Argument Realization and Clausal Architecture in Baltic, Academia Salensis Duodecima,
Salos, Lithuania, July 26 – August 2, 2015

TWO TYPES OF NON-AGREEING PARTICIPLES IN LITHUANIAN

Peter Arkadiev
(Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences;
Institute of Linguistics, Russian State University for the Humanities;
Institute of Modern Linguistic Research, Sholokhov Moscow State University for the Humanities
& Vilnius University)
alpgurev@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Lithuanian participles are verbal forms combining morphosyntactic features of tense and voice with adjectival inflection for gender, number, and case (Ambrazas 1990, Arkadiev 2014a, 2014b).

Table 1. The paradigm of Lithuanian participles (*sakyti* 'say')

	Active (m,f)	**Passive (m,f)**
Present	*sakąs, sakanti*	*sakomas, sakoma*
Simple Past	*sakęs, sakiusi*	*sakytas, sakyta*
Habitual Past	*sakydavęs, sakydavusi*	—
Future	*sakysiąs, sakysianti*	*sakysimas, sakysima*

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

(1) a. ***nuvažiav-ęs*** *traukin-ys*
leave-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M train(M)-NOM.SG
'the train that left'

b. *traukin-ys* *jau* *yra* ***nuvažiauv-ęs***
train(M)-NOM.SG already AUX.PRS.3 leave-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
'the train has already left'

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

❶ forms traditionally called "neuter gender" (Ambrazas (ed.) 2006: 346], ex. (2);

❷ forms traditionally called "gerunds" (Ambrazas (ed.) 2006: 339–340], ex. (3).

(2) *Buv-o* ***privažiav-ę*** *policij-os* *automobili-ų...*
AUX-PST.3 arrive-PST.PA.DF police-GEN.SG car-GEN.PL
'There arrived a lot of police cars...' (LKT)

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

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

2. Forms of default agreement

"Neuter" forms like the one shown in (2) are found with active and passive participles as well as with adjectives. The traditional term "neuter gender" is not fully adequate since nouns controlling agreement can only be either masculine or feminine, but not neuter, in Lithuanian. The syntactic distribution of these forms discussed below can be best captured by the term "default agreement forms" or simply "default forms" (DF).

Morphology:

– with adjectives and passive participles DF is segmentally identical to NomSgF, but shares the stress with NomSgM;

– with active participles DF coincides with NomPlM.

Table. 2. Morphology of default agreement forms

	adjectives	passive participles	active participles
NomSgM	*áukštas* 'high'	*àtneštas* 'brought here'	*atnešą̃s* 'bringing here'
NomSgF	*aukštà*	*atneštà*	*àtnešanti*
DF	***áukšta***	***àtnešta***	***atnešą̃***
NomPlM	*aukštì*	*atneštì*	*atnešą̃*

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

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

(4) *Mums* *buv-o* ***saky-t-a,*** [*kad* *traukin-ys* *jau* *nuvažiav-o*].
we:DAT AUX-PST.3 say-PST.PP-DF that train-NOM.SG already leave-PST.3
'We were told that the train has already left.'

(5) *Kol* *vyk-s* *nemaloni-os* *procedūr-os,*
while occur-FUT.3 unpleasant-NOM.PL.F procedures-NOM.PL
man ***liepi-a-m-a*** [*žiūrė-ti* *pro* *lang-ą*].
I:DAT order-PRS-PP-DF look-INF through window-ACC.SG
'While unpleasant procedures are taking place I am required to look through the window.' (LKT)

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

(6) *Mums* *bū-tų* ***reikėj-ę*** *daug* *laik-o.*
we:DAT AUX-IRR(3) need-PST.PA.DF much time-GEN.SG
'We would need much time.' <*reikėti*: Dat, Gen>

(7) *Ar* *iš* *jūs-ų* *yra* *k-am* ***skaudėj-ę*** *dantuk-ą?*
Q from 2PL-GEN AUX.PRS.3 who-DAT ache-PST.PA.DF tooth-ACC.SG
'Has anyone of you had toothache?' (LKT) <*skaudėti*: (Dat) Acc>

