Peter M. Arkadiev*

(Non)finiteness, constructions and participles in Lithuanian

Abstract: This article offers an analysis of the morphosyntactic properties of Lithuanian participles in terms of the criteria of "canonical" finiteness proposed by (Nikolaeva, Irina. 2013. Unpacking finiteness. In Dunstan Brown, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Canonical morphology and syntax*, 99–122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.). It is shown that in their different uses, i. e., as heads of two types of evidential clauses, as predicates in complement, adverbial and attributive clauses and as lexical verbs in periphrastic constructions, Lithuanian participles show considerably different combinations of finite and nonfinite characteristics and hence cannot be unequivocally treated as nonfinite. It is argued that it is the individual constructions where the participles occur that determine their morphosyntactic features and that the very notion of (non)finiteness is composite and largely derivative.

Keywords: Lithuanian, participles, finiteness, canonical typology, morphology, syntax, verbal categories

1 Introduction

This article deals with the morphosyntactic behavior of participles in Lithuanian, a Baltic language, and aims to show that in their various uses Lithuanian participles display very different degrees of "(non)finiteness", to the extent that the very notion of "(non)finiteness" does not seem to be adequately applicable to these forms and the constructions in which they appear. By applying the multi-factorial approach to finiteness proposed in such classic works as Givón (1980) and Lehmann (1988) and recently elaborated by Cristofaro (2003) and Nikolaeva (2013), to different constructions with participles in Lithuanian, I show that the morphological and syntactic properties of participles, such as inflection for tense and agreement, projection and case marking of the subject etc., as well as particular combinations of these properties, are determined by the constructions

*Corresponding author: Peter M. Arkadiev,** Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences and Russian State University for the Humanities, Leninskiy prospekt 32A, Moscow 119334, Russia, E-mail: alpgurev@gmail.com

DE GRUYTER MOUTON

themselves and, moreover, do not seem to form a clear cline of "nominalization" or "deverbalization" (cf. Malchukov 2004). The evidence from Lithuanian, which only rarely appears in theoretical or typological studies (cf. Arkadiev et al. 2015: 62–69), amply reveals that if the notion of "(non)finiteness" is to have any meaning at all, it should be applied to whole constructions rather than to concrete verbal forms (cf. Creissels 2009). Lithuanian has been chosen as the object language not only because the analysis of its verbal forms in such terms has never been carried out before,[1] but primarily since its rich and coherent system of participles able to occur in a wide variety of contexts with different syntactic features has proved to be an excellent testing ground for multifactorial approaches to finiteness.

The article is structured as follows. In Section 2 I briefly outline the current state of the study of (non)finiteness and in particular the approach of Nikolaeva (2013). In Section 3 I give a general overview of the Lithuanian verbal system with a focus on participles. In Sections 4 to 6 I analyze various constructions featuring participles in Lithuanian, and in Section 7 I summarize the results of the investigation and discuss its theoretical implications.

2 Approaches to (non)finiteness

The notion of finiteness stems from classic grammar, which drew the morphological distinction between verbal forms with personal endings (*verbum finitum*) and forms without such endings (*verbum infinitum*), cf. in the Indo-Europeanist tradition Brugmann (1892: 836–837), Meier-Brügger (2003: 184); see also Koptjevskaja-Tamm (1999: 146). However, even the Neogrammarians were already aware of the fact that the morphological dichotomy does not exactly align with syntactic positions in which morphologically finite and nonfinite verbal forms occur, cf. the following quotation from Brugmann (1892):

> [...] 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)

---

1 It is worth mentioning here that in a discussion of nonfinite forms on "the basis of data from Uralic and Indo-European languages of Europe" Ylikoski (2003) does not mention Baltic languages at all – a major shortcoming given not only the richly developed systems of polyfunctional nonfinite forms in these languages, but their prolonged contact with Uralic languages as well. On Baltic-Finnic participial constructions in their areal context see Kehayov et al. (n.d.).

In contemporary theoretical and typological studies it has become clear that in order for the notions "finite" and "nonfinite" to be crosslinguistically applicable they should not refer to such non-universal formal features as presence or absence of markers for person, tense etc. (cf., however, Ylikoski 2003). Thus, in recent typological work (Kalinina 1998; Givón 2001: Ch. 18; Cristofaro 2003, Cristofaro 2007; Nikolaeva 2007a, Nikolaeva 2013; Creissels 2009), the notion of finiteness is usually treated as gradual and multifactorial, rather than binary. Finiteness and nonfiniteness have 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; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993: 254–257; Malchukov 2004). On the other hand, those typologists who, like Bisang (2001, 2007), maintain a binary conception of finiteness as reflecting the grammaticalization of the independent status of predication explicitly state that the notion is not universal, cf. the following quotation:

> 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. <...> If there is no such indicator in a language there is no finite/nonfinite distinction in that language. In that sense, finiteness is not a universal category. (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, completeness or deficiency of the syntactic structure, e. g., elaboration of the left periphery related to the (im)possibility of extraction, etc. (see e. g., Wurmbrand 2001; Landau 2004; Adger 2007; Eide 2016).

Regardless of the concrete ways finiteness and nonfiniteness are defined and modeled in particular "formalist" or "functionalist" frameworks, virtually all current approaches to this notion converge on the following points. First, the notion of finiteness is neither elementary nor binary, but rather is derivative with respect to more basic notions such as "independent vs. dependent clause", "person/tense/mood inflection", "subject licensing" etc. Second, nonfinite constructions and verbal forms show considerable typological variation, and in particular may differ as to the degree of their nonfiniteness, cf. Adger's (2007: 26) statement that "There is more than one way to be non-finite". Importantly, since, as already said, the morphosyntactic correlates of (non)finiteness are necessarily language-specific, no concrete grammatical feature, such as expression of person or tense or extraction of question words can be treated as a universal criterion. Moreover, there is ample evidence that the different features

do not necessarily correlate neatly with each other either in grammars of particular languages or typologically, and this has led certain researchers (e. g., Cristofaro 2007) to cast well-founded doubt on the validity of the very notion of finiteness.

In this article I assume a "canonical" perspective on finiteness and non-finiteness. "Canonical typology" (see e. g., Corbett 2005; Brown et al. 2013) is an approach developed to address both intralinguistic and crosslinguistic variation in phenomena which are not easily amenable to clear-cut "all-or-nothing" definitions. From the "canonical" perspective phenomena are defined and made comparable across languages by establishing a set of independent empirically motivated criteria converging on the so-called "canonical ideal" and defining a structured typological space of logically possible deviations from that "canon" violating one or several of the criteria. Most of the phenomena attested in actual languages are "non-canonical" in certain respects, and this approach allows the researcher to situate them in the typological space and compare them by means of the criteria defined.

A "canonical" approach to finiteness has been proposed by Nikolaeva (2013) and is based on the following thirteen criteria pertaining to morphology, syntax and semantics of verbal forms (the " > " sign should be read as "is more canonical than"):

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

The positive values of the criteria C-1–C-13 are clearly the properties cross-linguistically associated with independent declarative clauses, while their negative values indicate a certain degree of reduction or "deranking" (Stassen 1985). Hence verbal forms or constructions showing the positive values of all thirteen criteria are the "canonical finite" forms or constructions, while those forms or constructions which show negative values of certain features or to which some of the features are inapplicable deviate from the "canon" of finiteness in certain respects defined by the criteria. From a typological perspective, mismatches between whole sets of features are perhaps of especial interest; thus, those forms and constructions which are nonfinite by morphological criteria but show syntactic behavior and semantic interpretation characteristic of finite forms, have received considerable attention in the literature, see e. g., Kalinina (1998, 2001), Nikolaeva (2007b), Evans (2007), Creissels (2009).

It must be acknowledged that – at least in view of the current author – the "canonical" approach to finiteness is not a new "theory" of the relevant phenomena substantially different from or superior to the existing conceptions of (non)finiteness as a gradable and multifactorial phenomenon. Rather, the "canonical" perspective provides a useful toolkit for assessing the morphosyntactic properties of constructions across languages or within a single language by means of an arguably universally applicable set of criteria. Therefore, this paper argues for a multifactorial perspective on (non)finiteness in general, which is compatible with a variety of theoretical frameworks, rather than for any particular framework or theory. In this respect, the perspective assumed here is largely framework-neutral.

In this paper, the above criteria are applied to different uses of participles in Lithuanian, an Indo-European language of the Baltic subgroup, possessing a rich system of morphologically nonfinite verbal forms and a large variety of different constructions where such forms are used (cf. Arkadiev et al. 2015: 28–31 for a brief overview). Though from the traditional purely formal perspective Lithuanian participles are invariably nonfinite in all their uses, the multifactorial "canonical" approach will show that they in fact differ widely in their degree of similarity to the "canonical ideal" of finiteness. Below I will mainly deal with the morphological and syntactic criteria of finiteness from Nikolaeva's (2013) list, because the semantic criteria do not always yield clearly interpretable results. Before analyzing the various constructions with participles in Lithuanian I will briefly introduce the verbal system of the language and the main object of my study.

