

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Eglė Žilinskaitė

**THE EXPRESSION OF SPACE IN MIKALOJUS DAUKŠA'S *POSTILLA*:  
POSTPOSITIONAL LOCAL CASES AND THEIR  
FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENTS**

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation

Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2010

The research has been mainly performed at Vilnius University in 2005–2010.

Research supervisor:

Prof. Dr. Habil. **Albertas Rosinas** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

**The dissertation defence is to be held at the Academic Council of Philology, Vilnius University:**

Chair:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Members:

Prof. Dr. Habil. **Giedrė Čepaitienė** (Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Prof. Dr. **Birutė Jasiūnaitė** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Prof. Dr. **Bronius Maskuliūnas** (Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Inesa Šeškauskienė** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Official Opponents:

Prof. Dr. Habil. **Aleksas Girdenis** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Prof. Dr. Habil. **Pēteris Vanags** (Latvijas University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The dissertation will be under open consideration at 3.00 p.m. on 29 of June 2010 at the open session of the Academic Council of Philology at Vincas Krėvė auditorium, Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University.

Address: 5 Universiteto St., LT-01513, Vilnius, Lithuania.

Summary of the doctoral dissertation has been distributed on \_\_\_\_\_ May 2010.

The doctoral dissertation is available at Vilnius University Library.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Eglė Žilinskaitė

**VIETOS RAIŠKA MIKALOJAUS DAUKŠOS *POSTILĖJE*:  
POSTPOZICINIAI VIETININKAI IR JŲ  
FUNKCINIAI EKVIVALENTAI**

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka  
Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H)

Vilnius, 2010

Disertacija rengta 2005–2010 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinis vadovas:

prof. habil. dr. **Albertas Rosinas** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

**Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje:**

Pirmininkas:

doc. dr. **Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Nariai:

prof. habil. dr. **Giedrė Čepaitienė** (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

prof. dr. **Birutė Jasiūnaitė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

prof. dr. **Bronius Maskuliūnas** (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

doc. dr. **Inesa Šeškauskienė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Oponentai:

prof. habil. dr. **Aleksas Girdenis** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

prof. habil. dr. **Pēteris Vanags** (Latvijos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2010 m. birželio 29 d. 15 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakultete, Vinco Krėvės auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2010 m. gegužės \_\_\_\_\_ d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

## INRODUCTION

**Object.** The object of this dissertation is a semantic analysis of the four Old Lithuanian postpositional local cases and their relationship to their functional equivalents (prepositions, genitive and dative cases) in Mikalojus Daukša's *Postilla* (1599, further – DP). They are used in relational constructions consisting of *Figure* (or *Trajector*), *Ground* (or *Landmark*) and relational gram. In prepositional constructions the relational gram is a preposition, while in postpositional local case it is a bound ending. From a historical point of view, postpositional local cases go back to univerbations of case forms and postpositions. Traditionally they are considered spatial cases defined according to two dimensions: i) stasis (inessive and adessive) / kinesis (illative and allative), ii) internal location (inessive and illative) / external location (adessive and allative). Only one of them, the inessive, has survived in modern standard Lithuanian. The others were lost except for some adverbialized relics. It is often admitted that postpositional local cases were ousted by prepositional phrases.

**Data.** The data are collected from Mikalojus Daukša's *Postilla* (1599), which belongs to the central variant of the written language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It is a sermon book of 646 pages translated from the Polish *Postilla Mnieysza* by Jakob Wujek. There were four editions of the Polish *Postilla* during the 16<sup>th</sup> century and it is acknowledged that Daukša's text follows the third edition (1590). Lithuanian examples are systematically compared to Polish expressions in order to establish the influence of the latter. The possible influence of other texts (for instance, the Latin text of the *Vulgata* or Vilentas' 1579 *Evangelias bei epistolas*) in Daukša's translation of the Gospels is also taken into account.

**The aim of the research** is to describe the functions of the inessive, adessive, illative and allative cases, to determine their spatial meaning status, and to analyze the semantic distribution between prepositional phrases and postpositional local cases.

### **Main tasks:**

1. To perform a semantic analysis of the postpositional local cases in order to distinguish their various use types.
2. To determine how many use types are related to the expression of space.
3. To define the semantic distribution of the postpositional local cases.

4. To analyze the distribution between postpositional local cases and their functional equivalents (prepositions, genitive and dative cases).

5. To evaluate the influence of the Polish original in Daukša's expression of space.

**Historia quaestionis.** The number of studies devoted to the expression of space is enormous. The following approaches (classified according to the methodological framework) are of particular interest for this dissertation:

1. Descriptive works (e.g. Karl-Gunnar Lindquist).

2. Structural and componential analysis (e.g. Geoffrey Leech, David C. Bennett).

3. Logical analysis (e.g. Gloria S. Cooper).

4. Cognitive linguistics (e.g. Leonard Talmy, Annette Herskovits, Susana J. Lindner, Claudia Brugman, George Lakoff, Mark Johnson, Ronald Langacker, Bruce Hawkins, Robert B. Dewell, Andrea Tyler and Vyvyan Evans, Priska-Monika Hottenroth, Alan Cienki, Elena Bellavia, Brigitta Meex, Jan Heegård Petersen, Renata Przybylska, Ljiljana Šarić, Ignasi Navarro i Ferrando, Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano).

5. Functional-geometric analysis (e.g. Claude Vandeloise, Kenny R. Coventry, Simon C. Garrod).

6. Typological linguistics (Leonard Talmy, Dan I. Slobin, Stephen C. Levinson, David Wilkins and the research of Language and Cognition group at Max Planck Institute of Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, Soteria Svorou, Sally Rice, Kaori Kabata).

The expression of space in contemporary Lithuanian has mostly been studied within a structural framework (Jonas Kilius, Elena Valiulytė). The postpositional local cases of Old Lithuanian have mostly been studied from a semantic and syntactic point of view as well as in a historical perspective (Ernst Fraenkel, Albertas Rosinas, Zigmas Zinkevičius, Vytautas Ambrazas, Adelė Laigonaitė, Wojciech Smoczyński, Gina Kavaliūnaitė, William R. Schmalstieg, Jochen D. Range, Jonas Palionis, Jolanta Gelumbeckaitė, Bronius Maskuliūnas, Eglė Bukantytė, Ilja Seržant).

**Methodology.** The research is based on the conception of linguistic units as natural categories. Postpositional local cases are treated as multifunctional cases possessing a number of various use types that differ in status: some are prototypical, other are located in the periphery of the case. Use types are instantiations of an ideal or schematic category meaning, which cannot always be established.

Following Przybylska (2002), the spatial use types are classified according to the following criteria:

1. Conceptualization of Ground according to its dimension:

- a) Three-dimensional Ground (solid / container),
- b) Two-dimensional Ground (surface / plane),
- c) One-dimensional Ground (line),
- d) Dimensionless Ground (point).

2. Categorization of Ground as:

- a) THING possessing a constant form and shape (e.g. a house, a cup, etc.),
- b) MATERIAL having a form but lacking a constant shape (e.g. a cover, paper, leather, fabric, etc.),
- c) SUBSTANCE, a formless aggregate varying according to a level of consistence (e.g. gas, powder, fluids, wood, etc.),
- d) PERSON (you, John the Baptist, Christ, a woman, etc.).

3. Transformations:

- a) Uniplex Ground → multiplex Ground → mass,
- b) Figure's motion towards Ground → Figure's orientation towards Ground,
- c) Figure's motion towards Ground → Figure's extension towards Ground.

Non-spatial use types depend on the following parameters:

1. Conceptual metaphors,
2. Particular grammatical principles,
3. Influence of Polish text.

In accordance with the guidelines stated above, a semasiological analysis of the postpositional local cases is performed, starting from their concrete spatial use types and then going into their abstract domains. The description of postpositional local cases is followed by an onomasiological investigation aiming to analyze the semantic distribution between prepositional phrases and postpositional local cases.

**Research novelty and relevance.** This is the first attempt to apply a cognitive linguistics to the study of the expression of space in (Old) Lithuanian. All functions of the postpositional local cases are systematically described, their various use types are distinguished and their complex category structure is revealed. This enables us to define the spatial meaning status of each postpositional local case and to question the

traditional account of the local cases as exclusively spatial. A systematic comparison of spatial use types and their functional equivalents shows that the latter highlight different aspects of the encoded spatial scenes.

**Presentation of results.** Some of the results of this dissertation have been presented at:

1. Scientific conferences:

a) *Par kādu ceļa izteikšanas līdzekli Mikaloja Daukšas Postillā (Expressing a Particular Meaning of Path in Mikalojus Daukša's Postilla)* // 43. Artura Ozola dienas konference: Alvils Augstkalns (1907–1940) un baltu valodu pētniecība (2007. gada 16.–17. marts, Rīga, Latvija).

b) *Par adesīva lietojumu Mikalojus Daukšas Postillā (The Use of the Adessive Case in Mikalojus Daukša's Postilla)* // 45. Artura Ozola dienas konference: baltu valodas diahroniskā un areālā aspektā. Veltījums Jurim Plāķim (1869–1942) 140. gadadienā (2009. gada 20.–21. marts, Rīga, Latvija).

