Ilja A. Seržant

8 Dative experiencer constructions as a Circum-Baltic isogloss

1 Introduction

The present chapter is devoted to dative experiencer constructions in the Circum-Baltic area (established in a number of works, cf., inter alia, Stolz 1991, Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001). I will primarily focus on Russian, West Finnic, and Baltic.

More specifically, I will argue that the languages of the Eastern part of the Circum-Baltic area (i.e., Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Finnish, and Russian) share the same set of properties with certain predicates encoding psychological states. In these languages, there is a productive pattern according to which the experiencer is encoded with the dative case (or with another case that functions as an equivalent of the dative case in the given language[1]) and the object of the experience (stimulus) is encoded with the nominative case, cf.:

(1) Latvian
     Man   *patīk*   *šī*   *grāmata.*
     I:DAT   like:3.PRS   this:NOM.SG   book:NOM.SG
     'I like this book'

An important step toward the claim to be made here has been made primarily by Bossong (1998) and, subsequently, Haspelmath (2001) who show that the dative-like marked experiencers are very productive specifically in the northeastern part of Europe as opposed to the western part of Europe.

Furthermore, the area of dative-like marked experiencers in a subject-like position might potentially be extended to Scandinavia as well. As I will argue below, a low degree of subjecthood is also found in Baltic, Slavic, and Finnic with these predicates. Data from other languages of the area such as (Low) German, Polish, or Belarusian can be adduced.

---

1 Thus, Finnic languages lack an exact counterpart to Russian or Latvian dative case. In these languages, such local cases as allative or adessive cover the dative domain. The adessive case fulfils the functions of the dative in the possessive *mihi est* construction in Estonian and Finnish. The recipient is usually marked with the allative case in both languages, cf. (Finnish) *Tarjoamme vieraille illallisen* (offer.1PL guest.ALL.PL dinner.ACC=GEN.SG) 'We offer the guests a dinner'.

I will claim that the dative-like marked experiencers can be regarded as a feature that originally pertained at least to the Eastern part of the Circum-Baltic linguistic area. I will concentrate on rather "idiosyncratic" parameters and properties of the constructions in order to provide evidence for the claim that there is much more than a simple typologically frequent constructional pattern found in the area. I will conclude that the presence of dative experiencer constructions across the East of the Circum-Baltic area is a contact-induced or at least contact-facilitated phenomenon, and as a whole, not a result of independent developments or genetic inheritance.

To do so, I will proceed as follows. I will first introduce the semantically oriented notion of DAT (Section 2) that will enable cross-linguistic comparison. Then, I will discuss the question about how typologically frequently recurrent patterns may be shown to be subject of language contact (Section 3). Section 4 contains the main body of the chapter presenting the data and analysis thereof. Here I will discuss two predicate types, namely, a verbal predicate *'to ache'* (Section 4.1) and adverb-like predicatives (Section 4.2), both taking dative experiencers. In these subsections, I will argue that these predicates exhibit correlations across the languages under investigation along all grammatical levels, i.e., in the morphological makeup of the predicates, in their morphosyntactic interface and in the syntactic properties of the DAT case-marked experiencers. In Section 5, I will summarize the main arguments for the claim that there are significant correlations that the pattern exhibits in the Eastern part of the Circum-Baltic area. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the main conclusions.

2 Dative domain (DAT)

In the following, I will use the term dative domain to refer to case markers that are typically used to encode dative semantics in the languages under investigation such as recipient, beneficiary, experiencer, or (external) possessor. The DAT domain is a semantic-functional domain not tied to morphological datives only. Thus, the East Slavic prepositional phrase *u*+gen. 'at sbd.', apart from its purely locative semantics, also has dative functions: It can encode experiencer, beneficiary, and external possessor. In addition, Russian has the old dative case that is in the process of losing grounds in favor of the adessive PP but is still frequently used.

Finnic languages do not have a dedicated dative case except for Livonian. Instead, they use genitive (Finnish only), adessive, or allative cases (Finnish, Estonian, Votic, amd Karelian) to express such semantic roles as recipient, experiencer, or beneficiary (Ariste 1968: 19, Sands & Campbell 2001: 275–276, 288)

Q: Ariste 1968: Not in the reference list.

pertaining to the dative domain (Metuzāle-Kangare & Boiko 2001: 491). Livonian, in turn, has a dative case in *-n* in its Curonian dialect (historically stemming from the genitive and essive) and a second dative in *-l* in the Salis dialect representing a merger of the former adessive and allative case (Sjörgren 1861: XLI–XLII, 75–77, 105). Morphologically different cases that are inherently linked to the semantic domain of dative case will be referred to in this chapter as DAT in order to highlight the structural correspondences across these languages and leave aside the morphological discrepancies.

Thus, in Russian and Finnic, there are several strategies that – only if taken together – cover the dative domain, while the Baltic languages have only one strategy, namely, the morphological dative case, that is responsible for this grammatical domain. As a consequence, when comparing the experiencer constructions across these languages, one will unavoidably end up with different correspondence sets because the dative case in Baltic may correspond to several cases in Finnic and to either the adessive PP or the dative case in Russian. The speakers of Estonian, e.g., do not have the same choice of cases if they would switch to Latvian, and subsequently, they would have to stick to the dative case for their adessive and allative because the directionality is not featured in Latvian (Metuzāle-Kangare & Boiko 2001: 491). Exactly as the speakers of some other Finnic languages (such as Votic or Karelian) have to stick with either the dative case or the adessive PP in Russian, whereby the latter two strategies do not have the same distribution of meanings as the adessive/allative vs. genitive case in Finnic.

