This study analyzes periphrastic permissive and factitive causative constructions in a corpus of 16th and 17th century Old Lithuanian texts. In contrast to modern use, permissive constructions with duoti play a central role in many texts, while those with leisti are only more frequent in some sources and appear to have spread from the east to the west. Due to the influence of bifunctional German lassen constructions, duoti is used not only in permissive constructions, but also in factitive constructions, especially in Prussian Lithuanian. The permittees in duoti and leisti constructions are usually marked as dative, although the accusative is also attested due to the influence of German lassen + acc constructions; however, in the case of leisti, the accusative may sometimes be interpreted as archaic, marking the direct object of the source construction leisti ‘release’ + acc. In addition to permissive constructions with duoti and leisti, this paper also discusses rare cases of the archaic verb (pa-)velti and the borrowed Slavic permissives pa-velyti and pa-/pri-zvalyti. The majority of reflexive permissive constructions are based on duoti and contain a reflexive affixal marker on the matrix predicate, but constructions with an additional marker on the subordinate infinitive are also well-attested. In general, factitive constructions are less frequent than permissive ones and, just as in Modern Lithuanian, the most common factitive is (pri-)versti, but borrowed Slavic (pri-)slyti is also attested in some sources.
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1. Introduction

Periphrastic causative constructions (PCCs) use free verbal forms to express causative relations and can be subdivided into two types: permissive
The most frequent permissive PCCs in Modern Lithuanian are based on the verb *leisti*, while the factitive ones usually employ *versti*, as illustrated in (1a) and (1b), respectively. PCCs with other predicates, such as *spausti*, *spiriti* ‘compel’ and *duoti* ‘allow’, are quite rare (Pakerys 2016, 434–446). The case marking of the affected participant, termed “permittee” for permissive PCCs and “causee” for factitive PCCs, has a clear-cut distribution: the dative is used for permissive PCCs while the accusative is used for factitive constructions.

(1) a. Modern Lithuanian

```
Dabar gali, Valdove, [...] leisti savo
tarnui ramiai įskeliauti
‘Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace [...]’ (KJV)
```

(Biblija1999 Luke 2:29)

b. Modern Lithuanian

```
Ar=gi galite versti pasninkauti
vestuvų svečius [...]?
‘Can ye make the children of the bridechamber fast?’ (KJV)
```

(Biblija1999 Luke 5:34)

When compared to modern PCCs, 16th and 17th century sources show a number of differences, especially in the realm of permissive causation. Before proceeding to the analysis, it should be noted that the texts of this period are traditionally subdivided into three main groups according to their linguistic features and the area in which they were written, translated, published, and used (Zinkevičius 1996, 227–255; Dini 2014, 407–409):

1) the Prussian variety, which was developed in Prussia and is mostly based on western High Lithuanian dialects spoken there,
2) the central variety, based on the western High Lithuanian dialects of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL), and
3) the eastern variety, based on the eastern High Lithuanian dialects of the GDL.
Due to time restrictions, this study covers only a selection of sources from the three varieties, which are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. 16th–17th c. Lithuanian authors and sources included in this study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16th c.</th>
<th>17th c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prussian variety</strong></td>
<td><strong>Central variety</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mažvydas (all texts, Mž1547-1570)</td>
<td>Daukša (Postilla, DP1599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilentas (all texts, VlnE/EE1579)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretkūnas (translation of the Bible, only the four Gospels were used for data collection, BNT1580)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17th c.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sapuhn and Schultz (grammar of Lithuanian in Latin, SSchG1673)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réza (edition of Psalms, RPs1625)</td>
<td>Suma evangelių, part of Knyga nobažnystės (KNSE1653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein (grammar of Lithuanian in Latin and German, KIG1653, KIC1654)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappuhn and Schultz (grammar of Lithuanian in Latin, SSchG1673)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *For the sake of brevity, henceforth all of these grammars are collectively referred to as “Prussian grammars of 17th c.” and all of these dictionaries collectively as “Prussian dictionaries of 17th c.”.*

The present analysis is further divided into two parts according to the basic semantic type of the given PCCs: permissive (‘allow, let’) and factitive (‘make, have V-ed’). Section 2 covers permissive constructions, which are based on the verbs *duoti* (2.1), *(per-/)pri-*)*leisti* (2.2), and *(pa-)velti, pa-veltyi, pa-/)pri-zvalyti* (2.3), while Section 3 is devoted to factitive constructions, based on the verbs *(pri-)versti* and *(pri-)slyti*. Cases of primarily permissive constructions with *duoti* and *leisti* used as factitives are also discussed in
Sections 2.1 and 2.2. The main points of the study are summarized in the conclusion in Section 4.

