

Notes on the Lithuanian restrictive

PETER ARKADIEV

Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow

This paper focuses on the previously barely described restrictive use of the prefix *te-* in Lithuanian. This prefix, whose meaning is similar to that of the particle *tik* ‘only’, is peculiar in that it can take scope over almost any kind of phrases, including constituents of non-finite embedded clauses. In this paper, morphosyntactic properties and scope of the restrictive *te-* are analysed on the basis of both elicited and corpus data. Besides that, it is shown that from a cross-linguistic point of view, a restrictive affix displaying both rigid verb-adjacency and scope flexibility is quite rare.

Keywords: restrictive markers, scope, prefixation, focus

1. On the typology of restrictive markers¹

Restrictive markers, exemplified by English *only*, German *nur* or Russian *tol’ko*, are focus-sensitive elements which “presuppose the relevant sentence without particle and entail that none of the alternatives under consideration satisfies the open sentence obtained by substituting a variable for the focus expression” (König 1991, 94). Thus, a sentence like (1a) can be represented as in (1b) and (1c) (*ibid.*):

¹ The research this paper is based on has been mainly conducted during my stay in Vilnius in May 2009 and was funded by the Russian Science Support Foundation and by the section of History and Philology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. I thank my Lithuanian consultants Valdemaras Klumbys, Vidmantas Kuprevičius and Jurga Narkevičiūtė, as well as Axel Holvoet and Jurgis Pakerys for various help and support during my stay. A very preliminary version of this paper has been presented at *Moscow Syntax and Semantics* in October 2009, and I also express gratitude to the audience for useful comments. Besides that, I thank the colleagues who have responded to my LINGTYP query, in particular Nicholas Evans, Martin Haspelmath and Ekkehard König. I also thank Rolandas Mikulskas, Norbert Ostrowski and Barbara Partee for useful comments on the earlier version of this paper. All faults and shortcomings are mine.

- (1) a. **Only** JOHN came². English
 b. John came (presupposition)
 c. $\neg\exists x [x \neq \text{John} \ \& \ \text{came}(x)]$ (assertion)

The element which is asserted to satisfy the ‘open sentence’ will be further on called the **scope** of the restrictive marker. In (1a) it is *John*. It is usually assumed that the scope of restrictive markers, similarly to that of additive (*also*) and scalar (*even*) markers, is determined by the focus structure of the sentence (see, e.g., Rooth 1996; Erteschik-Shir 1997, 110–116), in particular in that elements outside of the focus domain cannot constitute the scope of the restrictive. Though this issue is not completely uncontroversial (see e.g. Dryer 1994 for counterarguments), for the sake of simplicity I will assume that focus and scope of restrictives indeed coincide, at least in the data I am going to discuss (see section 4).

Cross-linguistically, there exist several formal kinds of restrictive markers or restrictive constructions (see König 1991, Ch. 2). The first and probably the most common is a particle (i. e., a morpheme showing at least some of the morphosyntactic properties of an independent word, notably, transcategoriality, i. e., ability to combine with words of different lexical classes) attaching directly to the word or phrase in its scope. To this kind belong the Russian particle *tol’ko* (normally occurring in preposition), cf. (2), and the Japanese particle *dake* (postposed), cf. (3).

- (2) **Tol’ko** KOLJA prišël. Russian
 RSTR K. come:PST.M.SG
 ‘Only Kolja came.’
- (3) *Boku wa sono hi RINGO dake tabe-ta.* Japanese
 I TOP this day apple RSTR eat-PST
 ‘I ate only an apple this day.’
 (Alpatov *et al.* 2008, vol. I, 255)

Another type of restrictive marker is constituted by morphemes which appear in some dedicated position in the sentence, usually ad-

² In the examples, **boldface** is used for the restrictive markers, while SMALL CAPS indicate their scope.

jacent to the main predicate, and are able to take scope over different constituents. A clear example of such a restrictive marker comes from Mandarin Chinese, where the particle *zhi* ‘only’, according to Li & Thompson (1981, 332), “modifies solely the entire predicate phrase” and “can never modify a noun phrase alone”. Thus, examples like (4) are in principle multiply ambiguous:

- (4) *Wo zhi xie shu.* Mandarin Chinese
 I RSTR write book
 ‘Only I write books/I write only books’, etc.
 (König 1991, 18)

The English restrictive particle *only* can attach both to the constituent in its scope (5a) or to the finite verb (5b). In the latter case *only* shows scope flexibility similar to that of the Chinese *zhi* with the notable exception that preverbal *only* cannot take scope over the structurally superior subject noun phrase.

- (5) a. *Only JOHN gave a book to Mary.* English
 b. John *only* gave a book to Mary.
 ‘... only gave/only a book/only to Mary ... /*only John’

The third type of restrictive construction consists of an exception marker attaching to the scope constituent and a predicate negation, cf. French *ne... que* (6) and Japanese *shika... Neg* (7). The motivation for such a formal means of expressing restrictive meaning is the truth-conditional equivalence of *only X* with *nobody but X* (König 1991, 95).

- (6) *Mon enfant ne lit que DES MAGAZINES!* French
 ‘My child reads only magazines!’³
- (7) *Kare wa BIRU shika nom-ana-i.* Japanese
 he TOP beer except drink-NEG-PRS
 ‘He drinks only beer.’ (Alpatov *et al.* 2008, vol. II, 151)

The fourth type is similar to the first one in that the restrictive marker attaches to the scope constituent, but now the marker is not

³ <http://www.vosquestionsdepartements.fr/dossier/460/il-ne-lit-que-des-magazines/page/2>.

a particle (a free word) but rather an affix, i.e. a bound morpheme⁴ morphosyntactically and phonologically integrated into the host word. According to König (1991, 20), genuine restrictive affixes are relatively rare cross-linguistically. An example of the restrictive affix is the Imbabura Quechua ‘limitative’ *-lla* (Cole 1985, 169–170), cf. (8).

- (8) *Marya-ka SHUJ WAGRA-lla-ta chari-n.* Imbabura Quechua
 M.-TOP one COW-RSTR-ACC have-3
 ‘Maria has just one cow.’ (Cole 1985, 169)

The fifth and the most rarely attested type of restrictive marker is an affix on the verb able to take variable scope. The only previously known example of this kind of restrictive comes from Bininj Gun-wok, a polysynthetic Gunwingguan language of North Australia (Evans 1995, 248–256), cf. (9).

- (9) *A-djal-wokdi GUN-DJEIHMI.* Bininj Gun-wok
 1SG-RSTR-speak language.name
 ‘I speak only Gun-djeihmi.’ (Evans 1995, 250)

This brief cross-linguistic overview shows that there is considerable variation in the expression of the restrictive function, the major parameters of diversity being the position of the restrictive marker with respect to its scope (scope-adjacency vs. predicate-adjacency) and the degree of boundedness of the restrictive marker to its morphosyntactic host.

In Lithuanian, there exist two kinds of restrictive markers: the particles *tik*, *tiktai* and *vien* always appearing to the left of their scope (10), (11), and the verbal prefix *te-* (12).

- (10) a. *Tik JON-AS myl-i Aldon-q.*
 RSTR J.-NOM.SG love-PRS A.-ACC.SG
 ‘Only Jonas loves Aldona.’

⁴ Being perfectly aware of the difficulties with the word-clitic-affix distinction, as recently sharply emphasized by Haspelmath (2010), I nevertheless believe that these notions are not only valid and operationally definable at least for the individual languages, but are also relevant for cross-linguistic discussions. For the latter, in my view, relative notions such as ‘more/less bound’ obviate the need of hard-to-arrive-at ‘universal’ definitions of word resp. affix.

- b. *Jon-as myl-i tik ALDON-Ą.*
 J.-NOM.SG love-PRS RSTR A.-ACC.SG
 ‘Jonas loves only Aldona.’
- c. *J-is ne tik MYLI, bet ir nor-i*
 3-NOM.SG.M NEG RSTR love-PRS but and want-PRS
j-q ves-ti.
 3-ACC.SG.F marry-INF
 ‘He not only loves her, but also wishes to marry her.’⁵

(11) *Taip gal-i bū-ti vien AMERIK-OJ.*
 SO can-PRS be-INF RSTR America-LOC.SG
 ‘It can be so only in America.’ (LKT)

(12) *J-is te-parod-ė j-ai savo meil-ę.*
 3-NOM.SG.M RSTR-SHOW-PST 3-DAT.SG.F his.OWN love-ACC.SG
 ‘He only showed her his love.’⁶ (LKT)

In some contexts, the particle and the prefixal restrictive markers co-occur, cf. (13).

(13) *Nejaugi... Deivid-as tik DAIN-AS te-padovanoj-o?*
 really D.-NOM.SG only song-ACC.PL only-give-PST
 ‘Did David really give <you> only songs?’⁷

In this paper I will focus on the restrictive prefix *te-*, which is peculiar from the point of view of both its morphosyntactic and scopal properties. This use of *te-*, as far as I know, has never been subject to linguistic analysis before. The existing grammars of Lithuanian, e.g. Schleicher (1856, 139), Kurschat (1876, 130), Otrębski (1965, 368–369), Senn (1966, 245), Ulvydas, red. (1971, 296), Mathiassen (1996a, 172), Chicouene, Skūpas (2003, 126–127) give it just a few lines, while Ambrazas, ed. (1997), the most authoritative grammar written in English, does not mention it at all. Even Paulauskas (1958), a fundamental monographic work devoted to Lithuanian prefixes, does not give any detailed account of this use of *te-*, dismissing it and other

⁵ <http://www.straipsniai.lt/bendravimas/informacija/Meile/puslapis/1679>

⁶ This Lithuanian sentence is actually multiply ambiguous, similarly to the Mandarin Chinese example (4). See section 4 for a detailed discussion of scopal properties of *te-*.

⁷ <http://www.alfa.lt/straipsnis/123908/?Natalijos.Zvonkes.gimtadienis.kvepejo.agurkais>

prefixes “not altering the lexical meaning of the verb” (ibid., 323) as “not belonging to the category of verbal prefixes” (ibid., 321).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 I will discuss the morphosyntactic properties of *te-*, and in section 3 I will turn to its surprising polyfunctionality. Section 4 will be devoted to the scopal properties of the restrictive *te-* in general, while section 5 will specifically discuss the phenomenon of embedded scope. In section 6 I will briefly summarize the main findings of this study.

