



**Wichita State University Libraries**  
**SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository**

---

Gary H. Toops

Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures

---

**The Syntax and Semantics of Lithuanian Curative Constructions**

Gary H. Toops  
*University of Virginia*

---

**Recommended citation**

Toops, Gary H. 1989. The syntax and semantics of Lithuanian curative constructions. The Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR: Linguistic Studies. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 249-282.

**Copyright** Gary H. Toops, 1989

**This paper is posted in Shocker Open Access Repository**

<http://soar.wichita.edu/dspace/handle/10057/3509>

## THE SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS OF LITHUANIAN CURATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS<sup>1</sup>

Gary H. Toops  
*University of Virginia*

**0. Introduction.** Given a Lithuanian transitive verb meaning 'to do' (e.g., Lithuanian *darýti*), suffixing the infinitive stem with the inherently unstressed morpheme *-din* results in a verb signifying 'to have (something) done' (cf. *darýdinti*—Kurschat 1968:410). Verbs that are suffixed with *-din* and convey this particular type of causative meaning are designated in Lithuanian linguistics and lexicography by the term *parūpinamieji veiksmāžodžiai* and/or its neo-Latin translation *verba curativa*.<sup>2</sup> The adjective *parūpinamieji* 'curativa' is derived from the verb *parūpinti* 'to procure, secure, see to,' which is occasionally used to paraphrase the meaning of these verbs (cf. Jakaitienė 1968:228 and 1970:175): *darýdinti* = "pasirūpinti, kàd kàs kã darýtų" 'to see to it that someone do something,' Latin "*curare ut quis quid faciat*," whence the grammatical term "curative" (likewise Lithuanian *kuratývinis*—Jakaitienė 1970:175).

This paper is intended as a contribution to a comprehensive description of the syntax and semantics of Lithuanian curative constructions, a description which, in my assessment of the available linguistic literature, has thus far been lacking. Towards this end, the paper is divided into four parts, dealing with the following questions: (1) the existence of two *-din* suffixes in the light of Senn's "active" versus "passive causative" dichotomy (Senn 1929); (2) valence; (3) diathesis, or the correlation between semantic and syntactic levels of analysis (i.e., between "participants" and "actants"—see Babby 1976:699-700); and (4) the syntactic expression of Direct Agents in curative sentences. In undertaking to describe curative constructions, I apply two theoretical frameworks: generative grammar (including certain semantic concepts afforded by government and binding theory and generative semantics, specifically, thematic roles [ $\theta$ -roles] and the semantic primitive CAUSE, resp.) and the so-called "theory of

diatheses" (Russian *teorija diatez*) as elaborated by the Leningrad-based Structural Typology School.<sup>3</sup> The application of more than one theoretical approach allows for a fuller description than either theory alone can provide, while at the same time obviating certain problems that Lithuanian curative constructions pose for for one or the other theoretical analysis (see below).

It is appropriate here to make some final introductory remarks regarding the question of productivity. As I pointed out in Toops (In press), from the standpoint of lexical derivation, *-din*-suffixation is not as productive as the works of non-native Lithuanian scholars would lead one to infer (see especially Stang 1941:187, cited also in Toops [In press]). An important point not explicitly made by previous scholars is that only native Lithuanian infinitive stems can be suffixed with *-din* for the expression of curative meaning. Thus, a newly created verb, or a verb of perceptibly foreign origin like *(nu)fotografuoti* 'to photograph,' does not lend itself to *-din*-suffixation, even though the need to convey the notion "to have (someone/oneself) photographed" obviously arises. Rather than express curative meaning by means of a verb *\*(nu)fotografuodinti*, contemporary Lithuanian, like Russian, has recourse to the "contextual" expression of curative meaning (see Toops 1987). The proposition "I'm having myself photographed," therefore, is expressed as "Aš fotografuojuos (pàš fotogrãfã),” literally 'I'm photographing myself (at the photographer's)' (the parenthetical expression of the "service provider" at whose place of business the activity is performed provides a context which reduces the chances that the sentence will be misperceived by the recipient of the message in a noncurative sense). The ability to convey curative meaning contextually is limited to verbs denoting (what is generally perceived to be) a professional, service activity (cf. Geniušienė 1978:665);<sup>4</sup> otherwise, a periphrastic construction with curative meaning can be formed by means of derivatives of the verb 'to give' *įdúoti/atidúoti* + infinitive (cf. Russian *otda(va)t'* + infinitive constructions with this same meaning in Toops 1988:243-45 and Section 4 below).<sup>5</sup> Conversely, this means that, given a verb which is native Lithuanian and which at the same time denotes a

service activity, curative meaning can be expressed in three different ways: (1) by means of a *-din*-suffixed verb form, (2) by context, and (3) by periphrasis.

- (1) Móteris nóri suknėlę pasiūdinti.  
WomanNOM wants dressACC to-have-sewn.  
'The woman wants to have a dress sewn.'
- (2) Móteris nóri suknėlę pasiūti (pàs siuvėją, ateljėjė).  
WomanNOM wants dressACC to-sew—  
'The woman wants to have a dress sewn (at the seamstress's, at the dress shop).'
- (3) Móteris nóri įdúoti suknėlę pasiūti.  
WomanNOM wants to-consign dressACC to-sew  
'The woman wants to have a dress sewn.'

However, given the established dichotomy between unproductive, lexical causatives and productive, morphologically regular causatives (Shibatani 1976:2-3), it would be wrong to relegate Lithuanian curative verbs to the former category. The above-mentioned lexical constraints notwithstanding, curative verb derivation is completely transparent—morphophonologically (i.e., both segmentally and suprasegmentally), syntactically, and semantically. This observation is supported by the following considerations:

(a) Curative verb formation is restricted to the suffix *-din* (or, correspondingly, in the dialects of the Dzūkai and Western Aukštaičiai, *-dy*—LKG 1971:265). Curative verbs preserve throughout their paradigms (without exception) the stress of the infinitive stem of the basic verb from which they are derived (i.e., curative verbs have strictly fixed stem stress).

(b) Curative verbs, like the corresponding basic verbs when used to convey curative meaning by contextual means (see example (2) above), exhibit the same syntactic constraint on the occurrence of the accusative reflexive pronoun *savė* as a direct object (thus, it is no more possible to express "to have oneself shaved [i.e., 'get a shave']" as *\*skùsdinti savė* than it is to express the same meaning contextually as *\*skùsti savė [pàs kirpėją]* 'to

have oneself shaved [at the barber's]—see Toops [In press] and 1987:607).

(c) Although the existence of a verb *\*(nu)fotografúodinti* 'to have (something/someone) photographed' is not attested, according to one informant, its derivation, however artificial it may seem to a native speaker of contemporary standard Lithuanian, remains "theoretically imaginable" (Venclova, personal communication), and such a verb form would certainly be understood in its intended (curative) meaning.<sup>6</sup>

1. **"Active" vs. "passive causatives."** Senn (1929:236-37) cited two types of causative verbs—"aktive Kausativa" and "passive Kausativa"—formed by means of *-in* and *-din*-suffixation, resp. He established this distinction on the basis of his observation that the former express the meaning "die Handlung des betreffenden primären Tätigkeitswortes hervorbringen oder veranlassen" ('to bring about or induce the action of the corresponding basic verb'), while the latter express the meaning "machen, daß etwas getan, angefertigt wird" ('to see to it that something be done, manufactured'). Although Senn made no further attempt to justify his terms, the terms "neveikiamieji priežastiniai veiksmāžodžiai / verba causativa passiva" have nonetheless made their way into contemporary Lithuanian linguistics, coexisting, as it were, with "parūpinamieji" or "kuratýviniai veiksmāžodžiai / verba curativa" (see note 2). As explained in Toops 1987:602ff., the dichotomy—active vs. passive causatives—can be justified within a generative framework. This is demonstrated below. First, however, a few comments on the (for the time being, putative) "active causative" suffix *-in* are in order.

