

Why *byloti dievop* ‘speak to God’, but *prašyti dieviep* ‘ask God’? The Allative and the Adessive with verbs of speaking in Old Lithuanian¹

EGLĖ ŽILINSKAITĖ-ŠINKŪNIENĖ
Vilnius University

The paper aims to investigate the historical usage of two local cases, namely the Allative and the Adessive, governed by *verba dicendi* in Old Lithuanian. In Mikalojus Daukša’s *Postil* (1599) the Allative occurs with verbs of address and denotes the Addressee as a Goal of a verbal act. The Adessive, however, is governed by predicates of request and conveys the Source of a desired item. To verify whether this is part of Daukša’s idiolect or a general feature of Lithuanian at the beginning of its written period, the data from DP are compared to the texts of two other varieties of written Lithuanian of the 16th–17th century: Jonas Bretkūnas’ *Postil* (1591) and Konstantinas Sirvydas’ *Punktų sakimu* (two parts, 1629 and 1644). In order to explain the motivation for this usage, dialectal and typological data are used.

Keywords: local cases, Allative, Adessive, verbs of speaking, Old Lithuanian

0. Introduction

Means of spatial expression are frequently employed to express non-locative meanings, such as time (e.g. *The worst is behind us*, Engberg-Pedersen 1999, 133), emotions (e.g. *We had to cheer him up*, Kövecses 2000, 24), social status (e.g. *He’s at the bottom of the social hierarchy*, Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 16), interpersonal relations, music and sound, mathematics etc. (e.g. *close friends, flat notes, high and low numbers*, Levinson 1992, 5; see also Levinson 2003, 16ff). Researchers within different schools of thought account for this phenomenon in diverse, though not entirely dissimilar, ways.

¹ This paper is based on a talk given at the conference in memory of Marta Rudzite held in Latvia in November 2014. I thank the participants of the conference for the interesting discussion. I am very grateful to two anonymous reviewers as well as to Axel Holvoet for their valuable comments on the previous version of this paper. I am deeply indebted to Inesa Šeškauskienė and Wayles Browne for advice on English usage. All errors and shortcomings are mine.

For example, Ray Jackendoff, the founder of conceptual semantics, claims that human ability to construct abstract notions in terms of concrete is determined by one's experience: a person trying to understand the nature and structure of abstract concepts makes use of his/her knowledge about physical space and spatial concepts. Thus his/her mind adapts the existing mechanism to deal with abstractions (Jackendoff 1983, 188ff).

Cognitivists account for such ability by referring to metaphor, which is based on the idea of embodied cognition and a transfer from a more concrete source domain to a more abstract target domain; i.e. on a cross-domain mapping (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 14ff). For example, the metaphor *TIME IS SPACE* seems to be convincingly proved by Haspelmath's typological research (Haspelmath 1997). Space is also important when attempting to account for our expression of emotions; as claimed by Kövecses (Kövecses 2000, 36), it is among the source domains that apply to all emotional concepts. *CONTAINER*, a more specific source domain, is "the major metaphorical source for emotions" that applies to most emotional concepts (idem, 36f).

Linguists working on grammaticalization claim that one of the main causes of grammaticalization is a human need to identify abstract and complex concepts, which is done referring to concrete elements and is reflected in language evolution. For example, body-part terms may evolve into means of spatial expression and subsequently, into expression of time, etc. (Heine & Kuteva 2007, 233).² Means of expressing location are among those which frequently become the source of grammaticalization (see Source-Target Lexicon in Heine & Kuteva 2002). The process usually involves lexical elements evolving into the grammatical subsystem as well as the context-induced reinterpretation of the lexical element. The first mechanism is important when researching the evolution of Lithuanian postpositional local cases, whereas the second, semantic bleaching by way of context-induced reinterpretation, is relevant when analysing their models of polysemy.

² For more on body-part terms evolving into spatial grams in a typological perspective see Svorou (1993).

1. Spatial cases and verbs of speaking in Old and Modern Lithuanian

Before moving on to the analysis of the Adessive and the Allative with verbs of speaking, the semantics and scope of usage of local cases as well as the morphosyntax of *verba dicendi* should be defined in Old Lithuanian and nowadays.

1.1. Spatial cases

In Old Lithuanian,³ four local cases—Inessive, Illative, Adessive and Allative—are attested. Traditionally, they are referred to as ‘postpositional’ local cases since they developed once the particular postpositions were affixed to the inherited case forms (for more on formation see Zinkevičius 1996, 111–113). Usually the Inessive and the Illative are called ‘inner’ local cases whereas the Adessive and the Allative are ‘outer’ local cases. They are also differentiated in terms of location vs. motion.

Table 1. The traditional approach to Old Lithuanian local cases

	Interior	Exterior
Stasis	INESSIVE: <i>miške</i> ‘in the forest’	ADESSIVE: <i>miškiop</i> ‘next to the forest’
Kinesis	ILLATIVE: <i>miškan</i> ‘into the forest’	ALLATIVE: <i>miškop</i> ‘to the forest’

The usage of each case can be illustrated with examples from Daukša’s *Postil* (1599; hereafter referred to as DP):

³ Written Lithuanian dates from the 16th century. The old period encompasses two stages of the written language: the 16th–17th century and the 18th century. In the 16th–17th century three varieties or traditions of written Lithuanian existed: the written language in Lithuania Minor (or the Duchy of Prussia) and two variants in Lithuania Major (or the Grand Duchy of Lithuania), i.e. Central and Eastern (for more see Zinkevičius 1996, 227–255). This article deals with data from the first stage of the old period and provides examples from all three varieties of Old Lithuanian.

- (1) *sedėi-au moki-dam-as bažnūčž-ioi* 154₃₂⁴ ~
 sit-PST.1SG teach-CVB-M.SG church-INESS.SG
šiedžia-t-em vcž-ac w košciel-e 160₃₃⁵
 sit-PST-M.1SG teach-PRS.CVB in church-LOC.SG
 ‘I sat teaching in church.’
- (2) *sedėi-o fkom-iėip’ wienūlik-a mokitin-iu:* 226₁₅ ~
 sit-PST.3 table-AD.SG eleven-NOM.SG pupil-GEN.PL
šiedžia-t-o v ftoł-u iedennaście vcžni-ow 235₁
 sit-PST-N.SG at table-GEN.SG eleven pupil-GEN.PL
 ‘Eleven disciples were sitting at the table.’
- (3) [*Pilot-as*] *i-ėi-o wel’ Rōtuš-ion’* 167a₂ ~
 [Pilate-NOM.SG] PFV-go-PST.3 again city.hall-ILL.SG
w-βed-t žās w Ratuš 175₇
 PFV-go-PST.M.SG again to city.hall.ACC.SG
 ‘Pilate entered the city hall again.’
- (4) *Chrift-us t-ū mēt-ū miėst-oḗ ėi-o /*
 Christ-NOM.SG that-INS.SG.M time-INS.SG TOWN-ALL.SG go-PST.3
kađ t-u numírel-i láido-tu néβ-e 335₇ ~
 when that-ACC.SG deceased-ACC.SG bury-SUP carry-PST.3
Chryftus ná ten cžás do miáft-á
 Christ.NOM.SG on that.ACC.SG.M time.ACC.SG to TOWN-GEN.SG
przy-chodži-t 345₄₆
 PFV-go-PST.M.SG
 ‘Christ was going to town at the time when the deceased was carried to be buried.’

However, Old Lithuanian writings evidence some deviations from this ideal model of spatial meanings. These are particularly characteristic of the Adessive (this will be discussed to a greater extent in section 4.1 about the general properties of the Adessive). Moreover, all four local cases were also used in non-locative contexts and exhibited a high level of multifunctionality. And, furthermore, they coexisted and to some ex-

⁴ The first number indicates the page and the second (subscript) number specifies the line of the book. The sign ∞ after the page number shows that the example is a part of pericopes.

⁵ DP was translated from Polish to Lithuanian from the third edition of *Lesser Postil (Postrilla Catholica Mnieyza*, hereafter referred to as WP) by Jacob Wujek of 1590. Therefore, Polish equivalents are provided after the Lithuanian syntagms with the local cases. DP syntagms are given from the electronic version of the text, while the Polish text is taken from Palionis (2000). The translation is given for the Lithuanian text only.

tent competed with the prepositional phrases that ousted the spatial cases from usage over time.

In Modern Lithuanian spatial relations are mostly expressed by numerous prepositional phrases and by the Locative case, which is the former Inessive. Locative, together with Nominative, Genitive, Dative, Accusative and Instrumental, constitutes the case system of Modern Lithuanian. The Illative traditionally is not considered as a part of it any more, even though it is possible to use any noun in this case. In comparison to the prototypically Goal-denoting preposition [i + ACC] ‘to, into’, the phrases with the Illative are stylistically marked except for some collocations, e.g.

- (5) *pa-trauk-ti* *baudžiam-ojon* *atsakomyb-èn*
 PFV-draw-INF criminal-ILL.SG.DEF responsibility-ILL.SG
 ‘to prosecute’

The Allative is preserved only in some adverbs (e.g. *vakar-op* ‘towards evening’, *veln-iop* ‘to the devil’, *gal-op* ‘at the end’, *pavasariop* ‘towards spring’) while the Adessive is fully extinct. However, in some Lithuanian dialects the situation is slightly different. The Illative is widely used in most Eastern and Southern Aukštaitian dialects, but the Allative and the Adessive occur in Lithuanian dialects in Belarus (the isolated Lithuanian linguistic islands Gervėčiai, Lazūnai and Zietela) or in a very few dialects of Eastern Aukštaitija where the remnants of the ‘outer’ local cases have been preserved (Arumaa 1930; džž; Laigonaitė 1957; Senkus 1959; Zinkevičius 1966, 200–203; zšž).

1.2. Verbs of speaking

Verba dicendi are not a homogeneous group. According to the relationship between the Agent and the Addressee, predicates fall into at least two semantic groups. The first includes verbs of address, such as *byloti* ‘tell’, *kalbėti* ‘speak’, *sakyti* ‘say’. They denote the transfer of information by the Agent to the Addressee. The second group encompasses verbs of request, such as *klausti* ‘ask’, *prašyti* ‘request’, *melsti* ‘pray for [i.e. ask for something earnestly, beg]’. They identify the verbal act and also imply the probability of a reaction on the part of the Addressee.