2. Morphosyntactic properties of the restrictive *te-*

Before turning to more intricate issues, it is necessary to say a few words in support of the treatment of *te-* as a prefix, and not as a particle or a proclitic which for whatever reason happened to be spelled together with the verb. A strong piece of evidence for the status of *te-* as a bound morpheme comes from the well-known fact that in Lithuanian prefixes trigger the shift of the reflexive marker *-si* from the suffixal position to the position immediately before the stem (see, e. g., Ambrazas, ed., 1997, 222; Stolz 1989). Thus, in (14a) the unprefixated verb with the reflexive surfacing as a suffix is shown; in (14b) the ‘reflexive displacement’ is triggered by an aspectual prefix (glossed ‘preverb’), in (14c) by the negative prefix, and in (14d) by the restrictive prefix *te-*. As is shown by (14e), genuine particles, such as *tik* ‘only’, do not affect the position of the reflexive marker. This evidence suffices to argue that *te-* is a prefix in Lithuanian, on a par with all other uncontroversial prefixes attested in this language.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| (14) a. <i>džiaug-ti-s</i> | b. <i>ap-si-džiaug-ti</i> |
| rejoice-INF-RFL | PVB-RFL-rejoice-INF |
| ‘rejoice’ | ‘start rejoicing’ |
| c. <i>ne-si-džiaug-ė</i> | d. <i>te-si-džiaug-ė</i> |
| NEG-RFL-rejoice-PST | RSTR-RFL-rejoice-PST |
| ‘did not rejoice’ | only + rejoiced |
| e. * <i>tik si-džiaug-ė</i> | |

The important difference between the aspectual prefixes, on the one hand, and the restrictive *te-* on the other, lies in their relative position in the verbal form. While the aspectual prefixes, with minor lexical-

ized exceptions, see Paulauskas (1958, 418–419), can only attach to the bare verbal stem (the single morpheme which is able to intervene is the reflexive marker), *te-*, as well as the negative prefix *ne-* and the ‘continuative’ prefixes *be-*, *tebe-* and *nebe-*, can be prefixed to verbs already containing aspectual prefixes, cf. *te-pa-rod-ė* or *te-pa-dovanoj-o* in (12) and (13). Thus, *te-* and other prefixes sharing the aforementioned property can be called ‘outer’ prefixes in contrast to the ‘inner’ aspectual prefixes.

In its restrictive use, *te-* can attach to both finite and non-finite verbal forms. It is attested with present (15), past (12) and future (16) tenses, with the imperative (17) and the subjunctive (18) moods, as well as with the infinitive (19).

- (15) *Vos POR-OJE išNAŠ-Ų*
 just couple-LOC.PL footnote-GEN.PL
te-aptink-a-me lotynišk-us ir
 RSTR-COME.across-PRS-1PL Latin-ACC.PL.M and
lenkišk-us tekst-us.
 Polish-ACC.PL.M text-ACC.PL
 ‘We come across Latin and Polish texts just in a couple
 of footnotes.’ (LKT)
- (16) *Ne-s-u Tav-ęs sutik-ęs, tik*
 NEG-AUX-PRS.1SG YOU-GEN meet-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M only
spėj-u Tav-e es-a-nt-į;
 GUESS-PRS.1 SG YOU-ACC be-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.M
SUTIK-ĖS te-pajusi-u, kad es-i
 meet-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M RSTR-feel + FUT-1SG that be:PRS-2SG
aukšt-esn-is.
 high-COMP-NOM.SG.M
 ‘I have not met you, I only guess that you exist; I will feel
 that you are superior only when I meet you.’ (LKT)
- (17) *VIEŠPAT-Ī SAVO DIEV-Ą te-garbin-k ir*
 Lord-ACC.SG OWN God-ACC.SG RSTR-worship-IMP and
J-AM VIEN-AM te-tarnau-k!
 3-DAT.SG.M ONE-DAT.SG.M RSTR-serve-IMP
 ‘Worship only the Lord your God and serve only Him.’
 (Mt. 4:10)

- (18) *Nes argi tu čia sėdė-tum, jeigu*
 because really you here sit-SBJ:2SG if
te-įsteng-tum višt-ą pavog-ti.
 RSTR-be.able-SBJ:2SG hen-ACC.SG steal-INF
 ‘Because would you, really, sit here if you would have been
 able to steal just a hen.’ (LKT)
- (19) ... *te-turė-ti TIK VIEN-ą SKAITYTOJ-ą — savo*
 RSTR-have-INF only one-ACC.SG reader-ACC.SG own
žmon-ą.
 wife-ACC.SG
 ‘... to have only one reader — one’s own wife.’ (LKT)

Besides this, restrictive *te-* can co-occur with participles used as heads of attributive (20), ‘nominative-plus-participle’ (21), ‘accusative-plus-participle’ (22) and ‘dative-plus-participle’ (23) constructions, as well as with converbs (24).

- (20) *Buv-o iškel-t-a nemaža nauj-ų, iki*
 AUX-PST reveal-PST.PP-PRED a.lot new-GEN.PL until
tol lingvist-ams ne-žin-o-m-ų ar MAŽAI
 then linguist-DAT.PL NEG-know-PRS-PP-GEN.PL or little
te-žino-t-ų kalb-os fakt-ų.
 RSTR-know-PST.PP-GEN.PL language-GEN.SG fact-GEN.PL
 ‘A lot of facts about language, previously unknown or only
 little known to linguists, have been revealed.’ (LKT)
- (21) ... *todėl buv-o įsitikin-ęs MAŽAI*
 therefore AUX-PST be.convinced-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M little
te-pamat-ęs ir NEDAUG
 RSTR-see-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M and not.much
te-sužinoj-ęs.
 RSTR-learn-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
 ‘Therefore he was convinced that he had seen only a little
 and learned only a few things.’ (LKT)
- (22) *Kaz-ys man-ė Aldon-ą J-į te-myl-i-nt.*
 K.-NOM.SG think-PST A.-ACC.SG 3-ACC.SG.M RSTR-love-PRS-PA
 ‘Kazys thought that Aldona loved only him.’

- (23) — *Tau reiki-a apsisprę-ti, Rimul-i, — pasak-ė,*
 YOU:DAT need-PRS decide-INF R.-VOC say-PST
te-gird-i-nt JŪR-AI IR SMĖLI-UI.
 RSTR-hear-PRS-PA sea-DAT.SG and sand-DAT.SG
 ‘You need to decide, Rimulis — said he, when only the sea
 and the sand heard <them>.’ (LKT)
- (24) *Partizan-ai, MENK-AS PAJĖG-AS*
 guerilla-NOM.PL weak-ACC.PL.F force-ACC.PL
te-turė-dam-i, su rus-ais
 RSTR-have-CNV-NOM.PL.M with Russian-INS.PL
susirem-ti ne-si-ryž-o ir pasitrauk-ė
 encounter-INF NEG-RFL-resolve-PST and withdraw-PST
už miesteli-o.
 outside small.town-GEN.SG
 ‘The guerillas, possessing only weak forces, did not dare to
 encounter the Russians and withdrew from the town.’ (LKT)

By contrast, with eventive deverbal nominals restrictive *te-* is infelicitous, cf. the acceptable example (25a) with the free particle *tik* modifying the object of the nominalized verb and the corresponding ungrammatical (25b) with *te-* prefixed to the nominalization.

- (25) a. *Tik GROŽIN-ĖS LITERATŪR-OS pardav-im-as*
 only fiction-GEN.SG literature-GEN.PL sell-NML-NOM.SG
išaug-o tr-is kart-us.
 grow-PST three-ACC.PL time-ACC.PL
 ‘The sales of only fiction grew three times.’
- b. **GROŽIN-ĖS LITERATŪR-OS te-pardav-im-as*
 fiction-GEN.SG literature-GEN.PL RSTR-sell-NML-NOM.SG
išaug-o tr-is kart-us.
 grow-PST three-ACC.PL time-ACC.PL
 intended: ‘id.’

With the periphrastic forms, such as the perfect (26), the resultative (27), the passive (28), and the counterfactual (29), the restrictive *te-* can attach either to the auxiliary or to the participle, without any evident difference in meaning.

- (26) a. *Iš Dostojevski-o rašt-ŭ te-s-u*
of D.-GEN.SG writing-GEN.PL RSTR-AUX.PRS-1SG
perskait-ęs “IDIOT-Ń”.
read-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M idiot-ACC.SG
‘Of Dostoyevsky, I have read only *The Idiot*.’
- b. *Iš Dostojevski-o rašt-ŭ es-u*
of D.-GEN.SG writing-GEN.PL AUX.PRS-1SG
te-perskait-ęs “IDIOT-Ń”.
RSTR-read-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M idiot-ACC.SG
‘id.’
- (27) a. *Kaz-ys te-buv-o apsireng-ęs*
K.-NOM.SG RSTR-AUX-PST dress-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
MARŠKINI-AIS.
shirt-INS.PL
‘Kazys was dressed just in a shirt.’
- b. *Kaz-ys buv-o te-apsireng-ęs*
K.-NOM.SG AUX-PST RSTR-dress-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
MARŠKINI-AIS.
shirt-INS.PL
‘id.’
- (28) a. *Šit-as nam-as te-buv-o*
this-NOM.SG.M house-NOM.SG RSTR-AUX-PST
pastaty-t-as PRIEŠ DEŠIMT MĖNESI-Ų.
build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M before ten month-GEN.PL
‘This house has been built just ten months ago.’
- b. *Šit-as nam-as buv-o*
this-NOM.SG.M house-NOM.SG AUX-PST
te-pastaty-t-as PRIEŠ DEŠIMT
RSTR-build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M before ten
MĖNESI-Ų.
month-GEN.PL
‘id.’
- (29) a. *Jeigu te-bū-tŭ atėj-ęs JON-AS,*
if RSTR-AUX-SBJ.3 come-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M J.-NOM.SG
bū-tŭ nuobod-u.
be-SBJ.3 tedious-PRED
‘It would have been tedious, if just Jonas had come.’

