

Marking of subjects and objects in Lithuanian non-finite clauses: A comparative and diachronic perspective

1. Introduction

Lithuanian possesses a rich system of non-finite verbal forms, especially when compared to the modern “Standard Average European” languages:

- infinitive: *saky-ti* ‘say’;
- participles, cf. Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 326–372; Klimas 1987; Wiemer 2001, see below;
- converb denoting simultaneity: *saky-dam-as* ‘saying’;
- debitive participle: *saky-tin-as* ‘such that must be said’.

In this paper, only the infinitive and the participles will be dealt with. Both can head sentential arguments and adjuncts, and both may license non-trivial case-marking of their overt subjects and/or objects.

2. Lithuanian participial clauses

2.1. Participles in Lithuanian distinguish the following morphosyntactic features:

- tense (present, simple past, past habitual, future);
- voice (active vs. passive);
- presence vs. absence of agreement in gender/number/case.

<i>sakyti</i> ‘say’	Active		Passive
	Agreeing	Non-agreeing	
Present	<i>sakęs</i> (m), <i>sakanti</i> (f)	<i>sakant</i>	<i>sakomas</i>
Preterite	<i>sakęs</i> (m), <i>sakiusi</i> (f)	<i>sakius</i>	<i>sakytas</i>
Habitual Past	<i>sakydavęs</i> (m), <i>sakydavusi</i> (f)	<i>sakydavus</i>	—
Future	<i>sakysiąs</i> (m), <i>sakysianti</i> (f)	<i>sakysiant</i>	<i>sakysimas</i>

Participles are used in various functions:

- attributive (as heads of relative clauses);
- adverbial (as converbs, i.e. heads of clausal adjuncts, see Greenberg & Lavine 2006);
- as heads of clausal complements with diverse matrix predicates (see Grone-meyer & Usonienė 2001; Arkadiev 2010);
- in various periphrastic TAM-constructions (Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988, Sližienė 1995);
- as independent predicates in the evidential function (Wiemer 2006).

2.2. In clausal arguments and adjuncts, the [\pm agreement] feature functions as a sort of switch-reference mechanism: agreement is present only when the (null) subject of the participle is referentially identical to (presumably controlled by) the nominative subject of the main clause, otherwise a non-agreeing participle is used.

- (1) a. [\emptyset_i *Paraš-ēs* *laišk-q*], *Jon-as_i* *nuėj-o* *į* *pašt-q*.
 write-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M letter-ACC.SG J.-NOM.SG go-PST in post-ACC.SG
 ‘Having written a letter, Jonas went to the post-office.’
- b. *Jon-as_i* *sak-ė* [\emptyset_i *paraš-ēs* *laišk-q*].
 J.-NOM.SG say-PST write-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M letter-ACC.SG
 ‘Jonas said that he had written a letter.’
- (2) a. [*Jon-ui* *paraš-ius* *laišk-q*], *Jurg-a* *nuėj-o* *į* *pašt-q*.
 J.-DAT.SG write-PST.PA letter-ACC.SG J.-NOM.SG go-PST in post-ACC.SG
 ‘Jonas having written a letter, Jurga went to the post-office.’
- b. *Jon-as* *sak-ė* [*Jurg-q* *paraš-ius* *laišk-q*].
 J.-NOM.SG say-PST J.-ACC.SG write-PST.PA letter-ACC.SG
 ‘Jonas said that Jurga had written a letter.’

2.3. The major overt structural difference between participial complements and adjuncts lies in the case-marking of their overt subjects: with complements, the subject is marked Accusative (2b), whereas with adjuncts it appears in the Dative (2a).

⇒ There is ample evidence (see Arkadiev 2010 for details) that with the majority of predicates taking participial complements, the Accusative NP belongs to the embedded non-finite clause and gets its case there. Cf. scope and position of adverb in (3).

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

Thus, participial complements and adjuncts show synchronic structural similarities with respect to such features as:

- switch-reference and presence vs. absence of agreement;
- presence of a subject position;
- non-nominative case assignment to the subject.

2.4. Some cross-linguistic data

– Neighbouring languages, viz. Latvian, Estonian and Finnish, have (somewhat) similar constructions.

LATVIAN (IE > Baltic, Mathiasen 1997: 150–151)

- (4) a. *Dzirdē-ju* [*Alm-u* *atbrauc-a-m* *uz* *Stokholm-u*].
 hear-PST:1SG A.-ACC.SG come-PRS-PP in S.-ACC.SG
 ‘I have heard that Alma has come to Stockholm.’
- b. [*Jān-im* *uzrakst-ot* *vēstul-i*], *Sarm-a* *atnāc-a*.
 J.-DAT.SG write-PRS.PA letter-ACC.SG S.-NOM.SG come-PST:3
 ‘When John was finishing writing the letter, Sarma came.’

