

Nominalizations without passives: evidence from Lithuanian

Intro: A long-standing generalization is that complex event nominalizations (CENS) are like passives (PASS) in that they suppress an external argument (Grimshaw 1990). CENS have also been argued to display an ergative case pattern that results from the presence of a passive-like Voice (Alexiadou 2017). I show that Lithuanian CENS lack passivization and don't exhibit an ergative case-marking. Just like PASS, CENS contain a thematic Voice that introduces an external θ -role (Alexiadou 2009). However, CENS differ from PASS: CENS have a projected implicit external argument (Sichel 2009; Bruening 2013), while PASS lack it. Lithuanian CENS also have two distinct genitives, which are analogous to a NOM-ACC case marking in the verbal domain. These two striking properties of CENS are captured by proposing a Voice-bundling analysis (Pyłkkänen 2008) to the nominal domain.

- (1) Tu su-naik-in-ai mane. (2) Aš buvau tavo sunaik-in-t-as.
 You.NOM destroy-CAUS-PST me.ACC I.NOM was you.GEN.POSS destroy-CAUS-P.PTCP
 'You destroyed me.' 'I was destroyed by you.'
- (3) Tav-o neįtikėtinas *(man-ęs) su-naik-in-im-as per kelias minutes
 you-GEN.POSS incredible me.GEN.NPOSS PRF-destroy-CAUS-NMLZ-SG within few minutes
 'Your incredible destruction of my within a couple of minutes' (scenario: in a computer game)

Basics: In CENS marked with the suffix *-i/ym-*, the accusative theme and the nominative agent become genitive, and precede the nominal (cf.1-3). Following Alexiadou's (2001) tests, (3) behaves like a CEN: **i**) it allows telic modifiers, **ii**) the theme is obligatory under a complex event reading. (3) has a *vP* layer: it allows the causative suffix *-in-*, and the *vP*-internal Aspect, the prefix *su-*.

Two genitives: CENS exhibit a transitive case pattern analogous to NOM-ACC case marking, rather than an ergative one. Lithuanian pronominal forms have two genitives: possessive genitive (GEN.POSS) and non-possessive genitive (GEN.NPOSS) (Ambrazas et al). **I**) GEN.POSS appears on possessors, (4). **II**) It occurs with different subjects. **A.** Non-finite evidentials have a genitive subject and a nominative grammatical object, (5), (Lavine 2006). GEN.POSS marks the subject of transitives (5), unergatives, *walk* (7), and unaccusatives, *grow* (7). **B.** In PASS, the demoted thematic subject expressed in an adjunct is in GEN.POSS (2). **III**) GEN.NPOSS appears on genitive objects e.g., objects of verbs like *wait* in (6), or genitive complements of prepositions like *ant*, (8).

- (4) tav-o/*-ęs knyga (6) Laukiu tav-ęs/*-o.
 you-GEN.POSS/GEN.NPOSS book wait.1.SG.PST you-GEN.NPOSS/GEN.NPOSS
 'your book' 'I am waiting for you.'
- (5) Tav-o/*-ęs nuraminta (7) Kur tav-o/*tav-ęs
 you-GEN.POSS/GEN.NPOSS calm.down.PTCP where you-GEN.POSS/-GEN.NPOSS
 vaikas. vaikščiota/augta.
 child.NOM walk.PTCP/grow.PTCP
 'You must have calmed down the child.' 'Where you must have walked/grew up...'

In CENS, **GEN.POSS** is assigned to the agent of (8) Rėkiaiu ant tav-ęs/*-o.
 shout.1.PST on you.GEN.NPOSS/GEN.POSS
 'I am shouting at you.'

transitives (3) (Pakerys 2006), unergatives (9), and the theme of unaccusative (10). Thus, it is not assigned thematically like non-structural case. Rather it behaves like a structural case realized on the highest available argument, patterning like nominative in an active transitive. **GEN.NPOSS** is assigned to the theme of transitives (3). This is a structural object case as it replaces a structural accusative (cf. 1-3) and precedes the nominal. DPs with inherent case like dative cannot receive GEN.POSS and occur postnominally (12). GEN.NPOSS in (3) is not assigned by silent P, unlike the theme, PPs also follow the nominal (13). In CENS with an ergative case pattern, the sole argument of intransitives and the theme of transitives typically bear genitive whereas the agent of transitives has a different case marking (Alexiadou 2017). However, this is not what we find in Lithuanian.

- (9) Tav-o/*-ęs plaukioj-im-as (11) *mano sunaikin-im-as tavo
 you-GEN.POSS/GEN.NPOSS swim-NMLZ-SG me.GEN.POSS destroy-NMLZ-SG you.GEN.POSS
 baseine
 pool ‘your swimming in the pool’
- (10) tav-o/*-ęs dažnas (12) Jono tarnav-im-as tau /
 you-GEN.POSS/GEN.NPOSS frequent Jonas.GEN serve-NMLZ-SG you.DAT /
 krit-im-as
 *tav-ęs
 fall-NMLZ-SG you-GEN.NPOSS
 ‘your frequent falling’
 ‘Jonas’ serving you’

Lack of Passivization: CENS and PASS allow in-(13) instrumental (14-15) signaling the presence of the agentive Voice (Alexiadou et al. 2015). However, the two constructions are distinct. **I**) in PASS, the theme is promoted to NOM subject, the agent is realized as an adjunct with GEN.POSS, (2). If CENS included passivization, then the agent should be an adjunct and bear GEN.POSS. The theme would become the highest available argument and should bear GEN.POSS, which isn’t the case, (11). **II**) CENS have a projected implicit agent, whereas PASS don’t. The agent binds the subject-oriented anaphor *savo* in the CEN (16), while that of PASS doesn’t, (17). The agent of CENS binds reciprocals (19), whereas that of PASS does not (18).

- (14) Namai buvo sunaikin-t-i (15) namų sunaikin-(*t)-im-as
 houses.NOM were destroy-P.PTCP-NOM house.GEN PRF-destroy-P.PTCP-NMLZ-M
 buldozeriu.
 bulldozer
 ‘Houses were destroyed with a bulldozer.’
 ‘the destruction of houses with a bulldozer.’
- (16) Augalų naikin-im-as savo_i sode (18) *Vienas kitas buvo sunaikintas.
 plants.GEN destroy-NMLZ-M self garden one another.NOM was destroyed
 ‘the destruction of plants in one’s garden’
 ‘Each other were destroyed.’
- (17) *Augalai buvo sunaikinti savo_i (19) [vienas kito_i sunaikin-im-as] nėra
 plants.GEN were destroy.P.PTCP self one another.GEN destroy-NMLZ-M isn’t
 sode.
 garden
 ‘The plants were destroyed in his garden.’
 solution ‘The destruction of each other is not a solution.’

Analysis: CENS inherit their argument structure(20) of the verb, (1-3), and therefore contain a vP, (20). CENS have $n_{\text{voice}}\text{P}$ that is represented by the nominal suffix *-im* and performs the functions of both, a n and an active thematic Voice bundled together. The n_{voice} head i) nominalizes the vP, and ii) introduces an external argument as well as assigns structural object case, GEN.N-POSS, to the theme. The theme is base-generated post-nominally, but it receives GEN.N-POSS pre-nominally (cf.1-3). Thus, it raises to $\text{Spec}n_{\text{voice}}\text{P}$ to receive its case from the n_{voice} head. Voice-bundling languages lack true passives and separate morphemes for Voice and v (Harley 2017) (in our case n). Indeed, Lithuanian CENS disallow passivization and lack passive morphology, the suffix *-t* in (15).

