

## On the semantic motivation of some verbal prefixes in Lithuanian

Inesa Šeškauskienė

### 1. Introduction. Previous research

Lithuanian is known for its rich derivational and grammatical morphology. Its investigation, especially from the semantic point of view, is aggravated by the fact that almost all morphemes have more than one meaning, or are polysemous. For example, the prefix *par-* attached to the verb *duoti* ‘give’ renders the meaning of selling; when attached to the verb *nešti* ‘carry’ the prefix contributes to expressing the meaning of bringing or carrying something home.

Polysemy has been a problematic issue for many linguistic schools; some, like generative grammar, refused to tackle it altogether (for an overview see, for example, Raven, Leacock 2000; Geeraerts 2001, among others). The cognitive approach, foregrounding human cognition in the study of meaning, takes a rather different perspective (see Evans, Green 2006; Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2007, etc.). Placing language among other cognition-related disciplines and meaning at the core of the study, the cognitive approach regards polysemy as “a reflection of interrelated operation of language, meaning, and cognition” (Shibuya 2007: 658).

It is therefore understandable why in the cognitive linguistic framework, differently from structural linguistics, the dichotomy between polysemy and homonymy is not even posed as such. Rather, they are treated as the end-points of a continuum (Murphy 2010: 98–104). Moreover, cognitivists tend to adhere to the polysemy rather than homonymy, in other words, senses of an item (morpheme, word, phrase, etc.) are related, or motivated, rather than idiosyncratic. Some cognitively-oriented researchers claim that each sense of a polysemous item (morpheme, word, phrase, etc.) requires its own representation. Others adhere to the core, or monosemy, view holding that multiple senses are derived from the core, or a single semantic representation (Murphy 2010: 101–104). Whichever approach is favoured, cognitivists search for systemic semantic relations, often demonstrated as semantic networks, reflecting a range of

actual uses of individual lexemes (see, for example, Lakoff 1987: 416–461 and Murphy 2010: 103).

Arguing for a cognitive approach in the study of meaning, it is important to define the notion of motivation and its mechanism, which helps account for the systemic treatment of meaning. Motivation refers to explainability of meaning in one language or across several languages (Matlock 2004: 3) as opposed to conventionality and arbitrariness (Langacker 1987; 2008; Panther 2011). Polysemy, in the cognitive framework, is a matter of related, motivated senses, which in language is far more frequent than occasional emergence of new unrelated meanings.

As noted by scholars (Benczes 2010; Panther 2011), semantic motivation is based to a large extent on the mechanisms of metonymy and metaphor. The meaning transfer based on metonymy relies on the intra-domain transfer (Lakoff, Johnson 1980/2003). In the example given at the beginning of this paper, the prefix *par-* in Lithuanian attached to the verb *duoti* ‘give’ can be explained as rendering a metonymical sense of giving something for money, or selling<sup>1</sup>. The primary sense of *par-* is concerned with physical transfer of an item from one point to the other, usually the latter being the original point of departure, as evident in the verb *par-eiti* (par-go-PFV.INF ‘come home’). The secondary sense of *par-duoti* is based on the primary and conceptually can be located within the same domain thus rendering the sense of giving in a specific way, as an exchange of money and goods.

Metaphor is treated as a cross-domain transfer whereby one domain is understood in terms of the other (Lakoff, Johnson 1980/2003). One of rather obvious examples is the prefix *iš-* in the verb *iš-duoti* (iš-give-PFV.INF). One sense refers to giving something that officially belongs to that person, like giving out uniforms to soldiers in the army. Another sense refers to revealing a secret or betraying. In this case, a more abstract domain is identifiable; the sense of betrayal is based on the concrete sense of giving (for more details, see further).

Affixational polysemy has been an acknowledged but not really solved problem. With a huge amount of literature focusing on English derivatives, both in the structural and cognitive

---

<sup>1</sup> Most verbal prefixes in Lithuanian, like in many other inflecting languages, also mark the perfective aspect.

linguistic frameworks (see, for example, Katamba 1993; Plag 2003; Jackson, Amvela 2007; Tuggy 2005; Basilio 2006; Ungerer 2010; Balázs 2013; Brdar, Brdar-Szabó 2013), some other languages have received less attention, especially in the cognitive framework. However, Russian, Czech and Norwegian have been extensively studied by Janda (2011; 2014), Polish by Pawelec (2009) and Tabakowska (2010). The study of Lithuanian prefixal semantics has so far mostly adhered to the structural linguistic framework (see, for example, Paulauskienė 1994; Jakaitienė 2010).

One of the key ideas discussed in literature focusing on affixal meaning and prefixes in particular, is concerned with the ability of prefixes to mostly render grammatical aspectual oppositions (see Paulauskienė 1994: 272–279; Ambrazas et al. 1997: 222). However, the scholars also acknowledge that this is not their only capacity; many prefixes have their own meanings and are not semantically “empty”. Endresen et al. (2012) in their paper on Russian prefixes question the idea of semantic emptiness. Referring to a vivid metaphor that memorising all possible uses of Russian prefixes not linked in any possible way would be like memorising the keys to 2,000 doors in an office, the authors adhere to the view that the uses are linked to one another in many different ways. In their analysis, they choose a radial category profiling approach and demonstrate how it works in the analysis of ten Russian prefixes. The results show an interesting tendency that in most cases the meaning of prefixes overlaps with that of the base verb. However, and more importantly, the investigation demonstrates that the prefixal meaning is neither an abstraction nor a list of unrelated meanings. Rather, it is a network of related senses. Other papers by Janda and her colleagues mainly continue the same line of research (Janda, Lyashevskaya 2012).

Another idea frequently touched upon in papers on prefixal semantics is concerned with the semantic relationship between prefixes and prepositions. Indeed, it can hardly be questioned that inflecting languages, such as Russian, Polish or Lithuanian, have a number of prefixes and prepositions coinciding in form, which is mainly due to the fact that many prefixes developed from prepositions. In Lithuanian, of ten deverbal prefixes in Lithuanian only two have no prepositional counterparts (see Table 1). Moreover, the prefix and the respective preposition often occur together, for example, *iš-ei-ti iš namų* (iš- go-INF from house-GEN.PL ‘to leave home, to get out of the house’), *per-ei-ti per tiltą* (per- go-INF across bridge-ACC.SG ‘to cross the bridge’).

