

Eric P. HAMP

THE IN- AND AD- FORMS OF CASE IN XVI AND XVII C. BALTIC

The complex case inflexions of XVI–XVII century Lithuanian (for convenient examples see J. P a l i o n i s, Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a., Vilnius, 1967, 118–119 § 93), and ultimately of earlier East Baltic, may be illustrated by *galvojè, galvõn, -ósna, dievíep* (also *kitámp, kituosemp* DP), *dievóp(i), -ump(i)*.

The component elements are relatively easily segmented serially, and their separate etymologies have been identified. In addition to the historic Baltic and IE cases, *-e < *ē, -n ~ na < *nā, -p < pie, -p(i) < pie*. In order to proceed to explanation and derivation of the system – a task for another day – we wish to isolate, characterize, and relate synchronically and historically the semantic parameters of these desinential and enclitic bundles.

They may be charted as follows:

COTERMINOUS	VICINITY <i>PEI</i>	
Loc. *loc. + <i>ē</i> 'Inessive'	Adessive *loc. (pl.) + <i>pie</i> also *dat., acc.	POSITION <i>BE</i>
Illative *acc. + <i>nā</i>	Allative *gen. + <i>pie</i>	MOTION <i>GO(TO)</i>

It will be noted that the phono-segmental structure is not orthogonal, not homomorphous with the semantic structure. Here there is a problem of mapping. The semantic features are four (in capitals); their parameters are two: SPECIFICITY OF LOCUS (+ = COTERMINOUS; - = VICINITY), FIXITY (+ = POSITION; - = MOTION). Thus we have

++	-+	
+-	--	FIXITY
SPECIFICITY OF LOCUS		

Note that the weakest of these was the Adessive, the least focussed in its segmental marking yet with the consistent *pie* ironically less distinguished from the Allative. In the XVI c. it was already losing ground. It is suggested that the Adessive suffered competition from the long inherited case marking that specified sociative functions.