Passive Constructions in Lithuanian: Selected Works of Emma Geniušienė. (Studies in Language Companion Series, 179), edited by Anna Kibort and Nijolė Maskaliūnienė. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Company 2016. xx + 313 pp.
ISBN 978 90 272 5944 8

Reviewed by CORI ANDERSON, Rutgers University

1. Introduction

This volume, a collection of newly translated works by Emma Geniušienė, including her 1973 dissertation, contains some of the first and most extensive examinations of passive constructions in Lithuanian. Various functions of Lithuanian passive constructions have been widely examined, and these translations make these studies of passives available to a much wider audience. The editors, Anna Kibort and Nijolė Maskaliūnienė, have ensured that the material is indeed accessible. The translation, by Artūras Ratkus, is nearly flawless, reading perhaps even more fluidly than the original. This is also thanks to the editors' careful work of glossing and translating every example in the text, and the added structure of titled sections and subsections. In the foreword, which includes a brief biography of Geniušienė, the editors note these and other limited changes from the original, including two updated terms: the replacement of nearly all instances of the word 'transformation' with 'alternation', in light of the fact that while Geniušienė was likely influenced by the then-novel Transformational Grammar, her analysis does not reflect a true belief in this approach. The term 'agentive object' (Russian *агентивное дополнение*) used to describe the demoted agent in the genitive case has been replaced with the phrase 'oblique agent' due to the more restricted meaning of the term 'object' in the English-language literature. Throughout the volume, the editors use spare but insightful footnotes to provide commentary or clarification.

Some aspects of the analysis offered in the volume are, of course, dated, such as the limited use of theta roles: nearly every external argument is labeled an agent. Geniušienė represents the argument structure of passive alternations following the schema of diatheses and dependency tree structures used by the Leningrad/Saint-Petersburg school of typology, which are not widely used in current literature (although see Kulikov 2010 for modern usage, and also Babby 2009 for a novel interpretation). Other aspects of Geniušienė's analysis remain relevant: her quantitative analysis of passive constructions, based on two corpora she created, examines how passive constructions differ from active ones in

frequency, form (e.g. aspect, valency), and function. She provides a careful study of how passive constructions are used in texts, examining how both the meaning and argument structure interact with textual coherence. Much attention is given to the distinction between the actional and the stative passive, similar to the distinction between verbal and adjectival passive participles presented in Wasow (1977). The analysis of the stative passive as a resultative is also put forth in a variety of current lines of research (Dubinsky & Simango 1996, Kratzer 2001, Embick 2004, *inter alia*).

The non-agreeing passive participle in Lithuanian has received broad attention in a range of linguistic frameworks (Timberlake 1982, Lavine 2000, Holvoet 2001a, Wiemer 2006, Sprauniene, Razanovaite & Jasionyte 2015, to name only a few), and thus the passive constructions described in this volume remain an important contribution to the field. Given that this book is a translation of works that are over 40 years old, rather than evaluate the data and analyses on their own merit, I will instead provide a summary and then discuss their relevance to more contemporary approaches to Lithuanian passive constructions, with special attention to generative frameworks.

2. Summary

The volume is divided into three parts: Geniušienė's never-before published (or translated) 1973 dissertation on passive constructions in Lithuanian in part I, and a selection of articles on diathesis (argument structure) and voice in Lithuanian, which had never been translated, in part II. The third part consists of a brief article on textual cohesion with the passive in Russian.

2.1. Part I

Geniušienė's 1973 dissertation, "Passive constructions in Lithuanian", is the first large work dedicated to the Lithuanian passive. She examines constructions with passive participles by comparing them with active constructions in terms of argument structure, syntax, meaning and textual functions. As she notes, there are two passive participles, the present passive participle formed with *-m-*, and the past passive participle formed with *-t-*. Both participles can be formed from either perfective or imperfective verbs, but the examples below in (1) show the more typical present passive participle with an imperfective verb, and the past passive participle with a perfective verb. The patient of the active verb is

the nominative subject of the passive, and the agent, if expressed, is in the genitive case.