3 Overview of the Lithuanian verbal system and participles

Lithuanian possesses a relatively rich verbal inflectional system (see e. g., Ambrazas 2006: 220–376), the core of which comprises four synthetic tenses (Present, Preterite or Simple Past, Habitual Past and Future), three moods (Indicative, Subjunctive or Irrealis and Imperative; tenses are distinguished only in the Indicative), all of which inflect for person and number of the subject (Singular and Plural are not distinguished in the 3rd person), and are thus treated as "finite" by traditional grammars (cf. Ambrazas 2006: 220). In addition to that, there exist several periphrastic constructions such as Perfect/Resultative, Passive, Counterfactual, and Avertive (see Section 5 below), as well as a number of more marginal formations such as Permissive, Restrictive, and Continuative (see Arkadiev 2010, Arkadiev 2011). The paradigm of the non-negative "finite" synthetic forms of the verb *gérti* 'drink' is shown in Table 1.[2]

Table 1: "Finite" (personal) forms of the Lithuanian verb *gérti* 'drink'.

			Indicative				Subjunctive	Imperative
			Present	**Preterite**	**Habitual Past**	**Future**		
3			*gḗria*	*gḗrė*	*gérdavo*	*geȓs*	*gértų*	
Sg	1		*geriù*	*gḗriau*	*gérdavau*	*gérsiu*	*gérčiau*	
	2		*gerì*	*gḗrei*	*gérdavai*	*gérsi*	*gértum*	*gérk*
Pl	1		*gḗriame*	*gḗrėme*	*gérdavome*	*gérsime*	*gértumème*	*gérkime*
	2		*gḗriate*	*gḗrėte*	*gérdavote*	*gérsite*	*gértumète*	*gérkite*

Turning to the "nonfinite" forms, which are characterized in Ambrazas (2006: 220) as those that "cannot be inflected for person", it is worth mentioning that the system of such forms in Lithuanian is quite elaborate in comparison not only to the other modern Indo-European languages, but even to its Baltic relatives Latvian (see Nau 1998: 42–47) and Latgalian (see Nau 2011: 57–62). Here belong the Infinitive with the suffix *-ti*, the Converb of simultaneity with the suffix *-dam(as)*, which agrees with the

---

2 In Tables 1 and 2 Lithuanian forms are given with stress indication (on stress and "syllable intonations" in Lithuanian, marked by the acute, grave and circumflex signs, see e. g., Young 1991; Dogil 1999). The following orthographic conventions should be kept in mind: the letters *ą, ę, į, ų* denote long (etymologically nasal) vowels; *e* is /æ/, *ė* is /eː/, *y* is /iː/, *ū* is /uː/; the letter *i* between a consonant and a back vowel indicates palatalization of the consonant, thus *riu* is /rʲu/.

main subject in gender and number (cf. Greenberg and Lavine 2006), another agreeing Converb of simultaneity formed with the suffix -in(as) only from a fairly restricted set of verbs (Gliwa 2003), productive event Nominalization with the suffixes -im(as)/-ym(as) distributed according to the inflectional class of the base verb, the passive debitive form in -tin(as), the deverbal intensifying adverb in -te (Ambrazas 2006: 384), and finally a whole system of participles, which are the main object of this study (see also Klimas 1987; Wiemer 2001; Ambrazas 2006: 326–372 on Lithuanian participles in general; Arkadiev 2013 for a recent typologically grounded discussion of some of their uses).

I follow the traditional definition of participles in Lithuanian as verbal forms sharing morphosyntactic properties of verbs and adjectives and, notably, the only verbal forms which morphologically distinguish Active and Passive voice. This definition appears to closely match the comparative concept of participle developed in Shagal (2013, 2019), who defines participles broadly as morphosyntactically deranked verbal forms used for modification (cf. also Ylikoski 2003). Like verbs, participles inflect for tense, and like adjectives, show agreement in gender, number and case with their head (when used attributively) or with some syntactic controller (normally the subject of their own or the matrix clause) in other syntactic positions. Unlike finite verbs, participles do not inflect for person and mood, and unlike adjectives, which always inflect for agreement features, in some constructions participles may altogether lack agreement inflection. As to number, both finite verbs and participles inflect for it, but in different ways. In finite verbs, as already said, the number of the subject is distinguished only in the first and second persons and is expressed together with person; participles never neutralize the number of the noun phrase they agree with, and, like adjectives, express number cumulatively with gender and case, which, in turn, are not encoded by finite verbs.

The formation of participles in Lithuanian is in principle absolutely productive and regular; each verb potentially forms the full array of agreeing and non-agreeing participles of all four tenses and both voices (with the exception of the Habitual Past Passive participle, which does not exist). Notably, there is no restriction on the formation of Passive participles from intransitive verbs of any kind (see e. g., Timberlake 1982; Spraunienė et al. 2015).

In principle, it is possible to define Lithuanian participles purely formally on the basis of their characteristic suffixes: -nt- (Active participles of Present and Future tenses), -us- (Active participles of Preterite and Habitual Past tenses), -m- (Passive participles of Present and Future tenses), and -t- (Past Passive participle). All these suffixes are added to the stems of the respective tenses (technically often identical to the 3rd person form), with the exception of the Past Passive participle, which is based on the Infinitive stem (see Arkadiev 2012a on the Lithuanian verbal stems). The schematic paradigm of the participial forms of

the verb *gérti* 'drink' is shown in Table 2; for each agreeing participle, only Nominative Singular Masculine and Feminine forms are given.

Table 2: The paradigm of Lithuanian participles.

gerti 'drink'	Active		Passive
	inflecting	non-inflecting	
Present	*geriąs/gēriantis* (M), *gērianti* (F)	*gēriant*	*gēriamas* (M), *geriamà* (F)
Preterite	*gérȩs* (M), *gérusi* (F)	*gḗrus*	*gértas* (m), *gertà* (f)
Habitual Past	*gérdavȩs* (M), *gérdavusi* (F)	*gérdavus*	–
Future	*gérsiąs/gérsiantis* (M), *gérsianti* (F)	*gérsiant*	*gérsimas* (m), *gérsima* (f)

The Passive participles are declined exactly like adjectives, while the Active participles show special "short" forms in -*ąs*/-*įs* in the Nominative Singular and Plural of the Masculine gender; with Present and Future participles, these "short" forms are mostly used in the non-attributive contexts, while in the attributive position the longer forms in -*antis*/-*intis* appear.

A peculiar distinction deserving some discussion is the one between the non-inflecting participles and the so-called default agreement forms of inflecting participles. The non-inflecting participles are attested only in the Active voice and are traditionally called "gerunds" or "indeclinable active participles" (Ambrazas 2006: 339–340). These forms contain the participial suffixes -*nt* and -*us* in their "pure" shape, lacking any markers of agreement. They mainly occur as heads of embedded complement and adverbial clauses whose subject, which can be overtly expressed and is marked by non-nominative cases, is not identical to the nominative subject of the main clause (for more details see Section 4.2 below, as well as Darden 2015[1992], Greenberg and Lavine 2006 and Arkadiev 2013), cf. Example (1) with the non-inflecting participle heading an embedded complement whose subject is marked by the Accusative case (on the syntax of participial complements in Lithuanian see Arkadiev 2012b).

(1) *Prisimini-au*   [*sen-ȩ*   **saki-us,**
     remember-PST.1SG old.woman-ACC.SG say-PST.PA
     kad jokiu būdu neičiau pro užpakalines duris].
     'I remember the old woman saying that I should never go through the back door.'[3]

---

3 All examples, if not stated otherwise, are taken from the Corpus of Modern Lithuanian, http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/

By contrast, the forms of default agreement are available to both Passive and Active participles as well as adjectives; their traditional name is "neuter participles" (cf. Ambrazas 2006: 346), though this term is only justified historically, since there are no neuter gender nominals in Lithuanian. Morphologically, default agreement forms look like the Nominative Singular Masculine forms without the final -*s*; syntactically, they occur both in main and embedded clauses as predicates with or without a copula in those cases when there is no suitable agreement controller, i. e., a gendered noun phrase in the Nominative case. For instance, the default agreement form surfaces when the subject position is occupied by a demonstrative, indefinite or interrogative pronoun with inanimate reference, as in Example (2), as well as when the predicate itself does not license a nominative subject at all (on such predicates, which are characteristic to the Baltic languages, see e. g., Holvoet 2013; Wiemer, Bjarnadóttir 2014; Seržant 2013, Seržant 2015), cf. Example (3).

(2) *Tai*   *buv-o*   **saky-t-a**   *kel-is*   *kart-us.*
     this(INAN).NOM AUX-PST.3   say-PST.PP-DF   several-ACC.PL.M   time-ACC.PL
     'This has been said several times.' (constructed)

(3) *Mums*   *bū-tų*   **reikėj-ę**   *daug*   *laik-o.*
     we:DAT   AUX-IRR.3   need-PST.PA.DF   much   time-GEN.SG
     'We would need much time.'

There are very few syntactic contexts where non-inflecting participles compete with default agreement forms; one such context will be discussed in Section 5 below.

Participles in Lithuanian are prone to lexicalization accompanied by adjectivization and nominalization, cf. the following lexemes as *suaugęs* 'grown-up' (grow. up.PST.PA), *suprantamas* 'intelligible' (understand.PRS.PP) or *sekantis* 'following' (follow.PRS.PA), which retain participial inflection. Adjectivized passive participles, like adjectives, derive comparative and superlative forms., e. g., *suprant-am-esn-is* 'more intelligible' (understand-PRS.PP-COMP-NOM.SG.M), *suprant-am-iausi-as* 'the most intelligible' (understand-PRS.PP-SPRL-NOM.SG.M). However, for active participles, as far as can be deduced from existing sources and corpora, forms of comparison are not attested, at least in the modern standard language.[4] Of course, the

---

4 The form *pavarg-esn-is* 'more tired' (get.tired.PST.PA-COMP-NOM.SG.M < *pavargęs* 'tired') is mentioned as "rare" in Schleicher (1856: 148), but is not attested outside of his seminal grammar.

respective meanings can be expressed periphrastically, as in e. g., *dar labiau išsigandęs* 'still more frightened'.