(8) *Nakt-į* *buv-o* ***lij-ę.***
night-ACC.SG AUX-PST.3 rain-PST.PA.DF
'It has rained at night.' <*lyti*: ∅>

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

(9) *Iki treči-ųjų gaidži-ų ten bu-s* ***šok-a-m-a*** *ir* ***dainuoj-a-m-a.***
till third-GEN.PL.DEF cock-GEN.PL there AUX-FUT.3 dance-PRS-PP-DF and sing-PRS-PP-DF
'There will be dancing and singing there till the third cock-crow.' (LKT)

(10) *festival-is, į kur-į buv-o* ***pa-kvies-t-a*** *sveči-ų*
festival-NOM.SG in which-ACC.SG.M AUX-PST.3 PRV-invite-PST.PP-DF guest-GEN.PL
iš Ryg-os bei Talin-o.
from Riga-GEN.SG and Tallinn-GEN.SG
'the festival, to which a number of guests from Riga and Tallinn were invited.' (LKT)

❹ The subject position is occupied by genderless pronouns *tai* 'this', *kas* 'what' and *viskas* 'everything' (11) (*kas* can also have animate reference with masculine agreement (12)).

(11) a. *Tai buv-o* ***saky-t-a*** *kel-is kart-us.*
this.NOM AUX-PST.3 say-PST.PP-DF several-ACC.PL.M time-ACC.PL
'This has been said several times.'

b. *K-as buv-o* ***saky-t-a*** *kel-is kart-us?*
what-NOM AUX-PST.3 say-PST.PP-DF several-ACC.PL.M time-ACC.PL
'What has been said several times?'

c. *Visk-as buv-o* ***saky-t-a*** *kel-is kart-us.*
everything-NOM AUX-PST.3 say-PST.PP-DF several-ACC.PL.M time-ACC.PL
'Everything has been said several times.'

(12) *K-as buv-o* ***atėj-ęs?***
who-NOM AUX-PST.3 come-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
'Who came?'

A similar distribution of agreeing forms vs. DF is attested in evidential constructions, where the participle appears in the position of the main predicate without the copula or auxiliary (see Ambrazas (ed.) 2006: 262–266; Wiemer 2006b; Holvoet 2007: Ch. 4; Arkadiev 2014a: 75–79]:

– verb with a nominative subject

(13) *Valg-a-nt Karin-a Štolovski pa-pasakoj-o,*
eat-PRS-PA Karina-NOM.SG Štolowski PRV-relate-PST(3)
kad savaitgal-į j-ą ***aplanky-si-ą*** *tėv-ai…*
that weekend-ACC.SG 3-ACC.SG.F visit-FUT-PA.NOM.PL.M father(M)-NOM.PL
'While eating Karina Štolowski related that her parents were going to visit her this weekend.' (LKT)

– verb without a nominative subject

(14) *Labiausiai galv-ą* ***skaud-ą*** *dėl rajon-ų higien-os centr-ų…*
mostly head-ACC.SG ache-PRS.PA.DF because.of district-GEN.PL hygiene-GEN.SG center-GEN.PL
'[According to the head physician] they were mostly concerned because of the district's hygiene centers.' (LKT)

– a «defective» subject

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

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

(16) *Tačiau šaltini-ai ne-min-i, kad ir X a. pabaig-oje*
however source-NOM.PL NEG-mention-PRS.3 that and 10th c. end-LOC.SG
bū-t-a ***įkur-t-a*** *koki-ų šved-ų kolonij-ų*
AUX-PST.PP-DF found-PST.PP-DF which-GEN.PL Swede-GEN.PL colony-GEN.PL
kurši-ų teritorij-ose.
Curonian-GEN.PL territory-LOC.PL
'However, sources do not mention any Swedish colony allegedly founded on the Curonian territory in the end of the tenth century.' (LKT)

Table. 3. Syntactic distribution of the default agreement form

	+ φ-complete subject	– φ-complete subject
+ nominative subject	agreement (1a,12,13)	DF (11,15)
– nominative subject	DF (6,7,10,16)	DF (4,5,8,9,14)

3. Non-agreeing participles

Non-agreeing forms like the one shown in (3) are only found with active participles. Morphologically, they are constituted by the bare participle stem of the respective tense stripped off of any agreement markers.