(1)   a. *Nam-as*   *yra*   *stat-o-m-as*
          house(M)-NOM.SG be.PRS.3 build-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
          darbinink-ų.
          worker-GEN.PL
          'The house is being built by workers.'
      b. *Nam-as*   *pa-staty-t-as*   *pernai.*
          house(M)-NOM.SG PVB-build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M last.year
          'The house was built last year.' (p. 3)

The dissertation has two goals: to describe the passive voice in Lithuanian as it relates to the active, and to describe the use of the passive in discourse. Geniušienė created two corpora of passive constructions in Lithuanian, from a variety of sources (magazines, newspapers, popular science, fiction, academic journals). These corpora serve as the basis for her analysis, both in the dissertation and in her subsequent work. She follows the approaches of the Leningrad school of typology (e.g. Mel'čuk & Xolodovič 1970), defining voice as "a means of realizing syntactic and semantic relations within the sentence" (p. 3). She argues that the passive can be defined primarily as the lack of a correspondence between agent and subject, with the correspondence between patient and subject as a secondary component of the meaning of the passive, allowing passive constructions from intransitive or impersonal verbs to still be considered passive.

The morphosyntactic details of the passive alternation are provided in Chapter 3. Geniušienė thoroughly discusses how various verbal categories, such as mood, person, number and tense affect the relationship between the active and the passive. She also introduces the distinction between the stative meaning of the passive, in which the patient-subject is the holder of a state that results from the action described by the verb, as opposed to the actional meaning, which does not have such a resultative meaning (see example (8) below).

Next Geniušienė turns to various realizations of the agent and patient in passive constructions. She presents examples of case retention on the patient, for both oblique cases,[1] and in rare instances, for the accusative, as in (2) below:

(2)   *Prarand-a-m-a*   *žmogiškum-ą*
      lose-PRS-PP-NA   humanness(M)-ACC.SG
      'Humanness is being lost.' (Geniušienė 2016, 58)

---

[1] Some verbs with oblique objects can form agreeing passive participles, as noted here (p. 57).

Geniušienė proposes syntactic rules for the passive, presented as dependency tree diagrams following the method of Gladkij & Mel'čuk (1971). These diagrams represent a predicate, with the syntactic functions of arguments (subject, object) as branches, and the nodes showing the actual arguments and their case. The syntactic rules describe how active predicates of various valencies alternate with the passive with respect to the correspondence of arguments to syntactic functions, and case marking. The optionality of the demoted agent in the genitive is not shown in the trees, but is discussed, particularly as concerns passive alternations of subjectless active sentences.

Chapter 4 examines the function of passive constructions in a text, with special attention to the role of textual coherence, which involves the domination (i.e. repetition) of arguments in chains of predicates. Typically the theme (old information, vs rheme, new information) is the dominated argument. In passive constructions the patient-subject is usually the dominated theme, creating a coherent text. The presence and absence of the various arguments of a passive predicate contribute to its function in a text, specifically in terms of how the patient-subject is brought into prominence and the oblique agent is deemphasized, or omitted completely. Geniušienė identifies four functional categories based on the presence or absence of the oblique agent and patient-subject. The patient-subject is present when it is emphasized, absent when the action is emphasized. The oblique agent is backgrounded or deemphasized, even when present, and this argument is omitted if it is generic or irrelevant.

The final chapter gives a quantitative account of passive constructions, based on the aforementioned corpora. Geniušienė provides detailed comparisons between active and passive constructions, tense forms of passive participles, and a range of other factors. Among her findings is that past passive participles are most common, perhaps connected to the fact that stative passives (which are themselves quite prevalent) can only occur with past passive participles. She concludes that the formal and functional descriptions of passive constructions presented in the dissertation support one another: all passives share the lack of correspondence between agent and subject, and can include the correspondence of patient to subject and agent to oblique. The passive changes the prominence and emphasis of these arguments, and thus a passive participle may be used to provide more textual coherence in a given chain of predicates. Voice alternations then are alternations between the syntactic and semantic elements of a verb.

2.2. Part II.

The second part of the volume presents five articles relating to diathesis (argument structure) and voice in Lithuanian, published in the years just before and after the defense of Geniušienė's dissertation in 1973. The first article, "Diatheses and voices in present-day Lithuanian," begins with an overview of verbal categories (e.g. tense, person, number, mood, etc.) in Lithuanian, followed by a discussion of the passive construction. Geniušienė presents diatheses of active verbs and passive predicates, showing which semantic roles link to which syntactic roles. This article includes a detailed analysis of complex predicates, expanded from the dissertation. She examines phasal, modal, and causative verbs, such as 'force' and 'order.' Causative verbs, unlike phasal and modal verbs, introduce a causer argument, and the agent of the infinitive is either in accusative or dative. Only accusative agents become nominative subjects under passivization, shown in (3); dative agents remain in dative case, as in (4).

