

Disputation von Wolfgang Christoph von Nettelhorst⁶ in einer Sammelschrift neu abgedruckt worden ist: "Zwey historische Disputationen, die ... 1. durch W. C. von Nettelhorst, Ao 1674 von dem Ursprung der Preußen; 2. durch F. Werner, Ao 1675 von ihrem lebendigen Götzendienst ... abgehandelt worden sind ..., Königsberg 1755" ["reprints"]⁷.

Der zitierte Respondent Daniel Funck ist ein Kind der Stadt Insterburg, der nicht nur seinem eigenen im Rat sitzenden Vater, sondern auch Friedrich Werner ausführlich dankt. Auch er ist durch die Königsberger Universitätsmatrikel für das Wintersemester 1699 als Funck Daniel, Insterburg. Pruss. erfaßt, während es sich bei dem unter dem Wintersemester vom 4.2.1677 erfaßten Daniel Funck wohl schon um dessen Vater handeln dürfte⁸.

Wir geben zu, daß dieser "Zwischenbericht" keine Klärung der Biographien der genannten Persönlichkeiten darstellt, wohl aber Anregungen zu weiterer Beschäftigung mit dem bewußt benennenden und sich selbstbewußt nennenden Th. Siegmann enthalten dürfte, der offensichtlich als der jüngere Insterburger die Gunst des Beschenkten, wie oft bei Büchergaben "warmer Hand" erlebt; denn er ist im Wintersemester des Jahres 1717 unter dem 9. November eingetragen als Siegmann Theodor., Insterburg. Pruss., iur.⁹

Defreggerstr. 8
D-0-1193 Berlin

Friedhelm Hinze

⁶Nach dem s., op. cit., 2. Bd., S. 67: Wolf Christoph Nettelhorst, nobil. Pr. stip.; op. cit., 3. Bd., S. 297: Wolf Christoph Nettelhorst, nobil. Pr. Sommersemester 1671 N. 110.

⁷Angaben nach dem British Library Catalogue to 1975 (348), S. 219: Historische Disputation von dem Götzendienst und andere abergläubische Gewohnheiten der alten Preußen. See Nettelhorst (W. C. von), Zwey historische Disputationen etc. 1755. 4⁰⁰.

⁸G. Erlerer, op. cit., Bd. 2, S. 27.

⁹A. a. O., S. 297.

On the syntax and semantics of adpositional local phrases in Latvian

AXEL HOLVOET

The paper deals with the system of adpositional phrases covering the domain of spatial relations in Latvian. The main problems discussed in it are: the semantic structure of the system of spatial relations denoted by Latvian adpositional phrases (Latvian is described as having a quaternary system of spatial relations, including perlocative meaning as a distinct term in addition to locative, lative and ablative meaning); the functioning of prepositional, postpositional and circumpositional phrases within the adpositional system; the government of postpositional and circumpositional phrases and its syntactic and semantic determinants; and the areal links which might connect the Latvian adpositional system with the Fennic one.

1. Types of local phrases in Latvian

Latvian has a heterogeneous system of adpositional local phrases. In addition to prepositions, it has numerous examples of local phrases which appear to be postpositional or circumpositional:

- (1) Māja ir aiz ezera.
- (2) Stāvējām durvju priekšā un gudrojām [...] (A. Eglītis)
- (3) Par vilkaci [...] cilvēks [...] pārvēršas, izlīdzams pa saknes, siekstas apakšu, pa nažu starpu, caur melnu kreklu... (T. Zeiferts)

This state of affairs is not recognised by Latvian grammatical terminology. The term "postposition" is reserved for *dēļ*, *labad* and (in some of its uses) *pēc* (none of these has a local meaning, so that they will be left out of consideration here). Postposition-like markers of location such as *apkārt* in *mājai apkārt* 'around the house' are referred to as "semi-prepositions" (*pus-prievārdi*, Bergmane e.a., eds., 1959:701, 722-3; "semi-adpositions" would

perhaps be more accurate, as they may be either prenominal or postnominal). Circumpositions are not mentioned at all. From the viewpoint of the classification of the parts of speech nothing is to be said against this presentation of the facts, as a form like *priekšā* in (2) is nothing but a case form of *priekša* 'front', which is a normal noun. Moreover, serious objections may be raised against the treatment of *priekšā* as a postposition. In those cases where one would expect a combination of *priekšā* with a personal (or reflexive) pronoun, the latter is replaced by the locative of the corresponding possessive pronoun wherever a possessive pronoun is available; we thus have *manā priekšā* and not **manis priekšā*, as we would expect if *priekšā* were consistently treated as an adposition¹.

Purely semantic considerations are not always decisive either. *Priekša* may mean 'front part' or 'the space in front of something'. In the first meaning we may regard it as a referential noun, in the second meaning it is more likely to function just as a marker of location. The difference is illustrated by (4) and (5):

(4) *Gar stacijas priekšu* pastaigājās daži jauni cilvēki. (J. Veselis)

(5) Viņš gaida tikai to brīdi, kad [...] patrieks viņus *no skolas priekšas*. (A. Jakubāns)

In (4) *priekša* should probably be taken to be referential ('the front part of the station hall'). This impression is created by the use of the preposition *gar* 'along'. When a second preposition is added to an adpositional phrase already marking location, it is usually to denote quite fundamental and simple kinds of relations, such as that of goal (cf. English *in the room* and *into the room*) or source (cf. Polish *przed dworcem* and *sprzed dworca*). The relation denoted by *gar* is too complex and too specific to be integrated in the meaning structure of an adpositional phrase as a second element in addition to its main component, which is location with regard to the object denoted by the noun to which the adposition is added (this would be *stacija* if we insisted on treating *gar ... priekšu* as a compound adposition).

