is worth noting that in sentences similar to (iii) the overt subject does not have to be coreferential with the matrix subject.

- (ii) *J-i minėj-o kad turėj-us-i Marij-q*
 he-NOM.SG.F mention-PST(3) that have-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F Maria-ACC.SG
sveči-uose.
 guest-LOC.PL
 ‘She mentioned having Maria as a guest.’
- (iii) *sak-ė-si, kad j-i es-a-nt-i niek-uo*
 say-PST(3)-RFL that he-NOM.SG.F be-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F nothing-INS.SG.M
nekalt-a.
 not.guilty-NOM.SG.F
 ‘[she,] said that she, was not guilty of anything.’
 (<http://anthology.lms.lt/texts/34/tekstas/50.html>)

- (24) *Prokuror-as sak-ė dar ne-žin-qs, ar*
 prosecutor-NOM.SG say-PST(3) yet NEG-know-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M Q
rašy-si-qs kasacin-į skund-q
 write-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M cassation-ACC.SG.M appeal-ACC.SG
Aukščiausi-ajam Teism-ui.
 higher-DAT.SG.M.DEF court-DAT.SG
 ‘The prosecutor said he did not yet know whether he would write an appeal to the Higher Court.’ (<http://www.londonozinios.com/a-news-2065>)
- (25) *J-is ne-pamirš-dav-o atsiųs-ti ... radiogram-q,*
 he-NOM.SG.M NEG-forget-HAB-PST(3) send-INF radiograms-ACC.SG
praneš-dam-as kur es-qs, kaip
 inform-CNV-SG.M where be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M how
gyven-qs ...
 live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
 ‘He would not forget to send ... radiograms informing where he was and how he lived.’ (LKT)

Interestingly, overt *wh*-words and complementisers are not allowed in the non-agreeing (different-subject) participles⁶, as is shown by the ungrammaticality of (26a) and (26b).

- (26) a. **Ne-žin-a-u ar tėv-q jau atėj-us.*
 NEG-know-PRS-1SG Q father-ACC.SG already come-PST.PA
 intended meaning: ‘I don’t know if father has already come.’
- b. **Ne-žin-a-u kur tėv-q išėj-us.*
 NEG-know-PRS-1SG where father-ACC.SG go.out-PST.PA
 intended meaning: ‘I don’t know where father has gone.’

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

⁶ Again, Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 119) mention examples where the non-agreeing participle appears in an embedded question structure. However, as they themselves acknowledge, this is a different construction characterised (i) by obligatory coreference of the embedded subject with the matrix subject (contrary to the different subject restriction of non-agreeing participles), and (ii) by a modal meaning of necessity.

- (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-q_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 also possible from other types of non-finite complements in Lithuanian, such as infinitives, cf. (29), so the evidence for a CP status of the participial complements may not be compelling.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (34) ... *žino-ti sav-e es-a-nt skurd-ų yra diding-a.*
 know-INFself-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-ųju kiekvien-as kunig-as_i*
 among believe-PRS-PA-GEN.PL.DEF each-NOM.SG.M priest-NOM.SG
turė-tų žino-ti \emptyset_i *es-qs* “*broli-is*”
 have-SBJ(3) know-INF be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M brother-NOM.SG
tarp broli-ų.
 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)

It is thus evident that the distinction between agreeing and non-agreeing participles is based not just on the reference of the embedded subject (a discourse-based parameter), but also on the morphosyntactic factor of Nominative case. Similar observations have been made by Greenberg & Lavine (2006) with respect to adverbial participial clauses. It is worth noting that in the opposition between agreeing and non-agreeing participles, the latter constitute the unmarked member, in terms of both their morphology and their functions: It is the licensing of agreeing participles which requires special conditions, whereas the non-agreeing participles are an elsewhere option; concomitantly, agreeing participles exhibit extra morphological marking which is absent from the non-agreeing ones.

3.3. Reflexivisation of the matrix verb

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

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

Most of the verbs simply never admit a Reflexive marker, even with same-subject participial complements, cf. (38) and (39).⁷

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

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

⁷ The Reflexive marker in Lithuanian surfaces as a suffix when the verb has no prefixes, but shifts into the pre-stem position when a prefix is attached, cf. Ambrasas (1997: 222–223).

