Argument Realization in Baltic

edited by Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau

Argument Realization in Baltic

Argument Realization in Baltic

Edited by

Axel Holvoet
University of Warsaw & Vilnius University

Nicole Nau
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań & Vilnius University

MOKSLAS · EKONOMIKA · SANGLAUDA

Kuriame Lietuvos ateitį

EUROPOS SĄJUNGA
EUROPOS SOCIALINIS FONDAS

Table of contents

Part III. Nominalizations and their argument structure

Preface

Argument Realization in Baltic is the third and last in a series of collections of articles published in the framework of the project *Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic*. This series is the outcome of a research project conducted by Vilnius University and supervised by the Lithuanian Research Council. It was financed from the European Social Fund under measure VP1-3.1-ŠMM-07-K "Support to Research Activities of Scientists and Other Researchers" (also called the Global Grant Measure), Priority 3 "Strengthening of Capacities of Researchers and other Scientists" of the Operational Programme for Human Resources Development.

The articles in this volume are mostly concerned with alternations in the encoding of verbal arguments, but the argument structure of nouns, and the encoding of nominal arguments, also receive attention. A few articles deal with constructions reflecting the expansion of argument structure through the addition of causative, resultative or applicative predications. Most of the contributions have profited from discussion at the 2014 Salos conference and at the Vilnius workshop in January 2015.

Our sincere thanks go out to the external reviewers, who have devoted a generous portion of time improving the quality of the articles by their judicious comments and criticisms: Bernard Comrie, Stephen M. Dickey, Thórhallur Eythórsson, Nikolaus Himmelmann, Tuomas Huumo, Anna Kibort, Andrej Malchukov, Adam Przepiórkowski, Lea Sawicki, Olga Spevak, Bernhard Wälchli, and Lindsay J. Whaley.

Like its predecessors in this series, this volume has immensely benefited from the patient efforts of Wayles Browne, who has improved the language of almost all articles and made many valuable observations that have contributed to enhancing their quality. While expressing our heartfelt thanks to him, we must emphasize that responsibility for the remaining flaws lies solely with us.

Finally, it is our pleasure to acknowledge the efficient efforts of Arvydas Sabonis, who was responsible for the typesetting of this and previous volumes; of the project coordinator, Gina Kavaliūnaitė; and of the Vilnius University administration. We have also greatly appreciated the constructive cooperation with the representatives of the Lithuanian Research Council.

The Editors

Variation in argument realization in Baltic

An overview

Axel Holvoet[i,ii] and Nicole Nau[ii,iii]
[i]University of Warsaw / [ii]Vilnius University /
[iii]Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

1.   Introduction[1]

The study of argument structure and argument realization has always afforded a privileged role to alternations of various kinds, as they seem to provide the researcher with an empirical tool for establishing the position of a linguistic unit in syntactic structure wherever coding properties such as case marking, agreement and position in linear order do not give us enough clues. Nominalizations, genitive of negation and passivization are classic examples of grammatical phenomena mentioned in the literature, as often as not, in order to test some issue of argument structure or grammatical relations rather than to pause over what they are in themselves. Though the initial impetus came from the interest of early Transformational Grammar in syntactic tests revealing underlying structure, emphasis has shifted, in the typologically informed literature, to the phenomena themselves, their rise from the interplay of conflicting strategies, and the constraints on their occurrence. Both veins of research are continued in contemporary linguistic work. Research on the Baltic languages is no exception here, and this is reflected in the present volume.

In the broadly defined domain of alternations, two types have been singled out in the two previous volumes published in this series. One is voice alternations, dealt with in *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*, the other is differential subject and object marking, well represented in the collection *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. While these earlier volumes focused on basic clause structure and core arguments, the studies in the present volume deal with phenomena more at the periphery: the topics appearing here include

---

marking of non-core arguments, adverbials, argument marking in embedded clauses, and in nominalizations.

Case alternations figure prominently in this volume, which is hardly surprising considering the rich case systems which the Baltic languages, especially Lithuanian, have at their disposal for reflecting often subtle differences in semantic role assignment or event structure. The domain of argument marking and marking alternations thus stands out as a major thematic block in the present volume. It also plays an important role in the articles in the two following thematic blocks: nominalizations and constructions introducing additional predications – causative, resultative, and applicative.

The aim of the present article is to provide a background for the studies in this volume by taking a Baltic perspective on the three thematic blocks just outlined. In the process, we will also briefly characterize the articles contained in the volume, and we will discuss the factors involved in alternations – information structure, event structure, finiteness and non-finiteness, etc.

2.   Case marking and case alternations

2.1   Alternations in core grammatical relations

An overview of the system of alignment and case marking in Baltic has been given in Holvoet & Nau (2014), where attention is also given to differential marking of core grammatical functions – subjects and objects. Two articles in the volume to which the text just referred to serves as an introduction, viz. Nau (2014) and Seržant (2014), are detailed studies of differential marking in objects: the former deals with various factors determining the use of other cases than the accusative, whereas the latter focuses on the partitive genitive. As the reader may be referred to this earlier publication, we can be brief about subject and object marking here, though a few specific issues must be touched upon.

The Baltic languages have, along with Slavic, widespread use of adverbal genitives to mark objects and intransitive subjects, alongside the basic marking with the accusative. The so-called partitive genitive is used to denote indefinite quantity. It is still fully alive in modern Lithuanian but defunct in Standard Latvian (on the demise of the adverbal genitive in Latvian cf. Berg-Olsen 1999), where the last attestations can be found in literary texts from the late 19th and early 20th century:

(1)   Lithuanian
      Išgerkime   kav-os.
      drink.IMP.1PL   coffee-GEN.SG
      'Let's have some coffee.'

(2) Latvian
Esi   tik lab-s,   Pēterīt, nogriez
be.IMP.2SG so kind-NOM.SG.M PN.VOC cut.IMP.2SG
*man   **maiz-es**.*
1SG.DAT bread-GEN.SG
'Be so kind as to cut me a slice of bread, Peter.'

(Rūdolfs Blaumanis, 1863–1908)

Next, we have the genitive of negation, which is, historically speaking, a subtype of the partitive genitive, but has become largely emancipated from it. This emancipation can be seen from the fact that the genitive-of-negation rule now applies also to definite NPs denoting discrete objects, not normally susceptible to partitive marking:

(3) Lithuanian
*Ne-mačiau   šiandien **Jon-o**.*
NEG-see.PST.1SG today   John-GEN
'I haven't seen John today.'
(originally, this genitive would have meant 'not a bit of John')

The genitive of negation thus presupposes the partitive genitive, but only historically, not synchronically, and both types may develop further independently of each other. In Latvian, for instance, the object partitive genitive finally went out of use at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, but the object genitive of negation, though now defunct as well, survived well into the 20th century: the 1959–1962 Academy Grammar (MLLVG ii 285–289) still treats the object genitive of negation as a living phenomenon, though specifying that the dialects diverge in this respect: the further to the East the better the genitive of negation is retained, and Latgalian, discussed by Nau (2014), still uses it frequently.

While in Latvian the use of the genitive-of-negation rule was sensitive, as long as it existed, to certain semantic conditions, in Lithuanian (as in neighbouring Polish) it has become completely grammaticalized, admitting no semantically-determined exceptions. What is more, both in Lithuanian and in Polish the genitive-of-negation rule also operates, though not with the same exceptionless regularity, across clause boundaries: it appears in infinitival (and often also participial) complements dependent on negated verbs:

(4) Lithuanian
*Ne-noriu   šiandien matyti **Jon-o**.*
NEG-want.PRS.1SG   today   see.INF John-GEN
'I don't want to see John today.'

This phenomenon is dealt with by Peter Arkadiev, *Long-distance Genitive of Negation in Lithuanian*. In any syntactic theory recognizing that the infinitive together with its complement constitutes a kind of clausal structure, comparable (*mutatis mutandis*) to finite clauses, such a rule as illustrated in (4) is unexpected; in mainstream Generative Grammar, it is disallowed by the general principle of the locality of case assignment (cf., e.g., McFadden 2010). One is reminded of Bolinger's dictum (Bolinger 1980: 297, cited by Heine 1993: 27) according to which a verb starts down the road of auxiliaries as soon as it takes an infinitival complement. Even if this is true, such rules of case transmission as the long-distance genitive of negation would seem to require an advanced stage of clausal union, for which, in Slavic and Baltic, no decisive evidence seems to be available even in the case of modal verbs (cf. Holvoet 2007: 129–152), which would seem to be particularly prone to auxiliarization; much the less would one expect it for other complement-taking verbs. Still, the long-distance genitive of negation is taken as evidence for clausal union in Polish in Przepiórkowski (2000). Arkadiev argues, however, that it is the mechanisms of case assignment that should be reconsidered. The facts discussed in this article can be put alongside those discussed in Arkadiev (2014), which also seem to contradict the view, well established in Generative Grammar, of the strict locality of case assignment.

More work remains to be done on the use of the genitive of negation in Baltic. Probably conflicting factors are at work in determining the application or non-application of the rule, and two alternative tendencies can be discerned: syntacticization, i.e. dependency of the genitive of negation on the presence of the negative operator regardless of semantic factors, is one; dependency of its application on expectations of actuation of an event, is the other. The latter principle seems to operate in Latgalian, as shown by numerous examples in Nau (2014), such as

(5)   Latgalian
      Kurs   ta   tī   āstu   tūs   zuoḷ-u?
      who.NOM   PTC   PTC   eat.IRR   DEM.GEN.PL   medicine-GEN.PL
      'Who would want to eat this medicine?'
      (implied meaning: 'Nobody would eat it.')

In this instance, the genitive seems to reflect negative expectations of actuation despite the absence of a formal negative marker. It would be interesting to investigate whether positive expectations of actuation could counteract the syntacticized genitive-of-negation rule in Lithuanian, as could be suggested by examples like (6):

(6) Lithuanian
Kasatori-us,   *bū-dam-as*   *sąžining-as,*   *niekada*
appellant-NOM.SG be-CVB-SG.M bona.fide-NOM.SG.M never
ne-atsisakė   **sumokėti** *ieškov-ui*   *kain-os*
NEG-refuse.PST.3 pay.INF   plaintiff-DAT.SG price-GEN.SG
skirtum-ą.
difference-ACC.SG
'The appellant, being bona fide, never refused to pay the plaintiff the difference
in price.'   (http://liteko.teismai.lt/viesasprendimupaieska/tekstas.
aspx?id=951e9f7f-7de8-48d8-ab71-6e424b68af52)

2.2   Alternations and indeterminacy of grammatical relations

Whatever the degree of syntacticization of the genitive of negation, it can still be
identified, functionally, as a feature of reduced semantic transitivity: a negated
verb is, in the light of Hopper & Thompson's (1980) Transitivity Hypothesis, less
transitive than a non-negated one.

Other alternations involving objects in Baltic are also associated with tran-
sitivity, but are more problematic for the description of grammatical relations,
as they oppose the accusative to cases well known to be associated with specific
semantic roles other than patient-theme. This is the case with the Lithuanian and
Latvian alternation between accusative and dative for verbs of physical impact, as
sist suni 'beat a dog (ACC)' and *sist sunim* 'deal a blow to a dog (DAT)' (cf. Holvoet
& Nau 2014: 11–13), where the dative applies to experiencer-like objects. This
case assignment also seems to be an instance of reduced transitivity, but does
the NP actually cease to be a direct object, and is the verb correspondingly to be
treated as formally intransitive? Similar questions are raised by instrument-like
objects that appear with causatives of verbs of light and sound emission, as in
Lith. *barškinti puodus* (ACC) *: puodais* (INS) 'clatter about with pans', Latv. *šķindināt
traukus* (ACC) *: ar traukiem* 'id.', cf. Anderson (2011), Holvoet (2015a).

More fundamental problems are raised by two-place low-transitivity experi-
encer predicates, where it is often difficult to assign the status of subject or object
even if nominatives and accusatives are present. One such instance of doubtful
assignment occurs with verbs of pain. Lithuanian has two constructions here:

(7) Lithuanian
On-ai   *skauda*   ***galv-a.***
PN-DAT.SG hurt.PRS.3 head-NOM.SG

(8) *On-ai   skauda   **galv-ą.***
     PN-DAT.SG hurt.PRS.3 head-ACC.SG
     'Ann has got a headache.'

Is the body-part NP a subject in (7) and an object in (8)? The question cannot be posed in such a simplistic way as structures like these are low in transitivity and prone to non-canonicity in grammatical relations and their encoding. For one, the dative-marked experiencer clearly outranks the nominative- or accusative-marked body-part NP in prominence, and would therefore appear to be a candidate for the status of datival quasi-subject. Against such a view one could object that the dative is actually but an external possessor, that is, a non-argument. This is not the only and, perhaps, not even the most obvious interpretation, as one could argue that pain verbs notionally require an experiencer argument. Granted, however, that the dative is an external possessor, a sentence like (8) would present us with an instance of a one-place predicate whose unique argument is marked with the accusative – typologically a rare situation which some theoretical models tend to consider disallowed by general principles of case assignment. Burzio's generalization (Burzio 1986: 178) predicts that accusative will be assigned only if the thematic role of agent is also bestowed; and in an Optimality Theory framework (cf. Woolford 2003) the assignment of accusative without concomitant assignment of a nominative would be a highly marked option calling for a special explanation.