⇒ In Latvian, the participial complement construction is more restricted than in Lithuanian (cf. Eiche 1983: 40–49):

- it is used mostly with verbs of perception (in Lithuanian the range of predicates allowing participial complements is virtually unrestricted);
- it involves mostly the Participle in *-m* (historically the Present Passive Participle), which does not distinguish tense.

➤ However, Latvian and Lithuanian participial complement and adjunct clauses are similar in the use of the [\pm agreement] feature for switch-reference and in distinguishing complements from adjuncts by the Accusative vs. Dative marking of the subject.

ESTONIAN (Uralic > Finno-Ugric > Balto-Finnic)

- (5) a. *Mari arva-s [Tooma/Toomas-t raamatu-t kirjuta-va-t].*
 M.(NOM.SG) think-PST T.:GEN.SG/T.-PART.SG book-PART.SG write-PRS.PA-PART.SG
 ‘Mary thought that Thomas was writing a book.’ (Tamm 2008: 1)
- b. *Heli_i tundu-s [\emptyset _i tule-va-t koopa-st.]*
 sound(NOM.SG) seem-PST come-PRS.PA-PART.SG dungeon-ELAT
 ‘The sound seemed to come from a dungeon.’ (Tamm 2009: 390)

➤ In Estonian, participial complements are allowed with a range of predicates comparable to that of Lithuanian, and show non-nominative case marking of their subjects (Genitive vs. Partitive depending on semantic factors, see Tamm 2009), but the form of the participle does not depend on the same vs. different subject feature.

FINNISH (Uralic > Finno-Ugric > Balto-Finnic; Karlsson 1999: 186–187; 201–202)

- (6) a. [\emptyset _i *Herät-e-ssä-än*] *Pekka_i oli sairas.*
 wake-INF-INNESS-3SG P.(NOM.SG) was ill
 ‘When Pekka woke up, he was ill.’
- b. [*Peka-n herät-e-ssä*] *Liisa lähtee tö-i-hin.*
 P.-GEN.SG wake-INF-INNESS L.(NOM.SG) go:PRS.3SG work-PL-ILLAT
 ‘When Pekka wakes, Liisa goes to work.’
- (7) a. *Tiedä-n_i [\emptyset _i ole-va-ni vanha].*
 know-PRS.1SG be-PRS.PA-1SG old
 ‘I know that I am old.’
- b. *Pekka kuuli [juna-n saapu-va-n].*
 P.(NOM.SG) hear:PST train-GEN.SG arrive-PRS.PA-GEN.SG
 ‘Pekka heard the train arrive.’

➤ In contrast to Estonian, the Finnish non-finite adjunct and complement constructions show the same vs. different subject distinction via presence vs. absence of agreement (albeit not in case/number/gender but in person/number). However, case marking of overt subjects is the same in both kinds of construction, i.e. Genitive; instead, different kinds of non-finite form are used: case-marked Infinitives in adjuncts vs. Participles in arguments.

– “Absolute” participial constructions in other Indo-European languages (Keydana 1997)

PALI (IE > Indo-Iranian > Indo-Aryan, Duroiselle 1997/1906: 160)

- (8) [*t-esu vivad-a-nt-esu*] *bodhisatt-o cintesi.*
 3-LOC.PL argue-PRS-PA-LOC.PL bodhisattva-NOM.SG thought
 ‘While they were disputing, the Future Buddha thought.’

OLD RUSSIAN (IE > Slavic, Zhivov 2008: 15)

- (9) и бѣжащю ему нападе на нь бѣсъ.
i [běž-ašt’-u j-emu] napad-e na nj-ĭ bēs-ŭ.
 and run-PRS.PA-DAT.SG.M 3-DAT.SG.M attack-AOR.3SG on 3-ACC.SG.M devil-NOM.SG
 ‘And while he was fleeing, a devil attacked him.’

– Accusative-plus-Participle constructions in other Indo-European languages, cf. Cristofaro 2008 on Ancient Greek, Schoof 2004 on Latin.

ANCIENT GREEK (IE > Greek; Herodotus, Hist. I 10:6)

(10) καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐπορᾷ μιν ἐξιόντα.

kai h-ē gyn-ē e-por-āi min exi-o-nt-a.

and ART-NOM.SG.F woman-NOM.SG PST-see:AOR-3SG he:ACC.SG go.out-PRS-PA-ACC.SG

‘And the woman saw him go out.’

➔ Note that only Lithuanian possesses the non-agreeing type of participle used in different-subject configurations.

– “Complementizer case” in some Australian languages, Dench & Evans 1988.