2. Permissive PCCs

2.1. *duoti*

Permissive PCCs in Modern Lithuanian are usually based on the verb *leisti*, while constructions with *duoti* are rather rare (Pakerys 2016, 443–445). In many Old Lithuanian texts, the situation is just the opposite: with the exception of DP1599 and SPS1629-44, PCCs with *duoti* are more frequent than those with *leisti* (see Table 2 below and Table 6 at the end of Section 2.2). With respect to geographical distribution, *duoti* is always more frequent in the Prussian texts included in this study, while *leisti* is more common in the GDL.\(^2\) The PCC with *duoti* is possibly of a common Baltic origin (Pakerys 2017a, 119–120; Pakerys 2018, 114) and the innovation of employing *leisti*

\(^2\) Here, I also counted the PCCs with verbs of cognition and perception, which can sometimes be interpreted as factitive (see notes below).

Table 2. PCCs with *duoti*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mž1547-70</th>
<th>VlnE/EE1579</th>
<th>BNT1580</th>
<th>RPš1625</th>
<th>Prussian grammars (17(^{th}) c.)</th>
<th>Prussian dictionaries (17(^{th}) c.)</th>
<th>DP1599</th>
<th>KNSE1653</th>
<th>SPS1629-44</th>
<th>SD1677</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factitive (cognition/perception)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factitive (except for cognition/perception)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in PCCs appears to have spread from the east to the west in Lithuania: PCCs with *leisti* are more than twice as frequent as those with *duoti* in SPS1629-44 (eastern variety; 22 cases of PCCs with *(per-)*leisti vs. 10 cases with *duoti*), slightly more frequent in DP1599 (central variety; 47 *(per-/pri-)*leisti vs. 38 *duoti*), yet never more frequent in the Prussian Lithuanian texts used in this study. The exception to these tendencies is KNSE1653 (central variety) where *duoti* constructions still significantly surpass those with *leisti* (21:4). The Prussian Lithuanian dictionaries also seem to indicate the spread of *leisti* in the 17th century because these PCCs had to be salient enough to merit their inclusion in the dictionaries (PCCs with *duoti* are not even mentioned in Lex and C); however, more 17th century texts from Prussia need to be analyzed to provide a more representative view.

A typical use of the permissive PCC with *duoti* where the permittee is marked as dative is illustrated in (2a); the corresponding passage in possible Latin and German sources of the translation is in (2b) and (2c), respectively.

(2) a. Old Lithuanian

\[Ne \quad dūs \quad paľfišti \quad koije \quad tawa\]

\[\text{NEG} \quad \text{let:FUT.3} \quad \text{slip:INF} \quad \text{leg:DAT.SG} \quad \text{poss.2SG}\]

‘He will not suffer thy foot to be moved’ (KJV)

(Mž1547-70 531,9 Psalms 121:3)

b. Latin

\[\text{Non det in commotionem pedem tuum}\]

(Michelini 2000, 593)

c. German

\[\text{Er wird deinen fuss nicht gleitten lassen}\]

(Michelini 2000, 593)

The dative of the permittee is inherited from the source construction *duoti* ‘give’, where it marks the recipient, but in the PCCs in Prussian Lithuanian sources, the accusative is also sometimes found, as illustrated in (3a); quantitative data are discussed below. Apparently, this marking is influenced by German PCCs with *lassen* + *acc*, and the use of the accusative instead of the expected dative is also seen in Old Prussian PCCs with *dāt* (= Lithuanian *duoti*) (Pakerys 2017a, 122).
(3) a. Old Lithuanian

ir  
dūkite  
gī  
eiti³

and  
let:IMP.2PL  
3SG.ACC.M  
go:INF

‘and let him go’ (KJV)

(BNT1580 John 11:44)

b. German

und lasset ihn gehen

(Luther1545 John 11:44)

In addition to having a permissive function, some PCCs with *duoti* can be interpreted as factitive. For instance, factitive readings are possible when permissive PCCs are used with verbs of cognition and perception (see von Waldenfels 2012, 103–106, 150–152, 218–221 for Slavic data). A factitive interpretation is most evident when PCCs include the predicates *žinoti* ‘know’ or *pažinti* ‘get to know’ (i.e. ‘let know/get to know’ = ‘inform’), or verbs of visual perception, such as *išvysti* ‘see’ (i.e. ‘let see’ = ‘show’), as in (4a).

(4) a. Old Lithuanian

*Kuri*  
*Pon*  
*dawei*  
*man*  
*ifchwifti* / 

which:ACC.SG.M  
lord:VOC.SG  
let:PST.2SG  
1SG.DAT  
see:INF

*Ir*  
*gī*  
*pāšinti* […]

and  
3SG.ACC.M  
get.to.know:INF

‘Which you, Lord, let me see (= showed me) and let me get to know him⁴ (= made known to me) [...]’

(Mž1547–70 226,3–5)

b. German

*Den du mich Herr hast sehen lon* / und *macht bekand* […]

(Michelinin 2000, 288)

Such constructions are found in all varieties of Lithuanian texts included in this study, but another type of factitive PCC with *duoti*, which uses infinitival complements of various semantic classes (i.e. not restricted to cognition and perception), is found mostly in Prussian Lithuanian and is illustrated in (5a) and (5c).

---

³ The whole construction is corrected to IMP.3 *tewaiksčowej* ‘let him walk’ in the manuscript.