Two articles in the present volume attempt, from different angles, to approach the problem of pain-verb constructions. In his article *Variable argument realization in Lithuanian impersonals,* James Lavine interprets the dative-marked argument as an external possessor, and therefore not a core argument. The problem reduces, then, to accounting for the typologically rare assignment of an accusative to what, at first sight, appears to be a one-place predicate. Lavine argues that the features of agentivity, accounting for nominative, and causation, accounting for accusative, need not be bundled, as Burzio seemed to assume tacitly (though authors like Cruse 1973 and DeLancey 1984 had already pointed out that agentivity is not a homogeneous notion). Many languages provide evidence that causative verbs can appear in non-agentive contexts. Lavine views the pain-verb construction with accusative-marked body-part NP as an instance of the Transitive Impersonal, on a par with constructions like (9), where the verb 'shake', normally used agentively with an animate subject, occurs in an impersonal construction referring to an ambient subject:

(9) Lithuanian
     Keleivi-us   *smarkiai kratė.*
     traveller-ACC.PL heavily   shake.PST.3
     'The travellers were jolted heavily.'

Argument structure is, he argues, dyadic in both instances, with a non-volitional Causer that is present in semantic interpretation but may be not overtly realized in syntax, or realized as an oblique relation. Lexical underspecification also accounts for the use of verbs like *kratyti* 'shake, jolt' in both agentive and non-agentive contexts. Whether languages allow or disallow the assignment of accusative without agent assignment, according to the Minimalist analysis of Lavine, depends on the structure of *v*P, more specifically on the mutual relationship of the Voice and Cause heads.

Though pain-verb constructions like (8) were cited in order to illustrate the kind of issues Lavine deals with in his article, the article itself exceeds, of course, the narrow limits of the small group of pain verbs and bears on fundamental questions of verbal diathesis. 'Pain verbs', as Lavine points out, is not a linguistic notion.

This, however, is a statement one could take issue with. In linguistic models in which the search for the broadest possible generalizations is not so pervasive, and the line of division between grammar and the lexicon not as rigid as in Minimalism, one can easily imagine even small lexical groups having their own syntax (for this idea cf. Croft 2001 and other publications in the line of Construction Grammar, as well as Culicover & Jackendoff 2005). For pain verbs this is claimed in Fried's (2004) constructional approach, in which she shows how productive syntactic models can be constructionally adapted and modified to serve the specific needs of pain predicates. Specific problems connected with the syntactic and morphosyntactic behaviour of pain verbs as such are also dealt with in Holvoet's article *Argument marking in Baltic and Slavonic pain-verb constructions*. Unlike Lavine, Holvoet rejects the interpretation of the experiencer as an external possessor on semantic, typological and language-specific syntactic grounds. He argues that the experiencer NP, by virtue of the whole-to-part relation linking it to the body-part NP, often gets the same morphosyntactic treatment as the external possessor, but this is a language-specific strategy often not quite consistently realized. Pain verbs, he argues, tend to underlie two-place constructions in which the experiencer is an argument standing in a whole-to-part relationship to a body-part NP which it outranks in prominence. These properties account for the often non-canonical syntactic and morphosyntactic behaviour of pain-verb constructions, though the specific types of non-canonical behaviour observed in individual languages depend on the syntactic source constructions used to express the arguments of the pain verb.

2.3   The Latvian debitive: Alternations and canonicization

The Latvian debitive is a modal form expressing necessity. It is peculiar to this language and absent from Lithuanian. The debitive is characterized by non-canonical argument marking: the original object of the verb is usually marked with the nominative (in the standard language and in most dialects; cf. Endzelin 1922: 752–753); and the original subject is in the dative. Moreover, the debitive shows differential argument marking: the original object is marked with the nominative in most cases when it is a noun or a 3rd person pronoun (10), but with the accusative if it is a 1st or 2nd person pronoun or a reflexive pronoun (11):

(10) *Pēter-im bija   jā-uzvelk   **mētel-is.***
      PN-DAT   be.PST.3 DEB-put.on coat-NOM.SG
      'Peter had to put on his coat.'

(11) *Tev   būs   **mani**   drusciņ jā-pagaida.*
      2SG.DAT be.FUT.3 1SG.ACC a.bit   DEB-wait
      'You'll have to wait a moment for me.'

The problem of grammatical functions with the debitive is discussed in detail in Holvoet & Grzybowska (2014). This discussion is taken up in this volume in Ilja Seržant's contribution *The nominative case in Baltic in a typologic perspective* (see below). The differential marking of the lower-ranking argument is not the only alternation observed with the debitive. Changes in case marking seem to be taking place which create alternations opposing the old, receding case form to the new, expansive one. These processes are examined in Ilja Seržant & Jana Taperte's article *Differential Argument Marking with the Latvian Debitive: A multifactorial analysis*. There has been, presumably for quite some time, a tendency to replace the nominative with the accusative also in those varieties where the nominative is traditionally used. Thus, in contemporary Latvian, examples like the following are found:

(12) *Es   arī ne-saprotu,   kāpēc bū-tu jā-pērk*
      1SG.NOM also NEG-understand.PRS.1SG why   be-IRR DEB-buy
      ***telefon-u**   pie mums.*
      telephone-ACC.SG   at 1PL.DAT
      'I don't understand why one should buy a telephone in our country either.'
        (http://www.boot.lv/forums/index.php?/topic/154436-samsung-s3-vai-s4/)

The authors use a multifactorial analysis to establish which conditions favour the change in case marking. They conclude that the expansion of the accusative is constrained by different factors having different impact strength, such as the linear position relative to the debitive predicate, noun phrase accessibility, animacy of the referent, the semantic class of the embedded lexical verb, and others.

In addition, Seržant & Taperte also find some evidence for replacement of the dative with a nominative, a process hitherto not noted in the literature (except for occasional remarks by Latvians concerned with signs of "decay" in the contemporary language), though they emphasize that such constructions are, at the present stage, unacceptable for most speakers:

(13) *Vai **viņ-š**   jā-būt līdzīpašniek-s   vai*
       Q   3-NOM.SG.M   DEB-be co-owner-NOM.SG   or
       vienkārši algot-s   darbiniek-s?
       simply   salaried-NOM.SG.M employee-NOM.SG
       'Must he be co-owner or may he be just an employee?'

                                          (from Seržant & Taperte, this volume)

These two processes do not seem to be directly connected, the former occurring in transitive structures and the latter in intransitive (e.g. copular) ones. Considered together, however, they seem to point to an evolution towards canonical case marking, with nominative for the agent-subject and accusative for the patient-object. Unlike most other alternations discussed in this volume, which appear to be diachronically more or less stable, the patterns manifesting themselves in constructions with the debitive seem to emerge from an ongoing process of canonicization, but in both types of situations a deeper understanding of the processes involved can be gained by a careful multifactorial analysis. Such an analysis is also undertaken by Björn Wiemer and Vaiva Žeimantienė in their investigation of the alternation between genitive and instrumental in agent phrases, which appears to be fairly stable in modern Lithuanian.

2.4 Alternations in agent phrases: Argument hierarchies and the causal chain

Baltic agent phrases have received a lot of attention from a diachronic point of view (cf. Holvoet 2000, with literature), but are of synchronic interest as well. Curiously, the instrumental of agent, well attested in Old Church Slavonic (Miklosich 1926: 704–705), has left no trace in Baltic, and is therefore likely to be a separate development of Slavonic. Instead, both Baltic languages have used a possessive strategy for creating agent phrases: in constructions with passive participles, an adnominal possessive genitive could assume a secondary agentive function with regard to the participle, and in time this function could oust the original possessive function. The development can be illustrated as follows:

(14) Latvian
       tēv-a   [*cel-t-ā*   *māj-a*]
       father-GEN   built-PPP-NOM.SG.F.DEF house-NOM.SG

(15)   →   [*tēv-a*   *cel-t-ā*]   *māj-a*
            father-GEN built-PPP-NOM.SG.F.DEF house-NOM.SG
            'Father's built house' → 'the house built by father'

Though this view has been challenged (Schmalstieg 1978 views the genitive as a trace of an IE ergative pattern), the adnominal origin of the agentive genitive is corroborated by the fact that in Latvian it can still not be used as an agent phrase in a fully-fledged sentential passive but is basically adnominal, or at least forms a constituent with the passive participle and cannot function as an autonomous clause constituent in a true passive construction (for details cf. Holvoet 2015b).

As the agentive function ousted the possessive function, the genitive could shift from prototypically human or at least animate, individualized agent-possessor to weakly individualized and ambient forces, as in the following Latvian example:

(16)   *meln-o*   *zustreņ-u*   *čemur-i*   *mirdzēja*
        black-GEN.PL.DEF currant-GEN.PL cluster-NOM.PL glitter.PST.3
        jautri *kā* *liet-us*   *nomazgā-t-i*
        merrily like rain-GEN.SG wash-PPP-NOM.PL.M
        'clusters of blackcurrants glittered merrily as if they had been washed by the
        rain.'   (Edvarts Virza)

In the naive world view of language, however, forces of nature are difficult to identify or to locate, and it is often difficult to establish whether some ambient phenomenon is a self-sufficient agent or a non-initial link in a causal chain (as proposed in Croft 1991), hence alternations letting an ambient phenomenon appear sometimes as an agent-subject (Example (17)) and other times as what Kibort (2009) calls an 'intermediary agent' in a construction that could be described either as impersonal or as containing a zero subject (Example (18)):

(17)   Lithuanian
        Nors *snieg-as*   *užpustė*   *keli-us,*
        though snow-NOM.SG blow.over.PST.3 road-ACC.PL
        simboliškai išvaryti žiemą pavyko.
        'Though snow had covered the roads, the symbolic driving out of winter was
        a success.'
              (http://www.lrytas.lt/?id=13296636931329432434&view=6&order=2)

(18)   *Vietoj*   *saul-ės,*   *šilum-os*   *miest-ą*   *vėl*
        instead.of sun-GEN.SG warmth-GEN.SG town-ACC.SG again
        užpustė   *snieg-u.*
        blow.over.PST.3 snow-INS.SG
        'Instead of sun and warmth, the town was again covered with snow.'
              (http://skrastas.lt/?data=2013-04-03&rub=1141817778&id=1364825402)

In passive and passive-like constructions the agentive genitive and the instrumental of the intermediate agent appear to vie for the same syntactic position, even though one might like to assume an underlying syntactic difference if one views (19) as derived from a sentence like (17):

(19) *Tačiau* **užpusty-t-as**   *snieg-u*   *keli-as*   *pasirodė*
      but   blow.over-PPP-NOM.SG.M snow-INS road-NOM.SG turn.out.PST.3
      neįveikiam-as   *sunkiai serganči-am vyr-ui.*
      impassable-NOM.SG.M gravely ill-DAT.SG.M man-DAT.SG
      'But the snow-blown road turned out to be impassable for the gravely ill man.'
              (http://www.tv3.lt/naujiena/724665/pasipriesino-stichijai-gelbetojai-
                  du-kilometrus-ant-ranku-nese-infarkta-patyrusi-senuka)

(20) *Vyriški-o*   *kūn-as*   *buvo*   *griov-yje*
      man-GEN.SG body-NOM.SG be.PST.3 ditch-LOC.SG
      įšal-ęs   *į*   *led-ą*   *ir*
      freeze.into-PPA.NOM.SG.M into ice-ACC.SG and
      užpusty-t-as   *snieg-o.*
      blow.over-PPP-NOM.SG.M snow-GEN.SG
      'The man's body, lying in the ditch, had frozen into the ice and was blown over with snow.'
          (http://www.lrytas.lt/-12964855481294462210-atpa%C5%BEintas-netoli-
              panev%C4%97%C5%BEio-mi%C5%A1ke-rastas-negyv%C4%97lis.htm)

The alternation obtaining in such cases is dealt with in Björn Wiemer and Vaiva Žeimantienė's article *Contexts for the choice of genitive vs. instrumental in contemporary Lithuanian.* The theoretical framework for their investigation is provided by Role and Reference Grammar. The authors consider the place the relevant argument occupies in the causal chain, as defined by Croft, as the underlying motivation for the choice of case. As the authors convincingly show, the inherently hierarchical view which the Role and Reference Grammar model enables us to take of semantic role and event structure allows us to avoid the circularity lurking behind explanations based on sets of discrete semantic roles interacting with ontological features of noun phrases. The authors offer a multifactorial analysis to explain how the use of the genitive or the instrumental is determined in specific instances. The factors include quantification, animacy, controllability and agentivity, and a hierarchical ordering of these factors is proposed to explain the choices in instances of conflicting factors.

2.5   Alternations in local phrases and alternative construals

Another alternation outside the domain of core grammatical relations is that
between locative and directive expressions in translocational constructions, dealt
with by Natalia Zaika, *The directive/locative alternation in Lithuanian and else-
where*. Basically, in Baltic as elsewhere, locational and directional expressions
correlate with semantic features of the predicate: a stative verb combines with
a locational construction whereas a verb of motion will occur with a directional
expression. This can be seen in Lithuanian examples (21) and (22), which show
an opposition between a stative local case and a prepositional phrase with *į* 'into',
whereas the opposition has to a great extent been eliminated in Latvian (on this
process cf. Wälchli 1998): (23) and (24) both have the locative case.