- b. *Jeigu bū-tų te-atėj-ęs* *JON-AS,*
 if AUX-SBJ.3 RSTR-COME-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M J.-NOM.SG
bū-tų nuobod-u.
 be-SBJ.3 tedious-PRED
 ‘id.’

Some of my consultants consistently rejected periphrastic constructions with *te-* prefixed to the participle, but corpus data shows that this option is indeed possible, even though rare, cf. (30) and (31).

- (30) ... *student-as ... būv-o te-baig-ęs*
 student-NOM.SG AUX-PST RSTR-finish-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
TR-IS J-0 KURS-US ...
 three-ACC.PL 3-GEN.SG.M term-ACC.PL
 ‘... the student ... had finished only three terms <at the university>’ (LKT)

- (31) ... *mokytoj-ui gyven-ti bū-tų*
 teacher-DAT.SG live-INF AUX-SBJ.3
te-lik-ę DIEN-A AR
 RSTR-remain-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M day-NOM.SG or
DVI.
 TWO:NOM.PL.F
 ‘... the teacher would have lived just a day or two more.’
 (LKT)

The only periphrastic form that allows the restrictive prefix to appear only on the auxiliary is the avertive (or, in terms of Mathiasen 1996b, 8–9, ‘thwarted inceptive’) formed by the past auxiliary and the present active participle obligatorily prefixed with *be-*, cf. (32a). The attachment of *te-* to the participle would result in the homonymy of the sequence *te-* + *be-* with the complex continuative prefix *tebe-*, which is presumably the reason why (32b) is ungrammatical. However, it must be noted that (32a) is also marginal: though accepted by some of my consultants, such examples are not found in the corpora.

- (32) a. *Te-buv-a-u be-nuperk-a-nt-i*
 RSTR-AUX-PST-1SG CNT-buy-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F

DUON-os, *kai* *tu* *man*
 bread-GEN.SG when you:NOM I:DAT
paskambin-a-i *ir* *pasak-e-i,* *kad* *reikėj-o*
 call-PST-2SG and say-PST-2SG that need-PST
nupirk-ti *ir* *pien-o.*
 buy-INF and milk-GEN.SG

‘I was going to buy just bread when you called me and told that it was necessary to buy milk, too.’

- b. **Buv-a-u* *te-be-nuperk-a-nt-i*
 AUX-PST-1SG RSTR-CNT-buy-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F
DUON-os...
 bread-GEN.SG
 intended: ‘id.’

The combinatory possibilities of the restrictive *te-*, including its ability to attach both to the auxiliary and to the participle in periphrastic constructions, mirror the similar properties of two other Lithuanian ‘outer’ prefixes, viz. the continuative *tebe-* ‘still’ and the discontinuative *nebe-* ‘no more’ (for details, see Arkadiev 2010a). About the behaviour of *te-* in complex constructions with matrix verbs and infinitives, see section 5.

3. Polyfunctionality of *te-*

The Lithuanian prefix *te-* displays a remarkable degree of polysemy, productively appearing in at least three hardly interrelated functions. In addition to the restrictive use focused upon in this study, *te-* also participates in the formation of the permissive (or ‘3rd person imperative’, see Ambrazas, ed., 1997, 261) mood, and in the formation of the continuative aspectual forms. This proliferation of meanings associated with a single prefix potentially gives rise to ambiguity, which is resolved by imposing constraints on the interpretations of various verbal forms containing *te-*.

In the continuative forms *te-* serves as a semantically bleached, almost obligatory component of the complex prefix *tebe-*, opposed to the negative version of the continuative *nebe-*, cf. *tebe-gyvena* ‘is still living’ vs. *nebe-gyvena* ‘is no longer living’. However, continuative

forms like *be-gyvena* are still, though rarely, attested⁸, cf. (33a), so the sequence like *te-be-gyvena* could, in principle, be interpreted as ‘only continue to live’. Nevertheless, such interpretations are consistently ruled out, cf. (33b), due to the homonymy with the much more frequent continuative *tebe-*.

- (33) a. *Dabar tik 30 karaim-ų be-gyven-a*
 now only 30 Karaim-GEN.PL CNT-live-PRS
Panevėž-yje...
 P.-LOC.SG
 ‘Now only 30 Karaims still live in Panevėžys.’ (LKT)
- b. *Dabar 30 karaim-ų te-be-gyven-a Panevėž-yje.*
 now 30 Karaim-GEN.PL te-CNT-live-PRS P.-LOC.SG
 ‘Now (*only) 30 Karaims still live in Panevėžys.’

In other instances, for example in the periphrastic avertive construction, as we have seen above, the combination of *te-* and *be-* is prohibited altogether, for the reason that this sequence can only be interpreted as a continuative form of the present active participle, which does not co-occur with the auxiliary in Lithuanian. The combination of the restrictive *te-* with the continuative *tebe-* (**te-tebe-*) is also ungrammatical.

Let us now turn to the permissive. This mood in contemporary Lithuanian is normally formed by prefixation of *te-* to the 3rd person forms of present or future, thus *terašo, terašys* ‘let him/her/them/write’ (Ambrasas, ed., 1997, 261). Hence, sentences like (34) are interpreted as permissive rather than restrictive. However, the possibility of confusion of the restrictive with the permissive exists only in these cells of the tense-person paradigm. Indeed, the 3rd person preterite *terašė* ‘te + wrote’ can only involve the restrictive, not the permissive, and the same is true of non-3rd person forms of the present and future tenses.

- (34) *K-as nor-i, te-augin-a avokad-us,*
 who-NOM.SG want-PRS PRM-grow-PRS avocado-ACC.PL
citrin-as, melion-us...!
 lemon-ACC.PL melon-ACC.PL

⁸ Cf. the ratio of *begyvena* vs. *tebegyvena* in LKT: 13 vs. 325 occurrences.

‘Let those who wish it grow avocados, lemons, melons...!’ /
 *‘Those who wish only grow avocados, lemons, melons...’
 (LKT)

However, the interpretation of the combination *te-* + 3rd person present largely depends on the context rather than being strictly grammatically predetermined. Beside unambiguous permissive examples like (34) one finds sentences like (35), which, though containing the 3rd person present form, can be understood only as involving the restrictive. Finally, genuinely ambiguous sentences can also be found, cf. (36).

(35) ... *čigon-u vaik-ai mokykl-ose ne-užsibūn-a,*
 gipsy-GEN.PL child-NOM.PL school-LOC.PL NEG-stay.long-PRS
te-baigi-a 5-6 KLAS-ES.
 RSTR-finish-PRS 5-6 grade-ACC.PL
 ‘Gipsy children do not stay at school for long, they finish
 just 5-6 grades.’ (LKT)

(36) *Te-myl-i tai mano šird-is, te-byloj-a*
te-love-PRS this my heart-NOM.SG te-talk-PRS
apie tai mano burn-a.
 about this my mouth-NOM.SG
 ‘Let my heart love it, let my mouth speak about it’ / ‘My
 heart only loves it, my mouth only speaks about it.’ (LKT)

It seems that 3rd person present forms of stative and modal verbs such as *galėti* ‘can, be able’, *norėti* ‘want’, *turėti* ‘have; must’ especially favour the restrictive interpretation of *te-* over the permissive one, cf. (37)–(40). For these three verbs, it is even hard to come by examples of the permissive reading⁹.

(37) *Ties-a te-gal-i bū-ti VIEN-A.*
 truth-NOM.SG RSTR-CAN-PRS be-INF one-NOM.SG
 ‘There can be only one truth.’ (LKT)

⁹ However, as Rolandas Mikulskas pointed out to me, permissive meanings are certainly not altogether banned with these verbs, cf. *Vaikas nori ledų / pasivažinėti dviračiu. — Tenori, neleisiu!* ‘The child wants ice-cream / to ride the bicycle. — Let him want, I won’t allow that!’. However, such examples are definitely rare and require special context for their use.

- (38) *J-is sak-ė, kad po ilg-o ir*
 3-NOM.SG.M say-PST that after long-GEN.SG.M and
varginanči-o važiavim-o te-nor-i
 exhausting-GEN.SG.M journey-GEN.SG RSTR-want-PRS
IŠSIMIEGO-TI.
 have.a.good.sleep-INF
 ‘He said that after a long and exhausting journey he wanted
 nothing but a good sleep.’ (LKT)
- (39) *Žirg-as KETURI-AS KOJ-AS te-tur-i!*
 horse-NOM.SG four-ACC.PL.F leg-ACC.PL RSTR-have-PRS
 ‘A horse has only four legs!’ (LKT)
- (40) ... *šiandien mu-ms te-tur-i rūpė-ti*
 today WE-DAT RSTR-MUST-PRS CONCERN-INF
VIEN-AS KLAUSIM-AS...
 one-NOM.SG question-NOM.SG
 ‘... only one question should concern us today...’ (LKT)

The 3rd person present forms of other stative verbs such as *matyti* ‘see’, *girdėti* ‘hear’ or *žinoti* ‘know’ are found in both permissive and restrictive contexts, however, the distribution is very uneven: of 18 occurrences of *tegirdi* attested in LKT, only 4 displayed the permissive; for *temato* the figures are 7 out of 60, and for *težino* 5 out of 175. By contrast, with dynamic verbs the ratio of restrictive vs. permissive uses is the opposite; e.g. for *ateiti* ‘come’: 16 permissive examples out of 24 unambiguous occurrences.

In addition to this, it must be acknowledged that in actual usage the permissive is only rarely (if at all) based on the future tense, and consequently the combinations of *te-* with the 3rd person future can very well yield the restrictive meaning, cf. (41).

- (41) ... *prognozuoj-a-m-a, kad 2020 met-ais Europ-os*
 predict-PRS-PP-PRED that 2020 year-INS.PL Europe-GEN.SG
gyventoj-ai te-sudary-s 7 PROC.
 inhabitant-NOM.PL RSTR-constitute-FUT 7 %
PASAULI-O GYVENTOJ-U.
 world-GEN.SG inhabitant-GEN.PL
 ‘It is predicted that by 2020 inhabitants of Europe will
 constitute just 7 % of the world’s population.’ (LKT)

However, in appropriate contexts even 1st person future forms prefixed with *te-* can get permissive readings, cf. (42). By contrast, with the 1st person present forms such interpretations are absent.

