PARTICIPLES AND FINITENESS IN LITHUANIAN

Peter Arkadiev, alpgurev@gmail.com
(Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences;
Institute of Linguistics, Russian State University for the Humanities; Vilnius University)

Disclaimer 1: This is a somewhat updated version of the talk given under a slightly different title at the 47th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Poznań, September 2014, and at the Max-Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, October 2014; the work has been published in Russian (Arkadiev 2014), and its article-long English version (Arkadiev Ms-a) is currently under review. I thank Ksenia Ershova, Martin Haspelmath, Ksenia Shagal, Sergejus Tarasovas, Aurelija Usonienė and Björn Wiemer for their useful feedback.

1. On (non-)finiteness
➲ Indo-Europeanist tradition: a morphological distinction between verbal forms with personal endings (*verbum finitum*) and forms without such endings (*verbum infinitum*), cf. Brugmann (1892: 836–837); Meier-Brügger (2003: 184); Koptjevskaja-Tamm (1999: 146).

However, already the Neogrammarians were aware of the fact that the morphological dichotomy does not exactly align with syntactic positions in which morphologically finite and non-finite verbal forms occur:

"[daß] zwischen verbum finitum und verbum infinitum insofern keine scharfe Grenze zu ziehen ist, als Formen des letzteren dieselbe Function bekamen, die die Formen mit echter Personalendung hatten" (Brugmann 1892: 842).

➲ In recent typological work (Kalinina 1998, Givón 2001: Ch. 18; Cristofaro 2003, 2007; Nikolaeva 2007, 2013; Creissels 2009), the notion of finiteness is usually treated as gradual and multifactorial rather than binary. It has to do with the degree of similarity of a given verbal form (or construction) to the prototypical independent action clause resp. its bearing some properties characteristic of nominals (cf. the notion of "nominalization scale", Lehmann 1988; Malchukov 2004).

➲ Those typologists, who, like Bisang (2001, 2007), maintain a binary conception of finiteness having to do with the grammaticalization of the independent status of predication, explicitly state that the notion is not universal:

"If a language has an overt morphosyntactic marker from which the human parser can derive the independent status of a grammatical structure that language makes a finite/nonfinite distinction" (Bisang 2007: 116).

➲ In formal (e.g. generative) theories, (non-)finiteness is not an elementary notion, either, but is based on such independently motivated and not necessarily intercorrelated features as subject agreement, independent temporal interpretation, information-structure related left periphery, etc. (see e.g. Wurmbrand 2001; Landau 2004; Adger 2007; Eide ed. 2016).

➲ If the notion of "finiteness" is to be retained at all, it has to be treated as:
– not elementary, but derivative from more basic notions;
– not binary, but rather multifactorial: "There is more than one way to be non-finite" (Adger 2007: 26).

➲ The "canonical" approach (Corbett 2005, Brown et al. 2013):
– independent criteria converging on the "canonical ideal" of a phenomenon;
– logically possible deviations from the "canon" structuring the typological space;
– both language-particular and cross-linguistic insights possible.

➲ Criteria of "canonical" finiteness (Nikolaeva 2013):
morphology
  C-1: tense marking > no tense marking
  C-2: subject agreement > no subject agreement
  C-3: mood and/or illocutionary force marking > no such marking
  C-4: politeness marking > no politeness marking
  C-5: evidential marking > no evidential marking
  C-6: no switch-reference marking > switch-reference marking
  C-7: nominative subject > non-nominative subject
syntax
  C-8: independent clause > dependent clause
  C-9: subject licensing > no subject
  C-10: morphosyntactic expression of information structure > no such expression
semantics:
  C-11: assertion > no assertion
  C-12: independent temporal anchoring > no independent temporal anchoring
  C-13: information structuring > no information structuring

➲ In this paper, the above criteria are applied to different uses of participles in **Lithuanian**, a "classic" Indo-European language with a rich system of morphologically non-finite verbal forms.

2. Overview of Lithuanian participles
➲ As "participles" in Lithuanian are treated verbal forms sharing morphosyntactic properties of verbs and adjectives. Traditionally, such forms are regarded as non-finite, for the reason that they do not show inflection for mood and person and instead inflect for case and gender (see Klimas 1987, Wiemer 2001, Ambrazas ed. 2006: 326–372).

➲ Participles distinguish voice and tense, and presence vs. absence of agreement in case, gender and number. Non-agreeing participles head non-finite clauses and are traditionally called "gerunds" (see Darden 1992/2015, Greenberg & Lavine 2006, Arkadiev 2012, 2013, Ms-b, Geniušienė 2014 for a discussion of their syntactic properties).

Table 1. The paradigm of participles in Lithuanian

gerti 'drink'	Active		Passive
	+ agreeing	**– agreeing**	
Present	*geriąs* (m), *gerianti* (f)	*geriant*	*geriamas* (m), *geriama* (f)
Preterite	*gėręs* (m), *gėrusi* (f)	*gėrus*	*gertas* (m), *gerta* (f)
Habitual Past	*gerdavęs* (m), *gerdavusi* (f)	*gerdavus*	—
Future	*gersiąs* (m), *gersianti* (f)	*gersiant*	*gersimas* (m), *gersima* (f)

➲ Participles in Lithuanian are very polyfunctional and in different environments show different combinations of verbal and nominal properties, i.e. elaboration vs. reduction of tense distinctions, availability and case-marking of overt subjects, presence of overt adjectival morphology and possibility to inflect for case.

Disclaimer 2: In this talk, unlike Nicole Nau, I won't say anything about the possible differences in finiteness properties between active and passive participles and will not present any quantitative data.

3. "Finite" participles in evidential constructions
➲ Participles in Lithuanian can head independent clauses with evidential (reportative, inferential and admirative) meanings (Litvinow 1989; Gronemeyer 1997; Wiemer 1998, 2006a; Holvoet 2001, 2007: Ch. 4, 5).

➲ Encoding of indirect evidentiality or other functions related to "reduced assertivity" (see e.g. Kalinina & Sumbatova 2007) by means of morphologically non-finite forms is common cross-linguistically (e.g. Aikhenvald 2004: 117–119) and is an areal trait of the languages of the East Baltic region (Wälchli 2000; Kehayov 2008).

