

tic of adjunct secondary predicates in *as* + NP constructions. Yet for syntactic reasons it is only in loose apposition that such constituents may be unquestionably assigned the status of secondary predicates, or sentential modifiers. Such appositives are usually connected with the main sentence predication by a causal relation, which can be readily deduced from the overall meaning of the sentence. Thus, from the viewpoint of grammatical function, the principal difference between such noun-adjacent appositives and the corresponding constructions of the type *as* + NP is purely formal: the causal interpretation of the latter is prompted by these constructions' explicit element *as*, whereas the identical meaning of the former is implied by the inherent logic of the occurrence of a secondary predication alongside the main predication. This is why such noun-adjacent appositives can confidently be characterised as functional precedents of the corresponding constructions of the type *as* + NP.

JURGIS PAKERYS

Action nominal constructions with predicative complements in Modern Lithuanian

Lithuanian action nominal constructions (ANCS) are classified with the double possessive type of ANCS (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993, 2003), because they use possessive markers (= genitives) to code the subject, the agent and the patient of the nominalized clause, cf. **Kolumb-as** (Columbus-NOM.SG) *knark-ia* (snore-PRS.3) 'Columbus snores' → **Kolumb-o** (Columbus-GEN.SG) *knark-im-as* (snore-AN-NOM.SG) 'Columbus' snoring'; **Kolumb-as** (Columbus-NOM.SG) *atrad-o* (discover-PST.3) **Ameriką** (America-ACC.SG) 'Columbus discovered America' → **Kolumb-o** (Columbus-GEN.SG) **Amerik-os** (America-GEN.SG) *atrad-im-as* (discover-AN-NOM.SG) 'the discovery of America by Columbus'. Typologically, ANCS are known to be parasitical constructions, as they copy the argument marking that is used either in finite clauses or in possessive NPs. This is considered to be a universal feature of ANCS (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993, 2003, 2008).

The present paper aims at describing the case marking strategies for predicative complements (including copula complements) used in Lithuanian ANCS, and at evaluating them in terms of the universal properties of ANCS (cf. above). The study covers both subject-controlled (a) and object-controlled (b) predicative complements (PCs), cf. the following finite clauses:

(a) **Jon-as** (John-NOM.SG) *yra* (be.PRS.3) **šykšt-us** (stingy-NOM.SG.M) ‘John is stingy’; **Jon-as** (John-NOM.SG) *yra* (be.PRS.3) *įmon-ės* (company-GEN.SG) **direktor-ius** (manager-NOM.SG) / *buv-o* (be-PST.3) *įmon-ės* (company-GEN.SG) **direktor-iumi** (manager-INS) *tik* (just) *du* (two.ACC) *mėnes-ius* (month-ACC.PL) ‘John has been a company manager / was (worked as) a company manager only for two months’; **Jon-as** (John-NOM.SG) *pasidar-ė* (become-PST.3) **pavyd-us** (jealous-NOM.SG.M) ‘John became jealous’;

(b) *Avarij-a* (accident-NOM.SG) *padar-ė* (make-PST.3) **j-q** (3-ACC.SG.F) **atsarg-esn-ę** (cautious-CMPR-ACC.SG.F) ‘the accident made her more cautious’; **Jon-as** (John-NOM.SG) *padar-ė* (make-PST.3) **j-uos** (3-ACC.PL.M) *savo* (REFL.POSS) **verg-ais** (slave-INS.PL) ‘John made them his slaves’.

The list of verbs taking PCs was compiled from *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika* [Lithuanian grammar], Ulvydas ed. (1976) and the data were collected from the *Corpus of Modern Lithuanian* (<http://donelaitis.vdu.lt>).

The only case used to mark nominal PCs (i. e. those expressed by nouns and noun-like pronouns) in ANCS is instrumental and the possibility of a permanent / temporary state distinction (or emphasis) is excluded, cf. *buv-im-as* (be-AN-NOM.SG) *pavaduotoj-u* (deputy-INS.SG) ‘(the fact of) being a deputy’ alongside the finite *buv-o* (be-PST.3) *pavaduotoj-as/-u* (deputy-NOM.SG/-INS.SG) ‘was / (worked as) a deputy’. In Lithuanian the infinitival construction also permits only predicative instrumentals (*bū-ti* (be-INF) *pavaduotoj-u* (deputy-INS.SG) ‘to be a deputy’) and it is argued that Lithuanian ANCS copy their PC case marking from the infinitival constructions. When the instrumental is used in a finite construction with a subject complement (*buvo pavaduotoju*) or an object complement (in this case, only the instrumental is possible, cf. *padar-ė* (make-PST.3) **j-i** (3-ACC.SG.M) *savo* (REFL.POSS)

pavaduotoj-u (deputy, assistant-INS.SG) ‘made him his / her deputy’), the influence of the infinitival construction is hard to prove, because the instrumental can also be simply transferred from the finite clause to the ANC, cf. *pasitikėj-o* (trust-PST.3) *pavaduotoj-u* (deputy-INS.SG) ‘trusted the deputy’ → *pasitikėj-im-as* (trust-AN-NOM.SG) *pavaduotoj-u* (deputy-INS.SG) ‘(the fact of) trusting the deputy’.