In Modern Lithuanian verbs of address prototypically govern the Dative for expressing the meaning of Addressee (6) while verbs of request

take either the Accusative (7) or the Genitive (8), the latter conveying the meaning of the Source of a desired item, e.g.

- (6) *Bū-dam-as Viln-iuje pas Vytaut-q, karal-ius*
 be-CVB-M.SG Vilnius-LOC.SG at Vytautas-ACC.SG king-NOM.SG
Jogail-a kalbėj-o broli-iii. (LKT)
 Jogaila-NOM.SG speak-PST.3 brother-DAT.SG
 ‘Being at Vytautas’ place in Vilnius Jogaila spoke to his brother.’
- (7) *Atsisveikin-dam-as kareiv-is praš-ė*
 say.goodbye-CVB-M.SG soldier-NOM.SG ask-PST.3
Humbolt-q užtar-ti j-į ger-u
 Humboldt-ACC.SG intercede-INF he-ACC.SG good-INS.SG.M
žodž-iu sostin-ėje. (LKT)
 word-INS.SG capital-LOC.SG
 ‘Saying goodbye the soldier asked Humboldt to intercede for him with a kind word in the capital.’
- (8) *Lažin-uo-si, kad j-ie tav-ęs praš-ė*
 bet-PRS.1SG-RFL that they-NOM.PL.M you-GEN.SG ask-PST.3
pinig-ų— kaip visada. (LKT)
 money-GEN.PL as always
 ‘I bet that they asked you for money—as always.’

The verbs of asking or seeking may also appear with the prepositional phrase [iš + GEN] with the ablatival meaning ‘from’:

- (9) *Kelion-ei pinig-ų iš Seim-o praš-ė*
 trip-DAT.SG money-GEN.PL from Seimas-GEN.SG ask-PST.3
rem-dam-as-is Užsien-io reikal-ų
 refer-CVB-M.SG-RFL abroad-GEN.SG affair-GEN.PL
komitet-o sprendim-u. (LKT)
 committee-GEN.SG decree-INS.SG
 ‘He asked for travel money from the Seimas, citing the decree of the Committee of Foreign Affairs.’

In Old Lithuanian different verbs of address prototypically governed the Dative and the Allative, the former being the predominant means (ex. 10, 11 and 13; more on their correlation see Ambrasas 2006, 263f; Bukantytė 2007, 90ff; Gelumbeckaitė 2002, 72tt; Kavaliūnaitė 2003, 40; Range 1995, 96tt; Rosinas 2001, 140tt), but verbs of request or inquiry usually governed the Accusative (12) and the Genitive (13), sometimes

also the prepositional phrases [*nuog* + GEN] ‘from’ (14) or [*tarp* + GEN] ‘among’ (13). Although rare, the Adessive was another alternative expression for the Source of a desired item (15). All these means can be illustrated by examples from Daukša’s *Postil* (1599):

- (10) *biði-o Ief-us min-iómus / ir an-úmp*
 speak-PST.3 Jesus-NOM.SG crowd-DAT.PL and that-ALL.PL
kur-ié búw-o at-êi-ę i-op 154₂₉ ~
 which-NOM.PL.M AUX-PST PFV-go-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M he-ALL.SG
mowi-ł Iezus rzeß-ami / y do nich
 speak-PST.M.SG Jesus.NOM.SG crowd-INS.PL and to they.GEN.PL
ktorz-y by-l-i przyß-l-i do
 which-NOM.PL.VIR AUX-PST-VIR.PL come-PST-VIR.PL to
niego 160_{30t}
 he.GEN
 ‘Jesus spoke to the crowds and to those who had come to him.’
- (11) *taw-ęþ katb-u* 585₄ ~
 you-ALL.SG speak-PRS.1SG
do ciebie mowi-ę 631₄₃
 to you.GEN.SG speak-PRS.1SG
 ‘I am speaking to you.’
- (12) *k-o man-é klauf-i Klauf-k t-ús*
 what-GEN I-ACC ask-PRS.2SG ask-IMP.2SG that-ACC.PL.M
kur-ié girdêi-o / k-a aß biði-eu 158₁₀ ~
 which-NOM.PL.M hear-PST.3 what-ACC I.NOM tell-PST.1SG
co mnié pyta-ß? pyta-y tych
 what.ACC I.ACC ask-PRS.2SG ask-IMP.2SG that.ACC.PL.VIR
ktorz-y ftyße-l-i 164₁₉
 which-NOM.PL.VIR hear-PST-VIR.PL
 ‘Why are you asking me? Ask those who heard what I said.’
- (13) [*Mokin-iai*] *i-o* [*Jéz-aus*] *norêi-o klauf-t’/*
 [Disciples-NOM.PL] he-GEN.SG [Jesus-GEN.SG] want-PST.3 ask-INF
ir tár-e i-iémus: Ape tai klauf-ete-ś
 and tell-PST.3 they-DAT.M about this.ACC ask-PRS.2PL-RFL
tarp’ faw-és 211₃[∞] ~
 among self-GEN
go chcie-l-i pyta-ć / y rzek-ł im:
 he.ACC.SG want-PST-VIR.PL ask-INF and tell-PST.M.SG they.DAT.PL

O tym fię pyta-ćie między sobą 219₂
 about that.LOC RFL ask-PRS.2PL among self.INS

‘The disciples wanted to ask him, but he [Jesus] told them: You are asking each other about that.’

- (14) *žmôn-es Ifráel-o / k-o-g W. Díew-as*
 people-NOM.PL Israel-GEN.SG what-GEN-PRT the Lord God-NOM.SG
trôkšt-a / núg iúf-u 94₄₃ ~
 desire-PRS.3 from you-GEN. PL
cžego-ž Pan Bog tvoj
 what-GEN-PRT Lord.NOM.SG God.NOM.SG your.NOM.SG.M
žada po tobie 96₇
 desire.PRS.3SG after you.LOC.SG

‘People of Israel, what does [the Lord] God want from you?’

- (15) *šeš-í dáikt-ai yra / kur-íe pig-ái*
 six-NOM.PL.M thing-NOM.PL be.PRS.3 which-NOM.PL.M easy-ADV
Díew-íep iš-prášt-o núdem-ių atłaidím-a 361₄₀ ~
 God-AD.SG PFV-ask-PRS.3 sin-GEN.PL forgiveness-ACC.SG
ktor-e łácn-o v Bog-á vprašá-ia
 which-NOM.PL.NVIR easy-ADV at God-GEN.SG ask-PRS.3PL
grzech-ow odpuszczeni-e 373₂₂
 sin-GEN.PL forgiveness-ACC.SG

‘There are six things that easily grant absolution from God.’

The next sections will deal with the historical usage of the Allative and the Adessive governed by the *verba dicendi*.

2. Allative and Adessive with verbs of speaking

As was mentioned previously, Old Lithuanian spatial cases were widely used in non-spatial contexts. One such context refers to clauses where the two local cases—the Allative and the Adessive—are governed by *verba dicendi* and mark oblique objects. In Daukša’s *Postil* predicates of address govern, among other cases, the Allative, and verbs of request, in addition to complements realized otherwise, govern the Adessive. To verify whether this is part of Daukša’s idiolect or a general feature of Lithuanian at the beginning of its written period, the data from DP are compared to the texts of two other varieties of written Lithuanian of the 16th–17th century: Jonas Bretkūnas’ *Postil* (1591; hereafter referred to as BP) and

Konstantinas Sirvydas' *Punktay sakimu* (two parts, 1629 and 1644; hereafter referred to as *PS*). For the sake of comparison and in order to understand the motivation for the use of case forms, dialectal and typological data are used. The latter is taken either from extensive cross-linguistic studies or reference grammars of different languages.

3. The Allative with verbs of address

3.1. The general functions of the Allative

In *DP*, the Allative has four locative meanings. In contexts with verbs of motion it usually encodes the following:

1. Direction of motion, i.e. Goal without specifying the Ground's⁶ interior or exterior. The Allative in this meaning is characteristic of nouns referring to a three-dimensional container or part of space (the lexemes *namai* 'home', *miestas* 'town', *šalis* 'country', *tėvykštė*, *tėvykščia* 'native land') whereto the Figure (person) is moving, e.g.

- (16) *ei-túmb-ei nam-opi 35*₂₂ ~
 go-COND-2SG home-ALL.SG
*βed-t do dom-u 34*₄₉
 go-PST.M.SG to home-GEN.SG
 'You would go home.'

If the Goal of motion is reached (i.e. the location of the Figure and the Ground coincide at the endpoint of motion), another spatial case, namely, the Illative, or the prepositional phrase [*ing* + ACC] 'to, into' are used, cf.

- (17) *min-ía žíd-u [...] griž-o nam-úfn'* 181₃₉ ~
 crowd-NOM.SG Jew-GEN.PL return-PST.3 home-ILL.PL
*wracá-l-i fię do dom-u 190*₁
 return-PST-VIR.PL RFL to home-GEN.SG
 'The crowd of the Jews returned home.'
- (18) *Su-gri-β-iú ing nam-ús man-ús 118*₇ ~
 PFV-return-FUT-1SG into home-ACC.PL my-ACC.PL.M
*Wroc-ę fię do dom-u mego 125*₁₂
 return-FUT.1SG RFL to home-GEN.SG my.GEN.SG.M
 'I will return to my home.'

⁶ In this paper, the term *Figure* will be employed to refer to an object which is being located; the term *Ground* will be employed as a reference object to locate the Figure (Talmy 1972).

2. Vicinal Goal, e.g. Goal of motion in the Ground's proximity.⁷ The Figure (usually a person) is moving towards the inanimate Ground where the motion is completed, e.g.

- (19) [*Viešpat-s*] *krikšti-tu-s* *Iordón-op* *at-êi-o* 424₁₀ ~
 Lord-NOM.SG baptize-SUP-RFL Jordan-ALL.SG PFV-go-PST.3
chrzści-ć *fię* *do Iordan-u* *przy-βed-ł* 438₃₈
 baptize-INF RFL to Jordan-GEN.SG PFV-go-PST.M.SG
 'The Lord came to the Jordan to be baptized.'

