

Silvia PICCINI
University of Pisa

**TRACES OF NON-NOMINATIVE ALIGNMENT IN
LITHUANIAN: THE IMPERSONAL CONSTRUCTIONS
IN INDO-EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE**

0. Introduction

Lithuanian is an accusative language, as it treats the subject (S) of an intransitive verb like the subject of transitive verbs (A) – both encoded by the nominative –, distinguishing them from the direct object (O) of transitive verbs, marked with an accusative case¹.

In spite of these accusative characteristics, syntactic phenomena, that do not integrate coherently in this pattern, can be pointed out.

In particular, this analysis will focus on the argument realization displayed in Lithuanian by the impersonal monoactantial verbs, where the use of the accusative case like *Subjektkasus* seems to be evidence – at least residual – of an active-like organization in the domain of the syntax.

This structure – consisting of impersonal verb and “subject” marked with accusative case – occurs with different verbs as well in Vedic, Latin, Hittite, the Germanic languages as in the Slavic ones. The genesis of such a syntactic “anomaly” can presumably be placed in an archaic stage of the Indo-European, when the principles organizing the syntax, at some levels of diasystem, were not oriented according to the principles of an accusative language.

In this paper we will not deal with the thorny subject of the Proto-Indo-European coding (which according to some scholars could be active-inactive and in the opinion of others, instead, ergative). Since non-canonical features are typical in all the natural languages and since a holistically organized system does not exist, the purpose of this paper is to recognize evidence of non-canonical subject marking in Lithuanian and to discuss it.

Before explaining in detail the impersonal constructions in Lithuanian, some preliminary remarks on the terminology used in this article are in or-

¹ See Cuzzolin (1998) and the bibliography mentioned there.

der. We will not use the term “impersonal” as synonymous of “subjectless”², but rather of “agentless”. As we shall observe, most of these impersonal constructions do have a subject, although this is marked in a non-canonical way, because of its inactive, unagentive semantic role (UNDERGOER).

In this paper we will assume the classification of impersonal constructions proposed in Moreno 1990. We shall distinguish between *agentless impersonals*, that denote uncontrolled events, and *impersonals with an agent*. This second class of impersonal constructions denotes controlled events in which the controller can be [+specific], for instance the agentive passives of Spanish and Dutch, or a generic agent, denoted by a special word such as German *man*, French *on*, Spanish *se*.

Agentless impersonals are classified in:

- *external agentless impersonals*, the so-called *Witterungsimpersonalia*, when the participant involved in the event is characterized by the feature [-animacy];
- *internal agentless impersonals*, when an animate – typically human – participant is involved.

This last type of construction and its argument realization will be investigated in the first part of this article (1.). In particular, I will focus on experiential predicates denoting physical processes such as *gelti* “to ache”, *skaudėti* or *sopėti* “to hurt”, *mausti* “to ache”, *peršėti* “to tingle”, *troškinti* “to be thirsty”, *dusinti* “to stifle”, *pykinti* “to anger, to feel sick”, *niežėti* “to itch”, etc.

In the second section (2.) I will show patterns of active-like typology both in unaccusative contexts and in the *external agentless impersonals*. Finally, I will draw some conclusions (3.).

1. Internal agentless impersonals and their argument realization

The *verba sentiendi*, known in the literature as well as *psychological predicates* (psych-verbs), always attracted the attention of scholars, because of their peculiar syntactic behaviour, particularly of their argument realization. These verbs involve, indeed, an animate actant, typically human, with the semantic role of experiencer. They denote an internal condition of subject, which does not have any control over the event described by the verb: in terms of

² The definition of impersonal structure proposed by Lambert (1998) is different: «le mot (scil. impersonnel) désigne l'absence ou l'effacement du sujet (ou premier actant) là où l'attend, c'est-à-dire avec un verbe conjugué».

Fillmore's (1968) grammar they govern a dative, rather than an agentive, as they do not allow any will of the participant in the action³.

The stimulus, the source of the experience, is not necessarily characterized by features [+animacy] and [+human], contrary to the experiencer.

There is, therefore, a semantically oriented pole opposite to another, that is not semantically oriented.

The prototypical bivalent verbs, namely the transitive activity predicates, usually denote an activity performed by a human actant, which is highly animated, that entails a change of state over an inactive patient.

In the experiential predicates the semantic vector is reversed: the activity does not start from an animate actant, but rather it is the human actant that undergoes the effects, being the point of arrival, not the starting point of the process.

This semantic problem produces different ways of experiencer marking⁴:

³ Cruse (1973), after a careful study of the syntactic properties of agentive verbs in English, concludes that there are four agent-like roles – volitive, effective, initiative, and agentive – that must be distinguished, as they display distinctive behaviour.

⁴ The terminology, adopted here, is based on Haspelmath 2001. Bossong's study on the experiencer coding in the Standard Average European is also worth mentioning. He investigated ten experiential predicates in forty languages: three cognition predicates (*see, forget, remember*), four sensation predicates (*be cold, be hungry, be thirsty, have a headache*), and three emotion predicates (*be glad, be sorry, like*). One of the most remarkable results of this research is the tendency for the SAE languages to realize the experiencer as Agent, in the nominative case. Based on Bossong's observations, Haspelmath points out that the cognition predicates show a strong affinity with the agent-like experiencer construction, the emotion predicates tend to realize, following the Bossong terminology, "inverted" constructions, that is the experiencer is encoded in accusative/dative. The sensation predicates are intermediate between cognition and emotion (Haspelmath 1984, 64 «It is perhaps not surprising that cognition concepts, i.e. the more rational aspects of our mental life, should be assimilated most easily to the transitive prototype of volitional causation, while emotion concepts, i.e. the most irrational aspects of our experience, are the most likely to have the experiencer in object position»). Even though the Bossong's conclusion is still valid, there is one point I want to make clear: the scholar, as regard the Baltic languages, considers equivalent constructions such as *man šalta* "I am cold" or *man malonu* "it is a pleasure for me" and constructions like *man skauda galvą* "I have got a headache". In both cases, according to Bossong, the dative marks the experiencer. Actually, as I will try to show, the dative in the structures such as *man skauda galvą* has a possessive meaning (*dativus sympatheticus*) and codes the inalienable possession. The experiencer is, on the contrary, encoded in accusative.

- **Agent-like experiencer.** The experiential predicate is treated like a normal transitive predicate and the prototypical argument realization of the bivalent transitive verb is generalized: the experiencer is encoded as an A (in the nominative case) and the stimulus as an O (therefore in the accusative case).

In Lithuanian the experiencer is in nominative with verbs such as *mėgti* “to like”, *atsiminti* “to remember”, *džiaugtis* “to joy”, *užmiršti* “to forget” etc., as seen in the following examples:

| | | |
|---------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <i>Aš</i> | <i>mėgstu</i> | <i>muziką.</i> |
| I PERS.PRON.NOM.SG. | to likePRES.1SG. | musicACC.SG. |

“I like music.”

| | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------|
| <i>Aš</i> | <i>džiaugiuosi,</i> | <i>kad</i> | <i>skambinai.</i> |
| I PERS.PRON.NOM.SG. | to be gladPRES.1SG. | thatCOMP. | to callPAST2SG. |

“I’m glad that you have called.”

- **Dative-experiencer.** The experiencer is encoded in the dative, whereas the stimulus, when it does occur, behaves like an S. This is the case of the Lithuanian verb *patikti* “to like”:

| | | |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Man</i> | <i>patinka</i> | <i>šita knyga.</i> |
| I PERS.PRON. DAT.SG. | to likePRES.3 | this ADJ.DEM.+ bookNOM.SG. |

“I like this book.”

or expressions such as:

| | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| <i>Man</i> | <i>šalta.</i> |
| I PERS.PRON.DAT.SG. | coldADJ.NEUTER |

“I’m cold.”