Researchers working on Russian and other Slavic languages claim that many patterns of affixal word formation are motivated by metonymy (Janda 2011; 2014) or metonymy and metaphor (Pawelec 2009; Tabakowska 2003; 2010). Metonymy and metaphor are mechanisms underlying some other word building processes such as compounding (Basilio 2006; Brdar, Brdar-Szabó 2013). Apparently, this applies to Lithuanian prefixes as well.

Further in the paper, I will give a brief overview of all verbal prefixes in Lithuanian and describe the overall methodological framework of research. Then I will focus on two selected prefixes, *į-* ('into') and *iš-* ('from, out of'), and their motivated polysemy, trying to account for all their senses when attached to four basic, or semantically non-complex, verbs in Lithuanian: *duoti* 'give', *gauti* 'get', *imti* 'take', and *dėti* 'put'.

## 2. Framework of research

Lithuanian has 12 verbal prefixes: *ap-*, *at-*, *į-*, *iš-*, *nu-*, *pa-*, *par-*, *per-*, *pra-*, *pri-*, *su-*, *už-*. Only two of them, *at-* and *par-*, do not have corresponding prepositions. Very often prefixed verbs and corresponding prepositions appear together, for example, *į-eiti į kambarį* (į-PFV-go-INF į room-ACC.SG 'to come into the room'), *iš-eiti iš namų* (iš-PFV-go-INF iš house-GEN.PL 'to leave home, to get out of the house').

Unlike other prefixes, verbal prefixes do not change the word class after derivation. However, their capabilities to attach to individual verbs vary. Below, Table 1 shows the derivative potential of all twelve verb-building prefixes attached to four basic verbs. They are among top frequent words not only in English but in other languages as well.

Table 1. Derivative potential of verb-building prefixes in Lithuanian\*

verb prefix	<i>ap-</i>	<i>at(i)-</i>	<i>į-</i>	<i>iš-</i>	<i>nu-</i>	<i>pa-</i>	<i>par-</i>	<i>per-</i>	<i>pra-</i>	<i>pri-</i>	<i>su-</i>	<i>už-</i>
duoti ‘give’												
gauti ‘get’												
imti ‘take’												
dėti ‘put’												

\* Dark cells mark productive derivation, and white cells mark cases where the pattern is unacceptable.

Since the analysis is primarily based on studying two dictionaries of contemporary Lithuanian (DLKŽ and LKŽ) and grammars (Ambrasas et al. 1994; Ambrasas et al. 1997; Valeckienė 1998), it should be noted that not all the information provided in the dictionaries was taken for granted. Some meanings registered in the dictionaries are obsolete and no longer relevant in present-day Lithuanian. This is mostly identifiable in LKŽ providing more senses and including more archaic and obsolete cases than DLKŽ. The usage of the prefixed verbs in all their verbal forms was verified in the Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian (CCL) and only the senses attested there were included in the analysis.

As already mentioned, the present paper focuses on two selected verbal prefixes in Lithuanian *į-* and *iš-* attached to four basic verbs, which in their unprefixed forms roughly correspond to the English verbs *give*, *get*, *take*, and *put*. The prefix *iš-* is attached to all four verbs; the prefix *į-* is only possible with three verbs: *duoti* ‘give’, *gauti* ‘get, receive’ and *dėti* ‘put, lay’. They are all described in dictionaries and grammars and numerous represented in CCL. In Table 1, the verb *į-imti* (į-PFV-take-INF) is marked as unacceptable. Interestingly enough, it was only found in one dictionary (LKŽ), but most senses there were obsolete or dialectal. A simple search in CCL resulted in a very small number of cases of the verb *į-imti* (normalised frequency=0.004 per 10,000 words). Therefore, it was decided to mark it as unacceptable and exclude it from further analysis. Each of the other *į-* and *iš-* verbs will be described further.

### 3. The prefix *į-*. *Įgauti, įdėti, įduoti*

As already mentioned, the prefix *į-* correlates with the primary preposition expressing the spatial meaning of movement towards an entity; often also the interior of the destination is meant. Constructions with *į-*verbs, especially when reinforced by a repetitive use of the same preposition, often signal both directionality and the interior, e.g. *jis į-ėjo į kambarį* ('he-NOM.SG *į-* PFV-go-PST.3 *į* room-ACC.SG 'he came into the room'). The destinations are usually three-dimensional objects and may be conceptualised as containers: concrete entities like *rooms* or *forests* as well as abstract notions like *history* (e.g. *įvykis įėjo į istoriją* 'the event entered the history') or *study programmes* (e.g. *tie dalykai įėjo į studijų programą* 'the subjects entered/were part of the study program'). Apparently, the interpretation of the Lithuanian *į-*verb *įsimylėti* (*į-*REFL-love-INF) 'to fall in love' can also be interpreted through the notion of a container signalled by the prefix *į-* (for more details see Urbonaitė, Šeškauskienė, Cibulskienė 2019: 176).

Having studied the usage of the three verbs with the prefix *į-* and all of their verbal forms (gerunds, participles, etc.) in CCL, I identified that the verb *įgauti* ('*į-*get') was the most frequent followed by *įdėti* ('*į-*put') and *įduoti* ('*į-*give'). Below, is Table 2 showing their absolute and normalised frequencies of the three *į-*verbs per 10,000 words in CCL (the size of the corpus: 140, 921, 288 words).

Table 2. Frequencies of the verbs *įdėti, įduoti, įgauti* in CCL

Basic forms	Absolute	Normalised
Įgauti	5,675	0.4
Įdėti	4,703	0.33
Įduoti	870	0.062

Further, each verb will be described starting with the most frequent and proceeding to less frequent.

### 3.1. Įgauti

Two dictionaries of Lithuanian treat the verb *įgauti* differently. DLKŽ defines a single, metaphorical, sense of the verb, and LKŽ enumerates a large number of its senses, many of which are obsolete and/or dialectal. The verification of the usage of the prefixed verb in CCL has resulted in identifying two senses. They are both concerned with changing. Despite rather poor polysemy, the frequency of the verb is the highest of the three *į*-verbs (normalised frequency= 0.4 per 10,000 words, see Table 2).