(21) Lithuanian
      Dien-omis   ji,   praleis-dam-a pamok-as,
      day-INS.PL 3.NOM.SG.F skip-CVB-SG.F lesson-ACC.SG
      sėdėjo   savo kambar-yje   ir   nuolat   verkė.
      sit.PST.3 RPO room-LOC.SG and constantly cry.PST.3
      'By daytime she used to sit in her room, skipping lessons, and to cry the whole
      time.'   (http://ask.fm/Brraske)

(22) *Aš   įbėgau   į   savo kambar-į,*
      1SG.NOM run.in.PST.1SG into RPO room-ACC.SG
      įjungiau   švies-ą   ir   taip išsėdėjau
      switch.on.PST.1SG light-NOM.SG and so   sit.out.PST.1SG
      vis-ą   likusi-ą   nakt-ies   dal-į.
      all-ACC.SG remaining-ACC.SG night-GEN.SG part-ACC.SG
      'I ran into my room, switched on the light and remained sitting like that the
      whole remaining part of the night.'
                          (http://www.15min.lt/naujiena/aktualu/orai/kamuolinis-zaibas-
                                          i-namus-prasiverza-ir-per-sienas-60-231769)

(23) Latvian
      No   kād-a   vecum-a   tav-s   mazul-is
      from what-GEN.SG.M age-GEN.SG your-NOM.SG.M baby-NOM.SG
      guļ   pat-s   sav-ā   istab-ā?
      sleep.PRS.3 self-NOM.SG.M RPO-LOC.SG room-LOC.SG
      'From what age has your baby been sleeping in his/her own room?'
                          (http://www.maminuklubs.lv/bebitis/diskusija-no-kada-
                                  vecuma-tavs-mazulis-gul-pats-sava-istaba-172151/)

(24) *Krīz-es   moment-os   eju   **sav-ā***
     crisis-GEN.SG moment-LOC.PL go.PRS.1SG RPO-LOC.SG
     istab-ā,   aiztaisu   durv-is.
     room-LOC.SG close.PRS.1SG door(PL)-ACC
     'In moments of crisis I go to my room and close the door.'

<div align="right">(http://sirdselpa.blogspot.com/)</div>

Latvian has, on the other hand, another distinction, absent from Lithuanian, viz. that between constructions focusing on the motion itself to the exclusion of its final point (marked by the preposition *uz*), and a construction focusing the attainment of the goal, and the crossing of its boundaries. The contrast, which is available only for location 'in', can be seen by comparing (24) with (25):

(25) Latvian
     *Kāpju   augšā   **uz sav-u**   **istab-u**…   un*
     mount.PRS.1SG upstairs to RPO-ACC.SG room-ACC.SG and
     pēkšņi   mani   pārņēma   šausminoš-a   sajūt-a,   ka
     suddenly 1SG.ACC seize.PST.3 terrifying-NOM.SG.F feeling-NOM.SG that
     kād-s   mani   nepārtraukti slepus   novēro …
     somebody-NOM 1SG.ACC incessantly   secretly observe.PRS.3
     'I go upstairs to my room and suddenly I was seized by the terrifying feeling that somebody was secretly observing me the whole time.'
     *(*https://twitter.com/santakokina/status/283145447588130817)

In those languages where a distinction between location and direction is observed, the two constructions sometimes compete when used with verbs of 'placement', as in

(26) Lithuanian
     Padėj-o   šluot-ą   į   kamp-ą /   kamp-e.
     put-PST.3 broom-ACC.SG in corner-ACC.SG corner-LOC.SG
     'He put the broom in the corner'.   (Valiulytė 1989: 190)

This alternation suggests that in expressing the initial point of a situation of static placement, languages may either zoom into a smaller scene in which the located object is already in the relevant spatial region and switches from motion to rest, or may select a broader view in which the located object's being in a certain region A is contrasted with its not being in region A at a previous moment. Languages may have a general preference for one or the other type of conceptualization, but nonetheless most languages seem to allow for a certain degree of variation. Zaika proposes a multifactorial analysis to explain what may contribute to the selection of one or the other type of construal. The occurrence of the alternation itself seems to correlate more or less with Zwarts' (2010) hierarchy

of locations, reflecting degrees of markedness: location 'in', being least marked, is most amenable to a 'locative : directive' distinction (cf. the Latvian example above) and also to locative-directive alternations with verbs of translocation. Various factors may influence the choice where it is enabled in principle, e.g. the permanent rather than temporary character of location favours locative marking whereas additional force applied to overcome physical resistance favours directive marking.

2.6   Alternations in adverbials and case meanings

In the domain of adverbials, modern Lithuanian has an alternation that is probably unique among Indo-European languages – even Latvian does not have it. Alongside accusatives of duration, Lithuanian has, in some uses, alternative constructions with nominatives, first studied in detail by Roduner (2005):

(27)   Lithuanian
*Jon-as   čia   gyvena   jau   **trej-i**   **met-ai***
PN-NOM.SG   here   live.PRS.3   already   three-NOM   year(PL)-NOM
/ ***trej-us   met-us***.
three-ACC   year(PL)-ACC
'John has been living here for three years already.'

In his article *The nominative case in Baltic in a typological perspective*, Ilja Seržant takes this alternation as a point of departure for a probe into the meaning of the nominative. According to Seržant, nominatival time adverbials are marked for the semantic feature of emphasis – in this case, emphasis on the time value expressed by the adverbial is involved. To Seržant, this feature of emphasis becomes a key for understanding functions of the nominative as well as its form. The Baltic nominative (unlike that of many other languages, both Indo-European and non-Indo-European) nearly always has overt markers. When it comes to the expression of subjects and their relation to topic and focus, the author argues that topichood is expressed by verbal agreement suffixes, so that the nominative marking of noun phrases in subject position correlates with either contrastive topichood or focal status – both of which can be viewed as instances of emphasis. In analysing the functions of the nominative, ample attention is given to pragmatic factors and the functioning of nominatives in texts is duly taken into account.

Seržant's article stands out among the contributions to this volume through its return to the question of case meanings. Since the foundational work on semantic roles by Fillmore, Gruber and Jackendoff in the 1960s and 1970s (cf. Gruber 1965/1970; Fillmore 1968; Jackendoff 1972; etc.), alternations have been viewed mainly as elements of an interface, more revealing of underlying difference in

semantic role or event structure than of the meanings of cases as such; indeed the very question whether cases can have meanings of their own is hardly ever posed in this tradition. Actually discussions of case alternations in the literature are much older, but they used to centre on meaning. Jakobson (1936) liked to cite examples of alternations as a means of singling out distinctive features. Indeed, if case has meaning, alternations are the only contexts providing something like minimal pairs as they are used in phonology. True, Cognitive Grammar, the linguistic school in which the notion of cases as meaningful, symbolic units of language is nowadays probably most energetically advocated (see Janda 1993: 10–40 for discussion), shows relatively little interest in alternations, perhaps because of their flavour of minimal pairs, suggestive of the featurized approach to meaning which Cognitive Grammar and some other contemporary approaches reject. But whatever our theoretical commitments, the notion that cases might have certain recurring meaning correlates manifesting themselves across otherwise very dissimilar types of use, and that these could be brought to light through a careful analysis of alternations, remains viable and is explored in an interesting way in Seržant's article.

3.   Nominalizations

The Baltic languages have several regular and productive means to derive nouns from verbs, and such deverbal nouns are frequently used in various kinds of texts. Most regular and frequent are action nouns with the suffixes Latvian *-šan-*, Lithuanian *-im-/-ym-* and agent nouns with the suffixes Latvian *-ēj-*, *-tāj-* and Lithuanian *-ėj-*, *-toj-*. There are at least two aspects in which the study of these nouns relates to the topic of this volume. First, the question of whether and how the argument structure of verbs is reflected in nominalizations and how core arguments are realized in action-nominal constructions has been studied within various approaches of modern linguistics and continues to be on the agenda, especially with data from languages other than English (for nominalizations in linguistic typology see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993 and later; Comrie & Thompson 2007; for formal approaches see, among many others, Grimshaw 1990; Alexiadou & Rather, eds. 2010). Second, with one and the same type of nominalization we observe alternations in argument marking which slightly differ from the alternations investigated in the first part of this volume. Nicole Nau's contribution on *Argument realization in Latvian action nominal constructions* is mainly concerned with the first aspect, while Natalia Zaika in her paper *Lithuanian nominalizations and the case marking of their arguments* explores in detail the marking alternations found with action and agent nouns in Lithuanian.

Nominalizations with the suffixes mentioned above show some verbal features, notably combinability with the reflexive marker, with aspectual prefixes, and the negative prefix with scope over the predication. However, the internal syntax of constructions with these nouns is that of noun phrases in general: they are modified by adjectives, not by adverbs,[2] and arguments corresponding to nominative subjects and accusative objects of the verb are expressed as genitive noun phrases preceding the head noun. As in other languages (cf. Dik 1985: 22–25), we usually find subjects of intransitive verbs (S) and objects of transitive verbs (P) expressed in action nominal constructions.

(28) Lithuanian
bet gand-as   *apie*   **karalien-ės**   **Kleopatr-os**
but   rumour-NOM.SG about queen-GEN.SG Cleopatra-GEN
atvyk-im-ą   *jau*   *buvo*   *pasklidęs*
arrive-ACN-ACC.SG already be.PST.3 spread.PPA.NOM.SG.M

(28′) Latvian
bet baum-as   *par*   **karalien-es**   **Kleopatr-as**
but rumour(PL)-NOM about queen-GEN.SG Cleopatra-GEN
iera-šan-os   *jau*   *bija*   *izplatījušās*
arrive-ACN-ACC.SG.REFL already be.PST.3 spread.PPA.NOM.PL.F.REFL
'but the rumour about **Queen Cleopatra's arrival** had already spread'
(Lila, Lith[3])

(29) Lithuanian
O   *šiaip tai*   *buvo*   *Diev-o*   *koron-ė*
but in.all DEM.NA be.PST.3 God-GEN.SG punishment-NOM.SG
už **Amerik-os**   *atrad-im-ą.*
for America-GEN discover-ACN-ACC.SG

(29′) Latvian
Bet vispār   *tas*   *bija*   *Diev-a*
but generally DEM.NOM.SG.M be.PST.3 God-GEN.SG
sod-s   *par* **Amerik-as**   *atklā-šan-u.*
punishment-NOM.SG for America-GEN discover-ACN-ACC.SG
'But by and large this was God's punishment for **the discovery of America**.'
(Lila, Lith.))

---

2. Modification of Latvian agent nouns by adverbs does occasionally occur, see Nau (2013: 113–114). For possible combinations of Lithuanian action nouns with adverbs see Pakerys (2006: 145).

3. When citing examples from the Lithuanian-Latvian parallel corpus Lila, "Lith" marks original Lithuanian and "Latv" marks original Latvian texts, while a sentence in the respective other language is a translation.

The overt expression of subjects of transitive verbs (A) is found much more rarely in action-nominal constructions. With the Latvian action noun with the suffix *-šan-*, the A can only be expressed together with the P. The Lithuanian action noun with *-im/ym-* allows the expression of the A without the P (**Kolumbo atradimas** 'Columbus' discovery'), as does the Latvian action (or rather, act) noun with the suffix *-um-*, which is less general and productive than *-šan-* (**Kolumba atklājumi** 'Columbus' discoveries'). When both the A and the P are expressed, the construction is of the Double-Possessive type in Koptjevskaja-Tamm's typology (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993 and later).

(30) Latvian
Kolumb-a   *Amerik-as*   *atklā-šan-a*
Columbus-GEN   America-GEN   discover-ACN-NOM.SG

(30′) Lithuanian
Kolumb-o   *Amerik-os*   *atrad-im-as*
Columbus-GEN   America-GEN   discover-ACN-NOM.SG
'the discovery of America by Columbus'   (constructed example)

The Double-Possessive type is not widespread in the languages of the world (attested in 7 out of 168 languages in Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2013), and in languages where it occurs it is "often avoided as clumsy and marginal" (Koptjevskaja-Tamm, in press). The latter is certainly true for the Baltic languages. Avoidance of the Double-Possessive construction and a strong tendency to allow only one argument to be realized as genitive in an action nominal construction has different consequences in Latvian and Lithuanian. As mentioned above, the Latvian action noun with the suffix *-šan-* allows the realization of the A only in combination with the P. This means that a single genitive complement of an action noun derived from a transitive verb can only be interpreted as representing the P argument. Structural ambiguity may arise with verbs which may be used in transitive and intransitive constructions, for example, *dziedāt* 'sing' or *zaudēt* 'lose'. In *dziesmu dziedāšana* 'singing of songs', the genitive expresses the P, while in *meiteņu dziedāšana* 'the girls' singing' the genitive represents the S. In most cases, as in this example, the lexical meaning of the complement is an unambiguous cue to the interpretation of the construction (songs do not sing and girls are not sung). Animacy plays a crucial role here and elsewhere in disambiguation, as pointed out by Zaika, this volume.

