Ilja A. Seržant
Unversity of Konstanz; Institute of Lithuanian Language, Vilnius
Valgerður Bjarnadóttir
University of Stockholm

VERBALIZATION AND NON-CANONICAL CASE MARKING OF SOME IRREGULAR VERBS IN *-ē- IN BALTIC AND RUSSIAN

Abstract: The paper deals with some morphologically irregular verbs derived with the suffix *-ē- in Baltic and Russian such as Lithuanian *skaudėti* 'to ache', *reikėti* 'have to, need', *gailėti* 'to pity', Russian *bolet'* 'to ache', etc. These morphological irregularities appear primarily in the present tense of the Baltic verbs under investigation. We claim that these verbs are denominal in their origin. We assume that there is a recurrent development found with these verbs: they rise as adverb-like or noun predicatives and, then, gradually acquire verbal properties. Their denominal origin furthermore explains the non-canonical alignment of the arguments of these verbs. We argue that this alignment represents a residue of a former nominal alignment. This explanation not only straightforwardly explains the quirky case-assignments, but also the morphological irregularities found in the present stem.
Keywords: non-canonical case-marking, alignment, verbalization, Baltic, Russian.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper aims to provide a historical account of the irregular present-stem morphology and the non-canonical alignment of some verbs in *-ē- in Baltic and East Slavic, exemplified by such verbs as Russian *bolet'* / Old Russian *bolěti* 'to ache', Lithuanian *skaudėti* 'to ache' / dial. *sopėti* 'to ache', *gailėti* 'to pity', *reikėti* 'to need', 'have to, must' and Latvian *sāpēt* 'to ache'. Differently from other approaches, an attempt is made to account for both syntactic and morphological irregularities at the same time.

These verbs have been subjected to scrutiny in several works, cf., inter alia, Bjarnadóttir (to appear), Holvoet (2009; 2013), Seržant (2013a, 2013b), cf. also Seržant (to appear) for the areal account of these verbs. Their nominal and late origin has been asserted for many years in the literature (Skardžius 1943; Jakaitienė 1968; contrastingly Kaukienė 1994). While the nominal origin of these verbs seems to be unquestionably clear, none of the aforementioned works provides a historical scenario that would account for the morphosyntactic make-up and the morphological irregularities of the present stem formation of these verbs. The nominal origin in itself does not entail the case assignment patterns and morphological irregularities in the present stem formations and, hence, requires an explanation.

In this paper, we will try to provide a historical account that would explain both the syntactic alignment and the morphology of these verbs. The typological background is provided by Bricyn et al. (2009).

The paper is structured as follows. Sections 1.1 and 1.2 provide brief descriptions of the irregular syntactic and morphological patterning of these verbs, respectively. Section 2 provides a historical account that simultaneously explains both. Section 3 summarizes the main results.

1.1. Syntactic description. The most typical pain verbs in Latvian, Lithuanian and Russian are Lithuanian *skaudėti* (dial. *sopėti*), Latvian *sāpēt* and Russian *bolet'* – all are exact translations of each other, all meaning 'to ache' and all having analogical argument structures and case frames: $DAT_{EXPeriencer}$ – Verb – $Nom_{STIMulus}$ (Seržant, to appear):

(1) *Man   skauda   galva / galvą.*   (Lithuanian)
I:DAT   ache:PRS.3   head:NOM / head:ACC
'I have a headache.'

(2) *Man   sāp   galva.*   (Latvian)
I:DAT   ache:PRS.3   head:NOM
'I have a headache.'

(3) *U menja bolit   golova*   (Modern Russian)
at me   ache:PRS.3SG   head:NOM
'I have a headache.'

Only Standard Lithuanian has recently developed the DAT – Verb – Acc structure with this verb, replacing the older DAT – Verb – Nom with DAT – Verb – Acc (Bjarnadóttir, to appear; Holvoet, 2013; Seržant, 2013a; contrastingly Piccini 2008, Ambrazas 2006: 214 and Fraenkel 1928: 116). Otherwise, the structures are the same across these languages. Bjarnadóttir (to appear) demonstrates that the alternating nominative vs. accusative marking of the body-part argument is distributed quite evenly across the Lithuanian dialects; she shows that, although nominative marking is the most prevalent in the Northwestern part of Lithuania, it is by no means limited to that area and examples of NOM can be found in most corners of Lithuania as far as Eastern parts and even dialects spoken outside the Lithuanian borders as in Lithuanian spoken in Belarus.

We see that these verbs exhibit a less canonical alignment of their arguments. They assign the dative case (a dative-like PP in Russian) to their highest ranked or subject-like argument while the second, object-like argument is assigned the nominative (accusative in Lithuanian). Alongside the verbs of pain, there are also other verb classes such as modal verbs that exhibit exactly the same type of irregularities with regard to both morphology and case assignment: Lithuanian *reikėti* 'to need' ($Dat_{Maleficiary}$ – Gen_{Theme}) and 'have to, must' ($Dat_{Subject}$ – Complement clause) or *gailėti* 'to pity' (beside the regular Nom–Gen one also finds non-standard $Dat_{Experiencer}$ – $Gen_{Stimulus}$):

(4) *Man   reikia   tavęs*   (Lithuanian)
     I:DAT   need:PRS.3   you:GEN.SG
     'I need you.'

1.2. Morphological description. While the past stem formation exhibits no variation with any verb in *-ė-* in Lithuanian, the present stem formation clearly discriminates between the deverbal and the denominal verbs in *-ė-*. The regular and old deverbal inagentives[1] in *-ė-* are formed as *sėdėti* 'to sit' and *gulėti* 'to lie' (cf. inter alia, Harðarson 1998; Rasmussen 1993; Ostrowski 2006; Seržant 2008, 2011). In the standard language, these verbs synchronically take the extension in *-i-* in their present stem formation as in the right-most column of *Table 1*, cf. *sėd-i* 'sits'. Even though these verbs exhibit some competing, innovative formations alongside the regular *-i*-present, the latter are extremely rare and restricted either to a specific dialect area or, in the case of the athematic endings, to Old Lithuanian only. Notably, Old Lithuanian exhibits some productivity of the athematic pattern, cf. 1.sg. *sėdmi,* which is arguably secondary with regard to Modern Standard Lithuanian *sėdi*. Yet, this is different with the verbs of concern (*skaudėti*, *sopėti*, *reikėti* and *gailėti*). Here we find much more morphological variation and less uniformity, though the thematic present-stem formation is the most dominant/unmarked (in bold):

Table 1. *Morphological variations of the verbs under investigation*

Infinitive	Thematic form	Athematic or neothematic form	Thematic & suffixed *-j-*	Regular form
sėdėti	–	*sėd-mi*[2]	*sėdž-ia*	**sėd-i**
gulėti	–	–	*gùl-ia*	**gùl-i**
skaudėti	**skaũd-a**	*skaũs-ta*	*skaũdž-ia*	*skaũd-i*
sopėti	**sóp-a**	*sóp-ti*	–	*sõp-i*
reikėti	– (*reik-a*)	–	*reĩk-ia*	–
gailėti	– (*gail-a*)	–	*gaĩl-ia*	**gaĩl-i**

Bold: *the regular present 3rd form*
Brackets: *the form is not considered to belong to the paradigm of the respective verb in the descriptive grammars*

---

[1] Traditionally, this morphological class is assumed to encode *statives* (passim) in Indo-European linguistics – not to confuse with *statives* in Vendler's (1967) terminology. Seržant (2011) has argued that the notion of *statives* is rather ill-advised instead seeking for a better definition of the semantico-functional core of this class which is attested in most of the Indo-European language families. He suggests that these verbs encode an action or state not controlled by its subject referent, the latter undergoes rather than instantiates the action / state. This morphological marking signals that the situation comes about inagentively, hence, the term *inagentives*.