2. Articles (see *List of Publications*).

The dissertation was approved at the Department of Baltic Philology, Vilnius University, April 28, 2010.

**Defence statements:**

1. The system of postpositional local cases in Daukša's *Postilla* is quadripartite. Contrary to Smoczyński's and Kavaliūnaitė's claim that the adessive and inessive do not constitute separate cases in terms of case meaning (they are in complementary distribution according to Silverstein's animacy hierarchy), 7,4% of the occurrences of the adessive in Daukša's *Postilla* exhibit its etymological meaning 'position near to the object'.

2. Inessive and illative are clearly spatial cases, whereas the local meanings of the allative and the adessive are situated in the semantic periphery of these cases.

3. The interchangeability of the postpositional local cases and their functional equivalents in Daukša's *Postilla* is motivated cognitively and semantically.

4. The usage of some postpositional local cases could be influenced by the Polish original, but there are very few borrowed constructions.

**Structure.** The dissertation consists of three introductory chapters ("Preface", "Historia quaestionis", "Methodology"), three research chapters ("Stative Local Cases",



“Dynamic Local Cases”, “The Relation between Inessive and Illative and between Adessive and Allative”), conclusions and bibliography. The first two research chapters consist of subchapters devoted to each postpositional local case and their functional equivalents.

## RESEARCH RESULTS

9698 instances of the postpositional local cases are attested in Daukša’s *Postilla*. The inessive is found most often (5748x, 59%), the allative comes next (2395x, 25%), whereas adessive (918x, 9,5%) and illative (637x, 6,5%) are definitively rarer. The use types of the local cases are briefly presented in the following chapters.

### INESSIVE

Compared to the other postpositional local cases, the inessive is used most frequently in spatial relational constructions. Relational constructions with the inessive encode spatial situations in which the Figure is located in the interior region of the container Ground. The evidence can be classified into the following use types, which correspond to different aspects of the CONTAINER schema.

1. The Ground is a three-dimensional, hollow, bounded from all sides container, which is capable to enclose the Figure:

*Turi [...] fkrînioia daugiafñ rubu / daugiafñ pinigú neğ priwału* 55<sub>43</sub>,

*Maß [...] w fkrzyni wiecey ßat y wiecey pieniedzy niželi potrzebá* 55<sub>11</sub>,

‘You have more clothes and more money in the ark than it is necessary’.

This is the prototypical use type of the inessive. The inessive denoting three-dimensional Grounds contrasts most markedly with all other spatial units, cf. *skrynioje* ‘in the ark’ / *ant skrynios* ‘on the ark’ / *prie skynios* ‘at the ark’. In Daukša’s *Postilla* this type of inessive is instantiated by names of buildings and institutions, but also by lexemes that do not belong to larger semantic groups, e.g. *asmuo karietoje* ‘a person in carriage’, *aliejus inde* ‘oil in a vessel’, *pinigai maišelyje* ‘money in a bag’, *malkos pečiuje* ‘wood in a stove’, etc. It encompasses also various subtypes where the Ground deviates from the ideal geometrical three-dimensional specifications, e.g. lacks

the top (*asmuo duobėje, guolyje, prakarte, laivėje, luote* ‘a person in a pit, a lie, a crib, a boat, a dugout’, *pelenai rankoje* ‘ashes in a hand’).

Topologically the Figure of the first use-type is included in a Landmark which is conceptualized as three-dimensional and functions as a container of the Figure. Perceptually the Figure is invisible or only partly visible for an external observer. There is also a force-dynamic relation between the Figure and Ground according to which Ground in some way limits or controls the position of the Figure.

2. The second use type of the inessive highlights a different aspect of the container schema. It encompasses the cases where the container is instantiated by topographical or geographical regions. The boundaries of such landmarks usually are not perceived but are imposed by human beings according to their interaction with such regions. Though typologically geographical regions and place names form a special group and exhibit diverse kinds of spatial expressions, in Lithuanian they are usually conceptualized stereometrically as three-dimensional invoking a container schema. Accordingly, place names, appellatives denoting natural places (*giria, pustynia* ‘desert’, *laukas, dirva* ‘field, land’, *pieva* ‘meadow’, *daržas* ‘garden’, *sala* ‘island’), territories whose boundaries are defined by confessional or administrative dependence (*karalystė* ‘Kingdom’, *vyskupystė* ‘See’, *krikščionystė* ‘Christendom’), and the names of wide-ranging or religious regions (*pasaulis, svietas* ‘the world’, *žemė* ‘earth’, *dangus* ‘heaven’, *pragaras* ‘hell’, *rojus* ‘Eden’, *skaistykla* ‘purgatory’) are used in the inessive case.

3. The Figure is located in the Ground which is a part of the space, e.g. names of the cardinal points and nouns indicating parts of territories (borders, edges): *vakaruose* ‘in the West’, *rytuose* ‘in the East’, *Betliejaus kraštuose* ‘in the suburbs of Bethlehem’.

4. The fourth use-type is motivated by the transformations *uniplex Ground* → *multiplex Ground* → *mass*. The conceptualization of multiplex landmark as a container is based on the imposed outline resulting in transformation of a cluster of several objects into a single homogenous mass. Such landmarks are instantiated by *nomina collectiva* like *minia* ‘crowd’, *pulkas* ‘troop’, *žmonės* ‘people’, *žydai* ‘Jews’, *daržas* ‘garden’, *šilas* ‘pinewood’, *vinyčia* ‘vineyard’, etc.).

5. The Figure is contained by the Ground-substance:

*tė̄si lō̄bis mū̄su pā̄šleptas dī̄rwoia* 614<sub>46</sub>,  
*niechay bed̄ziē ſkarb nā̄β zākryty w roley* 508<sub>43</sub>,  
'Let our treasure be hidden in the soil'.

It encompasses inessives as *aliejuje* 'in the oil', *vandenyje* 'in the water', *krauje* 'in blood', *ugnyje* 'in fire', *liepsnoje / liepsnose* 'in flame / flames', *ežere* 'in the lake', *mariose* 'at sea', *žemėje* 'in ground', *molyje* 'in clay', *mėšle* 'in muck', *purve* 'in mud', *žaiždoje* 'in wound'.

6. In the sixth use-type the animate Figure is located in Ground which objectively exists but is experienced by the senses, e.g. atmosphere phenomena, smells, sounds, light, darkness: *šaltyje* 'in cold', *tamsoje* 'in the darkness', *šviesoje* 'in the light', *smarvėje* 'in stink', etc. Such Grounds resemble substances in structure as they do not have a constant shape and strictly-defined boundaries but contrary to substances they are immaterial and heterogeneous, usually possessing a center and a periphery.

7. In the seventh use-type the Ground is a material that constitutes a layer on the external sides of Figure. There is a conceptual reversal of Figure and Ground: the latter is conceptualized as smaller, more mobile and flexible than the former. Figure is always a person and the material-Ground is instantiated by names of clothes and *the crown* lexeme:

*du wīru ſtōiōs pas iūs r ūb ūſe bałt ūſé* 228<sub>39</sub>,  
*dwá mę̄żowie ſtāneli wedle nich w βacīech białyech* 237<sub>11</sub>,  
'Two men stood near them in white clothes'.

This type (*person in clothes*) can be influenced by Polish construction *w + loc*. In contemporary Lithuanian names of clothes are used in the instrumental case.

8. The Figure and the Ground are objects of the same kind. The Ground characterizes the shape of the Figure:

*idānt' rugėi tawėii ſtīrtōſe arba βpīktleri ūſe ſup ūtu* 242<sub>51</sub>,  
*āby žyto twoie w brogách / ālbo w βpiklerzách pognilo* 251<sub>17</sub>,  
'Let your rye rot in stacks'.

9. The topological aspect of the Figure-Ground relation loses importance against the force-dynamic aspect. The Ground (instantiated usually by lexemes denoting *hands, arms*) controls the position of the Figure at least from two sides:

*turei' lampas déganczes / arbá žwakés vždegtas / rakofe sawoffe* 568<sub>25</sub>,  
*mieć lámpy goráiace / ábo świece zápalone w rekách swoich* 615<sub>22t</sub>,  
'To have burning lamps or lighted candles in one's hands'.

10. THE SUBSTANCE IS A CONTAINER FOR THE OBJECT. The Figure is an artifact.  
The Ground represents the stuff from which the Figure is made:

*[Kristus] paláidotas yrá [...] nauiamé grabé / ákmenie ižkáltame* 182<sub>24</sub>,  
*[Chryftus] pogrzebion iest [...] w nowym grobie / w kámieniu wykowánym* 190<sub>32</sub>,  
'Christ is buried in the new grave, carved in stone'.

This type could be influenced by the Polish inessive construction *w + loc.* (in Lithuanian *iš + gen.* is used, ENTITIES COME OUT OF THE SUBSTANCE).