In the historical development of Lithuanian, the suffix *<-in>* originally had an allomorph *-din* which occurred with infinitive stems ending in a vowel; an automatic phonological rule operated to eliminate hiatus between the final vowel of the infinitive stem and the suffix *-in* (Otrębski 1965:413, Stang 1966:374): *valgy-ti* 'to eat' → *\*valgy-in-ti* → *valgy-din-ti* 'to feed (i.e., to have [someone] eat).' Over time, however, this type of *-din*-suffixation lost some of its transparency and became more and more opaque, so that while *-din* in contemporary Lithuanian still occurs

automatically after stem-final vowels (cf. Jakaitienė 1970:175-76), it may also occur, irregularly, after stem-final **consonants**. This has created in the modern language a confused situation not only where synonymous pairs of suffixally derived transitive verbs occur (e.g., *lipinti* and *lipdinti* 'to glue, stick [i.e., make (something) stick]' < *lìpti* 'to stick, adhere [intransitive],' *sproginti* and *sprogdinti* 'to burst [i.e., make (something) burst]' < *sprógti* 'to burst [intransitive],' *bėginti* and *bėgdinti* 'to let/make [someone/something] run' < *bėgti* 'to run'), but also where an historically unjustified *-din*-suffixed form is the only one attested (e.g., *žėldinti* 'to grow [i.e., let (something) grow],' *but not \*žėlinti* < *žėlti* 'to grow [intransitive]'; cf., however, *nužilinti* 'to let/make [someone('s hair)] turn completely grey,' but not \**nužildinti* < *nužilti* 'to turn completely grey').

Note that, as the verbs *valgydinti*, *lipdinti*, *sprogdinti*, and *bėgdinti* demonstrate, this *-din* allomorph of <*-in*> can be stressed, unlike the curative *-din* (according to Senn 1929:236, "stets unbetont") discussed in the Introduction above. Thus, in the case of *valgydinti*, we may view the verb as morphophonemically (suprasegmentally) marked for noncurative meaning, since only a theoretically imaginable \**válgydinti* could conceivably signify 'to have (something) eaten' (conversely, verbs without stress on the suffix *-din* are morphophonemically unmarked, hence potentially ambiguous, if they are derived from basic transitive verbs—see note 6).<sup>7</sup>

I propose the following S-structures for sentences containing a basic intransitive verb and sentences containing the corresponding transitive verb derived through *-(d)in*-suffixation:

bėgti 'to run' → bėg(d)inti 'to let/make (someone/  
something) run'

(4) Žirgas bėga.

[S[NP žirgas][VP bėgti]]

'The horse is running.'

(5) Žmogùs bėg(d)ina žirgą.

[S[NP žmogùs][VP CAUSE [S[NP žirgas][VP bėgti]]]]

'The man is making the horse run.'

The semantic primitive CAUSE in the S-structure of sentence (5) serves a twofold purpose. First, from the viewpoint of government and binding theory, it assigns the  $\theta$ -role Indirect Agent to the subject *žmogùs* 'man' (an Indirect Agent, as opposed to a Direct Agent, being a participant which only "indirectly" performs a particular action, i.e., by causing it to be performed by someone/something else). Second, from the viewpoint of generative semantics, it meets the goal of capturing the synonymy and entailment relations that obtain between morphological and periphrastic causative constructions. For example, the semantics of sentence (5), containing the morphological causative *bég(d)inti* (defined in Kruopas et al. 1972:75 as "*versti bégti*" 'force to run'; see also Jakaitienė 1968:225 and 228), can be expressed periphrastically by means of the analytic causative construction *veřsti* + infinitive as in sentence (6), for which the same S-structure is posited:

- (6) *Žmogùs veřčia žirgą bégti.*  
 [S[NP *žmogùs*][VP CAUSE [S[NP *žirgas*][VP *bégti*]]]]  
 'The man is making the horse run.'

Note that the foregoing analysis is based on the following statement of generative semantic theory put forth by Shibatani (1975:5-7): "[T]he underlying structure and the surface structure are mediated essentially by two types of transformations, Predicate Raising and Lexical Insertion... Predicate Raising may not apply all the way... and as long as the lexicon provides morphemes that have structures matching amalgamations of predicates under one node, the amalgamation of predicates may be replaced by a morpheme at any level... [T]here is no significant and uniform level between underlying structure and surface structure where lexical insertion takes place and where no transformation has yet applied." Thus, in the generation of sentence (5), a Predicate Raising transformation occurs before Lexical Insertion, yielding -CAUSE *bégti*-, for which the lexicon

provides morphemes to produce *bėg(d)inti*.<sup>8</sup> In the generation of sentence (6), Lexical Insertion operates first, before Predicate Raising, so that *veĩsti* is inserted into the VP occupied by CAUSE. (See Section 2 below for discussion of case hierarchy and the syntactic demotion of subject to object position.)

Although the "active" causative suffix *-(d)in* serves "most often" to derive transitive verbs from basic intransitives (Jakaitienė 1968:227-28), this same suffix occurs as well with the infinitive stems of a number of basic **transitive** verbs: *valgydinti* 'to feed (i.e., have [someone] eat)' < *válgyti* 'to eat,' *vėsdinti* (Kurschat 1973:2668 cites *vėsdinti*) 'to get (someone) to marry' < *vėsti* (*mergáite*) 'to marry, take (a young woman) in marriage' (also *vėdinti* < *vėsti* [morphophonemically <ved-ti>]), *lėsinti/lėsdinti* 'to have (an animal) peck' < *lėsti* 'to peck,' *dainúodinti* (LKŽ 2:230, Kurschat 1968:400) 'make (someone) sing' < *dainúoti* 'to sing.'

For sentences containing a basic transitive verb and sentences containing the corresponding causative (likewise transitive) verb derived through *-(d)in*-suffixation, I propose the following S-structures:

*válgyti* 'to eat' → *valgydinti* 'to feed, have (someone) eat'

- (7) *Vaikaĩ valgo.*  
 [S[NP *vaikaĩ*][VP[V *válgyti*][NP e]]]  
 'The children are eating.'
- (8) *Mótina valgydina vaikùs.*  
 [S[NP *mótina*][VP CAUSE [S[NP *vaikaĩ*][VP[V  
*válgyti*][NP e]]]]]  
 'Mother is feeding the children.'

We are dealing here with the causativization of basic transitive verbs that are frequently used intransitively, such usage being syntactically marked by the nonoccurrence of a direct object (reflected in the above S-structures by the lexically empty [NP e]): cf. the omissibility of direct objects with transitive verbs in English sentences of the type "He hasn't eaten (anything) yet,"

"He hasn't married (anyone) yet." Common to the S-structures of sentences (5), (6), and (8) is the fact that the lexical NP in the embedded S (*žirgas* 'horse,' *vaikai* 'children') is consistently **agentive**. In other words, the S embedded in the VP CAUSE is regularly an active sentence. For this reason, Senn's use of the term "active causative" to designate Lithuanian verbs of the type represented in sentences 5 and 8 is justified within a generative framework. It remains to be seen whether the term "passive causative" adequately describes the meaning expressed by curative *-din* (N.B.: not *-(d)in!*) suffixed verbs. (This is in keeping with Stang's observation, "Im Lit. hat sich der Typus auf *-dina* von demjenigen auf *-ina* losgerissen, und eine spezielle Funktion angenommen" [1942:186].)

Let us first remind ourselves that curative verbs express the meaning 'to have (something) done,' while the noncurative, "active" causatives discussed above express the meaning 'to have (someone) do.' Thus, Lithuanian and English are similar in distinguishing between the two meanings in surface structure, while most Germanic and Romance languages, for example, do not (German "Die Mutter läßt die Kinder essen" [likewise French "La mère fait manger les enfants"] is, unlike Lithuanian "Mótina valgydina vaikùs," potentially ambiguous, since it may be generated by two different underlying structures: either [S[NP[DET die][N Mutter]][VP CAUSE[S[NP[DET die][N Kinder]][VP[V essen][NP e]]]]] 'The mother is having the children eat' or [S[NP[DET die][N Mutter]][VP CAUSE[S[NP e][VP[V essen][NP[DET die][N Kinder]]]]]] 'The mother is having the children eaten'). Therefore, for sentences containing a basic transitive verb and sentences containing the corresponding curative verb formed by means of *-din*-suffixation, I tentatively propose the following S-structures:

siùti 'to sew' → siūdinti 'to have (something) sewn'

- (9) Móteris siùva sukneļę.  
 [S[NP móteris][VP[V siùti][NP sukneļé]]]  
 'The woman is sewing a dress.'

- (10) Móteris siūdina sukñėļę.  
 [S[NP móteris][VP CAUSE [S[NP e][VP[V siūti][NP  
 sukñėļē]]]]]  
 'The woman is having a dress sewn.'

