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:

> “[… ] zwischen verbum finitum und verbum infinitum insofern keine scharfe Grenze zu ziehen ist, als Formen des letzteren dieselbe Funktion 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).

- 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

---
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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 Greenberg & Lavine 2006, Arkadiev 2012, 2013 for a recent discussion of their syntactic properties).

Table 1. The paradigm of participles in Lithuanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gerti ‘drink’</th>
<th>Active + agreeing</th>
<th>Passive – agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>geria (m), gerianti (f)</td>
<td>geriant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>gere (m), geres (f)</td>
<td>geres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Past</td>
<td>gerdavę (m), gerdavus (f)</td>
<td>gerdavus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>gersi (m), gersianti (f)</td>
<td>gersiant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Declension of active participles vis-à-vis adjectives in Lithuanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>present active participle ‘drinking’</th>
<th>adjective ‘good’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>geria</td>
<td>gerianti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>geriančio</td>
<td>geriančios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>geriančiam</td>
<td>geriančiai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>gerianti</td>
<td>geriančią</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins</td>
<td>geriančiu</td>
<td>geriančia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc</td>
<td>geriančiame</td>
<td>geriančioje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>geria</td>
<td>geriančios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>geriančią</td>
<td>geriančį</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat</td>
<td>geriantiems</td>
<td>geriančioms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>geriančius</td>
<td>geriančias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins</td>
<td>geriančiais</td>
<td>geriančiomis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc</td>
<td>geriančiuose</td>
<td>geriančiose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 types of evidential participial constructions have to be distinguished: “neutral” and “passive impersonal”.

3.1. Neutral evidential constructions
– 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).

(1) a. J-is gyven-a / gyven-o / gyven-s / gyven-dav-o miest-e.  
‘He lives / lived / will live / used to live in the town.’

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

(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.’

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)

(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-qz tiesi-a-m-as keli-as.  
through our yard-ACC.SG AUX-PRV.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.’
   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 (Holvoet 2007: 88):

(5) *Jeigu bū-či-ąs žinoj-ęs, kad niek-o ne-gau-s,*
   if AUX-IRR-P A.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-P A.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.

simple tenses

(6) a. *J-is miest-e stat-o nam-q.*
   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 viš-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.)

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.’
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criterion</th>
<th>“neutral” constructions</th>
<th>“impersonal passive” constructions</th>
<th>finite forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 (tense marking)</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 (subject agreement)</td>
<td>+ (gender, number)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+ (person, number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 (mood marking)</td>
<td>– (+ in dialects)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 (switch-reference marking)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 (nominative subject)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8 (independent clause)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9 (subject licensing)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 (independent temporal anchoring)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal paradigm</td>
<td>reduced (NOM, DF)</td>
<td>fixed (DF)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


Table 4. Features of adverbial and complement participial constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>expression of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same-subject</td>
<td>complement</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different-subject</td>
<td>complement</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (13), (20), perfect (14), (21) and avertive (15).

same-subject
– present

(9) **Kaškur-įs skund-ė-si [gyven-qš praeit-imi**

somebody-NOM.SG.M complain-PST(3)-RFL live-PRES.PA.NOM.SG.M PAST-INS.SG

**ir ne-gal-įs j-os atsikratty-ti].**

and NEG-can-PRES.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)
Janina Šimonienė says that she has made several errors which she cannot forgive herself. (LKT)

‘Janina Šimonienė says that she has made several errors which she cannot forgive herself.’ (LKT)

The lad told that he used to go cap in hand and beg money.’ (LKT)

‘The lad told that he used to go cap in hand and beg money.’ (LKT)

‘I used to believe people when they promised to do this and that.’ (LKT)

‘Vaištaras boasted to his neighbours that he had been taken to Moscow.’ (LKT)

‘Vaištaras boasted to his neighbours that he had been taken to Moscow.’ (LKT)

‘I am calling her, but she keeps telling me that she is occupied.’ (LKT)

‘The dean said that ... he almost ran to stop such a singer’s mouth...’ (LKT)

‘In old times Samogitians believed that deities lived in the corners of houses.’ (LKT)

‘Tibetans ... recall that similar event occurred some five years ago.’ (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 (22).

(22) 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)
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)

In constructions like (22c) 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 percep-
tion (and only there) the participle can appear not only in the “bare” form (23), but also
show full agreement with the direct object in gender, number and case, accusative (24a)
or genitive when the matrix verb is negated (24b).

