Peter M. Arkadiev, alpgurev@gmail.com
Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences

VERY EXCEPTIONAL CASE MARKING IN LITHUANIAN

1. Participles in Lithuanian

➤ In Lithuanian, there is a rich system of participial formations (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 326–372; Klimas 1987), distinguishing the following grammatical categories:

✦ Tense (Present, Preterite, Habitual Past, Future);
✦ Voice (Active, Passive);
✦ presence vs. absence of Agreement (Case, Gender, Number). Non-agreeing participles are traditionally called Gerunds (*padalyviai*), but the term is rather misleading; for a recent contrastive analysis of non-agreeing participles in Russian and Lithuanian see Greenberg & Lavine 2006.

sakyti 'say'	Active		Passive
	Agreeing	**Non-agreeing**	
Present	*sakąs, sakanti*	*sakant*	*sakomas*
Preterite	*sakęs, sakiusi*	*sakius*	*sakytas*
Habitual Past	*sakydavęs, sakydavusi*	*sakydavus*	—
Future	*sakysiąs, sakysianti*	*sakysiant*	*sakysimas*

➤ Participles may be used in various functions:

✦ attributive (only agreeing participles), ex. (1);
✦ adverbial (presence of agreement signals co-reference between the subject of the participle and the main clause subject), ex. (2a), (2b);
✦ main clause predicate with an evidential meaning (only agreeing participles), cf. Gronemeyer 1997, Вимер 2007, ex. (3);
✦ lexical verb in various periphrastic constructions (only agreeing participles), e.g. Perfect, ex. (4), Proximative, ex. (5), or Passive, ex. (6);
✦ complement with some verbs taking clausal complements (presence of agreement signals co-reference between the subject of the participle and the main clause subject), ex. (7a), (7b).

(1) *Vis-i   gerai   mat-ė   **artėj-a-nt-į**   traukin-į.*
       all-NOM.PL.M   well   see-PST(3)   approach-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.M   train-ACC.SG
       'Everybody could see well the approaching train.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 353)

(2) a. ***Išėj-us-i*₍ᵢ₎**   *iš   mišk-o,   j-i*₍ᵢ₎   *net   stabtelėj-o.*
          go.out-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F from   forest-GEN.SG she-NOM.SG.F even   stop-PST(3)
       'Having left the forest, she (suddenly) stopped.' (ibid.: 362)

     b. ***Vaik-ams su-grįž-us,***   *pra.gyd-o*   *lakštingal-a.*
          child-DAT.PL   PVB-return-PST.PA   start.singing-PST(3)   nightingale-NOM.SG
       'When the children came back, a nightingale burst into singing.' (ibid.: 363)

(3) *Vien-o   pon-o   **mir-us-i***   *pat-i   ir*
       one-GEN.SG   lord-GEN.SG   die-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F   wife-NOM.SG   and
       palik-us-i   *dvylika sūn-ų   ir   dar vien-ą   dukterėl-ę.*
       leave-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F twelve   son-GEN.PL   and   also   one-ACC.SG.F daughter-ACC.SG
       'The wife of a lord died and left twelve sons and a little daughter.' (ibid.: 265)

(4) *Es-u   **ap-keliav-ęs***   *vis-ą   pasaul-į   ir*
       AUX.PRS-1SG   PVB-travel-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   all-ACC.SG   world-ACC.SG   and
       *daug   krašt-ų   **mat-ęs.***
       a.lot   country-GEN.PL   see-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
       'I have traveled all over the world and have seen many countries.' (ibid.: 249)

(5) *Vakar   Jon-as   buv-o   **be-su-serg-ąs**,*
 yesterday Jonas-NOM.SG   AUX-PST(3) CNT-PRV-be.ill-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
 bet iš-gėr-ė   vaist-ų   ir   ne-su-sirg-o.
 but PVB-drink-PST(3) medicine-GEN.PL   and   NEG-PVB-be.ill-PST(3)
 'Yesterday Jonas had almost fallen ill, but he took medicines and did not fall ill.'[1]

(6) *J-is   yra   vis-ų   **myl-i-m-as**.*
 he-NOM.SG.M AUX.PRS.3 all-GEN.PL   love-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
 'He is loved by everyone.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 251)

(7) a. *Sak-ia-u   tėv-ą   gerai   **gyven-a-nt**.*
    say-PST-1SG father-ACC.SG   well   live-PRS-PA
 'I said [my] father lived well.' (ibid.: 367)

   b. *Tėv-as_i   sak-ė-si   gerai   **gyven-ąs**_i.*
    father-NOM.SG   say-PST(3)-RFL   well   live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
 'Father said he lived well.' (ibid.)