- **Patient-like experiencer.** The experiencer is treated like an O (and therefore is encoded in the accusative) and the stimulus like an A (marked with a nominative case).

In Lithuanian there is a small class of verbs denoting physical states, such as “to hurt”, “to itch”, “to sting”, where the experiencer is marked with an accusative:

skaudėti = *jausti kūno kančią*: to feel pain

sopėti = *skaudėti*: to ache

diegti = *smarkiai skaudėti, gelti, smelkti*: to feel a strong and sudden pain

gelti = *labai skaudėti*: to ache a lot

mausti = *po truputį be perstogės skaudėti*: to ache a bit incessantly

peršėti = *dilgiai skaudėti*: to feel a prickly pain (about the skin, wound)

niežėti (or **knitėti**) = *peršėti, knitėti odai*: to itch (about the skin)

These predicates, in their impersonal monoactantial use, select an argument with the syntactic function of subject⁵ and thematic relation of experiencer.

In the languages with a nominative-accusative case system, such as Lithuanian, the subject is always marked in the same way – nominative – quite apart from its semantic role: both the argument of an activity predicate, typically agentive and uninvolved by the event, and the argument introduced by a state predicate, non-agentive and completely affected by the verbal process, are encoded as “subjects” (i.e. in nominative).

Nevertheless, deviations from these case/grammatical relation associations can be pointed out. The experiential predicates, mentioned above, denoting physical processes, unintentional activities, over which the subject has no control⁶, display a non canonical subject marking. This is marked with an accusative case, instead of a nominative, as one might expect. This phenomenon is known in literature as *extended accusative*. The term was introduced by Moravcsik (1978), to indicate the extension of the accusative case, which encodes the object (O) of a transitive predicate, to the subject of some intransitive verbs (S), denoting mostly mental processes, unvolitional actions and existence⁷.

The use of the accusative markers to code some intransitive subjects, instead of the nominative, is interpreted by Moravcsik as a relic of the “erga-

⁵ We shall assume the multifactor notion of subject, connected to the interaction of pragmatic, semantic and syntactic factors (see Keenan 1976 and Comrie 1989). The notion of subject as a grammatical relation needs to be distinguished from its morpho-syntactic instantiation, as we will see.

⁶ Lots of experiential predicates, analysed here, are characterized by the suffix *-ėti*: they are statives. Formally the *-ė* comes from a **-ē*, a marker of statives in other Indo-European languages (see Latin *tacēre, habēre* etc.). It is known that the argument of a stative predicate is typically inactive and affected by the event described by the verb (see Van Valin & LaPolla 1997; Van Valin 2001; 2005); it has, in terms of the Role and Reference Grammar, the Macrorole of UNDERGOER.

⁷ S, A, O are syntactico-semantic primitives: S (subject) refers to the sole argument of an intransitive predicate, A (Agent) and O (Patient) refer, respectively, to the subject and to the object of a transitive predicate. In their prototypical encoding, they coincide with the notion of subject (S and A) and object (O), in the languages where these relations can be identified (Dixon 1979).

tive” pattern in languages that exhibit accusative patterning in their commonest case-marking system.

In my opinion, these constructions, found in Lithuanian, seem to follow an active-inactive pattern, in which the sole argument of an intransitive verb (S) is sometimes marked in the same way as the subject of a transitive verb (A), and sometimes in the same manner as the direct object of a transitive verb (accusative).

The underlying principle is clear: the accusative, the prototypical object case, inherently inactive, is extended to code also the inagentive, inactive subject, as atypical.

In the coding of the actants three parameters interact: syntactic role, thematic relation and animacy /individuation hierarchy. The conflict between syntactic role of the subject, typically agentive, and the inactive semantic role of the animate actant explains why this participant is marked non canonically with the accusative.

Let us look at the following examples⁸:

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------|
| <i>Man</i> | <i>pilvq⁹</i> | <i>skaust.</i> | KII18 |
| I PERS.PRON.DAT.SG | stomachACC.SG. | to achePRES.3 | |

“I have stomach-ache.”

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| <i>Nuo tų dūmų</i> | <i>galvą</i> | <i>sopa.</i> | NS500 |
| PREP.+ that smokeGEN.PL. | headACC.SG. | to achePRES.3 | |

“I have got a headache because of that smoke.”

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|----|
| <i>Ar</i> | <i>tau</i> | <i>žandą</i> | <i>labai</i> | <i>maudžia ?</i> | Rm |
| INTERR.PART. | you PERS.PRON.DAT.SG. | jawACC.SG. | a lotADV. | to hurtPRES.3 | |

“Does your jaw hurt a lot?”

⁸ The examples illustrated were drawn from the *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (20 volumes), published between 1941 and 2002, containing about a million and a half entries and from a Corpus elaborated by the Centre of Computational linguistics of the University of Vytautas Magnus. This Corpus, prepared in order to give a broad description of standard Lithuanian, contains 100 million entries and is based, essentially, on the material drawn from the Lithuanian press since 1990 (the Independence period). This balanced Corpus is made up primarily of texts of the general press (regional and national newspapers) and the specialized press (specialized newspapers and journals), somewhat less of pieces drawn from romances, scientific and popular literature and official documents.

⁹ Some experiential predicates can govern a locative case. For details see K a t k u v i e n ė 1985.

Širdį heartACC.SG. *man* I PERS.PRON.DAT.SG. *diegia.* to have a twingePRES.3 R338

“I have a twinge in my heart.”

Sumuštus beatPAST PASSIVE PART.ACC.PL. *kaulus* bonesACC.PL. *moteriai* womanDAT.SG. *gelia* to bitPRES.3 *iki šiol.* stillADV. Corpus

“The woman’s bones still hurt after the beating”.

Daugeliui manyDAT.SG. *jų* theyPERS.PRON.GEN.PL. *perši* to itchPRES.3 *gerklę.* throatACC.SG. Corpus

“Most of them have a sore throat.”

Nuolat ConstantlyADV. *niežti* to itchPRES.3 *galvos* headGEN.SG. *odą.* skinACC.SG. Corpus

“The scalp constantly itches”.

The cases, illustrated above, show patterns of active-like typology, since it is the semantic role that is pertinent in the coding of the subject: the person (see below) or the body part that are affected by the ache are expressed by the accusative (and not by the nominative, as one might expect), as inactive and not agentive (UNDERGOER¹⁰).

In negated sentences two kinds of constructions are possible (see Senn 1966, 424):

Man I PERS.PRON.DAT.SG. *neskauda* NEG.+ to achePRES.3 *galvos.* headGEN.SG. Senn 1966, 424

and

Man I PERS.PRON.DAT.SG. *galvą* headACC.SG. *neskauda* NEG. + to achePRES.3 Senn 1966, 424

¹⁰ According to Foley and Van Valin (1984, 29), the two Macroroles of Actor and Undergoer subsume the different thematic relations. They are defined respectively as «the argument of a predicate which expresses the participant which performs, effects, instigates or controls the situation denoted by the predicate» and «the argument which expresses the participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation, but rather is affected by it in some way». Intransitive verbs can take either Macroroles, depending on the Logical Structure (LS) of the verb: if the verb has an activity predicate in its LS, the Macrorole is an Actor; if the verb has a stative predicate in its LS, the Macrorole is Undergoer.

