

Local Cases in Lithuanian: a Baltic Archaism or an Innovation?

Report at the international conference “Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics” (Moscow, Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 7-8 October 2009)

0. The present report deals with the origins of the secondary case forms found across Lithuanian texts and dialects. The objective is to summarise data and views on the chronology of their genesis and development, the material and typological sources of the case endings, as well as to attempt to find external comparative evidence which may be applicable.

There are numerous papers describing the syntax and phonetic characteristics of this phenomenon in Lithuanian (e.g., [Range 1995]). However, there have been scarce attention so far to the issues of its origins, and those papers which cover it sometimes controversial. There is a need analyse all of them in order to implement a general analysis of diachronic processes having led to the formation of Lithuanian local cases, to compile an internal reconstruction and to gather external comparison data. A short summary is the first step, and this is what this paper is trying to produce.

1. The so called secondary local case forms are frequently met in both Old Lithuanian texts and a number of modern local varieties of the language. Dialectal forms have mostly survived in the Aukštaitian (High Lithuanian) area (for survey see [Palionis 1995]). However, even in official and colloquial Lithuanian some adverbial forms containing old secondary local cases have been preserved to date.

These local case forms include the following:

- 1) adessive: sg. *miškiēp(i)* ‘by the forest’, pl. *miškuosemp(i)*
- 2) allative: sg. *miškop(i)* ‘towards the forest’, pl. *miškum̃p(i)*
- 3) illative: sg. *miškañ(a)* ‘in(to) the (area of the) forest’, pl. *miškuosna* [Ambrazas 1997: 68].

The term ‘secondary’ means that the above case endings are bound to other case forms but not the word stem itself. This witnesses their chronologically later appearance in the language. Secondary cases act in parallel with the ‘primary’ Lithuanian locative (or, more precisely, inessive) case with its *-è / -ojè / -yjè* endings.

The illative case forms are suffixed to the accusative both in singular and plural. Its endings vary between *-na*, *-no*, *-nu*, *-nq* and the reduced *-n*.

The adessive case ending is *-pi* or *-p*. In the plural, it is not at all clear where the 'primary' case ending ends and the adessive form begins: forms like *dievuosemp* provide us with the *-m-p* ending. The nasal *-m-* element is thought to emerge due to the analogy with the plural allative forms like *dievūsump*.

It was thought by Rosinas [1999] that the adessive acts with the older dative form. However, we tend to agree with Seržant [Сержант 2004] and see locative forms here instead of dative.

The allative case uses the same postpositive particle as the adessive, which is bound to the Lithuanian genitive case endings in both singular and plural.

In Lithuanian, adessive and allative endings have spread to adverbs, numerals and various pronouns: *musumpi* 'to us', *pirmop* 'to the first', etc.

2. There has been disagreement among the scholars in defining the chronological age of this Lithuanian morphological feature. It is certain that these case forms derive from the older postpositive constructions which are still seen in Lithuanian (e.g., postpositions *dėl*, *dryn*, *tarp* etc. which are also used as postfixes in both older texts and modern language in *ko-dėl*, *to-dryn*, *ko-drilei* etc. [Bezenberger 1877]). These postpositions have gradually been grammaticalised to become part of the noun declension and bound to certain older case forms. Some linguists [Serafini Amato 1976; Дини 2002] assume that postpositive nominal constructions existed on Proto-Baltic level already, since it is evident that the Lithuanian secondary cases are remnant and are considered archaic by their speakers. They were met much more frequently in older texts, including Old Lithuanian and Old Latvian which also used postpositions.

Others [Nieminen 1957; Zinkevičius 1978] consider the Old Lithuanian nominal declension a feature of only one language, stressing that no secondary noun case forms similar to Lithuanian ones are witnessed in either Latvian or Old Prussian.