11. The Figure and the Ground exhibit a part / whole relation:  
*žweieí [...] wiéta ir kiekwiéna kampêli vpefe / êžerũfe / žino* 379<sub>46</sub>,  
*rybitwi [...] káždy kaćik w rzekách y w iežiorách wiedzã* 394<sub>3</sub>,  
'Fishermen know every place and corner in the rivers and lakes',

12. The Figure is a person and the Ground denotes an event: Mass, wedding, christening, feast, meeting, synod, assemblage, etc. This type stands in the border between the expression of space and time.

The cases studied above express concrete physical space. The following types are extensions from physical space to the domain of abstract location. They are usually motivated by conceptual metaphors or other cognitive mechanisms.

13. TIME IS SPACE. The inessive of time covers a greater variety of lexeme-types in DP than in contemporary Lithuanian (names of hours, day parts, days, weeks, months, years, centuries, religious time-periods, festivals, stages of human life, and the phases of the moon), e.g. Luke 14,1:

*ieio Iefus namũfn' nê kurio kunigáikβczio Phariféuβu subatoie* 338<sub>5∞</sub>,  
*wβedł Iezus do domu niektorego Książeciã Pharyzáyskiego / w Sobote* 348<sub>30</sub>,  
'he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath day'.

14. WRITTEN SOURCES ARE CONTAINERS FOR INFORMATION. LEXICAL UNITS ARE CONTAINERS FOR MEANING. THE CONDUIT METAPHOR.

15. SOCIAL GROUPS ARE CONTAINERS, e.g. *bażnyćioje* ‘in the church’, *luome* ‘in the estate’, *šeimoje* ‘in the family’, *bursoj* ‘in company’, *sektose* ‘in sects’.

16. BODY, SHAPE IS A CONTAINER FOR GOD’S INCARNATION. The Figure is God and the Ground denotes forms or shapes of its incarnation. Because of the religious nature of DP, this type quite frequent and heterogeneous.

*parôdés Téwas bałfe / Sunús / kûne o Dwafiá S. îpatineie karwêlo* 258<sub>33</sub>,  
*fié okazał Oćiec w głoście / Syn w ćielie / á Duch święty w ofobie gołebice* 266<sub>22</sub>,  
‘The Father appeared as voice, the Son as body, and the Holy Ghost as a pigeon’.

17. VISUAL FIELD IS A CONTAINER, e.g. *akyse, lèlełėje akies* ‘in one’s eyes, sight’.

18. CONSCIOUSNESS, MEMORY, THOUGHTS, AND DREAMS ARE CONTAINERS FOR MENTAL STATES, e.g.

*Karâlus ne owiie / be’ fapné ana pawéikłta regéio* 583<sub>2</sub>,  
*nie ná iáwi / ále we fnie on obraz widział* 629<sub>45</sub>,  
‘The King saw that vision not in the reality but in a dream’.

19. BODY AND BODYPARTS ARE CONTAINERS FOR FEELINGS, EMOTIONS AND STATES:

*ner’ baimes Diéwo akife iu* 394<sub>36</sub>,  
*nie máß boiáźni Bożey przed ich oczymá* W<sup>2</sup>16<sub>32</sub>,  
‘There is no fear in their eyes’.

20. PERSON’S PERSONAL SPHERE IS A CONTAINER FOR FEELINGS, EMOTIONS AND STATES:

*Nôbażnumas ir báime bernęliię Iéfuię tamę paródes* 66<sub>6</sub>,  
*Nabożeństwo y boiaźń Boża w dziećiećiu Iezuśie w tym fié okazała* 67<sub>2</sub>,  
‘Godliness and fear have appeared in boy Jesus’.

21. PHYSICAL STATES, FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS ARE CONTAINERS FOR PERSONS:

*[źmonès] atliéktís ligofé ir biaurîbessę sawofé* 370<sub>47</sub>,  
*zofćia w chorobách y w plugáftwách swoich* 383<sub>7t</sub>,  
‘People remain in their illnesses and in their nastiness’.

The use types 20 and 21 are two alternatives for expressing an emotional state. 21 is quite frequent, but this could be due to Polish influence. In 20 the adessive is more common than the inessive.

22. PERSON'S AUTHORITY IS A CONTAINER FOR ANOTHER PERSON. This type is an extension of type 9 and denotes the abstract notion of control (might, captivity, asylum, supervision, etc.).

23. SOCIAL STATUS IS A CONTAINER FOR PERSON. The Ground specifies the social status of a person (*urėde* 'in employment', *mergystoje* 'in girlhood', *sužiedavime* 'in matrimony').

24. The final groups are caused by the influence of the Polish construction *w + loc.*

24.1. Figure (person's quality) is qualified in Ground (particular domain of life):

*žmónes dabár maži tikėiime ir mėiļeię* 423<sub>26</sub>,

*lud / iešćęe mály w wierze y w miłości* 438<sub>8</sub>,

'Nowadays people are small in religion and in love'.

24.2. The inessive is used as complement of the verbs *duksėtis* 'believe, have faith in', *grožėtis* 'admire', *gėrėtis* 'enjoy', *girtis* 'make boast of', *abejoti* 'doubt', *džiaugtis*, *linksmintis* 'rejoice at', *gėdinti* 'be ashamed of':

*páduksi penigųfe turėdamas* 307<sub>9</sub>,

*nádźieie w pieniądźách pokłádáiac* 316<sub>15</sub>,

'Having faith in money'.

It is found interchangeably with the instrumental (alone used in contemporary Lithuanian).

24.3. The inessive indicates manner, cause, middleman. Some examples do not correspond to the Polish construction *w + loc.* In part they must reflect the influence of the *Vulgata*.

Luke 1,44:

*pradžiuęos džiaukfmė bernėlis ifcioia máno* 471<sub>10∞</sub>,

*wyskoczyło od rádości dziećiatko w żywoćie moim* 502<sub>5</sub>,

'the babe leaped in my womb for joy'.

John 11,24:

*Žināu ioę [brolis] kėlfs / kílime iżg numirufsiu / anói paškutínioi diėnoi* 578<sub>10∞</sub>,

*Wiem iż [brát moy] powstánie / w žmartwychwstánie / w on oštátni dźień* 625<sub>2</sub>,

'I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day'.

Luke 11,15:

*nêkurie iżg iu biłôio Beelzebube kunigáikβtiie welinú iβmetinéie welinuwas 117<sub>34∞</sub>,  
mowili / przez Beelzebubá kšiaże Czártowſkie wygania czárty 124<sub>7</sub>,*  
'some of them said, He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils'.

24.4. With *turėti pavaizdą* 'have an example', *pa(si)rodyti* 'show', *regėti* 'see' the inessive indicates that a person is a model to follow:

*nôbažnumo gîwus pawayzdus iżkialtus tur: Gimditoiey Marioye ir Iožephę gimditoiûſę W. Iéſaus 64<sub>8</sub>,*  
*pobožności żywe przykłady wystáwione máia: Rodżice w Máryey y w Iozephie /  
w rodżicach Páná Iezufowych 65<sub>9t</sub>,*  
'Parents have real examples of godliness in Mary and in Ioseph, in parents of Lord Jesus'.

The inessive of space interchanges with the following prepositional phrases: *ant + gen.* 'on', *po + acc.* 'throughout, through', *per + acc.* 'through, across', *viduryje + gen., viduje + gen.* 'in the middle of', *tarp + gen.* 'between, among'.

*Ant + gen.* prototypically designates the Figure's contact with a horizontal surface (contrast *ant skrynios* 'on the ark' with *skrynioje* 'in the ark'). With some lexemes the inessive and *ant + gen.* are apparently synonymous. On closer inspection, however, it is evident that they are not. The inessive evokes the container schema, whereas *ant + gen.* determines a planimetric conceptualization of the Ground object as a horizontal plane or a surface:

*žmogus lovoje, vežime* 'a person in bed, cart' /  
*žmogus ant lovos, vežimo* 'a person on the bed, cart',  
*nešioti Jėzų rankose* 'to carry Jesus in one's arms' /  
*nešioti Jėzų ant rankų* 'to carry Jesus on one's arms',  
*sėti sėklą dirvoje* 'to sow seed in soil' /  
*sėti sėklą ant dirvos* 'to sow seed on soil'.

In a number of cases, on the other hand, the usage of the prepositional phrase *ant + gen.* is conditioned by the Polish construction *na + loc.*:

*gyventi pasaulyje / ant pasaulio, žemėje / ant žemės,*  
*mieszkać na świecie, na ziemi,*

‘to live in / on the world’, ‘in / on earth’;

*angelai danguje / ant dangaus, aukštybėse / ant aukštybių,*

*anyoły na niebie, na wysokości,*

‘angels are in / on heaven, in / on high’.

*Po* + *acc.* ‘throughout, through’ and *per* + *acc.* ‘through, across’ are inherently dynamic. Their functional equivalence to the inessive is based on the end-point focus. They differ from the inessive in profiling the dispersion of the Figure, whereas the inessive is neutral. There is a difference in *contour of path* between the prepositional phrases *per* + *acc.* and *po* + *acc.* The former prototypically requires a straight path of a Figure, the latter indicates a meandering contour.