➲ In Lithuanian, two formal types of evidential participial constructions have to be distinguished, which I call "active" and "passive impersonal". Their exact semantics is not of direct relevance for my current purposes.

3.1. Active evidential constructions
– The participle features as the main predicate showing full tense distinctions (including the periphrastic perfect);
– expression of verbal arguments is not affected;
– participle agrees with its nominative subject in number, gender and case (1)–(3).

simple tenses

(1) a. *J-is* **gyven-a / gyven-o / gyven-s / gyven-dav-o** *miest-e.*
3-NOM.SG.M live-PRS.3 / PST.3 / FUT.3 / HAB-PST.3 town-LOC.SG
'He lives / lived / will live / used to live in the town.'

   b. *J-is* **gyven-ąs / gyven-ęs / gyven-si-ąs / gyven-dav-ęs** *miest-e.*
3-NOM.SG.M live-[PRS- / PST- / FUT- / HAB-PST.]PA.NOM.SG.M town-LOC.SG
'(They say) he lives / lived / will live / used to live in the town.'

perfect

(2) a. *Sveči-as* **yra** **kil-ęs** *iš* *kaimieči-ų.*
guest-NOM.SG AUX.PRS.3 rise-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M from peasant-GEN.PL
'The guest is descended from peasants.'

   b. *Sveči-as* **es-ąs** **kil-ęs** *iš* *kaimieči-ų.*
guest-NOM.SG AUX.PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M rise-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M from peasant-GEN.PL
'The guest is said to be descended from peasants.' (Ambrazas ed. 2006: 263)

passive

(3) a. *Per* *mūsų* *sod-ą* **bu-s** **tiesi-a-m-as** *keli-as.*
through our yard-ACC.SG AUX-FUT.3 stretch-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M road-NOM.SG
'A road will be built through our yard.'

   b. *Per* *mūsų* *sod-ą* **bu-si-ąs** **tiesi-a-m-as** *keli-as.*
through our yard-ACC.SG AUX-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M stretch-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M road-NOM.SG
'They say that a road will be built through our yard.' (Ambrazas ed. 2006: 264)

When a nominative-marked subject is lacking, e. g. with impersonal experiencer predicates, the participle has a special **default form** (NB distinct from the non-agreeing form); fully finite verbs do not have default forms formally distinct from the 3rd person, cf. (4).

(4) a. *J-am* **reikėj-o** *iš-si-pasako-ti.*
3-DAT.SG.M need-PST.3 PRV-RFL-tell-INF
'He needed to unburden his heart.'

   b. *Jaut-ęs* *kalt-ę* *ir* *j-am* **reikėj-ę** *iš-si-pasako-ti.*
feel-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M guilt-ACC.SG and 3-DAT.SG.M need-PST.PA.DF PRV-RFL-tell-INF
'He (told that he) felt guilt and needed to unburden his heart.' (LKT)

Though in the standard language only indicative verb forms have evidential participial counterparts, "parasitic" use of participial morphology attached to non-indicative stems is reported for some dialects (Kučinskaitė & Morkūnas 1964 quoted after Holvoet 2007: 88):

(5) *Jeigu* **bū-či-ąs** **žinoj-ęs,** *kad niek-o* *ne-gau-s,*
if AUX-IRR-PA.NOM.SG.M know-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M that nothing-GEN.SG NEG-get-FUT(3)
tai **ne-bū-či-ąs** *nė* *iš* *viet-os* **judin-ęs-is.**
then NEG-AUX-IRR-PA.NOM.SG.M even from place-GEN.SG move-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M-RFL
'(He says that) if he had known he would get nothing, then he wouldn't have stirred from the place.'

3.2. Impersonal passive evidential constructions
– The participle features as the main predicate showing reduced tense distinctions (habitual past does not form passive participles; future passive participles are very rarely used);
– the subject is marked by the genitive, the direct object (if present) by the nominative (in some varieties of Lithuanian by the accusative), without any redistribution of grammatical functions;
– the participle appears in the default form.
On the morphosyntax of these constructions see Timberlake (1982), Lavine (1999, 2006, 2010), Geniušienė (2006), Wiemer (2006b), Holvoet (2007: 96–104), Usonienė & Šinkū-nienė (2017); on Lithuanian impersonal passives see also Spraunienė et al. (2015). The most typologically peculiar property of the Lithuanian evidential impersonal passive is its ability to recursively apply to the "normal" passive, cf. (8).

simple tenses

(6) a. *J-is* *miest-e* **stat-o** *nam-ą.*
3-NOM.SG.M town-LOC.SG build-PRS.3 house-ACC.SG
'He is building a house in the town.'

   b. *Girdėj-au,* *j-o* *miest-e* *nam-as* **stat-o-m-a.**
hear-PST.1SG 3-GEN.SG.M town-LOC.SG house-NOM.SG bouid-PRS-PP-DF
'I hear, he is building a house in the town.' (Ambrazas ed. 2006: 281)

(7) a. *Vag-is* **nu.si.kirt-o** *vis-us* *kopūst-us.*
thief-NOM.SG cut.down-PST.3 all-ACC.PL.M cabbage-ACC.PL
'The thief cut down all the cabbages.' (Geniušienė 2006: 31)

   b. *Vag-ies* **nu.si.kirs-t-a** *vis-i* *kopūst-ai.*
thief-GEN.SG cut.down-PST.PP-DF all-NOM.PL.M cabbage-NOM.PL
'Evidently, a thief [had] cut down all the cabbages.' (ibid.)

regular passive

(8) a. *Kuodel-is* **buv-o** **užbur-t-as.**
tow-NOM.SG AUX-PST.3 enchant-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M
'The tow was enchanted.'

   b. *...pasirod-o* *kuodeli-o* **užbur-t-o** **bū-t-a.**
turn.out-PST(3) tow-GEN.SG enchant-PST.PP-GEN.SG.M AUX-PST.PP-DF
'The tow turned out to have been enchanted.'[1]

impersonal passive

(9) a. *J-o* **buv-o** **išei-t-a.**
3-GEN.SG.M AUX-PST.3 go.away-PST.PP-DF
'He was already gone.' (Ambrazas ed. 2006: 282)

   b. *J-o* **bū-t-a** **išei-t-a.**
3-GEN.SG.M AUX-PST.PP-DF go.away-PST.PP-DF
'They say he was gone out.' (Ambrazas ed. 2006: 284)