3. Vicinal Goal of motion in a person's physical sphere. The Figure (person) is moving towards the environment or habitat of the animate Ground expressed by the Allative, e.g.

- (20) *Żid-ai* *vż-êi-e* *fu* *Wiešpat-imi*
 Jew-NOM.PL PFV-go-PST.PA.NOM.PL.M with Lord-INS.SG
Iéz-umi *Annaš-euřp* 159₃₃ ~
 Jesus-INS.SG Annas-ALL.SG
Żyd-owie *sftapi-wřsy* *z* *Pán-em* *Iezuf-em* *do*
 Jew-NOM.PL step-PST.CVB with Lord-INS.SG Jesus-INS.SG to
Annaš-á 165₃₇
 Annas-GEN.SG
 'The Jews came with Lord Jesus to Annas.'

4. Goal of direction or orientation. The Figure is static, its orientation or extension towards the Ground is given, e.g.

- (21) *įž-tief-eu* *iuf-úmp* *raq-ás* *faw-ás* 964 ~
 PFV-spread-PST.1SG you-ALL.PL arms-ACC.PL own-ACC.PL.F
wyciąga-ł-em *ku* *wam* *ręc-e*
 stretch.out-PST-M.1SG towards you.DAT.PL arm-ACC.PL
fwoi-e 9716
 self's-ACC.PL.NVIR
 'I have spread my arms towards you.'

In addition to the above locative meanings, the Allative in DP also could encode Time, Abstract Goal of motion (state or emotion), Address-

⁷ The term Vicinal Goal is introduced by Kittilä & Ylikoski (2011). It indicates the endpoint of direction without the coincidence of the Figure and the Ground, whereas the semantic role of Goal requires such a coincidence. I thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to me.

ee, Emotional Target, Recipient, Standard of Comparison, Possessor or Purpose. It could also acquire an additive meaning or become a discourse organizing element: governed by *eiti* ‘go’, *prieiti(s)* ‘approach’, *sugrižti* ‘return’ the Allative denotes the topic of discourse (for more see Žilinskaitė 2010).

3.2. The Allative of the Addressee in Daukša’s *Postil*

In DP, the Allative of the Addressee is used 258 times, which accounts for ca. 13% of all occurrences of the Allative. The case is governed by the verbs *aprašyti* ‘accuse’, *byloti* ‘tell’, *įsistoti* ‘intercede’, *kalbėti* ‘speak’, *melstis* ‘speak to God, pray’, *prakalbti* ‘start speaking’, *rašyti* ‘write’, *šaukti* ‘shout’, *tarti* ‘pronounce’ and the nouns *atsakymas* ‘reply’, *įstojimas* ‘defense’, *malda* ‘prayer’, *meldimas* ‘praying’, *pasveikinimas* ‘greeting’, *sakymas* ‘saying’, *sentencija* ‘maxim’, *gromata* ‘letter’, *žodžiai* ‘words’. It corresponds to the Polish prepositions [*do* + GEN] ‘to’ (88.5% of all instances), [*ku/k* + DAT] ‘in the direction’ (8.8%), [*na* + ACC] ‘on’ (1.5%, always with the verb ‘shout’, i.e. Polish *wolac*) and to the Dative (1.2%), e.g.

- (22) *pradėi-o Iėj-us biłô-t min-iúmp ape*
begin-PST.3 Jesus-NOM.SG speak-INF crowd-ALL.PL about
Iôn-a 17₁₁ ~
John-ACC.SG
zácž-a-t Iezus mowi-ć do rzeß-ey o
begin-PST.M.SG Jesus.NOM.SG speak-INF to crowd-GEN.PL about
Iani-e 17₁
John-LOC.SG
‘Jesus began to speak to the crowds about John.’
- (23) *biłoi-o Iej-us min-iúmp 368₁ ~*
speak-PST.3 Jesus-NOM.SG crowd-ALL.PL
mowi-t Iezus ku tłußcz-am 380_{1-2}}
speak-PST.M.SG Jesus.NOM.SG towards crowd-DAT.PL
‘Jesus spoke to the crowds.’
- (24) *W. Chrįft-us ßáuk-ia muf-úmp 319₁₈ ~*
[The Lord] Christ-NOM.SG shout-PRS.3 we-ALL.PL
Pan Chryftus wola ná nas 329_{12}}
Lord.NOM.SG Christ.NOM.SG shout.PRS.3 on we.ACC
‘Jesus Christ is shouting to us.’

- (25) [Jéz-us] tár-e mókitin-ioþ 173₂ ~
 Jesus-NOM.SG say-PST.3 pupil-ALL.SG
 rzek-ł vcžni-owi 182₁₂
 say-PST.M.SG pupil-DAT.SG
 ‘Jesus said to his pupil.’

In contexts with verbs of address the Allative of the Addressee competes with the Dative of the Addressee, cf. the syntagms with the verb *kalbėti* ‘speak’:

- (26) *idánt’ miłé-tumb-it’ iûf-umþ kalb-ant-i* 576₄₀ ~
 in.order.that love-COND-2PL you-ALL.PL speak-PRS.PA-ACC.SG.M
áby = ście miłowa-l-i do was
 in.order.that = 2PL love-PST-VIR.PL to you.GEN.PL
mowi-ac-ego 623₃₆
 speak-PRS.PA-ACC.SG.M
 ‘In order that you should love the one who is speaking to you.’
- (27) *Tatái i-umus kalbêi-au / idant ne*
 this.ACC you-DAT.PL speak-PST.1SG in.order.that NEG
píktin-tumb-ite-ś 231₂₇[∞] ~
 resent-COND-2PL-RFL
To mowi-ł-em wam / áby = ście fię
 that.ACC speak-PST-1SG.M you.DAT.PL in.order.that = 2PL RFL
nie zgorŕy-l-i 240₂[∞]
 NEG resent-PST-VIR.PL
 ‘I told you that so that you should not be offended.’

When translating *Postil*, Daukša mostly adhered to the verbatim translation. Therefore, the choice of the Dative and the Allative was mainly determined by the Polish source. As Polish verbs of speaking govern either the Dative or prepositional phrases [*do* + GEN] ‘to’ (sometimes also [*ku/k* + DAT] ‘in the direction’ and [*na* + ACC] ‘on’), Daukša offers the Allative where the Polish prepositions are used, but the Dative in the instances where the Polish version has it, cf.

- (28) [Pilot-as] tár-e Iéf-aufp: iž kur tu? O
 Pilate-NOM.SG say-PST.3 Jesus-ALL.SG from where you.NOM but
 Iéf-us nô-t-fak-e i-am’ 167b(167)₃ ~
 Jesus-NOM.SG NEG.PFV-say-PST.3 he-DAT.SG

[*Pilat*] *rzek-ł* *do Iezuf-a:* *Skąd = eś*
 Pilate.NOM.SG say-PST.M.SG to JESUS-GEN.SG whence = 2SG
ty? *A Iezus* *nie da-ł* *mu*
 you.NOM but JESUS.NOM.SG NEG give-PST.M.SG he.DAT.SG
odpowiedz-i 175₈
 answer-GEN.SG
 ‘[Pilate] said to Jesus: where are you from? But Jesus did not
 answer him.’

The Polish Dative has been translated as the Allative by Daukša only in three instances⁸, the Polish construction [*do* + GEN] has been only sporadically rendered as the Dative, e.g.:

(29) *tár-e* *i-iémus* 381₆ ~
 say-PST.3 they-DAT.M.PL
rzek-ł *do nich* 394₅₄
 say-PST.M.SG to they.GEN.PL
 ‘[He] said to them.’

3.3. The Allative of the Addressee in other old writings and dialects

Besides DP, the Allative of the Addressee is also characteristic of other texts of the 16th–17th century, see Range (1995, 96ff), Kavaliūnaitė (2003, 40, on the Allative of the Addressee in the *New Testament* translated by Chylinski), Gelumbeckaitė (2002, 72ff, on the *Gospel of Luke* translated by Bretkūnas), Ambrasas (2006, 263f); Bukantytė (2007, 90ff, on the *New Testament* translated by Bretkūnas). The Allative of the Addressee also appears in the original preface to the *Catechism* by Martynas Mažvydas (1547):

(30) *Knigi-el-es* *Pacz-ias* *byl-a* *Letuuinik-ump*
 book-DIM-NOM.PL self-NOM.PL.F speak-PRS.3 Lithuanian-ALL.PL
jr *Szemaicz-iump*
 and Samogitian-ALL.PL
 ‘The books themselves speak to Lithuanians and Samogitians.’

⁸ In addition to the above instance, there are two more: *Ir táre ioj Iéfus* 148₂₇ ~ *Y rzekł mu Iezus* 154₁₂ ‘And Jesus said to her’; *Táre tad mótinofj fawójj* 173₁ ~ *Rzekł Mátce fwoiey* 182₁₁ ‘And then [Jesus] said to his mother’.

The distribution of the Allative of the Addressee and the Dative in **BP** and **PS** is given in Table 2.

Table 2. The distribution of the Allative of the Addressee and the Dative in DP, BP and PS

Verb	DP		BP		PS	
	Allative	Dative	Allative	Dative	Allative	Dative
<i>aprašyti</i> ‘accuse’	1	–	–	2	1	–
<i>byloti</i> ‘tell’	104	116	92	164	5	9
<i>įsistoti</i> ‘intercede’	11	–	–	–	–	–
<i>kalbėti</i> ‘speak’	12	22	5	112	5	3
<i>melsti(s)</i> ‘pray’	6	11	2	3 ⁹	1	6
<i>prakalbti</i> ‘start speaking’	2	–	–	–	–	–
<i>rašyti</i> ‘write’	9	2	3	3	–	2
<i>sakyti</i> ‘say’	–	97	9	149	–	14
<i>šaukti</i> ‘shout’	17	–	22	4	1	–
<i>tarti</i> ‘pronounce’	72	253	3	3	16	56
Total	234	501	136	440	29	90

The Allative of the Addressee is also characteristic of Lithuanian dialects in Belarus and some particular dialects of Eastern and Southern Aukštaitija where the ‘outer’ local cases have been preserved. Laigonaitė, who has researched dialects of Gervėčiai, Lazūnai and Zietela, claims that “sometimes it [the Allative] is also used with verbs which are somewhat related to the concept of speaking” (Laigonaitė 1957, 35), e.g.

