

TAIKOMOJI KALBOTYRA/ APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Prototypical Possessive Dative in Lithuanian

Jurgita Kerevičienė, Jūratė Patašiūtė

Abstract. The article represents one of the semantic dative usage called the dative possession. It is the first attempt to characterize the Lithuanian constructions with external possessors (alternating with adnominal genitives) taking account the results of recent typological research into external possession. However, the attention is mainly paid to the notion and the main properties of the possessive dative. The article presents the linguistic analysis of the Lithuanian possessive dative from the cognitive point of view underlining its prototypical attributes and the ways of expression of three main components in the possessive dative constructions: the possessor, the possessum and the predicate emphasizing their syntactic and semantic properties in Lithuanian sentence structures. Only preliminary observations are made, but it is already possible to state that the Lithuanian constructions with external possessors belong to the prototypical area, in which these constructions are subject to a number of constraints mainly with regard to animacy and degree of affectedness.

The problem is that in Lithuanian grammar the dative is introduced as a case expressing an object (animate or unanimate) that may be affected positively or negatively (for the benefit or to the prejudice of the object) by a certain action or event (A Grammar of Modern Lithuanian, 1997:513 §1418). Recent linguistic analysis proves that the dative case may appear in rather varied constructions where it takes on apparently very different values.

According to the semantic distinctions, datives may be classified as the *dativus commodi* or *incommodi*, the *dativus finalis*, the *dativus possessivus*, the *dativus sympatheticus*, the *dativus ethicus*, etc. and they have their distinctive attributes and different syntactical behaviour. When the dative takes on a possessive aspect it is distinguished as ***dativus possessivus***. Literally, its construction means "to be at the disposition of" or "to have something at one's disposal", "to possess" (Hoecke, 1996:13). Linguistically, the dative possession is often treated as the particular use of the dative with its ***external possession (EP)*** and differs from other cases of dative. For instance, differently from the ethical dative, the possessive dative characterizes phrases that manifest all the properties of genuine clause-level constituents. Lithuanian scholars tend to accept various definitions and explanations of the dative. J. Šukys (1998), A. Paulauskienė (1989) and other Lithuanian scholars point out a certain case of the dative that alternates with the determiner genitive and has a meaning of crucial possession to the mentioned object. Because of various foreign and Lithuanian linguists' notions and their different propositions it is useful to define and single out essential syntactical and semantic properties of the possessive dative and determine prototypical Lithuanian cases.

On the other hand, prototypical Lithuanian possessive dative has not been properly analyzed. Historical retrospection shows that the dative possessive was first identified and described by W. Havers (1911) in his study "*Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*" where the

term *dativus sympatheticus* was firstly proposed. The linguist primarily introduced the dative as a case by means of which it is possible to express sympathetic, i.e. feeling attitude towards an addressee. According to Havers, in the sentence structures the *dativus sympatheticus* alternates with more "objective" genitive that states the addressee's possession. However, his study didn't supply a profound linguistic analysis.

At a later date the first attempt to give a profound look at the Baltic possessive dative was made by E. Fraenkel (1928). In his study "*Syntax der litauischen Kasus*" the scholar tried to find and analyze linguistic examples with Lithuanian *dativus sympatheticus* and drew a conclusion that the sympathetic dative is common for many Indo-European languages. In Baltic languages, though, he noticed obvious competitive constructions between the sympathetic dative and the possessive genitive where the adnominal genitive often dominates. According to the linguist, at many events, the Lithuanian sympathetic dative is determined by semantic and morphological aspects of the predicate and some syntactic peculiarities, such as the dative position in the sentence, etc. Thus, Fraenkel stated that the sympathetic dative in Baltic languages is not so frequent as in Slavic or German languages (57-60). However, as linguist A. Holvoet has noted Fraenkel used Lithuanian facts taken from ancient sourcebooks and, consequently, they could not reflect the outspread tendency in Baltic languages (2001:202).