The S-structure of curative sentence (10) differs from that of active causative sentence (8) by virtue of the fact that the embedded S under CAUSE in (10) contains a lexically empty subject (directly agentive) NP, while that in (8) contains a lexically empty direct *object* NP (because the woman is not having a dress sew something, but is instead having [an unexpressed] someone sew the dress). On the other hand, it may well be argued that there is no lexically empty subject NP in the underlying structure of sentence (10) at all; that the S embedded under CAUSE should actually be passive with no empty categories in the syntax (as shown in Section 2 below, the Lithuanian data do in fact support such an argument), cf. example (11):

- (11) Móteris siūdina sukñėļę.  
 [S[NP móteris][VP CAUSE[S[NP sukñėļė][VP[INFL  
 būti][V siūti\* t]]]]]  
 'The woman is having a dress sewn.'

However, the argument at this point is moot for two reasons. First, according to Chomsky (1981:54), a passive S like that in example (11) turns out to have a lexically empty subject NP in D-structure in any case, cf. example (12):

- (12) [S[NP e][INFL būti][VP siūti\* sukñėļę]]

Second, since in this section I am concerned with justifying Senn's terminological distinction between "active" and "passive" causativity, the actual syntactic (subject or object) status of the lexical NP (*sukñėļė*) is irrelevant. Of concern here rather is the *semantic* status of that NP (i.e., the  $\theta$ -role assigned to it).

Therefore, regardless of whether we posit an embedded active S with lexically empty subject NP, as in example (10), or an embedded passive S with no lexically empty NP, as in example (11), the salient feature of either S is the nonagentive semantic function ( $\theta$ -role Patient) of the NP *suknėlė*. To this extent, Senn's term "passive causative" is justified within a generative framework as a designation for the meaning expressed by Lithuanian curative verbs.

To further summarize the contents of this section, we may state that noncurative *-(d)in*-suffixed verbs differ from curative *-din*-suffixed verbs in the following ways:

(a) noncurative causative verbs express the active causative meaning 'to have (somebody) do'; curative verbs express the passive causative meaning 'to have (something) done.'

(b) noncurative causative verbs (specifically, those derived from infinitive stems ending in a consonant) are irregularly suffixed with *-in* and/or *-din*; curative verbs are regularly suffixed with *-din*.

(c) noncurative causative verbs suffixed with *-din* may occur with stress on the suffix; curative verbs never have stress on the suffix.

(d) the lexical NP of the embedded S under CAUSE in the underlying structure of active causatives is agentive (i.e., assigned the  $\theta$ -role Direct Agent); the lexical NP of the embedded S under CAUSE in the underlying structure of passive causatives (i.e., curatives) is nonagentive, hence what I propose to call "patientive" (i.e., assigned the  $\theta$ -role Patient—cf. Toops 1987:602-603, 607-608).

(e) active causative verbs are formed primarily from basic intransitive verbs, but may also be formed from basic transitive verbs; curative verbs are formed exclusively from transitive verbs, which, however, may be either basic or derived (i.e., through previous stem suffixation, cf. note 4).

**2. Valence.** Valence is defined, in generative terms, as the number of NP arguments for which a given verb is subcategorized. Within Tesnière's theory of structural syntax (1959) as well as the more recent theory of diatheses (hereafter

“TD”), causativity (or “causativization”—Babby 1981:1) is defined as a valence-increasing operation. In terms of syntactic surface structure, causativity entails the addition of a new actant (subject NP) whose semantic function ( $\theta$ -role; in TD terms, participant status) is that of Indirect (i.e., causing) Agent (symbolized K [for “Kausator”] in TD notation—see Löttsch, Fiedler, and Kostov 1976:68ff.). In Lithuanian, as in Turkish and the modern Germanic and Romance languages, this new actant is syntactically expressed as the subject of the sentence, with the result that, given a certain actantial (or case) hierarchy, the subject of the basic, noncausative sentence is demoted to direct object position (see Comrie 1976b:262-64). This is seen in comparing sentence (4) with sentence (5), repeated here as (13) and (14):

*žirgas* ‘horseNOM’ → *žirgą* ‘horseACC’

- (13) *Žirgas bėga.*  
horseNOM runs  
‘The horse is running.’
- (14) *Žmogùs bėg(d)ina žirgą.*  
manNOM run-causes horseACC  
‘The man is making the horse run.’

We may observe the same phenomenon in comparing sentence (7) with sentence (8), repeated here as (15) and (16):

*vaikai* ‘childrenNOM’ → *vaikùs* ‘childrenACC’

- (15) *Vaikai vėlgo.*  
childrenNOM eat  
‘The children are eating.’
- (16) *Mótina valgydina vaikùs.*  
motherNOM eat-causes childrenACC  
‘Mother is feeding the children.’

With respect to curative constructions, however, we see that there is no demotion of a nominative subject to accusative direct object position, unless a (noncausative) passive sentence is taken as the basic construction from which the curative is derived. Compare sentence (17) with sentence (10), repeated here as (18):

*suknēlē* 'dressNOM' → *suknēļe* 'dressACC'

- (17) *Suknēlē* (*yrà*) *siuamà*.  
 dressNOM (is) being-sewn  
 'A dress is being sewn.'
- (18) *Móteris siúdina suknēļe*.  
 womanNOM sew-causes dressACC  
 'The woman is having a dress sewn.'

This analysis proves to be of minimal utility, however, when we consider that noncurative active sentence (9) (repeated here as (19)) could, by the same reasoning, likewise be "derived" from passive sentence (17):

*suknēļe* 'dressACC' ?< *suknēlē* 'dressNOM'

- (19) *Móteris siúva suknēļe*. (?< *Suknēlē* [*yrà*] *siuamà*.)  
 womanNOM sews dressACC  
 'The woman is sewing a dress.'

Preferable here is an analysis applicable to Turkish and the modern Romance languages: if the basic active construction has a direct object (for Turkish, accusative) NP, that direct object retains its syntactic slot, and the original Direct Agent (if expressed at all) is demoted to some other position further down the actantial hierarchy (typically, to [dative] indirect object position). I repeat here sentences (19) and (18), with French translations:

*suknēļe* 'dressACC' = *suknēļe* 'dressACC'

- (19) Móteris siùva sunkēļe.  
 'La femme coud une robe.'  
 The woman<sub>S<sub>b</sub></sub> sews a dress<sub>DO</sub>
- (18) Móteris siūdina sukņēļe.  
 'La femme fait coudre une robe.'  
 The woman<sub>S<sub>b</sub></sub> makes to-sew a dress<sub>DO</sub>

Returning now to the question of valence, the discussion undertaken here will show that Lithuanian curative constructions pose problems not only for the concept of causativity as a valence-increasing operation, but also for the notion of lexically empty categories inherent in the generative analyses proposed in Section 1. In the general linguistic literature these problems have already been addressed by Babby 1981 in his treatment of analogous passive causative constructions in Turkish. He states, "It is very common for the subcategorized or 'old' subject to remain unspecified (cf. 'agentless passives')," and provides the following examples (1981:15), cited here as (20) and (21):

- (20) (Ben) saat-im-i            [tamir et-tim]V  
 I        watch-poss-acc    fix-past  
 'I fixed my watch.'
- (21) (Ben) saat-im-i            [tamir et-tir-dim]V  
 I        watch-poss-acc    fix-caus-past  
 'I had my watch fixed (i.e., I had [someone=Ø] fix my watch).'

According to Babby (1981:15), "[t]he existence of sentences like... [21] and the fact that they are so common in all styles of Turkish is a problem for syntactic analyses in which a rule simultaneously adds a NP to the derivation and marks this expansion of the verb's valency with -DIR-: this analysis requires that we add a dummy or pro NP meaning 'unspecified person,' and then obligatorily delete it." I propose here to make the same point with respect to Lithuanian curative constructions. Unlike Babby 1981, however, I will not adduce a new theoretical

analysis to account for them, but rather rely on the explanatory force of TD (see Section 3), since my concern in this paper, as stated above (see Introduction), is to provide only a description of Lithuanian curatives. Ultimately, however, my description of Lithuanian *-din-*suffixed verbs will lead to the same conclusion at which Babby arrived in his analysis of Turkish *-DIR-*suffixed verbs (see Conclusions below): "A rule that adds *-DIR-* to a verb, creating a new, derived verb is not an operation on syntactic structures; it is a *lexical* operation because its domain is confined to a single word, not a phrase marker" (1981:29).