(3) a. *Tėv-as*   *ver-čia*   *Rim-ą*   *moky-ti-s*
       father(M)-NOM.SG force-PRS.3 Rimas(M)-ACC.SG study-INF-RFL
       'Father forces Rimas to study'

     b. *Rim-as*   *ver-čia-m-as*   *(tė-vo)*
       Rimas(M)-NOM force-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M father(M)-GEN.SG
       moky-ti-s.
       study-INF-RFL
       'Rimas is forced to study (by the father).' (p. 208)

(4) a. *Tėv-as*   *liep-ia*   *j-am*   *moky-ti-s.*
       father(M)-NOM.SG order-PRS.3 he-DAT study-INF-RFL
       'Father orders him to study.'

     b. *J-am*   *(tėv-o)*   *liep-t-a*   *moky-ti-s.*
       he-DAT father(M)-GEN.SG order-PST.PP-NA study-INF-RFL
       'He was ordered to study (by the father).' (p. 209)

Other 'modifying' verbs (those that are followed by an infinitive) do not change the valency of the infinitive. Geniušienė identifies two possibilities for passivization of these complex predicates: the modifying verb is in the passive, or infinitive is in the passive. The latter is only possible for two modal verbs:[2]

---

[2] The modal verb *reikėti* 'need' behaves similarly, albeit with a dative subject:
     (i) a. *Jon-ui*   *reik-ia*   *ap-gau-ti*   *Tad-ą.*
          Jonas-DAT need.PRS.3 PVB-deceive-INF Tadas-ACC
          'Jonas has to deceive Tadas.'

galėti 'be able to' and *turėti* 'must, be obliged'. An example is given in (5). If the modifying verb is passivized, the patient of the infinitive can remain a patient with a non-agreeing passive participle, as in (6), or the patient can become the subject as in (7).

(5) a. *M-es   tur-i-me   baig-ti   darb-ą.*
    we-NOM   must-PRS-1PL finish-INF   work(M)-ACC.SG
    'We must finish the work.'

  b. *Darb-as   tur-i   **bū-ti**   (mūs-ų)*
    work(M)-NOM.SG must.PRS.3 be.INF 1PL-GEN
    ***baig-t-as**.*
    finish-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
    'The work must be finished (by us).' (p. 213)

(6) a. *Tėv-ai   nutar-ė   staty-ti   nam-ą.*
    parents(M)-NOM.PL decide-PST.3 build-INF house(M)-ACC.SG
    'The parents decided to build a house.'

  b. *(Tėv-ų)   **buv-o   nutar-t-a**   staty-ti*
    parents(M)-GEN.PL be.PST.3 decide-PST.PP-NA build-INF
    nam-ą.
    house(M)-ACC.SG
    'It was decided (by the parents) to build a house.' (p. 212)

(7) a. *Nam-ą   pradė-jo-me   staty-ti*
    house(M)-ACC.SG begin-PST-1.PL build-INF
    vasar-ą.
    summer(F)-ACC.SG
    'We began to build the house in summer.'

  b. *Nam-as   **buv-o   pradė-t-as***
    house(M)-NOM.SG be-PST.3 begin-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
    staty-ti   vasar-ą.
    build-INF summer(F)-ACC.SG
    'Building the house began in summer.' (p. 212-213)

The examples above all have infinitives with accusative patients. If an oblique case is used instead, a non-agreeing participle is used and the patient remains in the oblique case, much like (6b) above.

    While this article largely echoes the dissertation, there is a novel discussion

---

  b. *Tad-ui   reik-ia   **bū-ti   ap-gau-t-am**   Jon-o.*
    Tadas-DAT need-PRS.3 be-INFINF PVB-deceive-PST.PP-DAT.SG.M Jonas-GEN
    'Tadas had to be deceived by Jonas.' (Vaikšnoraitė 2015, 68)

of oblique agents in passive constructions. The agent can be human or non-human, definite or indefinite, known or unknown, expressed or unexpressed. Non-human agents tend to be expressed: *Jis buvo apniktas *(abejonių)* 'He was seized with doubt' (p. 221). Human agents are left unexpressed when indefinite, or "definite but unknown to the speaker (e.g. 'Someone is singing in the room next door' refers to a definite person but the speaker does not know who it is)" (p. 221). The presence or absence of known and definite agents depends on the context, being obligatory when the agent is part of the rheme.