Table. 4. Morphology of non-agreeing participles

	NomSgF	**non-agreeing form**
Present	*sakanti*	*sakant*
Simple Past	*sakiusi*	*sakius*
Habitual Past	*sakydavusi*	*sakydavus*
Future	*sakysianti*	*sakysiant*

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

Contexts requiring non-agreeing participles, cf. Geniušienė (2014: 166–169):

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

(17) a. *Jurg-is sak-ė* [***Jon-ą*** *skait-a-nt laišk-ą*].
Jurgis-NOM.SG say-PST.3 Jonas-ACC.SG read-PRS-PA letter-ACC.SG
'Jurgis said that Jonas was reading a letter.'

b. *Jurg-is atėj-o* [***Jon-ui*** *skait-a-nt laišk-ą*].
Jurgis-NOM.SG come-PST.3 Jonas-DAT.SG read-PRS-PA letter-ACC.SG
'Jurgis came when Jonas was reading a letter.'

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

(18) *… gegut-ė j-iems*$_i$ ***kukuoj-a*** [∅$_i$ *netikr-ą nuotak-ą* ***be-vež-a-nt***]…
cuckoo-NOM.SG 3-DAT.PL.M cuckoo-PRS.3 fake-ACC.SG bride-ACC.SG CNT-carry-PRS-PA
'… the cuckoo is saying (lit. cuckooing) them that [they] are carrying a fake bride' ("Eglė Žalčių karalienė", http://www1.omnitel.net/sakmes/frames.html)

(19) [∅$_i$ ***Atvažiav-us*** *į pa-žadėt-ąją viet-ą*], *iš žmoni-ų*$_i$
arrive-PST.PA in PRV-promised-ACC.SG.F.DEF place-ACC.SG from people-GEN.PL
paprastai surenk-a-m-i pas-ai.
usually collect-PRS-PP-NOM.PL.M passport-NOM.PL
'On the arrival to the promised place they usually collect the travelers' passports.' (LKT)

❸ The subject of the subordinate clause is a null pronoun with generic, arbitrary or contextually definite reference:

(20) [$\varnothing_{\text{DEF}}$ ***Atvažiav-us*** *prie* *bažnyči-os*], *palydov-ai* *įneš-dav-o*
arrive-PST.PA at church-GEN.SG attendant-NOM.PL carry.in-HAB-PST.3
mirus-ijį *į* *bažnyči-ą,* *o* *mergin-os* *ei-dav-o* *šalia.*
dead-ACC.SG.M.DEF in church-ACC.SG but girl-NOM.PL go-HAB-PST.3 by
'On the arrival to the church, the attendants brought the dead into the church while the girls walked by.' (LKT)

(21) *Apie* *tai* *nuolat* *gird-i-m* [$\varnothing_{\text{generic}}$ ***kalb-a-nt*** *ir* ***raš-a-nt***].
about that constantly hear-PRS-1PL talk-PRS-PA and write-PRS-PA
'We constantly hear people talking and writing about that.' (LKT)

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

(22) *Vien-ą* *ryt-ą* *nubud-ęs* *pro* *lang-ą*
one-ACC.SG morning-ACC.SG wake.up-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M through window-ACC.SG
pa-mač-ia-u ***sning-a-nt.***
PRV-see-PST-1SG snow-PRS-PA
'Once, having waken up in the morning, I saw that it was snowing.' (LKT)

(23) *Prabund-u* ***aušt-a-nt*** *ir* *tuoj pat* *keli-uo-si.*
wake.up-PRS.1SG dawn-PRS-PA and at once raise-PRS.1SG-RFL
'I wake up at dawn and get up at once. ' (LKT)

