Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. (Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic, vol. 1) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2014. vii + 370 p.
ISBN 9789027259097 (hardback), ISBN 9789027270399 (e-book)

Reviewed by Andrej L. Malchukov, Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz & Institute for Linguistic Research, Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg

The volume under review deals with various aspects of non-canonical argument marking, grammatical relations and argument alternations in Baltic languages. The volume is a gold mine both for typologists interested in grammatical relations as well as for the students of Baltic languages. Since the reviewer is a typologist rather than a specialist in Baltic languages, in my review I will focus on some aspects which are of general typological interest.

The introductory chapter "Argument marking and grammatical relations in Baltic: An overview" (pp. 1–41) by Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau introduces major topics addressed in the volume as well as individual volume contributions. In terms of size and content it is more substantial than usual introductions to edited volumes and may count as a separate research article. The topics covered include: noncanonical subjects and objects in Baltic languages; differential case marking (in particular, the genitive-accusative alternation) across Baltic; syntactic subject properties of oblique subjects and non-canonical marking of arguments. All these topics are addressed from a contrastive perspective; in particular, the authors put to good use available parallel corpora of Lithuanian and Latvian. Along the way, the authors raise a number of topics of general interest, including the distinction between differential and non-canonical marking: indeed these are overlapping concepts, which are sometimes used indiscriminately. Another controversial question addressed (in particular, with regard to the patterns of pain-verbs) is whether the patterns with non-canonical subjects (A) and objects (O) qualify as transitive or intransitive ("extended intransitive" in the terminology of R.M.W. Dixon). One aspect which one would have wished to see more highlighted in this otherwise very instructive discussion is a diachronic outlook. Indeed, what looks synchronically like noncanonical marking of As and Os, diachroni-

cally, often represents intermediate stages of construction reanalysis (e.g. transitive to intransitive reanalysis of transimpersonals, as described in Malchukov & Ogawa 2011, or reanalysis of object experiencers into subject experiencers, as described in Haspelmath 2001). Apart from that, the editors do an excellent job in outlining research questions, laying a conceptual framework, as well as briefly introducing the contributions to the volume.

The volume opens with Peter Arkadiev's chapter "Case and word order in Lithuanian infinitival clauses revisited" (pp. 43–95). Arkadiev, who is better known as a typologist, here adopts a generative framework, which must be partly due to the fact that his analysis takes the minimalist account of Franks and Lavine (2006) as its starting point. Yet, the paper has a pronounced typological outlook in that the author takes inspiration from a typological comparison with Australian languages like Kayardild featuring case-stacking in the form of "complementizing" and "associating" case marking (Evans 1995). The construction under discussion is unusual in that the rules of object assignment with infinitives differ from verbs in a matrix clause: instead of accusative the object of the infinitive may appear in nominative, genitive or dative. Such variation, unattested in this form in matrix clauses, is indeed puzzling and in need of explanation. (One may, however, note in passing that nominative marking is reminiscent of emergence of the unmarked object in subjectless contexts in Finnish, while genitive and dative marking of objects is reminiscent of antipassive constructions in Australian languages, which—like infinitive/ supine constructions—are often associated with incompletive/irrealis/ future contexts). After presenting Franks & Lavine's movement analysis of case assignment in infinitival clauses, the author raises a number of empirical and conceptual problems with this account. His critique is substantial, and evidence against the proposed analysis is solid (also informed by the corpus data). Instead, he proposes an account informed by the analysis of multiple case-marking in languages like Kayardild. In essence, Arkadiev proposes that the dative and genitive cases are assigned by some higher heads to the verb phrase containing the object of the Infinitive and then percolate to its subconstituents (ending up on the object). The analysis is interesting and certainly an improvement as compared to earlier generative treatments. One may add that it is also in line with a typological observation that infinitives frequently originate from case-marked verbal nouns (Haspelmath 1989). It would be interesting to

compare the author's generative account and its predictions with Nord-linger's (1998) influential "Constructive Case" approach to multiple case marking (couched in Lexical Functional Grammar). One aspect, which I am missing in this otherwise excellent paper, is a diachronic dimension: the origin of the constructions in Lithuanian is not explained in detail, although the diachronic scenario could also inform synchronic analyses of whatever persuasion.[1]

