The voice domain in Baltic and its neighbours: Introduction

Axel Holvoet

Vilnius University

This article outlines the aims, methodological approaches and research topics of the thematic volume *Studies in the Voice Domain in Baltic and Its Neighbours.* It also briefly characterises the individual contributions to the volume, highlighting their main ideas and pointing out their relevance to ongoing discussions as well as the impulses they can give to further (also cross-linguistic) research. The grammatical domains explored in the volume are the passive, the middle voice and the causative.

Keywords: grammatical voice, passive, middle voice, causative, impersonal, reflexive, facilitative, antipassive, autobenefactive, Baltic, Slavonic, Fennic

1. The nature of the undertaking[1]

The present volume contains eight studies in the domain of voice, concentrating on Baltic but occasionally extending in their coverage to the neighbouring Slavonic and Fennic languages. The subdomains represented are those of the passive, the middle and the causative.

This volume was preceded by a collection of articles entitled *Minor Grams in Baltic, Slavonic and Fennic,* which made up Vol. 10 of this journal. The contributions to that volume dealt with phenomena that are relevant to grammar but rarely make it to the grammars, except, perhaps, in the form of a footnote. These included, on the one hand, grammatical con-

structions of limited scope and frequency, not quite fitting into the major grammatical correlations running through the whole verbal system, such as the Lithuanian progressive-proximative-avertive construction '*buvo + be*-PPRA' (Arkadiev 2019) or the Latvian continuative construction *runāt vienā runāšanā* 'talk in one talking' (Nau 2019). On the other hand, they included constructional idioms on the borderline between grammar and the lexicon. No particular grammatical domain was singled out in that volume, as the common thread running through it was the character of the constructions dealt with, all eluding the traditional notion of grammatical category while for the most part being firmly grounded in the grammatical domains of tense, aspect or voice. The last-mentioned of these domains is represented by a study of the Latvian and Fennic agentive construction (Holvoet, Daugavet, Spraunienė and Laugalienė 2019), which could just as well have found a place in the present volume.

The present collection of articles continues, in an important sense, the line of research represented in the earlier volume. The contributions deal, this time, with one grammatical domain, that of voice; but the emphasis is on smaller-scope constructions within major categories, and on splitting rather than on lumping. In the domain of reflexive-marked constructions representing the domain of the middle voice, this was actually already the prevailing practice. What we here call middle-voice constructions, that is, constructions with a formerly reflexive marker that are not in any meaningful way semantically reflexive, is rarely treated as a unitary domain. Instead, 'anticausatives', 'reciprocals' and the like are usually dealt with as constructions in their own right. The very notion of 'middle voice' has become discredited in the eyes of many linguists as being vague or hybrid (cf. e.g., Mel'čuk 1993, 21–22). But categories traditionally viewed as much more homogeneous, like the passive, also turn out, on closer inspection, to allow of a convincing subdivision into a number of functionally differentiated constructions, as reflected already in the work of Geniušienė (2016). It is, of course, not difficult to formulate an invariant feature underlying all passives: the best candidate for that would be the demotion of the agent from the position of grammatical subject. But this invariant feature would hardly do justice to the functional variety we find among passive-marked (in the sense just characterised by this invariant) constructions. The main motivation for a passive construction

may be foregrounding of the patient rather than backgrounding of the agent; patient-foregrounding passives can further be subdivided into those that just profile an event from the point of view of the patient (rather than taking the agent as a vantage point, as the active usually does), and those whose function is to characterise the patient (abstracting away from the agency producing it); and more subdivisions can be envisaged. Viewed in this way, the differences between the passive and the middle domain are perhaps not so enormous as might be suggested by current grammatical terminology.

The present volume is dedicated, then, to three subdomains within the broadly defined domain of voice: the passive, the middle and the causative. The work presented in the volume has profited, in many respects, from the insights gained from earlier research work carried out at Vilnius University between October 2012 and September 2015 in the framework of the project *Valency, Argument Realisation and Grammatical Relations in Baltic*.[2] The research results pertaining to the domain of voice and its relation to argument structure are presented in Holvoet & Nau, eds. (2015). Apart from an overview article on voice in Baltic (Nau & Holvoet 2015) this volume presents a number of studies on causatives, passives and middles in Lithuanian and Latvian. In many respects these studies were able to profit from grammatical research work carried out over almost a hundred years by Lithuanian and Latvian linguists, but they also took a broader typological view and, in a few cases, offered novel approaches inspired by theoretical frameworks such as Minimalism or Role and Reference Grammar. The authors contributing to the present volume are therefore certainly not treading in uncharted territory. The studies contained in it are, however, a further step forward in their consistent use of corpora (the internet corpora now available through Sketch Engine[3] have been instrumental in this), its construction-based approach enabling a more fine-grained analysis, and the ever-increasing body of typological insights brought to bear on the data of the Baltic languages.

