



HAL
open science

Šauti šautuvu or iš šautuvo? About two constructions of the instrument in Lithuanian

Hélène de Penanros

► **To cite this version:**

Hélène de Penanros. Šauti šautuvu or iš šautuvo? About two constructions of the instrument in Lithuanian . *Baltic Linguistics*, 2013, 4, pp.133-157. halshs-01266705

HAL Id: halshs-01266705

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01266705>

Submitted on 3 Feb 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Šauti šautuvu or iš šautuvo?
About two constructions of the instrument in Lithuanian

Hélène de Penanros

Inalco

CNRS Laboratoire de Linguistique Formelle, Université Paris-Diderot

helene.depenanros@inalco.fr

Keywords : cases, instrumental, prepositions, *iš*, synonymy, relator, semantics, syntax, theory of predicative and enunciative operations

Abstract :

In Lithuanian, the instrument of verbs of shooting may be introduced by two different syntactic constructions: the instrumental case or the preposition *iš*. These two constructions are often considered as synonyms. A detailed study of numerous contexts where these constructions appear shows that they are not equivalent but correspond to two different representations of the event SHOOTING: the instrumental case defines the process providing it with qualitative determinations, whereas the preposition *iš* constructs the exteriorization of the projectile. We will show that these hypotheses on the semantics of the instrumental case and of the preposition *iš* permit to account for the different uses of the two constructions and for their differences of acceptability, should they arise. This analysis is based on the Theory of Predicative and Enunciative Operations of A. Culioli. It argues for the thesis that grammar and lexicon are not to be dissociated.

In Lithuanian, the instrument of verbs of shooting may be introduced by two different syntactic constructions: the instrumental case or the preposition *iš*. These two constructions are often considered as synonyms (Cf. Šukys: 409). As a matter of fact, in most contexts – especially those of murders –, one can have both constructions without the slightest difference of interpretation. Example (1)¹, which was extracted from an advertising and where the two constructions follow each other, is a good illustration of this so-called "synonymy":

(1) *Atvykstant kartu ne mažiau kaip 3 asmenims –*

10	šūvių	iš	Glock 17	pistolet-o	ir	10 šūvių	iš	Steyer	pistolet-o
10	shots	<i>iš</i>	Glock 17	pistol-GS	and	10 shots	<i>iš</i>	Steyer	pistol-GS

Jums kainuos tik 50 Lt asmeniui.

10 šūvių	pistolet-u	Steyer,	10 šūvių	pistolet-u	Glock 17,	10 šūvių	Glock 21	pistolet-u
10 shots	pistol-IS	Steyer	10 shots	pistol-IS	Glock 17	10 shots	Glock 21	pistol-IS

jums kainuos – 80 Lt asm...

If you come as a group of a minimum of 3 people, 10 shots with Glock 17 pistol and 10 shots with Steyer pistol will cost you only 50 Lt per person. 10 shots with Steyer pistol, 10 shots with Glock 17 pistol, 10 shots with Glock 21 pistol will cost you 80 Lt per person.

The theory of semantic roles does not distinguish between the different constructions: *pistoletu* (pistol-IS) and *iš pistoleto* (*iš* pistol-GS) are two syntactic realizations of the same role, that of the instrument. The question that arises is that of the definition of the notion of

¹ This example, with the 2 constructions following each other, is emblematic. Still, it is to be noted that the instrumental case usually predominates in contexts of shooting sports, as we shall see below.

"instrument". Nilsen (1973), after a detailed study of this role in English, concluded that it should be divided into 4 distinct ones. This question is indeed complex and one finally realizes that any detailed description of any linguistic phenomenon shows a proliferation of values², which, depending on the granularity of the study, may be multiplied *ad infinitum*. For this reason, we will only use the term "instrument" as a label for the constructions we are studying, without giving it any other status. More generally, following A. Culioli, we consider that language is not a means to encode preexisting cognitive categories, but that it is itself a "meaningful representational activity" (See Culioli 1983). Language is considered as an arrangement of complex operations, of which the different markers we have in languages are the tracks. In other words, different syntactic constructions are the tracks of different linguistic operations, and it is the linguist's task to uncover them. Our analysis will then proceed from the linguistic forms to try and describe the way the meaning of the utterance constructs itself in the tangle of interrelations in which these forms are involved. The question raised by this case of syntactic "synonymy" is then to determine the underlying differences between the two constructions at stake.

1. HYPOTHESES:

In order to analyze this problem, we will start by proposing general hypotheses on the functioning of a case and of a preposition³.

Cases and prepositions have in common the fact that they put two elements in relation with each other. This basic connecting function was long noted by numerous linguists⁴. We will follow Pottier (1974, 1997) and Hagège (1982, 1997) among others, who introduced the concept of *relator* to account for this function, and will use it to define cases and prepositions. We then consider that we have, in all cases, a relation which can be noted X R Y. But we provide this commonly admitted general definition with a crucial precision: the relation established by the case or the preposition is non-symmetric, in so far as Y is the source of determinations for X. In all cases, Y corresponds to the noun introduced by the preposition and the noun inflected with the instrumental case. The identification of X is more difficult because a verb is involved. A study of its semantics is necessary.