The next chapter, by Axel Holvoet and Marta Grzybowska (pp. 97–135), is an in-depth study of non-canonical grammatical relations in the Latvian debitive construction. The aim of the paper is to account for the pattern of grammatical relations with the debitive, an inflectional form of the Latvian verb expressing necessity. The authors argue that the debitive construction displays what they call "diffuse grammatical relations". The debitive construction of the type *Man jā-dzer ūden-s* [1SG.DAT DEB-drink water-NOM] 'I must drink water' is unusual in that it shows non-canonical argument marking with the A in the dative, and the O in the nominative (or accusative, if the O is a 1st or 2nd person or reflexive pronoun). The authors show that some of the subjecthood tests (like control) cannot be applied here (for lack of nonfinite forms of the debitive), while the re-sults of some other tests (such as conjunction reduction) are inconclusive. Moreover, those tests which can be applied (like reflexivization), raise a more general question, whether the purported subjecthood diagnostics do not diagnose topics rather than subjects (p. 119). As far as I am aware, this issue in its general form remains unresolved in typology, as it is re-lated to the question of cross-linguistic comparability of constructions used as diagnostics and, in a broader perspective, to the hotly debated distinction between language-particular categories vs. cross-linguistic concepts (Haspelmath 2010). The authors further propose to regard Da-tive experiencers as 'demoted subjects' (an analysis inspired by Relational Grammar), and explain their subject properties by a higher rank on the 'obliqueness hierarchy'.[2] In effect, this means that the demoted subject-experiencer outranks the object in prominence. What can account for the diffuseness of grammatical relations in these structures? The authors warn

---

[1] But see another recent publication by Arkadiev (Arkadiev 2013), which does address dia-chronic issues.

[2] It should be noted that the terminology used in the paper is somewhat unconventional; thus what the authors call an obliqueness hierarchy is usually called an argument hierarchy or prominence hierarchy.

against simplistic diachronic explanations and propose instead that grammatical diffuseness "reflects obliqueness adjustments", whose "purpose is to bring the hierarchical ordering of cases in accordance with syntactic obliqueness when an obliqueness mismatch occurs" (p. 127). Given that 'obliqueness adjustment' refers to realignment of grammatical relations with the prominence hierarchies, this explanation is not at variance with the diachronic explanation, as far as I can see.

The next chapter "Alternations in argument realization and problematic cases of subjecthood in Lithuanian" (pp. 137–180) by Kristina Lenartaitė-Gotaučienė discusses the "*swarm*-alternation" in Lithuanian from a Construction Grammar perspective. The "*swarm*-alternation" is well known from English (cf. *Bees swarm in the garden ~ The garden swarms with bees*), but is also attested in Lithuanian (cf. *Filharmonij-oje knibždėjo įvairiausi-ų žmoni-ų.* [philharmonic-LOC.SG swarm.PST.3 various-GEN.PL people-GEN.PL] 'All kinds of people were swarming in the concert hall.' ~ *Filharmonij-a knibždėjo (nuo) įvairiausi-ų žmoni-ų.* [philharmonic-NOM.SG swarm.PST.3 (with) various-GEN.PL people-GEN.PL] 'The concert hall was swarming with all kinds of people.'). The author provides a detailed description of discourse-functional and semantic restrictions on the use of the "*swarm*-alternation". In particular, she shows that five different semantic classes of verbs take part in this alternation in Lithuanian (p. 144): 1) verbs denoting (multidirectional) movement of entities or substances (e.g., *knibždėti* 'teem, swarm'); 2) verbs denoting sound emission (e.g., *skambėti* 'sound, resound'); 3) verbs denoting light emission (e.g., *spindėti* 'shine, glow'); 4) verbs denoting smell emission (e.g., *kvepėti* 'smell, scent'); 5) verbs with the prefix *pri-*, denoting massive (usually directed) movement to some location (e.g., *privažiuoti* 'arrive massively'). Especially illuminating is a contrastive discussion of verb classes in Lithuanian, as compared with other European languages (English, but—less systematically—also other languages, like Dutch, Russian, German, Czech). This comparison reveals similarities but also some differences and raises a question of what motivates cross-linguistic variation in this domain. The variation seems to be partially due to structural factors: as the author observes, more liberal use of the "*swarm*-alternation" in Lithuanian may be due to its use with prefixed verbs; in fact, the verbs with the prefix *pri-* (*pribėgti* 'flow in, run (about liquid)' and the like) constitute the largest class of verbs in Lithuanian participating in this alternation. On the other hand, cross-linguistic similarities are semantically conditioned; thus