KAYARDILD (Tangkic, Northern Australia; Evans 1995: 490)

(11) *ngada murnmurdawa-th, [ngijin-inja thabuju-ntha thaa-thuu-nth].*

1SG:NOM be.glad-ACT my-COBL brother-COBL return-POT-COBL

‘I am glad that my brother is coming back.’

YUKULTA (Tangkic, Northern Australia; Evans 1995: 545)

(12) *dangka-ya = kanda kurri-ja maku,*

man-ERG = PST.3 > 3 see-IND woman(NOM)

[kunawuna-ntha jambila-tharrba-ntha].

child-CDAT hit-ANT-CDAT

‘The man saw the woman as the child kicked her.’

– Accusative/Oblique marking of subjects of subordinate clauses in the Northern Uto-Aztecan languages

KAWAIIISU (Uto-Aztecan > Northern, USA; Zigmund et al. 1990: 105)

(13) *niʔi pucugu-ri = ika [taʔnipizi-a pogwiti-na paka-kaa-na = ina].*

I:NOM know-NMR = it man-ACC grizzly-ACC kill-REAL-SBD = him

‘I know that the man killed the grizzly bear.’

SOUTHERN PAIUTE, Kaibab dialect (Uto-Aztecan > Northern, USA; Bunte 1986: 296)

(14) *[John-i-ung pichi-ka-ʔngw] pingwa-ʔngw suvai-va-nt.*

J.-OBL-ART arrive-SBD-3SG wife(NOM)-3SG happy-FUT-PRT

‘When John arrives his wife will be happy.’

2.5. Diachronic sources: structural convergence of originally different constructions.

– The Dative + Participle construction is a development of an IE-type Dative Absolute construction (cf. the cognate Old Russian construction in (9)), where the participle used to agree in case/number/gender with the Dative subject (Ambranzas 1990: 163–179; Greenberg & Lavine 2006), cf. Old Lithuanian examples (15).

(15) a. *[Bet Petr-ui atai-us-iam ing Antiochia],*

but P.-DAT.SG come-PST.PA-DAT.SG.M in A.

pa-ssi-steng-ia-u esch ing ak-is.

PRV-RFL-stand-PST-1SG I:NOM in eye-ACC.PL

‘When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face.’ (BrB 1579–1590, Gal. 2:11, quoted after Ambranzas 1990: 164)

- b. [*Ir reg-i-nt-iemus an-iemus*] *gh-is-sai usseng-e dang-un-a.*
 and see-PRS-PA-DAT.PL.M 3-DAT.PL.M 3-NOM.SG.M-DEF ascend-PST sky-ACC-ALLAT
 ‘And while they were looking, He ascended to the sky.’ (BrP 1591, II:10₂₃,
 quoted after Ambrazas 1990: 169)
- c. *Ir karali-us ... numir-e [Saul-ei nussileid-e-ncz-ei].*
 and king-NOM.SG die-PST sun-DAT.SG descend-PRS-PA-DAT.SG.F
 ‘And the king died at sunset.’ (BrB 1579–1590, I Chron. 18:34, quoted after
 Ambrazas 1990: 169)

Already in Old Lithuanian the agreeing participle was being ousted by the truncated non-agreeing participle in such constructions, and by the XIX cent. constructions shown in (15) became obsolete (Ambrazas 1990: 171).

– The Accusative + Participle construction goes back to the construction where the participle was modifying the Accusative direct object of a verb of perception or cognition; the participle was agreeing with this NP in case/number/gender (Tangl 1928/1999; Schmalstieg 1987: 86–98; Ambrazas 1990: 141–163). Cf. Old Lithuanian examples in (16):

- (16) a. *Reg-i-m mald-a daug gal-i-ncz-e.*
 see-PRS-1SG prayer-ACC.SG a.lot can-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.F
 ‘We see that prayer can (do) a lot.’ (BrP 1591, II 99, quoted after Ambrazas
 1990: 143)
- b. *Atmin-k man-e gerai giwen-us-i ...*
 remember-IMP I-ACC well live-PST.PA-ACC.SG.M
ir dar-ius-i k-as taw intjkk-a.
 and do-PST.PA-ACC.SG.M what-NOM.SG you:DAT like-PST
 ‘Remember me having lived well ... and having always done what you
 liked.’ (BrP 1591, II 426, quoted after Ambrazas 1990: 143)

Historically, these constructions go back to predicate nominals (nouns, adjectives or participles) appearing in apposition to the direct object, widely attested in Old Lithuanian (17), as well as in the contemporary language (18), cf. Giparaitė 2008:

- (17) a. *Ischwid-a i-ūs ne linksm-us.*
 see-PST 3-ACC.PL.M NEG happy-ACC.PL.M
 ‘He saw that they were dejected.’ (BrB 1579–1590, Gen. 40:6, quoted after
 Ambrazas 1990: 146)
- b. *Szinn-a an-us ne-giw-us.*
 know-PRS 3-ACC.PL.M NEG-alive-ACC.SG.M
 ‘They know that they are dead.’ (BrB 1579–1590, Bar. 6:41, quoted after
 Ambrazas 1990: 146)
- (18) a. *Rad-a-u trobel-ę tušči-q.*
 find-PST-1SG cabin-ACC.SG empty-ACC.SG.F
 ‘I found the cabin empty.’ (Giparaitė 2008: 58)
- b. *Kaip šiandien j-is mat-ė sav-e student-q.*
 as today 3-NOM.SG.M see-PST self-ACC student-ACC.SG
 ‘He saw himself still a student, as if it were today.’ (ibid.: 68)

The development of the Accusative + Participle construction involved two separate processes:

- the extension of the range of predicates licensing the construction, with a concomitant reanalysis of the Accusative direct object of the matrix verb as an overt subject of the participial clause (Ambrazas 1990: 150–151):

(19) $V \text{ NP}_{\text{Acc } i} [\emptyset_i \text{ V}_{\text{Part}[+Agr]}] \rightarrow V \text{ [NP}_{\text{Acc}} \text{ V}_{\text{Part}[+Agr]}]$

- the analogical extension of the non-agreeing participles already used in different-subject adjunct clauses to the different-subject participial complements:

(20) $V \text{ [NP}_{\text{Acc}} \text{ V}_{\text{Part}[+Agr]}] \rightarrow V \text{ [NP}_{\text{Acc}} \text{ V}_{\text{Part}[-Agr]}]$

That the second process must have followed the former is confirmed by the following facts:

- already in Old Lithuanian, the Accusative + agreeing Participle construction was attested with verbs of speech, cf. (21), which suggests an advanced degree of extension along the lines of the first process;
- agreeing participles are still attested in contemporary Lithuanian in constructions where the accusative NP is a direct object of the perception verb, cf. (22);
- in Old Latvian, agreeing participles were found in the complement constructions parallel to the Old Lithuanian ones, whereas in the Dative + Participle adjunct constructions, only non-agreeing participles were attested even in the oldest texts (Ambrazas 1990: 171), cf. (23), (24).

(21) *T-ūs sak-o-me nūg ischganim-a amszin-oia atpūl-us-ius.*
 that-ACC.PL.M say-PRS-1PL from salvation-GEN.SG eternal-GEN.SG.M.DEF fall.back-PST.PA-ACC.PL.M
 ‘About those we say that they have fallen back from the eternal salvation.’ (MT 1600, Praef. 6:4, quoted after Ambrazas 1990: 143)

(22) *Rad-a-u broleli-us be-gul-i-nči-us.*
 find-PST-1SG brother-ACC.PL CNT-lie-PRS-PA-ACC.PL.M
 ‘I found the brothers sleeping.’ (Ambrazas 1990: 142)

LATVIAN

(23) *t-e zinna-ia wini-ū esse-t-u Christ-um.*
 that-NOM.PL.M know-PST.3 3-ACC.SG.M be:PRS-PA-ACC.SG.M Christ-ACC.SG
 ‘...they knew he was the Christ.’ (EEv 1671, Luc. 4:41, quoted after Ambrazas 1990: 143)

(24) [*Un wiņņ-am us Semm-es iseij-oht*]
 and 3-DAT.SG.M in land-GEN.SG go.out-PST.PA
sastapp-a t-am ween-s Wihr-s.
 meet-PST.3 that-DAT.SG.M one-NOM.SG.M man-NOM.SG
 ‘When He stepped ashore, a man met Him.’ (GLB 1685–1689, Luc. 8:27, quoted after Ambrazas 1990: 166)

⇒ Thus, the development of the Lithuanian participial complement and adjunct constructions involved a complex interplay of to a large extent mutually independent and non-simultaneous processes:

- morphological (truncation of the agreeing Dative participle),
- semantico-syntactic (extension and reanalysis of the Accusative + Participle construction),
- analogical (extension of the truncated non-agreeing participle from the adjunct to the complement construction).

All these historical tendencies have led to a considerable degree of structural isomorphism of the two participial constructions and to the rise of the new category of switch-reference expressed by the [\pm agreement] feature.

3. Lithuanian infinitive clauses

3.1. In Modern Lithuanian, the overt object of the Infinitive based on a transitive verb can be marked in four different ways depending on the type of matrix clause (see Franks & Lavine 2006):

- with most verbs taking infinitival complements, the object is in the Accusative, like in ordinary finite clauses, cf. (25a);
- with predicates denoting emotional attitudes and certain kinds of modality, the object of the Infinitive can be in the Nominative, cf. (25b);
- with verbs of motion, the object of the infinitival clause denoting the goal of motion, is in the Genitive, cf. (25c);
- in other kinds of purpose infinitives adjoined to verbs or nouns, the object is in the Dative, cf. (25d).