Our conception of the semantic identity of units is based on the thesis that we never observe the "raw" or inherent meaning of a lexical unit or any marker. The idea we defend is that the meanings attributed to a unit are always the product of the interactions with its co-text and context. We maintain that any uttered word has a context, even when it seems isolated: it always has an intonation, it is always part of a context, a situation, in a word, it is always inscribed in a set of relations. As Victorri (1999 :87) underlines it, « La construction du sens d'un mot hors énoncé peut être considéré comme un cas très particulier du processus d'interaction dans lequel le co-texte est vide. Cela ne signifie pas qu'il n'y a pas d'interaction du tout : il existe toujours un contexte, en l'occurrence la situation où un sujet, linguiste, lexicographe ou simple locuteur (ce sont des situations très différentes !) s'adonne à l'activité métalinguistique qui consiste à s'interroger sur le sens d'un mot. ». We also maintain that the local or concrete values of a unit are not primary, but proceed directly from the properties of the terms of the co-text, as the contrast between the following phrases shows : *iš virtuvės* (*iš* kitchen, **out of** the kitchen) / *iš ryto* (*iš* morning, **since** morning) / *iš bado* (*iš* hunger, **of** hunger), *šovė mintis* (**shot** thought, a thought **popped up**) / *šovė medžiotojas* (**shot** hunter, the

² In this respect, one could also cite Cruse (1973), who analysed the syntactic properties of agentive verbs in English and came to the conclusion that the role "agent" should be divided into 4 distinct functions: *volitive*, *effective*, *initiative* and *agentive*.

³ For a thorough analysis of this question, see de Penarros (2013)

⁴ See for instance Du Marsais (Encyclopédie, (1778-1779), 3rd edition, Geneve, J-L. Pellet, Neuchâtel), Hjelmslev (1935), Brøndal (1950), Fillmore (1968), etc.

hunter **shot**) / **šovė** raketa (**shot** rocket, the rocket **blasted off**). At the same time, the unit itself constrains its environment and imposes a certain value to its co-text. For instance, a phrase like *nuo rudens* (*nuo* autumn, since the fall) at the beginning of a sentence may serve as a temporal locator to any kind of process, and the possible continuations are infinitely various (*pradėjo filosofijos studijas, atlyginimai augs dar 14,5%*, etc), whereas the phrase *iš rudens* (*iš* autumn, in the fall) considerably limits the possible continuations, which all tend to be related to agriculture or to the question of survival during winter (*sėjami augalai, dirva buvo nuskusta, būdavo pasirūpinama maisto atsargų*, etc). One consequence of this observation is that the semantics of a unit should not be reduced to one of the concrete values it is likely to have. Likewise, the semantics of a unit should not be conceived as a set of semes inferred from the various values observed, these features being in fact the product of the different interactions of the unit with the various elements of its co-text. We then consider that the definition of the semantics of a unit has to be conceived as an abstract form, which, on the one hand, configures the environment of the unit, and on the other hand, is invested by the terms of the co-text.

The dictionary (DLKŽ) gives the following values of the verb *šauti*⁵ (to shoot):

1. paleisti saudmenį (to send off ammunitions)
2. su trenksmu sprogti, išlėkti (to explode, to rush out noisily)
3. smarkiai eiti, bėgti, skristi (to dart, rush, shoot quickly)
4. sklęsti, stumti (duris) (to push a bolt)
5. kišti, stumti į krosnį (to shove into the stove)
6. šaudyklę stumti audžiant (to throw the shuttle weaving)
7. tiestis (to stretch oneself)

The study of the verb in context⁶ shows that the value most represented (around 45% of the whole) is absent of the definition of the dictionary: it expresses the sudden apparition of an idea or a thought in someone's mind (see (2)).

(2) *Staiga Rit-ai į galv-q šovė dar vien-a geniali idėja.*
 suddenly Rita-DS in head-AS shoot.PST.3 again one-NS brilliant-NS idea-NS
 Suddenly, another brilliant idea struck my mind.

It then turns out that the verb *šauti* may signify an apparition as well as a “disappearance”, or at least a prompt departure, in any direction (see (3)&(4)).

(3) *Skraidynė šau-te šov-ė vertikalčiai aukštyn*
 flying craft shoot-BUD shoot-PST.3 vertically upwards
ir greitai dingo beribėse Visatos platybėse...

The flying craft all of a sudden dashed vertically upwards and quickly disappeared in the endless immensity of the Universe.

(4) *Automobilis [...] šiek tiek sulėtino greitį,*
o tuomet šovė į priekį ir tuoj dingo iš akių
 and then shoot-PST.3 in front

The car reduced speed a little, **then dashed forward** and immediately disappeared from our sight.

⁵ We will study the construction of the verbs *šauti* and *šaudyti*. These 2 verbs share the same semantics. We consider that the determinations provided by the suffix *-dy-* are secondary for the question we deal with here.

⁶ We studied a corpus of 1635 occurrences of the form *šovė* (to shoot.PST.3) and 465 occurrences of the form *šauņa* (to shoot.PRS.3) from the Lithuanian database.

The verb *šauti* is also often employed to express a rise or a fall of quantified values (see (5) & (6)). It is to be noted that this rise or fall is important : the value goes from a -high or low- position to another -very low or very high- position.

(5) *Vilniaus biržoje vakar žemyn šov-ė 22 iš 25 prekiatų pozicijų,*
 Vilnius-GS stock-LS yesterday downwards shoot-PST.3 22of 25 sold positions
sumenko ir visų likvidžiausių akcijų kursai.

Yesterday, on the stock exchange of Vilnius, 22 of the 25 positions for sale plunged, and all prices of liquid assets fell.

(6) *Rusijos akcijų indeksas RTS pernai šovė 83% į viršų,*
 Russia-GS stock index RTS last year shoot-PST.3 83% upwards
o nuo šių metų pradžios paaugo dar beveik 20%.