⁹ The verb *melsti(s)* ‘pray’ in **BP** usually governs the Accusative (46×) or the Genitive (24×).

- (31) *Vien-a merg-a ūtarij-a kit-os*¹⁰
 one-NOM.SG.F girl-NOM.SG speak-PRS.3 other-ALL.SG.F
 ‘One girl says to the other.’

However, there is also another means of expressing the directive meaning in the function of the Addressee, namely, the preposition [*ingi* + ACC] ‘to’ and the Dative,¹¹ e.g.

- (32) *sak-o in-gi dzied-ū*
 say-PRS.3 to-PRT man-ACC.SG
 ‘One says to a man.’ (example from Dieveniškės, also see DŠŽ II 209)

- (33) *sak-o sav-o dukter-ai*
 say-PRS.3 own-GEN.SG daughter-DAT.SG
 ‘One says to his/her daughter.’ (example from Dieveniškės)

3.4. The Allative of the Addressee from a typological perspective

In languages which are equipped with the Allative case it usually designates an Addressee, e.g. in Finno-Ugric: Finnish (Karlsson 1999, 120; Västi 2011, 70), Hungarian (Rounds, 2001, 109), Votic (Ariste 1968, 27), Veps (Brodskij 2008, 42¹²). Grams in the meaning of the Goal of motion encode the Addressee in Nakh-Daghestanian languages (Ganenkov 2002, 53; Testelefs 2008, 44f; Forker 2010, 1089, see also Figure 1 on p. 1102), Germanic and Romance languages (e.g. English *to*, Haspelmath 2003; French *à*, Kilroe 1997).

The polysemy and patterns of grammaticalization of Goal-marking morphemes have been revealed by an investigation of 44 languages (Rice & Kabata 2007). Besides the domain of locative meanings, they are characterized by expansion into mental, social, temporal, and logical-textual domains. The Addressee as well as the Recipient, the Benefactive, the Possessive, the Passive Agent, the Human Source of Transfer, the Cause

¹⁰ *kitos* < *kitosp*; the example is from Lazūnai.

¹¹ As it was already noted, the Dative is a typical means for this function in Standard Lithuanian, but [*i* + ACC] is used to denote the Goal (inanimate endpoint of motion reached by the Figure). Its usage to encode the Addressee is dialectal only.

¹² In this research the meaning of the Addressee is referred to as the Possessive.

and the Comitative represent the social domain. In it, according to the authors, the locative meaning is first of all extended to the meaning of the Recipient, since its role is performed by nouns referring to persons, which are “spatial endpoints of physical transfer” (idem, 482). Only later can the meanings of the Addressee and the Benefactive evolve. Ganenkov also claims that from the diachronic point of view the meaning of the Addressee must have evolved from the Recipient, since in many Dagestian languages the Addressee has preserved the same form as the Recipient (Ganenkov 2002, 53).¹³

Typological research (idem; also see Narrog 2010; Schmidke-Bode 2010; Västi 2011) has shown that morphemes referring to the Goal of motion may acquire a number of very different meanings. According to Forker, who investigated nonlocal uses of local cases in the Tsezic languages, “the less specific the spatial meaning of a case is, the more grammatical functions it has and vice versa” (Forker 2010, 1104). This statement can be equally applied to the Allative in Old Lithuanian in which the schematic meaning of Goal motivates the vast majority of its abstract functions: the Addressee of speaking is perceived not as a Goal of motion but of a verbal act.

4. The Adessive with verbs of request

4.1. The general functions of the Adessive

The meaning of the Adessive is traditionally described as location in proximity to an object (Zinkevičius 1996, 106; Ambrazas 2006, 265, *inter alia*) or in terms of the differential features *state* and *exterior* (Rosinas 1995, 54). Many researchers claim that the Adessive in the texts of the 16th–17th century was almost extinct; some authors confused it with the Inessive (Laigonaitė 1957, 27; Ambrazas 2006, 265; Gelumbeckaitė 2002, 96) or the Allative (Rosinas 2001, 136ff) or they sometimes failed to identify shades of meaning of static cases (Palionis 1967, 170). However, as claimed by Kavaliūnaitė (2001, 109), Chyliński was well aware of the distinction between the Adessive and the Inessive. Its usage in the *New*

¹³ As already mentioned, in DP the Allative is characterized by the meaning of the Recipient (the Allative in this meaning is governed by the verbs *atsiusti* ‘send’, *atnešti* ‘bring’, *nunešti* ‘take’, e.g., *neščiōiimę [sakramento] ligōniumų* 140₄₁ ~ *w nošeniū do chorych* 147₂₀, ‘in carrying the sacrament to ill people’). However, it is not frequent, since the role of a Recipient is usually performed by the Dative.

Testament translated by Chyliński depends solely on the feature of animacy: “the opposition between the Inessive and the Adessive is based on animacy rather than spatial relationship”, “the Inessive and the Adessive are two variants of the same case. The Adessive is a variant of the Inessive, characteristic of nominals referring to animate entities” (Kavaliūnaitė 2003, 46; also see Smoczyński 2001).

In principle, the close link between the Adessive and the category of animacy is obvious. It was first noticed by Zinkevičius: “the Adessive used to be employed when discussing animate entities; in old writings, such usage accounts for 70–100% of all instances” (Zinkevičius 1982, 33). This feature is characteristic of all old writings, including *DP*. However, in the latter source the usage of the Adessive is not only motivated by the feature of animacy. *DP* also attests to the primary locative meaning of proximity to an object (for more see Žilinskaitė 2007), e.g.

- (34) *W.* *Christ-us* [...] *stów-i* *dúr-ifiamp̃* *mufu* 45₄₉ ~
 [The Lord] Christ-NOM.SG stand-PRS.3 door-AD.PL our
ktor-y *stoi* *v drzw-i* *náß-yh* 45₁₁
 which-NOM.SG.M stand.PRS.3SG at door-GEN.PL our-GEN.PL
 ‘Christ is standing at our door.’
- (35) [*Viešpat-is*] *Iš-wīd-o* *hór-u* *pá-žeif-t-a*
 Lord-NOM.SG PFV-see-PST.3 disease-INS.SG PFV-harm-PST.PP-ACC.SG
sožeuk-aiþ 335₄₈ ~
 pond-AD.SG
Vyžrza-t *powietrz-em* *záráž-onego* *v*
 glance-PST.M.SG disease-INS.SG infect-PST.PP.ACC.SG at
fadzówk-i 346₃₄
 pond-GEN.SG
 ‘The Lord saw a diseased man at the pond.’

In ex. 34 and 35, the Adessive is Ground in reference to which Figure is located.

The above meaning of the Adessive is locative and etymological; however, in *DP* it appears in the periphery of the meanings of the Adessive and accounts for ca. 9% of all instances of usage. But in most other occurrences, the Adessive is characteristic of nominals referring to animate entities; therefore, the Figure is seen as located in the environment, territory or personal sphere of the Ground rather than the proximity between Figure and Ground (ex. 36). Such [animate] Adessive also designates the

Evaluator (*adessivus iudicantis*, ex. 37), Possessor (38) or Experiencer (39); when used with verbs of request, it might also express the Source of a desired item.

- (36) *Wießpat-is Iéf-us yra Pharizeuf-ieþ*
 Lord-NOM.SG JESUS-NOM.SG be.PRS.3 pharisee-AD.SG
ant' piet-ų 478₃₀ ~
 at dinner-GEN.PL
Pan IEžus ieft v Pháryzeuþ-á
 Lord.NOM.SG JESUS.NOM.SG be.PRS.3SG at pharisee-GEN.SG
ná obiedži-e 512₁₀'
 at dinner-LOC.SG
 'Lord Jesus is at a Pharisee's place for dinner.'
- (37) *Ir t-afs-ái lúm-as Žíd-ųfiamp bū łąbái*
 and that-NOM.SG-DEF estate-NOM.SG Jew-GEN.PL be.PST.3 very
þwént-as 137₄₄ ~
 sacred-NOM.SG.M
A ten ftan v Žyd-ow by-t
 and that.NOM.SG.M estate.NOM.SG at Jew-AD.PL be-PST.M.SG
bardzo święt-y 144₃₆'
 very sacred-NOM.SG.M
 'This estate was very sacred among Jews [i.e. for Jews].'
- (38) *Néffq teip' didž-ių gēr-ių ner'*
 because such great-GEN.PL pleasure-GEN.PL be.NEG.PRS.3
ir muf-imp' 615₃₅ ~
 and we-AD
Abowiem tak wielk-ich rofkoþ-y nie máþ
 because such great-GEN.PL pleasure-GEN.PL not have.PRS.2SG
áni v nas 528₁₂
 and at we.GEN
 'Because we do not have such great pleasures either.'
- (39) *Wießpat-is Diéw-as mus-imp giwên-a 233₁₃ ~*
 Lord-NOM.SG God-NOM.SG we-AD live-PRS.3
Pan BOG w nas mieþka 242₂
 Lord.NOM.SG God.NOM.SG in we.LOC live.PRS.3SG
 'Lord God lives in us.'

4.2. The Adessive with verbs of request in Daukša's *Postil*

The Adessive in the meaning of the Source of a desired item is only used in some specific syntagms N1NOM + V + N2ACC /GEN + N3AD where N2 and N3 mark Figure and Ground respectively; the verb expresses a request (such as *klausti*, *išklausti*, *klaustis* 'ask', *prašyti*, *išprašyti* 'request'), e.g.

- (40) *dwiei-ų dáikt-ų t-as karat-êl-us*
 two-GEN thing-GEN.PL that-NOM.SG.M king-DIM-NOM.SG
Wießpat-îp práß-e 357₂₁ ~
 Lord-AD.SG ask-PST.3
dw-u rzecż-y ten Krol-ik v
 two-GEN thing-GEN.PL that.NOM.SG.M king-DIM.NOM.SG at
Pán-á proši-ł 368₅₀
 Lord-GEN.SG ask-PST.M.SG
 'That king asked the Lord for two things.'