---

[1] http://www.pasakos.lt/sakmes-padavimai/egle-zalciu-karaliene-2/

Table 3. Finiteness properties of Lithuanian participles in evidential constructions

criterion	"active"	"impersonal passive"	finite forms
C1 (tense marking)	full	reduced	full
C2 (subject agreement)	+ (gender, number)	–	+ (person, number)
C3 (mood marking)	– (+ in dialects)	–	+
C6 (switch-reference marking)	–	–	–
C7 (nominative subject)	+	–	+
C8 (independent clause)	+	+	+
C9 (subject licensing)	+	+	+
C12 (independent temporal anchoring)	+	+	+
nominal paradigm	reduced (NOM, DF)	fixed (DF)	–

4. Participles as heads of embedded clauses

Lithuanian participles regularly feature as heads of embedded clauses. Traditional grammar (e.g. Ambrazas ed. 2006: 353, 360) distinguishes between attributive (heads of relative clauses) and "semi-predicative" uses of participles, the latter comprising "adverbial" (heads of adverbial clauses) and "completive" (heads of complement clauses) uses.

4.1. Participles as heads of adverbial and complement clauses

➲ Participles can head adverbial clauses whose precise interpretation (temporal, conditional, concessive etc.) is determined by the context (i.e. they are **contextual converbs** in terms of Nedjalkov 1995: 106, 108–109), and propositional complements with verbs of speech, perception and cognition. More on the syntax of these constructions see Ambrazas (1990: 98–179), Darden (1992/2015), Gronemeyer & Usonienė (2001: 108–112, 116–120), Greenberg & Lavine (2006), Sakurai (2008), Arkadiev (2012, 2013, Ms-b), Geniušienė (2014).

Table 4. Features of adverbial and complement participial constructions

		agreement	expression of subject
same-subject	complement	+	∅
	adverbial	+	∅
different-subject	complement	–	ACC
	adverbial	–	DAT

In both types of construction, the tense features of participles are interpreted relative to the tense of the matrix clause. In complement constructions, all tenses are allowed (though with predicates of direct perception normally only the present participles denoting simultaneity are found; see below for some additional details), including the periphrastic passive (14), (21), perfect (15), (22) and avertive (16).

same-subject
– present

(10) *Kažkur-is   skund-ė-si   [**gyven-ąs**   praeit-imi*
somebody-NOM.SG.M   complain-PST(3)-RFL   live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M   PAST-INS.SG
*ir   **ne-gal-įs**   j-os   atsikraty-ti*].
and   NEG-can -PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M   3-GEN.SG.F   get.rid.of-INF
'Someone complained about being obsessed by the past and not being able to get rid of it.' (LKT)

– simple past

(11) *Janin-a Šimonien-ė   sak-o-si   [**pa-dar-ius-i**   kelet-ą   klaid-ų,*
proper.name-NOM.SG   say-PRS.3-RFL   PRV-do-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F   several-ACC.SG   error-GEN.PL
kuri-ų   ne-gal-i   sau   atleis-ti].
which-GEN.PL   NEG-can-PRS.3   self.DAT   forgive-INF
'Janina Šimonienė says that she has made several errors which she cannot forgive herself.' (LKT)

– habitual past

(12) *Vaikin-as   pasakoj-o   [**ei-dav-ęs**   su   išties-t-a*
lad-NOM.SG   tell-PST(3)   go-HAB-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   with   extend-PST.PP-INS.SG.F
*rank-a   ir   **prašy-dav-ęs**   pinig-ų*].
hand-INS.SG   and   ask-HAB-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   money-GEN.PL
'The lad told that he used to go cap in hand and beg money.' (LKT)

– future

(13) *Tikėj-au   žmon-ėmis, kai   j-ie   žadė-dav-o*
believe-PST.1SG   people-INS.PL   when   3-NOM.PL.M   promise-HAB-PST(3)
[**pa-dary-si-ą**   t-ą   bei   an-ą*].
PRV-do-FUT-PA.NOM.PL.M   this-ACC.SG   and   that-ACC.SG
'I used to believe people when they promised to do this and that.' (LKT)

– passive

(14) *...Vaištar-as   kaimyn-ams   gyr-ė-si*
Vaištaras-NOM.SG   neighbour-DAT.PL   praise-PST(3)-RFL
[**buv-ęs**   **nu-vež-t-as**   į   Maskv-ą*].
AUX-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   PRV-bring-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M   in   Moscow-ACC.SG
'Vaištaras boasted to his neighbours that he had been taken to Moscow.' (LKT)

– perfect/resultative

(15) *Skambin-u,   j-i   vis   sak-o   [**es-a-nt-i**   **užsiėm-us-i**].
call-PRS.1SG   3-NOM.SG.F   still   say-PRS(3)   AUX-PRS-PA.NOM.SG.F   be.occupied-PST.PA.NOM.SG.F
'I am calling her, but she keeps telling me that she is occupied.' (LKT)

– avertive

(16) *Klebon-as   sak-ė ...   [**buv-ęs**   **be-bėg-ąs***
dean-NOM.SG   say-PST(3)   AUX-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   CNT-run -PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
tok-iam   daininink-ui   užčiaup-ti   burn-ą]...
such-DAT.SG.M   singer-DAT.SG   squeeze-INF   mouth-ACC.SG
'The dean said that ... he almost ran to stop such a singer's mouth...' (LKT)

different subject
– present

(17) *Senov-ės   žemaiči-ai   tikėj-ę*
old.time-GEN.SG   Samogitian-NOM.PL   believe-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M
[*nam-ų   kerči-ose   dievaiči-us   **gyven-a-nt**].
house-GEN.PL   corner-LOC.PL   deity-ACC.PL   live-PRS-PA
'In old times Samogitians believed that deities lived in the corners of houses.' (LKT)

– simple past

(18) *Tibetieči-ai ...   prisimen-a   [panaš-ų   įvyk-į   **buv-us***
Tibetan-NOM.PL   remember-PRS.3   similar-ACC.PL.M   event-ACC.SG   be-PST.PA
prieš   koki-us   penkeri-us   met-us].
before   what-ACC.PL.M   five-ACC.PL.M   year-ACC.PL
'Tibetans ... recall that similar event occurred some five years ago.' (LKT)