- (40) *Es-i provincial-as, jei jaut-ie-si*
 be-PRS.2SG provincial-NOM.SG if feel-PRS.2SG-RFL
gyven-qs “provincij-oje”.
 live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M province-LOC.SG
 ‘You are a provincial if you feel yourself living in a “province”.’
 (<http://www.moteris.lt/00may/moterys/anapus.htm>)
- (41) *J-is aiškiai jauči-a gyven-qs*
 he-NOM.SG.M clearly feel-PRS(3) live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
tūleriop-u būd-u.
 various-INS.SG.M way-INS.SG
 ‘He clearly feels himself living in various ways.’
 (<http://www.geocities.com/linasrim/Vyduno/Sveikata.html>)
- (42) *Jon-as už-(si-)mirš-o serg-qs grip-u*
 J.-NOM.SG PRV-(RFL-)forget-PST3 be.ill-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M flu-INS.SG
ir išėj-o iš nam-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 in these cases, the Reflexive marker does not behave like a reflexive pronoun that has been “raised” from the position of the embedded subject (though historically this was probably the case, see Ambrazas 1990: 128, 138–141 for discussion), but rather looks like a lexical marker altering the meaning of the verb in such a way that it denotes an act of communication or cognition which is directed towards the agent (such “indirect reflexives” are widespread in the Baltic languages, cf. Geniušienė 1987: 126–137). This is suggested by the fact that Reflexive verbs such as *sakytis* ‘say about oneself’ may appear not only with participial complements, but also with finite subordinate clauses introduced by complementisers, cf. (43), which shows also that such clauses may even have a subject distinct from the matrix subject.

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

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

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

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

The claim that agreeing participial complements display obligatory control is based on the following arguments (cf., e.g., Hornstein 2003: 12–14). First, PRO in the subject position must have a c-commanding antecedent, as is evidenced by (44), which is ungrammatical because an antecedent is lacking altogether, and by (45), which is ungrammatical because the participle agrees in gender not with the matrix subject but with its possessor.

- (44) **Many-ti* [PRO_{arb} *es-qs* *laiming-as*] *yra*
 think-INF be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M happy-NOM.SG.M be+PRS(3)
nesqmon-ė.
 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, cf. (46), and under ellipsis show sloppy identity readings, but not strict coreference, cf. (47):

- (46) *Jon-as_i sak-ė Aldon-ai_j [PRO_{i+j} es-q
 J.-NOM.SG say-PST(3) A.-DAT.SG be-PRS.PA.NOM.PL.M
laiming-i].
 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
 J.-NOM.SG say-PST(3)-RFL love-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M self-POSS
brol-į], ir Jurg-is_j taip pat sakė-si [~~PRO_{*i+j} myl-įs~~—
 brother-ACC.SG and J.-NOM.SG so too
~~savo_{*i+j}—~~ *brolį*].
 'Jonas said that he loved his brother, and Jurgis, too [said that he loved
 his own brother / *Jonas's brother]'

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

- (48) a. Kiekvien-as žmog-us_i nor-i [PRO_i bū-ti
 every-NOM.SG.M man-NOM.SG want-PRS(3) be-INF
laiming-as].
 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?'

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

- (49) *Tikriausiai kiekvien-as žmog-us_i galvoj-a*
 rather every-NOM.SG.M man-NOM.SG think-PRS(3)
 [PRO_i *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 an obligatory control analysis of the agreeing participial complements⁸. Having established this, the question arises about what licenses these obligatory control structures. In paradigmatic cases of obligatory control, it is the matrix verb’s semantics and sub-categorisation frame which are responsible for the licensing of control (cf. Davies & Dubinsky 2004: 11–12, where closed classes of subject and object control verbs in English are identified; see Culicover and Jackendoff 2003 for an essentially semantic approach to control). Moreover, Culicover and Jackendoff (2003), following Lasnik and Fiengo (1974), claim that obligatory control requires a notion of volition: it is generally possible only when the complement clause expresses an action, and the controller is that argu-

⁸ An apparent complication arises in examples like (iv), which show a lack of agreement in number (and here also in gender) between the matrix subject and the embedded subject.

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

- (v) *...tik labai nedidel-ė dal-is 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>)

ment of the matrix predicate which, due to the semantics of the verb or of the construction, is supposed to carry out that action.

