MOTOKI NOMACHI
(Sapporo)

ON THE RECIPIENT PASSIVE IN THE KASHUBIAN LANGUAGE
(Annex to Milka Ivić's Syntactic Inventory for Slavonic Dialectology)

This paper deals with grammaticalization of the recipient passive such as *òn to dostôł* (*òd ni*) *przëdzeloné* and its place in the verbal system of the Kashubian language. Taking as a starting point Milka Ivić's typological studies of Slavonic syntax, the author of this paper describes and analyses the Kashubian recipient passive and shows its grammatical and semantic features from a comparative viewpoint.

Keywords: Kashubian, syntactic typology, passive, grammaticalization, language contact.

1. Introduction

The contributions to general and Slavonic linguistics made by academician Milka Ivić range over a number of fields and especially her works on syntax and semantics on the Slavonic languages, having a pioneering quality, are of great importance. As an example of such works, we can refer to her *Диференцијалне синтаксичке особине у словенском језичком свету* (Ивић 1960: 49–74). This article was published based on the results of the 4th International Congress of Slavists taking place in Moscow, where distinguished Slavists such as Samuil Bernštejn, Ruben Avanesov, and Zdzisław Stieber had a lively and fruitful discussion on making "The Slavic Linguistic Atlas (OLA)" (ibid.: 49).

Inspired by the discussion and other works on the same theme, Milka Ivić contributed to the trend of Slavonic linguistics from the viewpoint of a Slavonic syntax specialist. This work was originally written for the purpose of dialectological studies at the time, but, as the title of the work shows, it is in essence a pioneering article of typological studies of Slavonic syntax, which is the very theme for Serbian linguistic typology today (Пипер 2007: 12).

In the article mentioned among others, Milka Ivić puts emphasis on two principal points: "1. За синтаксички квестионар вредност имају само *диференцијалне особине*. Према томе не могу се узимати у обзир они синтаксички феномени, ма колико они иначе били важни за језичку структуру, који су подједнако заступљени у свим словенским језицима. 2. *Синтаксички калкови*, уколико живе као масовно заступљен језички феномен, морају се узети у обзир као и свака друга диференцијална одлика" (Ивић 1960: 50).

The rich syntactic inventory made by academician Ivić makes her work very informative, and her work remains important for the syntactic typology of Slavonic languages.

In this article, based on the principals of the academician, the author describes and analyzes the recipient passive (hereafter RP) or a passive construction in Kashubian with the verb *dostac* (= to get) and the past passive participle (hereafter PPP) such as *òn to dostôł przëdzeloné*, which Milka Ivić does not deal with in her inventory of passive constructions.[1]

2. The German "bekommen Passiv" and RP in Slavonic

As is well known in linguistic typology, the verb *to get* can be a source of passive marker in a wide variety of languages (Lehmann 1995: 32, Heine & Kuteva 2002: 143–144). Among Slavonic languages, RP can be found in such languages as Upper and Lower Sorbian, Czech, Slovak (Giger 2003: 79–101), Slovene, Burgenland Croatian, and Kashubian (Номаћи 2007: 44–45). Such a construction as RP existed in Slovincian, too (Lorentz 1905: 111).[2] East and South Slavonic languages except Slovene and Burgenland Croatian do not possess such a passive construction with the verb *to get*. Thus, according to this areal patterning of RP in the Slavonic world, in those languages, it doubtlessly has come into being as a result of language contact with the German language, which has well developed RP in the verbal system.

Taking the facts into consideration, it would be better to begin with a brief look at the model construction or the original German construction

---

[2] It is natural that Milka Ivić did not mention the construction, since no scientific grammars of Sorbian, Czech, Slovak were published at the time and there has been no works on this theme until recently. Markus Giger is the first person who wrote paper on the theme from a comparative perspective, which was delivered at International Congress of Slavists 2003.