– habitual past

(19) ... *skatin-a*   *many-ti*   [*j-ą*   *dažnai* **bū-dav-us** *susierzinusi-ą* ...]
     induce-PRS(3)   think-INF 3-ACC.SG.F often   be-HAB-PST.PA irritated-ACC.SG.F
     '[this] induces one to believe her to have often been irritated...' (Arkadiev 2012: 296)

– future

(20) *Vis-i*   *j-ie*   *žadėj-o*   [*netrukus* **atei-si-ant** *pasauli-o*   *pabaig-ą*].
     all-NOM.PL.M 3-NOM.PL.M promise-PST(3) soon   come-FUT-PA world-GEN.SG end-ACC.SG
     'They all promised that the end of the world would come soon.' (LKT)

– passive

(21) ...*ir* *dat-a*   *rod-o*   [*j-į*   **buv-us**   *perraš-o-m-ą*].
     and date-NOM.SG show-PRS   3-ACC.SG.M AUX-PST.PA rewrite-PRS-PP-ACC.SG
     '... and the date shows that it was being rewritten.' (LKT)

– perfect

(22) ...*š-is*   *mieg-as*   *liudij-a*   [*j-ą*   **es-a-nt**   *mir-us-ią*].
     DEM-NOM.SG.M dream-NOM.SG testify-PRS(3) 3-ACC.SG.F AUX-PRS.PA die-PST.PA-ACC.SG.F
     'this dream testifies that she has died.' (LKT)

⊃ A special subtype of different subject participial complements is attested with verbs of (mainly visual) perception (cf. Enghels 2009 on the subtle distinctions between visual vs. non-visual perception verbs wrt complementation).
– the embedded clause can only contain present participles expressing simultaneity;
– the syntax of such constructions differs from that of different-subject participial complements with other kinds of matrix verbs (see Arkadiev 2012: 313–323): in the latter the accusative NP denoting the "logical subject" of the embedded proposition belongs to the dependent clause, while in the former the accusative NP behaves in all respects as a direct object of the matrix predicate, cf. a contrast in adverbial position test in (23).

(23) a.   *Sak-iau*   [**rytoj**   **Jurg-į**   *atvyk-si-ant*].
          say-PST.1SG tomorrow Jurgis-ACC.SG   arrive-FUT-PA
          'I said that Jurgis would arrive tomorrow.' (Arkadiev 2012: 321)

     b.   **Mat-au*   [**lėtai** **Jurg-į**   *vaikščioj-a-nt*   *park-e*].
          see-PRS.1SG slowly Jurgis-ACC.SG walk-PRS.PA   park-LOC.SG
     c.   *Mat-au*   **Jurg-į**   [**lėtai** *vaikščioj-a-nt*   *park-e*].
          see-PRS.1SG Jurgis-ACC.SG   slowly walk-PRS.PA   park-LOC.SG
          'I see Jurgis slowly walking in the park.' (Arkadiev 2012: 316)

Similar behaviour show constructions with matrix verbs *palikti* 'leave' and *rasti* 'find', see Darden (1992/2015: 275–279).

⊃ In constructions like (23c) the participle does not constitute a fully-fledged clause, but rather forms an appositive modifier or secondary predicate to the direct object. In this light it is not surprising that in different-subject constructions with verbs of direct perception the participle can appear not only in the "bare" form (24), but also show full agreement with the direct object in gender, number and case, accusative (25a) or genitive when the matrix verb is negated (25b).

(24) ...*tu*   *mat-ai*   *žmog-ų*   [**pasilenki-a-nt** *prie* *fontan-o*].
     you.SG:NOM see-PRS.2SG man-ACC.SG bend-PRS.PA   at   fountain-GEN.SG
     '... you see a man bending near the fountain.' (LKT)

(25) a.   *An-ą*   *nakt-į*   **motin-ą**   *mač-iau*   [**sėd-i-nči-ą**   *virtuv-ėj*
          DEM-ACC.SG night-ACC.SG mother-ACC.SG see-PST.1SG sit-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.F kitchen-LOC.SG

          ir   *pjaust-a-nči-ą*   *raudon-us*   *mės-os*   *gabal-us*].
          and cut-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.F red-ACC.PL.M meat-GEN.SG piece-ACC.PL
          'That night I saw mother sitting in the kitchen and cutting red pieces of meat.' (LKT)

     b.   ...*niekada* *ne-mač-iau*   **j-o**   [**be.si.juoki-a-nči-o** *ar* *linksm-o*]
          never   NEG-see-PST.1SG 3-GEN.SG.M laugh-PRS-PA-GEN.SG.M or cheerful-GEN.SG.M
          'I have never seen him laughing or cheerful.' (LKT)

That verbal forms embedded under verbs of direct perception show more syntactic integration into the matrix clause and a higher degree of nominalization that those embedded under verbs of speech and cognition is fairly common cross-linguistically, cf. Dik & Hengeveld 1991, Cristofaro (2003: 131, 133).

⊃ In adverbial constructions, only present (simultaneity) and simple past (anteriority) participles are systematically used, though habitual participles are sometimes also attested (30), and future participles are allowed in clauses introduced by the preposition/complementizer *prieš* 'before' (31). Notably, in same-subject clauses denoting simultaneity instead of agreeing present active participles special converb forms (the so-called "half participles") in *-dam* are used (26).

same-subject
– present: *-dam*-converb

(26) **Persireng-dam-a** *j-i*   *pa-si-žiūr-i*   *į*   *veidrod-į*.
     change.clothes-CNV-SG.F 3-NOM.SG.F PRV-RFL-look-PRS(3) in mirror-ACC.SG
     'While changing clothes she looks at herself in the mirror.' (LKT)