We have already observed that *-(d)in-*suffixation derives two-place (bivalent) transitive verbs (cf. sentences (4), (5), (7), (8) and (13)-(16)) from one-place (univalent) verbs. This observation is obfuscated, however, by the verbs *valgydinti* 'to feed,' *vėsdinti/vėdinti* 'to get (a man) to marry,' *lėsinti/lėsdinti* 'to feed (a bird),' *dainuodinti* 'to make (someone) sing,' which I classified in Section 1 as derivatives of basic transitive verbs and whose underlying structural analysis entailed my positing a lexically empty direct object NP (see example (8)). The only immediately apparent solution to this problem is to adopt a traditional lexicographic approach to the verbs *valgyti* 'to eat,' *lėsti* 'to peck,' *dainuoti* 'to sing,' etc., and classify them as being both bivalent, transitive verbs (cf. *valgyti duoną* 'to eat bread,' *lėsti grūdus* 'to peck grains/kernels,' *dainuoti dainą* 'to sing a song') **and** univalent, intransitive verbs (cf. *vaikai valgo* 'the children are eating,' *žąsys lėsa* 'geese peck/the geese are pecking,' *tas žmogus gerai dainuoja* 'that man sings well'). This is, in fact, the approach adopted by the Lithuanian Academy Dictionary and most English-language dictionaries (see, for example, LKŽ 2:230, 7:378, and AHD 1980:985, 1980:1208) as well as Mel'čuk (1974:353), who states, with respect to Russian verbs of the type *čitat* 'to read,' *verit* 'to believe,' *pet* 'to sing,' etc., that "a direct object is syntactically optional" (see Xrakovskij 1981:14ff. for discussion of obligatory [*objazatel'nye*] and optional actants [*fakul'tativnye aktanty*]).<sup>9</sup> By adopting this approach, we need no longer have recourse to the empty-category analysis exemplified by S-structures (7) and (8) (see Section 1). The first statement of this paragraph may therefore be revised to the effect that *-(d)in-*

suffixation derives bivalent, transitive verbs from both obligatorily and optionally univalent, intransitive verbs (lexical constraints notwithstanding).<sup>10</sup> Thus, *-(d)in*-suffixation regularly conforms to the conception of causativization as a valence-increasing operation.

The same cannot be said of Lithuanian *-din*-suffixed, curative verbs. In order to demonstrate that curative verb derivation is not a valence-increasing operation, I will first attempt to increase the actantial structure of *Móteris siūdina suknelę* 'The woman is having a dress sewn.' As will be shown, either the participant status of the added actant proves to be identical to its participant status in the noncausative sentence *Móteris siūva suknelę* 'The woman is sewing a dress,' or the occurrence of the added actant will result in an infelicitous sentence. In no instance can the occurrence of any such actant in surface structure be generated by lexicalization of the empty NP ([NP e]) in the underlying structure proposed in example (10) (Section 1), repeated here as example (22):

- (22) *Móteris siūdina suknelę.*  
 [S[NP *móteris*][VP CAUSE[S[NP e][VP[V *siūti*][NP  
*suknelė*]]]]]  
 'The woman is having a dress sewn.'  
 (i.e.: 'The woman is having [someone=Ø] sew a dress.')

I will then **reduce** the actantial structure of *Móteris siūdina suknelę* 'The woman is having a dress sewn' by means of two "recessive" (Sil'nickij 1974:55) grammatical operations: *-si-*affixation ("reflexivization") and passivization. Since these operations are the reverse of causativization, the resulting sentence with reflexive/passive verb forms should theoretically be noncausative (Geniušienė 1978:657). We will see, however, that after undergoing such grammatical operations, the curative sentence ((22) above) nonetheless retains its passive causative meaning.

With reference to French and Turkish causative constructions, Comrie has noted: "The surface exponency of the embedded subject (provided that it is not omitted) depends on the syntactic

arguments of the embedded verb. If it has no direct object, then the embedded subject appears as direct object; if it has a direct object but no indirect object, then the embedded subject appears as indirect object; if it has both a direct and an indirect object, then the embedded subject appears as one of the other oblique cases (i.e., neither subject nor direct object nor indirect object). More generally, if we order these four syntactic positions as follows: ... Subject - direct object - indirect object - other oblique constituent ... then we find that the embedded subject is shifted from left to right along this list to the leftmost position that is not occupied. It is clearer to consider this ordering as a hierarchy, with subject at the top and other oblique constituents at the bottom; then we can say that the embedded subject is demoted from subject position down the hierarchy to the next-highest available position (position that is not yet filled)" (1976b:263). Comrie further points out that "[t]his hierarchy is not valid solely for causative constructions.... The evidence from causative constructions shows that there is independent confirmation for the hierarchy from a different area of syntax; while within the analysis of causative constructions, we can systematize our description by using a descriptive tool of general linguistic theory whose validity has already been proved elsewhere" (1976b:263-64).

If we now consider the underlying structure proposed for curative sentence (22) above, we see that the embedded verb has a direct object ([NP *suknėlė*]), but no indirect object. Therefore, one might expect that increasing the surface actantial structure of sentence (22) by means of an indirect object, e.g., *dùkteriai* 'daughterDAT,' could result from lexicalization of the embedded subject NP ([NP *e*]) in the underlying structure. While this same operation holds true of French and a number of other languages, it does not hold true for Lithuanian:

- (23) *Móteris siūdina dùkteriai sukneļe.*  
 'The woman is having a dress sewn *for (her) daughter.*'

Note that the literal French translation of Lithuanian sentence (23), "La femme fait coudre une robe à sa fille" signifies 'The

woman is having her daughter sew a dress' and, unlike the Lithuanian sentence, can be generated by an S-structure with no lexically empty NPs on the order of [S[NP femme][VP CAUSE[S[NP fille][VP[V coudre][NP robe]]]]].<sup>11</sup>

English passive-causative constructions of the type "The woman is having a dress sewn *by the seamstress*" share with noncausative passive constructions the ability to express Direct Agents in the surface syntax as objects of the preposition *by* (cf. "A dress is being sewn *by the seamstress*"). Agents in (contemporary) Lithuanian passive constructions are expressed by means of the genitive case without prepositional governance: cf. *Suknėlė (yrà) siuvamà siuvėjos* 'The dress is being sewn by a seamstress.' In Lithuanian curative constructions, the genitive case of a noun cannot perform this same semantic function (contrary to what one would expect had one definitively accepted the embedded passive-S analysis of example (11) in Section 1 above). Cf. the ungrammaticality of sentence (24):

- (24) \*Móteris siūdina suknele *siuvėjos*.  
 'The woman is having the dress sewn *by a seamstress*.'

Thus, for the expression of Direct Agent in the surface syntax of Lithuanian curative constructions, neither of the possibilities suggested by cross-language syntactic typology exists.

"In natural languages," according to Geniušienė (1978:657), "two opposing derivational processes can be identified: on the one hand, an increase in the valence of a verb (predicate raising); on the other hand, a decrease (predicate lowering). The former is primarily instrumental in the derivation of causative verbs (cf. Lithuanian *Sugėdo laikrodis* 'The clock broke' → *Sugad-in-aũ laikrodį* 'I broke the clock' [i.e., 'I made the clock break'—GHT]), the latter for the derivation of formally reflexive verbs (cf. Lithuanian *Sugadinaũ laikrodį* 'I broke the clock' → *Su-si-gadino laikrodis* 'The clock broke')... The main function of a causative morpheme is to impart causative meaning to the semantics of the initially chosen verb (see the first example above). A reflexive morpheme, in contrast, can have, among

other things, a decausativizing function, i.e., it can eliminate the causative component from the semantics of the initially chosen verb (see the second example above, which, as concerns the direction of semantic derivation, represents to a certain extent a mirror image of the first)."<sup>12</sup> In view of the foregoing statements, it is worth considering what semantic changes are observable when curative verbs undergo formal reflexivization. As far as an actual decrease in the actantial structure of sentence (22) is concerned, only two meanings emerge, neither of which is noncausative; cf. examples (25) and (26):

- (25) Suknēlé lengvāi siūdinas.  
 dressNOM easily sew-causes-reflexive  
 'A dress is (can be) easily "gotten sewn".'  
 (i.e.: 'One can easily have a dress sewn.')
- (26) Daūg suknēlių pasisiūdino.  
 many dressesGEN perfective-reflexive-sew-caused  
 'Many dresses were "gotten sewn".'  
 (i.e.: 'People [unexpectedly] had [managed to have] lots  
 of dresses sewn.')

