

Rise of canonical objecthood with the Lithuanian verbs of pain¹

ILJA A. SERŽANT

University of Konstanz & Institute for the Lithuanian Language, Vilnius

The present paper aims to uncover the processes governing the rise of canonical case-markings. Experiencer verbs with the $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{NOM}_{\text{Stim}}$ case frame must necessarily first acquire canonical case marking on their second argument in order to enable the acquisition of the nominative by their first argument. The present paper concentrates, thus, on the acquisition of the accusative case by the second argument. Lithuanian verbs of pain are taken under scrutiny. I examine the change that leads to the acquisition of canonical objecthood, namely, the change from the original $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{NOM}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ case frame to the more canonical $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{ACC}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ case frame. In the latter, the body-part argument not only acquires the canonical object marking, but also certain syntactic object properties as, for example, the obligatory change into genitive under negation. Strikingly, this change is only found with the verbs of pain *skaudėti* ‘to ache’ and dial. *sopėti* ‘to ache’ in Lithuanian, while other $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{NOM}_{\text{Stim}}$ experiencer verbs do not undergo this change. I argue that the rise of the canonical object with $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{NOM}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ verbs of pain in Lithuanian is due to some analogical processes internal to the semantic class of verbs of pain and not to a general drift leading to the acquisition of canonical case assignments. Verbs of pain represent a more complex subclass of experiencer verbs in that they typically take three arguments, namely, experiencer, body-part and stimulus. Those verbs that encode all three participants of the pain event as core arguments typically have the following case frame in Baltic: $\text{NOM}_{\text{Stim}}-\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{ACC}_{\text{BodyPart}}$. I argue that the loss of the stimulus position by some of these triadic causal verbs of pain let them conflate semantically with the dyadic stative $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{NOM}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ verbs of pain. This semantic merger results in the redundancy of the morphosyntactic variation between $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{NOM}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ and $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{ACC}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ which, in turn, leads to a generalization of one particular case frame: $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{ACC}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ in the standard language and $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}}-\text{NOM}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ in some dialects.

Keywords: Lithuanian, verbs of pain, case frame, canonicization, objecthood, productivity, dative-accusative pattern, dative-nominative pattern, alignment

¹ Special thanks are due to Jóhanna Barðdal, Rolandas Mikulskas, Nicole Nau and two anonymous reviewers. All disclaimers apply.

0. Introduction

In this paper I will assume that an argument is marked non-canonically if it morphologically deviates from the marking used in this language to encode participants of a prototypically transitive event. A prototypically transitive event is defined in terms of semantics. In Lithuanian, the first argument (agent) of such an event is marked nominative and the second argument (patient) is marked accusative. However, Lithuanian has a number of two-place predicates that deviate from this canonical pattern, one type of which are the verbs of pain to be discussed here. Thus, the Latvian verb *sāpēt* ‘to ache’ requires two arguments: the experiencer and her/his affected body part. As can be observed in example (1) below both of its arguments are marked non-canonically: the first argument, the experiencer, is case-marked with the dative case, while the second argument, the body part, is assigned nominative case:

- (1) *Man sāp galv-a* (Latvian)
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3head-NOM.SG
 ‘I have a headache’

Extensive research on non-canonical subjects and subject-like arguments such as the dative experiencer in (1) and their relation to canonical ones is taking place (cf., *inter alia*, Aikhenvald *et al.* 2001, Bhaskararao & Subbarao 2004, Barðdal 2008, 2009, Seržant & Kulikov 2013). However, much less attention is being paid to what happens with the second argument of such predicates taking non-canonical subject-like arguments. In the present paper I investigate how and why canonicization may proceed with the second argument. CANONICIZATION is a diachronic process whereby an argument acquires canonical morphological case-marking, i. e., the case-marking that is used in the prototypical transitive clause. The role of the second argument in the process of canonicization is very important. Thus, in order for a DAT–NOM predicate to acquire the canonical transitive alignment, it must first acquire canonical case marking on its second argument. Only then can the nominative case be acquired by the first argument, since most languages do not allow two distinct arguments of a verb to both be marked with nominative.

In this paper, I show that the acquisition of the canonical case marking cannot be sufficiently accounted for by just assuming a simple drift from less to more canonical case marking. I will illustrate that there is a rather complex motivation for such a change. For these purposes, I will concentrate on Lithuanian verbs of pain that subcategorize for the dative case-marked experiencer. These verbs attest some variation in the case marking of the second, body-part argument. It is striking that, among the psychological verbs or *verba sentiendi*, only the verbs of pain exhibit this kind of case alternations on their second core arguments in Lithuanian. My aim is to provide a diachronic analysis of how such a variation may have come about. In particular, I will concentrate on the question of why the body-part argument loses its original nominative case-marking becoming a rather marginal option in Lithuanian and acquires the secondary, accusative case marking.

In the present paper I will proceed as follows. In Section 1, I will present data illustrating the possible case alternations on the body-part argument of the dyadic verb of pain *skaudėti*. Then, in Section 2, I will present an account of this alternation and, finally, in Section 3, I will summarize the main results.

1. Data

One of the most common case frames of Standard Lithuanian verbs of pain consists of a dative-marked experiencer and accusative marked Theme (i. e., body-part), cf. Standard Lithuanian (2) and dialectal (3):

- (2) *Man skauda galv-q*
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 head-ACC.SG
 ‘I have a headache.’
- (3) *Man sopa galv-q*
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 head-ACC.SG
 ‘I have a headache’

At the same time, the construction with the nominative marked body-part is also possible, even though not as common:

- (4) *Man skauda galv-a*
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 head-NOM.SG
 ‘I have a headache’

In addition to both of these patterns $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}} - \text{ACC}_{\text{BodyPart}}$ and $\text{DAT}_{\text{Exp}} - \text{NOM}_{\text{BodyPart}}$, there is also a case frame where the body-part is encoded as a Location, cf. (5) and (6):

- (5) *Man skauda po krūtin-e*
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 under chest-INS.SG
 ‘I have pains under my chest.’
- (6) *Man skauda šon-e*
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 side-LOC.SG
 ‘I have pains in my side’