The second article, "The relation between the passive and the stative in Lithuanian", gives a much more thorough analysis of the stative meaning of the passive than in the works already described. The actional meaning is shown in (8a) and the stative meaning shown in (8b):

(8) a. *Nam-as   pa-staty-t-as   pernai*
    house(M)-NOM.SG PVB-build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M last.year
    'The house was built last year.'

  b. *Nam-as   pa-staty-t-as   iš*
    house(M)-NOM.SG PVB-build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M from
    plyt-ų.
    brick(F)-GEN.PL
    'The house is built of brick' (p. 231)

There are no formal differences between (8a) and (8b), but in this article (as in the relevant sections of the dissertation) Geniušienė identifies several differences between stative and actional meanings of passive constructions. The stative is only available with past passive participles of telic perfective transitive verbs, and only from certain semantic categories: creation/destruction, change in appearance or position, correlation in space of two objects (e.g. *pripilti* 'fill'), giving/receiving, and psychological influence. The stative meaning, it is proposed, arises from an "extra semantic layer on top of the actional meaning" (p. 233): in addition to the actional phase with an implied prior action, there is a resultative phase implying the resulting state. The subject of the stative serves as both the patient of the action and the holder of the resulting state. Statives also differ from actional passives in that they cannot be replaced by an active verb without changing its temporal relations in a chain of predicates, and combine with adverbial modifiers of duration, adjectives, and adverbs of place. Geniušienė also notes a metaphorical use of the stative, as in (9) below.

(9) *Blyž-a*   **buv-o**   *stipriai*
     Blyža(M)-NOM be-PST.3 sturdily
     su-kal-t-as.
     PVB-hammer-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
     'Blyža was sturdily built.' (p. 243)

The article concludes with a brief comparison of the distinction between actional and stative passives in Russian, English and German.

In the following article, "The relation between the indefinite personal and the passive in Lithuanian", Geniušienė examines the motivation for choosing between indefinite personal constructions, as in (10), and passive constructions, given that both emphasize the action denoted by the verb.

(10) *Lyg* *šaud-ė*   *dien-ą*   *mišk-e.*
      as.if shoot-PST.3 day(F)-ACC.SG wood(M)-LOC.SG
      'It seems that (someone) fired shots in the wood during the day.'
      (p. 248)

Both constructions require human agents, whether generic, indefinite or definite. In indefinite personal constructions, Geniušienė claims, the agent is implied, whereas in the passive, it is "alluded to" (p. 251). As the editors note, no clarification of this difference is given, but they suggest that she has in mind a null subject for indefinites and an empty subject for the passives. Further distinctions between the two constructions are made on the basis of when the passive can and cannot replace an indefinite personal construction, and vice versa. The article concludes with a quantitative analysis of the two constructions, alongside definite personal constructions for contrast. While Geniušienė observes some differences in information structure and argument structure (e.g. the case marking of the patient), the constructions are ultimately quite similar in meaning and function.

The fourth article, "On the passive form of intransitive verbs", is brief, but contains many examples of passives from intransitive verbs from Geniušienė's own study of 1,200 passive constructions collected from literary, non-literary, and scholarly texts. The goal of this article is to determine whether the passive participle of intransitive verbs, as in (11), has a passive meaning.

(11) *Čia* *žmoni-ų*   *buv-o*   *gyven-a-m-a / gyven-t-a*
      here   people(M)-GEN.PL be-PST.3 live-PRS-PP-NA / live-PST.PP-NA
      'People seem to have lived here.' (Geniušienė 2016, 269)

Geniušienė argues that the primary meaning of the passive is the lack of cor-
respondence between agent and subject, and that the correspondences of agent
to an oblique argument and patient to subject are secondary and, crucially, op-
tional. Under this definition, passives of intransitive verbs do have a passive
meaning. She observes that intransitive passives, also called impersonal pas-
sives due to the lack of a subject, are limited to verbs with human agents, unless
the passive is in the so-called oblique mood with an evidential meaning. She
notes that the oblique agent is typically absent from intransitive passives, as
with transitive passives, but can nonetheless be understood in some cases as
a definite, known agent, particularly with past passive participles. In lieu of a
generic or indefinite agent, which typically occurs with present passive parti-
ciples, adverbial modifiers are frequently observed with intransitive passives.
The oblique agent can be present, however, and usually this indicates the pas-
sive participle is in the oblique (evidential) mood. These constructions are given
more discussion in the following article.

The final article of Part II, "Categories of the Lithuanian verb in the passive
voice" examines how mood and tense affect the passive meaning semantically,
structurally, and functionally. After an overview of the types of passive parti-
ciples in Lithuanian, Geniušienė turns to mood, paying special attention to the
so-called oblique mood. Oblique, or indirect mood (what is now considered the
evidential, see Holvoet 2007) is formed from either active or passive participles,
either present or past, without an auxiliary. Examples of the past active and past
passive are shown in (12).