The body part affected by the event described by the verb can occur or in accusative or in genitive. In Lithuanian, in negated sentence, both the object of a transitive predicate and the subject of the intransitive verb *būti* “to be”, in its existential meaning, are coded by the genitive.

This double coding of the experiencer part in the negated sentence could be explained in the following way: the experiencer part is encoded by the genitive as a standard object, since it is an object in the deep structure of the clause; the experiencer part is, however, the logical subject of the predicate and therefore can keep being encoded in the same way as in the positive sentence (in this case in accusative), as all subjects of predicates except for *būti*.¹¹

The construction – consisting of “subject” in the accusative case and impersonal verb – already occurs in the first grammars (Kurschat)¹² and in the first authors of Lithuanian literature¹³:

¹¹ Klein pointed out that sometimes the predicates, in negated sentences, as well as in the ancient texts, governed the accusative of the object and not the genitive, as one might expect and as the rule requires («Verba cum particula negativa *ne* posita frequentissime genitivum recipiunt, cum alias sine illa accusativum admitterent» 1977, 154).

¹² See Kurschat 1876, 376: “Das Sprachgefühl sträubt sich dagegen, diese Accusative als blosser Accusative der Beziehung anzusehen”. There is no mention of these constructions in the *Pirmoji lietuvių gramatika* (1653), neither in the Sapūno ir Šulco Gramatika – *Compendium Grammaticae Lithuanicae* (1673), nor in the Anoniminė 1737 Gramatika *Universitas linguarum Lituaniae* (1737), nor in Čiulda (1854-1855), nor in Schleicher (1856-1857). In Senn (1966), as well as in Kurschat (1876), the accusative of the body part affected by the ache is interpreted as an accusative of relation. The same thesis is supported more recently by Balkevičius 1998. Our analysis goes in a totally different direction; the accusative marks the inactive experiencer. The structures, analysed here, are also in the contemporary grammars: *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, edited by Ulvydas (1965-1976) and *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, edited by Ambrazas (1996, 2^d ed.), but an active-inactive reading is not provided for.

¹³ Daukša is an exception: the experiencer introduced by the predicate *sopėti* “to ache”, the sole experiential predicate attested by this author, always occurs in the nominative case. A syntactic loan translation cannot be ruled out, as Daukša translated the *Postilė* from the Wujek’s work, written in Polish.

422₃₃ *Sopa gałwa/ o ant pęczio apertūra dâro fkaũft ingftai*
 pol. *Boli glowá/ a na ramieniu ápture częnio: bola nerki.*
 176₂₇. *tái yrá/ ant wiêtų g̃fłotų ir káułtų/ kuriós didzêufe jôpa pázejstos*
 pol. *y zyly tãrgálo/ ták iz zãwfze bolu przyraflálo*

Skaust
to achePRES.3^a
“I am aching.”

*manę*¹⁴.
mePERS.PRON.ACC.SG.

Bretkūnas, Prov.2335

The difference between *man skauda galvą* and *mane skauda* is that in the first case the process crucially affects a body part: the structure is part-centered; in the second case, on the other hand, the structure is whole-centered, i.e. the whole person is affected.

Constructions with a pronoun encoded by the accusative in modern standard Lithuanian are no longer possible, as they are marked: the first person pronoun is on the top of the animacy/individuation hierarchy and refers to an [+animate] and [+human] actant, typically agentive. In such constructions the contrast among inactive semantic role, syntactic role of subject and animacy/individuation hierarchy is much more evident than in those constructions, where it is the body part, less animate and less individuated than a human referent, that is encoded by the accusative. In modern Lithuanian forms equivalent to the ancient Lithuanian *mane visą skauda* are *man skauda visą kūną* “all the body is aching” or *man viskas skauda* “I am aching all over”.

In the monoactantial experiential constructions, I am analysing, the verb always occurs in the third person¹⁵: the non-agreement of the verb and the

Although Daukša is regarded as the founding father of the literary language, in his writings, there are often syntactic innovations: «Daukšos sintaksę daug kur lėmė pažodinis vertimas. Dėl to dažnai nepaisoma įprastinės lietuvių kalboje žodžių tvarkos... Veiksmožodinės konstrukcijos neretai keičiamos daiktavardinėmis... Dažnai nelietuviškai vartojami prielinksniai... Visa tai gerokai užgožė gyvąją ano meto kalbos sintaksę, jos konstrukcijų atspindžius»: translation: “A literal translation influences a lot of Daukša’s syntax. Therefore, he often does not maintain the word order typical of the Lithuanian language. The verbal constructions not seldom are replaced with nominal ones... Often Lithuanian prepositions are not used. It all casts a shadow on the living syntax of the language of that period and the typical constructions” (Kazlauskas 1968, 189-190).

¹⁴ Specht (1931, 50) wants to emend this form with *skaustim*. This emendation seems not to be necessary, as subject accusative coding occurs as well as in the dialects: *Manę visą sopa* (Lp.) “I am aching all over”; *Mane* [sic] *visą skauda, kad skauda, jejus!* (Rs.) “I am aching all over, what pain o Jesus!”; *Net mane* [sic] *skauda, kad tu sergi.* (Krok.) “I am sorry that you are not well.”

¹⁵ In Lithuanian the ending of third person is formally a pure stem, with a singular, dual and plural function for any tense and mood. According to some scholars this feature is archaic, inherited from an Indo-European stage, that encodes the lack of participation of the third person in the communicative process. For the different hypothesis see D i n i

subject iconically reflects the autonomy of the event described by the predicate in regard to the participants. It has been shown, that these constructions denote, from a semantic point of view, an internal condition of the subject, affected by the verbal process, over which he does not have control («the human is unvolitionally involved in the state of affairs and that there also is no conceivable CAUSER for that event/process», McCawley's 1976, 201).

As Scholz (1973) pointed out in his monograph dedicated to impersonal constructions in Russian, the speaker, talking about his mental or physical state, focuses on the state itself. Thus, he prefers an impersonal expression, stressing that the verbal process develops independently of the will of the actant. In this way, the event described by the predicate is portrayed as taking place spontaneously, by itself, rather than being carried out by an external causer.

The verb is the topic, the element that takes a particular prominence in the clause in respect to the rest. The preference for the topical elements to occupy the clause-initial position explains the reason why the subject, in these specific experiential structures, very often appears after the verb (VS).

Although it is only an epiphenomenon, influenced first of all by factors of a pragmatic kind, it is noteworthy that the subject occurs in a marked postverbal position, as the object in transitive clauses (or the core actants of unaccusative verbs¹⁶). In fact, the subject of these experiential constructions is closer to transitive patients than transitive agents, as being inactive, static (UNDERGOER, in terms of the Role and Reference Grammar).

The postverbal positioning of the subject in the commentative part of a clause can also be regarded as a strategy of "event-focusing in discourse" (Dressler 1968, 4).

The dative, when it does occur, denotes the person whose the body part is affected by the verbal process. Such a *dativus sympathicus* has a possessive shade and usually occurs, in Lithuanian, with verbs denoting physical or mental states, such as:

(1997) and the bibliography mentioned there. The grammars interpret these structures as impersonal with the verb in third singular person. In this article, I will assume Lehmann's definition of impersonal verbs: «The forms of impersonals are third singular present indicatives» (1991: 33).

¹⁶ This tendency to the VS order, where the subject occurs in a postverbal position typical of comment position, is particularly evident with some verbal classes, such as predicates denoting existence, the coming into existence, the cessation of existence, and more generally essential changes of state of core actants.

