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1 Introduction

This paper presents evidence from Lithuanian (a Baltic language) demonstrating that structural accusative case can be assigned in the absence of a higher c-commanding nominal. This finding counterexemplifies Burzio’s (1986) Generalization, its alternative versions (e.g., Kratzer 1994, 1996; Legate 2014) and related theories such as Dependent Case Theory (Marantz 1991; Woolford 2003; McFadden 2004; Bobaljik 2008; Preminger 2014) whereby the assignment of accusative is dependent on co-occurrence with higher clause-mate DP with structural case.

This central claim of the paper is based on the investigation of the Lithuanian construction in (1), which I term active existential.\(^2\) This construction has an accusative theme, but lacks an overt nominative subject.\(^3\) The initiator\(^4\) is interpreted as unknown, indefinite ‘someone’. The verb shows 3rd person active morphology.

\[
\text{(1) Val-į\text{-}u kvie\-č-ia į dekanat-ą Valius-ACC invite-PRS.3 to dean’s.office-ACC 'Someone is inviting Valius to the dean’s office.' (adapted from Kibort and Maskaliūnienė 2016:251)}
\]

I demonstrate that the implicit external argument is not projected in the active existen-

\(^2\)For a collection of attested examples of the active existential, see Paulauskienė 1971:50, and Kibort and Maskaliūnienė 2016. In the latter study, the active existential is conflated with other types of impersonal constructions which also have no overt subject and take 3rd person active morphology e.g., constructions with a generic agent *visi* ‘all’, *žmonės* ‘people’, or a 3rd person pro-drop subject. All these instances together with the active existential are grouped under one label known as ‘indefinite personals’. However, in this study, I make a distinction between the active existential, on the one hand, and other impersonals marked with 3rd person active morphology on the other hand.

\(^3\)There is variation regarding the translation of this construction. Ambrazas et al. 1997:600 translate these sentences as active constructions, whereas in Kibort and Maskaliūnienė 2016, these are translated sometimes as passives. In this paper, I will follow the former line of work and translate them as active. Nevertheless, neither translation is accurate enough because English does not have the active existential construction. Therefore, nothing should be concluded from the choice of translation used in this paper.

\(^4\)Following Ramchand 2008; Bruening 2013; Legate 2014 and others, I use a term ‘initiator’ to refer to external argument \(\theta\)-roles such as an agent, a natural force or a causer. The instances that I focus on the most in this paper involve the agent \(\theta\)-role.
tial despite the presence of the thematic grammatical object with structural accusative case. Thus, I argue that Lithuanian exhibits an active existential Voice – a Voice which assigns accusative case and is realized by active morphology, but whose external argument variable is bound at the level of Voice$^0$ by the existential operator. I revise Burzio’s Generalization by proposing that while accusative case must be assigned by a Voice that introduces an external $\theta$-role, each Voice head is free to bundle with an accusative case feature regardless of the selection of a specifier. This study provides important insights about conditions that govern the assignment of structural accusative case, suggesting that Burzio’s Generalization is not a linguistic universal (for other studies that have questioned the validity of Burzio’s Generalization also see Haider 1985, 2000; Haegeman 1986; Harley 1995; Woolford 1993, 1997, 2003; Mahajan 2000; Lavine 2005; Schäfer 2012; i.a.), but a typological tendency where the licensing of structural accusative case is often linked to the presence of the nominative initiator (for a brief overview of various typological tendencies see Woolford 2003 and references therein).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 distinguishes between the active existential on the one hand, and 3rd person pro-drop sentences and other types of impersonals on the other hand. These constructions overlap morphosyntactically, but differ from each other in various ways including the interpretation of the initiator and conditions under which the initiator can be null. The central argumentation of this paper is presented in Sections 3 and 4. I demonstrate that the theme argument of the active existential bears structural accusative case and behaves like an object of an active transitive in Section 3. Then, in Section 4, I show that while the active existential has an external-argument-introducing projection, a VoiceP, there is no syntactically realized argument in the thematic subject position, SpecVoiceP. Finally, I provide an analysis of the active existential in Section 5. I explain the lack of the external argument in SpecVoice by proposing that the external argument variable is bound at the level of the Voice head. I argue that the existential
operator, which binds the initiator variable, is built into the active existential Voice head lexically rather than being introduced by the Existential Closure (Heim 1982) that applies at LF. I further discuss what theoretical consequences this analysis has for Case Theory. Section 6 concludes.

2 Active Existential and Other Impersonals

Before we proceed to the investigation of the syntactic structure of the active existential, it is first necessary to distinguish the active existential from 3rd person pro-drop instances and other types of impersonals, which seem identical on the surface, but exhibit different properties.

It is noteworthy that Lithuanian belongs to a group of what is known as partial null-subject languages (for a discussion of partial null subject languages, see Holmberg 2005, 2010; Holmberg, Nayudu, and Sheehan 2009). Its 1st and 2nd definite subject pronouns are optionally null as exemplified in (2). The information about the subject can be recovered from the agreement morphology on the verb, which inflects for tense, person and number.

(2) a. (Aš) kvieč-iau Val-į́ ú dekanat-ą́.
   I.NOM invite-PST.1SG Valius-ACC to dean’s.office-ACC
   ‘I was inviting/invited Valius to the dean’s office.’

b. (Tu) kviet-ei Val-į́ ú dekanat-ą́.
   you.NOM invite-PST.2SG Valius-ACC to dean’s.office-ACC
   ‘You were inviting/invited Valius to the dean’s office.’

However, Lithuanian verbs do not show the distinction between singular and plural with 3rd person subjects as in (3). The lack of number distinction may restrict the optionality of 3rd person definite null subjects as they can only be null under certain circumstances. A 3rd person subject cannot be null (3) unless it has a previously mentioned linguistic antecedent, e.g., as in (4-5). In (4), the optional subject in the embedded clause refers back
to the antecedent in the matrix clause. In the question-answer pair in (5), the referent is presented in the previous utterance.

(3) *(Jis/jie) kviet-ė Val-į Valius-ACC to dean’s.office-ACC
‘He/they was/were inviting/invited Valius to the dean’s office.’

(4) Jonas-NOM say-PST.3 that he-NOM buy-PST.3 mother-DAT house-ACC
‘Jonas said that he bought the mother a house.’

(5) a. Ką veik-ia Val-ius,
What.do-PRS.3 Valius-NOM
‘What is Valius doing?’

b. (Jis) raš-o laišk-ą,
he.NOM write-PRS.3 letter-ACC
‘He is writing a letter.’

In contrast, the active existential constructions under consideration here with 3rd person active verbal morphology have no overt subject when the initiator is interpreted as the indefinite pronoun ‘someone’ or ‘some people’ (6-10). These are instances of the active existential, which crucially are different from 3rd person pro-drop contexts whose subject, as discussed above, is definite and can be null only under certain conditions. Pragmatically, the active existential is similar to passives without a by-phrase in that it is used when the utterance is about the theme and the action expressed by the verb, and the initiator is unknown or irrelevant (see [Kibort and Maskaliūnienė2016] 247-269 for a comparative overview of pragmatic functions of the active existential and the passive). The active existential is compatible with various predicates: unergative verbs (6-7), transitives with an accusative theme as in (8) or a dative maleficiary\(^5\) as in (9), and ditransitives (10).

\(^5\)Note that not all speakers accept dative maleficiary construction, independently of the active existential. These speakers use a PP instead, which also permits the active existential as illustrated in (i).
(6) Lyg šaud-ė ą dien-ą mišk-e.
as.if shoot-PST.3 day-ACC forest-LOC
‘It seems that (someone) fired shots in the wood during the day.’ (Kibort and
Maskaliūnienė 2016:248)

(7) Auditorijoj-e vir-ė varakin-is Institut-o gyvenim-as. Vienur
lecture.rooms-LOC boil-PST.3 evening-NOM institute-GEN life-NOM one.place
skambin-o pianin-u, kitur dainav-o
play-PST.3 piano-INS elsewhere sing-PST.3
‘Lecture rooms were boiling with the institutes’ evening life. Some people
were playing piano, others were singing.’ (adapted from Kibort and Maskaliūnienė
2016:253)

(8) Val-ių kvieč-ia į dekanat-ą
Valius-ACC invite-PRS.3 to dean’s.office-ACC
‘Someone is inviting Valius to the dean’s office.’ (adapted from Kibort and Maskaliūnienė
2016:251)

(9) Jam pavog-ė arkl-j.
he.DAT steal-PST.3 horse-ACC
‘Someone stole a horse from him.’ (Ambrazas et al. 1997:600)

(10) Val-iui atsiunt-ė pakvietim-ą į vakarėl-į.
Valius-DAT send-PST.3 invitation-ACC to party-ACC
‘Someone has sent Valius an invitation to the party.’

However, the active existential is not possible with unaccusative verbs like ‘fall’ and
‘die’ as in (11). I discuss this restriction further in Section 4.2.2 and Section 5.

(11) *Kambaryje buvo daug krauj-o. Toks jausm-as lyg nukrit-o ir
room.LOC be-PST.3 a.lot blood-GEN such feeling-NOM as.if fall-PST.3 and

(i) Iš Jon-o pavog-ė arkl-j.
from Jonas-GEN steal-PST.3 horse-ACC
‘Someone stole a horse from Jonas.’
‘There was a lot of blood in the room. It feels like if someone fell and died here.’

In Kibort and Maskaliūnienė 2016, it is reported that the initiator of impersonal constructions including instances of the active existential is restricted to human agents. Nevertheless, we do find instances of the active existential with non-human animate subjects. The examples below are illustrated with predicates such as *bite* (12) and *tear apart* (13), which in this context are interpreted as having non-human subjects.6

**Context: a nurse is asking a patient at the hospital about what happened. The patient responds:**

(12) Man atrod-o, kad mane su-kandžioj-o.
me.DAT appear-PST.3 that me.ACC PRF-bite-PST.3
‘It appears to me that something bit me (all over).’ (e.g., mosquitoes, bed bugs, etc.)

(13) Atsikël-ės anksti, ūkinink-as pastebøj-o, kad jam sudrask-ė ėvis.
waking.up-PTCP.NOM.M.SG early, farmer-NOM.M.SG realize-PST.3 that him.DAT tear-PST.3 sheep.ACC
‘After waking up early the farmer realized that something had torn apart the sheep on him.’ (e.g., wolves, bears, foxes, etc.)

As a reviewer points out, instances involving inanimate causers may also be found. The following example provided by the reviewer may have an interpretation whereby the

---

6 No overt subject is necessary in constructions with verbs of smell like *kvepėti* - to smell, *smirdėti* - to stink as illustrated in (i). Nevertheless, I take these constructions to be counterparts of the English construction ‘It smells here’, and thus they should have a different analysis from that of the active existential.

(i) Čia malon-iai kvep-ia.
Here pleasingly-ADV smell-PRS.3
‘It smells pleasant here.’
causer of the event may be ‘fate’ (14). Furthermore, instances with a natural force are also available (15), as noted by the reviewer and also discussed in Lavine (2016).