Till nowadays linguists have not focused much on Lithuanian possessive dative. However, in contemporary linguistics scholars try to distinguish and define what the possessive dative is in other languages and what distinctive features it is distinguished for.

In the linguistic literature the dative possessive is defined as: *Constructions in which a semantic possessor-possessum relation is expressed by coding the possessor as a core*

grammatical relation of the verb and in a constituent separate from that which contains the possessum. Despite being coded as a core argument, the possessor phrase is not licensed by the argument frame of the verb root itself (Payne & Barshi, 1999:3).

The usage of the possessive dative is called **dative external possessor** (EP) and was analyzed by another linguist M. Haspelmath (1999:109). He proposed the dative as a characteristic feature of many languages not only in the Indo-European family, but also in many so called exotic languages including Southeast Asian, South American, North and Meso-America, Australian, African, the Pacific, Semitic, Caucasian languages (Payne & Barshi, 1999:3). In such case, Baltic languages including Lithuanian should not be an exception. Despite of this fact, different languages have various patterns of the possessive dative marking, there must be two main constituents, namely, the possessor and the possessum in the construction. To study them M. Haspelmath (1999:110) names 4 prototypical patterns of the external possession in European languages:

(1)

			Possessor	Possessum	
a.	Subj	V	Dat		Obj.
b.	Subj	V	Dat	Obj	PP
c.	Subj	V	Dat		PP
d.		V	Dat		Subj.

Having analyzed facts from the given scheme, Haspelmath (1999:110) represents the dative external possessor as a clause-level dative-marked NP argument, while the possessum is a direct object, a locative argument marked by a preposition phrase, or an unaccusative subject. These facts suggest that European languages require the dative for the possessor, whereas the possessum may vary depending on the particular language.

On this understanding, in the linguistic analysis it is significant to make an attempt to formulate the prototypical properties of the dative of possession.

The External-Possession Prototype

According to linguists, the prototypical external possession construction must include **an external possessor** expressed by the dative case and **a possessum**, whereas, it must meet **the strict affectedness condition** i.e. external possessors are only possible if the possessor is thought of as being mentally affected by the described situation.

Since the affectedness condition is not equally strong in different languages, Haspelmath (1999:113) suggests to apply 4 implicational hierarchies reflecting the strength of the affectedness:

(2)

a. **The Animacy Hierarchy**, where EP constructions are favored if the possessor is a) *1st / 2nd p. pronoun* ⇒ *3rd p. pronoun* ⇒ *proper name* ⇒ *other animate* ⇒ *inanimate*.

b. **The Situation Hierarchy**, where EP constructions are favored if the predicate is) *patient-affecting* ⇒ *dynamic non-affecting* ⇒ *stative*.

c. **The Inalienability Hierarchy**, where EP constructions are favored if the possessum is a) *body part* ⇒ *garment* ⇒ *other contextually unique item*.

d. **The Syntactic Relations Hierarchy**, where EP constructions are favored if the syntactic relation of the possessum is) *PP* ⇒ *direct object* ⇒ *unaccusative subject* ⇒ *unergative subject* ⇒ *transitive subject*.

On this hierarchy the statement "*EP constructions are favored*" means that if an EP construction is possible for a position at any point of the hierarchy, then that EP construction is also possible with all higher hierarchical positions.

Moreover, Haspelmath tries to show the geographical distribution of the dative EP construction in Europe. According to him, the existence of dative external possessors is a characteristic feature of European linguistic area known as *Standard Average European* (SAE). Having adapted the implicational hierarchies to European languages, the linguist drew a conclusion that some languages of the central Europe (Dutch, German, French, northern Italian) have prototypical dative EP, however, the periphery of it comprises East Slavic, Baltic, Balto-Finnic, Hungarian, Maltese, Armenian and Georgian (1999:116-117). Formulating his conclusion about Baltic languages, Haspelmath took only Lettish into consideration. Notwithstanding, Lithuanian is far different from Lettish in this case and consequently Haspelmath's findings don't fit the real facts about prototypical Lithuanian external possessum. Summing up all the facts, it is useful to present Lithuanian EP and determine its place in the SAE.