– simple past

(27) *Ein-u*   *gal*   *į*   *vien-ą*   *premjer-ą*   *per*   *met-us,*
     go-PRS.1SG maybe in one-ACC.SG theatre.opening-ACC.SG through year-ACC.PL
     [**persireng-us-i**   *kit-u*   *žmog-umi*].
     change.clothes-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F other-INS.SG.M man-INS.SG
     'I visit just one theatre opening per year dressed as a different person.' (LKT)

different-subject
– present

(28) [*Man*   *su*   *Povil-u*   **lank-a-nt** *Baltarusij-os*   *lietuvi-us*],   *ne*   *kart-ą*
     I:DAT   with Paul-INS.SG visit-PRS-PA Belorussia-GEN.SG Lithuanian-ACC.PL not time-ACC.SG
     siūly-t-a   *iš-ger-ti*   *svaigal-ų.*
     offer-PST.PP-DF PRV-drink-INF spirits-GEN.PL
     'When together with Paul I was visiting Belorussian Lithuanians, they many times offered us to drink spirits.' (LKT)

– simple past

(29) [*Vyr-ui*   **parėj-us**],   *Iren-a*   *sėdėj-o*   *virtuv-ėje...*
     husband-DAT.SG come.home-PST.PA Irena-NOM.SG sit-PST(3)   kitchen-LOC.SG
     'When her husband came home, Irena was sitting in the kitchen...' (LKT)

– habitual past

(30) [*J-ai*   *kažkur*   **išei-dav-us**], *berniuk-ai* [...]
     3-DAT.SG.F somewhere go.out-HAB-PA   boy-NOM.PL
     imituo-dav-o   *duj-ų*   *paleid-im-o*   *gars-ą.*
     imitate-HAB-PST.3 gas-GEN.PL let.go-NML-GEN.SG sound-ACC.SG
     'After she would go out somewhere, the boys would imitate the sound of running gas.' (Pakerys 2017: 297)

– future

(31) a. *[*Saul-ei* **nusileisi-ant**], *atsigul-ė-me.*
     sun-DAT.SG   descend+FUT-PA   lie.down-PST-1PL
     'We went to bed before the sun set.'

   b. [*Prieš pat uždang-ai* **nusileisi-ant**], *su-jund-a*   *grab-as.*
     before   INTF curtain-DAT.SG descend+FUT-PA   PRV-move-PRS(3)   coffin-NOM.SG
     'Before the curtain falls, the coffin moves.'[2]

➲ A special type of participial constructions with the complementizer *užuot* 'instead of':
– contains only past active participles;
– always null subject controlled from the matrix;
– agreeing participles if the matrix subject in the nominative (32), non-agreeing participles otherwise (33).

(32) *Ar,* [**užuot** **gav-us-i**   *tiek daug*]*, ne-gau-s-iu*   *niek-o ..?*
     Q   instead   get-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F   so   much   NEG-get-FUT-1SG   nothing-GEN
     'Do I get nothing instead of getting so much ..?' (LKT)

(33) *...*[**užuot** *ėm-us*   *nekęs-ti*]*, man j-os*   *pagail-o.*
     instead   take-PST.PA   hate-INF   I:DAT   3-GEN.SG.F   pity-PST(3)
     '...instead of beginning to hate her, I pitied her.' (LKT)

4.2. Participles as heads of relative clauses

– Like adjectives, occur as prenominal attributes and fully agree with their nominal heads in gender, number and case;
– distinguish synthetic tenses and voice;
– no overt subject; with passive participles, the original agent in the genitive.

     active voice
     –present

(34) *Atsigręž-ęs*   *mat-au*   [*greit* **artėj-a-nt-į**]   *eržil-ą.*
     turn.back-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   see-PRS.1SG   quickly   approach-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.M   stallion-ACC.SG
     'Turning back, I see a quickly approaching stallion.' (LKT)
     –simple past

(35) [*Iš*   *mokykl-os* **parėj-us-io**]   *vaik-o*   *skub-a-me*
     from   school-GEN.SG come.home-PST.PA-GEN.SG.M child-GEN.SG   hurry-PRS-1PL
     pa-klaus-ti   *apie*   *pažymi-us...*
     PRV-ask-INF   about   mark-ACC.PL
     'We hurry to ask the child who has come back from school about marks...' (LKT)
     –past habitual

(36) **Už-si-rakin-dav-us-iai**   *kambar-y Edit-ai*   *po to*   *tek-dav-o*   *atkentė-ti.*
     PRV-RFL-lock-HAB-PST.PA-DAT.SG.F   room-LOC.SG   Edita-DAT.SG   after.that   get-HAB-PST.3   suffer-INF
     'Edita, who used to lock herself in the room, would have to suffer afterwards.' (LKT)
     –future

(37) *...geriau po truputį*   *rūpin-ki-mė-s*   *t-ais,*   *kur-ie*
     better   a.little   take.care-IMP-2PL-RFL   DEM-INS.PL.M   which-NOM.PL.M
     ne-su-lauk-s   [*po*   *40 met-ų*   **atei-si-anči-o**]   *pagerėjim-o.*
     NEG-PRV-wait-FUT(3)   after   40 year-GEN.PL come-FUT-PA-GEN.SG.M   improvement-GEN.SG
     '... let's better take care of those who won't live till the improvement expected to come 40 years later.' (LKT)

---

passive voice
–present

(38) *Mėgėj-ų*   *komand-os, ne-turė-dam-os kur*   *žais-ti, noriai*   *dalyvav-o*
     amateur-GEN.PL team-NOM.PL   NEG-have-CNV-PL.F   where   play-INF   willingly   participate-PST.3
     [*mūs-ų* **rengi-a-m-uose**]   *turnyr-uose.*
     we-GEN   arrange-PRS-PP-LOC.PL.M   tournament-LOC.PL
     'Amateur teams, having no places where they could play [basketball], willingly participated in the tournaments we were organizing.' (LKT)
     –past

(39) *...*[*valdov-o*   *aistr-os*   **apakin-t-am**]   *Erod-ui*   *ne-reiki-a*
     ruler-GEN.SG   passion-GEN.SG   blind-PST.PP-DAT.SG.M   Herod-DAT.SG   NEG-need-PRS(3)
     joki-o   *Diev-o...*
     no-GEN.SG.M   god-GEN.SG
     '... Herod, blinded by the passion of power, does not need any god...' (LKT)
     –future