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|
| <i>Nusviro</i> | <i>tėvui</i> | <i>galva.</i> | Ambrazas 2006, 253 |
| to spinPAST3 | fatherDAT.SG. | headACC.SG. | |
| “His father’s head span.” | | | |

| | | | |
|------------------------|------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Nukirto</i> | <i>jam</i> | <i>ranką</i> ¹⁷ . | Ambrazas 2006, 253 |
| to cut off PAST3 | himDAT.SG. | handACC.SG. | |
| “He cut off his hand.” | | | |

In modern standard Lithuanian, as well as in ancient texts, the dative encode the *external possession*¹⁸ and is equivalent to a possessive pronoun:

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>ta szalczui sutrins galwa/Ir tu igelsi kulni jos.</i> (BrPII 7 ₁₇₋₁₈) | Fraenkel 1928, 122 |
| “This one will stamp on the head of the snake and you will bite her heel.” | |

Nevertheless in the experiential structures, examined here, the dative seems to be the sole possible marker case¹⁹ and combines only with the typical elements of inalienable possession: body parts, clothes, objects strictly bound to the person in question²⁰.

¹⁷ Such constructions are also used in Russian, in German, in the Romance languages, and in Albanian. The dative with this possessive function is well attested, in an archaic stage, in all the Indo-European languages, but tends to be replaced, over time, by a possessive pronoun. Some scholars made a connection between the loss of the casual flexion and the loss of this *dativus sympathicus*. For a treatment of the construction with external possessor in the European languages see König, Haspelmath 1998; for a study on the external possession in Lithuanian see Kerevičienė 2004.

¹⁸ The external possessor is prototypically the possessor “of the relevant body part expressed by a separate clause-level constituent in the dative case that is not a part of the same phrase as the possessum” (König 2001, 970). The external possessor, according to König (2001), is prototypically animate, human and even speech-act participant.

¹⁹ For some speakers it is also possible to say “*Mano galvą skauda*”, but this structure is more marked, because it entails a kind of independence of the head from the whole body. A structure such as ** “*Man skauda mano galvą*” instead is impossible: this can be regarded as a proof that *man* and *mano* have the same function: they mark the inalienable possession.

²⁰ See *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika* (1996, 611): «Savybinis naudininkas įtraukiamas į beasmenius sakinius tais pačiais atvejais, kaip ir į asmeninius: kai reikia nusakyti dalies ir visumos santykį. Asmuo reiškiamas naudininku, jo dalis ar drabužis – galininku» “The possessive dative occurs in the impersonal constructions in the same cases as personal constructions: when it does occur, it expresses the relation between a part and the whole. The person is encoded by the dative, his body part or his clothes are in the accusative case”. The Lithuanian does not distinguish between alienable and inalienable

It is different with regard to the genitive of the possessive pronoun because it has a direct link to the verb (Jablonskis: «nutinkančio kam dalyko» “something that happens to someone”²¹). Jakobson (1936/1971) pointed out that the dative is closely correlated to the accusative: the first is characterized by the feature [+peripheral], the second has a central and non-peripheral *Hauptbedeutung*. Both denote an involvement of the referent in the verbal process: the accusative refers, in the structures I am analysing, to the part directly involved in the verbal process; the dative to the object peripherally involved. In the inalienable relation between the body part and the person, to whom this belongs, it is natural to think that a process, which directly involves a part, causes concomitant effects on the whole person.

These constructions, often used in the spoken language, are very archaic, as the comparison shows. The structure, consisting of impersonal verb and “subject” in accusative marker, is well attested, indeed, in many Indo-European languages.

For instance the Latin constructions with the impersonal verbs such as *pigere* “to be sorry”, *pudere* “to feel ashamed”, *paenitere* “to regret”, *miserere* “to have pity”, *taedere* “to be bored, to be fed up”:

Fratris me quidem pudet pigetque (Ter., Ad. 391–992)²² “I really feel ashamed for my brother and feel sorry for him.”

possession, a typical feature of the inactive: active languages. It displays, nevertheless, in the expression of possession, a distinctive feature of the active languages: the possessive adjectives “my” and “your” have two forms, respectively *mano* ~ *savo* and *tavo* ~ *savo*. The form *savo* occurs only when there is the coreferentiality between subject/agent and possessor. Another trace of possession coding, not distinctive of the accusative languages, is the construction known as “dative of possession”, attested in all the Indo-European languages: the element owned occurs in the nominative, unmarked case; the verb “to be” is in third person and the possessor is encoded by an oblique case, the dative. This syntactic structure has been replaced over time both in Lithuanian and in some other Indo-European languages by structures with the verb “to have”, a typical feature of a syntax where the notion of transitivity is pertinent. The construction of dative of possession and other elements lead some scholars to suppose a Proto-Indo-European stage not nominative–accusative but active–inactive oriented (see Bauer 1996, 2000).

²¹ The quotation is drawn from Ambrazas 2006.

²² Patterns of active-like typology are already attested in archaic Latin in some areas of syntax. The use of the accusative to encode the “subject” reappears in Late/Medieval Latin and gradually spreads together with the disappearance of voice distinction, well attested already in the second half of the IV century B.C. In particular, the accusative seems to spread from the nominal structures to the equative ones, from the impersonal

This construction is well attested in Vedic as well:

Na mā taman na śraman na tandrat. (RV, II, 30, 7) "I am neither, lazy, tired nor insolent."

Stryiaṃ dr̥ṣṭavāyaṃ kitavāṃ tatāpa. (RV, X, 34, 11) "The player feels sad when he sees a woman."

in the Germanic languages:

Gothic: *þana gaggandan dumis ni huggreiþ jah þana galaubjandan du mis ni þarseiþ hvanhun.* (Deibrück 1900, 33) "He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst";

Old English²³: *mee likes... go see the hoped heaven* (Lightfoot 1979, 230) "I like to go see the hoped heaven."

me thynketh I heare (Lightfoot 1979, 229) "I think that I hear."

O.H.Germ./M.H.Germ.²⁴: *mir/mich gerinnet* "I miss"; *mich belanget* "I desire, I want"; *mich hungert* "I am hungry"; *mich dürstet* "I am thirsty".

constructions to the passive-anticausative ones, intransitive and finally transitive. After a early stage of active alignment, Latin passes to a neutral coding of the actants, where the order of the elements in the clause and/or the verbal concordance allow to distinguish the participants A and O (see Cennamo 2001).

²³ In Old English there was a large class of experiential predicates which could occur with an accusative experiencer subject, for instance *hyngrian* "to be hungry", *lystan* "to want", *langian* "to long for", *eglian* "to worry, to trouble" and many others (for a full list see Allen 1995). In Middle English these constructions became obsolete; several of the verbs disappeared or underwent a drastic change in the coding of the experiencer actant. According to a traditional explanation, there was a reanalysis due to the ambiguity that arose after case distinction had been reduced in Middle English. For instance *the wife_{DAT} liked_{PL} the words_{NOM}* is reanalyzed as *the wife_{SOGG} liked_{SG} the words_{OCC}* (see Van der Gaaf 1904; Lightfoot 1979; Von Steffrenz-Montag 1984). The process of re-analysis is gradual: the NP of the experiencer acquires *behavioural properties*, associated with subjecthood in the language, prior to the *coding properties*, typical of the subject, e.g. nominative case and control of verb agreement (see Cole et al. 1980).

²⁴ These constructions are not usual today in standard German, but many impersonal expressions are still familiar to some speakers. They have been replaced by personal constructions basically in two ways: or by the introduction of a *dummy subject* "es" (for instance *mich schaudert* > *es schaudert mich*) or by a nominative experiencer subject (*mich schaudert* > *ich schaudere*). For a discussion detailed see Von Steffrenz-Montag 1984.

and in Hittite²⁵:

I tarkijazzi kuinki. (Friedrich 1960–1967, 193) “Someone falls ill.”
Tuk-ma irmaliġattat. (Friedrich 1960–1967, 193) “Do you get ill?”