(14) Man sudauž-ė šird-j. me.DAT break-PST.3 heart-ACC

‘Something/someone broke my heart.’ (e.g., fate/person)

(15) Keleiv-ius smark-iai krat-ė. travellers-ACC strongly-ADV jolt-PST.3

‘Something/someone heavily jolted the travellers.’ (e.g., a person/wind).

(Adapted from Lavine 2016:123)

In addition to the active existential, there are other types of impersonal sentences that have no surface subjects. These are cases in which the initiator is being interpreted as generic, visi ‘all (people)’, žmonės ‘people’. Examples are provided in (16-17).

(16) ...Visur myluoj-a, glost-o, o ji iš talk-os everywhere caress-PRS.3 stroke-PRS.3 but she.NOM from collective.help-GEN vej-a... turn.away-PRS.3

‘[People] everywhere show endearment and care, but she turns [one] away from collective work...’ (adapted from Kibort and Maskaliūnienė 2016:248)

(17) Čia (žmon-ės) dirb-a. here people-NOM work-PST.3

‘People work/are working here.’ (Geniušienė 2006:40)

Impersonals with the initiator being interpreted as institutional ‘they’ can also be found which refer to, for example, military/police (18) or doctors (20).

(18) Jei mane ra-s, su-šaudy-s, - pasak-ė Mara Landau. if me.ACC find-FUT.3, PRF-shoot-FUT.3 say-PST.3 Mara Landau.

‘"If they find me, they’ll shoot me," said Mara Landau.’ (Kibort and Maskaliūnienė 2016:255)
(19) Kar-as, brolyt-i!-.tar-é Chmieliausk-as. Bombard-avo Kaun-ą! war-NOM, bother-VOC say-PST.3 Chmieliauskas-NOM shell-PST.3 Kaunas-ACC “It was a war, brother!”, said Chmieliauskas. They shelled/have shelled Kaunas.’
(adapted from Kibort and Maskaliūniene 2016:256)

(20) Jonas-išraš-ė iš ligonin-ės. Jonas-ACC discharge-PST.3 from hospital-GEN ‘They discharged Jonas from the hospital.’

With this background in mind, we can now turn to a detailed investigation of the active existential. In the rest of the paper, all the examples will be based on a context where the initiator is interpreted as an indefinite, non-specific entity, the hallmark of the active existential. 7 3rd person pro-drop contexts and other types of impersonals will be set aside, unless otherwise indicated.

3 Presence of Grammatical Object

I begin the investigation of the active existential by identifying the grammatical status of its accusative theme argument. A grammatical object of an active transitive construction with a nominative thematic subject typically bears accusative case as exemplified in (21).

(21) Tėv-as kvieč-ia Val-į. father-NOM invite-PRS.3 Valiūs-ACC ‘The father is inviting Valius.’

The theme argument of the active existential also bears accusative case, and in this way, patterns like the grammatical object of a transitive. In this section, I provide additional evidence showing that the theme argument of the active existential is the structural object of a transitive construction. This is demonstrated by means of comparing the theme of

the active existential with the grammatical object of transitives and the nominative theme subject of passives. The first two arguments presented here pertain to case and the third argument is based on binding relations.

3.1 Genitive of Negation

The first piece of evidence comes from genitive of negation. When a verb is negated, the grammatical object bearing structural accusative case (21) appears with genitive case as in (22).

(22) Tėv-as ne-kvieč-ia Val-iaus/*Val-ių.
father-NOM NEG-invite-PRS.3 Valius-GEN/Valius-ACC
‘The father is not inviting Valius.’

The theme of the active existential also becomes genitive in the presence of negation (23), and thus behaves like the object of the transitive in (22).

(23) Val-iaus/*Val-ių ne-kvieč-ia i dekanat-ą
Valius-GEN/Valius-ACC NEG-invite-PRS.3 to dean’s-office-ACC
‘It is not the case that someone is inviting Valius to the dean’s office.’

In contrast, a theme that does surface as a grammatical subject cannot be affected by the genitive of negation as illustrated by unaccusatives (24) and passives (25). Note that a by-phrase in Lithuanian passives is typically realized as a genitive DP. Thus, it can be seen that the theme of the active existential does not exhibit the behavior of a derived theme subject.

8 It is noteworthy that Lithuanian, unlike for example Icelandic (Svenonius 2006; Sigurðsson 2011, 2012; Wood 2017, ia.), lacks accusative subjects; see Author 2019 for discussion.

9 Thus, Lithuanian genitive of negation is different from Russian genitive of negation, which can be applied to the theme of unaccusatives (Pesetsky 1982). For additional arguments showing that Lithuanian genitive of negation tracks structural accusative case see Sigurðsson and Sereikaite 2020. See also Arkadiiev 2016 for an overview of Lithuanian genitive of negation.
It is also worth pointing out that non-structural case cannot be affected by the genitive of negation. The accusative complement of the preposition 'to' retains its case under negation as illustrated in (26). Similarly, the object of tarnauti ‘to serve’, which bears inherent dative case (see Sigurðsson, Šereikaitė and Pitteroff 2018, Šereikaitė in prep), is not compatible with the genitive of negation (27).

Thus, the contrast between (26-27) and the active existential in (25) suggests that the theme of the active existential bears structural, rather than non-structural case.

3.2 Case Transmission to PRO

The second argument for the theme behaving as a grammatical object comes from case transmission to PRO (see Landau 2008 and references therein for a related discussion on case transmission facts in Russian and an analysis of case transmission; for case transmission facts in Lithuanian see Vaikšnoraitė 2015, Šereikaitė 2016a). In object control cases,
the object permits optional case transmission. The case of PRO can be either accusative, hence transmitted from the case of the matrix object, or it can bear dative case;\textsuperscript{10} this is illustrated by the agreement properties of the emphatic pronoun *pats* ‘self’ in (11).\textsuperscript{11}

(28) [PRO\textsubscript{1} griž-ti namo pač-iₐₗ/pač-iₐₗₗ Marija-ACC return-INF home self-ACC/self-DAT rytoj].
Jonas-NOM convince-PST.3 tomorrow
‘Jonas convinced Marija to return home by herself tomorrow.’

However, case transmission is obligatory for subject control as in (29) with PRO prohibiting dative, but allowing nominative case.

(29) Marija-NOM want-PST.3 return-INF home self-NOM/self-DAT tomorrow

\textsuperscript{10} The realization of dative may be a subject to speaker variation as observed by Vaikšnoraitė\textsuperscript{2015}.

\textsuperscript{11} An anonymous reviewer wonders whether the accusative case realized on the emphatic pronoun in to-infinitive clause is indeed the type of case that comes from the matrix object. I provide three arguments below showing that the accusative/dative alternation in cases like (32) is not internal to PRO, but depends on the case properties of the matrix object. The first piece comes from genitive of negation. When the matrix verb is negated, the accusative object becomes genitive as in (cf.(32)-(i)). As shown by the emphatic pronoun *pats*, the case of PRO is also genitive, thus transmitted from the matrix object. The accusative case on *pats* is not permitted which suggests that the realization of accusative does not depend on the case properties of PRO. Note that the dative is not available in (i), showing that the case transmission is obligatory when the genitive of negation is applied to the matrix object.

Jonas-NOM ne-gřįkin-o Marij-oₐₗ [PRO\textsubscript{1} griž-ti namo pač-iₐₗ/pač-iₐₗₗ].
‘Jonas did not convince Marija to return home by herself.’

Another argument is based on verbs that assign non-accusative case to their object. For example, verbs like *prašyti* ‘to ask’ assign genitive case to their object. The object transmits this case to PRO as indicated by the emphatic pronoun *self* ‘pats’ (ii), and again the accusative is not possible in this instance.

(ii) I.NOM ask-NOM.M.SG Jonas-GEN do-ING that.ACC self. GEN/self. ACC/self. DAT
‘I asked Jonas to do it by himself.’ (Adapted from Vaikšnoraitė\textsuperscript{2015:36})

Lastly, when no case transmission takes place, as for example in cases where PRO is arbitrary, referring to ‘people in general’ and is not controlled by any argument in the matrix clause, the accusative case is ungrammatical. This can be observed in (iii) where PRO triggers dative on the predicative element ‘alone’, and accusative is not permitted.

(iii) [PRO\textsubscript{1} eiti namo vien-ₐₗ³/vien-ₐₗₗₗ nakti] yra ne-saug-u.
[PRO\textsubscript{1} eiti namo vien-ₐₗₗₗ alone-DAT/alone-ACC night be.PST.3 NEG-safe-N]
‘To go home alone at night is not safe.’
‘Marija wanted to return home by herself tomorrow.’

In the active existential, we can see that the theme optionally transmits its case to PRO as indicated by the grammaticality of accusative and dative case on the pronoun *pats* ‘self’ (30). This behavior gives additional evidence that the theme patterns like a grammatical object of a transitive.

(30) Valiu-˛ 
    kviet-˙e i dekanat-˛a [PRO_i atvykti pat-ji/paˇc-iam_i Valius-ACC invite-PST.3 to dean’s.office-ACC arrive-INF self-ACC/self-DAT rytoj]. tomorrow
    ‘Someone invited Valius to come to the dean’s office by himself tomorrow.’

It is notable that the grammatical subject of the passive requires obligatory case transmission to PRO showing a typical behavior of a grammatical subject (31), which is distinct from the behavior of the theme of the active existential.

(31) Marij-a_i 
    buv-o ˙ tikin-t-a [PRO_i griž-ti Marija-NOM be-PST.3 convince-PST.PASS.PTCP-NOM.F.SG return-INF namo pat-ji/*paˇc-iai_i home self-NOM/self-DAT tomorrow rytoj].
    ‘Marija was convinced to return home by herself tomorrow.’

3.3 Binding

The last argument comes from binding. In an active transitive clause, the nominative grammatical subject binds the subject-oriented reflexive anaphor *savo* ‘self’,

12 but it cannot bind the anti-subject-oriented pronoun *jo* ‘his’ (32a). The grammatical object binds the anti-subject-oriented pronoun *jo* and cannot be an antecedent of *savo* (32b).

12 For arguments showing that *savo* is indeed a subject-oriented anaphor, and not a logophor see AUTHORS2018.
(32) a. Kažk-as rūšiav-o tarnautoj-us pagal sav-o/*j-o
someone-NOM divide-PST.3 employees-ACC according to self-GEN/*his-GEN
beliefs
‘Someone divided employees according to his own beliefs.’

b. Kažk-as rūšiav-o tarnautojus pagal j-u/*sav-o
someone-NOM divide-PST.3 employees-ACC according to their-GEN/self-GEN
beliefs
‘Someone divided employees according to their beliefs.’ (adapted from Tim-
berlake[1982]515-516)

Just like the active object of transitives, the theme of the active existential binds the non-
reflexive form and prohibits the subject-oriented anaphor savo (33).

(33) Val-ių kvieč-ia j dekanat-ą dėl j-o/*sav-o prast-u
Valius-ACC invite-PST.3 to dean’s office-ACC because his-GEN/self-GEN bad-GEN
grades-GEN
‘Someone is inviting Valius to the dean’s office because of his bad grades.’