Lithuanian participles show remarkable polyfunctionality appearing in a variety of constructions and, importantly for the current presentation, showing different combinations of (non)finiteness properties in different environments. Notably, to my knowledge, in previous work on Lithuanian participles (see references above) the issue of their (non)finiteness has not been specifically addressed beyond simple statements that, on the one hand, from the morphological point of view they are nonfinite, and, on the other hand, in some of their uses they may function as main predicates. In this article three main types of syntactic contexts will be surveyed (cf. the classification of the uses of participles in Ambrazas 2006: 352–372): (i) participles as subordinate predicates in attributive, complement and adverbial clauses, (ii) participles as lexical verbs in periphrastic constructions with auxiliaries, and (iii) participles as main predicates in indirect evidential clauses. All these contexts, more precisely, particular constructions constituting them, will be evaluated against Nikolaeva's criteria of "canonical" finiteness given above, with the exclusion of the purely semantic criteria C-13 ("assertion") and C-14 ("information structuring"). The criteria C-4 ("politeness marking") and C-10 ("morphosyntactic expression of information structure") are not applicable to Lithuanian, which does not have such marking; criterion C-5 ("evidential marking") is also excluded, since Lithuanian marks evidentiality precisely by means of participles. Finally, the following criterion absent from Nikolaeva's (2013) list but highly relevant for Lithuanian is added: elaboration of the nominal declensional paradigm. It has to be borne in mind that all the relevant criteria are a priori considered to be of equal importance or "weight", since trying to rank them would involve arbitrary choices.

4 Participles as heads of embedded clauses

Lithuanian participles regularly feature as heads of embedded clauses. Traditional grammar (e. g., Ambrazas 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. In this section, I will follow this classification, and will first discuss the attributive use, which most neatly corresponds to the comparative concept of participle (Shagal 2019).

4.1 Participles as heads of attributive (relative) clauses

Attributive participles in Lithuanian retain the paradigm of synthetic tenses as well as a voice distinction (the agent of the Passive is marked by the Genitive) and the internal syntax of verbs in general (e. g., they combine with adverbs and govern the same object cases as morphologically finite verbs). However, they show the external syntax of adjectives, i. e., fully agree with their nominal heads in gender, number and case, and lack an overt subject, which is always identical to the head (underlined in the examples). Examples below show Active and Passive attributive participles in different tenses, which are usually interpreted relative to the tense of the main clause.

Active voice

−simultaneity: Present

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

−precedence: Preterite

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

−precedence: Past Habitual

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

−succession: Future

(7) *...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***]
NEG-PRV-wait-FUT.3 after 40 year-GEN.PL come-FUT-PA-GEN.SG.M

pagerėjim-o.
improvement-GEN.SG
'... let's better take care of those who won't live till the improvement expected to come 40 years later.'

Passive voice
−simultaneity: Present

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

−precedence: Past

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

−succession: Future

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

Attributive participles can also appear in the special Definite forms (on which see Holvoet and Spraunienė 2012), but, as far as I can tell from my data, only when nominalized and used without either a head or nominal dependents, cf. (11).

(11) _...jei... pažadė-s   palik-ti gyvyb-ę   vis-iems_
if   promise-FUT.3 leave-INF life-ACC.SG all-DAT.PL.M
**pasidav-us-iesiems**.
surrender-PST.PA-DAT.PL.M.DEF
'if ... he promises to grant life to all those who surrendered.'

The behavior of attributive participles in Lithuanian is quite expected both from the classic Indo-Europeanist and crosslinguistic points of view. Let us now turn to less trivial syntactic contexts.

4.2 Participles as heads of adverbial and complement clauses

Participles in Lithuanian 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), as well as propositional complements with verbs of speech, perception and cognition. It is mainly the Active participles which are regularly used in these contexts, though the Passive participles are not excluded. More on the syntax and semantics of these constructions see Ambrazas (1990: 98–179), Darden (2015[1992]), Gronemeyer and Usonienė (2001: 108–112, 116–120), Greenberg and Lavine (2006), Sakurai (2008), Arkadiev (2012b, 2013), Geniušienė (2014).

The main morphosyntactic divisions in the adverbial and complement uses of participles pertain to the presence or absence of agreement and the expression of the subject. The feature [±agreement] functions as a sort of a switch-reference mechanism: participles show inflection for gender, number and Nominative case only when their obligatorily covert subject is coreferent to the Nominative subject of the main clause, which can be considered the controller of the agreement features of the participle. Otherwise (i. e., when the subject of the participle is distinct from that of the main clause or when the latter is not in the Nominative case) the non-inflecting participles appear, the only exception being the constructions with verbs of direct perception, whose complement can feature the Present participle agreeing with the Accusative direct object (see below). The only surface difference between the complement and the adverbial (adjunct) participial clauses lies in the case marking of their subjects, when those are overt (i. e., only in different-subject environments): the subject of participial complements is marked Accusative, while that of the adverbial constructions appears in the Dative. The morphosyntactic distinctions among the "semi-predicative" participles are summarized in Table 3.

In both types of construction, the tense features of participles are interpreted relative to the tense of the matrix clause, not to the speech time. In complement constructions, all tenses are attested (though with predicates of direct perception normally only the present participles denoting simultaneity are found; see below for additional details), including the periphrastic Passive, Perfect and Avertive. In the adverbial participial clauses, only the Present and Preterite participles are systematically used, though habitual participles are sometimes also attested, cf.

Table 3: Features of adverbial and complement participial constructions.

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

Example (18). Future participles, by contrast, are excluded, cf. the ungrammatical Example (19a). Note that in the same-subject adverbial constructions the Converb of simultaneity in -*dam(as)* is used instead of the Present Active participle, as in Example (12). This converb resembles participles in its syntactic and morphological properties, but since it occurs virtually in only one construction and its morphosyntactic properties are constant, I do not discuss this form here.

Examples (12)–(18) illustrate the same-subject and different-subject adverbial participles with the temporal interpretation of simultaneity and precedence.

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

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

– simultaneity: Present Passive

(13) [*Saul-ės*   *spinduli-ų* ***glost-o-m-a***   *ir* *jūr-os*
 sun-GEN.SG ray-GEN.PL stroke-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.F and sea-GEN.SG
 liūliuoj-a-ma],   *j-i*   *pa-jut-o*   *sav-ąjį*
 lull-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.F 3-NOM.SG.F PRV-feel-PST.3 RPOSS-ACC.SG.M.DEF
 Aš.
 I.NOM
 'Stroked by the rays of the sun and lulled by the sea, she got the feeling of her own Self.'

–precedence: Preterite Active

(14) [***Nu-si-pirk-us-i***   *nauj-ą*   *drabuž-į*],   *vien-o*
       PRV-RFL-buy-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F new-ACC.SG clothes-ACC.SG one-GEN.SG.M
       at-si-kraty-k.
       PRV-RFL-throw-IMP
       'Having bought a new piece of clothing, throw away one [of the old ones].'

– precedence: Preterite Passive

(15) [***Paleis-t-as***   *iš*   *kalėjim-o*]   *vert-ė-si*
       release-PST.PP-NOM.SG.M from prison-GEN.SG occupy-PST.3-RFL
       gydytoj-o   *praktik-a.*
       doctor-GEN.SG practice-INS.SG
       'After he was released from prison, he worked as a private doctor.'

different-subject
–simultaneity: Present Active

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

–precedence: Preterite Active

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

– precedence: Habitual Past Active

(18) [*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)

The Future participles, which would be expected to denote an event that follows the one in the main clause, are not allowed in adverbial clauses of the type exemplified above, cf. (19a), but do occur when the clause is introduced by the preposition/complementizer *prieš* 'before', cf. (19b).

(19) 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*
          before INTF curtain-DAT.SG descend+FUT-PA PRV-move-PRS.3
          grab-as.
          coffin-NOM.SG
          'Before the curtain falls, the coffin moves.'[5]

Another adverbial participial construction is introduced by the complementizer *užuot* 'instead'; it is peculiar in that regardless of the temporal relations between the main and subordinate clauses *užuot* always requires the Preterite Active participles (cf. Wiemer 2016: 158–159), perhaps due to the counterfactual semantics of the construction. The subject of the participial clause with *užuot* is always null and coreferential with the main clause subject; if the latter is in the Nominative case, the participle agrees with it, as in (20), otherwise it appears in the non-inflecting form, as in (21).

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

(21) ...[**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.'

Turning to complement participial clauses with verbs of speech, cognition and (indirect) perception, we see that they allow a much broader range of temporal forms than the adverbial clauses discussed above. Not only are all four synthetic

---

5 http://antologija.lt/text/balys-sruoga-milzino-paunksme/10?lang=en, accessed March 2016.

tenses attested both in same-subject and different-subject participial comple-
ments, but the periphrastic verbal forms as well. All of these are exemplified
below.

> same-subject
> – simultaneity: Present

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

> – precedence: Preterite

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

> – precedence: Habitual Past

(24) *Moter-is   sak-ė   [**klaus-dav-us-i**   dukr-os,*
woman-NOM.SG say-PST.3 ask-HAB-PST-NOM.SG.F daughter-GEN.SG
ar j-i   myl-i-nt-i   š-į   žmog-ų].
Q 3-NOM.SG.F love-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F DEM-ACC.SG.M man-ACC.SG
'The woman said she used to ask her daughter if she loved this man.'