❺ The predicate of the main clause does not subcategorize for a nominative subject; the subject of the subordinate clause may be coreferential to the non-nominative "subject" of the main clause as in (24):

(24) [$\varnothing_i$ ***Atvažiav-us*** *į* *Kanad-ą*], (*mums*$_i$) ***reikėj-o*** *iš-mok-ti*
arrive-PST.PA in Canada-ACC.SG we.DAT need-PST.3 PRV-learn-INF
kalb-ą *ir* *pelny-ti* *duon-ą.*
language-ACC.SG and earn-INF bread-ACC.SG
'When we arrived to Canada, we had to learn the language and earn our living.' (LKT)

(25) ***Sak-o-m-a*** [*dvitašk-į* *pirmiausia* ***atsirad-us*** *IX a.* *rankraščі-uose*].
say-PRS-PP-DF colon-ACC.SG for.the.first.time occur-PST.PA IX cent. manuscript-LOC.PL
'The colon is said to be for the first time attested in the 11th century manuscripts' (LKT)

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

(26) a. *Aldon-a*$_i$ *sak-ė* [$\varnothing_i$ ***pa-raši-us-i*** *laišk-ą*].
Aldona(F)-NOM.SG say-PST.3 PRV-write-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F letter-ACC.SG
'Aldona said that she had written the letter.'

b. [$\varnothing_i$ ***Pa-raši-us-i*** *laišk-ą*], *Aldon-a*$_i$ *nu-si-šypso-jo.*
PRV-write -PST.PA-NOM.SG.F letter-ACC.SG Aldona(F)-NOM.SG PRV-RFL-smile-PST.3
'Having written the letter, Aldona smiled.'

Table 5. Syntactic distribution of non-agreeing participles

main verb \ embedded verb	+ nominative subject		– nominative subject
	same	different	
+ nominative subject	+AGR (26)	–AGR (17)	–AGR (23), (24)
– nominative subject	–AGR (24)	–AGR (25)	–AGR

4. Analysis

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

	DF	–AGR
independent clause	+	–
subordinate clause	+	+
main predicate (T head)	+	+
lexical verb (V head)	+	–
passive (Voice head)	+	–

The distribution of non-agreeing participles shows that their occurrence is determined by the properties of the functional layer of the clause:

– they are admitted only in the T(ense) head, and not lower;

– their distribution is sensitive to interclausal relations (switch-reference), i.e. to the C(omp) level.

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

NB When the subordinate clause contains a periphrastic form of a verb lacking a nominative subject, as in (27) with the subject in the partitive genitive, only the auxiliary appears in the non-agreeing form, while the lexical verb features the default form:

(27) *Net* *Evangelij-oje* *gnostik-ams* *atrod-o* [***es-a-nt*** ***primašy-t-a***
even Gospel-LOC.SG Gnostic-DAT.PL seem-PRS.3 AUX-PRS-PA admix-PST.PP-DF
neaiški-ų *dalyk-ų*].
unclear-GEN.PL things-GEN.PL
'Even the Gospel seemed to Gnostics to contain an admixture of unclear things.' (LKT)

The contexts requiring DF and –AGR participles appear to overlap because of the following facts:

a) DF occupies the head position (T) of independent (more precisely, morphosyntactically finite, see Arkadiev 2014a, 2014b) evidential clauses under the same conditions which require DF to appear on the lexical verb of periphrastic forms;

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

Thus:

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

– if all arguments receive non-nominative case at this early stage of the derivation ("assignment of case upon first merge", Preminger 2011: 151) and agreement is precluded by the principle of Case Opacity (28), cf. (29a):

(28) Case Opacity (Rezac 2008):
A DP with theta-related Case may not value a φ-probe.