The incoherence of these constructions in nominative language explains why, in the Lithuanian dialects of the north-western area, these impersonal structures with the experiential predicates have the personal equivalents: the body part affected by the ache is encoded not with the accusative marker, but with a nominative, as one might regularly expect in a language characterized by a nominative-accusative syntax. The subject, quite apart from its experiencer semantic role, inactive, unvolitional, is encoded as an ACTOR, that is in nominative. Let us look at the following examples:

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---------------------|--|------------------------|----|
| Sopa | | <i>man</i> | | <i>visi sqnariai.</i> | J. |
| to achePRES.3 | | I PERS.PRON.DAT.SG. | | all ADJ.+ jointNOM.PL. | |

“All my joints ache.”

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|--------|
| <i>Nejaugi</i> | <i>dabar</i> | <i>jiems</i> | niežti | <i>nagai?</i> | Corpus |
| reallyINTERR.PART. | nowADV. | theyPERS.PRON.DAT.PL. | to itchPRES.3 | nailsNOM.PL. | |

“Really do their nails itch?”

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| Skauda | | <i>visas kūnas.</i> | | | Corpus |
| to itchPRES.3 | | all ADJ. + body NOM.SG. | | | |

“All the body itches”.

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------|
| <i>Tik</i> | gelia | <i>didelė žaizda</i> | <i>širdyje.</i> | Corpus |
| OnlyCONJ. | to stingPRES.3 | big ADJ.+ woundNOM.SG. | heartLOC.SG. | |

“Only big wounds hurt the heart.”

The experiencer, encoded by the nominative (agent-like experiencer), can also be found in the contemporary press, although these forms are not in the normative grammars.

This development fits the general tendencies of Indo-European languages (Bauer 1998).

The use of the accusative as *Subjektkasus* occurs as well with other monoactantial experiential predicates, such as *troškinti* “to be thirsty”, *dusinti*

²⁵ Note, however, that the verbs of sickness can also be construed with a personal subject:

EGIR-*ma-aš irmaliyattat* “but later he became ill as well” (see Friedrich 1960–1967, 193).

“to stifle”, *pykinti* “to feel sick”, *purtyti o pertinti* “to be disgusted”, *laužyti* “to break” (intr.), *kratyti* “to shake”.

Let look us to the following sentences:

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|------|
| <i>Aš</i> | <i>negaliu</i> | <i>riebiai</i> | <i>valgyt,</i> | <i>mane</i> | <i>partina.</i> | Snt. |
| I PERS. | can NEG.+ | fat | eat | I PERS. | to disgust | |
| PRON.NOM.SG. | PRES 3 | ADV. | INF. | PRON.ACC.SG. | PRES.3 | |

“I cannot eat fat, it disgusts me.”

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----|
| <i>Muni</i> ²⁶ | <i>baisiai</i> | <i>troškina.</i> | Sd. |
| I PERS.PRON.ACC.SG. | awfullyADV. | to be thirstyIND.3 | |

“I am awfully thirsty”.

| | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------|
| <i>Ji</i> | <i>vis labiau</i> | <i>dusino.</i> | DLKG 607 |
| shePRON.PERS.ACC.SG. | more and moreADV. | stiflePRES.3 | |

“She feels ever more stifled.”

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|----------|
| <i>Gal</i> | <i>prieš</i> | <i>oro</i> | <i>atmainą</i> | <i>mane</i> | <i>taip</i> | <i>laužo.</i> | DLKG 607 |
| perhaps | before | weather | change | I PERS.PRON. | so | to break | |
| ADV. | PREP. | GEN.SG. | ACC.SG. | ACC.SG. | ADV. | PRES.3 | |

“My bones are aching with the change of season.”

| | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------|
| <i>Vežime</i> | <i>ligonę</i> | <i>labai</i> | <i>kratė.</i> | DLKG 607 |
| cartLOC.SG. | patientACC.SG. | muchADV. | to shakePAST3 | |

“The patient was severely shaken in the cart.”

These predicates deserve particular treatment, as characterized by the causative suffix *-inti* (or *-yti*). They have two uses: in their monovalent/impersonal use clear elements of non-nominative syntax emerge. The sole participant S is encoded by the accusative, as totally affected by the verbal process: there is no will, nor control of the actant in the event. In these cases, the accusative, prototypical marker of the object, as inactive, is extended to code the atypical subject, which has little or no control over the verbal process, being “inert” or “neutral” in the clause (Vincent 1982).

The verbs, mentioned in these examples, incorporate the notion of an external cause, but do not entail the notion of Agent in order to avoid the representation of the event as spontaneous and internal to the subject.

In the monovalent/impersonal use of these predicates the external cause is implicitly evoked by the causative marker, which highlights the lack of

²⁶ *Muni* is the dialectal form of *mane*.

control of the experiencer in the verbal process. The event is encoded, in this way, as completely internal to the subject. The intransitive/impersonal use of these predicates is close to the passive, since in both the external cause is defocused and there is a reduction of the valency of the verb²⁷.

2. Elements of active syntax in the unaccusative contexts and in the external agentless impersonals

The construction, consisting of impersonal verb and subject marked with the accusative, seems to also occur in the contexts known in the literature as unaccusative.

The non-homogeneous nature of intransitives cross-linguistically is a well-known phenomenon: in several languages, the sole argument (S) of some intransitive verbs is semantically similar to the Patient-like nuclear argument (O) of a canonical transitive verb, whereas the sole argument of other intransitive verbs is akin to the Agent-like nuclear argument (A) of canonical transitive verbs²⁸.

The subject of the unaccusatives is characterized by a low agentivity: the participant does not have any control over the event described by the verb. He seems to undergo a change of state produced by external factors.

Also in the unaccusative constructions, therefore, the syntactic role of the subject, prototypically active, clashes with the inactive semantic role. This

²⁷ Such a reading of these predicates seems to give an answer to doubts put forward by Holvoet 2005. According to the latter, the impersonal use of such predicates as *kratyti* or *mėtyti* presents some difficulties: these verbs, indeed, in most constructions introduce a subject marked in the mandatory nominative case, but in other cases they do not have any expression of the agent, which is neither understood nor can be inferred by contextual inferences. The assumption that these verbs can have a transitive/causative use and an impersonal/inchoative use partly resolves the problem. The subject is always expressed, but in different morphological cases: in the causatives it is encoded by nominative as Agent, in the inchoatives is in accusative, as Patient, as an object in deep structure.

²⁸ In literature the term *underlying object* is often used in order to denote transitive object and unaccusative subject. This term is often associated with multistratal theories, such as the *d-structure* and *s-structure* in Generative Grammar. In Relational Grammar the verbs, whose subject is an initial 2/D-object in the initial stratumD-structure level of representation of the clause, are unaccusative. The so-called Unaccusative hypothesis, presented by Perlmutter 1978, attracted several researchers, starting with the Relational Grammar of Perlmutter and Postal, and Burzio and his Government and Binding framework.

conflict explains the non-canonical marking of the subject, by the accusative.