In (5), on the other hand, *priekša* is probably not referential, but marks location with regard to the object (the school building), and it may be considered part of a compound adposition marking both relative location and

¹A similar syntactic behaviour is characteristic of Lithuanian expressions with *tarpe*, the only counterpart Lithuanian seems to have for the noun-based postpositions of Latvian: we have *savo tarpe* (with the possessive form of the reflexive pronoun), *tame tarpe*.

source, a meaning complex often represented by compound prepositions (cf. Polish *sprzed dworca* and English *from under the table*).

Nevertheless, there is no guarantee that it will always be possible to distinguish the referential uses of such nouns as *priekša*, *apakša* etc. from those where they function as parts of adpositional phrases. Thus neither formal nor semantic criteria will allow to set apart such markers of location as the ones illustrated in (2) and (3) as a distinct category. The case of the "semi-prepositions" is slightly different: if an adverb is observed to govern a certain case form in a regular way, then this renders it, in a way, similar to a preposition; for a noun, on the contrary, it is quite normal to be accompanied by a possessive genitive, as *priekša* and *apakša* in (2) and (3) are.

If one would be tempted to interpret *priekšā* in (2) as a postposition, then it is because *durvju priekšā* is opposed to an antonymous prepositional phrase *aiz durvīm*, and because there is no alternative case form or adpositional phrase to cover the meaning 'in front of something'. As in the present paper I will not be concerned with the theory of the parts of speech, but rather with the status of this and similar expressions within the system of case forms and adpositional phrases covering the field of spatial relations, especially from the viewpoint of typology and areal linguistics, I will simply call *priekšā* in (2) a postposition and *pa ... apakšu* in (3) a circumposition.

At this point a few terminological stipulations are needed. A local phrase involves a *reference object*, i. e. the object serving as a point of reference for location (Jackendoff 1983:163). What the local phrases directly refers to is the *reference domain*, i. e. a part of space defined with regard to the reference object (called *reference place* by Jackendoff 1983:163; the term *domain* is borrowed in this sense from Weinsberg 1973:23-27). A (static) locative phrase describes an object as being in the reference domain, lative and ablative phrases describe an object as entering and leaving the reference domain respectively².

2. Types of government

The adpositions illustrated in (2) and (3) are based on nouns with a spatial meaning, denoting various possible reference domains. The following nouns occur in this function: *apakša* 'the space under, beneath something',

²The terms are somewhat awkward, especially *ablative*, as this term often refers to one of the "external" local cases of some languages, opposed to the "internal" relative case. However, I cannot think of a better alternative.

augša 'top, upper part', *starpa* 'interval, interspace', *vidus* 'middle', *virsa* (*virsus*) 'top, upper surface', and (rarely) *iekša* 'inside'.

The adpositions containing these nouns may of course combine with a genitive, which is to be interpreted originally as an adnominal possessive genitive. But in Latvian adnominal possessive genitives are often replaced by possessive datives, which are not strictly adnominal, but function as independent noun phrases. Instead of *izsist mājas logu* one may say *izsist mājai logu* (or *izsist logu mājai*). Similar constructions occur in many Indo-European languages, but Latvian is specific in not restricting them to animate nouns (a feature unknown even to Lithuanian). This alternative use of the possessive genitive and dative may be observed with noun-based postpositions as well. As the dative is treated as an independent noun phrase, it is not restricted to prenominal position, as the possessive genitive always is, and may be put after the adposition. This phenomenon I will call *extraction of the noun from the postpositional phrase*. It may be observed in (7) as against (6):

(6) "Te tev ir papīrs!" — teica Gnēze, nosviezdams *galda vidū* iegarenu zīmi. (A. Eglītis)

(7) Kad viņas jau bija *vidū ezeram*, Mazītis pieslējās sēdus... (A. Eglītis)

In a similar way, a noun may be extracted from a circumpositional phrase like the one illustrated in (3) and positioned before or after it (the adposition then ceases to be discontinuous):

(8) Kuģis izbrauca *pa tiltā apakšu*.

(9) Kuģis izbrauca *tiltam pa apakšu* (*pa apakšu tiltam*).

Often, though not always, additional shades of meaning are associated with this extraction from the adpositional phrase, and with the use of the dative instead of the genitive. These will be discussed further on.

Noun-based adpositions occur in series covering different types of spatial relations, just as the "internal" and "external" local cases of the Fennic languages do. The latter occur, as is known, in series of three, comprising a locative, lative and ablative term. In Latvian the system of adpositional local phrases is similar, but there are a few differences.