These discrepancies should not leave astray in making the impression of no correspondence. It is natural that genetically unrelated languages (such as Finnic and Baltic/Slavic) do not have a clear-cut set of correspondences when they come into contact. Such a set may be created as a result of a long contact. Indeed, we observe developments toward such a set: Russian creates another "dative case", the adessive PP, that is not only functionally parallel to the adessive case in Finnic but also employs the same locational metaphor. Finnic and Russian are also parallel in another respect, both gradually replace the older experiencer and external-possessor case, the genitive case in Finnic, and the dative case in Russian with the innovative adessive case/adessive PP. Thus, one finds in older texts the genitive case-marked predicative possessor in Finnish (*minun on* I:GEN is 'I have', cf. Kettunen 1938: XLI) beside the regular adessive case-marked predicative possessor in present day Finnish (*minulla on* I:ADESS is 'I have'). At the same time, only the adessive case-marking is found in Estonian (*mul/minul on* I:ADESS is 'I have'), while the genitive is no longer grammatical in the latter. The same holds for the subject-like experiencers. Finnish allows for both *minun on kylmä* (I:GEN is cold 'I am cold') and *minulla on kylmä* (I:ADESS is cold 'I am cold'). Notably, the former is a conservative option. Estonian again does not have the older, genitive

case-marking option, allowing only for adessive here. Now, Russian has undergone a very similar development in replacing the older dative with the – originally only locative – adessive-like PP formed by the preposition *u* 'at' (Veenker 1967: 117–119, Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 676). While the earliest Old Russian still attests the original, inherited option of encoding the predicative possessor with the dative, one finds already in the Middle Russian and regular in Modern Russian the adessive PP encoding the predicative possessor (*u menja jest'* lit. 'at me is', i.e., 'I have'). Seržant and Bjarnadóttir (2014) argue that the Russian verb *bolet'* 'to ache' to be discussed in detail below originally did have the option to encode the experiencer with the dative case while Modern Russian allows the adessive PP only.

Meanwhile, Baltic languages, as has already been mentioned, attest only the original, inherited dative case with no tendency to replace it with some locative expression.[2] The situation found in Livonian is telling in this context. Its northeastern, Salis dialect does not have traces of the dative-like use of the genitive and unifies both adessive and allative into a new dative case, while its southwestern, Curonian dialect loses the non-locative readings of the adessive and allative case and introduces a new dative case (partly) stemming morphologically from the older genitive (Sjörgren 1861: 75–77 and 105). It seems that, with Livonian, one faces here a transitional zone mediating between the two patterns: the new, originally locative adessive in the east and the north as opposed to the old dative (in Livonian *genitivus pro dativo*) in the south (summarized in Table 1).

Tab. 1: Diachronic changes in the encoding of the DAT domain

	Old DAT strategy	New DAT strategy (based on a locative expression)
Russian	Dative	Adessive PP
Finnish	Genitive	Adessive and allative
Estonian	–	Adessive and allative
Livonian/northeastern, Salis dialect	–	Dative‹adessive and allative
Livonian/southwestern, Curonian dialect	Dative‹genitive	–
Latvian	Dative	–
Lithuanian	Dative	–

---

2 However, both the allative and the adessive cases have existed in Old Lithuanian and Latvian, cf., inter alia, Seržant (2004a,b) and still exist lexicalized in some eastern Lithuanian subdialects. These cases had only purely locative semantics in these languages.

As can be observed, there is a common development based on the same loca-tive metaphor, namely, '**at** the landmark', to encode meanings from the dative domain showing non-trivial correlations across the languages under investiga-tion already at this point.

3 Areal, inherited, or independent parallelism? Some preliminary considerations

While dative experiencer pattern is not typologically infrequent (Gupta & Tuladhar 1980, Bossong 1998, Haspelmath 2001, Verhoeven 2010, inter alia), it still appears striking that the languages under investigation exhibit correspondences over a whole array of parameters and properties, e.g., the employment of the same con-ceptualization of the experience events, correspondences in derivational verb morphology (Sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.1), common tendencies in the renewal of the dative encoding (Section 2), correspondences in syntactic behavior (Sections 4.1.2 and 4.2.2), and a higher type frequency of this pattern than in other Standard Average European (SAE) languages, even closely related ones (Bossong 1998). That is, while, in the SAE languages, there is rather a tendency to generalize the transitive nominative (experiencer) – accusative (stimulus) alignment of the experience predicates (Haspelmath 2001), the type frequency of the dative expe-riencer is twice as high in Russian than in other Slavic languages (not belonging to the Eastern part of the Circum-Baltic Area) such as Bulgarian, Serbian or Czech (Bossong 1998: 285–286). Analogically, it is, furthermore, ca. four times higher in Finnic than in the related Hungarian (Bossong 1998: 282–284).

Different properties of the dative experiencer constructions can be found cross-linguistically. Vice versa, many of the properties found with the dative expe-riencer construction of the languages under investigation can also be found in comparable constructions of some other languages of the world. However, what matters here is that one finds merely the same set of the correlating properties across the languages under investigation. A specific composition of properties recurrent in the languages at issue makes this pattern more idiosyncratic or exclu-sive and less typologically general.

To give an example: On the one hand, it is typologically quite probable that a psychological predicate would subcategorize for a less canonical case pattern, construing the experiencer as goal or recipient (cf., inter alia, Bickel 2004) or as a possessor (cf., inter alia, Bossong 1998, König & Haspelmath 1998, Næss 2007: 199). On the other hand, it is less typologically motivated that the very experiencer marking, at the same time, would undergo parallel developments in the languages under investigation (as discussed in Section 2). Recall that it has the tendency to be replaced with a new case in this pattern in both Russian and Finnic, whereby the new Case is based on the same local, *at*-landmark periphrasis. There is no

general or typological motivation for specifically this periphrasis and, not, say, for an *in*-landmark pattern replacing the older case marking. Such complex correlations found with the dative experiencer predicates in the East of the Circum-Baltic area make the assumption of an areal influence (at minimum, in terms of an accommodation) strongly suggested (cf. Heine 2009: 39, Seržant 2010: 194–195).[3] In other words, there is much more in common between the dative experiencer constructions in the languages of the Eastern Baltic than with other languages of the world attesting superficially the same pattern: DAT-Verb(-Nom).

One of the major problems of the areal linguistics in general and the research on the Circum-Baltic area in particular is that typologically frequently recurrent patterns are left out from the descriptions of the areas because, in these cases, diffusion cannot sufficiently be argued for against the "null hypothesis" of an independent development (Wälchli 2012, Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001). The aim of the chapter is to fill this gap. The main idea here is the same as with the "quirky" areal features: For a feature to be shown to be areal, it must be individualized in contrast to its typological background. While quirky features are typologically individuated already at their superficial level by virtue of their typological idiosyncrasy, the individualization of the frequently recurrent features must be sought in a deeper level of analysis, e.g., in an idiosyncratic composition of semantic, syntactic or morphological properties. Thus, Klaiman (1980) suggests that the semantic properties of the dative-subject constructions may also be used to define an areal pattern. The selection of a complex set of implicationally unrelated properties as the main criterion for establishing language contact has been suggested already in Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli (2001: 732). Notably, these properties do not have to be necessarily central to the function of the pattern. Thus, the makeup of the predicates – e.g., whether they contain a predicative noun with a light verb or whether they are formed by full-fledged verbs – is less relevant for their very function but, at the same time, may be helpful for the typological individualization:

> **Requirement for idiosyncratic correlations (RIC):**
> The feature must exhibit correlations along some (typologically) idiosyncratic properties in the languages of the area and/or the very composition of properties in the area of concern must be typologically idiosyncratic.

