

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Argument Realization in Baltic*.

Edited by Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau.

© 2016. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

The directive/locative alternation in Lithuanian and elsewhere

Natalia M. Zaika

Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences /
Vilnius University

This article analyzes the directive/locative argument alternation, both in Baltic and Slavic languages and cross-linguistically. The alternation in question appears to be connected to a number of parameters (focus, deixis, presence or absence of extra force, informational structure, voice, etc.), which tend to trigger either locative or directive coding of NPs/PPs. Another factor contributing to the choice of directive or locative NPs/PPs is the semantic group of the verb. Thus, in Lithuanian and neighbouring languages (Latvian, Russian, Belarusian, Polish) the alternating verbs form a hierarchy, where directed motion verbs tend to be coded most directionally, and verbs of sinking and burying more locationally, with other groups occupying intermediate positions. The possibility of the directive/locative argument alternation also depends on what the location is, with *IN* and *ON* allowing alternation in most languages of the area under consideration, while *IN FRONT OF*, *OVER* and *BETWEEN* allow the alternation only in Czech and Polish. Finally, some minor differences concerning several alternating semantic groups ('get together', 'get stuck in', 'lock up') in Baltic and Slavic languages are analyzed.

1. Introduction¹

My article is devoted to the directive/locative argument alternation, with particular attention given to Lithuanian and Slavic languages. I will deal mostly with European languages (not only Indo-European ones), although a similar

1. I would like to thank Axel Holvoet, Vladimir A. Plungian and an anonymous reviewer for their comments on my paper, all the participants of the project Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic for their useful remarks, and Anzhalika Dubasava for helping me with Belarusian and Polish examples, as well as Polina Oskol'skaya for helping me with Estonian examples. Any errors that remain in the paper are my own.

alternation is attested in some other languages. The alternation under consideration has drawn less attention than many other types, at least cross-linguistically.

In any particular language, location and destination can be expressed in the same way (“In systems of special adpositions, the conflation of location and destination is quite common” – Creissels 2009:615) or in different ways. However, there are some languages where these two meanings are expressed in different ways, but where some verbs allow possible alternation between a locative and a directive NP/PP.

In this paper, I compare the alternation of two NPs/PPs, where one of them is usually used with motion verbs, meaning a change of location (a directive NP/PP), and the other has a primary meaning of location or the endpoint of motion (a locative NP/PP).² To illustrate the alternation, I will use a Lithuanian example ((1)–(3)). The PPs in (1) and (3) have a directive meaning, and the NPs in (2) and (3) have a locative meaning. It is important to remember that the instances analyzed here are those where the two NPs/PPs alternate but the verb is the same (3). I investigate cases (allative, illative or dative case for direction, and inessive, adessive or locative case for location) on the one hand, and prepositional and postpositional constructions on the other.

(1) Lithuanian

Aš ein-u į parduotuv-ę.
1SG.NOM go-PRS.1SG in shop-ACC.SG
‘I am going to the shop’.

(2) Lithuanian

Aš es-u parduotuv-ėje.
1SG.NOM be-PRS.1SG shop-LOC.SG
‘I am in the shop’.

(3) Lithuanian

Padėj-o šluot-q į kamp-q / kamp-e.
put-PST.3 broom-ACC.SG in corner-ACC.SG corner-LOC.SG
‘He put the broom in the corner’. (Valiulytė 1989: 190)

The first part of this paper concentrates on typological problems linked with the variation in question. I describe directive/locative argument alternation (in other terms, Differential Translocation Marking) and compare it with other types of argument alternations (DAM) (2.1, 2.2). Languages allowing for the alternation in

2. Cf. the test “To determine whether a P is locative or not, the following test can be employed. Whereas locative PPs can be complements of stative verbs like *stay* or *remain* [...], directional PPs cannot” (Gehrke 2008: 87).

question, as well as semantic groups of the relevant verbs, are cited in 2.3. Further, I list the factors that can influence this alternation in different languages (2.4). The first part is mostly based on examples gleaned from studies where the alternation was mentioned or described in detail. I use a convenience sample, which is areally and genetically biased, with most examples coming from Indo-European languages.

The second part addresses language-specific problems, focusing on so far unexplored points in Lithuanian in comparison with neighbouring languages to find the degree of their divergence. The distribution of locative and directive NPs/PPs with alternating verbs in several Baltic (Lithuanian and Latvian) and Slavic (Russian, Belarusian and Polish) languages is compared, with Estonian (a Finno-Ugric Language) as a background (3.1). Alternation for different locations in Baltic and Slavic languages (Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Polish and Czech) is described (3.2). Some aspects linked with the alternation in Eastern Baltic and Slavic languages are described in 3.3 and 3.4. The data is based on linguistic corpora and on interviews with native speakers (sometimes via linguistic colleagues), as well as on examples from other linguistic studies. The main points of the paper are summarized in the Conclusion (4).

2. Differential Translocation Marking

2.1 Two approaches

The phenomenon in question can be described both in terms of argument alternation and Differential Argument Marking – the two approaches being connected. Some types of Differential marking of argument with locative meaning have already been described cross-linguistically. I will call the alternation in question Differential Translocation Marking. It would probably be better to call it “Differential Goal Marking”, but this term has already been used in typological studies for other purposes.

I would like to mention some similar alternations connected with locative NPs/PPs. One such alternation is described in Kittilä’s work as Differential Goal Marking (4), where in some languages the animate goal/recipient (*the phonetician*) and inanimate goal (*the town*) can be marked in different ways, which is explained by animacy effects.

- (4) *A linguist sent a book to the phonetician/to the town*’ (Kittilä 2008: 247–248)³

3. In the same article, he compares the two sentences: *I gave the poor man some money* vs. *I put the potatoes in the pot*.

Another kind of alternation is Differential R/Goal marking (Kittilä 2011: 1), where animate P, inanimate P, animate R, and inanimate R are compared, as illustrated in the sentences below:

- (5) a. *The teacher transfers the book to the student*
 b. *The teacher transfers the book to the school.* (Kittilä 2008: 248)

A similar typological distribution is analyzed by Kittilä and Luraghi as “Differential Marking of Spatial Relations” (Kittilä & Luraghi 2009):⁴

- (6) *John went to the station.*
 (7) *I went to Mary and asked her a favor.*
 (8) *John gave a present to Mary.*⁵

The problem we face here is that Goal and Recipient are usually perceived as different semantic roles. But, for example, when analyzing Differential Object Marking we are dealing with the same semantic role, though referential features or other argument features are different.⁶ When analyzing the directive/locative alternation, it is quite difficult either to prove that the two constructions have the same semantic role or the opposite.

2.2 Similarities to and differences from other alternation types

As locative and directive NPs/PPs are not core arguments, the alternation in question is less studied than other types of argument alternations, for example, load verbs, swarm verbs, instrumental and accusative alternation, etc.,⁷ which involve subjects and direct objects. Still, the locative/directive alternation, even

4. See different types of coding Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal in Kittilä & Ylikoski (2011).

5. “In our paper we will address the issue of direction coding with human landmarks from a cross-linguistic perspective, and explore its relation with direction coding with inanimate landmarks and with recipient coding (is the coding identical, or are there differences). Possible patterns of direction and recipient marking that emerge are the following:

i. direction (animate) = direction (inanimate) = recipient
 ii. direction (animate) = direction (inanimate) ≠ recipient
 iii. direction (animate) ≠ direction (inanimate) = recipient
 iv. direction (animate) ≠ direction (inanimate) ≠ recipient” (Kittilä & Luraghi 2009)

6. Comparing Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal, Kittilä and Ylikoski argue that all the roles can be regarded as Goals (Kittilä & Ylikoski 2011).

7. For example, Kristina Lenartaitė in her thesis on Lithuanian alternations (Lenartaitė 2011) analyses only alternations involving subject and direct object.

though restricted to non-core arguments, has also drawn some attention in recent decades.