(29) a. [$_{\text{TP}}$ T [$_{\text{AspP}}$ Asp$_i$ [$_{\text{VP}}$ DP V$_i$]]]
φ-features: [φ:#] [PART;φ:#] ←··· ~~agree~~ ····· [φ]
case: [NOM] ····· ~~case~~ ····· → [case:K]←·····[CASE]
morphology: 3 DF

– if the nominative case is assigned to a φ-incomplete DP, like in (29b)

(29) b. [$_{TP}$ DP_k T [$_{AspP}$ Asp_i [$_{VP}$ DP_k V_i]]]
φ-features: [–φ] [φ:#] [PART;φ:#]← ~~agree~~···[–φ:]
case: [case:NOM]←case···[NOM] [case:#]
morphology: 3 DF

Otherwise, i.e. when the subject of the verb does not get inherent case early in the derivation and is φ-complete, it may serve as a valid goal for the participle in Asp to agree with, and later both the subject DP and the participle get nominative case from the T head, as shown in (29c).

(29) c. [$_{TP}$ DP_k T [$_{AspP}$ Asp_i [$_{VP}$ DP_k V_i]]]
φ-features: [φ]···agree→[φ] [PART;φ]← agree ···[φ]
case: [case:NOM]←case···[NOM]···case→ [case:NOM]
morphology: AGR AGR

❷ By contrast, non-agreeing participles occur in those cases when the subject receives structural non-nominative case from the silent C head (see Arkadiev 2012 for arguments supporting such an analysis of the Lithuanian participial complements) and again fails to agree with the T head, but this time not because of Case Opacity, but due to Baker's (2008) Case-Dependency of Agreement Parameter (CDAP) in (30):

(30) Case-Dependency of Agreement Parameter (Baker 2008: 155)
F agrees with DP/NP only if F values the case feature of DP/NP or vice versa.

In Lithuanian (as well as in other Baltic and some Indo-European other languages) CDAP applies only to the T head, which is evidenced by the fact that Asp must agree with the appropriate subject in gender and number before both of them get nominative case from a higher head, as in (29c); see below for even stronger arguments.

Thus, (31a) shows the derivation of cases like (17); cases like (27), where the subject fails to get structural case due to Case Opacity, work similarly, cf. (31b).

(31) a. [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ DP T_i [$_{VP}$ V_i]]]
φ-features: [φ]·····~~agree~~→[PART;φ:#]
case: [CASE]·····case····→ [case:K] ····→ [case:K]
morphology: –AGR

b. [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ T_i [$_{AspP}$ Asp_i [$_{VP}$ DP V_i]]]]
φ-features: [PART;φ:#]←~~agree~~···[PART;φ:#]←~~agree~~···[φ]
case: [CASE]·····case····→[case:K] ·····~~case~~····· → [case:c]
morphology: –AGR DF

5. Additional arguments

❶ When a periphrastic verbal form consisting of an auxiliary (T) and a lexical verb (V) occurs in a structure headed by a non-agreeing participle (32), (33), the participle of the lexical verb does not appear in the default agreement form, but rather fully agrees in gender, number and non-nominative case with the subject. The only reasons why this is possible is that (i) as said above, the participle agrees in φ-features with the subject yet lacking case before the T-C level is merged, and (ii) structural non-nominative case is assigned both to the subject and the participle by the same mechanism as in finite clauses (e.g. by head-to-complement assignment argued for by Matushansky 2008 and Arkadiev 2014c).

(32) *Tekst-as* *atskleidži-a* [*Krist-ų* *taut-os* *sąmon-ėje* ***buv-us***
text-NOM.SG reveal-PRS.3 Christ(M)-ACC.SG people-GEN.SG consciousness-LOC.SG AUX-PST.PA
lygin-a-m-ą *su* *kritišk-aisiais* *pranaš-ais*].
compare-PRS-PP-ACC.SG.M with critical-INS.PL.M.DEF prophet-INS.PL
'The texts reveals that in the minds of the people Christ had been compared to critical prophets…' (LKT)

(33) *Vartoj-a-m-a* [***es-a-nt*** ***pa-varg-us-ioms*** *rank-oms*].
use-PRS-PP-DF AUX-PRS-PA PRV-tire-PST.PA-DAT.PL.F arm(F)-DAT.PL
'It is used when one's arms are tired.' (http://m-d.lt/straipsniai/bulve-ir-jos-gydomieji-budai/)