The stimulus (or the source) of the pain cannot be encoded as a core argument with this verb; it can only occur as an adjunct, typically encoded by the instrumental case or a PP. All in all, there are three possible alignments corresponding to one and the same event structure, depending on how the body-part is coded: (i) as object-like with accusative, (ii) as subject-like with nominative or (iii) as location-like with an adjunct (cf. Bonč-Osmolovskaya *et al.* 2009, 17). This is summarized in Table 1

Table 1. Types of alignment with verbs of pain

i		$\text{ACC}_{\text{BodyPart}}$	ex. 2, 3
ii	DAT_{Exp}	$\text{NOM}_{\text{BodyPart}}$	ex. 1, 4
iii		$\text{LOC/PP}_{\text{BodyPart}}$	ex. 5, 6

There are almost no semantic differences behind these alternations. Pattern (i) is the most frequent and standard one, while pattern (iii) is more rare and marked. With the latter, there are also lexical restrictions which might be motivated pragmatically. Thus, small body parts such as *dantis* ‘tooth’ can hardly be used with this pattern.

Pattern (ii) is less standard and is also quite rare (ratio 1/62)². However, crucially, while there is a semantic difference between (i) and (iii)

² There is no tagged corpus for Lithuanian. I have checked *jam skauda* on www.google.com. It and found the first occurrence of DAT-NOM only after having checked 63 hits with an overt body-part argument.

to be discussed below, there seems to be no difference between (i) and (ii). There might be certain discourse-pragmatic preferences regarding, for example, the use pattern (ii) when the body-part is topical and pattern (iii) for the focus on the type of pain, i. e., on the predication and not on the body-part. However, as the data show, pattern (i) can be used in all these cases as well, cf. (7) for the topical accusative:

- (7) *Uždegim-o* *pažeisti* *od-os*
inflammation-GEN affect-PPP-NOM.PL.M skin-GEN
plot-ai *būna* *karšt-i,* *juos* *skauda*
area-NOM.PL be.PRS.3 hot-NOM.PL.M 3.ACC.PL.M ache.PRS.3
‘The skin areas affected by inflammation often feel hot and they smart.’³

Now, what are the reasons for this sort of lability with the pain verbs? There are several reasons for these alternations, I believe. First of all, in terms of semantics, there is a partitive (iii) vs. holistic (i/ii) distinction, as Fried (2004, 104) states: while (iii) is used to intimate that only a particular, though not identifiable part of the body-part is affected, constructions (i) and (ii) are noncommittal in this respect. Presumably, this semantic difference is employed in those cases where the suffering person cannot exactly locate the source of the pain, as suggested by Holvoet (p. c.). While frequent inability of the suffering person to locate her/his pain is indeed a straightforward account for (iii), the situation is different with respect to the alternation (i) vs. (ii). Differently from (iii), the alternation between (i) and (ii) does not carry any content-related distinctions. It seems reasonable to assume that (i) and (ii) historically represent the same construction.

The nominative case-marking in (ii) is much less productive or, even, exceptional with *skaudėti* ‘to ache’ and its dialectal counterpart *sopėti* ‘idem’, as I mentioned, while (i) represents the standard way of encoding a pain event. This would be in contrast to the assumption of the nominative case-marking being a new replacement for an old accusative. Indeed, the comparative evidence does not support this assumption. The NOM case-marking in (ii) reveals itself to be the historically original case marking with these verbs, as comparison with

³ <http://www.sveikata24.lt/lt/paieska/keyword:skauda/criteria:articles/page:2/>

Old Lithuanian (most prominently texts composed by Daukša⁴) and Latvian shows, since neither of them allows ACC here (Seržant and Bjarnadóttir, to appear; differently Piccini 2008). In turn, the ACC in (i) can be easily explained in terms of a more general drift from the non-canonical (NOM) towards the canonical (ACC) case-assignment that would be manifested in the body-part argument becoming a more prototypical object. Such drifts are frequently found in related constructions cross-linguistically (in Old English, cf. Allen 1996; in Faroese, cf. Thráinsson *et al.* 2004, and even in substandard Icelandic, cf. Sigurðsson 2006). This is illustrated by the following examples with *líka* ‘to like’ and *vanta* ‘to lack’ in Faroese. These predicates take the DAT–NOM case frame in the more conservative Standard Icelandic but have changed it to DAT–ACC in Faroese (Thráinsson *et al.* 2004, 255ff):

- (8) *Mær líkar hana væl.*
 1SG.DAT like.PRS.3 3.F.ACC well
 ‘I rather like her.’
- (9) *Henni vantar góða orðabók.*
 3.F.DAT lack.PRS.3 good dictionary.ACC
 ‘She needs a good dictionary.’

These examples are generally considered to exemplify the second stage in a drift towards transitive alignment as in (10) below:

- (10) *DAT–NOM* > *DAT–ACC* > *NOM–ACC*
 (Old Norse/Icelandic) (Faroese, (Norwegian,
 substandard Swedish)
 Icelandic)

At first glance, the Lithuanian pattern seems to adhere to the cline in (10). Indeed, the ACC case as in (2) above is assigned structurally and is not an inherent case, as revealed by a negated context. In such a context, any structural accusative is obligatorily replaced by genitive, exhibiting thereby a typical object property of Lithuanian:

⁴ Thus, Daukša seems to have nominative only. Otherwise, the nominative case-marking is spread across the whole Lithuanian area from Marijampolė in the South to Šiauliai in the North, cf. LKŽ, *vide sub verbo*. Thus, the opinion that this case-marking is typical for the Eastern subdialects is not correct.

- (11) *Man ne-skauda galv-os / *galv-q*
 1SG.DAT NEG-ache.PRS.3 head-GEN / *head-ACC
 ‘I don’t have a headache.’

Note that the *genitive-under-negation* rule is also found with unaccusative subjects. Crucially, while it is only optional with unaccusative subjects, the alternation between the genitive and nominative being constrained semantically⁵, it is obligatory with objects. The genitive under negation in (11) is obligatory and by no means optional here, thereby unequivocally pointing to the (secondary) object status of the body-part argument.