---

3 The *paired structural similarity* in Heine (2009: 39) is an important diagnostic for a contact-induced pattern; cf. also the *principle of complex correlation* in Seržant (2010), which assumes that a correlation of a feature's properties in more than one domain in two neighboring languages may be used as evidence for its areal nature.

Furthermore, it is notoriously difficult to decide whether a certain pattern is inherited or contact-induced (Heine 2009), in which case the RIC alone will not warrant areal diffusion, since the typologically idiosyncratic composition of properties or particular typologically idiosyncratic properties may potentially be due to genetic inheritance. In this case, the following requirement has to be satisfied (following Thomason 2007: 94). Note that the conservative effect of language contact is excluded here.

Requirement for the correlation in innovations (RCI):
Correlations satisfying the RIC must contain innovations.

The RCI has to be tested first of all with closely related languages such as Lithuanian and Latvian for the simple reason that in languages of a more distant relation such as, e.g., between English and Irish (both Indo-European), there will assumedly be no instances satisfying RIC that could be explained by the common inheritance. It should be emphasized that the application of RCI is not biconditional. Thus, if RCI is not satisfied, i.e., the feature is inherited in the alleged source and target language, this does not imply that language contact has not played a role here, since theoretically language contact may also be made responsible for the preservation of inherited items.

Since both inheritance and language contact may potentially interplay, I will not concentrate in this chapter on whether or not there were certain inherited prerequisites for the pattern under investigation at earlier layers of the languages involved. Instead, I will argue that regardless of what the historical basis is for this pattern, the issue that solely matters is whether, from the synchronic point of view, it correlates sufficiently across the languages along its "idiosyncratic" properties, satisfying both RIC and RCI. I will regard the evidence as satisfying the RIC and RCI if, in turn, at least one of the three following requirements is met:

i.   Two synonymous non-cognate predicates in some two neighboring languages exhibit striking correlations in their derivational morphology (cf. "ähnliche innermorphologische Struktur"[4] in Holvoet 2004: 120).
ii. The predicate in one of the languages is a lexical borrowing (sensu stricto, or MAT(erial) borrowing in Matras and Sakel 2007, Sakel 2007) from another.
iii. Two predicates in two different languages entail the same syntactic status for their core arguments in terms of syntactic (behavioral) properties.

---

4 Similar intra-morphological structure.

i. The languages under discussion have different strategies at disposal to encode low transitivity on the verb. Hence, if two or more predicates from different languages, having the same meaning, but not being etymological cognates, exhibit the same derivational pattern, then this correlation of semantic and morphological properties can hardly be considered accidental. While it is typologically not unusual to mark low transitivity by special verbal morphology, the exact choice of a morphological marker is much more a matter of a particular language and a particular cognitive model involved, especially if the given language has more than one competing means to do so, as do Baltic and Russian.[5] Moreover, typical for a derivational means, the presence *vs.* absence of a particular low-transitivity marker is furthermore matter of lexicon organization in a particular language. Finally, to satisfy RCI, it must be shown that the predicates do not represent archaisms in at least one of the languages.

ii. If two neighboring languages employ the same construction for the same meaning, this in itself is not a sufficient argument in favor of the assumption that this pattern is contact-induced. However, if there are lexical predicates that assign this pattern and that simultaneously are borrowings in one language from the other then the probability of a contact-induced pattern is much higher and can indeed be assumed. The phonetic string of a lexical predicate represents an idiosyncratic feature. The correspondence in idiosyncratic features of a pattern is an indication for a non-independent development.

iii. Experiencer predicates are low on the transitivity scale and none of their arguments exhibits prototypical subjecthood or objecthood in terms of syntactic properties. I consider that a particular subset of syntactic subjecthood tests that the dative-like argument passes or fails to pass as typologically less motivated, since this is exactly the point at which languages having dative experiencers crucially distinguish themselves. Thus, Icelandic dative subjects score highest being compatible with nearly all subjecthood tests in that language, while, on the opposite end of the scale, the dative-like experiencer *to me* in English *it seems to me that* ... can hardly be argued to have any subject properties at all.

In the next section, I will present the application of these principles and the data.

---

5 Thus, Baltic and Slavic can mark an experience event with a primarily stative marker $*-\bar{e}-$ (cf. Lith. *skaud-ė-ti* 'ache', Latvian *sāp-ē-t* 'idem', Russ. *bol-e-t'* 'idem'), with a middle-like infix *-n-* in present (cf. Lith. *pati-n-ka* 'likes'), with a reflexive periphrasis, cf. Lith. *džiaugti-s* 'to joy'.

4 Analysis

4.1 Verbal predicate 'to ache'

Lithuanian *skaudėti*, Latvian *sāpēt*, and Russian *bolet'* are exact translations of each other, all meaning 'to ache' and all having the same structure: DAT_{EXP}-verb-nom_{STIM}:

(2)   Lithuanian
       Man   *skauda*   *galva/galvą.*
       I:DAT   ache:PRS.3   head:NOM.SG/head:ACC.SG

       Latvian
       Man   *sāp*   *galva.*
       I:DAT   ache:PRS.3   head:NOM.SG

       Russian
       U   *menja*   *bolit*   *golova.*
       at   me.GEN   ache:PRS.3SG   head:NOM.SG

       Livonian
       Mi'n   *va'lləbəd*   *ambəd*
       I:DAT   ache:PRS.3PL   tooth:NOM.PL
       'I have a tooth pain.'[6]

       Estonian
       Mul   *valutab*   *pea.*
       I:ADESS   ache:PRS.3SG   head:NOM.SG
       'I have a headache'

       Finnish
       Minulla   *särkee*   *pää/päätä*
       I:ADESS   ache:PRS.3SG   head.NOM.SG/head.PART.SG
       'I have a headache'

It is only Standard Lithuanian and Finnish that also allow for the direct-object marking: accusative in Lithuanian and partitive in Finnish. The DAT-Verb-Acc structure replaces the older DAT-Verb-Nom in Lithuanian (discussed in detail by Seržant 2013). Otherwise, the structures are identical across these languages. It is important that there is more than just a superficial correspondence in case frames.