- (25) a. *Jon-as nor-i [perskaity-ti laišk-a].*
 J.-NOM.SG want-PRS read.through-INF letter-ACC.SG
 ‘Jonas wants to read the letter.’
- b. *J-am ne-patik-o [laukel-is ar-ti].*
 3-DAT.SG.M NEG-like-PST field-NOM.SG plough-INF
 ‘He did not like to plough the field.’ (Ambrasas (ed.) 1997: 638)
- c. *išvažiav-o [keli-o taisy-ti].*
 drive.out-PST road-GEN.SG repair-INF
 ‘(they) went to repair the road.’ [ibid.]
- d. *iššov-ė [žmon-ėms pagąsdin-ti].*
 shoot-PST people-DAT.PL frighten-INF
 ‘(he) fired to scare the people.’ (ibid.: 557)

⇒ Constructions with the “non-canonical” marking of the object of the infinitive tend to show OV rather than VO word order, especially in the written language (Franks & Lavine 2006). However, my consultants belonging to the post-Soviet generation prefer the neutral VO order even with the non-accusative marking of the object, cf. (26).

- (26) a. *Jon-as atėj-o [aplanky-ti draug-o].*
 J.-NOM.SG come-PST visit-INF friend-GEN.SG
 ‘Jonas came to visit his friend.’
- b. *Mes pastat-ė-me ligonin-ę [gydy-ti vaik-ams].*
 we:NOM build-PST-1PL hospital-ACC.SG treat-INF child-DAT.PL
 ‘We built a hospital in order to treat children.’

⇒ This together with other facts (see Franks & Lavine 2006) suggests that all infinitive constructions exhibit parallel syntactic structure, with the object NP belonging to the infinitive clause, and not somehow being a part of the matrix (see below).

The behaviour of the Dative object + Infinitive clauses (25d), (26b) is parallel to that of the clauses where the Dative NP is the subject of the Infinitive clause (see Holvoet 2010 for a recent analysis and discussion), cf. (27).

- (27) a. *Pastūm-ė kėd-ę [sveči-ui at-si-sės-ti]*
 move-PST chair-ACC.SG guest-DAT.SG PRV-RFL-sit-INF
 ‘He moved the chair for the visitor to sit down.’ (Ambrasas (ed.) 1997: 558)
- b. *tikimyb-ė [vaik-ams susirg-ti]*
 probability-NOM.SG child-DAT.PL fall.ill-INF
 ‘the probability that the children would fall ill.’ (Google)

3.2. Some cross-linguistic data

– In the neighbouring languages, only the Nominative object construction in (25b) finds counterparts, see Larin 1963, Timberlake 1974, Ambrasas 2001.

LATVIAN (IE > Baltic; Holvoet 1993: 157)

- (28) *Visvairāk viņai patīk [lasīt Bībel-e].*
 most.of.all 3-DAT.SG.F like:PRS:3 read-INF Bible-NOM.SG
 ‘Most of all she likes to read the Bible.’

ESTONIAN (Uralic > Finno-Ugric > Balto-Finnic; Klaas 1996: 45)

- (29) *Meil tuleb [vaheaeg teh-a].*
 we-ADESS must break(NOM.SG) make-INF
 ‘We should make a break.’

NORTH RUSSIAN DIALECTS (IE > Slavic; Larin 1963: 91)

- (30) *Xoč-u [pi-t’ xolodn-aja vod-a].*
 want-PRS:1SG drink-INF cold-ACC.SG.F water-ACC.SG
 ‘I want to drink cold water.’

However, constructions similar to the Lithuanian Dative + Infinitive have been sporadically attested in some ancient Slavic languages, cf. (32), but did not develop any further and gradually fell out of use.

OLD CZECH (IE > Slavic; Ambrasas 1981: 18)

- (32) *kúpi-chu pol-e pútnik-óm hrěs-ti.*
 buy-AOR:1SG field-ACC.SG traveller-DAT.PL bury-INF
 ‘I bought a field in order to bury travelers.’

– “Non-canonical” marking of objects of goal/purpose infinitives in some Australian languages.

NYAMAL (Pama-Nyungan > South-West; Dench 2009: 761, 767)

- (31) a. *Ngunti-rna-rna jilya [kurti-larta yurta-yu].*
 send-PST-1SG child get-PURP fish-DAT
 ‘I sent the child to get fish.’
- b. *Ngunya-ngku mangkurla-lu warnta kurti-la [punga-lartara-lu yukurru-ku].*
 that-ERG woman-ERG stick get-PRS hit-PURP-ERG dog-DAT
 ‘That woman is getting a stick to hit the dog.’