When a transitive action noun has two animate arguments, a strategy to avoid the Double-Possessive construction and to disambiguate the participants is dative marking (see Kolářová 2014 for Czech). This seems to be possible only in instances where the non-agent participant can be understood as an Addressee, that is, with transitive verbs of communication in a wider sense, such as 'praise', 'encourage', 'warn'. This strategy is found with the Lithuanian action noun with *-im-/-ym-* and

with the Latvian action noun with the suffix *-um-* (not with *-šan-*). With these nouns, the Addressee may be expressed either by a genitive or by a dative complement, and the variant with the dative is probably preferred when the Agent is expressed, as in the following examples. Note that the verbs Lithuanian *pagirti* 'praise' and Latvian *uzmundrināt* 'encourage' are not used with the dative, and the Latvian action noun *uzmundrināšana* is attested only with genitive complements expressing the Patient/Addressee.

(31) Lithuanian   (Zaika, this volume)
   Ir   visgi Tav-uosius   pagyr-im-us   man
   and   still   your-ACC.PL.M.DEF praise-ACN-ACC.PL 1SG.DAT
   kaipmat   atrem-siu.
   presently refute-FUT.1SG
   'And still I will refute your praise of me presently.'   (LKT)

(32) Latvian
   Labo iespaidu bojā muļķīgi sīkumi, piemēram,
   Smilten-es TV ziņ-u   vadītāj-a   uzmundrināj-um-s
   PLN-GEN   TV news-GEN.PL director-GEN.SG encourage-ACN-NOM
   dom-es   vadītāj-am,   lai   pēc   nākam-ajām
   council-GEN.SG director-DAT.SG HORT after next-DAT.PL.F.DEF
   vēlēšan-ām   viņ-am   vis-s   lab-i.
   election-DAT.PL 3-DAT.SG.M all-NOM.SG good-ADV
   'The positive impression is spoilt by stupid trifles, for example, Smiltene TV's news director's encouragement of the chairman of the council [wishing that] everything may be fine for him after the next elections.'
                              (from a feature in the magazine *Ir*, 2014)

Occasionally, one may even find accusative marking of the P as a strategy to avoid ambiguity. In the following example from Lithuanian, accusative marking and word order signal that the noun phrase expresses the object (*žaidimas girtuoklį* 'playing the drunkard'). A construction with a prenominal genitive would be ambiguous and the genitive most probably be interpreted as expressing an agent (*girtuoklio žaidimas* 'the drunkard's playing').

(33) Lithuanian
   Jau ir pati mačiau, kad viską esu pagadinusi, nes paslaptis dabar buvo įvardyta ir
   žaid-im-as   girtuokl-į   ne-be-teko   žavesi-o.
   play-ACN-NOM.SG drunkard-ACC.SG NEG-CNT-get.PST.3 charm-GEN.SG
   'Meanwhile I saw myself that I had ruined everything, for the secret had been spelled out and **playing the drunkard** had lost its charm.'   (Lila, Latv)

With agent nouns, only the object can be realized as a genitive complement, as the subject is already incorporated in the noun. There are thus no problems with ambiguity or "clumsy" constructions.

The realization of arguments other than canonical subjects and objects has received much less attention in the study of nominalizations. There seems to be less cross-linguistic variation, the tendency being that such arguments are marked as their correspondents in verbal phrases (cf. Comrie & Thompson 2007: 355). Zaika in her contribution to this volume takes a closer look at arguments and adjuncts marked with the dative, instrumental, locative, or as prepositional phrases that occur with Lithuanian action and agent nouns. She finds that in several instances the original marking alternates with genitive marking, for example:

(34) Lithuanian   (Zaika, this volume)
      a. *susirg-im-as*   ***grip-u***
          fall_ill-ACN-NOM.SG flu-INS.SG   'catching the flu'   (LKT)
      b. ***grip-o***   *susirg-im-as*
          flu-GEN.SG fall_ill-ACN-NOM.SG   'catching the flu'   (LKT)

(35) a. *kovo-toj-ą*   ***už*** *nepriklausomyb-ę*
          fight-AGN-ACC.SG for independence-ACC.SG
          'fighter for independence'   (LKT)
      b. ***nepriklausomyb-ės***   *kovotoj-as*
          independence-GEN.SG fight-AGN-NOM.SG
          'fighter for independence'   (LKT)

Zaika works out several factors that influence the choice of marking. For example, with action nouns inanimate dative or instrumental arguments genitivize more easily than animate (human) arguments, especially when the subject of the corresponding verb is animate (human) as well. This is motivated by avoidance of ambiguous constructions, as a human participant expressed as a genitive before the noun tends to be interpreted as the Agent. For dative and instrumental arguments of action nouns, Zaika found a correlation with frequency of occurrence, which in turn partly (though not always) correlates with degree of lexicalization: with more frequent agent nouns, such as *padėjėjas* 'helper' or *pasekėjas* 'follower', realization as a genitive complement prevails, while with less frequent agent nouns (less than 50 hits in LKT) such as *keršytojas* 'avenger' or *tikėtojas* 'believer' the original dative or instrumental marking is retained. Noun phrases in the locative and prepositional phrases as a rule do not genitivize, though genitivization is possible when these phrases function as local or temporal adjuncts. In this instance the alternation between original marking and the genitive correlates with a change

in meaning as well as construction, for example *gyvenimas mieste* (locative) 'life in the city (maybe a specific city)' vs. *miesto gyvenimas* (genitive) 'city life, urban life'.

Another less studied field of investigation is nominalizations of verbs with non-canonical argument structure, such as the pain verbs mentioned above and other experiencer verbs. Which of the arguments of such a verb may be realized, what marking is possible, and which argument (if any) may become the referent of an agent noun? There is no uniform answer to these questions, as individual verbs show different behaviour. Let us first have a look at the Lithuanian verb *skaudėti* 'hurt', whose argument marking was shown above (dative Experiencer/ Possessor and accusative or nominative Theme (body-part)). With the action noun *skaudėjimas* the argument referring to the body-part is easily realized and appears as a genitive complement, for example *galvos skaudėjimas* 'headache'. The Experiencer is very rarely realized, and the only possible form of its realization seems to be the possessive pronoun. When a genitive complement refers to the person experiencing the pain, it is more likely to be interpreted structurally as a modifier of the noun phrase expressing the body part than as a complement of the action noun. Thus, while the following example is ambiguous, the interpretation 'the hurting of the child's little stomach' is more natural than (literally) 'a child's aching of the little stomach'. Note, however, that the action-nominal construction refers to a situation ('a four-year-old having stomach ache').

(36) Lithuanian
      keturmeči-o   **vaik-o**   **pilveli-o**
      four_years_old-GEN.SG child-GEN.SG   stomach.DIM-GEN
      skaudėj-im-as,   *kai*   *reikia*   *eiti*   *į*
      hurt-ACN-NOM.SG   when   be_necessary.PRS.3   go.INF to
      daržel-į
      kindergarten-ACC.SG
      'a four-year-old's stomach ache when they have to go to the kindergarten'
                              (www.psichoterapijairpsichoanalize.lt/gydome3.html*)*

The agent noun *skaudėtojas* 'one who feels pain' occurs only as a creative derivation in colloquial texts, as in the following example.

(37) Latvian
      Vakars, **galv-ų**   **skaudė-toj-ai,**   *referat-ų*
      evening head-GEN.PL   hurt-AGN-NOM.PL   report-GEN.PL
      rašy-toj-ai…
      write-AGN-NOM.PL
      'Good evening, head-achers, report-writers…'
            (forum/chat post at *banga.tv3.lt/lt/*, responding to posts where members
                        wrote about their having headaches and writing reports)

Thus, there are some parallels between Lithuanian *skaudėti* 'hurt' and transitive verbs with respect to nominalization, but these are rather on the level of possibilities than that of established language use: IF an agent noun is formed, its referent is the Experiencer, not the Theme, and IF the Experiencer is realized with an action noun, possessive marking is used instead of the original dative.

In her contribution on action nouns in Latvian, Nau examines several verbs with a dative argument expressing an Experiencer or a Possessor (see also Nau 2013 for agent nouns). She finds that in general it is the other argument (marked with the nominative, genitive, or accusative with the verb) that genitivizes, not the Experiencer/Possessor. The latter may be expressed by a possessive pronoun (for example, *mana salšana* 'my being cold'), but these constructions are very rare. It seems that this argument is not accessible in action nominalizations. On the other hand, it may be the referent of an agent noun. As with Lithuanian *skaudėtojas*, such agent nouns belong to creative language use and are found mainly, but not only, in colloquial registers.

Two verbs differ in their behavior from these general rules. The possessive verb *piederēt* 'belong to' treats the dative Possessor argument as a lexical dative object: with action nouns it retains its case and is placed after the head noun. The nominative Possessum in turn genitivizes. An agent noun seems to be impossible with this verb. Of special interest is the verb *patikt* 'appeal to; like', as it may behave in two different ways, according to which argument is more prominent. In most instances this is the Experiencer dative argument and *patikt* then behaves like other experiencer verbs: the Experiencer may be the referent of the agent noun and never genitivizes with the action noun, while the Stimulus argument genitivizes, for example: *rudens patikšana* 'liking autumn, the appeal of autumn', *zēnu paticējs* 'boy-liker'. It is however also possible to highlight the other argument, especially if it refers to humans. Then this argument may become the referent of an agent noun and the Experiencer may appear as genitive complement of action and agent nouns, for example *publikas patikšana* 'pleasing the public, the public's liking', *sievu paticēji* 'wife-pleasers'. Word-formation thus shows that the verb *patikt* is polysemous in modern Latvian, combining the meanings of English *like* and *please*. In finite forms of the verb this polysemy does not show. The argument marking is the same in both meanings, and there are no formal signs of "canonization" of this verb when it has the meaning 'like' (for example, there is never agreement with the dative Experiencer). These data open up interesting questions about the relation between word-formation and syntax, for example, the status of word-formation in relation to "behavioural" and "coding" properties of arguments (Haspelmath 2010).

4.   Operations adding predications and arguments

In our overview of voice phenomena in Volume 2 of this series, we briefly discussed the different techniques that may relate transitive and intransitive verbs in Baltic (Nau & Holvoet 2015: 2–5). For transitivization, or valency-increasing in general, two different techniques are used in Latvian and Lithuanian. Derivational suffixes create morphological causatives and are thus associated with transitivization by addition of an agent, while derivational prefixes are associated with the addition of an object to the argument structure of the verb. Referring to the latter process we will speak of the applicative function of prefixes. Causativization and the argument structure of morphological causatives were discussed in three chapters of Volume 2 (Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015; Holvoet 2015a; Nau 2015). In the current volume, we focus on the applicative function of prefixes and on nonmorphological causative constructions.

Prefixation as transitivization is less regular than causativization by suffixes. There is no prefix specialized for the applicative function, and transitivization sometimes seems to be a side-effect of other functions of the prefix.

The set of derivational prefixes, or preverbs, in Baltic is similar to and partly cognate with such elements in Slavic and Germanic languages (see Kozhanov, this volume, for a list of prefixes in Baltic and Slavic). At first glance, the Latvian and Lithuanian inventories look almost identical, but there are many differences in the meaning and distribution of individual prefixes, which we will not be able to discuss here.

The applicative function of Lithuanian preverbs is the topic of Kirill Kozhanov's paper *Verbal prefixation and argument structure in Lithuanian*. He distinguishes several groups of constructions where prefixation is associated with a change in argument structure, and applies transitivity tests to investigate whether an accusative-marked added noun phrase is indeed a direct object. In the first group, landmark applicatives, an intransitive verb of motion, such as *eiti* 'go', *bėgti* 'run', combines with one of the prefixes *ap-, per-, pra-,* or *pri-* and an object expressing a landmark in relation to the motion, for example *per-eiti gatvę* 'cross the street (by walking)', *pra-bėgti tiltą* 'pass the bridge by running'.

(38)   Lithuanian
 J-is lėtai patraukė nam-ų linkui, bet
 3-NOM.SG.M slowly pull.PST.3 house-GEN.PL towards but
 pri-ėjęs   *savo tarpuvart-ę staiga* **per-ėjo**
 PVB-go.PPA.NOM.SG.M RPO gateway-ACC.SG suddenly PVB-go.PST.3
 gatv-ę ir nu-bėgo į cerkv-ę.
 street-ACC.SG and PVB-run.PST.3 to church-ACC.SG

'He walked slowly homewards but, having arrived at his gateway (literally: having approached his gateway), he suddenly crossed the street and ran towards a church.'   (Lila, Lith)

These constructions pass all or most transitivity tests (such as obligatoriness, passivization, impossibility of having two objects), which distinguishes them from the second group, called distance applicative. With distance applicatives, which are formed from a motion verb with the prefix *nu-*, the accusative-marked noun phrase expresses a measured distance, for example ***nu-eiti du kilometrus*** 'walk two kilometers', ***nu-eiti visą gatvę*** 'walk the whole street (through)'.

(39) Lithuanian
*Mes   jau   beveik   **nu-ėjom**   vis-ą   gatv-ę*
1PL.NOM PTC almost PVB-go.PST.1PL all-ACC.SG street-ACC.SG
ligi   gal-o.
up_to end-GEN.SG
'Now we have almost walked the whole street up to its end.'   (Lila, Lith)

A crucial difference between landmark applicatives and distance applicatives is that the latter can also be formed from transitive verbs, in which case the original object retains all characteristics of a direct object. This shows that the accusative NP expressing the distance cannot be a direct object. Kozhanov speaks of this element as "an obligatory spatial accusative".