It is known that there is a correlation between type of DAM and alignment.⁸ As neither locative NP/PP nor directive NP/PP are core arguments, potentially both accusative and ergative languages can be involved in the alternation (though few ergative languages are included in the sample presented here, this nevertheless appears to be true).

In Malchukov and de Swart's terms, an alternation can be either split ("an alternation of lexical case associated with different verb lexemes")⁹ or fluid ("the same verb takes alternative case frames depending on transitivity parameters", Malchukov & de Swart 2009: 341) – in the present paper, depending on locativity parameters. As a rule, neither of the constructions is formally unmarked: we are dealing with a symmetrical case alternation, where two overt cases alternate.

The alternation is typical of different semantic classes, though all of them have something to do with motion (it seems that the number of semantic classes is higher than in a typical alternation). The number of verbs which allow this alternation in a specific language is quite small (we can usually find only a few dozen), but this is quite natural, as many argument alternations concern only a restricted group of verbs, and only a restricted number of tokens. While some argument alternations allow only two-place predicates (the *swarm* alternation) or three-place predicates (the *load/spray* alternation and *give* alternation), the directive/locative alternation is licensed by both two-place and three-place predicates (i. e., verbs referring to internal motion and caused motion).

In the directive/locative alternation frequent instances of stronger preference for only one of the alternatives are attested, very often the other alternative being extremely marginal. Thus, in Basque the verb *sartu* 'enter' is more often used with a locative NP than with a directive one, while the verbs *igo* 'get up', *erori* 'fall', *bota* 'throw', *lotu* 'tie' prefer a directive NP; in Lithuanian *klimpti* 'get stuck', *sėsti* 'sit down' are more often used with a directive NP, and *skęsti* 'sink' with a locative one (Valiulytė 1989); in Russian *zastrjat'* 'get stuck', *uvjaznut'* 'get bogged down', *uto-nut'* 'sink', *utopit'* 'drown sth.', *poxoroniť* 'bury sb.' prefer locative coding, whereas *posadit'* 'set, put (sb.)', *postavit'* 'put (sth.)', *zakopat'* 'bury sth., sb.' prefer directive

8. Cf. "DOM is predominantly found in accusative languages (where A is the primary argument), whereas DSM is most often found in ergative languages (where O is primary argument)" (Malchukov & de Swart 2009: 349).

9. This kind of locative/directive alternation is also seen in Finnish: "Vision differs from hearing and smell by favoring a more static locative coding of the position of the participants. Hearing and smell in turn favor the directional coding of the type stimulus/experiencer". (Huomo 2010: 52).

coding. It is perfectly normal for some speakers to use one construction and rule out the other. The degree of acceptability of some examples differs as well (sometimes native speakers find some constructions unacceptable, nevertheless they are easily found in corpora).

Some diachronic tendencies concerning the alternation in question are attested as well. At least in some Indo-European languages locative NPs/PPs tend to be replaced with directive ones – but not the other way round. This is the case with Lithuanian, Russian (Toporov 1961), and Ancient Greek (Nikitina and Maslov 2013: 44).¹⁰ Nevertheless, the opposite tendency is attested in Latvian, where locative replaced illative.

2.3 Languages and predicates

The directive/locative alternation has mostly been analyzed in European languages (as the sample is certainly biased, there could be an SAE pattern). There are a number of publications where this alternation has been described, or at least mentioned, in different languages: English (Nikitina 2008), Spanish (Nueva gramática 2009: 2269–70), Czech (Běličová-Křížková 1974: 108–109, 118), Polish (Kopecka 2002, cited in Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2003), Ukrainian (Nedashkivska 2001), Russian (Blažev 1975; Nikitina 2010), Latvian (Miljuxina 2012), Lithuanian (Valiulytė 1989), Ancient Greek (Nikitina & Maslov 2013), Finnish (Rahkonen 1977, cited in Huumo 2006), Basque (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2004; Zaika, forthcoming), Akhvakh (Creissels 2010: 17), Even < North-Tungusic (Malchukov 2010: 14), Gurindji, Warlpiri, Kaytetye < Pama–Nyungan (Australia) (McConvell & Simpson 2012).¹¹

I will now cite some examples from different languages (the lists are not always comprehensive, but they can give an idea about different semantic classes involved in the alternation). The number of semantic groups is different in different languages, the probability of using directive or locative NP/PP depending on the language and semantic group, as well as on parameters below.

10. Cf. “Verbs of self-propelled motion are the first verbs to be used exclusively with specialized directional expressions, followed by verbs of externally caused motion. Verbs of change of configuration never exclude the static option, even though the frequency of directional encoding increases” (Nikitina & Maslov 2013: 44); “The differences suggest that the three verb classes [self-propelled, externally caused, change of position – N.Z] undergo a similar type of change (a shift toward a more consistent use of specialized directional satellites), but at different rates and possibly in slightly different ways.” (Nikitina 2013: 199); “At the earliest attested stages (Homeric Greek), goals of motion are commonly introduced by inherently static combinations of preposition and case, rather than by specialized directional ones” (Nikitina 2013: 190).

11. There are some similar tendencies in French, but they are more difficult to find.

Spanish: *entrar* 'enter', *hundir* 'sink, plunge', *introducir* 'put in', *meter* 'put, insert', *penetrar* 'penetrate', *profundizar* 'to make deeper', *sumergir* 'submerge, immerse', *zambullirse* 'dive, plunge'; *ir* 'go' (some dialects) (Nueva gramática 2009: 2269–70).¹²

Lithuanian: *klimpti* 'get stuck', *paslėpti* 'hide', etc., *skęsti* 'sink', *sėti* 'sow', *sodinti* 'put in (plants)', *padėti* 'put', *paguldyti* 'lay', *rinktis* 'gather together' (Valiulytė 1989).¹³

Russian: *postavit* 'put', *položit* 'put, lay', *povesit* 'hang', *sest* 'sit down', *leč* 'lie down', *posadit* 'seat, offer a seat', *prizemlit'sja* 'land', *prikrepiť*, *ustanovit* 'set'; *posejat* 'sow', *posadit* 'put in (plants)'; *sprjatat* 'hide', *zatočit* 'confine, immure'; *utonut* 'sink', *utopit* 'drown sb. / submerge sth.'; *poxoronit* 'bury sb.', *zakopat* 'bury sth., sb.', *smotret'sja* 'to look (in the mirror)'.¹⁴

Latvian: *iet* 'go', *aizsūtīt* 'send away', *aiznest* 'take away', *uzlikt* 'put' (Miljuxina 2012).

All in all, the directive/locative alternation is typical for a limited class of verbs, such as verbs of directed/non-directed motion (*go, come*) in Latvian, verbs of entering (*enter, penetrate*) in Spanish and Basque, verbs of putting (*put*) in Lithuanian, Russian and Spanish, verbs of sticking (*get bogged down, get stuck*) in Lithuanian and Russian, verbs of looking (*look (in the mirror)*) in Russian, Spanish and Basque, verbs of throwing (*throw*) in Basque, etc. All the relevant semantic groups of verbs for the area in question are listed in 3.1.

2.4 Parameters of distribution

The distribution of locative and directive constructions can be connected with a significant number of different parameters, some of them linked to each other. I will call these "locativity parameters" (cf. the transitivity parameters of Hopper and Thompson).¹⁵ Some of the parameters seem to depend on semantic groups, which I will not analyze.

12. This list seems to be comprehensive, at least for Spanish.

13. Cf. also *įvystyti/suvystyti, įvynioti* 'wrap' in Old Lithuanian (Žilinskaitė 2010: 212).

14. Some of these verbs were mentioned in Nikitina (2010), the others were found by the author.

15. Nedashkivska argues that Hopper and Thompson's criteria are also applicable for the alternation in question in Ukrainian (Nedashkivska 2001).

While classical transitivity-parameter features can be linked both with object (agency and affectedness) and verb (affirmation, mode and negation),¹⁶ most of the parameters in the alternation in question are connected with verbal properties. The number of facts accounting for the alternation depends on the number of locations possible as well, as some factors can be applied only to some verbs which imply a restricted number of locations (for example, *enter* and *get stuck in* are used exclusively with IN location).