---

[2] This project was financed from the European Social Fund under grant agreement with the Research Council of Lithuania (project No. vp1-3.1-šmm-07-к-02-022).

[3] https://www.sketchengine.eu

2. A note on voice

Our approach has been not to make any a-priori decisions as to what should, or should not, count as voice on the basis of argument structure, but to take the morphology traditionally associated with voice as our point of departure and to look without preconceived opinions at the constructions relying on this morphology for their formal marking. We fully embrace the now increasingly predominant construction-based view of grammar (Fillmore, Kay & O'Connor 1988, Hoffmann & Trousdale, eds. 2013, etc.), which is now paralleled by a construction-based approach to diachronic developments in grammar (Barðdal *et al.*, 2015) and a constructional reformulation of grammaticalisation (Traugott & Trousdale 2013). The constructional view (like any other view, it should be added) allows both for a form-to-function and a function-to-form approach: one can either look at a group of constructions with comparable semantic-pragmatic functions, or at a group of constructions sharing common morphology (a common 'grammatical category'). Both approaches just outlined are represented in the present volume. The form-to-function approach can be found in Nicole Nau, Birutė Spraunienė and Vaiva Žeimantienė's study of the passive family, which explores, with the aid of corpus data, the constructions united by the common passive morphology. On the other hand, Axel Holvoet & Anna Daugavet's study of antipassive reflexives in Latvian, though also corpus-based, starts out from a clear idea of what can or cannot be viewed as an instantiation of the cross-linguistic concept of antipassive. In the case of reflexive-marked constructions, a consistent form-to-function approach would have been less practicable in view of the very wide functional field covered by reflexive markers.

A persistent question in the domain of voice has been that of grammatical voice as opposed to lexical valency-changing constructions, also formulated as a difference between 'meaning-preserving' and 'meaning-changing' alternations (Kroeger 2005, 270–282); for a recent discussion see Spencer (2013, 90–109). The discussion comprises, as an important aspect, argument structure, with many arguing that the defining feature of grammatical voice is valency change without changes in argument structure; this is the point of view of the St Petersburg school of typology as outlined in Kulikov (2011), while other definitions are non-restrictive in this respect, e.g. Zuñiga & Kittilä (2019, 4–5). But there is also the contrast

between lexically entrenched constructions and those that are freely created online. These questions are relevant especially in the middle domain, which is extremely heterogeneous. The passive domain seems to be safely on the inflectional side, whereas causatives show great variety, ranging from clearly derivational in Baltic to near-inflectional in Japanese ('morphosyntactic' rather than 'morpholexical' in Sadler & Spencer 1998, 228). If any conclusion can be said to emerge from the studies in the present volume, it would be that neat divisions do not seem to exist; even within the relatively small domain of antipassive reflexives—argument structures being equal—some subtypes appear to be clearly lexical in forming closed classes of lexical forms while others are freely produced online and so little entrenched that they do not make it into the dictionaries. With regard to the inflection-derivation divide, the middle voice is clearly split, and it is split in different ways with regard to different criteria, that of argument structure and that of the 'entrenched vs. online' distinction (cf. Holvoet, Grzybowska & Rembiałkowska 2015).

3. The articles in this volume

Three papers in this volume deal with the domain of the passive and the closely related impersonal. In their article "The passive family in Baltic", Nicole Nau, Birutė Spraunienė and Vaiva Žeimantienė decompose the Lithuanian and Latvian passive into a number of smaller voice constructions with varying formal and functional parameters but sharing the passive morphology. Apart from canonical passives, the authors single out a number of constructions differing along a finely differentiated set of parameters. Some passive constructions have a non-identified agent while in other cases the agent is definite and known (often coinciding with the speaker); some have definite, topicalised patients whereas others are characterised by indefinite, weakly referential patients; some have modal overtones whereas others have not, etc. For every construction that is singled out, a table of attribute values is given, specifying how it behaves with regard to agent defocusing, object promotion, telicity, expression or suppression of the agent, animacy of the main arguments, and information structure. This differentiated approach, focusing on function and taking into account a large number of variables, sheds a new light on several established notions in the domain of the passive. One of these

is that of 'impersonal passive', traditionally based on the transitivity or intransitivity of the verb. The authors find it to be of limited usefulness, as it obfuscates more important functional divisions. They replace it with the notion of 'subjectless or subject-weak passive'. 'Subject-weak passives' are passives with non-topical, indefinite and weakly individuated patients. An example of a subject-weak passive is seen in (1), where a formally personal passive is coordinated with two impersonal passives:

(1) Latvian (from Nau, Spraunienė & Žeimantienė, this volume)
[*Šī gada Annas tika pilnībā "iznestas uz Rucavas sievu pleciem."*]

Tika	*gan*	***dziedāts***,	*gan*	***dancots***,
AUX.PST.3	ADD	SING.PST.PPP.SG.M	ADD	dance.PST.PPP.SG.M
gan	*Annas*	***godinātas***.		
ADD	Anna.NOM.PL	celebrate.PPP.PL.F		

'[This year St Anna's day was completely "shouldered by the women of Rucava".]
There was singing, dancing, and celebration of Annas.'

Though the last of these coordinated constructions is formally not an impersonal passive, it obviously has a similar function as the impersonal ones: the patient is not topicalised, but neither is it in focus: here *godināt Annas* 'Ann-celebrating' is represented as an activity with a generic patient. Another interesting and hitherto unnoticed phenomenon pointed out in the article is what is here called the 'cumulative-retrospective construction'. It is used to sum up a person's past experience in a domain of activity and in this sense it is somewhat similar in function to the experiential perfect. In Latvian it can actually be classified with the passive perfect, but in Lithuanian there is hardly any functional overlap. The Lithuanian variety is often superficially similar to the passive-based evidential because of the combination of intransitive verbs with a genitival subject, but is nonetheless distinct from it functionally:

(2) Lithuanian (CCLL, cited from Nau, Spraunienė & Žeimantienė, this volume)

Kiek	*anuomet*	*mano*	*vaikščiota*
how_much	at_the_time	1SG.POSS	walk.PPP.NA
gatvėmis,	*kiek*	*pamatyta,*	*kiek*
street.INS.PL	how_much	see.PPP.NA	how_much
nekantriai	*ieškota!*		
impatiently	search_for.PPP.NA		

'How much I walked along the streets at the time, how much I saw, how much I impatiently searched for things!'

On balance, it seems that the distinctive features of the 'cumulative-retrospective construction' should be viewed in the context of passive rather than of perfect semantics. Nau, Spraunienė & Žeimantienė's article thus identifies several hitherto unnoticed passive constructions in Baltic and offers a fuller picture of the functional diversity of the passive domain in Baltic and in general.

Lindström, Nau, Spraunienė & Laugalienė's article "Impersonal constructions with personal reference. Referents of deleted actors in Baltic and Estonian" elaborates, from a slightly different point of view and in a broader areal context, on one subtype of the passive also mentioned in the previously discussed article (section 6.1.3), viz. the impersonal or subject-weak passive referring to a definite, contextually retrievable agent, often the speaker:

(3) Latvian (from Lindström, Nau, Spraunienė & Laugalienė, this volume)

Barselonā	*un*	*Limasolā*	*ir*	*būts,*	*bet*
PLN.LOC	and	PLN.LOC	be.PRS.3	be.PPP.NA	but
tajā	*laikā*	*nezināj-u,*		*kas*	
dem.LOC.SG	time.LOC.SG	NEG.know.PST-1SG		what.NOM	
ir	*skriešana.*				
be.PRS.3	run.ACN.NOM.SG				

'I have been [= impersonal passive] to Barcelona and Limassol, but at that time I didn't know [= personal active] what running means.'

Such uses are at variance with the widespread conviction that the implicit agents (or quasi-agents) of impersonal constructions are mostly generic or vague. In the article, both Latvian and Lithuanian impersonal passives are investigated alongside functionally comparable constructions in Estonian. In Estonian, the counterpart of the Baltic subjectless passives with participles in -*t*- is a set of forms usually characterised as the impersonal. However, the Estonian impersonal shows a split in exponence: the simple tenses have affixal markers while the compound tenses consist of the auxiliary 'be' and a past participle; only the latter are examined in the article as they can be both formally and functionally compared to the Baltic constructions. On the functions of the Estonian impersonal in general cf., e.g., Torn-Leesik & Vihman (2010).