The RTS index of Russian stock jumped 83% last year and rose by almost 20% since the beginning of this year.

In all these uses, the verb *šauti* is frequently employed with adverbs (like *staiga* (suddenly), *ūmai* (immediately), *smarkiai* (quickly)), prepositional phrases (like *iš karto* (right away)), elements of comparison (like *tarsi strėlė* (as an arrow), *kaip kulka* (like a bullet), *kaip iš patrankos* (as from a cannon) or verbal adverbs (*būdinys*⁷) which underline the intensity or suddenness of the process. In all these contexts, it is about switching from one position to another without transition, like things happen in a firearm shot, when the projectile is still in the barrel at time T, and when then suddenly it is not there anymore: in (2), the brilliant idea was not here, and suddenly it is here, in (3) and (4), the flying craft and the car were here and suddenly they are no longer visible, in (5) and (6), the stock positions were at a certain level, and suddenly they are at another (very different from the previous one, as the interpretation in terms of big rise or fall shows). This property, shared by all the uses of *šauti*, tends to suggest a definition of this kind⁸:

"*šauti* means that a term *a* is involved in an immediate switch between 2 strictly distinct positions (*k* and *l*)"

- where *a* corresponds to the projectile – be it lexicalised or not – when *šauti* means to shoot, *k* and *l* corresponding respectively to the interior and the exterior of the weapon;
- and where *a* corresponds to the subject when *šauti* means to explode, to appear, to disappear or to fly out, *k* and *l* corresponding respectively to the initial and final locations of the element it refers to.


This definition also accounts for the value “to push the bolt”, a bolt having two opposed positions “open (*k*) /closed (*l*)”, and for its use in the field of weaving, where the shuttle (*šaudyklė*) is constantly thrown from one end (*k*) of the loom to the other (*l*) and back again. One can imagine that this property is also relevant for the value “to shove into the oven or stove”. Any wise cook knows that this process must be as quick as possible, if one does not want to let all the heat out of the oven; the passage between “outside” (*k*) and “inside” (*l*) must then tend to a "switch" from one position to the other, with a transition limited to a minimum, that is, in other words, tending towards zero (in this case, the element *a* of the definition of *šauti* corresponds to the object).

This abstract definition of the semantics of *šauti* provides us with a framework to think the composition of meaning when the verb combines with the instrumental case or with the prepositional phrase. We will consider that the X of the preposition corresponds to the

⁷ The *būdinys* is a verbal adverb used in a reduplicated construction with the verb of the same root.

⁸ This formulation is just a minimal hypothesis which would require further research to be finalised.

element *a*, that is, in the case we deal with here, to the projectile. As for the instrumental case, we will consider that X is the process taken as a whole⁹.



The detailed analysis of the preposition *iš* and of the instrumental case led us to propose the following definitions:

Semantics of the preposition *iš*:

- 1- *iš* is a relator: it posits a relation of location between terms X and Y, where Y is the source of determinations for X;
- 2- *iš* posits that Y has a double status: it has an Interior (noted I) and an Exterior (noted E);
- 3- *iš* poses that X which is initially located by Y's Interior, is located by Y's Exterior.

The notion of Interior of Y has to be understood as "fully Y", whereas the Exterior of Y is "not Y": this may correspond to "totally different from Y", or "Y considered from an external point of view". The interpretation of the "Interior" and "Exterior" of Y highly depends on the properties of the terms involved in the construction. In the case we deal with here, which involves terms referring to concrete elements, the opposition between I and E of Y corresponds to "I: weapon / E: not weapon"; thus *iš* posits that X (*a*, the projectile) originates in the weapon but is located by what is not the weapon, hence the interpretation in terms of "out of the weapon"¹⁰.

Semantics of the instrumental case:

- 1- the instrumental case is a relator: it poses a relation of location between terms X and Y, where Y is the source of determinations for X;
- 2- Y defines X in providing it with qualitative properties.

Given these two definitions, with verbs of firing, we have the expression of **two different representations of the event SHOOTING**.

In "*šauti šautuvu_{instr}*", the instrumental case constructs the name of weapon as a term which **defines the shooting with qualitative properties**: the name of weapon provides defining properties to the shooting, the phrase *šauti*+*šautuvu* is interpreted as a particular type of shooting¹¹ (in that it is a rifle shooting, which distinguishes it from a pistol shooting or a submachine gun shooting for instance).

In "*šauti iš šautuvo*", *iš* **spatializes the shooting** by putting the spotlight on the movement of the projectile from the interior of the weapon to the exterior.

⁹ As we shall see later, the noun in the instrumental case qualifies the process like an adverb, defining a type of shooting.

¹⁰ In this case, E of Y fortuitously corresponds to the exterior of the weapon in the trivial sense of the word.

¹¹ One can note that it is possible to define a type of shooting otherwise than by a type of weapon. The type of ammunition used may also play this role, and it is still the instrumental case which is used: *šauti tikr-omis kulkomis, šrat-ais* (to fire real-IP bullet-IP, pellet-IP) "to fire real bullets, pellets".

In numerous contexts, these two representations of the SHOOTING are equivalent, in the sense that the difference in meanings involved, (type of shooting *versus* movement of a projectile), is not relevant: the two constructions are then exchangeable. But we maintain that these semantic differences are at stake in all cases even if they are not interpretable and that they can account for the differences in use of the two constructions.