3. Semantic types of local phrases

3.1. Locative and lative phrases

Locative and lative phrases are usually not formally distinguished in Latvian. The illative, attested in Old Latvian, has been replaced by the locative (Livonian influence has been suspected here, cf. Serebrennikov 1959). As a result of this syncretism, the same case forms occur in *sēdēt istabā* and *ieiet istabā*. Thereby the means of formally distinguishing locative and lative postpositional phrases was also lost, as the postposition is based on a locative case form in both cases. It should be noted that *uz* (with the accusative), corresponding to English *to* and German *nach*, stands apart from the basic system of spatial relations represented by regular oppositions of locative, lative and ablative expressions, as it can never refer to an object's entering the reference domain (one cannot say **ieiet uz istabu*).

Within the system of adpositional phrases there are no formal distinctions directly associated with the distinction of locative and lative meaning. There are, however, some distinctions which are connected with it in a remote and indirect way, inasmuch as lative phrases, which more frequently represent obligatory arguments of predication than static locative phrases do, often enter a closer relationship with the verb, which may be reflected in extraction of the noun from the adpositional phrase and, correspondingly, in the use of the dative instead of the genitive; I will return to this point further on.

3.2. Ablative phrases

Apart from prepositional phrases with *no*, which (as a result of the loss of *iz* 'out of' in most dialects as well as in the standard language) provides ablative counterparts to locative phrases containing both the locative case and the preposition *uz* (with the genitive) 'on', all ablative phrases consist of combinations of *no* with nouns denoting the various reference domains, e.g. *no galda apakšas* 'from under the table'. The use of such circumpositional phrases to express ablative meaning is of course somehow connected with the lack of compound prepositions (comparable to Polish *spod stołu*, Lith. *iš po stalo*) in Latvian, but it is hard to establish the direction of the causal relation between these facts. Lithuanian provides no reliable evidence here, because its compound prepositions may be instances of Slavonic influence.

3.3. Perlative phrases

Most languages distinguish three possible relations of the located object to the reference domain: static (locative), lative and ablative. In addition to

these some languages, to which Latvian belongs, distinguish a fourth one: the perlocative relation. Perlocative expressions denote motion through the reference domain, the reference domain being traversed in such a way that the located object enters it at the initial point of its path and leaves it at the final point. Typical examples are *pa saknes apakšu* and *pa nažu starpu* in (3).

The perlocative relation often involves a change in location with regard to the reference object, but this is usually not treated as a relevant feature. In many languages locative phrases do not formally distinguish perlocative meaning from pure static location³. An exception seems to be constituted by Fennic, which sometimes treats the perlocative relation in the same way as the ablative one, v. *infra*.

Often the meaning of the compound expressions with *pa* is not strictly perlocative; it may also involve the idea of a chaotic motion or dispersion over a certain surface or space (which is in agreement with the original meaning of the preposition *pa*). In this meaning, perlocative local phrases may secondarily acquire a static locative character⁴. This is an instance of "the construction of a place concept from a reference path" (Jackendoff 1983:167); the local phrase basically denotes a path, but the located object may be "asserted to occupy the entire path at a single point in time" (Jackendoff 1983:173). This can be seen in (10):

(10) Viņa nopirka saulesargu, kur bālganā zīdā ziedēja sarkanās magones un tulpes, bet *tām pa vidu* zilas neaizmirstules. (P. Rozītis).

The question must of course be posed on what grounds the compound expressions with *pa* should be taken to represent one of the fundamental relations of the located object to the reference domain distinctly marked in every series of adpositional phrases associated with a particular reference domain, while this status was denied to the phrase with *gar* in (4). I think the reason is threefold.

First, the use of adpositional phrases with *pa* is frequent and regular, whereas expressions as the one illustrated in (4) occur sporadically. A second

³Another IE language formally distinguishing perlocative meaning in a consistent way is Romanian, described by Weinsberg (1973); in Romanian as well as in Latvian perlocative meaning is marked by a preposition, but in Romanian this preposition is added to the preposition marking the reference domain.

⁴This is also characteristic of the instrumental in Both Slavonic and Lithuanian, cf. Fraenkel (1928:191-2). Weinsberg (1973:108) notes the same for Romanian perlocative phrases with *pe*.

reason, already invoked in the discussion of (4) and (5), is that the nouns appearing in perlocative phrases with *pa* do not, as a rule, seem to be referential. Finally, perlocative meaning can be defined by means of rather elementary notions which are also involved in the definition of the locative, lative and ablative relations, whereas the definition of compound expressions with *gar* would have to be more complex. The four relations just mentioned could be defined in the following way:

- (a) LOCATIVE: the object is in the reference domain;
- (b) LATIVE: the object starts being in the reference domain;
- (c) ABLATIVE: the object ceases to be in the reference domain;
- (d) PERLOCATIVE: the object starts being in the reference domain and subsequently ceases to be in it.