*Ewangelikai ne wiėnos baųnicųios po wiųųa paųauli [...] parodit ne gal’* 445<sub>43</sub>,

*Ewangelikowie ųadnego Koųcioła po wųyųtkim ųwiecie [...] ukázac nie moga* 466<sub>14</sub>,

‘The evangelicals cannot show any church throughout the whole world’;

*ųidai [...] turėio nėkures iųkalás per paųauli* 89<sub>32</sub>,

*ųydųi [...] mieli niektore boųnice po ųwiecie* 90<sub>44</sub>,

‘The Jews had some synagogues across the world’.

*Viduryje* and *viduje* + *gen.* correspond to Polish *w poųrzód* + *gen.*, *w poųzodku* + *gen.* ‘in the middle of’. They convey more detailed information about the Figure’s location than the inessive.

*Tarp* + *gen.* ‘between, among’ corresponds to the inessive when the Ground lexeme is a collective (*family, crowd, people, eglantines, worms, waves*). The inessive is based on the conceptualization of the Ground as a mass-container, whereas *tarp* + *gen.* highlights the separation of the objects of the Ground.

## **ADESSIVE**

We can distinguish 7 use types of the adessive. The types 1–5 translate the Polish construction *u* + *gen.*, the types 6–7 translate Polish *w* + *loc.*

1. Spatial meaning of proximity. The Figure and the Ground are equally visible; force dynamics are not relevant. The Figure is always a person in close proximity or



contact to an inanimate Ground object (e.g. *altar, village, door, window, gate, table, fire, etc.*):

*βildes' úgnip̃ [Petras] 158<sub>6</sub>,*  
*grzał fie v ogniá 164<sub>15</sub>,*  
‘Peter warmed near the fire’;  
*Lòzorius kurís guléio wárt ũfem̃p̃ io 270<sub>37t</sub>,*  
*Lázarz / ktory leżał przede wroty iego 277<sub>49</sub>,*  
‘beggar named Lazarus lied at his gates’.

This usage of the adessive is extremely rare in other Old Lithuanian texts. In DP it makes the 7,4% of all occurrences.

2. Localization in the physical sphere of a person (home, working place, town, country, confessionally defined territory, religion, language, works, etc.):

*Wießpatis Iéfus yra Phariżeufieþ ant' pietú 478<sub>30</sub>,*  
*Pan IEżus ieft v Pháryzeuþá ná obiedźie 512<sub>10</sub>,*  
‘The Lord Jesus is at the Pharisee for dinner’.

3. *Adessivus iudicantis*. The Ground functions as an assessor: one person (Figure) is evaluated by another (Ground):

*Iónas S. kríkβtitoies [...] buwa didimę braginimę teip phariżiúþŭfamp / kaip' ip žmonefiám̃p wifsókiófump 45<sub>29</sub>,*  
*Ian ś. [...] był w wielkiew wadze ták v Pháryzeuþow / iáko y v poşpolŃtwá 44<sub>44t</sub>,*  
‘John the Baptist was in great esteem among the Pharisees and all manner of people’.

4. Possession with the verb *to be* (*Nadess.* ‘possessor’ + *V<sub>BE</sub>* + *Nnom.* ‘possessum’), corresponding to Old Polish *coś (jest) u kogoś* ‘somebody has something’. The Figure is never a concrete object:

*páhoniŃiam̃p priéþus búwo búdas 138<sub>1</sub>,*  
*v Pogánow przeciwny był obyczay 144<sub>45</sub>,*  
‘Pagans had the opposite custom’;  
*DideŃnis [tikėjimas] búwo taip' ligônip̃ žmonáip̃ 369<sub>14</sub>,*  
*Wietþa [wiara] byłá v tey chorey niewiáŃty 381<sub>29</sub>,*  
‘That ill woman had major belief’.

5. The adessive is a person who is being asked, begged or demanded for something. Matt. 20,20:

*Atáio Iefufop motina funú Zebedéuþo [...] praþídama neko iamimþ 482<sub>16</sub>,*

*Przyftapilá do Iezufá mátká synow Zebedeuþowych [...] žadáiac częgoś v niego 516<sub>24</sub>,*

‘Then came to him the mother of Zebedees children with her sons [...] desiring a certain thing of him’.

6. Experiencer. The Ground is a person and the Figure is a state. This is the main use type of the adessive:

*tóii małóne ne tûiäus iamimp paródes 53<sub>6</sub>,*

*tá láfká nie zaráz fie w nim pokazálá 52<sub>17</sub>,*

‘That grace has appeared in him not at once’.

7. The final groups are due to the influence of the Polish construction *w + loc*.

7.1. *Dieviep* (Polish *w Bogu*, Latin *in Deo*) expresses ‘in God, according to God’s will, in the name of God’, e.g. John 3,21:

*idant parodituš darbái io / ioğ Diewiéþ padaríti yra 240<sub>38</sub><sup>∞</sup>,*

*áby fie obiáwiły vcžynki iego / iż w Bogu fa vcžynione 249<sub>17t</sub>,*

‘that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God’.

7.2. With *duksétis* ‘believe in’, *grožétis* ‘admire’, *pradžiuğtis*, *papiktintis* ‘get indignant at’, e.g. Matt. 11,6:

*pałáimintas yrá / kursái ne papíktifís manimp 17<sub>10</sub><sup>∞</sup>,*

*A błogóšławiony ieft / ktory fie nie zgorþy we mnie 16<sub>42</sub>,*

‘And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me’.

The adessive is used interchangeably with the inessive and the instrumental (alone used in contemporary Lithuanian).

7.3. *savimp* ‘in one’s self’ (Polish *w sobie*) is used as an emphatic reflexive.

Luke 7,49:

*Ir pradéio kurié draugia fedéio kalbét fa wimþ 476<sub>29</sub><sup>∞</sup>,*

*poczéli społem siedacy mowic w sobie 510<sub>21</sub>,*

‘And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves’.

The adessive of spatial meaning correlates with the prepositions *prieg + dat. / gen. / instr.* ‘at, with’, *pas + acc.* ‘near’, *ties + instr.* ‘in front of’, *už + gen.* ‘behind’, *ant + gen.* ‘on’, *po + dat.* ‘under’. The last four are used interchangeably with the adessive only with a limited number of inanimate Grounds and differ from the adessive in meaning. The first two do not differ from the adessive with inanimate Grounds, but they do with animate Grounds. *Pas + acc.* treats Ground-persons as physical bodies in proximity to which the Figure is located. *Prieg + dat. / gen. / instr.* and adessive differ in Figure-Ground status. With *prieg* Figure and Ground may be objects of equal status (*minia buvo prieg Jėzaus / Jėzus buvo prieg miniai* ‘a crowd was with (near) Jesus / Jesus was with (near) a crowd’), whereas the adessive requires the Ground to be more influential than the Figure. This feature determines the non-spatial uses of the adessive, in which the Figure depends on the Ground or becomes a part of it.

## ILLATIVE

In DP the illative is the least used local case because of its correlation with the preposition *ing + acc.* In most use types they are used synonymously, the difference being sometimes stylistic. They both denote GOAL of motion and profile the inner region of the CONTAINER. The use types of illative and *ing + acc.* correlates with the inessive as the dynamic equivalents of the latter.

1. The Figure moves into a three-dimensional container, which is capable of enclosing the Figure:

*minia Židu [...] grižo nam ūfn’* 181<sub>39</sub> / *Sugriβiū ing nam ūs man ūs* 118<sub>7</sub>,  
*rzeβa Žydow [...] wracāli fię do domu* 190<sub>1</sub> / *Wroce fię do domu mego* 125<sub>12</sub>,  
 ‘The crowd of Jews came back home’ / ‘I will come back home’.

2. The Figure moves into the Ground, instantiated by geographical or topographical regions, natural places, wide-ranging or religious regions:

*[gimdytojai] fugrižo Jerofoliman* 63<sub>27</sub> / *[gimdytojai] fugrižo ing Jerufālem* 65<sub>38</sub>,  
*[rodzicy] wrocili fię do Jerozolimy* 64<sub>10</sub> / *[rodzicy] wrocili fię do Jeruzalem* 66<sub>36</sub>,  
 ‘The parents turned back again to Jerusalem’.

3. The Figure moves into a mass-Ground:

*Kad W. Iefus atêio daržán’ 150<sub>32</sub> / dâržas ing kuri iêio Iéfus 148<sub>32</sub>,  
Pan Iezus przybedł do ogrodá 143<sub>31</sub> / ogrod: do ktorego wbedł on 154<sub>17</sub>,  
‘When Jesus came into the garden’ / ‘The garden into which Jesus came’.*

4. The Figure moves into a substation–Ground:

*Eikite prakeiktiéii úgnin’ amžinon’ 309<sub>13</sub> / Eikítę ing úgni ámžina 171<sub>20</sub>,  
Idźcie przekleći w ogieñ wieczny 318<sub>12</sub> / Idźcie w ogieñ wieczny 180<sub>21</sub>,  
‘Go, you cursed, to the eternal fire’.*

5. The Figure is enclosed into a Ground–material (swaddling–clothes, kerchief) that forms a layer on the external sides of the Figure: *įvystyti Jėzų vystykluosna / ing vystyklus* ‘to swaddle Jesus into swaddling–clothes’.