⁴ = Jesus Christ.
The use of originally permissive PCCs as factitives can be explained by the influence of bifunctional (permissive/factitive) German lassen construction, which is why factitive duoti is usually found in Prussian Lithuanian where German played an important role (cf. Slavic curative PCCs based on ‘give’ in von Waldenfels 2015, 116–118). The causee is frequently marked as accusative instead of the expected dative, as in (5a) and (5c), which also reflects the German influence (lassen + ACC). It is interesting to note that in (5d), which is a possible source of the translation of (5c), the lassen construction is absent and the accusative is used independently from the source; this demonstrates that the use of the accusative in PCCs with duoti was in some cases independent from the sources of the translation. A dative causee is also found in factitive duoti constructions, but is less frequent (see Table 3 below). The data of RPs1625 are especially telling because the factitive use of duoti in this source is rather frequent and it seems that the factitive function is

---

5 Urbas (1996, 399) interprets this form as instrumental, but the instrumental of ugnis in Mž1547–1570 is ugn-imi (see ibid.; cf. also the interpretation of siera as accusative on p. 333). The agreeing adjective didi ‘great’ (ACC.SG.M) further confirms that ugni is accusative (the instrumental is didzu; see ibid., p. 94).

6 I acknowledge that differentiating permissive and factitive functions is not always easy and that a detailed study focusing solely on RPs1625 could change some of my current interpretations.
tied to the accusative. This can be explained by a tendency to interpret the permittees as having more control over the action than the causees and thus marking them as dative (see Givón 2001, 66–68 on the link between dative and non-implicative manipulation).

Table 3. Dative and accusative of permittee/causee in PCCs with duoti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Permissive</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mž1547-70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VlnE/EE1579</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNT1580</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPs1625*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total**</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Four cases of ambiguous 1sg.dat/acc clitic mi found in permissive PCCs are not included in the counts.
** Only in some PCCs are permittees/causees explicitly indicated, which accounts for lower totals in Table 2 than in Table 1.

In one case only, a factitive (curative) use of the PCC with duoti is found in the GDL, where Sirvydas (eastern variety) apparently mimics the factitive function of Polish dać ‘give; let; make; have V-ed’ (von Waldenfels 2012, 144–146, 271–272). In (6a) Sirvydas describes the beheading of John the Baptist as ordered by Herodes: a corresponding passage is found in BNT1580 (Prussian variety) where the initial factitive (curative) PCC dawe ... nukirſti ‘had ... beheaded’ is corrected to the morphological causative nukirſdina, as shown in (6c). It is interesting to note that Bretkūnas uses the factitive PCC with duoti independently from the German source of the translation, which simply reads enthauptete Johannes ‘beheaded John’, not ließ Johannes.

---

7 Only sources where DAT/ACC variation occurs are included. Factitive PCCs with predicates of cognition and perception are excluded.

8 In Klein’s grammar of Lithuanian, one morphological causative (rašydiinti ‘have written’) is also paraphrased by a PCC with duoti and is translated using a German PCC with lassen (while other non-curative causatives in that passage are notably translated by employing Latin paraphrases only): rafy-din-u [write-CAUS-PRS.1SG] / id eft, dúmi rafyti [let:PRS.1SG write:INF] / ich laffe schreiben (KIG1653 83r, 23–24).
enthaupten ‘had John beheaded’. This indicates that factitive PCCs with duoti were gaining some productivity in Prussian Lithuanian and could be used without the stimulus of the corresponding German lassen construction.

(6) a. Old Lithuanian
   \textit{imete} \text{ii ápkálinen /} \textit{ir potam dáfwe}
   [\text{throw.in:pst.3 3sg.acc.m prison:ill.sg and then let:pst.3}]
   \textit{nukirft}
   [\text{behead:inf}]
   ‘[Herodes] threw him into prison and then had him beheaded’
   (SPS1644 142,3-4)

b. Middle Polish
   \textit{wzi\acute{a}ł go do wieźienia, y potym \d{a}ł ś\piacić}
   (SPS1644 142,7-8)

c. Old Lithuanian
   \textit{ir dáfwe Ioaną nukirfti apkalime}
   [\text{and let:pst.3 John:acc.sg behead:inf prison:loc.sg}]
   (corrected to: [... \textit{nukirf-din-a} [...])
   \text{behead-caus-pst.3}
   ‘And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison’ (KJV)
   (BNT1580 Matthew 14:10)

d. German
   \textit{und enthauptete Johannes im Gefängnis}
   (Luther1545 Matthew 14:10)

Turning now to reflexive (middle) variants of PCCs with duoti, there are three types of reflexive (\textit{rfl}) marker affixations: (1) \textit{rfl} appears only on the matrix verb, (2) \textit{rfl} appears on both the matrix verb and the embedded infinitive, and (3) \textit{rfl} appears only on the embedded infinitive.