If we start analysing the mechanism of functioning of all the three secondary local cases, we will note that adessive and allative have much in common both phonetically and syntactically. Seržant [Сержант 2004: 49-50] proves that both of them were formed after the changes made by Leskin Law were completed in the language, i.e. acute-stressed long vowels have been dropped in a final position. This could not take place in or before the Proto-Baltic period, but must have happened at earliest in the Proto-East-Baltic time. The origin of the adessive was the well known Baltic preposition **pie* 'at' [Zinkevičius 1982: 21], Latvian *pi*

which was put in the postposition to the noun. The total absence of comparable forms in Old Prussian does not allow us to call this feature Proto-Baltic. In the neighbouring Slavic languages, the genetically close particles are used as prepositions. There are more Indo-European parallels, including Hittite (and Lydian) *pe-* which is a verbal prefix with a lative meaning [Иванов 1963: 192], but it is nowhere postposited.

The modern Latvian language does not present evidence for secondary nominal cases. It does demonstrate postpositions though, some of them developed quite recently, like *lauka vidū* ‘in the middle of a field’ vs. Lithuanian *vydury lauko id*. It is possible to show that at least the adessive / illative case has once been there: Old Latvian texts show us adverbial forms *turp* ‘thither’ and *kurp* ‘whither’ which are identical with Lithuanian pronominal samples. The drop of the final vowel is characteristic for Latvian here, so the adessive / illative cases should be reconstructed for Proto-East Baltic rather than independently for Lithuanian and Latvian.

3. The illative ending *-na* should have been formed earlier than adessive / allative forms, as Zinkevičius (1982) earlier suggested basing on internal reconstruction. Apart from Lithuanian itself, it was retained in the singular forms of the Middle Latvian locative *-an*, as was successfully shown by Seržant [Seržants 2004].

This ending can have an Indo-European cognate as well, namely in Tocharian. The Baltic illative ending has been long compared with the Slavic preposition *na* [Zubatý 1896], which, in its turn, has got genetically related forms across Indo-European: Avestan *ana* ‘across’, Gothic *ana*, Greek *ανα* etc. Besides East Baltic, though, it never acts as a postpositive nominal case marker.

The only curious exception among the Indo-European languages is Tocharian, which has a locative case ending *-ne* (Tocharian B) / *-am* (Tocharian A) phonetically identical to the East Baltic illative [Adams 1988: 142].

It is necessary to note that the Tocharian system on nominal declension resembles the Lithuanian in terms of forming the secondary noun case forms based on earlier syntactically independent postpositions. Indeed, in Tocharian postpositions absolutely prevail over prepositional nominal markers. Some of the postpositions still act independently in Tocharian manuscripts of A or B languages, like the comitative marker (A) *-śśāl* versus (B) *śle* ‘together with’. Moreover, the locative case is built upon the older accusative case which is also identical to East Baltic. Adams [1988: 143] suggests that the locative case form was a grammaticalisation of *(e)ne* ‘on, upon’ cognate to Slavic *na*.

The two Tocharian languages are comparable to the two East Baltic languages typologically: one of them (B) is more conservative than the other, in both phonetics and

morphology. It is interesting to notice how the reduction of final vowels in both Tocharian A and Latvian resulted into virtually the same locative case forms, while Tocharian B and Lithuanian preserved them.

4. It was argued that the development of older Baltic prepositions into East Baltic postpositions and further into noun case endings must have been the result of the Fennic areal influence. This point of view is not universally supported [Дини 2002: 177] but is the most widespread one. Indeed, we know that such influence took place both in syntax and in morphology of the East Baltic languages. The only geographical puzzle lies in the distance between High Lithuanian, the dialect cluster containing most secondary case forms, and the present area of Baltic Fennic languages: it would be logical if the latter influenced Latvian, Semigalian or Low Lithuanian (Žemaitian) rather than High Lithuanian which does not border any Fennic people at the moment. We will have to admit the prehistoric existence of a Fennic-speaking population in east Lithuania too.

Tocharian is also said to be influenced by Uralic, most probably Fenno-Ugric languages in the prehistoric period, and the presence of the agglutinative secondary noun declension unusual for Indo-European was attributed to this influence among other features [van Windekens 1962]. Krause & Thomas [1960] went as far as to compare the Tocharian locative ending *-ne* to the Finnish *kotona* ‘zu Hause’ and Hungarian *lovon* ‘zu Pferd’, there also Samoyedic locative forms in *-na*. It would be tempting to analyse this form’s possible Nostratic cognates in line with the proposed Proto-Nostratic locative **na / *nV* ending. But until this is proven, we do not have any solid evidence as to treat the Baltic - Tocharian comparison more than a mere coincidence, the presence of postpositive *-na* in Fennic languages could encourage both East Baltic and Tocharian languages to use the old Indo-European preposition as a postposition and subsequently as a noun case suffix.