6. The Figure and Ground are objects of the same kind. The Ground characterizes the shape that the Figure obtains. The Ground may be the result of both the distribution and the unification of the Figure:

*Angelái (...) piktūfius wel kaip’ kulūfn furišę 83<sub>42</sub> / będiewięi / kaip’ kukâlei furišti  
ing kulús 86<sub>24</sub>,*

*złe záfie iákoby w snopki powiazawby 85<sub>27</sub> / niezbożnicy / iako kokol powiazány w  
snopie 87<sub>49</sub>,*

‘The Angels have bound the evil-minded into the sheaves’ / ‘The infidels are bound like weeds into the sheaves’.

7. The force–dynamic aspect of the Figure–Ground relation is highlighted: *įduoti lazda rankon / ing ranką* ‘to give a stick into one’s hand’.

8. The Figure is a person and the Ground denotes an event (wedding, feast, Council, trial, fair) as an achieved goal of motion.

9. With verbs of beating the Ground denotes a part of the human body, to which the movement of the Figure (hand, first) is directed. The movement results in a Figure–Ground contact:

Luke 18,13: *múitinikas [...] múše krutišna fáwo 313<sub>26∞</sub> / [muitininkas] múšes ing  
krutís sawas 315<sub>47</sub>,*

*Jáwnogrzeβnik [...] fie bił w pierśi swoie 322<sub>43</sub> / fie bił w pierśi swe 325<sub>24</sub>,*

‘the publican smote upon his breast’.

The next use types represent abstract location expressions with the inessive and *ing + acc.*

10. Location in time. Only the illative is used. It expresses simultaneous location in time (like the inessive) or a goal in time, e.g. *atguldinēti nuog dienos dienon* ‘to delay from one day to another’.

11. WRITTEN SOURCES ARE CONTAINERS FOR INFORMATION: *įrašyti, surinkti istoriją žodžiuosn / ing knygas* ‘to inscribe the story in words / books’.

12. SOCIAL GROUPS ARE CONTAINERS. With *intekti* ‘get into’, *notgrįžti* ‘not to return’, *atvesti* ‘bring’, *priimti* ‘accept’, *rankioti* ‘collect’ the Figure is a person who becomes a member of a social group (*sect, community, church, association, etc.*).

13. SHAPE IS A CONTAINER FOR THE FIGURE. The examples denote a change in the Figure’s shape. The illative is rare (3x), whereas *ing + acc.* is attested 77 times:

John 2,9: *paragâwo wiriaufias wandeni winán permainta* 68<sub>12</sub><sup>∞</sup>,  
*įkoštował przelōżny wody w wino przemienionej* 69<sub>4</sub>,  
‘The ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine’;  
*[Jėzus] pėrmaine wādeni ing wīna* 138<sub>43</sub>,  
*gdy przemienił wodę w wino* 145<sub>31</sub>,  
‘Jesus has made the water wine’.

14. BODY AND BODYPARTS ARE CONTAINERS FOR FEELINGS, EMOTIONS AND STATES: *krauti Dievo žodžius širdin / ing širdį* ‘to load the words of God into one’s heart’.

15. A PERSON’S PERSONAL SPHERE IS A CONTAINER FOR FEELINGS, EMOTIONS AND STATES. Only *ing + acc.* is found in this use type, e.g. Luke 1,35:

*Angelas táre iey: Dwaśia S. atáys ing tawe* 438<sub>10</sub><sup>∞</sup>,  
*Anyoł rzekł iey: Duch S. nadeydzie ná cie* 454<sub>10</sub>,  
‘And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee’.

16. PHYSICAL STATES, FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS ARE CONTAINERS FOR PERSONS: *impulti nuodēmėn / ing nuodēmę* ‘to fall into sin’.

17. A PERSON’S AUTHORITY IS A CONTAINER FOR ANOTHER PERSON: the figure moves into one’s will, might, captivity, supervision, trap, etc.: *impulti ing žabangus velino* ‘fall into devil’s traps’.

18. THE FIGURE MOVES INTO A CERTAIN SOCIAL STATUS AS A CONTAINER: *jeiti moteryston* ‘to go into matrimony’.

19. SEEING IS ENTERING. The Ground is a goal for the eyes’ movement.

20. Usage in phraseological units and idioms.

Illative and *ing + acc.* do not differ semantically in any use type, but there are differences in frequency. *Ing + acc.* dominates in types 6 and 16. It is preferred in contexts in which both the source (*nuog + gen., iš + gen.*) and the goal of motion are expressed, e.g. Luke 2,4:

*Nueio wel ir Iósephas nuğ Galiléos izğ miéfto Nazareth / ing žeme Iúdos / ing míefta Dówido / kuri wadína Betthlè 37<sub>38</sub>∞,*

‘And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem’.

*Ing + acc.* could here be favored for stylistic reasons (two prepositional constructions follow each other).

To indicate Goal of direction and Orientation between Figure and Ground only *ing + acc.* is used (e.g. *veidu ing veidq* ‘face to face’).

The other functional equivalents of the illative are *ant + gen.* ‘on’, *tarp + gen.* ‘between, among’, *viduryje / viduje + gen.* ‘in the middle of’, *per + acc.* ‘across’.

*Ant + gen.* is used with verbs denoting horizontal movement into the container ground (names of towns, states, places of events, lexemes *pasaulis* ‘world’, *dangūs* ‘heaven’, *vieta* ‘place’). This usage, which is not semantically motivated, is borrowed from Polish (*na + acc.*). Differently, with the verb *to spit* (*spjauti ant veido* ‘to spit onto one’s face’) the Goal on the Ground’s surface is highlighted.

*Tarp + gen.* interchanges with the illative and *ing + acc.* when movement into a collective Ground is expressed.

*Viduryje / viduje + gen.* corresponds to Polish *w pośrzodku + gen.* and expresses a more detailed Goal than the illative.

With verbs of beating (use type 9) *per + acc.* is also used. It must be a native expression because it does not have a counterpart in the Polish text. The difference between *per + acc.* and illative / *ing + acc.* lies in the conceptualization of the

Figure–Ground contact: in the latter case it is a point while in the former it is a line or a surface.

## ALLATIVE

14 types of allative are distinguished, which reflect well-established patterns of grammaticalization of goal-marking morphemes. The allative corresponds to three Polish prepositional constructions: *k(u) + dat.*, *do + gen.*, *na + acc.*

1. Inanimate Goal of motion. The movement of the Figure (a verb of motion) is directed to the Goal expressed by the allative. This is the most basic meaning of the allative, e.g. Luke 24,28:

*du iżg mokitiniu [...] priârtinos miêfteloþ kurioþ êio* 189<sub>31</sub><sup>∞</sup>,

*Dwá z ucźniow [...] przybliżyli się do miáfteczka / do ktorego byli* 198<sub>11</sub>,

‘And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went’.

2. Goal of motion. The Figure acquires a location in physical proximity to the Goal, e.g. Luke 24,24:

*Ir nuêio nêkurie iżg mûfu grâboþ* 189<sub>25</sub><sup>∞</sup>,

*Y chodzili niektorzy z nábych do grobu* 198<sub>5</sub>,

‘And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre’.

This is the most frequent spatial type and is traditionally considered as the main one. Proximity, however, is determined by the context in the case of three dimensional Grounds, whereas with two-, one-dimensional or dimensionless Grounds it is determined by the lexical meaning of the reference object.

3. Animate Goal of motion. The Figure acquires a location in the physical sphere of the person, e.g. John 1,11:

*Sawúmpiump atêio / ir fáwíei io ne priéme* 43<sub>4</sub><sup>∞</sup>,

*Do włafności przybedł / á swoiż go nie przyieli* 42<sub>19</sub>,

‘He came unto his own, and his own received him not’.

4. Goal of direction or orientation. The Figure is static. It is motivated by the transformations *Figure’s motion towards Ground* → *Figure’s orientation towards Ground* and *Figure’s motion towards Ground* → *Figure’s extension towards Ground*:

*íʒtiefeu i uʃúm p̄ rakás ʃawàs 96<sub>4</sub>,*  
*wyciągałem ku wam ręce swoje 97<sub>16</sub>,*

‘I have spread my hands towards you’.

5. Allative of time. Usually the allative denotes a border of time approached by the Figure.

6. Abstract Goal of motion (state or emotion). The Figure (a person) moves towards or into a psychological condition, e.g. John 13,20:

*Wiffôkes neʃʃa kurís piktái dáro nopkencze βwiefós / ir notêit βwiefóʃp̄ 240<sub>36∞</sub>,*  
*ktory źle czyni / nienawidzi świátłóści / y nie przychodzi ná świátłóć 249<sub>15</sub>,*  
‘For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light’.

7. Addressee, e.g. Luke 1,34:

*Táre tađ Mariá Angełóp 438<sub>9∞</sub>,*  
*Rzekłá tedy Márya do Anyolá 454<sub>7t</sub>,*  
‘Then said Mary unto the angel’.