[3] Lorentz recorded a phrase as follows: Te-na- *kra* vjìęlä pjoụʒi *podarǒụnė* (literary: *then she got a lot of money presented*). The verb *kra* is borrowed from German verb *kriegen* or Low East German *kjriee*.

called "bekommen Passiv", "recipienten Passiv", or "dativ Passiv" in German linguistics.

2.1. The German "bekommen Passiv"

Apart from two passive constructions with the verb *sein* and *werden*, the standard German language has one more passive construction with the auxiliarized verb *bekommen / kriegen / erhalten*, which has now become widespread (Eisenberg 2006: 132–33). Compare following sentences below: the active (1), "bekommen Passiv" (2), and "werden Passiv" (3).

(1) *Die Karla* füllt dem Karl das Formular aus.
(2) *Der Karl* bekommt von der Karla das Formular ausgefüllt.
(3) *Das Formular* wird dem Karl von (der) Karla ausgefüllt.

Example (2) can be considered as a result of the "passivization" (or "subjectivization") of the dative object that the verb *ausfüllen* governs. According to Eisenberg (Eisenberg 2006: 132), the "bekommen Passiv" can usually be formed from the three-place verb (agent, recipient, and patient), but it is becoming possible to form it from the two-place verb (agent and recipient) without a direct object (*helfen*, *danken*, *applaudiren*, *gratulieren*, *kündigen*, *verzeihen*, *widersprechen…*) or with a dependent clause instead of a direct object like *Sie bekommt geschrieben, daß das Treffen verschoben wird* (Diewald 1997: 32). The maker of agent is usually facultative element in this type of sentence.

This construction is derived by syntactic reanalysis of the sentence. At first, the PPP functioned as a predicative complement that grammatically (in number, gender, and case) agrees with a direct object. Gradually, the agreement is being lost and the semantically full verb "bekommen" is turning into the auxiliary. Schematically, this process is as follows:

X, Y = nouns, Z = PPP
X bekommt Y ("bekommen" is semantically a "full" verb).
¢ X bekommt <u>Y Z</u> (X bekommt + Y and Y + Z: Z is a complement
   of the noun Y).
¢ X bekommt Y Z (Z is related now more to the verb "bekommen" than Y).
¢ X bekommt Z (The auxiliary verb "bekommen" and Z forms a unit).

The formation of the "bekommen Passiv" is relatively very restricted by a number of grammatical and semantic conditions if compared to the "werden Passiv", but in the synchronic moment, it can be said that the "bekommen Passiv" is "Noch-nicht-ganz-grammatikalisiert-Seins" (Diewald 1997: 32) and "functionally integrated in the (sub-)system of German passive constructions" (Askedal 2001: 126).

This type of passive construction is known widely not only in the standard German languages, but also in many German dialects including the East Low German dialects (East Pomeranian dialect and others), which had direct contact with Kashubian. In these dialects, the verb *kjriee* (the equivalent of German *kriegen*) functions as the auxiliary (cf. *Ekj kjreag daut Buak aus jeschenkj = Ich krieg das Buch geschenkt*).

2.2. RP in Slavonic languages

As mentioned before, the "bekommen Passiv" (and possibly similar constructions in German dialects) is calqued by some West and South Slavonic languages. In most of these languages, calqued passive constructions are used in colloquial style, but in Sorbian, the construction has penetrated into literary expression, being used in all dialects (Lötzsch 1968: 337) and included in the paradigm of the verbal system of literary language (Faßke 1981: 221–223).

Upper Sorbian RP consists of three elements: 1. the finite form of the auxiliary verb *dóstać* (in colloquial speech, the verb *krydnyć*, which is borrowed from the German verb *kriegen*), 2. PPP, and 3. a direct object in the accusative case. These three elements are common to the other Slavonic languages that possess RP.

(4) Hilža dóstanje nowy *šat zešity.*
(5) Jurij je rjanu *knihu darjenu* dóstał.
(6) My dóstachmy *pomahne*.