A theme argument that is a grammatical subject shows different binding relations than a
grammatical object. For example, the grammatical subject of the passive in (34) binds both
the subject-oriented anaphor savo and the anti-subject-oriented pronoun jų.13 The theme’s

13One hypothesis why the theme grammatical subject of passives is able to bind the pronoun like jų in
(34) may be because it is base-generated in the lower position, namely as a complement of VP, and this may
be enough to license this binding relation. Nevertheless, this generalization does not hold for theme subjects
of unaccusative verbs as in (i) where the subject can only bind savo.

(i) Artist-as nu-kri-o sav-o/*jo pasirodym-o metu.
artist-NOM PRF-fall-PST.3 self-GEN/his-GEN performance-GEN time
‘The artist fell down during his own performance.’

Further investigation reveals that the binding relation between the theme and the anti-subject oriented pronoun
is also sensitive to agreement. For instance, when the subject of the passive is a 1st person pronoun which
shows full agreement with the auxiliary, i.e., it agrees with it in person and number, the binding of the personal
pronoun for some speakers is not possible (out of 8 speakers, only 3 speakers allowed binding of mano), as in
(ii). The agreement disfavours the binding of this pronoun when the theme is promoted to a subject position.
Hence, I hypothesize that the binding relation between the theme and the personal pronoun in (34) may be
influenced by its lower position along with the lack of agreement. The theme in (34) is a 3rd person subject,
inability to bind *savo* in the active existential in (33) indicates that this accusative DP has not been advanced to the grammatical subject position, SpecTP.

(34) Tarnautoj-ai, yra rūšiuoja-m-i
    Employees-NOM.M.PL. be.PRS.3 divide-PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.PL
Domant-o pagal sav-o/į-ų, įsitikinimus.
Domantas-GEN according.to self-GEN/their-GEN beliefs
‘The employees are divided by Domantas according to their beliefs.’

In fact, the theme of the active existential bears identical binding relations to a topicalized grammatical object in (35), which can only bind the anti-subject-oriented form *jo* as well. This pattern suggests that when the active existential theme appears in a high position, it has undergone A-bar movement to a projection above a TP. In other words, the sentence initial theme in the active existential in (33) is topicalized.

(35) Val-ių tėv-as mat-ė j-o/į sav-o/į namuos-e.
    Valius-ACC father-NOM see-PST.3 his-GEN/self-GEN house-LOC.
‘It was Valius that the father saw in his house.’

3.4 Interim Summary

To sum up, the examination of the theme argument of the active existential revealed that this theme bears structural accusative case and exhibits the characteristic behavior of a grammatical object of an active transitive construction. The theme does not behave like a grammatical thematic subject of a passive in that it is not promoted to a subject position, SpecTP. Furthermore, it lacks other properties associated with a subject, like obligatory and the 3rd person subject agrees with the auxiliary in person and does not show agreement in number, unlike the subject in (ii).

(ii) Aš buv-au nominuo-t-as gyventoj-ų į Šlovės muziej-ų
    I.NOM be-PST.1SG nominate-PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.SG residents-GEN to ‘Fame’ museum-ACC
del sav-o/į/%man-o/į pasiekimų.
because.of self-GEN/me-GEN achievements.
‘I was nominated to the ‘Fame’ museum by the residents because of my own achievements.’
case transmission or binding of a subject-oriented anaphor. In contrast, it was demonstrated that the theme in the active existential undergoes A-bar movement and exhibits the behavior of a grammatical object of transitives in binding the anti-subject-oriented personal pronoun, undergoing genitive of negation, and allowing optional case transmission to PRO. If Burzio’s Generalization and/or its later versions are correct, then the presence of the structural accusative object in the active existential predicts that there should be a projected external argument. I investigate this prediction in the next section.

4 Thematic Voice without Projected Implicit Argument

This section examines the Voice properties of the active existential and addresses the question of whether this construction has a projected implicit argument. Following recent work on Voice phenomena (e.g., active versus passive) (Pylkkänen 1999, 2008; Schäfer 2008; Harley 2013; Legate 2014; Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer 2015, ia.), I assume that VoiceP and v-cause are two separate projections: the former introduces an external argument, whereas the latter is associated with causative semantics as sketched in (36).I4 I also adopt the idea that this Voice head, also known as thematic Voice (term from Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer 2015), is the locus of structural accusative case assignment (see Legate 2014 for discussion, also see footnote 30 in this paper for evidence from Lithuanian).

Building on the basic Voice typology and featural inventory proposed in Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer’s (2015) work and Legate et al. (2019), I propose that the basic structure for an active transitive sentence in Lithuanian is as follows. The active Voice

---

14 A reviewer wonders why the external argument is introduced by the thematic Voice rather than v-cause. There is a number of arguments for assuming this. For instance, Legate (2014, Ch5) shows that in Achenese, v-cause occurs in environments that lack an external argument: it occurs in the complement of restructuring, which is a vP, and in passives. The same facts hold true for the Lithuanian v-cause, see Sereikaite 2016b in prep. Also see Pylkkänen (2008) arguing that little v-cause does not introduce an external argument.
head, Voice\textsubscript{ACT}, is a type of thematic Voice head which introduces an external $\theta$-role, encoded here by the $\theta$ feature in (36), which presents the derivation of (37). The active transitive construction requires a specifier to be merged in SpecVoiceP, thus I assume that the Voice head bears the $[\bullet\text{D}\bullet]$ (Müller 2010), which encodes this requirement. Lastly, this active thematic Voice head assigns accusative case to the theme, which is presented here by ACC feature on the Voice head. The question now is how the active existential construction differs from the active transitive construction presented here. I address this question below.

(36) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice}_{\text{ACT}}P \\
\text{DP(NOM)} \\
\text{Voice}_{\text{ACT}}' \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{v-cause} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP(ACC)}
\end{array}
\]

(37) Jonas-NOM \text{sulauž-ė} pieštuk-ą. 
Jonas-NOM break-PST.3 pencil-ACC 
‘Jonas broke a pencil.’

4.1 Thematic Voice Projection

In order to understand whether the active existential has a projected implicit initiator, just like the active transitive in (36) does, we first need to identify whether this construction has an external-argument-introducing projection, a VoiceP. The presence of the thematic VoiceP is signaled by material that points to the initiator, such as instruments or agent-oriented adverbials (Bruening 2013; Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer 2015). Recall from our original example in (1), repeated in (38), that the active existential has a non-specific, indefinite initiator reading, suggesting that it does involve agentive semantics.
The active existential is also compatible with instruments. The instruments here point to certain tools that the initiator used, e.g., a cannon \((39)\) or a hole puncher \((40)\), to perform an action.

\[(39)\quad \text{Lyg šaud-ė dien-ą mišk-e su patrank-omis.} \\
\text{as.if shoot-PST.3 day-ACC forest-LOC with cannons-INS} \\
\text{‘It seems that someone fired shots in the wood during the day with cannons.’}\]

\[(40)\quad \text{Taigi visa kontor-a šnek-a, kad pavaduotoj-ą užmuš-ė su} \\
\text{so all office-NOM talk-PRS.3 that assistant.director-ACC kill-PST.3 with} \\
\text{whole.puncher-INS} \\
\text{‘So the entire office is saying that someone killed the assistant director with a hole puncher.’}^{15}\]

Furthermore, external-argument-oriented adverbials modifying the initiator of the action, such as ‘intentionally’ or ‘unwillingly’, are licit in this construction as in \((41)\).\(^{16}\)

\[(41)\quad \text{Man atrod-o, kad Val-ių tyčia kvieč-ia į} \\
\text{me.DAT appear-PST.3, that Valius-ACC intentionally invite-PRS.3 to} \\
\text{dekanat-ą.} \\
\text{dean’s.office-ACC}\]

\(^{15}\)The example was accessed on 06-13-2018.

\(^{16}\)An anonymous reviewer points out that agent-oriented adverbials may be coerced with unaccusative verbs, which lack the thematic VoiceP. Indeed, as discussed by [Folli and Harley 2005] [Kallulli 2007] [Schäfer 2009 fn.3], unaccusatives may be combined with adverbials like on purpose as e.g., in English (i). An event or a state needs to be compatible with a purpose, and it is an initiator introduced by a thematic Voice head that can have the purpose. The example in (i) lacks an overt initiator, but it introduces a type of situation which provides one from outside: it is not the thermostat that acted on purpose, but someone else. Regardless of the compatibility of unaccusatives with these modifiers, the examples like \((41)\) are still important because in these cases it is the the actual inviter that had the purpose rather than the situation from outside as in (i).

(i) The thermostat is low on purpose.
‘It appears to me that someone is inviting Valius to the dean’s office intentionally.’

Context: Valius is afraid of the dean and everyone at the university knows about it. One day Valius receives an anonymous letter in which he is being invited to the dean’s office. It seems like someone has intentionally invited Valius to the dean’s office.

(42) Suprantam-as dalyk-as, kad apie t-ą vagyst-ę understandable-NOM thing-NOM, kad that about that ACC robbery-ACC nenor-iai kalbėj-o ne tik London-e, bet ir visoj-e unwillingly-ADV talk-PST.3 not only London-LOC, but and whole-LOC Anglijoj-e.

‘It is an understandable thing that some people talked about this robbery unwillingly not only in London, but also in all of England.’ (adapted from Paulauskienė 1971:50)

To conclude, it can be seen that the modifiers related to the initiator, namely instruments and agent-related adverbials, are licensed in the active existential. I take this as evidence for the presence of a thematic VoiceP layer in the structure.

4.2 Lack of Implicit Argument

Having identified the presence of a thematic VoiceP, we can now proceed to the investigation of whether the implicit initiator is syntactically projected in the structure. Implicit arguments have been extensively discussed in the literature (Rizzi 1986; Roeper 1987; Williams 1987; Bhatt and Pancheva 2006; Landau 2010; Legate 2014; ia.). The presence of a grammatical object with structural accusative case has often been taken as evidence for the projected implicit argument (e.g., Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002; Maling 2006, 2010). However, I demonstrate that this may not necessarily be the case and provide ten arguments that the active existential lacks a syntactically projected implicit argument. I argue that the licensing of structural accusative case is dissociable from the presence/absence
of the external argument, contradicting Burzio’s Generalization.

To illustrate the lack of the implicit argument, I first compare the active existential with two constructions: the Lithuanian ma/ta impersonal, which, as argued by Šereikaitė (in prep) (see also Spraunienė, Razanovaitė, and Jasionytė 2015 for discussion), has a fully projected implicit argument, and a canonical passive which, as I argue, has no projected initiator.

The ma/ta impersonal construction on the surface is similar to the active existential: it has an accusative theme and no overt subject is present. The construction expresses a certain action performed by people in general, and its initiator is interpreted as an indefinite, generic subject ‘one’. The verb appears in a non-agreeing, neuter form of a passive participle. Examples of the ma/ta impersonal are presented with transitive predicates (43), unergatives (44a), and unaccusatives (44b). While the ma/ta impersonal is productive with unaccusatives and unergatives, transitives are used much less frequently, as noted by Geniušienė 2006 and Kibort and Maskalüniene 2016.