The first sense of *įgauti* is mostly concerned with changing physical properties (colour, smell, form, shape, etc.) and becoming different; it is linked to the base verb *gauti* encoding the meaning of getting, e.g.:

- (1) *Akių vokai (...) įgauna pilkšvą atspalvį.*<sup>2</sup>  
Eye-GEN.PL lid- NOM.PL *į*-PFV-get-PRS.3 greyish-ACC.SG shade-ACC.SG  
‘The eyelids are turning grey’
- (2) *Sultys įgavo acto kvapą.*  
Juice- NOM.PL *į*-PFV-get-PST.3 vinegar- GEN.SG smell-ACC.SG  
‘The juice started to smell like vinegar’

By getting a new colour (1) or smell (2) eyelids or juice change some of their properties. The process of acquiring a different quality with an element of direction into the object may be interpreted as loosely related to a container: a different colour or smell gets into some entity, or a container. As a result, it is bound to change. This sense is referred to by Paulauskienė as resultative, signalling that a required result is attained (Paulauskienė 1994: 275).

The prefixed verb *įgauti* can appear in contexts concerned with more subjective changes and the speaker’s evaluation of colours, shades, forms, style or appearance, for example:

- (3) *Rūmai įgavo klasicistinio stiliaus išvaizdą.*

---

<sup>2</sup> This and subsequent examples are from CCL; otherwise the source is indicated in round brackets.

Palace-NOM.PL į-PFV-get-PST.3 classicist-GEN.SG style-GEN.SG appearance- ACC.SG

‘The palace turned into a classicist style building’

The second sense is realised in contexts referring exclusively to living beings, mostly people. The sense is also concerned with changes, but they are mostly linked to capabilities or mental properties (such as *confidence, sensibility, wisdom, freedom, attraction*, etc.), which are gained by getting inside someone’s mind or character, apparently perceived as containers, for example:

- (4) (...) *su metais ir proto daugiau įgauni.*

With year-INSTR.PL also sensibility-GEN.SG more į-PFV-get-PRS.2SG

‘As time goes by, you become cleverer’

Both senses of the verb *įgauti* are concerned with gaining some properties or capabilities; in some cases they are quantifiable, as in (4), where *protas* ‘sensibility’ combines with *daugiau* ‘more’. The process can be loosely interpreted as filling in a container, since gaining or acquisition is often concerned with getting inside, affecting not only the surface but also the interior. This equally applies to animate and inanimate beings and is consistent with the theory of embodiment where the human body is normally perceived as a container, and so is the human mind (Johnson 2007). Thus the main idea of a container expressed through the prefix *į-* seems to be preserved.

### 3.2. Įdėti

The verb *įdėti* is slightly less frequent than *įgauti* and about 30 times more frequent (normalised frequency = 0.33 per 10,000 words, Table 2) than *įduoti*. The first and basic sense is realised in concrete situations when something is placed inside a container which is naturally larger than the object which is put inside, for example, linen is put into a box or a wardrobe, a voting ballot is put into an envelope (5). The sense is also realised in situations when something is installed by attaching it to or inside a larger object, such as windows installed in a house (6) or a new leg is attached to a table (7):

- (5) [turite] *slaptai užpildyti rinkimų biuletenius ir įdėti juos į balsavimo voką.*



[you have] secretly-ADV PFV-fill-INF election-GEN.PL ballot-ACC.PL and *į*-PFV-put-INF they-ACC.PL *į* voting-GEN.SG envelope-ACC.SG

‘[you have] to secretly fill in the election ballots and place them in an envelope’

- (6) *Kam įdėjai žemus langus?* (LKŽ)

Why *į*-PFV-put-PST.2 low-ACC.PL window-ACC.PL

‘Why did you install small windows?’

- (7) *Įdėk stalui naują koją.* LKŽ

*Į*-PFV-put-IMPER table-DAT.SG new-ACC.SG leg-ACC.SG

‘Attach a new leg to the table’

The container (such as *an envelope* or a *box*) is often explicit (5), but could also be implied (6). Explicit containers are often expressed by the accusative case with the preposition *į*- (5). In example (7) the container is implied; table legs are attached by inserting their parts in special holes of the upper part of the table and fastened there.

There are more contexts when the prefixed verb is followed by the prepositional phrase *į* + *N<sub>acc</sub>*, which designates a more abstract destination, which can be interpreted as a metaphorical container, e.g.:

- (8) *Įdėsiu į kelionę maisto ir vandens.*

*į*-PFV-put-FUT.1SG *į* trip-ACC.SG food-GEN.SG and water-GEN.SG

‘[I] will give you some food and water for your trip’

The above case is interesting in that the objects (food and water) are concrete but the container (trip) is abstract; hence the perceived metaphoricity of the utterance. Moreover, such cases show that division into non-metaphorical and metaphorical senses is not so clear-cut, and the discussion about gradable metaphoricity is meaningful (Hanks 2006), even though proving it may require a more refined methodology.

The second sense of *įdėti* is metaphorically derived from the first one and is based on the perception of a text, written or spoken, as a container. Words, phrases, observations, ideas are often put into texts, e.g.:

- (9) (...) *autorius ano meto papiruse idėjo šį pastebėjimą.*

Author- NOM.SG that- GEN.SG time- GEN.SG papyrus- LOC.SG į- PFV-put- PST.3 this-ACC.SG remark- ACC.SG

‘The author put this remark on a papyrus of those times’

The metaphoricity in this case is not so obvious because text is only hinted at by reference to a papyrus on which in ancient times people produced texts. Therefore, putting an observation into papyrus would be synonymous to writing on it. An extra argument for treating the second sense as metaphorical could be derived from examples where words and phrases are conceptualised as containers for putting meaning into them:

- (10) [įdomu] į jau žinomas žodžius ir frazes *idėti* prasmę.

[it is interesting] į already-ADV know- PTCP.PASS.ACC.SG word-ACC.PL and phrase-ACC.SG į-put-INF meaning-ACC.SG

‘It is interesting to put meaning into already known trivial words and phrases’

The claim that ideas could be treated as physical objects that are taken, put, raised or otherwise manipulated is not new. Lakoff and Johnson (1980/2003), Grady (1998) discussed it in reference to the metaphoricity of communication where ideas are put into words (containers) and sent to another person. Thus communication is conceptualised through the container, or conduit, metaphor.