the author takes up a suggestion by Elena V. Padučeva (2007) that explains why olfactory perception (like *kvepėti* 'smell, scent' in Lithuanian and *paxnut'* 'smell' in Russian) take part in this alternation while verbs of visual perception do not (p. 157). The author also discusses the syntactic status of arguments within the "*swarm*-constructions" concluding that "in neither variant of the Lithuanian *swarm*-alternation can either of the two arguments be considered a prototypical subject, i.e., be said to display properties on the lexical (semantic), grammatical, and discourse levels of representation that are typical of a prototypical subject". While this observation is valid, in my view, it would be more profitable to distinguish between functional vs. syntactic properties more clearly and study the influence of the former on the latter rather than placing all these properties on a par (cf. Malchukov & Ogawa 2011). Yet, in general, this is an interesting empirical study which hopefully will be pursued more systematically in later work, as part of a wider program of contrastive analysis of argument alternations across Baltic languages.

The chapter by Rolandas Mikulskas "*Subjecthood in specificational copular constructions in Lithuanian*" (pp. 181–206) discusses specificational constructions like *Varžyb-ų nugalėtoj-as yra Jon-as.* [race-GEN.PL winner-NOM.SG be.prs.3 John-NOM.SG] 'The winner of the race is John', which are frequently considered to be an inverted variant of the more common type of predicative copular constructions (cf. *Jon-as yra varžyb-ų nugalėtoj-as* [John-NOM.SG be.PRS.3 race-GEN.PL winner-NOM.SG] 'John is the winner of the race'). A kind of inversion analysis is also adopted by mainstream generative accounts, which rely on movement to derive specificational constructions. The author argues convincingly against the movement-based generative accounts, but also notes some problems for the Cognitive Grammar accounts of specificational constructions. In particular, Cognitive Grammar accounts have difficulties in explaining cross-linguistic variation in these structures. Indeed, while languages like English (but also Danish, Swedish and French) treat the first nominal in specificational copular construction as the grammatical subject (for purposes of verb agreement), other languages including Lithuanian and Russian (but also Italian and German) assign subject properties (in particular, control of verb agreement) to the second nominal. On the Cognitive Grammar approach, this is unexpected on the assumption that Trajector and Landmark should be given consistent morphosyntactic expression across languages (with the Trajector mapping to subject). This also raises the question of

what is at the heart of the attested variation between languages in that domain. The author briefly considers (in footnote 15 on p. 195) a suggestion relating the possibility of having a postcopular subject to the freedom of word order (possibility of "scrambling"), but discards it pointing to some counterexamples (thus, Faroese generally disallows scrambling, like English, but shows variable agreement in specificational structures). Yet, it seems that this connection deserves further consideration, as it offers a straightforward functional explanation for the attested pattern. From a typological perspective, a single counterexample can't falsify a statistical generalization, but of course care should be taken to offer more typological evidence for the purported correlation from a broader range of languages.

Nicole Nau deals in her chapter (pp. 207–255) with Differential Object Marking (DOM) in Latgalian, a close relative to Latvian, which in some respects shows similarities to Lithuanian. The author offers a comprehensive analysis of differential argument marking based on corpus research, and thus makes a valuable contribution to documentation of this endangered idiom. The author covers a wide range of topics ranging from instances where DOM is morphologically conditioned (in particular, patterns of accusative-genitive syncretism in pronouns), to those where case variation is conditioned syntactically (by the context of negation and in irrealis clauses), as well as intermediate situations (such as accusative/partitive alternation with mass nouns). The analysis is typologically informed; for example, in discussion of bivalent intransitive verbs taking a genitive object (such as *meklēt* 'look for'), the author notes that distribution of the semantic classes of bivalent transitive and bivalent intransitive (genitive-assigning) verbs is at variance with the one-dimensional version of Tsunoda's (1985) Transitivity Hierarchy. In conclusion the author presents interesting discussion of DOM in Latgalian in a contrastive perspective, comparing the attested patterns of differential argument marking to other Baltic languages as well as to Russian. The analysis is insightful and suggestive, but leaves the reader wishing that this contrastive perspective could be pursued more systematically (e.g., by providing parallel data from the other Baltic languages for the Latgalian patterns summarized in Table 7 on p. 250), which would hopefully help to uncover the role of genealogical and areal factors in convergent patterns.

