1. Introduction

Lithuanian participles are verbal forms combining morphosyntactic features of tense and voice with adjectival inflection for gender, number, and case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. The paradigm of Lithuanian participles (sakyti ‘say’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active (m,f)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like adjectives, participles agree in gender, number and case with the head of the DP when used attributively (1a) or with the nominative subject of the clause when used predicatively, e.g. as the lexical verb in the periphrastic perfect or passive (1b).

(1) a. nuvažiav-ęs  traukin-ys
leave-PST.PA,DIST.MM train(M)-NOM.SG
‘the train that left’ (constructed)

b. traukin-ys  jau  yra  nuvažiauv-ęs
train(M)-NOM.SG  already  AUX.PRS.3 leave-PST.PA,DIST.MM
‘the train has already left’ (constructed)

Along with forms inflecting for agreement features, Lithuanian participles have two forms lacking them:

1 forms traditionally called “neuter gender” (Ambrazas (ed.) 2006: 346), ex. (2);

(2) Buv-o  privažiav-ę  policij-os  automobili-ų...
AUX.PRS.3  arrive-PST.PA,DIST.DEF  police-GEN.SG  car-GEN.PL
‘There arrived a lot of police cars...’

(3) Privažiav-us  Kaun-ą,  vairuotoj-us  pasitink-a  tams-a.
arrive-PST.PA  Kaunas-ACC.SG  driver-ACC.PL  meet-PRS.3  darkness-NOM.SG
‘When we reached Kaunas, the drivers were caught by darkness.’

In this talk I discuss the distribution of the two kinds of non-agreeing participles in Lithuanian and propose an analysis thereof in the spirit of the recent proposals in the Minimalist theory of agreement and case (Baker 2008, Keine 2010, Preminger 2011).

If not indicated otherwise, all examples come from the Corpus of Contemporary Standard Lithuanian, Lietuvių kalbos tekstynas, http://tekstynas.vdu.lt
2. Forms of default agreement

“Neuter” forms like in (2) are found with active and passive participles as well as with adjectives. The traditional term “neuter gender” is inadequate since nouns controlling agreement can only be either masculine or feminine, but not neuter, in Lithuanian. Rather, according to their syntactic distribution, these forms can be best called “default agreement forms” or simply “default forms” (DF).

Morphology:
– with passive participles DF is segmentally identical to NomSgF, but shares the stress with NomSgM;
– with active participles DF coincides with NomPlM.

Table 2. Morphology of default agreement forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NomSgM</th>
<th>NomSgF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>NomPlM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>áukštas ‘high’</td>
<td>aukštà</td>
<td>áukšta</td>
<td>aukštì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>àteštas ‘brought here’</td>
<td>atneštà</td>
<td>àtešta</td>
<td>atneštì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atnešà̃s ‘bringing here’</td>
<td>atneštà</td>
<td>atnešà̃</td>
<td>atnešà̃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntax: DFs are used in the predicative position (with or without a copula) in the absence of a fully-fledged nominative subject characterized by gender and number features. There are several subtypes of such situations listed below.

1 The subject position is occupied by a finite (4) or infinitival (5) clause:

(4) Mums buv-o saky-t-a, [kad trauki-ys jau nuvažiav-o].
we:DAT AUX-PST.3 say-PST.PP-DF that train-NOM.SG already leave-PST.3

‘We were told that the train has already left.’ (constructed)

(5) [M]an liepi-a-m-a [žiūrė-ti pro lang-q].
I:DAT order-PRS-PP-DF look-INF through window-ACC.SG

‘I am required to look through the window.’

2 The verb does not subcategorize for a nominative argument (on such verbs in the Baltic languages see Holvoet 2013; Seržant 2013, 2015; Wiemer & Bjarnadóttir 2014):

(6) Mums bū-tų reikėj-ę daug laik-o.
we:DAT AUX-IRR(3) need-PST.PA.DF much time-GEN.SG

‘We would need much time.’ < reikėti: Dat, Gen > (constructed)

(7) Ar iš jūs-ų yra k-am skaudėj-ę dantuk-ą?
Q from 2PL-GEN AUX.PRS.3 who-DAT ache-PST.PA.DF tooth-ACC.SG