The External-Possessor Prototype in Lithuanian

As Haspelmath states, external possessor is prototypically a 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" (Haspelmath, 2001:970):

(3)

a. German	<i>Mir</i>	<i>zittern</i>	<i>die Hände</i>
Lith	Man	<i>dreba</i>	<i>r a n k o s</i>
	Me:DAT	are shaking 3PL	the hands
	<i>My hands are shaking.</i>		
b. German	<i>Ich habe es ihm ins Gesicht gesagt.</i>		
Lith	<i>Aš tai jam į akis pasakiau.</i>		
	I it	he.DAT into-DEF face	said
	<i>I said it to him into his face.</i>		

From the syntactic point of view, the possessum is usually a direct object while the possessor can be a direct / indirect object. The stated characteristic of the possessor (by Payne and Barshi) may perfectly suit to prototypical Lithuanian external possessor. It is easy to notice that Lithuanian possessor is mainly a direct / indirect object whereas the Lithuanian possessum is a direct object, expressed by NP or PP, cf.:

(4)

a. Vincukui	<i>k ū n a s</i>	<i>iš karto</i>	<i>sušalo</i>	<i>į raga.</i>
Vincukas DAT	the body	at once	froze	to the bone.
	<i>At once Vincukas's body froze to the bone.</i>			
b. Norėjau paprašyti	švarkui	<i>alkūnę</i>	<i>užlopyti.</i>	

I wanted to ask the jacket.DAT an elbow ACC to mend.
I wanted to ask you to mend an elbow of my jacket.

c. Bitè igèlè **žmogui** i r a n k a .
The bee stung a person.DAT into the hand ACC.
The bee stung the person into the hand.

Adapting Haspelmath's prototypical patterns of the external possession (1), a conclusion about the Lithuanian prototypical pattern can be drawn according to its syntactical and semantic properties.

Syntactic Properties

As it has repeatedly been pointed out, the main grammatical EP essential attribute concerning the possessor is its *expression by a dative-marked argument*.

(5)

a. Šuo	įkando	<u>kaimynui</u>	i	koją.
The dog	bit	the neighbour.DAT	into	the leg SG-LOC

The dog bit the neighbour into the leg.

b. Močiutė nuplovė anūkėliui rankas.
The grandmother washed her grandson.DAT hands.ACC.
The grandmother washed her grandson's hands.

Linguists (König 2001, Haspelmath, 1999) state that the possessum phrase may have different status, like a state of a direct object, a subject or an oblique phrase. Lithuanian possible status of the possessum may be illustrated by the following examples:

(6)

a. Gydytojas	peršvietė	man	koją. (direct object: What has he x-rayed?)
The doctor	has x-rayed	me.DAT	my leg.
	<i>The doctor has x-rayed my leg.</i>		

b. Man drebējo lūpos. (subject)
Me.DAT were.trembling lips.
 My lips were trembling.

c. Jis spjovė man i veida.
(an oblique phrase)
He spat me.DAT into the face.
He spat into my face.

Nevertheless, the prototypical Lithuanian possessum has the status of direct object and other possible status takes only the peripheral cases restricted by special requirements.

Firstly, external possessum may be different in Lithuanian most probably depending on the valence (argument structure) of the relevant verb. Different possibilities occur: the verb can be either transitive or intransitive. Usually with the intransitive verbs such as *drebėti* (tremble), (*iš / su*)*gyti*, *pasveikti* (recover, convalesce), *sudrekti* (sweat, moisten), etc. a possessum phrase either corresponds to the subject (6-b) or to a prepositional phrase (6-c), the latter normally expresses the location of the possessum.

When the verb is transitive, the following possibilities exist: the part is either indicated by the direct object (7-a,b) or by a prepositional phrase (7-c,d), the whole being in the dative again.