Ilja Seržant in his chapter ("The independent partitive genitive in Lithuanian", pp. 257–299) looks more specifically at the accusative-par-

titive alternation in Lithuanian. The author starts by introducing a theoretical assumption that constructions with the partitive genitive (of the type *Nusipirkau pien-o* [buy.PST.1SG milk-GEN.SG] 'I bought (some) milk.') involve an implicit quantifier, which implies an indefinite quantity and is responsible for case assignment. Usually the quantifier is left implicit, but it may also be overtly coded on the verb with prefixes with quantificational force (cf. *Pri-važiavo žmoni-ų* [QUANT-drive.PST.3 people-GEN.PL] 'There have arrived a lot of people.'). He further proceeds to an interesting discussion of aspectual composition, i.e. interaction of object marking with aspectual properties of the verb. This interaction is familiar from both Finnic and Slavic languages, but manifests itself in different ways. In Finnish, for example, it leads to aspectual contrasts (with the partitive associated with imperfective uses, and the accusative with perfective), while in Russian the partitive genitive is blocked in imperfective contexts altogether. In Lithuanian the situation is more complex and seems to be in a way intermediate between the Slavic and the Finnic patterns. As the author shows, the partitive genitive is used more freely in Lithuanian than in Russian; in particular, it can also be used when the object is bounded. The discussion is interesting and typologically informed and the data is subtle, yet, sometimes the discussion might have been clearer and more systematic. Thus one wishes that key notions such as 'boundedness' (also 'bounded indeterminate', 'bounded determinate', etc.) could be more clearly defined and provided with diagnostic contexts. Once this is done they can be applied across languages and can help to pinpoint similarities and divergences between languages. Introducing the tables comparing Lithuanian to Finnish (on p. 287) is certainly a step in the right direction, but it should have been accompanied with more explanation and also cross-referencing to the examples exemplifying the relevant contexts.

The last chapter by Björn Wiemer and Valgerður Bjarnadóttir "On the non-canonical marking of the highest-ranking argument in Lithuanian and Icelandic: Steps toward a database" (pp. 301–361) takes up a systematic contrastive perspective which I also advocated above. The choice of the two languages partially reflects the expertise of the authors, but is also due to the fact that Icelandic is famous for its non-canonical subject marking, and thus provides a suitable backdrop for the presentation of the Lithuanian data. The authors note that the analysis of the corresponding Lithuanian pattern in terms of noncanonical subject marking is controversial, as the respective arguments do not pass many subjecthood tests. This

also explains the choice of terminology: the terminology ('highest rank-ing argument') is adopted from Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) (Van Valin 2005 *passim*) and has the advantage that the authors do not commit themselves to the claim that they are dealing with non-canonical subjects. The authors explicitly present their study as a progress report on a project aiming at comprehensive contrastive treatment of valency patterns in Icelandic and Lithuanian, an ambitious enterprise which also envisages constructing a database of valency patterns in the two languages. In this regard the project follows up on two recent typological projects dealing with verbal valency, the project on bivalent valency patterns based in St. Petersburg (see, e.g., Say 2014), and the recently completed project on valency classes at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropol-ogy in Leipzig, which produced an edited volume (Malchukov & Comrie 2015) as well as a database (Hartmann, Haspelmath & Taylor 2013). Even though the results of the contrastive study of Lithuanian and Icelandic are preliminary, the study has already produced some interesting outcomes. As the authors show, although both languages display non-canonical ar-gument marking, the patterns are somewhat different (see the statisti-cal data summarized in the charts on pp. 326–329). Thus, Icelandic fea-tures dative marking on subjects more extensively than Lithuanian, while Lithuanian marks the highest-ranking argument by accusative instead (showing a preference for object experiencer verbs). A possibly correlated difference is that Lithuanian has a more developed class of physiological verbs than Icelandic, while Icelandic features some other verb classes li-censing non-canonical subjects (in particular, "fructitive verbs", the name the authors use for verbs like 'manage' and 'fail'). The data is fascinating and the discussion is insightful, bridging the fields of syntactic and lexi-cal typology, and inquiring to what extent semantics of individual verbs (and verb classes) is responsible for deviant case marking. Unfortunately, again the outlook is predominantly synchronic, and diachronic aspects are not sufficiently addressed: in particular, the authors do not relate the accusative-experiencer constructions (or oblique ambitransitives in Icelandic for that matter) to the transimpersonals scenario (i.e. reanalysis of transitive impersonals to experiencer subject constructions giving rise to oblique subjects and quasi-subjects at intermediate stages) which has been well documented across languages (Malchukov 2008: Malchukov & Ogawa 2011).