(43) a. Rašo-m-a laišk-ą. 
write-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[-AGR] letter-ACC
‘A letter is being written.’ (Ambrazas et al. 1997:661)

b. Praranda-m-a žmogiškum-ą
lost-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[-AGR] humanness-ACC
‘Humanness is being lost.’ (Kibort and Maskalüniene 2016:58)

c. Didžiaus-ia vyr-u klaid-a laik-iau girtuoklyst-ę:
greatest-INS men.GEN mistake-INST consider-PST.1SG binge.drinking-ACC
čia praranda-m-a ir vyriškum-ą ir žmoniškum-ą
here lose-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[-AGR] and manliness-ACC and humanity-ACC
‘I consider drinking to be men’s worst weakness: this is where both manliness and humanity are lost.’ (Kibort and Maskalüniene 2016:122)

The ma/ta impersonal is translated as passive in Ambrazas et al. 1997. In Geniušienė 2006 and Kibort and Maskalüniene 2016, it is sometimes translated as a passive and sometimes as an active with an indefinite subject. I translate it as an active construction.
(44) a. Jeigu (yra) dirba-m-a legaliai, tada atsirand-a
if be.PRS.3 work-PASS.PTCP-[AGR] legally, then appear-PRS.3
gamilyb-ė atgau-ti mokesč-ius.
opportunity-ACC receive-INF taxes-ACC
‘If one works legally, then one also has an opportunity to get back one’s taxes.’

b. Dažniausiai (yra) miršta-m-a nuo šird-ies ir
mostly be.PRS.3 die-PASS.PTCP-[AGR] from heart-GEN and
kraujagysl-ių lig-ų.
blood-vessel-GEN disease-GEN
‘Mostly one often dies from heart and blood-vessels diseases.’

If the active existential has a projected implicit argument, we expect its initiator to
behave like that of the ma/ta impersonal, rather than that of the passive, since the ma/ta
impersonal construction has a fully projected implicit argument, whereas the passive does
not. I test this prediction below by applying a number of well-established syntactic diag-
nostics. A detailed investigation reveals that the active existential patterns like the passive,
and unlike the ma/ta impersonal, in that it has no syntactically realized implicit initiator.

4.2.1 Binding

The first argument for the lack of the implicit argument comes from binding of the subject-
oriented reflexive savo. Landau [2010] argues that syntactically projected implicit argu-
ments bind reflexive anaphors. The unpronounced initiator of the ma/ta impersonal binds
the subject-oriented reflexive possessive anaphor savo, as exemplified below in (45-46),
indicating that the implicit argument is syntactically projected.

(45) Dažnai IMP₁ rašo-m-a laišk-us pagal sav-o₁
often write-PASS.PTCP-[AGR] letter-ACC according self-GEN
sukurt-as taisykl-ės.
created-ACC rules-ACC

[18](https://www.lzinios.lt/lzinios/sveikata/0-3-5-140-5-3-0-sveiko-zmogaus-kodas/70426) Accessed on
06-13-2018.
‘One often writes letters according to one’s own created rules.’

(46) Dažnai IMP↓ praranda-m-a Žmogūškum-ą dėl sav-o↓
often lose-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[AGR] humanity-ACC because.of self-GEN
kalt-ės.
fault-GEN

‘One often loses humanity because of one’s own fault.’

In contrast, the demoted initiator of a passive cannot bind the subject-oriented reflexive savo as in (47). Thus, it shows the behavior of an initiator that is not projected in the syntax.19

(47) Šiame fabrike darbuotoj-ai (yra)
this-LOC factory-LOC employees-NOM.M.PL be.PRS.3
rūšiuoja-m-i pagal (*sav-o↓ jsitikinim-us).
divide-PRS.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.PL according.to self-GEN beliefs-ACC

‘In this factory, the employees are being divided according to his beliefs.’ [according to the initiator’s beliefs]

If the initiator of the active existential were projected, as in the ma/ta impersonal, we would expect it to be able to bind savo. Nevertheless, this prediction is not borne out. Similarly to the initiator of the passive, the initiator of the active existential cannot bind the subject-oriented reflexive savo as illustrated below with unergative predicates (48), transitive with accusative objects (49) and dative maleficiaries (50).

19There is variation regarding the judgments for binding by overt by-phrases in passives. For Lavine (2006; 2010a), and AUTHORS’ 2019 consultants, the by-phrase in the passive binds the anti-subject-oriented pronoun jo as in (i), whereas Sprauniene, Razanovaitė, and Jasionytė’s (2015) consultants allow the by-phrase to bind the reflexive savo. Our consultants, whose judgment is reported in (47), share their grammaticality judgment with the former group and do not permit savo to be bound by the by-phrase.

(i) Darbuotoj-ai (yra) rūšiuoja-m-i Domant-o↓ pagal
employees-NOM.M.PL be.PRS.3 divide-PRS.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.PL Domantas-GEN according.to
*sav-o↓/j-o↓ jsitikinim-us.
self-GEN/his-GEN beliefs-ACC

‘The employees are divided by Domantas, according to his beliefs.’
(48) Lyg šaud-ė dien-ą mišk-e su (*sav-o, ginkl-u).
as if shoot-PST.3 day-ACC forest-LOC with self-GEN gun-INS
‘It seems that someone fired shots in the woods during the day with his own gun.’

(49) Val-ių kvieč-ia j (?sav-o, biur-ą)
Valius-ACC invite-PRS.3 to self-GEN office-ACC
‘Someone is inviting Valius to his office.’ Context: Valius receives an anonymous letter with an address of an office where he is being invited.

(50) Jon-ui ištryp-ė darž-ą su (*sav-o, bat-ais).
Jonas-DAT trample-PST.3 garden-ACC with self-GEN shoes-INS
‘Someone trampled on Jonas’s garden with his own shoes.’

The second argument comes from binding a reflexive non-possessive pronoun. The possessive reflexive form savo has non-possessive reflexive counterparts like sau ‘self.DAT’ or savės ‘self.GEN’ (for a full paradigm, see Ambrazas et al. 1997:192). These elements differ from savo in that they function like independent arguments rather than modifiers of a DP. Nevertheless, as shown in Sereikaitė (in prep), non-possessive reflexives pattern like savo in that they are also subject-oriented anaphors. The implicit argument of the ma/ta impersonal binds the reflexive pronoun sau ‘self.DAT’ as in (51), which is expected if this argument is projected in the syntax.

(51) Dažnai IMP praranda-m-a žmogiškum-ą dėl sau
often lose-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[AGR] humanity-ACC because of self-DAT
nežinom-ų priežasč-į, be jok-io rimt-o pagrind-o.
unknown-GEN reasons-GEN without any-GEN serious-GEN base-GEN
‘One often loses humanity because of the reasons that are unknown to oneself, without any serious basis.’

In contrast, the initiator of the passive does not bind the reflexive (52) as one would expect in cases where the initiator is not projected.
(52) Žmogišku-mas būv-o prarast-as (??dėl humanness-NOM.M.SG be-PST.3 lose-PST.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.SG because.of sauj nežinom-ų priežasč-į). self-DAT unknown-GEN reasons-GEN

‘Humanness was lost due to reasons that are unknown to oneself.’

Applying this test to the active existential, it can be seen that the initiator fails to bind the reflexive sau patterning like the unprotected initiator of the passive, and showing the opposite behavior to the projected initiator of the ma/ta impersonal.


‘Someone deceived Valius due to the reasons that were beneficial for him.’


‘Someone stole a car from Valius due to the reasons that were beneficial for him.’

The third argument is based on binding of the reciprocal vienas kitą ‘each other’. The nominative subject (55) can bind the reciprocal. This is also the case with the ma/ta impersonal where the reciprocal is being controlled by the initiator (56).

(55) Kai kur-ie žmon-ės, myl-i vienas kitą. some-NOM.M.PL people-NOM.M.PL love-PRS.3 one other-ACC.M.SG

‘Some people love each other.’

(56) Mylėkim-e poezij-ą, kaip IMP; myli-m-a vienas love-1PL.IMP poetry-ACC, as love-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[AGR] one kitą. other-ACC.M.SG

‘Let us all love poetry in a way one loves each other.’

The fact that this binding relation is possible indicates that the initiator in (56) is projected since the reciprocal cannot be bound by a DP that is not syntactically present. For

---

instance, it is ungrammatical to promote the reciprocal to the subject position in the passive
(57). The reciprocal has no binder, as there is no projected implicit initiator that can bind it, which yields ungrammaticality.\footnote{\textit{vienas kitas} also has a meaning ‘one or two’. The string in (57) is grammatical under the irrelevant non-reciprocal interpretation ‘one or two are being loved’. On the other hand, the non-reciprocal meaning ‘one or two’ of \textit{veinas kitas} is not available in the active existential constructions in (58)-(59).}

(57) * Vien-as kit-as yra myli-m-as.
   one another-NOM.M.SG be.PRS.3 love-PRT.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.SG
   ‘Each other are being loved.’

If the active existential has no implicit argument, it is predicted that placing the reciprocal in this construction would yield ungrammaticality as well. Indeed, ‘each other’ is barred from the active existential, regardless of whether it is placed in a theme position or in a dative maleficiary position (58)-(59).

(58) * Vienas kit-ą kviet-ę į sveč-ius.
   one another-ACC.M.SG invite-PST.3 to guests-ACC
   ‘Some people invited each other to come over.’

(59) * Vienas kit-am vog-ę maist-ą įš parduotuv-ių.
   one another-DAT.SG.M steal-PRS.3 food-ACC from shops-GEN
   ‘Some people stole food for each other from shops.’

Up to this point we used binding facts to test the possibility as to whether the initiator in the active existential is projected in a subject position, and it was revealed that the active existential lacks a projected subject. We can now use other binding diagnostics to test the possibility whether this initiator is projected in other positions. I introduce an additional binding test involving the anti-subject-oriented pronoun below demonstrating that the existential initiator does not appear in the syntax at all.

The fourth argument for the lack of the projection of the initiator is built on the initiator’s inability to bind the anti-subject oriented personal pronoun in the active existential.
Recall from (32b), repeated here in (60), that the personal pronoun may be bound by a grammatical object.

(60) Kažk-as rūšiav-o tarnausto-jus i pagal j-u_i jsitikinimus.  
someone-NOM divide-PST.3 employees-ACC according.to their-GEN beliefs  
‘Someone divided employees_i according to their_i beliefs.’

This personal pronoun can also be bound by an overt adjunct, e.g., the agent-oriented comitative (61) or the by-phrase as illustrated in footnote 19, repeated here in (62).

(61) Domant-as tarnaustoj-us rūšiav-o kartu su Marij-a_i  
Domantas-NOM employees-ACC divide-PST.3 together with Marija-INS  
pagal j-os_i jsitikinimus.  
according.to her-GEN beliefs  
‘Domantas divided the employees together with Marija_i according to her_i beliefs.’

(62) Darbuotoj-ai (yra) rūšiuoja-m-i  
employees-NOM.M.PL be.PRS.3 divide-PRS.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.PL  
Domant-o_i pagal j-o_i jsitikinim-us.  
Domantas-GEN according.to his-GEN beliefs-ACC  
‘The employees are divided by Domantas_i according to his_i beliefs.’