The Lithuanian case is entirely different in two respects: First, the participial complement construction does not impose any constraints on the nature of the situation denoted by the embedded clause. In particular, it does not require that situation to be an action, cf. (49). Second, the majority of verbs allowing agreeing participial complements in Lithuanian are not prototypical obligatory control verbs from a semantic point of view, nor do they behave like obligatory control verbs with respect to their subcategorisation frames. Rather, the control relation established between the subject of the matrix verb and the null pronoun in the subject position of the embedded clause is licensed by the participial complement construction itself.⁹

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

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

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

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). For an interesting discussion of similar phenomena cross-linguistically, see Sundaesan & McFadden (2009).

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

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

b. a raising analysis

Sakiau tėvq_i [t_i gerai gyvenant]
 ↳_{ACC} ↑

c. an ECM analysis

Sakiau [tėvq gerai gyvenant]
 ↳_{ACC} ↑

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

5.1. Is the embedded subject a direct object?

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

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

- (51) ... *aš_i pasipasakoj-us daktar-ui apie sav-o*
 I tell-PST.PA(NOM.SG.F) doctor-DAT.SG about self-POSS
sapn-a, kuri-ame sapnav-a-u_i sav-e_i
 dream-ACC.SG which-LOC.SG.M dream-PST-1SG self-ACC
stov-i-nt operacin-ėje ...
 stand-PRS-PA operating.theatre-LOC.SG
 ‘... I told the doctor about my dream, in which I saw myself standing
 in the operation theatre ...’ (http://medikai.org/19)

- (52) *Rajon-o politik-ai_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*
 one-NOM.SG.M other-ACC.SG.M take-PRS-PA political-ACC.PL.M
sprendim-us.
 decision-ACC.PL
 ‘The district’s politicians are ever more often suspecting each other of
 making politically motivated decisions’ (www.gargzdai.lt/?lt=1148888566)

- (53) 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.’

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

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

The second diagnostic relates to the Genitive of negation. If the negative prefix is attached to the verb, the Accusative case on the direct object is obligatorily replaced by the Genitive, cf. (57); as (58) shows, this apparently applies to the ES of the participial complement, too.

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

However, as (59a+b) show, the Genitive of negation is not clause-bound in Lithuanian, so it is only a very weak indicator of the syntactic position of the ES¹⁰. However, the *absence* of the Genitive of negation effect can be a

¹⁰ However, as Alexey Andronov has rightly pointed out to me, the Genitive on the ES in (58) cannot be explained by the “transparency” of non-finite clauses with respect to the Genitive of Negation rule, since the direct object of (58) is still in the Accusative.

strong diagnostic *against* the direct object status of an NP, and below we will see that it works for a subtype of participial complements.

- (59) a. *Jurg-is ne-nor-i [pabandy-ti [pradė-ti [skaity-ti*
 J.-NOM.SG NEG-want-PRS(3) try-INF begin-INF read-INF
*ši-os knyg-os // *ši-q knyg-q]]].*
 this-GEN.SG.F book-GEN.SG // *this-ACC.SG.F book-ACC.SG
 ‘Jurgis does not want to try to start reading this book.’
- b. *Jurg-is ne-nor-i [liep-ti Aldon-ai [per-skaity-ti*
 J.-NOM.SG NEG-want-PRS(3) order-INF A.-DAT.SG PRV-read-INF
*ši-os knyg-os // *ši-q knyg-q]]].*
 this-GEN.SG.F book-GEN.SG // *this-ACC.SG.F book-ACC.SG
 ‘Jurgis does not want to order Aldona to read this book.’

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

- (60) *Tik patirt-is ir kanči-a žmog-ų,*
 only experience-NOM.SG and suffering-NOM.SG man-ACC.SG
padar-o t_i žmog-umi ...
 make-PRS(3) man-INS.SG
 ‘Only experience and suffering make man a man.’ (LKT)
- (61) *Žmog-us [išorin-ius atribut-us]_i gal-i many-ti t_i*
 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)

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

- (62) *Es-u girdėj-ęs, kad kai kuri-ose*
 AUX-PRS.1SG hear-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M that some which-LOC.PL.F
mokykl-ose [ši-a knyg-a]_i liepi-a skaity-ti t_i
 school-LOC.PL this-ACC.SG.F book-ACC.SG order-PRS(3) read-INF
 ‘I have heard that in some schools they order [students] to read this
 book...’
 (<http://skaityta.lt/review/get/78>)
- (63) *Toki-a agnostin-ė pozicij-a*
 such-NOM.SG.F agnostic-NOM.SG.F position-NOM.SG
ne-trukd-o [aukščiausi-oje hierarchij-os pakop-oje]_i
 NEG-prevent-PRS(3) highest-LOC.SG.F hierarchy-GEN.SG level-LOC.SG
suvok-ti t_i es-a-nt Diev-a.
 conceive-INF 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.2. Passivisation and two types of non-agreeing participles