The derivation for cases like (32) and (33) is schematized in (34). The caseless subject DP agrees in gender and number with the participle in Asp, which is not subject to CDAP, but fails to agree with the participle in T precisely due to CDAP, since the non-finite T cannot assign nominative case to it; when the C head is merged, both the subject DP and the participle in Asp get non-nominative structural case from it, but only the fully agreeing lexical participle in Asp is able to morphologically realize it.

(34) [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ DP_k T [$_{AspP}$ DP_k Asp_i [$_{VP}$ DP_k V_i]]]
φ-features: [φ]···~~agree~~→[PART;φ:#] [φ]···agree→ [PART;φ] [φ]
case: [CASE]·····→[case:K]····→[case:K]·····case·····→ [case:K]
morphology: –AGR AGR

In other words, the non-agreeing participles receive case but fail to realize it due to an independently motivated language-specific morphological constraint on feature realization in (35), while default agreement forms of participles lack case altogether.

(35) Of the values of features "case", "number" and "gender" either all are expressed in a given word, or none.

Such an analysis of non-agreeing participles is supported by diachrony: historically, they are truncated accusative and dative forms of agreeing ones (Ambrazas 1990).

These structures are paralleled by the evidential impersonal passive construction (see Holvoet 2007: Ch. 4; Lavine 2006, 2010), where both the subject and the lexical participle are assigned structural genitive by the evidential head, while the auxiliary receives the default agreement form due to CDAP, cf. (36) and (37).

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

(37) [$_{EvidP}$ Evid [$_{TP}$ DP_i T [$_{AspP}$ Asp_k [$_{VP}$ DP_i V_k]]]]
φ-features: [φ] ···~~agree~~→[PART;φ:#] [PART;φ]←·····[φ]
case: [GEN]·····→[case:GEN]·····→[case:GEN]
morphology: DF AGR

Additional stipulations may be needed to derive the DF and not –AGR in cases like (36); the crucial difference between (32) and (33), on the one hand, and (36), on the other, is presence vs. absence of syntactic embedding realized at the C level. Possibly, –AGR should be treated as a merger of the T and C heads.

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

(i) an agreeing participle when the matrix verb is finite and the subordinate verb does not assign inherent case to its subject (38);

(ii) the default agreement form when the subordinate verb lacks a nominative subject (39);

(iii) the non-agreeing form when the subordinate verb does not assign inherent case to its subject and the matrix verb is non-finite and its subject gets structural non-nominative case (40) via case-transmission (Landau 2008).

(38) a. *Jūr-a*$_{i}$ *liov-ė-si* [$\varnothing_{i,NOM}$ ***bangav-us-i***].
sea-NOM.SG stop-PST(3)-RFL be.choppy-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F
'The sea ceased being choppy.' (LKT)

b. *Lik-us* *dv-iem* *dešimt-ims* *metr-ų,* *j-is*$_{i}$ *sustoj-o*
remain-PST.PA two-DAT ten-DAT.PL meter-GEN.PL 3-NOM.SG.M stop-PST.3
[$\varnothing_{i,NOM}$ ***bėg-ęs***] *ir* *lik-us-į* *keli-ą*
run-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M and remain-PST.PA-ACC.SG.M way-ACC.SG
ėj-o *žingsni-u.*
walk-PST.3 step-INS.SG
'When there remained twenty meters (till the finish), he stopped running and walked the rest of the way at a slow pace.'

c. [$_{TP}$ DP$_{k}$ T$_{m}$ [$_{VP}$ *liovėsi*$_{Vm}$ [$_{TP}$ $\varnothing_{k}$ T$_{i}$ [$_{VP}$ V$_{i}$]]]
φ-features: [φ]·····→[φ]·····agree·····→[φ]·····→[PART;φ]
case: [case:NOM]←[NOM]·····case·····→[case:NOM]→[case:NOM]
morphology: +AGR