---

6 Adopted from Kettunen (1938: 468) in a simplified spelling.

4.1.1 Morphological correlations

If we first limit ourselves just to the Indo-European languages of the East Circum-Baltic Area (i.e., Lithuanian, Latvian, and Russian), we see that despite not being etymological cognates in any pair of the languages, these verbs exhibit a number of morphological correspondences, which therefore can hardly be accidental:

i.   In all three languages, *ache*-verbs show the same derivational morphology, namely, the traditionally stative or functionally rather deagentivizing (Seržant 2011) suffix (historically) *-ē-: Lith. *skaud-ė̇-ti*, Latv. *sāp-ē-t*, Russ. *bol'-e-t'*.

ii. Furthermore, this deagentivizing suffix, if added to a verbal base, required historically zero grade of the root (LIV²: 25, Seržant 2011). Thus, one would expect to find something like Lith. **skudėti*, Latv. **s(a)pēt/*s(i)pēt*, Russ. **blet'*. Instead, one finds the unexpected *o*-grade (yielding *-a-* in the Baltic languages) in all three cases: Lith. *sk-**a**-udėti*, Latv. *s-**ā**-pēt*, Russ. *b-**o**-l'et'*.[7] The combination of the root *o*-grade and the deagentivizing suffix *-ē-* points out that these verbs are rather denominal in their origin because the *o*-grades have been typically employed to derive nouns in Proto-Indo-European (see Seržant & Bjarnadóttir 2014 for a comprehensive historical account).[8]

iii. Not only do Russian, Lithuanian, and Latvian exhibit striking correspondences in the morphological makeup of the verb, but Estonian and Livonian also show considerable similarity as well. The Estonian and Livonian verbs both are also denominal in origin containing the noun *valu* 'pain, ache'. The Estonian verb *valu-ta-* 'ache' employs the causative/factitive suffix *-ta-*. The same is true for its Livonian cognate. Interestingly, while it is also denominal in the origin it is a causative formation, the latter being seemingly in contradiction to the deagentivizing suffix *-ē-* in Baltic and Slavic. However, this issue is more complicated than appears at first glance, and there are parallels even here. In Latvian – a language that has the most intensive contacts with Estonian (Stolz 1991) – an etymologically different suffix originating from the old causative paradigm became phonetically identical to the deagentivizing suffix *-ē-* due to a series of morphological and phonetic changes (for the most comprehensive historical account, see Ostrowski 2006), cf. *aug-t* 'to grow' vs. (caus.) *audz-ē-t* 'to cultivate'. In other words, Latvian *-ē-* may have both functions: (i) derivation of less agentive denominal verbs and (ii) derivation of causatives. By this, it

---

7 Note that this verb had the meaning of "to be sick" (with a nominative experiencer and no slot for a stimulus) in Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic.

8 The *o*-grade has mainly been used to derive different kinds of nominal formations as well as forms of the reduplicated perfect in Proto-Indo-European.

patterns with both Lithuanian in respect to the original function and with Estonian along its secondary function. Notably, Latvia is also geographically situated between Estonian and Lithuanian. In turn, it is only Finnish that employs a lexical verb that elsewhere has the meaning 'to break' (summarized in Table 2).

Tab. 2: Distribution of the causativizing and the detransitivizing morphological strategies with the denominal verbs of pain

	Deagentivizing suffix	Causativizing suffix
Finnish	–	–
Estonian		**+**
Livonian		**+**
Latvian	**+**	
Russian	**+**	
Lithuanian	**+**	

4.1.2 Syntactic correlations

Additionally, there are syntactic correspondences among Baltic, Russian, and Finnic. The syntactic structure these verbs assign is also exactly the same. In all three languages, the DAT argument shows the same degree of subjecthood: It can control reflexivization (cf. 3) and it occupies the first position in an unmarked word order:

(3)   Lithuanian
   Man   skauda   širdį   dėl   savo   vaiko.
   I:DAT   ache:PRS.3   heart:ACC.SG   for   REFL.GEN   child:GEN.SG

   Latvian
   Man   sāp   sirds   par   savu   bērnu.
   I:DAT   ache:PRS.3   heart:NOM.SG   about   REFL.ADJ   child:ACC.SG

   Russian
   U   men'a   bolit   serdce   za   svoego   rebenka.
   at   me:GEN   ache:PRS.3SG   heart:NOM.SG   for   REFL.ADJ   child:GEN.SG

   Estonian
   Mul   valutab   süda   oma   lapse   pärast.
   I:ADESS   ache:PRS.3SG   heart:NOM.SG   REFL.GEN   child:GEN.SG   for
   'I am worrying about my child.' (lit. 'I have heartache for my child')

I skip here the data from Finnish because this language lacks a possessive reflexive pronoun.

At the same time, the DAT argument lacks other subject behavioral proper-
ties, (cf. Keenan 1976, Onishi 2001), such as, the subject control in infinitival
subclauses, in which the logical subject of the complement subclause is omitted
on identity with the subject of the main predicate (cf. 4).

(4) Lithuanian

   Ne-noriu   *skaudėti*   *galva/galvą.*
   NEG-want:PRS.1SG   ache:INF   head:NOM.SG/head:ACC.SG

   Latvian

   Ne-grību   *sāpēt*   *galva.*
   NEG-want:PRS.1SG   ache:INF   head:NOM.SG

   Russian

   Ne   *xoču*   *bolet'*   *golova*
   NEG   want:PRS.1SG   ache:INF   head:NOM.SG

   Estonian

   Ma   *ei*   *taha*   *valutada*   *pead.*
   I   NEG   want   ache:INF   head:PART.SG

   Finnish

   Minä   *en*   *halua*   *särkeä*   *päätä*
   I:NOM   NEG.1SG   want   ache:INF   head:PART.SG
   Intended meaning: 'I don't want to have headache'

I turn to the conjunction reduction test. This test is less informative in our
context, because the languages under investigation allow for *pro*-drop in the first
and second person and, partly, in the third person (under different conditions,
however). Generally, utterances as in (5) are acceptable rather in those contexts
where the DAT argument's referent is the active discourse topic anyway. The
omission of the subject pronoun is rather due to the *pro*-drop effect. The referen-
tial identity between the dropped nominative argument and the DAT argument
is rather due to pragmatics, and provided the right context, the co-referential
interpretation might be cancelled. To conclude, the DAT argument is not good at
controlling the subject left unexpressed in conjoined clauses[9]:

(5) Lithuanian

   ?Jam   *skauda*   *galvą*   *ir*   Ø
   he:DAT   ache:PRS.3   head:ACC.SG   and

---

9 Thus, the subject left unexpressed need not be co-referential with the DAT argument given the
appropriate context.

ne-gali   *užmigti.*
NEG-can:PRS.3   fall.asleep:INF

Latvian
?Viņam   *sāp*   *galva*   *un* Ø
he:DAT   ache:PRS.3   head:NOM.SG   and
ne-var   *aizmigt.*
NEG-can:PRS.3   fall.asleep:INF