5. To conclude, we must admit that the secondary locative postfixes are not a particular East Baltic feature, they are typologically known across Indo-European including Greek and Anatolian languages which used older postpositions to serve as a kind of local case markers. An old one of possibly Indo-European origin (or even Nostratic) origin is the East Baltic illative *-na* which finds a direct cognate in Tocharian. It was firmly built into a system of agglutinative case in both of these language groups which was formed due to the external Uralic (Fenno-Ugric) influence.

There was a close contact between Fennic languages and East Baltic dialects which allowed the latter to further develop this feature forming more secondary case forms including

illative and adessive cases. It was retained longer in the highly conservative morphology of the High Lithuanian dialects.

This influence, however, did not interfere morphological forms of secondary case endings: they all retain their Indo-European origin.

Literature

Adams D. Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1988.

Ambrazas V. (ред.) Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika. Vilnius, 1997.

Bezenberger A. Beiträge zur Geschichte der litauischen Sprache auf Grund litauischer Texte des XVI. und des XVII. Jahrhunderts. Göttingen: R.Peppmüller, 1877.

Krause W., Thomas W. Tocharisches Elementarbuch, Band I: Grammatik. Heidelberg: C.Winter, 1960.

Nieminen E. Über einige Eigenschaften der Baltischen Sprache, die sich in den ältesten baltischen Lehnwörtern der ostseefinnischen Sprachen abspiegelt. // SbFAW 1956, 1957, pp. 185-206.

Palionis J. Lietuvių rašomosios kalbos istorija. Vilnius, 1995.

Range J. Allativ und Adessiv in altilitauischen Texten des 16. Jahrhunderts. // Linguistica Baltica, 4 (1995), pp. 93-102.

Rosinas A. Inesyvo ir adesyvo formų kilmės ir raidos klausimu. // Baltistica 34 (2), 1999. Pp. 173-183.

Serafimi Amato L. La distribuzione della postposizione nel lituano antico. // AION-SI, Suppleta II, 8. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1976.

Seržants I. Einige Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des Illativs. // Baltu filologija, 13 (1), 2004.

van Windekens A.J. Éléments ouraliens en tocharien. // Orbis. Bulletin international de Documentation linguistique. Vol. 11, 2, 1962. Pp. 600-612.

Zinkevičius Z. Lietuvių kalbos dialektologija. Vilnius, 1994.

Zinkevičius Z. Lietuvių kalbos postpoziciniai vietininkai. // Baltistica 18 (1), 1982.

Zubatý J. Baltische Miscellen. // Indogermanische Forschungen, vol. VI, 3-4, 1896. Pp. 269-290.

Дини П.У. Балтийские языки. М., ОГИ, 2002 [1997].

Иванов В.В. Хеттский язык. М., 1963.

Сержант И.А. К вопросу об образовании адессива. // *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica*, 2004, pp. 49-57.

Summary

This paper presents a summary analysis of the Lithuanian and, wider, East Baltic postpositive 'secondary' case markers from the historical and comparative standpoint. It is argued that the adessive and allative, from one side, and the illative, from the other side, appeared on different stages of the language development. While the former two case forms are of clear East Baltic origin and do not have any Indo-European morphological cognates, the latter can have a Tocharian parallel and can bear traces of Indo-European or even Nostratic origins.

Статья представляет собой краткий анализ литовских и, шире, восточнобалтийских «вторичных» падежных показателей с точки зрения сравнительно-исторического подхода. Утверждается, что формы адессива и аллатива, с одной стороны, и иллатива, с другой, появляются на разных стадиях развития языка. В то время как формы первых двух падежей имеют явно восточнобалтийское происхождение и не имеют параллелей в морфологии других индоевропейских языков, форма иллатива может иметь параллель в тохарских языках и нести, таким образом, следы индоевропейского, а возможно, и ностратического происхождения.