(40) Lithuanian   (from Kozhanov, this volume)
Nu-nešiau   *vaik-ą*   *du   kilometr-us*
PRV-carry.1SG.PST child-ACC.SG two kilometer-ACC.PL
'I carried the child for two km'

Such a construction is impossible with landmark applicatives: with transitive motion verbs such as *nešti* 'carry', a landmark can only be expressed by a prepositional phrase, such as *per gatvę* 'across the street'. Prepositional phrases for landmarks are common with intransitive motion verbs as well and seem to be more frequent than direct objects. Applicativization of landmarks is thus optional.

In Latvian, landmark applicativization is more restricted. Translation equivalents of Lithuanian constructions with an accusative object most often contain a prepositional phrase or a relational adverb, as in the following translation of Example (38).

(41) Latvian
Lēnām viņ-š   devās   uz māj-u
slowly 3-NOM.SG.M make_for.PST.3 to house-GEN.PL
*pus-i,   bet, **no-nācis**   **pie** sav-as*
side-ACC.SG but PVB-come.PPA.NOM.SG.M at   RPO-GEN.SG.F

vārt-u   starp-as,   pēkšņi pār-gāja   pāri
gate(PL)-GEN space-GEN.SG suddenly PVB-go.PST.3 across
iel-ai   un aiz-skrēja   uz baznīc-u.
street-DAT.SG and PVB-run.PST.3 to church-ACC.SG
'He started to walk slowly homewards but, having arrived at his gateway, he
suddenly crossed the street and ran towards the church.'   (Lila, Lith)

Latvian has further techniques for the expression of landmarks with motion
verbs. In addition to prepositions and relational adverbs (which may also occur
together), it has introduced the dative as a case governed by prefixed motion verbs
(on the origin of this type of marking cf. Holvoet 2007: 138–141). The different
techniques are illustrated in the following constructed examples with the verb
ap-iet 'walk around'.

(42) Latvian   (constructed examples)
    a. *Viṇ-a   ap-gāja   māj-u*
        3-NOM.SG.F PVB-go.PST.3 house-ACC.SG
    b. *Viṇ-a   ap-gāja   ap   māj-u*
        3-NOM.SG.F PVB-go.PST.3 PREP house-ACC.SG
    c. *Viṇ-a   ap-gāja   apkārt māj-ai /*
        3-NOM.SG.F PVB-go.PST.3 ADV   house-DAT.SG
        māj-ai   apkārt
        house-DAT.SG ADV
    d. *Viṇ-a   ap-gāja   apkārt ap   māj-u*
        3-NOM.SG.F PVB-go.PST.3 ADV   PREP house-ACC.SG
    e. *Viṇ-a   ap-gāja   māj-ai*
        3-NOM.SG.F PVB-go.PST.3 house-DAT.SG
        'She walked around the house.'

With the prefix *pie-*, accusative marking of the landmark is not possible, but the
remaining variants are well attested. The relational adverb (*klāt*[4]) has no formal
similarity to the prefix.

(43) Latvian
      *Noa **pie-gāja**   **pie** plaukt-a   un t-o   vēroja.*
      PN   PVB-go.PST.3 to   shelf-GEN.SG and DEM-ACC.SG watch.PST.3
      'Noa walked to the shelf and watched.'   (Lila, Latv)

---

4.   In both Latvian and Lithuanian an adverb meaning 'close' (often in the comparative) can
also be used in this function, while Latvian *klāt* has no equivalent in Lithuanian (or in English).
It signals presence at a landmark as the result of motion towards this landmark.

(44) Latvian
    Viņ-š   **pie-gāja**   **plaukt-am**   *un*
    3-NOM.SG.M PVB-go.PST.3 shelf-DAT.SG and
    paburzīja   *vien-a*   *audekl-a*   *stūr-i.*
    crinkle.PST.3 one-GEN.SG.M canvas-GEN.SG corner-ACC.SG
    'He walked to the shelf and crinkled a corner of the canvas.'   (Lila, Latv)

(45) *sa-klausīja*   *rūgt-o*   *raudā-šan-u*   *un*
      PVB-hear.PST.3 bitter-ACC.SG.DEF cry-ACN-ACC.SG and
      pie-gāja   **nelaimīg-ajam**   **klāt.**
      PVB-go.PST.3 unhappy-DAT.SG.M.DEF ADV
      'He caught the sound of the bitter crying and approached the unhappy man.'
                                                   (Lila, Latv)

There seem to be no clear rules for this variation. With *pie-*, the prepositional phrase is the prevalent variant; dative marking with or without a relational adverb is found both with animate and inanimate landmarks, but less frequently. With *pār-*, the construction with the relational adverb seems to be most frequent, while motion verbs with the prefix *ap-* more often combine with an accusative object. More research is needed to understand the factors at work here.

Distance applicatives, on the other hand, are common in Latvian and seem to follow the same rules as in Lithuanian. The following sentence is the translation of Example (39):

(46) Latvian
    Mēs   *gandrīz jau esam*   **no-gājuši**
    1PL.NOM almost   PTC be.PRS.1PL PVB-go.PPA.NOM.PL.M
    vis-u   **iel-u**   *līdz*   *gal-am.*
    all-ACC.SG street-ACC.SG up_to end-DAT.SG
    'Now we have almost walked the whole street up to its end.'   (Lila, Lith)

The Latvian prefix *no-* is also used in combination with time expressions measuring the time span in which an activity is performed. In Lithuanian, the prefixes *at-* and *iš-* are used in this function.

(47) Latvian
    Darba devējam ir pienākums precīzi uzskaitīt
    katr-a   *darbiniek-a*   **no-strādā-t-ās**
    each-GEN.SG.M employee-GEN.SG PVB-work-PPP-ACC.PL.F.DEF
    stund-as.
    hour-ACC.PL

(47′) Lithuanian
Darbdavys privalo tiksliai suskaičiuoti
*kiekvien-o   darbuotoj-o   **iš-dirb-t-as**   valand-as.*
each-GEN.SG.M employee-GEN.SG PVB-work-PPP-ACC.PL.F hour-ACC.PL
'The employer is obliged to precisely count the hours worked by each employee.'
(Lila, Latv)

(48)   Latvian
Ne-gribēja   jau lais-t,   ne-biju
NEG-want.PST.3 PTC let_go-INF NEG-be.PST.1SG
no-strādājusi   *obligāt-os*   *div-us   gad-us*
PVB-work.PPA.NOM.SG.F mandatory-ACC.PL.M.DEF two-ACC year-ACC.PL

(48′) Lithuanian
Tik ne-norėjo   paleis-ti,   mat ne-buvau
PTC NEG-want.PST.3 let_go-INF PTC NEG-be.PST.1SG
ati-dirbusi   *privalom-ų*   *dvej-ų   met-ų*
PVB-work.PPA.NOM.SG.F mandatory-GEN.PL two-GEN year-GEN.PL
'He didn't want to let me go, I hadn't worked the mandatory two years'
(Lila, Latv)

Kozhanov shows that Lithuanian temporal applicatives with the prefixes *at-* and *iš-* behave like transitive verbs. They pass all relevant transitivity tests, not only passivization and genitive of negation (as can be seen in the above examples), but, more importantly, also the double-object restriction: they do not combine with transitive verbs. Another Lithuanian prefix used with temporal extension, *pra-*, does not share this last restriction.

When the verb designates a state rather than an activity, there seems to be a greater variety of prefixes, and the accusative-marked time expression shares fewer characteristics of direct objects. More research on state verbs is needed.

Another group of applicatives discussed by Kozhanov includes constructions where an object is affected (created, eliminated, damaged) as the result of the action expressed by the verb. These objects pass the relevant transitivity tests.

(49)   Lithuanian   (from Kozhanov, this volume)
Su-sėdėjai   *man*   *skar-el-ę.*
PVB-sit.PST.2SG 1SG.DAT scarf-DIM-ACC.SG
'You sat on my scarf and rumpled it.'   (DLKŽ)

Applicative predication of this type is sometimes hard to set apart from another construction: resultative secondary predication. In the above example the prefix merely implies a change of state of the object. The specific character of this change (for example, that the scarf is rumpled, not torn, or bleached, etc.) is not spelled out but has to be inferred from the meaning of the verb and the object. Apart

from their basic local meaning, prefixes have abstract and rather general meanings which can only be interpreted in context. An especially intriguing example is the Lithuanian prefix *pri-*, which in its spatial meaning indicates that a landmark has been reached (as in *pri-eiti* 'walk up to', 'arrive at'). In this meaning it is equivalent to Latvian *pie-*. However, Lithuanian *pri-* has additional functions not shared by Latvian *pie-*: it signals indefinite quantity and/or is associated with the concept 'full' (see Seržant 2014: 261–262; for similar uses of Slavic prefixes, see, among others, Filip 2005). The following examples illustrate the meaning 'full' which the prefix seems to convey. The first example is discussed in Riaubienė's contribution to this volume, to which we will now turn. The second is taken from Wiemer & Žemaitienė, this volume, who discuss several instances of this and related uses of *pri-* and coding alternations with *pri-*prefixed verbs.

(50)   Lithuanian
       Jon-as   ***pri*-*valgė*.**
       John-NOM.SG   PVB-eat.PST.3
       'John ate himself full.'

(51)   ***Pri*-*lijo***   *vand-ens*   *ežer-us*.
       PVB-rain.PST.3   water-GEN   lake-ACC.PL
       'The lakes were filled with water', more literally: 'It rained the lakes (full) with water.'   (http://zodynai.igloro.info/z/ežeras/)

Given the many other functions of *pri-*, it would be inadequate to maintain that *pri-* has the lexical meaning 'full' and that in examples like the two above it introduces a secondary predication. An additional property predicated of an argument of the verb has to be made explicit by an independent word or a phrase. Such constructions are the topic of Benita Riaubienė's paper *Resultative secondary predicates in the Baltic languages*. She adopts Levin & Rappaport Hovav's definition of resultative secondary predicate as "an XP that denotes the state achieved by the referent of the NP it is predicated of as a result of the action denoted by the verb" (Levin, Rappaport Hovav 1995: 34). In the Baltic languages, such XP may be an adjective, an adverb, or a prepositional phrase. In general, Latvian uses adjectives while Lithuanian uses adverbs, for example:

(52)   Latvian   (from Riaubienė, this volume)
       Jān-is   *no-krāsoja*   *mašīn-u*   ***sarkan-u*.**
       John-NOM.SG   PVB-paint.PST.3   car-ACC.SG   red-ACC.SG

(52′) Lithuanian   (from Riaubienė, this volume)
       Jon-as   *nu-dažė*   *mašin-ą*   ***raudon-ai*.**
       John-NOM.SG   PVB-paint.PST.3   car-ACC.SG   red-ADV
       'John painted the car red.'

With this preference Latvian is in line with its northern neighbours Estonian and Finnish, while Lithuanian shares its lack of adjectival resultatives with the Slavic languages.

Prepositional phrases in both languages often appear in the type Riaubienė calls "non-entailed resultatives" (as the change of state is not lexically entailed in the verb; this corresponds to the notion of "strong resultatives", cf. Washio 1997). Constructions with non-entailed resultatives (with a PP or an adjective/adverb) are possible both with derivatives from transitive verbs (Examples (53) and (54)) and from intransitive verbs (Examples (55) and (56)).

(53) Lithuanian
Jon-as   pri-mušė   vyr-ą   iki mirt-ies.
John-NOM.SG PVB-beat.PST.3 man-ACC.SG to   death-GEN.SG
'John beat the man to death.'

(54) Latvian
Jān-is   no-kasīja   rok-u   līdz asin-īm.
John-NOM.SG PVB-scratch.PST.3SG hand-ACC.SG to   blood(PL)-DAT
'John scratched his hand bloody.'

(55) Latvian
Mērij-a   sa-sēdēja   kleit-u   slapj-u.
Mary-NOM.SG PVB-sit.PST.3   dress-ACC.SG wet-ACC.SG
'Mary sat her dress wet (with sweat).'

(56) Latvian
Jān-is   no-sēdējās   stīv-s.
John-NOM.SG PVB-sit.PST.3.REFL stiff-NOM.SG.M
'John sat himself stiff.'

Riaubienė argues that in these constructions, the features of telicity and causativity, which are constitutive for resultative secondary predication, are introduced by the prefix. Furthermore, if the base verb is intransitive (such as *sēdēt* 'sit' in Example (55)), prefixation is obligatory. In other words, the prefix licenses the additional argument (see also Holvoet 2008). A further variant of this construction is shown in Example (56), where the additional argument is coreferential with the subject and therefore realized by the reflexive marker.

The connection between prefixation and resultative secondary predication is well known (cf., among others, Müller 2002 on German), but their co-occurrence and interplay in Baltic seem to call for a more detailed and differentiated description of lexicalization patterns (in the sense of Talmy 2007) in the verb phrase in connection with resultativity, and of the degrees of lexical specification of "results". The complexity and apparently layered nature of resultative (secondary)

predication in Baltic, especially Latvian, is reminiscent of the structure of spatial constructions, whose complex structure, illustrated above for Latvian, involving an interplay of prefixes, spatial adverbs and spatial complements, defies a clear-cut characterization in terms of verb-framed and satellite-framed constructions (cf. Talmy 1991). A comparative areal study of these two domains could perhaps be a rewarding topic.