2. METHODOLOGY:

The present analysis is based on a corpus of 2500 occurrences from the database of *Kompiuterinės lingvistikos centras* (donelaitis.vdu.lt) submitted to native Lithuanian speakers. It is to be noted that only the long lasting interviews, face to face, where the informant was immersed for several hours in the variety of contexts – long, showing the paragraphs preceding and following the studied sequence – could give contrasting results, that is where the answers varied between the instrumental case and the prepositional phrase. The short questionnaires – and when the occasion arose, the distance questionnaires – which concerned only one or two sequences, gave almost invariably the answer “iš” and not the instrumental case. This may indicate that the case is losing ground to the preposition, which is, as we know, a general tendency in case languages.

In any case, this practical difficulty of the study points out that the two expressions are extremely close and that the differences between them are virtually non-existent in the Lithuanian speakers' consciousness. However, the study of numerous occurrences of these two constructions shows that if the instrumental case and the preposition *iš* are most of the time substitutes for each other, there are still some regularities which depend on the type of context involved: one form massively employed in certain contexts, which often goes hand in hand with informants less convinced by the proposed modification (replacing the prepositional phrase by the noun phrase in the instrumental case or vice versa).

We will thus present the evidence supporting our hypotheses on these markers by exposing successively the two orders of arguments they are based on: firstly, the types of **contexts where one marker quantitatively predominates**, secondly, the cases when the use of one or the other construction is **collocationally constrained**.

3. EVIDENCE:

3.1. Instrumental case: a type of shooting

3.1.1. Types of contexts where the Instrumental case predominates

Sport shooting

One observes that the instrumental case predominates in the cases when the weapon qualitatively defines the firing. That is, for instance, contexts of sport shooting.

(7) *Di Dona nugalėjo šaudym-o pneumat-in-ju pistol-et-u iš 10 metrų atstumo varžybose.*
 Di Dona won shooting-GS air gun-IS at 10 meters distance competition
 Di Dona won the competition of air gun shooting at a distance of 10 meters.

(8) *Raudondvario pradinės mokyklos komanda užėmė 4-ąją vietą.*

Varžyb-ose buvo šaudoma šautuv-u ir pistol-et-u.
 competition-LP was shot.PPRSPAS rifle-IS and pistol-IS

The team of elementary school of Raudondvaris took the 4th place. **It was a rifle and pistol shooting competition.**

What matters in such cases is the type of competition, the type of weapon employed; the bullets and their target as such are secondary.

Instruction manuals of weapons

The instrumental case is also massively employed in instruction manuals of weapons. The main thing in this case is not the projectile reaching a target, but the process itself, the way you shoot, i.e. the qualitative determination of the process:

(9) *Šiuo šautuv-u/?Iš šio šautuvo šaudoma tik nuo trijų taškų atramos, todėl jis yra labai stabilus. Specialus mechanizmas neleidžia patekti į vamzdį dulksmoms ir purvui.*

With this gun, you can only shoot from a tripod, that is why it is very stable. A special mechanism prevents dust and dirt from getting into the barrel.

However, it is to be noted that the instrumental case predominates in the contexts treating the general handling of the weapon (see also (10)). If the question is about the bullets to be used with the weapon considered, the preposition *iš* is employed (see (11)), but we will come back to this point in part 3.2.

(10) *Šiuo šautuv-u /?iš šio šautuvo šaudoma stovint, atsigulus, itt.*
DEM.IS gun-IS /?iš DEM gun-GS shoot.PPRSPAS stand.GERPRS lie.GERPST
You shoot this gun standing up, lying down, etc.

(11) *Iš šio šautuv-o /?šiuo šautuv-u šaudoma 9mm kalibr-o kulkomis.*
Iš DEM.GS gun-GS / DEM.IS gun-IS shoot.PPRSPAS 9mm calibre-GS bullets-IP
You shoot this gun with 9,5 calibre bullets

Shooting as an eventuality

The instrumental case also predominates in the cases when the shooting is taken into account as an eventuality. See example (12) with a context of sociological analysis, and example (13) where the shooting is presented as an abstract hypothesis.

(12) *Sociologin-iu aspekt-u nusišauti pistolet-u ar medžioklin-iu šautuv-u, du skirtingi dalykai.*
sociological-IS aspect-IS commit suicide pistol-IS or hunting-IS rifle-IS

Sociologically, to commit suicide with a pistol or a hunting rifle are two very different things.

(13) *Pamaniau, kad verčiau jau būčiau laiku nusišovusi. O jeigu jau neįstengiau nusišauti, - ne taip jau lengva nusišauti medžioklin-iu šautuv-u /??iš medžioklinio šautuvo, - tuomet reikėjo pasikasti po siena.*
NEG so already easy to suicide hunting-IS rifle-IS /?? iš hunting rifle

I thought it would be better if I had committed suicide on time. And if I was not able to shoot myself dead, - **it is clearly not that easy to kill oneself with a hunting rifle** - , I had to dig under the wall.

It is perfectly possible to use the prepositional phrase with the verb *nusišauti* (to shoot oneself dead) and this construction is quite widespread in contexts of effective shooting. However, what matters here, again, is that the name of weapon provides a qualitative definition of the shooting: the bullet, its origin and destination are not relevant, and *iš* is not employed.

Forensic medicine

In contexts of effective, concrete shooting, the instrumental case is also used to provide a qualitative determination of the process.