JIWARLI (Pama-Nyungan > South-West; Austin 2009: 4)

- (32) a. *Ngatha kamurri-a-rru [pirru-wu thika-lkarringu].*
 I(NOM) get.hungry-PRS-now meat-DAT eat-INT
 ‘I am becoming hungry to eat meat.’
- b. *Kuwarti kurriya purra-rninyja [patha-rrkarringu-ru jiriparri-yi].*
 now boomerang toss-PST pelt-INT-ERG echidna-DAT
 ‘Next (he) threw a boomerang to hit echidna.’

➤ “Non-canonical” marking of objects of infinitival or purpose clauses seems to be an infrequent phenomenon cross-linguistically; e.g. in a recent comprehensive typology of purpose clauses (Schmidtke-Bode 2009) such patterns are not mentioned at all.

3.3. Diachronic sources: again convergence of different constructions.

– The Lithuanian Nominative + Infinitive and Dative + Infinitive constructions have developed from constructions with infinitives adjoined to the Nominative resp. Dative NPs selected by particular matrix constructions (see Ambrazas 1981, 1987, 2001).

In contemporary Lithuanian, Dative NPs can occur as purpose adjuncts to certain verbs and especially nouns, see Sawicki 1992, Kerevičienė 2008: 111–113, 182–183.

- (33) a. *Čia bu-s lentyn-a knyg-oms.*
 here be-FUT shelf-NOM.SG book-DAT.PL
 ‘Here will be a shelf for books.’ (Kerevičienė 2008: 182)
- b. *Žem-ė keli-a-s darb-ui ir kūryb-ai.*
 earth-NOM.SG get.up-PRS-RFL work-DAT.SG and creation-DAT.SG
 ‘Earth is getting up to work and to create.’ (ibid.)

Thus the development of the Dative + Infinitive construction involved a reanalysis whereby the Dative NP got interpreted as belonging only to the dependent clause, the semantic “licensing conditions” (Holvoet 2010) on the dative, which used to come from the matrix, being suspended. After this process has reached an advanced stage (which seems to have happened only recently), the infinitive clause with the Dative object starts to accommodate to the neutral OV word order.

- (34) a. *laišk-as motin-ai_i [∅_i pasveikin-ti]*
 letter-NOM.SG mother-DAT.SG greet-INF
 lit. ‘a letter to the mother in order to greet (her)’
- b. *laišk-as [motin-ai pasveikin-ti]*
 letter-NOM.SG mother-DAT.SG greet-INF
 ‘a letter in order to greet the mother’
- c. *Šit-q laišk-q Jon-as siunt-ė [motin-ai pasveikin-ti].*
 this-ACC.SG.M letter-ACC.SG J.-NOM.SG send-PST mother-DAT.SG greet-INF
 ‘Jonas sent this letter in order to greet his mother.’

This scenario pertains both to the subject and the object dative NPs in purpose infinitive clauses (see Ambrazas 1981; Holvoet 2010). Note that if (27a) can be synchronically understood as a modification of the NP *kėdė svečiui* ‘the chair for the guest’ by the infinitive, (27b) cannot be thus interpreted, since **tikimybė vaikams* lit. ‘the probability for the children’ is semantically ill-formed.

– The Genitive + Infinitive construction with verbs of motion followed a different path of development. They go back to the construction involving the Supine, a special verbal noun used with verbs of motion, which shared its stem with the Infinitive and assigned Genitive to its object, like other verbal nouns (Schmalstieg 1987: 174–176), cf. the Old Lithuanian example (35).

- (35) *Atei-s [sudi-tu giw-u ir nūmirusi-u].*
 come-FUT judge-SUP living-GEN.PL and dead-GEN.PL
 ‘He will come to judge the living and the dead.’ (VE 1579, 18:8, quoted after Schmalstieg 1987: 174)

The Supine has been in use in the literary language until the beginning of the XX century and is still said to be used in some Eastern dialects (see Schmalstieg 1987: 174–175). It has been gradually replaced by the semantically and formally very similar Infinitive, with the retention of the original Genitive marking of the object.

➤ Though Genitive NPs may denote goals of motion in the absence of the Infinitive, cf. (36), examples like (35) indicate that the Genitive object belonged to the non-finite clause headed by the Supine already in Old Lithuanian.