4. The syntactic properties of postpositional phrases

The syntactic status of local phrases may be of two different kinds. They may be optional modifiers of the predicate, or they may represent arguments of predication. Lative local phrases usually represent obligatory arguments with motion predicates (such as 'go', 'put' etc.), whereas static locatives are often optional modifiers. This statement is not universally valid, but it explains some of the morphosyntactic properties of local phrases in Latvian. As lative phrases usually represent arguments of motion predicates, they tend to enter a closer syntactic association with the verb. When taken in the lative sense, a marker of location may oscillate between the status of adposition and that of an adverb. In such cases it is not clear whether the noun denoting the reference object is syntactically dependent on the marker of location or on the compound verbal syntagm consisting of verb and adverb. Consider (15):

(11) Debess kļūst tumšāka, *saulei priekšā* velkas mākoņi. (R. Valdess)

The dative is obligatory here. *Priekšā* has a different status here than in (2), as can be seen from the fact that in (11) we may have inverse word order, i. e. we have extraction of the noun from the adpositional phrase, cf. (12), where inverse word order occurs:

(12) ... mākoņi velkas priekšā saulei.

Furthermore the close association of *priekšā* with the verb is often shown by the occurrence of a prefix with the verb. In sentences comparable in meaning to (11) the prefix *aiz-* may be added to the verb; the idea associated with this prefix is that of covering up, obstructing, concealing. This meaning of the prefix *aiz-* occurs exclusively in combination with *priekšā*, so that one might

even consider *aiziet priekšā* to be a kind of verbal compound obligatorily governing the dative.

(13) *Mēnesim priekšā* aizgāja mākonis. (A. Jakubāns)

Two different ways of segmenting the verb phrase might be considered here: [[*aiziet priekšā*] *mēnesim*] or [*aiziet* [*mēnesim priekšā*]]. Clearly, in (2) the verb phrase could be segmented in one way only: [*stāvēt* [*durvju priekšā*]].

The specific features distinguishing (11)-(13) from (2) seem to be both syntactic and semantic. But one may also contrast two sentences where the same semantic distinction occurs without a syntactic difference being manifest:

(14) *Vārtu priekšā* ir smilšu kaudze.

(15) *Vārtiem priekšā* ir smilšu kaudze.

(14) just denotes location in front of the gate, whereas (15) suggests the gate being obstructed. Of course one could consider proposing different syntactic derivations for (14) and (15) (by operating with a compound *būt priekšā*), but that would not solve the problem. The dative may occur in sentences where we are clearly dealing with an adpositional phrase representing no more than an optional modifier, as in (16):

(16) *Viņa ieraudzīja* [...] omnibusu, *kuram priekšā* snauda divi pāti, *izdējuši zirgi*. (P. Rozītis)

Here, of course, we have no reason whatsoever to suppose that *priekšā* constitutes a verbal compound together with *snauda*. Syntactically, there are no differences between (16) and (2) with regard to the features which concern us here. The fact that in (16) it is the pronoun *kurš*, not a noun, that occurs in the dative, is irrelevant, cf. (17), where we have the genitive:

(17) *Dievu šie saimnieki turēja par savu vienīgo kungu, kura priekšā* vajadzēja piekāpties [...] (E. Virza)

The only conceivable reason for the use of the dative in (16) is thus exclusively semantic. I think the semantic feature associated with the use of the dative is that of "affectedness". If the mere idea of location with regard to a reference object is involved, without this reference object being affected by it, then we will expect the genitive to be used. Now the idea of obstruction conveyed by (13) and (15) is clearly a kind of affectedness. We probably have another kind of affectedness in (16): here the use of the dative suggests the located object somehow belongs to the reference object; in this particular case, that the horses are harnessed to the coach, not just standing in front of it.

A still closer relation, that of part to whole, is suggested in (18). Here, however, it is not clear whether we are still dealing with a postpositional phrase. The sentence may be viewed as containing a possessive predicate, expressed by a construction of the type *mihi est*, and *priekšā* may be just an adverb. The translation might be 'The door has a padlock on it' as well as 'There is a padlock on the door'.

(18) *Apeju laidaru — durvīm atslēgas priekšā*. (E. Virza)

The choice between these two alternative constructions is probably not always associated with semantic differences. Extraction of the noun from the adpositional phrase allows word order to be changed, and word order is often determined by topicalisation. A reason for the use of *izlīst sētai pa apakšu* instead of *izlīst pa sētas apakšu* may be that the reference object is topicalised and the path is in focus. Another reason for the noun to be extracted from the adpositional phrase may be the wish to attach a relative clause to it, which is impossible if the noun is immediately followed by the postposition or the right part of the circumposition.

5. Types of adpositional local microsystems.

5.0. The microsystems of case forms and adpositional phrases covering the particular reference domains are thus structured in various ways. Nearly all of them are heterogeneous. Only two of them are consistently postpositional/circumpositional: those based on *vidus* and *priekša*. Not a single one is consistently prepositional. The following microsystems illustrate the particular types (the overview is far from complete):

5.1. 'IN': locative and lative meaning are covered by the locative case, ablative meaning by *no*. The preposition *pa*, which marks perlocative meaning in compound adpositional phrases, has by itself a rather imprecise meaning, as it also denotes dispersion over a surface, and in purely perlocative meaning the preposition *caur* or the semi-preposition *cauri* are commonly used (*sēdēt istabā, ieiet istabā, iziet no istabas, iziet cauri istabai*).