Geniušienė (1978:664-65) labels *-si-*affixed verbs of the above (semantic) type "quasipassive reflexives," which, according to her, include "modal-passive reflexives" (sentence (25)) and "resultative-passive reflexives" (sentence (26) above).

"Submitting" curative verbs to a further recessive (i.e., valence-reducing) operation, viz., passivization, likewise fails to result in the elimination of causative meaning (illustrated above by Geniušienė with the *-(d)in-*suffixed example *sugadinti*). Consider example (27):

- (27) Suknēlé (yrà) siūdinama.  
 dressNOM (is) being-sew-caused  
 'A dress is being "gotten sewn".'  
 (i.e.: '[Someone] is having a dress sewn.')

Finally, note should be taken of the fact that introducing an actant in the genitive case into the surface structure of passivized curative sentence (27) does not result in the expression of a Direct Agent (i.e., the person who is actually sewing the dress), but rather results in the expression of the "previously omitted" Indirect Agent. Thus, passive sentence (28) below is semantically equivalent to active sentence (22) above:

- (28) Móteries (yrà) siūdinama suknẽlė.  
 womanGEN (is) being-sew-caused dressNOM  
 'A dress is being "gotten sewn" by the woman.'  
 (= [22] Móteris siūdina suknẽlė 'The woman is having a  
 dress sewn')

To conclude this section, we have seen that the syntax of curative constructions, in terms of valence (as well as case hierarchy and the semantic status of actants [in the dative and genitive cases] introduced secondarily into the surface structure), is identical to that of the corresponding (active, reflexive, or passivized) noncausative constructions.

**3. Diathesis.** Since Lithuanian curative constructions, as we have seen, do not lend themselves to adequate generative analyses, in this section I will describe curative derivation in terms of diathesis. In so doing, I adopt linear, conjoined-block notation introduced by Löttsch, Fiedler, and Kostov 1976 (cf. also Xrakovskij 1981 for a slight variation on this notational system): each block represents a semantic or syntactic constituent, semantic constituents being arrayed in a row of blocks superimposed on another row of blocks which individually symbolize the surface syntactic expression of the semantic constituent in the block superimposed directly above it. The constituents are symbolized by letters. Semantic constituents are represented (in the top row) by: A = Direct Agent, K = Indirect Agent ("Kausator"—see Section 2), P = Patient, Ad = Addressee (Beneficiary, Recipient, or "Goal of Action"), X = Circumstant (adverbial/prepositional phrase/modifier). Syntactic constituents are represented (in the bottom row) by S = subject (not to be confused with S for "sentence" in generative bracketing notation), Od = direct object,

$O_i$  = indirect object,  $O_a$  = "passive agent" (i.e., oblique constituent notationally superimposed with A or K, e.g., Lithuanian noun in the genitive case, English object of the preposition *by*, etc., in passive sentences),  $O_{ak}$  = "causative direct agent" (i.e., any oblique constituent notationally superimposed with A in causative constructions),  $O_x$  = all other oblique constituents (these can be specified, if necessary, by grammatical case form:  $O_{ins}$  = noun in the instrumental case, etc.). In TD terminology, the semantic constituents, as stated previously, are called "participants" (equivalent to  $\theta$ -roles in government and binding theory). Syntactic constituents are called "actants."

For comparison, we may first consider the change in diathesis produced by active causative *-(d)in*-suffixation. Sentences (4) and (5) are shown here as example (29):

(29) Žirgas bėga.                      

A
S

  
'The horse runs.'

*(d)in* → 

K	A
S	O <sub>d</sub>

      Žmogùs bėg(d)ina žirgą.  
'The man makes the horse run.'

The notation of diathesis not only illustrates the semantic status of the individual actants, but also reflects the demotion of subject to direct object in the process of causativization mentioned in Section 2 above (i.e.,  $\frac{A}{S} \rightarrow \frac{A}{O_d}$ ).

If we now consider the change in diathesis induced by curative verb derivation, we see that *-din*-suffixation is a significantly different operation. In all four transformations considered below, the only observable change in the diathesis is in the semantics: wherever A occurs in the noncausative sentence, K occurs in the curative sentence. The syntactic (not to mention all other semantic) constituents remain the same. Compare the diatheses of sentences (22), (23), (28), and (27) (see Section 2), together with those of the corresponding noncausative sentences, cited here as examples (30), (31), (32), and (33):

- (30) Móteris siùva suknėlė.

‘The woman is sewing a dress.’

A	P
S	O <sub>d</sub>

*-din* →

K	P
S	O <sub>d</sub>

Móteris siūdina suknėlė.

‘The woman is having a dress sewn.’

- (31) Móteris siùva dūkteriai suknėlė.

‘The woman is sewing her daughter a dress.’

A	Ad	P
S	O <sub>i</sub>	O <sub>d</sub>

*-din* →

K	Ad	P
S	O <sub>i</sub>	O <sub>d</sub>

Móteris siūdina dūkteriai suknėlė.

‘The woman is having a dress sewn for her daughter.’

- (32) Móteries (yrà) siuвамà suknėlė.

‘A dress is being sewn by the woman.’

A	P
O <sub>a</sub>	S

*din* →

K	P
O <sub>a</sub>	S

Móteries (yrà) siūdinama suknėlė.

‘A dress is being “gotten sewn” by the woman.’

- (33) Suknėlė (yrà) siuвамà.

‘A dress is being sewn.’

A	P
-	S

*-din* →

K	P
-	S

Suknėlė (yrà) siūdinama.

‘A dress is being “gotten sewn”.’

Thus we arrive at the same conclusion reached by Babby 1981 with respect to Turkish *-DİR*-suffixed verbs (see Section 2): *-din*-suffixation in Lithuanian, unlike *-(d)in*-suffixation, is not a syntactic operation. It is a lexical operation, since its function is strictly semantic: the curative suffix *-din* serves to signal unambiguously that the  $\theta$ -role “Agent” assigned by the VP is “Indirect” rather than “Direct.”

We are left finally with the question: assuming the possible existence of some oblique syntactic constituent “\*” not yet considered, is the following diathesis possible in Lithuanian at all (i.e., without recourse to a periphrastic causative construction)?<sup>13</sup>

K	A	P
S	*	Od

4. **Direct Agents in Curative Constructions.** Data collected from informants reveal that there are three basic ways of expressing Direct Agents in curative constructions. They do not represent regular grammatical means of introducing directly agentive NPs into the actantial structure of curative sentences, but rather constitute typically recurrent means of making oblique reference to Direct Agents. Some of the curative constructions below, while cited in dictionaries of contemporary standard Lithuanian (including the Lithuanian Academy Dictionary), are attested in rather old sources (sentence (39), for example, dates from 1653). Nevertheless, the grammar of these sentences is still that of contemporary Lithuanian: while one informant, for example, found some of the sentences “old-fashioned,” it became apparent that his assessment was based on the idiom rather than on the grammar per se (which, in fact, as a non-linguist, but as a speaker of contemporary standard Lithuanian, he felt competent to comment upon). As I alluded in Toops (In press), contextual and periphrastic means of expressing passive causative relations appear to be more common in the contemporary language than *-dīn*-suffixation (I am aware of no statistical analysis that would corroborate this observation, however). Intuitively, this makes sense: if the valence of curative verbs is such that there is no syntactic position in the actantial structure of curative sentences to which the  $\theta$ -role “Direct Agent” is configurationally assigned in the course of their generation, then periphrastic (and possibly also contextual—see below) causative constructions, which enable the regular syntactic exponency of both Direct and Indirect Agents, will presumably occur with greater frequency (cf. *Norėjo man jūdوتي siūti suknelę* [LKŽ 2:884] ‘She $\kappa$  wanted to have me $\Delta$  sew a dress.’ Also compare in this regard the nonoccurrence of “agentive passive” constructions in Classical Arabic and other languages in which only active constructions allow for the expression of both Agent and Patient.).

(a) Accusative-case object of the preposition *pàs*. As discussed in Toops (In press), Senn (1966:418) seemed to consider Lithuanian use of the preposition *pàs* (equivalent for the most part to the Russian and Polish preposition *u*, German *bei*, French *chez*) to mark direct agents a "Slavismus." In fact, if we consider the Russian contextual-causative (Toops 1987) construction signifying "The neighbor is having his son treated by a doctor," we see that the literal Lithuanian translation expresses the identical passive causative meaning:

- (34) Russ: Sosed lečit syna u vrača.  
 Lith: Kaimýnas gýdo sūnų pàs gýdytoją.  
 neighborNOM treats sonACC "chez" doctorACC  
 'The neighbor is having his son treated by a  
 doctor.'