- (36) a. *išėj-o* *pien-o.* b. *išsiunt-ė* *sūn-ų* *daktar-o.*
 go.out-PST milk-GEN.SG send-PST son-ACC.SG doctor-GEN.SG
 ‘(he/she) went for milk’ ‘(he/she) sent the son to get the doctor.’
 (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 557)

The corpus data of contemporary Lithuanian suggests that the Genitive + Infinitive construction does not show a preference for OV order over the neutral VO order, still observed with the Dative + Infinitive construction.

‘to visit the friend’ (Gen)	OV: <i>draugo aplankyti</i>	ca. 180 hits
	VO: <i>aplankyti draugo</i>	ca. 270 hits
‘to read a book’ (Dat)	OV: <i>knygai skaityti</i>	ca. 600 hits
	VO: <i>skaityti knygai</i>	ca. 90 hits

(Google searches from 25.09.2010)

➤ Again, as with the participles, different sources and different diachronic paths have resulted in the development of an array of constructions which from a synchronic point of view are to a large extent structurally isomorphic and differ mainly in the type of environment they may occur in.

4. Conclusions

The patterns of case-marking of subjects and objects of participial and infinitive clauses in Lithuanian are interesting and instructive from the following perspectives:

- They show how elaborate a system of marking dependent clauses may be, and how nominal case may be employed to signal the kind of relation between two clauses rather than between an NP and its syntactic head.
- They contribute to the typology of both non-finite clauses and case, showing patterns which are not very widespread cross-linguistically (in particular this relates to the non-canonical marking of objects of infinitives).
- From a diachronic point of view, they show how synchronically parallel constructions arise via a complex interplay of different changes on various linguistic levels (semantic, syntactic, and morphological), “pushing” originally heterogeneous structures to morphosyntactic convergence.

Lithuanian offers particularly rich and elaborate systems of clause combining (Grone-meyer & Usonienė 2001) and differential case-marking, and these data should be integrated into any comprehensive typology of both kinds of phenomena.

Abbreviations

ACC – accusative, ACT – actual, ADESS – adessive, ALLAT – allative, ANT – anterior, AOR – aorist, ART – article, CDAT – complementizing dative case, CNT – continuative, COBL – complementizing oblique case, DAT – dative, DEF – definiteness, ELAT – elative, ERG – ergative, F – feminine, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, IE – Indo-European, ILLAT – illative, IMP – imperative, IND – indicative, INESS – inessive, INF – infinitive, INT – intensitive, LOC – locative, M – masculine, NEG – negation, NMR – nominalizer, NOM – nominative, OBL – oblique, PA – active participle, PART – partitive, PL – plural, POT – potential, PP – passive participle, PRS – present, PRT – participle, PRV – preverb, PST – past, PURP – purposive, REAL – realized, RFL – reflexive, SBD – subordinator, SG – singular, SUP – supine

Sources

BrB – Jonas Bertkūnas' Lithuanian translation of the Bible, Königsberg 1579–1590.
 BrP – Jonas Bretkūnas' Lithuanian Postilla Catholica, Königsberg, 1591.
 GLB – Latvian Bible, Riga, 1685–1689.
 EEv – Georgius Elger's Latvian Gospel. Wilno, 1671.
 MT – Simonas Waischnoras' Lithuanian Margarita Theologica, Königsberg, 1600.
 VE – Baltramiejus Vilentas' Lithuanian translation of Luther's Enchiridion, Königsberg, 1579.

References

- Ambrazas V. (1981). Zur Geschichte einer indogermanischen Konstruktion (Dativus cum infinitivo im Baltischen). *Kalbotyra* 32/3, 12–24.
- Ambrazas V. (1987). Die indogermanische Grundlage des Dativus und Nominativus cum infinitivo im Baltischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 92, 203–219.
- Ambrazas V. (1990). *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis prichastij baltijskix jazykov* [Comparative Syntax of Participles in Baltic Languages]. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrazas V. (2001). On the development of nominative object in East Baltic. In: Ö. Dahl & M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, V. 2, 391–412.
- Ambrazas V. (ed.) (1997). *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
- Arkadiev P.M. (2010). Participial complementation in Lithuanian. To appear in: V. Gast, H. Diessel (eds.), *Clause Combining in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Austin P. (2009). Issues in the synchrony and diachrony of case marking in the Mantharta and Kanyara languages, Australia. Handout of talk at *Case in and Across Languages*, Helsinki.
- Bunte P.A. (1986). Subordinate clauses in Southern Paiute. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 52/3, 275–300.
- Cristofaro S. (2008). Argument encoding in Ancient Greek infinitive and participial complement clauses. Handout of the paper presented at *Syntax of the Worlds Languages-3*, Berlin.
- Dench A. (2009). Case in an Australian language. Distribution of case and multiple case marking in Nyamal. In: A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 756–769.
- Dench A. & N. Evans (1988). Multiple case-marking in Australian languages. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 8/1, 1–47.
- Duroiselle Ch. (1907/1997). *Practical Grammar of the Pāli Language*. 3rd ed. Buddha Dharma Education Association.
- Eiche A. (1983). *Latvian Declinable and Indeclinable Participles. Their Syntactic Function, Frequency and Modality*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Evans N. (1995). *A Grammar of Kayardild*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Franks S. & J.E. Lavine (2006). Case and word order in Lithuanian. *Journal of Linguistics* 42/1, 239–288.
- Genušienė E. & V.P. Nedjalkov (1988). Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian. In: V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 369–386.