For Type 1, the \textit{rfl} marker could be interpreted as a historical clitic that marks the direct object of the following transitive infinitive (taking second position in the structure $V_{\text{FIN}}=\text{rfl} V_{\text{INF}}$) and the matrix verb is simply its phonological host (cf. \\textit{Paker}ys 2016, 440–441). Alternatively, the reflexive permissive PCCs in question could have also developed out of anticausative

---

9 In the case of SPS, the text was actually translated from Lithuanian into Polish, but the interference of Polish is certainly apparent in the language of Sirvydas.
structures like *duoti-s* ‘give in, submit oneself (to somebody/something)’, which were later complemented by infinitives, such as ‘submit oneself, not resist (to action)’; unfortunately, I am currently unable to discuss this option based on Old Lithuanian data (see some notes on Old Latvian in Pakerys forthcoming). Whatever the exact origin of the construction in question, the reflexive marker can be interpreted as referring to the direct object of the infinitive complement (Holvoet 2016, 16). Former *rfl* clitics typically do not have the proper reflexive function in Old Lithuanian (in such contexts as ‘see oneself’) and have to be treated as middle markers; the proper reflexive function is instead usually expressed by orthotonic reflexive pronominal forms. As a result, in some PCCs with *duoti*, orthotonic reflexive pronouns appear rather than the affixal reflexive markers of Type 1 constructions, cf. (7a) and (7c). (For a comparison between Old and Modern Lithuanian, see Holvoet 2016, 19–20.) For example, in VlnEE1579, out of four PCCs with *duoti*, only one has the affixal *rfl* marker, while three contain orthotonic reflexive pronouns, and in BNT1580 there are four affixal markers and one orthotonic pronoun, whereas DP1599 only contains constructions with affixal *rfl* markers.

(7) a. Old Lithuanian

```
ir [Jeſus] dawe-s krikſchtit nůg Iano
and Jesus:NOM let:PST3-RFL baptize:INF from John:GEN
```

(corrected to:

```
ap-fi-krikſchtiti-din-a Iano
PFX-RFL-baptize-CAUS-PST.3 John:GEN
```

‘and [Jesus] was baptized of John’ (KJV)

(BNT1580 Mark 1:9)

b. German

```
und ließ sich taufen von Johannes
```

(Luther1545 Mark 1:9)

c. Old Lithuanian

```
Ir [Saul] kelefi / dawe fawe
and Saul raise:PST.3-RFL let:PST.3 RFL.ACC
apchrikſchtiti
baptize:INF
```

‘and [Saul] arose, and was baptized’ (KJV)

(VlnEE1579 144,1-2 Acts 9:18)

10 It is unclear if the preposition *nůg* is intentionally omitted in the correction.
c. German

\[\text{und stund auf, ließ sich taufen}\]  
(Luther1545 Acts 9:18)

d. Latin

\[\text{et surgens baptizatus est}\]  
(Vulgata Clementina Acts 9:18)

Type 1 is found in 69 PCCs with \textit{duoti}, while Type 2, in which affixal markers are found on both the matrix predicate and the subordinate infinitive as seen in (8), is quite rare (attested in eleven cases). Holvoet (2016) explains that the matrix verb gets the \textit{rfl} marker because it can be interpreted as being controlled by the subject, thus resulting in the marker becoming one lexical unit with the matrix verb, while the subordinate infinitive assigns the semantic role of patient to that marker. Out of all sources included in the present study, KNSE1653 stands out by having five double affixal markers out of six total reflexive PCCs with \textit{duoti} (in contrast to five examples out of 59 in DP1599 and one out of six in SPS1629-44). It should be noted that the double affixal \textit{rfl} marker is the most frequent type in 17\textsuperscript{th} century Latvian (see Paker ys forthc.), but was generally rare in Old Lithuanian; in addition, this same kind of doubling in permissive PCCs is also sometimes found in East Slavic languages (Holvoet 2016, 39–40).

(8) a. Old Lithuanian

\[ir\text{ dāwe-s paāugštinti-s anī križeus}\]  
and let:pst.3-rfl raise:inf-rfl on cross:gen.sg  
‘and (Jesus Christ) allowed himself to be raised on the cross’  
(DP1599 241,21)

b. Middle Polish

\[y\text{ dal fie powyżbyć ná kryźyu}\]  
(WP1590 249,37)

Type 3, in which the \textit{rfl} marker is affixed only to the subordinate infinitive, is even rarer and was found two times in DP1599, one of which is in (9), and three times in KNSE1653. (Note that these numbers are not included in Table 4, which only includes cases of \textit{rfl} affixation to the matrix predicate \textit{duoti}.)
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(9) a. Old Lithuanian

\[\text{[\ldots] Wiêßpatis Christu} \text{ appia[}\text{u}]\text{ftiti-š dáwe}\]

\text{Lord:nom.sg Christ:nom circumcise:inf-rfl let: pst.3}

‘Lord Christ allowed himself to be circumcised’

(DP1599 54,43)

b. Middle Polish

\[\text{[\ldots] fie Pan Chryftus obrzeźać dopuścili}\]

(WP1590 54,17)

All reflexive PCCs with duoti (and also with leisti, to be discussed in Section 2.2) found in the sources of this study were complemented by infinitive clauses; no instances of present passive participle complements, such as Modern Lithuanian ne-si-duoda išjuokiamas neg-rfl-let-prs.3 mock-prs.act.ptcp.nom.sg.m ‘(God) does not allow himself to be mocked’ = ‘God is not mocked’ (Biblija1999 Galatians 6:7), were found. In Pakevys (2016, 440), I suggested that permissive PCCs with duoti-s and leisti-s complemented by participles could be explained as having arisen from accusativus cum participio constructions, but Holvoet (2016, 31–33) noted that permissive PCCs with leisti-s and participles are not found in the Old Lithuanian sources he consulted and that this type of complementation was most likely a later development. Having reviewed the sources included in the present study, I can only confirm that participial complementation is not attested with either reflexive duoti-s or leisti-s and this type of complementation should be viewed as an innovation that did not develop out of accusativus cum participio constructions.