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

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

- (67) **Kaltinam-asis* *buv-o* *irody-t-as*
 defendant-NOM.SG.M.DEF AUX-PST(3) prove-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
es-qs *nekalt-as.*
 be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M innocent-NOM.SG.M
 intended meaning: ‘The defendant was proved to be innocent.’
- (68) **Kurši-ai* *buv-o* *suprant-a-m-i*
 Kuronian-NOM.PL AUX-PST(3) understand-PRS-PP-NOM.PL.M
es-q *vien-a* *iš latvi-ū* *potauči-ū.*
 be-PRS.PA.NOM.PL.M one-INS.SG.F of Latvian-GEN.PL tribe-GEN.PL
 intended meaning: ‘Kuronians were considered to be one of Latvian tribes.’
- (69) ...*nes* *ne-buv-o* *irody-t-as* *kyši-o*
 because NEG-AUX-PST(3) prove-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M bribe-GEN.SG
ëmim-o *fakt-as.*
 taking-GEN.SG fact-NOM.SG
 ‘... because the fact of receiving the bribe has not been proven.’ (LKT)
- (70) *Jêz-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-ū.*
 understand-PRS-PP-NOM.PL.M and without miracle-GEN.PL
 ‘The face of Jesus and His mission can be understood (lit. are being understood) even without miracles.’ (LKT)

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

- (71) a. $V \text{ NP}_{\text{ACC}} \text{ V}_{\text{PART}} \rightarrow V \text{ NP}_{\text{ACC}}$
 b. *Mač-ia-u* *têv-q* *parein-ant.* \rightarrow
 see-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG come.back-PRS.PA
 \rightarrow *Mač-ia-u* *têv-q.*
 see-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG
 ‘I saw [my] father coming back.’
 ‘I saw [my] father.’

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

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

- (72) a. $NP_{NOM} V_{PASS} V_{PART} \rightarrow NP_{NOM} V_{PASS}$
 b. *Tėv-as buv-o mat-o-m-as*
 father-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) see-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
parein-qs. \rightarrow *Tėv-as buv-o*
 come.back-PRS.PA-NOM.SG.M father-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3)
mat-o-m-as.
 see-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
 ‘Father was seen coming back’ \rightarrow ‘Father was seen.’

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

- (73) a. *Jurg-is buv-o pristaty-t-as*
 J.-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) introduce-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
es-qs žurnalist-as.
 be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M journalist-NOM.SG
 ‘Jurgis was introduced as a journalist (lit. being a journalist).’
 b. $NP_{NOM_i} V_{PASS} t_i [PRO_i V_{PART}]$
 c. $NP_{NOM_i} V_{PASS} t_i [t_i V_{PART}]$

Extending this analysis to the active counterparts of such passive clauses, cf. (74a), we might argue that with this set of verbs the non-agreeing participial

complement displays an object control structure shown in (74b) rather than a raising structure as in (74c).¹³

- (74) a. *Pristači-a-u Jurg-į es-a-nt žurnalist-u.*
 introduce-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG be-PRS-PA journalist-INS.SG
 ‘I introduced Jurgis as a journalist (lit. being a journalist).’
 b. V NP_{ACC_i} [PRO_i V_{PART}]
 c. V NP_{ACC_i} [t_i V_{PART}]

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

- (75) a. *Mat-a-u Jurg-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 ‘=(75a)’

Similarly, the “restrictive” prefix *te-* meaning ‘only’ (see Arkadiev 2010) can have scope over the ES with verbs allowing passivisation only when it is attached to the matrix verb (76a), but not to the participle (76b), again suggesting that the ES in such examples belongs to the matrix clause.

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

¹³ An alternative analysis in terms of attributive modification or secondary predication, though applicable to the earlier stage of the historical development of the constructions in question (cf. Ambrazas 1990: 141–143), is not possible for the non-agreeing participial complements in contemporary Lithuanian for the simple reason that in this language attributes must agree with their heads, while secondary predicates either must agree or appear in the Instrumental case, see Timberlake 1988, 1990, Holvoet 2004, Giparaite 2010. I thank Volker Gast for pointing out the necessity to touch upon this issue.