- Giparaitė J. (2008). *Non-verbal Small Clauses in English and Lithuanian*. PhD Thesis, Vilnius University.
- Greenberg G. & J.E. Lavine (2006). New syntax in Russian and Lithuanian: The case of the adverbial participle. In: R. Rothstein, E. Scatton & Ch. Townsend (eds.), *Studies in Slavic Linguistics and Folklore*. Bloomington (IN): Slavica.
- Gronemeyer Cl. & A. Usonienė (2001). Complementation in Lithuanian. In: Cl. Gronemeyer. *Laying the Boundaries of Syntax: Studies in the Interfaces between Syntax, Semantics and Lexicon*. Lund: Lund University, 105–135.
- Holvoet A. (1993). On the nominative object in Latvian, with particular reference to the debitive. *Linguistica Baltica* 2, 151–161.
- Holvoet A. (2010). Reanalysis or just ambiguity? Infinitival clauses with overt dative subjects in Baltic. Paper presented at *New Perspectives on Baltic Philology*, Poznań.
- Karlssohn F. (1999). *Finnish: An Essential Grammar*. 2nd ed. London, New York: Routledge.
- Keydana G. (1997). *Absolute Konstruktionen in altindogermanischen Sprachen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kerevičienė J. (2008). *The Lithuanian Dative and its English Counterparts (A Case Study in Cognitive Grammar)*. PhD Thesis, Vilnius University.
- Klaas B. (1996). Similarities in case marking of syntactic relations in Estonian and Lithuanian. In: M. Ereht (ed.), *Estonian: Typological Studies*. I. Tartu: Tartu Univ. Press, 37–67.
- Klimas A. (1987). The Lithuanian participles: Their system and functions. *Lituanus* 33/1, 38–73.
- Larin B.A. (1963). Ob odnoj slavjano-balto-finckoj izoglosse. [On a Slavic-Baltic-Finnic isogloss.] *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 6, 87–107.
- Sawicki L. (1992). Genitive and dative in goal and purpose expressions in contemporary Lithuanian. *Linguistica Baltica* 1, 93–101.
- Schmalstieg W.R. (1987). *A Lithuanian Historical Syntax*. Columbus (OH): Slavica.
- Schmidtke-Bode K. (2009). *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schoof S. (2004). *An HPSG Account of Nonfinite Verbal Complements in Latin*. Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics 51.
- Sližienė N. (1995). The tense system of Lithuanian. In: R. Thieroff (ed.), *The Tense Systems in European Languages*. V. II. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 215–232.
- Tamm A. (2008). Partitive morphosemantics across Estonian grammatical categories, and case variation with Equi and Raising. In: *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Tamm A. (2009). The Estonian partitive evidential. Some notes on the semantic parallels between aspect and evidential categories. In: L. Hogeweg, H. de Hoop, A. Malchukov (eds). *Cross-linguistic Semantics of Tense, Aspect and Modality*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 365–401.
- Tangl E. (1928/1999). Der Accusativus und Nominativus cum Participio im Altlitauischen. Doctoral Dissertation, Berlin. (Partly reprinted in *Res Balticae* 5 (1999): 151–209.)
- Timberlake A. (1974). *The Nominative Object in Slavic, Baltic and West Finnic*. München: Otto Sagner.
- Wiemer B. (2001). Partizipien zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik: Ein Überblick zu aspektuellen, diathesebezogenen und diskursrelevanten Eigenschaften im modernen Litauischen. In: B. Wälchli, F. Zúñiga (Hrsg.), *Sprachbeschreibung und Typologie*. Bern: Universität Bern, 65–81.
- Wiemer B. (2006). Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (A typological assessment). In: *Baltistica* 41/1, 33–49.
- Zhivov V.M. (2008). Referentnaja struktura i porjadok slov: datel'nyj samostojatel'nyj v dvux drevnix cerkovnoslavjanskix tekstax [Reference and word order: Dative Absolute in two ancient Church Slavonic texts.]. *Russkij jazyk v nauchnom osveschenii* 15/1, 5–56.
- Zigmond M.L., C.G. Booth & P. Munro (1990). *Kawaiisu. A Grammar and Dictionary with Texts*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.