The third sense of *idėti* demonstrates another type of a container and is closely linked to the previous sense. It refers to abstract entities conceptualised as containers such as *project*, *people*, *a piece of art*, etc. What is put into a container is also no less abstract, e.g. *effort*, *work*, *energy*, *hope*, *idea*, *love*, *hatred*, etc. For example:

- (11)(...) *energetika, kurią Bachas idėjo į kūrinį* (...).

Energy-NOM.SG that Bach-NOM.SG į- PFV-put-PST.3 į creation-ACC.SG

‘the energy that Bach put into his creative work’

- (12)(...) *katalikiškoji inteligentija į tai idėjo nemaža vilčių.*

Catholic-NOM.SG intelligentsia-NOM.SG į it- ACC.SG į-PFV-put-PST.3 not-few-ADV hope-GEN.PL

‘The Catholic intelligentsia put into that many hopes’

All the three senses of the prefixed verb *įdėti* are rendered in a sequence of increasing abstraction. The first sense is concrete and the other two are abstract: the second is more concerned with verbal and textual entities and the third with abstract containers and abstract content that is put into containers. As seen in the examples, some cases are very well established, stable phrases (e.g. *įdėti vilčių* ‘to put hopes’) and some are more innovative and creative (e.g. *įdėti energetiką į kūrinį* ‘to put energy into a piece of creative work’). Apparently, the latter result from creatively manipulating the container metaphor which is treated as one of few universal metaphors identifiable in many cultures (see, for example, Kövecses 2005).

The stability of certain patterns can be observed in idioms where the container metaphor is productively employed. For example, Lithuanian abounds in idioms with the word *širdis* ‘heart’. In Lithuanian and other languages, it can metonymically refer to emotions put into an abstract container such as work; it can also serve as a container for emotions or other abstractions. In such cases the verb *įdėti* is among several verbs frequently employed in the realisation of heart idioms, e.g.:

- (13) (...) *jei jau ko imuosi, įdedu visą širdį*.

If at all what-GEN.SG take-REFL.PRES.1, į-PFV-put-PRES.1SG all-ACC.SG heart-ACC.SG

‘If I start doing something, I put into it my whole heart’

- (14) (...) *amžinybės supratimą jis įdėjo į jų širdį*.

Eternity-GEN.SG understanding-ACC.SG he-NOM.SG į-PFV-put-PST.3 į they-GEN.PL heart- ACC.SG

‘He put his understanding of eternity into their heart’.

In (13) heart is measurable; the whole heart signals strong emotion. In Lithuanian there are also contexts where the heart is quantifiable, e.g. *daug širdies* ‘much heart’, *truputį širdies* ‘some/a little heart’, etc. In (14) heart serves as a container for the understanding that was put into it. Many idioms are also evaluative, for example, someone putting ‘much heart’ into his work is seen as a hard-working good person.

### 3.3. Įduoti

The prefixed verb *įduoti* is the least frequent of the three *į-* derivatives. The verb is defined in DLKŽ and LKŽ as mainly encoding two meanings: 1) to give something in, to give something to someone to carry or take to some place or person and 2) to betray. LKŽ gives a large array of senses; however, most of them are obsolete. DLKŽ lists fewer senses, and most of them are still identifiable in contemporary Lithuanian.

The first sense of the verb, that of physical giving, has an element of giving as a result of premeditated intention of giving for a particular purpose and/or secretly. The object of giving is usually inanimate (*kastuvas* ‘spade’, *duona* ‘bread’, *dažai* ‘paint’, *pinigai* ‘money’, *dovana* ‘gift’, etc.), e.g.:

- (15) *Įdavė į rankas platų kastuvą ir nuėjo savais keliais.*

į-PFV-give-PST.3 į hand-ACC.PL broad-ACC.SG spade-ACC.SG and PFV-go-PST.3 own-INSTR.PL road-INSTR.PL

‘[He] handed him a broad spade and left’

- (16) *Dažus į rankas jam pirmąkart įdavė mama.*

Paint-ACC.PL į hand-ACC.PL he-DAT.SG first-time-ADV į-PFV-give-PST.3 mother-NOM.SG

‘The paint was first given to him by his mother’

- (17) *Lilė įdavė dovanų panelei Dubkovej*

Lilė-NOM.SG į-PFV-give- PST.3 gift-GEN.PL miss-DAT.SG Dubkova-DAT.SG

‘Lilė gave me some gifts for Miss Dubkova’

In example (15), the giver’s intention is to persuade the other person to dig; in example (16) the intention is to teach the child how to paint. In example (17), the intention is to pass gifts to Miss Dubkova. The latter case is rather revealing since the phrase *įdavė dovanų /dovanų* (gave a gift-ACC.SG/GEN.PL) would be unlikely in contexts where the receiver of the gift is the interlocutor unless some physical or psychological pressure is applied and the interlocutor has to accept what is given to him/her. So apart from the intention of passing the object to someone else, another contextual clue could be concerned with physical or emotional force attached to the

physical act of giving. Presumably, in such cases the link with the primary prefixal meaning of *į* ‘into’ referring to the interior of some container is identifiable.

In the second sense of *įduoti* the object of giving is exclusively human. The meaning of *įduoti* changes so that the act of giving is not physical but abstract. The meaning is concerned with reporting someone to some authorities (police, municipality, etc.), turning someone in, in some cases also betraying. Apparently, it is based on the metaphor REPORTING IS GIVING; the CONTAINER metaphor features in this case rather indirectly, for example:

- (18) *Vagi įdavė policijai.* (DLKŽ)

Thief-ACC.SG *į*- PFV-give- PST.3 police-DAT.SG

‘The thief was handed in to the police’

- (19) *Šimtus žmonių įdavė skundikai – kaimynai skundė kaimynus, kiemsargiai ir liokajai – šeimininkus.*

Hundred-ACC.PL person-GEN.PL *į*-PFV-give- PST.3 snitch-NOM.PL—neighbour- NOM.PL report-pst.3  
neighbour-ACC.PL, watchman-NOM.PL and butler-NOM.PL master-ACC.PL

‘Snitches turned in hundreds of people: neighbours were complaining about their neighbours, watchmen and butlers about their masters’

Such utterances are often evaluative. In some cases, such as (18), the act of reporting is socially right but the cause for reporting is a crime or violation of legal or moral rules. In other cases, such as (19), the act of reporting is treated by the speaker as unacceptable for moral reasons; contextual indicators are usually words like *skundikai* ‘snitches’ or *Gestapo*, *gendarmes*, etc., which are strongly socially connoted. In the sense of reporting or betraying the prefixed verb seems to have maintained its relation with the first sense where the element of physical or emotional force or pressure is very important. Therefore, as a result of reporting or betraying, people are usually apprehended and detained.