5.2. 'ON': locative and lative meaning are covered by *uz*, ablative meaning by *no*, perlocative meaning by *pa ... virsu*, as in *pa ūdens virsu* 'over the surface of the water'. *Pa ... virsu* may sometimes function as a perlocative counterpart of *virš* 'above' (*mākoņi skrien pa galvas virsu*). It may be derived from *virsa* 'top, upper surface', whereas the locative *viršū* (in the isolated Biblical expression *zemes viršū*) is derived from the now obsolete form *virsus*. There are also (mainly ablative) adpositional phrases based on *augša* 'top, upper

part', e.g. *nocelt koferi no skapja augšas*. It seems that *augša* is used when the vertical dimension of the reference object is stressed (in *no ... augšas* the reference object is viewed as having a certain height and a downward motion is suggested), whereas in the case of *virsa* the horizontal dimensions of the object are prominent. Adpositional phrases with *virsa* and *augša* seem to be used mainly when the unmarked type of location is *inside* the reference object, so that the mere preposition *no* (as in *ņemt koferi no skapja*) would be taken to mean 'from inside the reference object'.

5.3. 'UNDER': locative and lative meaning are covered by *zem* (or *apakš*, which dominates in some regions but is felt to be somewhat archaic in the literary language), ablative meaning by *no ... apakšas*, perlative meaning by *pa ... apakšu*. The regularity of this microsystem is disturbed by occasional uses of *apakšā* (always with the dative) in locative and lative meaning. *Apakšā* may be translated as 'at the bottom of something', and it is used when the located object is thought of as being a part, or an essential accessory of, the reference object, as in (19), (20):

(19) Man gan bija acis redzēt, ka jūs [...] bāzāt vienai čupiņai apakšā norunātas kārtis (A. Deglavs)

(20) [...] ja viņš apliecībai reiz licis apakšā savu parakstu [...], tad nevienam nebija tiesība par viņu ko labāk zināt [...]. (A. Deglavs)

Such uses of *apakšā* always show extraction of the noun from the postpositional phrase. From the semantic point of view, there seem to be similar conditions on the use of such constructions as on the uses of *priekšā* with extraction of the noun: in (19) and (20) there is a relation of part to whole between the located object and the reference object, as in (16), (18).

5.4. 'BETWEEN, AMONG': this microsystem is comparable to the preceding one in that the locative and lative meanings are covered by a preposition: *starp*, whereas the perlative *pa ... starpu* is based on the noun *starpā*. Here as well, there are postpositional phrases competing with the preposition in locative and lative meaning, but here the semantic differentiation is more clearly defined: postpositional *starpā* means 'among', and it is used with plural nouns referring to groups of persons or objects.

5.5. 'IN THE MIDDLE OF': locative and lative *vidū*, ablative *no ... vidus*, perlative *pa ... vidu*. Probably the most regular of the microsystems mentioned here.

5.6. 'IN FRONT OF': *priekšā* in locative and lative meaning, *no ... priekšas* in ablative meaning. The perlative *pa priekšu* shows a certain se-

mantic specialisation. It can only mean 'ahead of (some object or person in motion)' and thus lacks the meaning of motion across the reference domain, which is characteristic of the remaining perlative phrases. In this case we observe obligatory extraction of the noun from the circumpositional phrase, whereas the perlative phrases denoting motion across the reference domain are regularly used as circumpositions with the genitive:

(21) *Draugiem pa priekšu* viņš noskrēja pa trepēm zemē. (P. Rozītis)

Perhaps this deviant syntactic treatment correlates with the semantic deviancy of these expressions. It may be noted that *pa priekšu* shows the same syntactic features as the antonymous *pakaļ*, which belongs to the class of semi-prepositions:

(22) *Viņiem pakaļ* aizgāja arī citi puikas. (P. Rozītis)

5.7. Some microsystems are defective; this is the case with *aiz* 'behind', for which there are no regular ablative and perlative counterparts. These can be constructed only when there is a nominal compound with *aiz*- denoting the reference domain. So, for instance, there is a noun *aizdurve* 'the place behind the door', from which (in addition to the locative *aizdurvē* 'behind the door') an ablative *no aizdurves* may be derived. In other cases such a compound noun doubles prepositional expressions, cf. *pabāzt koferi pagultē* and *pabāzt koferi zem gultas*. The productivity of this derivational type in both Latvian and Lithuanian is quite striking⁵. Perhaps the cause should be sought in the tendency of Baltic to denote the reference domain in local phrases by means of a noun, as in expressions with *priekša*, *apakša* etc. The names of familiar objects often used as landmarks were even incorporated, which gave rise to nouns denoting the reference object and the reference domain at the same time.

6. The semi-prepositions

The second group mentioned at the start, and referred to in Latvian grammatical terminology as semi-prepositions, comprises the following items: *apkārt* 'around', *blakus*, *līdzās* 'next to', *cauri* 'through', *garām* 'past, by', *pāri* 'over, above', *pakaļ* 'behind, after', *pretī* 'opposite'.

Between the noun-based postpositions and the semi-prepositions there are

⁵There is no equivalent for this in Slavonic, where formations like Polish *podstrzesze* (from *strzecha*) do exist, but are not used just to mark the reference domain in local phrases.

two major differences. The most salient feature of noun-based postpositions is that they can govern the genitive, whereas the semi-prepositions cannot. The semi-prepositions always govern the dative, and they may be either prenominal or postnominal:

(23) *Zēns aizskrēja mājai garām.*

(24) *Zēns aizskrēja garām mājai.*

It should be added that some of the noun-based adpositional phrases mentioned above show, in certain of their uses, a distinct preference for the construction with extraction of the noun from the adpositional phrase, and combine with the dative only; they are thereby reminiscent of the semi-prepositions. With regard to syntactic properties, the line of division between both groups is not always a neat one.