> –succession: Future

(25) *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.'

–Passive

(26) ...*Vaištar-as*   *kaimyn-ams*   *gyr-ė-si*
proper.name-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.'

–Perfect/Resultative

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

–Avertive

(28) *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
toki-am   *daininin, k-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...'

different-subject
– simultaneity: Present

(29) *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
'[It is said that] In old times Samogitians believed that deities lived in the corners of houses.'

–precedence: Preterite

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

–precedence: Habitual Past

(31) *kuri-uos   poet-as   sak-o   [savo   koj-omis*
which-ACC.PL.M poet-NOM.SG say-PRS.3 RPOSS leg-INS.PL
atei-dav-us   į   diev-ų   susirinkim-us].
come-HAB-PST.PA in god-GEN.PL meeting-ACC.PL
'[tripods], which, says the poet, of their own accord entered the assembly
of the Gods'
(from the translation of Aristotle's "Politics", Book 1, Part IV)

–succession: Future

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

–Passive

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

–Perfect

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

A special subtype of different-subject participial complements is attested with
verbs of direct perception, mainly with *matyti* 'see' (cf. Enghels 2009 on the
subtle distinctions between visual vs. non-visual perception verbs with respect
to the constraints they impose on the interpretation of the embedded situations,
reflected in complementation patterns). With this kind of matrix verb, only
Present participles are allowed, in accordance with the requirement that the
perceived situation be simultaneous with the act of direct perception (see Dik
and Hengeveld 1991: 237–242; specifically on Lithuanian see Usonienė 2003;
Usoniene and Vincent 2018). Thus, with direct perception verbs, the temporal

paradigm of participles is severely reduced. Moreover, the syntax of such constructions differs from that of different-subject participial complements with other kinds of matrix verbs (see Arkadiev 2012b: 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 noun phrase behaves in all respects as a direct object of the matrix predicate, the participial clause serving as a subjectless appositive modifier to it. This is evident, e. g., from the position of adverbials semantically belonging to the embedded situation: only in the participial complements of verbs of speech and cognition may such adverbials linearly precede the Accusative "logical subject", cf. (35a); by contrast, in the direct perception construction such adverbials may only follow the Accusative noun phrase, which indicates that the latter belongs to the matrix clause, cf. (35b,c).

(35)　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 2012b: 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 2012b: 316)

Finally, in different-subject constructions with verbs of direct perception (as well as with a restricted set of other verbs like *palikti* 'leave' and *rasti* 'find', see Darden 2015[1992]: 275–279) the participle can appear not only in the "bare" non-inflecting form as in (35b) and (36), but also show full agreement with the matrix direct object in gender, number and case, which can be Accusative, as in (37a), or Genitive when the matrix verb is negated, as in (37b).

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

(37)　a. *An-ą*　　　　*nakt-į*　　　***motin-ą***　　　*mač-iau*
　　　　 DEM-ACC.SG　night-ACC.SG　mother-ACC.SG　see-PST.1SG

[**sėd-i-nči-ą**   virtuv-ėj   ir   **pjaust-a-nči-ą**
sit-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.F kitchen-LOC.SG and cut-PRS-PA-ACC.SG.F
raudon-us   mės-os   gabal-us].
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.'

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

With respect to Example (37b) with the Genitive of Negation it is worth noting
that though the shift of case marking from the Accusative to the Genitive is in
principle obligatory in Lithuanian (cf. Arkadiev 2016), it systematically fails to
affect the embedded subject of participial complements with verbs of speech and
cognition (Arkadiev 2012b: 318–319), cf. Example (38).

(38) *Mokslinink-ai*   **ne**-*įrod-ė*   **rūkym-ą** // ***rūkym-o***   **es-a-nt**
scientist-NOM.PL NEG-prove-PST.3 smoking-ACC.SG //*GEN.SG be-PRS-PA
žaling-ą // **žaling-o*.
unhealthy-ACC.SG.M//*GEN.SG.M
'Scholars have not proved smoking to be harmful.'
(adapted from Arkadiev 2012b: 318)

The contrasts in (35) and between (37) and (38) show that the participial con-
structions with 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, which is fairly common crosslinguistically,
cf. Dik and Hengeveld (1991), Cristofaro (2003: 131, 133). The constructions with
agreeing participles occurring with verbs of perception retain the historically
original morphosyntax, while the non-inflecting participles are morphologically
innovative (see Section 7 below for more details are references).

4.3 Summary

Table 4 shows how different subtypes of complement, adjunct and attributive
participial constructions fair against the criteria of "canonical" finiteness. The
parenthesized " + " sign in the line corresponding to the criterion C-7

Table 4: Finiteness properties of participles as heads of subordinate clauses.

Criterion	Complement			Adverbial			Attributive	Finite forms
	Same subject	Different subject		Same subject		Different subject		
		speech and cognition	direct perception	"standard"	užuot			
C-1 (tense marking)	full	full	fixed (PRS)	reduced (PRS, PST)	fixed (PST)	reduced (PRS, PST)	reduced (only synthetic)	full
C-2 (subject agreement)	gender, number	–	gender, number, case	gender, number	–	gender, number	n/a	person, number
C-3 (mood)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
C-6 (SR- marking)	+	+	–	+	+	+	n/a	–
C-7 (NOM subject)	(+)	– (ACC)	–	(+)	(+)	– (DAT)	–	+
C-8 (indep. clause)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
C-9 (subj. licensing)	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	+
C-12 (independent temporal anchoring)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+
nominal paradigm	reduced	–	reduced	reduced	reduced	–	full	–

"nominative subject" symbolizes the fact that the same-subject participles can be regarded as having a Nominative subject, albeit an obligatorily covert one.

As Table 4 shows, different constructions show quite distinct sets of morphosyntactic features. Although one may say that the attributive participles and the participles in perception complements are the most "nonfinite" of all the constructions surveyed in this section, it is hardly possible to say in which of the remaining uses the participles show more finiteness properties, since both positive and negative values of the criteria are mixed in all constructions. On the other hand, it can be clearly seen that most morphosyntactic properties of participles correlate with the same vs. different subject dichotomy, being reflected in the values of the criteria referring to the licensing, case marking and agreement of the subject. By contrast, participial complements and adjuncts as a whole differ only in the degree of elaboration of their temporal paradigms, which appears to be determined by the semantic properties of each construction, such as the temporal relations obtaining between the main verb and its complement vs. its adjunct (cf. e. g., Xrakovskij 2016: 22–25 on "valency" vs. "nonvalency taxis") or the restrictions on the simultaneous interpretation of complements of direct perception verbs.

5 Participles in periphrastic verbal forms

Main periphrastic verbal forms in Lithuanian, the Perfect/Resultative, the Passive, and the Avertive, are formed with the participial forms of the lexical verb and the auxiliary *būti* 'be', which can often be omitted in the Present tense, thus giving rise to the systematic homonymy of the forms of the Present Perfect and the Preterite Evidential (see Section 6). The system is schematically presented in Table 5. On the functions and structure of these periphrastic forms, besides the grammar Ambrazas (2006), see Geniušienė (1976, 2006, 2016), Wiemer (2004), Spraunienė et al. (2015) on the Passive, Geniušienė and Nedjalkov (1988), Wiemer and Giger (2005: 43–47) on the Perfect/Resultative, Arkadiev (2011, 2019) on the Avertive. In this section I will speak only about the

Table 5: 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

morphosyntactic behavior of the participles in these constructions, and not about the functions and morphosyntax of the constructions as a whole – to the extent that the features of participles can be separated from the properties of constructions.

Active participles in periphrastic constructions fully retain the argument structure and case marking abilities of the lexical verb (including the subject), and Passive participles modify the argument structure in a regular way (for some peculiarities of the Lithuanian passives see e. g. Anderson 2015). In the presence of a Nominative subject, the participle agrees with it in gender, number and case, cf. Examples (39), (41) and (42), otherwise appearing in the default agreement form, cf. Example (40).

Perfect/Resultative

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

Passive
–with the Present participle (imperfective passive)

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

–with the Past participle (perfective or statal passive)

(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...'

Avertive

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

In the contexts where the auxiliary is itself nonfinite and takes a non-nominative subject, i. e., in the impersonal passive evidential construction discussed in Section 6.2 below, in the participial complement construction (see Section 4.2) and in infinitival clauses, the participle agrees with the subject in gender, number and case, which can be Accusative, Genitive and Dative, see Examples (43)–(45) (the subject is underlined).

–Accusative in participial complements

(43) *istorini-ai*   *šaltini-ai*   *liudij-a*   [*pirmąkart*
historical-NOM.PL.M source-NOM.PL testify-PRS.3   first.time
Mozart-o   <u>*oper-ą*</u>   *"Užburtoji fleita"* *Lietuv-oje*
Mozart-GEN.SG   opera-ACC.SG   "The.magic.flute" Lithuania-LOC.SG
buv-us   ***pa-rody-t-ą***   *1802–1805* *met-ais*].
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.'

–Genitive in impersonal passive evidential constructions

(44) <u>*Kulk-os*</u>   ***bū-t-a***   ***išėj-usi-os***   *kiaurai*.
bullet-GEN.SG AUX-PST.PP-DF exit-PST.PA-GEN.SG.F through
'The bullet must have gone through.'