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

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

Thus, constructions with verbs of perception and possibly with other matrix verbs allowing passivisation in the presence of the participial complement are actually ambiguous between the two analyses, one with object control, cf. (74b), and another that is yet to be determined (as I will show, the raising analysis as shown in [74c] is not feasible). However, it may be argued that at least the passive structures like (64), (72b) and (73a) are derived only from the object control structure; evidence for this comes from their semantics as well as from the fact that those verbs for which the object control analysis is impossible do not allow passivisation.¹⁴

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

- (vi) *asmuo gal-i bū-ti pripažin-t-as*
 person(NOM.SG) can-PRS(3) be-INF recognise-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
netek-ęs Lietuv-os Respublik-os
 lose-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M Lithuania-GEN.SG Republic-GEN.SG
pilietyb-ės
 citizenship-GEN.SG

‘... a person may be recognised as having lost the citizenship of Lithuanian Republic ’ (LKT)

5.3. The embedded subject is indeed embedded

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

- (78) a. *Mit-ai atskleidži-a žmog-ui pači-q*
 myth-NOM.SG reveal-PRS(3) man-DAT.SG very-ACC.SG.F
gili-qjā ties-q, bet tik tada, kai
 deep-ACC.SG.F.DEF truth-ACC.SG but only then when
j-is ne-žin-o j-uos es-a-nt
 he-NOM.SG.M NEG-know-PRS(3) it-ACC.PL.M be-PRS-PA
mit-ais.
 myth-INS.PL
 ‘Myths reveal the deepest truths to man, but only when he does not know that they are myths.’
 (http://aidai.us/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=6926&Itemid=471)
- b. *Kaip juoking-a, juk net ne-žin-o j-o*
 how funny-N PTCL even NEG-know-PRS(3) he-GEN.SG.M
vard-o.
 name-GEN.SG
 ‘How funny, [she] even does not know his name.’ (LKT)
- (79) a. *Mokslinink-ai ne-įrod-ė rūkym-q // *rūkym-o*
 scientist-NOM.PL NEG-prove-PST3 smoking-ACC.SG // *GEN.SG
es-a-nt žaling-u.
 be-PRS-PA unhealthy-INS.SG.M
 ‘Scholars have not proved smoking to be harmful.’
- b. *...niek-as ne-įrod-ė koki-os nors*
 nobody-NOM.SG.M NEG-prove-PST(3) which-GEN.SG.F any
mūs-ų kalt-ės.
 we-GEN guilt-GEN.SG
 ‘... nobody has proved any guilt of ours.’ (LKT)
- (80) a. *Ne-suprat-a-u tėv-q // *tėv-o išvyk-us.*
 NEG-understand-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG / *GEN.SG leave-PST.PA
 ‘I did not understand that father had left.’

- b. *Apsimeči-a-u, kad ne-suprat-a-u j-o*
 pretend-PST-1SG that NEG-understand-PST-1SG he-GEN.SG.M
metafor-ų.
 metaphor-GEN.PL

‘I pretended to have not understood his metaphors.’ (LKT)

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (82) ...*toliau perskait-a-u apie T-a,* [kur-į
further read-PRS-1SG about that-ACC.SG.M which-ACC.SG.M
atei-si-ant]_i *Jon-as skelb-ė* t_i...
come-FUT-PA 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 Vilni-uje*]_i *ne-žinoj-a-u* t_i.
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 [*Jurg-į atvykus*].
but mother-NOM.SG yet NEG-know-PRS(3)
'Father already knows that Jurgis has arrived, but mother does not yet know it.'

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

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

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

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

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

- (88) ...*ir mat-o* [*nuo mišk-o atein-a-nt kareiv-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)

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

That the postverbal embedded subject in the participial complements in (87)–(89) is located inside the embedded clause can be shown by using several diagnostics. First, it must appear in the Genitive case when the embedded predicate is a negative existential, cf. (90).

- (90) *Tiki-uo-si man-o straipsn-yje ne-s-a-nt*
 hope-PRS.1SG-RFL I-POSS article-LOC.SG NEG-be-PRS-PA
*klaid-u // *klaid-as.*
 error-GEN.PL // *ACC.PL

‘I hope there are no errors in my article.’