The first parameter I would like to mention is *free variation* (i), which is found in Kaytetye (Australia) (McConvell & Simpson 2012).¹⁷ Like any free variation, it is not very common, and is rarely mentioned in linguistic studies of the alternation.

Geographical variation (II) can be regarded as an insignificant factor, as it has nothing to do with grammar (there is no variation in a particular system), however it is often connected to other types of parameters. As an example, one can mention the alternation *entrar a* 'enter DIR' vs. *entrar en* 'enter LOC' in Spanish of Latin America and Spain (Bosque & Demonte 1999: 669).

The difference between *focus on the goal of the spatial scene* vs. *focus on the location of the spatial scene* (ii) is attested in Polish (Kopecka 2002, cited by Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2004) and Old Lithuanian (Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė 2012: 32).¹⁸

16. Cf. "Among the features contributing to high transitivity they (sc. Hopper and Thompson) mention both parameters relating to participants of the events, such as subject's volitionality and the object's affectedness and definiteness, as well as properties of the event itself, such as perfectivity, affirmativity and reality" (Malchukov 2005: 73).

17. "[...] both Subject and Object can be co-located with an ALL suffix, as in (30c), or with a LOC suffix (30d), without an obvious meaning difference [...]:

(30) c. Ahakeye (re) elyewarle kwenke
bush.plum s/he shade.ALL swallows
'He eats bush plums in the shade.' (Turpin 2000: 50)

d. Elyenge=pe atanth=pe atanth=pe
shade.LOC=FOC they=FOC cook.used.to-CONTINUE
'They would cook (the meat) in the shade for a long time.'" (Turpin 2000: 83)

18. "Kopecka (2002), for example, argues that in Polish, the distinction between accusative and locative case marking with the preposition *na* 'on' used in a dynamic context corresponds to a contrast of profiling of the spatial scene based on the conceptualizer's perspective. In a sentence like *Anna puts the journal on the table*, the conceptualizer would use *na* 'on' + locative, if s/he wanted to focus on the location of the spatial scene, the final location for the journal, i.e. the table. But, on the other hand, if s/he wanted to focus on the goal of the spatial scene, that is, the fact that Anna takes the journal from somewhere else and moves it onto the table, then the conceptualizer would use *na* 'on' + accusative" (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2004). As for Old Lithuanian, where the same fact can be observed, Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė cites Kopecka's research, so her conclusions about Lithuanian could be based on it.

The next alternation parameter is *the dynamic character of motion* (a directive NP) vs. *the endpoint of motion* (a locative NP) highlighted (iii). In Basque and Spanish, cf. *entrar a* ‘enter DIR’ vs. *entrar en* ‘enter LOC’ (Morera 1988: 149; Gili Gaya 1990: 254; Roegiest 1980: 94; Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2003: 30). In Latvian the preposition *uz* with accusative is used for a motion in a certain direction, while the locative NP is used if the endpoint is reached (Miljuxina 2012: 131) (cf. (9) vs. (10)). A similar distribution is observed in the alternation of the English prepositions *to* and *into*.¹⁹

- (9) Latvian
Es ej-u uz skol-u.
 1SG.NOM go.PRS-1SG to school-ACC.SG
 ‘I am walking to school’.
- (10) Latvian
Viņ-š iet sav-ā istab-ā.
 3-NOM.SG.M go.PRS.3SG RPO-LOC.SG room-LOC.SG
 ‘He goes into his room’.

Another parameter which can be involved in the alternation under consideration is *presence or absence of contact* (iv). Here we can take Akhvakh²⁰ (a Nakh-Dagestanian language) and Even as examples.²¹ The NP in the Even example (11) has the directive meaning, and the NP in (12), the locative meaning.

- (11) Akhvakh
D’uu-tki em-re-n
 house-ALL come-NF-3SG
 ‘(S)he came to/towards a house’.
- (12) Akhvakh
D’uu-la em-re-n
 house-LOC come-NF-3SG
 ‘(S)he came (in)to the house’.
- (Malchukov 2010: 14)

19. I would like to thank Axel Holvoet for providing me with the Latvian examples and for the remark concerning alternation in English.

20. “In Akhvakh [...] NPs referring to the goal of a movement may be in the locative when the final phase of the movement involves contact between the orienter and the figure.” (Creissels 2010: 17).

21. “For Goal marking either Allative [...] or Locative [...] are used: the former marking the direction, the latter an achieved Goal” (Malchukov 2010: 14).

Sometimes *extra force* (v) is involved as an alternation parameter (cf. (13)–(14)) (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2003: 34–35²²), where a locative PP (13) is used for “neutral force dynamic relation” and a directive one (14) for “negative/positive force dynamic relation” – meant as “some extra resistance to the trajector’s entering”:

(13) Spanish

El cuadrado entra en el triángulo.
the square enters in the triangle
‘The square enters the triangle’

(14) Spanish

El cuadrado le entra al triángulo.
the square it.DAT enters to.the triangle
‘The square enters the triangle’.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano analyses only one example, but she says that the same explanation could be applied for other verbs, for example *put* (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2003).

Duration (vi) as an alternation parameter is attested in quite a number of languages. Thus, in Basque in (15) when using locative marking, the subject is supposed to stay in the room “for some period of time”, which is not implied in (16) (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2004: 283):

(15) Basque

Mikel gelan sartu da.
PN room.LOC enter.PFV AUX.3SG
‘Michael went into the room’.

(16) Basque

Mikel gelara sartu da.
PN room.ALL enter.PFV AUX.3SG
‘Michael went into the room’

(Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2004: 283)

According to Nikitina, in Russian “the prepositional marking is more likely to be used when the resulting location is relatively **permanent**, but only the accusative marking is acceptable when the resulting location is **temporary**” (Nikitina 2008: 189) (cf. also other Examples (17) with a directive PP and (18) with a locative PP from Rozental’ et al. 1998):

(17) Russian

prjatat’ čas-y v karman
hide.INF watch-ACC.PL in pocket.ACC.SG
‘to put a watch into one’s pocket’

22. Ibarretxe-Antuñano investigates the Spanish of La Rioja and the Basque Country.

(18) Russian

prjatat' dragocennost-i v sejf-e

hide.INF jewel-ACC.PL in safe-LOC.SG

'keep one's jewels in the safe' (= keep hidden, have) (Rozenal' et al. 1998)

In Ukrainian **imperfectivity** correlates with locative phrases (Nedashkivska 2001: 226), though some of the author's examples are not confirmed by corpora studies.²³

The next parameter I would like to mention is *deixis* (vii). The directive/locative alternation depending on deixis is attested in Spanish. Thus, Ibarretxe-Antuñano, comparing (19) and (20), argues that "in the first case [locative PP] the room where the speaker was and the one Peter entered refer to the same room, while in the second sentence [directive NP] the rooms are different":

(19) Spanish

Estaba trabajando (en mi habitación_i) cuando Pedro entró en_i la habitación_i

'I was working (in my room) when Peter came in'.

(20) Spanish

Estaba trabajando (en mi habitación_i) cuando Pedro entró a_k la habitación_k

'I was working (in my room) when Peter went in'.

(Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2003: 48)

Quite interestingly, a similar distribution (transitive verbs being involved in the alternation) is typical of Yuulngu (an Australian language).²⁴

The next parameter accounting for the alternation in question is *voice* (viii). For instance, in Russian, it seems that some finite forms tend to be used with directive phrases, whereas past participles are more likely to be used with locative phrases; at least this is the case with the verb *zaperet'* 'lock up smth'. ((21) is a directive PP and (22) is a locative PP) and *zapisat'* 'write down'.