If the overt initiator in the passive is not projected, it should not be able to bind the anti-subject oriented anaphor. All my consults agree that the anti-subject oriented pronoun can refer to someone else that is not the initiator, thus the reading in (63-i). However, speakers’ judgments vary whether the anti-subject oriented pronoun can refer to the null initiator of the passive, 7 speakers (out of 12) do not allow the personal pronoun to be co-referential with the initiator, which is expected if the initiator is not projected. Nevertheless, 5 speakers allow jo to be bound by the null initiator, the reading presented in (63-ii). Thus, the latter group of speakers allows an initiator that has not been syntactically introduced, to be admitted into the context for coreference.\footnote{Observe that this is also possible in English passives as in (i). The anaphoric expression here can identify}

\footnote{Observe that this is also possible in English passives as in (i). The anaphoric expression here can identify...
may adjust the context of utterance in such a way that it would allow them to accommodate the presupposed information, which is a type of phenomenon known as accommodation (see Beaver and Zeevat 2007; Von Fintel 2008; i.a.). I hypothesize that the acceptability of the reading in (63-ii) may stem from the fact that these speakers could be more freely accommodating, and therefore they allow the pronoun to refer to the initiator in these situations.

(63) Darbuotoj-ai (yra) rūšiuoj-ę m-į pagal jo-i jsitikin-im-ųs.
employees-NOM.M.PL be.PRS.3 divide-PRS.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.PL according his-GEN beliefs-ACC
‘The employees are divided according to his beliefs.’

(i) According to someone else’s beliefs that is not initiator.

(ii) According to initiator’s beliefs

In the active existential, the personal pronoun cannot refer to the initiator of the clause; however, it can refer to someone else who is not the initiator of the action. Thus, the anti-subject oriented pronoun cannot be bound by the initiator of the active existential, which can be treated as another argument for the non-projection of the initiator in this construction. Specifically, this argument rules out the possibility that this initiator is projected in the adjunct position.

(64) Lyg šaud-ę dien-a miš-ę su jo-i ginklais.
as.if shoot-PST.3 day-ACC forest-LOC with his-GEN guns-INS

(i) *‘It seems that someone, fired shots in the wood during the day with his, own guns.’

(ii) ‘It seems that someone fired shots in the wood during the day with his guns.’

the initiator referent that has not been mentioned previously. For discussion on the licensing of these types of anaphoric expressions see Yule 1982; Geurts 2011; Gerrig, Horton, and Stent 2011; i.a.

(i) Maxine was kidnapped but they didn’t hurt her. (Bolinger 1977 as quoted in Geurts 2011)
[not initiator’s guns]

(65) Val-įų kvieč-ia į j-oį biur-ą  
Valius-ACC invite-PRS.3 to his-GEN office-ACC
(i) *‘Someoneᵢ is inviting Valius to hisᵢ own office.’
(ii) ‘Someone is inviting Valius to his office.’ [not initiator’s office]

Jonas-DAT PRF-trample-PST.3 garden-ACC with his-GEN shoes-INST
(i) *‘Someoneᵢ trampled on Jonas’s garden with hisᵢ own shoes.’
(ii) ‘Someone trampled on Jonas’s garden with hisᵢ shoes.’ [not initiator’s shoes]

4.2.2 Unaccusative Verbs

The fifth argument comes from unaccusative verbs. It has been argued in the literature (Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002; Maling 2006, 2010) that in an active impersonal, a projected implicit argument may function as an argument of unaccusative verbs. Passives, on the other hand, have been argued to lack an implicit argument, and thus may not be formed with unaccusatives. Unaccusative predicates are grammatical in the ma/ta impersonal construction as in (44b), repeated in (67), and (68) suggesting that the ma/ta impersonal functions like an active impersonal with a syntactically present implicit argument.

(67) Dažniausiai (yra) miršta-m-a nuo šird-ies ir kraujagysl-ių lig-ų.  
mostly be.PRS.3 die-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[AGR] from heart-GEN and blood-vessels-GEN disease-GEN.
‘Mostly one often dies from heart and blood-vessel diseases.’

(68) Daugiausia nelaiming-u atsitikim-u įvykst-a statybos-e, 
mostly unhappy-GEN accidents-GEN happen-PST.3 construction.sites-LOC
kai nukrenta-m-a iš didelio aukščio.  
when fall-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[AGR] from big height
‘Most accidents happen in construction sites when one falls from a great height.’\footnote{Adapted from https://naujienos.alfa.lt/leidinys/sekunde/pagalbos-sauksma-isgirdo-tik-ryte/) Accessed on 08-07-2018.}

As expected, passives do not permit unaccusative verbs as in (69)-(70). Furthermore, two argument unaccusatives (like ‘cost’) are also not possible (71).\footnote{I was not able to construct the \textit{ma/ta} impersonal with two-argument unaccusatives since this construction is restricted to human subjects whereas this class of unaccusatives occurs with inanimate subjects.}

(69)  *Nuo gripo buv-o miršta-m-a žmon-ių kiekvienais metais. from flu be-PAST.3 die-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[AGR] people-GEN every year

‘It was died by people from flu every year.’

(70)  *Daugiausia nelaiming-u įvykst-a iš statybos-e, kai darbinink-u yra nukrenta-m-a iš didelio aukšˇcio. mostly unhappy-GEN accidents-GEN happen-PST.3 construction.site when employees-GEN be.PRS.3 fall-PASS.PTCP-[AGR] from big height

‘Most accidents happen in construction sites when it is fallen by the employees from a great height.’

(71)  a. Knyg-a kainuoj-a penk-is eur-us.
book-NOM cost-PST.3 five-ACC euros-ACC

‘The book costs five euros.’

five-NOM euros-NOM be.PST.3 cost-PST.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.PL book-GEN

‘Five euros were costed by the book.’

The active existential patterns like the passive: it may only be applied to predicates with a thematic initiator (i.e., unergatives and transitives, for examples see (6)-(10)). Unaccusatives are banned from the active existential (72)-(74) showing that the active existential behaves like the passive in requiring suppression of the initiator, rather than like the impersonal in syntactically encoding the presence of a null argument.
(72) *Per žin-ias mes sužinojo-me, jog šiandiena mir-è nuo grip-o. through news-ACC we.NOM learn-PST.1PL that today die-PST.3 from flu-GEN. ‘On the news we have learned that today someone/some people died from flu.’

(73) *Kambaryje buvo daug krauj-o. Toks jausm-as lyg nukrit-o ir room.LOC be-PST.3 a.lot blood-GEN such feeling-NOM as.if fall-PST.3 and mir-è čia. die-PST.3 here ‘There was a lot of blood in the room. It feels like if someone fell and died here.’

(74) *Pastebėj-au, kad kainuoj-a didel-ius pinig-us. realize-PST.1.SG that cost-PST.3 big-ACC money-ACC ‘I realized that something costs a lot of money.’ Context: I realized that a lot of money was charged from my back account. I haven’t made any purchases recently. But clearly, something cost a lot of money.

To sum up, I have shown that there is a syntactic difference between the ma/ta impersonal on the one hand, and the active existential and the passive on the other. The implicit argument of the ma/ta impersonal participates in binding and licenses unaccusative verbs suggesting that it patterns like a projected initiator. In contrast, the initiator of the active existential lacks these features and shows similarities to the unprojected initiator of the passive: it does not antecede pronouns and is incompatible with unaccusative verbs.

Further argumentation for the absence of the implicit argument in the active existential comes from comparing its initiator with the indefinite overt subject kažkas ‘someone’ of an active transitive. The initiators of both constructions have the same interpretation, and yet, as I argue below, they show opposite behaviors. The indefinite kažkas ‘someone’ shows the behavior of a fully projected argument that functions as a grammatical subject, whereas the non-overt initiator of the active existential shows a complete absence of these features.
4.2.3 Depictives

Thus, the sixth argument for the absence of the syntactic initiator in the active existential comes from depictives, which typically show agreement with their controller, be it a subject or an object (for a discussion of Lithuanian depictives, see Timberlake [1988] and Holvoet [2008]). An indefinite overt subject licenses depictives which agree with it in number, gender and case. The examples are illustrated below with transitive clauses.

(75) a. Kažk-\textit{as}, pa-kviet-\textit{-ė} Valiu\textit{-}i vakarėl-\textit{-į} someone-NOM.M.SG PRF-invite-PST.3 Valius-ACC to party-ACC išgėr-\textit{-ęs}i, drunk-PTCP.NOM.M.SG

\text{\textquoteleft}Someone invited Valius to the party drunk\textquoteright;\textquoteleft

b. Kažk-\textit{as}, man iš-tryp-\textit{-ė} darž-\textit{-ą} someone-NOM.M.SG me.DAT PRF-trample-PST.3 garden-ACC išgėr-\textit{-ęs}i, drunk-PTCP.NOM.M.SG

\text{\textquoteleft}Someone trampled on my garden drunk\textquoteright;\textquoteleft Context: in the garden I have found a lot of beer cans and the steps of someone who trampled the garden. The ground looked uneven as if a drunk person had walking on it.

It is ungrammatical for the depictive to predicate over the initiator of the passive as demonstrated below. Hence, in constructions that lack a projected initiator, such as passives, depictives are not possible. Note that the depictive is marked with a genitive DP here since the by-phrase introducing the initiator in Lithuanian is realized with genitive case. An alternative form of case assignment does not allow the depictive to predicate over the initiator, examples not included for space reasons.

(76) Val-\textit{ius} buv-o pa-kvies-t-as \textit{i} vakarėlį Valius-NOM be-PST.3 PRF-invite-PPRT-NOM.M.SG to party-ACC *išgėrus-i\textit{ų}, drunk-PTCP.PTCP.GEN.M.SG
‘Valius was invited to the party by a drunk person.’

(77) Man buv-o iš-tryp-t-as darž-as
    me.DAT be-PST.3 PRF-trample-PPRT-NOM.M.SG garden.NOM
    *išgėrus-iøj.
    drunk-ACT.PTCP.GEN.M.SG
‘The garden was trampled on me by a drunk person.’

If the initiator of the active existential is not projected, it should not be able to control a depictive because depictives can only be licensed by a DP that is projected in the syntax. This prediction is borne out. The indefinite initiator of the active existential cannot be a controller of depictives, thus patterning like the unprojected initiator of the passive and showing the opposite behavior to the overt projected subject kažkas. Again, alternative case agreement does not improve the predication, examples not included.

(78) a. Val-ių pakviet-ė į vakarėlį *išgėr-ėsį.
    Valius-ACC invite.PST.3 to party-ACC drunk-ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG
    ‘Someone invited Valius to the party drunk.’

b. Man iš-tryp-ė daržą *išgėr-ėsį.
    me.DAT PRF-trample-PST.3 garden-ACC drunk-PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG
    ‘Someone trampled on my garden drunk.’