8. Emotional target. The Figure (emotion) is directed to a Ground (a person, God, or an inanimate object).

9. Recipient. With *atsiȳsti* ‘send’, *atnešti*, *nunešti* ‘bring’, *nešiojimas* ‘bearing’ the allative is a person-recipient.

10. Additive allative:

*Néʃsa to p̄ purwóp̄ źêmes / síla giwâtos primâiʃe 406<sub>4</sub>,*  
*do tego błotá źiemʃkiego / síle żywotna przymieʃał 420<sub>11</sub>,*  
‘Power of life was added to the mud of the Earth’.

11. Comparison. With *prilyginti* ‘equate’, *pridėti* ‘add’ the allative is used as the standard of comparative constructions.

12. Possessor. With *uʒgulėti*, *prigulėti*, *prieitis* ‘belong, fit’ (Polish *należec*) the allative is almost exclusively used with inanimate possessors.

13. Purpose (PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS). This use type is very common. Allatives of this type correlate with the infinitive and dative of purpose.

*[ʒmonès] nêʃa kríkβtop̄ S. maʒús waikélús 348<sub>13</sub>,*  
*noʃa do Chrztu świetego mále dźiatki 359<sub>27</sub>,*  
‘People carry little children to baptize’.



14. Discourse organizing type. With *eiti* ‘go’, *prieti(s)* ‘approach’, *sugrižti* ‘return’ the allative denotes the topic of the discourse:

*Bēt’ fugriβkimę Siméonop* 430<sub>13</sub>,

*Ale fię wroćmy do Symeoná* 445<sub>28</sub>,

‘Let’s go back to Simon’.

The spatial allative in DP correlates with the genitive and dative cases, as well as with the prepositions *ik* + *dat.* / *gen.* ‘up to’, *prieg* + *dat.* ‘to, near’, *pas* + *acc.* ‘near’, *ties* + *instr.* ‘in front of’, *už* + *gen.* ‘behind’, *ant* + *gen.* ‘on’. They are all rare.

The dative of Goal of motion is found with *artintis* ‘near / approach’ and corresponds to Polish *przybliżyć się* + *dat.*:

*múm us priârtiŝis karaliŝte dagáus* 123<sub>9</sub>,

*fię nam przybliży kroleŝtwo niebieŝkie* 129<sub>50</sub>,

‘The kingdom of heaven will approach us’.

The correlation between allative and dative is very common crosslinguistically. It is observed also in DP when denoting not only Goal of motion, but also addressee, emotional target, purpose and recipient.

The genitive as a synonym of the allative is usually found with abstract Goals of motion / purpose. It usually corresponds to Polish *dojść, dowieść* + *gen.* ‘come / bring close to’.

The interchangeability of *ties* + *instr.* ‘in front of’, *už* + *gen.* ‘behind’, *ant* + *gen.* ‘on’ with the allative is very rare. *Ik* + *dat.* / *gen.* ‘up to’ (corresponding to Polish *aż do* + *gen.*) usually denotes approaching a border in time, but is sometimes found in spatial contexts. *Prieg* + *dat.* is found only twice with animate Grounds and implies that the movement of the Figure ends both in the spatial proximity of the Ground and in the Ground’s personal sphere. Finally, *pas* + *acc.* is attested both with animate and inanimate Grounds. The movement of the Figure ends in the spatial proximity of the Ground.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. 24 use types of the inessive and 20 use types of the illative are distinguished (12 and 9 of them denote physical space, respectively). The schematic meaning of the inessive can be defined as CONTAINER, while the illative (as well as *ing + acc.*) denotes movement into the inner region of the CONTAINER. The prototypical container is a three-dimensional Ground that encloses the Figure from all sides. This is the main use type of the inessive and the illative. Other use types are based on different conceptualizations and categorizations of the Ground, whereas the abstract locations are motivated by conceptual metaphors.

2. 7 use types of the adessive are distinguished:

2.1. Proximity.

2.2. Localization in the physical sphere of a person.

2.3. *Adessivus iudicantis*.

2.4. Possession.

2.5. Adessive-person who is being asked, begged or demanded for something.

2.6. Experiencer.

2.7. Expressions determined by the influence of Polish.

The first use type represents the etymological meaning of the adessive and constitutes the 7,4% of all examples. The second use type (10%) is also spatial. The superschema is not clear.

3. 14 use types of the allative are distinguished:

3.1. Inanimate Goal of motion.

3.2. Goal of motion. The Figure acquires a location in physical proximity to the Goal.

3.3. Animate Goal of motion. The Figure acquires a location in the physical sphere of the person.

3.4. Goal of direction or orientation.

3.5. Time.

3.6. Abstract Goal of motion (state or emotion).

3.7. Addressee.

3.8. Emotional target.

- 3.9. Recipient.
- 3.10. Additive.
- 3.11. Standard of comparison.
- 3.12. Possessor.
- 3.13. Purpose.
- 3.14. Discourse organizing type.

The first four types are used for expressing space. The schematic meaning of the allative is Goal. This motivates the vast majority of its abstract functions. The traditional meaning of proximity is not fundamental for the allative; it is determined by the context and the lexical meaning of the reference object.

4. The usage of the adessive is strongly related to Silverstein's animacy hierarchy: 93,6% of the adessives denote persons. Daukša's language, however, does not confirm the theory that the relation between inessive and adessive is determined exclusively by animacy. The 7,4% of the adessives are used in the etymological meaning 'location in the proximity to something'. In this aspect Daukša's language differs from that of other Old Lithuanian texts.

5. The following cases and prepositional phrases occur interchangeably with the postpositional local cases (the usual Polish equivalents are given in brackets).

Postpositional local cases and their functional equivalents

<b><i>inessive</i></b> ( <i>w + loc., na + loc.</i> )	<b><i>adessive</i></b> ( <i>u + loc., przed(e) + instr., przy + loc.</i> )	<b><i>illative</i></b> ( <i>do + gen., w + acc., na + acc.</i> )	<b><i>allative</i></b> ( <i>do + gen., ku + dat., na + acc.</i> )
<i>ant + gen.</i> ( <i>na + loc.</i> )	<i>prieg + dat. / gen. / instr. (przy + loc., przed + instr.)</i>	<i>ing + acc.</i> ( <i>do + gen., w + acc., na + acc.</i> )	<i>dat.</i> ( <i>dat.</i> )
<i>per + acc.</i> ( <i>po + loc., na + loc.</i> )	<i>pas + acc. (wedle + gen., podle + gen., u + gen., przed + instr.)</i>	<i>ant + gen.</i> ( <i>na + acc.</i> )	<i>gen.</i> ( <i>gen.</i> )
<i>po + acc.</i> ( <i>po + loc.</i> )	<i>ties + instr.</i> ( <i>przed(e) + instr.</i> )	<i>tarp + gen.</i> ( <i>między + acc.</i> )	<i>net ik + gen. / dat.</i> ( <i>aż do + gen.</i> )
<i>viduryje + gen., viduje + gen.</i> ( <i>w pośrząd + gen., w pośrzedku + gen.</i> )	<i>už + gen.</i> ( <i>za + instr., u + loc.</i> )	<i>viduryje + gen., viduje + gen.</i> ( <i>w pośrzedku + gen.</i> )	<i>prieg + dat.</i> ( <i>przy + loc.</i> )
<i>tarp + gen.</i> ( <i>między + loc.</i> )	<i>ant + gen. (u + loc., nad + instr., na + loc.)</i>	<i>per + acc.</i> ( <i>÷</i> )	<i>pas + acc. (podle + gen. wedle + gen.)</i>
	<i>po + instr. / dat.</i> ( <i>pod + instr., po + loc.</i> )		<i>ties + instr. / gen.</i> ( <i>przed + acc.</i> )
			<i>už + gen. (za + instr.)</i>
			<i>ant + gen. (na + loc.)</i>

The interchangeability of language units does not necessarily imply synonymy. A systematic comparison of the spatial use types and their functional alternates reveals that these highlight different aspects of the encoded spatial scenes. Prepositional constructions correlating with postpositional local cases correspond to different Polish prepositional constructions. It is difficult to determine the influence of Wujek's *Postilla* in Daukša's translation in this issue. Both the syntactic and semantic system of Lithuanian and the syntax of Wujek's *Postilla* could determine the use of these prepositional constructions.

The closest relationship is that between the illative and the preposition *ing* 'into' with accusative. This explains why the illative is the least used postpositional local case. The construction *ing* + *acc.* is used twice as often as the illative, which it gradually replaces. There is no semantic difference in most use types, but there are stylistic differences.

6. With certain groups of lexemes the construction *ant* + *gen.* as a functional equivalent of inessive and illative is borrowed from the Polish constructions *na* + *loc.* and *na* + *acc.*, respectively.

7. The adessive and allative are not confused with the verbs *sėsti(s)* 'sit down', *stoti(s)* 'stand up', *pulti* 'fall upon'. The choice of the case depends on the author's intention to highlight either the location of the Figure or the goal of the Figure's motion:

*pulti kojosemp* 'to fall at one's legs' /

*pulti kojump* 'to fall to one's legs'.