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

- (91) a. **Birut-ė apsimet-ė sav-o vaikel-į serg-a-nt.*
 B.-NOM.SG pretend-PST(3) self-POSS child-ACC.SG be.ill-PRS-PA
 intended meaning: ‘Birute pretended as if her child was ill.’
 b. *Birut-ė apsimet-ė sav-o nam-uose ne-s-a-nt*
 B.-NOM.SG pretend-PST(3) self-POSS house-LOC.PL NEG-be-PRS-PA
pinig-u.
 money-GEN.PL

‘Birute pretended as if she had no money at home.’

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

- (92) a. *Jon-as_i įrod-ė Algird-o kambar-yje buv-us*
 J.-NOM.SG prove-PST(3) A.-GEN.SG room-LOC.SG be-PST.PA
sav-o_i šautuv-q.
 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-q.
 be-PST.PA he-GEN.SG.M gun-ACC.SG
 ‘Jonas proved that there was his gun in Algirdas’s room.’

All this points towards the conclusion that apart from object control constructions with a special class of verbs discussed in section 5.2, the subject of the non-agreeing participial complement is not a constituent of the matrix verb, neither base-generated, nor derived by raising. Having said this, we now have to answer the last important question, i.e. the one

concerning the mechanism which is responsible for the case marking of the embedded subject. Though an obvious hypothesis might look like “if not raising, then ECM”, in the next section I will show that such an analysis is also problematic.

5.4. Where does the embedded subject get case from?

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

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

¹⁵ Note that *laukti* ‘wait’ is able to assign Genitive even in contexts like (89), where the subject of the participial complement is located in the embedded rather than in the matrix clause. Such examples are problematic and require further investigation.

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

since unless special technical stipulations are made, it is not plausible that the embedded subject indeed gets its case from the matrix verb.

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

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

Second, as is pointed out by Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 117), non-agreeing participial complements containing Accusative-marked subjects are allowed with matrix predicates which otherwise do not assign Accusative case at all. Consider the verb *tikėti* ‘believe’, which can normally be combined with an Instrumental, but not with an Accusative noun phrase, cf. (94a). This pattern of case marking, however, is not retained when the same verb co-occurs with a participial complement, cf. (94b).¹⁹

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

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

¹⁸ The only context where ‘double Accusative’ is allowed in Lithuanian is the small clause construction, see Giparaitė (2010).

¹⁹ Examples with the ES marked Accusative are attested with the verb *laukti* ‘wait’, too.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- b. ...*kai kur-ie* *tyrinėtojų-ai* *man-o* [*j-ų*
 some which-NOM.SG.M researcher-NOM.PL think-PRS(3) it-GEN.PL
es-a-nt *kel-is* *milijard-us* *ton-ų*].
 be-PRS-PA several-ACC.PL.M milliard-ACC.PL ton-GEN.PL
 ‘Some researchers think that there are several milliard tons of them
 [of sapropel]’ (<http://ausis.gf.vu.lt/mg/nr/99/2/2kadun.html>)

These are instances of what may be called “quirky” or “semantic” (“inherent”) case assigned by the embedded verb via a lexical specification or, as in the case of negation, by a higher functional head. Let us return to the Accusative now, which is the default option both for objects and for the ES, and looks more like a “configurational” or “structural” case. If we assume that in Lithuanian subjects are assigned case by T (which is the least controversial option under current generative assumptions), we meet with the following difficulty. On the one hand, it is tempting to propose that just as the finite T assigns Nominative case, the non-agreeing participial T assigns Accusative in Lithuanian. On the other hand, this proposal is not feasible for the simple reason that, as was shown in Section 2, the same participial morphology occurs with a Dative subject in the adverbial use of the participles, compare (98a) and (98b):

- (98) 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*], *pragydo*
 child-DAT.PL return-PST.PA start.singing-PST(3)
lakštingal-a. (=7b)
 nightingale-NOM.SG
 ‘When the children came back, a nightingale burst into singing.’
 (Ambrasas 1997: 363)

It does not seem 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 one appearing in the adverbial clauses and assigning Dative case, both of them always being realised by identical morphology and having a common interpretation. Rather, I propose an analysis in which 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 adverbial, 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).²⁰

Examples (98a) and (98b) can accordingly be analysed as follows:

$$(99) \text{ a. } \dots [_{VP} V [_{CP} C_{[acc]} [_{TP} NP_{ACC} \dots V_{PART}]]] \rightarrow (98a)$$