(12) a. *J̃-is   buv-ęs   tenai.*
         he-NOM be-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M there
         '(They say) he has been there.'
      b. *J̃-o   ten   bū-t-a.*
         he-GEN there be-PST.PP-NA
         '(It is obvious) he has been there.' (p. 284)

Compound tenses are possible, and the auxiliary *būti* 'be' is also in a participial
form, as the examples in (13) show.

(13) a. *J̃-is   es-ąs   buv-ęs   tenai.*
         he-NOM be-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M be-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M there
         '(Probably, they say) He has been there.'
      b. *J̃-is   buv-ęs   sutik-ęs*
         he-NOM be-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M meet-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M

225

        vilk-ą.

        wolf(M)-ACC.SG

        '(They say) He met with a wolf.'

c. *J̌-is   es-ąs   vis-ų   myl-i-m-as.*

     he-NOM be-PRS.PA.NOM,SG.M all-GEN.PL love-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M

     '(They say) He is loved by everyone.'

d. *J̌-is   buv-ęs   visur*

     he-NOM be-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M everywhere

     kvies-t-as.

     invite-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M

     '(They say) He used to be invited everywhere.' (p. 285-286)

Geniušienė notes that examples like (13) are rare outside of folklore, and considers oblique mood to have inconsistent correspondences between active and passive. Rather, the correspondences between indicative and oblique are more consistent: "*yra stumd-o-m-as/pa-kvies-t-as* 'is pushed-PRS.PP-NOM.SG.M/PVB-invited-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M' ~ *esąs stumd-o-m-as/pakvies-t-as* '(they say, it seems, probably) is pushed-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M /PVB-invited-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M'" (p. 286). Note that in oblique mood passive constructions from transitive verbs, the patient-subject is nominative, but the participle is always in its non-agreeing form, as in (14).

(14) *Vagi-es   nu-si-kirs-t-**a**   kopūst-**ai**   ir*

      theif(M)-GEN.SG PVB-RFL-cut-PST.PP-**NA** cabbage(M)-**NOM.PL** and

      nu-važuo-t-a.

      PVB-drive-PST.PP-NA

      'It is obvious that a theif has cut the cabbages and gone away.' lit. '(One can see that) The cabbages have been cut and (it was) gone away by the thief.' (p. 285)

This article also explores the correlation between tense forms of active and passive sentences. The aspect of the verb interacts with the tense of the participle, and thus there is not always a one-to-one correspondence of tense between active and passive. Geniušienė again provides a quantitative analysis of passives, examining the frequency of different mood forms and tense forms for active and passive, and the tense and aspect of passive participles.

2.3. Part III

Part III contains only one short article, "A brief note about the incorporation of the passive text in Russian." Geniušienė applies the principles of textual coher-

ence to the choice of passives over actives in Russian. She examines instances of passive clauses following active ones, and pays special attention to the nominal elements, with respect to position, information structure (theme or rheme), and repetition of the referent. The use of the passive, she argues, is typically to place the patient in a more syntactically prominent position when it is the theme of a clause. Other possibilities exist, as the construction is flexible.

3. The continuing relevance of Geniušienė's research on Lithuanian passives

I will now consider two uses of passive participles that have garnered much attention: passives of intransitive verbs, particularly of unaccusatives, and the evidential use of passive participles.

3.1. The passive of intransitive verbs: passive or impersonal?

Geniušienė's analysis of passives in this volume (and elsewhere, cf. Geniušienė 2006) considers all instances of the passive participle to have "passive meaning" (p. 279). Recall that her central definition of the passive is the lack of correspondence between the agent and the subject. In that sense, all passive participles are related by the fact that the agent (or any external argument, taking the narrow understanding of the term 'agent') of an active predicate is not represented as the nominative subject of the passive participle. This view is also shared by Timberlake (1982), Keenan & Timberlake (1985), Baker, Johnson & Roberts (1989), *inter alia*.

It is on this definition that Geniušienė claims that passive participles from intransitive verbs have the passive meaning. Lithuanian is not the only language to allow passive participles from intransitive verbs; Germanic languages allow impersonal passives of the sort of German *Es wurde getanzt* 'It was danced'. Because they are intransitive, there is no patient to be promoted to subject, and thus they are inherently subjectless, or impersonal. As has been claimed since at least Perlmutter (1978), not all intransitive verbs have the same argument structure. Unergative verbs have as their sole argument an agent (e.g. *work, play, speak*), whereas unaccusative verbs have only an internal argument, a patient (*burn, fall, drop*). As Perlmutter first noted, only unergative verbs can be used in a truly passive impersonal construction; unaccusative verbs cannot (Baker, Johnson & Roberts 1989, Lavine 2000, Blevins 2003). However, in Lithuanian all verbs, including the unaccusative ones, can form passive participles. It has been

shown (Blevins 2003, Sprauniene, Razanovaite & Jasionyte 2015) that unaccusative passives do not have a passive meaning, but an impersonal one. Consider (15), which shows the impersonal reading of the participles.