As I stated in the Introduction above, noncausative (specifically, noncurative) forms of verbs denoting professional "service" activities can, as in a number of Slavic languages, be used with passive causative meaning. Unlike the modern Slavic languages, however, Lithuanian has, in addition, curative verb forms that **unambiguously** convey this same meaning ('to have [something] done'). Thus, passive causative situations, which can be rendered in Russian and other Slavic languages for the most part only by potentially ambiguous (i.e., with respect to causative vs. noncausative meaning) "contextual" means, can be expressed in Lithuanian both ways, cf. example (35):

- (35) Russ: On strižetsja u parikmaxera.  
 Lith: Jis keĩpasi pàs kirpėją.  
 heNOM shears-reflexive "chez" barberACC  
 Lith: Jis kiĩpdinasi pàs kirpėją.  
 heNOM shear-causes-reflexive "chez" barberACC  
 'He's having his hair cut (literally: "having  
 himself shorn") at the barber's/by the barber.'

Although I disagree with their analysis (cf. Toops 1987:608), it is worth noting that Löttsch, Fiedler, and Kostov (1976:87) have,

so to speak, elevated the status of the Russian preposition *u* (and, by extension, that of the Lithuanian preposition *pàs*, although Lithuanian is not among the languages included in their typology) to that of a grammatically regular marker of a syntactic constituent symbolized as  $O_{ak}$  in their notation of diatheses (see Section 3). The sentences in illustration (35) (above) all express, therefore, the following diathesis:

K	P	A
S	$O_{ak}$	

Similarly, the corresponding nonreflexive Russian and Lithuanian sentences represent the diathesis:

K	P	A
S	$O_d$	$O_{ak}$

Thus, at least within the theory of diatheses as elaborated by Löttsch, Fiedler, and Kostov 1976, the question I posed at the conclusion of Section 3 (see above) must be answered affirmatively: Lithuanian does have regular grammatical means (accusative NP governed by the preposition *pàs*) for introducing directly agentive NPs into the actantial structure of formally curative constructions. (Note that the horizontal notational ordering of the constituents— $K|A|P$  or  $K|P|A$ —is irrelevant.)

There are at least two objections that can be raised against this analysis, however. First, in Lithuanian, as in a number of Slavic languages, the “service establishment,” rather than the “service provider” is frequently expressed in constructions with passive causative meaning:

- (36) Russ: On strižetsja v parikmaxerskoj.  
           heNOM shears-reflexive in barbershopPRE  
 Lith: Jis keĩpasi (kiĩpdinasi) kirpĩkloje.  
           heNOM shears-reflexive (shear-causes-reflexive)  
           barbershopLOC

'He's having his hair cut (literally: "having himself shorn") at the barbershop.'

Thus, *pàs* + accusative NP constructions in essence convey nothing more than the place where the action expressed by the verb is being performed. In my opinion, it is only because *pàs* + acc. constructions usually (but do not necessarily) express the attendant presence of someone professionally trained in the performance of the particular action involved that such prepositional phrases convey the notion of Direct Agent. Interpreting the object of the preposition *pàs* as Direct Agent is, therefore, simply a result of pragmatic assessment (cf. English "Every year I go to the dentist to have my teeth cleaned" and the unlikelihood of the proposition "Every year I go the dentist to have my teeth cleaned by my neighbor").

Second, even in Lithuanian constructions with formally curative verbs, the preposition *pàs* does not always mark an NP as being a Direct Agent, cf. (37):

- (37) Rašýdink grōmataþ pàs brólį. (LKŽ 11:208)  
 write-cause-imperative letterACC "chez" brotherACC  
 'Have the letter written to your brother.'  
 (not: \*'Have the letter written by your brother.')

In the case of sentence (37) above, according to one informant, the preposition *peĩ* (see below) could "theoretically" be used in place of *pàs* for the purpose of rendering the notion "by (your) brother," but this informant considered the resulting sentence to be characteristic of "archaic" or "rural" speech.

(b) Accusative-case object of the preposition *peĩ*. According to one informant, the meaning expressed by the preposition *peĩ* in the curative constructions cited below is 'thanks to (the help of).' It is apparently a logical extension of this meaning that enables the object of the preposition to be interpreted as Direct Agent. Because of this meaning, on the other hand, it is not possible in Lithuanian to replace *pàs* with *peĩ* in sentence (35) above—*Jis kirpdinasi pàs kirpēja*—since the resulting sentence would signify 'He is having his hair cut thanks to the barber' (*peĩ* is

etymologically related to English *for*, and the meaning ‘thanks to, because of’ is likewise expressed by the preposition in English contexts of the type “Were it not *for* the barber, he would not be getting his hair cut”—which is approximately what the Lithuanian sentence with *peĩ* would imply).<sup>14</sup> Consider the following examples:

- (38) Daũg vãlgių iĩgi ragaĩšių peĩ tarnùs atnèšdino kũmams.  
(Fraenkel 1929:128)  
many coursesGEN and flatcakesGEN by servantsACC  
bring\_out-caused3P godparentsDAT  
‘They had the servants bring out lots of courses/dishes and flatcakes for the godparents’ (literally: ‘They had many courses/dishes and flatcakes brought out to the godparents by the servants.’)
- (39) Dĩrva... peĩ mĩkytojus pradĩrbdinai..., uždĩdinai. (LKŽ  
2:566)  
fieldACC... by teachersACC till-caused2P..., sow-  
caused2P  
‘You had the field tilled and sown by the teachers.’

According to my informant, the prepositional phrase *peĩ mĩkytojus* ‘by the teachersACC’ in sentence (39) above can be replaced by *mĩkytojais* ‘teachersINS’ (cf. sentence (40) below), but *peĩ tarnùs* ‘by the servantsACC’ in sentence (38) cannot be replaced by *tarnaĩs* ‘servantsINS.’ My informant’s comments suggest that this discrepancy is due solely to the different (real) situations conveyed by the two sentences: the situation portrayed in sentence (39) is such that the likelihood of an animate (or rather, personal) noun in the instrumental case (*mĩkytojais*) being interpreted as a true instrument (implement) used in tilling and sowing is significantly smaller than the likelihood of servants in sentence (38) being viewed as instruments of carrying (that is, so to speak, as human beasts of burden; cf. example (40) below). With respect to examples (34) and (35) above, replacing *pàs*

*kirpėjā* 'at the barber'sACC' with *kirpėju* 'barberINS' is impossible.

(c) Instrumental case without prepositional governance. Senn (1966:419) cites the following example without commentary (except to draw the German-speaking reader's attention to the fact that "double accusatives" [see note 11], characteristic of German causative *lassen*-constructions, do not occur in Lithuanian curative constructions):

- (40) [Jis] *āvižas žąsimis lėšindin*[a].  
 heNOM oatsACC geeseINS peck-causes  
 'He is letting the geese peck the oats.'  
 ('He is having the oats pecked by the geese.')

For reasons given with respect to the previous sentences cited in this section, the instrumental case here is the only available means of conveying a Direct Agent. The preposition *pàs* is excluded, since geese do not have a place of business where service activities are performed (pecking oats, moreover, does not constitute a professional service activity). Replacing *žąsimis* with *peĩ žąsìs* would similarly seem to personify the geese.

To conclude this section, the data presented above strongly suggest that there are no regular grammatical means of introducing Direct Agents into the actantial structure of Lithuanian curative constructions. The directly agentive status of NPs in the instrumental case or as objects of the prepositions *pàs* and *peĩ* in the accusative case is contextually implied and situationally determined, not grammatically assigned.

**5. Conclusions.** Lithuanian *-din*-suffixation is a lexical, not a syntactic operation. The suffix *-din* is a formal marker of the indirectly agentive status of the  $\theta$ -role assigned by the VP to its subject NP. It signals no increase in the valence of the verb stem to which it is added; hence, curative verbs have the same syntactic arguments as the basic verbs from which they are derived. This is seen in the inability of established generative analyses (entailing Predicate Raising and underlying lexically

empty NPs) to account for the semantics and syntactic surface structure of curative constructions.