(14) *Kūną tyręs medicinos ekspertas priklaupė. - Šauta standartin-iu lazerin-iu pistolet-u, sere.*
shoot-PPP standard-IS laser-IS pistol-IS sir

Ginklo tipas neaiškus - tiesą sakant, bet kuris iš dešimčių, parduodamų iš po prekystalio. Lygiai tokiais pat šūviais nukautos ir kitos aukos.

The medical expert who examined the body put one knee on the floor. "They shot a standard laser gun, Sir. The weapon model is unclear: to tell the truth, it can be any of the dozen types which is sold under the counter. This is exactly the same shots as those which killed the other victims."

Example (14) is about the examination of a medical expert: he is capable of determining which type of shooting causes this type of wounds, but he does not know exactly which weapon is involved, and to determine it is not his object. What matters here are the qualitative determinations of the shooting, and hence of the wound, which explains the use of the instrumental case.

One "idiomatic expression"

The semantics of the instrumental case, which posits a qualitative determination of the process, explains the particular use of *šaudyti patrankomis* (to shoot cannons-IP), to express « to take extreme measures, to crack a nut with a sledgehammer » (See (15)).

(15) *Žvirbl-ių patrank-omis/?iš patrank-ų niekas ne-šaudo.*
 sparrows-GP cannons-IP / ? iš cannons-GP nobody NEG-shoots
 Nobody shoots sparrows with cannons. (= No need to take extreme measures)

It is not question of an effective shooting of the sparrows here, but the image of the implementation of extreme measures for a bagatelle. In this case, the name of weapon is less an instrument than a qualification of a process: the noun *patranka* (cannon) in the instrumental case defines the shooting as being drastic measures. And this basic qualitative value explains the privileged use of the instrumental case in this expression.

3.1.2. Collocational constraints

This function of the instrumental case which constructs the name of weapon as providing the shooting with defining qualitative properties also explains the fact that not all the names of weapons are possible with this construction: only the names of weapons typical enough to define a type of shooting are possible, whereas weapons' brand names cannot be used.

(16) *šaudyti pistolet-u, kulkosvaidž-iu, automat-u, revolver-iu, patrank-a, šautuv-u,*
 to shoot pistol-IS machine gun-IS submachine gun-IS revolver-IS cannon-IS rifle-IS
*?Kalašnikov-u/ iš Kalašnikovo, *Mauseriu/iš Mauserio, *Berett-a/iš Berettos, itt*
*?Kalashnikov-IS/ iš Kalashnikov, *Mauser.IS/ iš Mauser *Beretta-IS/iš Beretta*
 to shoot a pistol, a machine-gun, a submachine gun, a revolver, a cannon, a rifle, a Kalashnikov, a Mauser, a Beretta, etc.

It is to be noted that this partition is not frozen: the noun "Kalashnikov" which has entered common use and represents a particular type of weapon in the collective imaginary, now appears to be possible in the instrumental case.

3.2. Prepositional phrase: focus on the projectile and its trajectory

3.2.1. Types of contexts where the prepositional phrase predominates

Focus on the bullets

In the contexts where the focus is on the projectile, the preposition *iš* is massively employed whereas the instrumental case is more difficult: see (17), where the verb is in the passive voice and where the subject “*jos*” (they) refers to the bullets.

(17) *Į įvairias jo kūno vietas buvo paleisti devyni šūviai. Lietuvis nukautas 7,65 milimetro kulkomis.*

Jos galėjo būti šautos iš pistolet-o /??pistolet-u "Walther".
 they could be shot.PPP iš pistol-GS /?? pistol-IS Walther

Nine shots were fired at various parts of his body. The Lithuanian man was shot with 7,65 mm bullets. **They may have been fired from a "Walther" pistol.**

For the same reason we have the preposition *iš* in (11), repeated here as (18):

(18) *Iš šio šautuv-o šaudoma 9mm kalibr-o kulkomis.*
Iš DEM.GS gun-GS shoot.PPRSPAS 9mm calibre-GS bullets-IP
 You shoot this gun with 9,5 calibre bullets.

Focus on the target

In the contexts where the emphasis is on the target, the preposition *iš* is also predominant. There is no occurrence of *šauti į taikinį* (to shoot at a target) with a name of weapon in the instrumental case in the Lithuanian database.

(19) *šaudyti iš pistolet-o į taikin-į*
 shoot iš pistol-GS at target-AS
 to shoot at a target with a pistol

(20) *Dar moku gerai į taikin-į šaudyti iš pistolet-o /??pistolet-u,*
 still can well at target-AS shoot iš pistol /??pistol_{instr}
*o iš Melkaškės/*Melkaške su optika tai ir į musę galiu pataikyti, va.....*

I am still good at shooting at a target with a pistol, and with a telescopic Melkashke I can even reach a fly, man!

The only occurrences found are from the internet and all relate to the field of sport; see example (21), which is about the rules of a shooting competition.

(21) *Pagal varžybų nuostatus komandų dalyviai turėjo šaudyti dviejų rūšių ginklais: koviniu pistoletu ir automatiniu šautuvu „M-14“.*

Kovin-iu pistolet-u buvo šaudoma į „krūtinės“ taikin-į.
 combat-IS pistol-IS was shot.PPRSPAS at chest target-AS

Bandomiesiems šūviams buvo skirta 1 min., o devyniems įskaitiniams šūviams – 2 min.

According to the statutes of the competition, the team participants had to fire two types of weapons: a combat pistol and a "M-14" submachine gun. **With the combat pistol one had to shoot at a "chest" target.** One minute was given for test firing, and two minutes for the nine recorded shots.