[2] Ruhig 1747: 26 (from LKŽ, *sub verbo*).

Apart from this, the verbs under investigation deviate from the morphological pattern of *gulėti* 'to lie' and *minėti* 'to mention' by having an *o* grade of the root[3] which is historically unexpected and irregular.[4] Importantly, the morphological irregularities correlate with the semantic classes: only the experiencer verbs (*sopėti* 'to ache', *skaudėti* 'to ache', *gailėti* 'to feel pity', *reikėti* 'have to, to need') and modals (*reikėti* 'to need, have to') have the irregular present affix and o/e-root grade, while the old *ē*-inagentives like *gulėti* with the regular zero grade of the root do not have this irregularity in the present stem. They all consistently have the present suffix *-i* in the third person, which is etymologically regular, stemming from the inagentive Proto-Indo-European suffix *-h₁ie/o-* (cf. inter alia, Harðarson 1998; Rasmussen 1993; Ostrowski 2006; Seržant 2011).

Crucially, the verbs under discussion only exhibit morphological idiosyncrasies in their present stem formation and not in the preterit, infinitive or future. In the latter formations, they pattern exactly as the old *ē*-verbs of *gulėti* type. An explanation of these idiosyncrasies must thus concomitantly account for this paradigmatic asymmetry as well.

In the following, two different historical analyses will be suggested for Russian / Old Russian *boleť* / *bolěti* 'to ache' (Section 3) and the aforementioned Baltic *-ē*-verbs (Section 2).

2. HISTORICAL ACCOUNT:
BALTIC VERBS IN *-ē-*

2.1. From noun/adverb to a verb. We claim that the reason for both the morphological and syntactic irregularity is the denominal origin of these verbs. They stem from predicative nouns, subsequently, adverbs such as *sópa / sópė*, *skaudà* 'pain', *reikà* 'necessity, need', *gailà* 'pity'. This straightforwardly explains the non-canonical alignment: a nominal predication cannot assign a transitive Nom – Acc case frame while dative, on the contrary, is very frequent with the nominal predication in these languages (cf. Bonch-Osmolovskaya 2003), cf. Modern Russian:

(5) *Mne   bylo   len'*   *gotovit's'a*   *k referatu*   (Modern Russian)
     I:DAT   COP.PST.3SG.N   laziness:NOM.F   prepare:INF   to presentation
     'I was too lazy to prepare for the talk.'

---

[3] In case of Lith. *sopėti*, Latv. *sāpēt* the original *o* grade of the root, yielding *a* in Baltic, has even been secondarily lengthened.

[4] Generally, of course, the *o*-grade of the root might be old in some rare instances. It might be inherited from the old perfect stem formation, morphologically remodeled later along the *-ē-* pattern as it has been assumed for Slavic *gorěti* 'to burn' (Stang 1942; 1966), for example. Nevertheless, the assumption of old perfects for the verbs under discussion is highly improbable.

(6) *Im   bylo   grex   žalovaťsa*   (Modern Russian)
　　they:DAT   COP.PST.3SG.N   sin:NOM.M   complain
　　'They should not have complained.' (A. Gračev, *Order na smert'*, RNC)

As Bonch-Osmolovskaja (2003) states, these nouns do not inflect for case in Modern Russian in the relevant syntagma. They also do not agree with the copular verb as adverbs but never nouns typically do. Thus, in example (5), the predicative noun *len'* is feminine while the copular verb *bylo* has the neuter form. Example (6) is analogical. Consequently, their status has to be reconsidered as predicative (copula is optional in the present stem) while the part-of-speech attribution is rather one of adverbs patterning with true adverb-like predicatives as in (7):

(7) *Im   bylo   styd-no   žalovaťsa*   (Modern Russian)
　　they:DAT   COP.PST.3SG.N   ashamedly:ADV   complain
　　'It was a shame for them to complain.'

Indeed, the nominal origin has already been suggested for other verbs in *-ė-* in, inter alia, Fraenkel (1925: 35–38) and Ambrazas (2001: 403) for Lithuanian *reikėti*. The respective noun *reikà* 'necessity, need', cf. *reikà yra / est(i) / buvo / bit / būtų* [lit. 'need is / was / would be'] 'it is necessary, needed' is well documented in Old Lithuanian (e.g. in Mažvydas, Vilentas, to mention some), alongside such allegro-forms as *reikia* or *reikė*:

(8) *Liekoriaus   fveikiem   ne eft   reika*   (Old Lithuanian)
　　doctor:GEN.SG   healthy:DAT.PL   not is   necessity:NOM
　　'Those who are healthy do not need a doctor.' (Bretkūnas, *Giesmės Duchaunos*, 27,2)

A parallel development to *reika* is found in Old Russian where the noun *nuža* 'necessity, need' is used predicatively as a modal predicate, the clausal complement being indicative of a certain degree of grammaticalization:

(9) *da nuža   mi   bystъ   o   semъ pisati*   (Old Russian)
　　but necessity   I:DAT   was   about   this   to-write
　　'But I had to write about this.' (Nikon Chronicle, 203)

To summarize, the following development for the Baltic verbs in discussion can be postulated:

(i) At the first stage, a complex predicate expression arises from a composition of a noun in the nominative case (originally subject) and a sort of "light verb", originally the copula. The noun loses its nominal properties (inflection for case, subject – verb agreement, etc.) and develops into an adverb;

(ii) Consequently, at the second stage, there is a predicate that is compositionally formed by this adverb and the "light verb" (copula);

(iii) Finally, at the third stage, the adverb-predicate starts acquiring verbal properties (acquires personal endings, infinitive form, tense forms, etc.) and becomes integrated into the verbal paradigm.

Note that the assumed development from (i) to (iii) is not a "probable reconstruction" but is a documented development attested in Latvian *vajadzēt* 'to need, have to, must' or Lithuanian *mažnėti/možnėti* 'can', *reikėti* 'to need, have to, must' and Old Russian *nadoběti*.

2.1.1. Latvian *vajadzēt*. It is traditionally assumed that this verb has been borrowed from a Finnic language (Estonian or Livonian) as an adverb Latvian *vajag(a)* 'it is necessary, have to', cf. Estonian *vaja(k)* 'deficit, requirement' (Thomsen 1890: 284), Livonian *vajàg* 'necessity' (Kettunen 1938: 466). Crucially, no verbal status is attested in South Finnic suggesting that the verbalization must not have taken place until its borrowing by Latvian. The Latvian *vajag(a)* has been reinterpreted as the third person singular and plural form and secondarily acquired third person past form *vajadz-ēja* and the infinitive *vajadz-ē-t*.

As noted by Stolz (1991: 78), the fact that the nature of the Latvian counterpart is verbal while the Estonian one is still nominal is striking. Recall that Estonian *vajak* / Livonian *vajàg* 'deficit, requirement' is a noun in the source languages but develops in Latvian through the intermediary stage of an adverb *vajag* 'necessary' into a third person singular verb form *vajag-a* and, subsequently, acquires the infinitive *vajadzēt* (< *vajag-ē-t*) as well as the respective past form *vajadzēja* (< *vajag-ēj-a*). It is probable that this noun was originally borrowed as a noun and adapted morphologically accordingly into *vajaga* 'necessity' (Andra Kalnača, p.c.). At least the following example allows for such an interpretation:

(10) *Man   vajaga   jir   sacīt*
　　I:DAT   vajaga:ADV/(?)NOUN.FEM.SG   be/(?)COP:PRES.3   say:INF
　　'I have to say.' / 'I have a need to say.'