Intuitively, however, there is something to be said for the conceptualization of curatives as "passive causatives," in a literal sense of the term. If, within the framework of theories of valence, passivization is understood as a valence-decreasing operation (minus one actant) and causativization as a valence-increasing one (plus one actant), then it is understandable why basic transitive verbs (valence = 2) and their curative derivatives (valence =  $2 - 1 + 1 = 2$ ) should be subcategorized for the same number of NP arguments. As I have stated elsewhere (Toops 1985:12), "the valence attributable to a given verb form or verbal syntagm is not in and of itself a criterion for the identification of a causative construction. The grammatical processes operating relative to the basic verb must also be taken into account. Thus, while both *Mary wrote John a letter* and *Mary was forced to write John a letter* are trivalent relations, the difference between them may be expressed as  $3 = 3$  versus  $3 = 3 + 1 - 1$ , respectively."

Finally, the conceptualization of causativity as a lexical operation is not unusual. As Bowers (*The Theory of Grammatical Relations*. Ithaca, 1981: Cornell University Press, p. 11), cited in Babby (1981:29-30), states: "[A]ny separation between 'syntactic' processes and 'lexical' processes is quite arbitrary. It is a matter of fact that the central grammatical processes in natural languages are characteristically both syntactic and lexical. Some processes are 'more lexical' and others are 'more syntactic.' Languages vary widely, however, in the ways in which they can encode fundamental semantic relations into grammatical form, so that it is neither theoretically nor practically possible to maintain a strict separation between lexicon and syntax."

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHD = Morris, William, ed. 1980. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Ninth ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Babby, Leonard H. 1976. Review of *Tipologija passivnyx konstrukcij: diatezy i zalogi* (A. A. Xolodovič, ed.). *Language*, 52:698-701.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. "A Compositional Analysis of Voice in Turkish: Passive, Derived Intransitive, Impersonal, and Causative." *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2:1-31.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding* (Studies in Generative Grammar, 9). Dordrecht: Foris.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976a. Review of *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij: morfoložičeskij kauzativ* (A. A. Xolodovič, ed.). *Language*, 52:479-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1976b. "The Syntax of Causative Constructions: Cross-Language Similarities and Divergences." In Shibatani, ed., 1976: 261-312.
- Fraenkel, Ernst. 1929. *Syntax der litauischen Postpositionen und Präpositionen* (Indogermanische Bibliothek, 1. Abteilung: Sammlung indogermanischer Lehr- und Handbücher, 1. Reihe: Grammatiken, 19). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Geniušienė, Emma Š. 1978. "Die Reflexivverben des Litauischen im Vergleich zu denen des Lettischen, Russischen und Deutschen." *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 23:657-66.
- Jakaitienė, E. 1968. "Deverbatyviniai dabartinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmožodžiai su priesaga -inti." *Baltistica*, 4:221-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. "Dėl lietuvių kalbos veiksmožodžių priesagų." *Baltistica*, 6:173-77.
- Kruopas, J. et al., eds. 1972. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Kurschat, Alexander. 1968-73. *Litauisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. 4 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- LKG = Lithuanian Academy Grammar = Lietuvos TSR Mokslų Akademija. Lietuvių kalbos ir literatūros institutas. 1971. *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, 2.: *Morfologija*. Vilnius, Mintis.
- LKŽ = Lithuanian Academy Dictionary = Lietuvos TSR Mokslų Akademija. Lietuvių kalbos ir literatūros institutas. 1941-84. *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. 20 vols. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, Mintis, and Mokslas.
- Löttsch, Ronald. 1972. "Zum Ausdruck der Kausativität in den slawischen Sprachen." *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 17:360-70.
- \_\_\_\_\_, W. Fiedler, and K. Kostov. 1976. "Die Kategorie des Genus verbi in ihrem Verhältnis zu einigen verwandten morphologischen Kategorien." *Satzstruktur und Genus verbi* (Studia grammatica, 13. Ronald Löttsch and Rudolf Růžička, eds.). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 63-94.
- Mel'čuk, I. A. 1974. "O sintaksičeskom nule." In Xolodovič 1974:343-61.
- Otrębski, Jan. 1965. *Gramatyka języka litewskiego*. 2: *Nauka o budowie wyrazów*. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Senn, Alfred. 1929. *Kleine litauische Sprachlehre*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1966. *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*. 1: *Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1976. "The Grammar of Causative Constructions: A Conspectus." In Shibatani, ed. 1976:1-40.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi, ed. 1976. *Syntax and Semantics. 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions*. New York: Academic Press.
- Sil'nickij, G. G. 1974. "Glagol'naja valentnost' i zalog." In Xolodovič 1974:54-72.
- Stang, Christian S. 1941. *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*. (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi, 2: Historisk-filosofisk klasse, 1).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Tesnière, Lucien. 1959. *Eléments de syntaxe structurale*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Toops, Gary H. 1985. Grammatical Causativity in Slavic. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. "Russian Contextual Causatives." *Slavic and East European Journal*, 31:595-611.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. "The Russian Verb *da(va)t'*: Its Status as a Causative Auxiliary." *University of Chicago Working Papers in Linguistics*, 4:232-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. In press. "Notes on causativity and reflexivity in Lithuanian." To appear in: *Papers from the Fourth International Conference on the Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Xolodovič, A. A., ed. 1974. *Tipologija passivnyx konstrukcij. Diatezy i zalogi*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Xrakovskij, V. S. 1981. "Diateza i referentnost' (K voprosu o sootnošenii aktivnyx i reciproknnyx konstrukcij)." In Xrakovskij, ed. 1981:5-38.
- Xrakovskij, V. S., ed. 1981. *Zalogovyje konstrukcii v raznostrukturnyx jazykax*. Leningrad: Nauka.

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SUBSCRIPT ABBREVIATIONS

A	= Direct Agent
ACC	= accusative case
DAT	= dative case
DO	= direct object
GEN	= genitive case
INS	= instrumental case
K	= Indirect Agent ("Kausator")
LOC	= locative case
NOM	= nominative case
PRE	= prepositional case
Sb	= subject
2P	= second person (singular)
3P	= third person (singular or plural)

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful to my Lithuanian-speaking informants, Tomas Venclova and Rimvydas Šilbajoris, for answering a number of questions I asked them about the data presented in this paper. It bears little resemblance to the paper "On the Syntax of Curative Constructions in Lithuanian" that I actually read at the University of Chicago's Fifth International Conference on the Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR.

<sup>2</sup>The Lithuanian Academy Dictionary (LKŽ) marks all such verbs "cur." and in the list of abbreviations that prefaces most of the volumes, the following entry appears: "cur. = verbum curativum, parūpinamasis veiksmazodis." See, for example, LKŽ 1:xix, 2:vii, 11:vii, and other volumes. Senn (1929:263ff.) originally called curative verbs "passive causatives" ("passive Kausativa"), and this term also exists in contemporary Lithuanian linguistics ("neveikiamieji priežastiniai veiksmazodžiai"—see Jakaitienė 1968:228, who also cites the corresponding neo-Latin term "verba causativa passiva"). Stang adopted the term "passive causative" in his own work (1942:187 and 1966:374), although eventually Senn (1966:255ff.) used the term "resultative causatives" ("resultative Kausativa") instead.

<sup>3</sup>For brief, but nonetheless incisive, overviews of the work of Soviet and East German scholars in the field of structural typology and the theory of diatheses, see Babby 1976, Comrie 1976a, and Xrakovskij, ed. 1981:3-4. For an introduction to the notation of diatheses used in this paper, the reader is referred to Löttsch, Fiedler, and Kostov 1976 and Xrakovskij 1981. Implicit in these works is a familiarity with Tesnière 1959, a refinement and elaboration of whose "structural syntax" are inherent in the theory of diatheses (cf. Xolodovič 1974:55 and Xrakovskij, ed. 1981:4, 39, 44, and *passim*). Lest one think that my application of more than one theoretical approach is *ad hoc*, I refer the reader to Babby 1981:1.