(21) Russian

Vzjal u nego korzink-u, zaper

take. PST.SG.M from 3.GEN.SG.M basket-ACC lock.up.PST.SG.M

v škaf [...].

in cupboard.ACC.SG

'He took the basket from him, locked it up in the cupboard [...]' (RNC)

23. See also the difference in Accomplishments vs. Activities and States in Russian (Israeli 2004: 36).

24. "[...] a LOC appears in a transitive sentence only if the agent and the object 'are in, at, on' a place [...]. However, when only the object 'is in, at, on' the place, the LOC of the underlying intransitive sentence must be transformed into the DIR [= ALL]; when only the agent 'is in, at, on' the place, the underlying LOC must be transformed into the EX [= ABL]" (Schebeck 1976: 365, cited in McConvell & Simpson 2012).

(22) Russian

[*Ja by mog, konečno, vyprosit' u njaneček na odin večer svoj koncertnyj kostjum,*
čto zapert v šlaf-u.

which lock.up.PPP.M.SG in cupboard-LOC

'[I could, of course, cadge from the nurses, for one night, my concerto suit]
 which was locked up in the wardrobe'. (RNC)

This seems to be the case in some other semantic groups in Russian, as well. Lithuanian participles for *klimpti* 'get stuck', *padėti* 'put', *pakabinti* 'hang' and some other verbs behave in a similar way (Valiulytė 1989) (a locative NP is exemplified in (23)):

(23) Lithuanian

Skryni-os padė-t-os pasien-y.

chest-NOM.PL put-PPP-NOM.PL.F space.along.wall-LOC.SG

'The chests are set against the wall'.

A similar distribution depending on voice is attested in Polish (Dancygier 1999: 39), in Ancient Greek, where "static encoding of endpoints is allowed with perfect participles" (Nikitina & Maslov 2013: 105), as well as in Basque, where for some verbs (for example, *erori* 'fall down') locative NPs are more often used with participles.

Sometimes, locative or directive marking can depend on whether the verb denotes a **prototypical activity** (ix) or not. Following Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2003: 47), by prototypical activity I mean that which "stands for the place in which it usually takes place". Still, in some languages we can observe the opposite tendencies. While in Spanish the directive phrase is used for prototypical activities (e.g., *entrar* 'enter' is used with a directive PP (the preposition *a*) for prototypical activity)²⁵ (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2003), in Latvian it is the other way round, the verb *iet* 'go' being used with locative NP for prototypical activities (Wälchli 2001).

According to Nikitina, **information structure** (x) is another factor accounting for directive/locative alternation (cf. "In Russian there is a strong preference for locative marking when PP is included in the topic", and some examples from Blažev's work)²⁶:

25. For example, in Spanish, *entrar a la escuela* is used when referring to the start of a student's career, and *entrar en la escuela* when referring to entering a school building (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2003), though not all native speakers of Spanish seem to support this distribution.

26. In (24) and (25), *na stenu* is directive and *na stene* is locative.

(24) Russian

V kuxne na stenu / na stene ja povetil časy.
 in kitchen.LOC on wall.ACC / on wall.LOC I hang.PFV clock
 'In the kitchen on the wall I hang a clock'.

(25) Russian

Ja povetil časy v kuxne na stenu / na stene.
 I hang.PFV clock in kitchen.LOC on wall.ACC / on wall.LOC
 'I hang a clock in the kitchen on the wall'. (Blažev 1988; Nikitina 2010: 283)

In particular languages some more factors are attested, such as **highly specific manners of motion** in English, where directive *in* is dispreferred (Nikitina 2008: 185). **Animacy effects** concerning Differential Goal/R marking were already mentioned in Kittilä (2008: 247–248). The directive/locative alternation connected with animacy is attested in Russian and in Ukrainian for some verbs (Nedashkivska 2001; Israeli 2004). **Transitivity** could be another factor accounting for preference for directive PP in English (Nikitina 2008: 192) and Ukrainian (Nedashkivska 2001). The last factor I would like to mention here is **the type of container** or the **opposition between the container and the area** (cf. Nikitina 2008: 193 for English and Israeli 2004 for Russian). Finally, the parameter I would like to analyse in Baltic and Slavic languages is location (the only parameter that is not binary).

Table 1. Parameters influencing directive/locative alternation

coding	directive	locative
meaning	movement	state
focus	goal	spatial scene
contact	–	+
extra force	+	–
deixis	the same place	different places
duration	–	+
prototypical activity	+/-	+/-
informational structure	focus	topic
voice	active	passive

To summarize, the directive/locative alternation can be described as a multifactorial phenomenon. The parameters in question can be related, with a certain co-variation (as in transitivity parameters (cf. Hopper & Thompson 1980). For example, prototypical activity and duration seem to be related, while informational structure and presence or absence of contact do not. The parameters can predict argument structure up to a point, the factors mentioned being able to account for the directive/locative alternation as well as verbal splits in several languages.

3. Areal tendencies (Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Russian, Belarusian, Polish)

3.1 The distribution of locative and directive NPs/PPs

It is well known that argument structure can easily be borrowed (Aikhenvald 2006), and this cross-linguistic tendency is observed in Lithuanian as well. For instance, Russian influence on Lithuanian verbs (*ieškoti* 'look for', *dėkoti* 'thank') was attested (Zavjalova 2007). Analysing the NPs with the alternations in question, we can attest that sometimes certain areal influences are possible, as neighbouring languages often behave in the same way.

The table below represents the distribution of locative and directive NPs/PPs with different semantic classes of verbs.²⁷ The table lists all the verbs that allow for directive/locative alternation in the same language or in several languages of my sample, which naturally fell into 12 semantic groups (for the sake of simplicity only English translations are provided).²⁸ As my point of interest is Baltic languages, I have chosen Lithuanian, Latvian, as well as the neighbouring languages (Estonian, Russian, Belarusian and Polish) to study the geographical distribution of the alternation in question. The differences observed will be discussed later in the paper.

The first observation to be made is that some of the languages allow for alternation for several groups of verbs (Lithuanian, Russian), while in others the alternation does not exist or is limited to a small group of verbs in the North of the area under consideration (Latvian, Estonian). So, both Latvian and Estonian do not or almost never allow for directive/locative alternation, though Estonian shows directive constructions, while Latvian basically uses locative constructions. As we can see, the distribution does not depend on genetic factors, Baltic languages behaving in different ways in this respect. Geographically, locativity with alternating verbs seems to increase from North-East to South-West, Latvian being an exception.

The tendency towards directive or locative NP/PP within several groups of verbs can be interpreted as a hierarchy (see **Conclusions**), where leftward members

27. Data for Estonian were obtained from Polina Oskol'skaya, for Latvian from the RNC parallel corpus and LILA, for Lithuanian from LKT and Valiulytė (1989), for Russian from RNC, for Byelorussian from the RNC parallel corpus, BNC and Anzhalika Dubasava, and for Polish from the RNC parallel corpus and Anzhalika Dubasava.

28. "d/l" means that both a directive and a locative NP/PP can be equally used with the same verb, "d>l" means that a directive NP/PP is preferred, and "l>d" means that a locative NP/PP is preferred with the same verb.

Table 2. Distribution of locative and directive NPs/PPs with different verb classes

	go	enter, penetrate	dive	write down (in)	put, lay, seat, hang	get stuck (in)	get together	lock up	sow, plant	drown sb. / submerge sth.	sink	bury sb.
Estonian	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d	d
Latvian	d/l	l	l	l	d>l	l	l	l	l	l	l	l
Lithuanian	d	d	d>l	d/l	d>l	d>l	d/l	l>d	d/l	l	l>d	l
Russian	d	d	d	d/l	d/l	l>d	l>d	d/l	d/l	l>d	l>d	l>d
Belarusian	d	d	d	d>l	d>l	l	l>d	l	l	l>d	l	l
Polish	d	d	d/l	d/l	l>d	l	l	l	l	l	l	l

tend to be more directive and rightward ones more locative.²⁹ Verbs tending to have directive arguments usually denote directed motion (*go*, *enter*, *penetrate* and *dive*). Cross-linguistically, *go* can be considered more directive than *enter*, not only on basis of Latvian data; in Basque *joan* ‘go’ behaves more “directively” than *sartu* ‘enter’ as well: while the former verb allows only for directive NPs, the latter can take both directive and locative NPs. The next group of verbs in my hierarchy are verbs of putting (*put*, *lay*, *seat*, *hang*) and verbs meaning *write down* (somewhere). Both groups allow for alternation in Lithuanian, Russian, Belarusian and Polish, usually preferring the directive NP. The intermediate groups involve verbs meaning *get stuck*, *get together*, *lock up* and *sow/plant*. The last group (*drown sb.*, *submerge sth.*, *sink*, *bury sb.*) usually opts for locative NPs/PPs, with occasional instances of directive NPs/PPs for some languages.