➢ In my presentation, only examples such as (7a) will be discussed, i.e. participial complements (PCs) with non-agreeing participles and different subjects in the matrix and the embedded clauses. Previous studies of these constructions, mainly investigating their historical origin among other types of participial constructions in Lithuanian, include Ambrazas 1979 and Wiemer 1998.

2. General properties of Lithuanian PCs

➢ PC-taking verbs:

✦ verbs of perception: *matyti* 'see', *girdėti* 'hear', *jausti* 'feel';

✦ verbs of information transmission: *sakyti* 'say', *pripažinti* 'confess, acknowledge', *įrodyti* 'prove', *tvirtinti* 'assert', *teigti* 'assert', *neigti* 'deny', *skelbti* 'announce, declare', *rašyti* 'write', *pasakoti* 'tell, narrate', *tarti* 'say', *rodyti* 'show', *vaizduoti* 'depict' etc.

✦ verbs of cognition: *manyti* 'think, believe', *žinoti* 'know', *sužinoti* 'learn', *įtarti* 'suspect', *vaizduotis* 'imagine', *suvokti* 'realize', *tikėti* 'believe', *suprasti* 'understand, realize', *numanyti* 'guess, understand', *prisiminti* 'to remember', *atrodyti* 'look like, appear', *skaityti* 'consider', *laikyti* 'consider' etc.

➢ (Surface) syntactic properties:

✦ the subjects of the matrix and of the embedded clause are distinct, and the latter is expressed by an Accusative NP;

✦ the participle bears no agreement morphology, but may freely inflect for tense (interpreted usually as relative to the tense of the matrix clause): Present (7a), Preterite (8), Habitual Past (9), Future (10).

(8) [*J-i*]   *prisimin-ė   j-į   **buv-us** labdaring-ą   ir   malon-ų.*
 she-NOM.SG.F   remember-PST(3) he-ACC.SG.M   be-PST.PA charitable-ACC.SG.M and   nice-ACC.SG.M
 'She remembered him to be nice and charitable.' (Internet)

(9) ... *skatin-a   many-ti   j-ą   dažnai   **bū-dav-us**   su-si-erzin-usi-ą* ...
 induce-PRS(3) think-INF she-ACC.SG.F often   be-HAB-PST.PA   PVB-RFL-irritate-PST.PA-ACC.SG.F
 '[this] induces one to believe her to have often been irritated...' (Internet)

(10) *"Sanit-as"   tik-i-si   rugsėj-į   **bū-si-ant** pelning-u.*
 "Sanitas"-NOM.SG hope-PRS(3)-RFL September-ACC.SG be-FUT-PA   profitable-INS.SG.M
 '"Sanitas" [a Lithuanian pharmaceutical company] hopes that September will be profitable.'

---

[1] Examples with no source indicated come from the native speakers I have consulted. I heartily thank all my consultants.

➢ Problems:

❶ What is the syntactic position of the Accusative NP (the 'logical subject' of the embedded clause), and how does it get its case?

❷ Do all instances of PCs (e.g. PCs embedded under different types of verbs) share uniform syntactic characteristics?

The answer to ❶ depends on the answer to ❷, which, as will be shown below, is **NO**.

3. The Raising analysis

A straightforward analysis of Lithuanian PCs might be that via Raising of the embedded subject (ES) to the position of the matrix direct object (DO):

(11) *Sak-ia-u   tėv-ą*$_i$ [t$_i$ *gerai   gyven-a-nt*].   (=7a)
    say-PST-1SG   father-ACC.SG   well   live-PRS-PA
'I said [my] father lived well.'

➢ In favour of the Raising analysis speaks the fact that, superficially, the ES behaves in all respects like an ordinary DO in Lithuanian:

✦ ES undergoes passivization, ex. (12b);
✦ ES may change Accusative into Genitive under negation, ex. (13b);
✦ ES may freely scramble with the elements of the matrix clause, ex. (14b).

(12) a. *J-is   yra   vis-ų   **myl-i-m-as**.   (=6)
    he-NOM.SG.M   AUX.PRS.3   all-GEN.PL   love-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
'He is loved by everyone.'

    b. ***Tėv-as**   buv-o   **mat-o-m-as**   parein-ąs.*
    father-NOM.SG   AUX-PST(3)   see-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M   come.back-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
'Father was seen coming back.'