The authors find that the impersonal constructions utilised to refer to specific persons such as the speaker have an experiential flavour in that they sum up a person's past experiences of a certain type of activity or

event. This 'experiential' meaning is related to that of the experiential perfect, but should not be confused with it: the perfect is experiential in the sense of indefinite location in time (hence the alternative term 'existential perfect'), whereas the 'personal subjectless' passive denotes the current relevance of accumulated experience. Another interesting finding is that where a language has several impersonal constructions, one of them tends to specialise in a specific reading; in Estonian, one of the varieties of the periphrastic impersonal, with the auxiliary *saama* 'get', has become specialised in the function of referring to a specific implicit subject. While the extension of the research to neighbouring Estonian is instructive in several respects, the authors refrain from claiming that the correspondences between Baltic and Estonian are areally determined; they seem to reflect more widespread tendencies.

A third article dealing with the passive domain in Baltic is Kirill Kozhanov and Peter Arkadiev's study "(Non-)agreement of passive participles in South-Eastern Lithuanian". In Vytautas Ambrazas' work on Lithuanian participles, agreeing and non-agreeing passives had been described as separate developments in the rise of the passive construction. The agreeing passive now characteristic of Standard Lithuanian was, in Ambrazas' view, based mainly on the passive constructions of Western Aukštaitian. Eastern Aukštaitian independently developed a non-agreeing passive that was closely related to the non-agreeing impersonal passive, and was basically resultative (leading, as a secondary development, to the rise of inferential meanings). It is illustrated in (4):

(4) Lithuanian, South Aukštaitian (from Kozhanov and Arkadiev, this volume)
    sklǽ.p-as   *pa-darí˙-t-a*
    cellar-NOM.SG   PVB-do-PST.PPP-NA
    'the cellar is built'

On the basis of South-Eastern Aukštaitian texts from the TriMCo corpus,[4] Kozhanov and Arkadiev conclude that the occurrence or absence of agreement in passives statistically correlates with (but is, importantly, not categorically determined by) morphosyntactic features (plural subjects often show non-agreement) as well as with word order (the participle more often does not show agreement with postverbal subjects). They find no

---

[4] https://www.trimco.uni-mainz.de/trimco-dialectal-corpus/

correlation with the semantic type of passive. The discussion on the history of the Lithuanian passive is thereby reopened. Another important conclusion of the article is that the non-agreeing passive shows no areal links to similar developments in East Slavonic (Russian and Belarusian).

The middle domain is not represented in this volume by an overview article illustrating the extent and parameters of variety in the same way as Nau, Sprauniene & Žeimantienė's article does this for the passive; for a more comprehensive treatment of the middle domain in Baltic the reader may be referred to Holvoet (2020). Here the middle domain is represented by two studies focusing on antipassive and facilitative reflexives respectively. The intrinsic interest of these topics goes beyond matters of description of middle-voice grams in Baltic. Apart from what the empirical data of the Baltic languages can contribute to the typological study of the categories involved, the problems of definition and demarcation touched upon in these articles are in themselves cross-linguistically relevant.

Axel Holvoet and Anna Daugavet's article "Antipassive reflexive constructions in Latvian: A corpus-based analysis" focuses exclusively on one of the Baltic languages because in Latvian antipassive reflexives are much better represented than in Lithuanian and, for that matter, the neighbouring Slavonic languages. The cross-linguistic voice category of antipassive is now well established in the typological literature, and the discovery of reflexive-antipassive and reciprocal-antipassive polyfunctionality has naturally broadened the typological context of the study of reflexive-marked grams in Slavonic and Baltic. For Slavonic, the notion of antipassive reflexives appears in Say (2005) and Janic (2013) and for Baltic in Holvoet (2017). Holvoet and Daugavet's article is based on the Latvian internet corpus, an approach that has proved fruitful in view of the fact that some subtypes of antipassive reflexives are productive in the spoken language but not strongly entrenched, so that they can be captured only by using internet data, as these reflect an informal language register close to spoken language. This applies most of all to antipassives characterised by object suppression, here called deobjectives. They represent a particular type of object-oriented agency as a self-contained activity, often with the aim of conveying the irrelevance of the activity, the self-absorbedness of the agent etc.:

(5) Latvian

Es	***gleznojo-s***	*sesto*	*gadu,*
1SG.NOM	**paint.PRS.1SG-REFL**	sixth.ACC.SG.DEF	year.ACC.SG
bet	*tagad*	*kaut kas*	*sāk*	*mainīties.*
but	now	something.NOM	begin.PRS.3	change.INF

[*Negribas vairs. Pati esmu pārsteigta.*]

'I've been painting away happily for six years, but now something is getting different. [I don't feel like it any more. I'm surprised myself.]'[5]

Unlike Slavic and Lithuanian, Latvian has a large class of deaccusative antipassives (better known in the typological literature as oblique antipassives) focusing on ineffectual agency and incomplete affectedness of the object. This is illustrated in (6), where the transitive *šķirstīt* 'leaf' is intransitivised, with a prepositional phrase to encode the object, in order to convey the idea of chaotic, cursory perusal:

(6) Latvian

[*Augusts brīdi domīgs nolūkojās aizgājējam pakaļ, tad*]

sāka	*šķirstītie-s*	*pa*	*papīriem.*
start.PST.3	leaf.INF-REFL	about	paper.DAT.PL

'[For a while August gazed thoughtfully after the retreating man, then] started leafing about in his papers.'[6]

One of the ideas advanced in the article is that the domain of the antipassive reflexive is itself not quite homogeneous and that we can distinguish two closely related and yet subtly different constructions, one with implicit object and the other with oblique object (an idea also advanced recently in Vigus 2018). The difference is usually formulated as optional expression or non-expression of the patient, but this optionality might be misleading, and the expression or suppression of the patient might serve a specific construction-related purpose. The authors suggest that in the deaccusative construction the self-containedness of the agency is reinterpreted as incomplete affectedness of the patient.

While the article on the antipassive reflexive focuses on one language and is consistently corpus-based, the same authors' study "The facilitative

---

[5] http://site-453017.mozfiles.com/files/453017/SIRDSPRIEKS3.pdf (accessed 28-11-2020)

[6] https://newspapers.lib.sfu.ca/lat-27275/page-5 (accessed 28-11-2020)

middle in Baltic and Slavonic: An overview of its variation" is wider in coverage but thereby inevitably goes less in depth. What is here referred to as the facilitative middle is basically the same construction that figures in the literature on Western European languages, especially by authors of the formal persuasion, as 'the middle' *tout court*. This construction is widely held to be exclusively generic, with a consistently implicit agent. Its Baltic and Slavonic counterparts, however, are different: they are often but not consistently generic, and allow expression of the agent either in the dative or in a prepositional phrase. Compare:

(7) *The latched gate handle locks/unlocks easily with one hand.*[7]

(8) Lithuanian (constructed)
Spyna	*man*	*lengvai*	*at-si-rakino.*
lock.NOM.SG	1SG.DAT	easily	un-REFL-fasten.PST.3

'I found it easy to unfasten the lock.'

In order to explain this divergence, the authors hypothesise that the Baltic and Slavonic facilitatives could have had more than one source construction within the anticausative domain, one giving rise to the (predominantly) generic type also occurring in the Western European languages and the other yielding the non-volitional uses characteristic of Baltic and Slavic and absent from English, German etc., as shown in (9):

(9) Latvian (from Holvoet & Daugavet, this volume)
[*Tas kurš man rakstīja par to krūzīšu apdruku uzraksti man vēlreiz,*]
man	*nejauši*	*izdzēsā-s*	*tava*
1SG.DAT	accidentally	delete.PST.3-REFL	your.NOM.SG.F

vēstule
letter.NOM.SG

[*un neuzspēju atcerēties tavu vārdu.*]

'[Could the person who wrote me about printing on mugs please write to me once more?] I accidentally deleted your message [and I can't remember your name.]

This type is inherently perfective and episodic. The interaction between the different types, the predominantly generic and the inherently episodic ones, could have given rise to the situation now obtaining in the Baltic and

---

[7] https://www.pinterest.com/pin/336573772134689958/ (accessed 28-11-2020)

Slavonic languages, with their robust episodic readings of the facilitative, and often with overt expression of the agent.

The third article on the middle domain is Vladimir Panov's study "Exploring the asymmetric coding of autobenefactive in Lithuanian and beyond". The Baltic languages (formerly both Lithuanian and Latvian, now only Lithuanian) often mark the fact that the agent is also the beneficiary of the agency by adding a reflexive affix:

(10) Lithuanian (CCLL)

Tėvai	*pardavė*	*mūsų*	*namą*	*ir*
parent.NOM.PL	sell.PST.3	our	house.ACC.SG	and

nu-si-pirko	*šį*	*butą,*	
PVB-REFL-buy.PST.3	this.ACC.SG.M	apartment.ACC.SG	

[*kai aš išvažiavau į Lietuvą.*]

'My parents sold our house and bought this apartment [when I left for Lithuania.]'