3.2 Location in Baltic and Slavic languages

One of the most important parameters attested in languages of my sample is location. The direction/location alternation does not allow all locations; for instance, in Russian it is more typical of ON than of IN location, as seen in the example, where both locative and directive PP are possible with ON location, while only locative location is preferred with IN location with the verb *položít* ‘put’:

29. See Nikitina (2013: 197) for three groups of Ancient Greek – self-propelled (*go*, *come*) > externally caused (*píptō* ‘fall’, *bállō* ‘throw, cast’, *elaínō* ‘drive (a weapon into sb.)’) > change of position ‘put’, as well as another hierarchy in Nikitina & Maslov (2013: 113).

(26) Russian

^{??}*Položi ključ-i v korzin-e / v karman-e*
 put[PFV].IMP.2SG key-ACC.PL in basket-LOC / in pocket-LOC
 ‘Put the keys in the basket / in the pocket’. (Nikitina 2010: 285)

(27) Russian

^{ok}*Položi ključ-i na stol-e*
 put[PFV].IMP.2SG key-ACC.PL on table-LOC
 ‘Put the keys on the table’.

In Lithuanian it is the other way round: illative and inessive locations are expressed in different ways ((28)–(29)), and illative/inessive alternation does exist (3), while allative/adessive alternation (with ON location) is absent. The system does not allow it, as both meanings are expressed in the same way, by the preposition *ant* and the genitive case ((30)–(31)).

(28) Lithuanian

Povil-as atvažiav-o į Šiauli-us [...] (LKT)
 PN-NOM.SG come-PST.3 in PLN-ACC.PL
 ‘Povilas came to Šiauliai’.

(29) Lithuanian

Kiem-e jau stov-i ir Albertien-ė. (LKT)
 yard-LOC.SG already stand-PRS.3 and PN-NOM
 ‘Albertienė is also standing in the yard already’.

(30) Lithuanian

Bažnyč-i-a [...] stovi ant Petr-o uol-os [...] (LKT)
 church-NOM.SG stand-PRS.3 on Peter-GEN.SG rock-GEN.SG
 ‘The church stands on Saint Peter’s Rock’.

(31) Lithuanian

Tris kart-us varžyb-ų organizatori-ai liejo vanden-į ant hipodrom-o tak-o (LKT)
 three.ACC time-ACC.PL competition-GENPL organizer-NOM.PL pour.PST.3
 water-ACC.SG on hippodrome-GEN.SG track-GEN.SG
 ‘The organizers of the competition have poured water on the racing track three times’.

Nevertheless, this alternation used to exist in Old Lithuanian (e.g. allative/adessive alternation in *sėsti(s)* ‘sit down’, *stotis* ‘stand up’, *gulti(s)* ‘lie down’, *dėti* ‘put’ (Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė 2012: 24–25), but even in Old Lithuanian it was only characteristic of a few nouns (e.g. *kojos* ‘legs’, *keliai* ‘laps’, *sostas* ‘throne’, etc., in Daukša’s text, cf. Žilinskaitė 2010: 214). It is known that inessive and illative in

Old Lithuanian were more frequent than adessive and allative, which is probably the reason why nowadays the language does not make this distinction. In Czech, locative and directive PPs can also be altered by locations *nad* 'over', *před* 'in front of', *za* 'behind', *na* 'on', *pod* 'under' (Běličová-Křížková 1974: 108–109, 118). The directive/locative alternation is not always symmetrical; thus, in Russian it involves the prepositions *za* (+ ACC/INS 'behind'), *pod* (+ ACC/INS) 'under', but not *pered* 'in front of' and *nad* 'over' (Israeli 2004: 1), besides many others.

The following table summarizes the possibilities of directive/locative alternation with different locations in different languages.

Table 3. Alternation for different locations in Baltic and Slavic languages³⁰

	IN	ON	BEHIND	UNDER	IN FRONT OF	OVER	BETWEEN
Estonian	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Latvian	– / +	– ³¹	–	–	–	–	–
Lithuanian	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
Russian	– / +	+	+	+	–	–	–
Belorussian	– / +	+	+	+	–	–	–
Ukrainian	– / +	+	+	+	–	–	–
Polish	– > +	+	– / +	+	+	+	+
Czech	–	+	+	+	+	+	+

Basically, the correlation of the directive/locative alternation with the locations corresponds to Zwarts' hierarchy of locations AT < IN, ON < UNDER < BEHIND < FRONT (Zwarts 2010). In this hierarchy, on the contrary, the possibility of alternation is connected with both the areal and the genetic factor. The only Finno-Ugric language in our sample, Estonian, does not allow for alternation; Baltic languages, Lithuanian and modern Latvian, allow for it only with IN location; in East Slavic languages it is possible with IN, ON, BEHIND and UNDER locations; Czech and Polish are the most variable in this respect. Now I will try to explain in detail some differences in related and neighbouring languages.

30. As seen from the table, there is no such variation in Estonian, a Finno-Ugric language; Estonian data is given here for reference.

31. The alternation does not exist in modern Latvian, but it used to exist until the 19th century (I would like to thank Axel Holvoet for this remark).

3.3 East Slavic languages: Russian vs. Belarusian and Ukrainian

Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian have similar case systems (there is a full-fledged vocative in Ukrainian and in Belarusian, but this case is not involved in the alternation in question here). Having compared several classes of verbs using parallel corpora (RNC), it is possible to argue that the cases practically coincide. Even if we compare occasional differences ((32)–(39)), they are interchangeable (locative PPs are used in (32), (35), (36), (39), directive in (33), (34), (37), (38)).

*Russian vs. Ukrainian*³²

(32) Ukrainian

Ale vynes-l-y von-y t-i lyčink-y ne dl'a
 but bring.away-PST-PL 3-NOM.PL that.ACC.PL grub-ACC.PL no for
t-oho, ščob sxova-ty v bezpečn-omu misc-i. (Ukrainian, RNC)
 that-GEN.SG to hide-INF in safe.LOC.SG.N place-LOC.SG
 'But they brought away those grubs not to **hide them in a safe place**'.

(33) Russian

No vynes-l-i on-i ix ne dlja t-ogo,
 but bring.away-PST-PL 3-NOM.PL 3.ACC.PL no for that-GEN.SG
čtoby sprjata-t' v bezopasn-oe mest-o. (Russian, RNC)
 to hide-INF in safe.ACC.SG.N place-ACC.SG
 'But they brought them away not to **hide them in a safe place**'³³

(34) Ukrainian

Odn-a žink-a znajš-l-a ta j zaxova-l-a v
 one-NOM.SG.F woman-NOM.SG find-PST-SG.F also and hide-PST-SG.F in
skrynj-u. (Ukrainian, RNC)
 chest-ACC.SG

(35) Russian

Odn-a ženščin-a naš-l-a, da i sprjata-l-a v
 one-NOM.SG.F woman-NOM.SG find-PST-SG.F also and hide-PST-SG.F in
skryn-e. (Russian, RNC)
 chest-LOC.SG
 'One woman found it and **hid it in the chest**'.

32. Israeli claims that Russian and Ukrainian differ in this respect, though corpus studies do not seem to prove this claim (Israeli 2004).