The status of *vajaga* is nevertheless controversial here as it can be analyzed as a noun or as a predicative adverb. It is quite probable to assume that Latvian has borrowed this noun with the predicative use of it because no other, nominal uses are attested in Latvian. This is supported by the fact that South Finnic languages employ this noun in the same context, cf. (11) from Livonian:

(11) *äb_ùo   vajàg   mi'nnən*
　　NEG.PRT_NEG.COP   necessity   I:DAT
　　'I don't need.' (Kettunen 1938: 466)

This explanation is compatible with the data in South Finnic, and it would also explain the rapid development of *vajag/vajaga* in Latvian into an adverb-type predicative and, subsequently, into a full-fledged verb.

The cline from (i) to (iii) put forward above explains this discrepancy between the source and the target languages: this is the general treatment of these kinds of predicatives in Baltic languages (and partly in the history of Russian too).

2.1.2. Lithuanian *mažnėti / možnėti*. Notably, there is no need for the first stage (i) to occur. An adverb-type predicative can have an original adverb and, consequently, enter the cline (i) to (iii) at stage (ii). This is the case with the Lithuanian dialectal verb *mažnėti / možnėti* 'can' from East Slavic adverb *možno* 'allowed, possible' (LEW 1, *sub verbo*) that functions as a modal predicative in Slavic with the meaning 'can, may'. Crucially, this verb does not have a present stem in Lithuanian (cf. Kurschat 1968–1973, 2: 1382; LKŽ, *sub verbo*), although it has a conditional *mažn-ė-tų* ['can'-Ē-COND] and both this and the future *mažn-ė-s* ['can'-Ē-FUT] are formed with the suffix *-ē-* like the other verbs discussed here. This is because the present stem (generally the unmarked and most frequent one cross-linguistically) is provided by the respective adverb *mažna* (cf. Kurschat, *loc. cit.*).

2.1.3. Old Russian *nadobĕti*. Another example, running fully parallel to Lithuanian *mažnėti / možnėti*, comes from Old Russian. The Old Russian modal adverb *nadobĕ* 'it is needed' can sometimes acquire the regular third singular verbal ending *-t'/-tъ* in later texts as in (13) from Sokolova (1962: 266) to contrast with Old Russian (12):

(12) *I   ne **nadobĕ**   ixъ   suditi   nikakomu že čelověku* (Old Russian)
And not necessary:ADV they:ACC.PL judge:INF any:DAT.SG PRT man:DAT.SG
'And no man may denounce them.' (Ustav. Gramota, Smolensk, 1150)

(13) *koli   čego   netъ a   **nadobe-t'*** (Middle Russian)
If   something:GEN.SG lacks but necessary:3SG.PRES
'If there is something missing though necessary...'

The suggested developmental cline (i) – (iii) straightforwardly explains the case assignment to both arguments of the predicates. Both Russian and Baltic generally assign datives to the highest ranked argument of adverb-like predicatives, irrespective of whether they originate from adverbs / adjectives (14) or nouns as in (15):

(14) *Mne   tjaželo*   (Modern Russian)
Man   grūti   (Latvian)
Man   sunku   (Lithuanian)
I:DAT difficult:ADV
'I am having it difficult.'

(15) *Jemu   uže   vremja   spat'*   (Modern Russian)
Jam   jau   laikas   miegoti   (Lithuanian)
Viņam jau   laiks   iet gulēt (Latvian)
He:DAT already time:NOM.SG go sleep
'It is time for him to go to bed.'

2.2. Account of the syntactic alignment. While the dative case assignment to the highest ranked argument of these verbs is straightforward given that it is one of the most productive case-markings of the highest ranked arguments of predicatives in Baltic and Slavic, the only question that remains to be answered is about the second argument of these predicates. Now, the genitive of *gailėti* or *reikėti* is straightforward since the corresponding nominal-type or adverb-type predicatives also govern the genitive:

(16) *Man   jo   gaila*   (Lithuanian)
I:DAT he:GEN   pity:ADV
'I pity him.'

This is, however, not as straightforward with the predicates that assign nominative case to their second argument, such as Lithuanian *skaudėti* and *sopėti* or Latvian *sāpēt*. We assume that this second argument is secondary here. The original meaning of the adverb-type / noun-type predicatives *skauda / skaudžia, sopa / sopė* must have been 'painful', cf. the modern adverb-like predicative Lithuanian *skaudu* 'painful':

(17) *Man   skaudu*
I:DAT painful:ADV
'I am having pains.'

The utterance in (17) is grammatical and complete without requiring a stimulus argument. This is different from the verb *skaudėti* 'to ache' which requires a stimulus/body-part argument to be encoded explicitly or, at least, be retrievable from the discourse:

*(18) *Man   skauda*
I:DAT skaudėti:PRES.3
'I am having pains.'

Indeed, we find attestations from Old Lithuanian which suggest rather adverb-like usage of *sopa*:

(19) *Sopá*   *dabár juog Pons IEʒus* <...> (Old Lithuanian)
pain:NOM/ADV/PRES.3   yet   that Lord Jesus

grieku àtłaydima <...> *ne už piningus   duoſt*
sins   remission   not for money   gives
'It is furthermore painful for them that Lord Jesus still does not give the remission of sins for money.' (*Knyga nobažnystės*, SE 172,8)

The following example – even though providing typical verbal features such as the future suffix *-s* with a zero ending – is also used as a predicative adverb in (17) and as a verb in (18) if compared to Modern Lithuanian:

(20) O   Diewas   jůs   umai   ſchaus   (Old Lithuanian)
      but   God   them   immedately will-shoot

      Iog   ſkaudês   ghiemus
      as   ache:FUT.3 they:DAT
              'But God will immediately shoot them and it will be painful for them.' (Jonas Rėza,
      Psalteras Dovydo 64,8)

In contrast to modern language use, where *skauda* and *sopa* are ungrammatical without the nominative or accusative body-part argument, unless the latter is somehow identifiable from the context or pragmatics, the usage of *sopa* in Old Lithuanian does not seem to underlie this restriction. This indicates that the nominative argument was not a valence-bound argument to that extent it is today.

In what follows, we provide examples of how a second argument may have arisen with the originally adverb-type predicatives. The target of pain, i.e. the body part, can be explicitly mentioned but not as a core argument of the predicate to begin with. The reader may compare this stage of development again with the adverb *skaudu* which allows for the body part to be encoded in the locative case in non-standard speech:

(21) Taip   man   čia   šone   skaudù   ir   skaudù   (Lithuanian)
      So   I:DAT here   side:LOC.SG painful:ADV and   painful:ADV
              'I feel such pain in the side.' (Kiduliai, Šakiai region, LKŽ)

Notably, the locative government is still an option with *skaudėti / sopėti* verbs in both Latvian and Lithuanian (the location-like strategy to encode the body part, cf. Bonch-Osmolovskaya et al. 2009: 17 for the classification):

(22) Man   skauda   šone   (Lithuanian)
      Man   sāp   sānī   (Latvian)
      I:DAT ache:PRES.3 side:LOC.SG
              'I feel pain in the side.'

The nominative stimulus may stem from the former subject argument of the predicative, cf. examples such as the following one (Petit 2001: 291ff.; Ambrazas 2006: 140):

(23) Sveikam   žmogui   viskas   sveika   (Lithuanian)
      healthy:DAT person:DAT everything:NOM healthy:ADV
              'For a healthy person everything is healthy.' (Ambrazas 2006:140)

In (23), the adverb-like predicative *sveika* 'healthy' has two quasi-arguments: *the healthy person* and *everything*. The latter is in the nominative case and is the subject of *sveika*. Thus, we assume that constructions as in (23) have enabled the body-part argument to be introduced with the former adverb-type predicatives. Consequently, the nominative subject could be introduced no earlier than at stage (ii) since at stage (i) the predicate consisted already of noun in (formally) the nominative case.