Semantically related to resultatives through the causal relationship, but syntactically very different is the syntactic causative, dealt with in Jurgis Pakerys' article *On periphrastic causative constructions in Lithuanian and Latvian*. The author gives a thorough overview of factive and permissive causative constructions (corresponding to English constructions with *make* and *let*, respectively) in both languages. These constructions have received virtually no attention until now in Baltic scholarship because of the stronger prominence of morphological causatives and presumably also because of the low degree of grammaticalization of the periphrastic constructions. The lexical input for periphrastic causatives in Baltic comes mainly from manipulative complement-taking predicates (on these predicates see Noonan 2007: 136–137), and there are as yet but few symptoms of the processes of auxiliarization and clausal union observed in other languages (cf. the French causative constructions of the type *Eve fit manger la pomme à Adam*). Still, the shift from manipulative to causative construction has taken place, as can be seen from numerous examples where the animacy restrictions applying to manipulative predicates (which refer to human interaction) have been lifted:

(56)   Lithuanian   (from Pakerys, this volume)
       K-as   **verčia**   *vasar-ą*   **žydė-ti**   *gėl-es?*
       what-NOM   compel.PRS.3   summer-ACC.SG   blossom-INF   flower-ACC.PL
       'What makes the flowers blossom in the summer?'

At the present stage, both Lithuanian and Latvian show a considerable variety of what Harris & Campbell (1995: 72–75) call "exploratory expressions", involving verbs with lexical meanings ranging from physical action (Lithuanian *spausti*, Latvian *spiest* 'press, squeeze') to verbal interaction (Lithuanian *liepti*, Latvian *likt* 'bid, order') through more general manipulative meaning (Lithuanian *versti* 'compel'). Any of them could eventually give rise to a grammaticalized syntactic causative, but it is not clear which, if any, will come out as winner. In his article, Pakerys uses corpus and internet data to establish the relative productivity of individual verbs used to encode the causative relationship and its subtypes (both factive and permissive constructions are taken into account), the syntactic contexts in which they occur, and features possibly attesting to processes of clausal union. This investigation will make it possible to monitor changes and to see whether a grammaticalized syntactic causative is emerging in Baltic.

5.   Concluding remarks

The collective effort, reflected in this volume and its predecessors, towards advancing our understanding of clausal architecture, argument marking, voice and a series of related phenomena in Baltic, will have fully achieved its aim if, apart from new insights, new research questions appear in its wake. We can but conjecture which research threads will prove most tempting. Some will no doubt emerge from ongoing processes of language change: one will be curious to follow further developments in argument marking with the debitive (discussed in Seržant & Taperte), or the possible grammaticalization of a syntactic causative (discussed in Pakerys). Intra-Baltic comparison will no doubt benefit from the parallel corpora currently under construction, and one could imagine fruitful studies on the scope of the genitive of negation (discussed in Arkadiev) or valency-changing prefixation (discussed in Kozhanov). Much is to be done in areal research: Baltic-Fennic convergences in secondary resultative predication (discussed in Riaubienė) or in the marking of translocation (discussed by Zaika) deserve to be investigated in detail, or explored. Perhaps most of all it is to be wished that the accounts proposed by the contributors to this and previous volumes will be challenged, and research results improved upon, which would be a true measure of the vitality of Baltic scholarship.

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	LOC	locative
ADV	adverb	M	masculine
AGN	agent noun	NA	non-agreeing form
ACN	action noun	NEG	negation
CNT	continuative	NOM	nominative
CVB	converb	PL	plural
DAT	dative	PLN	place name
DEB	debitive	PN	personal name
DEF	definite	PPA	past active participle
DEM	demonstrative	PPP	past passive participle
DIM	diminutive	PRS	present
F	feminine	PST	past
FUT	future	PTC	particle
GEN	genitive	PVB	preverb
HORT	hortative	Q	interrogative marker
IMP	imperative	REFL	reflexive
INF	infinitive	RPO	reflexive possessive
INS	instrumental	SG	singular
IRR	irrealis		

Sources

DLKŽ = *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [Dictionary of modern Lithuanian]. 2006. Stasys Keinys, Laimutis Bilkis, Jonas Paulauskas, Vytautas Vitkauskas (eds). Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Lila = *Lietuviešu-latviešu-lietuviešu paralēlo tekstu korpuss*; parallel corpus of Lithuanian and Latvian texts. Available online at http://www.korpuss.lv/lila/

Lila, Lith = Lithuanian original, Latvian translation

Lila, Latv = Latvian original, Lithuanian translation

LKT = *Lietuvių kalbos tekstynas*; corpus of contemporary Lithuanian. Available online at http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis & Rathert, Monika (eds). 2010. *The Syntax of Nominalizations Across Languages and Frameworks*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110245875

Anderson, Cori. 2011. Case theory and case alternation: Evidence from Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2: 9–35.

Arkadiev, Peter M. 2014. Case and word order in Lithuanian infinitival clauses revisited. In *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 43–95. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/vargreb.1.02ark

Arkadiev, Peter & Pakerys, Jurgis. 2015. Lithuanian morphological causatives. A corpus-based study. In *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 39–97. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Berg-Olsen, Sturla. 1999. *A Syntactic Change in Progress: The Decline in the Use of the Non-Prepositional Genitive in Latvian, with a Comparative View on Lithuanian*. MA thesis, Oslo University.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel. doi:10.1007/978-94-009-4522-7

Comrie, Bernard & Thompson, Sandra A. 2007. Lexical nominalization. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Timothy Shopen (ed). Second edition. Volume III: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 334–381. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, William. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive Organization of Information*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar. Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198299554.001.0001

Cruse, D. Alan. 1973: Some thoughts on agentivity. *Journal of Linguistics*, 9 (1): 1–23. doi:10.1017/S0022226700003509

Culicover, Peter & Jackendoff, Ray. 2005. *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199271092.001.0001

DeLancey, Scott.1984. Notes on agentivity and causation. *Studies in Language* 8 (2): 181–213. doi:10.1075/sl.8.2.05del

Dik, Simon C. 1985. Formal and semantic adjustment of derived constructions. In *Predicates and Terms in Functional Grammar*, A. Machtelt Bolkestein, Casper de Groot and J. Lachlan Mackenzie (eds.), 1–28. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Endzelin, J[an]. 1922. *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: Kommissionsverlag A. Gulbis.

Filip, Hana. 2005. On accumulating and having it all. Perfectivity, prefixes and bare arguments. In *Perspectives on Aspect*, Henk J. Verkuyl, Henriëtte de Swart and Angeliek van Hout (eds), 125–148. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/1-4020-3232-3_7

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms (eds), 1–25. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fried, Mirjam. 2004. Predicate semantics and event construal in Czech case marking. In *Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective*, Mirjam Fried and Jan Ola Östman (eds), 78–119. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cal.2

Grimshaw, Jane 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT-press.

Gruber, Jeffrey. 1965/1970. *Studies in Lexical Relations*. PhD dissertation, MIT. Reprinted as Jeffrey Gruber, *Lexical Structures in Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Harris, Alice C. & Campbell, Lyle. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511620553

Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. The Behaviour-before-Coding Principle in syntactic change. In *Essais de typologie et de linguistique générale. Mélanges offerts à Denis Creissels*, Franck Floricic (ed.), 541–554. Lyon: ENS.

Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford: University Press.

Holvoet, Axel. 2000. Once more the Baltic genitive of agent. *Baltistica* 35 (1): 45–58.

Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Studies in the Latvian Verb*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Holvoet, Axel. 2008. Secondary predicates in Baltic. In *Secondary Predicates in Eastern European Languages and Beyond*, Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel and Winfried Boeder (eds.), 125–140. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.

Holvoet, Axel. 2015a. Extended uses of morphological causatives in Latvian. In *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 147–177. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benhamins.

Holvoet, Axel. 2015b. Latvian passives – personal, impersonal and evidential. In *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 367–394. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/vargreb.2.08hol

Holvoet, Axel & Grzybowska, Marta. 2014. Non-canonical grammatical relations in a modal construction. The Latvian debitive. In *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 97–135. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/vargreb.1.03hol

Holvoet, Axel & Nau, Nicole. 2014. Argument marking and grammatical relations in Baltic. An overview. In *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 1–41. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/vargreb.1.01hol

Hopper, Paul J. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56 (2): 251–299. doi:10.1353/lan.1980.0017

Jakobson, Roman. (1936/1971). Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. In *Selected Writings, II: Word and Language*, The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 23–71.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Janda, Laura A. 1993. *A Geography of Case Semantics. The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110867930

Kibort, Anna. 2009. Intermediary agents and unexpressed pronouns. In *Proceedings of the LFG09 Conference*, *Trinity College, Cambridge*, Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (eds), 289–309. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Kolářová, Veronika. 2014. Special valency behavior of Czech deverbal nouns. In *Noun Valency*, Olga Spevak (ed.), 19–60. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/slcs.158.02kol

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 1993. *Nominalizations*. London: Routledge.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2013. Action nominal constructions. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath (eds). Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at http://wals.info/chapter/62, Accessed on 2014-03-30.)

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. Forthcoming. *Nominalizations*. To appear in: *Word-Formation. A Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, Peter O. Müller, et al. (eds). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Levin, Beth & Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax–Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McFadden, Thomas. 2010. Structural case, locality and cyclicity. In: *Explorations of Phase Theory: Features and Arguments*, Kleanthes K. Grohmann (ed.), 107–130. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Miklosich, Franz. 1926. *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen, vol.4. Syntax*. Reprint. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

MLLVG. 1959–1962. *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.

Müller, Stefan. 2002. *Complex Predicates: Verbal Complexes, Resultative Constructions, and Particle Verbs in German*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Nau, Nicole. 2013. Latvian agent nouns: their meaning, grammar, and use. *Baltic Linguistics* 4: 79–131.

Nau, Nicole. 2014. Differential object marking in Latgalian. In *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 207–255. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/vargreb.1.06nau

Nau, Nicole. 2015. Morphological causatives in contemporary Latvian. In *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 99–145. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nau, Nicole & Holvoet, Axel. 2015. Voice in Baltic: An overview. In *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 1–36. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Noonan, Michael. 2007. Complementation. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Timothy Shopen (ed). Second edition. Volume II: *Complex Constructions*, 52–150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pakerys, Jurgis. 2006. Veiksmo pavadinimo konstrukcija lietuvių kalbos gramatikoje [Action Noun Construction in Lithuanian Grammar]. In *Daiktavardinio junginio tyrimai* (Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai 4), Axel Holvoet and Rolandas Mikulskas (eds.), 121–149. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla.

Przepiórkowski, Adam. 2000. Long-distance genitive of negation in Polish. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8: 119–158.

Roduner, Markus. 2005. Der Nominativ in Zeitadverbien im Litauischen. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 52: 41–58.

Schmalstieg, William R. 1978. Lithuanian constructions of the type *jo būta* as a reflection of the Indo-European voice. *Baltistica* 14 (1): 15–19.

Seržant, Ilja. 2014. The independent partitive genitive in Lithuanian. In *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*, Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau (eds), 257–299. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/vargreb.1.07ser

Talmy, Leonard. 1991. Path to realization: a typology of event conflation. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 17: 480–519.

Talmy, Leonard. 2007. Lexical typologies. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description,* Timothy Shopen (ed). Second edition. Vol. III: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 67–168. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wälchli, Bernhard. 1998. Der Synkretismus der Lokalkasus im Lettischen und Livischen. *Linguistica Baltica* 7: 207–228.

Washio, Ryuichi. 1997. Resultatives, compositionality and language variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6: 1–49. doi:10.1023/A:1008257704110

Woolford, Ellen. 2003. Burzio's generalization, markedness and locality constraints on nominative objects. In *New Perspectives on Case Theory* [CSLI Lecture Notes 156], Ellen Brandner and Heike Zinsmeister (eds), 299–327. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Zwarts, Joost. 2010. A hierarchy of locations: Evidence from the encoding of direction in adpositions and cases. *Linguistics* 48 (5): 983–1009. doi:10.1515/ling.2010.032

Case marking and case alternations

Long-distance Genitive of Negation in Lithuanian

Peter Arkadiev

Institute of Slavic Studies / Russian State University for the Humanities / Sholokhov Moscow State University for the Humanities, Moscow / Vilnius University

This paper investigates the phenomenon of the replacement of Accusative case marking on the direct object of a transitive infinitive (or, rarely, participle) by the Genitive when the non-finite clause is embedded under a negated matrix verb. Basing myself on data collected from native speakers, corpora and the Internet, I show that the phenomenon of long-distance Genitive of Negation in Lithuanian is acceptable (and often obligatory) with various kinds of matrix verbs: subject control verbs, object control verbs with Dative, Genitive and Accusative objects, and some complex noun + verb predicates. In some of these instances, Genitive of Negation can affect more than one direct object. Besides that, the case-marking rule is virtually unbounded in its application, being able to target deeply embedded direct objects, provided that there is a chain of infinitival clauses. The application of this rule shows considerable variation, which depends on the type of the matrix verb, on the degree of syntactic embedding, on word order and also to a large extent on individual preferences of speakers. From an areal perspective Lithuanian is shown to pattern with the more conservative Slavic languages (Polish and Slovene), Latgalian and the Baltic Finnic languages Estonian and Finnish, rather than with the closely related Latvian, which, like Czech, has abolished Genitive of Negation almost completely.