Lithuanian itself attests this drift with a number of other constructions such as the independent-infinitive-construction in which the older nominative object marking (with DAT–NOM) is being gradually replaced by the accusative (to DAT –ACC), cf.

- (12) *Kas → Ką man daryti?*
 what.NOM → what.ACC 1SG.DAT do.INF
 ‘What am I supposed to do?’ (Adapted from Ambrazas 2001, 395)

It is fairly uncontroversial that the nominative object marking represents a very old, most probably the original pattern, while the accusative one gradually extends it (Ambrazas 2001, 401).

However, there is one problem with this general account. A drift towards canonical argument case marking alone fails to apply to the other DAT–NOM experiencer verbs of Lithuanian that never allow ACC for their second argument. Thus, other psychological verbs such as Lithuanian *patikti* ‘to like’, *nusibosti* ‘to get tired of’, *atrodyti* ‘to appear, seem’ etc. belong to the semantic class of experiencer verbs but only have a DAT–NOM case frame and do not allow ACC case marking on their second argument. There is also no escape in terms of a relative chronology because such a predicate as Lithuanian *patikti* ‘to like’ seems to be at least as old as *skaudėti*. The former must be of Proto-East-Baltic origin given that, etymologically, the same predicate is used in Latvian, cf. Latvian *patikt* ‘to like’.

⁵ Contrast: *Aš nebuvau Maskvoje* ‘I.NOM was not in Moscow.’ vs. *Manęs nebuvo Maskvoje* ‘I.GEN was not (to be found) in Moscow.’

Holvoet (2013) argues that the rise of the accusative case from the nominative with *skaud-ė-ti* ‘to ache’ (as in (3) above) must be explained as due to adjustments along the Noun Phrase Hierarchy or Obliqueness Hierarchy, first explored in Keenan and Comrie (1977) (as the ‘Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy’), and integrated in grammatical theory, e. g., in HPSG (Pollard and Sag 1994). The Obliqueness Hierarchy is a hierarchy of NPs in a clause dependent on their semantic role and inherent properties. Holvoet argues that there is a correlation between the Obliqueness Hierarchy and the Case Hierarchy (cf. Blake 2001, 89–90). He writes: ‘[t]here is a default correspondence between the elements of the obliqueness hierarchy and those of the case hierarchy, in that the least oblique argument will be matched with the case that is highest in the case hierarchy, viz. the nominative, and so on. As stated by Blake, the case hierarchy takes the shape “NOM > ACC/ERG > GEN > DAT > LOC > LOC/INS > others”, but there are, of course, language-specific differences.’ The author argues that the accusative is not due to the spread of the transitive NOM–ACC pattern: the predicate remains both semantically and formally intransitive, even though being a two-place predicate. Instead, it is suggested that the acquisition of the accusative case-marking is due to obliqueness adjustments, that is, changes in case marking that aim to bring it into accord with syntactic obliqueness. The dative argument is less oblique due to its thematic (semantic) and discourse saliency than the stimulus argument on the Obliqueness Hierarchy, however, its dative case-marking is more ‘oblique’ than the nominative case-marking of the stimulus argument on the case hierarchy. This mismatch between the obliqueness degree of the arguments and their morphological encoding—nominative being higher on the case hierarchy than the dative—is resolved by introducing the accusative here which is now accordingly lower than the dative case.

This approach is indeed a better explanation for the data in Lithuanian, since there is no transitivity in syntactic terms (let alone semantic transitivity): as is convincingly argued in Holvoet (2013), the experiencer NP is not endowed with any unequivocal syntactic subject properties. However, Holvoet rejects any correspondence between the accusative case-marked stimulus NP with a prototypical object in Lithuanian and glosses over the fact that by acquiring the accusative

case-marking—even if triggered by the obliqueness adjustments—the stimulus NP acquires certain object-like behavior that was not present with the nominative marking before. As I mentioned above (ex. 11), the genitive-under-negation rule is not only possible but also mandatory now with the stimulus argument, thus unequivocally pointing out to more syntactic objecthood with this argument than before. The genitive-under-negation rule is a strong test for syntactically prototypical objecthood as long as it is obligatory, as it indistinguishably applies to all direct objects of Lithuanian. Of course, there are also some few unaccusative subjects that are also subject to this rule. However, first, the unaccusative subject interpretation of *galvą* is excluded here as all unaccusative subjects of Lithuanian are unexceptionally marked with nominative and never with accusative. Secondly, as mentioned in footnote 5, the genitive-under-negation rule is weaker with unaccusative subjects in that it allows for a semantically constrained optionality of the genitive which is in contrast to the obligatoriness of the genitive with uncontroversial objects. The latter is the case with the second argument in (11). Furthermore, the nominative stimulus had originally also the causative-stimulus reading still found in Latvian, in which case it behaves as a full-fledged subject. This is no longer a productive option with the nominative stimulus in Lithuanian. Be it as it may, this explanation—although more coherent with the Lithuanian data—is equally too general as the previous one in terms of a drift towards canonical case assignment. Lithuanian has a number of DAT-NOM predicates (e. g., different kinds of experiencer verbs) which do not turn into DAT-ACC, although they actually exhibit exactly the same sort of mismatches on the obliqueness hierarchy as *skaudėti*.

To summarize, the general drift toward expanding the canonical case assignment on the experiencer verbs is coherent with the cross-linguistic evidence and with the structural behavior of the accusative of *skaudėti* (cf. 11), but it fails to explain the lack of such a development with other experiencer verbs of this type. The same is true of Holvoet's approach. Hence, an additional motivation is required in order to account for the restriction of this replacement exclusively to pain verbs such as *skaudėti*. I will provide a more specific account in the following section that takes certain properties of this semantic subclass into account.

2. Conflation of two conceptualizations of experience

Conceptualization of events is the underlying cognitive structure that is responsible, e. g., for mapping the event participants onto particular syntactic slots (Croft 1993, 58). By conceptualizing a particular event, the speaker makes assumptions about the internal organization of that event on the bases of her/his world knowledge, observation and understanding of what happens in that event. As will be seen below, similar events may be conceptualized differently which, as a consequence, leads to variation in alignment.