(13) a. *J-is   **ne-pa-raš-ė**   **laišk-o**.*
    he-NOM.SG.M   NEG-PRV-write-PST(3)   letter-GEN.SG
'He did not write a letter.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 503)

    b. *Ar   **ne**-mat-e-i   **tėv-o**   parėj-us?*
    Q   NEG-see-PST-2SG father-GEN   come.back-PST.PA
'Haven't you seen father come back?' (ibid.: 368)

(14) a. ***Motin-ą**   t-a   žini-a   labai su-jaudin-o.*
    mother-ACC.SG   that-NOM.SG.F   news-NOM.SG   very   PRV-excite-PST(3)
'Mother was very excited by the news.' (ibid.: 696)

    b. *Žmog-us **išorin-ius** **atribut-us** gal-i   many-ti es-a-nt savo*
    man-NOM.SG external-ACC.PL attribute-ACC.PL may-PRS(3)   think-INF be-PRS-PA RFL.POSS
    pat-ies   dal-imi.
    self-GEN.SG   part-INS.SG
'A person may think that external attributes are a part of his own self.' (Internet)

However, there are data which seem rather problematic under the Raising analysis.

4. Evidence against the Raising analysis of Lithuanian PCs

➢ Passivization of ES is in fact very restricted and is systematically allowed only by the following verbs: *matyti* 'see', *girdėti* 'hear', *įtarti* 'suspect', *vaizduoti* 'describe, depict', *pripažinti* 'acknowledge', *skelbti* 'announce', and *laikyti* 'consider'. Such verbs as *sakyti* 'say', *manyti* 'think', *teigti* 'assert, claim' etc. do not admit passivization:

(15) *Jon-as   buv-o   **man-o-m-as**   // **sak-o-m-as**   // **teig-ia-m-as**
　　Jonas-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) think-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M say-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M   claim-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
　　es-ąs   *gerai*   *moky-t-as.*
　　be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M   well   learn-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
　　intended meaning 'Jonas was thought // said // claimed to be well-educated.'

✦ It is possible to generalize that passivization of the ES is allowed only by those verbs with which this NPs is a **genuine** DO, selected and assigned thematic role by the matrix verb. This is especially evident with verbs of perception for which the following implication naturally holds:

(16) *Mač-ia-u*   **tėv-ą**   *parėj-us.*   →   *Mač-ia-u*   **tėv-ą**.
　　see-PST-1SG   father-ACC.SG   come.back-PST.PA   see-PST-1SG   father-ACC.SG
　　'I saw the father come back.'   　　　　'I saw the father.'

✦ Thus, at least for a subset of the passive-allowing verbs, PC-constructions may (and possibly should) be analysed as involving **Control**, and not Raising:

(17) *Girdėj-a-u* **Jon-ą**ᵢ   [PROᵢ *su*   *Aldon-a*   *šnek-a-nt*]
　　hear-PST-1SG Jonas-ACC.SG   with   Aldona-INS.SG   chat-PRS-PA
　　'I heard Jonas chatting with Aldona.'

✦ The situation is more complicated with *laikyti* 'consider', which generally does not select for the type of object which may appear in the ES position, cf. (18), but nevertheless freely allows passivization, cf. (19):

(18) a. *Kadangi žyd-ai*   *laik-o*   **Izrael-į**   **es-a-nt** *savo*   *istorine*   *tėvyne...*
　　　　because   Jew-NOM.PL   consider-PRS(3)   Israel-ACC.SG   be-PRS-PA RFL.POSS   historical-INS.SG.F homeland-INS.SG
　　　'Because Jews consider Israel to be their historical homeland...' (Internet)
　　b. ??*Žyd-ai*   *laik-o*   **Izrael-į**.
　　　　Jew-NOM.PL   consider-PRS(3)   Israel-ACC.SG

(19) ... *žmog-us*   **laik-o-m-as**   *es-ąs*   *racional-i*   *būtyb-ė...*
　　man-NOM.SG   consider-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M   rational-NOM.SG.F   being-NOM.SG
　　'[although] man is considered to be a rational being...' (Internet)

A possible explanation of the occurrence of examples like (19) might lie in the fact that the original (and synchronically available and widely used) meaning of *laikyti* is 'hold', for which the passive is unproblematic.