Let us have a look at the following examples:

| | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|
| <i>Mane</i> | <i>buvo</i> | <i>smarkiai</i> | <i>išbėrę.</i> | DLKG 608 |
| I PERS.PRON.ACC.SG. | to bePAST.3 | intenselyADV. | eruptPART.NEUTRAL | |

“The marks were scattered all over my body.” (I was covered in bruises/marks.)

| | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------|
| <i>Man</i> | <i>nukėlė</i> | <i>spuogais</i> | <i>liežuvi</i> | DLKG 608 |
| I PERS.PRON.DAT.SG. | to appearPAST3 | spotsINSTR.PL. | tongueACC.SG. | |

“Spots have appeared on my tongue.”

| | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------------|----------|
| <i>Mane</i> | <i>kartais</i> | <i>išmuša</i> | <i>raudonomis dėmėmis.</i> | DLKG 608 |
| I PRON.ACC.1SG. | sometimesADV. | to getPRES.3 | red ADJ.+ spot INSTR.PL. | |

“I sometimes get red marks on the body.” (Sometimes I’m full of red spots.)

| | | | |
|--------------|---------------|--|----------|
| <i>Vaiką</i> | <i>išbėrė</i> | <i>raudonais spuogeliais</i> ²⁹ . | DLKG 608 |
| childACC.SG. | eruptPRES.3 | red spot ADJ.+INSTR.PL. | |

“The child’s body erupted in red spots.”

In the constructions, mentioned above, the verb is conjugated in the third person and denotes cutaneous eruption (*berti, kelti, mėtyti, mušti, pilti*, etc.), of which the effects are expressed by the instrumental.

The person, who is affected by the eruption, or the concrete body part involved, is encoded by the accusative according to what we have previously seen: the accusative encodes the inactive participant, the Patient (and/or Theme).

Similar constructions are possible even when using verbs which mark meteorological phenomena (external agentless impersonals)³⁰. There are two trinominal models ($V_{imp} N_{gen} N_{acc}$ and $V_{imp} N_{acc} N_{strum}$) and one binominal ($V_{imp} N_{acc}$).

- The $V_{imp} N_{gen} N_{acc}$ type is not very productive: the verb, in the third person, is prefixed with the preverb *pri-* (for instance *prilyti, pripilti, pripustyti, priversti, prinešti*, etc.).

The place involved by the verbal process, although from a semantic point of view it is the “subject” of the clause, is encoded by the accusative, as completely affected.

²⁹ In the grammar there are also equivalent personal constructions: *Vaikus pila šašai* “The children were covered in scabs” or *Jai spuogai nubėrė veidą* “Spots covered his face”.

³⁰ For a detailed study on meteorological verbs see Katkuvienė 1979.

According to *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, the genitive expresses the effect, the consequence of the meteorological process, which sometimes might be omitted (when the verbal root explicitly refers to it), for instance *prilyti* (that implies *lietaus* “rain”) as well as *prisnigti* (that implies *sniego* “snow”).

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| <i>Prilijo</i> ³¹ | <i>pilną griovį</i> | <i>vandens.</i> | DLKG 607 |
| to be filled PAST3 | full ADJ.+ ditch ACC.SG. | waterGEN.SG. | |

“The ditch was completely filled with water.”

- The **V_{imp} N_{acc} N_{strum}** type is similar to the first: it differs only because of the presence of the instrumental case instead of the genitive.

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------|
| <i>Dangų</i> | <i>užtraukė</i> | <i>debesimis.</i> | DLKG 608 |
| skyACC.SG. | to be coveredPAST3 | cloudINSTRUM.PL. | |

“The sky was covered in clouds.”

This model, although it is more productive than the previous one, has personal parallels, where the nominative replaces the instrumental. It is a passage from active coding, perceived as anomalies by the speaker, to accusative coding, where the “subject”, codified as an accusative, is re-interpreted as an object:

| | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|
| <i>Dangų</i> | <i>užtraukė</i> | <i>debesys.</i> | DLKG 608 |
| skyACC.SG. | to coverPAST3 | cloudNOM.PL. | |

“Clouds covered the sky.”

- The binomial type **V_{imp} N_{acc}** presents only the verb in the third person and the place completely affected by the verbal process in the accusative:

| | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|
| <i>Visai</i> | <i>užpustė</i> | <i>kelią.</i> | DLKG 607 |
| completelyADV. | to be coveredPAST3 | roadACC.SG. | |

“The road was completely covered (with snow).”

In all those intransitive constructions, both those pointing out cutaneous reactions and those indicating meteorological processes, the verb unaccusative tends to be used with a prefix.

One of the main functions of the verb prefixation in Lithuanian consists in giving telic actionality to the predicate. In the verbal system of each language,

³¹ See *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*: the “subject” of *prilyti*, in its intransitive meaning, can be encoded also by the nominative: *Ežerai vandens prilijo* (Žem.) “The lakes were filled with water”.

there are couples, in which an atelic durative verb opposes another one, stressing the absolute completion of the process or inchoativity. In particular, one of the two words, usually the telic one, comes from the other, through the addition of an affix, as seen in the following oppositions: *valgyti* “eat” ~ *sualgyti* “to consume”, *rašyti* “to write” ~ *parašyti* “to produce”; *gerti* “to drink” ~ *išgerti* “to drink completely”. Since the verb prefixation gives telic actionality to the verb, it is evident the reason why those unaccusative verbs always have the prefix, as in the examples mentioned above: it is well known that the prototype of the unaccusative verb is telic (Sorace 1995). This fact explains also the oppositions, that occur in modern Lithuanian, such as *rodyti* “to show” ~ *atrodyti* “to see, to appear”, where the function of the prefix is to commute in unaccusative/inchoative a basically transitive/causative predicate³². Perhaps this is a residual case, that leads us to suppose a productive morphological strategy in the more ancient stages of Lithuanian. In a second stage, the reflexive particle *si* becomes a productive means to transforming a basically transitive verb into intransitive and the non reflexive activity verbs oppose the reflexive correspondents, that denote a state (*rodyti* ~ *rodytis*; *daryti* ~ *darytis*).

The constructions, that denote meteorological phenomena or cutaneous rashes, are characterized by a great archaism, testified to both by the subject accusative coding and by the prefixed predicate, where the prefix encodes the unaccusativity.

3. Conclusions

Throughout the analysis of the impersonal constructions in Lithuanian, some traces of active-inactive syntax have emerged.

In the *internal agentless impersonals* the sole actant of the experiential predicates, although it is characterized by the features [+animate] and [+human], is encoded in accusative, as inagentive and unvolitional, inactive. In the *external agentless impersonals*, the sole argument introduced by the verb denoting meteorological phenomena is also encoded in accusative, as completely affected by the verbal process.

In these impersonal constructions no-control, no-agentivity and no-volitional, affectedness are all parameters pertinent to the subject coding: it is the semantic role and not the syntactic one that brings about the coding of the actant.

³² See also the opposition *stoti* “to stop” (intr.) ~ *pastoti* “to stop” (trans.), *likti* “to remain” ~ *palikti* “to leave”, where the verbal prefix changes an inherently intransitive verb into transitive.

The data offered by Lithuanian is consistent with the results that emerged from the research carried out, in the different areas of the Indo-European studies, and provide further evidence for those, who think that, on a level of the diasystem, the principles organizing the Proto-Indo-European syntax showed patterns of active-like typology. In particular, in most Indo-European languages, the impersonal verbs conveying emotion and physical experience seem not fit the patterns of an accusative language, but rather show similarities with pattern of active typology.

Taking into account the research done, Lithuanian seems to be the sole Baltic language to show such a pattern. In Latvian, an East Baltic language like Lithuanian, the verb *sāpēt* “to ache”³³, as well as other experiential predicates, introduces a “subject” always marked in the nominative:

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Viņai | sāp | zobi | un arī | kakls. |
| shePERS.PRON.DAT. | to achePRES.3 | toothNOM.PL. | and soCONJ. | neckNOM.SG. |

“Her teeth ache and so does her neck.”