- (42) *Sulauž-ęs* *ši-q* *priesaik-q,*
 break-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M this-ACC.SG.F oath-ACC.SG
te-bū-si-u *amžinai* *prakeikt-as.*
 PRM-AUX-FUT-1SG forever cursed-NOM.SG.M
 ‘If I break this oath, let me be damned forever.’ (LKT)

A somewhat different picture emerges when the negative prefix *ne-* comes into play. First of all, *ne-* and *te-* always occur in a fixed order, where *te-* comes first, the sequence **ne-te-* being ungrammatical. Second, among the several dozens of different verbal tokens containing the sequence *te-ne-*, only finite present and future 3rd person forms have been found, being always interpreted as permissive ‘let him/her/ them not V’, cf. (43) and (44).

- (43) *Vis-q* *amži-ų* *žen-ki-te* *kartu* —
 all-ACC.SG age-ACC.SG walk-IMP-2PL together
te-ne-skiri-a *jūs-ų* *atstum-ai,*
 PRM-NEG-differ-PRS YOU-GEN.PL distance-NOM.PL
te-ne-atsitink-a *niek-o,* *k-as*
 PRM-NEG-happen-PRS nothing-GEN.SG what-NOM.SG
išskir-tų *jus.*
 divide-SBJ YOU:ACC.PL
 ‘Go together all the time — let your distances not differ, let nothing happen that could divide you.’ (LKT)
- (44) ... *net pat-i* *mirt-is* *te-ne-nugąsdin-s*
 even itself-NOM.SG.F death-NOM.SG PRM-NEG-frighten-FUT
jūs-ų.
 YOU-GEN.PL
 ‘Let even death itself not frighten you.’ (LKT)

The only attested example of a non-3rd person form combined with *te-ne-* also exhibits a permissive reading:

- (45) *Te-ne-bū-si-u* *klaidingai*
 PRM-NEG-AUX-FUT-1SG erroneously

supras-t-a...
 understand-PST.PP-NOM.SG.F
 ‘Let me not be misunderstood.’ (LKT)

Infrequent combinations of *te-* with the discontinuative *nebe-* also yield a permissive interpretation:

(46) ... *te-ne-be-nor-i* *daugiau niek-o...*
 PRM-NEG-CNT-want-PRS more nothing-GEN.SG
 ‘... let him no longer wish anything...’ (LKT)

Thus, the restrictive *te-* cannot be combined with negation, cf. the ungrammatical (47a). The reason for this restriction is unclear; it definitely has nothing to do with the semantic incompatibility of the negation with the restrictive, since sentences like (47b) are perfectly acceptable. The order of the restrictive and the negative prefixes in (47a) reflects their would-be mutual scope (restrictive > negation), so the ban on such combinations is not due to the conflict of the rigid prefix ordering and semantic scope, either.

(47) a. **Te-ne-atėj-o* *PRAN-AS.*
 RSTR-NEG-COME-PST P.-NOM.SG
 intended: ‘Only Pranas did not come.’
 b. *Ne-atėj-o* *tik* *PRAN-AS.*
 NEG-COME-PST only P.-NOM.SG
 ‘id.’

To conclude this section, I would like to observe that the Lithuanian prefix *te-* exhibits somewhat contradictory characteristics: on the one hand, it has functions which can be safely treated as synchronically unrelated¹⁰ and, moreover, are in principle not mutually exclusive from a purely semantic point of view. Indeed, nothing prevents such a sentence as (i) ‘Let him love only his wife’, which involves both the restrictive and the permissive, or (ii) ‘He still loved only his wife’,

¹⁰ Whether different uses of *te-* are in any way related diachronically, is an unresolved issue; the existing etymologies of both restrictive and permissive *te-* (see Fraenkel 1965, 1071 and Zinkevičius 1981, 198) are speculative and hardly plausible from the semantic point of view. Ostrowski (2010) convincingly argues that *te-* in *tebe-* goes back to an emphatic use of a deictic element meaning ‘here’, but it is hardly possible to advocate the same source for other uses of *te-*.

with restrictive in the scope of the continuative. On the other hand, for some purely morphological reasons, all these different meanings compete for a single exponent, viz. prefix *te-*, which shows identical morphosyntactic behaviour when used in any of its different functions. It is not surprising, therefore, that *te-* can appear in the verbal form only once and in a position fixed with respect to other prefixes, and that, consequently, meanings such as (i) and (ii) above cannot be expressed in the verb simultaneously. However, certain restrictions, such as the ungrammaticality of the combination of the restrictive *te-* with negation in the preterite, look unmotivated even from the morphological point of view. Such constraints, for the lack of further data which might shed more light on them, so far admit only of being registered in a comprehensive description of Lithuanian, not of being explained.

4. Scope of the restrictive *te-*

From the point of view of structuralist logic, which regards language as a system of well-defined oppositions, if a language possesses two synonymous morphemes expressing the restrictive meaning ‘only’, one of which attaches exclusively to verbs while the other can co-occur with any kind of constituent, we would expect these two morphemes to exhibit a distribution close to complementary, and their scope to mirror their combinatory possibilities. In other words, it would be ‘natural’ if the Lithuanian prefixal restrictive *te-* had been used only in those cases where the scope of ‘only’ included the verb, whereas the particle *tik* had been able to take scope over any other kind of constituent.

This, however, is not at all the case. As the numerous examples given above, as well as those presented and discussed below, show, the scope of *te-* is by no means restricted to the verb or to the verb phrase. Moreover, *te-* actually quite rarely takes the verb in its scope. Thus, out of 30 occurrences of the restrictive *te-* in Vincas Mykolaitis-Putinas’ novel *Altoriaų šešėly* (hereafter MPA)¹¹, only two show the narrow scope of *te-* limited to the verb. In all other 28 occurrences, *te-* takes scope elsewhere. Below I will discuss the scope possibilities of *te-* in more

¹¹ Electronic version available at <http://www.antologija.lt/texts/37/turinys.html>.

detail, basing my account on both corpus and elicited data. However, I will not be able to say anything conclusive on the issue of the distribution of the two means of expressing restrictivity in Lithuanian, viz. the prefix *te-* and the particle *tik* and its kin. Suffice it to say that, on the one hand, in the contexts where for morphological reasons the restrictive *te-* is not available, the restrictive meaning is taken over by *tik*, while, on the other hand, in contexts where *te-* is possible, *tik* is not excluded, either. Moreover, the two may and often do co-occur (see below). Thus it does not seem that there is any linguistically interesting distribution of *te-* and *tik* over different contexts, except that *tik* is much more frequent (to give a single example, while in the whole novel *Altorių šešėly* the restrictive *te-* is attested just 30 times, the same number of occurrences of the particle *tik* is found in a just couple of its initial chapters).

The scopal possibilities of the restrictive *te-* seem to be virtually unconstrained, at least as regards the major sentence constituents. The prefix can take scope over the subject, both intransitive (48), (49) and transitive (50), (51). As the comparison of (48) with (49) and (50) with (51) shows, both preverbal and postverbal subjects can fall into the scope of the restrictive.

- (48) *Te-atėj-o* *JON-AS*.
 RSTR-COME-PST J.-NOM.SG
 ‘Only Jonas came.’
- (49) ... *plotel-yje*, *kur* *TR-YS* *RIEŠ-O*
 small.space-LOC.SG where three-NOM.PL.M wrist-GEN
STORUM-O *BERŽELI-AI* *te-aug-o*.
 thickness-GEN.SG birch-NOM.PL RSTR-grow-PST
 ‘... on a patch of land where only three wrist-thick birch-trees
 grew.’ (LKT)
- (50) ... *o kit-q* *vard-q* *te-žin-o*
 and other-ACC.SG name-ACC.SG RSTR-know-PRS
ARTIM-IAUS-I *J-OS* *ŽMON-ĖS*.
 close-SUP-NOM.PL.M 3-GEN.SG people-NOM.PL
 ‘... and the other name is known only to her closest friends.’
 (LKT)

- (51) *J-is* *VIEN-AS* *te-žin-o,* *k-o*
 3-NOM.SG.M one-NOM.SG.M RSTR-know-PRS what-GEN.SG
mu-ms *reiki-a.*
 we-DAT need-PRS
 ‘Only he knows what we need.’ (LKT)

Besides the subject, *te-* can take scope over the direct (52), (53) and various types of indirect objects (54)–(56).

- (52) *Aš* *SAVO* *žMON-Ń* *te-myl-i-u.*
 I:NOM own wife-ACC.SG RSTR-love-PRS-1SG
 ‘I love only my own wife.’
- (53) ... *dr. Pavalki-ui,* *kur-is* *man* *te-duo-dav-o*
 dr. P.-DAT.SG who-NOM.SG.M I:DAT RSTR-give-HAB-PST
10 KAPEIK-Ů
 10 copeck-GEN.PL
 ‘... to Dr. Pavalkis, who would only give me 10 copecks.’
 (LKT)
- (54) *Karinink-as,* *atrod-o,* *T-o*
 military.officer-NOM.SG seem-PRS that-GEN.SG.M
te-lauk-ė.
 RSTR-wait-PST
 ‘It seems that the officer was waiting just for that.’ (LKT)
- (55) *Kaz-ys* *gimim-o* *dien-os* *prog-a*
 K.-NOM.SG birth-GEN.SG day-GEN.SG occasion-INS.SG
gėli-Ů *te-dovanoj-o* *SAVO* *žMON-AI.*
 flower-GEN.PL RSTR-give-PST own wife-DAT.SG
 ‘Kazys gave flowers only to his own wife as a birthday present.’
- (56) *T-q* *vakar-q* *klierik-ai* *tik*
 that-ACC.SG evening-ACC.SG seminarian-NOM.PL only
ir te-kalbėj-o *VIEN* *APIE* *BŪSIM-UOSIUS*
 and RSTR-talk-PST solely about future-ACC.PL.M.DEF
šVENTIM-US *IR* *APIE* *KANDIDAT-US* *Į*
 ordainment-ACC.PL and about candidate-ACC.PL in
SUBDIAKON-US.
 subdeacon-ACC.PL

‘That evening, the students of the seminary talked about nothing but the future ordainments and the candidates for the subdeaconate.’ (MPA, I:23)

In addition to arguments, the restrictive *te-* can take scope over various adjuncts, such as locative (57), manner (58), degree (59) or temporal (60), (61) adverbials.