‘Has anyone of you had toothache?’ < skaudėti: (Dat) Acc >

(8) Nakt-į buv-o lij-ę.
night-ACC.SG AUX-PST.3 rain-PST.PA.DF

‘It has rained at night.’ < lyti: Ø > (constructed)

3 In impersonal passives from intransitive (9) and transitive (10) verbs (on impersonal passive in Lithuanian see Timberlake 1982; Wiemer 2006a; Sprauniené et al. 2015):

(9) Iki treči-ujų gaidži-ų ten bu-s šok-a-m-a ir dainuoj-a-m-a.
till third-GEN.PL.DEF cock-GEN.PL there AUX-FUT.3 dance-PRS.PP-DF and sing-PRS.PP-DF

‘There will be dancing and singing there till the third cock-crow.’

(10) [B]uv-o pa-kvies-t-a sveči-ų iš Ryg-os bei Talin-o.
AUX-PST.3 PVB-invite-PST.PP-DF guest-GEN.PL from Riga-GEN.SG and Tallinn-GEN.SG

‘[A] number of guests from Riga and Tallinn were invited.’
The subject position is occupied by genderless pronouns tai `this`, kas `what` and viskas `everything` (11) (kas can also have animate reference with masculine agreement (12)).

(11) a. *Tai buv-o saky-t-a kel-is kart-us.*
    `this.NOM AUX-PST.3 say-PST.PP-DF several-ACC.PL.M time-ACC.PL`

    ‘This has been said several times.’ (constructed)

b. *K-as buv-o saky-t-a kel-is kart-us?*
    `what-NOM AUX-PST.3 say-PST.PP-DF several-ACC.PL.M time-ACC.PL`

    ‘What has been said several times?’ (constructed)

c. *Visk-as buv-o saky-t-a kel-is kart-us.*
    `everything-NOM AUX-PST.3 say-PST.PP-DF several-ACC.PL.M time-ACC.PL`

    ‘Everything has been said several times.’ (constructed)

(12) *K-as buv-o atej-ęs?*
    `who-NOM AUX-PST.3 come-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M`

    ‘Who came?’ (constructed)

A similar distribution of agreeing forms vs. DF is attested in evidential constructions, where the participle appears in the position of the main predicate without the copula or auxiliary (see Ambrazas (ed.) 2006: 262–266; Wiemer 2006b; Holvoet 2007: Ch. 4; Usonienė & Šinkūnienė 2017):

– verb with a nominative subject

(13) *Valg-a-nt Karin-a Štolovski pa-pasakoj-o,*
    `eat-PRS-PA Karina-NOM.SG Štolowski PVB-relate-PST(3)`

    kad savaitgal-į j-q aplinky-si-q tėv-ai...
    `that weekend-ACC.SG 3-ACC.SG.F visit-FUT-PA.NOM.PL.M father(M)-NOM.PL`

    ‘While eating Karina Štolowski related that her parents were going to visit her this weekend.’

– verb without a nominative subject

(14) *Labiausiai galv-ą skaud-ą dėl rajon-ų higien-os centr-ų...*
    `mostly head-ACC.SG ache-PRS.PA.DF because.of district-GEN.PL hygiene-GEN.SG center-GEN.PL`

    ‘[According to the head physician] they were mostly concerned because of the district’s hygiene centers.’

– a «defective» subject

(15) *J-i atsak-ė, kad visk-as buv-ę labai puik-u.*
    `3-NOM.SG.F reply-PST.3 that everything-NOM be-PST.PA.DF very splendid-DIF`

    ‘She replied that everything was splendid.’

– impersonal passive (NB both the lexical verb and the auxiliary show DF)

(16) *Tačiau šaltini-ai ne-min-i, kad ir X a. pabaig-oje*
    `however source-NOM.PL NEG-mention-PRS.3 that and 10th c. end-LOC.SG`

    bū-t-a įkur-t-a koki-ų šved-ų kolonij-ų
    `aux-PST.PP-DF found-PST.PP-DF which-GEN.PL Swede-GEN.PL colony-GEN.PL`

    ‘However, sources do not mention any Swedish colony allegedly founded [on the Curonian territory] in the end of the tenth century.’