The same holds for inessive and illative with the verbs *įvystyti* 'swaddle', *įvynioti* 'fold', *padėti* 'put':

*įvynioti vystykluose* 'to swaddle in swaddling-clothes' /

*įvynioti vystykluosna* 'to swaddle into swaddling-clothes',

*padėti prakarte* 'to put in a crib' /

*padėti prakartan* 'to put into a crib'.

# VIETOS RAIŠKA MIKALOJAUS DAUKŠOS *POSTILĖJE*: POSTPOZICINIAI VIETININKAI IR JŲ FUNKCINIAI EKVIVALENTAI

Reziumė

**Tyrimo objektas.** Disertacijoje aprašoma vietos raiška Mikalojaus Daukšos *Postilėje*. Dėl plačios vietos raiškos priemonių sistemos darbe apsiribojama postpozicinių vietininkų ir jų funkcinių ekvivalentų (arba kontekstinių variantų) analize.

**Tyrimo šaltinis.** Tiriamasis šaltinis – tai 1599 metais Vilniuje išleista *Postilė* (toliau – DP), kurią iš lenkiškosios Jokūbo Wujeko *Mažosios postilės* (toliau – WP) išvertė Mikalojus Daukša. Naudotasi Lietuvoje geriausiai išsilaikiusiu, ryškios spaudos, nedefektiniu Simonui Stanevičiui priklausiusiu egzemplioriumi (VUB RSS, sign. L<sub>R</sub> 1618) ir jo skaitmeniniu variantu bei konkordancijomis. WP sintagmos duodamos iš VU bibliotekos egzemplioriaus (VUB RSS, sign. II 5343) ir 2000 metų J. Palionio perspaudo (Palionis Jonas, 2000, *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų POSTILĖ ir jos šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos).

**Darbo tikslas ir uždaviniai.** Darbo tikslas – aptarti postpozicinių vietininkų vartoseną ir apibrėžti jų santykį su funkciniais variantais. Keliami šie uždaviniai:

1. Išskirti postpozicinių vietininkų vartosenos tipus.
2. Nustatyti, kiek vartosenos tipų susiję su vietos raiška.
3. Apibrėžti postpozicinių vietininkų tarpusavio ryšį.
4. Apibūdinti postpozicinių vietininkų ir jų kontekstinių variantų santykį.
5. Įvertinti vertimo šaltinio – lenkiškosios Jokūbo Wujeko *Postilės* – sintagmų įtaką Daukšos teksto vietos raiškos priemonėms.

**Tyrimo metodai.** Darbe laikomasi kognityvinės poliseminių kalbos vienetų reikšmės sampratos: vietininko reikšmę sudaro tarpusavyje susiję vartosenos tipai, kurių vieni yra būdingesni, prototipiškesni, o kiti – esantys linksnio reikšmių periferijoje. Kiekvienas postpozicinis vietininkas aptartas semasiologiškai, po to einama onomasiologine kryptimi – apibrėžiamas jo santykis su funkciniais ekvivalentais. Taikomas deskriptyvinis ir lyginamasis metodai: Daukšos *Postilės* vietos reikšmės sintagmos nuosekliai lyginamos su lenkiškojo originalo konstrukcijomis.

**Disertacijos naujumas.** Disertacijoje pirmą kartą sistemiškai aprašomos visos postpozicinių lokatyvų reikšmės ir išskiriami vietos reikšmės tipai: tai leidžia verifikuoti tradicinį požiūrį, kad postpoziciniai vietininkai yra vietos linksniai. Darbas aktualus tuo, kad jame išsamiai apžvelgiamos dabartinių vietos raiškos priemonių tyrimų kryptys, nuosekliai taikomi kognityviniai metodai ir terminija bei remiamasi lokatyvinių kalbos vienetų analizei skirtais tipologiniais tyrimais.

#### **Ginamieji teiginiai:**

1. Postpozicinių vietininkų sistema Daukšos *Postilėje* yra keturnarė. Adesyvo ir inesyvo santykis yra pagrįstas ne tik gyvumu, bet ir erdviu santykiu, todėl jie, kaip ir iliatyvas bei aliatyvas, *Postilėje* yra atskiri linksniai.

2. Inesyvas ir iliatyvas yra vietos linksniai, o adesyvo ir aliatyvo vietos reikšmė yra šių linksnių reikšmių periferijoje.

3. Postpozicinių vietininkų ir jų funkcinių ekvivalentų gretiminė vartoseną Daukšos *Postilėje* yra motyvuota semantinių ir kognityvinių principų.

4. Kai kurių prielinksnių konstrukcijų ir postpozicinių vietininkų gretiminę vartoseną vietos reikšmė lėmė vertimo šaltinis, tačiau lietuvių kalbai svetimų konstrukcijų nėra daug.

**Darbo aprobavimas.** Dalis tyrimo rezultatų disertantės jau buvo pristatyta:

1. tarptautinėse konferencijose skaitytuose moksliniuose pranešimuose:

a) *Par kādu ceļa izteikšanas līdzekli Mikaloja Daukšas* Postillā // 43. Artura Ozola dienas konference: Alvils Augstkalns (1907–1940) un baltu valodu pētniecība (2007. gada 16.–17. marts, Rīga, Latvija).

b) *Par adesīva lietojumu Mikalojus Daukšas* Postillā // 45. Artura Ozola dienas konference: baltu valodas diahroniskā un areālā aspektā. Veltījums Jurim Plāķim (1869–1942) 140. gadadienā (2009. gada 20.–21. marts, Rīga, Latvija).

2. moksliniuose straipsniuose (žr. publikacijų sąrašą).

**Disertacijos struktūra.** Darbą sudaro trys įvadinės dalys („Įvadas“, „Vietos raiškos tyrimai ir teorijos lietuvių ir užsienio kalbotyroje“ ir „Metodologija“), trys tiriamieji skyriai („Esamieji vietininkai“, „Einamieji vietininkai“ ir „Inesyvo ir iliatyvo sąsaja bei adesyvo ir aliatyvo sąsaja“), tyrimo išvados ir šaltinių, literatūros bei santrumpų sąrašai. Darbas turi priedą. Pirmuose dviejuose tiriamuosiuose skyriuose

atskirai analizuojamas kiekvienas postpozicinis vietininkas ir jo koreliacija su funkciniais ekvivalentais.

### **Tyrimo rezultatai ir išvados:**

1. Daukšos *Postilėje* iš viso pavartotos 9698 postpozicinių vietininkų lytys: dažniausiai randamas inesyvas (5748x, 59%), daugiau nei dvigubai rečiau – aliatyvas (2395x, 25%), o adesyvo ir iliatyvo formos atitinkamai sudaro 918x (9,5%) ir 637x (6,5%) visų postpozicinių vietininkų lyčių.

2. Inesyvą ir iliatyvą galima įvardyti vietos linksniais, o aliatyvo ir ypač adesyvo vietos reikšmė yra šių linksnių reikšmių periferijoje. Aliatyvą ir adesyvą įprasta vartoti abstraktesniems santykiams nusakyti.

3. Iš viso išskirta 24 inesyvo ir 20 iliatyvo vartosenos tipų (iš kurių atitinkamai 12 ir 9 žymi konkrečią fizinę vietą, likusieji – abstrakčią lokaciją). Bendroji inesyvo kategorijos reikšmė – TALPYKLA, o iliatyvo (ir konstrukcijos *ingAcc*) – galinis judėjimo taškas vidiniame TALPYKLOS regione. Geriausiai talpyklos vaidmenį atlieka trimatis, uždaras, figūrą (lokalizuojamąjį objektą) iš visų pusių dengiantis fonas (orientyras), – tai pirmasis inesyvo ir iliatyvo vartosenos tipas. Kiti vietos raiškos tipai skiriasi fono kategorizavimu, o abstraktieji aiškintini konceptualiosiomis metaforomis. Inesyvas ir iliatyvas koreliuoja tarpusavyje: daugelis konkrečiųjų ir abstrakčiųjų vartosenos tipų sutampa.

4. Išskirti 7 adesyvo vartosenos tipai:

1. adesyvas-orientyras, prie kurio lokalizuojama figūra,
2. adesyvas-asmuo, kurio aplinkoje lokalizuojama figūra,
3. adesyvas-vertintojas (*adessious iudicantis*),
4. adesyvas-posesorius,
5. adesyvas-asmuo, kurio klausama, prašoma, reikalaujama,
6. adesyvas eksperimentas,
7. adesyvas, kurio vartoseną lėmė Wujeko *Postilės* sintagmos.

Vietą žymi dvi pirmosios grupės: 1 tipo adesyvo vartosenos pavyzdžiai sudaro 7,4% visų adesyvų, antrojo – apie 10% visų adesyvų. Pagrindinė adesyvo reikšmė DP yra eksperimento, o bendroji adesyvo kategorijos reikšmė neišryškėja.