$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \uparrow \\ \uparrow \end{array}$

$$\text{b. } [_{CP} C_{[dat]} [_{TP} NP_{DAT} \dots V_{PART}]] [_{TP} \dots] \rightarrow (98b)$$

$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \uparrow \\ \uparrow \end{array}$

This analysis has the following advantages. First, it allows us to make a broader generalisation about case assignment in non-agreeing participial clauses, comprising both the complement and the 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 in participial clauses as a feature specific to the relevant constructions.²¹

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

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

²⁰ Another kind of analysis, opted for by Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001), follows the lines of a ‘default’ accusative assignment proposed on different grounds for Russian by Franks (1995: 35). As Gronemeyer & 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.

²¹ See Aarts (2008) and Gisborne (2008) for a constructional analysis of English non-finite clauses.

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

6. Conclusion

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

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

2) There are two main types of participial complement in Lithuanian: one involving an agreeing participle and requiring its implicit subject to be coreferential with the Nominative subject of the matrix clause; and one, appearing elsewhere, which is based on a non-agreeing participle and allows an overt subject, mostly encoded as a noun phrase in the Accusative case. Most relevant verbs combine with both agreeing and non-agreeing participial complements. Both kinds of participial complements exhibit full clausal structure, including tense and left peripheral syntactic positions, and may thus best be analysed as non-finite CPs.

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

4) The class of non-agreeing participial complements falls into two subtypes. The first subtype is allowed with a limited set of verbs and can best be analysed as involving a participial clause with a null subject co-indexed

with the base-generated direct object of the matrix verb. Only in this type of construction may the “embedded subject” of the participial clause be promoted in passivisation and undergo the Genitive of negation rule. The other type of non-agreeing participial complement, as I have argued, cannot be analysed as a raising construction, since its subject does not in fact exhibit the relevant features of a matrix direct object, i.e. it cannot be promoted in passivisation, does not undergo the Genitive of negation rule, and behaves as a constituent of the embedded clause with respect to various tests. Furthermore, it has been shown that this construction is not an instance of “Exceptional Case Marking” either, since the case marking of the embedded subject cannot be naturally analysed as coming from the matrix clause. A mechanism of “construction-internal” case assignment has been proposed to account for this.

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

Acknowledgements

The research has been funded by the Department of History and Philology of the Russian Academy of Sciences and by the Russian Foundation for the Humanities, Grants Nos. 09-04-00297a and 11-04-00282a. 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 Alexey Andronov, Volker Gast, Sergei Minor, Jurgis Pakerys, Yakov Testeleťs, Aurelija Usonienė, Vitaly Volk, Anton Zimmerling and especially to Natalia Serdobolskaya for valuable comments and help on various stages of the research, and to Axel Holvoet and Antanas Smetona for help during my stay in Lithuania in October 2008 and May 2009. Special thanks go to my Lithuanian consultants: Aurelija Genelytė, Valdemaras Klumbys, Vidmantas Kuprevičius, Sigita Lissauskaitė, Jurga Narkevičiūtė, Rolandas Rudomanskis, Audrius Sruogis and Justinas Žilinskas. All faults and shortcomings are mine.

Abbreviations

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

References

- Aarts, Bas. 2008. Approaches to English gerund. In Graeme Trousdale & 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 pričastij baltijskix jazykov* [Comparative Syntax of Participles in Baltic Languages]. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.). 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
- Arkadiev, Peter. 2010. Notes on the Lithuanian restrictive. *Baltic Linguistics* 1: 9–49.
- Arkadiev, Peter. 2011. On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2: 37–78.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan & 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 & Paul Kiparsky (eds.), *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, 232–286. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: Life in Language*, 1–73. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Comrie, Bernard & 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 & Ray Jackendoff. 2003. The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79: 517–556.
- Davies, William D. & 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 & Alexandra Aikhenvald (eds.), *Complementation: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 1–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eiche, Aleksandra. 1983. *Latvian Declinable and Indclinable Participles. Their Syntactic Function, Frequency and Modality*. (Stockholm Studies in Baltic Languages 1.) Stockholm: Almqvist & Wikseel.
- Engels, Renata. 2009. The syntactic position of the perceived participant as indicator of the internal structure of the Spanish and French infinitival complement. *Linguistics* 47: 759–791.
- 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 & 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. 2010. *Non-verbal Small Clauses in English and Lithuanian*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Gisborne, Nikolas. 2008. Dependencies as constructions: A case study in predicative complementation. In Graeme Trousdale & 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 & James E. Lavine. 2006. New syntax in Russian and Lithuanian: The case of the adverbial participle. In Robert Rothstein, Ernest Scatton & Charles Townsend (eds.), *Studies in Slavic Linguistics and Folklore*, 143–170. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Gronemeyer, Claire. 1997. Evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Working Papers* 46: 93–112. Lund: Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics.