–Dative in infinitival clauses

(45) ... *visada reiki-a*   [∅_{DAT} ***bū-ti pasireng-usi-am***
always need-PRS.3   be-INF prepare-PST.PA-DAT.SG.M
prasmeg-ti].
fail-INF
'One always needs to be prepared to fail.'

Besides the periphrastic verbal forms with the auxiliary *būti* 'be', which are recognized as belonging to the verb's paradigm, Active Preterite participles are employed in constructions with the phasal verbs *(pa)liauti(s)* and *sustoti/nustoti* 'stop, cease', which demonstrate some features of auxiliaries. These constructions are interesting because here the participle can appear in three different forms depending on subtle syntactic parameters. These forms are: (i) an agreeing participle when, on the one hand, the matrix verb is morphologically finite and, on the other, the subordinate verb is able to have a Nominative subject, cf. Example (46); (ii) the default agreement form when the subordinate verb lacks a

nominative subject, cf. Example (47) with impersonal meteorological verbs; (iii) the non-inflecting form when, on the one hand, the subordinate verb is able to have a Nominative subject and, on the other hand, the matrix verb is morphologically nonfinite and its subject gets non-nominative case, cf. Example (48) with the phasal verb in the Infinitive and its null subject controlled by the object of a superordinate verb in the Dative or Accusative.

(46)   a. *Jūr-a*   <u>*liov-ė-si*</u>   **_bangav-us-i_**.
         sea-NOM.SG   stop-PST(3)-RFL   be.choppy-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F
         'The sea ceased being choppy.'

   b. <u>*Sustoj-o*</u>   **_valg-ęs_**   *ir*   *pa-si-jut-o*
         stop-PST.3   eat-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   and   PRV-RFL-feel-PST.3
         ne-žin-ąs   *kur*   *dė-ti-s.*
         NEG-know-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M   where   put-INF-RFL
         'He stopped eating and felt that he didn't know where to go.'

(47)   a. *Ką tik* <u>*pa-liov-ė*</u>   **_lij-ę_**   *ir*   *vėl*   *nu-švit-o*
         just   PRV-stop-PST.3   rain-PST.PA.DF   and   again   PRV-shine-PST.3
         saul-ė.
         sun-NOM.SG
         '...it has just stopped raining and sun started shining again.'

   b. *Po*   *t-o,*   *kai*   <u>*nusto-s*</u>   **_snig-ę,_**   *tap-s*
         after   that-GEN.SG.M   when   stop-FUT.3   snow-PST.PA.DF   become-FUT.3
         šalčiau...
         colder
         'After it stops snowing it becomes colder.'

(48)   a. *Gydytoj-ai*   *liepi-a*   *j-am*$_i$ [∅$_i$ <u>*liau-ti-s*</u>
         doctor-NOM.PL   order-PRS.3   3-DAT.SG.M   stop-INF-RFL
         rūki-us].
         smoke-PST.PA
         'Doctors order him to stop smoking.'

   b. *Bar-is*   *nutari-a ...*   *privers-ti* <u>*žmonij-ą*$_i$</u>   [∅$_i$ <u>*nusto-ti*</u>
         Baris-NOM.SG   decide-PRS.3   make-INF   humanity-ACC.SG   stop-INF
         valgi-us   *med-ų*].
         eat-PST.PA   honey-ACC.SG
         'Baris decides to ... make humanity stop eating honey.'

In Table 6 the (non)finiteness properties of participles in periphrastic constructions (including the one with the phasal verbs) are summarized. As is evident,

Table 6: Finiteness properties of participles in periphrastic constructions.

Criterion	Avertive	Perfect/ Resultative	Passive	'stop' + V	Finite forms
C-1 (tense marking)	fixed (PRS)	fixed (PST)	reduced (PRS, PST)	fixed (PST)	full
C-2 (subject agreement)	+ (gender, number, case)	+ (gender, number, case)	+ (gender, number, case)	+ (gender, number)	+ (person, number)
C-3 (mood marking)	–	–	–	–	+
C-6 (SR-marking)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	–
C-7 (NOM subject)	+	+	+	+	+
C-8 (indep. clause)	–	–	–	–	+
C-9 (subj. licensing)	+	+	+	+	+
C-12 (independent temporal anchoring)	–	–	–	–	+
nominal paradigm	reduced (NOM, ACC, GEN, DAT, DF)	reduced (NOM, ACC, GEN, DAT, DF)	reduced (NOM, ACC, GEN, DAT, DF)	reduced (NOM, DF)	–

the participles in such constructions retain just a few verbal properties, most notably the argument structure. The tense paradigm of the participles in each construction is severely reduced, while the nominal case paradigm, though also reduced in comparison to the attributive participles, is nevertheless available, and, notably, is not limited just to the Nominative.

6 "Finite" participles in evidential constructions

Participles in Lithuanian can head independent clauses with evidential (reportative, inferential and admirative) meanings, the so-called "oblique mood" of the traditional grammar (Ambrazas 2006: 262–266, 370–372). This use of Lithuanian participles has received comparatively much attention in linguistic literature, see e. g., 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 and Sumbatova 2007) by means of morphologically nonfinite forms is a crosslinguistically common strategy (see e. g., Aikhenvald 2004: 117–119) and is an areal trait of the languages of the East Baltic region, being attested in Latvian and Estonian as well,

cf. Wälchli (2000) and Kehayov (2008). Two types of evidential participial constructions have to be distinguished in Lithuanian, which I call "active" and "passive impersonal". Since I am only interested in the morphosyntactic properties of these constructions, I will completely abstract away from the peculiarities of their semantics, on which see the works cited. It is worth noting that, as can be seen from some of the examples below, participles are often used in indirect reports introduced by explicit speech act verbs; this is, however, certainly not necessary, and participles are able to express reported or inferential evidentiality fully on their own.

6.1 Active evidential constructions

The active evidential constructions differ from the corresponding indicative non-evidential (or rather: unmarked for evidentiality) ones only in the morphology of the verb: evidentiality is marked by the use of participles in the respective tenses as main verbs instead of forms inflected for person. The expression and case marking of arguments remains intact, and when a nominative subject is present, the participle obligatorily agrees with it in gender and number, just as the finite verb agrees with it in person and number. Examples (49)–(52) show the evidential use of participles of all synthetic tenses.

> Present
(49) a. *Aš* **gyven-u** *iliuzij-omis.*
> I.NOM live-PRS.1SG illusion-INS.PL
> 'I feed on illusions.' (constructed)
> b. *Dar niek-as man ne-sak-ė,*
> yet nobody-NOM.SG I.DAT NEG-say-PST.3
> *kad aš* **gyven-ąs** *iliuzij-omis.*
> that I.NOM live-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M illusion-INS.PL
> 'Nobody has told me yet that I [they say] feed on illusions.'

> Preterite
(50) *Jau t-ie vaik-ai pup-ose* **buv-ę:**
> already DEM-NOM.PL.M child-NOM.PL bean-LOC.PL be-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M
> *didžiausi-os bryd-ės palik-t-os.*
> largest-NOM.PL.F track-NOM.PL leave-PST.PP-NOM.PL.F
> 'Those children must have been in the beans again, wide tracks were left.'
> (Ambrazas 2006: 264)

Habitual Past

(51) *Kartkarčiais   čia   **atvažiuo-dav-ęs**,   tar-ė,   bet*
from.time.to.time   here   arrive-HAB-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   say-PST.3   but
gana   retai.
quite   rarely
'He said he used to come here from time to time, but quite rarely.'

Future

(52) *Sak-ė,   kad   mūsų   ab-iems   vaik-ams*
say-PST.3   that   our   both-DAT.PL.M   child-DAT.PL
***duo-si-ą**   po pus-ę   milijon-o   paskol-os,   o*
give-FUT-PA.NOM.PL.M   by half-ACC.SG   million-GEN.SG   loan-GEN.SG   and
mano   vyr-as   daugiau   niek-o
my   husband-NOM.SG   more   nothing-GEN.SG
***ne-gau-si-ąs**.*
NEG-get-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M
'He said that they will give both our children half a million loan each, but
that my husband won't get anything more.'

Since in the periphrastic Perfect/Resultative constructions, which consist of the
Preterite Active participle and the auxiliary *būti* 'be' (see Section 5 for more
details), the Present tense form of the auxiliary is regularly omitted, examples
like (50) with a Preterite Active participle in the main verb position are often
ambiguous between the evidential Preterite and the Present Resultative inter-
pretations, and this ambiguity is resolved only by the broader context. Thus,
while for Example (50) above with an existential verb the Resultative reading is
excluded and only the evidential interpretation is possible, Example (53) with a
Preterite participle of a telic verb and a first-person subject strongly favors the
non-evidential Present Resultative reading.

(53) *Aš   **apsireng-us-i**   ispanišk-ą   striuk-ę...*
I.NOM   put.on:RFL-PST.PA.NOM.SG.F   Spanish-ACC.SG   jacket-ACC.SG
'I have put on the Spanish jacket...'

In the evidential constructions, various periphrastic verbal forms occur along-
side synthetic ones, cf. Examples (54) and (55) contrasting the non-evidential
forms with a finite auxiliary and the evidential ones with a participial form of the
auxiliary.

Perfect

(54) a. *Redakcij-a*   **yra**   **numači-us-i**   *daugiau*
editorial.board-NOM.SG AUX.PRS.3 envisage-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F more
galimybi-ų.
possibility-GEN.PL
'The editorial board has envisaged more possibilities.' (constructed)

  b. *Nors priduriama, kad tai tik viena leidybos galimybių,*
redakcij-a   **es-a-nt-i**
editorial.board-NOM.SG AUX-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F
numači-us-i   *j-ų*   *ir*   *daugiau.*
envisage-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F 3-GEN.PL and more
'Although they add that this is only one of the possibilities of the editorial house, the editorial board (reportedly) has envisaged even more.'