(40) *...kaip*   *tur-i*   *laiky-ti-s*   **svarsty-si-m-ų**   *reikal-ų*   *atžvilgi-u.*
     how   have-PRS(3) hold-INF-RFL   discuss-FUT-PP-GEN.PL issue-GEN.PL   respect-INS.SG
     '... how they have to conduct themselves with respect to the issues which will be discussed.' (LKT)

Table 5. Finiteness properties of participles as heads of subordinate clauses

criterion	complement			adverbial			attributive	finite forms
	same subject	different subject		same subject		different subject		
		speech & cognition	direct perception	"standard"	*užuot*			
C1 (tense marking)	full	full	fixed (PRS)	reduced (PRS, PST)	fixed (PST)	reduced (PRS, PST)	reduced (only synthetic)	full
C2 (subject agreement)	gender, number	–	gender, number, case	gender, number	–	gender, number	n/a	person, number
C3 (mood)	–							+
C6 (SR-marking)	+		–	+			n/a	–
C7 (NOM subject)	(+)	– (ACC)	–	(+)	(+)	– (DAT)	–	+
C8 (indep. clause)	–							+
C9 (subject licensing)	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	+
C12 (indep. temp. anchoring)	–							+
nominal paradigm	reduced	–	reduced	reduced		–	full	–

---

5. Participles in periphrastic verbal forms

⮕ Main periphrastic verbal forms in Lithuanian are formed with the auxiliary *būti* 'be' and participial forms of the lexical verb:

Table 6. Periphrastic verbal forms in Lithuanian

	form of the auxiliary	form of the participle
perfect/resultative	any	active PST
passive	any	passive PRS or PST
avertive	mainly PST	*be-* + active PRS

On the morphosyntax and semantics of these forms see Geniušienė (1976, 2006, 2016), Wiemer (2004), Spraunienė et al. (2015) on the passive, Sližienė (1969), Geniušienė & Nedjalkov (1988), Wiemer & Giger (2005: 43–47), Arkadiev & Wiemer (Ms) on the perfect/resultative and Sližienė (1961), Arkadiev (2011) on the avertive.

– The participle fully retains the argument structure of the verb and agrees with the subject in gender, number and case if the verb subcategorizes for a gendered nominative subject (41), and appears in the default form otherwise (42), (45).

– The case marking of the subject and of the participle depends on the finiteness of the auxiliary: with a finite auxiliary (including the evidential participle) nominative case is used, with non-finite auxiliaries accusative, dative, or genitive (45)–(47) are used.

perfect/resultative

(41) *Kelet-ą   kart-ų   j-is   yra   atėj-ęs   pas man-e*
several-ACC.SG time-GEN.PL 3-NOM.SG.M AUX.PRS.3 come-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M at   I-ACC
į   vienut-ę...
in   solitary.cell-ACC.SG
'Several times he has come to visit me in my solitary cell…' (LKT)

passive
– with the present participle (imperfective)

(42) *Ar j-is   iš-si-aiškin-a,   k-as   bu-s   stat-o-m-a*
Q   3-NOM.SG.M PRV-RFL-explain-PRS(3) what-NOM.SG AUX-FUT(3) build-PRS-PP-DF
j-o   teritorij-oje?
3-GEN.SG.M   territory-LOC.SG
'Does he explain what will be being built at its territory?' (LKT)

– with the past participle (perfective)

(43) *Diev-o   viet-oje   buv-o   pastaty-t-as   žmog-us...*
god-GEN.SG place-LOC.SG AUX-PST(3) put-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M man-NOM.SG
'Man was put into God's place…' (LKT)

avertive

(44) *Jau   buv-au   be-atidar-ąs   automobili-o dur-is,*
already AUX-PST.1SG CNT-open-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M car-GEN.SG   door-ACC.PL
kai   man-e pa-šauk-ė.
when   I-ACC PRV-call-PST(3)
'I was about to open the car's door when someone called me.' (LKT)

agreement with non-nominative subjects
– genitive in impersonal evidential constructions

(45) *Kulk-os   bū-t-a   išėj-us-ios   kiaurai.*
bullet-GEN.SG AUX-PST.PP-DF exit-PST.PA-GEN.SG.F through
'The bullet must have gone through.' (LKT)

– accusative in participial complements

(46) *istorini-ai   šaltini-ai   liudij-a   [pirmąkart Mozart-o   oper-ą*
historical-NOM.PL.M source-NOM.PL testify-PRS.3 first.time   Mozart-GEN.SG opera-ACC.SG
"Užburtoji fleita" Lietuv-oje   buv-us   pa-rody-t-ą   1802–1805 met-ais].
"The magic.flute"   Lithuania-LOC.SG AUX-PST.PA PRV-show-PST.PP-ACC.SG 1802–1805 year-INS.PL
'Historical sources testify that Mozart's "The magic flute" was for the first time staged in Lithuania in 1802–1805.' (LKT)

– dative in infinitival clauses

(47) *... visada   reiki-a   [∅_DAT bū-ti pasireng-us-iam   prasmeg-ti].*
always   need-PRS.3   be-INF prepare-PST.PA-DAT.SG.M fail-INF
'One always needs to be prepared to fail.' (LKT)

Table 7. Finiteness properties of participles in periphrastic constructions

criterion	perfect/resultative	passive	avertive	finite forms
C1 (tense marking)	fixed (PST)	reduced (PRS, PST)	fixed (PRS)	+
C2 (subj. agr.)	+ (gender, number, case)			+ person, number
C3 (mood)	–			+
C6 (SR-marking)	n/a			–
C7 (NOM subject)	+			+
C8 (indep. clause)	–			+
C9 (subj. licensing)	+			+
C12 (indep. tense)	–			+
nominal paradigm	reduced			–

6. Summary and conclusions

Table 8. Finiteness properties of participles across different constructions

construction		tense paradigm	subject marking	subject agreement	nominal paradigm
finite forms		full	NOM	+	–
evidential constructions	active	full	NOM	+	reduced
	impersonal passive	reduced	GEN	–	reduced
complement constructions	same-subject	full	∅	+	reduced
	different-subject speech & cognition		ACC	–	–
	different-subject direct perception	fixed (PRS)	∅	–	reduced (ACC, GEN)
adverbial constructions	same-subject	reduced	∅	+	reduced
	different-subject		DAT	–	–
	with *užuot*	fixed (PST)	∅	+	reduced (NOM)
attributive constructions		full (synthetic only)	∅	n/a	full
periphrastic constructions	perfect/resultative	fixed (PST)	NOM	+	reduced
	passive	reduced (PRS, PST)			
	avertive	fixed (PRS)			