4.2.4 Agreement

The seventh argument is agreement. The overt grammatical subject kažkas ‘someone’ may trigger grammatical subject agreement on a predicate, whereas the initiator of the active existential may not. This property is illustrated by using the agreeing active participle found in the perfective evidential construction (see Ambrazas et al. [1997] 262-266, Lavine [2010b] 121 for discussion). This construction encodes reported speech or hearsay. It

\[25\] As shown by AUTHOR2019, the default agreement in an active clause is 3rd person active morphology. Thus, the morphology of the default agreement is identical to a grammatical subject agreement triggered by a 3rd person subject. Due to this overlap, the agreement facts from an active construction are not used for this
exhibits an auxiliary and an active participle which shows agreement with the grammatical subject. The overt indefinite subject *kažkas* can agree with the participle in number, gender and case as in (79) or occur with the neuter non-agreeing form of the active participle (term from Ambrazas et al. [1997:335]).

(79) Girdėjau, kažk-as buvo pakviet-ės / hear-PST.1SG someone-NOM.M.SG be-PST.3 invite-ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG / pakviet-ę Val-ių į vakarėlį. invite-ACT.PTCP.N Valius-ACC to party-ACC

‘I heard that someone had invited Valius to the party.’

In contrast, there is no agreement between the initiator of the active existential and the participle. Only the non-agreeing form is available in the active existential (80). It can be argued that the initiator is not projected in this construction, and as a result the participle has nothing to agree with, taking the non-agreeing neuter form, which is the default.

(80) Gridėjau, Val-ių buvo pakviet-ė / hear-PST.1SG Valius-ACC be-PST.3 invite-ACT.PTCP.N / *pakviet-ės į vakarėli. invite-ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG to party-ACC

‘I heard that someone had invited Valius to the party.’

4.2.5 Control into Adjuncts

A further distinction between the two initiators comes from control into participial adjunct clauses, non-obligatory control. Lithuanian has two types of active participles that can appear in these clauses: agreeing and non-agreeing ones (see Ambrazas et al. [1997:363, Arkadiev 2012 2017 for a full paradigm of these participial forms). The indefinite matrix subject *kažkas* may control into the adjunct, and by doing so it may also trigger agreement on the participle or the participle can occur in the non-agreeing form as shown below.
(81) Kažk-as, man pavog-ė rakt-us [prieš PROi
someone-NOM.M.SG me.DAT steal-PST.3 keys-ACC before
išei-damas / išei-a-nt iš nam-u].
leave-HAB.PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG / leave-PRS.ACT.PTCP from house-GEN.
‘Someone stole the keys from me before leaving the house.’

In constructions that lack a projected implicit argument like passives, the initiator may control into the adjunct, but it cannot trigger agreement on the participle, which otherwise is possible if the initiator is projected.\footnote{It has been observed that the initiator of passives that may not be projected in syntax can control into adjunct clauses \cite{Bhatt and Pancheva2006, van Urk2013, Landau2015, Pitteroff and Schäfer2018}.} Hence, only the non-agreeing participle is available in the adjunct if the matrix clause is passive (82).

(82) Rakt-ai buvo pavog-t-i [prieš PROi
keys-NOM.M.PL be-PST.3 steal-PST.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.PL before
išei-a-nt / *išei-damas iš nam-u].
leave-PRS.ACT.PTCP / leave-HAB.PST.PASS.PTCP.NOM.M.SG from house-GEN
‘The keys were stolen before leaving the house.’ (could be both the initiator leaving the house or someone else)

The initiator of the active existential shows behavior parallel to the unprojected initiator of the passive rather than the overt indefinite form kažkas of the active transitive. The initiator can be a controller of the adjunct, but it does not agree with the participle. Only the non-agreeing participle is grammatical in such instances as illustrated in (83). This is expected in situations where the implicit argument is not syntactically realized.

(83) Man pavog-ė rakt-us [prieš PRO išei-a-nt / 
me.DAT steal-PST.3 keys-ACC before leave-PRS.ACT.PTCP /
*išei-damas iš nam-u].
leave-HAB.PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG from house-GEN
‘Someone stole keys from me before leaving the house.’ (could be either the initiator leaving the house or maleficiary)
4.2.6 Scope

The ninth argument is scope. The overt subject kažkas ‘someone’ may take a wide scope over negation. I assume that negation, NegP, is projected above VoiceP. The subject may be realized above the NegP. This property is illustrated in (84) with a context that favours the wide scope of the existential reading.

*Context: there is a committee of 10 people that can nominate Valius for a scholarship. We count the votes for the nominations and see that 9 out of 10 anonymous committee members nominated Valius for the scholarship. Then we can report the results by saying...

(84) Kažk-as ne-nominav-o Val-iaus.
    Someone-NOM NEG-nominate-PST.3 Valius-GEN
    ‘Someone has not nominated Valius.’

If the active existential lacks a syntactically projected subject, and the subject is bound at the level of VoiceP, we would expect negation to scope obligatorily over the existential. This prediction is borne out. In the active existential, negation must take a wide scope over the existential, and thus is infelicitous in the same context that requires a wide scope of the existential reading as in (85).

(85) #Val-iaus ne-nominav-o.
    Valius-GEN NEG-nominate-PST.3
    ‘No one nominated Valius.’

4.2.7 Word Order

Finally, the last difference between the two initiators comes from word order, which has been barely discussed in Lithuanian. I demonstrate that the neutral word order in the active existential is a theme preceding a verb, which is a type of order order we find in constructions that lack a projected initiator like passives. In contrast, I show that in constructions
with a syntactically realized initiator, a theme argument neutrally follows a verb.

Word order in Lithuanian may vary depending on the ‘communicative intention’ (see Mathiaseen 1996:236-242, Ambrazas et al. 1997:690-692 for word order facts). As far as the information structure goes, a sentence is known to consist of two parts: THEME and RHEME (Halliday 1967, 1973, ia.). It contains old or given information which serves as a departure point for the speaker, known as the THEME or Topic of a sentence. It may also include new information, known as the RHEME. As noted by Ambrazas et al. (1997), in Lithuanian, old information, thus the THEME of a sentence, precedes new information, the RHEME.

In instances that intend to report new information about what happened and are discourse neutral i.e., nothing is presupposed between the speaker and the hearer, the basic pattern is SVO where the initiator precedes the verb and the theme argument follows it. These principles apply to constructions with an overt grammatical subject (86) and those with an implicit projected subject, e.g., 3rd person pro-drop contexts (87) and the ma/ta impersonal (88). To facilitate the pro-drop context and to draw minimal pairs between the overt subject and the null subject, the word order facts are presented below in ‘that’-clauses. The context is set up in such a way that it presents new information to the hearer.

**Context:** The students are usually never invited to the dean’s office. But surprisingly, yesterday one student received an invitation to the dean’s office and my friend is telling me about it.

(86) Jon-as man sak-ė, kad vakar kažk-as pakviet-ė vien-ą student-ą į dekanat-ą.
Jonas-NOM me.DAT say-PST.3 that yesterday someone-NOM invite-PST.3 one-ACC to dean’s.office-ACC

‘Jonas told me that yesterday someone invited one student to the dean’s office.’

---

27I use small caps for the THEME denoting the topic of the sentence as opposed to the theme that refers to the θ-role.
(initiator-verb-theme)

(87) Pavaduotojas man sakė, kad vakar pro i pakvietė assistant.director-NOM me.DAT say-PST.3 that yesterday invite-PST.3 vieną studentą į dekanatą. one-ACC student-ACC to dean’s.office-ACC

‘The assistant director told me that he invited one student to the dean’s office.’

(initiator-verb-theme)

(88) Dažnai IMP sako-m-a, kad IMP praranda-m-a often say-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[AGR] that lose-PRS.PASS.PTCP-[AGR]

žmogiškumą dėl savo kaltęs. humanness-ACC because self-GEN fault-GEN

‘Often it is said that one loses humanity due to one’s own fault.’

(initiator-verb-theme)

While the theme grammatical object in constructions with a projected external argument comes after the verb, in the passive the pattern is opposite. The initiator has been demoted and is not projected. The theme argument has become a grammatical subject and precedes the verb as in (89). The communicative intention of the passive construction is to express information about an affected entity, thus a theme argument, with an initiator being less relevant. Therefore, the starting point of the passive sentence, the Topic/THEME, in discourse neutral instances is the theme argument. Due to the fact that the information structure in Lithuanian is THEME/Topic-RHEME order, we see that in (89) the theme argument occurs clause initially because it is the Topic of the sentence.

(89) Jonąs man sakė, kad vakar vienas studentas buvo Jonas-NOM me.DAT say-PST.3 that yesterday one-NOM student-NOM be-PST.3 pakvietė į dekanatą. invite-PST.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.SG to dean’s.office-ACC

‘Jonas told me that yesterday one student was invited to the dean’s office.’

(theme-verb)
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The word order in the active existential is different from that with an overt indefinite subject or a 3rd person pro-drop subject. Instead of following the verb, the theme argument neutrally precedes it, as in (90), indicating that it patterns like the passive in (89).28 This word order pattern suggests that when the initiator is not projected, the theme neutrally occupies the sentence-initial position. One may wonder what mechanisms derive such word order. Pragmatically, as mentioned in Section 2, the active existential is similar to passives in that it is also used in situations where the initiator is unknown, less relevant to the hearer. The utterance is about the theme and the action itself. I suggest then that in the active existential, the Topic/THEME of the sentence is the grammatical object, and therefore it occupies the pre-verbal position. In other words, to satisfy the THEME/topic requirement in this construction, I hypothesize that the grammatical object moves to the left-edge of the clause, to a projection Top(ic)P, above a TP (see Bailyn 2012:266-275 for a similar approach in Russian, which shows similar word order effects to Lithuanian; also see Büring 2016 for discussion of Topic).

(90) Jon-as man sak-ë, kad vakar vien-ą student-ą pakviet-ę į dekanat-ą.
Jonas-NOM man.DAT say-PST.3 that yesterday one-ACC student-ACC invite-PST.3 to dean’s.office-ACC
‘Jonas told me that yesterday someone invited one student to the dean’s office.’

An anonymous reviewer notes that alternative word order patterns in the active existential may be possible. Specifically, there is a possibility for the object to occur sentence

28 As an anonymous reviewer points out, the fact that a sentence initial position is filled with a DP in the data presented here is reminiscent of V2 effects (see Haider and Prinzhorn 1989, Wechsler 1991, i.a.). While V2 effects may be observed here, there are cases where OSV and SOV word orders as well as VSO and VOS are possible (see e.g., Ambrazas et al. 1997:693-699). The V2 principle also does not hold true for unaccusatives. If the subject of an unaccusative is indefinite, the basic word order is VS (see Gillon and Armokaitė 2015). The possibility of having these word order patterns suggests that Lithuanian cannot be treated as a well-behaved V2 language.
finally and the PP may follow the verb as in (91) (example provided by the reviewer). This word order is indeed possible, but it receives a marked interpretation whereby a special focus falls on the PP. Another possibility pointed out by the reviewer would be for the grammatical object to immediately follow the verb; however this is a canonical word order in 3rd person pro-drop contexts, e.g., (87). Thus, to test verb-theme word order in the active existential, a context which excludes a 3 person pro-drop subject is necessary. One instance of that would be examples presented in (92). (92) introduces a type of situation whereby an assistant director was deceived, no one knows who did it, and everyone in the office is talking about it. The canonical word order in the active existential is theme-verb (92a). If the grammatical object occurs after the verb, the object receives a contrastive focus interpretation: it was the assistant director who was deceived, but not a manager (92b). Therefore, it seems that the verb-theme word order is compatible with the active existential, but it yields a marked interpretation.