Relics of inactive syntax are not attested in Latvian (cfr. Endzeliņ 1923; Fennell & Gelsen 1980)³⁴.

I am very grateful to Prof. W. R. Schmalstieg for having reviewed my English and to Prof. Dini for his useful suggestions on an earlier version of the paper. All shortcomings and misinterpretations are, of course, mine.

NENOMINATYVINĖS SANDAROS PĖDSAKAI LIETUVIŲ KALBOJE: BEASMENĖS KONSTRUKCIJOS IŠ INDOEUROPIETIŠKOSIOS PERSPEKTYVOS

Santrauka

Straipsnyje tiriamos lietuvių kalbos beasmenės konstrukcijos, ypač su eksperimento predikatais, žyminčiais fizinį procesą, pvz.: *gelti*, *skaudėti* ar *sopėti*, *mausti*, *peršėti*, *troškinti*, *dusinti*, *pykinti*, *niežėti*. Šiai nedidelei veiksmožodžių klasei būdingas nekanoninis sub-

³³ The verb *kaitēt* “to ache” behaves in the same manner, although it is used mostly in the interrogative clauses such as *Kas (nom.) tev kaiš?* “What is hurting you?” (I.e. “Where do you feel pain?”). Latvian language presents many affinities with the north-western Lithuanian dialects.

³⁴ Further researches are necessary in order to analyse the impersonal constructions displayed by the Old Prussian.

jekto žymėjimas: asmens kūno dalys, kurias veikia skausmas, reiškiamos galininku, o ne vardininku, kaip būtų galima tikėtis. Toks principas yra aiškus: galininkas, t.y. prototipinis objekto linksnis, iš prigimties neaktyvus, pavartojamas žymėti ir neagentiniam, neaktyviam subjektui, kuris nereguliuoja veiksmažodinio proceso. Tokiose konstrukcijose, kaip *man skauda galvą*, galininkas nurodo kūno dalį, tiesiogiai įtrauktą į veiksmažodinį procesą; tuo tarpu naudininkas žymi objektą, kurio ryšys su procesu yra periferinis, ir turi posesyvinę reikšmę (*dativus sympatheticus*). Analizėje išryškinti duomenys neprieštarauja įvairių indoeuropiečių kalbų tyrimų rezultatams ir remia tuos mokslininkus, kurie mano, kad ide. prokalbės ankstyvaisiais laikais tam tikruose diasistemos lygiuose sintaksinės sandaros principai nebuvo paremti akuzatyvinių kalbų principais.

SOURCES

Eigminas Kazimieras (red.) 1981, Anoniminė 1737 m. Gramatika “Universitas Linguarum Lituaniae”, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Klein Daniel 1977, *Grammatica Lituanica*, Hamburg: Buske.

Kurschat Friedrich 1876, *Grammatik der littauischen Sprache*, Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

LKŽ - *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, 20 vol., Vilnius.

Palionis Jonas, Tamara Buchienė 1957, *Pirmoji lietuvių kalbos gramatika: 1653 metai*, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Sapūnas Kristupas, Theophylus Schultz 1997, *Compendium Grammaticae Lithuanicae*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Schleicher August 1856–1857, *Handbuch der litauischen Grammatik*, vol. 2, Prag: Calve.

Subačius Giedrius (red.) 1993, *Juozas Čiulda. Trumpi samprotavimai apie žemaičių kalbos gramatikos taisyklės* (Lietuvių atgimimo istorijos studijos 6), Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Ulvydas Kazys (red.) 1965–1976, *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika 3: Sintaksė*, Vilnius: Mintis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen Cynthia 1995, *Case Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ambrasas Vytautas (red.) 1996, *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, 2nd ed., Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla,

Ambrasas Vytautas 2006, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė – Historische Syntax der litauischen Sprache*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Balkevičius Jonas 1998, *Lietuvių predikatyvinių konstrukcijų sintaksė*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

- Bauer Brigitte L.M. 1996, Residues of non-nominative syntax in Latin: the *mihi est* construction, *Historische Sprachforschung* 109 (2), 241–256.
- Bauer Brigitte L.M. 1998, Impersonal verbs in Italic: their development from an Indo-European perspective, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26 (1), 91–120.
- Bauer Brigitte L.M. 2000, *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European: the Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French (Trends in Linguistics 125)*, The Hague etc.: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bossong Georg 1998, Le marquage de l'expérient dans les langues d'Europe, in Jack Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et Valence dans les Langues de l'Europe*, Berlin-New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 259–294.
- Cennamo Michela 2001, L'*extended accusative* e le nozioni di voce e relazione grammaticale nel latino tardo e medievale, in Valeria Viparelli (ed.), *Ricerche Linguistiche fra Antico e Moderno*, Napoli: Liguori, 3–27.
- Cole Peter, Wayne Harbert, Gabriella Hermon and Shikaripur N. Sridhar 1980, The acquisition of subjecthood, *Language* 56, 719–743.
- Collinge Neville 1978, Restructuring of noun-cases in syntax. Why “anti-“ will not do..., in Werner Abraham (ed.), *Valence, Case, and Grammatical Relations*, Amsterdam, 617–633.
- Comrie Bernard 1989, *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Cruse Alan 1973, Some thoughts on agentivity, *Journal of Linguistics* 9, 11–23.
- Cuzzolin Pierluigi 1998, Tra ricostruzione e tipologia: il caso dell'ergatività indoeuropea, in Giuliano Bernini, Pierluigi Cuzzolin & Piera Molinelli (eds.), *Acta Linguistica. Studi offerti a Paolo Ramat*, Roma: Bulzoni, 181–204.
- Delbrück Berthold 1900, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* 3, Strasbourg: Trübner.
- Dini Pietro Umberto 1997, *Le lingue baltiche*, La Nuova Italia Editrice: Scandicci (Firenze).
- Dixon Robert, Malcolm Ward 1979, Ergativity, *Language* 55 (1), 59–138.
- Dressler Wolfgang 1968, Eine textsyntaktische Regel der idg. Wortstellung (zur Anfangsstellung des Prädikatverbums), *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 33, 1–25.
- Endzelīns Jānis 1922, *Lettische Grammatik*, Rīga: Gulbis.
- Fennell Trevor, Henry Gelsen 1980, *A Grammar of Modern Latvian*, 3 vols., The Hague: Mouton.
- Fillmore Charles 1968, The case for case, in Emmon Bach & Robert Thomas Harms (eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, London etc. 1–90; Idem, *Gli universali nella teoria linguistica*, Torino, 1978.
- Foley William A. and Robert D. Jr. Van Valin, 1984, *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraenkel Ernst 1928, *Syntax der litauischen Kasus*, Kaunas: Valstybės spaustuvė.
- Friedrich Johannes 1960–1967, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, 1. u. 2. Teil, 2. Auflage, Heidelberg: Winter.

Gaaf Willem van der 1904, *The Transition from the Impersonal to the Personal Construction in Middle English*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Haspelmath Martin 2001, Non canonical marking of core-arguments in European languages, in Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, et al. (eds.), *Non Canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins, 53–83.

Haspelmath Martin 1993, More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations, in Bernard Comrie, Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 87–120.

Holvoet Axel, Rolandas Mikulskas 2005, *Gramatinių funkcijų tyrimai*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Jakobson Roman 1936/1971, Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus, in Idem, *Selected Writings 2*, The Hague: Mouton, 23–71.

Katkuvienė Laima 1979, Lietuvių kalbos beasmeniai veiksmažodiniai sakiniai, žymintys gamtos reiškinius, *Kalbotyra* 30 (1), 39–47.