33. However, in such parallel texts there can always be an influence of the original.

Russian vs. Belarusian

(36) Russian

Pisatel' [...] *na xod-u postavi-l v*
 writer[NOM.SG] on passing-LOC.SG put-PST[SG.M] in
podstavl-enn-oj emu knig-e kak-uju-to
 proffer-PPP-LOC.SG.F 3.DAT.SG.M ledger-LOC.SG some-ACC.SG.F-INDEF
zakorjučk-u [...]. (Russian, RNC)
 flourish-ACC.SG

(37) Belarusian

Pis'mennik [...] *na xad-u pastavi-ŭ u*
 writer[NOM.SG] on passing-LOC.SG put-PST.SG.M in
padsunu-t-uju jamu knih-u nejk-i
 proffer-PPP-ACC.SG.F 3.DAT.SG.M ledger-ACC.SG some-ACC.SG.M
značok [...] (Belarusian, RNC)
 flourish[ACC.SG]
 'The writer [...] in passing put some flourish in the proffered ledger [...].'
 (RNC)

(38) Russian

Azazello [...] *oxotno podse-l k stol-u,*
 PN[NOM.SG] willingly sit.down-PST[SG.M] to table-DAT.SG
predvaritel'no postavi-v v ugol u pečk-i
 first put-CVB in corner[ACC.SG] by stove-GEN.SG
kak-oj-to svertok v temn-oj parč-e.
 some-ACC.SG.M-INDEF package[ACC.SG] in dark-LOC.SG.F brocade-LOC.SG
 (Russian, RNC)

(39) Belarusian

Azazela [...] *axvotna pryse-ŭ da stala, pastavi-ŭ*
 PN[NOM.SG] willingly sit.down-PST.SG.M to table-GEN.SG put-PST.M
u kuce lja pečk-i nejk-i skrutak
 in corner-LOC.SG near stove-GEN.SG some-ACC.SG.M package[ACC.SG]
u cëmn-aj parč-y. (Belarusian, RNC)
 in dark-LOC.SG.F brocade-LOC.SG
 'Azazello [...] willingly sat down at the table, having first placed some
 package wrapped in dark brocade in the corner by the stove'. (RNC)

Still, some native speakers of Belarusian tend to use more locative constructions than native speakers of Russian, probably due to Polish influence, as Polish verbs allowing for directive/locative alternation are more often used with locative PPs than in Russian, Belarusian and even Lithuanian.³⁴ Some examples, where a directive PP is used in Russian and Ukrainian, and a locative one in Polish:

34. Cf. Toporov (1961).

- (40) Russian
 – *Postav'-te škatulk-u na pol!*
 put.IMP-2PL box-ACC.SG on floor[ACC.SG] (RNC)
- (41) Ukrainian
 – *A teper postav-te skryn'k-u na pidloh-u.*
 and now put.IMP-2PL box-ACC.SG on floor-ACC.SG (RNC)
- (42) Polish
 – *Prosz-ę postawić pudełk-o na podłodz-e.*
 ask-1SG.PRS set.INF box-ACC.SG on floor-LOC.SG
 'Now set the box on the floor'. (RNC)

3.4 Russian and Lithuanian

Now I will compare factors attested in **Slavic languages** that can also be found in **Lithuanian** (the factors mentioned in Valiulytė 1989 and 1995 will not be discussed). The opposition between a *container* (Israeli 2004) and an *area*, attested in Russian, seems a relevant parameter, as well as the *size of the container*. For the case of “fitting into a container” (NPs/PPs including *dežutė* ‘box’, *kišenė* ‘pocket’, *vaza* ‘vase’, *seifas* ‘strongbox’, *stalčius* ‘drawer’, etc.), a directive PP is usually preferred:

- (43) Lithuanian
Taigi sumaigi-au gėl-es ir padėj-au
 so crumple-PST.1SG flower-ACC.PL and put-PST.1SG
j-as į gili-q balt-q kriaukl-ę.
 3-ACC.PL.F in deep-ACC.SG.F white-ACC.SG wash.bowl-ACC.SG
 ‘So, I crumpled the flowers and put them in a deep white wash-bowl’. (LKT)

Areas and large containers seem to allow the alternation (*padėjo į kampą* (DIR)/*kampe* (LOC) ‘he put it in the corner’) or to prefer a locative NP (*padėjo kambaryje* (LOC) ‘he put it in the room’).

The same distribution is characteristic of Belarusian, where *seif* ‘strongbox’, *torba* ‘bag’, *dalon* ‘palm’, *truna* ‘coffin’ are used with directive PPs, while *ložak* ‘bed’, *stol* ‘table’, *pol* ‘floor’, *spal’nja* ‘bedroom’ either opt for the locative PP, or allow for alternation.³⁵

35. The data are obtained from BNC and RNC.

Another point worth mentioning when comparing Lithuanian and Slavic languages relates to *nested locations* (i.e. locations within other locations).³⁶ According to Israeli, in Russian a directive PP is typical of inner location and a locative one of outer location, two locative PPs being possible as well (Israeli 2004: 21). However, even in Russian having two directive PPs is possible (44). A directive PP for inner location and a locative one for outer location can be observed as a general tendency, attested in Lithuanian as well ((45)–(46)).

(44) Russian

Vitj-a, Viktor, postav' v Tol-in-u komnat-u
 PN-NOM.SG PN[NOM.SG] put-IMP.2SG in PN-POSS-ACC.SG room-ACC.SG
na kniž-n-yj škaf, kitajsk-uju vaz-u,
 on book-ADJ-ACC.SG.M case[ACC.SG] Chinese-ACC.SG.F vase-ACC.SG
ja vymy-l-a eë.
 1SG.NOM wash-PST-SG.F 3-ACC.SG.F
 'Vitya, Viktor, put the Chinese vase in Tolya's room (DIR), on the book-case (DIR), I've washed it' (RNC)

(45) Lithuanian

jį perriš-o mėlyn-u kaspin-u ir padėj-o
 3.ACC.SG.M wrap-PST.3 blue-INS.SG.M ribbon-INS.SG and put-PST.3
į slapt-ą stalčiuk-ą savo sekretėr-e [...]
 in secret-ACC.SG drawer-ACC.SG RPO secretaire-LOC.SG
 '(He) wrapped it with a blue ribbon and put it in a secret drawer (DIR) in his secretaire (LOC) [...]' (LKT)

(46) Lithuanian

O kad ne-trukdy-tų t-am "proces-ui",
 but that NEG-disturb-IRR.3 that-DAT.SG.M process-DAT.SG
uždar-o šeiminink-ą Veisiej-uose į dabokl-ę.
 lock-PRS.3 master-ACC.SG PLN-LOC.PL in guard.room-ACC.SG
 'In order that he should not disturb this "process", they lock up the master in Veisiejai (LOC), in the guard-room (DIR)' (LKT)

Russian vs. Lithuanian

In Slavic languages and Lithuanian most of the semantic groups allowing for directive/locative alternation seem to coincide (see Table 2), though some differences can be attested. I will mention three cases of different government in Slavic

36. The term is borrowed from Israeli (2004).

languages and Lithuanian. The first refers to verbs of sticking (*įklimpti*, *nuklimpti* vs. *zavjaznutʹ*, *uvjaznutʹ* ‘get stuck in’). Lithuanian and Russian verbs of this group behave in different ways, Lithuanian preferring the directive phrase (Valiulytė 1989: 181), and Russian the locative:

- (47) Lithuanian
 [...] *latv-is* *pajut-o*, *kad rat-ai* *įklimp-o*
 Latvian-NOM.SG feel-PST.3 that wheel-NOM.PL stick-PST.3
į snieg-q.
 in snow-ACC.SG
 ‘The Latvian felt that the wheels had got stuck in the snow’. (LKT)
- (48) Russian
Gnatʹsja by-l-o *trudno: nog-i* *uvjaza-l-i*
 chase-INF be-PST-SG.N difficult foot-NOM.PL stick-PST-PL
v sneg-u.
 in snow-LOC.SG
 ‘It was difficult to chase him, my legs sticking in the snow’. (RNC)

Interestingly enough, Polish behaves like Russian in this regard:

- (49) Russian
Utr-om *vystupi-vš-ij* *na rabot-u* *otrjad*
 morning-INS go-PPA-NOM.SG.M on work-ACC.SG squadron[NOM.SG]
uvjaza-l *v glubok-om* *sneg-u.*
 stick-PST[SG.M] in deep-LOC.SG.M snow-LOC.SG (RNC)
- (50) Polish
Oddział, *któr-y* *rano* *wyruszy-ł*
 squadron[NOM.SG] which-NOM.SG.M in.the morning go-PST[M]
do prac-y, *grzqz-ł* *w głębok-im* *śnieg-u.*
 to work-GEN.SG stick-PST[SG.M] in deep-LOC.SG.M snow-LOC.SG
 ‘The squadron that went to work in the morning was sticking in the deep snow’.