5. Išskirta 14 aliatyvo vartosenos tipų:

1. aliatyvas-judėjimo tikslas,

2. aliatyvas-galinis judėjimo taškas pašalyje,
3. aliatyvas-galinis judėjimo taškas asmens aplinkoje,
4. aliatyvas-krypties tikslas,
5. laiko aliatyvas,
6. abstraktus judėjimo tikslas (būsena),
7. kalbėjimo adresatas,
8. emocinis adresatas,
9. recipientas,
10. adityvinis aliatyvas,
11. lyginimo standartas,
12. posesorius,
13. tikslas,
14. diskursą organizuojantis tipas.

Vietą žymi pirmieji keturi. Bendroji aliatyvo kategorijos reikšmė – tikslas, ja pagrįsta dauguma abstraktesnių aliatyvo reikšmių. Judėjimo tikslas yra vienas iš aliatyvų žymimų tikslų tipų. Tradiciškai aliatyvui priskiriama pašalio reikšmė nėra esminė vietos reikšmė – kontekstuose su trimačiais orientyrais ji yra lemiamą konteksto, o kitokio pobūdžio fonais (plokštumomis / linijomis / taškais / asmenimis) – daiktavardžio leksinės reikšmės. Tiek Daukšos, tiek Chylinskio raštai (Kavaliūnaitė 2003) leidžia aliatyvui priskirti bendresnę judėjimo tikslo reikšmę, tai grindžiama ir tipologiniais tyrimais.

6. Adesyvas DP yra stipriai susijęs su gyvumo kategorija: 93,6% adesyvų yra gyvas būtybes reiškiančių vardažodžių formos. Tačiau DP duomenys neleidžia patvirtinti Smoczyński (2001) įžvalgos, kad inesyvo ir adesyvo sąsaja remiasi gyvumo, o ne erdvės santykiu, o tarp kalbamųjų linksnių esantis papildomos distribucijos santykis (šią sistemą pagrindžia Chylinskio kalba, Kavaliūnaitė 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2009). Adesyvas yra aiškiai paliudytas konkrečios vietos prie objekto reikšme (7,4% pavyzdžių), – šiuo požiūriu DP skiriasi nuo kitų to paties laikotarpio lietuviškųjų raštų, kuriuose adesyvas kalbamąja reikšme jau nebėra vartojamas.

7. Postpoziciniai vietininkai vietos reikšme *Postilėje* koreliuoja su šiais linksniais ir prielinksnių junginiais (skliausteliuose duoti tipiški vertimo šaltiniai):



Postpoziciniai vietininkai ir jų funkciniai ekvivalentai

<b>inesyvas</b> (wLoc, naLoc)	<b>adesyvas</b> (uLoc, przed(e)Instr, przyLoc)	<b>iliatyvas</b> (doGen, wAcc, naAcc)	<b>aliatyvas</b> (doGen, kuDat, naAcc)
<b>antGen</b> (naLoc)	<b>priegDat/Gen/Instr</b> (przyLoc, przedInstr)	<b>ingAcc</b> (doGen, wAcc, aAcc)	<b>Dat</b> (Dat)
<b>perAcc</b> (poLoc, naLoc)	<b>pasAcc</b> (wedleGen, podleGen, uGen, przedInstr)	<b>antGen</b> (naAcc)	<b>Gen</b> (Gen)
<b>poAcc</b> (poLoc)	<b>tiesInstr</b> (przed(e)Instr)	<b>tarpGen</b> (międzyAcc)	<b>net ikGen/Dat</b> (aż doGen)
<b>viduryjeGen,</b> <b>vidujeGen</b> (w pośródGen, w pośrzedkuGen)	<b>užGen</b> (zaInstr, uLoc)	<b>viduryjeGen,</b> <b>vidujeGen</b> (w pośrzedkuGen)	<b>priegDat</b> (przyLoc)
<b>tarpGen</b> (międzyLoc)	<b>antGen</b> (uLoc, nadInstr, naLoc)	<b>perAcc</b> (nėra)	<b>pasAcc</b> (podleGen, wedleGen)
	<b>poInstr /Dat</b> (podInstr, poLoc)		<b>tiesInstr/Gen</b> (przedAcc)
			<b>užGen</b> (zaInstr)
			<b>antGen</b> (naLoc)

Iliatyvas ir prielinksnio *ingAcc* junginiai daugeliu atvejų vartojami sinonimiškai, skirtumas galėtų būti nebent stilistinis, todėl galima teigi, kad gretiminė jų vartosena laipsniškai lėmė iliatyvo formų nykimą (*ingAcc* DP vartojama beveik dvigubai dažniau nei iliatyvas).

Kitų išvardytų vietos raiškos priemonių vartosena skiriasi, postpozicinių vietininkų funkciniais ekvivalentais jie tampa tik tam tikruose kontekstuose. Raiškos priemonės pasirinkimą galėjo paveikti jos sintaksinis ir semantinis atitikmuo Wujeko *Postilėje*, tačiau neatmestina ir vertėjo intencija vartojant skirtingus kalbos vienetus atskleisti skirtingus erdvinės scenos aspektus.

8. Skolinta laikytina sintagmos *antGen* vartosena buvimo vietai žymėti su apibendrintos vietos reikšmės daiktavardžiais (*pasaulis, svietas, žemė, dangus, dangūs, aukštybės, vieta, čysčius*), įvykio vietų pavadinimais, *oro, širdies, dūšios* leksemomis bei slinkties galinio taško reikšme su apibendrintos vietos reikšmės daiktavardžiais, miestų pavadinimais, įvykių, susibūrimų vietų įvardijimais bei abstraktais *valia* ir *tamsybės*.

9. Veiksmažodžiai *sėti(s)*, *stoti(s)*, *pulti* laikytini ne grynaisiais slinkties, o padėties kitimo veiksmažodžiais, todėl aliatyvo ir adesyvo vartoseną su jais (*pūle kóiofiamp̃* 369<sub>11</sub> ir *pulk' kóiump̃* 231<sub>8</sub>) nelaikytina šių linksnių painiojimo atvejais. Tas pats pasakytina ir apie gretiminę inesyvo bei iliatyvo vartoseną su veiksmažodžiais (*i-/su-*)*vystyti*, *įvynioti* ir (*in-/pa-*)*dėti* (*wiftiklūfe suwīstito* 438<sub>8t</sub> ir *Wiftiklūfna yra iwiftitas* 422<sub>45</sub>). Linksnio pasirinkimas priklauso nuo to, ką vertėjas labiau norėjo pabrėžti: vietos ar galinio taško reikšmę.

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO THE SUBJECT OF THE DISSERTATION

1. Žilinskaitė Eglė 2004, M. Daukšos *Postilės* postpozicinių vietininkų ir jiems sinonimiškų prielinksninių konstrukcijų vartoseną ir vertimo šaltiniai, *Baltistica* 39(1), 33–53.
2. Žilinskaitė Eglė 2006, Dėl vieno kelio raiškos atvejo Mikalojaus Daukšos *Postilėje*, *Baltistica* 41(2), 407–415.
3. Žilinskaitė Eglė 2007, Adesyvas Mikalojaus Daukšos *Postilėje*, *Baltistica* 42(3), 407–422.

EGLĖ ŽILINSKAITĖ (g. 1981) 1999–2003 m. studijavo lietuvių filologiją su užsienio (latvių) kalba ir įgijo filologijos bakalauro kvalifikacinį laipsnį. 2005 m. Vilniaus universitete baigė lietuvių kalbotyros magistrantūrą ir įgijo filologijos magistro kvalifikaciją. 2005–2010 m. studijavo Vilniaus universiteto filologijos mokslo krypties baltų kalbų šakos doktorantūroje. Doktorantė buvo išvykusi dalinių studijų į Latvijos universitetą (2001.09–2002.02, 2004.02–2004.07), Antverpeno universitetą (2008.02–2008.08), stažavosi Maxo Plancko psicholingvistikos institute (Olandija, 2008.04.21–25) ir Mančesterio universitete (2008.11.06–16). Nuo 2003 metų disertantė dirba Vilniaus universitete (dėstomieji dalykai – Latvių kalba, Latvistikos pagrindai), 2006 metais buvo viena iš Lietuvos valstybinio mokslo ir studijų fondo remiamo projekto „Senųjų lietuviškų raštų skaitmeninimas ir duomenų bazės kūrimas“ vykdytojų, dalyvauja Vilniaus universiteto Baltistikos katedros projekte „Lietuvių kalbos etimologinė duomenų bazė“.

EGLĖ ŽILINSKAITĖ (1981) studied Lithuanian Philology and Latvian at Vilnius University (1999–2003), acquiring the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Philology in 2003. In 2005 she obtained the degree of Master of Arts in Lithuanian Linguistics at the Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University. From 2005 to 2010 she was a PhD student in the Department of Baltic Philology at Vilnius University, including stages abroad at Latvian University (Fall term 2001–2002, Spring term 2003–2004), University of Antwerp (Spring term 2007–2008), Max Planck Institute of Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen (21–25 April 2008) and Manchester University (6–16 November 2008). Since 2003 she teaches Latvian language and philology at Vilnius University. In 2006 she participated in the project “Database of Old Lithuanian Texts”, supported by the Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation. At present she also works in the project “Lithuanian Etymological Database”.