With respect to function, reflexive constructions with duoti in the majority of cases are permissive, as in (8a) or (9a), but sometimes factitive uses are found, as in the curative situation in (7a), in which the PCC was corrected to a morphological causative in the manuscript. The factitive use in Prussian Lithuanian is evidently copied from the German lassen constructions or reflects rare Polish factitive PCCs with dać in the case of texts from the GDL, such as düfti-s laidót let:prs.3-rfl bury:inf ‘have themselves buried’ DP1599 539,44 (= fie dáią chowác WP1590 586,1). The occasional marking of a causee by a PP with nuog ‘from’, as illustrated in (7a), is found only in Prussian Lithuanian (two times in BNT1580) and can be interpreted as reflecting the influence of the German construction using PP with von. Prepositional
marking in corresponding PCCs is also found in Old Latvian (see Pakerys (2017, 90–91) and Pakerys (forthc.); see also von Waldenfels (2012, 134, 138–140, 187, 196, 260, 271) for the Slavic data). Reflexive PCCs, including predicates of cognition and perception, can also be interpreted as factitive, as in (10a) where the PCC ‘allowed himself to be seen’ is crossed out in favor of ‘appear’:

\[(10)\]

a. Old Lithuanian

\[Potam \quad wel \quad pafsirode \quad Jefus\]  
\[\text{after that again appeared: PST.3 Jesus: NOM}\]

\[dawe-s \quad ifchwifti\]  
\[\text{let: PST.3-RFL see: INF}\]

‘After these things Jesus shewed himself again’ (KJV)  
\[(BNT1580 \text{ John 21:1})\]

b. German

\[Danach \text{ offenbarte sich } \text{ Jesus abermal}\]  
\[(Luther1545 \text{ John 21:1})\]

As seen in Table 4, reflexive PCCs with \textit{duoti} are especially frequent in DP1599 but are generally uncommon in the Prussian sources. Perhaps this can be explained by the high productivity of reflexive PCCs with \textit{dac} in Polish, as noted by von Waldenfels (2012, 120–121). Polish played an important role in the GDL and in most cases, it was the language of the sources of translation, so the productivity of reflexive PCCs with \textit{duoti} in texts such as DP1599 may reflect Polish influence; however, further studies are needed to explain why a similar impact is not seen in, for example, KNSE1653, which was also translated from Polish. The impact of translation sources recalls the problem of the development of reflexive permissive constructions. With the influence of translation sources in mind, a possible scenario is that the translators were at least sometimes tempted to render PCCs like \textit{prs.3sg Polish daje się V\text{\textsubscript{TRANS}}} and German \textit{lässt sich V\text{\textsubscript{TRANS}}} as Lithuanian \textit{duosti-si (let:PRS.3-RFL) V\text{\textsubscript{TRANS}}}, similarly to many cases when they rendered sequences of Polish/German \textit{V\text{\textsubscript{TRANS}} + sie/sich} as Lithuanian \textit{V\text{\textsubscript{TRANS}}-si} with the affixal reflexive marker. So on the one hand, permissive reflexive PCCs could be archaic, but on the other hand, they may reflect specific renderings of the constructions found in the translation sources. Further study is needed to determine how reflexive permissive constructions were used in archaic folklore material.
where the influence of other languages like Polish or German was minimal or absent altogether.

Table 4. **PCCs with reflexive duoti-s**\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Mž1547-70</th>
<th>VinE/EE1579</th>
<th>BNT1580</th>
<th>RPs1625</th>
<th>Prussian grammars (17(^{\text{th}}) c.)</th>
<th>Prussian dictionaries (17(^{\text{th}}) c.)</th>
<th>DP1599</th>
<th>KNSE1653</th>
<th>SPS1629-44</th>
<th>SD1677</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factitive (cognition/perception)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factitive (except for cognition/perception)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. *(per-/pri-*)leisti*

As mentioned previously, permissive PCCs with *leisti* are rare in Prussian Lithuanian; more examples are found in sources from the GDL, notably with prefixed *per-leisti* and *pri-leisti*, which are no longer used in PCCs in Modern Lithuanian (see Table 6 at the end of this section). The permissive function developed out of the primary meaning ‘release, let go’ (as in *leisti vandenį* release:*INF* water:*ACC.SG* ‘release water’) combined with the initially optional infinitive of purpose, which was later reinterpreted as a complement (*leisti vandenį bėgti* release:*INF* water:*ACC.SG* run:*INF* ‘(lit.) release water to flow’ >

\(^{11}\) This table includes cases of Type 1 (the *rfl* affix appears only on the matrix predicate) and Type 2 (the *rfl* affix appears on both the matrix predicate and subordinate infinitive).
‘let the water flow’; see Pakerys (2018, 115–117) for more details and a Baltic context). The data are limited, but several examples of permissive non-prefix ed *leisti* in Prussian Lithuanian show a clear link to the primary meaning ‘let go’ and are complemented by the predicate *eiti* ‘go’ (three times out of three in Mž1547–70, two out of two in VlnE/EE1579, and three out of four in BNT1580).12 One such example is in (11a).