#### 4. The prefix *iš-* ‘out of, from’. *Išduoti, išimti, išgauti, išdėti*

Like the prefix *į-*, *iš-* also correlates with the preposition *iš* signalling movement from an entity, to its exterior. The two prefixes mark opposite directions and, according to Paulauskienė (1994:

274), may form directional opposites, e.g. [*jis*] *į-ėjo į kambarį—iš-ėjo iš kambario* (he-NOM.SG *į*- PFV-go-PST.3 *į* room-ACC.SG ‘he came into the room’—he-NOM.SG *iš*-PFV-go-PST.3 *iš* room-GEN.SG ‘he went out of the room’).

As pointed out by Paulauskienė (1994: 274), the sense of directionality features very strongly in the semantics of the prefix *iš-*. Even with verbs which can hardly be described as non-directional, the prefix adds the element of purposeful directed action or activity, e.g. *išpasakoti* ‘*iš*-tell’, meaning ‘tell something that was not supposed to be told or the speaker did not have any intention to do so’.

All the verbs under study can appear with the prefix *iš-*. However, their frequencies of use, as attested by a search in CCL, are different. The verb *išduoti* (‘*iš*-give’) is from 7 to 164 times more frequent than the other *iš*-verbs. Table 3 below shows absolute and normalised frequencies of the four *iš*-verbs per 10,000 words in CCL:

Table 3. Frequencies of the verbs *išduoti*, *išimti*, *išgauti*, *išdėti* in CCL

Basic forms	Absolute	Normalised
<i>Išduoti</i>	23,120	1.64
<i>Išimti</i>	2,946	0.21
<i>Išgauti</i>	2,618	0.19
<i>Išdėti</i>	143	0.01

In Table 3, the sequence of the verbs is given according to their frequency. Further the same sequence is preserved and each verb is described separately, starting with the most frequent.

#### 4.1. *Išduoti*

The verb *išduoti* (*iš*-give) is not only the most frequent of the *iš*-verbs, but also the most frequent of all the derived verbs chosen for analysis. In the two dictionaries the number of senses attached to the verb varies from seven to 19. However, the analysis of collocates of the retrieved data has demonstrated that most senses included in the dictionaries have not been attested in CCL. All the cases fall into two types: concrete and abstract, hence the two senses described further.

The act of giving as encoded in the base form *duoti* ‘give’ usually involves an agent, or a giver, and a recipient. The verb *išduoti* presupposes a human giver and a human recipient in both senses. The prefix *iš*- signals a source or a container; however, the container, like in *j*-verbs above, is not so easily identifiable.

The first sense refers to giving to a person or persons an object or substance that officially belongs to him/her/them. There are two types of situations that can be identified: one is concerned with the distribution of some items to a group of people, usually all the items are of the same type (uniforms, rations of food in the army, etc.) and the other is realised in contexts of issuing documents (passports, IDs, certificates, diplomas, permits, warrants, etc.). Apparently, what could be identified as a container is the source of objects and/or substance; the container is usually not explicitly mentioned. In the former situation the recipients are normally more than one, such as groups of people working in a particular place or soldiers in the army, prisoners, and the like. The givers are usually people in charge, officially superior and in control. In some contexts, the giver is not explicitly mentioned. However, the idea of giving items to recipients as a result of some generally approved principle or order is kept, for example:

(20) *Ten maistą mums išduodavo gerą.*

There food-ACC.SG we-DAT.PL *iš*- PFV-give-PST.3 good-ACC.SG

‘We were served good food there’

In the second type of situations realising the first sense, the recipient is also human; however, the implication of distributing the same items to many recipients is not retained. What seems to be the same is the official giver, the one who is in charge. In many cases the giver is not a single person but an institution, such as a court of law issuing warrants, a university issuing diplomas and certificates, etc. The giver in this sense can be perceived as a container.

In the second sense, which is attested in a large number of utterances in CCL, the verb *išduoti* refers to revealing some secret, betraying people or ideas. The link to a container is rather indirect, possibly pointing to the human mind conceptualised as a container, identifiable through the object metaphor BETRAYING IS GIVING AWAY when abstractions are conceptualised as objects that can be taken or given, such as *ideas, values, love, arguments*, etc. The verb under study is negatively connoted; the connotation is systemic, default, it often appears in contexts with positively charged nouns so that a clash between the negative evaluation encoded in *išduoti* and the noun is obvious, e.g.:

(21) *Jo herojus, išdavęs moterį, išdavęs meilę, paskui išduoda ir tėvynę.*

He-GEN.SG protagonist-NOM.SG iš-PFV-give-PTCP.PST.SG woman-ACC.SG, iš-PFV-give-PTCP.PST.SG  
love-ACC.SG then iš-PFV-give-PRS.3 also motherland-ACC.SG

‘His protagonist, having betrayed his woman, his love, then also betrays his motherland’

The two senses are linked in such a way that the first sense realises concrete giving, albeit rather specific, and the second—abstract giving. The container in one case is implied, it could also be an institution; in the other it is the human mind.

## 4.2. Išimti

The verb *išimti* (*iš*-take) is almost as frequent as *išgauti* (*iš*-get; normalised frequency=0.21 per 10,000 words). The two major dictionaries (DLKŽ, LKŽ) have registered four to eight senses of the verb; however, the analysis of collocations of the retrieved data revealed that most of them have not been attested in CCL. The analysis has demonstrated that the verb is mostly



linked to three senses, the fourth being a more creative, metaphorical, adaptation of the three previous senses.