As pointed out by Faßke (Faßke 1981: 222), in Sorbian, the noun and PPP must agree in gender, number, and case as the examples (4), (5) show. If there is no object in the accusative case, the PPP has a neuter form in the nominative / accusative case as in (6). Such grammatical conditions can also be found in Czech (cf. *Karel dostal přidány dva tisíce*. *Karel dostal vuhubováno*), Slovak (cf. *Ján dostal prisľúbené nové auto*. *Ján dostal pridané na plate*), and Slovene (cf. *In je dobil vrnjeno le puško*. *Tudi to boš dobila plačano*), although the level of grammaticalization in these three languages is different. In this point, Burgenland Croatian presents a peculiarity. Compare (7) and (8) below.

(7) *Knjigu* ćeš dostat *nohihićenu*.
(8) Škola je *pratež* dostala gotovo *zapokano*.

According to Ivo Sučić who provided examples, Burgenland Croatian has two possibilities, namely versions with grammatical agreement as (7) and those without it, that is, neutralized PPP with a noun that is grammatically not agreed with PPP as in (8). It means that the feminine

form *zakopanu* in the accusative instead of the neuter form *zakopano* in the nominative / accusative is also possible in (8). Semantically, there is no difference between them, but a non-agreement version like (8) is more often used among the native speakers of Burgenland Croatian, suggesting "decategorization" of PPP, which is one of the markers of grammaticalization in process (Hopper 1991: 22).

3. RP in Kashubian

3.1. Research on RP until today

Almost one and the same construction, RP can be found in the Kashubian language, which has been subject to very strong influence of German literary language and the East Low German dialect. Compare examples: the active (9), RP (10), and the passive (11).

 (9) òna *mù* to prëdzelëła.
(10) *òn* to dostôł (òd ni) prëdzeloné.
(11) to bëło mù (òd ni) prëdzeloné.

It is strange enough that there has been neither description nor analysis of Kashubian RP until now in either dictionaries, normalized or descriptive grammars, from Ceynowa's *Zarés* (1879) to Gołąbk's *Wskôzë* (2008), except a very brief mention made by Lötzsch (1969: 108). Even Friedrich Lorentz, one of the most distinguished specialists of Kashubian and Slovincian, did not mention RP in his fundamental descriptive Kashubian grammar (1958–1962), though he recorded RP in his Kashubian texts (1924) (see 3.2).

However, it goes without saying that the phenomenon of Kashubian RP is important, along with the possessive perfect calqued from the German language, as it is one of the differential morpho-syntactic features in the Slavonic linguistic world.

3.2. The formal (morpho-syntactic) features of RP

There is no source that may suggest the time of penetration of RP into Kashubian, but one of the first examples noted by F. Lorentz in the beginning of the twentieth century, *òn dostôł tã skórã dobrze zapłaconé*, shows the high level of its grammaticalization, at least formally, since there is no grammatical agreement between the feminine noun singular *ta skóra* in the accusative and PPP *zapłaconé* in the neuter form singular in the nominative / accusative case.

In this context, comparison of Kashubian RP with the situation in other Slavonic languages mentioned in this article (especially Burgenland

Croatian, cf. (7) and (8)) as well as development of the possessive perfect in Kashubian sheds light on the possibility of the existence of an earlier stage, namely the stage where there was a construction with grammatical agreement in gender, number, and case. However, the author of this paper could not find a clear example with grammatical agreement in the corpus of contemporary Kashubian literary texts as the examples (12) and (13) show.

> (12) człowiek jaż *dzesãc deka* do zbrëkowani *dostôł wëdzeloné*
>   (R. Skwiercz).
> (13) Czej *gò* dostelë pòtemù *przëdzeloné*, Béta z nima tuszowa
>   (H. Dawidowski).

Moreover, apart from the prototypical construction with a direct object in the accusative case, there are examples in which PPP appears in "absolute" use, for example, with a dependent clause instead of a direct object (14) and without a direct object in the accusative as in (15) and (16). These are, formally, a final stage of the grammaticalization of RP (see scheme 1 in section 2.1. of this paper).