Russian
?U   *nego*   *bolit*   *golova*   *i* Ø
at   him   ache:PRS.3SG   head:NOM.SG   and
ne   *možet*   *zasnut'*
NEG   can:PRS.3SG   fall.asleep:INF

Estonian
?Tal   *valutab*   *pea*   *ja*   Ø
s/he:ADESS   ache:PRS.3.SG   head:NOM.SG   and
ei   *saa*   *magada.*
NEG   CAN   SLEEP:INF

Finnish
?Hänellä   *särkee*   *pää/päätä*   *eikä*   Ø
s/he:ADESS   ache:PRS.3.SG   head:NOM.SG/PART.SG   NEG.3SG-and
saa   *nukuttua*
GET.PRS.3   sleep:PTC.PART
Intended meaning: 'He has headache and cannot fall asleep'

While the first position in unmarked word order and reflexivization control both reveal a subject-like behavior of the DAT argument in these languages, such subjecthood tests as the control of PRO in infinitival complements do not hold. Note, however, that the former properties are not necessarily exclusive of subjects in these languages and may have other motivations. In total, one finds considerable correlations as to the syntactic behavior of the DAT argument across these languages in that they are endowed with only some few and not unambiguous subject properties.

    To sum up, the 'ache'-verbs in Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and Russian exhibit the same set of morphological and syntactic correspondences: They all show traces of denominal origin and they all exhibit the same degree of subjecthood of the DAT argument – a fact that can hardly be accidental. Meanwhile, none of these verbs are etymological cognates. Even the two closely related Baltic languages (Lithuanian and Latvian) exhibit two etymologically different

verbs here. The etymological unrelatedness, on the one hand, and a number of striking correspondences in morphology and syntax, on the other, can only be accounted for by assuming a contact-induced convergence between the languages in this domain.

4.2 Predicatives

There is a large number of predicatives used with a copula 'to be' in Russian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and Finnish, which have a dative-like marked experiencer.[10]

(6) Latvian
  Man   *(ir)*   *žēl*   +GEN/ACC
  Man   *(yra)* *gaila*   +GEN

  Russian
  Mne   Ø   *žal'*   +GEN/ACC
  I:DAT   (be:PRS.3) sorry:ADV

  Estonian
  Mul   *on*   *kahju*   +PART
  I:ADESS be:PRS.3SG sorry

  Finnish
  Minun *on*   *sääli* +PART
  I:GEN   be:PRS.3SG sorry

  Finnish
  Minulla *on*   *sääli* +PART
  I:ADESS be:PRS.3SG sorry
  'I am sorry about (someone).'

Again, as in the case of verbs of pain discussed above, Latvian, Lithuanian, Russian, Estonian, and Finnish exhibit structurally the same pattern: DAT-(copula)-adv, which can optionally be extended with a genitive/partitive or (as a later innovation in Latvian and Russian) accusative case-marked object (see Holvoet, this volume, on Latvian). In all languages, the experiencer is

---

10 In present indicative clauses, the copula is optional in Baltic and Finnic and is impossible in Russian. It is otherwise obligatory in order for the clause to be marked for other tenses and moods.

case-marked with the case that correlates with the dative domain in that language. While Finnish preserves the older genitive alongside the more productive, adessive case marking, Estonian allows only for the adessive case marking on the experiencer in this construction. Both the genitive case in Finnish and the adessive case in Finnish and Estonian correlate with the dative case in Baltic and Russian in other constructions too. Recall that neither Finnish nor Estonian has dative case proper.

4.2.1 Morphological correlations

What is striking in this example is the fact that alongside the structural similarity of the patterns in different languages, there is no direct genetic inheritance in the morphology of the predicates even in such closely related languages as Finnish and Estonian or Latvian and Lithuanian. Thus, Latvian *žēl* is a very old borrowing from Old Russian **žālĭ*,[11] exactly as is the Finnish *sääli*, which preserves the old ending *-i* and the original length of the root vowel. Thus, there has been a large degree of interaction between these languages on the lexical level from ancient times. The fact that there was a significant interference on the lexical level may suggest that the syntactic level was not untouched by language contact either, since a predicate can neither exist detached from its case frame, nor can it be uttered in isolation like, for instance, lexemes that denote artifacts. This means that the borrower always faces an utterance of a given predicate with its syntactic structure in the source language, and hence, (s)he is likely to copy the whole pattern.

4.2.2 Syntactic correlations

As in the case of verbs of pain, the DAT argument of the predicatives shows only a low degree of subjecthood: It can control reflexivization and tends to occupy the first position in the unmarked word order, but it fails to control the reference of the subjects of coordinated clauses (cf. 7). Latvian and Lithuanian are slightly different from the other languages in that sentences as in (7) are not entirely impossible here. Crucially, however, the subject left unexpressed in the conjoined clause is not controlled by the DAT argument in these languages as well. Thus, (7) is only grammatical

---

11 The borrowing of Old Russian *žal'* into Latvian *žēl* shows such features as long vowel retention and the change from Old Russian *ā* to *ē* in Latvian, which are typical for borrowings dating back to no later than the twelfth century, cf. Seržant (2006) for details.

in Latvian or Lithuanian if the referent of the subject left unexpressed is otherwise retrievable from the context than just from the presence of the DAT argument:

(7) Finnish
Pekan   *oli*   *kylmä* *ja Ø*   *haki* *huovan.*[12]

Russian
Pekke   *bylo*   *xolodno i* *Ø*   *prines odejalo*

Latvian
?*Pekam*   *bija*   *auksti* *un*   *Ø atnesa*   *segu.*

Lithuanian
?*Pekkui*   *buvo*   *šalta*   *ir Ø*   *atnešė*   *antklodę.*
Pekka:DAT COP:PST.3 cold:ADV   and   bring:PST.3   blanket
Intended meaning: 'Pekka was cold and fetched a blanket'

Subject control of PRO in infinitival complements results in ungrammaticality, cf. (8), which is ungrammatical in all languages under discussion:

(8) Lithuanian
Ne-noriu   *būti*   *šalta*
NEG-want:PRS.1SG be:INF   cold:ADV

Latvian
Ne-grību   *būt*   *auksti*
NEG-want:PRS.1SG be:INF   cold:ADV

Russian
Ne   *xoču*   *byt'*   *xolodno*
NEG   want:PRS.1SG be:INF   cold:ADV

Estonian
Ei   *taha*   *olla*   *külm*
NEG   want   be:INF   cold:ADV
Intended meaning: 'I don't want to be cold'