As is clear from the discussion above, the volume under review is a

valuable contribution to both Baltic studies (including language documentation, as in the chapter by Nau), and to general linguistics, and, in particular, to language typology. The thoroughness of the individual contributions makes Baltic languages some of the best investigated in the domain of argument marking. My only wish is that in follow-up studies[3] this research will be pursued in a more systematic manner (also through the use of questionnaires, which allow researchers to pool together all the wealth of interesting novel observations). Such systematic studies might start with the contrastive perspective (along the lines of research reported by Wiemer & Bjarnadóttir), and then be expanded to other Baltic languages, in order to create a cross-linguistic database, which can be used to inform areal typology, contact research and historical studies. A related issue already mentioned in relation to several contributions is that complementing a predominantly synchronic perspective with a diachronic outlook would be highly welcome, as it also helps to integrate the results of individual studies into a larger picture.

Overall, this is an excellent collection of papers, which makes Baltic languages among the most thoroughly investigated in the domain of grammatical relations. The discussion of non-canonical marking of subjects and objects in Baltic, as well as of related issues of diffuseness of grammatical relations, argument alternations, differential case marking and impersonal constructions, will inform the future typological and theoretical studies in this domain.

Andrej Malchukov
Johannes Gutenberg-Universität
General Linguistics/Language Typology
Jakob-Welder-Weg 18, D-55128 Mainz
malchuko@uni-mainz.de

---

[3] It is worth noting that the volume under review is part of an ambitious project on grammatical relations in Baltic languages coordinated by Axel Holvoet, whose results will appear in the series *Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic*. This project does a great service to both typological linguists as well as to specialists in Baltic languages by bringing these two research communities together. A related effort aimed at a junior audience to be mentioned in this connection is the yearly Summer School at Salos (Northeastern Lithuania) organized by Axel Holvoet and Gina Kavaliūnaitė-Holvoet since 2004, which is a forum promoting interdisciplinary approaches to Baltic languages, including descriptive, typological, historical, theoretical and corpus studies, to name a few.

References

ARKADIEV, PETER. 2013. Marking of subjects and objects in Lithuanian non-finite clauses: A typological and diachronic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 17.3, 397–437

EVANS, NICHOLAS. 1995. *A Grammar of Kayardild.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

FRANKS, STEPHEN & JAMES E. LAVINE. 2006. Case and word order in Lithuanian. *Journal of Linguistics* 42.1, 239–288.

HARTMANN, IREN, MARTIN HASPELMATH & BRADLEY TAYLOR, eds., 2013. *Valency Patterns Leipzig.* Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at http://valpal.info.)

HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 1989. From purposive to infinitive—a universal path of grammaticalization. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10.1–2, 287–310.

HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2001. Non-canonical marking of core arguments in European languages. In : Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, Robert M. W. Dixon & Masayuki Onishi, eds., *Non-Canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects* [Typological Studies in Language, 46], 53–83. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in cross-linguistic studies. *Language* 86.3, 663–687.

MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ. 2008. Split intransitives, experiencer objects and 'transimpersonal' constructions: (re-) establishing the connection. In: Mark Donohue & Søren Wichmann, eds., *The Typology of Semantic Alignment.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 76–101.

MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ & BERNARD COMRIE, eds., 2015. *Valency Classes in the World's Languages.* 2 vols. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

MALCHUKOV, ANDREJ & AKIO OGAWA. 2011. Towards a typology of impersonal constructions. A semantic map approach. In: Anna Siewierska & Andrej Malchukov, eds., *Impersonal Constructions,* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 19–57.

NORDLINGER, RACHEL. 1998. *Constructive Case: Evidence from Australian Languages.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

PADUČEVA, ELENA V. 2007. Genitiv otricanija i nabljudatel' v glagolax tipa zvenet' i paxnut' [Genitive of negation and Observer with verbs of the type *zvenet' and paxnut'*]. http://lexicograph.ruslang.ru/TextPdf1/paxnut_2007.pdf

SAY, SERGEJ. 2014. Bivalent verb classes in the languages of Europe: A quantitative typological study. *Language Dynamics and Change* 4, 116–166.

TSUNODA, TASAKU. 1985. Remarks on transitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 21.2, 385–396.

VAN VALIN, ROBERT D. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.