1. Introduction[1]

In Lithuanian, the Accusative direct object of transitive verbs changes its case marking to the Genitive when the predicate is negated, cf. Examples (1a) vs. (1b):

---

(1) a. *Jon-as   per-skait-ė   laišk-ą.*
    Jonas-NOM.SG PRV-read-PST(3) letter-ACC.SG
    'Jonas read the letter.'

   b. *Jon-as   ne-per-skait-ė   laišk-o.*
    Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-PRV-read-PST(3) letter-GEN.SG
    'Jonas did not read the letter.'

The object Genitive of Negation (further GenNeg) in Lithuanian is characterized by the following general properties:

1. GenNeg is obligatory and does not depend on any properties either of the transitive verb or of the object itself; for instance, proper names, cf. Example (2a), and personal pronouns, cf. Example (2b), are affected by the rule just as well as common noun phrases like the one shown in Example (1); note also that the verb *matyti* 'see' is removed from the semantic prototype of transitivity as formulated by Hopper & Thompson (1980) and Tsunoda (1981), but given that it is syntactically transitive, its object is affected by GenNeg all the same.

(2) a. *Ne-mači-au   Jon-o / *Jon-ą.*
    NEG-see-PST.1SG Jonas-GEN.SG /*ACC.SG
    'I did not see Jonas.'

   b. *Ne-mači-au   tav-ęs / *tav-e.*
    NEG-see-PST.1SG 2SG-GEN.SG / *ACC.SG
    'I did not see you.'

2. GenNeg can affect the direct object of a non-negated Infinitive embedded under a negated matrix verb, cf. Example (3). This long-distance GenNeg is not always obligatory to the same extent as the local (clause-bound) GenNeg.

(3) *Jon-as   ne-nor-i   rašy-ti laišk-o / *laišk-ą.*
    Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-want-PRS(3) write-INF letter-GEN.SG / *ACC.SG
    'Jonas does not want to write a letter.'

Moreover, matrix negation can trigger GenNeg on several (potentially all) direct object NPs embedded under it, cf. Example (4), as well as on secondary predicates or floating modifiers associated with such objects, cf. Example (5).

(4) *Tėv-ai   ne-mok-o   vaik-ų / *vaik-us   dažy-ti*
     father-NOM.PL NEG-teach-PRS(3) child-GEN.PL / child-ACC.PL paint-INF
     tvor-os /ˀtvor-ą.
     fence-GEN.SG / ACC.SG
     'Parents do not teach the children to paint the fence.'   (elicited)

(5) *Ne-gal-i-m-a   palik-ti   motin-os   vien-os / *vien-ą.*
     NEG-can-PRS-PP-DF leave-INF mother-GEN.SG one-GEN.SG.F/ ACC.SG
     'It is impossible to leave one's mother alone.'   (elicited)

This article is concerned with the long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian and asks the following questions:

1. Which kinds of matrix predicates allow long-distance GenNeg?
2. "How far" can the GenNeg rule triggered by the matrix negation reach into the chain of embedded clauses and what constrains it?
3. Is GenNeg operative in other non-finite contexts besides the Infinitive in Lithuanian, such as participial complements?
4. How can the phenomenon of long-distance GenNeg be interpreted in an areal-typological perspective? This question is important given that it is well known that negation affects case marking of direct objects in other languages geographically close to Lithuanian, e.g. in Polish and Estonian.

By contrast, the following questions will not be addressed in this article: (i) the behavior of accusative measure phrases and temporal adverbials, which is not identical to that of direct objects (cf. some remarks in Kozhanov, this volume); (ii) the impact of different types of negation (i.e. contrastive or metalinguistic negation) on GenNeg; this issue requires a separate empirical investigation; (iii) theoretical interpretation of the Lithuanian long-distance GenNeg, beyond some informal speculations in the conclusions. Regarding the last point, my contribution is mainly empirical and theory-neutral, and its aim is to provide a coherent description of the most important facts which should be taken into account by any syntactic framework.

The phenomenon of long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian is both well known and understudied. It is usually recorded in the grammars of Lithuanian as a prescriptive rule (e.g. Ulvydas (ed.) 1976: 336; Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 669), sometimes with qualifications that in certain (not well-defined) instances the Accusative can also be used; some of the existing formulations are inaccurate, e.g. Mathiassen

(1996: 185) states that GenNeg occurs with "auxiliaries" (a notion not defined), giving as an example *norėti* 'want' and possibly implying that GenNeg does not occur with matrix verbs with non-auxiliary-like behaviour, cf. also Šukys (1998: 110–111). I know only a handful of articles specifically dealing with GenNeg (both local and long-distance); thus, Švambarytė (1998, 1999) discusses variation between Genitive and Accusative under negation in the Lithuanian standard language and dialects, while Menantaud (2007) compares the extent of GenNeg in Lithuanian and Latvian; Menantaud (1999) is a more theoretically than empirically oriented discussion of (local) GenNeg in Polish and Lithuanian. The only study discussing long-distance GenNeg in Lithuanian from a theoretically-informed perspective is Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 128–129), some of whose claims I will show below to be not fully accurate. Therefore, the present article aims at filling the gap in the description of this aspect of Lithuanian grammar and in particular at unveiling the real extent of both the application of long-distance GenNeg and the variation in its occurrence in present-day Standard Lithuanian.

My empirical data comes from three main sources. First, it is native speakers' judgments of a large number of elicited examples. All in all, I have consulted 18 native speakers of Standard Lithuanian, men and women from 20 to 50 years old; all of them are educated and most but not all of them are philologists. It should be kept in mind that not all examples have been checked with all speakers; almost all elicited examples in the article are presented together with the figures showing how many of the speakers have accepted them with particular case marking. The second source is the Corpus of Modern Lithuanian (LKT, tekstynas.vdu.lt, ca. 140 mil. tokens); since this corpus lacks any kind of morphological annotation, it was not technically possible to search for all possible combinations of a negated verb with an infinitive, but only for particular matrix verbs. The third source of data is Google, which was mainly used in order to obtain data for statistical analysis. Given the sources available, it is possible that the data presented in this article contains serious lacunae of which the author is not aware.

The article is structured as follows. In Section 2 I discuss the occurrence of long-distance GenNeg with different kinds of matrix predicates taking infinitival complements. In Section 3 I address the question of the optionality of long-distance GenNeg and certain factors which facilitate or inhibit the application of the rule. Section 4 shows that GenNeg is potentially unbounded in its application and investigates possible constraints on it. In Section 5 I discuss GenNeg in participial clauses, and Section 6 puts the Lithuanian data into the areal context. In the Conclusions I summarize my findings and make some preliminary theoretical observations.

2.   Kinds of matrix predicates and GenNeg

In this section I discuss the occurrence of long-distance GenNeg with regard to the matrix predicates (including verbs and larger constructions) which embed the infinitival clause containing a direct object. Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 129) claim that long-distance GenNeg depends on the type of matrix predicate: "The genitive of negation usually applies in constructions with raising, subject control … The genitive of negation does not apply to object control structures".[2] My data (both elicited and naturally occurring) suggest that long-distance GenNeg is perfectly licit with both subject and object control matrix verbs, and that when substantial differences between types of matrix predicates in GenNeg licensing are observed, they do not have much to do with the distinction between various kinds of control. Below I survey different kinds of matrix predicates with respect to GenNeg.

2.1   Same-subject complement matrix verbs

The rubric of "same-subject complement matrix verbs" includes verbs falling under the headings of both "subject control" and "raising to subject" verbs, as well as predicates which can arguably be characterized as modal or phasal auxiliaries; since for Lithuanian distinguishing between subject control and raising-to-subject constructions, on the one hand, and between clearly biclausal constructions and constructions showing some degree of clausal integration, on the other hand, is notoriously difficult (see e.g. Holvoet 2007: 129–152 on the lack of specific grammatical features of modal verbs in Baltic), and since these distinctions so far do not seem to be of great relevance for my purposes, I will further subclassify different same-subject matrix verbs only on the basis of their semantics.

   Long-distance GenNeg is attested (and is in fact a preferred if not the only option) with the following subtypes of same-subject complement predicates:

1. Modal predicates with Nominative subjects such as *galėti* 'can' (6), *turėti* 'must' (7):

   (6)   *Vartoj-a-nt-ys*   *antibiotik-us*   **ne-gal-i**   *ger-ti*
         use-PRS-PA-NOM.PL.M antibiotics-ACC.PL NEG-can-PRS(3) drink-INF
         ***alkoholi-o* / **alkohol-į*.**
         alcohol-GEN.SG/ ACC.SG
         'Those who take antibiotics cannot drink alcohol.'   (elicited; Gen: 3, Acc: 0)

---

2.   Note that Gronemeyer & Usonienė exemplify their "raising constructions" by the verb *norėti* 'want', which is clearly an error.

(7) …*j-is*   ***ne-tur-i***   *maty-ti* ***tav-ęs***   ***nuog-o***.
     3-NOM.SG.M NEG-have-PRS(3) see-INF 2SG-GEN naked-GEN.SG.M
     'He should not see you naked.'   (LKT)

2. Modal or aspectual predicates with Dative experiencers (for more on the behavior of matrix predicates with Dative experiencers see Section 2.6), such as *reikėti* 'need' (8) or *tekti* 'happen' (9).

(8) *Man*   *ne-reiki-a*   *nu-pirk-ti*   ***balt-o***   ***kamuoli-o*** /
     I:DAT NEG-need-PRS(3) PRV-buy-INF white-GEN.SG.M ball-GEN.SG /
     ****balt-ą***   ***kamuol-į***.
     white-ACC.SG ball-ACC.SG
     'I don't need to buy a white ball.'   (elicited; Gen: 4; Acc: 0)

(9) …*man*   ***ne-tek-o***   *maty-ti* ***graž-esni-o***
     I:DAT   NEG-happen-PST(3) see-INF beautiful-COMP-GEN.SG.M
     žmog-aus   *už*   *jus*.
     person-GEN.SG than 2PL:ACC
     'I have never seen a person more handsome than you.'   (LKT)

3. Phasal verbs, such as *pradėti* 'begin, start' (10) or *baigti* 'finish' (11):

(10) *Jon-as*   ***ne-pradėj-o***   *rašy-ti*   ***laišk-o*** / ****laišk-ą***.
     Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-begin-PST(3) write-INF letter-GEN.SG / ACC.SG
     'Jonas did not start writing the letter.'   (elicited; Gen: 3; Acc: 0)

(11) *Aš*   *dar* ***ne-baig-iau***   *staty-ti*   ***skalbykl-os***.
     I:NOM yet NEG-finish-PST.1SG build-INF laundry-GEN.SG
     'I haven't yet finished building the laundry.'   (LKT)

4. Speech act verbs such as *prižadėti* 'promise' (12) and mental verbs such as *pamiršti* 'forget' (13), (14), or *norėti* 'want' in (3) above:

(12) *Jon-as*   ***ne-prižadėj-o***   *Aldon-ai*   *nu-pirk-ti*
     Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-promise-PST(3) Aldona-DAT.SG PRV-buy-INF
     nauj-o   ***automobili-o*** / ?? ***nauj-ą***   ***automobil-į***.
     new-GEN.SG.M car-GEN.SG /   new-ACC.SG car-ACC.SG
     'Jonas did not promise Aldona to buy a new car.' (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 0; both: 1)

(13) *Iš-ei-dam-a*   ***ne-pamirš-k***   *uždary-ti* ***lang-o*** / ?***lang-ą!***
     PRV-go-CNV-SG.F NEG-forget-IMP(2SG) close-INF window-GEN.SG/ ACC.SG
     'When you go out, don't forget to close the window.'
                                  (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both: 2)

(14) …*niekur* ***ne-pamiršt-a***   *pa-minė-ti*   ***Lietuv-os***.
     nowhere NEG-forget-PRS(3) PRV-mention-INF Lithuania-GEN.SG
     '…he does not forget to mention Lithuania anywhere.'   (LKT)

2.2   Different-subject complement matrix verbs

To this class belong object control verbs.[3] The object serving as the antecedent of the zero subject of the Infinitive can be marked by Dative, Genitive, and Accusative cases. With all of these, long-distance GenNeg is always possible, in clear contradiction to Gronemeyer & Usonienė's (2001) statement above.

1. Verbs with a Dative object like *liepti* 'order' (15) or *leisti* 'let' (16):

    (15)   *Jon-as*   *ne-liep-ė*   ALDON-AI   *rašy-ti*
             Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-order-PST(3) Aldona-DAT.SG write-INF
             *laišk-o / *laišk-ą*.
             letter-GEN.SG/ ACC.SG
             'Jonas did not order Aldona to write a/the letter.'   (elicited; Gen: 3, Acc: 0)

    (16)   *Tai k-as*   TAU   *ne-leidži-a*   *j-o*   *atidary-ti?*
             so   what-NOM 2SG:DAT NEG-allow-PRS(3) 3-GEN.SG.M open-INF
             'So what does not allow you to open it?'   (LKT)

2. A verb with a Genitive object: *(pa)prašyti* 'ask', cf. (17) and (18).

    (17)   a.   *Jon-as*   *pa-praš-ė*   ALDON-OS   *uždary-ti lang-ą.*
                Jonas-NOM.SG PRV-ask-PST(3) Aldona-GEN.SG close-INF window-ACC.SG
                'Jonas asked Aldona to close the window.'   (elicited)
        b.   *Jon-as*   *ne-praš-ė*   ALDON-OS   *uždary-ti*
                Jonas-NOM.SG NEG-ask-PST(3) Aldona-GEN.SG close-INF
                lang-o / ?lang-ą.
                window-GEN.SG/ ACC.SG
                'Jonas did not ask Aldona to close the window.' (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both: 2)

    (18)   *Niek-as*   *ne-praš-ė*   RUSIJ-OS   *garantuo-ti*
             nobody-NOM NEG-ask-PST(3) Russia-GEN.SG guarantee-INF
             Baltij-os   *šali-ų*   *saugum-o.*
             Baltic-GEN.SG country-GEN.PL safety-GEN.SG
            'Nobody asked Russia to guarantee the safety of the Baltic states.'   (LKT)

3. Verbs with an Accusative object, such as *mokyti* 'teach' in (4) above, *priversti* 'make, force' (19) and (20) or *įtikinti* 'persuade' (21). With such verbs GenNeg obligatorily affects the "local" direct object and can always affect the embedded direct object as well.