In addition to the verbs of request (*iš*)*klausti(s)* and (*iš*)*prašyti*, the Adessive is also governed by the verbs *geisti* 'crave', *elgetauti* 'beg for money', *ieškoti* 'search', *įgyti* 'gain', *gauti* 'get', *nupelnėti* 'deserve', *rasti* / *turėti* *malonę*, *garbę*, *algą* 'to find / have grace, honor, spiritual reward', that belong to the broader semantic class of verbs, i.e. verbs of desire, demand or search, e.g.

- (41) *iėßk-ome páßatp-os pasául-ip / wêlin-łép ir*
 look.for-PRS.1PL support-GEN.SG world-AD.SG devil-AD.SG and
draug-ųfiamp i-o 115(116)₈ ~
 friend-AD.PL he-GEN.SG
ßuka-my pomoc-y v šwiát-á / v czárt-á /
 look.for-PRS.1PL support-GEN.SG at world-GEN.SG at devil-GEN.SG
y v towárzyß-ow iego 116₁₉
 and at friend-GEN.PL he.GEN
 'We are looking for support from the world, devil and his friends.'

Usually the Figure is abstract. If the contexts lack the object of request, the Adessive is perceived to represent the location in the environment, territory or personal sphere of the Ground, cf.

- (42) *mūfū krikščion-is ertės Żyd-ųšėmp' elgetai-a* 631₈₃ ~
 our Christian-NOM.PL maybe Jew-AD.PL beg-PRS.3
náß-y Chrześcijáni-e fnađž v Żyd-ow
 our-NOM.PL.VIR Christian-NOM.PL maybe at Jew-GEN.PL
žėbrz-a 302₁₇
 beg-PRS.3PL
 'Perhaps our Christians beg for money among Jews (i.e. in the Jewish neighbourhood).'
- (43) *Pówił-as S. Ialmúžn-os Korinczion-istamp' elgetaw-o* 308₂₉ ~
 Paul-NOM.SG alms-GEN.SG Corinthian-AD.PL beg-PST.3
Páwėl S. iátmužn-y v Korynth-ow žėbra-t 317₂₈
 Paul.NOM.SG alms-GEN.SG at Corinthian-GEN.PL beg-PST.M.SG
 'St. Paul begged for alms from the Corinthians.'

In DP, the Adessive of the Source of a desired item is used 66 times, which accounts for ca. 8% of all instances of the Adessive. In addition to these occurrences, the Source of a desired item is rather often expressed by another means. For this purpose the verb *klausti* 'ask' also governs the Accusative, the Genitive and the preposition [*tarp* + GEN] 'between, among', but the verbs *trokšti* 'desire', *įgyti* 'gain', *išprašyti* 'request' take the construction [*nuog* + GEN] 'from'.

Most often the Adessive corresponds to the Polish preposition [*u* + GEN] 'at', which is a typical source of translation for this case. However, the Polish prepositions [*od* + GEN] 'from' (3x), [*na* + LOC] 'on' (1x) and [*po* + LOC] 'after' (4x) are also found rendered as the Adessive, e.g.

- (44) *Hėrod-as [...]* *i-amĩmp' ne ž{ò}dž-io iž-kláuf-t' ne*
 Herod-NOM.SG he-AD.SG not.even word-GEN.SG PFV-ask-INF NEG
galėi-o 167a(164)₆ ~
 can-PST.3
Herod [...] *fię ná nim y fłow-á dopytá-ć nie*
 Herod.NOM.SG RFL on he.LOC.SG even word-GEN.SG ask-INF NEG
mog-t 172₄₈
 can-PST.M.SG
 'Herod could not ask [get] a word from him.'
- (45) [*Herod-as*] *kláuf-e-s i-ųfiámp wĩet-os / kur*
 Herod-NOM.SG ask-PST.3-RFL they-AD.PL place-GEN.SG where
turė-tų Chrĩst-us vž-gim-t 60₃₆ ~
 have-COND.3 Christ-NOM.SG PFV-be.born-INF

- pyta-ł* *fię od nich* *mieśc-á* 60₁₁
ask-PST.M.SG RFL from they.GEN.PL place-GEN.SG
‘Herod inquired of them where Christ was to be born.’
- (46) *k-o* [*Chríst-us*] *mus-ímp gēidz-e* 327₆ ~
what-GEN Christ-NOM.SG we-AD crave-PRS.3
cżego po nas żada 337₂₀
what.GEN after we.LOC crave.PRS.3SG
‘What Christ craves from us.’

Moreover, in some instances there is no counterpart for the Adessive in the Polish text at all (cf. ex. 47 and 48). This could indicate that the Adessive seemed an appropriate means to render the Source for the interpreter.

- (47) *T-ó-ii* *nu-pėtn-e* *Diėw-ieþ / idánt*
that-NOM.SG.F-DEF PFV-deserve-PST.3 God-AD.SG that
ángle-as *i-a* *at-łaki-tų* 472₃₅ ~
angel-NOM.SG she-ACC.SG PFV-visit-COND.3
ktor-a *żáftuży-ł-á* *od Anyoł-a* *by-ć*
which-NOM.SG.F deserve-PST-F.SG by angel-GEN.SG AUX-INF
náwiedz-on-á 503₂₄
visit-PST.PP-NOM.SG.F
‘She deserved from God that the angel visited her.’
- (48) *idánt tatái po fmėrt-i turė-tų Dew-ieþ*
that this.ACC after death-DAT.SG have-COND.3 God-AD.SG
nu-pėtni-t’ 551₂₇ ~
PFV-deserve-INF
áby to mia-ł po śmierc-i v Bog-á
that this.ACC have-PST.M.SG after death-LOC.SG at God-GEN.SG
żáftuży-ć 598₃
deserve-INF
‘In order to deserve this from God after death.’

4.3. The Adessive denoting the Source of a desired item in other old writings and dialects

Compared to the Allative of Addressee, it is rather uncommon to use the Adessive with the *verba dicendi* in Old Lithuanian. The distribution of both the Adessive and other possible constructions for expressing the Source of a desired item in DP, BP and PS is given in Table 3.

Table 3. The Adessive of the Source and other possible means in DP, BP and PS

Verb	DP		BP		PS	
	Ades-sive	Other con-structions	Ades-sive	Other con-structions	Ades-sive	Other con-structions
<i>elgetauti</i> 'beg for money'	5	–	–	–	–	–
<i>gauti</i> 'get'	3	6: [ižg + GEN] (3) 'from', [nuog + GEN] (3) 'from'	2	47: [nuog + GEN] (27) 'from', [ižg + GEN] (20) 'from'	–	–
<i>geisti</i> 'crave'	4	10x: [nuog + GEN] 'from'	–	–	–	–
<i>igyti</i> 'gain'	11	3: [ižg + GEN] (2) 'from', [nuog + GEN] (1) 'from'	–	–	–	–
<i>ieškoti</i> 'search'	8	8: [nuog + GEN] (6) 'from', [tarp + GEN] (2) 'between, among'	–	1: [tarp + GEN] 'between, among'	1?	5: LOC (1), [terp + GEN] (2) 'between, among', [iž + GEN] (1) 'from', [nuog + GEN] (1) 'from'
<i>išklausti</i> 'ask'	1	2: [nuog + GEN] 'from'	–	–	–	–
<i>išprašyti</i> 'request'	8	1: GEN	4	–	–	–

Continuation of Table 3

Verb	DP		BP		PS	
	Ades- sive	Other con- structions	Ades- sive	Other con- structions	Ades- sive	Other con- structions
<i>klausti</i> 'ask'	2	58: ACC (52), GEN (5), [<i>nuog</i> + GEN] (1) 'from'	–	40: ACC (28), GEN (7), [<i>nuog</i> + GEN] (3) 'from', [<i>tarp</i> + GEN] (2) 'between, among'	–	5: GEN (4), ACC (1)
<i>klaustis</i> 'ask'	1	4: ACC (1), [<i>tarp</i> + GEN] (3) 'between, among'	–	–	–	4: GEN
<i>nupelnyti</i> 'deserve'	2	–	–	–	–	1: [<i>iž</i> + GEN] 'from'
<i>prašyti</i> 'request'	9	111: ACC (78), GEN (24), [<i>nuog</i> + GEN] (9) 'from'	–	42: ACC (31), GEN (2), [<i>nuog</i> + GEN] (9) 'from'	–	–
<i>rasti</i> <i>malonę</i> 'find grace'	7	–	2	–	–	–
<i>turėti</i> <i>malonę,</i> <i>garbę,</i> <i>algą</i> 'have grace, honor, reward'	5	–	1	–	–	3: [<i>iž</i> + GEN] 'from'
Total	66	203	9	130	1?	18

As can be seen from the data in the table, the Adessive denoting the Source is hardly ever used in the texts that represent the written language both of Lithuania Minor and the Eastern variant of Lithuania Major. There is only one sentence with this use of the Adessive governed by the verb *ieškoti* ‘search’ in PS:

- (49) *idant dabo-tu-s i-am / ir ieško-tu*
 that examine-COND.3-RFL he-DAT.SG and search-COND.3
*i-umpi*¹⁴ / *iey gate-s ráf-ti pátepim-u*
 he-AD.SG if can-FUT.3 find-INF consecration-ACC.SG
ko[k]-i? II 127₁₄
 some-ACC.SG
 ‘That [the priests] would examine him and search (in him) if they can find any consecration.’

However, the quoted instance is questionable for the ambiguity of the Adessive: it can also be understood as Experiencer, which is a more common meaning for the Adessive in Old Lithuanian. Moreover, the Polish counterpart, namely the preposition *w* governing the Locative (*βukáli w nim*), would support the latter interpretation.¹⁵

In BP, the Adessive is used nine times and is governed by the verbs *gauti* ‘get’ (BP I 283₁₁; II 300₁₅), *išprašyti* ‘request’ (BP II 106₂₂; 354₂₃; 363₁₈; 414₂₃), *rasti, turėti malonę* ‘find, have grace’ (BP I 331₅; 336₁₇; 336₂₃), e.g.

- (50) *Diew-e mus pat-fai mokin-k tikr-ai*
 God-VOC.SG we.ACC sefl-NOM.SG teach-IMP[2SG] proper-ADV
melf-ti-fi / ir ifch-prafchi-ti
 pray-INF-REFL and PFV-request-INF
taw-ip amβin-a βiwat-a P II 106₂₂
 you-AD.SG eternal-ACC.SG life-ACC.SG
 ‘God, you yourself teach us to pray properly and to ask you for eternal life.’
- (51) *Be pennig-u be alg-os gal-im*
 without money-GEN.PL without reward-GEN.SG can-PRS.1PL

¹⁴ The adessive form *iumpi* is dialectal and it would correspond to *iampi* in two other varieties of written Lithuanian of the 16th–17th century.