The first two senses are concrete. One is concerned with retrieving something from an enclosure, or a container, such as items from a box, a drawer, a pot or a pan, a bag, a pocket, etc. There are also cases when the container is less obvious; however, it remains the focus of attention, as seen in the following example:

- (22) *[reikia] iš lašišos išimti kaulus ir smulkiai supjaustyti.*

From salmon-GEN.SG iš-PFV-take- INF bone-ACC.PL and fine-ADV –PFV-cut-INF

‘[You need] to bone the salmon and cut it into small pieces’

The second sense is attested in contexts about fibrous tissues, such as paper, clothes or canvases, and is concerned with removing from them stains or colour, apparently soaked through. The sense is attested in both dictionaries and seems to be deeply entrenched in actual usage, e.g.:

- (23) *Skiediklis naudojamas dėmėms išimti.*

Solvent- NOM.SG use-PTCP.PASS.PRS stain-DAT.PL iš-PFV-take-INF

‘The solvent is used to remove stains’

The idea of a container in this sense is much less obvious than in the first; however, entities like cloth or garment implied in (23) can still be loosely interpreted as containers, especially when it comes to stains or colours which are soaked through and are impossible to wipe away from the surface. The second sense, differently from the first, focuses on the process of removal and on the result rather than the container, which is often implicit.

The third sense is identifiable in contexts about containers such as banks and other institutions and is concerned with retrieving money from a bank (account) for use or books from a library, for example:

- (24) *Išimti iš banko dolerius grynais sunkumų nebūta.*

iš-PFV-take-INF from bank-GEN.SG dollar-ACC.PL pure-INSTR.PL hardship-GEN.PL be-PTCP.PASS.PST

‘Retrieving dollars from the bank in cash was not a problem’

In the above case, the source, or container, is much less concrete than a box or a bag. However, the link with a concrete container is identifiable. The verb is also frequent in contexts when, for example, books are removed from a library or money removed from circulation. As a result, books or money may become no longer available for use.

In CCL there are a number of cases when the verb *išimti* could be interpreted as used metaphorically, but not necessarily directly linked to any of the above senses. Such contexts are usually abstract, discussing, for example, one's personal history, which is seen as a container: some unpleasant episodes are impossible to remove from one's memory, as attested in the following poem by Janina Degutytė (1928–1990), a famous Lithuanian poetess:

(25) *Taip viskas įsirėžia ligi skausmo –  
Ir nieko nebegalima išimti:  
Nei delno su pirmom žibuoklėm,  
Nei akmenio, pataikyto širdin.*<sup>3</sup>

'In such a way everything is painfully engraved  
And nothing can be removed:  
Either a palm with first violets  
Or a stone which had hit my heart'<sup>4</sup>

There are also contexts where the situation of taking something out is creatively employed when speaking about abstractions, such as values, feelings and emotions, reasoning, creative texts, for example, arguments removed from a text, a question removed from the agenda, historical figures removed from context, etc. Moreover, the noun *išimtis* 'exception' is derived from the verb *išimti* (*iš*-take); it points at something excluded, not applicable, and is linked to the previous, more physical, senses of removal.

All the four senses are linked via the concept of container: in the first, it is a concrete solid object, in the second, it may be soft or porous, in the third, it is an institution, and in the fourth,

---

<sup>3</sup> The poem was written in 1962 and published several times in magazines and books.

<sup>4</sup> The translation is mine. I.Š.

it could be a text, an agenda, memory, history and other abstractions. They are logically linked into a consistent network proceeding from more concrete to more abstract situations.

### 4.3. Išgauti

The verb *išgauti* (‘iš-get’) is fairly frequent in the corpus (normalised frequency= 0.19 per 10,000 words) and is primarily associated with three senses. One is very concrete and linked to getting (extracting, producing) gas, salt, oil and other natural resources; the process requires considerable human effort. In contexts with *išgauti* the container is either explicitly mentioned (26) or implied (27), e.g.:

- (26) *Nafta paprastai išgaunama Šiaurės jūroje.*

Oil-NOM.SG usually-ADV iš-PFV-get-PTCP.PASS.NOM.SG North-GEN.SG Sea-LOC.SG

‘Oil is usually extracted in the North Sea’

- (27) *Išgauti cukrų iš nendrių (DLKŽ)*

Iš-PFV-get-INF sugar-ACC.SG from cane-GEN.PL

‘To get sugar from canes’

The second sense mostly appears in contexts related to vision or auditory effects such as music. The verb is typically used to describe a situation when a musical sound is extracted from some instrument, especially when it requires effort, e.g.:

- (28) *Tėvo rankos moka išgauti stebuklingus muzikos garsus.*

Father-GEN.SG hand-NOM.PL be able-PRS.3 iš-PFV-get-INF wonderful-ACC.PL music-GEN.SG sound-ACC.PL

‘My father’s hands are capable of extracting wonderful sounds of music’

Music is an abstract entity, but describing its production by means of the verb *išgauti* is natural; any musical instrument can be perceived as a container from which the sound is extracted. The process requires skill and effort.

The sense can also be realised in contexts related to visual experience whereby some colour, specific texture (soft, glassy, etc.) or general visual effect is produced, usually as a result of effort and/or long hours of work, e.g.:

- (29) *Gražiausia spalva išgaunama tada, kai šie prieskoniai pakaitinami.*

Most beautiful-NOM.SG colour-NOM.SG iš-PFV-get-DAT.SG then-ADV when this-NOM.PL spice-NOM.PL heat-PTCP.PASS.PRS.3PL

‘The most beautiful colour is achieved when the spices are heated’

The third sense is metaphorically derived from the two previous senses. It is normally realised in contexts related to human interaction when psychological pressure is applied and answers, promises or secrets are forced out of people, hence the usage of *pažadas* (‘promise’), *paslaptis* (‘secret’), *nauda* (‘profit’), *nuolaidos* (‘discount’), *parodymai* (‘evidence’) with the verb *išgauti*. The element of force may be reinforced by explicitly mentioning it, e.g.:

- (30) *[jis] atsisakė savo parodymų, nes jie buvo priverstinai išgauti.*

Refuse-pst.3 his evidence- GEN.PL because they- NOM.PL be-pst.3 by force-adv iš-get-PTCP.PASS.PST.PL

‘He refused his evidence because it had been forced from him’

The three senses are closely linked together through the notion of a container and the element of effort or force. The first is most concrete, mostly natural, like canes for extracting sugar, the second is more abstract (music ‘extracted’ by playing some instrument), and the third is the most abstract (promises, evidence ‘extracted’ by force from people). Apparently, the verb has a potential to being metaphorically used in many more abstract, often also very creative, contexts.