(15) *Taip apmaud-u,   kad kovo-t-a   ir žū-t-a*
      so   disappointing-NA that fight-PST.PP-NA and perish-PST.PP-NA
      be reikalo.
      in vain
      'It is so disappointing that one fought and perished in vain.'
      (Sprauniene, Razanovaite & Jasionyte 2015, 338)

Geniušiene's own analysis does not distinguish between unaccusative and unergative verbs, although most of her (non-evidential) examples of intransitive passives appear to contain unergative verbs.[3] Clear examples have been found elsewhere (Sprauniene, Razanovaite & Jasionyte 2015, Šereikaite 2017). A review of Geniušiene's own corpora with the categories of unaccusative and unergative in mind could prove enlightening.

Geniušiene makes two more claims about passive participles from intransitive verbs: they very rarely occur with the oblique agent (6–7% of all uses), and they require a human participant.[4] Šereikaite (2017) claims that impersonal passive participle constructions have an arbitrary [+human] PRO subject reading, but Geniušiene shows that intransitive passives can have a non-arbitrary reading, as in (16).

(16) *Po   daugeli-o   met-ų   j-is   ėj-o   namo,*
      after many-GEN.SG years.GEN.PL he-NOM go-PST.3 home
      ėj-o   atsikariau-ti savo Basiulišk-ų.
      go-PST.3 win.back-INF RPOSS placename-GEN.PL
      *Ar be-spė-s?   Ar ne-bu-s   **pa-vėluo-t-a?***
      Q PFX-make.it-FUT.3 Q NEG-be-FUT.3 PVB-be.late-PST.PP-NA
      Pa-vėluo-t-a   su vis-u   gyvenim-u?
      PVB-be.late-PST.PP-NA with all-INS.SG.M life(M)-INS.SG
      'After many years he was going home, he was on his way to win back his Basiuliškes. Will he make it in time? Won't he be too late? Too late with all his life?' (p. 274–275)

---

[3] As will be discussed below, the evidential construction with the passive participle has been shown to be non-passive, and thus should be excluded from the analysis of intransitive passives and impersonals with passive participles.

[4] Evidential passives almost always occur with the oblique agent and can have a non-human agent. See the following section for more details.

Note that the agent is unexpressed; all of her examples in this article are agentless.[5] Šereikaitė (2017) argues that the agent cannot be expressed in the impersonal with the passive participle:

(17) a. *Nuo grip-o (yra) mirš-ta-m-a*
from flu-GEN.SG be.PRS.3 die-PRS-PP-NA
kiekvien-ais met-ais.
every-INS.PL.M year-INS.PL
'One dies from the flu every year.'

b. **Nuo grip-o (yra) mirš-ta-m-a **žmoni-ų***
from flu-GEN.SG be.PRS.3 die-PRS-PP-NA **people-GEN.PL**
kiekvien-ais met-ais.
every-INS.PL.M year-INS.PL
Intended: 'It is died **by people** every year.' (Šereikaitė 2017, 235)

Sprauninė, Razanovaitė & Jasionytė (2015) arrive at similar conclusions to Šereikaitė (2017): they found no examples of non-evidential intransitive passive participles with an overt oblique agent. They conclude that non-agreeing passive participles from unaccusative verbs are impersonal. Unergative passives are ambiguous, interpreted either as subjectless passives or as (active) impersonals. Both are limited to verbs with a human agent.

3.2. Passive participles and evidential (oblique) mood

Unlike the impersonal passive constructions discussed above, the evidential construction with non-agreeing passive participles (described as 'oblique mood' in the present volume) has been shown to have obligatory[6] expression of the agent. Unlike other intransitive passives, as in the previous section, evidentials can be used with non-human agents, as in (18).

---

[5] There are a handful examples of 'subjectless agented passives' from intransitive verbs in Geniušienė 2006, including unaccusative predicates. These passives do not have an impersonal reading.

