Verb-stranding ellipsis constructions (VSE) have been the subject of intensive crosslinguistic investigation for their potential to inform two important theoretical questions about the interaction of head movement and ellipsis. The first question concerns the possible size of the ellipsis site, which has been claimed to be as large as TP (TP-VSE; Lipták 2012 (Hungarian); Martins 2016 (Portuguese); Gribanova 2017 (Russian); McCloskey, 2017 (Irish), or as small as VP (VP-VSE; Lipták 2013 (Hungarian); Gribanova 2017 (Russian); Hebrew (Goldberg 2005)), depending on the language at issue. Although Landau (2019a,b) has recently argued for the crosslinguistic unavailability of VP-VSE as a result of locality constraints on interactions between head movement and ellipsis. The second question concerns the elusive nature of the Verbal Identity Requirement (VIR), which holds in a subset of languages with VSE (Irish (McCloskey, 2017); Scottish Gaelic (Thoms, 2018)), and requires lexical identity of the extracted element to their antecedent, even if the antecedent and stranded verb are contrasted. There currently exist two competing explanations for this observation. The first takes the VIR to follow from the inability of verbs in VSE to bear the pitch accent associated with narrow focus in these languages (Merchant, 2018; Thoms, 2018). The second takes it to be the result of the postsyntactic nature of the head movement that is involved in VSE in this subset of languages (Schoolkemmer & Temmerman, 2012; McCloskey, 2017; Gribanova, 2018). In this paper, I argue that Lithuanian has genuine VP-VSE, contra Landau (2019a,b). I further demonstrate that Lithuanian VSE obeys the VIR, for reasons which cannot be explained by an inability of the verb to host the pitch accent associated with narrow focus.

**Preliminaries:** Lithuanian has both of the ingredients necessary for VP-VSE: regular VP ellipsis (1) and verb movement (2,3) to Asp.

(1) Jei tu moki <pataisyti duris>, padėk man pataisyti duris.

   if you able-PRES.2SG ASP-fix door.ACC help-IMP.2SG me ASP-fix door.ACC.

   ‘If you know how to (fix the door), help me fix the door.’

Manner adverbs (2) and stranded quantifiers (not shown here) cannot intervene between the verb and its complement, suggesting that the verb does not move to T.

(2) ??Ji skaitė greitai knygą.

   she read quickly book.ACC.

   ‘She read quickly the book.’

(3) ne-be-pa-si-liek-a

   NEG-PROG-ASP-REFL-remain-PRES.3SG

   ‘He is no longer remaining.’

However, the verb does not stay in situ. Lithuanian verbs are composed of syntactic heads joined together through head movement (3). Perfective morphemes are productive and behave much like Slavic superlexical aspectual prefixes (Mathiassen 1996), which in Russian are hosted in Asp (Svenonius 2004). I assume that Lithuanian has also an AspP projection between TP and VP. Like Russian (Bailyn 1995), it has across the board movement of the verb out of coordinated VPs; I take the landing site of this movement to be Asp. (For arguments against a gapping analysis of (4), see Bowers 1993; Bailyn 1995).

(4) Marija nudažė namą mėlynai, o (*Darius) tvartą rudai.

   M.NOM ASP-painted house.ACC blue.ADV, but (D.NOM) barn.ACC brown.ADV.

   ‘Marija painted the house blue, but (Darius) the barn brown.’

This evidence indicates that Lithuanian verbs move to Asp for the purposes of morphological unification, and therefore, the independent ingredients required for VSE are available in Lithuanian. Next, I demonstrate that VSE applies in Lithuanian, and is distinct from argument drop or argument ellipsis (AE) of internal arguments.

**Genuine VP-VSE:** Though Lithuanian can omit DP and PP arguments, it is not possible to independently omit predicative adjectives and nominals or resultatives (I will only present predicative nominal examples due to limited space.). In (5) whether the predicate is an argument or part of a small clause, the conclusion that it cannot be independently elided still holds. If all the VP internal material is elided the predicate is always interpreted.


   ‘Marija painted the house blue’.

   *Marija nudažė namą (Darius) tvartą rudai.

   ‘Marija painted the house blue, but (Darius) the barn brown’.

   This evidence indicates that Lithuanian verbs move to Asp for the purposes of morphological unification, and therefore, the independent ingredients required for VSE are available in Lithuanian. Next, I demonstrate that VSE applies in Lithuanian, and is distinct from argument drop or argument ellipsis (AE) of internal arguments.
at first, the children didn’t declare him king, but then they declared (him king) / him (king).

At first, he didn’t become boss, but then he became (boss).

VIR: Only Irish and Scottish Gaelic are still believed uncontroversially to respect the VIR, which requires lexical identity between the stranded verb and its antecedent (Landau 2019b). Mismatching contrasting verbs is possible in Lithuanian AE (7), where the ellipsis site does not contain a predicative XP. Importantly, however, Lithuanian VP-VSE containing predicates do not allow mismatch even when the verbs are contrasted and host pitch-accent (8). If the verb roots lexically match, then VP-VSE is possible (6). Thus, Lithuanian VP-VSE, like these Goidelic languages, respects the VIR.

Unlike Irish or Scottish Gaelic, Lithuanian allows pitch accent on finite verbs in non-ellipsis contexts. This means that the unavailability of the pitch accent associated with contrastive focus on stranded verbs in VSE (A requirement of any mismatched extraction out of an ellipsis site) (Merchant 2018; Thoms 2018) cannot explain the VIR in Lithuanian VP-VSE. Instead, the Lithuanian facts make way for an alternative explanation of the source of the VIR, in which the head movement that results in the verb being pronounced outside of the ellipsis site is postsyntactic. If this is the case, the syntactic structure that is evaluated for the identity condition on ellipsis contains all the relevant syntactic heads in situ, giving rise to the VIR (McCloskey, 2017; Gribanova, 2018). I discuss how this conclusion fits with recent claims by Harizanov and Gribanova (2019) that head movement may come in a syntactic or a postsyntactic form, and provide arguments that the Lithuanian configuration here is of the latter type.