Verbs of pain represent a specific semantico-syntactic subclass of a more general class of experiencer verbs. A typical feature of this subclass is that the event or state that these verbs encode is pragmatically unlikely to be instigated (or even admitted) by the experiencer as one usually tries to avoid and prevent pain situations, not trigger them. Thus, if a language allows for an oblique encoding of experiencers at all, then these predicates are usually the first to take an oblique case-marked experiencer (cf. the data collected in Bossong 1998). Another specificity of this subclass is the number of core participants. While experience-based events usually include only one or two core participants, viz. an experiencer and, in some cases, a stimulus, the pain, or more generally sensation events/states, differ from other experiences in that they ideally have three core participants. In addition to the standard valence slots, such as experiencer and stimulus, they may also provide a valence slot for the body-part (Bonč-Osmolovskaja *et al.* 2009, 17). Even though the body-part is always a part of the experiencer and, hence, represents an argument semantically inalienable from the experiencer, it is, nevertheless, often syntactically realized as an extra argument of a pain verb, as if the experiencer and the body-part were to interact. I assume that this is because the body-part is conceptually ambiguous: it can be conceived and construed by speakers either as a stimulus, i. e., the instigator of the pain event, or the target of the pain event, i. e., the endpoint in Croft's terms (Croft 1993; 1998). In the former case, it is conceptualized as triggering the event. In the latter case, it shares the impact of the pain together with the experiencer. A special case of the latter is when the whole body of the experiencer is affected. In this case, there is no need to encode the experiencer and

the body-part with two separate arguments, the body-part and the experiencer are both conflated in the body-part slot (for a different account see Piccini 2008), cf.

- (13) *Mane vis-q skauda.*
 1SG.ACC whole-ACC ache.PRS.3
 ‘I’m hurting all over.’

Note that the accusative *mane* here occupies the position of the body-part and is modified by the adjective *visq* ‘whole.ACC’, lit. ‘the whole of me’.

I summarize this in Table 2:

Table 2. *Competing conceptualizations with verbs of pain*

	Initiator (Figure)	Endpoint (Ground)
a	Stimulus = <i>Body-part</i>	Experiencer
b	Stimulus	<i>Body-part</i> & Experiencer

The different conceptualizations of a pain event, i. e., (a) body-part ‘acts upon’ experiencer and (b) stimulus ‘acts upon’ body-part of experiencer, trigger different morphosyntactic realizations. Given the ambiguity of the body-part mentioned here, it does not come as a surprise that one and the same event can be encoded via two different patterns. The fluid semantics of the body-part with respect to its role as a stimulus or theme/goal within the pain event can lead to variation in its formal encoding. In the following I will briefly discuss the two different conceptualizations, which seem to have yielded grammatical lability in Lithuanian (but also in Russian, cf. Kozlova 2009; Bonč-Osmolovskaja *et al.* 2009, 20).

The first conceptualization entails a pain situation, the affected body-part and the experiencer. Typical of this conceptualization is the example (3), repeated here for convenience as (14). I will refer to this conceptualization as *stative*:

- (14) *Man skauda galv-a.*
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 head-NOM.SG
 ‘I have a headache’

The affected body-part is encoded by the nominative case and is conceptualized as the participant being somehow responsible for the state (viz. the pain) of the experiencer. The relation between the experiencer and the body-part is one of a figure-ground-relation, while the aspectual properties of the predicate are that of a stative verb.

On this conceptualization, the body-part is construed as the stimulus. This is the reason why no other stimulus than the body-part can be encoded as a core argument of the verb of this conceptualization. This conceptualization type typically exploits intransitive source verbs (Bonč-Osmolovskaja *et al.* 2009, 19). A trigger of the pain event cannot be expressed as a valence-bound argument, cf. (15) which is ungrammatical with such a verb but grammatical with pain verbs of the second conceptualization (see below):

- (15) **Skausm-as man skauda galv-q /galv-a*
 pain-NOM.SG 1SG.DAT ache-PRS.3 head-ACC.SG /head-NOM.SG
 Intended literal meaning: ‘Pain hurts me the head’

The Lithuanian verbs *skaudėti* ‘to ache’, (dial.) *sopėti* ‘idem’ are originally and synchronically of the stative type, which is also manifested in their derivational morphology: the suffix *-ė-* (*skaud-ė-ti*, *sop-ė-ti*) marks intransitive, middle-like, typically (but not exclusively) stative events (Seržant and Bjarnadóttir, to appear).

Now, turning to the second conceptualization, we see that prototypically it involves a pain situation with a stimulus, affected body-part and an experiencer:

- (16) *Nusivylim-as po Atėn-ų ir Pekin-o*
 disappointment-NOM.SG after Athens-GEN and Beijing-GEN
žaidyni-ų iki šiol gelia jam šird-į.
 games-GEN even.now hurt.PRS.3 him.DAT heart-ACC.SG
 ‘The disappointment after the Athens and Beijing games causes his heart pain.’⁶

On this conceptualization, the stimulus initiates a pain state on the body-part, the latter, in turn, affects the experiencer by virtue of being its inalienable part. The body-part and the stimulus are, thus,

⁶ http://m.lrytas.lt/?data=20090926&id=spo26_a4090926&np=2&nsk_id=andview=2

non-coreferential here, each being on a different edge of the causal chain (in the sense of Croft 1993; 1998): stimulus is the initiator while the body-part is the affected endpoint entity. This conceptualization conforms, thus, to the transitivity prototype in terms of a metaphoric extension (cf. Givón 1984) or in terms of assimilation to the major transitive construction (Lazard 1998) and receives the (formally) transitive encoding: the stimulus is encoded by the nominative case and the body-part by the accusative case. The stimulus is the subject because the force transmission runs from the stimulus to the target. The latter splits here into two participants: the body-part and the experiencer *per se*. This second conceptualization differs crucially from the first one as it is encoded as a (di)transitive action with two main participants (stimulus and the body-part), one acting upon another affecting the experiencer. I will refer to this conceptualization as ‘causal’ (similarly Croft 1993, 1998).⁷

Typically for the predicates of the second conceptualization, the original, non-metaphorical source meaning of the predicate is a prototypical transitive meaning, cf. *plėšti* (non-metaphorically) ‘to tear’, *gelti* (non-metaphorically) ‘to sting’, etc. (cf. Bonč-Osmolovskaja *et al.* 2009, 19), see also fn. 7 above.