[6] Except with zero-place predicates, such as weather verbs:
(i) *Pa-snig-t-a.*
PVB-snow-PST.PP-NA
'It has snowed.' (an observable result: everything is covered with snow)
(ii) *Pa-ly-t-a.*
PVB-rain-PST.PP-NA
'It has (obviously) rained.' (there are indirect signs of earlier rain) (p. 201).

(18) *Čia   paukšči-o   **tupė-t-a**.*
      here bird(M)-GEN.SG sit-PST.PP-NA
      'A bird seems to have sat here.' (p. 12)

Despite the required oblique agent being unique to these constructions (recall that only 6-7% of passive participles from intransitive verbs have an overt agent), Geniušienė argues that these oblique mood constructions are passive, claiming that "voice and mood are not mutually exclusive, and may coexist in the same verb form" (p. 276), as the passive participle occurs without an auxiliary in the "oblique mood," as shown in (18) above, and thus are difficult to distinguish from a passive with a null present participle.

The evidential usage of the passive participle has been discussed in generative grammar for some time (Timberlake 1982, Keenan & Timberlake 1985, Postal 1986, Baker, Johnson & Roberts 1989, Nuñes 1994a, b *inter alia*). Because verbs of all kinds (unaccusative, zero-place predicates) can form passive participles in Lithuanian, such constructions as (18) were seen as evidence against the prevailing theory that passivization involved demotion of an external argument, as not all verbs have external arguments. The so-called 'double passive,' shown in (19c), is problematic for an external argument demotion analysis: if the external argument has already been demoted in a passive, how can it be further demoted?

(19) a. *Vėj-as   nupūt-ė   t-ą   lapel-į*
          wind(M)-NOM.SG   blow.down-PST.3   this-ACC.SG leaf(M)-ACC.SG
          'The wind blew down that leaf.'

      b. *T-as   lapel-is   vėj-o*
          this-NOM.SG.M   leaf(M)-NOM.SG   wind(M)-GEN.SG
          nupūs-t-as
          blow.down-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
          'That leaf was blown down by the wind.'

      c. *T-o   lapeli-o   bū-t-a   vėj-o*
          this-GEN.SG.M   leaf(M)-GEN.SG   be-PST.PP-NA wind(M)-GEN.SG
          nupūs-t-o
          blow.down-PST.PP-GEN.SG.M
          'That leaf was (presumably) blown down by the wind.'
          (Timberlake 1982, 517)

To account for the Lithuanian data, different solutions were offered, in line with the authors' given frameworks, by Timberlake (1982) and Baker, Johnson & Roberts (1989). Later research suggested that evidential constructions with pas-

sive participles were not passive in meaning. Nuñes (1994a, b) argues that the evidential construction is a nominalization. Lavine (1999, 2000, 2006, 2010) analyzes these constructions as active, but with a genitive subject and a nominative object. Blevins (2003) argues that the evidential passive is an impersonal (subjectless) construction. Along with Lavine (2006, 2010), Wiemer (2006), and Spraunienė, Razanovaitė & Jasionytė (2015) counter that an impersonal reading does not fit with these constructions. Wiemer shows that not all evidentials involve a human agent, a requirement of impersonal constructions as discussed above, a claim supported by Spraunienė, Razanovaitė & Jasionytė (2015). Furthermore, Lavine and Spraunienė, Razanovaitė & Jasionytė argue that the genitive oblique agent in evidential constructions functions as a syntactic subject. Geniušienė herself in later work (2006) treats evidentials as a separate category from passives, still noting that intransitive passives and evidentials are formally identical.

4. Conclusion

Syntactic theory has evolved greatly over time, in all frameworks. Geniušienė's careful work presented in this volume does not fully tease apart the impersonal and evidential functions of passive participles in Lithuanian, having focused more on the seeming lack of correspondence between agent and subject. It is important to note that unlike the other research mentioned above, Geniušienė's focus was not on theoretical explanation, but on presentation and description of passives. Some topics that feature prominently in this volume, such as the actional/stative distinction and passives in complex predicates, have not perhaps been conclusively examined. The quantitative analyses still provide insight into the usage of passive participles. Her syntactic analysis may not have stood the tests of time, much like the then-novel Transformational Grammar she attempted to incorporate into her dissertation; nevertheless, her early work remains of great importance for its data and descriptions.