We summarize the development from (i) to (iii) in the following table:

Table 2. *Relative chronology of the* skaudėti-*type verbs*

	Stage	Syntactic structure	Comments
(i)	1st stage	**(dat)** + **(copul)** + **noun** 'There is a need (for me) in smth. / to do smth.'	The dative is either the *predicative possessor* or (more likely) a *free dative* (affected participant, external possessor)
(ii)	2nd stage	**dat** + **(nom)** + **(copul)** + **adv** (**< noun**) 'It is necessary (for me) to do ...'	Typically at this stage: no agreement with the copula, no plural forms, no modifiers etc.
(iii)	3rd stage	**dat** + **verb** (**< adv** (**< noun**)) + **(nom)** 'I have to do ...'	Acquisition of the verbal paradigm (past tense form, infinitive, etc.)

Brackets in the syntactic structure mean optionality

2.3. Account of the present stem morphology. The historical account of the concerned verbs in *-ėti* as denominals allows a straightforward explanation of the morphological irregularities found in the present stem of these verbs.[5] Note that the irregularities are found in the present stem formations only while the preterite, infinitive or conditional stem formations do not show any diversity with the old *gulėti*-type. We claim that this is because the present stem formations are older while the preterite etc. stems represent a recent innovation that was acquired only in course of the verbalization of this kind of originally predicative nouns and adverbs.

In Table 1 above, the simple thematic and the suffixed *-i̭-* thematic forms can be straightforwardly accounted for as sustained adverbs or nominative nouns. Indeed, the unexpected and irregular form *skauda* (3.PERS.PRES. to *skaudėti*) patterns with the Lithuanian *gaila* 'pity' (adverb) with regard to case-assignments (except for the genitive stimulus with *gaila* instead of nominative or accusative with *skauda* which is, though, of no relevance here):

(24) Man   gaila   jo   (Lithuanian)
      I:DAT pity:ADV   he:GEN
              'I am sorry for him.'[6]

The difference between *skaudėti* 'to ache' and *gailėti* 'to pity' is simply that, with the verb *gailėti*, the regular form *gaili* has been selected according to the inherited pattern of inagentives (the *gulėti* type) while the original adverb formation *gaila* has not been fully verbalized. Notably, according to LKŽ (*sub verbo*), there is also a noun *gaila* with

the meaning 'sorrow'. Thus, the adverb *gaila* may have arisen from this noun in the same way as Modern Russian *len'* and *grex* did in (5) and (6) or like Old Russian *želja*:

(25) *něsť   ošьlьcju   želja*   (Old Russian)
      not-is hermit:DAT   regret:NOM
      'The hermit does not regret ...' (Troickij Sbornik)

In the same way, *skauda* and *sopa* can be regarded as original predicative nouns, still attested as nouns in LKŽ (*sub verbo*), cf. the nouns *skauda / skaudė* and *sopa / sopė* 'pain'.

Furthermore, we consider *skaũdžia* to originally be a denominal derivation of *skaud-(i)i̯a*. In fact, the Lithuanian noun *skaudė* 'pain' is just another, we concede analogically, phonological realization of the same proto-form *skaud-(i)i̯-a* (Stang 1966), cf. the same alternation in Lithuanian *sopa / sopė* 'pain', *reika / reikia / reikė* 'need' (LEW 2: 714). The presence or the absence of the derivational suffix *-(i)i̯- is subject to variation with no difference in meaning, cf. Russian / Old Russian *nuža* 'need' (OCS *nužda*) from *noud-i̯-a* as opposed to Lithuanian *nauda* 'use, need' without this suffix. Furthermore, both *reikia / reikė* (with the suffix *-(i)i̯- and *reika* (without the suffix) are attested in the same predicative position; cf., furthermore, Old Russian *želja* (*gel-i̯-a*) in (25) above.

The possibility, that forms like *skaudžia* represent a simple thematization in analogy to Lithuanian dialectal *gulia* and Latvian *guļ* (to *gulėti*), cannot, of course, also be excluded. In exactly the same way, it cannot be claimed that, in all instances discussed so far, only the denominal origin of the present form must be assumed. We believe, however, that both morphological and syntactic evidence, as well as such parallels as Latvian *vajadzēt* or Lithuanian *možnėti / mažnėti* and Old Russian *nadobēti* with an unequivocal denominal origin, provide strong evidence in favor of the assumption that, in most of the cases, the denominal origin of the present form via the adverb status can be assumed. This also does not preclude etymologically related verbal formations from having any impact on the named verbs.

Table 3 summarizes the main conclusions on the morphology of the present stem formations:

Table 3. *Morphology of the present stem of* skaudėti

Current function:	Thematic form	Athematic form	Thematic & suffixed *-(i)i̯-	Regular form
skaudėti	***skaũda***	*skaũsta*	*skaũdžia*	*skaũdi*
Its Source:	Thematic nouns / Thematic adverbs	Analogical (to -st- stems)	Thematic nouns derived with the suffix *-(i)i̯a	The inherited Indo-European inagentive suffix

The case frame is not affected by the morphological change from (noun >) adverb-like predicative > verb.

3. HISTORICAL ACCOUNT:
RUSSIAN / OLD RUSSIAN *boleť* / *bolěti*

3.1. From Old Russian to Russian. A somewhat different development for *bolěti* is attested in Old Russian. One cannot, however, exclude that a development similar to the one found in Baltic may have preceded the Old Russian and Proto-Slavic period.

We assume the following development for the Russian *boleť* based on the examples we found (contrastingly, Yavorskaya 2009):

(i)   Originally, it was a subject-experiencer verb meaning 'to be sick, to have pains' with an optional, non-argumental stimulus on the syntactic periphery;

(ii) Secondarily, it changes its meaning into 'to ache' with the body part as the subject. The body part stands metonymically for the experiencer, cf.: "if something affects part of a whole, then the whole is affected." (Lamiroy, Delbecque 1998: 31).

(iii) Finally, the experiencer argument is introduced either by means of the indirectly affected-participant morphology, namely, (iiia) the dative or dative-like expressions, or, alternatively, – and that is quite rare in Slavic – (iiib) by means of the *accusativus commodi*.

In what follows, we present our data and argumentation for each stage.

3.1.1. Stage (i). Stage (i) is attested in Old Russian. In Old Russian (Sreznevskij 1-1: 150; SRR 1: 284) and Old Church Slavonic (StSl 1: 136) the verb *bolěti* (1.sg. *boli̯ǫ*, 2.sg. *boliši*) meant 'to be sick, to have pains' only and never 'to ache':

(26) *molja i   glagolja: bolju   zělo*   (Old Russian)
      asking and saying   suffer:1.SG very
      'Asking and saying: I am hardly suffering' (Vita of Niphon 325, from 1219)

The stimulus, i.e. the disease, may be encoded by an instrumental adjunct. Occasionally, also the affected body part can be encoded by the instrumental case thus being construed as the stimulus:

(27) *často že bolęše   lonomь   starecь*   (Old Russian)
      often PRT suffer:IMPF.3.SG breast:INSTR.SG old-man:NOM.SG
      'The old man had often pains in his breast.' (adopted from SDR 1: 294, from XIV–
      XV cc.)