5 Both patterns outside the languages of concern

There are several criteria that make the patterns discussed typologically standing out with respect to the surrounding languages: (i) it is the morphological makeup

---

12 From Sands and Campbell (2001: 289).

of the verbs in Section 4.1 and of the predicatives in Section 4.2 that provides for the individuation on the typological background; (ii) it is their syntactic makeup that shows striking correlation on the background of the surrounding languages.

i.   The recurrent morphological makeup of the respective verbs discussed in Section 4.1.1 at length is specific to the languages under investigation. Thus, one finds a different construction in, e.g., Czech *mam bolesti hlavy* (lit. 'I **have** a headache'). The alternative construction in this language *hlava mě bolí* (head:NOM I:ACC aches) matches morphologically to the pattern described in Section 4.1.1.

As regards the predicatives discussed in 4.2, Czech has analogical pattern *je mi líto* (is me:DAT pity) 'I am sorry'. However, as I have shown in Section 4.2.1, the predicative 'pity' is a borrowing from the oldest stage of Old Russian into Finnish and Latvian, which, again, suggests a somewhat closer relationship between the Eastern Circum-Baltic languages as opposed to the wider European background.

ii. When it comes to the case frame of the *ache*-verbs, one finds accusative case marking of the experiencer in Czech in contrast to the pattern under investigation. Furthermore, as Seržant and Bjarnadóttir (2014) show, the argument marking of the Russian verb *bolet'* has undergone a series of changes in the history of Russian, finally yielding structurally similar pattern to the one in Baltic and Finnic and quite different from the one that it had in Old Russian. Without going into details here, I just state that at some stage of development (approximately Late Old Russian), the experiencer marking of the corresponding Old Russian/Old Church Slavonic verb *bolěti* was accusative (standard), dative or, later, the adessive PP (Danylenko 2003: 105–106, Krys'ko 2006: 117–119, Seržant & Bjarnadóttir 2014). Thus, Ukrainian dialects still preserve all three options,[13] while West Slavic languages opt for the accusative case marking as does Czech. Crucially, while West Slavic languages have generalized the accusative case marking, which has been the most frequent option in Old Russian too, Modern Russian has generalized the adessive PP and lost the accusative option altogether. Even more, it has also lost the option to encode the experiencer with the dative case in favor of the adessive PP that is the closest Russian counterpart of the Finnic adessive case. Baltic languages simply did not have this choice because the adessive case has been lost here. I take the rise and generalization of the adessive-like PP in Russian as a strong evidence in favor of the areal influence from Finnic.

---

13 Cf. also German that allows for both accusative and dative case marking of the experiencer with *schmerzen* 'to ache'.

As regards syntactic correlations found with the predicates under investigation, I concede, these do not define the Eastern Circum-Baltic area on their own in terms of discriminating it from the neighboring languages as do the more idiosyncratic morphological properties or common developments in the case marking. Thus, similar syntactic behavior is found in SAE languages (see Haspelmath 2001: 67–75). Nevertheless, the syntactic correlations additionally strengthen the claim that the pattern is syntactically uniform in the area – a fact that by no means is typologically motivated. As I have mentioned in Section 3, the syntactic behavior of the experiencer datives varies cross-linguistically considerably from Icelandic with all syntactic subject properties to English with none. The dative experiencers in Hindi, Marathi, and Nepali pass such subjecthood tests as *raising*, *equi-NP deletion (control)*, *control over the reflexive*, *conjunction reduction* (Gupta & Tuladhar 1980), which makes them syntactically quite distinct from the Circum-Baltic dative experiencers (cf. also Masica 1976: 164 on the lack of parallels for the dative subjects of the South-Asian sprachbund). At the same time, the same tests have been shown positive for the other languages of the area not genetically related to Indo-Aryan, namely, the Dravidian languages. Thus, Kannada, a Dravidian language shows the same test values as Hindi or Nepali with regard to dative subjects (cf. the tests in Sridhar 1979). Analogically, the dative experiencer arguments of the East Caucasian (Nakh-Daghestanian) languages, e.g., in Agul, pattern syntactically rather with subjects of Western European languages, e.g., by allowing and controlling the co-referential omission (Ganenkov, Maisak, & Merdanova 2008), in contrast to the pattern discussed here. Finally, the cross-linguistic study of oblique subjects of Bhaskararao and Subbarao (2004) treating a number of dative or dative-like non-canonical subjects reveals that even those dative arguments that can be analyzed as non-canonical subjects vary as to how much behavioral subject properties they are endowed with.

Furthermore, as has been repeatedly claimed in the literature, a particular set of (behavioral and coding) subject properties is characteristic not only of a particular language, but rather of a particular construction and varies both intra- and cross-linguistically (cf. Croft 2001). Thus, Moore and Perlmutter (2000), while discussing the Russian dative first arguments, state that only those dative first arguments can be treated as a kind of subjects that trigger gender and number agreement while the others cannot.

To conclude, the syntactic tests provide an important, typologically rather idiosyncratic characteristic of the pattern. They support the claim of uniformity of the pattern in the languages under investigation, but at the same time, they establish a link to the Eastern part of the SAE (as described by Haspelmath 2001: 62). The latter does not come as a surprise, since one would not expect to find an abrupt boundary between the east of the CBA and the east of SAE, where the analogical construction would have a completely different syntactic makeup.

6 Conclusions

In this chapter, I have tried to make a case on how typologically recurrent features may also be shown to be driven by the areal diffusion processes. The main idea consists in "zooming-in" on the feature of concern establishing the typologically individual profile of the feature based on a set of its semantic and formal properties.

In Section 3, I have introduced my framework based on the RIC and RCI, which allow for individualizing particular features on the basis of their typological background and exclude inheritance as a potential reason for the correlation of their individual profiles.

In Section 4, I have discussed two subclasses of experiencer predicates in West Finnic, Baltic, and Russian. These predicates show striking structural parallelisms in lexical, morphological, and syntactic levels across the languages of the Eastern Circum-Baltic Area. At the same time, none of the discussed predicates are etymological cognates with any of its translational equivalents, even in such closely related languages as Lithuanian and Latvian (one exception may be the dialectal Lithuanian *sopėti* and Standard Latvian *sāpēt* 'to ache'). To provide sufficient evidence for the claim about the contact-induced nature of the phenomenon in question, I have formulated three characteristics (Section 3), at least one of which has to be met to make an areal account plausible and to exclude an independent parallel development. The innovative character and the lack of etymological counterparts in the ancestor language exclude inheritance as a factor in convergence. I have argued that all three characteristics are met in the case of verbs of pain and predicatives. As already mentioned, if one or more characteristics are met, then the chance of independent parallel development can be safely excluded as improbable.