Cori Anderson
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Dept of Germanic, Russian, and East European Languages and Literatures
College Avenue Campus
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
cori.anderson@gmail.com

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC — accusative, DAT — dative, F — feminine, FUT — future, GEN — genitive, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, LOC — locative, M — masculine, NA— non-agreeing, NEG — negation, NOM — nominative, PA — active participle, PFX — prefix, PL — plural, PP — passive participle, PRS — present, PST — past, PVB — preverb, Q — question particle, RFL — reflexive marker, RPOSS — reflexive possessor, SG — singular

REFERENCES

BABBY, LEONARD. 2009. *The Syntax of Argument Structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BAKER, MARK, KYLE JOHNSON & IAN ROBERTS. 1989. Passive arguments raised. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.2, 219–251.

BLEVINS, JAMES. 2003. Passives and impersonals. *Journal of Linguistics* 39, 473–520.

EMBICK, DAVID. 2004. On the structure of resultative participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35.3, 355–392.

DUBINSKY, STANLEY & SILVESTER RON SIMANGO. 1996. Passive and stative in Chichewa: Evidence for modular distinctions in grammar. *Language* 72.4, 749–781.

GENIUŠIENĖ, EMMA. 2006. Passives in Lithuanian (with comparison to Russian). In: Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö, eds., *Passivization and Typology: Form and Function.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29–61.

GLADKIJ, ALEKSEJ & IGOR' MEL'ČUK. 1971. Grammatiki derev'ev. 1. Opyt formalizacii preobrazovanij sintaksičeskix struktur estestvennogo jazyka [Tree grammars. A formalism for syntactic transformations in natural languages]. *Informacionnye voprosy semiotiki, lingvistiki i avtomatičeskogo perevoda* [Informational Problems of Semiotics, Linguistics and Automatic Translation] 1, 16–41.

HOLVOET, AXEL. 2001a. Impersonals and passives in Baltic and Finnic. In: Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds.,*Circum-Baltic Languages.* Vol. 2. *Typology and Contact,* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 363–389.

HOLVOET, AXEL. 2001b. On the paradigm of the oblique mood in Lithuanian and Latvian. *Linguistica Baltica* 9, 69–86.

HOLVOET, AXEL. 2007. *Mood and Modality in Baltic.* (Baltica Varsoviensia, 6). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

KEENAN, EDWARD & ALAN TIMBERLAKE. 1985. Predicate formation rules in universal grammar. In: *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, vol. 4, 123–138.

KRATZER, ANGELIKA. 2001. Building statives. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 26.1, 385–399.

KULIKOV, LEONID. 2010. Voice typology. In: Jae Jung Song, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 368–398.

LAVINE, JAMES. 1999. Subject properties and ergativity in North Russian and Lithuanian. In Katarzyna Dziwirek *et al.*, eds., *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 7. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 307–328.

LAVINE, JAMES. 2000. *Topics in the Syntax of Nonagreeing Predicates in Slavic*. PhD dissertation, Princeton University.

LAVINE, JAMES. 2006. Is there a passive evidential strategy in Lithuanian? *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 42.2, 41–55.

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

MATTHEWS, W. K. 1955. Lithuanian constructions with neuter passive participles. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 33(81), 350–371.

MEL'ČUK, IGOR' & ALEKSANDR XOLODOVIČ. 1970. K teorii grammatičeskogo zaloga: opredelenie, isčislenie [Towards a theory of grammatical voice: definition, calculus]. *Narody Azii i Afriki* [Peoples of Asia and Africa] 4, 111–124.

NUÑES, JAIRO. 1994a. *Participle Constructions in Lithuanian: A Minimalist Account*. Master's thesis, University of Maryland.

NUÑES, JAIRO. 1994b. Another look at Lithuanian impersonal passives. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 24.1/2, 347–360.

PERLMUTTER, DAVID. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4, 157–190.

POSTAL, PAUL M. 1986. *Studies of Passive Clauses*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

ŠEREIKAITĖ, MILENA. 2017. Lithuanian and passive-like impersonals. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 23.1, 231–240.

SPRAUNIENĖ, BIRUTĖ, AUKSE RAZANOVAITĖ & ERIKA JASIONYTĖ. 2015. Solving the puzzle of the Lithuanian passive. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 323–365.

TIMBERLAKE, ALAN. 1982. The impersonal passive in Lithuanian. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 8, 508–524.

VAIKŠNORAITĖ, ELENA. 2015. *Case and Non-Verbal Predication: The Syntax of Lithuanian Control Clauses.* MA thesis, Leiden University.

WASOW, THOMAS. 1977. Transformations and the lexicon. In: Peter W. Culicover, Tomas Wasow & Adrian Akmajian, eds., *Formal Syntax.* New York: Academic Press, 327–360.

WIEMER, BJÖRN. 2006. 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.