Thus, the more general (possibly the more original) meaning almost lost in Modern Russian seems to have been 'to worry about', 'to suffer', usually quoted as the second meaning in the dictionaries (Sreznevskij 1-1: 150; SDR 1: 295):

(28) *Jako bolju   o   tebě*   (Old Russian)
      As   worry:1.SG   about you
      'as much as I worry about you' (adopted from SDR 1: 295)

(29) i   tvorę   bolĕti   dьjavolu   (Old Russian)
     And   making   suffer:INF devil:DAT
     'and making the devil suffer' (XIV c., adopted from SDR 1: 295)

3.1.2. Stage (ii). In Middle Russian[7], this verb acquires the meaning of 'to ache', thus stage (ii). The experiencer may be encoded as the internal possessor of the body-part NP at this stage:

(30) črevo   moe   boli(t)   (Old Russian)
     body:NOM my:NOM   suffer:PRES.3.SG
     'I have pains in my body.' (adopted from SDR1: 295; from XIV c.)

The semantic change from stage (i) into stage (ii) can be explained by the loosening of the lexical input restrictions on the subject slot. However, the process of loosening is in itself semantically constrained. As we mentioned above, following the general explanation in Lamiroy and Delbecque (1998: 31), we assume that the body part could be used in the subject slot thanks to its metonymic extension which allowed it to represent the experiencer:

(i)   the lexical input restrictions on the subject slot of bolĕti have been weakened and body-parts denoting NPs started occurring in this position;
(ii) the meaning of the verb has metonymically changed from 'to be sick' (only about animate NPs) to 'to ache' (only about inanimate NPs);
(iii) the internal-possessor strategy was gradually replaced by the external-possessor / indirectly affected-participant strategy for expressing the experiencer of the pain event.

Interestingly, this development is also found with the Old Russian nemošči 'to be sick' (the only meaning in Sreznevskij 2: 397) turning into 'to ache' beside 'to be sick' in the inchoative za-nemoč of Modern Russian. The metonymical extension of this type is quite frequently found across languages and in Modern Russian as well, e.g., with merznut' 'get cold' (see below).

3.1.3. Stage (iiia). As regards stage (iiia), the adessive-like PP u 'at' with the genitive or, alternatively, the dative case – which is a more archaic strategy – is introduced to encode the indirectly affected participant. Both the adessive-like PP and the dative case are non-argumental adjuncts (free datives) to begin with. We believe that the possession relation that the indirectly affected participant shows towards the body part is motivated rather pragmatically (one can hardly be affected by someone else's body part pains) and is, hence, secondary. It has also been argued that the external possessors are primarily affected participants (Haspelmath 1999; Payne, Barshi

_____
7 Examples are taken from the relevant dictionaries (Sreznevskij 1893–1912 and SDR, SRR); all examples in this subsection are no earlier than XIII–XIV c.

1999). The term, affected participant, is semantically (and, hence, syntactically) more justified as it primarily relates to the whole clause and not to a particular NP (cf. McIntyre 2006 for the argument).

Notably, there is some variation regarding the case-marking of the affected participant: while Russian almost exclusively tends to encode it with the adessive PP with intransitive verbs (Garde 1985, Cienki 1993), cf. (31), other East Slavic branches (32) and Old Russian (33) – where the adessive PP does not enjoy such a degree of productivity – may employ the old strategy, namely, the dative case. Thus, as in a number of Russian dialects (AUM 3, map 81; Lönngren 1994: 57) as well as in Ukrainian (e.g. in Žitormiščina, cf. Samoxvalova 1982) – alongside the regular adessive PP v mene 'at me' – we find the dative case-marked affected participant:

(31) U menja bolit   golova   (Modern Russian)
     at me   ache:PRS.3.SG head:NOM
     'I have headache.'

(32) peršij raz   na Kapri bolila   meni   holova   (Ukrainian)
     First   time   on Capri ache:PST.3.SG.F I:DAT head:NOM.SG.F
     'For the first time on Capri, I've got headaches.' (Mikhailo Kotsiubynsky)

(33) mnogo bo   mi   bolitь   d(ou)ša   (Old Russian)
     a lot PRT I:DAT suffer:PRES.3.SG soul:NOM
     'My soul suffers hard.' (Časoslov, Jaroslavľ, from XIII cc., adopted from SDJ)

The development (i) to (iiia) is frequently found and analogies are easily adducible, cf. the verb merznut' 'to get cold' in Modern Russian that attests all three assumed stages in (i) – (iii) or the Lithuanian verb sušalti 'idem'. Thus, in addition to the Old Russian verb nemošči 'to be sick', similar developments are found in Lithuanian, cf. (34) representing stage (i), (35) – stage (ii), and, finally, (36) – stage (iii):

(34) Aš   sušalau   (Lithuanian)
     Ja   zamerz   (Standard Russian)
     I:NOM get.cold:PST.1.SG
     'I got cold.'

(35) (Mano) pirštai sušalo   (Lithuanian)
     (Moi)   paľcy   zamerzli   (Standard Russian)
     My   fingers:NOM get.cold:PST.3
     'My fingers got cold.'

(36) Man   sušalo   pirštai   (Lithuanian)
     I:DAT   get.cold:PST.3 fingers:NOM
     U menja zamerzli   paľcy   (Standard Russian)
     at me   get.cold:PST.1PL fingers:NOM.PL
     'I have my fingers cold.'

Note the dative case in Lithuanian and the adessive PP in Russian at stage (iii). Modern Russian has developed a new marker for the affected participant, i.e. the adessive PP, which – despite some semantic and distributional differences – competes with the dative case (Garde 1985, Cienki 1993). As, however, the (non-standard) Ukrainian example in (32) shows, the dative case has been another valid option in East Slavic for encoding the affected participant (external possessor and / or experiencer).

3.1.4. Stage (iiib). Old Church Slavonic, West Slavic and also East Slavic had another alternative for encoding a non-argumental experiencer of an intransitive event referred to by *bolěti*, namely, the *accusativus commodi* (first suggested by Popov 1879–1881, 1881 and elaborated in Danylenko 2003: 105–106; Krys'ko 2006: 117–119). This historical source of the experiencer case-marking has been compared to the Latin accusative experiencer predicates such as *me pudet* 'I (ACC) am ashamed (3.SG)' (Popov, *loc. cit.*; Danylenko, *loc. cit.*).

In addition to the frequent and more productive *dativus commodi*, Slavic attests this typologically rare pattern (cf. Seržant 2013b: 328–329). The accusative constituent is not an argument to begin with, it only acquires some object properties in the later languages (Krys'ko 2006: 119); in the same way as the dative experiencer, it is not originally an argument of the verb:

(37) *zělo   mja   golova   bolitъ*   (Middle Russian)
     very   I:ACC head:NOM.SG.F ache:3.SG
     'I have strong headache.' (Vita of Joseph 55, XVI c.)

This pattern remained productive in the Western Slavic languages such as Polish, it is also marginally preserved in Ukrainian.

Given the homonymy of the genitive and the accusative, it is often difficult to decide whether the experiencer is coded as an internal possessor (as unambigiously attested in example (37)) or as the *accusativus commodi*:

(38) *ljudi   ne starejutsa ni oči   ixъ   ne boljatъ* (Middle Russian)
     people:NOM   not get-old   nor eyes:NOM   they:GEN / ACC.PL   not ache:3.PL
     'People are not getting older and their eyes do not ache' (Story of Ind. Kingdom, 73; XV c.)