---

3.   There do not seem to be any uncontroversial raising-to-object verbs with infinitival complements in Lithuanian.

(19)   *Jon-as*   *pri-vert-ė*   Aldon-ą   *uždary-ti lang-ą.*
       Jonas-NOM.SG prv-make-PST(3) Aldona-ACC.SG close-INF window-ACC.SG
       'Jonas made Aldona close the window.'   (elicited)

(20)   *…gatvi-ų*   *demonstracij-os*   **ne-pri-vert-ė**   J-O
       street-GEN.PL demostration-NOM.PL NEG-prv-make-PST(3) 3-GEN.SG.M
       pakeis-ti   **pozicij-os.**
       change-INF   position-GEN.SG
       '… the street rallies did not make him change his position.'   (LKT)

(21)   Man-ęs *nė vien-a*   *iš*   *keturi-ų*   *čigoni-ų*
       I-GEN   none-NOM.SG.F from four-GEN.PL gypsy(F)-GEN.PL
       ne-įtikin-o   *ati-duo-ti*   **šimtin-ės,**   *buv-us-ios*
       NEG-persuade-PST(3) prv-give-INF hundred-GEN.SG be-PST.PA-GEN.SG.F
       rankin-ėje.
       hand.bag-LOC.SG
       'None of the four gypsy women persuaded me to give them the hundred
       litas note that was in my handbag.'   (LKT)

2.3   Verb + noun complexes

On a par with lexical verbs, Infinitival complements can be selected by semi-idiomatic complex predicates consisting of a nominal and a light verb, similar to the English *have a/the right to* or *give consent to*. When the nominal part of the construction itself is case-marked Accusative, it obligatorily takes the Genitive under negation, and this does not preclude the embedded object from also being amenable to GenNeg. Such constructions also fall into the same-subject, such as in Example (22), and different-subject, as in Example (23), categories.

(22)   *Prezident-as*   **ne-tur-i**   TEIS-ĖS   *pat-s*
       president-NOM.SG NEG-have-PRS(3) right-GEN.SG self-NOM.SG.M
       keis-ti   **įstatym-ų** / **įstatym-us.**
       change-INF   law-GEN.PL / ACC.PL
       'The president does not have a right to change laws himself.'
                                         (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 0; both: 4)

(23)   *Aldor-a*   *niek-am*   **ne-dav-ė**   ĮSAKYM-O
       Aldora-NOM.SG nobody-DAT NEG-give-PST(3) order-GEN.SG
       ap-ieško-ti   **traukini-o.**
       prv-search-INF   train-GEN.SG
       'Aldora did not give anybody an order to search the train.'[4]

---

4.   http://skaitliava.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/astuntas-skyrius.pdf, accessed 8 October 2013.

The case marking of the embedded object in these constructions is subject to large variation, which will be discussed in Sections 3 and 4.

2.4   Lexicalized non-finite verbal forms

Some matrix predicates with modal and evaluative meanings are lexicalized non-finite forms of verbs, such as the Debitive participle, Example (24), or the Passive Participle, Example (25), cf. also *galima* 'possible' in Example (5) above; they also license long-distance GenNeg in their infinitival complements.[5]

> (24) *Visai   **ne-būtina**   man   **visk-o**   saky-ti.*
>   at.all   NEG-necessary(=be.DEB.DF)   I:DAT   everything-GEN   say-INF
>   'It is not necessary at all to tell me everything.'   (LKT: Gen: 24; Acc: 24)

> (25) ***ne-įmanoma***   *supras-ti*   *Tibet-o*
>   NEG-possible(=be.able.PRS.PP.DF)   understand-INF   Tibet-GEN.SG
>   ***kultūr-os***
>   culture-GEN.SG
>   'it is impossible to understand the culture of Tibet'   (LKT: Gen: 42; Acc: 7)

Interestingly, productive deverbal action nominals with the suffix *-im-/-ym-*, like verbs, allow GenNeg (26a), while synonymous action nominals formed by less productive means rather prohibit it (26b).

> (26) a.   ***ne-norėj-im-as***   *pri-si-im-ti*   ***atsakomyb-ės*** /
>   NEG-want-NML-NOM.SG   PRV-REFL-take-INF   responsibility-GEN.SG /
>   ***atsakomyb-ę***
>   responsibility-ACC.SG
>   'not wishing to assume responsibility'   (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 1; both: 2)
>   b.   ***ne-nor-as***   *pri-si-im-ti*   ***atsakomyb-ę*** /
>   NEG-wish-NOM.SG   PRV-RFL-take-INF   responsibility-ACC.SG /
>   ?****atsakomyb-ės.***
>   responsibility-GEN.SG
>   'id.'   (elicited; Acc: 4; Gen: 0; both: 2)

---

5.   The figures in parentheses referring to LKT indicate the overall number of examples of a given verb followed by a transitive Infinitive and a noun phrase in the relevant case.

2.5   Copula in the perception construction

In Lithuanian there is a special construction involving the copula *būti* 'be' and an infinitive of a perception verb (*matyti* 'see' or *girdėti* 'hear'), with the perceived object appearing in the Nominative case, and not in the expected Accusative (see e.g. Ambrazas 2001: 395–396; Sirtautas 1971), cf. (27a). In these constructions the perceived object assumes Genitive case when the copula is negated, cf. (27b).

(27) a. *Buv-o   maty-ti **kaim-as**.*
          be-PST(3) see-INF village-NOM.SG
          'One could see a village.'

  b. *Ne-buv-o   maty-ti **kaim-o**.*
          NEG-be-PST(3) see-INF village-GEN.SG
          'The village could not be seen.'

However, the syntactic structure of this construction, in particular its biclausal status and the grammatical role of the NP denoting the perceived object, is unclear (e.g. Sirtautas 1971 argues that the Nominative noun phrase is the grammatical subject), so I won't discuss it in this paper.

2.6   Verbs with Dative experiencers

Above I noted that Dative experiencer verbs with modal and similar meanings license GenNeg on the object of their infinitival complement. However, there are some verbs with Dative primary arguments which disfavour GenNeg, in contrast to verbs like *reikėti* discussed in Section 2.1. Predicates showing a strong preference for the Accusative marking of the embedded object are, for example, *patikti* 'like', see Examples (28)–(30), and *pakakti* 'suffice', see Examples (31)–(33).

(28) *Man **ne-patink-a**   tikrin-ti student-ų   **darb-us** / �**darb-ų**.*
      I:DAT NEG-like-PRS(3) check-INF student-GEN.PL work-ACC.PL / GEN.PL
      'I don't like checking students' assignments.' (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 5; both: 4)

(29) *Jeigu j-iems   **ne-patink-a**   pirk-ti **žaliav-ą***
      if   3-DAT.PL.M NEG-like-PRS(3) buy-INF stuff-ACC.PL
      iš   mūs-ų…
      from   we-GEN.PL
      'If they don't like to buy raw materials at our place…'   (LKT; Acc: 11)

(30) *Man **ne-patink-a**   skriaus-ti **ses-ut-ės**.*
      I:DAT NEG-like-PRS(3) harm-INF sister-DIM-GEN.SG
      'I don't like to harm my sister.'   (LKT; Gen: 1)

(31) *J-am   ne-pakak-tų   su-valgy-ti vien-ą   bandel-ę /*
     3-DAT.SG.M NEG-suffice-IRR(3) PRV-eat-INF one-ACC.SG roll-ACC.SG /
     ?vien-os   bandel-ės, kad bū-tų   sot-us.
     one-GEN.SG.F roll-GEN.SG that be-IRR(3) satiated-NOM.SG.M
     'It won't suffice for him to eat one roll to have enough.'

                                    (elicited; Gen: 1; Acc: 3; both: 7)

(32) *Ne-pakank-a   žino-ti   tik partij-os   lyder-į.*
     NEG-suffice-PRS(3) know-INF only party-GEN.SG leader-ACC.SG
     'It is not enough to know only the party leader.'   (LKT; Acc: 30)

(33) *Ne-pakank-a   analizuo-ti vien tik finansin-ės*
     NEG-suffice-PRS(3) analyze-INF only only financial-GEN.SG.F
     atskaitomyb-ės
     accountability-GEN.SG
     'It is not sufficient to analyze only the financial accounting.'   (LKT; Gen: 3)

However, other verbs of this class do not show a robust preference for either of the two cases or even favour the Genitive. Consider, for example, *nusibosti* 'to bore' in (34) and the quantitative data[6] in Table 1, both showing that the Genitive and the Accusative are equally licit options with this verb.

(34) *Ar tau   ne-nusibod-o   žiūrė-ti   š-į*
     Q 2SG.DAT NEG-bore-PST(3) watch-INF this-ACC.SG.M
     film-ą /   ši-o   film-o?
     film-ACC.SG / this-GEN.SG.M film-GEN.SG
     'Haven't you got bored watching this film?'   (elicited; Gen: 2; Acc: 3; both: 6)

Table 1. Genitive vs. Accusative with *nusibosti* 'bore' (Google)

	Acc	Gen
nenusibodo rašyti 'did not get bored writing'	7	3
nenusibodo žiūrėti 'did not get bored watching'	1	4
nenusibodo skaityti 'did not get bored reading'	3	2
total:	11	9

Yet another Dative experiencer verb *vertėti* 'be worth' shows a clear preference for GenNeg, cf. Examples (35)–(37).[7]

─────────────────────────

6. The number of relevant examples of this verb in LKT was too small, so I had to revert to Google searches (11.01.2015).

7. As James Lavine suggests, the Accusative in (36) may be due to the "pleonastic" nature of negation in such contexts; however, I cannot see the difference between (36) with the Accusative

(35) *Tau*   ***ne*-*vertėj-o***   *pirk-ti* ***tok-į***
2SG.DAT NEG-be.worth-PST(3) buy-INF such-ACC.SG.M
brang-ų   ***automobil-į*** / ***toki-o***   ***brang-aus***
expensive-ACC.SG.M car-ACC.SG   such-GEN.SG.M expensive-GEN.SG.M
automobili-o.
car-GEN.SG
'You shouldn't have bought such an expensive car.'   (Gen: 4; Acc: 0; both: 7)

(36) *Seim-e*   *vir-ė*   *karšt-os*   *diskusij-os* –   *ar*
Seimas-LOC.SG boil-PST(3) hot-NOM.PL.F discussion-NOM.PL Q
ne*-*vertėj-o   *lietuvi-ų*   *taikdari-ų*
NEG-be.worth-PST(3) Lithuanian-GEN.PL peacemaker-GEN.PL
dalyvavim-o   *Kroatij-oje*   ***klausim-ą***   *spręs-ti*
participation-GEN.SG Croatia-LOC.SG question-ACC.SG decide-INF
referendum-u.
referendum-INS.SG
'Hot discussions were raging in the Parliament: shouldn't the participation
of Lithuanian peacemakers in Croatia be rather decided by referendum?'
                                                                    (LKT; Acc: 15)

(37) *Ar* ***ne*-*vertėj-o***   ***ši-o***   ***klausim-o***   *spręs-ti*
Q   NEG-be.worth-PST(3) this-GEN.SG.M question-GEN.SG decide-INF
referendum-o   *būd-u?*
referendum-GEN.SG   means-INS.SG
'Shouldn't this question be decided by means of a referendum?'
                                                                    (LKT; Gen: 50)

The pronounced preference for GenNeg with *vertėti* might be due to its function-
ing as a kind of a modal verb partly synonymous to *reikėti* 'need'. Indeed, there
does not seem to be a significant difference between *reikėti* and *vertėti* in their
behaviour with respect to GenNeg, cf. the data on the fixed expression *sukti galvą*
'to puzzle', lit. 'turn one's head' in Table 2 (Google searches 11.01.2015). It is pos-
sible that semantically modal verbs, including *vertėti*, favour GenNeg due to the
higher degree of their syntactic integration with their infinitival complements;
however, as has been mentioned above, there do not seem to be many independent
reasons to assume so.

---

and (37) with the Genitive in this respect. Anyway, the impact of "normal" vs. "pleonastic"
negation on GenNeg has not been part of my empirical investigation, and, moreover, I find the
notion of "pleonastic negation" itself ("the occurrence of a Neg head without a Neg operator",
James Lavine, p.c.) not uncontroversial. Note, incidentally, that Brown & Franks (1995) show
that GenNeg can occur even under "pleonastic negation" in Russian.