(7)

a. Ji	sulaužė	jam	kairę ranką.
She	has broken	he.DAT	his left arm.

She has broken him his left hand.

b. Okulistas pritaikė močiutei akinius.
An oculist adjusted Grandmother.DAT the glasses.
An oculist adjusted grandmother's glasses.

c. Jis sušnibždėjo jai kažką į ausį.
He whispered she.DAT something into her ear.
He whispered something into her ear.

d. Jis	sviedė	pagalvę	vaikui	į veidą.
He	threw	a pillow	the child.DAT	in his face.

He throw a pillow into the child's face.

Considering the verb grouping proposed by Laminory & Delbecque (1998:43-44) and matching them with Lithuanian external possessum, it is useful to state that the prototypical possessum as direct object usually goes with verb-classes:

- ◆ dynamic verbs, i.e. expressing activities such as suduoti (hit), perplėšti (tear), sudaužyti / sulaužyti (break), sviesti (throw);
- ◆ causative verbs, i.e. expressing activities which cause the object to undergo a certain change, e.g. nupjauti / nukirsti (cut off), nuskinti, nugnybti (pick off, nip off), amputuoti (amputate);
- ◆ movement verbs, i.e. expressing a change in position, e.g. pakelti (raise), nuleisti (lower), pasukti (turn);
- ◆ inchoative verbs, i.e. expressing the activity that has a certain point which coincides with the beginning of a new state, e.g. sustorėti (get fat), (iš)rausti (reddden);
- ◆ stative verbs expressing statives of suffering, e.g. skaudėti (ache, hurt).

To indicate the prototypical external possession in Lithuanian it is helpful to adapt Haspelmath's (1999:113) implicational hierarchies. According to the Syntactic Relations Hierarchy, Lithuanian EP constructions are valid if the syntactic relation of the possessum is prepositional phrase (PP) $\Rightarrow$ direct object. As to the verb or the predicate of such constructions, it is more expedient to use the Situation Hierarchy explaining that the predicates of prototypical EP must be patient-affecting at best, however, in peripheral cases the predicates may be dynamic non-affecting and even stative.

As it has been mentioned so far, a possessive dative is used to indicate the part-whole relationship and it is affected by the process expressed by the verb. Although the dative itself is not predicated by the verbal valence, it brings a participant into the predicate frame affected by the process because, as Lamiroy and Delbecq (1998:43) note, it stands in a whole-part relationship to the affected part that can occupy an argument position of either a subject or an object, or even a prepositional phrase.

On the other hand, although the dative does not belong to the valence of the verb, not all verbs allow the possessive dative to appear. The verb in the prototypical EP should be an action verb which brings about a change involving the possessor rather than a stative verb leaving the possessor unaffected (Laminory & Delbecq, 1998:43).

Semantic Properties

Semantic properties also involve the three components of EP: the possessor, the possessum and the lexical predicate. Prototypical external possessors, according to König (2001), are most typically animate, human and even speech-act participants. In Lithuanian as across all languages the meaning of external possessor may be formulated in terms of the well-known animacy hierarchy:

The Animacy Hierarchy: 1st / 2nd p. pronoun $\Rightarrow$ 3rd p. pronoun $\Rightarrow$ proper name $\Rightarrow$ other animate $\Rightarrow$ inanimate nouns.

If an external possessor construction is possible for a type of possessor low on the hierarchy, it is also possible for any possessor higher on the scale (Haspelmath, 1999:113). In Lithuanian all the types are possible.