(57) *Šit-a knyga 10 lit-ų te-kainav-o*
 this-NOM.SG.F book-NOM.SG 10 litas-GEN.PL RSTR-COST-PST
MŪS-Ų KNYGYN-E.
 we-GEN.PL bookstore-LOC. SG
 ‘This book cost 10 litas only in our shop.’

(58) ... *klebon-as į tai te-atsiliep-dav-o VIEN-U*
 dean-NOM.SG in this RSTR-ANSWER-HAB-PST ONE-INS.SG.M
KIT-U ŽODŽI-U ...
 other-INS.SG.M word-INS.SG
 ‘The dean used to answer to this in just a few words.’
 (MPA, II:13)

(59) *Sen-osiose lietuvi-ų kalb-os*
 old-LOC.PL.F.DEF Lithuanian-GEN.PL language-GEN.SG
gramatik-ose veiksmažodži-ų priešdėli-ų
 grammar-LOC.PL verb-GEN.PL prefix-GEN.PL
klausim-ui dar LABAI NEDAUG te-kalb-a-m-a.
 question-DAT.SG still very little RSTR-talk-PRS-PP-PRED
 ‘In the old grammars of Lithuanian, the problem of verbal prefixes is discussed only a little.’ (Paulauskas 1958, 306)

(60) *Aš tav-e pirm-ą syk-į te-mat-a-u.*
 I:NOM you-ACC.SG first-ACC.SG time-ACC.SG RSTR-see-PRS-1SG
 ‘I see you only for the first time.’ (LKT)

(61) *Jon-as te-atvažiav-o į Kopenhag-ą po DVIEJ-Ų*
 J.-NOM.SG RSTR-arrive-PST in K.-ACC.SG after two-GEN
DIEN-Ų.
 day-GEN.PL
 ‘Jonas arrived in Copenhagen only two days later.’

Predicate nominals (62) and secondary predicates (63) can also fall in the scope of the restrictive prefix:

- (62) *Gal visk-as te-buv-o BAIS-US*
 maybe all-NOM.SG RSTR-be-PST terrible-NOM.SG.M
SAPN-AS...
 dream-NOM.SG
 ‘Maybe all this was just a terrible dream...’ (LKT)
- (63) ... *kad j-is džiaug-ti-s te-gal-i*
 that 3-NOM.SG.M rejoice-INF-RFL RSTR-can-PRS
VIEN-AS...
 one-NOM.SG.M
 ‘... that he can rejoice only alone’ (MPA, III:3)

Besides nominal and adverbial constituents, *te-* can take scope over phrases headed by verbs, such as infinitive complement clauses (64), participial adjunct clauses (65), finite clauses introduced by complementizers (66) and even direct speech (67).

- (64) *J-os te-gal-i ŽAIS-TI MEIL-E...*
 3-NOM.PL.F RSTR-can-PRS play-INF love-INS.SG
 ‘They can only play with love.’ (MPA, II:15)
- (65) ... *džiaug-ti-s ir bŭ-ti laiming-am*
 rejoice-INF-RFL and be-INF happy-DAT.SG.M
mini-oj te-gal-i-m-a DALIN-A-NT-IS
 crowd-LOC.SG RSTR-can-PRS-PP-PRED share-PRS-PA-RFL
SAVO DŽIAUGSM-U SU ARTIM-U ŽMOG-UM.
 own joy-INS.SG with near-INS.SG.M man-INS.SG
 ‘... in a crowd it is possible to rejoice and be happy only sharing one’s joy with one’s neighbour.’ (MPA, III:12)
- (66) ... *o kit-i te-myl-i tik sav-e ir*
 and other-NOM.PL.M RSTR-love-PRS only self-ACC and
te-nor-i, KAD VIS-I J-UOS
 RSTR-want-PRS that all-NOM.PL.M 3-ACC.PL.M
*TE-MYLĒ-TŪ.*¹²
 RSTR-love-SBJ.3
 ‘... and others love only themselves and only want that everyone loved just them.’ (LKT)

¹² This example is remarkable in that the subordinate clause falling in the scope of the restrictive on the matrix verb (*tenori*) itself contains a prefixal restrictive construction (*JUOS temylėtu*).

- (67) ... *beveik maldaujanči-u bals-u vos*
 almost imploring-INS.SG.M voice-INS.SG hardly
te-galėj-o ištar-ti:
 RSTR-CAN-PST utter-INF
 — *Kaip ne! Aš žin-a-u, kad panel-ė*
 how not I:NOM know-PRS-1SG that young.lady-NOM.SG
liuc-ė...
 L.-NOM.SG
 ‘... with an almost imploring voice he could hardly utter just:
 But why not?! I know that Miss Lucy...’ (MPA, I:7)

To summarize so far, the restrictive *te-* behaves like an operator able to take into its scope any constituent of the clause headed by the verb *te-* attaches to, much like other kinds of adverbial or ‘unselective’ quantificational elements occurring in different languages (see e.g. Partee 1995)¹³. In this respect *te-* is similar to the English verb-adjacent *only* as analysed by Rooth (1985; 1992) and Bonomi & Casalegno (1993), or to the Mandarin Chinese *zhi* discussed in section 1. As to the verbal prefix *-djal-* in Bininj Gun-Wok, also already mentioned in section 1, which is similar to Lithuanian *te-* from the morphological point of view (both are bound morphemes, moreover, both are prefixes), there is an important difference between the two. As is shown by Evans (1995), the Bininj Gun-wok *-djal-* can take in its scope not only free overt constituents, cf. (9) above and (68), but also verb-internal constituents, such as pronominal prefixes and incorporated nominal roots, cf. (69).

- (68) *NA-MEGE BININJ ga-djal-murrng-yo.* Bininj Gun-wok
 CL-that man 3SB-RSTR-bone-lie:NPST
 ‘Only the man’s bones remain.’ (Evans 1995, 255)
- (69) *Ga-bi-djal-ganj-wo-n.* Bininj Gun-wok
 3SB-3OB-RSTR-meat-give-NPST
 i. ‘Only she gives him meat.’
 ii. ‘She gives him only meat.’
 iii. ‘She gives meat only to him.’ (ibid., 252)

¹³ Strictly speaking, Lithuanian restrictive *te-* is not ‘unselective’ in the original sense of Lewis (1975), since it does not “bind all the variables in its scope indiscriminately”, but rather is free in selecting a single constituent it applies to.

polarity items pattern similarly in Lithuanian, being able to appear in the subject position, cf. (73a,b).

- (73) a. *Jon-as niek-o ne-mat-ė.*
 J.-NOM.SG nobody-GEN.SG NEG-SEE-PST
 ‘Jonas didn’t see anybody/anything.’
- b. *Niek-as ne-mat-ė Jon-o.*
 nobody-NOM.SG NEG-SEE-PST J.-GEN.SG
 ‘Nobody saw Jonas.’

When we now proceed from the question about possible scope interpretations of *te-* to the question of rules governing its scope assignment, it turns out that nothing really conclusive can be said on the latter subject so far, except for the following rather preliminary remarks.

First of all, it must be stressed that given a sentence with several constituents, the prefixal restrictive can take scope over any of them; thus, strictly speaking, almost any sentence with *te-* is potentially ambiguous, cf. (74) with at least five theoretically possible interpretations.

- (74) *Kaz-ys te-dovanoj-o mergait-ėms knyg-as.*
 K.-NOM.SG RSTR-give-PST girl-DAT.PL book-ACC.PL
- i. ‘Only Kazys gave books to girls.’
 - ii. ‘Kazys only gave books to girls <and not sold flowers to boys>.’
 - iii. ‘Kazys gave books only to girls <and not to boys>.’
 - iv. ‘Kazys gave girls only books <and not flowers>.’
 - v. ‘Kazys only gave books to girls <and not sold books to girls>.’

However, there certainly exist various clues which in most cases allow to determine the scope of *te-* unambiguously. Since the scope of restrictive is associated with focus, some of these clues must be those mechanisms which serve to mark focus in Lithuanian, i.e. intonation and word order. Unfortunately, this domain of Lithuanian syntax remains virtually unexplored, so I am not able to base my conclusions on any pre-established generalizations about the relation between word order, intonation and information structure in Lithuanian. Nevertheless, even the scarce data I possess allows me to make at least the following two claims.

First, intonation definitely plays a role in scope assignment of the restrictive prefix. When asked to interpret sentences like (74) above, my consultants informed me that the interpretation would differ depending on where the primary stress of the sentence falls, and that it is the stressed constituent¹⁴ which forms the scope of *te-*. This observation, however, is not always very helpful, especially for a study largely based on the data from written sources where intonation is not overtly marked.

Second, word order is important for the determination of the scope of *te-*, too, though in a way definitely much less straightforward than intonation. To begin with, confronted with identical sentences, my consultants did not always agree with each other about which interpretation is preferable. One of them tended to assign the scope of the restrictive to the immediately postverbal constituent, while others did not show such a restriction. The analysis of the corpus data is also not very conclusive. Thus, in MPA, of the 28 examples of the prefixal restrictive taking scope “outside” of the verb, in 18 the focused constituent was verb-adjacent; however, among the 10 instances of non-verb-adjacent focus, 9 are constituted by sentences involving the modal verb *galėti* ‘can’, which, together with other modal verbs, tends to ‘attract’ the restrictive (see section 5). Among the 18 instances of verb-adjacent focus, there are 7 examples of preverbal and 11 examples of postverbal scope of *te-*, which does not seem to be a statistically significant difference, if it is possible to speak about statistical significance in such a small corpus at all¹⁵. The only conclusion which I am able to draw from this and other available data is that there is indeed quite a strong tendency to put the constituent in scope of *te-* immediately before or after the verb (more precisely, before or after the complex

¹⁴ Actually, things are much more complicated here, since it is single words, not entire constituents that receive stress. The rules determining the choice of the word bearing primary stress when a larger string is in focus are yet to be discovered for Lithuanian.