NB In all their various uses Lithuanian participles can combine with negation (cf. Nicole Nau's material on Latvian, which is different), notably including the lexical participle in periphrastic constructions (Arkadiev to appear), hence the position of negation is not a particularly revealing finiteness criterion for Lithuanian:

(48)   O   *armij-oje*   **es-u**   <u>**ne-miegoj-ęs**</u>   *tr-is*   *par-as*.
      and   army-LOC.SG   AUX.PRS-1SG   NEG-sleep-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   three-ACC.PL   day-ACC.PL
      'When I was in the army I once did not sleep for three days.' (Google)

➲ Lithuanian participles defined as a morphological class (cf. the notion of **morphome**, Aronoff 1994, Round 2011) cannot be treated as unequivocally non-finite: in their different uses, they show considerably varying "balance" of verbal vs. nominal features, ranging from virtually fully "finite" behaviour in evidential constructions to fairly high degree of "non-finiteness" in attributive constructions (let alone numerous cases of lexicalization when participles turn into adjectives and nouns concomitantly losing all verbal properties).

Therefore, as argued in typological literature, finiteness is not a binary but a scalar parameter comprising many different features, and this scalarity of (non-)finiteness is manifested not only in cross-linguistic comparison, but also in the behaviour of a single formal class in a particular language.

➲ Moreover, in Lithuanian the degree of reduction of verbal features does not correlate with the degree of elaboration of nominal or adjectival features, and vice versa, e.g. attributive participles distinguish the full arrays of both synthetic tenses and adjectival agreement, while participles in periphrastic constructions are restricted with respect to both of the above.

Rather, morphosyntactic features of participles (or infinitives, verbal nouns etc.) are determined by **constructions** in which they occur, and it is these constructions, rather than verbal forms themselves, which should be regarded as (non-)finite (cf. Creissels 2009), and the very notion of (non-)finiteness is probably to be regarded as epiphenomenal.

Abbreviations

ACC — accusative; AUX — auxiliary verb; CNT — continuative; CNV — converb; DAT — dative; DEM — demonstrative; DF — default form; F — feminine; FUT — future; GEN — genitive; HAB — habitual; IMP — imperative; INF — infinitive; INS — instrumental; INTF — intensifier; IRR — irrealis; LOC — locative; M — masculine; NEG — negation; NOM — nominative; PA — active participle; PL — plural; PP — passive participle; PRS — present; PRV — preverb; PST — past; Q — question particle; RFL — reflexive; SG — singular.

References

Adger D. 2007. Three domains of finiteness: a Minimalist perspective. In: Nikolaeva (ed.) 2007: 23–58.

Aikhenvald A.Yu. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ambrazas V. 1990. *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov*. [Comparative syntax of participles in Baltic Languages]. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Ambrazas V. (ed.) 2006. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.

Arkadiev P. 2011. On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2, 37–78.

Arkadiev P. 2012. Participial complementation in Lithuanian. In: V. Gast & H. Diessel (eds.), *Clause Linkage in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Data-Driven Approaches to Cross-Clausal Syntax*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 285–334.

Arkadiev P. 2013. Marking of subjects and objects in Lithuanian non-finite clauses: A typological and diachronic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 17:3, 397–437.

Arkad'ev [Arkadiev] P.M. 2014. Kriterii finitnosti i morfosintaksis litovskix pričastij [Criteria of finiteness and the morphosyntax of participles in Lithuanian]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5, 68–96.

Arkadiev P. To appear. Perfect and negation: Evidence from Lithuanian and sundry languages. To appear in a volume on the perfect ed. by K. M. Eide & M. Fryd. https://www.academia.edu/30833280

Arkadiev P. Ms-a. (Non)finiteness, constructions, and participles in Lithuanian. Submitted. https://www.academia.edu/24106603

Akadiev P. Ms-b. Predicative participle (non)agreement in Lithuanian: Implications for the theories of agreement and case. Ms., https://www.academia.edu/35980613

Arkadiev P. & B. Wiemer. Ms. Perfects in Baltic and Slavic. To appear in R. Crellin & Th. Jügel (eds.), *Perfects in Indo-European languages*.

Aronoff M. 1994. *Morphology by Itself. Stems and Inflectional Classes*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.

Bisang W. 2001. Finite vs. non-finite languages. In: M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, W. Raible (eds.), *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*, Vol. 2. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1400–1413.

Bisang W. 2007. Categories that make finiteness: discreetness from a functional perspective and some of its repercussions. In: Nikolaeva (ed.) 2007: 115–137.

Brown D., M. Chumakina & G.G. Corbett (eds.) 2006. *Canonical Morphology and Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brugmann K. 1892. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen. II. Bd. Wortbildungslehre (Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre). 2 Hälfte*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

Corbett G.G. 2005. The canonical approach to typology. In: Z. Frajzyngier, A. Hodges, D.S. Rood (eds.), *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 25–49.

Creissels D. 2009. Participles and finiteness: the case of Akhvakh. *Linguistic Discovery* 7:1, 106–130.

Cristofaro S. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cristofaro S. 2007. Deconstructing categories: Finiteness in a functional-typological perspective. In: Nikolaeva (ed.) 2007: 91–114.

Darden B. J. 1992/2015. On the syntax of Lithuanian participles. In: B. J. Darden. *Studies in Phonological Theory and Historical Linguistics*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 263–286. (Orig. publication: H. I. Aronson (ed.), *Non-Slavic languages of the USSR: Linguistic studies*. Chicago: CLS, 1992, 71–98.)

Dik S. & K. Hengeveld. 1991. The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of perception-verb complements. *Linguistics* 29, 231–259.

Eide K. M. (ed.). 2016. *Finiteness Matters. On Finiteness-Related Phenomena in Natural Languages*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Enghels R. 2009. The syntactic position of the perceived participant as indicator of the internal structure of the Spanish and French infinitival complement. *Linguistics* 47/3, 759–791.