<sup>4</sup>The contextual expression of curative relations is not limited to verbs of foreign origin and may be the preferred means of expressing curative relations with verbs denoting professional service activities even when a *-din-* suffixed verb exists. Thus *gýdydinti* (Kurschat 1968:589) 'to have (someone) treated' is almost never used, the verb *gýdyti* 'to treat (medically)' (< *gýti* 'to heal [intransitive (as of a sore)], convalesce') being preferred. Thus, as indicated in Toops (In press), the proposition "The neighbor is having his son treated by a doctor" is normally expressed as *Kaimýnas gýdo sūnų pàs gýdytoją*, literally 'The neighbor is treating (his) son at a doctor's,' rather than *Kaimýnas gýdydina...*

<sup>5</sup>How the verbs *įdúoti* and *atidúoti* become functionally equivalent to a causative auxiliary is explained in Toops 1988 with reference to the Russian

etymon of *atidúoti*, viz. *otda(va)t'*. There I proposed that the meaning 'to have (something) done' is a "contextually inferrable, logical extension" (1988:250) of the meaning 'to give,' specifically 'to give a thing to somebody (not necessarily expressed in surface structure) for the purpose of his doing something with it.' This proposition is supported by the existence of constraints on the range of nouns that can conceivably occur as a direct object in such periphrastic constructions. For example, "He had his hair cut" cannot be expressed periphrastically as *\*Jis įdavė pláukus nukĩrpti* or *\*Jis įdavė savė nukĩrpti*, presumably because one can neither "give" one's natural hair to another for the purpose of having it cut, nor can one "give" oneself to another for the purpose of being shorn. The verb *įdúoti* (but not *atidúoti*) is, like Russian *otda(va)t'*, nonetheless grammaticalized to the extent that it is possible to "give/hand over/consign" to someone something which, logically, does not yet exist; cf. sentence (3). Use of the verb *atidúoti* in place of *įdúoti* in sentence (3) would, however, signify that the dress (*suknėlę*) already exists and that the woman (*móteris*) wants to have it resewn (i.e., mended or altered).

<sup>6</sup>On the other hand, well-attested, native Lithuanian curative verbs can also be "misunderstood," at least in terms of the original verb form from which they have been derived. For example, one informant raised no objection to Senn's example (1966:419) *āvižas žąsimis lēsindinti* 'den Hafer von den Gänsen aufpicken lassen' ('to have the oats pecked by the geese'), while another informant objected to Senn's example on the grounds that *lēsindinti* does not signify 'to have (something) pecked,' but rather 'to have (someone/something [e.g., a bird]) fed (by letting it peck).' Interpreting *lēsindinti*, therefore, as a curative of *lēsinti/lėsdinti* (meaning, like *valgydinti*, 'to feed [i.e., to have (someone) eat]'), this informant considered the phrase nonsensical: 'to have the oats fed (with) geese.' The following entry in Kurschat 1970:1307, however, provides an adequate explanation for this discrepancy, i.e., the verb *lēsindinti* has both meanings: "*lesindinti*, -dinu, -dinau trans. 1. 'Geflügel oder Vögel füttern lassen.'—2. 'vom Geflügel aufpicken lassen'; *āvižas žąsimis* ~. NSB." (NSB = Niedermann, Max, Alfred Senn and Franz Brender. 1926-28. *Wörterbuch der litauischen Schriftsprache*. Heidelberg.) At the risk of confusing the reader (who may not yet have read Section 1 of this paper), I will attempt an explanation for this ambiguity. The basic verb is *lėsti* 'to peck.' From this verb Lithuanian derives *lēsinti* as well as the historically unjustified *lėsdinti*, both with the meaning 'to have/let (e.g., geese) peck (i.e., to feed [geese])' (cf. *valgydinti* 'to have/let [someone] eat [i.e., to feed (someone)]' < *válgyti* 'to eat'). The verb *lēsindinti* is therefore doubly causative (at least formally). Either it is interpreted as a curative form of the transitive (active causative) verbs *lēsinti/lėsdinti*, meaning 'to have (geese) fed' (cf. *gýdydinti* < *gýdyti* < *gýti* in note 4), or,

because *lėsdinti* has already been accepted as a synonym of *lėsinti* rather than a curative verb meaning 'to have (something) pecked,' *lėsdinti* functionally "fills the void" left by the failure of *lėsdinti* to acquire curative meaning (i.e., it is treated semantically as a curative derived directly from *lėsti*).

<sup>7</sup>The situation is not as bad as it may sound. As Jakaitienė 1970:175 points out, if the basic verb is intransitive, it does not matter which allomorph (-*in* or -*din*) is suffixed to its infinitive stem, since the resulting transitive derivative can only have the noncurative meaning 'to cause (someone/something) to do.' If, on the other hand, the basic verb is transitive (e.g., *válgyti* 'to eat'), semantic confusion still cannot arise provided (as I have already indicated here) that the suffix is stressed (cf. *valgydinti*). According to Jakaitienė 1968:222-23, the suffix is stressed in only 20% of -(*d*)*in*-derived verbs, but this figure includes transitive verbs derived from intransitives, which constitute the vast majority of "active causatives" (cf. Jakaitienė 1968:227).

<sup>8</sup>The term "Lexical Insertion" should not be taken to imply that the resulting causative verb is necessarily a "lexical causative" (see Shibatani 1976:2-3 and Toops 1985:17-18), although it may be. Lexical causatives express the semantic elements "CAUSE + ACTION" in the form of a single basic lexeme (e.g., English *kill* "CAUSE to die-"); productive causatives express the semantic elements "CAUSE + ACTION" as either morphemically or lexically divisible constructs (e.g., Lithuanian *bėg-(D)IN-ti* ← -CAUSE *bėg-ti*).

<sup>9</sup>Note that it is precisely such optionally bivalent verbs in Russian and Lithuanian whose intransitivity is not marked by the "reflexive" morpheme -*s' / -sja* (in Russian) or -*si-* (in Lithuanian); cf. Toops 1987:608.

<sup>10</sup>Sentences of the type *Mótina valgydina vaikùs dúona* (mother<sub>NOM</sub> eat-causes children<sub>ACC</sub> bread<sub>INS</sub>) 'Mother is feeding the children (with) bread,' seemingly derived by an increase in the actantial structure of *Vaikaĩ valgo dúonà* (children<sub>NOM</sub> eat bread<sub>ACC</sub>), may lead one to conclude that -(*d*)*in*-suffixation also derives trivalent verbs from basic bivalent ones. However, as far as I have been able to determine, there is in Lithuanian no regular demotion of a noncausative active sentence's accusative direct object to instrumental NP in the process of causativization. I believe, rather, that in the case of *Mótina valgydina vaikùs dúona* we are witnessing a certain tendency towards semantic lexicalization on the part of suffixally derived verbs. This observation is supported by, among other things, the fact that *spáusdinti*, for example, formally a curative verb derived from *spáusti* 'to press, squeeze; to print' (cf. German *drücken* vs. *drucken*), does not signify 'to have (something) pressed/printed,' but rather only 'to print' (see Kruopas et al. 1972:729). Although dictionaries still list 'to print' as a meaning of

*spáusti* (ibid.), one of my informants rejected the sentence *Jis atidavė knỹgą spáusti* (cf. Kurschat 1968:175) 'He had a book printed,' accepting, as he did, only the variant *Jis atidavė knỹgą spáusdinti*.

<sup>11</sup>Double-accusative constructions, i.e., causative constructions in which both the embedded subject and the embedded direct object occur, as in the Germanic languages, as accusative-case direct objects is possible in Lithuanian only if causativity is expressed analytically (e.g., by means of periphrastic constructions of the type *veĩsti* + infinitive).

<sup>12</sup>Geniušienė uses here the term "Ausgangsverb," which is ordinarily rendered in English as "basic verb." I have translated the term as "initially chosen verb," since Geniušienė obviously does not mean to imply that the verb *sugadinaũ* (derived historically from *sugėsti* through *-in*-suffixation) is a "basic" verb in the commonly accepted sense of the term. She uses the term "Ausgangsverb" literally to refer to any (basic or derived) verb form one may choose as a point of departure (Ausgang) for identifying (the semantics of) further derivational processes.

<sup>13</sup>The theory of diatheses recognizes that not all conceivable diatheses actually occur in any given language. Thus, the diathesis

Ad	P
S	Od

which occurs naturally in English (cf. "John was given a medal"), does not occur at all in Russian (which in this particular instance responds with the diathesis

Ad	P
Q	S

"To John was given a medal.")

<sup>14</sup>Although Fraenkel (1929:128) classifies the use of *peĩ* in curative sentences together with its now archaic use in noncurative passive constructions (attributed by some, e.g., Senn [1976:376], to influence by Polish use of the preposition *przez*), it is worth repeating here Fraenkel's comments on the Lithuanian use of the preposition *peĩ*: "Just as Lithuanian uses *peĩ*, so Polish uses *przez*.... Nevertheless it is a mistake to see nothing more than a Polonicism in the Lithuanian usage under discussion here; nor are we dealing with an imitation of German *durch*..., but rather with an independent development whose great expansion has at most been [only] aided by foreign models."