¹⁵ In the other text which I specifically searched for the restrictive *te-*, the article Paulauskas 1958, I could find only 26 examples thereof, and considering the scientific nature of this text and the fact that many examples are actually different tokens of identical or very similar sentences, the number of independent examples is even less. However, it can be observed that Paulauskas is much more consistent in putting the focus immediately before or after the verb than Mykolaitis-Putinas: there is not a single example of the scope of *te-* being assigned to a non-verb-adjacent constituent.

auxiliary/modal + lexical verb), but that this tendency is not a rigid grammatical constraint.

Two other clues which help to establish the scope of the restrictive prefix have to do with the lexicon rather than with syntax. One of them is related to the fact that restrictive elements interact with scalar implicatures generated by lexical items with the meaning of quantity or degree (König 1991, 37–42, 95–96), excluding in particular the higher members of the relevant scale. Thus, a sentence like (75) presupposes a scale of natural numbers and explicitly denies that John ate more apples than three.

(75) *John **only** ate THREE apples.* English

Therefore it is not surprising that in discourse there appears to be a particularly strong association of *te-* with lexical items denoting a low degree (*mažai* ‘a little’, *nedaug* ‘not much’, *menkai* ‘weakly’, *retai* ‘seldom’) or a small quantity (especially *vienas* ‘one’)¹⁶, so that if a sentence with the verb prefixed with *te-* contains any of such words, there is a very high probability that they would fall in the scope of *te-*.

The last formal means of establishing the scope of the Lithuanian prefixal restrictive, definitely not unrelated to its association with the expressions of low degree, is the aforementioned ‘pleonastic’ use of the restrictive particles *tik*, *tiktai* and *vien* together with *te-*. This has been already shown in several of the examples above, cf. also (76) and (77).

(76) *Vis-i* *j-ie* *te-mokėj-o* *tik*
all-NOM.PL.M 3-NOM.PL.M RSTR-be.able-PST only
LIETUVIŠK-AI.
Lithuanian-ADV
‘All of them knew only Lithuanian.’ (LKT)

(77) ... *dar tik* *aštuoni-os* *savait-ės* *te-praėj-o* ...
yet only eight-NOM.PL.F week-NOM.PL RSTR-pass-PST
‘... only eight weeks have passed by now...’ (LKT)

¹⁶ To give just one example, among 30 instances of the form *tepadėjo* ‘only helped’ attested in LKT, 29 involved expressions of low degree.

This ‘doubling’ of restrictives also finds parallels in Bininj Gun-wok, where sentences like (69) can be disambiguated by overt noun phrases suffixed with *-wi* ‘only’ or *-gudji* ‘one’ (Evans 1995, 251–253), cf. (78).

- (78) a. *GUN-WARDDE-wi Ø-djal-wo-n.* Bininj-Gun-wok
 CL-money-RSTR 1SB/2OB-RSTR-give-NPST
 ‘I offer you only money.’ (ibid., 253)
- b. *NA-MEKKE-wi ga-bi-djal-bo-wo-n.*
 CL-that-RSTR 2SB-3OB-RSTR-water-give-NPST
 ‘She gives it <water — P.A. > only to him.’ (ibid.)
- c. *AYE A-DJAL-gudji a-marne-djal-djare.*
 I 1SG-just-one 1SG.SB/3SG.OB-BEN-RSTR-want
 ‘Only I love her/him.’ (ibid., 251)

Not much can be said about the distribution of the ‘simple’ and ‘doubled’ restrictives. As to their relative frequency, in MPA 7 out of 28 examples of *te-* taking scope outside of the verb contain the restrictive particle, and the survey of the more representative LKT creates an impression of a somewhat similar distribution. There do not seem to exist any preferences, let alone grammatical constraints, on the co-occurrence of *tik* and its kin with *te-*, having to do either with the syntactic status or linear position of the focused constituent. It is not the case that *tik* appears in those sentences which otherwise would allow multiple interpretations; for instance, were *tik* omitted from (76) or (77), these sentences would hardly become ambiguous. Also, it is possible to find examples differing only in the presence vs. absence of *tik*, cf. (79a,b).

- (79) a. ...*su veiksmažodži-ais, atskirai be priešdėli-ų*
 with verb-INS.PL separately without prefix-GEN.PL
ne-vartoj-a-m-ais ar tik LABAI RETAI
 NEG-USE-PRS-PP-INS.PL.M or only very rarely
te-vartoj-a-m-ais.
 RSTR-USE-PRS-PP-INS.PL.M
 ‘with verbs which are not or only very rarely used without prefixes’ (Paulauskas 1958, 348)
- b. ... *kamien-ai, kur-ie be priešdėli-o*
 stem-NOM.PL which-NOM.PL.M without prefix-GEN.SG
RETAI te-vartoj-a-m-i ar vis-ai
 rarely RSTR-USE-PRS-PP-NOM.PL or all-ADV

ne-vartoj-a-m-i ...

NEG-USE-PRS-PP-NOM.PL.M

‘... stems which are only rarely or not at all used without prefixes’ (ibid., 313)

To conclude this section, the Lithuanian restrictive prefix *te-* behaves as an adverbial quantificational (in a broad understanding of this term, similar to that of Evans 1995) element whose scope assignment is associated with the focused constituent. No rigid grammatical constraints are imposed either on the choice of the restricted element in the sentence, nor on its linear position (though verb-adjacency is preferred to a statistically significant degree). Finally, the constituent in the scope of *te-* can be optionally marked as such by one of the restrictive particles, and again no grammatical constraints regulating this ‘scope marking’ have been detected. In the next section I will discuss some further and particularly intriguing scopal properties of the Lithuanian prefixal restrictive.

5. Embedded scope of *te-* and constituent structure

A remarkable property of the Lithuanian prefixal restrictive is its ability to scope into various kinds of constituents, including embedded non-finite clauses. Among the constituents whose parts can fall into the scope of *te-* are argument NPs (80), infinitival complement clauses (81), (82), and participial complement clauses, both same-subject (nominative-plus-participle) (83), and different-subject (accusative-plus-participle) (84).

- (80) *Te-skait-a-u* [MAIRONI-O *eilėrašči-us*], *kit-ų*
 only-read-PRS-1SG M.-GEN.SG poetry-ACC.PL other-GEN.PL
poet-ų ne-mėg-st-u.
 poet-GEN.PL NEG-like-PRS-1SG
 ‘I read only poetry by Maironis, I don’t like other poets.’

- (81) *Deja, j-is te-mokėj-o* [rašy-ti *tik*
 unfortunately 3-NOM.SG.M RSTR-can-PST write-INF only
PROKLAMACIJ-AS AR KIT-Ą PANAŠI-Ą
 proclamation-ACC.PL or other-ACC.SG similar-ACC.SG.F

“UGNING-A” MEDŽIAG-A...]

fiery-ACC.SG stuff-ACC.SG

‘Unfortunately, the only thing he knew how to write were proclamations and similar “fiery” stuff...’ (LKT)

- (82) *Ši-os scen-os grož-į*
 this-GEN.SG.F scene-GEN.SG beauty-ACC.SG
te-gal-i-m-a [sulygin-ti su GERV-ĖS
 RSTR-CAN-PRS-PP-PRED compare-INF with crane-GEN.SG
SKRYDŽI-U]...
 flight-INS.SG
 ‘The beauty of this scene can be compared only to a crane’s flight...’ (Gintaras Beresnevičius, *Apie pagavimą šnipų* 1998, <http://www.tekstai.lt/tekstai>)

- (83) *Birut-ė te-sak-ė [pamiejoj-us-i PENKI-AS*
 B.-NOM.SG RSTR-say-PST sleep-PST-NOM.SG.F five-ACC.PL.F
VALAND-AS].
 hour-ACC.PL
 ‘Birutė said that she had slept just five hours.’

- (84) *Kaz-ys te-man-ė [Aldon-q j-į myl-i-nt].*
 K.-NOM.SG RSTR-think-PST A.-ACC.SG 3-ACC.SG.M love-PRS-PA
 ‘Kazys thought that only Aldona loves him / that Aldona loves only himself.’

Situations when the restrictive prefix attaches to the matrix verb while taking scope inside of the embedded clause are especially frequent with modal verbs taking infinitival complements. Actually, sentences with *te-* appearing on the infinitive have been judged as ungrammatical by some of my consultants, cf. the contrast in (85a) vs. (85b). Nevertheless, examples like (85b) are actually attested in the corpora, though very rarely, cf. (86), (87).

- (85) a. *Te-turėj-a-u [užmokė-ti DEŠIMT LIT-Ų].*
 RSTR-must-PST-1SG pay-INF ten litas-GEN.PL
 ‘I had to pay only ten litas.’
 b. **Turėj-a-u [te-užmokė-ti DEŠIMT LIT-Ų].*
 must-PST-1SG RSTR-pay-INF ten litas-GEN.PL
 intended: ‘id.’

- (86) *Nor-i-nt-ys ei-ti toki-u keli-u,*
 want-PRS-PA-NOM.PL.M go-INF SUCH-INS.SG.M road-INS.SG
gal-i [NE-TOLI te-nu-ei-ti].
 can-PRS NEG-far RSTR-PVB-go-INF
 ‘Those who want to by go this road can go only not far away.’
 (LKT)
- (87) ... *prietais-as turè-tų [te-sver-ti PUS-Ė*
 device-NOM.SG must-SBJ RSTR-weigh-INF half-ACC.SG
KILOGRAM-O].
 kilogram-GEN.SG
 ‘... the device would have to weigh just half a kilogram.’
 (LKT)

With other matrix verbs, *te-* on the infinitive seems to be more acceptable, cf. the constructed example (88), which was judged as grammatical by the same consultant who had rejected (85b), and the corpus examples (89)–(90).