Passive

(55) a. *Pirminink-ui* **bu-s**   **reiški-a-m-as**   *nepasitikėjim-as.*
chair-DAT.SG AUX-FUT.3 express-PRS.PP-NOM.SG.M distrust-NOM.SG
'Distrust will be expressed to the chair.' (constructed)

  b. *Skleidžiami gandai, kad Aukščiausiosios Tarybos*
pirminink-ui   **bū-si-ąs**   **reiški-a-m-as**
chair-DAT.SG AUX-FUT-PA.NOM.SG.M express-PRS-PP-NOM.SG.M
nepasitikėjim-as.
distrust-NOM.SG
'Rumours are being spread that distrust will be expressed to the chair of the Supreme Council [of the Soviet Union].'

When a nominative-marked subject is lacking, the participle appears in the default agreement form, cf. Examples (56) with a negative existential verb requiring its subject to appear in the Genitive (see Aleksandravičiūtė 2013 on this construction) and (57) with a Dative experiencer. Note that finite verbs have no distinct forms of default agreement and show up in the 3rd person form in such contexts.

(56) *...saky-dam-as, kad j-oje*   **ne-s-ą**   *"nei*
say-CVB-SG.M that 3-LOC.SG.F NEG-be-PRS.PA.DF nor
istorišk-os   *ties-os,*   *nei dramatini-o*
historical-GEN.SG.F truth-GEN.SG nor dramatic-GEN.SG.M
nuosakum-o".
expression-GEN.SG
'...saying that in it [the play] there was "neither historical truth nor dramatic expression".'

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

Though in the standard language only indicative verb forms have evidential participial counterparts, the "parasitic" use of participial morphology attached to non-indicative stems is reported for some dialects, see Holvoet (2007: 88), cf. Example (58) with the evidential forms of the Subjunctive auxiliary in the periphrastic Counterfactual construction.

(58) *Jeigu* **bū-či-ąs**   *žinoj-ęs,*   *kad*
      if   AUX-IRR-PA.NOM.SG.M   know-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M   that
      niek-o   *ne-gau-s,*   *tai*
      nothing-GEN.SG   NEG-get-FUT.3   then
      ne-bū-či-ąs   *nė*   *iš*   *viet-os*
      NEG-AUX-IRR-PA.NOM.SG.M   even   from   place-GEN.SG
      judin-ęs-is.
      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.'
      (Kučinskaitė and Morkūnas 1964 quoted after Holvoet 2007: 88)

It is worth mentioning here that the active evidential constructions have probably arisen by insubordination (Evans 2007) from the same-subject complement constructions discussed in Section 4.2 (see Wiemer 1998), which, as will be shown in more detail in Section 7, explains the similar arrays of features displayed by participles occurring in these constructions.

6.2 Impersonal passive evidential constructions

The impersonal passive evidential constructions are characterized by typologically rather peculiar morphosyntax and have been subject to a considerable

number of publications (e. g., Timberlake 1982; Lavine 1999, Lavine 2006, Lavine 2010; Wiemer 2006b; Holvoet 2007: 96–104; Usonienė and Šinkūnienė 2017; see also Spraunienė et al. 2015 for a more general discussion of Lithuanian impersonal passives). The main verb position is occupied by a Passive participle in the default agreement form; concomitantly, the expression of arguments differs from that of finite and active evidential clauses: the subject appears in the Genitive case, while the direct object, if present, is coded by the Nominative (in some varieties by the Accusative), cf. ex. (61). However, there are no signs of any redistribution of grammatical relations in the impersonal passive evidential construction, in contrast to the regular Passive. For instance, the Genitive subject retains the relevant controlling properties, e. g., it is able to control reflexives, cf. ex. (59), see Holvoet (2007: 100–103) and Lavine (1999, 2006). It has to be mentioned that this construction has largely become obsolete in contemporary standard Lithuanian, especially with transitive verbs (see Usonienė and Šinkūnienė 2017; cf. also Geniušienė 2006: 55; Spraunienė et al. 2015: 342).

Impersonal passive evidential constructions theoretically occur in all tenses but the Habitual Past, which does not form a Passive participle; the Future forms are extremely rare, cf. Examples (59)–(62). In (59a), (60a) and (61a) I give the non-evidential active versions of the actual impersonal passive evidential examples given in (59b), (60b) and (61b).

(59) Present
    a. *Mam-a*$_i$ *jau*   ***yra***   *savo*$_i$ *kaim-e.*
       mother-NOM.SG already be.PRS.3 RPOSS village-LOC.SG
       'Mother is already in her village.' (constructed)
    b. *Mam-os*$_i$ *jau*   ***es-a-m-a***   *savo*$_i$ *kaim-e.*
       mother-GEN.SG already be-PRS-PP-DF RPOSS village-LOC.SG
       'Mother is (presumably) already in her village.'
       (Timberlake 1982: 516)

    Preterite
(60) a. *Čia* *didel-is*   *med-is*   ***aug-o*.**
       here big-NOM.SG.M tree-NOM.SG grow-PST.3
       'A big tree grew here.' (constructed)
    b. *Iš*   *plači-os*   *erdv-ės*   *mat-ė-si,*
       from broad-GEN.SG.F space-GEN.SG see-PST.3-RFL

*kad čia dideli-o   medži-o   **aug-t-a**.*
that here big-GEN.SG.M tree-GEN.SG grow-PST.PP-DF
'One could see from the broad empty space that, evidently, a big tree had grown here.'
(Sprraunienė et al. 2015: 342, originally from the Corpus of Modern Lithuanian)

(61) a. *Traktori-us   **vež-ė**   durp-es.*
      tractor-NOM.SG carry-PST.3 peat-ACC.PL
      'The tractor carried peat.' (constructed)

  b. *...traktori-aus **vež-t-a**   durp-ės...*
      tractor-GEN.SG carry-PST.PP-DF peat-NOM.PL
      '... evidently, peat was being carried by a tractor'
      (extract from Sprraunienė et al. 2015: 343, originally from the Corpus of Modern Lithuanian)

Future

(62) *Taigi **es-a-m-a**   ir   **bū-si-m-a**   bedarbi-ų*
      as.well be-PRS-PP-DF and be-FUT-PP-DF unemployed-GEN.PL
      armij-os...
      army-GEN.SG
      'There is and will be an army of unemployed as well...'

The most typologically non-trivial characteristic of the Lithuanian impersonal passive evidential constructions, which has attracted most attention in theoretical literature, consists in the fact that they can be based on genuine Passive constructions, both "personal" Passives, formed from transitive verbs, as in Example (63), and impersonal Passives of active intransitive verbs, as in Example (64), the latter construction being arguably no longer in use in the modern language. Again, for the sake of explicitness, the corresponding non-evidential constructions are provided in the a-examples. In "double passives" from transitive verbs the Passive participle of the lexical verb agrees in gender, number and Genitive case with the subject of the Passive (= the original direct object), while in the impersonal passive evidential construction embedding the impersonal Passive of an intransitive verb, whose subject has received Genitive case already on the first "cycle" of passivization, both the lexical verb and the auxiliary appear in the default agreement form.

evidential passive from a personal passive

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

       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.'[6]

evidential passive from an impersonal passive

(64) 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 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 2006: 284)

6.3 Summary

The evaluation of the active and impersonal passive evidential constructions in terms of the criteria of "canonical" finiteness is given in Table 7. The values of the criteria for the morphologically finite forms are given in the last column for comparison.

It is evident that the Lithuanian participles in the evidential constructions are maximally close to the morphologically finite forms, fulfilling their primary function, i. e., the expression of an independent predicate, and exhibiting the largest number of the morphosyntactic properties of the latter. Besides that, the two evidential constructions differ in their degree of finiteness, the impersonal passive evidential participles being farther removed from the "canonical ideal" of finiteness than the active evidential participles.

---

6 http://www.pasakos.lt/sakmes-padavimai/egle-zalciu-karaliene-2/, accessed March 2016.

Table 7: Finiteness properties of Lithuanian participles in evidential constructions.

criterion	"active" constructions	"impersonal passive" constructions	finite forms
C-1 (tense marking)	full	reduced	full
C-2 (subject agreement)	+ (gender, number)	–	+ (person, number)
C-3 (mood marking)	– (+ in dialects)	–	+
C-6 (switch-reference marking)	–	–	–
C-7 (nominative subject)	+	–	+
C-8 (independent clause)	+	+	+
C-9 (subject licensing)	+	+	+
C-12 (independent temporal anchoring)	+	+	+
nominal paradigm	reduced (NOM, DF)	fixed (DF)	–

7 Discussion and conclusions

The morphosyntactic criteria of (non)finiteness of Lithuanian participles discussed in Sections 4–6 are summarized in Table 8. Since each of the relevant constructions has been evaluated against the "canonical" criteria proposed by Nikolaeva (2013) in Tables 4, 6 and 7 above, Table 8 assembles these criteria into larger blocks and excludes those of them which yield identical results for all constructions. The constructions are arranged from "most" to "least" finite.