Table. 3. Syntactic distribution of the default agreement form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ Φ-complete subject</th>
<th>– Φ-complete subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ nominative subject</td>
<td>agreement (1a,12,13)</td>
<td>DF (11,15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– nominative subject</td>
<td>DF (6,7,10,16)</td>
<td>DF (4,5,8,9,14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Non-inflecting participles

Non-inflecting forms (NI) like in (3) are only found with active participles.

Morphology: the bare participle stem of the respective tense.

Table 4. Morphology of non-inflecting participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>NomSgF</th>
<th>non-inflecting form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>sakanti</td>
<td>sakant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Past</td>
<td>sakiusi</td>
<td>sakius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Past</td>
<td>sakydavusi</td>
<td>sakydavus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>sakysianti</td>
<td>sakysiant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main function of such forms is to express the predicate of a non-finite subordinate clause whose subject does not coincide with the nominative subject of the matrix clause (Greenberg & Lavine 2006; Wiemer 2009: 179–200; Geniušienė 2014: 159–162; Arkadiev 2011, 2012, 2013). Such clauses may be both complements and adjuncts.


1. The subject of the subordinate clause is referentially distinct from the nominative subject of the matrix clause and is expressed by an overt DP in the accusative (complement clauses) (17a) or in the dative (adjunct clauses) (17b):

   (17) a. Jurg-īs sak-ē [Jon-q skait-a-nt] [laišt-q].
   Jurgiš-NOM.SG say-PST.3 Jonas-ACC.SG read-PRS-PA letter-ACC.SG
   ‘Jurgis said that Jonas was reading a letter.’ (constructed)

   b. Jurg-īs atēj-o [Jon-ui skait-a-nt] [laišt-q].
   Jurgiš-NOM.SG come-PST.3 Jonas-DAT.SG read-PRS-PA letter-ACC.SG
   ‘Jurgis came when Jonas was reading a letter.’ (constructed)

2. When a periphrastic form consisting of an auxiliary and a lexical verb occurs in such a structure, the participle of the lexical verb does not appear in the DF form, but fully agrees in gender, number and non-nominative case with the subject (18), (19):

   (18) Tekst-as atskleidži-a [Krist-ų taut-os samon-ēje] buv-us
   text-NOM.SG reveal-PRS.3 Christ(M)-ACC.SG people-GEN.SG consciousness-LOC.SG AUX-PST.PA
   lygin-ā-m-q su krūšk-aisiais pranaš-ais.
   compare-PRS-PP-ACC.SG,M with critical-INS.PL.M.DEF prophet-INS.PL
   ‘The texts reveals that in the minds of the people Christ had been compared to critical prophets...’

   use-PRS-PP DF AUX-PRS-PA PVB-tire-PST.PA-DAT.PL.F arm(∅)-DAT.PL
   ‘It is used when one’s arms are tired.’ (http://m.d.lt/straipsniai/bulve-ir-jos-gydomieji-budai/)

3. The subject of the subordinate clause is phonologically null and coreferential to a non-subject DP in the main clause:

   (20) ... gegut-ē j-iems, kukuoj-ā [∅, netkr-q nuotak-q be-vež-a-nt]...
   cuckoo-NOM.SG 3-DAT.PL.M cuckoo-PRS.3 fake-ACC.SG bride-ACC.SG CNT-carry-PRS-PA
   ‘... the cuckoo is saying (lit. cuckooing) them that [they] are carrying a fake bride’
   (“Eglė Žalčių karalienė”, http://www1.omnitel.net/sakmes/frames.html)

   (21) [∅, Atvažiav-us į pa-žadėt-ąją viet-q], iš žmoni-ų paprastai
   arrive-PST.PA in PVB-promised-ACC.SG.F.DEF place-ACC.SG from people-GEN.PL
   suvenk-a-m-i pas-ai.
   usually collect-PRS-PP-NOM.PL.M passport-NOM.PL
   ‘Upon arrival to the promised place they usually collect the travelers’ passports.’
The subject of the subordinate clause is a null pronoun with generic, arbitrary or contextually definite reference:

(22) \[∅_{\text{DEF}} \text{Atvažiav-us prie bažnyči-os, palydov-ai } įneš-dav-o\]

\[\text{arrive-PST.PA at church-GEN.SG attendant-NOM.PL carry.in-HAB-PST.3}\]
\[\text{mirus-įjį į bažnyči-q, o mergin-os et-dav-o šalia.}\]
\[\text{dead-ACC.SG.M.DEF in church-ACC.SG but girl-NOM.PL go-HAB-PST.3 by}\]

‘On the arrival to the church, the attendants brought the dead into the church while the girls walked by.’