(39) *Mnogyxъ   bolętъ   duša*   (Old Russian)
     many:GEN / ACC.PL   ache:3.PL soul:NOM.PL
     'Souls of many are suffering.' (adopted from SDJ, vide sub verbo)

Even though the *accusativus commodi* is a marginal pattern in East Slavic, it shows some degree of productivity in the earlier languages. Thus, adverb-predicatives based on the copular construction may also assign adjunct-like accusative experiencers (*accusativus commodi*) in Old Church Russian and Old Russian (see examples in Krys'ko 2006: 118–119 with further references to Šaxmatov):

(40) *Straxъ   mja   eda   vъdadjatъ   ny   ognevi*   (Old Russian)
     fear:NOM I:ACC whether expose:INF   us:ACC fire:DAT
     'I am afraid, they might expose us to the fire.' (XII c., adopted from Krys'ko 2006: 118)

(41) *da   mja   tuža   ne budetъ* (Old Russian)
     That I:ACC trouble:NOM.SG   not be
     'so that I would not come into troubles.' (XIV c., adopted from Krys'ko 2006: 118)

Examples (40) and (41) clearly illustrate that the *accusativus commodi* adjunct could adjoin an inherently intransitive predicate given the fact that the "light" verb of the predicative nouns *straxъ* 'fear' and *tuža* 'trouble' stems here from the copular predicate *byti* 'to be' that was never transitive.

We believe, following Danylenko (2003: 105–106), that the accusative experiencer with *bolěti* has emerged in the same way as with the noun predicates *straxъ* and *tuža*, namely, from the syntactic slot provided by the *accusativus commodi* adjunct. As mentioned above, the accusative experiencer remains preserved in the Western Slavic languages and, marginally, in Ukrainian while it is completely lost in Russian (Popov 1879–1881).

3.1.5. Summary. The described development can be summarized in the following table:

Table 4. *Relative chronology of the* bolěti-*type verbs*

Stage	Syntactic structure			Comments
1st stage	**Experiencer**: nominative **Source → Body part**: instrumental **Verb**: 'to be sick'			Only the experiencer can occupy the nominative slot; the body part may be construed as *stimulus* and encoded with instrumental (like other stimuli)
2nd stage	**Experiencer → Body part**: nominative **Experiencer**: internal possessor **Verb**: 'to be sick' → 'to ache'			Both experiencers and body parts can occupy the nominative slot (in one NP: the experiencer can optionally be encoded as an internal possessor of the body part)
3rd stage	**Russian**	**Ukrainian**	**Polish**	Only body parts can occupy the nominative slot; the experiencer has to be encoded by means of the adessive PP (*u* 'at' with Gen.) / *dativus* or *accusativus commodi*
	Experiencer: – adessive PP	**Experiencer**: – adessive PP (– dative) (– accusative)	**Experiencer**: – accusative	
	Body part: *nominative*			

3.2. Parallels in Baltic. Before we conclude, some remarks on Old Lithuanian and Latvian are in order. Notably, the development of the Latvian (*sāpēt*) and Lithuanian (*skaudėti / sopėti*) counterparts show some correlations with stage (ii) in Old and Middle Russian. Thus, we find that the logical subject of the middle participles allowed for the experiencers to occur in the head slot as evidenced by the data from Old Lithuanian. The middle participle in *-ma-* (e.g., *skauda-ma-s, sopa-ma-s*) can occur with both thematic roles in the head NP: the body part and the experiencer, cf. (42) and (43) with the body part subject as opposed to (44) and (45) with the experiencer head:

(42)   *Jo*   *kūnas*   *skaudamas*   (Lithuanian)
      His   body:NOM.SG.M   ache:PARTC.PRES.PASS/MID.NOM.SG.M
      [lit.] 'His body is aching', 'He has pains in the body.' (Nesselmann 1851, LKŽ, *sub verbo*)

(43)   *Aš turiu*   *skaūdamą*   *koją*   (Lithuanian)
      I   have   ache:PARTC.PRES.PASS/MID.ACC.SG.F   leg:ACC.SG.F
      'I have pains in my leg.' [lit.] 'I have an aching leg.' (Kurschat 1968–1973, LKŽ, *sub verbo*)

(44)   *Numirre*   *ir*   *tas*   *bagotas*   *Waitodams*   (Old Lithuanian)
      die:PAST.3 and   this   rich-man   cry:PARTC.PRES.PASS/MID.NOM.SG.M

      irgi   *ſkaudamas*
      and   ache / suffer:PARTC.PRES.PASS/MID.NOM.SG.M

      'This rich man died crying and suffering.' (Bretkūnas, *Giesmės Duchaunos* 122,6–7)

(45)   *Sȝytáy tévas*   *távas*   *ir*   *aß*   (Old Lithuanian)
      thus   father:NOM.SG yours:NOM.SG and   I:NOM.SG

      ſopamí   *iéßkoiome*   *tavęs*
      ache / suffer:PARTC.PRES.PASS/MID.NOM.SG.M   look-for:1.PL   you:GEN.SG

      'Thus, your father and I was looking for you in pains [lit. suffering].' (Daukša's *Postillé* 63,32–33)

We also found one example in Latvian where the nominative subject slot is occupied by the experiencer and not by the body part – the latter being the regular situation. This is highly reminiscent of the stage (i) for East Slavic:

(46)   *visu*   *tuo*   *dzird*   *un*   *sajūt*   *Anna,*   *sāpēdama*   (Latvian)
      all   this   hears and   feels Anna:NOM   suffering:NOM
      'Anna hears and feels all this with pains.' (EH XVI, 472)

Also, as assumed for stage (ii), the experiencer can be expressed via the internal-possessor strategy in Old Lithuanian:

(47)   *ſu*   *kuriuo ir*   *Tewá*   *pàties /*   *ſirdis /*   *ligieai*   *ſopeia*   (Old Lithuanian)
      with   whom and   Father's himself   heart:NOM equally   ache:PAST.3

      ir   *ſiirgá.*
      and   be-sick:PAST.3
      'with whom also the Father's heart equally ached and was sick.' (*Knyga nobažnystės*, SE 245,24–25)

(48)   *Skaust, gel*   *mano širdužis*   *ir*   *be*   *tų*   *žodelių*   (Lithuanian folkore)
      aches   aches I:GEN   heart:NOM and   without these   words
      'My heart hurts even without these words.' (RD 121, Rhesa 1843)

(49)   *Ui skausti*   *skausti*   *mano širdelę*   (Lithuanian folkore)
      Oi aches:PRES.3   aches.PRES.3   I:GEN   heart:ACC
      'Oi, my heart aches.' (Tilžė, 265, Aleksynas, par. 1998 = Kalvaitis 1905)

So far we are not in a position to make claims about the origin of the Old Russian verb *bolěti*, whether it also stems from a noun (like Old Russian/Old Church Slavonic *bolʹ*, StSl: 98) or an adverb in the same manner as did, e.g., the Lithuanian verbs *skaudėti* or *sopėti*. However, we would like to emphasize that the development of these verbs in Baltic via a predicative noun, subsequently, predicative adverb suggested above is compatible with what we find in East Slavic since there are a number of adverb-type predicatives that may take both the nominative or the dative experiencer, cf. Modern Russian (see Say, to appear):

(50a)   *Mne*   *bolʹno*
       I:DAT   painful:ADV
       'I feel pain.'

(50b)   *Ja*   *bolen*
       I:NOM   sick:ADJ.M
       'I am sick.' (about males)

Note that both predicatives *bolʹno* and *bolen* are morphological variants of the same stem. The predicative *bolen* is different from *bolʹno* in that it has to agree with its nominative subject in gender and number. The predicative *bolen* would correspond semantically to East Slavic *bolěti* while the predicative *bolʹno* corresponds to Baltic (Lithuanian) *skaudėti/sopėti*.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the present paper, we have argued that the Baltic verbs Lithuanian *skaudėti*, *sopėti*, Latvian *sāpēt* 'to ache', as well as such verbs as *reikėti* 'to need, have to', *gailėti* 'to pity', represent verbalizations of the predicative adverbs (historically from adverbs

or nouns). This development not only coherently accommodates the syntactic alignment found with these verbs in both Modern and Old Lithuanian as well as in Latvian, but also provides an explanation for the morphological irregularities found with these verbs in their present stems. We have claimed that the morphologically irregular thematic present-stem formations are, in fact, sustained adverb or nominative-noun forms (with subsequent, morphophonological accent retraction due to the change in the part of speech: from a noun to an adverb).