This autobenefactive marking, however, correlates strongly with perfectivity, marked by the addition of a verbal prefix. Though not strictly confined to verbs perfectivised by prefixation (iterative contexts do not block the occurrence of the reflexive marking), the autobenefactive marking seems to be only weakly compatible with progressive meaning. The author argues that this asymmetry is not accidental, pointing to the parallel of Georgian, where the 'subjective version' (autobenefactive) marker *-i-* is, in some verbs, obligatory in perfective or non-progressive forms like the aorist:

(11) Georgian (constructed)

a   *saxl-s*   *v-q'id-ul-ob*
     house-DAT   1SG.SUBJ-buy-THEM-THEM
     'I am buying a house.'

b   *saxl-i*   *v-**i**-q'id-e*
     house-NOM   1SG.SUBJ-VERS-buy-AOR
     'I bought a house.'

The regular addition of telicising prefixes to perfectivise a verbal stem in Georgian is well known (cf. Hewitt 1995, 153 ff., Tomelleri 2009). The author suggests that, like the preverbs of local origin, the autobenefactive

semantic modification could also act as a bounder, introducing telicity and thereby developing an association with perfectivity.

Both formal and semantic aspects of the development of the middle voice in Baltic are discussed in "The rise of the affixal reflexive in Baltic and its consequences: Morphology, syntax and semantics" by Axel Holvoet, Gina Kavaliūnaitė and Paweł Brudzyński. The modern Baltic languages have a marker that is exclusively associated with middle-voice grams, viz. the historically reflexive affix -*s(i)*-, originally an unstressed (clitic) variant of the reflexive pronoun. The Old Lithuanian and Old Latvian texts reflect the final stage in the process of separation of the reflexive and middle domains—there are still some traces of the former status of the affixal reflexive marker as an enclitic, and in a number of cases it still has the original function of an unstressed variant of the reflexive pronoun, as in (12):

(12)   Old Latvian (*Senie*, Glück's Old Testament, Gen. 16.5, cited from Holvoet *et al.*, this volume)

nu   *redſah-s*   *wiņņa*   *gṛuhta*
now   see.PRS.3-REFL   3.NOM.SG.F   pregnant.NOM.SG.F

eſſoti
be.PPRA.NOM.SG.F

'Now she sees herself (being) pregnant [...]'

The article gives an overview of the processes set in motion by the affixalisation of the reflexive marker. These were partly semantic, as the affixalisation caused the reflexive marker to lose one of its two functions, that of unstressed reflexive pronoun, and to become exclusively a middle-voice marker. But the consequences went beyond that: the affixalisation set in motion a series of morphosyntactic and syntactic changes as well. Two factors were in play here. First, in certain syntactic configurations (when the reflexive pronoun was controlled across clause boundaries) the disappearance of the reflexive pronoun from the syntax had to lead to a reorganisation in syntactic structure. On the other hand, the hesitation as to the host to which the affixalising reflexive clitic was to accrete led to interesting morphosyntactic patterns, as in (13) from Old Latvian, where a modal verb complemented by a reflexive verb itself assumes the reflexive marker:

(13) Old Latvian (*Senie*, Manzel, *Langgewünschte Postill* i 152.13–14)
[*Wings tick dauds töw dohß*]

ka	tu	warrehſſee-ß	usturretee-ß.
that	2SG.NOM	be.able.FUT.2SG-REFL	sustain.INF-REFL

'[He will give you so much] that you will be able to sustain yourself.'

Historically, this probably reflects a process of clitic climbing, which could also potentially lead to clitic duplication, but clitic duplication would not be stable as it would be countered by a tendency toward clitic haplology. However, once fossilised in the morphology as a result of affixalisation, the double reflexivisation was no longer accessible to syntactic rules. The morphosyntax thereby preserves a trace of the oscillations that occurred during the process of affixalisation, as the affixalising marker was in quest of a host. The article shows that the data of Baltic shed an interesting light on the process of affixalisation of clitics and its possible broader consequences.