(23) ...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)

(24) a. An-ą nakt-į motin-ą mač-iau [sėd-i-nėti-q virtuv-ėj]
DEM-ACC.SG night-ACC.SG mother-ACC.SG see-PST.1SG sit-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.F kitchen-LOC.SG
and pjaust-a-nči-ą raudon-us mės-os gabal-us.
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)
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 (antiquity) participles are found, though future participles are allowed in clauses introduced by the preposition/complementizer prieš ‘before’ (29). 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 (25).

same-subject
– present: -dam-converb

change.clothes-CNNGS.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

(26) Ein-u gal į vien-q premjer-q 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-u-ų].
change.clothes-PST.PL-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

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

– simple past

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

– future

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

b. [Prieš pat uždang-a nusileisi-ant], su-jund-a grab-as.
before INTF curtain-DAT.SG descend + FUT.PAR PRV-move-PRS(3) coffin-ACC.SG
‘Before the curtain falls, the coffin moves.’

A special type of participial constructions with the complementizer užuot ‘instead of’:
– contains only past active participles;
– always null subject controlled from the matrix;
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agreeing participles if the matrix subject in the nominative (30), non-agreeing participles otherwise (31).

(30) *Ar, [uzuo tum-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)

(31) *…[uzuo tum-em-us nekes-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
– distinguish synthetic tenses and voice;
– fully agree with their nominal heads in gender, number and case;
– no overt subject; with passive participles, the original agent in the genitive.

active voice
– present


turn.back-PST.PT.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

(33) *Iš mokykl-os parėj-us-io vaik-o sku-b-a-me pa-klaus-ti apie pažymi-us...*  

from school-GEN.SG come.PST.PA-GEN.SG.M child-GEN.SG hurry-PST.1PL ask-INF about mark-ACC.PL

‘We hurry to ask the child who has come back from school about marks...’ (LKT)

– past habitual

(34) *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

(35) *...geriau po truputį rūpin-ki-mé-s t-ais, kur-ie ne-su-lauk-s [po 40 met-ų atei-si-anči-o pagerėjim-o].*

better a.little take.care-IMP-2PL-RFL DEM-INS.PL.M which-NOM.PL.M 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

(36) *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*


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

(37) *...[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)
‘... Herod, blinded by the passion of power, does not need any god...’ (LKT)

(38) ...kaip tur-i laiky-ti-s svarsty-si-ų reikal-ų atžvilgi-u.
‘... 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criterion</th>
<th>complement</th>
<th>adverbal</th>
<th>attributive</th>
<th>finite forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 (tense marking)</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>fixed (PRS)</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 (subject agreement)</td>
<td>gender, number</td>
<td>gender, number, case</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>person, number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 (mood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 (SR-marking)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 (NOM subject)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>– (ACC)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>– (DAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8 (indep. clause)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9 (subject licensing)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 (indep. temp. anchoring)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal paradigm</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>form of the auxiliary</th>
<th>form of the participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perfect/resultative</td>
<td>any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avertive</td>
<td>mainly PST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


– 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 (39), and appears in the default form otherwise (40), (43).
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 (43)–(45) are used.

perfect/resultative

(39) *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

ǐ 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)

(40) *Ar j-is iš-si-aškin-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)

(41) *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

(42) *Jau buv-au be-atidar-ąs automobili-o dur-is, kai man-e pa-šauk-ė.*
already AUX-PST.1SG CNT-open-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M car-GEN.SG door-ACC.PL

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

(43) *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

(44) *istorini-ai šaltini-ai liudij-a [pirmąkart Mozart-o oper-q "Užburtoji fleita" Lietuv-oje buv-us pa-rody-t-tą 1802–1805 met-ais].*

‘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

(45) *... 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criterion</th>
<th>perfect/resultative</th>
<th>passive</th>
<th>avertive</th>
<th>finite forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 (tense marking)</td>
<td>fixed (PST)</td>
<td>reduced (PRS, PST)</td>
<td>fixed (PRS)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 (subject agreement)</td>
<td>+ (gender, number, case)</td>
<td>+ person, number</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 (mood)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 (SR-marking)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 (NOM subject)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8 (indep. clause)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9 (subj. licensing)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 (indep. temporal anchoring)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal paradigm</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Summary and conclusions

Table 8. Finiteness properties of participles across different constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>construction</th>
<th>tense paradigm</th>
<th>subject marking</th>
<th>subject agreement</th>
<th>nominal paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>finite forms</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impersonal passive</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement</td>
<td>same-subject</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructions</td>
<td>different-subject</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>speech &amp; cognition</td>
<td>fixed (PRS)</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>reduced (ACC, GEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructions</td>
<td>direct perception</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>reduced (ACC, GEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributive</td>
<td>same-subject</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructions</td>
<td>different-subject</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with <em>užuo</em></td>
<td>fixed (PST)</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reduced (NOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periphrastic</td>
<td>perfect/resultative</td>
<td>fixed (PST)</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructions</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>reduced (PRS, PST)</td>
<td></td>
<td>reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>avertive</td>
<td>fixed (PRS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lithuanian participles defined as a morphological class (cf. the notion of morpheme, 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 — convert; 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.
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