An attempt has been made to trace the documented changes in meaning for the Russian verb *bolet'* / Old Russian *bolĕti*. We have illustrated that the original meaning of this verb was 'to be sick', while the modern meaning of 'to ache' is the result of the metonymical extension of the lexical input restrictions on the subject slot of this verb where body-parts denoting NPs secondarily became also allowed to occur. We have additionally added parallels from Lithuanian and Latvian.

ABBREVIATIONS. ACC – accusative, ADJ – adjective, ADV – adverb, COP – copula, DAT – dative, F – feminine, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, IMPF – imperfect, INF – infinitive, INSTR – instrumental, LOC – locative, M – masculine, MID/PASS – middle/passive, N – neuter, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PARTC – participle, PL – plural, PRT – particle, PRES – present, PST – past, SG – singular.

REFERENCES

Aleksynas, K. (par.) 1998: *Prūsijos lietuvių dainos*, surinko V. Kalvaitis, parengė K. Aleksynas, paaiškinimus parašė G. Šmitienė, faksimilinis leidinys, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas.

Ambrazas, V. 2001: On the development of nominative objects in East Baltic. Ö. Dahl, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *Circum-Baltic Languages* 2: *Grammar and Typology*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 391–412.

Ambrazas, V. 2006: *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

AUM: *Атлас української мови* 1–3, Київ: Наукова Думка, 1984–2001.

Bjarnadóttir, V., to appear: Non-canonical case-marking of core arguments in Lithuanian. Typological and historical perspective, PhD Dissertation, manuscript, Stockholm.

Bonch-Osmolovskaja, A.A. 2003: А.А. Бонч-Осмоловская, *Конструкции с дативным субъектом в русском языке: опыт корпусного исследования*, Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Рукопись, Москва: Московский государственный университет.

Bonch-Osmolovskaya, A.A., Rakhilina, E.V., Reznikova, T.I. 2009: А.А. Бонч-Осмоловская, Е.В. Рахилина, Т.И. Резникова, Глаголы боли: лексическая типология и механизмы семантической деривации. В.М. Брицын, Е.В. Рахилина, Т.И. Резникова, Г.М. Яворская (ред.), *Концепт БОЛЬ В типологическом освещении*, Київ: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго, 8–27.

Bricyn, V.M., Rakhilina, E.V., Reznikova, T.I., Yavorskaya, G.M. (eds.) 2009: В.М. Брицын, Е.В. Рахилина, Т.И. Резникова, Г.М. Яворская (ред.), *Концепт БОЛЬ В типологическом освещении*, Київ: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго.

Cienki, A. 1993: Experiencers, possessors, and overlap between Russian dative and *u* + genitive. *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 76–89.

Danylenko, A.I. 2003: А.I. Даниленко, *Предикати, відмінки і діатези в українській мові: історичний і типологічний аспекти*, Харків: Око.

Fraenkel, E. 1925: *Zur Baltoslavischen Grammatik und Syntax*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Fraenkel, E. 1928: *Syntax der litauischen Kasus*, Kaunas: Valstybės spaustuvė.

Garde, P. 1985: О так называемых "симпатических" падежах в современном русском языке. *Russian Linguistics* 9 [2-3], 181–196.

Harðarson J. A. 1998: Mit dem Suffix *-eh₁-* bzw. *-(e)h₁-ie/o-* gebildete Verbalstämme im Indogermanischen. W. Meid (ed.), *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen. Akten der X. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft Innsbruck, 22.-28. September 1996*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 323–339. (*Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 93)

Haspelmath, M. 1999: External Possession in a European Areal Perspective. D.L. Payne, I. Barshi (eds.), *External Possession*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 109–135. (*Typological Studies in Language* 39)

Holvoet, A. 2009: Difuziniai subjektai ir objektai. A. Holvoet, R. Mikulskas (eds.), *Gramatinių funkcijų prigimtis ir raiška*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Asociacija *Academia Salensis*, 37–67. (*Acta Salensia* 1)

Holvoet, A. 2013: Obliqueness, quasi-subjects and transitivity in Baltic and Slavonic. I.A. Seržant, L. Kulikov (eds.), *The Diachronic Typology of Non-Canonical Subjects*, SLCS, John Benjamins, 257–282.

Jakaitienė, E. 1968: Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžiai su priesaga *-ėti*. *Kalbotyra* 19, 31–44.

Kalvaitis, V. 1905: *Prūsijos lietuvių dainos*, surinko ir pridėdamas anas per Rėzą, Nesselmaną, Sauerweiną bei kitus rinktas arba sutaisytas dainas išleido Vilius Kalvaitis, Tilžė: Atspaudė E. Jagomastas.

Kaukienė, A. 1994: *Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžio istorija* 1, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universitetas.

Kettunen, L. 1938: *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Helsinki. (*Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae* 5)

Krys'ko, V.B. 2006: *Исторический синтаксис русского языка: Объект и переходность*, 2-е издание, исправленное и дополненное, Москва: Азбуковник.

Kurschat, A. 1968–1973: *Litauisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Thesaurus Linguae Lituanicae*. Hrsg. von W. Wissmann und E. Hofmann, unter Mitwirkung von A. Kurschat und H. Krick, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Band 1: 1968, Band 2: 1970, Band 3: 1972, Band 4: 1973.

Lamiroy, B., Delbecque, N. 1998: The possessive dative in Romance and Germanic languages. W. van Langendonck, W. van Belle (eds.), *The Dative 2: Theoretical and Contrastive Studies*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 29–74.

LEW: Fraenkel, E. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Heidelberg, Göttingen: Winter, 1962–1965. (*Indogermanische Bibliothek*, II. Reihe: Wörterbücher)

LKŽ: Naktinienė, G. (red.), *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (I–XX, 1941–2002): elektroninis variantas, 2005, http://www.lkz.lt.

Lönngren, T. 1994: Т. Лённгрен, *Лексика русских старообрядческих говоров (на материале, собранном в Латгалии и на Житомирщине)*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell. (*Studia Slavica Uppsalensia* 34)

McIntyre, A. 2006: The interpretation of German datives and English *have*. D. Hole, A. Meinunger, W. Abraham (eds.), *Datives and Other Cases: Between Argument Structure and Event Structure*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 185–211.

ME: Endzelins, J. (ed.), *K. Mŭlenbacha Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* 1, Chicago: Die Gruppe der lettischen Baltologen in Chikago, 1953. (Quoted after http://www.tezaurs.lv/mev)

Nesselmann, G. H. F. 1851: *Wörterbuch der Litauischen Sprache von G.H.F. Nesselmann*, Königsberg: Verlag der Gebrüder Bornträger.

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

Payne, D. L., Barshi, I. 1999: External possession: what, how, where and why. D.L. Payne, I. Barshi (eds.), *External Possession*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 3–29. (*Typological Studies in Language* 39)

Petit, D. 2001: À propos des adectifs «neuters» du lituanien: statut grammatical et fonctions syntaxiques, *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 96-1, 285–310.

Piccini, S. 2008: Traces of non-nominative alignment in Lithuanian: the impersonal constructions in indo-european perspective. *Baltistica* 43(3): 437–461.

Popov, A.V. 1879–1881: А.В. Попов. Сравнительный синтаксис именительного, звательн<ого> и винительного пад<ежей>. <…> *Филологические записки* 1879, 5: 1–42, 6: 43–76; 1880, 1: 77–100, 2: 101–146, 3: 147–182, 4: 183–240, 5: 241–266; 1881, 2: 267–308.