The main thing here is not the target itself, but the kind of weapon used in such or such event, hence the use of the instrumental case and not the preposition *iš*.

Focus on the bullets, their trajectory and/or target

Example (22) illustrates a case where the emphasis is both on the target (Cf. the use of *į taikinį* (to the target)) and on the projectile (Cf. the subject of the sentence: *kulkos* (bullets)), and where, according to our hypothesis, the preposition *iš* is employed:

(22) *Šaudant iš pneumatinių šautuvų /??šautuvais, kulkos lėkė tiesiai į taikinį.*
 shooting-GERPRS iš pneumatique-GP guns-GP /??guns-IP

When shooting with air rifles, bullets flew directly into the target.

The preposition *iš* is also typical of contexts of ballistics: in such a context, the weapon, the projectile and its trajectory are precisely what matters. It is an ideal context for *iš*, and the instrumental case does not convene here :

(23) *Iš kokio ginklo /??Kokiu ginklu buvo šaudyta,*
 iš which weapon ??which-IS weapon-IS was shot.PPP
turės nustatyti balistikos ekspertai. Vakar jie galėjo pasakyti tik tiek, kad
E.Bitaitis galėjo būti nušautas iš pistoleto /?pistoletu.
 E. Bitaitis could be shot dead iš pistol /? pistol-IS

Ballistics experts will have to establish **which weapon was shot**. Yesterday they could only say that **E. Bitaitis could have been killed with a pistol**.

Even if this context seems similar to the one in (14), because it is, roughly speaking, about "the scientific police" in both cases, we see the subtle difference between the forensics and the ballistics as it is expressed in the Lithuanian language: the first ones study the properties of the wounds they come across, whereas the latter deal with bullets and trajectories in order to identify the position of the shooter and his weapon.

3.2.2. Collocational constraints

The semantics of the preposition *iš* which spatializes the shooting, focusing on the projectile, its origin or destination, explains that only the prepositional phrase can be employed when the shooting is expressed by constructions which, in one way or another, put the emphasis on the projectile: *paleisti šūvį į ką* (to let off a **shot**), *atidengti ugnį į ką* (to open **fire**), *pliekti* (to machine-gun):

(24) *paleisti šūvį į ką iš ko/*kuo, atidengti ugnį į ką iš ko /*kuo, pliekti iš ko/??kuo*
 to fire a **bullet** into someone with sth, to open **fire** on someone with sth, to **machine-gun** with sth

(25) *Jis ketvirtadienio vakarą prie Jugoslavijos federalinio parlamento Belgrade*

*iš pistolet-o /*pistolet-u paleido šūvį sau į galv-q.*
 iš pistol-GS /*pistol-IS sent shot himself-DS into head-AS

Thursday evening, near the Federal Parliament of Yugoslavia in Belgrade, **he shot himself in the head**.

For the same reason, the instrumental case is possible with the nouns *šaudymas* (shooting) or *šūvis* (shot, see (1) for instance), but it is not employed with the nouns *salvė*, *pagliūpa* (salvo) which posit a number of simultaneous projectiles, and hence, by virtue of their very semantics, focus on the projectile:

(26) *salvė iš patrank-os /*patrank-a*
 salvo iš cannon-GS / *cannon-IS
 cannon salvo

According to the same principle, the verb *iššauti*, which is defined as "*paleisti kulką iš šaunamojo ginklo*" (to let a bullet out of a firearm), and which, as such, emphasizes on the projectile, turns out to be a perfect candidate to be used with the preposition *iš*. In a corpus of 474 occurrences of the form *iššovė* (shoot.PST) from the Lithuanian database, the instrument of the process is mentioned 97 times, with the following partition between the two possible constructions: 95 occurrences of the preposition *iš* and only 2 of the instrumental case. As was shown before (see de Penanros 2010), the prefix *iš-* has the same semantics as the preposition *iš*: it locates one term X in the Exterior of a term Y (none of these terms being necessarily lexicalized). We hypothesize that X corresponds to the element *a* of the definition of the

verbal base, i.e. the projectile, and Y is its localization. Y has a double status: I, the initial localization, E, a localization which is strictly distinct from it. The prefix *iš-* then reconstructs the verbal base *šauti* by locating the element *a* (X, the projectile) in the Exterior of its initial localization (Y), hence the interpretation of the prefixed verb in terms of “to let a bullet **out of** a firearm”: this hypothesis¹² permits us to explain the fact that the verb *iššauti* in itself focuses on the projectile, which explains its privileged use with the prepositional construction to introduce its instrument.

The semantics of the preposition *iš* also explains the contrasted statistics in the case of the bow. The Lithuanian database gives 160 occurrences of SHOOT *iš lank-o/iš lank-ų* (*iš* bow-GS/GP) but 0 occurrence of SHOOT *lank-u/lank-ais* (bow-IS/IP). On the internet, the occurrences of SHOOT *lanku.IS/lankais.IP* exclusively relate to the field of sport, and the noun *lankas* is most of the time modified by an adjective: *skriemulinis* (compound), *olimpinis* (olympic), *tradicinis* (traditionnal), *senovinis* (ancient), or even *Robino Hudo laikų* (from the time of Robin Hood), which complies with our general observations on the use of the instrumental case, which provides a qualitative determination of the process. However, apart from these cases, it remains true that for this name of weapon, the use of the preposition massively exceeds that of the instrumental case.

