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1. On (non-)finiteness

In 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 interpretation, independent of case and number 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, Ms-b, Geniušienė 2014 for a discussion of their syntactic properties).

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.

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, Ambrasas ed. 2006: 326–372).


Table 1. The paradigm of participles in Lithuanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>geris ‘drink’</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ agreeing</td>
<td>- agreeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>geris (m), gerisai (f)</td>
<td>geris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>gėrės (m), gėirus (f)</td>
<td>gėrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual Past</td>
<td>gerdavęs (m), gerdavusi (f)</td>
<td>gerdavus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>geriašis (m), geriašant (f)</td>
<td>geriašant</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.

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
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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).

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

   '(They say) he lives / lived / will live / used to live in the town.'

(2) a. Sveči-as yra kil-ės iš kaimiečių.
   guest-NOM.SG AUX-PRES.3 rise-PST.PP PA.NOM.SG.M from peasant-GEN.PL
   'The guest is descended from peasants.'

b. Sveči-as es-qs kil-ės iš kaimiečių.
   guest-NOM.SG AUX-PRS.PP PA.NOM.SG.M rise-PST.PP 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-PRES.3 stretch-PP-PRF PA.NOM.SG.M road-NOM.SG
   'A road will be built through our yard.'

b. Per mūsų sod-ą bu-si-qs tiesi-a-m-as keli-as.
   through our yard-ACC.SG AUX-PRES.PP PA.NOM.SG.M stretch-PP-PRF PA.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.PP PRF-PP-PRF
   'He needed to unburden his heart.'

   feel-PST.PP PA.NOM.SG.M guilt-ACC.SG and 3-DAT.SG.M need-PST.PP PA.DF PRF-PP-PRF
   '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 (Kūčinskaitė & Morkūnas 1964 quoted after Holvoet 2007: 88):

(5) 1 Jeigu bū-či-ąs žinoj-ęs, kad niek-o ne-gau-s, if AUX-PRES.PP PA.NOM.SG.M know-PST.PP PA.NOM.SG.M that nothing-GEN.SG NEG-get-FUT(3)
    tai ne-bū-či-ąs nė iš viet-o-s judin-ę-s-is.
    then NEG-AUX-PRES.PP PA.NOM.SG.M even from place-GEN.SG move-PST.PP 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.


(6) a. J-is miest-e stat-o nam-q.
   3-NOM.SG.M town-LOC.SG build-PST.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-LOC.SG move-PST.PP-DF
   'I hear, he is building a house in the town.' (Ambrazas ed. 2006: 281)

(7) a. Vag-is nu.sí.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-is nu.sí.kirs-t-a vis-i kopūst-ai.
   thief-NOM.SG cut.down-PST.PP-DF all-LOC.PL.M cabbage-LOC.PL
   'Evidently, a thief [had] cut down all the cabbages.' (Ibid.)

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

b. ...pasirū-pod-o kuodeli-o užbur-t-o bū-t-a.
   turn-out-PST(3) tow-LOC.SG enchant-PST.PP-PP-DF PA.NOM.SG.M
   'The tow turned out to have been enchanted.'

impersonal passive

(9) a. J-o buv-o išei-t-a.
   3-GEN.SG.M AUX-PRES.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-PRES.PP-DF go.away-PST.PP-DF
   'He said he was gone out.' (Ambrazas ed. 2006: 284)

1 http://www.pasakos.lt/sakmes-padavimai/egle-zalciu-karaliene-2/
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>same-subject</th>
<th>complement</th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>expression of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>DAT</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 (14), (21), perfect (15), (22) and avertive (16).

4.2. Participles as heads of independent clauses

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).

Table 3. Finiteness properties of Lithuanian participles in evidential constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criterion</th>
<th>“active”</th>
<th>“impersonal passive”</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>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 (mood marking)</td>
<td>–</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>

- simple past
- habitual past
- future
- perfect/resultative
- avertive
- present
- simple past
- perfect
- past
- simple past
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– habitual past

(19) ... skat-in many-ti [j-q dažnai bū-tav-us susižiūr-si-q ...]
induce-PST(3) think- INF 3-ACC.SGL.F often be-HAB-PST.PA irritated-ACC.SGL.F

'[this] induces one to believe her to have often been irritated...' (Arkadiev 2012: 296)
– future

(20) Vis-i j-ie žadė-j-o [netrukus atei-si-ant pasaul-o pabaiq-q]
all-NOM.PL.SG 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-i buv-us perraš-o-m-q].
and DATE-NOM.SG show-PRES 3-ACC.SGL.M AUX-PST.PA rewrite-PPT-PP-ACC.SG