➢ ES may appear in the Genitive not only in the scope of the matrix negation, but also in the partitive function licensed in the embedded clause, ex. (20), (21):

(20) *Tačiau*   *žin-o*   **j-ų**   *es-a-nt*   *Vokietij-oje.*
　　however   know-PRS(3)   he-GEN.PL   be-PRS-PA   Germany-LOC
　　'However, [they] know that some of these things are in Germany.' (Internet)

(21) *Maist-o*   *produkt-uose tikrai*   *ne*   *tiek*   *yra*   *vitamin-ų*
　　food-GEN.SG   product-LOC.PL perhaps   NEG   as.much   be.PRS.3   vitamine-GEN.PL
　　kiek   *mes*   *įsivaizduoj-a-me* **j-ų**   *es-a-nt.* (Internet)
　　how.much   we:NOM   imagine-PRS-1PL   it-GEN.PL   be-PRS-PA
　　'There is perhaps not as many vitamins in food as we believe there to be [lit. "of them"]'

✦ We could "save" the Raising analysis of (20)–(21) if we assume that ES may get semantic Genitive case in the lower clause and then raise to the upper clause where it can no more be assigned the structural accusative case. This is corroborated by the fact that verbs with non-nominative subjects are marginally accepted in PC-constructions, too, cf. (22):

(22) ?*Jon-as*   *sak-ė*   **tėv-ui**   *reiki-a-nt* *pagalb-os.*
　　Jonas-NOM.SG   say-PST(3)   father-DAT.SG   need-PRS-PA help-GEN.SG
　　'Jonas said that his father needed help.' (Comment from the native speaker: 'grammatically correct, but we don't speak in this way')

A possible objection: Provided ES already has case, what is the reason for it to raise at all? Moreover, in a different type of construction, semantic (lexical) case precludes movement (Franks & Lavine 2006), cf. (23a,b) vs. (24a,b,c):

(23) a. *Pa-stat-ė   daržin-ę   kad sukrau-tų **šien-ą**.*
  PRV-build-PST(3) hayloft-ACC.SG COMP keep-SBJ(3) hay-ACC.SG
'[They] built a hayloft to keep hay.' (Franks & Lavine 2006, ex. (20a))

  b. *Pa-stat-ė   daržin-ę   **šien-ui**ᵢ   sukrau-ti* tᵢ.
  PRV-build-PST(3) hayloft-ACC.SG hay-DAT.SG   keep-INF
'id.' (ibid., ex. (17a))

(24) a. *Mes   pa-stat-ė-me   ligonin-ę   rūpin-ti-s   **vaik-ais**.*
  we(NOM) PRV-build-PST-1PL hospital-ACC.SG take.care-INF-RFL   child-INS.PL
'We built a hospital to take care of children.' (ibid., ex. (18a))

  b. ?*Mes   pa-stat-ė-me   ligonin-ę   **vaik-ais**ᵢ   rūpin-ti-s* tᵢ.
  we(NOM) PRV-build-PST-1PL hospital-ACC.SG child-INS.PL   take.care-INF-RFL
'id.' (ibid., ex. (18b))

  c. * *Mes   pa-stat-ė-me   ligonin-ę   **vaik-ams** rūpin-ti-s.*
  we(NOM) PRV-build-PST-1PL hospital-ACC.SG child-DAT.PL take.care-INF-RFL (ibid., ex. (18c))

A possible counterobjection: How to account for the scrambling facts (14b) without recourse to Raising?

A possible answer: Non-finite clauses are not islands to movement in Lithuanian, see the wh-extraction facts below.

➤ ES forms a constituent with its clause, as shown by pied-piping in (25), (26):

(25) *Film-e   yra   tok-ių   kadr-ų,   [**kur-iuos**   **es-a-nt**]ᵢ ne-įtar-ė   tᵢ*
  film-LOC.SG   be:PRS.3 such-GEN.PL shot-GEN.PL   which-ACC.PL   be-PRS-PA NEG-suspect-PST(3)
net   ir   pat-ys   grup-ės   nar-iai.
  even   and   self-NOM.PL group-GEN   member-NOM.PL
'In the film there are some shots which the members of the team themselves did not suspect to be there.' (Internet)

(26) *... toki-ų   problem-ų,   [**kuri-ų   es-a-nt**]ᵢ tėv-ai   nė   **ne-numan-ė** tᵢ.*
  such-GEN.PL problem-GEN.PL which-GEN.PL be-PRS-PA father-NOM.PL   even   NEG-surmise-PST.3
'[of] problems such that the parents did not even surmise that they existed.'

✦ ES may undergo wh-movement without pied-piping (and this is probably the default case), cf. (25), (26).