Katkuvienė Laima 1985, Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos beasmeniai veiksmažodiniai sakiniai su vietininku, žymintys asmens būseną, *Kalbotyra* 36 (1), 32–37.

Kazlauskas Jonas 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Keenan Edward 1976, Towards a universal definition of subject, in Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, New York, 1976, 330–333.

Kerevičienė Jurgita 2004, External possession in Lithuanian, *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 50, 25–33.

König Ekkehard 2001, Internal and external possessors, in Martin Haspelmath et al. (eds.), *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*, vol. 2, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 970–978.

König Ekkehard, Martin Haspelmath 1998, Les constructions à possesseur externe dans les langues d'Europe, in Jack Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et valence dans les langues d'Europe*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 525–606.

Lambert Pierre-Yves 1998, L'impersonnel, in Jack Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 295–345.

Lehmann Winfred P. 1991, Impersonal verbs as relics of a subclass in Pre-Indo-European, in Georgy Klimov, *Istoričeskaja lingvistika i tipologija. Festschrift für Thomas V. Gamkrelidze*, Moskva: Nauka, 33–38.

Levine James S. 1986, Remarks on the pragmatics of the “inalienable dative” in Russian, in Richard D. Brecht and James S. Levine (eds.), *Case in Slavic*, Columbus, OH: Slavica, 437–451.

Lightfoot David 1979, *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Löfstedt Einar 1928, *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins 1–2*, Lund: Gleerup.

McCawley Noriko 1976, From OE/ME “impersonal” constructions. What is a subject-less S?, in Sanford B. Steever et al. (eds.), *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

- Moravcsik Edith 1978, On the distribution of active and ergative patterns, *Lingua* 45, 233–279.
- Moreno-Cabrera Juan 1990, Processes and actions: internal agentless impersonals in some European languages, in Johannes Bechert, Giuliano Bernini, and Claude Buridant (eds.), *Toward a Typology of European Languages (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 8)*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Perlmutter David 1978, Impersonal passives and unaccusative hypothesis, *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4, 157–189.
- Plank Frans 1985, The extended accusative/restricted nominative in perspective, in Frans Plank (ed.), *Relational Typology*, Berlin, 269–310.
- Ramonienė Meilutė, Joana Pribušauskaitė 2003, *Praktinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Scholz Friedrich 1973, *Russian Impersonal Expressions Used with Reference to a Person*, Paris: Mouton.
- Seeffranz-Montag Ariane von 1984, "Subjectless" constructions and syntactic change, in Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Syntax (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 23)*, Berlin: Mouton, 521–533.
- Senn Alfred 1966, *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Sorace Antonella 1995, Acquiring linking rules and argument structures in a second language. The unaccusative/unergative distinction, in Lynn Eubank, Larry Selinker, Michael Sharwood Smith (eds.), *The Current State of Interlanguage*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 153–175.
- Specht Franz 1931, Zur Endung der 2. Pluralis im Litauischen, *Archivum Philologicum* 2, 47–57.
- Stang Christian Schweigaard 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- Van Valin Robert D. Jr., Randy J. LaPolla 1997, *Syntax: Structure, Meaning & Function*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin Robert D. Jr. 2001, *An Introduction to Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin Robert D. Jr. 2005, *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vincent Nigel 1982, The development of the auxiliaries *habere* and *esse* in Romance, in Nigel Vincent and Martin Harris (eds.), *Studies in Romance Verb*, London: Croom Helm, 71–96.
- http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/main_en.php?id=4&nr=1_2

ABBREVIATIONS

BrP = Bretkūno Postilė

DLKG = Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika.

K = Littauisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch von Friedrich Kurschat. Hale a.S. 1883; vol. I 1870, vol. II 1874.

Krok = Krókialaukis, Alytaus rajonas.

Lp = Léipalingis, Lazdijų rajonas.

NS = Lietuvių dainos ir giesmės šiaur-rytinėje Lietuvoje Dr.A.R. Niemi ir Kun. A. Sabaliausko surinktos. Annales Accademiae scientiarum Fennicae. Ser. B. Tom. VI (1911).

R = Littauisch-Deutsches un Deutsch-Littauisches Lexicon, Worinnen ein hinlänglicher Vorrath an Wörtern und Redensarten, welche sowol in der H. Schrift, als in allerley Handlungen und Verkehr der menschlichen Gesellschaften vorkommen, befindlich ist: Nebst einer historischen Betrachtung der Littauischen Sprache; Wie auch einer gründlichen und erweiterten Grammatick, mit möglichster Sorgfalt, vieljährigem Fleiss, und Beyhülfe der erfahrensten Kenner dieser Sprache gesammelt von Philipp Ruhig... Königsberg... 1747.

Rm = Ramýgala, Panevėžio rajonas.

Rs = Rasėiniai.

Sd = Sedà, Mažeikių rajonas.

Snt = Sintautai, Šakių rajonas.

Silvia PICCINI

Department of Linguistics

University of Pisa

Via S. Maria, 36

I-56126 Pisa

Italy

[silvia.piccini@tin.it]

Zigmas ZINKEVIČIUS

Vilniaus universitetas

**APIE LIEPIAMOSIOS NUOSAKOS
FORMANTĄ *-ke-* (<*-*kia-*?)**

Žemaičiai vietoj liepiamosios nuosakos formanto *-ki-* (pvz.: *rašý-ki-me*, *rašý-ki-te*, *rašý-ki-s*) turi *-ke-*, pvz.: *rašý-ke-m*, *rašý-ke-t*, *rašý-ke-s/rašý-kē-s* (su antriniu balsio pailgėjimu). Sporadiškai tokios formos pasitaiko ir pažemaitės aukštaičių tarmės plote. Kadangi šiose tarmėse veiksmazodžių *i* kamienas keičiamas *į* kamienu (pvz.: *mýliam* ‘mylime’, *mýliat* ‘mylite’, 3 refl. *mýlias/mýliās* ‘mylisi’), formantas *-ke-* gali būti iš *-kia-*. Taigi nurodytas formantas galima būtų suprasti kaip *rašý-kia-m*, *rašýkia-t*, 3 refl. *rašý-kia-s/rašý-kiās*. Tačiau tokiam aiškinimui ne visai pritaria senieji raštai: čia esama *-ke-me*, *-ke-te*, 3 refl. *-ke-s(i)* ir šalia esamojo laiko *-i-me*, *-i-te*, *-i*, būsimajo laiko *-si-me*, *-si-te*. Antai ankstyvuosiuose Mažvydo tekstuose (*Katekizme*, *Te Deum laudamus*, *Formoje krikštymo*, *Parafrazyje* ir *Giesmyno I* dalyje), mažiau paliestuose aukštaičių tarmės įtakos, tėra vien formantas *-ke-* (su *-ki-* rastas vienintelis abejotinas pavyzdys *Giesmyno I* dalyje), bet esamojo ir būsimajo laiko formų *i* kamienas visur išlaikytas sveikas (rasta tik pora esamojo laiko *į* kamieno pavyzdžių). Todėl gali būti teisingas Chr. S. Stangas, linkęs manyti, kad iš seno lietuviai šalia formanto *-ki-* yra turėję ir variantą *-ke-*, išlikusį nurodytose tarmių formose. Dėl *-ki-* : *-ke-* santykio plg. dalelytę lie. *gi* ir sl. *že*.

Ar iš tikrųjų senovėje lietuviai turėjo formantą *-ke-*, ar tai tėra *-kia-*, galėtų paaiškėti tik gerai ištyrus visų senųjų raštų duomenis.