The syntactic, morphological, and lexical coherence of the experiencer constructions across the languages of the Eastern Baltic area suggests that this pattern is areally induced. This claim does not exclude the fact that some of the constructions may be inherited and are possibly not acquired via language contact as such. This claim only implies that they must have been remodelled at some later stage of the language history in accordance with, and adjusting to, the prevalent areal pattern along their properties. I admit, thereby, that certain properties of the dative experiencer have been different in the respective languages before they entered the contact zone. In other words, my minimal claim is that the dative experiencer constructions discussed here must have been at least considerably adjusted to the areal pattern (thus commonly created) but not necessarily borrowed completely from one of the languages into another. Indeed, ancient Indo-European languages restrictedly do attest dative experiencers. Nevertheless, there are considerable differences between the

ancient Indo-European languages such as Sanskrit, on the one hand, and Baltic and Russian, on the other hand, as regards the morphological makeup of the respective predicates, the degree of integration of dative experiencers into the case frame of the respective verbs and other properties.

Another case of adjustment and not of a complete borrowing is found with the independent partitive case (Seržant 2015). The reason for the changes found in the syntactic behavior and function is due to a certain degree of "assimilation" of the Baltic and Slavic independent "partitive" genitive case with the Finnic independent partitive case that results in the creation of a common, Finno-Baltic-Slavic *partitive-case* pattern. Both the independent partitive case of Finnic and the "partitive" function of the independent genitive case of Baltic and Russian are inherited from the respective proto-languages; nevertheless, they exhibit considerable permutations that cannot be explained but by mutual influence. The creation of a common core pattern consists of a number of rather small micro-processes that affect particular properties of a category, and for each of these micro-processes, the target and the source languages must be determined independently.

Although I have examined only a small group of predicates, the areal analysis can be readily extended to a broader class of verbs. Hakulinen (1955: 240–241, 243) cites a large number of Finnish verbs with non-canonically marked highest ranked arguments (traditionally referred to as impersonal verbs) alongside their Russian counterparts and shows that in both languages exactly the same case frame is used. The structural parallelism in the encoding of experiencer events in Finnic and Slavic is not confined to just dative-like case-marked experiencers. One also finds an overwhelming correlation in accusative or object-like case-marked experiencers across these languages. Thus, a number of experiencer predicates in Finnish (cited in Hakulinen 1955) and Estonian (Erelt & Metslang 2006: 262, Lindström 2013) encode the experiencer as a direct object (i.e., with the partitive case), which corresponds to the semantically equivalent predicates with accusative case-marked experiencers in Russian, Latvian, and Lithuanian.[14] Moreover, the DAT experiencers are frequently grammaticalized into obligees of modal verbs (cf., inter alia, Holvoet 2003, 2004 suggesting the possessive origin of

---

14 Note that the partitive case is a canonical option to encode direct objects in Finnic. The alternation between the accusative (traditionally referred to as genitive) object marking and the partitive object marking is conditioned by a variety of factors not related to the present discussion (actionality interpretation of the VP, NP-related properties, etc.), cf. Kiparsky (1998), Huumo (2010), and Seržant (forthcoming).

the DAT argument; Kettunen 1938: lxviii for Livonian) and non-canonical subjects of "ergative-like" perfects in this area (Seržant 2012).

Furthermore, the correspondence in the encoding of experiencer events can be extended to precursors of Swedish and Norwegian as well, since the ancestors of these languages had quite similar patterns. Thus, accusative and dative case-marked experiencers with some syntactic subject-like properties are well known from Old Norse, which preserves the original stage of development (Faarlund 2001; Eythórsson & Barðdal 2005). However, in Old Swedish, a number of experiencer predicates are also attested with a dative or accusative experiencers exhibiting quite delimited subset of the syntactic properties of nominative subjects, not sufficient to claim subjecthood (Falk 1997, Faarlund 2001). Parallel to Old Scandinavian is (Low) German, which has played an important role in the area of concern. This language equally has a number of experiencer predicates whose main argument is coded by the dative case and is not syntactically a subject in this language (Bayer 2004, pace Barðdal 2006).

I conclude that dative-like marked experiencers can be regarded as a feature that originally pertained to the entire Circum-Baltic Area and that represents one of its most important syntactic isoglosses in the Eastern part of the Circum-Baltic Area.

Acknowledgments

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	INF	infinitive
ADESS	adessive	NOM	nominative
ADJ	adjective	PART	partitive
ADV	adverb	PRS	present
ALLAT	allative	PST	past
COP	copula	REFL	reflexive
DAT	dative	SG	singular
GEN	genitive		

References

Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2006. Construction-specific properties of syntactic subjects in Icelandic and German. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(1): 39–106.

Bayer, Joseph. 2004. Non-nominative subjects in comparison. In Peri Bhaskararao & Karumuri Venkata Subbarao (eds.) *Non-nominative subjects*. Vol. 1, 49–76. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bhaskararao, Peri & Karumuri Venkata Subbarao (eds.). 2004. *Non-nominative subjects*. Vols. 1–2. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bickel, Balthasar. 2004. The syntax of experiencers in the Himalayas. In Peri Bhaskararao & Karumuri Venkata Subbarao (eds.) *Non-nominative subjects*. Vol. 1, 77–111. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bossong, Georg. 1998. Le marquage de l'experient dans les langues de l'Europe. In Jack Feuillet (éd.) *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*, 259–294. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Croft, Wiliam. 2001. *Radical construction grammar. Syntactic theory in typological perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Danylenko, A. 2003. *Predykaty, Vidminky i Diatezy v Ukraïns'kij Movi: Istoryčnyj i Typolohičnyj Aspekty*. (Predicates, cases and diatheses in Ukrainian: historical and typological aspects). Xarkiv: Oko.

Erelt, Matti & Helle Metslang. 2006. Estonian clause patterns – from Finno-Ugric to Standard Average European. *Linguistica Uralica* 42(4): 254–266.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur & Jóhanna Barðdal. 2005. Oblique subjects: A common Germanic inheritance. *Language* 81(4): 824–881.