(27) *...tai, **k-ą**ᵢ   Bažnyči-a   šimtmeči-ais skelb-ė   tᵢ **es-a-nt**   nuodėm-e*
  that   what-ACC.SG church-NOM.SG century-INS.PL proclaim-PST(3) be-PRS-PA   sin-INS.SG
'things, which the Church has been for centuries proclaiming to be sinful' (Internet)

(28) *Gydytoj-ai kankin-a-si   dėl   t-o,   kad ne-gal-i   dary-ti tai,*
  doctor-NOM.PL be.upset-PRS(3)-RFL because that-GEN.SG.M that NEG-can-PRS(3) do-INF   that
***k-ą**ᵢ   žin-o   tᵢ es-a-nt   būtin-a.*
  what-ACC.SG know-PRS(3)   be-PRS-PA   necessary-INS.SG
'The doctors are upset because they cannot do what they know to be necessary.'

✦ This, however, does **not** imply anything concerning the position of ES: wh-extraction is generally possible from non-finite complement clauses in Lithuanian, cf. (29):

(29) *Reiki-a   dary-ti tai,   **k-ą**ᵢ   nor-i   [dary-ti   tᵢ].*
  need-PRS(3) do-INF   that   what-ACC.SG want-PRS.2SG   do-INF
'You should do what you want to do.'

➤ NPIs in Lithuanian constructions with infinitival complements may be licensed both by the clause-mate negation (30a) and by the matrix negation (30b):

(30) a. *Nor-i-u   [rytoj **niekur   ne-ei-ti**].*
  want-PRS-1SG   tomorrow nowhere NEG-go-INF
Lit. 'I want to go nowhere tomorrow.'

b. ***Ne**-nor-i-u* [*rytoj **niekur** ei-ti*].
    NEG-want-PRS-1SG   tomorrow nowhere go-INF
'I don't want to go anywhere tomorrow.'

➢ In PCs, NPI in the position of ES **may not be licensed at all**: neither by the negation on the embedded predicate, nor by the matrix negation:

(31) a. *Jon-as ***ne**-sak-ė* ***niek-o*** *parėj-us*.
    Jonas-NOM.SG   NEG-say-PST(3) nobody-GEN.SG come.back-PST.PA
intended meaning: 'Jonas didn't say that anyone had come back.'

b. *Jon-as *sak-ė* ***niek-ą*** ***ne**-parėj-us*.
    Jonas-NOM.SG   say-PST(3) nobody-ACC.SG NEG-come.back-PST.PA
intended meaning: 'Jonas said that nobody had come back.'

✦ However, with verbs which allow passivization of ES, NPIs may be licensed by the matrix negation (32a), but not by the lower negation (32b), cf. which supports the Control analysis:

(32) a. [*B*]*ėgioj-a-nt-ys* *t-oje* *tras-oje* *sak-ė,* *kad* *dar*
    run-PRS-PA-NOM.PL.M   that-LOC.SG.F   track-LOC.SG say-PST(3) that yet
ne**-mat-ė* ***niek-o *ridinėj-a-nt*.
    NEG-see-PST(3) nobody-GEN.SG roll-PRS-PA
'Those who run on this track said that they had not yet seen anybody roll [there].'

b. *Jon-as *mat-ė* ***niek-ą*** ***ne**-praėj-us*.
    Jonas-NOM.SG   see-PST(3) nobody-ACC.SG NEG-pass.by-PST.PA
intended meaning: 'Jonas saw that nobody had passed by.'

5. Interim summary

➢ Lithuanian PCs do not form a completely homogeneous class:

➢ with a subset of verbs (those which allow passivization), PCs are better accounted for in terms of Control, not Raising;

➢ the other type of PCs shows rather contradictory properties:

✦ accusative and genitive of negation suggest that ES raises to the matrix DO;
✦ 'semantic' case suggests that ES remains in the lower clause;
✦ possibility of pied-piping points towards ES being in the lower clause;
✦ movement facts (wh-extraction and scrambling) are inconclusive;
✦ NPI-licensing facts show that ES does not belong to the lower clause, but do not show that it belongs to the upper clause, either.

6. A further challenge: Existential PCs

➢ In Lithuanian, word order in existential clauses is usually VS, with the subject in the rhematic position (cf. Partee & Borschev 2007 for the properties of existential vs. locational sentences in Russian), ex. (33):

(33) *Sod-e* *aug-a* *didel-ė* *liep-a*.
    garden-LOC.SG grow-PRS(3) large-NOM.SG.F lime.tree-NOM.SG
'There is growing a large lime-tree in the garden.' (Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 694)

✦ NB: there are no expletives in Lithuanian, thus sentences like (33) are formed via some sort of 'inversion' (cf. Bailyn 2004 for Russian, and Циммерлинг 2006 for Lithuanian).