Thus, there are two different conceptualizations of a pain event in Lithuanian, each triggering different morphosyntactic interfaces. The morphosyntactic differences between the case frames of both patterns (in 14 and 16) were already highlighted in Holvoet (2009, 59–61). I claim that the alternation of pattern (i) versus pattern (ii) of the Lithuanian stative pain predicates as *skaudėti* ‘to ache’ has evolved by the semantic merger of both conceptualizations, resulting in the stative type. This happened in the following way.

First, a prototypically transitive verb denoting some sort of negative result (*to burn, to sting, to tear, etc.*) is used metaphorically to describe a particular sort of pain event, cf. *gelti* ‘to sting’ in its non-metaphorical usage:

⁷ This class comprises a number of verbs such verbs denoting different kinds pain metaphors: sticking and stabbing: *durti, remti, diegti, daigyti*, breaking: *laužti*, penetrating: *verti*, tearing: *draskyti*, cutting: *rėžti, raižyti*, or drilling: *gręžti* (Rolandas Mikulskas, p. c.).

- (17) *Kai nuvažiuoju į kaimą, kaimyn-o*
 when go.PRS.1SG to countryside neighbour's
bit-ės gelia man galv-ą
 bee-NOM.PL sting.PRS.3 1SG.DAT head-ACC
 'When I go to the countryside, my neighbour's bees sting my head.'⁸

Once this verb is used as a pain verb, a systematic variation often arises between utterances with an overtly expressed stimulus/subject and those without one, cf. (18a) with (18b):

- (18a) *Man gelia koj-as*
 1SG.DAT sting.PRS.3 foot-ACC.PL
 'I have stabbing pains in [my] feet.'
- (18b) *Šalt-is gelia man koj-as*
 cold-NOM sting.PRS.3 1SG.DAT foot-ACC.PL
 'I have stabbing pains in [my] feet because of the cold.'

In the second stage of the development, the usage without an overt subject stimulus is gradually lexicalized with some verbs of this type, and the semantic valence of subject stimulus is gradually lost (cf. transimpersonals in Malchukov 2008). Thus, even the verb *gelti*, being originally a prototypically transitive verb (non-metaphorically 'to sting', metaphorically 'to have strong/stinging pains'), is used in most of the cases without an overt subject stimulus as a pain verb. Even though I do not present any counts here, suffice it to say that it is quite difficult to find as much as a single occurrence of the subject stimulus on Google.

The state of affairs is even clearer with a verb such as *plėšti* that is used without any subject stimulus in its pain meaning.

- (19) *Man plėšia vis-ą krūtin-ę kitoki-u*
 1SG.DAT hurt.PRS.3 whole-ACC heart-ACC different-INS
skausm-u
 pain-INS
 'I felt a pain of a different kind all over my chest.'⁹

⁸ <http://m.lrytas.lt/?id=13139123021311662320andview=6>.

⁹ <http://www.nso.lt/old/liud1.htm>

The subject stimulus is restricted to only a few, less prototypical, semantically redundant NPS such as *skausmas* ‘pain’, *dieglys/dieguliai* ‘stitch(es)’ at this stage (cf., inter alia, Evans 2004, 176 for the same phenomenon in Iwaidjan languages in Australia, Malchukov 2008 for a typological overview). I interpret this as an indication of an ongoing loss of the subject-stimulus valence with these verbs. The reason for this lies in the pragmatics of a pain event. The stimulus of pain is very often simply unknown to the speaker. Apart from that, different Lithuanian pain predicates usually denote a very specific kind of pain where there are potentially not so many stimuli that can provoke this specific type of pain and thus, pragmatically, do not need to be mentioned, cf. Lithuanian *gelti* ‘to feel stabbing, stinging pain’, *plėšti* ‘to feel strong pain’. The stimulus is, in a way, already encoded in the lexical verb.

The gradual loss of the subject-stimulus valence with the retention of the transitive alignment essentially relates to the transitive impersonal or transimpersonal historical scenario (Malchukov 2008). This historical scenario has been put forward in order to account for constructions with object experiencers with some residual subject markers found typically only on the verb. The discussion mainly concerns split-S languages in which some S’s (intransitive subjects) are aligned with transitive subjects and others with transitive objects. The latter type predicates are often referred to as ‘inactive’ and have transimpersonal morphosyntax like literally ‘It sleeps me’ for ‘I sleep’. Malchukov (2008) claims correctly that this type of morphosyntax is likely to be derived from originally full-fledged transitive verbs via gradual loss of the subject slot (see further discussion in Creissels 2007, Malchukov and Ogawa 2011). However, the pattern as in (19) is different from this scenario in that the experiencer is due to a former adjunct and was not a core-argument to begin with as in the case of transimpersonals. While the transimpersonal scenario is more likely for object-like experiencers, the scenario suggested here concerns rather object-like stimuli.

Finally, these predicates lose their stimulus-subject valence altogether. This crucially changes the conceptualization of this pattern. The inherent feature of the causal conceptualization was the prototypical causative relation of one entity transmitting force onto another entity, i. e., the stimulus transmits force onto the body-part. After the stimulus

valence is lost, there is no causal relation anymore, and the overall event becomes stative. Hence, causal type pain verbs as *plėšti* and, to a great extent, *gelti* conflate with the stative type pain verbs semantically. By losing the stimulus valence they start encoding an event with two core participants, namely, the experiencer and the body-part. These predicates merge with the first, stative conceptualization and start denoting the same event structure.