'... and the date shows that it was being rewritten.' (LKT)
– perfect

(22) ... š-is mieg-as liudij-a [j-q es-o-nt mir-us-iq].
DEM-NOM.SG.M dream-NOM.SG testify-PRES(3) 3-ACC.SGL.M AUX-PST.PA die-PST.PP-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. Engels 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-a-nt].
say-PST.1SG tomorrow Jurgis-NOM.SG arrive-PRS.PA

‘I said that Jurgis would arrive tomorrow.’ (Arkadiev 2012: 321)

b. *Mat-au [lėtai Jurg-į vaikščioj-o-n-t park-e].
see-PRES.SGL slowly Jurgis-NOM.SG walk-PST-PA park-LOC.SG

‘I see Jurgis slowly walking in the park.’ (Arkadiev 2012: 316)

c. Mat-au Jurg-į [lėtai vaikščioj-o-n-t park-e].
see-PRES.SGL slowly Jurgis-NOM.SG walk-PST-PA park-LOC.SG

‘I see Jurgis slowly walking in the park.’ (Arkadiev 2012: 316)


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) ... in mat-ai Žmog-q [pasilenki-a-n-t prie font-an-o].
you-GEN.SG see-PRES.SGL man-ACC.SGL bend-PST.PA at fountain-GEN.SG

‘... you see a man bending near the fountain.’ (LKT)

(25) a. An-q nakt-i motin-o mač-i [sėd-i-nč-i virtu-v-įj].
DEM-ACC.SGL night-ACC.SGL mother-ACC.SGL sit-PST.1SG sit-PST.PA-ACC.SGL.F kitchen-LOC.SG

b. ... niekada ne-mač-iau j-o [be.sį juok-a-nč-o ar link-ns-o].
never NEG-see-PST.1SG 3-GEN.SGL.M laugh-PST.PA-GEN.SGL.M or cheerful-GEN.SGL.M

‘I have never seen him laughing or cheerful.’ (LKT)

c. ... netrukus pasaul-o pabaig-o [3-NOM.PL.M prėmįs-NOM.SG prėm-įs-NOM.SG prieš].
all-NOM.PL.M 3-NOM.SG.M promise-PST(3) soon come-FUT.PA world-LOC.SG before-LOC.SG

‘They all promised that the end of the world would come soon.’ (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).

– present: -dam-converb

(26) Persireng-dam-a j-i pa-si-šlūr-i į veidrod-i.
change.clothes-CNVS.GF 3-NOM.SGL.F PRV-RFL-look-PRES(3) in mirror-ACC.SG

‘While changing clothes she looks at herself in the mirror.’ (LKT)

– simple past

(27) Ein-u gal į priemįs-NOM.SGL per met-us, go-PST.1SG maybe in one-ACC.SGL theatre.opening-ACC.SG through.year-ACC.PL

– different-subject

(28) [Man su Povil-u lank-o-n-t Baltarussia-įs lieuvi-us], ne kart-q.
with Paul-NOM.SGL go-PST.PA-LOC.PL Belorussia-GEN.SGL Lithuanian-ACC.PL not time-ACC.PL

‘When together with Paul I was visiting Belorussian Lithuanians, they many times offered us to drink spirits.’ (LKT)

– simple past

(29) [Vyr-u parej-ų], iren-a sedėj-o virtu-ėj-e... husband-DAT.SGL come-home-PST.PA Irena-NOM.SGL 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-ų], berniuk-ai... [j-ai kažkur išei-dav-ų], berniuk-ai...
main.PRES.SGL somewhere go.out- HAB-PA boy-NOM.PL

‘After she would go out somewhere, the boys would imitate the sound of running gas.’ (Pakerys 2017: 297)
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– future
– present

(31) a. *[Saul-ei nusileisi-ant], atsigul-ė-me.

sub-DAT.SG descend + FUT-PA lie.down-PST-1PL

'Ve went to bed before the sun set.'

b. [Prieš pat uždang-ai nusileisi-ant], su-jund-a grab-as.

before INF curtain-DAT.SG descend + FUT-PA PRV-move-PRS(3) coffin-NOM.SG

'Before the curtain falls, the coffin moves.'

A special type of participial constructions with the complementizer *už* 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 ..?