¹⁵ Although *Punktay sakimu*, as the author claims in the preface of the book, was written in Lithuanian and only then translated into Polish, it is necessary to consider the parallel text in Polish for the sake of better semantic interpretation.

Diew-ip pagalb-a priefsch Welin-a gau-ti BP I 283₁₁
 God-AD.SG help-ACC.SG against devil-ACC.SG get-INF
 ‘We can get help from God against devil without money and reward.’

It is worth mentioning that almost all the occurrences of the Adessive are found in the text that is probably originally written by Bretkūnas himself,¹⁶ but not in the passages from the New Testament (except for 331₅).

The usage of the Adessive governed by the verb *klausti* ‘ask’ is characteristic of Lithuanian dialects where the Adessive is preserved, e.g.

(52) *bob-a klaus-ia dziēdz-iek*¹⁷
 woman-NOM.SG ask-PRS.3 man-AD.SG
 ‘A woman asks a man.’ (example from Gervėčiai, Laigonaitė 1957, 33)

(53) “*Kur ei-mi?*” — *klaus-ia j-amp*
 where go-PRS.2SG ask-PRS.3 he-AD.SG
 ‘Where are you going?—one asks him.’ (example from Lazūnai, Senkus 1959, 227)

(54) *pa-s’i-klaus’-k’i-g D’iēv’-ip*
 PFV-RFL-ask-IMP.2SG-PRT God-AD.SG
 ‘Ask God.’ (example from Zietela, zšž 32)

However, the Accusative or Genitive are also used, e.g. *klausia bob-q*, *klausia bob-os* ‘one asks a woman’.

4.4. The Adessive of the Source of a desired item in some other languages

The Adessive, used in constructions with the verbs of demand or request and indicating a person of whom something is asked, is also found in some languages which are equipped with the Adessive case. This fea-

¹⁶ According to Ona Aleknavičienė, the sermons in Bretkūnas’ *Postil* are to be considered semi-original, since they are based on popular works by Evangelical Lutheran theologians of that time (Aleknavičienė 2014).

¹⁷ The Adessive for *o*-stem nouns has the ending *-iek* instead of *-iep* in Gervėčiai dialect, as the postposition *-k* (instead of *-p < -pi*) was used for the formation of this case (Zinkevičius 1966, 210).

ture is characteristic of some Finno-Ugric languages, e.g. Estonian and Veps:¹⁸

(55) *Direktor palus sekretäri! asja selgitada.*
 director.NOM ask.PST.3SG secretary.AD thing.PART explain.INF
 ‘The director asked the secretary to explain the issue.’
 (quoted from Torn 2006, 509)

(56) *Neičukaine küzub opendajal, kuspäi sab otta vajehnik.*
 girl.NOM ask.PRS.3SG teacher.AD whence get.PRS.3SG take.INF
 dictionary.NOM
 ‘Девочка спрашивает у преподавателя, где (до сл. – откуда) можно взять словарь.’¹⁹ (quoted from Brodskij 2008, 39)

The above-mentioned strategy of morphosyntactic marking is not very usual cross-linguistically. It is more common to render the Source of a desired item using the grams expressing the ablative meaning that indicate remoteness from the Ground. In this way, the Ground is conceptualized as a Source from which any information follows (Ganenkov 2002, 56).

Otherwise, in some Nakh-Daghestanian languages directional grams are used to convey the Source of information, thus the expressions of both the Addressee and the Source of information coincide. In such cases the Source of information is conceived as the Addressee that is primarily capable to receive the information (Ganenkov 2002, 56). It is worth mentioning that such instances are observed also in Lithuanian dialects: Laigonaitė (1957, 36f) gives an example from Gervėčiai of the verb *klausti* ‘ask’ used with the Allative (*klausia bobosp* ‘one asks a woman’), but emphasizes that *klausti* governs the Allative exclusively rarely, as the Adessive is more common for this purpose (idem, 33).

4.5. Motivation for the usage²⁰

As already noted, the Adessive in DP corresponds to the Polish preposition [*u* + GEN]. According to Przybylska, the usage of the Polish preposition

¹⁸ The prototypical spatial meaning of the adessive in Estonian and Veps is contact with the surface, i.e. ‘on; on top of’, but the meaning of proximity is also possible.

¹⁹ ‘The girl is asking the teacher where to get a dictionary.’

²⁰ I am deeply indebted to an anonymous reviewer for the comprehensive discussion on the previous version of this section. Most of his/her suggestions have found their way into my text.

u is motivated by the conception of *the bordering part* of the Ground. The prototypical meaning of the preposition *u* can be illustrated by the situation in which the Figure is any object, but the Ground is the edge of any three-dimensional object seen as a surface, e.g. *lampa wisi u sufitu* ‘the lamp hangs from the ceiling’. If the Ground is animate, e.g. *dziecko siedzi u mamy na kolanach* ‘a child is sitting on mother’s knees’, a person is also understood as a physical object, but a part of him/her (*knees* in this instance) is seen as a bordering part which is in contact with the Figure. In contexts with request verbs having the syntactic structure NNOM + V + N1ACC/GEN (= Figure) + *u* + N2GEN (= Ground), e.g. *szukał rady u ojca* ‘he was looking for a piece of advice from the father’, *wyprosił u rodziców zgodę na wyjazd* ‘convinced [asked] the parents to let him travel’, the Figure, which is always an abstract object of demand, is conceptualized as a peripheral (bordering) part of a person as a spiritual and physical unity (Przybylska 2002, 518, 531, 536–539). Such interpretation reflects the concrete spatial meaning of the preposition [*u* + GEN], which is defined as the Figure’s being at the bordering part of the Ground or in contact with it.

The semantic reinterpretation of the Adessive has gone along a similar path. The usage of the Adessive in the meaning of the Source of a desired item is strongly related to two other meanings of this case: location in somebody’s personal sphere and possessive meaning. As outlined previously, the Adessive was very rare in its etymological meaning of proximity in Old Lithuanian. Hence this case was characteristic of nominals referring to animate entities (*animata*), constructions with the Adessive prototypically denoting Figure’s location in personal sphere of the animate Ground. Being in somebody’s personal sphere implied variable relation between the Figure and the Ground. Therefore the local meaning was bleached out but the function of the Ground in respect to the Figure came to the fore. This gave rise to several other meanings of the Adessive: Possessor, Evaluator, Experiencer and Source (of a desired item).

The possessive meaning of the Adessive occurs in Old Lithuanian texts of the 16th–17th century but due to the religious nature of these texts Adessive constructions hardly ever mark prototypical possessive relations: although the possessor is animate, the possessum is always an abstract entity, e.g.

(57) *páhon-ifiamþ priéß-us* *búw-o* *bûd-as* 138₁ ~
 pagan-AD.PL different-NOM.SG.M be-PST.3 custom-NOM.SG

- v Pogán-ow* *przeciwn-y* *by-ł* *obyczaj* 144₄₅
 at pagan-GEN.PL different-NOM.SG.M be-PST.M.SG custom.NOM.SG
 ‘Pagans had a different custom.’
- (58) *Didėfn-is* [*tikėjim-as*] *búw-o* *t-aip’* *ligôn-ip*
 bigger-NOM.SG.M faith-NOM.SG be-PST.3 that-AD.SG.F ill-AD.SG
žmon-áip 369₁₄ ~
 woman-AD.SG
Wietŝ-a [*wiar-a*] *by-ł-á* *v* *tęy*
 greater-NOM.SG.F faith-NOM.SG be-PST-F.SG at that.GEN.SG.F
chor-ey *niewiáŝt-y* 381₂₉
 sick-GEN.SG.F woman-GEN.SG
 ‘That sick woman had a stronger faith.’

However, instances of prototypical possessive relations expressed by Adessive constructions are observed in Lithuanian dialects²¹, e.g.

- (59) *mús-p* *karv-áit-ė* *yrà*
 we-AD.PL cow-DIM-NOM.SG be.PRS.3
 ‘We have a cow.’ (example from Lazūnai, Zinkevičius 1966, 293)
- (60) *Bùv-o* *bōc-iap* (*bōc-iep*) *vien-as* *sūn-ùs*
 be-PST.3 father-AD.SG (father-AD.SG) one-NOM.SG.M son-NOM.SG
 ‘Father had one child.’ (example from Lazūnai, Senkus 1959, 218)
- (61) *j-iesimp* *stāl-o* *ne-bīt*
 they-AD.PL table-GEN.SG NEG-be.PST.3
 ‘They did not have a table.’ (example from Zietela, Zinkevičius 1966, 293)

The Figure’s being in the Ground’s personal sphere may be easily reanalyzed as the Figure’s belonging to the Ground.²² But in contexts with the verbs of request the Figure marks the object of demand or request which can be understood as located in the Ground’s [Adessive’s] mental sphere and will. The Figure is seen as belonging to the Ground and depending on it; whereas the Ground may be interpreted as the Source of the Figure.

²¹ The prototypical present-day predicative possessive construction in Standard Lithuanian is the HAVE-construction, e.g. *Jonas turi dviratį* ‘John (NOM) has a bike (ACC)’.

²² Cross-linguistically, a location event schema frequently becomes a source for the expression of predicative possession (Y is at X’s place > X has, owns Y; Heine 1997, 50–53, 75).

As was already mentioned, the verbs of request, such as *klausti* ‘ask’, *prašyti* ‘request’, *melsti* ‘pray’, fall under a more extensive class of verbs—the verbs of search or desire (*geisti* ‘crave’, *elgetauti* ‘beg for money’, *ieškoti* ‘search’, *įgyti* ‘gain’, *gauti* ‘get’, *nupelnyti* ‘deserve’, *rasti* / *turėti malonę, garbę, algą* ‘to find / have grace, honour, spiritual reward’). It is necessary to emphasize that these verbs, in addition to the Adessive, strongly require explicit ablatival complements, namely, the prepositional phrases [*nuo* + GEN] and [*iš* + GEN], e.g.