After the loss of the stimulus, the dative experiencer occupied the first position in a sentence automatically. This is because it is the most topic-worthy remaining participant, by virtue of being restricted to animates only. It moves into the sentence-initial position due to a more general rule of Lithuanian that an occurrence of verb-initial placement in a sentence is highly dispreferred in unmarked word order (I rely here on the judgements of native speakers). This rule predicts that, if there is no overt nominative in the clause, the next prominent participant moves to its position in order to retain the unmarked word order:

- (20a) *Nikol-ė padovanojo man knyg-q*
 Nicole-NOM present.PST.3 1SG.DAT book-ACC.SG
 ‘Nicole presented me with a book.’
- (20b) *Man padovanojo knyg-q*
 1SG.DAT present.PST.3 book-ACC.SG
 ‘I have been presented with a book.’

Example (20a) features a transfer predicate *padovanoti* ‘to gift’ with all three valence bound arguments expressed overtly. Yet, if the subject is omitted in order to yield an impersonal meaning as in (20b), the dative recipient must occupy the first position in order to yield an unmarked word order.

Contrast the originally stative pattern in (21a) with the originally causal one in (21b):

- (21a) *Man skauda šird-is*
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 heart-NOM.SG
 ‘I have a pain in my heart.’
- (21b) *Man plėšia galv-q*
 1SG.DAT rend.PRS.3 head-ACC.SG
 ‘I have a strong headache.’

Both the originally causal *plėšti* (21b) and stative *skaudėti* (21a) verbs belong to the same semantic class of pain verbs and both exhibit the same argument structure consisting of the dative experiencer argument and an object-like body-part argument (marked with nominative case in (21a) and accusative in (21b)). The formal difference in the case marking between the object-like arguments in (21a) and (21b) becomes irrelevant at this point as it no longer bears any meaning differences. This leads to the merge of the two case frames under the stative heading. As a consequence, the NOM and ACC case become interchangeable and their alternation meaningless. Hence, from (21a) through the semantic merge with (21b), (21c) appeared:

- (21c) *Man skauda šird-į*
 1.SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 heart-ACC.SG
 ‘I’ve got a pain in the heart.’

I claim that this is the reason why both NOM and ACC are possible with verbs of pain in Lithuanian and with some causal verbs in Colloquial Russian (cf. Kozlova 2009; Bonč-Osmolovskaja *et al.* 2009, 20).

Moreover, there are contexts where both—the causal and the stative pattern—become even formally indistinguishable, as pointed out to me by Mikulskas (p. c.). This happens when the body part argument is encoded by a locative phrase, contrast the causal-conceptualization type with *durti* ‘to have stabbing pains’ (non-metaphorically ‘to stab’) in (22) and the stative-conceptualization type with *skaud-ėti* ‘to ache’ in (23):

- (22) *Man duria šon-e*
 1SG.DAT stab.PRS.3 side-LOC
 ‘I have stabbing pains in the side.’
 (23) *Man skauda šon-e*
 1SG.DAT ache.PRS.3 side-LOC
 ‘I have pains in the side.’

Thus, as pointed out by Mikulskas (p. c.), the causal-conceptualization type verbs also deviate with respect to their object marking from the transitive prototype, intersecting with the stative type.

In Standard Lithuanian, spread of the originally causal conceptualization went so far that the ACC even became the default case with

these verbs. The DAT-ACC pattern is the most frequent and expanding one with Lithuanian pain verbs, even though it is quite atypical elsewhere. Lack of nominative case has been observed to be generally dispreferred (cf., *inter alia*, Tsunoda 1981; ‘Obligatory NOM Requirement’ in Primus 1999; ‘Default Linking’ in Wunderlich and Lakämper 2001; Malchukov 2005, 95). Thus, in Malchukov (2005, 99) such a case frame is not even listed as a possible one.

There are two facts that support our analysis disfavouring more general accounts such as a drift towards formal transitivity or obliqueness adjustments put forward in Holvoet (2013). As I have already mentioned above, there is no motivation under these accounts for why other experience predicates with the same pattern such as *patikti* ‘to like’ with DAT-NOM should not also change their NOM into ACC. These predicates remain stable and show no affinity towards this change.

Moreover, it would remain unaccounted for that dialectally one finds the reverse development, namely, the DAT-NOM pattern expanding to some originally DAT-ACC verbs. Here, it is the stative case frame that has expanded onto the originally causal case frame, cf. the causal *gelti* ‘to have stinging/strong pain’ in dialectal (24):

- (24) *Mamyt-ei rank-os gelia*
 mother-DAT hand-NOM.PL sting.PRS.3
 ‘Mother has pain in the hands’ (LKŽ, vide sub *gelti*)

The same development can be observed in non-standard Russian. Here, analogically, the stative conceptualization patterns (such as Standard Russian (25a)) have spread to the causal conceptualization patterns (such as Standard Russian (25b)) yielding non-standard (25c) below:

- (25a) *U teba bolit spin-a* (Standard Russ.)
 with.you ache.PRS.3SG back-NOM
 ‘You have pains in the back.’
- (25b) *U teba sečas kolet spin-u?* (Standard Russ.)
 with.you now stab.PRS.3SG back-ACC
 ‘Do you have stitching pains in the back right now?’¹⁰

¹⁰ <http://forum.toptips.ru/topic2-kak-stat-feei-p182.html>—the relevant verbs is spelled as *kolit* here.

- (25c) *U menja, kogda sižu, spin-a* (Standard Russ.)
 with.me when sit.PRS.1SG back-NOM
kolet.
 stab.PRS.3SG
 ‘I have stitching pains in the back when I am sitting.’¹¹

The explanation in terms of semantics, put forward above, namely, that the merger of the causal type verbs with the stative ones is coherent with the developments in both directions: as soon as both case frames (DAT–NOM and DAT–ACC) became interchangeable with no concomitant change in semantics, both case frames could equally well start spreading across both subclasses of the pain verbs: the stative and the causal one. Hence, this ‘semantic merger’ analysis straightforwardly accounts for the deviation between the expansion of the accusative case marking in the standard language and the expansion of the nominative in dialects. The semantic merger of the two originally different conceptualizations of the pain event leads to the lability of the pain verbs, whereby accusative is more preferred in the standard language while nominative is more preferred in some dialects¹², cf. Table 3:

Table 3. Competition between stative DAT–NOM and causal DAT–ACC

Standard Lithuanian	<i>DAT–NOM → DAT–ACC</i> <i>(spread of the original causal pattern)</i>
Lithuanian dialects and Colloquial Russian	<i>DAT–ACC → DAT–NOM</i> <i>(spread of the original stative pattern)</i>

As Jóhanna Barðdal (p. c.) suggests, both developments could be accounted for in terms of competing motivations. The spread of the stative DAT–NOM pattern can be well accounted for in terms of its high type

¹¹ <http://www.baby.ru/answers/pregnant/category-4718029/question-97062239/>—the relevant verbs is spelled as *kolit* here.