- (88) *Mokytoj-as leid-o Kazi-ui [te-atsaky-ti I*
 teacher-NOM.SG let-PST K.-DAT.SG RSTR-answer-INF in
DU KLAUSIM-US].
 two question-ACC.PL
 ‘The teacher allowed Kazys to answer just two questions.’¹⁷
- (89) *Taigi įpras-ki-me [... te-turè-ti KELET-Ą*
 so get.used-IMP-1PL RSTR-have-INF several-ACC.SG
VERG-Ų...]
 slave-GEN.PL
 ‘So, let’s get used to ... having only a few slaves...’ (LKT)

¹⁷ As Rolandas Mikulskas pointed out to me, (88) with the restrictive prefix on the embedded verb is natural in the context when the teacher, knowing that Kazys is a good student, permitted him to answer only two questions (out of a larger number of questions). By contrast, a version of (88) with the restrictive prefix on the matrix verb (*teleido ... atsakyti į DU KLAUSIMUS*) is natural in a different context, viz. the one where the teacher got angry with Kazys and let him answer only two questions before dismissing him. Arguably, this difference corresponds to the mutual scope of restrictive and permission; put informally, *leido teatsakyti į DU KLAUSIMUS* means ‘permitted a situation such that [two questions were answered & no more questions were answered]’, whereas *teleido atsakyti į DU KLAUSIMUS* means ‘permitted a situation such that two questions were answered & did not permit a situation such that more questions were answered’. According to Barbara Partee, similar interpretive differences, which are not always easy to capture, can be found in parallel English examples, too.

- (90) *mano mam-a, kuri-ai likim-as*
 my mother-NOM.SG who-DAT.SG.F fate-NOM.SG
lém-é [te-baig-ti 4... mokykl-os klas-es...]
 doom-PST RSTR-finish-INF 4 school-GEN.SG grade-ACC.PL
 ‘my mother, whom fate doomed to finish just four grades at
 school...’ (LKT)

There are certain restrictions on the possibility of *te-* exhibiting embedded scope¹⁸. These restrictions, as it seems, are related to the well-known ‘island constraints’ (Ross 1967/1986)¹⁹. For instance, *te-* cannot be attached to the matrix verb governing two co-ordinated infinitive clauses, if the restricted element is contained in just one of them, cf. (91a,b).

- (91) a. *Bet kodėl objektyvuoj-a-nč-iu žvilgsni-u*
 but why objectivize-PRS-PA-INS.SG.M view-INS.SG
gal-i-me [[daug pamaty-ti] ir [MAŽA
 can-PRS-1PL much see-INF and little
te-supras-ti]]?
 RSTR-understand-INF
 ‘But why does the objectivizing view allow us to see a lot
 and to understand just a little?’ (LKT)
- b. **te-gal-i-me [[daug pamaty-ti] ir [MAŽA*
 RSTR-can-PRS-1PL much see-INF and little
supras-ti]]
 understand-INF
 intended: ‘we can see a lot but understand just a little’

Similarly, the restrictive prefix cannot appear on the matrix verb if the focused element is contained in an adverbial participial clause (adjunct island) (92a,b), in an attributive participial clause (complex NP island) (93a,b), or in a finite clause introduced by a complementizer (94a,b). Examples (92b), (93b), and (94b) are ungrammatical only under the interpretation identical to that of the respective a-examples; with the wide scope of the restrictive prefix, including the whole of the island constituent, these sentences become acceptable.

¹⁸ And anyway it must be acknowledged that embedded scope of *te-* with participial constructions is not accepted by all of my consultants.

¹⁹ See, however, Rooth (1996, Sect. 4.2) on island violations with English *only*.

- (92) a. *gal-i-m-a taip paprastai gyven-ti*, [TIEK NE-DAUG
can-PRS-PP-PRED SO simply live-INF SO NEG-much
te-užim-a-nt pasaul-yje viet-os].
RSTR-occupy-PRS-PA world-LOC.SG place-GEN.SG
'it is possible to live so simply, occupying just so little
space in the world.' (LKT)
- b. **te-galima gyventi* [TIEK NEDAUG užimant vietos]
RSTR-possible to.live so little occupying of.space
intended: 'id.'
- (93) a. ... *prie tėvišk-ės vienkiem-yje gyven-o*
near homeland-GEN.SG farmstead-LOC.SG live-PST
[VIEN RUSIŠK-AI *te-mok-a-nt-i*]
just Russian-ADV RSTR-can-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F
grioviakasi-o Deniso šeim-a.
navvy-GEN.SG D.-GEN.SG family-NOM.SG
'... on a farmstead near their homeland there lived navvy
Denis' family, who understood only Russian' (LKT)
- b. **te-gyveno* [VIEN RUSIŠKAI *mokanti*] *šima*.
RSTR-lived just Russian understanding family
intended: 'there lived a family who understood only Rus-
sian'
- (94) a. *Jurg-is sak-ė*, [kad ALDON-A *te-atėj-o*].
J.-NOM.SG say-PST that A.-NOM.SG RSTR-COME-PST
'Jurgis said that only Aldona had come.'
- b. **Jurg-is te-sak-ė*, [kad ALDON-A *atėj-o*].
J.-NOM.SG RSTR-say-PST that A.-NOM.SG come-PST
intended: 'id.'

It must be noted that with respect to the scope of the restrictive prefix, indicative and subjunctive finite clauses pattern identically, both disallowing the embedded scope, compare (94) with (95)²⁰. This is non-trivial, since only indicative, but not subjunctive clauses are islands with respect to the extraction of question words, cf. (96).

²⁰ One of my consultants judged (95b) acceptable under the relevant reading, but the others did not confirm it, saying that (95b) can only mean 'Jonas wanted nothing but that Aldona would come'.

- (95) a. *Jon-as norėj-o, [kad te-atei-tų ALDON-A].*
 J.-NOM.SG want-PST that RSTR-come-SBJ.3 A.-NOM.SG
 ‘Jonas wanted that only Aldona would come.’
- b. ??*Jon-as te-norėj-o, [kad ateit-tų ALDON-A].*
 J.-NOM.SG RSTR-want-PST that come-SBJ.3 A.-NOM.SG
 intended: ‘id.’
- (96) a. *Kur_i nor-i, [kad j-is —_i sėdė-tų]?*
 where want-PRS.2SG that 3-NOM.SG.M sit-SBJ.3
 ‘Where do you want him to sit?’
- b. **Kur_i sak-e-i, [kad j-is —_i sėdėj-o]?*
 where say-PST.2SG that 3-NOM.SG.M sit-PST
 intended: ‘Where did you say he sat?’

The ability of the restrictive *te-* to scope into non-finite clauses is not an isolated fact. For instance, negation on the matrix verb can license negation-dependent elements in the infinitive clause, such as genitive on the direct object (97a) or negative polarity items (97b).

- (97) a. *Jon-as ne-norėj-o [skaity-ti ši-os knyg-os].*
 J.-NOM.SG NEG-want-PST read-INF this-GEN.SG.F
 book-GEN.SG
 ‘Jonas didn’t want to read this book.’
- b. *Jon-as ne-norėj-o [niek-o skaity-ti]*
 J.-NOM.SG NEG-want-PST nothing-GEN.SG read-INF
 ‘Jonas didn’t want to read anything.’

That negation and the restrictive in Lithuanian are similar in their ability to take scope over the subject (see section 4) and to take embedded scope is probably not accidental, but I won’t pursue this parallelism any further here.

As we have seen, the restrictive prefix on the matrix verb can scope into the embedded non-finite clause. By contrast, *te-* prefixed to the embedded predicate cannot take scope over constituents of the matrix clause, cf. (98) with the infinitive and (99) with the nominative-plus-participle construction.

- (98) a. *Mokytoj-as te-leid-o Kazi-ui [atsaky-ti]*
 teacher-NOM.SG RSTR-let-PST K.-DAT. SG answer-INF

į du klausim-us].

in two question-ACC.PL

‘The teacher let (only) Kazys answer (only) two questions.’

b. *Mokytoj-as leid-o Kazi-ui [te-atsaky-ti į*
teacher-NOM.SG let-PST K.-DAT.SG RSTR-ANSWER-INF in
du klausim-us].

two question-ACC.PL

‘The teacher let (*only) Kazys answer only two questions.’

(99) a. *Birut-ė te-sak-ė [pa-miegoj-us-i*
B.-NOM.SG RSTR-say-PST PVB-sleep-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F
penki-as valand-as].

five-ACC.PL.F hour-ACC.PL

‘(Only) Birutė said that she had slept for (only) five hours.’

b. *Birut-ė sak-ė [te-pa-miegoj-us-i*
B.-NOM.SG say-PST RSTR-PVB-sleep-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F
penki-as valand-as].

five-ACC.PL.F hour-ACC.PL

‘(*Only) Birutė said that she had slept for only five hours.’²¹

In (98) and (99), the a-sentences with the restrictive prefix attached to the matrix verb have (at least potentially) two interpretations, with the restrictive taking scope either over one of the constituents of the matrix clause (the preferable interpretation) or over some constituent in the embedded clause (the less preferred interpretation). By contrast, the b-sentences, where *te-* appears on the embedded non-finite verb, have only the second interpretation, with the restrictive taking scope just in the embedded clause; the readings under which the embedded restrictive takes scope in the matrix clause are categorically rejected by all my consultants.

This property of the Lithuanian restrictive is by itself not at all surprising, since operators in general cannot take scope above their syntactic domain (cf. e.g. Sportiche 2006), but it turns out that it makes the restrictive a valuable diagnostic of syntactic structure in

²¹ This contrast is valid even for those speakers who are reluctant to allow the embedded scope of *te-* in (99a): for them, (99a) can only mean ‘Only Birute said ...’, while (99b) cannot have such an interpretation.

those instances where other evidence is inconclusive. In particular, the behaviour of *te-* helps to determine whether the accusative noun phrase belongs to the matrix or to the embedded clause in the accusative-plus-participle clausal complement constructions. As I argue in Arkadiev (2010b), there are actually two kinds of accusative-plus-participle construction in Lithuanian, which, though superficially very similar, exhibit fairly divergent syntactic properties. The constructions of the first type occur mainly with perception verbs and involve an accusative direct object of the matrix verb controlling the null subject of the participle. In the other type, found with verbs of speech and thought, the accusative NP belongs to the embedded clause. The evidence for this dichotomy and in particular for the different constituent structure is manifold, and among the various tests is the one involving the scope of the restrictive.