- (62) *Diew-as* [...] *geidž-ia* *pakâi-aus* *nûg* *mûf-u*
 God-NOM.SG desire-PRS.3 peace-GEN.SG from we-GEN
griešn-u-iu 42₁₃ ~
 sinful-GEN.PL-DEF
Bog [...] *žada* *pokoi-u* *od* *nas*
 God.NOM.SG desire.PRS.3SG peace-GEN.SG from we.GEN
grzešnik-ow *niegodn-yh* 41₄₇
 sinner-GEN.PL unworthy-GEN.SG
 ‘God desires peace from us the sinful.’
- (63) *kok-és* *náud-as* *ižg* *i-ó* [*Sakrament-o*]
 what-ACC.PL.F benefit-ACC.PL from he-GEN.SG [Sacrament-GEN.SG]
igĩ-t *túr-ime* DP 132₃ ~
 gain-INF have-PRS.1PL
co *zá* *pożytk-i* *z* *niego* *odnieś-ć* *ma-my* 139₅
 what for benefit-ACC.PL from he.GEN gain-INF have-PRS.1PL
 ‘What benefits do we have to gain from it (the Sacrament)?’
- (64) *nûdemei-es* *žmóg-us* [...] *gau-s* *nûg*
 commit.a.sin-PST.PA.NOM.SG man-NOM.SG receive-FUT.3 from
i-o *išrišim-a* 369₅₃ ~
 he-GEN.SG absolution-ACC.SG
grzešn-y *człowiek* [...] *dostanie* *od* *niego*
 sinful-NOM.SG.M man.NOM.SG receive.FUT.3SG from he.GEN
rozgrzešeni-a 382₁₅
 absolution-GEN.SG
 ‘A sinful man will receive absolution from him.’
- (65) *idánt’* *méit-ę* *gaut-ú* *ižg* *Dwáf-ios*
 in.order.to love-ACC.SG receive-COND.3 from spirit-GEN.SG
Chrift-aus 237(137)₃₈ ~
 Christ-GEN.SG

áby miłość-i dofta-t z Duch-á
 in.order.to love-GEN.SG receive-PST.M.SG from spirit-GEN.SG
Chryftuf-ow-ego 246₃₂
 Christ-ADJ-GEN.SG

‘In order that one should receive love from the spirit of Christ.’

For this reason it is possible that the interpretation of the Adessive as the Source governed by the verbs *klausti* ‘ask’, *prašyti* ‘request’ was influenced by this model as well.

Moreover, the verbs of search *ieškoti* ‘search’, *rasti* ‘find’, *elgetauti* ‘beg for money’ naturally demand the Adessive (or [*pas* + ACC] ‘at’ in Modern Lithuanian) which in such utterances indicates somebody’s personal space as domain of search. This domain of search might also be reinterpreted as the Source of a desired item (see (66) in which God is conceptualized as the origin or source of the grace):

- (66) *Ne biiò-ki-s Mari-á / nes’ rad-ái*
 NEG be.afraid-IMP.2SG-RFL Mary-VOC.SG because find-PST.2
małón-e Diew-iep’ 438₄[∞] 23 ~
 grace-ACC.SG God-AD.SG
náláz-t-á tájk-ę v Bog-á 454₃
 find-PST-F.SG grace-ACC.SG at God-GEN.SG
 ‘Don’t be afraid, Mary, for you have found grace with God.’

It is necessary to mention that the counterpart of the Adessive in Modern Lithuanian—the prepositional phrase [*pas* + ACC] ‘at’—has also followed the same path of semantic evolution and developed similar meanings. In Old Lithuanian preposition *pas* governed inanimate nouns mostly and denoted Figure’s location next to the Ground, cf.

- (67) *Lózor-ius kur-ís gułéi-o wárt-úfemp* 270₃₇ ~
 Lazarus-NOM.SG which-NOM.SG.M lie-PST.3 gate-AD.PL
ktor-y leża-t przede wrot-y 277₄₈
 which-NOM.SG.M lie-PST.M.SG in.front.of gate-INS.PL
 ‘Lazarus, who was lying at the gate.’
 (68) *Lozor-ius / kur-ís gułéi-o pas wart-ús*
 Lazarus-NOM.SG which-NOM.SG.M lie-PST.3 at gate-ACC.PL

²³ In the last (ecumenical) Bible edition the prepositional phrase [*pas* + ACC] ‘at’ is used: *Nebijok, Marija, tu radai malonę pas Dievą!*

- i-o* 269(267)₇[∞] ~
 he-GEN.SG
ktor-y leža-t v wrot iego 276₅
 which-NOM.SG.M lie-PST.M.SG at gate.GEN.PL he.GEN
 ‘Lazarus, who was lying at his gate.’
- (69) *ákt-as nêkur-is sedéi-o pas kél-a*
 blind-NOM.SG.M some-NOM.SG.M sit-PST.3 at path-ACC.SG
êlgetau-dam-as 102₉[∞] ~
 beg-CVB-M.SG
šlep-y niektor-y fiedzia-t wedla drog-i
 blind-NOM.SG.M some-NOM.SG.M sit-PST.M.SG next.to path-GEN.SG
žebrž-ač 103₂
 beg-PRS.CVB
 ‘A blind man was sitting on the side of the path begging.’

If the Ground was animate, the utterances containing [*pas* + ACC] denoted Figure’s being next to the animate Ground rather than location in one’s personal environment:

- (70) *Aņget-as Wiešpat-ies ftôi-o-s pas í-ús /*
 angel-NOM.SG Lord-GEN.SG rise-PST.3-RFL by they-ACC.M.PL
ir šwiefúm-as Diew-o ap-žieb-e
 and brightness-NOM.SG God-GEN.SG PFV-enlighten-PST.3
i-ús 38₂[∞] ~
 they-ACC.M.PL
Anyot Páń-fk-i ftána-t wedla
 angel.NOM.SG Lord-ADJ-NOM.SG.M stand-PST.M.SG next.to
ich 37₁₄
 they.GEN.PL
 ‘An Angel of the Lord stood by them and the brightness of God shone around them.’

But in present-day Lithuanian *pas* usually governs *animata* and prototypically denotes location in or motion into one’s personal sphere, e.g.

- (71) *Aš ne-gal-iu nakvo-ti pas svetim-a*
 I.NOM NEG-can-PRS.1SG stay.overnight-INF at strange-ACC.SG
žmog-ų. (LKT)
 man-ACC.SG
 ‘I cannot stay overnight at a stranger’s place.’

- (72) *Aš at-važiuo-s-iu pas tav-e šeštadien-į.* (LKT)
 I.NOM PFV-drive-FUT-1SG at you-ACC.SG Saturday-ACC.SG
 ‘I will come to your place [i.e. to visit you] on Saturday.’

Besides this meaning, *pas* has also acquired some other meanings that were also characteristic of the Adessive in Old Lithuanian. *Pas* also occurs with the verbs *klausti* ‘ask’, *prašyti* ‘ask’, *atsiprašyti* ‘apologize’, *teirautis* ‘inquire’ and indicates the person from whom something is asked or got ((73), (74); [*pas* + ACC] in (74) is ambiguous as it may have both Locative ‘at the dairyman’s place’ and Source ‘from the dairyman’ readings). *Pas* can also acquire possessive meaning (75).

- (73) [...] *stov-iu, lauk-iu, gal k-q nors*
 stand-PRS.1SG wait-PRS.1SG maybe what-ACC INDEF
pa-klau-s-iu pas kaž-k-q. (LKT)
 PFV-ask-FUT-1SG at INDEF-who-ACC
 ‘I am standing, waiting; maybe I will ask somebody something.’
- (74) *Kart-q nu-si-pirk-au sūr-io pas*
 time-ACC.SG PFV-RFL-buy-PST.1SG cheese-GEN.SG at
pieninink-q. (LKT)
 dairyman-ACC.SG
 ‘Once I bought cheese at/from the dairyman.’
- (75) *Pas mus gimin-ėj, tai buv-o tik vien-as*
 at we.ACC family-LOC.SG so be-PST.3 only one-NOM.SG.M
Gedimin-as (LKT)
 Gediminas-NOM.SG
 ‘In our family there was only one Gediminas.’

It is usually asserted that the semantic extension of Modern Lithuanian [*pas* + ACC] into possessive and source domain is highly determined by Slavonic languages. Even though such utterances are a part of spoken language, they are not considered normative by prescriptivists as they emerged under Slavonic influence (Šukys 1998, 439ff). Corresponding dialectal usage of Adessive (see (51)–(54) and (59)–(61)) could also be affected by language contact, as the Adessive is preserved in Lithuanian dialects on Belarusian territory. The possibility of external influence cannot be completely ruled out for Old Lithuanian Adessive as well, especially when the distribution of its usage is considered. In DP, which is translated from Polish, the Adessive of the Source accounts for ca. 8% of

all occurrences of this case. The representatives of two other varieties of written Lithuanian—Sirvydas and Bretkūnas—hardly ever use it: there is only one instance in *ps*, while nine such uses of the Adessive are attested in *BP*. Moreover, the former instance is ambiguous, while the latter ones could be influenced by the writings of Polish theologians. In other texts by Bretkūnas which are translated from Latin or German, the verb *klausti* ‘ask’ governs the Accusative or the Genitive (in the *Gospel of Luke*, see Gelumbeckaitė 2002, 71f) and the preposition [*nuog* + GEN] ‘from’ (in the *New Testament*, Bukantytė 2007, 53). According to the researchers, the choice between the cases or preposition was driven by the equivalents in the sources of translation. This evidence suggests that the Adessive in the meaning of the Source of a desired item might also be determined by the Polish construction [*u* + GEN], which is a common source of translation for this case.

5. Conclusion

The usage of the Allative with the verbs of speaking in Old Lithuanian is clearly motivated conceptually. It occurs rather frequently in all three varieties of written Lithuanian of the 16th–17th century and is preserved in some dialects. The meaning of the Addressee is based on the conceptualization of the speaking act as a purposeful verbal movement towards a human Goal (the Addressee is seen as a Goal of verbal act). This use of the Allative is consistent with and confirms the typological strategy to employ directional grams for the expression of the Addressee.