Another verb used mostly with a directive PP in Russian and with a locative PP in Lithuanian is *zaperetʹ* vs. *užrakinti* ‘lock up’:

- (51) Lithuanian
Štai dėl *k-o* *Vili-us* *iš j-o*
 there because.of which-GEN.SG PN-NOM.SG from 3-GEN.SG.M
paëm-ė automat-q *ir užrakin-o* *spint-oje.*
 take-PST.3 machine.gun-ACC.SG and locked.up-PST.3 chest-LOC.SG
 ‘That’s why Vilius took the machine gun from him and locked it up in the chest’.

(52) Russian

Ja zaper kon'k-i v škaf i
 1SG.NOM lock.up.PST.SG.M skate-ACC.PL in closet[ACC.SG] and
ključ nošu v karman-e.
 key ACC.SG carry.PRS.1SG in pocket-LOC.SG
 'I locked up the skates in the closet and I keep the key in my pocket.'

One more semantic group behaving in different ways in Lithuanian and Slavic languages is *rinktis* vs. *sobirat'sja* 'get together'. According to Israeli, in Russian both LocVS and SVLoc word orders are possible if a locative PP is used, while a directive PP can only precede the subject (Israeli 2004:44–46). This seems to be the case in modern Belarusian and Ukrainian as well. The postposition of the directive PP in Lithuanian is acceptable, both DIRVS (55) and SVDIR /VDIRS (56), (57) word orders being possible:³⁷

(55) Lithuanian

Į Čikag-q susirink-o buv-ę gimnazij-os
 in PLN-ACC.SG get.together-PST.3 be-PPP.NOM.PL gymnasium-GEN.SG
auklėtini-ai [...]
 pupil-NOM.PL
 'The alumni of the gymnasium got together in Chicago' (LKT)

(56) Lithuanian

Daugiausia žiūrov-ų per šias penkeri-as
 most spectator-GEN.PL during this.ACC.PL.F five-ACC.F
rungtyn-es susirink-o į Kaun-o Dari-aus
 match-ACC[PL] get.together-PST.3 in PLN-GEN.SG PN-GEN.SG
ir Girėn-o stadion-q – tūkstant-is.
 and PN-GEN.SG stadium-ACC.SG thousand-NOM.SG
 'Most spectators – a thousand – gathered for those five matches in the Kaunas Darius ir Girėnas stadium (DIR)'. (LKT)

37. The preposition and the postposition of a locative PP with this verb is possible as well, for example:

(53) Lithuanian

Mes, moter-ys, susirink-o-me virtuv-ėje.
 1PL.NOM woman-NOM.PL get.together-PST-1PL kitchen-LOC.SG
 'We women got together in the kitchen'. (LKT)

(54) Lithuanian

... kambarel-yje susirink-o apie 18 lietuvi-ų,
 small.room-LOC.SG get.together-PST.3 about 18 Lithuanian-GEN.PL
kel-i japon-ai, amerikieči-ai...
 several-NOM.PL Japanese-NOM.PL American-NOM.PL
 'About 18 Lithuanians, as well as several Japanese and Americans got together in the small room'. (LKT)

(57) Lithuanian

To ir *susirink-o* į *Anykšči-us*
 to.this.purpose and get.together-PST.3 in PLN-ACC.PL
mokytoj-ai *lituanist-ai*.
 teacher-NOM.PL Lithuanian.scholar-NOM.PL

'For this purpose the teachers of Lithuanian got together in Anykščiai (DIR).'
 (LKT)

While in Lithuanian locative NP and directive PP are interchangeable (Valiulytė 1989: 198), in East Slavic languages a strong preference for locative PPs is observed.

4. Conclusions

Though the mutual influence of Baltic and Slavic languages in directive/locative alternation is evident, the region in question is quite heterogeneous in this respect, having its own properties which distinguish it from other areas, both of the same genera (Baltic, Slavic) and of other genera (Romance languages, Caucasus, etc.). Lithuanian differs in this respect from Russian (types of location), Polish (preference for the Accusative in Lithuanian), and Latvian (preference for different semantic classes).

Most of the languages in the area in question allow for directive/locative alternation, while Estonian and Latvian tend to use either exclusively a locative or exclusively a directive NP/PP for the arguments of the verbs. These languages tend to increase their preference for locative marking from North-East (Estonian) to South-West (Polish), the only exception being Latvian.

It seems that the directive/locative alternation is typical of three-place (transitive) predicates, which are found in most of the languages of my sample. Basing the analysis on the languages available, the following possible hierarchy can be outlined: verbs of directed motion (LOC) => verbs of entering (LOC) => verbs of writing/verbs of putting (LOC) => verbs of sticking/verbs of getting together (LOC) => verbs of planting (LOC) => verbs of drowning and sinking/verbs of burying (LOC) => state verbs (LOC).³⁸

38. Some of the semantic groups, for example, verbs of throwing, are not included in the hierarchy.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	LOC	locative
ACC	accusative	M	masculine
ADJ	adjective	N	neuter
ALL	allative	NEG	negation
AUX	auxiliary	NF	non-future
CMP	comparative degree	NOM	nominative
CVB	converb	PFV	perfective
DAT	dative	PL	plural
DIR	directive	PLN	place name
F	feminine	PN	personal name
GEN	genitive	POSS	possessive
IMP	imperative	PPA	past active participle
IN	inessive	PPP	past passive participle
INDEF	indefinite	PRS	present
INF	infinitive	PST	past
INS	instrumental	RPO	reflexive possessive
IRR	irrealis	SG	singular

Sources

BNC – Belarusian National Corpus (<http://bnkorporus.info>)
 LILA – LILA parallel Corpus (<http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/page.xhtml?id=parallelLILA>)
 LKT – Lietuvių kalbos tekstynas (<http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas>)
 RNC – Russian National Corpus (<http://www.ruscorpora.ru>)

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic perspective. In *Grammars in Contact. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Robert M. W. Dixon (eds), 1–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Běličová-Křížková, Helena. 1974. Prostranstvennaja determinacija v ruskom i češskom jazykax [Spatial determination in Russian and Czech]. In *Sopostavitel'noe izučenie grammatiki i leksiki russkogo i češkogo jazykov* [The contrastive study of Russian and Czech grammar and lexicon], Mykola Zatovkanjuk, T.I. Konstantinova, and Aleksandra G. Širokova (eds), 93–118. Prague: Charles University.
- Blažev, Blažko. 1975. *Upotreblenie konstrukcij napravlenija i mesta v sovremennom ruskom jazyke* [The use of directional and locative constructions in contemporary Russian]. Sofija: Narodna prosveta.
- Bosque, Ignacio & Demonte, Violeta (eds). 1999. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Colección Nebrija y Bello, Espasa.