¹² Examples with nominatives quoted by LKŽ stem from Saloméja Nėris, Jonas Jablonskis and from a place in Žemaitija. The attribution to the Western part (from South (Mariampolė district) to the North (Telšiai)) of the Lithuanian area is thus possible but cannot be ascertained at this point.

frequency: the DAT-NOM pattern has a high type frequency among the experiencer verbs in Lithuanian (cf., e. g., Lithuanian *patikti* ‘to like’, *nusibosti* ‘to annoy’, *knietėti* ‘to bother’, *derėti* ‘to fit, suit’, *atrodyti* ‘to seem’, *rūpėti* ‘to take care of’, *sektis* ‘to be successful in’, *tikti* ‘to agree with, accept’, etc.), the DAT-ACC with no slot for a nominative stimulus is exceptional among the experiencer predicates of Lithuanian. Hence, the spread of the DAT-NOM case frame among the originally causal pain verbs can be accounted for in terms of its high type frequency (cf. Barðdal 2008). At the same time, the inverse spread of the originally causal DAT-ACC case frame among the stative verbs of pain (such as *skaudėti*) was facilitated by a canonicization process, by which an argument being reanalyzed as a logical object acquires object properties such as case marking. Indeed, the second argument exhibits a number of semantic properties typical for objects and not for subjects (inherently inanimate, non-causative stimulus/body part). I emphasize that these semantic properties alone do not suffice to account for the acquisition of the accusative case here, since such a general approach would predict that the accusative will be acquired under the same conditions elsewhere as well, which is not the case. To conclude, the cumulative motivation encompassing the semantic merger of the former DAT-NOM and NOM-DAT-ACC pain verbs as suggested above and the drift to canonical argument realization coherently accounts for the acquisition of the ACC by the stative pain verbs.

A brief remark is in order here. The presented analysis illustrates that the acquisition of canonical case marking may not necessarily only happen by Haspelmath’s (2010) ‘Behaviour-before-Coding’ principle but that analogy and semantic merger may instead trigger it (see also Seržant 2013). This principle assumes that first the behavioural and only then the coding properties of a grammatical category are acquired. The body-part argument of the stative pattern with the original DAT-NOM case frame does not exhibit any behavioural object properties, rather only semantic ones. This is why experiencer verbs with the same morphosyntactic structure as *patikti* ‘to like’ (DAT-NOM) are not prone to the acquisition of the canonical accusative case-marking in Lithuanian.

3. Summary

In the present paper, I have examined the rise of canonical object marking by the second, namely, body-part argument of the Lithuanian stative pain verbs *skaudėti* and *sopėti*. I have argued that the acquisition of the canonical case marking is not only stipulated by the general tendency of arguments to acquire canonical case marking and to adjust to the most frequent pattern, but also due to the impact of the originally causal pattern. This pattern was different in terms of semantics to begin with but later lost one of its valences, namely the stimulus valence. This process boiled down the semantic differences between the stative and the causal patterns making the difference in morphosyntactic encoding (DAT–NOM as opposed to DAT–ACC) rather redundant. Languages typically remove redundancy in the course of time. Thus, Standard Lithuanian generalizes the canonical ACC, while dialectally in Lithuanian and in Colloquial Russian sometimes the DAT–NOM pattern replaces the former causal DAT–ACC pattern, being higher in type frequency among the experience predicates.

Ilja A. Seržant

Institute of Lithuanian Language (Vilnius) /

University of Konstanz

Department of Linguistics

Zukunftskolleg, Box 216

D-78457 Konstanz

ilja.serzants@uni-konstanz.de

ABBREVIATIONS

ABL — ablative, ACC — accusative, DAT — dative, ERG — ergative, GEN — genitive, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, LOC — locative, NEG — negation, NOM — nominative, NP — noun phrase, PL — plural, PP — prepositional phrase, PPP — past passive participle, PRS — present, PST — past, SG — singular

REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD, A., R. M. W. DIXON, M. ONISHI 2001, eds., *Non-canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects* (Typological Studies in Language, 46). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins
- ALLEN, CYNTHIA L. 1996: A change in structural case-marking in Early Middle English. In: Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel David Epstein & Steve Peter, eds., *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax 2*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 3–20.
- AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS, EMMA GENIUŠIENĖ, ALEKSAS GIRDENIS, NIJOLĖ SLIŽIENĖ, D. TEKORIENĖ, A. VALECKIENĖ, E. VALIULYTĖ. 1977. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Edited by V. Ambrazas. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS. 2001. On the development of the nominative object in East Baltic. In: Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds., *The Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and Contact*. Vol. 2. *Grammar and Typology*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 391–412.
- ARKADJEVAS, PETRAS. 2008. Lietuvių kalbos pirminių veiksmažodžių klasių semantika tipologinių duomenių kontekste [Semantics of the primary verbal classes in typological context], *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 59, 1–27.
- BARÐDAL, JÓHANNA. 2008. Productivity: Evidence from Case and Argument Structure in Icelandic. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- BARÐDAL, JÓHANNA. 2009. The Development of Case in Germanic. In Jóhanna Barðdal & Shobhana Chelliah, eds., *The Role of Semantic, Pragmatic and Discourse Factors in the Development of Case*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 123–159.
- BHASKARARAO, PERI & KARUMURI VENKATA SUBBARAO, eds. 2004. *Non-nominative subjects*, Vols. 1–2. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- BLAKE, BARRY J. 2001. *Case*. Second edition. Cambridge: University Press.
- BONČ-OSMOLOVSKAJA, ANASTASIJ A., EKATERINA V. RACHILINA & TAT'JANA I. REZNIKOVA. 2009. Glagoly boli: leksičeskaja tipologija i mehanizmy semantičeskoj derivacii [Pain verbs: the lexical