(8)

- | | | |
|--------------|---|--------------------------------|
| a. Man / Tau | skauda | dantį. |
| I / You.DAT | have | a toothache. |
| | <i>I / You have a toothache.</i> | |
| b. Vaikai | sulaužė | jam / jai akinius. |
| Children | broke | he / she DAT. glasses. |
| | <i>Children broke his / her glasses.</i> | |
| c. Vaikai | sulaužė | Onai / mūsų draugui akinius. |
| Children | broke | Ann / our friend DAT.glasses. |
| | <i>Children broke Ann's / our friend's glasses.</i> | |
| d. Jis | nukirto | medžiui šaką. |
| He | cut | the tree DAT. the branch. ACC. |
| | <i>He cut the branch of the tree.</i> | |

The semantic characteristic of the possessum depends on the universal semantic hierarchy. The most common hierarchy is inalienable $\Rightarrow$ alienable; however, Payne and Barshi propose Haspelmath's expanded hierarchy:

The Inalienability Hierarchy: body part $\Rightarrow$ part-whole $\Rightarrow$ other inalienable $\Rightarrow$ alienable + proximate $\Rightarrow$ garment $\Rightarrow$ alienable + distal $\Rightarrow$ non-possessable $\Rightarrow$ other contextually unique item (Payne & Barshi, 1999:14).

In Lithuanian the Inalienability Hierarchy of the prototypical possessum may be formulated in such a way: body part $\Rightarrow$ part-whole $\Rightarrow$ alienable + proximate $\Rightarrow$ garment $\Rightarrow$ alienable+ distal $\Rightarrow$ other contextual item used metaphorically.

The deeper closeness between the possessor and the possessum is the higher possessor exists and the higher affectedness is relevant. In Lithuanian the possessum indicates "body parts", too, although, the examples with all the types of constructions can be found.

Conclusion

The external possession is a natural phenomenon across many languages and serves important needs of communication. At the outset, EP constructions express that a human experiencer or patient is affected by an event affecting a part of his body. Further, such constructions give an opportunity to express rightly the communicators' attitude towards the utterance or written statement. Moreover, EP constructions expand stylistic possibilities and the linguistic means.

Nevertheless, there are miscellaneous theories and viewpoints to the phenomenon in different languages to express EP in

different ways trying to distinguish between the external possessor and possessum. Thus, two aspects are examined in this article. Firstly, it is given a concept of the dative external possession emphasizing its notion, essential attributes. Secondly, these theoretical assumptions are practically verified with the Lithuanian dative phrases finding out the prototypical EP cases and bringing up peripheral EP events.

Thus, this article was one of the first attempts to analyze Lithuanian external possession. In such case, the linguistic data showed that Lithuanian prototypical EP is trivalent, i.e. it consists of three constituents: the possessor, the predicate and the possessum. Within the EP construction the possessor may be an in / direct object morphologically expressed by the dative case, whereas the possessum is usually either a subject, a direct object or a prepositional phrase morphologically expressed in different ways, viz. by the nominative, the accusative and the locative or PP.

Since there is an evident syntactic and semantic dependency between the constituents, the article deals with syntactic and semantic properties of the Lithuanian constituents of EP. From the syntactic point of view, the Lithuanian external possessor is expressed by the dative marked argument, as the possessum may have a state of direct object, subject or an oblique phrase.

Summing up all the linguistic facts, it is possible to conclude an inverse notion about prototypical Lithuanian external possession. As has been stated by M. Haspelmath (1999), Baltic languages comprise the periphery in the prototypical area of the dative external possessor. However, the linguistic facts show that Lithuanian EP expresses more or less the prototypical EP among European languages and occupies the more central place next to Polish in the Haspelmath's SAE map. The linguistic analysis showed that Lithuanian external possession may be concerned as prototypical among European languages.