(11) a. Old Lithuanian

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Leifket} & \text{Bernelus} & \text{manęspi} & \text{eiti} \\
\text{let:IMP.2PL} & \text{child:ACC.PL} & \text{1SG.ALL} & \text{go:INF}
\end{array}
\]

‘Let the children come to me’

(Mž1547-70 96,14 Mark 10:14)

b. German

*Last die Kindlein zu Mir komen*

(Michelini 2000, 158)

It is worth noting that the permittee in all of these cases of *leisti* + *eiti* ‘let go’ (eight in total) is marked as accusative, which is possibly inherited from the source construction, but was subsequently replaced by the dative, which is used with very rare exceptions in Modern Lithuanian and was already frequent in Old Lithuanian, especially with the prefixed *per-leisti* (see Table 5 below; see more notes in Pakerys 2018, 117–120). As the majority of examples with *leisti* + ACC come from Prussia, they may have been influenced by German *lassen* + ACC constructions, similar to the case of *duoti* ‘allow’ mentioned previously. Nonetheless, two examples are found in the GDL, illustrated in (12), which cannot be influenced by the translation source, where the dative is found.13 In Modern Lithuanian PCCs with *eiti* ‘go’ also sometimes have an accusative permittee. Thus, I conclude that at least some of the examples from Prussia of *leisti* + an accusative permittee (especially when complemented by *eiti* ‘go’) may be original (archaic) and not necessarily influenced by German *lassen* + ACC constructions.

---

12 *leisti* + *eiti* is also found once in RPs1625 66,12, but the context is apparently factitive, see (13).
13 The genitive of a negation, in (12b), corresponds to the accusative in a non-negated clause.
(12) a. Old Lithuanian

\[\text{laykit} \quad \text{tuos} \quad \text{nueyi} \quad \text{idánt} \]

let:IMP.2pl \quad DEM.ACC.PL.M \quad go:INF \quad so.that

\[\text{iþfipilditu} \quad \text{žodžia} \quad […] \]

be.fulfilled:IRR.3 \quad word:NOM.PL

‘let these go so that the [following] words would be fulfilled […]’

(KNSE1653 271,4-5; cf. John 18:8-9)

b. Old Lithuanian

\[\text{ne} \quad \text{priláidžia} \quad \text{io} \quad \text{niékam’} \]

NEG \quad allow:PRS.3 \quad 3SG.GEN.M \quad nobody:DAT.SG

géro \quad darii

good:GEN.SG \quad do:INF

‘(It) does not let him do good for anyone’

(DP1599 114,41)

c. Middle Polish

\[\text{nie dopuści } \text{mu nikomu dobrze cżyńić} \]

(WP1590 116,1–2)

Table 5. **Permittee marking in PCCs with leisti, per-leisti, and pri-leisti**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>leisti + ACC</th>
<th>leisti + DAT</th>
<th>per-leisti + ACC</th>
<th>per-leisti + DAT</th>
<th>pri-leisti + ACC</th>
<th>pri-leisti + DAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MN147-70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VnE/EE1579</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNT1580</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPs1625</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussian grammars (17th c.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussian dictionaries (17th c.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP1599</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNSE1653</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS1629-44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD1677</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One case when the permittee is marked by the morphologically ambiguous 1SG.DAT/ACC clitic \(m(i)\) is excluded from the count here.
With respect to function, PCCs with *leisti*, *per-leisti*, or *pri-leisti* are permissive, save one possible exception found in RPs1625, shown in (13), which may be factitive (cf. the KJV translation). The use of *leisti* in this case, though, is most likely due to the interference of the bifunctional German *lassen* construction, as discussed in Section 2.1 with regard to PCCs with *duoti*.