The main conclusion to be drawn from the complete picture presented in Table 8 is that Lithuanian participles defined as a morphological class cannot be treated as unequivocally nonfinite. Indeed, in their different uses, Lithuanian participles show considerably varying "balance" of verbal vs. nominal features, ranging from virtually fully "canonical" finite behavior in the active evidential constructions to fairly high degree of nonfiniteness in attributive constructions (let alone numerous cases, not discussed here, of lexicalization when participles turn into adjectives and nouns concomitantly losing all verbal properties).

No less important is the fact that the mutual relationships between different properties of (non)finiteness in Lithuanian participles are far from trivial and do not obviously correlate with each other. In Lithuanian the degree of reduction of verbal features does not always go hand in hand with the degree of elaboration of nominal or adjectival features, and vice versa. Thus, attributive participles distinguish the full arrays of both synthetic tenses (verbal feature) and case

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 (NOM, DF)
	impersonal passive	reduced	GEN	–	fixed (DF)
complement constructions	same-subject	full	⊘	+	fixed (NOM)
	different-subject speech and cognition	full	ACC	–	–
	direct perception	fixed (PRS)	⊘	–	reduced (ACC, GEN)
adverbial constructions	same-subject	reduced	⊘	+	fixed (NOM)
	different-subject	reduced	DAT	–	–
	with *užuot*	fixed (PST)	⊘	+	fixed (NOM)
attributive constructions		reduced (synthetic only)	⊘	n/a	full
periphrastic constructions	perfect/resultative	fixed (PST)	NOM	+	reduced (NOM, ACC, GEN, DAT, DF)
	passive	reduced (PRS, PST)	NOM	+	reduced (NOM, ACC, GEN, DAT, DF)
	avertive	fixed (PRS)	NOM	+	reduced (NOM, ACC, GEN, DAT, DF)
	phasal	fixed (PST)	⊘	+	reduced (NOM, DF)

inflection (nominal feature), while participles in periphrastic constructions are restricted with respect to both of these properties. On the other hand, the correlations between some of the features are purely formal and do not directly match the other properties of (non)finiteness; for instance, in most cases there is a strict covariation between such features as Nominative case marking of the subject and subject agreement, but these are constant across various constructions and do not correlate with, e. g., the retention of tense distinctions. Thus, though it is possible to single out two opposite poles on the "continuum" of (non)finiteness of Lithuanian participial constructions, these constructions do not form a clear hierarchy with a gradual loss of verbal and acquisition of nominal features (as implied by the scalar approaches like Malchukov 2004), but rather occupy a multidimensional and unevenly populated space.

As an anonymous reviewer rightly points out, this result is quite expected given the methodological approach chosen. Indeed, if the very notion of (non) finiteness is first disassembled into a number of independent parameters against each of whom individual constructions are then evaluated, it is quite natural that as a result each construction ends up being characterized by its own array of features. This apparent circularity, however, is not "vicious", because the finer-grained analysis advocated by most current approaches to (non)finiteness allows one to achieve greater descriptive accuracy with respect to the data of individual languages and facilitate crosslinguistic comparison and theoretical interpretation – something which the traditional binary approach entirely misses (see more on this point below).

I conclude that particular constellations of finite and nonfinite properties of participles are determined by the morphosyntactic and semantic characteristics of constructions in which they occur and constraints these constructions impose. It is the constructions themselves and participles as parts thereof rather than participles taken in isolation that can and should be adequately characterized as more or less "finite", cf. similar conclusions in Creissels (2009) with respect to participles in Akhvakh, or Ershova (2012) on the interplay of nominal and verbal features in different uses of deverbal nominals in Besleney Kabardian. Note that I understand "constructions" rather informally as morphosyntactic constellations with particular formal and semantic properties, and that the exact representation let alone formalization of these properties and their interaction specifically with verbal forms, including participles, is certainly beyond the scope of this article (for an attempt of formalization of the morphosyntactic behavior of the constructions with non-agreeing participles see Arkadiev 2018). Notably, however, as far as I may judge from the literature I know (see Section 2), the views expressed here are compatible with a variety of theoretical

frameworks, including both Construction Grammar and at least some versions of Minimalism.

The properties of participles in particular constructions are often motivated by diachronic links of these constructions with others. Thus, for instance, as already noted in Section 6.1 above, the active evidential construction as in Example (65a) has probably arisen by insubordination (Evans 2007) from the same-subject complement construction as in Example (65b), which neatly explains the similar arrays of features displayed by participles occurring in these constructions (see Wiemer 1998 on this historical scenario).

(65) a. *Jon-as*   *niekada* **ne-loš-ęs**   *kort-omis.*
     Jonas-NOM.SG never   NEG-play-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M card-INS.PL
     '(It is said that) Jonas has never played cards.' (constructed)

   b. *Jon-as*$_i$ *sak-ė-si*   [⊘$_i$ *niekada* **ne-loš-ęs**
     Jonas-NOM.SG say-PST.3-RFL   never   NEG-play-PST.PA.NOM.SG.M
     kort-omis].
     card-INS.PL
     'Jonas said that he had never played cards.'
     (adapted from Wiemer 1998: 234)

By contrast, the different-subject complement and adjunct constructions have a completely different origin, see Ambrazas (1990: 141–179) and Arkadiev (2013: 417–420). The vestiges of the former agreeing different-subject complements can be seen in the constructions with verbs of direct perception discussed in Section 4.2. In Old Lithuanian, such constructions were still more widespread and could occur with verbs not implying any perception and compatible with non-simultaneous interpretation of the complement, cf. Example (66) from Jonas Bretkūnas' "Postilla Catholica", published in Königsberg in 1591.

(66) *Atmin-k*   **man-e** *gerai* **giwen-us-i** ...
     remember-IMP.2SG I-ACC   well live-PST.PA.ACC.SG.M
     ir **dari-us-i**   *k-as*   *taw*   *intjkk-a.*
     and do-PST.PA.ACC.SG.M what-NOM.SG you.SG:DAT like-PST.3
     'Remember me having lived well ... and having always done what you liked.'
     (Arkadiev 2013: 418, quoted after Ambrazas 1990: 143)

Likewise, the participles in different-subject adjunct constructions showed agreement with their subject in the Dative case in Old Lithuanian, cf. Example (67) from the same source:

(67) [*Ir*   **reg-i-nt-iemus**   **an-iemus**] *gh-is-sai*   *usseng-e*
      and see-PRS-PA-DAT.PL.M 3-DAT.PL.M 3-NOM.SG.M-DEF ascend-PST.3
      dang-un-a.
      sky-ACC-ALL
      'And while they were looking, He ascended to the sky.'
      (Arkadiev 2013: 417, quoted after Ambrazas 1990: 169)

The evolution of different-subject participial constructions from Old to Modern Lithuanian, as has been shown in the works cited, involved a purely formal process of truncation of case-number-gender markers, which has led to the emergence of the non-inflecting participles as a peculiar switch-reference device and the change of the value of the feature "subject agreement" from the positive to the negative.

I would like to conclude by the following more general observations. First, the Lithuanian data clearly demonstrate that the notions "finite" and "nonfinite" are not elementary with respect to both typological comparison and descriptive analysis of an individual language, and that the morphosyntax of verbal forms requires a multifactorial analysis of the kind proposed in Nikolaeva (2013) and much previous work. Indeed, from a traditional purely formal perspective based exclusively on the morphological expression of person and mood, the whole discussion of the "degrees of (non)finiteness" of Lithuanian participles in their particular uses does not make sense. Instead of the systematic analysis of the interplay of nominal and verbal features in various participial constructions, traditional grammar offers just isolated observations scattered throughout different sections of descriptive works (cf. the relevant chapter of Ambrazas 2006 or the article Klimas 1987). Likewise, in the framework of the binary typological approach to finiteness advocated by Bisang (2001, 2007) and based on the formal expression of the independent status of the predication, it would be hard to characterize Lithuanian, since, on the one hand, the verbal forms inflected for person can appear in subordinate as well as main clauses, and, on the other hand, as we have seen, verbal forms lacking person inflection can nevertheless head full-fledged independent clauses as well; hence, neither presence nor absence of mood and person inflection can serve as grammaticalized markers of the independent resp. dependent predication in Lithuanian.

Moreover, the analysis of Lithuanian participles suggests that the very concept of "(non)finiteness" is to a large extent epiphenomenal with respect to particular constructions (whatever descriptive and theoretical apparatus is employed in their analysis), whose grammatical and semantic properties determine the concrete array of (non)finiteness properties of verbal forms contained in them. Even if these notions are still kept in use of descriptive, theoretical and

typological linguistics, their application must be based on an analysis of language-particular morphosyntactic and semantic properties of concrete forms and constructions – indeed, must presuppose such an analysis.

Finally, the remarkable polyfunctionality of Lithuanian participles and the heterogeneity of their behavior in different environments speaks in favor of such a model of interaction between morphology and syntax where the unity of morphological exponence does not necessarily require a unity of functional content and syntactic properties (cf. e. g., Aronoff 1994; Round 2015).

Abbreviations

1	1st person
2	2nd person
3	3rd person
ACC	Accusative
ALL	Allative
AUX	Auxiliary verb
CNT	Continuative
CVB	Converb
COMP	Comparative
DAT	Dative
DEF	Definite
DEM	Demonstrative
DF	Default agreement form
F	Feminine
FUT	Future
GEN	Genitive
HAB	Habitual
IMP	Imperative
INAN	Inanimate
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
RPOSS   Reflexive possessive
SG   Singular
SPRL   Superlative

References

Adger, David. 2007. Three domains of finiteness: A minimalist perspective. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 23–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yu. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aleksandravičiūtė, Skaistė. 2013. The semantic effects of the subject genitive of negation in Lithuanian. *Baltic Linguistics* 4. 9–38.