(39) a. *Ką tik* *pa-liov-ė* ***lij-ę*** *ir* *vėl* *nu-švit-o* *saul-ė.*
just PRV-stop-PST.3 rain-PST.PA.DF and again PRV-shine-PST.3 sun-NOM.SG
'…it has just stopped raining and sun started shining again.' (LKT)

b. *Po* *t-o,* *kai* *nusto-s* ***snig-ę,*** *tap-s* *šalčiau…*
after that-GEN.SG.M when stop-FUT.3 snow-PST.PA.DF become-FUT.3 colder
'After it stops snowing it becomes colder.' (LKT)

c. [$_{VP}$ *liovėsi*$_{V}$ [$_{TP}$ T$_{i}$ [$_{VP}$ V$_{i}$]]]
φ-features: [PART;φ:#]
case: [–NOM]
morphology: DF

(40) a. *Gydytoj-ai* *liepi-a* *j-am*$_{i}$ [$\varnothing_{i,DAT}$ *liau-ti-s* [$\varnothing_{i,DAT}$ ***rūk-ius***]].
doctor-NOM.PL order-PRS.3 3-DAT.SG.M stop-INF-RFL smoke-PST.PA
'Doctors order him to stop smoking.' (LKT)

b. *Bar-is* *nutari-a …* *privers-ti* *žmonij-ą* [$\varnothing_{i,ACC}$ *nusto-ti*
Baris-NOM.SG decide-PRS.3 make-INF humanity-ACC.SG stop-INF
[$\varnothing_{i,ACC}$ ***valgi-us*** *med-ų*]].
eat-PST.PA honey-ACC.SG
'Baris decides to … make humanity stop eating honey.' (LKT)

c. DP$_{i}$ [$_{TP}$ $\varnothing_{i}$ *liautis*$_{T}$ [$_{TP}$ $\varnothing_{i}$ T$_{k}$ [$_{VP}$ V$_{k}$]]]
φ-features: [φ]·····agree·····→[φ]·····→ [#] ·····→[φ] ·····x·····→[PART;φ:#]
case: [case:K]·····→[case:K]·····case·····→[case:K] ·····→[case:K]
morphology: INF –AGR

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

– the default agreement form occurs when the conditions for agreement are not fulfilled in the subordinate clause;
– the non-agreeing form occurs when the factors blocking the agreement originate in the main clause.

7. Conclusions

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

(i) by mostly local interaction between the lexical or functional heads of the vP/VP level with features of DPs, both inherent (φ-features) and contextual (non-structural case);

(ii) by not necessarily local interaction of factors of the higher clausal levels (CP/TP) having to do with structural case assignment and interclausal relations such as switch-reference (see Camacho 2010 on the role of case and agreement in switch-reference).

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

❷ There are two kinds of non-nominative subjects in Lithuanian, which turn out to be fundamentally different despite certain surface similarities:

– non-nominative (mostly dative) experiencers occurring with certain kinds of verbs and in fact exhibiting little properties of real subjects (see Holvoet 2013, Seržant 2015); their case marking is determined lexically ("at first merge") and under appropriate conditions they trigger the default agreement form of the participial predicate;

– non-nominative subjects of embedded non-finite clauses and evidential impersonal passives; they receive structural dative, accusative and genitive case from functional heads located high in the structure of the clause, and trigger (when embedded) the non-agreeing form of the participle occupying the T(ense) head and, most importantly, the agreeing form of the participle of the lexical verb in the Asp(ect) head.

Thus, an at first glance paradoxical conclusion of potential relevance for the VARGReB project:

Non-canonical marking may be a signal of canonical behavior; i.e. in Lithuanian, only canonical subjects which get nominative case and trigger full verbal agreement in regular independent clauses admit non-nominative case (and corresponding agreement) in certain structures headed by participles.

Abbreviations

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

LKT – Lietuvių kalbos tekstynas, http://tekstynas.vdu.lt (Corpus of Lithuanian).