> (14) òn *dostôł nakazóné*, żebë sprzątnąc pòdwòrzé (K. Lewna).
> (15) Walãti zôs wëpłôtk przepił i *dostôł wdraszowóné* òd swòji Walãtinë
>   (H. Breza).
> (16) a to, że òn *mô dostóné* òd ni *wczubaszoné*, to jô ju dawno wiém
>   (J. Drzeżdżon).

All the PPPs in the examples shown above are neuter, but according to native speakers, RP with grammatical agreement is also possible, although the non-agreement form is rather preferable or usual. Thus, theoretically, both (17) and (18) are acceptable.

> (17) òn dostôł *tã skórã* dobrze *zapłaconé*.
> (18) òn dostôł *tã skórã* dobrze *zapłaconą*.

Similarly to the contrast between (17) and (18), there are several possibilities as to the use of the genitive of negation, which is not obligatory in the Kashubian language. According to the author's informants, (19)–(21) are all grammatically correct and acceptable.

> (19) òn *to* nie dostôł *wëdzeloné*.
> (20) òn *tégò* nie dostôł *wëdzeloné*.
> (21) òn *tégò* nie dostôł *wëdzelonégò*.

The possibility of (17) suggests that the grammatical relation between the PPP *wëdzeloné* and the pronoun *to* is lost and that the PPP and the verb *dostac* are becoming a grammatical unit, in other words, penetrating into the paradigm of the verbal system as a whole.

All these facts suggest that RP is highly developed in contemporary Kashubian language, but as is the case with German and other Slavonic language that possess RP in their verbal system, Kashubian also has restrictions in forming RP.

3.3. The semantic features of RP

As mentioned before, this construction can be considered as a result of passivization of the dative object; thus, the existence of NP in the dative case in the active voice is obligatory. But it does not mean that the existence of NP in the dative case can always be transformed into such a passive construction. The restrictions mainly come from the semantics of the main verb, which appears as PPP in RP.

According to the materials gathered by the author of this paper, among verbs that govern the dative case, there seems to be a certain tendency as to the semantic features of passivization. As a common semantic feature, it must be noted that all the verbs that form RP must have the meaning of change of state and its resultativity. Therefore, PPP in RP comes only from verbs of the perfective aspect (22), not verbs of the imperfective counterpart (23).

(22) Wszëtko dostôł òddóné.
(23) *Wszëtko dostôł òddôwóné.

Apart from this, there are some typical semantic groups of verbs that are more easily transformed into RP. Although it is far from a complete list of these verbs, they can be classified as follows:

1. "Verba dandi" with semantic modifications (except the verb *dac*):
    Ko doch ten lëst òn dostôł *nadóné*, dostôł *przedóné* za fejn cenã, wszëtko dostôł *pòdóné*, knôp dostôł wiele *zadóné*, dostële pò równo *przedzeloné*, na geburstach dostôł *pòdarowóné.*
2. Verbs that indicate motion:
    przed wëbòrama dostôł ful dëtków *nagarnioné*, dostôł stół *òdniesóné*, dostôł *wëłożoné* kawã na ławã.
3. Verbs that mean "to hit" (without a direct object in the accusative):
    za pachtã dostôł *wpróné*, dostôł *wpùrgnioné* za to, nie rôz dostôł *wczadzóné*, dostôł *chlastnioné* w pësk, dostôł *włojóné* w skórã za to, że łgôł, dostôł *wpaloné* w łeb.
4. Some "verba dicendi":
    wszëtko dostôł *przekôzoné*, dostôł sztëk zemie *òbiecóné*, òn dostôł *nakazóné*, żebë sprzątnąc pòdwòrzé

5.   Other verbs that govern the dative case:
      dostôł *ùgrozioné* przez niégò, dostôł sztëk chleba fejn *pòsmarowóné*,
      dostôł *ùlżoné* w cerpieniu.

      Worth noticing is the fact that it is difficult or even impossible to
transform "verba accipiendi" into the RP construction in Kashubian. For
example, a sentence like *dostôł skradlé kòło* does not mean "*he's got his
bicycle stolen*", rather mean "*he's got stolen bicycle*", that is, here PPP is
regarded as an attribute to the noun *kòło*.