I form the hypothesis that this is linked to the properties of the bow itself: with a bow, contrary to a firearm, the arrow (i.e. the projectile) necessarily has a visibility: it is at the center of the process. The properties of bow shooting are in keeping with the semantics of the preposition *iš* which precisely defines the SHOOTING as a way to let off a projectile from a weapon, hence the privileged construction with this preposition. This analysis seems to be confirmed by the fact that only the prepositional phrase is possible with the term *ragatkė* (slingshot), whose translation in French “lance-pierre” (throw-stone) clearly shows the preponderant importance of the projectile :

(27)	<i>šaudyti</i>	<i>iš</i>	<i>ragatk-ės</i>	/* <i>ragatk-e</i>
	shoot	<i>iš</i>	slingshot-GS	/*slingshot-IS
	to shoot a slingshot			

3.3. Further evidence from the interpretations of the verb *sužeisti* (to wound)

Our hypotheses on the semantics of the preposition *iš* and of the instrumental case in Lithuanian also permit to account for the differences of interpretation of the instrument besides the verb *šauti* and its derivatives. Since the preposition *iš* posits the location of an element X in the Interior, then in the Exterior of an element Y, the sequence *iš pistoleto* (*iš* Y) necessarily involves a projectile, hence a shot. This is not true of the NP in the instrumental case *pistoletu*, which defines a process providing it with qualitative properties.

As a consequence, if the two constructions are equally possible with the verb *sužeisti* (to wound) for instance, their interpretation can be totally different. In particular, if the phrase *sužeisti iš pistoleto* implies a shot, because a projectile is necessarily at the heart of the process when *iš* is employed, this is not the case with *sužeisti pistoletu* which can perfectly signify that the weapon was used as a truncheon to hit someone (cp. (28) & (29)):

¹² We have here a good illustration of the differences between prepositions and prefixes, where prepositions only introduce arguments (or “modifications” to use Davidson’s terminology) of verbs, whereas prefixes reconstruct a verbal base to create a complex predicate (See Paillard 2010, for an analysis of prefixed verbs in terms of complex predicates). In other respects, one can also note that the semantics of the prefix *iš-* is echoing that of the verb *šauti* which also constructs two positions (Interior and Exterior/ k and l). This semantic coincidence would explain why the prefix seems devoid of any semantic value in the verb *iššauti*, and seems limited to a function of perfective marker (See de Penanros 2010 : 121).

(28) *Tą kartą iš pistoliet-o į galv-q sužeid-ę vien-q bank-o darbuotoj-q*
iš pistol-GS in head-AS wound-PPSTA.NP one-AS bank-GS employee-AS
plėšikai pagrobė 70 tūkst. litų.

That time, the burglars who **had wounded one employee of the bank by a pistol [shot] in the head**, had robbed 70 thousands litas.

(29) *Nusikaltėlis, sužeid-ęs bank-o tarnautoj-q pistoliet-u*
wound-PPSTA.NS bank-GS employee-AS pistol-IS

– *pistoletu rankena smogęs jam į viršugalvį – po kelių dienų buvo suimtas.*

The criminal who **had injured a bank employee with a gun** – hitting him on the head with the pistol grip – was arrested a few days later.

4. CONCLUSION:

Our hypotheses on the semantics of the preposition *iš* and the instrumental case in Lithuanian allowed us to account for the use of two constructions of the verbs of shooting considered as synonyms. In fact, they permitted us to highlight the two ways of representing a shot that these linguistic forms construct. In other words, these syntactic constructions are the tracks of two different semantic operations which posit two different representations of what a shot may be: the instrumental case qualitatively defines a type of shooting, whereas the preposition *iš* puts the emphasis on the movement of the projectile. One then understands why these two constructions are often interchangeable: in contexts of murders for instance, it is rarely essential to distinguish between a victim killed by a gun or by a bullet fired from a gun. The differences between the two constructions are then often uninterpretable and only a thorough study of a large number of contexts could help clear the dividing line between them.

Generally speaking, this analysis of a micro-phenomenon argues for the atomistic thesis, which considers that each unit is meaningful and contributes to the construction of the utterance and its meaning. It aims to show that the constraints of use of words or forms boil down to questions of lexical semantics, and hence that grammar and lexicon are not to be dissociated. As A. Culioli (2005:14) puts it: “**Tout fait grammatical est un fait de lexique**”¹³, the barriers posited between semantics, syntax and pragmatics disappearing as soon as the analysis reaches a certain level of granularity. This study (see in particular the points concerning the collocational constraints) will have shown, among others, that what could have appeared as pure syntactic constraints is in fact semantically motivated.

One can note, in this respect, that the autonomy of syntax, once postulated in certain linguistic theories, is now largely abandoned, because the necessity of taking into account meaning to report the forms observed in languages has become more and more obvious. Even Chomsky, in his Minimalist Program, recognizes the crucial role of Lexicon, which now provides all the information: phonological, morphological and semantic.

To take just another example of this general tendency, Radical Construction Grammar, contrary to other varieties of Construction Grammars « appeals to a rich, fine-grained model of semantic structure, and places much of the explanatory power in semantic structure and the symbolic mapping between components of semantic structure and elements of syntactic structure in constructions » (Croft 2013).