0 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 ém-us nekęs-ti], man j-os pagail-o.*

instead take-PST.PA hate-INF 1DAT 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


turn.back-PST.PA,NOM.SG,M see-PRR.1SG quickly approach-PRS.PA-ACC.SG.M stallion-ACC.SG

'Turning back, I see a quickly approaching stallion.' (LKT)

– simple past

(35) [Už mokykl-os parej-us io] vaik-o skub-a-me

from school-GEN.SG come.home-PST.PA,NOM.SG,M child-GEN.SG hurry-PRS-1PL

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

– past habitual

(36) Už-si-rakin-dav-us-iai kambary 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-INF-2PL.RFL DEM-INS.PL.M which-NOM.PL.M

ne-su-laik-s [po 40 met-ų ateis-si-anči-o] pagerejim-o.

NEG-PRR-wait-FUT(3) after 40 year-GEN.PL come-PST.PA,NOM.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-NOM.PL team-NOM.PL NEG-have-CNV-PL.F where-play-INF willingly participate-PST.3

[mūs-ų rengi-a-m-uose] turnyr-ufe

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

ruler-GEN.SG passion-GEN.SG bling-PST.PP-DAT.SG.M Herod-DAT.SG NEG-need-PRS(3)

Erod-ui ne-reiki-a

HEROD-DAT.SG NEG-need-PRS(3)

'... Herod, blinded by the passion of power, does not need any god...' (LKT)

Q i n s t e a d  g e t -PST.PA-NOM.SG.F s o  m u c h  NEG-get-FUT-1SG n o t h i n g -GEN

– future

(40) ...kaip tur-i laiky-ti-s svarsty-si-m-ų at žv i l g i -u

how have-PRS(3) hold-INF-RFL discuss-PST.PA-GEN.PL issue-GEN.PL respect-INS.SG

reikal-ų at ž v i l g i -u

issue-GEN.PL respect-INS.SG

instead take-PRS(3) hate-INF I : DAT 3.SG.F pity-PST(3)

'...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>Adverbial</th>
<th>Attributeal</th>
<th>Finite forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same subject</td>
<td>different subject</td>
<td>same subject</td>
<td>different subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech &amp; cognition</td>
<td>direct perception</td>
<td>'standard'</td>
<td><em>už</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 (tense marking)</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>fixed (PRS)</td>
<td>reduced (PRS, PST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 (subject agreement)</td>
<td>gender, number</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>gender, number</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 (mood)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 (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>(+)</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 (in-dep. temp. anchoring)</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 http://www.antologija.lt/texts/38/tekstas/10.html
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>perfect/resultative</th>
<th>passive</th>
<th>avertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>form of the auxiliary</td>
<td>active PST</td>
<td>any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form of the participle</td>
<td>passive PRS or PST</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 (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 nominative) nominative case is used, with non-finite auxiliaries accusative, dative, or genitive (45)–(47) are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>perfect/resultative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(41) Kelet-q kart-q j-ias yra atėj-ės pas man-e several-ACC.PL time-GEN.PL 3-NOM.SG.M AUX-PRS.3 come-PST.PP-PA.NOM.SG.M at I-ACC į vienut-ė... in solitary.cell-ACC.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42) Ar j-ias iš-si-aikš-in-a, k-as bu-s stat-o-m-a 3-NOM.SG.M PRIV-PFL-explain-PRS(3) what-NOM.SG AUX-FUT(3) build-PSS-PP-DF j-o 3-NOM.SG.M territory-LOC.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43) Diev-o viet-oje buv-o pastaty-t-as žmog-us... god-GEN.SG place-LOC.SG AUX-PST(3) put-PSTR.PP-PST.PP.NOM.SG.M man-NOM.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44) Jau buv-au be-atidars-qs 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-sauk-ė. when I-ACC PRIV-call-PST(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45) Kulk-os bū-t-a šieš-us-ios kiaurai. bullet-GEN.SG AUX-PST.PP-DF exit-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:
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 scalability of (non-)finiteness is manifested not only in cross-linguistic comparison, but also in the behaviour of a single 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, morphosyntactical 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; CVN — converb; DAT — dative; DEM — demonstrative; DF — default form; F — feminine; FUT — future; GEN — genitive; HAB — habitual; IMP — imperative; INFIN — infinitive; INT — intensifier; IOB — intransitive; IRR — irreparandum; LOC — locative; MAS — masculine; NEG — negation; NOM — nominative; PA — active participle; PL — plural; PRV — preverb; PST — past; Q — question particle; RFL — reflexive; SG — singular.
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