(23) Apie tai nuolat gird-i-m [∅_{\text{generic}} kalb-a-nt ir raš-a-nt].

about that constantly hear-PRS-1PL talk-PRS-PA and write-PRS-PA

‘We constantly hear people talking and writing about that.’

The predicate of the embedded clause does not subcategorize for a nominative subject:

(24) \[∅_{\text{N}} \text{ubud-ęs pro lang-q pa-mač-ia-u sning-a-nt}.\]

\[\text{wake.up-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M through window-ACC.SG PVB-see-PST-1SG snow-PRS-PA}\]

‘[H]aving waken up I saw that it was snowing.’

(25) Prabund-u aušt-a-nt ir tuoj pat keli-uo-si.

\[\text{wake.up-PRS.1SG dawn-PRS-PA and at once raise-PRS.1SG-RFL}\]

‘I wake up at dawn and get up at once.’

The predicate of the main clause does not subcategorize for a nominative subject; the subject of the subordinate clause may be coreferential to the non-nominative “subject” of the main clause as in (26):

(26) \[∅_{\text{I}} \text{Atvažiav-us į Kanad-ą], (mums) reikėj-o iš-mok-ti}\]

\[\text{arrive-PST.PA i n  C a n a d a -A CC.SG w e .DAT need-PST.3 PVB-learn-INF}\]
\[\text{kalb-q ir pelny-ti duon-q.}\]
\[\text{language-ACC.SG and earn-INF bread-ACC.SG}\]

‘When we arrived to Canada, we had to learn the language and earn our living.’

(27) Sak-o-m-a [dvitaš-į pirmiausia atsirad-us IX a. rankrašči-uose].

\[\text{say-PRS-PP-DF colon-ACC.SG for the.first.time occur-PST.PA IX cent. manuscript-LOC.PL}\]

‘The colon is said to be for the first time attested in the 11th century manuscripts.’

When the embedded verb subcategorizes for a nominative subject and the latter is coreferential to (bound by) a \(\phi\)-complete nominative subject of the main clause, fully agreeing participles must be used:

(28) a. \[Aldon-a_{i} sak-ė [∅_{i} pa-raši-us-i laišk-q].\]

\[\text{Aldona(F)-NOM.SG say-PST.3 PVB-write-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F letter-ACC.SG}\]

‘Aldona said that she had written the letter.’ (constructed)

b. \[∅_{i} \text{Pa-raši-us-i laišk-q, Aldon-a}_{i} nu-si-šypso-jo.\]

\[\text{PVB-write-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F letter-ACC.SG Aldona(F)-NOM.SG PVB-RFL-smile-PST.3}\]

‘Having written the letter, Aldona smiled.’ (constructed)

Table 5. Syntactic distribution of non-inflecting participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>main verb</th>
<th>embedded verb</th>
<th>+ nominative subject</th>
<th>- nominative subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ nominative subject</td>
<td>+ AGR (28)</td>
<td>NI (17)</td>
<td>NI (24), (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- nominative subject</td>
<td>NI (26)</td>
<td>NI (27)</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Analysis

Table 6. Syntactic positions of default agreement forms vs. non-agreeing participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>independent clause</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subordinate clause</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main predicate (T head)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical verb (V head)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive (Voice head)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of NIs shows that their occurrence is determined by the properties of the functional layer of the clause:

– they are admitted only in the T(ense) head, and not lower;
– their distribution is sensitive to interclausal relations, i.e. to the C(omp) level.

By contrast, the distribution of DFs is influenced by the presence of a φ-complete nominative subject at the VP/vP level, rather than by factors of the C/T level.