- Gronemeyer Claire & Aurelija Usonienė. 2001. Complementation in Lithuanian. In Claire Gronemeyer (ed.), *Laying the Boundaries of Syntax: Studies in the Interfaces between Syntax, Semantics and Lexicon*, 105–135. Lund University.
- Haiman, John & Pamela Munro (eds.). 1983. *Switch-reference in Grammar and Discourse*. (Typological Studies in Language 2.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 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 & 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 6.) Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Holvoet, Axel & Arturas Judžentis. 2003. Sudėtinio prijungiamojo sakinio aprašymo pagrindai [Basics of the study of complex subordinate constructions]. In Axel Holvoet & 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 & 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*.
- Lavine, James E. 2010. Mood and a transitivity restriction in Lithuanian: the case of the inferential evidential. *Baltic Linguistics* 1: 115–142.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In John Haiman & 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 afdeling, Universitetet i Oslo, Nr. 75)
- Nuñez, Jairo. 1994. Another look at Lithuanian impersonal passives. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 24: 347–360.
- Petit, Daniel. 1999. Lituanien. In *LALIES. Actes de sessions de linguistique et de littérature* 19: 5–135. Paris: Presses de l'école normale supérieure.
- Pires, Acrisio. 2006. *The Minimalist Syntax of Defective Domains. Gerunds and Infinitives*. (Linguistik Aktuell 98.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam. 2001. Long distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 583–646.
- Postal, Paul M. 1974. *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and its Theoretical Implications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London & New York: Longman.
- Schmalstieg, William R. 1986. Lithuanian participles in the nominative case as the modifier of the phrase subject. *Lituanus* 32.
- Schoof, Susanne. 2004. An HPSG Account of Nonfinite Verbal Complements in Latin. *Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics* 51.
- Serdobolskaya, Natalia. 2009. Towards the typology of raising: A functional approach. In Alexander Arkhipov & Patience Epps (eds.), *New Challenges for Typology*, 245–270. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Slišienė, Nijolė. 1995. The tense system of Lithuanian. In Rolf Thieroff (ed.), *The Tense Systems in European Languages*, Vol. II, 215–232. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-Reference and Discourse Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya & Thomas McFadden. 2009. DP distribution, finiteness and control in Tamil and other languages: selection vs. Case. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 2: 5–34.
- Tangl, Eberhard. 1928. *Der Accusativus und Nominativus cum Participio im Altlitauischen. Doctoral Dissertation*, Berlin. (Reprinted 1999 in *Res Balticae* 5: 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. 1988. Case agreement in Lithuanian. In Michael Barlow & Charles A. Ferguson (eds.), *Agreement in Natural Language: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*, 181–199. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1990. The aspectual case of predicative nouns in Lithuanian texts. In Nils B. Thelin (ed.), *Verbal Aspect in Discourse*, 325–347. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Usonienė, Aurelia. 2001. On direct/indirect perception with verbs of seeing and seeming in English and Lithuanian. *Working Papers* 48: 163–182. Lund: Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics.

- 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. 2000. Partizipien zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik: Ein Überblick zu aspektuellen, diathesebezogenen und diskursrelevanten Eigenschaften im modernen Litauischen. In Bernhard Wälchli & Fernando Zúñiga (eds.), *Sprachbeschreibung und Typologie* (Universität Bern, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft: Arbeitspapiere 38), 65–81. Bern: Universität Bern.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2006a. Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian. In Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö (eds.), *Passivisation and Typology. Form and Function*, 274–309. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2006b. Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (A typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41: 33–49.
- Župerka, Kazimieras. 1969. Sinonimija pridatočnyx predložnij i pričastnyx, polupričastnyx, deepričastnyx oborotov v sovremennom litovskom jazyke. [Synonymy of subordinate finite clauses and participial and gerundive clauses in contemporary Lithuanian.] *Doctoral dissertation abstract*. Vilnius.