(91) Jon-as man sak-ė, kad vakar pakviet-ė i dekanat-ą
Jonas-NOM me.DAT say-PRS.3 that yesterday invite-PST.3 to dean’s.office
vien-ą student-ą
one-ACC student-ACC
‘Jonas told me that someone invited one student to the office yesterday.’ (verb-PP-theme)

(92) a. Vis-a kontor-a šnek-a, kad pavaduotoj-ą apgav-o.
Entire-NOM office-NOM talk-PRS.3 that assistant.director-ACC deceive-PST.3
‘The entire office is saying that someone deceived an assistant director.’
(theme-verb)

b. Vis-a kontor-a šnek-a, kad apgav-o pavaduotoj-ą.
Entire-NOM office-NOM talk-PRS.3 that deceive-PST.3 assistant.director-ACC
‘The entire office is saying that it was an assistant director that someone deceived.’ (verb-theme)
Having reviewed different types of word order patterns, we can see that the neutral word order in the active existential is a theme preceding a verb which is the same type of word order we see in constructions that lack a projected implicit arguments like passives. If the active existential had a projected implicit argument, we may have expected verb-theme word order which is present in pro-drop contexts and the ma/ta impersonal with a syntactically realized initiator. The fact that the verb-theme order is not canonical in the active existential thus is consistent with the claim here that a projected implicit argument is not present.

4.3 Interim Summary

I have argued that the active existential has an external-argument-oriented projection, a VoiceP layer, and yet, it lacks a syntactically projected implicit argument in SpecVoiceP.\(^{29}\)

\(^{29}\)In this section, I have focused on the type of examples of the active existential that involve a human initiator. Given that the active existential is compatible with the thematic Voice head which assigns an external θ-role, my analysis predicts that this construction may be grammatical with other types of external arguments like an inanimate causer or a natural force. Indeed, the examples in (14-15), suggested by a reviewer and discussed by Lavine (2016), look like instances of the active existential. While it is rather difficult to test for the projection of an inanimate initiator due to its semantic content, the initial tests indicate that it patterns the same way as a human initiator. First, an over inanimate causer e.g., ‘fate’ binds the subject-oriented anaphor (i), whereas the initiator in the active existential does not (ii), and thus shows the behavior of an unprojected argument, see also sub-section 4.2.1.

(i) Tragiškas likim-as/Jonas, man sudauž-ė šird-į sav-o, nelemtais pokšt-ais.

tragic fate-NOM/Jonas-NOM me.DAT break-PST.3 heart-ACC self-GEN stupid tricks-INS

‘Tragic fate/Jonas broke my heart with its/his stupid tricks.’

(ii) Man sudauž-ė šird-į (*sav-o nelemtais pokšt-ais).

me.DAT break-PST.3 heart-ACC self-GEN stupid tricks-INS

‘Someone/something broke my heart with his/its stupid tricks.’ (e.g., a person/fate)

Third, the overt inanimate causer controls into adjunct clauses and triggers agreement on the active participle, see also sub-section 4.2.4.

(iii) Girdėj-au, kad likim-as buv-o sudauž-ęs Marij-ai šird-į.

hear-PST.1SG that fate-NOM.M.SG be-PST.3 break-ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG Marija-DAT heart-ACC

‘I heard that fate broke Marija’s heart.’

(iv) Girdėj-au, kad Marij-ai buv-o sudauž-ę/*/ęs šird-į

hear-PST.1SG that Marija-DAT be-PST.3 break-ACT.PTCP.N/-ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG happiness-ACC

‘I heard that someone/something broke Marija’s heart.’ (e.g., a person/fate)
Specifically, using a number of established syntactic tests, it was revealed that the active existential does not share properties with the *ma/ta* impersonal construction which has a projected external argument. Even though the active existential lacks morphological marking of the passive (i.e., has no passive morphology), it exhibits a characteristic of the passive in that its initiator does not occupy a syntactic position. I have demonstrated that the initiator of the active existential and that of the passive cannot participate in binding relations (i.e., binding of subject-oriented anaphor, non-possessive reflexive, reciprocals and personal pronouns), or license depictives, which is only expected if the initiator is not projected in the syntax since licensing these binding relations as well as depictives requires a syntactically realized binder/controller. Furthermore, impersonal *ma/ta* construction behaves like an impersonal with a projected initiator in that it can occur with unaccusatives predicates, whereas neither the active existential nor the passive can do that, and thus behave like constructions without the projected initiator.

Moreover, the indefinite initializer of the active existential has been contrasted with an overt indefinite form *kažkas* ‘someone’ of a transitive active construction. The exploration of these two initiators provided additional evidence for the lack of the projected implicit argument in the active existential. While the overt indefinite subject triggers agreement on a main predicate or a participle of control adjuncts, the initiator of the active existential does not and predicates in both environments take non-agreeing forms. The occurrence of these

whereas the initiator of the active existential does not, see also sub-section 4.2.5

(v) Likim-as$_i$ mus be gailesčio apgav-o [prieš PRO$_i$

fate-NOM.M.SG us.ACC without pity deceive-PST.3 before
atim-damas mūsų vaik-us ir nam-us].
take.way-HAB.PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG our children-ACC and home-ACC

‘Fate deceived us without pity before taking away our children and home.’

(vi) Mus apgav-o be gailesčio [prieš PRO atim-a-nt /

us.ACC deceive-PST.3 without pity before take.away-PRS-ACT.PTCP.N /

*atim-damas mūsų vaik-us ir nam-us].
take.away-HAB.PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.M.SG our children-ACC and house-ACC

‘Someone/something deceived us without pity before taking away our children and home.’
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non-agreeing forms is predicted if the initiator is not present in the structure. The overt ini-
tiator can take a wide scope over negation, whereas the initiator of active existential cannot
suggesting that it is existentially bound below negation, which, as I suggested, originates
above a VoiceP. Lastly, I took word order facts to suggest that the active existential behaves
like a construction without a projected implicit subject in requiring its theme argument to
occur sentence initially, which was not the case with constructions that have a projected
initiator. I summarize my findings in Table 1.

Table 1: Behavior of the initiator across different constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Active Existential</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>ma/ta Impers.</th>
<th>Active Trans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>binding of ‘savo’</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binding of ‘sau’</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binding of ‘each other’</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binding of jo</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>objects/adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows unaccusatives</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows depictives</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controls into agreeing adjuncts</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows agreement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide scope of negation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word order</td>
<td>theme-V</td>
<td>theme-V</td>
<td>Init.-V-theme</td>
<td>Init.-V-theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having identified the lack of the syntactically realized initiator in the active existen-
tial, it can be seen that this construction is not compatible with Burzio’s Generalization.
Burzio’s Generalization claims that accusative is available only if there is a projected ex-
ternal argument. Indeed, the ma/ta impersonal construction has a grammatical accusative
object and, as expected, it has a structure of a transitive construction with a projected im-
plicit argument. We saw that in the passive, there is no projected implicit argument, and
thereby a grammatical accusative object is promoted to a grammatical nominative subject.
In contrast, the active existential shows an unexpected pattern. We would have expected
the active existential to have a projected implicit subject, given that it licenses a grammat-
ical accusative object. However, this prediction was disconfirmed. Despite the presence of the grammatical accusative object, the external argument is not syntactically present in this construction. These findings require the reevaluation of conditions that are sufficient for the structural accusative case to be realized on the theme. I address this issue in the following section.

5 Analysis

In Sections 3 and 4, we have seen that the active existential has an accusative grammatical object that does not raise to the grammatical subject position, SpecTP, and a thematic Voice which lacks a projected subject. In this section, I propose a syntactic analysis to account for these properties. I argue that the active existential contains a type of Voice head which assigns structural accusative case to the theme, but whose external argument variable is bound at the level of Voice head by the existential operator that is built in the lexicon.

I first introduce a syntactic structure and semantic derivation of the active existential in (93) and compare it with the structure of an active transitive with an overt subject in (94).

(93) Val-į ˛kvieˇc-ia ˛ i ˛ dekanat-ą
Valius-ACC invite-PRS.3 to dean’s.office-ACC
‘Someone is inviting Valius to the dean’s office.’

(94) Kažk-as  kvieˇc-ia Val-į ˛ dekanat-ą.
someone-NOM invite-PRS.3 Valius-ACC to dean’s.office-ACC
‘Someone is inviting Valius to the dean’s office.’

I propose that the active existential construction has a Voice head, which I term VoiceACT-E. This head is projected above a vP, as illustrated in (95). Recall that I follow Kratzer (1996) and subsequent work and assume that the Voice head rather than v introduces an external argument θ-role. Like the Voice head of the active transitive construction in (96), this VoiceACT-E is also thematic, in the sense that it introduces an external argument variable,
which is represented by \( \theta \) in (95). However, unlike the active transitive Voice head, the Voice\textsubscript{ACT-E} of the active existential has no projected implicit argument, therefore, it lacks the \([\bullet D \bullet]\) feature that selects for a DP specifier. The external argument variable of the active existential needs to be bound, but there is no initiator projected in Spec\textsubscript{VoiceP} to do that. I propose that the Voice\textsubscript{ACT-E} is different from the Voice\textsubscript{ACT} in that its external argument variable is introduced already bound at the level of Voice\textsubscript{0} (also see Schäfer 2017 for a similar approach used for medio-passives). In other words, the existential operator that binds the external argument variable is a part of the lexical entry of this Voice head. This is illustrated in (95) with the existential quantifier \( \exists \) on the Voice head. On the other hand, in the active transitive, the external argument variable introduced by Voice\textsubscript{ACT} is saturated by merging a DP in its specifier, (96).