A second difference between the noun-based adpositions and the semi-prepositions is that, while the former are (to a varying extent) serial, the latter are not. As a preposition cannot be added to the semi-preposition, there is no means of deriving, say, an ablative phrase from them.

Semantically, the semi-prepositions are heterogeneous. *Blakus*, *līdzās* and *pretī* are either locative or lative. *Apkārt* is locative, lative or perlative, without it being possible to determine which meaning is primary (the same can be said of the corresponding prepositions in various languages). *Cauri*, *garām*, *pakaļ* and *pāri* are in themselves perlative, and they normally occur with motion verbs. However, in this case as well as in that of the perlative phrases discussed in 3.3., a perlative expression can be used to denote static location, as in (25) and (26):

(25) ... to varēja dzirdēt ne tikai Lasmaņa skārņī, bet *cauri visai pilsētai*. (P. Rozītis)

(26) [...] *pāri visai Krievijai* esmu veicinājis dejas mākslu. (J. Grete)

Were it not for constructions like these, one could view the combinations of verbs with the semi-prepositions as a kind of compound verbs (as their Estonian counterparts are in Estonian grammar). Some of them, like *iet*, *braukt garām* 'to pass', can in fact be used without a noun, as in *vilciens pašlaik brauc garām*. The same question was raised above in connection with the noun-based adpositions. Such an approach, however, would not permit a uniform treatment of either the semi-prepositions or the noun-based adpositions.

As to the distinction between these two categories, it exists from the morphological point of view, but there are no serious semantic or syntactic

arguments for keeping them apart. We might rather speak of a continuum than of a neat line of division. The noun-based *pa priekšu* in (21) is more similar in syntactic behaviour to the semi-preposition *pakaļ* in (22) than to *priekšā* in (2), which is noun-based too.

As to the government of the semi-prepositions, I assume it was taken over from the noun-based adpositions. With the latter, the dative has a purely syntactic motivation: it replaces an adnominal genitive. In the case of the semi-prepositions, one would have *a priori* expected other kinds of government, especially prepositional ones. Note that, if we have *iet istabā iekšā* and *kāpt kalnā augšā* (with double marking of the reference domain in each case), we would expect an analogous *iet ap māju apkārt*, instead of which we usually have *iet mājai apkārt*.

In fact, we have two divergent developments here. Some locatives of nouns with a spatial meaning started functioning as postpositions. This was not the case with *iekšā* and *augšā*, which are never used as postpositions replacing the locative case and the preposition *uz* respectively. Therefore these forms retain a purely adverbial function, and in *iet istabā iekšā* and *kāpt kalnā augšā* they merely provide redundant marking of a spatial relation already marked by the case form. *Apakšā*, on the other hand, developed a somewhat different meaning from the preposition *zem* (as we saw above), and instead of being used as a redundant marker occurring alongside with a preposition, it behaves itself as an adposition, competing (but usually not co-occurring) with *zem*. For this reason we have the dative *aplicībai*, not *zem aplicības*, in (20). Now this pattern was followed by semi-prepositions such as *apkārt*. As the dative (replacing the adnominal genitive) was syntactically motivated in the case of noun-based adpositions, these must have provided the model for the government of the semi-prepositions.

It should be noted that this type of government was even transferred to verbal constructions without semi-prepositions. Verbs with the prefixies *ap-* and *pār-* may now often govern the dative, which is a Latvian innovation, unknown to either Slavonic or Lithuanian. These datives originally depended on the semi-prepositions *apkārt* and *pāri* respectively, as in *apiet mājai apkārt* and *pāriet pāri ielai*. As a result, constructions arose where the dative was retained although the semi-preposition was dropped. In addition to the traditional types of government represented by *pārkāpt sliekšni* and *pārkāpt pār sliekšni* Latvian now has a third possibility, *pārkāpt sliekšnim*, whereas Lithuanian has only constructions of the first two types (*peržengti slenkestį*

and *peržengti per slenkstī*); similarly there is a construction *apiet mājai* instead of the traditional *apiet (ap) māju*.

7. Areal aspects

It has not escaped the notice of scholars that the Latvian postpositional phrases may have arisen under the influence of a Fennic substratum. Postpositions are a characteristic feature of the Fennic languages, which have a predominant adjunct-head order also reflected in the use of case affixes corresponding to the prepositions of languages with a predominant head-adjunct order. For a recent discussion cf. Stolz (1991:81-8).

One should, however, be cautious in assessing the extent to which the evolution of the Latvian system of adpositional local phrases has been determined by Fennic influence. The following facts should be taken into account.