References

Ambrazas, Vytautas. 1990. *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov*. [Comparative syntax of participles in Baltic Languages]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Ambrazas, Vytautas, ed. 2006. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2011. Problemy sintaksisa konstrukcij «accusativus cum participio» v litovskom jazyke [On the syntax of "accusativus cum participio" constructions in Lithuanian]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5, 44–75.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2012. Participial complementation in Lithuanian. In: Volker Gast & Holger Diessel (eds.), *Clause Linkage in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Data-Driven Approaches to Cross-Clausal Syntax*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 285–334.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2013. Marking of subjects and objects in Lithuanian non-finite clauses: A typological and diachronic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 17.3, 397–437.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2014a. Kriterii finitnosti i morfosintaksis litovskix pričastij [Criteria of finiteness and the morphosyntax of participles in Lithuanian]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5, 68–96.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2014b. (Non-)finiteness, constructions, and participles in Lithuanian. Talk at the Max-Planck Institute of Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, 10 October.

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

Baker, Marc C. 2008. *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Camacho, José. 2010. On case concord: The syntax of switch-reference clauses. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28, 239–274.

Geniušienė, Emma. 2014. Konverby v litovskom jazyke [Converbs in Lithuanian]. In: Sergej Ju. Dmitrenko & Natalia M. Zaika (red.), *Studia Typologica Octogenario Victoris Samuelis filii Khrakovskii dedicata* (Acta Linguistica Petropolitana 10.3). Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, 157–180.

Greenberg, Gerald & James E. Lavine. 2006. New syntax in Russian and Lithuanian: The case of the adverbial participle. In: Robert Rothstein, Edward Scatton & Charles Townsend (eds.), *Studies in Slavic Linguistics and Folklore*. Bloomington (IN): Slavica, 143–170.

Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and Modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Holvoet, Axel. 2013. Obliqueness, quasi-subjects and transitivity in Baltic and Slavonic. In: Ilja Seržant & Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *The Diachronic Typology of Non-Prototypical Subjects*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 257–282.

Keine, Stephan. 2010. *Case and Agreement from Fringe to Core. A Minimalist Approach*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Landau, Idan. 2008. Two routes of control: Evidence from case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 877–924.

Lavine, James E. 2006. Is there a passive evidential strategy in Lithuanian? *Papers from the 42nd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 41–55.

Lavine, James E. 2010. Mood and a transitivity restriction in Lithuanian: The case of the inferential evidential. *Baltic Linguistics* 1, 115–142.

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

Preminger, Omer. 2011. *Agreement as a Fallible Operation*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Rezac, Milan. 2008. Phi-agree and theta-related case. In: Daniel Harbour, David Adger & Susana Béjar (eds.). *Phi Theory. Phi-Features across Modules and Interfaces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 83–129.

Seržant, Ilja. 2013. Acquisition of canonical subjecthood. In: Ilja Seržant & Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *The diachronic typology of non-prototypical subjects*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 283–310.

Seržant, Ilja. 2015. Dative experiencer constructions as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. In: Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer (eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 325–348.

Spraunienė, Birutė, Razanovaitė, Auksė & Erika Jasionytė, to appear. Solving the puzzle of the Lithuanian passive. To appear in Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*.

Timberlake, Alan. 1982. The impersonal passive in Lithuanian. *Proceedings of the 8th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 508–524.

Wiemer, Björn (2006a). Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian. In: Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and Typology. Form and Function*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 274–309.

Wiemer, Björn. 2006b. Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (A typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41.1, 33–49.

Wiemer, Björn. 2009. Taksis v litovskom jazyke [Taxis in Lithuanian]. In: Viktor S. Xrakovskij (red.), *Tipologija taksisnyx konstrukcij* [The typology of taxis constructions]. Moscow: Znak, 161–216.

Wiemer, Björn & Valgerður Bjarnadóttir. 2014. On the non-canonical marking of the highest-ranking argument in Lithuanian and Icelandic: Steps toward a database. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 301–362.