(13) a. Old Lithuanian
    
    *Tu leidai Sžmones eiti per mufu Gâlwas*
    
    2SG.NOM let:PST.2SG people:ACC.PL go:INF over our head:ACC.PL
    
    ‘Thou hast caused men to ride over our heads’ (KJV)
    
    (RPs1625 66:12)

    b. German
    
    *du hast Menschen lassen über unser Haupt fahren*
    
    (Luther1545 Psalms 66:12)

    PCCs with *leisti* containing the affixal reflexive marker are very rare and are only found in the GDL: KNSE1653 contains one example with *leisti*-s, SPS1629–44 has one example with *per-leisti*-s, and DP1599 contains three examples with *pri-leisti*-s. This suggests that such constructions are not archaic, but gained popularity gradually alongside an increasing use of permissive *leisti*. On the one hand, these constructions could have developed independently, but on the other hand, they could have also been modeled after the permissive reflexive *duoti*-s and patterns found in Polish PCCs (as well as perhaps patterns in German PCCs at a later period in Prussia) and rendered as *permissive verb + reflexive affix + transitive verb*, as mentioned in Section 2.1 with regard to reflexive PCCs with *duoti* (cf. (14a) where Lithuanian *prilaisi*-s ... *prigaut* ‘will allow himself to be tricked’ corresponds to Polish *sie dopuści ... oszukać* in (14b)). In some cases, an orthotonic reflexive pronoun can be used in PCCs with *per-leisti*, as in (14c). (Note that *per-leisti* is used here alongside a PCC with *duoti*-s and the affixal reflexive marker, which is doubled on the subordinate infinitive.)

(14) a. Old Lithuanian
    
    *žmógus [...] priláif-is welinui prigáut'*
    
    man:NOM.SG allow:FUT.3-RFL devil:DAT.SG trick:INF
    
    ‘(lit.) a man [...] will allow himself to be tricked by the devil’
    
    (DP1599 383,32-33)
b. Middle Polish

człowiek [...] *pie dopuścić czártoi ożukáć* (WP1590 397,47-48)

c. Old Lithuanian

Nes ne perleyde fawis iiemus gaudit,
because NEG allow:pst.3 rfl:gen 3pl.dat.m catch:inf

ney dawe-s nu-fi-twerti

nor let:pst.3-rfl pfx-rfl-grab:inf

‘He did not allow them to catch him nor did he allow himself to be grabbed’ (SPS1629 377,12-14)

d. Middle Polish

Bo *śie im niedopuśćil imač ani śie dal włapić* (SPS1629 377,11-13)

Type 1 of the reflexive PCCs, in which the affixal rfl marker is added to the matrix verb, is found twice: once in DP1599 with pri-leisti, illustrated in (14a), and once in SPS1644 135,11-12 with per-leisti. Type 2, with the affixal rfl markers occurring both on the matrix verb and on the subordinated infinitive, was found three times (twice in DP1599, as in (15a), and once in KNSE1653). In one case, (15c), the rfl marker is affixed to the subordinate infinitive, notably ten lines above example (15a), and the verbs share the same root riš- ‘tie’ (*furįšdinti-ś prilaidai-ś* vs. *furįšti-ś prilaido*). This shows that very similar phrases could be rendered by varying the reflexive construction. Note also that in (15a), the PCC with duoti has the reflexive marker appearing on the matrix verb.

(15) 

a. Old Lithuanian

kurštái [...] fuguădinti-ś ir furišdinti-ś
who:nom.sg.m capture:caus.inf-rfl and tie.up:caus.inf-rfl

prilaidai-ś
allow:pst.2sg-rfl

‘[you,] who allowed to be captured and tied up’ (DP1599 157,31-32)

b. Middle Polish

ktoryś *śie [...] poimácz y zwieżáć dopuśćiil* (WP1590 163,20-21)

c. Old Lithuanian

Iišai dawe-ś fugau/i [...] furįšti-ś prilaido
3sg.nom.m let:pst3-rfl capture:inf tie.up:inf-rfl allow:pst.3

‘He allowed to be captured, [...] allowed to be tied up’ (DP1599 157,22)
d. Middle Polish

On fie dal poimáč / [...] ʒwiazáč fie dopuśčil

(WP1590 163,10)

Table 6. **PCCs with leisti, per-leisti, and pri-leisti**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Verb, function</th>
<th>Mź1547-70</th>
<th>VlnE/EE1579</th>
<th>BNT1580</th>
<th>RPš1625</th>
<th>Prussian grammars (17th c.)</th>
<th>Prussian dictionaries (17th c.)</th>
<th>DP1599</th>
<th>KNSE1653</th>
<th>SPS1629-44</th>
<th>SD1677</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leisti, permissive</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leisti, factitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per-leisti, permissive</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pri-leisti, permissive</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. **(pa-)velti, pa-velyti, pa-/pri-zvalyti**

A rare permissive PCC with *(pa-)velti* ‘allow’ is attested in two Prussian sources: BNT1580 includes fourteen instances of prefixed *pa-velti*, one of which is shown in (16a), while *Clavis Germanico-Lithvana* has one instance of *velti*, shown in (16b), and two of the prefixed *pa-velti*. (All three attestations are mentioned in essentially the same dictionary entry, found in C I 748-749.) In *Pakerys* (2018, 127), I suggest that the permissive function of *(pa-)velti* developed out of the basic meaning ‘wish’ and that the object in this construction was initially marked as accusative, but was later replaced by the dative (which is the only case found for any permittee in the corpus of this study), similarly to PCCs with *leisti*. The primary meaning of *velti* is seen in, for example, the reflexive *velti*-s used in RPš1625 84,11: *Welnie-s*
buti Wartininku wish:PRS.1SG-RFL be:INF doorkeeper:INS.SG ‘I would rather be a doorkeeper’.