- Creissels, Denis. 2009. Spatial cases. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer (eds), 609–625. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creissels, Denis. 2010. Valency properties of Northern Akhvakh verbs. (<https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/valency/pdf/ValencyAkhvakh.pdf>)
- Dancygier, Barbara. 1999. How Polish structures space: prepositions, direction nouns, case and metaphor. In *Constructions in Cognitive Linguistics* [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 178], Frederike van der Leek and Ad Foolen (eds), 27–45. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cilt.178.04dan
- Gehrke, Berit. 2008. *Ps in Motion. On the semantics and syntax of P elements and motion events*. PhD Thesis. Utrecht: LOT.
- Gili Gaya, Samuel. 1990. *Curso superior de sintaxis española*. Barcelona: VOX.
- Hopper Paul J., & Thompson Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56 (2), 251–299. doi:10.1353/lan.1980.0017
- Huumo, Tuomas. 2006. I woke up from the sofa: Subjective directionality in Finnish expressions of spatio-cognitive transfers. In *Grammar from the Human Perspective: Case, Space and Person in Finnish* [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 277], Marja-Liisa Helasvuo and Lyle Campbell (eds), 41–65. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cilt.277.07huu
- Huumo, Tuomas. 2010. Is perception a directional relationship? On directionality and its motivation in Finnish expressions of sensory perception. *Linguistics* 48 (1), 49–97. doi:10.1515/ling.2010.002
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide. 2003. Entering in Spanish. Conceptual and semantic properties of entrar en / a. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 1, 29–59. doi:10.1075/arcl.1.03iba
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide. 2004. Polysemy in Basque locational cases. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 18, 271–298. doi:10.1075/bjl.18.14iba
- Israeli, Alina. 2004. Case choice in placement verbs in Russian. *Glossos* 5, 1–54.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2008. Animacy effects on differential Goal marking. *Linguistic Typology* 12, 245–268. doi:10.1515/LITY.2008.038
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2011. Formal and functional differences between differential object marking and differential R marking: Unity or disunity? *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 1 (1), 1–8. doi:10.4236/ojml.2011.11001
- Kittilä, Seppo & Luraghi, Silvia. 2009. Differential marking of spatial relations: The case of direction with human landmarks. (http://lsa2009.berkeley.edu/alt8/kittila_luraghi_abstract.pdf)
- Kittilä, Seppo & Ylikoski, Jussi. 2011. Remarks on the coding of Goal, Recipient and Vicinal Goal in European Uralic. In *Case, Animacy and Semantic Roles* [Typological Studies in Language, 99], Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi and Jussi Ylikoski (eds.), 29–64. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/tsl.99
- Kopecka, Anetta. 2002. The use of spatial grams in Polish. Paper presented at the *International Conference on Adpositions of Movement*, Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium).
- Lenartaitė, Kristina. 2011. Argumentų raiškos alternavimas lietuvių kalboje [Argument Alternations in Lithuanian]. PhD Thesis, Institute for the Lithuanian Language, Vilnius.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2005. Case pattern splits, verb types and construction competition. In *Competition and Variation in Natural Languages: The Case for Case*, Mengistu Amberber & Helen de Hoop (eds), 73–117. London & New York: Elsevier. doi:10.1016/B978-008044651-6/50006-9
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2010. Valency classes in Even (North-Tungusic). https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/valency/pdf/Valency_Even.pdf

- Malchukov, Andrej & de Swart, Peter. 2009. Differential case marking and actancy variations. In *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer (eds), 339–355. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McConvell, Patrick & Simpson, Jane. 2012. Fictive motion down under: The locative-allative case alternation in some Australian indigenous languages. In *Shall We Play the Festschrift Game? Essays on the Occasion of Lauri Carlson's 60th Birthday*, Diana Santos, Krister Lindén and Wanjiku Ng'ang'a (eds), 159–180. Berlin: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-30773-7_11
- Miljuxina, Anna. 2012. Lokativ v značenii napravlénija v latyšskom jazyke [The locative in directive meaning in Latvian]. BA Thesis, St Petersburg University.
- Morera, Marcial. 1988. *Estructura semántica del sistema preposicional del español moderno y sus campos de uso*. Puerto del Rosario: Servicio de Publicaciones del Cabildo Insular de Fuerteventura.
- Nedashkivska, Alla. 2001. Whither or where: Case choice and verbs of placement in contemporary Ukrainian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 9 (2), 213–251.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2008. Pragmatic factors and variation in the expression of spatial goals: The case of into vs. in. In *Syntax and Semantics of Spatial P* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 120], Anna Asbury, Jakub Dotlačil, Berit Gehrke and Rick Nouwen (eds.), 175–95. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/la.120.09nik
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2010. Variation in the encoding of endpoints of motion in Russian. In *New Approaches to Slavic Verbs of Motion* [Studies in Language Companion Series, 115], Viktoria Hasko and Renee Perelmutter (eds.), 267–290. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/slcs.115.16nik
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2013. Lexical splits in the encoding of motion events from Archaic to Classical Greek. In *Variation and Change in the Encoding of Motion Events* [Human Cognitive Processing, 41], Juliana Goschler and Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.), 185–202. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/hcp.41.08nik
- Nikitina, Tatiana & Maslov, Boris. 2013. Redefining constructio praegnans: On the variation between allative and locative expressions in Ancient Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 13, 105–142. doi:10.1163/15699846-13130107
- Nueva gramática. 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Sintaxis. II. Madrid: Espasa libros.
- Rahkonen, Matti. 1977. Suomen paikanilmauksista. [On locative expressions in Finnish.] *Virtittäjä* 81 (1), 21–52.
- Roegiest, Eugene. 1980. *Les prépositions a et de en espagnol contemporain. Valeurs contextuelles et signification générale*. Gent: Rijksuniversiteit te Gent.
- Rozental', Ditmar E. et al. 1998. *Spravočnik po pravopisaniju, proiznošeniju, literaturnomu redaktirovaniju* [Spelling, pronouncing and editing guide]. Moscow: CheRo.
- Schebeck, Bernhard. 1976. Yuulngu. In *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, Robert M.W. Dixon (ed.), 352–382. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Toporov, Vladimir N. 1961. *Lokativ v slavjanskix jazykax* [The locative in Slavic languages]. Moscow: Akademija Nauk SSSR.
- Turpin, Myfany. 2000. *A Learner's Guide to Kaytetye*. Alice Springs: IAD Press.
- Valiulytė, Elena. 1989. Vietininko ir prielinksnio į su galininku sinoniminė vartosena [Synonymous use of the locative and į with the accusative]. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 26, 179–200.
- Valiulytė, Elena. 1995. *Vietą nusakome įvairiai: vietininkas ir jo sinonimai* [Place is variously expressed: The locative and its synonyms]. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2001. A typology of displacement (with special reference to Latvian). *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 54 (3), 298–323.
- Zaika, Natalia M. Forthcoming. Variativnost' padežnyx form pri glagolax dviženija v baskskom jazyke v diaxroničeskom i dialektnom aspektax [Case alternation with motion verbs in Basque from a diachronic and dialectological point of view]. To appear in *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*.
- Zavjalova, Marija. 2007. Obzor izmenenij v litovskoj padežnoj sisteme pod vlijaniem russkogo jazyka [An overview of changes in the Lithuanian case system under Russian influence]. In: *Areal'noe i genetičeskoe v strukture slavjanskix jazykov* [Areal and genealogical aspects of Slavonic language structure], Vjačeslav V. Ivanov and Peter M. Arkadiev (eds), 46–66. Moscow: Institute of Slavic Studies.
- Žilinskaitė, Ėglė. 2010. Vietos raiška Mikalojaus Daukšos postilėje: postpoziciniai vietininkai ir jų funkciniai ekvivalentai [Spatial expressions in Mikalojus Daukša's Postilla. Postpositional locatives and their functional counterparts]. PhD Thesis, Vilnius University.
- Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė, Ėgle. 2012. S. lie. adesyo ir aliatyvo neutralizacijos klausimu [On the neutralization of the adessive : allative opposition in Old Lithuanian]. *Baltistica* 47 (1), 23–36.
- Zwarts, Joost. 2010. A hierarchy of locations: Evidence from the encoding of direction in adpositions and cases. *Linguistics* 48 (5), 983–1009. doi:10.1515/ling.2010.032