NB When the subordinate clause contains a periphrastic form of a verb lacking a nominative subject, as in (29) with the subject in the partitive genitive, only the auxiliary appears in the non-inflecting form, while the lexical verb features the default form:

(29) **Net Evangelij-oje gnostik-ams atrod-o [es-a-nt primaišy-t-a**
    
    unclear-GEN.PL things-GEN.PL
    
    *‘Even the Gospel seemed to Gnostics to contain an admixture of unclear things.’*

The contexts requiring DFs and NIs appear to overlap because of the following facts:

a) DFs occupy the head position (T) of morphosyntactically finite (see Arkadijev submitted) evidential clauses under the same conditions which require DFs to appear on the lexical verb of periphrastic forms;

b) being determined by the (non)identity of the nominative subjects of the main and subordinate clauses, the distribution of NIs “inherits” the contexts where in an independent clause either a default 3rd person form of a morphologically finite verb or a DF evidential participle would be used (the right column of Table 5).

Thus:

 DFs occur when the lack of a (φ-complete) nominative subject is determined at the early stage of the derivation (VP and vP), in particular (I assume that the participial morphology in periphrastic forms is inserted in the functional head Asp):

– if all arguments receive non-nominative case at this early stage of the derivation (“assignment of case upon first merge”, Preminger 2011: 151) and agreement is precluded by the principle of Case Opacity (30), cf. (31);

(30) Case Opacity (Rezac 2008):

A DP with theta-related Case may not value a φ-probe.

– or if the nominative case is assigned to a φ-incomplete DP, like in (32).
By contrast, NI participles occur in those cases when the subject receives structural non-nominative case from the silent C head (see Arkadiev 2012), which happens when the embedded subject is non-coreferential with the nominative matrix subject.

I analyse the covariation of participial agreement and subject coreference in Lithuanian following Comacho (2010) as agreement of the silent C of the participial clause with the nominative matrix subject, which licenses the PRO-subject of the participial clause (cf. Landau 2004). Cf. (33) showing agreement in same-subject participial complements (28a):

(33) [TP [DP [C:NOM; φ:xxx] AGR] [CP [C:NOM; φ:xxx] AGR] [TP [∅ [C:NOM; φ:xxx] AGR] [T [C:NOM; φ:xxx] AGR]]]

The agreement of the C with the matrix subject is blocked in two cases:
– when this subject itself is non-nominative or φ-incomplete (34);
– when the embedded subject position is occupied by a full referential DP, with which C agrees (35):

(34) [TP [DP [C:DAT; φ:xxx] X] [CP [C: φ: x] X] [TP [T [C: φ: ] ...]]]

(35) [TP [DP [C:NOM; φ:xxx] X] [CP [C: [CASE; φ: ] X] [TP [DP [C: CASE; φ:yyy] AGR] [T [C: φ: ] ...]]]

In both cases, the embedded C activates its own case features assigning structural non-nominative case to the embedded subject.
Recall that, as shown in (18) and (19), the lexical verb in a periphrastic form heading the different-subject participial clause features full agreement with the non-nominative subject. I propose that this is achieved by the same mechanism that operates in independent clauses assigning the nominative case to the subject and the agreeing participle, and is due to the fact that the subject of the lexical verb does not yet have case at the stage of the derivation where it agrees with the participle in Asp, hence Case Opacity does not apply. This stage of the derivation, before the attachment of TP/CP, is shown in (36).

(36)

When the TP/CP layer is attached, the following may happen:
1) The finite T agrees with the subject and assigns nominative case to it (37), yielding an agreeing participle:

(37)

2) In the similar fashion work the non-finite clauses with a PRO-subject bound by the nominative matric subject (33).

3) In the non-finite clauses with a T licensing a referentially-independent subject, this T is unable to assign case to it; I hypothesise that this is linked to the lack of agreement by Baker’s (2008) Case-Dependency of Agreement Parameter (CDAP) in (38):

(38) Case-Dependency of Agreement Parameter (Baker 2008: 155)

\[ F \text{ agrees with } DP/NP \text{ only if } F \text{ values the case feature of } DP/NP \text{ or vice versa.} \]

NB In Lithuanian (as well as in other Baltic and some other Indo-European languages) CDAP applies only to the T head, which is evidenced by the fact that Asp must agree with the appropriate subject in gender and number before both of them get nominative case from a higher head, as in (36).

The source of non-nominative case both on the embedded subject and on the participle in Asp agreeing with it is the C head, cf. (39).
The same account extends to the evidential impersonal passive construction (see Holvoet 2007: Ch. 4; Lavine 2006, 2010), where both the subject and the lexical participle are assigned structural genitive by the evidential head, while the auxiliary receives DF due to CDAP, cf. (40) and (41).