When the restrictive prefix is attached to the matrix verb (100), there is no difference between the two constructions: in both of them, *te-* can take the accusative NP in its scope²². By contrast, when *te-* surfaces on the participle (101), the accusative NP can fall into the scope of restriction only in the construction with verbs of speech (101a), not in the construction with perception verbs (101a). This, together with such evidence as, for instance, adverb placement, indicates that only in the latter, but not in the former, construction, the accusative NP is located inside the participial clause²³.

- (100) a. *Te-mač-ia-u* *JON-Ā* *atėj-us*.
 RSTR-SEE-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG come-PST.PA
 ‘I saw that only John come.’
- b. *Te-sak-ia-u* *JON-Ā* *atėj-us*.
 RSTR-SAY-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG come-PST.PA
 ‘I said that only John had come.’

²² For those speakers who disallow the embedded scope of *te-* in participial constructions, (100b) is ungrammatical.

²³ Some speakers, however, do not reject (101a); as Rolandas Mikulskas pointed out to me, this, together with the felicitous (100a), suggests that the accusative NP with perception verbs somehow belongs both to the matrix and to the embedded clauses simultaneously (see also Holvoet & Judžentis 2003, 144 on the possible structural ambiguity of these constructions). Since some of these speakers reject (100b), the syntactic contrast between accusative-plus-participle constructions embedded under perception verbs vs. cognition verbs is relevant for them, too.

- (101) a. ??*Mač-ia-u* *JON-Ą* [*te-atėj-us*].
 see-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG RSTR-COME-PST.PA
 intended: ‘= 100a’
- b. *Sak-ia-u* [*JON-Ą* *te-atėj-us*].
 say-PST-1SG J.-ACC.SG RSTR-COME-PST.PA
 ‘= 100b’

6. Conclusions

In this paper I have presented the first detailed description of the Lithuanian restrictive prefix *te-*, looking upon it from a typologically and theoretically oriented perspective. Let me briefly summarize my findings.

1. From the point of view of morphology, *te-* belongs to the class of the “outer” prefixes in Lithuanian, attaching to the left of the “inner” (aspectual) prefixes, and sharing with the latter the ability to trigger the displacement of the reflexive morpheme.

2. From the point of view of its combinatory possibilities, *te-* shows few restrictions, being able to attach to different finite and non-finite verbal forms; in periphrastic forms, with the exception of the avertive, *te-* can attach both to the auxiliary and to the non-finite (participial) form.

3. The Lithuanian prefix in question is remarkably polyfunctional; it is shown that in some cases (combinations with the prefix *be-*) this polyfunctionality leads to the grammatical ban on the expression of the restrictive meaning, while in other cases (combinations with the present and future 3rd person forms) the polyfunctionality is resolved only by context, potentially leading to a restrictive/permissive ambiguity.

4. The Lithuanian prefixal restrictive is an ‘adverbial’ quantificational element whose scope assignment in the clause is sensitive to the focus structure of the sentence, but is not restricted by any rigid grammatical constraints. All kinds of the major sentence constituents, including subject, direct and indirect objects, and adverbials of different kinds, can fall into the scope of *te-*.

5. The prefix in question is not the only and even not the most common means of expression of restrictivity in Lithuanian. It is used on a par with the particles *tik*, *tiktai*, and *vien*, which appear to the left of the constituent in their scope. There is no ban on the simultaneous

use of both *te-* and one of these particles reinforcing each other in one and the same sentence.

6. One of the noteworthy properties of *te-* is its ability, when attached to a superordinate verb, to scope into constituents of different kinds, including non-finite subordinate clauses. However, *te-* prefixed to a subordinate verb cannot take scope in the ‘upstairs’ clause, which makes the restrictive prefix a valuable diagnostic of constituent structure.

7. From the cross-linguistic point of view, the Lithuanian restrictive prefix belongs to a fairly widespread class of verb-adjacent restrictive elements without a fixed position with respect to the constituent in its scope. At the same time, being a morphologically bound element, *te-* finds very few direct counterparts in the languages of the world. Its closest kin is so far found in the North Australian language Bininj Gun-wok (Evans 1995), where the verbal prefix *-djal-* ‘just, only’ can also take scope over various clausal elements. It must be also stressed that no direct or indirect counterparts of the Lithuanian prefixal restrictive are found in the closest neighbouring languages.

To conclude, I hope that the empirical data presented in this paper will be useful not only for a fuller description and deeper understanding of verbal categories, morphosyntax and syntax-semantics interface in Lithuanian, but also for a broader conception of restrictivity and focus-related phenomena in general.

Peter M. Arkadiev

Institute of Slavic Studies

Russian Academy of Sciences

Leninskij prospekt 32-A, RU-117334 Moscow

peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

http://www.inslav.ru/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=279

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC — accusative, ADV — adverbial, AUX — auxiliary, BEN — benefactive, CL — noun class marker, CNT — continuative, CNV — converb, COMP — comparative, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, F — feminine, FUT — future, GEN — genitive, HAB — habitual, IMP — imperative, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, LOC — locative, M — masculine, NEG — negation, NML — nominalization, NOM — nominative, NPST —

non-past, OB — object, PA — active participle, PL — plural, PP — passive participle, PRED — predicative, PRM — permissive, PRS — present, PST — past, PVB — preverb, RFL — reflexive, RSTR — restrictive, SB — subject, SBJ — subjunctive, SG — singular, SUP — superlative, TOP — topic, VOC — vocative

REFERENCES

- ALPATOV, VLADIMIR M., PETER M. ARKADIEV & VERA I. PODLESKAYA. 2008. *Teoretičeskaja grammatika japonskogo jazyka* [Theoretical Grammar of Japanese]. Vols. 1–2. Moscow: Natalis.
- AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS, ed. 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- ARKADIEV, PETER M. 2010a. Notes on Avertive and Continuative in Lithuanian. Submitted to *Cahiers Chronos*.
- ARKADIEV, PETER M. 2010b. Participial complementation in Lithuanian. To appear in Volker Gast & Holger Diessel, eds., *Clause Combining in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- BACH, EMMON, ELOISE JELINEK, ANGELIKA KRATZER & BARBARA H. PARTEE, eds. 1995. *Quantification in Natural Languages*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- BONOMI, ANDREA & PAOLO CASALEGNO. 1993. Only: Association with focus in event semantics. *Natural Language Semantics* 2, 1–45.
- CHICOUENE, MICHEL & LAURYNAS-ALGIMANTAS SKŪPAS. 2003. *Parlons lituanien, une langue balte*. 2ème éd. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- COLE, PETER. 1985. *Imbabura Quechua*. London: Croom Helm.
- DRYER, MATTHEW. 1994. The pragmatics of focus-association with *only*. Paper presented at the *LSA annual meeting* (<http://linguistics.buffalo.edu/people/faculty/dryer/dryer/papers>).
- ERTESCHIK-SHIR, NOMI. 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus-Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- EVANS, NICHOLAS. 1995. A-quantifiers and scope in Mayali. In: Bach *et al.*, eds., 1995, 207–270.
- FRAENKEL, ERNST. 1965. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bd. II. Heidelberg: Winter; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2010. The indeterminacy of word segmentation and the nature of morphology and syntax. Ms.
- HOLVOET, AXEL & ARTURAS JUDŽENTIS. 2003. Sudėtinio prijungiamojo sakinio aprašymo pagrindai. In: Axel Holvoet & Arturas Judžentis, red., *Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai. 2. Sintaksinių ryšių tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 115–172.
- KÖNIG, EKKEHARD. 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge.
- KURCHAT, FRIEDRICH. 1876. *Grammatik der litauischen Sprache*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- LEWIS, DAVID. 1975. Adverbs of quantification. In: Edward L. Keenan, ed., *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–15.
- LI, CHARLES N. & SANDRA A. THOMPSON. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese. A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- LKT — Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstynas (Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian). <http://donelaitis.vdu.lt>
- MATHIASSEN, TERJE. 1996a. *A Short Grammar of Lithuanian*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- MATHIASSEN, TERJE. 1996b. *Tense, Mood and Aspect in Lithuanian and Latvian*. (Meddelelser av Slavisk-baltisk avdeling, Universitetet i Oslo, Nr. 75.)
- OSTROWSKI, NORBERT. 2010. Pochodzenie litewskiego afiksu duratywnego *teb(e)*-. To appear in a Festschrift.
- OTRĘBSKI, JAN. 1965. *Gramatyka języka litewskiego*. T. 3. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- PARTEE, BARBARA H. 1995. Quantificational structures and compositionality. In: Bach *et al.*, eds., 1995, 541–601.
- PAULAUSKAS, JONAS. 1958. Veiksmazodžių priešdėlių funkcijos dabartinėje lietuvių literatūrinėje kalboje. *Literatūra ir kalba*, 3, 301–453.
- PROGOVAC, LILJANA. 1994. *Negative and Positive Polarity: A Binding Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- ROOTH, MATS. 1985. *Association with Focus*. PhD Thesis, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- ROOTH, MATS. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:1, 75–116.
- ROOTH, MATS. 1996. Focus. In Sh. Lappin, ed., *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 271–298.
- ROSS, JOHN R. 1967/1986. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. PhD Dissertation, MIT (published as *Infinite Syntax!* Ablex: Norwood, 1987).
- SCHLEICHER, AUGUST. 1856. *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*. Bd. I. *Grammatik*. Prag: Calve.
- SENN, ALFRED. 1966. *Handbuch der Lithauischen Sprache*. Bd. I. *Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- SPORTICHE, DOMINIQUE. 2006. Reconstruction, binding, and scope. In: M. Everaert et al., eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. IV. Oxford: Blackwell, 35–93.
- STOLZ, THOMAS. 1989. Zum Wandel der morphotaktischen Positionregeln des Baltischen Reflexivzeichens. *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 9:1, 13–27.
- ULVYDAS, KAZYS, red. 1971. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. II tomas. *Morfologija*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- ZINKEVIČIUS, ZIGMAS. 1981. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. T. II. Vilnius: Mokslas.