First, the Baltic languages consistently apply the adjunct-head pattern in the case of adnominal genitives (with the exception of partitive genitives with nouns functioning as quantifiers). It is true that, even if one regards this as an archaism (in accordance with the views of Lehmann and other scholars, who assume Indo-European to have been originally of the adjunct-head type, cf. Lehmann 1974), the Fennic adstratum must have contributed to the retention of this instance of adjunct-head order (which is much less consistent in Lithuanian, where Slavonic influence has been at work). But once this pattern had been firmly established, there had to be a strong tendency to observe it in newly created noun-based adpositions. A few case forms of nouns early developed into prepositions: *apakš*, *iekš*, *priekš* and *virš* developed from the locatives (partly illatives?) of *apakša*, *iekša*, *priekša* and *viršus*. There are isolated instances of non-truncated locatives functioning as prepositions, cf. *vidū jūras* cited by Endzelin 1905:200 = 1971:499), but they are not common. Lithuanian does not seem to share this aversion for non-truncated case forms used as prepositions, cf. *galè laūko*, *kraštè mārīy*, *prieky vežimo* (Ambrazas, ed., 1985:364). It is clear that at some time the tendency to make prepositions out of case forms of nouns with a spatial meaning has been at work in both languages. If Latvian has an aversion for prepositions which can be clearly recognised as being case forms of nouns (as *vidū* in *vidū jūras*), then this seems to point to the specific relevance of the prenominal genitive (which must have been Common Baltic) rather than of the adjunct-head order generally as a factor determining constituent order in adpositional syntagms. Against the background of Common Baltic constructions with prenominal genitives

Lithuanian *vidury sodo* (which is reminiscent of Russian *posredi sada*, Polish *pośrodku sadu*) is more conspicuously deviant than Latvian *dārza vidū*. Here and elsewhere, the Slavonic adstratum of Lithuanian is as much of a problem as the Fennic adstratum of Latvian. When studying the Baltic languages from the viewpoint of areal linguistics, one is in a much worse situation than the investigators of the Balkan languages, who at least have Ancient Greek, Latin and Old Church Slavonic as reliable landmarks.

A second point is that the Latvian system of adpositional locative phrases is characterised by a quaternary opposition including perlocative meaning as a distinct term, whereas Fennic has only a ternary system (locative, lative and ablative). What is characteristic of Fennic is that perlocative meaning may often be marked by an expression of the ablative type, sc. the elative. For Finnish this is noted by Fromm & Sadeniemi (1956:150). The reason for this seems to be that passing through, by, over or beneath some object ultimately results in motion away from the object (which seems to be echoed by the use of the prefix *iz-* in combination with *cauri*, *pa apakšu* etc. and *aiz-* in combination with *garām* in Latvian). In Estonian as well, the elative regularly occurs in this function (cf. Tauli 1983:112-4). We may note the following constructions:

- (27) *läksime saalist läbi* 'we traversed the room'
- (28) *läksin oma majast mööda* 'I walked past my house'
- (29) *ta läks sillast üle* 'he crossed the bridge'

Livonian has similar constructions, cf. *kōrantst pi'ddōZ* 'lāngs dem gehöfte' (Kettunen 1938:285b⁶). Neither of the neighbouring Fennic languages has a distinct set of perlocative expressions. Curiously enough the type of locative phrases showing the most consistent use of postpositional markers is the one which is not represented in Fennic.

The cause of the rise of a distinct set of perlocative expressions in Latvian should perhaps be sought in the loss of the instrumental case. In the original Indo-European case system the expression of the perlocative relationship seems to have been the spatial function of the instrumental (cf. Kuryłowicz 1964:189), and this function is well preserved in Slavonic and in Lithuanian (Fraenkel 1928:190-1), cf. Polish *iść drogą*, Lith. *eiti keliu*. Along with the loss of the instrumental as a distinct case form, Latvian generalised prepositional phrases with *pa*, as in *iet pa ceļu* (the Slavonic and Lithuanian equivalents of this preposition denote only dispersion over a surface). There are no instan-

⁶In the Livonian examples the orthography of the sources is retained.

ces of the instrumental being transferred in its specific perlocative meaning to prepositional phrases, as the locative, accusative and ablative (or the case forms replacing them as a result of case syncretism) were in Greek and Slavonic. In those languages where it is used in prepositional phrases (Slavonic and Lithuanian) its basic use is purely locative. In Latvian, however, the introduction of the preposition *pa*, together with the tendency to make new adpositional phrases out of nominal case forms, provided a convenient means of creating a distinct set of perlocative expressions, as *pa zemes virsū* could be opposed to *zemes virsū*.

However, the introduction of the preposition *pa* was a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for the creation of a set of perlocative adpositional phrases. Perhaps the cause of its rise should be sought in the abandonment of distinctive marking of the opposition of stative locative and lative meaning. In a situation where *gulēt zem galda* and *līst zem galda* are not distinguished by case marking or by the use of different prepositions, the opposition is conveyed exclusively by the verb. In languages with formally marked lative constructions a stative locative phrase in combination with a motion verb is interpreted as perlocative if the verb is one-directional, cf. Polish *statek płynie pod mostem* vs. *statek płynie pod most*. The lack of this differentiation in Latvian would normally lead to the coalescence of three out of the four terms of the system of spatial relations: locative, lative and perlocative. Perhaps insufficient differentiation in one part of this system has brought about the rise of an additional differentiation in another part.