➢ Existential clauses of the type exemplified by (33) may be freely embedded under PC-taking verbs, cf. (34), (35); the only overt difference between 'normal' and existential PCs concerns the position of the ES: it remains in its original position, i.e. **after** the embedded predicate, but is still case-marked **Accusative** — evidently, by the **matrix** verb.

(34) *Profesori-us* *prisimin-ė* [*buv-us* *ant* *vargon-ų* *angel-ų* ***skulptūr-as***].
    professor-NOM.SG remember-PST(3)   be-PST.PA on   organ-GEN.PL angel-GEN.PL sculpture-ACC.PL
'The professor recalled there to have been statues of angels on the organ.' (Internet)

(35) *Teig-ia* [*pasaul-yje*   *es-a-nt*   **tvark-ą**].
  claim-PRS(3) world-LOC.SG   be-PRS-PA   order-ACC.SG
  '[He] claims that there is order in the world.' (Internet)

✦ Negation on the matrix verb may trigger genitive on the ES:

(36) *Ekspert-ai* **ne-**man-o   [*es-a-nt*   **problem-ų**].
  expert-NOM.PL NEG-think-PRS(3)   be-PRS-PA   problem-GEN.PL
  'The experts do not believe there to be any problems.' (Internet)

➢ That the ES is indeed inside the embedded clause is supported by the fact that negation on the embedded verb may license NPIs (and genitive, too), cf. (37) vs. (31b):

(37) *Jurg-is*   *sak-ė*   [*kambar-yje* **niek-o**   **nes-a-nt**].
  Jurgis-NOM.SG say-PST(3)   room-LOC.SG   nobody-GEN.SG NEG:be-PRS-PA
  'Jurgis said that there wasn't anybody in the room.'

➢ It is hardly possible to check whether ES of embedded existentials may scramble, but the locative phrase may, cf. (38):

(38) *Toki-a*   *agnostin-ė*   *pozicij-a*   *ne-trukd-o*
  such-NOM.SG.F agnostic-NOM.SG.F position-NOM.SG NEG-prevent-PRS(3)
  [**aukščiausi-oje hierarchij-os**   **pakop-oje**]$_i$ *suvok-ti*   [*t$_i$ es-a-nt Diev-ą*].
  highest-LOC.SG.F hierarchy-GEN.SG   level-LOC.SG conceive-INF   be-PRS-PA God-ACC.SG
  'Such an agnostic position does not prevent one from conceiving that there is a God at the highest level of the hierarchy.' (Internet)

☞ It is clear (at least, there is no *prima facie* evidence to the contrary) that the ES of embedded existentials is located in the lower clause and that its case is not assigned via any kind of (overt) movement.

7. Possible analyses of embedded existentials

➢ If not Raising, then **Exceptional Case Marking** (Chomsky 1981), more precisely, Long Distance ECM across a clause boundary and across a lower predicate.

➢ **Edge condition** (Chomsky 2000: 108): only the edge (i.e. the highest Spec) of a phase (CP or vP) is accessible to syntactic operations.

✦ If we assume that case assignment/case checking is subject to the Edge condition, the only way to account for the Lithuanian embedded existentials is to assume that ES raises to the Edge position on LF[2].

✦ Polinsky & Potsdam (2001) on Long Distance Agreement (LDA) in Tsez: even when the NP triggering LDA is not located at the edge of the embedded clause on PF, cf. (39), it raises there on LF, which is proven by the fact that is interpreted as Topic.

(39) *eni-r*   [*už-ā*   **magalu**   *b-āc'-ru-łi*]   **b-**iyxo.
  mother-DAT boy-ERG   bread.III.ABS III-eat-PST.PART-NML   III-know
  'The mother knows that the boy ate the bread.' (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001: 584)

☞ Two objections from Lithuanian:

(i) the Edge position may be filled by the locative phrase, cf. (37), which may raise even higher, cf. (38);

(ii) the subject of embedded existentials is interpreted as rhematic, not as topical.