- typology and the mechanisms of semantic derivations]. In: Bricyn *et al.*, eds., 2009, 8–27.
- BOSSONG, GEORG. 1998. Le marquage de l'expérient dans les langues de l'Europe. In Jack Feuillet, ed., *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology; EURO TYP 20–2). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 259–294.
- BRICYN, V. M., E. V. RACHILINA, T. I. REZNIKOVA, G. M. JAVORSKAJA, eds., 2009. *Koncept Bol' v tipologičeskom osveščēnii* [The concept of Pain from a typological perspective]. Kyiv. Vydavnyčyj dim Dmytra Burago.
- CROFT, WILLIAM. 1993. The Semantics of Mental Verbs. In: James Pustejovsky, ed., *Semantics and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 55–72.
- CROFT, WILLIAM. 1998. Event Structure in Argument Linking. In: Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder, eds., *The Projection of Arguments. Lexical and Compositional Factors*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 21–63.
- CROFT, WILLIAM, to appear. Force dynamics and directional change in event lexicalization and argument realization. Manuscript: <http://www.unm.edu/~wcroft/WACpubs.html>.
- DIXON, ROBERT M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FRIED, MIRJAM. 2004. Predicate semantics and event construal in Czech case marking. In: Mirjam Fried & Jan-Ola Östman, eds., *Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective* (Constructional Approaches to Language, 2). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 87–120.
- GIVÓN, TALMY. 1984. *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2010. The Behaviour-before-Coding Principle in syntactic change. In: Franck Floricic, ed., *Mélanges Denis Creisels*. Paris: Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure, 493–506.
- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2009. Difuziniai subjektai ir objektai [Diffuse subjects and objects]. In: Axel Holvoet & Rolandas Mikulskas, eds., *Gramatinių funkcijų prigimtis ir raiška* [The Nature and Expression of Grammatical Functions]. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas ± Asociacija 'Academia Salensis', 37–68.

- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2013. Obliqueness, quasi-subjects and transitivity in Baltic and Slavonic. In: Ilja A. Seržant & Leonid Kulikov, eds., 2013, 257–282.
- DE HOOP, HELEN & PETER SWART. 2008. *Differential subject Marking* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 72). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- KEENAN, EDWARD L. 1976. Towards a universal definition of ‘Subject’. In: Charles Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 303–333.
- KEENAN, EDWARD L. & BERNARD COMRIE. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.1, 63–91.
- KITILÄ, SEPPO. 2002. *Transitivity: Toward a Comprehensive Typology*. Åbo: Åbo Akademiska Tryckeri.
- KOZLOVA, M. S. 2009. Glagol’nyje metafory boli v rusском jazyke [Verbal metaphors of pain in Russian]. In: Bricyn *et al.* 2009, 28–65.
- LAZARD, GILBERT. 1998. Transitivity revisited as an example of a more strict approach in typological research, *Folia Linguistica* 36.3–4, 141–90
- LKŽ — *Lietuvių Kalbos Žodynas* [Dictionary of Lithuanian Language] (<http://www.lkz.lt/startas.htm>)
- MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ. 2005. Case Pattern Splits, Verb Types and Construction Competition. In: Mengistu Amberber & Helen de Hoop, eds., *Competition and Variation in Natural Languages: The Case for Case*. Amsterdam, Boston: Elsevier, 73–118.
- MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ. 2008. Split intransitives, experiencer objects, and ‘transimpersonal’ constructions: (re-)establishing the connection. In: Mark Donohue & Søren Wichmann, eds., *The Typology of Semantic Alignment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 76–101.
- MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ & AKIO OGAWA. 2011. Towards a typology of impersonal constructions. In: Malchukov & Siewierska, eds., 2011, 19–56.
- MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ & ANNA SIEWIERSKA. 2011. *Impersonal Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- PICCINI, SILVIA. 2008. Traces of non-nominative alignment in Lithuanian: the impersonal constructions in Indo-European perspective, *Baltistica* 43.3, 437–461.

- POLLARD, CARL J. & IVAN A. SAG. 1994. *Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago–London: University of Chicago Press.
- PRIMUS, BEATRICE. 1999. *Cases and thematic roles*. Tübingen. Niemeyer.
- SERŽANT, ILJA A. & LEONID KULIKOV, eds., 2013. *The Diachronic Typology of Non-canonical Subjects* (Studies in Language Companion Series, 140). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- SERŽANT, ILJA A. 2013. Rise of Canonical Subjecthood. In: Seržant & Kulikov, eds., 2013, 309–336.
- SERŽANT, ILJA A. & VALGERÐUR BJARNADÓTTIR, to appear: Verbalization and non-canonical case marking of some irregular verbs in *-ē- in Baltic and Russian. In: Artūras Judžentis, Tatyana Civjan and Maria Zavyalova, eds., Proceedings of the International Conference Dedicated to the Academician Vladimir Toporov. The Balts and Slavs: Intersections of Spiritual Cultures. Vilnius.
- SIGURÐSSON, HALLDÓR ÁRMANN. 2006. The Nom/Acc alternation in Germanic. In Jutta Hartmann & Laszlo Molnarfi, eds., *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 13–50.
- THRÁINSSON, HÖSKULDUR, HJALMAR P. PETERSEN, JOGVAN I LON JACOBSEN & ZAKARIS SVABO HANSEN. 2004. *Faroese: An Overview and Reference Grammar*. Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.
- TSUNODA, TASAKU. 1981. Split case-marking in verb types and tense/aspect/mood, *Linguistics* 19, 389–438.
- WUNDERLICH, DIETER & RENATE LAKÄMPER. 2001. On the interaction of structural and semantic case. In: Helen de Hoop, Olaf Koenenman, Iris Mulders, Fred Weerman, eds., *Effects of morphological case*. Special issue of *Lingua*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 377–417.