The causative domain is represented in this volume by one single article dedicated to a small group of intensive causatives in Lithuanian. Causatives are clearly derivational in Baltic, and they do not show as much functional differentiation as passives and middles. But there is a certain degree of polyfunctionality in this domain as well, and the existence of causatives with non-causative meanings has already been discussed in the literature (most recently cf. Aikhenvald 2018). We have now two thorough studies of Lithuanian and Latvian causatives in general (see Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015 and Nau 2015 respectively) and a first study of the not strictly causative uses of causative morphology in Baltic (Holvoet 2015). In his article "Lithuanian intensive causatives and their history" Axel Holvoet identifies a small group of Lithuanian motion verbs whose reflexivised causatives have acquired an intensive function—an instance of the typologically well-attested causative-intensive polyfunctionality. What is interesting about the Lithuanian facts is the way this intensive function seems to have emerged. So, for instance, *judėti* 'move' (INTR) underlies a causative derivative *jud-inti* 'move' (TR), which can, in its turn, be intransitivised with a reflexive marker, yielding a secondary intransitive *jud-in-ti-s* 'move (INTR)'. Rather than being synonymous with the primary intransitive, the latter refers only to energetic motion requiring effort or external coercion, or to the onset of such motion. The following pair of examples illustrates the difference:

(14) Lithuanian

Planetos	*juda*	*ne*	*aplink*	*Žemę,*
planet.NOM.PL	move.PRS.3	NEG	around	Earth.ACC

kaip	*manė*	*Ptolemėjas,*	*o*	*aplink*	*Saulę*
as	think.PST.3	Ptolemy.NOM	but	around	Sun.ACC

'The planets don't move around the Earth, as Ptolemy thought, but around the Sun.'[8]

(15) Lithuanian (Dalia Grinkevičiūtė, CCLL)

[*Girdžiu Krikštanienės balsą. Turbūt galima eiti.*]

Judinamė-s	*namo.*
move.CAUS.PRS.1PL-REFL	home

'[I hear Krikštanienė's voice. We can probably go now.] We get on our way home.'

It is precisely the coexistence of a primary and a secondary intransitive that seems to have induced the rise of intensive meaning in the reflexivised causative. In other semantic groups the reflexivised causative usually differs from the primary intransitive as a result of lexical specialisation of the causative: this can be seen in the triad *šilti* 'get warm' : *šildyti* 'warm (up), heat (a house etc.)' : *šildytis* 'warm oneself'. In the case of motion verbs there was evidently no sufficient basis for lexical differentiation along similar lines, and the coexistence of primary and secondary intransitives was put to use to express a new meaning—an instance of what is often referred to as exaptation.

4. The outlook

The contributions to this volume bring a number of new insights into the domain of voice in Baltic and in general, and also raise a number of new questions to which researchers will hopefully return in the near future. Let us mention just a few. The problem of impersonal passives, subject-weak passives and non-promoting passives (or impersonals) in Lithuanian, where boundaries between the syntactically defined types are fluid, seems to call for a reassessment of traditional classifications.

---

[8] http://www.fotonas.su.lt/studdarbai/astronomija/priedai/Planetos.html

In the domain of the middle there is the problem of the relationship between what is here described as the Baltic and Slavonic facilitative middle and what is simply called 'the middle' in the literature on Western European languages; there is an obvious disconnect between research traditions, and the combined evidence of Baltic and Slavonic, if brought to bear on discussions, could yield important insights. The problems of the marking asymmetry in Lithuanian autobenefactives, briefly outlined in this volume, is a feature deserving further research both in the domain of Baltic and Slavonic and from a cross-linguistic point of view. More examples could be added. It is to be hoped that the contributions to the present volume will stimulate further research and discussions. It should be added that increasing availability of corpora, including historical ones, is a precondition for a further deepening of our understanding of the voice domain in Baltic and its typological implications.

Abbreviations

ACC — accusative, ACN — action noun, ADD — additive (particle), AOR — aorist, AUX — auxiliary, CAUS — causative, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, F — feminine, FUT — future, GEN — genitive, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, INTR — intransitive, LOC — locative, M — masculine, NA — non-agreeing form, NEG — negation, NOM — nominative, PL — plural, PLN — place name, POSS — possessive, PPP — past passive participle, PPRA — present active participle, PRS — present, PST — past, PVB — preverb, REFL — reflexive, SG — singular, SUBJ — subject marker, THEM — thematic extension, TR — transitive, VERS — version vowel

Sources

CCLL – Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language at http://tekstynas.vdu.lt

Senie – Corpus of Old Latvian Texts at http://senie.korpuss.lv/toc.jsp

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2018. Causatives which do not cause: Non-valency-increasing effects of a valency-increasing derivation. In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon, *Language at Large. Essays on Syntax and Semantics.* Leiden: Brill, 86–142.