The Fennic examples cited above reveal another difference between the Fennic and Latvian postpositional expressions. In Fennic postpositions normally govern the genitive, though other case forms occasionally occur (Tauli 1966:47). In Estonian postposition-like adverbs entering close combinations with verbs often govern local cases — the elative in (27)-(29) is an instance of this. Other cases also occur. We have an allative in (30):

(30) koer läheb *peremehele* järele 'the dog follows (walks behind) his master'

Nothing of the kind can be found in Latvian, where only the dative or, in the case of noun-based postpositions, the dative alternating with the genitive, can be found. As mentioned above, this dative must have been originally a possessive dative, just as the genitive was originally a possessive adnominal genitive. Nowhere is the case form determined by the type of spatial relationship denoted by the postposition or adverb. Its motivation is purely syntactic

and it is to be sought within Latvian itself.

On the other hand, the Latvian use of case forms with postpositions seems to have been at least partly adopted by Livonian. Livonian differs from the remaining Balto-Fennic languages in having developed a kind of dative case (Kettunen's "Dativ-Lokativ"), which, though proto-Fennic in origin (it is derived from an original locative), seems to have acquired its present functions under the influence of Latvian (Kettunen 1938:XLI, de Sivers 1970:499). One of the uses of this Livonian dative may be observed in constructions analogous to the Latvian ones discussed here, cf. *ta ai'liz sie mi'en tagān* 'elle courut après cet homme' (Latv. *skrēja šim vīram pakā*), *tarā um tubān immer* 'der garten ist um das haus herum' (Kettunen 1938:73a; Latv. *mājai apkārt*). This use of the dative could be due to Latvian influence. It is interesting to note that with certain postpositions both the genitive and the dative can be used in Livonian: Kettunen (1938:404b) cites *tabā um uksōn / uks je'ts* 'ein vorhängeschloss hängt vor der tür'. The available material is fragmentary and I could not establish whether the distribution of these case forms is comparable to what we observe in Latvian. But de Sivers (1970:498) also notes that in similar cases Estonian would have the allative, whereas Finnish would have the genitive: Est. *sellele jalale alla* = Fin. *sen jalan alle* 'sous ce pied'. This, in turn, seems to be connected with the fact that Estonian makes extensive use of the allative in possessive function, cf. Est. *kaarnale selga* 'elle se mit' sur le dos du corbeau' (de Sivers 1970:498). On the other hand, it should also be noted that Latvian makes much more extensive use of the possessive dative than Lithuanian does⁷. This is probably an areal feature shared by Latvian, Estonian and Livonian. It deserves to be separately investigated, not only in connection with the postpositional phrases.

From the point of view of areal linguistics I think the extensive use of postpositional phrases in Latvian and their occurrence in neighbouring Fennic cannot be a mere coincidence. In the details, however, there is much divergence.

⁷Fraenkel (1928:121) deals with a few Lithuanian instances of the possessive dative derived from animate nouns under the heading "*dativus sympatheticus*". He expresses the view that the Baltic languages, unlike many other IE languages, do not frequently use this kind of dative, giving preference to the possessive genitive instead. This statement is based on Lithuanian material only and is obviously due to ignorance of the Latvian facts.

References

- Ambrazas, Vytautas, ed. (1985), *Grammatika litovskogo jazyka*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Bergmane, A. e.a., eds. (1959-1962), *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika I-II*, Rīgā: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.
- Endzelīns, Jānis (1905-1906), *Latyšskie predlogi I-II* (also in Endzelīns, Jānis, *Darbu izlase I*, Rīgā: Zinātne, 1971, 307-654).
- Fraenkel, Ernst (1928), *Syntax der litauischen Kasus*. Kaunas: Valstybės spaustuvė.
- Fromm, Hans & Sadeniemi, Matti (1956), *Finnisches Elementarbuch. I. Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1983), *Semantics and cognition*, Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press.
- Kettunen, Lauri (1938), *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, V).
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy (1964), *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. (1974), *Proto-Indo-European syntax*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Serebrennikov, B. A. (1959), O nekotorych vozmožnych priččinach proischoždenija illativnogo značeniija u latyšskogo lokativa, in: E. Sokols e.a., eds., *Rakstu krājums akadēmiķim profesoram Jānim Endzelīnam viņa 85. dzīves un 65. darba gadu atcelei*, Rīgā: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība, 243-246.
- Sivers, Fanny de (1970), Le datif en live, in: Velta Rūķe-Draviņa, ed., *Donum Balticum to Professor Christian S. Stang on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 495-500.
- Stolz, Thomas (1991), *Sprachbund im Baltikum? Estnisch und Lettisch im Zentrum einer sprachlichen Konvergenzlandschaft*, Bochum: Universitätsverlag Brockmeyer, (Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung, Bd. 13).
- Tauli, Valter (1966), *Structural tendencies in Uralic languages*, The Hague: Mouton.
- (1983), *Standard Estonian grammar. Part II, Syntax*. Uppsala (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia 14).

- Weinsberg, Adam (1973), *Przyimki przestrzenne w języku polskim, niemieckim i rumuńskim*, Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Uniwersytet Warszawski
Katedra Filologii Bałtyckiej
ul. Dobra 56
PL-00-312 Warszawa

Azel Holvoet