The Adessive in the meaning of the Source of a desired item is used in Daukša’s *Postil*, but is very poorly attested in two other varieties of written Lithuanian. It occurs in some dialects and is possible in several Finno-Ugric languages, although it is not a common means to express the Source cross-linguistically. The usage of Adessive in Old Lithuanian to render the Source of a desired item may be determined by different factors. On the one hand, the distribution of such use of the Adessive in Old Lithuanian leads to the conclusion of external influence (namely, the Polish preposition [*u* + GEN]) as this case is mostly attested in Daukša’s *Postil* which is translated from Polish. But on the other hand, the meaning of Source can be easily derived from two other meanings of the Adessive: the meaning of location in one’s personal sphere and the

possessive meaning. Thus both internal and external conditions might have contributed to the Source meaning of the Adessive.

Eglė Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė

Vilnius University

Faculty of Philology

Department of Baltic Linguistics

Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius

egle.zilinskaite@flf.vu.lt

GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS

ACC — accusative, ADJ — adjective, AD — adessive, ADV — adverb,
ALL — allative, AUX — auxiliary, COND — conditional, CVB — converb,
DAT — dative, DEF — definite, DIM — diminutive, F — feminine, FUT —
future, GEN — genitive, HAB — habitual, ILL — illative, IMP — impera-
tive, INDEF — indefinite, INESS — inessive, INF — infinitive, INS — instru-
mental, LOC — locative, M — masculine, N — neuter, NEG — negation,
NOM — nominative, NVIR — non-virile, PA — active participle, PART —
partitive, PFV — perfective, PL — plural, PRS — present, PRT — particle,
PST — past, PP — passive participle, RFL — reflexive, SG — singular,
SUP — supine, VIR — virile, VOC — vocative

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS (SOURCE TEXTS)

- BP — *Postilla. Tatai esti Trumpas ir Praštas Iščguldimas Euangeliu [...] Per Iana Bretkuna Lietuwos Plebona Karaliaucziuię Prufūfu. Iščpaude Karaliaucziuię Iurgis Osterbergeras. 1591.* Cited from: Ona Aleknavičienė, ed., *Jono Bretkūno Postilė. Studija, faksimilė ir kompaktinė plokštėlė.* Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005.
- DP — *Postilla Catholica [...] Per Kūnigą Mikaloiv Davksza Kanoniką Médnikų / iš tēkiško pergūldita [...] W Wilniui. Drukārniui Akadēmios Societatis Iesv, A.D. 1599.* Cited from the electronic version of the text, forward and reverse concordances, available from: <http://www.lki.lt/seniejirastai/db.php?source=2>.
- DŠŽ — Danguolė Mikulėnienė, Kazys Morkūnas, Aloyzas Vidugiris, eds., *Dieveniškų šnektos žodynas.* Vol. 2 (N–Ž). Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005.

- LKT — Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstynas (Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian). <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/>
- LKŽ — Lietuvių kalbos žodynas (Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language). <http://www.lkz.lt/>
- PS — *Punkty kazan [...] przez Księdza Konstantego Szyrwida [...] wydane. W Wilnie, W Drukárni Akadémiey Societatis Iesu. 1629, 1644.* Cited from: Franz Specht, ed., *Šyrvids Punktay sakimu (Punkty kazań). Teil I: 1629, Teil II: 1644, litauisch und polnisch mit kurzer grammatischer Einleitung.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929.
- WP³ — *Postilla Catholica Mnieyszca [...] Przez D. Iakvba Wuyka [...] W Krakowie. 1590.* Cited from: Jonas Palionis, ed., *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų Postilė ir jos šaltiniai.* Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2000.
- zšž — Aloyzas Vidugiris, ed., *Zietelos šnektos žodynas.* Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1998.

REFERENCES

- ALEKNAVIČIENĖ, ONA. 2014. Ar Martynas Mažvydas buvo vyskupas? *Archivum Lithuanicum* 16, 59–122.
- AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS. 2006. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė.* Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- ARISTE, PAUL. 1968. *A Grammar of the Votic Language.* Bloomington/The Hague: Indiana University Press and Mouton.
- ARUMAA, PEETER. 1930. *Litauische mundartliche Texte aus der Wilnaer Gegend. Mit grammatischen Anmerkungen.* Dorpat: s.n.
- BRODSKIJ, IGOR' V. 2008. *Самоучитель вепского языка.* Санкт-Петербург: Санкт-Петербургское вепское общество, отдел науки и образования.
- BUKANTYTĖ, EGLĖ. 2007. *Martino Liuterio Naujojo Testamento (1522–1546) įtaka Jono Bretkūno Naujojo Testamento vertimui (1579–1580) sintaksės aspektu.* Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla.
- ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, ELISABETH. 1999. Space and Time. In: Jens Allwood, Peter Gärdenfors, eds., *Cognitive Semantics.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 131–152.
- FORKER, DIANA. 2010. Nonlocal uses of local cases in the Tsezic languages. *Linguistics* 48–5, 1083–1109.
- GANENKOV, DMITRIJ S. 2002. *Модели полисемии пространственных показателей.* Дипломная работа. Москва: МГУ.

- GELUMBECKAITĖ, JOLANTA. 2002. *Linksnių ir prielinksnių konstrukcijų sintaksė Jono Bretkūno Biblijos Evangelijoje pagal Luką*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 1997. *From Space to Time. Temporal Adverbials in the World's Languages*. München/Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2003. The geometry of grammatical meaning: semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison. In: Michael Tomasello, ed., *The New Psychology of Language*, Vol. 2. New York: Erlbaum, 211–243.
- HEINE, BERND. 1997. *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HEINE, BERND & TANIA KUTEVA. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HEINE, BERND & TANIA KUTEVA. 2007. *The Genesis of Grammar: A Reconstruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- JACKENDOFF, RAY. 1983. *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- KARLSSON, FRED. 1999. *Finnish: An Essential Grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.
- KAVALIŪNAITĖ, GINA. 2001. Adesyvas Chylinskio Naujojo Testamento vertime. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 45, 93–111.
- KAVALIŪNAITĖ, GINA. 2003. Postpozicinių vietininkų sistema Chylinskio Naujojo Testamento vertime. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 49, 33–49.
- KILROE, PATRICIA. 1994. The Grammaticalization of French *à*. In: William Pagliuca, ed., *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 49–61.
- KITILÄ, SEPPO & JUSSI YLIKOSKI. 2011. Remarks on the coding of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal in European Uralic. In: Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski, eds., *Case, Animacy, and Semantic Roles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29–64.
- KÖVECSES, ZOLTÁN. 2000. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and the Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LAIGONAITĖ, ADELĖ. 1957. Pašalio vietininkai dabartinėje lietuvių kalboje. In: Chackelis Lemchenas, ed., *Kai kurie lietuvių kalbos gramatikos klausimai*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 21–39.
- LAKOFF, GEORGE & MARK JOHNSON. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

- LEVINSON, STEPHEN C. 1992. Primer for the field investigation of spatial description and conception. *Pragmatics* 2.1, 5–47.
- LEVINSON, STEPHEN C. 2003. *Space in Language and Cognition. Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge: University Press.
- NARROG, HEIKO. 2010. A diachronic dimension in maps of case functions. *Linguistic Discovery* 8.1, 233–254.
- PALIONIS, JONAS. 1967. *Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a.* Vilnius: Mintis.
- PRZYBYLSKA, RENATA. 2002. *Polisemia przyimków polskich w świetle semantyki kognitywnej*. Kraków: Universitas.
- RANGE, JOCHEN D. 1995. Allativ und Adessiv in altlitauischen Texten des 16. Jahrhunderts. *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 93–102.
- RICE, SALLY & KAORI KABATA. 2007. Crosslinguistic grammaticalization patterns of the Allative. *Linguistic Typology* 11, 451–514.
- ROSINAS, ALBERTAS. 1995. *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai: morfologijos raida*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- ROSINAS, ALBERTAS. 2001. *Mikalojaus Daukšos tekstų įvardžių semantinė ir morfologinė struktūra*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- ROUNDS, CAROL. 2001. *Hungarian. An Essential Grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.
- SCHMIDKE-BODE, KARSTEN. 2010. The role of benefactives and related notions in the typology of purpose clauses. In: Fernando Zúñiga & Seppo Kittilä, eds., *Benefactives and Malefactives: Typological Perspectives and Case Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 121–146.
- SENKUS, JUOZAS. 1959. Lazūnų tarmės tekstai. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 2, 215–230.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2001. Przypadki lokalne języków bałtyckich. In: W. Smoczyński, *Język litewski w perspektywie porównawczej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 214–216.
- SVOROU, SOTERIA. 1993. *The Grammar of Space*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- ŠUKYS, JONAS. 1998. *Lietuvių kalbos linksniai ir prielinksniai: vartosena ir normos*. Kaunas: Šviesa.
- TALMY, LEONARD. 1972. *Semantic structures in English and Atsugewi*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

- TESTELETS, JAKOV G. 2008. *Именные локативные формы в дагестанских языках*. Available at (accessed 2016-03-29): <http://otipl.philol.msu.ru/~kibrik/content/pdf/Testelelets.pdf>.
- TORN, REELI. 2006. Oblique Dependents in Estonian: An LFG Perspective. In: Miriam Butt, Tracy Holloway King, eds., *Proceedings of the LFG06 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 504–515, <http://web.stanford.edu/group/cslipublications/cslipublications/LFG/11/lfg06.pdf>
- VÄSTI, KATJA. 2011. A case in search of an independent life. The semantics of the initial Allative in a Finnish verbless construction. In: Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski, eds., *Case, Animacy, and Semantic Roles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 65–109.
- ZINKEVIČIUS, ZIGMAS. 1966. *Lietuvių dialektologija*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- ZINKEVIČIUS, ZIGMAS. 1982. Lietuvių kalbos postpoziciniai vietininkai. *Baltistica* 18.1, 21–38.
- ZINKEVIČIUS, ZIGMAS. 1996. *The History of the Lithuanian Language*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- ŽILINSKAITĖ, EGLĖ. 2007. Adesivas Mikalojaus Daukšos *Postilėje*. *Baltistica* 42.3, 407–222.
- ŽILINSKAITĖ, EGLĖ. 2010. Aliatyvas Mikalojaus Daukšos *Postilėje*. *Baltistica* 45.2, 221–241.