➢ Bobaljik & Wurmbrand (2004): LDA/long-distance case assignment in restructuring constructions may be implemented as raising on LF with an anti-reconstruction effect, i.e. **obligatory wide**

---

[2] We could assume, certainly, that PCs are TPs, not CPs; however, given the Induced Phases hypothesis (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2004), this is irrelevant since TP embedded under V becomes a phase.

scope of the element triggering LDA, cf. (40) from Japanese (Nominative case marking under AGREE with the matrix predicate *-re-* 'can'):

(40) *John ga **migime dake ga** tsumu-**re**-ru.*
      John NOM right.eye only NOM close-can-PRS
      'John can close only his right eye.' (only > can, *can > only) (B&W 2004, ex. (3a))

☞ Two objections from Lithuanian:

(i) PCs can hardly be analysed as involving restructuring: PC-taking verbs are not those cross-linguistically favouring restructuring, and, more importantly, restructuring (*pace* Wurmbrand 2004) involves VP-embedding, while Lithuanian PCs undoubtedly project no less than a TP.

(ii) Most drastically, the ES in Lithuanian embedded existentials can have **only embedded** scope:

(41) *Mokytoj-as   man-o   [kambar-yje es-a-nt   **du**   **student-us**].*
      teacher-NOM.SG think-PRS(3) room-LOC.SG be-PRS-PA   two(ACC.PL.M) student-ACC.PL
      'The teacher thinks there are two students in the room' (thinks > two, *two > think)[3]

➢ Thus, the Accusative subject of Lithuanian embedded existentials **does not** raise to get case, either on PF or on LF. So, how does it get its Accusative case at all?

(i) From the embedded verb? Hardly plausible: finite existential sentences have nominative subjects, receiving their case, evidently, from the finite T through some sort of non-quite-local AGREE, cf. (42a), (42b):

(42) a. *Sod-e   aug-a   **didel-ė**   **liep-a**.*   (=33)
        garden-LOC.SG grow-PRS(3) large-NOM.SG.F lime.tree-NOM.SG
        'There is growing a large lime-tree in the garden.'

   b. Locative Phrase   T V_i [$_{VP}$ Subject t_i]
                            └──AGREE/CASE────────┘

✦ NB: non-finite T of the PC cannot assign case at all (cf. Chomsky 1981: 49–50; 2001: 8).

(ii) From the higher V/v? Impossible due to the Edge condition, see above and cf. (43):

(43) * v   V [$_{TP}$ Locative Phrase T_{part} [$_{VP}$ Subject V]]
        └──────‖─────────────AGREE/CASE────────────┘

(iii) From some local case-assigning functional head? That would not violate the Edge condition and could account for the scope facts, but would predict that the ES could not get Genitive from the matrix negation.

➢ I hypothesize (cf. Greenberg & Lavine 2006) that case assignment in Lithuanian embedded existentials is implemented via a mechanism of 'percolation' or 'case-spreading' (cf. Chomsky 1981: 49; Babby 1986, Matushansky 2008 etc.): Accusative (or Genitive if in scope of negation) is assigned to the whole PC and then 'percolates' to its subject, for which it is, incidentally, the only way to get case.

✦ Under this assumption, the structure of (41) is as in (44):

(44)   v   V   [$_{TP}$ T_{part} [$_{VP}$ Subject V]]
        └──ACC assignment──┘ └────ACC percolation──┘

➢ This analysis may be extended to other types of PC as well (except those which involve Control structures). The 'ordinary' PCs differ from the existential ones in that in the former the subject overtly raises to Spec,TP, most probably, for information structure purposes (it is not unreasonable to assume that unless overtly raised to Spec,TP, subjects are interpreted as rhematic in Lithuanian). From this position ES may further raise without violating the Edge condition. Cf. (45):

---

[3] The two readings may be paraphrased as follows: i. thinks > two students: 'in all the worlds compatible with the thoughts of the teacher, there are two students in the room'; ii. two students > thinks: 'there are two students such that in all the worlds compatible with the thoughts of the teacher, they are in the room'.

(45) a. *Sak-ia-u   tėv-ą   gerai   **gyven-a-nt**.*   (=7a)
     say-PST-1SG   father-ACC.SG   well   live-PRS-PA
'I said [my] father lived well.'

    b. v   V   [$_{TP}$ Subject$_i$ T$_{part}$ t$_i$ V]
      └─ACC assignment─┘ └ACC percolation─┘

✦ This hypothesis gets us the pied-piping facts (25), (26) 'for free': the TP with its subject form a constituent which may undergo movement as a whole.

✦ Genitive induced by the matrix negation is assigned in the same way as Accusative.

✦ The NPI non-licensing facts (31) remain problematic; but they are puzzling for any kind of reasonable analysis and have to be studied more deeply.