References

1. Ambrazas, V. (ed.) (1997). A Grammar of Modern Lithuanian. Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
2. Fraenkel, E. (1928). Syntax der litauischen Kasus. In: Tauta ir žodis. Books IV-V.
3. Haspelmath, M. (1999). External Possession in a European Areal Perspective. In: Payne, D. L., Barshi, I. (eds.), External Possession. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. P. 109-135.
4. Havers, W. (1911). Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner.
5. Holvoet, A. (2001). Zur Variation des possessiven Dativs mit dem adnominalen Genitiv im Baltischen (besonders im Lettischen). In: Winfried Boeder and Gerd Hentschel (eds.) Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia: Variierende Markierung von Nominalgruppen in Sprachen unterschiedlichen Typs. Bibliotheks- und Informations-system der Universität Oldenburg. P. 201-217.
6. König, E. (2001). Internal and External Possessors. In: Haspelmath, M. (eds.), Language Typology and Language Universals. Vol. 2. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter. P. 970-978.
7. König, E. & Haspelmath, M. (1998). Les constructions à possesseur externe dans les langues d'Europe. In: Jach Fenillet (eds.) Actance et Valence dans les langues de l'Europe. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter. P. 525-606.

8. Lamiroy, B. & Delbecque, N. (1998). The Possessive Dative in Romance and Germanic Languages. *In: Van Belle, W., Van Langendonck, W. (eds.), The Dative, Vol. 2, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. P. 29-74.*
9. Paulauskienė, A. (1989). Gramatinės lietuvių kalbos vardažodžių kategorijos. Vilnius: Mokslas.
10. Payne, L. D., Barshi, I. (1999). External Possession: What, Where, How, and Why. *In: Payne, D. L., Barshi I. (eds.), External Possession, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. P. 3-29.*
11. Šukys, J. (1998) Lietuvių kalbos linksniai ir prielinksniai: vartoseną ir normas. Kaunas: Šviesa.
12. Van Hoecke, W. (1996) The Latin Dative. *In: Van Belle, W., Van Langendonck, W. (eds.), The Dative, Vol. 1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. P. 3-38.*

Jurgita Kerevičienė, Jūratė Patašiūtė

Prototipinis lietuvių kalbos laisvasis posesyvinis naudininkas

Santrauka

Šiuolaikinėje lingvistinėje literatūroje vis dažniau susiduriama su semantinių linksnų analize, kai juos apibrėžti bandoma nustatant semantinio linksnio sampratą ir jo charakteringus bruožus. Šiame straipsnyje analizuojamas lietuvių kalbos laisvasis posesyvinis naudininkas. Kadangi lietuvių lingvistikoje užsimenama apie tokį naudininką be gilesnės analizės, o užsienio autoriai tiria daugelio kalbų posesyvinį naudininką (netgi bandydami sudaryti prototipinio posesyvinio naudininko išsidėstymo žemėlapi) nurodydami kalbas, turinčias tokio naudininko prototipinius požymius, ir kalbas, kurių posesyviniai naudininkai gali užimti tik periferines pozicijas. Savo ruožtu, mokslininkų išvados apie baltų kalbų naudininką nėra adekvačios, nes analizei buvo pasirinkta tik latvių kalba, kuri savo konstrukcijomis su laisvuju naudininku skiriasi nuo lietuvių kalbos ir negali būti charakteringa visom baltų kalbom. Šio straipsnio tikslas yra apibrėžti prototipinį lietuvių kalbos laisvąjį posesyvinį naudininką, nustatant charakteringus jo sintaksinius ir semantinius požymius, bei, taikant užsienio lingvistinės analizės duomenis, ištirti, kokią poziciją užima prototipinis lietuvių kalbos laisvasis posesyvinis naudininkas lyginant su kitomis Europos kalbomis.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2004 03
 Parengtas spaudai 2004 12

The Authors

Jurgita Kerevičienė, PhD student, assistant at Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania.

Academic interests: linguistics and sociolinguistics.

Address: Kaunas University of Technology, Faculty of Humanities, Centre of Foreign Languages, Gedimino str. 43-303, Lithuania.

E-mail: jurgita.kereviciene@ktu.lt

Jūratė Patašiūtė, PhD, assist. prof. at Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities, Lithuania.

Academic interests: linguistics, translation studies.

Address: Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities, Mutinės str. 8, Lithuania.

E-mail: jurate.patasiate@khf.vu.lt