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

Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.). 2006. *Lithuanian grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.

Anderson, Cori. 2015. Passivization and argument structure in Lithuanian. In Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Voice and argument structure in Baltic*, 290–322. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2010. Notes on the Lithuanian restrictive. *Baltic Linguistics* 1. 9–49.

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

Arkadiev, Peter. 2012a. Stems in Lithuanian verbal inflection (with remarks on derivation). *Word Structure* 5(1). 7–27.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2012b. Participial complementation in Lithuanian. In Volker Gast & Holger Diessel (eds.), *Clause linkage in cross-linguistic perspective: Data-driven approaches to cross-clausal syntax*, 285–334. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

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

Arkadiev, Peter. 2016. Long-distance genitive of negation in Lithuanian. In Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Argument realization in Baltic*, 37–81. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2018. Predicative participle (non)agreement in Lithuanian: Implications for the theories of agreement and case. Unpublished Ms.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2019. The Lithuanian "*buvo + be*-present active participle" construction revisited: A corpus-based study. *Baltic Linguistics* 10. 65–108.

Arkadiev, Peter, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer. 2015. Introduction: Baltic linguistics – state of the art. In Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer (eds.), *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics*, 1–109. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by itself: Stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bisang, Walter. 2001. Finite vs. non-finite languages. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook*, vol. 2, 1400–1413. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bisang, Walter. 2007. Categories that make finiteness: discreetness from a functional perspective and some of its repercussions. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 115–137. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.). 2013. *Canonical morphology and syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Corbett, Greville G. 2005. The canonical approach to typology. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Adam Hodges & David S. Rood (eds.), *Linguistic diversity and language theories*, 25–49. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Creissels, Denis. 2009. Participles and finiteness: The case of Akhvakh. *Linguistic Discovery* 7(1). 106–130.

Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cristofaro, Sonia. 2007. Deconstructing categories: Finiteness in a functional-typological perspective. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 91–114. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Darden, Bill J. 2015[1992]. On the syntax of Lithuanian participles. In Bill J. Darden, *Studies in phonological theory and historical linguistics*, 263–286. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

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

Dogil, Grzegorz. 1999. Baltic languages. In Harry van der Hulst (ed.), *Word prosodic systems in the languages of Europe*, 877–896. Berlin & New-York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Eide, Kristin Melum (ed.). 2016. *Finiteness matters: On finiteness-related phenomena in natural languages*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Enghels, Renate. 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.

Ershova, Ksenia. 2012. The Besleney masdar: Between a noun and a verb. Paper presented at *Typology, Theory: Caucasus*, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, 29 November–1 December, 2012.

Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Geniušienė, Emma. 2006. Passives in Lithuanian (in comparison with Russian). In Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and typology: Form and function*, 29–61. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Geniušienė, Emma. 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)*, 156–179. Saint Petersburg: Nauka.

Geniušienė, Emma. 2016. *Passive constructions in Lithuanian: Selected works by Emma Geniušienė* [edited by Anna Kibort & Nijolė Maskaliūnienė, transl. by Artūras Ratkus]. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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

Givón, Talmy. 1980. The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements. *Studies in Language* 4(3). 333–377.

Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An introduction*, vol. 2, rev. edn. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gliwa, Bernd. 2003. Nešinas, vedinas, tekinas. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 48. 19–34.

Greenberg, Gerald R. & James E. Lavine. 2006. New syntax in Russian and Lithuanian: The case of the adverbial participle. In Robert Rothstein, Ernest Scatton & Charles Townsend (eds.), *Studies in Slavic linguistics and folklore*, 143–170. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

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

Gronemeyer, Claire & Aurelija Usonienė. 2001. Complementation in Lithuanian. In Claire Gronemeyer, *Laying the boundaries of syntax: Studies in the interfaces between syntax, semantics and lexicon*, 105–135. Lund: Lund University.

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

Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Holvoet, Axel. 2013. Obliqueness, quasi-subjects and transitivity in Baltic and Slavonic. In Ilja Seržant & Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects*, 257–282. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Holvoet, Axel & Birutė Spraunienė. 2012. Towards a semantic map of definite adjectives in Baltic. *Baltic Linguistics* 3. 65–100.

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

Kalinina, Elena Ju. 2001. *Nefinitnye skazuemye v nezavisimom predloženii* [Nonfinite predicates in independent clauses]. Moscow: Institute of World Literature.

Kalinina, Elena Ju & Nina R. Sumbatova. 2007. Clause structure and verbal forms in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 183–249. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kehayov, Petar. 2008. *An areal-typological perspective to evidentiality: The cases of the Balkan and Baltic linguistic areas*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Kehayov, Petar, Liina Lindstöm & Miina Norvik. n.d. Finnic participles and participial constructions in typological, intra-genetic and areal perspective. Unpublished ms.

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

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 1993. *Nominalizations*. London & New York: Routledge.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 1999. Finiteness. In Keith Brown & Jim Miller (eds.), *Concise encyclopedia of grammatical categories*, 146–149. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

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

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

Lavine, James E. 1999. Subject properties and ergativity in North Russian and Lithuanian. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Herbert Coats & Cynthia Vakareliyska (eds.), *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics*, vol. 7, 307–328. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

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

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

Lehmann, Christian. 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, 181–226. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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

Malchukov, Andrej. 2004. *Nominalization/verbalization: Constraining a typology of transcategorial operations*. Munich: Lincom.

Meier-Brügger, Michael. 2003. *Indo-European linguistics*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Nau, Nicole. 1998. *Latvian*. Munich: Lincom.

Nau, Nicole. 2011. *A short grammar of Latgalian*. Munich: Lincom.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1995. Some typological parameters of converbs. In Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds.), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*, 97–136. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nikolaeva, Irina. 2007a. Introduction. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 1–19. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikolaeva, Irina. 2007b. Constructional economy and nonfinite independent clauses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 138–180. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikolaeva, Irina. 2013. Unpacking finiteness. In Dunstan Brown, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Canonical morphology and syntax*, 99–122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Round, Erich R. 2015. Rhizomorphomes, meromorphomes and metamorphomes. In Matthew Baerman, Dunstan Brown & Greville Corbett (eds.), *Understanding and measuring morphological complexity*, 29–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Schleicher, August. 1856. *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache, Bd. I: Grammatik*. Prag: J. G. Calve'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Seržant, Ilja. 2013. Acquisition of canonical subjecthood. In Ilja Seržant & Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects*, 283–310. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Seržant, Ilja. 2015. Dative experiencer constructions as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. In Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet & Björn Wiemer (eds.), *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics*, 325–348. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Shagal, Ksenia. 2013. Towards a comparative concept of participle. Paper presented at the *10th Biennial Meeting of the Association for Linguistic Typology (ALT 10)*, Leipzig, August 2013.

Shagal, Ksenia. 2019. *Participles: A typological study*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Spraunienė, Birutė, Auksė Razanovaitė & Erika Jasonytė. 2015. Solving the puzzle of the Lithuanian passive. In Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Voice and argument structure in Baltic*, 323–365. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stassen, Leon. 1985. *Comparison and universal grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Usonienė, Aurelija. 2003. Extension of meaning: Verbs of perception in English and Lithuanian. In Katarzyna Jaszczolt & Ken Turner (eds.), *Meaning through language contrast: The Cambridge papers*, vol. 1, 193–220. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Usonienė, Aurelija & Jolanta Šinkūnienė. 2017. Potential vs. use: Revisiting an evidential participial construction in Lithuanian. In Marín Arrese, Juana Isabel, Gerda Haßler & Marta Carretero (eds.), *Evidentiality revisited. Cognitive grammar, functional and discourse-pragmatic perspectives*, 171–192. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Usonienė, Aurelija & Nigel Vincent. 2018. Non-finiteness, complementation and evidentiality: The Lithuanian Accusativus cum Participio in a cross-linguistic perspective. In Dalila Ayoun, Agnès Celle & Laure Lansari (eds.), *Tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality: Crosslinguistic perspectives*, 239–260. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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

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

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

Wiemer, Björn. 2004. The evolution of passives as grammatical constructions in Northern Slavic and Baltic languages. In Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Björn Wiemer (eds.), *What makes grammaticalization? A look for its fringes and its components*, 271–331. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

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

Wiemer, Björn. 2006b. Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian. In Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö (eds.), *Passivization and typology: Form and function*, 274–309. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wiemer, Björn. 2016. Taxis in Lithuanian. In Viktor S. Xrakovskij (ed.), *Typology of taxis constructions*, 135–174. Munich: Lincom.

Wiemer, Björn & Valgerður Bjarnadóttir. 2014. On the non-canonical marking of the highest-ranking argument in Lithuanian and Icelandic: Steps toward a database. In Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Grammatical relations and their non-canonical encoding in Baltic*, 301–361. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wiemer, Björn & Markus Giger. 2005. *Resultativa in den nordslavischen und baltischen Sprachen (Bestandsaufnahme unter arealen und grammatikalisierungstheoretischen Gesichtspunkten)*. Munich: Lincom.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. 2016. Taxis: Semantics, syntax, typology. In Viktor S. Xrakovskij (ed.), *Typology of taxis constructions*, 3–98. Munich: Lincom.

Ylikoski, Jussi. 2003. Defining non-finites: Action nominals, converbs and infinitives. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16. 185–237.

Young, Steven. 1991. *The prosodic structure of Lithuanian*. New York: University Press of America.