(95) Active Existential

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\exists \text{Voice}^{0}_{\text{ACT-E}} \\
\theta \\
v \\
VP \\
V, \text{DP(ACC)}
\end{array}
\]

(96) Active Transitive

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice}^{0}_{\text{ACT}} \\
\theta, [\bullet D \bullet] \\
v \\
VP \\
V, \text{DP(ACC)}
\end{array}
\]

(97) is then the lexical entry of the Voice\textsubscript{ACT-E} where the existential operator is already built in. I assume that the Voice head with the existentially closed thematic subject is combined with the \( vP \) via Predicate Modification which then results in the derivation in (98).\footnote{I am ignoring the semantics of little \( v \) as it is irrelevant here; however, see Pylkkänen 2008, Harley 2012 ia. for various approaches.}
(97) \( \lambda e. \exists x. \text{Initiator}(x,e) \)

(98) \[
\text{Voice}_{\text{ACT-E}} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \lambda e. \exists x [\text{Initiator}(x)(e)] \land \text{inviting}(e) \land \text{Theme}(e, \text{Valius}) \\
\quad \text{VOICE}_{\text{ACT-E}} \quad \nu \text{P} \\
\quad \lambda e. \exists x [\text{Initiator}(x)(e)] \quad \lambda e. \text{inviting}(e) \land \text{Theme}(e, \text{Valius}) \\
\quad \nu \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \lambda e. \text{inviting}(e) \land \text{Theme}(e, \text{Valius}) \\
\quad \text{V} \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{inviting}(e) \land \text{Theme}(e, x) \quad \text{Valius}
\]

The motivation for incorporating the existential operator in the lexical entry of \( \text{Voice}_{\text{ACT-E}} \) comes from the active existential's incompatibility with \( by \)-phrases. One possible alternative to denote the initiator would be to use the Existential Closure (Heim 1982) as has been proposed for passives (e.g., Roberts 1987; Williams 1987 and for more recent discussion see Bruening 2013; Legate 2014; Bruening and Tran 2015; Sigurðsson 2017; Schäfer 2017). In passives, the Voice head enters the derivation with an external argument variable that needs to be saturated. Given that \( by \)-phrases are optional, the external argument can be saturated by a \( by \)-phrase, or when, no \( by \)-phrase is present, by the Existential Closure in the post-syntactic LF component. However, in the active existential, \( by \)-phrases are always blocked as exemplified with unergatives and transitives in (99-101). The unavailability of \( by \)-phrases suggests that the Voice head does not enter the derivation with a open argument slot, and thus the kind of the Existential Closure that is applied to the passive does not ap-
ply to the active existential. I propose that the existential operator, which binds the initiator variable, is built into the active existential Voice head lexically rather than being introduced by an unselective binding operation of the Existential Closure that applies at LF. I take this to be one of the main differences between the passive and the active existential.

(99) *Lyg šaud-ė dien-ą mišk-e kažkien-o.
    as.if shoot-PST.3 day-ACC forest-LOC someone-GEN
    Lit. ‘It seems that someone fired shots in the wood during the day by someone.’

(100) *Val-įų kvieč-ia į dekanat-ą kažkien-o.
    Valiuś.ACC invite-PRS.3 to dean’s.office-ACC someone-GEN
    Lit. ‘Someone is inviting Valius to the dean’s office by someone.’

(101) *Jam pavog-ė arkl-i kažkien-o.
    he.DAT steal-PST.3 horse-ACC someone-GEN
    Lit. ‘Someone stole a horse from him by someone.’

Given this difference between the active existential and the passive, the feature composition of passives is as follows. The passive contains a VoicePASS head, which is also thematic in that it introduces the external argument θ-role. This head, just like the thematic Voice head of the active existential, has no projected implicit argument in SpecVoiceP, thus it does not bear the [•D•] feature. When no initiator is introduced by the by-phrase like in (103), the Existential Closure applies at LF binding the external argument variable. Alternatively, the external argument variable can be saturated by a by-phrase as in (104).

(102) Val-ius buv-o pakvies-t-as (tėv-o).
    Valiuś-NOM be.PST.3 invite-PST.PASS.PTCP-NOM.M.SG father-GEN
    ‘Valius was invited (by the father).’
Having sketched the structure of the active existential, we are now in a position to consider how accusative case is assigned to the theme in this configuration. Recall that here I follow here Legate (2014) and subsequent work in assuming that Voice head instead of causative \( v \) head is responsible for accusative case assignment.\(^{31}\) In the active existential...
tial, the external argument is not projected in SpecVoiceP and yet the theme is assigned structural accusative case. Let us consider the original version of Burzio’s Generalization defined in (105). In this original version, it is required for a verb (in our case, a Voice head) to assign the $\theta$-role to the subject, in order for the accusative case to be assigned. However, we have seen that there is no syntactic argument in SpecVoiceP to which the Voice head can assign a $\theta$-role. Thus, instead of confirming this generalization, the active existential counter-exemplifies it.

(105) ‘All and only the verbs that can assign $\theta$-role to the subject can assign accusative case to an object.’ (Burzio, 1986:178)

Dependent Case theory (Marantz 1991; McFadden 2004; Preminger 2014, ia.) provides a slightly different version of Burzio’s Generalization. Under such theory, the accusative case is realized in relation to a DP that c-commands it. Specifically, when $\text{DP}_\alpha$ c-commands $\text{DP}_\beta$ from an A-position in their local domain, then $\text{DP}_\beta$ gets dependent case realized as accusative at Vocabulary Insertion and $\text{DP}_\alpha$ has the unmarked case realized as nominative (in NOM-ACC languages), leaving aside lexical non-structural case. In the active existential, there is no DP c-commanding the theme. Given this algorithm, accusative case should not be realized on the theme, but it is, which is in contradiction to Dependent Case theory.

Lastly, Legate (2014) provides another version of Burzio’s Generalization arguing that either a full DP or $\phi$-features in SpecVoiceP are enough for accusative case to be assigned by the Voice head. This version gives us more flexibility on what the sufficient conditions are for the accusative to be assigned. Nevertheless, it still cannot explain how accusative is realized on the theme in the active existential where neither a full DP argument nor $\phi$-features are present in SpecVoiceP.

In the Lithuanian active existential, a thematic active Voice head, namely $\text{Voice}^{0}_{\text{ACT-E}}$

‘On the plane, the travelers were heavily jolted by the risen wind.’
is present which suggests that it should be a source of the accusative case. However, there is no external argument in SpecVoice_{ACT-E}P which indicates that no subject is necessary in the specifier position for the accusative case to be assigned by this Voice head.\textsuperscript{32} Lithuanian shows that an active thematic Voice head is enough for the structural accusative case to be assigned. Therefore, I propose a revised version of Burzio’s generalization as in (106) where the assignment of accusative case is not dependent on the presence of a projected initiator. In other words, each thematic Voice is free to be bundled with an accusative case feature regardless of whether its specifier is projected or not.

(106) \textit{Revised Burzio’s Generalization}: while accusative must be assigned by a thematic Voice, the assignment of accusative case by Voice can vary independently from the selection of a specifier.

This proposal has important consequences for Case Theory. As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, the Lithuanian data provide the motivation for treating case as a type of primitive feature, e.g., \textsc{ACC} or \textsc{NOM} feature, which may combine with a particular functional head, e.g., the type of Voice head that introduces an external argument theta-role. As shown, the accusative is the only structural case in the active existential, meaning that these primitive case features do not need to be licensed on the basis of other c-commanding DPs with structural case, as proposed in Dependent Case Theory.

To summarize, the constructions discussed here have the following feature constellations. The active existential contains a Voice head that is thematic, bundles with the accusative case feature and its external argument variable is bound by the existential operator in the lexicon (107). The active transitive also has a thematic Voice head which bundles

\footnote{\textsuperscript{32}In the active existential, there is also a finite T that could potentially assign nominative case to the theme. Nevertheless, the theme retains accusative case instead of nominative suggesting that the assignment of nominative case by T is blocked here. It could be hypothesized that this happens due to the Activity Condition \cite{Chomsky2001}. According to this constraint, elements that became inactive during the derivation are no longer available for other operations. Thus, when the theme gets assigned accusative case by the Voice head, it becomes inactive and is no longer available for T.}
with the accusative case feature, but it also has a \(\bullet D \bullet\) feature that requires checking, forcing the external argument variable to be saturated by the DP in SpecVoiceP \(108\). Lastly, in the short passive \(109\), the thematic Voice head does not combine with accusative case feature and its initiator is existentially closed at LF, rather than in the lexicon as in the active existential.

(107) Active Existential

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice}_{ACT-E}^P \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\exists \text{Voice}_{ACT-E}^0 \quad \nu P \\
\theta, \text{ACC} \\
\end{array}
\]

(108) Active Transitive

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice}_{ACT}^P \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}(\text{NOM}) \quad \text{Voice}_{ACT}^0 \\
\nu P \\
\theta, \bullet D \bullet, \text{ACC} \\
\end{array}
\]

(109) Short Passive

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice}_{PASS}^P \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice}_{PASS}^0 \quad \nu P \\
\theta \\
\end{array}
\]

All in all, I have argued that the presence of the projected implicit argument is not a necessary condition for the accusative case to be assigned. Evidence from the active existential demonstrated that there exists a type of Voice that semantically is associated with an external-arugment theta-role, but it does not require a projected implicit argument in SpecVoiceP to assign structural accusative case. Recall that unaccusative verbs are not possible in the active existential as in \(74\), repeated in \(110\). Unaccusatives lack a thematic VoiceP, and their theme argument bears structural nominative case. Thus, I leave for future research the possibility of a language exhibiting a Voice head that does not include an external theta-role but does assign accusative case.
(110) *Kambaryj-e buv-o daug krauj-o. Toks jausm-as lyg nukrit-o ir room-LOC be-PST.3 a.lot blood-GEN such feeling-NOM as.if fall-PST.3 and mir-ė čia.
die-PST.3 here

‘There was a lot of blood in the room. It feels as if someone fell and died here.’

6 Conclusion

The empirical contribution of this paper has been to show that the assignment of accusative case need not hinge on the presence of the external argument. Specifically, I have demonstrated that the active existential has an accusative thematic object which patterns like an object of an active construction. However, this construction behaves like a passive in that it lacks a projected implicit argument, unlike the *malt* impersonal. Based on the evidence from the active existential, I argued for a revised version of Burzio’s generalization by suggesting that there exists a type of thematic Voice head that can assign structural accusative case in the absence of a syntactically projected implicit argument in SpecVoiceP. Identifying this type of Voice head has enriched the Voice typology which has not previously associated a thematic Voice head without a specifier with the assignment of accusative case (e.g., Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer [2015]).

As far as Case Theory is concerned, my findings suggest that case is a type of primitive feature that may combine with a certain type of functional head, and its licensing need not be restricted by certain syntactic configurations e.g., a higher c-commanding DP with a structural case as originally proposed in Dependent Case theory (Marantz [1991], Woolford [2003], McFadden [2004], Bobaljik [2008], Preminger [2014]). Hence, regardless of the merits of a configurational approach to the licensing of structural accusative case, my data demonstrate that this cannot be the only way the structural accusative case is assigned. While the assignment of accusative case need not be restricted by a certain hierarchical relation between two DPs, it can, however, vary according to the type of a thematic Voice head a
construction has. Voice heads of the active existential and the passive are similar in that they have no specifier and are both thematic. However, these heads differ in the assignment of accusative case: the former bundles with the accusative case feature, whereas the latter does not.

Lastly, I have also argued that the active existential and the passive differ from each other in the way the external argument variable is bound. In passives, the Voice head introduces the external argument variable, and then this variable is either saturated by a by-phrase, or is bound by existential closure (Heim 1982) at LF. Nevertheless, the unavailability of by-phrases in the active existential demonstrates that this cannot be the only way the external argument variable is saturated. The Voice head of the active existential introduces the external argument variable that is lexically bound, in other words the existential operator binding it is a part of the lexical entry of the Voice head. Thus, this study shows that two distinct treatments of the external argument are possible in a single language and suggests that existentially closing the external argument variable at LF cannot be treated as a parameter.
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