8. Conclusions

➢ Participial complement constructions in Lithuanian, despite superficial similarity, in fact show quite divergent behaviour with respect to various syntactic properties, and fall into three groups:

1. Constructions with object control:

(46) *Girdėj-a-u   **Jon-ą**$_i$*   [PRO$_i$ *su   Aldon-a   šnek-a-nt*]   (=17)
    hear-PST-1SG   Jonas-ACC.SG   with   Aldona-INS.SG   chat-PRS-PA
'I heard Jonas chatting with Aldona.'

2. Constructions with a special sort of ECM, when the entire embedded clause is case-marked by the matrix predicate, and its subject gets case via 'percolation'. These constructions, in their own turn, fall into two subclasses:

2.1. Constructions superficially resembling Raising, with ES occupying the Edge position:

(47) *Sak-ia-u*   [***tėv-ą**   gerai   **gyven-a-nt**.*]   (=7a)
    say-PST-1SG   father-ACC.SG   well   live-PRS-PA
'I said [my] father lived well.'

2.2. Constructions with embedded existentials, showing some kind of 'long-distance' case marking, with ES in the VP-internal position:

(48) *Teig-ia   [pasaul-yje   **es-a-nt**   tvark-ą]*.   (=35)
    claim-PRS(3)   world-LOC.SG   be-PRS-PA   order-ACC.SG
'[He] claims that there is order in the world.'

➢ I have shown that constructions of the type (2.1) can hardly be analysed as involving Raising, and that embedded existentials of the type (2.2) resist any of the currently assumed analyses involving some sort of long-distance dependency resolved by movement on LF.

➢ Even if the analysis proposed here turns out to be incorrect, I hope to have achieved my principal goal, i.e. to show that Lithuanian presents an unusual case of sentential complementation posing problems for existing theories of clause-combining.

Abbreviations

ABS – absolutive, ACC – accusative, AUX – auxiliary, CNT – continuative, COMP – complementizer, DAT – dative, F – feminine, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, HAB – habitual, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, LOC – locative, M – masculine, NEG – negation, NML – nominalization, NOM – nominative, PA – active participle, PART – participle, PL – plural, POSS – possessive, PP – passive participle, PRS – present, PST – past, PVB – preverb, Q – question particle, RFL – reflexive, SBJ – subjunctive, SG – singular, III – noun class

References

Ambrazas, Vytautas (1979). *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė* [*Historical Syntax of Lithuanian Participles*]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

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

Babby, Leonard (1986). The locus of case assignment and the direction of percolation: Case theory and Russian. In: R.D. Brecht & J.S. Levine (eds.), *Case in Slavic*. Columbus (OH): Slavica, 170–219.

Bailyn, John F. (2004). Generalized Inversion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22 (1), 1–50.

Bobaljik, Jonathan & Susi Wurmbrand (2004). Long distance object agreement, restructuring and anti-reconstruction. In: *Proceedings of NELS 33*, 67–86.

Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.

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

Chomsky, Noam (2001). Derivation by phase. In: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: Life in Language*. Cambridge (NA): MIT Press, 1–73.

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

Greenberg, Gerald & James E. Lavine (2006). New syntax in Russian and Lithuanian: The case of the adverbial participle. In: R. Rothstein, E. Scatton & Ch. Townsend (eds.), *Studies in Slavic Linguistics and Folklore*. Bloomington (IN): Slavica.

Gronemeyer, Claire (1997). Evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Working Papers* 46, Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics, 93–112.

Klimas, Antanas (1987). The Lithuanian participles: Their system and functions. *Lituanus* 33 (1).

Matushansky, Ora (2008). A case study of predication. In F. Marušič & R. Žaucer (eds.), *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics. Contributions from Formal Description of Slavic Languages 6.5*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 213–239.

Partee, Barbara & Vladimir Borschev (2007). Existential sentences, BE, and the Genitive of Negation in Russian. In: I. Comorovski & K. von Heusinger (eds.), *Existence: Semantics and Syntax*. Dordrecht: Springer, 147–190.

Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam (2001). Long distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19(3), 583–646.

Wiemer, Björn (1998). Pragmatical inferences at the threshold to grammaticalization. The case of Lithuanian predicative participles and their functions. *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 229–243.

Wurmbrand, Susi (2004). Two types of restructuring: Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua* 114(8), 991–1014.

Вимер, Бьёрн (2007). Косвенная засвидетельствованность в литовском языке. In: В.С. Храковский (ред.), *Эвиденциальность в языках Европы и Азии*. СПб.: «Наука», 197–240.

Циммерлинг, А.В. (2006). Типология языков со свободным порядком слов. Handout of a lecture delivered at the Institute of Lithuanian Language, Vilnius, June 2006.