Popov, A.V. 1881: А.В. Попов, *Синтаксические исследования. Именительный, звательный и винительный в связи с историей развития заложных значений и безличных оборотов в санскрите, зенде, греческом, латинском, немецком, литовском, латышском и славянском наречиях*, Воронеж.

Rasmussen, J. E. 1993: The Slavic *i*-verbs. With an excursus on the Indo-European *ē*-verbs. B. Brogyanyi, R. Lipp (eds.), *Indo-European and Finno-Ugric. Papers in Honor of Oswald Szemerényj* 3, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 475–488.

Rhesa, L. J. 1843: *Dainos oder litthauische Volkslieder. Gesammelt, übersetzt und mit gegenüberstehendem Urtext herausgegeben von L[udwig] J[edemin] Rhesa. Nebst einer Abhandlung über die Litthauischen Volksgedichte, und musikalischen Beilagen*. Neue Auflage. Durchgesehen, berichtigt und verbessert von Friedrich Kurschat. Berlin: Verlag von Theod[or] Chr[istian] Fr[iedriech] Enslin.

RNC: *Russian National Corpus*, http://www.ruscorpora.ru/search-main.html.

Ruhig, Ph. 1747: Historische Betrachtung der Littauischen Sprache. *Littauisch-Deutsches und Deutsch-Littauisches Lexicon, Worinnen ein hinlänglicher Vorrath an Wörtern und Redensarten, welche sowol in der H. Schrift, als in allerley Handlungen und Verkehr der menschlichen Gesellschaften vorkommen, befindlich ist: Nebst einer historischen Betrachtung der Littauischen Sprache; Wie auch einer gründlichen und erweiterten Grammatick <…>*, Königsberg: Hartung.

Samoxvalova, E.I. 1982: Е.И. Самохвалова. Особенности междиалектного взаимодействия русских и украинских говоров на синтаксическом уровне (на материале русских говоров Житомирщины). В.И. Собинникова et al. (ред.), *Русские говоры на Украине*, Киев: Наукова Думка, 129–180.

Say, S.S., to appear: С.С. Сай. Лексические механизмы грамматического дрейфа: конструкции с дативным субъектом в русском языке XVIII–XXI веков. *Типология и грамматика. Сборник статей в честь 80-летия В.С. Храковского*, Санкт Петербург.

SDR: Р.И. Аванесов (ред.), *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)* 1, Москва: Русский язык, 1988.

Seržant, I.A. 2008: (Rev.:) N. Ostrowski: *Studia z historii czasownika litewskiego. Iteratiwa. Denominatiwa*. Seria Językoznawstwo nr 25. Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM. Poznań 2006. *Historische Sprachforschung* 121, 308–320.

Seržant, I.A. 2011: Die Entstehung der Kategorie Inagentiv im Tocharischen. T. Krisch, T. Lindner, M. Crombach, S. Niederreiter (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*, Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 527–537.

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

Seržant, I.A., to appear: Dative experiencers as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. To be published in: P. Arkadiev, A. Holvoet, B. Wiemer (eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics*, De Gruyter.

Seržant, I.A. 2013b: *The Diachronic Typology of Non-canonical Subjects*. I.A. Seržant, L. Kulikov (eds.), *The Diachrony of Non-canonical Subjects*, SLCS 140, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 313–360.

Skardžius, P. 1943: *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*, Vlnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Sokolova, M.A. 1962: М.А. Соколова, *Очерки по исторической грамматике русского языка*, Ленинград: Издательство Ленинградского университета.

Sreznevskij, I.I. 1893–1912: И.И. Срезневский, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам* 1-3, Издание Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии Наук, Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии Наук.

SRR: С.Г. Бархударов et al. (ред.), *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв*. 1: *А–Б*, Москва: Наука, 1975.

Stang, Chr. 1942: *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*, Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi.

Stang, Chr.S. 1966: *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Stolz, T. 1991: *Sprachbund im Baltikum? Estnisch und Lettisch im Zentrum einer sprachlichen Konvergenzlandschaft*, Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer. (*Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung* 13)

StSl: Р.М. Цейтлин, Р. Вечерка, Э. Благова (ред.), *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков)*. 2-е издание, стереотипное, Москва: Русский язык, 1999.

Thomsen, V. 1890: *Beröringer mellem de finske og de baltiske (litauisk-lettiske) sprog: en sproghistorisk undersøgelse*, København: Blanco Lunos.

Vendler, Z. 1967: *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Yavorskaya, G.M. 2009: Г.М. Яворская. К этимологии праслславянского *bolěti*. В.М. Брицын, Е.В. Рахилина, Т.И. Резникова, Г.М. Яворская (ред.), *Концепт БОЛЬ В типологическом освещении*, Київ: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго, 413–417.

NETAISYKLINGŲJŲ *-ē- KAMIENO VEIKSMAŽODŽIŲ VERBALIZACIJA IR NEKANONINĖ LINKSNIŲ RAIŠKA BALTŲ IR RUSŲ KALBOSE

SANTRAUKA. Straipsnyje nagrinėjami kai kurie netaisyklingos morfologinės sandaros baltų ir rusų kalbų veiksmažodžiai, padaryti su priesaga *-ē- (tokie kaip lietuvių *skaudėti*, *reikėti*, *gailėti*, rusų *bolet'* 'skaudėti'). Netaisyklinga morfologinė sandara būdingiausia šios grupės baltų kalbų veiksmažodžių esamajam laikui. Laikomės nuomonės, kad jie yra vardažodinės kilmės. Manome, kad šios grupės veiksmažodžiams būdinga tokia nuolat pasikartojanti raida: jie randasi iš predikatiškai vartojamų prieveiksmių arba daiktavardžių ir palaipsniui įgyja veiksmažodžių ypatybes. Vardažodinė kilmė paaiškina nekanoninę jų argumentų raiškos strategiją. Manome, kad tokia strategija atspindi ankstesnę vardažodžių argumentų struktūrą. Tai paaiškina ne tik neįprastą linksnių priskyrimą, bet ir netaisyklingas esamojo laiko kamieno formas.

ВЕРБАЛИЗАЦИЯ И НЕКАНОНИЧЕСКОЕ ПРОЯВЛЕНИЕ ПАДЕЖЕЙ НЕПРАВИЛЬНЫХ ГЛАГОЛОВ *-ē- ОСНОВЫ В БАЛТИЙСКИХ И РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

РЕЗЮМЕ. В статье анализируются некоторые неправильные балтийские и русские глаголы, образованные при помощи суффикса *-ē- (такие, как литовские *skaudėti* 'болеть', *reikėti* 'быть нужным', *gailėti* 'жалеть', русский *болеть*). Неправильное морфологическое строение больше всего проявляется в настоящем времени балтийских глаголов этой группы. Мы придерживаемся мнения, что они именного происхождения. Мы считаем, что для глаголов этой группы характерна следующая постоянно повторяющаяся модель развития: они появляются из предикативно употребляемых адвербов или существительных и постепенно приобретают черты глагола. Именное происхождение объясняет неканоническую стратегию выражения аргументов этих глаголов. Мы считаем, что такая стратегия соответствует первоначальному именному характеру этой структуры. Этим объясняются не только необычное распределение падежей, но и неправильные формы основы настоящего времени.

ILJA A. SERŽANT
University of Konstanz
Department of Linguistics
Zukunftskolleg, Box 216, D-78457 Konstanz
Germany

VALGERÐUR BJARNADÓTTIR
University of Stockholm
Department of Baltic Languages, Finnish and German
SE-106 91 Stockholm
Sweden