(40) *Kulk-os bū-t-a išėj-us-ios kiaurai.*
bullet GEN.SG AUX-PST.PP-DF exit-PST.PA GEN.SG.F through
‘The bullet has evidently passed through.’

(41) EvidP

✦ The above analysis is supported by the case of phasal verbs *(pa)liauti(s)* and *sustoti/nustoti* ‘stop, cease’, whose complements can be expressed (alongside the infinitive, which is irrelevant here) by:

(i) an agreeing participle when the matrix verb is finite and the subordinate verb does not assign inherent case to its subject (42);

(ii) the DF participle when the subordinate verb lacks a nominative subject (43);
(iii) the NI participle when the subordinate verb does not assign inherent case to its subject, while the matrix verb is non-finite and its subject gets structural non-nominative case (44), (45) via case-transmission (Landau 2008).

(42) a. Jūr-a

liov-ė-si

[∅

i,NOM

bangav-us-i].

sea-NOM.SG

stop-PST(3)-RFL

be.choppy-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F

'The sea ceased being choppy.'

b. [TP

DP[OM,∅]

[VP

liovės

[CP

C[OM,∅][TP

∅[OM,∅] T[OM,∅]

VP ]]]]

(43) a. Po t-o,

kai nusto

snig-ė, tap-s šalčiau...

after that-GEN.SG.M when stop-PST.3 snow-PST.PA.DF become-FUT.3 colder

'The sea ceased being choppy.'

b. [TP

[VP

liovės

[CP

C

[TP

T[C,∅;∅;∅][VP

V[−ARG]]]]]

(44) Gydytoj-ai

liepi-a

i-ams

[∅

i,DAT

liaut-is

[∅

i,DAT

rūk-ius]].

doctor-NOM.PL

order-PRES.3 3-DAT.SG.M

stop-INF.RFL

smoke-PST.PA

'Doctors order him to stop smoking.'

(45) VP

DP[C,DAT,∅;XXX]

V'

CP

C[C,DAT,∅;XXX]

TP

PRO[C,DAT,∅;XXX] T'

T[∅;∅;∅]

VP

The distribution of participial forms in the complements of liautis and nustoti clearly shows that two types of non-agreement in Lithuanian participles have two sources:

– the DF form occurs when the conditions for agreement are not fulfilled in the subordinate clause;
– the NI form occurs when the factors blocking the agreement originate in the main clause.
7. Conclusions

Lack of agreement can be motivated by factors occurring at different stages of syntactic derivation:

(i) by mostly local interaction between the lexical or functional heads of the vP/VP level with features of DPs, both inherent (φ-features) and contextual (non-structural case);
(ii) by not necessarily local interaction of factors of the higher clausal levels (CP/TP) having to do with structural case assignment and interclausal relations such as switch-reference (see Camacho 2010 on the role of case and agreement in switch-reference).

Lithuanian is instructive in that these two groups of factors reveal themselves in the distribution of morphologically distinct verbal forms and therefore can be explicitly diagnosed.

There are two kinds of non-nominative subjects in Lithuanian, which turn out to be fundamentally different despite certain surface similarities:
– non-nominative (mostly dative) experiencers occurring with certain kinds of verbs and in fact exhibiting little properties of real subjects (see Holvoet 2013, Seržant 2015); their case marking is determined lexically (“at first merge”) and under appropriate conditions they trigger the DF on the participial predicate;
– non-nominative subjects of embedded non-finite clauses and evidential impersonal passives; they receive structural dative, accusative and genitive case from functional heads located high in the structure of the clause, and trigger (when embedded) the NI form of the participle occupying the T(ense) head and, most importantly, the agreeing form of the participle of the lexical verb in the Asp(ect) head.

Abbreviations

ACC — accusative; AGR — agreement; AUX — auxiliary; CNT — continuative; DAT — dative; DEF — definiteness; DF — default agreement form; F — feminine; FUT — future; GEN — genitive; HAB — habitual; INF — infinitive; INS — instrumental; IRR — irrealis; LOC — locative; M — masculine; NEG — negation; NOM — nominative; PA — active participle; PART — participle; PL — plural; PP — passive participle; PRS — present tense; PVB — preverb; PST — past tense; Q — question particle; RFL — reflexive; SG — singular.
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