Geniušienė E. 1976. Das Passiv des Litauischen und seine Verwendung. In R. Růžička & R. Lötzsch (Hrsg.), *Satzstruktur und Genus Verbi*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 139–152.

Geniušienė E. 2006. Passives in Lithuanian (in comparison with Russian). In: W. Abraham & L. Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and Typology. Form and Function*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29–61.

Geniušienė E. 2014. Konverby v litovskom jazyke [Converbs in Lithuanian]. In: Sergej Dmitrenko & Natalia Zaika (eds.), *Studia typologica octogenario Victori Khrakovskii Samuelis filio dedicata (Acta Linguistica Petropolitana X/3)*. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, 156–179.

Geniušienė E. 2016. *Passive Constructions in Lithuanian. Selected Works by Emma Geniušienė*. Ed. by A. Kibort & N. Maskaliūnienė, transl. by A. Ratkus. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Geniušienė E. & Nedjalkov V.P. 1988. Resultative, passive, and perfect in Lithuanian. In: V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 369–386.

Givón T. 2001. *Syntax. An Introduction*. Vol. 2. Rev. ed. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Greenberg G. & J.E. Lavine. 2006. New syntax in Russian and Lithuanian: The case of the adverbial participle. In: R. Rothstein, E. Scatton & Ch. Townsend (eds.), *Studies in Slavic Linguistics and Folklore*. Bloomington (IN): Slavica, 143–170.

Gronemeyer C. 1997. Evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Lund University Dept. of Linguistics Working Papers* 46, 93–112.

Gronemeyer C. & A. Usonienė. 2001. Complementation in Lithuanian. In: C. Gronemeyer. *Laying the Boundaries of Syntax: Studies in the Interfaces between Syntax, Semantics and Lexicon*. Lund University, 105–135.

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

Holvoet A. (2007). *Mood and Modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Kalinina E.Ju. 1998. Razgraničenie finitnyx i nefinitnyx form glagola v tipologičeskom aspekte [The distinction between finite vs. non-finite verbal forms in a typological perspective]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4, 82–110.

Kalinina E.Ju. & N.R. Sumbatova. 2007. Clause structure and verbal forms in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. In: Nikolaeva (ed.) 2007: 183–249.

Kehayov P. 2008. *An Areal-Typological Perspective to Evidentiality: The Cases of the Balkan and Baltic Linguistic Areas*. (Dissertationes Linguisticae Universitatis Tartuensis 10.) Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Klimas A. 1987. The Lithuanian participles: Their system and functions. *Lituanus* 33, 38–73.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm M. 1999. Finiteness. In: K. Brown, J. Miller (eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 146–149.

Kučinskaitė A. & K. Morkūnas. 1964. Retos lietuvių kalbos tariamosios nuosakos formos [Rare forms of subjunctive mood in Lithuanian]. In: *Mokslų akademijos darbai* 1(16). 313–318.

Landau I. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:4, 811–877.

Lavine J.E. 1999. Subject properties and ergativity in North Russian and Lithuanian. In: K. Dziwirek et al. (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 7*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 307–328.

Lavine J.E. 2006. Is there a passive evidential strategy in Lithuanian? In: *Papers from the 42nd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 41–55.

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

Lehmann Chr. 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: J. Haiman & S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 181–226.

Litvinow V.P. 1989. Der modus relativus baltischer Sprachen aus typologischer Sicht. *Baltistica* 35:2, 146–154.

LKT – Corpus of Modern Lithuanian, http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/

Malchukov A. 2004. *Nominalization/Verbalization: Constraining a Typology of Transcategorial Operations*. München: LINCOM Europa.

Meier-Brügger M. 2003. *Indo-European Linguistics*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Nedjalkov V.P. 1995. Some typological parameters of converbs. In: M. Haspelmath & E. König (eds.), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 97–136.

Nikolaeva I. 2007. Introduction. In: Nikolaeva (ed.) 2007: 1–19.

Nikolaeva I. (ed.) (2007). *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikolaeva I. 2013 Unpacking finiteness. In: Brown et al. (eds.) 2013: 99–122.

Pakerys J. 2017. On the development of past habitual from iterative in Lithuanian. *Baltistica* 52:2, 295–323.

Round E.R. 2011. Morphomes as a level of representation capture unity of exponence across the inflection-derivation divide. *Linguistica* 51, 217–230.

Sakurai E. 2008. Combination of past participles functioning as adverbials with main verbs in Lithuanian: Aspect and transitivity. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 59, 81–108.

Sližienė N. 1961. Apie sudurtines pradėtines veiksmažodžių formas. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 4, 67–72.

Sližienė N. 1969. Sudurtinių atliktinių veiksmažodžio laikų reikšmės ir vartojimas. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 11, 17–40.

Spraunienė B., A. Razanovaitė & E. Jasonytė. 2015. Solving the puzzle of the Lithuanian passive. In: A. Holvoet & N. Nau (eds.), *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 323–365.

Timberlake A. 1982. The impersonal passive in Lithuanian. *Proceedings of the 8th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 508–524.

Usonienė A. & J. Šinkūnienė. 2017. Potential vs use: Revisiting an evidential participial construction in Lithuanian. In: M. Arrese, J. Isabel, G. Haßler & M. Carretero (eds.). *Evidentiality Revisited. Cognitive Grammar, Functional and Discourse-pragmatic Perspectives*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 171–192.

Wälchli B. 2000. Infinite predication as a marker of evidentiality and modality in the languages of the Baltic region. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 53, 186–210.

Wiemer B. 1998. Pragmatical inferences at the threshold to grammaticalization. The case of Lithuanian predicative participles and their functions. *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 229–243.

Wiemer B. 2001. Partizipien zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik: Ein Überblick zu aspektuellen, diathesebezogenen und diskursrelevanten Eigenschaften im modernen Litauischen. In: B. Wälchli & F. Zúñiga (Hrsg.), *Sprachbeschreibung und Typologie*. Bern: Universität Bern, 65–81.

Wiemer B. 2006a. Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (A typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41:1, 33–49.

Wiemer B. 2006b. Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian. In: W. Abraham & L. Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and Typology. Form and Function*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 274–309.

Wurmbrand S. 2001. *Infinitives. Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.