#### 4.4. Išdėti

As already mentioned, the verb *išdėti* (‘iš-put’) is very rare (normalised frequency=0.01 per 10,000 words). The Lithuanian dictionaries list from four to fourteen senses of the verb *išdėti*; however, many are obsolete or hardly identifiable as distinct senses. Based on the data of CCL,

the verb can be claimed to be associated with two senses, both linked to a container. One sense expresses the idea of taking out, especially a large amount of something or a number of items, from a container, such as a jar, a box or a bag and putting it/them into/onto some place. The container is usually explicitly mentioned (31) or implied (32), so is the target or destination where the items or substance is put (implied in (31) and explicit in (32)), e.g.:

- (31) *Išdėti sviestą iš stiklainio.* (DLKŽ, LKŽ)

Iš-PFV-put- INF butter- CC.SG from jar-GEN.SG

‘To take out butter from a jar’

- (32) *Ant stalo išdėjo visas lauktuves – alų, degtinę, sidrą.*

On table-GEN.SG iš-PFV-put-PST.3 all- ACC.PL good-ACC.PL beer- ACC.SG, vodka- ACC.SG, cider- ACC.SG

‘[He] put out onto the table everything he brought with him: beer, vodka, cider’

The second sense of *išdėti* is more abstract and linked to speaking one’s mind, especially after some time when such speaking was either not allowed or considered socially inappropriate. Naturally, in such situations the prefixed verb is negatively connoted, since such speaking is usually not pleasant to the interlocutor, e.g.:

- (33) *Povilui draugas išdėjo į akis visą tiesą.*

Povilas-DAT.SG friend-NOM.SG iš-PFV-put-PST.3 into eye-ACC.PL all-ACC.SG truth-ACC.SG

‘His friend told Povilas all the truth’

The second sense is interpretable as metaphorically derived from the first one; speaking out, or speaking one’s mind, is based on the metaphor MIND IS A CONTAINER and ideas, verbalised or not, can be treated as the content. Such interpretation is fully compatible with the idea of embodiment (Johnson 2007), as verbalised thoughts are often perceived as coming from a container, the human mind.

Texts where this sense is realised are marked for register. The verb *išdėti* mostly appears in less formal contexts, which explains why in CCL it is mainly found in public discourse and fiction.

Moreover, the word appears in the idiom *išdėti į šuns dienas* (lit. to put to the dog's days), which means 'to tell someone unpleasant things, to curse, to offend, to humiliate' and is negatively connoted. The idiom is an example of the second sense of the verb. In CCL, of all 149 cases of *išdėti*, more than half (76) were used as part of this idiom.

Of the two senses of *išdėti* the first, concrete, sense is much less frequent in contemporary Lithuanian than the second, abstract. It can be explained by the fact that in the concrete sense it competes and is easily replaced by the verb *išimti* (iš-take), discussed in section 4.2.

## 5. Discussion and conclusion

The analysis of two verbal prefixes *į-* and *iš-* with four basic verbs in Lithuanian has demonstrated that, first of all, the prefixes, when attached to the verbs of giving, getting, putting and taking, vary in frequency. The prefix *į-* is almost never found with the verb *imti* 'take'; of the remaining three verbs it seems to be most frequent with *gauti* 'get'. The prefix *iš-* is abundantly used with the verb *duoti* ('give'). It is the most frequent derivative in my data.

Semantically, the derivatives are very diverse. All prefixed verbs are highly polysemous; the number of senses varies from two to four. The prototypical senses of *į-* ('into') and *iš-* ('out of, from') preserve their link with the corresponding prepositions and primarily refer to a directional movement either into (*į-*) or out of (*iš-*) some container. Other senses of the selected prefixes rely on the base verb with the prefix modifying the sense of the derived verb in a way consistent with the primary directional meaning of the prefix. Thus when *į-* is attached, for example, to the verb of getting, the resulting verb primarily carries the meaning of changing as a result of some acquired properties; when *į-* is attached to the verb of giving, the resulting verb carries the meaning of purposeful giving. When *iš-* is attached to the verb of giving, the derivative in its first, most basic, sense refers to distributing items of the same type to people, like in the army from an explicit or implied source; with the verb of getting it means extracting some substance, like oil or gas.

Each of the derived verbs develop their own polysemy network. Applying the motivated polysemy principle, the senses can be accounted for and consistently joined into a chain where each more abstract sense is explainable through reference to a more concrete sense, through embodiment and universal cognitive principles. Thus the verb *iš-gauti* ('iš-get') in its second sense means extracting sound or music, which is linked to the first sense of extracting oil and gas. The verb *į-dėti* ('į-put'), in addition to putting an object into a container, like a letter into an envelope, may also metaphorically refer to putting feelings into words or putting hopes into people. The verb *iš-duoti* ('iš-give'), in addition to distributing items to people, develops a sense of betraying someone, first of all, by speaking. The second sense has kept the sense of giving, but the element of distribution is lost. Rather, it is concerned with the perception of a human body as a container. Someone speaking may be perceived as spilling some content out of a container.

Metaphorical senses in many cases are not devoid of evaluation. Three of four *iš*-derivatives have negatively-marked senses: *iš-duoti* ('iš-give' > betray), *iš-dėti* ('iš-put' > 'tell something straightforward and not very pleasant to the interlocutor'), *iš-gauti* ('iš-get' > 'to get something by force, such as promise'). *Į*- also develops some evaluative senses, such as *į-duoti* ('į-give' > 'to turn someone in'), but they are not systematic and not exclusively linked to the semantics of the prefix.

The present investigation has shown that the selected Lithuanian derivatives are not just sums of the base verb and the prefix. Their semantics in intricate ways carries the meaning of the prefix and that of the base verb; many senses tend to develop from the basic sense of the derivative. As a result, each prefixed verb has its own set of senses. Understanding their nature and links may give a clue to their creative, less conventional, usage in more abstract texts. It may also be helpful to non-native speakers of Lithuanian often struggling with multiple senses of prefixes and prefixed verbs.

The present investigation has been limited to two prefixes and four basic verbs. Further research could focus on more verbs with the aim to disclose a full semantic scope of the two prefixes. Apparently, the semantic network of prefixal polysemy is very language-specific; if cross-linguistic similarities exist, they could be uncovered by further expanding this research.

## Aknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Emma Geniušienė for reading the first draft of the paper and giving valuable suggestions for its improvement. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their remarks, which have contributed to the final quality of the paper. However, any errors that remain are my own.