      This reflects the fact that the meanings of such verbs contradict the
original meaning of the verb *dostac*. In this sense, the desemantization of
the verb as auxiliary is not completed in difference from, for example, the
verb *miec* as an auxiliary verb in the compound perfect form in Kashubian.

4. Concluding remarks

      In this paper, the author has described some essential aspects of the
recipient passive in Kashubian from the viewpoint of typological study of
Slavonic languages, starting from the concept introduced by academician
Milka Ivić.

      This paper has discovered that Kashubian RP is highly grammati-
calized in comparison with RP in other Slavonic languages. The author is
sure that his analysis is far from complete, but has at least shown that RP
must be included into the grammatical (verbal) system of the Kashubian
language and described in normative grammars and dictionaries.

Literature

Askedal J. (2001) Grammaticalization and Persistance in the German "Dative/Recipi-
      ent Passive" with *bekommen|kriegen|erhalten //Interdisciplinary Journal for
      Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis*. Berkeley, 107–134.

Diewald G. (1997) *Grammatikalisierung: Eine Einführung in Sein und Werden
      gramatischer Formen*. Tübingen.

Eisenberg P. (2006) *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik*: *Der Satz*. Stuttgart.

Faßke H (1981) *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart:
      Morphologie*. Bautzen.

Giger M. (2003) Die Grammatikalisierung des Rezipientpassivs im Tschechischen,
      Slovakischen und Sorbischen // *Contributions suisses as XIIIe congrès mondial
      des slavistes à Ljubljana, août 2003*. Ljubljana, 79–101.

Gołąb E. (2008) *Wskôzë kaszëbsczégò pisënkù*. Gduńsk.

Heine B, Kuteva T. (2002) *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge.

Hopper P. (1991) On some principles of grammaticalization // *Approaches to
      Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, 17–37.

Lehmann Ch. (1991) Grammaticalization and Related Changes in Contemporary German // *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, 493–535.

Lorentz F. (1905) *Slovinzische Texte*. St. Petersburg.

Lorentz F. (1924) *Teksty pomorskie (kaszubskie)*. Kraków.

Lorentz, F. (1958‒62) *Gramatyka pomorska* I–III. Wrocław.

Lötzsch R. (1968) Někotre wuskutki němskeho sliwa na werbalny system serbšćiny // *Beiträge zur sorbischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Bautzen, 337–344.

Lötzsch R. (1969) Zum indirekten Passiv im Deutschen und Slawischen // *Slawisch-deutsche Wechselbeziehungen in Sprache, Literatur und Kultur*. Berlin, 102‒109.

Ивић М. (1960) Диференцијалне синтаксичке особине у словенском језичком свету // *Годишњак Филозофског факул� у Новом Саду* 5. Нови Сад, 50–74.

Номаћи М. (2007) О тзв. индиректном пасиву у словачком језику (на фону других словенских језика) // *Синͳаксичка исͳраживања (дијахроно-синхрони ͨлан). Лингвисͳичке свеске* 6. Нови Сад, 44–53.

Пипер П. (2007) Српски у кругу словенских језика // *Књижевносͳ и језик* 54/1–2. Београд, 1–12.

Р е з ю м е

Мотоки Номати

О «РЕЦИПИЕНТНОМ ПАССИВЕ» В КАШУБСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ
(Приложение к синтаксическому инвентарю Милки Ивич
для славянской диалектологии)

В настоящей статье рассматривается вопрос о грамматикализации «рэсципиентного пассива» типа *òn to dostôl (òd ni) przëdzeloné* (букв. он *это получил (от) нее распределенное*) и его месте в кашубском языке.

Принимая во внимание статью юбиляра акад. Милки Ивич, посвященную типологии славянского синтаксиса, автор показывает грамматические и семантические особенности данной конструкции в сравнении с немецким и другими славянскими языками.