Ambrazas, Vytautas. 2001. Lietuvių kalbos pasyvo raidos bruožai [An outline of the development of the Lithuanian passive]. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 45, 11–38.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2019. The Lithuanian '*buvo* + *be*-present active participle' construction revisited: A corpus-based study. *Baltic Linguistics* 10: *Minor Grams in Baltic, Slavonic and Fennic* (thematic issue), 65–108.

Arkadiev, Peter & Jurgis Pakerys. 2015. Lithuanian morphological causatives. A corpus-based study. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 39–97.

Barðdal, Jóhanna, Elena Smirnova, Lotte Sommerer & Spike Gildea, eds. 2015. *Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fillmore, Charles J., Paul Kay & Mary C. O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions. The case of *let alone*. *Language* 64.3, 501–539.

Geniušienė, Emma. 2016. *Passive Constructions in Lithuanian. Selected Works of Emma Geniušienė*, edited by Anna Kibort and Nijolė Maskaliūnienė. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hewitt, B. G. 1995. *Georgian. A Structural Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hoffmann, Thomas & Graeme Trousdale, eds. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holvoet, Axel. 2015. Extended uses of morphological causatives in Latvian. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 147–177.

Holvoet, Axel. 2017. Antipassive reflexives in Latvian. *Baltic Linguistics* 8, 57–96.

Holvoet, Axel. 2020. *The Middle Voice in Baltic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Holvoet, Axel, Marta Grzybowska & Agnieszka Rembiałkowska. 2015. Middle voice reflexives and argument structure in Baltic. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 181–209.

Holvoet, Axel, Anna Daugavet, Birutė Spraunienė & Asta Laugalienė. 2019. The agentive construction in Latvian and Fennic. *Baltic Linguistics* 10: *Minor Grams in Baltic, Slavonic and Fennic* (thematic issue), 195–236.

Janic, Katarzyna Maria. 2013. The Slavonic languages and the development of the antipassive marker. In: Irina Kor-Chahine, ed., *Current Studies in Slavic Linguistics*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 61–74.

Kroeger, Paul R. 2005. *Analyzing Grammar. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kulikov, Leonid. 2011. Voice typology. In: Jae Jung Song, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 368–398.

Mel'čuk, Igor. 1993. The inflectional category of voice. Towards a more rigorous definition. In: Bernard Comrie & Maria Polinsky, eds., *Causatives and Transitivity*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–46.

Nau, Nicole. 2015. Morphological causatives in contemporary Latvian. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 99–145.

Nau, Nicole. 2019. The Latvian continuative construction *runāt vienā runāšanā* 'talk in one talking' = 'keep talking'. *Baltic Linguistics* 10: *Minor Grams in Baltic, Slavonic and Fennic* (thematic issue), 21–63.

Nau, Nicole & Axel Holvoet. 2015. Voice in Baltic. An overview. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds, *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–36.

Sadler, Louisa & Andrew Spencer. 1998. Morphology and argument structure. In: Andrew Spencer & Arnold M. Zwicky, eds., *The Handbook of Morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 206–236.

Say, Sergey. 2005. Antipassive *sja*-verbs in Russian. Between inflection and derivation. In: Wolfgang U. Dressler *et al.*, eds., *Morphology and Its Demarcations. Selected Papers from the 11th Morphology Meeting, Vienna, February 2004*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 253–276.

Spencer, Andrew. 2013. *Lexical Relatedness. A Paradigm-Based Model*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tomelleri, Vittorio. 2009. The Category of Aspect in Georgian, Ossetic and Russian. Some areal and typological observations. *Faits de Langues* 34.2, 245–272.

Torn-Leesik, Reeli & Virve-Anneli Vihman. 2010. The uses of impersonals in spoken Estonian. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 23, 301–343.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vigus, Meagan. 2017. Antipassive constructions: Correlations of form and function across languages. *Linguistic Typology* 22.3, 339–384.

Zúñiga, Fernando & Seppo Kittilä. 2019. *Grammatical Voice.* Cambridge: University Press.

Axel Holvoet

Vilnius University
Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic
Universiteto 5
LT-01131
axel.holvoet@flf.vu.lt