## References

- Ambrazas, V., E. Geniušienė, A. Girdenis, N. Sližienė, D. Tekorienė, A. Valeckienė, E. Valiulytė. 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Ambrazas, V., K. Garšva, A. Girdenis, E. Jakaitienė, P. Kniūkšta, S. Krinickaitė, V. Labutis, A. Laigonaitė, E. Oginskienė, J. Pikčilingis, A. Ružė, N. Sližienė, K. Ulvydas, V. Urbutis, A. Valeckienė, E. Valiulytė. 1994. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- Basilio, M. 2006. Metaphor and metonymy in word formation. *D.E.L.T.A 22: Especial*: 67–80.
- Balázs, B. 2013. Semantic aspects of English prefixation – a cognitive linguistic account. *Határsávok 2011-2012*. 81–88.
- Benczes, R. 2010. Setting limits on creativity in the production and use of metaphorical and metonymic compounds. In A. Onysko, S. Michel (eds) *Cognitive Perspectives on Word Formation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 219–242.
- Brdar, M., R. Brdar-Szabó. 2013. Some reflections on metonymy and word-formation. *Exploration in English Language and Linguistics* 1.1: 40–62.



In: Diego Ardoino and Adriano Cerri (eds). 2021. *Intersezioni baltistiche. Studi e saggi*. (Baltica Pisana Series). Novi Ligure: Joker. 55–83.

CCL—*Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian*. Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania.  
<http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/index.jsp>

DLKŽ—Keinys, S. (ed.) 2012. *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 7<sup>th</sup> revised edition. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. [www.lkiis.lki.lt](http://www.lkiis.lki.lt)

Evans, V., M. Green 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Endresen, A., L. A. Janda, J. Kuznetsova, O. Lyashevskaya, A. Makarova, T. Nessel, S. Sokolova. 2012. Russian “purely aspectual” prefixes: not so empty after all? *Scandoslavica* 58 (2): 231–291.

Geeraerts, D. 2001. A hundred years of lexical semantics. *Versus: Quaderni di Studii Semiotici* 88/89: 63–87.

Grady, J. 1998. The “Conduit Metaphor” Revisited: a Reassessment of Metaphors for Communication. In J.-P. Koenig (ed.) *Discourse and Cognition. Bridging the Gap*. Stanford: CSLI. 205–218.

Hanks, P. 2006. Metaphoricity is gradable. In A. Stefanowitsch, S. Gries (eds) *Corpus-based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 17–35.

Jackson, H., E. Zé Amvela. 2007. *Words, Meaning, and Vocabulary. An Introduction to Modern English Lexicology*. London: Continuum.

Jakaitienė, E. 2010. *Leksikologija*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

In: Diego Ardoino and Adriano Cerri (eds). 2021. *Intersezioni baltistiche. Studi e saggi*. (Baltica Pisana Series). Novi Ligure: Joker. 55–83.

Janda, L. 2011. Metonymy in word formation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 22-2: 359–392.

Janda, L. 2014. Metonymy and word formation revisited. *Cognitive Linguistics* 25(2): 341–349.

Janda, L., O. Lyashevskaya 2012. Semantic profiles of five Russian prefixes: *po-*, *s-*, *za-*, *na-*, *pro-\**. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 21 (2): 211–258.

Johnson, M. 2007. *The Meaning of the Body. Aesthetics of Human Understanding*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Katamba, F. 1993. *Morphology*. Macmillan: London.

Kövecses, Z. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., M. Johnson. 1980/2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R. W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

In: Diego Ardoino and Adriano Cerri (eds). 2021. *Intersezioni baltistiche. Studi e saggi*. (Baltica Pisana Series). Novi Ligure: Joker. 55–83.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. 2007. Polysemy, prototypes, and radial categories. In D. Geeraerts, H. Cuyckens (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 139–169.

LKŽ—Naktinienė, G., J. Paulauskas, R. Petrokienė, V. Vitkauskas, J. Zabarskaitė (eds). 2008. *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. Vols 1–20. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. [www.lkz.lt](http://www.lkz.lt)

Matlock, T. 2004. The conceptual motivation of fictive motion. In G. Radden, K.-U. Panther (eds) *Studies in Linguistic Motivation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 221–248.

Murphy, L. 2010. *Lexical Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Panther, K.-U. 2013. Motivation in language. In S. Kreidler (ed.) *Cognition and Motivation: Forging an Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 407–432.

Paulauskienė, A. 1994. *Lietuvių kalbos morfologija*. Paskaitos lituanistams. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Pawelec, A. 2009. *Prepositional Network Models. A Hermeneutical Case Study*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Plag, I. 2003. *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raven, Y., C. Leacock. 2000. Polysemy: an overview. In Y. Raven, C. Leacock (eds) *Polysemy. Theoretical and Computational Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1–29.

Shibuya, Y. 2007. [Review] Brigitte Nerlich, Zazie Todd, Vimala Herman, and David D. Clarke (eds) *Polysemy: Flexible Patterns of Meaning in Mind and Language*. (Trends in

In: Diego Ardoino and Adriano Cerri (eds). 2021. *Intersezioni baltistiche. Studi e saggi.* (Baltica Pisana Series). Novi Ligure: Joker. 55–83.

Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 142.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. *Cognitive Linguistics* 18–4: 559–570.

Tabakowska, E. 2003. Space and time in Polish: the preposition *za* and the verbal prefix *za-*'. In H. Cuyckens, Th. Berg, R. Dirven, K.-U. Panther (eds) *Motivation in Language. Studies in Honor of Günter Radden*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 153–177.

Tabakowska, E. 2010. The story of ZA: in defense of the radial category. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 5: 65–77.

Tuggy, D. 2005. Cognitive approach to word building. In P. Štekauer, R. Lieber (eds) *Handbook of Word-Formation*. Dordrecht: Springer. 233–265.

Ungerer, F. 2010. Word formation. In D. Geeraerts, H. Cuyckens (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 650–675.

Urbonaitė, J., I. Šeškauskienė, J. Cibulskienė. 2019. Metaphor identification in Lithuanian. In S. Nacey, A. Gesina Dorst, T. Krennmayr, W. G. Reijnierse (eds) *Metaphor Identification in Multiple Languages. MIPVU around the world*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 159–181.

Valeckienė, Adelė. 1998. *Funkcinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.