Adjectival PCs (i. e. those expressed by adjectives, participles, adjective-like pronouns and ordinal numerals) in Lithuanian ANCs can be marked with the genitive, dative or instrumental. Genitive marking comes up as the rarest and is used in 4 constructions (2 subject PCs and 2 object PCs). The genitive of the PC agrees in case with the subject or the object of the ANC and it is argued that the marking strategy (viz. agreement) is copied from the finite constructions, which also show case agreement, cf. *žmog-aus* (man-GEN.SG) *buv-im-as* (be-AN-NOM.SG) *vien-o* (alone-GEN.SG.M) ‘man’s being alone’ ← *žmog-us* (man-NOM.SG) *yra* (be.PRS.3) *vien-as* (alone-NOM.SG.M) ‘(a/the) man is alone’; *pasidar-ym-as* (become-AN-NOM.SG) *j-os* (3-GEN.SG.F) *tok-ios* (such-GEN.SG.F) ‘(the fact of) it [viz. freedom] becoming such [that...]’ ← *j-i* (3-NOM.SG.F) *pasidar-ė* (become-PST.3) *tok-ia* (such-NOM.SG.F) ‘it became such [that...]’; [*medžiag-os* (material-GEN.SG)] *padar-ym-as* (make-AN-NOM.SG) *lengvai* (easily) *prieinam-os* (accessible-GEN.SG.F) ‘(the fact of) making the material easily accessible’ ← *padar-ė* (make-PST.3) *medžiag-q* (material-ACC.SG) *lengvai* (easily) *prieinam-q* (accessible-ACC.SG.F) ‘made the material easily accessible’. The dative is used more often than the genitive, but less often than the instrumental (15 constructions with subject PCs; the marking of object PCs with the dative is impossible). It is suggested that the dative marking of adjectival PCs is borrowed from infinitival constructions, cf. *jaut-im-as-is* (feel-AN-NOM.SG-REFL) *atsaking-am* (responsible-DAT.SG.M) ‘(the fact of) feeling responsible’ alongside *jaut-ti-s* (feel-INF-REFL) *atsaking-am* (responsible-DAT.SG.M) ‘to feel responsible’ and *jaut-ė-si* (feel-PST.3-REFL) *atsaking-as* (responsible-NOM.SG.M) ‘felt responsible’. The instrumental case marking of adjectival PCs in ANCs is the most common (475 ANCs: 77 constructions with subject PCs and 398 constructions with object PCs). On the one hand, this marking strategy

can be influenced by the instrumental, which is possible (though in many cases proscribed by normative grammar) alongside the dative in infinitival constructions, cf. *buv-im-as* (be-AN-NOM.SG) *ger-u* (good-INS.SG.M) '(the fact of) being good' ← *bū-ti* (be-INF) *ger-u/-am* (good-INS.SG.M/-DAT.SG.M) 'to be good'. On the other hand, in some cases one cannot exclude the influence of finite constructions, which also employ the instrumental (mostly proscribed by normative grammar), cf. *tap-o* (become-PST.3) *ger-esn-iu* (good-CMPR-INS.SG.M) 'became better' → *tap-im-as* (become-AN-NOM.SG) *ger-esn-iu* (good-CMPR-INS.SG.M) '(the fact of) becoming better'. The high frequency of instrumental of adjectival PCs in ANCS may also be explained by the influence of nominal PCs, which are marked with the instrumental only. Note that, in many cases, nominal PCs are more frequent than adjectival ones (cf. Table 1).

To sum up, the Lithuanian ANCS with PCs present an interesting case of competing morphosyntactic marking strategies. They provide further support for the claim that ANCS are parasitical constructions. In this respect, Lithuanian ANCS use the PC marking strategies that are also used in either infinitival or finite constructions. The dative and instrumental marking of PCs reflect the case marking of infinitival clauses and in some instances the instrumental can be explained as being copied from the finite clauses. As far as genitive marking is concerned, it is not the case marking itself but the general principle of agreement between the subject / object and its predicative complement that is borrowed from finite clauses. Further study of predicative adjuncts, combined with data from other languages than Lithuanian, should reveal a more detailed picture of predicative marking strategies in ANCS.

AGNIESZKA REMBIAŁKOWSKA

Levels of predication and free datives in Lithuanian

The aim of this article is to establish criteria for the classification of free datives in Lithuanian so as to achieve a systematic description that would be somewhat more satisfactory than those based on the criteria