Faarlund, Jan Terje. 2001. The notion of oblique subject and its status in the history of Icelandic. In Jan Terje Faarlund (ed.) *Grammatical relations in change*, 99–137. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Falk, Cecilia. 1997. *Fornsvenska upplevarverb*. Lund: Lund University Press.

Ganenkov, Dmitry, Timur Maisak & Solmaz R. Merdanova. 2008. Involuntary agent as non-canonical subject in Agul. In Helen de Hoop & Peter de Swart (eds.) *Differential subject marking*, 173–198. Dordrecht: Springer.

Gupta, Sagar Mal & Jyoti Tuladhar. 1980. Dative subject constructions in Hindi, Nepali and Marathi and Relational Grammar. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 7(1–2): 119–153.

Hakulinen, Lauri. 1955. *Razvitie i struktura finskogo jazyka. II. Leksikologija i sintaksis*. [*The development and structure of Finnish II. Lexicology and Syntax.*] Moscow: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoj literatury.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. Non-canonical marking of core arguments in European languages. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon & Masayuki Onishi (eds.) *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*, 53–83. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd. 2009. Identifying instances of contact-induced grammatical replication. In Samuel Gyasi Obeng (ed.) *Topics in descriptive and African linguistics. Essays in honor of distinguished professor Paul Newman*, 29–56. München, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.

Holvoet, Axel. 2003. Modal constructions with 'be' and the infinitive in Slavonic and Baltic. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 48(4): 465–480.

Holvoet, Axel. 2004. Eine modale Konstruktion ostseefinnischer Herkunft im Lettischen. In Irma Hyvärinen, Petri Kallio & Jarmo Korhonen (eds.) *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen. Fs. für J. Koivulehto zum 70. Geburtstag*, 117–127. Helsinki.

Huumo, Tuomas. 2010. Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: The case of the Finnish object. *Journal of Linguistics* 46(1): 83–125.

Keenan, Edward L. 1976. Towards a universal definition of "subject". In Charles N. Li (ed.) *Subject and topic*, 303–333. New York: Academic Press.

Kettunen, Lauri. 1938. *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae V. Helsinki.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1998. Partitive case and aspect. In Miriam Butt & William Geuder (eds.) *The projection of arguments. Lexical and compositional factors,* 265–307. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

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

Klaiman, Miriam H. 1980. Bengali dative subjects. *Lingua* 51: 275–295.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria & Bernhard Wälchli. 2001. The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) *Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and contact*. Vol. 2, 615–750. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Krys'ko, Vadim B. 2006. *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka: Ob"ekt i perexodnost'*. (Historical Syntax of Russian. The object and Transitivity) 2-nd ed. Moscow: Azbukovnik.

Lindström, Liina. 2013. Between Finnic and Indo-European: Variation and change in the Estonian experiencer-object construction. In Ilja A. Seržant & Leonid Kulikov (eds.) *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects*, 139–162. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

LIV[2]. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. *Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildun*. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage, bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Matras, Yaron & Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31(4): 829–865.

Masica, Colin P. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Metuzāle-Kangare, Baiba & Kersti Boiko. 2001. Case systems and syntax in Latvian and Estonian. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) *Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and contact*. Vol. 2, 481–497. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Moore, John & David M. Perlmutter. 2000. What does it take to be a dative subject? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 373–416.

Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Onishi, Masayuki. 2001. Non-canonically marked subjects and objects: Parameters and properties. In Alexandra Yu. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon, & Masayuki Onishi (eds.) *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*, 1–52. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ostrowski, Norbert. 2006. *Studia z historii czasownika litewskiego. Iteratiwa. Denominatiwa*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.) *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 15–29. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sands Kristina & Lyle Campbell. 2001. Non-canonical subjects and objects in Finnish. In Alexandra Yu. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon, & Masayuki Onishi (eds.) *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*, 251–305. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2004a. K voprosy ob obrazovanii adessiva (On the development of the adessive case). *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 51: 49–57.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2004b. Zur Vorgeschichte des Inessivs im Urostbaltischen. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica 51*: *59–67*.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2006. Vermittlungsrolle des Hochlettischen bei den Altrussischen und litauischen Entlehnungen im Lettischen. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 55: 89–105.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2010. Phonologische Isoglossen des Hochlettischen, Nord-Ost-Litauischen, Nord-West-Russischen und Weißrussischen. *Baltic Linguistics* 1: 193–214.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2011. Die Entstehung der Kategorie Inagentiv im Tocharischen. In Thomas Krisch & Thomas Lindner unter redaktioneller Mitwirkung von Michael Crombach & Stefan Niederreiter, *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*. *Akten der XIII. Fachtung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*, 527–537. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2012. The so-called possessive perfect in North Russian and the Circum-Baltic area. A diachronic and areal approach. *Lingua* 122: 356–385.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2013. Rise of canonical objecthood with the Lithuanian verbs of pain. *Baltic Linguistics* 4: 187–211.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2015. Independent partitive as a Circum-Baltic isogloss, *Journal Language Contact* 8: 341–418.

Seržant, Ilja A. & Valgerður Bjarnadóttir. 2014. Verbalization and non-canonical case marking of some irregular verbs in *-ē- in Baltic and Russian. In Artūras Judžentis, Tatyana Civjan & Maria Zavyalova (eds.) *Baltai ir Slavai: Dvasinių kulūtors sankritos. Balty I Slavjane: peresečenie duxovnyx kul'tur*. Skiriama akademikui Vladimirui Toporovui atminti, 218–242. Vilnius: Versmė.

Sjörgren, Joh. Andreas. 1861. *Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben*. Gesammelte Schriften. Band II. Theil I. St. Petersburg. Reprinted in: Unveränderter fotomechanischer Nachdruck der Originalausgabe. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR. 1969.

Sridhar, S. N. 1979. Dative subjects and the notion of subject. *Lingua* 49: 99–125.

Stolz, Thomas. 1991. *Sprachbund im Baltikum? Estnisch und Lettisch im Zentrum einer sprachlichen Konvergenzlandschaft*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2007. *Language contact (an introduction)*. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press.

Veenker, Wolfgang. 1967. *Die Frage des finnougrischen Substrats in der russischen Sprache*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Verhoeven, Elisabeth. 2010. Agentivity and stativity in experiencer verbs: Implications for a typology of verb classes. *Linguistic Typology* 14: 213–251.

Wälchli, Bernhard. 2012. Grammaticalization clines in space: Zooming in on synchronic traces of diffusion processes. In Björn Wiemer, Bernhard Wälchli & Björn Hansen (eds.) *Grammatical replication and borrowability in language contact*, 233–274. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.