The central difference between these theories and that elaborated by A. Culioli remains that in the latter language is not considered as a means to encode whatever semantico-cognitive substrate: it is itself an **activity**. Meaning, then, is not assumed to be given independently, but to be constructed in the utterance; it is considered unknown and to be

¹³ Any grammatical fact is a lexical fact.

uncovered, “retraced” by the linguist from the forms observed in the diversity of languages and texts¹⁴. This theoretical difference entails a difference of methodology: within this framework, we do not know *a priori* what is an instrument or a cause, the linguist’s analysis proceeds only from the forms he observes. His task is to try and reconstitute the operations of which they are the tracks. Hence the importance of studying language in its reality, its everyday reality, literary reality, juridical reality, etc., in the most microscopic facts, without *a priori* excluding anything that was naturally uttered/written, without separating the phenomena (intonation, morphology, pragmatics, syntax, etc.), but in organizing them through rigorous analysis procedures.

This position does not mean that everything is language specific, and that no generalization is possible. The linguist’s objective is precisely, by a constant toing and froing between conceptual and empirical work, to research, in this infinite diversity of phenomena and languages, what constitutes the invariance of this human faculty, i.e. the Language, and which allows translation and the learning of other languages. This invariance is constituted by a set of abstract operations to which we can only have access through their infinitely variable manifestations that are the markers observed in languages.

Abbreviations:

S : singular	PST : past	FUT : future	PRS : present
P : plural	N : nominative	A : accusative	G : genitive
I : instrumental	LOC : locative	D : dative	
1 : 1 ^e person	3 : 3 rd person	NEG : negation	BUD : verbal adverb
PPRSPAS : passive present participle		PPP : Passive past participle	
GERPRS : present gerundive		GERPST : past gerundive	
PPSTA : active present participle			
DEM : demonstrative			

Bibliography

BOOKS:

- Brøndal, Viggo 1950: *Théorie des prépositions: introduction à une sémantique rationnelle*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995), *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.
- Culioli A., 2002, *Variations sur la linguistique*, Série Linguistique, Klincksiek.
- Culioli A., Normand Cl., 2005, *Onze rencontres sur le langage et les langues*, Ophrys: Paris.
- Franckel J-J., Paillard D., 2007, *Grammaire des prépositions*, Tome 1, Ophrys: Paris.
- Hagège Cl., 1982, *La structure des langues*, Paris, PUF (coll. Que sais-je?)
- Nilsen D.L.F., 1973, *The instrumental case in English: syntactic and semantic considerations*, Mouton, La Hague.
- Pottier B., 1974, *Linguistique générale: théorie et description*, Paris Klincksiek.
- Šukys J., 1998, *Lietuvių kalbos linksniai ir prielinksniai: vartosena ir normos*, Kaunas: Šviesa.

¹⁴ In this theoretical framework, « text » refers to any sequence of language, be it written or oral.

ARTICLES IN VOLUME:

- Colombat B., 1981, « Préposition, cas et syntaxe dans l'encyclopédie », in *Histoire, épistémologie, langage*, vol. 3, pp. 3-20.
- Croft W., 2013, « Radical construction grammar », <http://www.unm.edu/~wcroft/Papers/RCG-HdbkCxG-final2.pdf>, to appear in *The Oxford construction grammar handbook*, Hoffman & Trousdale eds, Oxford : Oxford University Press, pp. 211-232.
- Cruse D.A., 1973, « Some thoughts on agentivity », in *Journal of linguistics* 9, pp. 11-23.
- Culioli A., 1983, « The Concept of Notional Domain », in Hansjakob Seiler (ed.), *Language Universals*, Tübingen: Narr, reprinted in A. Culioli, *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation, Opérations et représentations*, Tome 1, 1990, 67-81
- Culioli A., 1990, « Formes schématiques et domaine », in *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation : Opérations et représentations*, Tome 1, Paris, Ophrys, pp.115-126.
- Culioli A., 2002, « A propos de même », in *Langue Française*, n°133, pp. 16-27.
- Davidson D., 1967 (2006), « The logical form of Action Sentences », in *The Essential Davidson*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 37-71
- Fillmore Ch., 1968, « The case for case », in Bach and Harms (Ed.): *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, pp. 1-88.
- Fillmore Ch., 1975, « Quelques problèmes posés à la grammaire casuelle », in *Langages*, vol. 9, n° 38, pp. 65-80.
- Hagège Cl., 1997, « Les relateurs somme catégorie accessoire et la grammaire comme composante nécessaire », in *Faits de Langues* n°9: 19-28.
- Hjemslev L., 1935, La catégorie des cas 1, in *Etude de grammaire générale*, KØbenhavn : Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus.
- Paillard D., 1998, « Les préverbes russes : division et discernement », in *Revue des études slaves*, vol.70, n°1, pp.85-99.
- Paillard D., 2010, « Prédicats complexes », in *Faits de Langue– Les Cahiers* n°2: 197-228.
- de Penanros H., 2010, « la préfixation en lituanien : le cas de *iš* », in *Faits de Langue– Les Cahiers* n°2: 105-137.
- de Penanros H., 2013 à paraître, « Cas et préposition en lituanien », in *Faits de Langue* n° 41 : 145-173.
- Pottier B., 1997, « Le cognitif et le linguistique dans l'expression des relations", in *Faits de Langues* n°9: 29-38.
- de Vogüé S., 2006, « Qu'est-ce qu'un verbe ? », in *Constructions verbales et production de sens*, Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, Lebaud, Paulin, Ploog eds., pp.43-62.
- Victorri B., 1999, « Le sens grammatical », in *Langages*, 33^e année, n°136, pp. 85-105.

CO-AUTHORED PUBLICATION :

- Franckel J-J., Paillard D., 1998, « Aspects de la théorie d'Antoine Culioli », in *Langages*, 32^e année, n°129, pp. 52-63