(16) a. Old Lithuanian

Mofešchus pawele iumus ſkirties
Moses:NOM allow:PST.3 3PL.DAT.M separate:INF.RFL
nūg iuſu Motery
from POSS.2PL woman:GEN.PL
‘Moses [...] suffered you to put away your wives’ (KJV)

(BNT1580 Matthew 19:8)

b. German

Mose hat euch erlaubt, zu scheidern von euren Weibern

(Luther1545 Matthew 19:8)

c. Old Lithuanian

Motery ne (corrected from: nu) wēliu jeng
woman:DAT.SG NEG allow:PRS.1SG that
mokintu teach:IRR.3
‘But I suffer not a woman to teach’ (KJV)

(C I 748 1 Timothy 2:12)

d. German

Einem Weibe geſtatte ich nicht, daß fie lehe

(C I 748 1 Timothy 2:12)

Finally, the rarely used permissive verbs pa-velyti and pa-, pri-zvalyti should be mentioned. Both are Slavic borrowings (Fraenkel 1962, 556, 559; Smoczynski 2018, 1628, 1705) with permissive functions found in the source Slavic languages. The PCC with pa-velyti is attested twice in VlnE1579 and once in KNSE1653, one of which is shown in (17). The verb pa-zvalyti is attested in the Prussian dictionaries (once in Lex and three times in C) and once in DP1599. Pri-zvalyti appears once, only in DP1599, while pa-, pri-zvalyti with finite complements do not appear at all. Therefore, only

---

14 This form is certainly dative in -ij; the accusative would be marked with the nasal -i.
15 I sincerely thank Birutė Triškaitė for providing me with the transcription of the Old Lithuanian and German sentences cited in (16c) and (16d).
pa-velyi functions as a truly permissive PCC. It should also be mentioned that in C (C I 354, 748, 749) the verb pa-zvalyti is spelled with <e> (Pafwéliti, Pazweliu, etc.), apparently under the influence of pa-velti (listed in the same dictionary entry in C I 748, 749). None of these borrowings are used in Modern Lithuanian.

(17) Old Lithuanian

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{paweliju} & \text{efch} & \text{Ponams} & \text{dariti} & \text{kaip} & \text{ghiems} \\
enallow:PRS.1SG & 1SG.NOM & \text{lord:DAT.PL} & \text{do:INF} & \text{as} & 3PL.DAT \\
luba & \text{jra} & \text{pleasing} & \text{be:PRS.3} & \text{‘I allow the lords [...] to act as they like’}
\end{array}
\]

(VlnE1579 45,21-46,2)

3. Factitive PCCs

Factitive PCCs, as in Modern Lithuanian, can be expressed by the verb (pri-)versti, which is attested in many of the sources in this study (see Table 7 at the end of this section). The factitive function of (pri-)versti developed out of the primary meaning ‘turn, topple’ and belongs to the group of semantic development ‘cause to move’ > ‘cause’ (see Pakerys (2018, 131–132) for a wider context and some additional cases of this development in the Baltic languages). It is interesting to note that versti is more frequently used with the prefix pri-, which is also found in permissive constructions. This suggests that some specific spatial constructions showed a stronger tendency of developing into causative constructions. In the case of the shared prefix pri- (which corresponds to and is of the same origin as the preposition prie), the constructions (pri-)leisti prie ‘to allow to come to’ and (pri-)versti prie ‘to turn, push towards’ may have shown a stronger tendency of developing into causative PCCs than other spatial constructions; this tendency is reflected in the frequent use of prefixed pri-leisti/versti in PCCs (cf. also Latvian pie-spiest ‘make’). In Old Lithuanian, the goal could have been marked by postpositional case; a number of constructions with (pri-)versti have a clear component of compelling and are complemented by NPs marked by allatives (which functionally correspond to PPs with prie), but are not yet

\[\text{16 LKŽe lists the permissive da-zvalyti complemented by the infinitive from the Bible translation of Bretkūnas: ne-dazvalyk (added above: ne-duok) mum prapulti NEG-allow:IMP.2SG (NEG-allow:IMP.2SG) 1PL.DAT perish:INF ‘let us not perish’ (Jonah 1:14).}\]
complemented by infinitives, cf. (18a) and (19a); note that the Latin source in (18b) contains a factitive PCC complemented by an infinitive clause, while the German source in (18c) is closer to Old Lithuanian by having a PP:

(18) a. Old Lithuanian
   Er gailite (corrected to galite) funus (corrected to waikus)
   Q be.able:prs.2pl son:acc.pl child:acc.pl
   iaunika (corrected to Iauniko) […] pafinikawimap
   bridegroom:gen.sg fasting:all.sg
   wersiti?
   compel:inf
   ‘Can ye make the children of the bridechamber fast […]?’ (KJV)
   (BNT1580 Luke 5:34)

b. Latin
   Numquid potestis filios sponsi […] facere jejunare?
   (Vulgata Clementina Luke 5:34)

c. German
   Ihr möget die Hochzeitleute nicht zum Fasten treiben
   (Luther1545 Luke 5:34)

In true factitive PCCs with verbal complements, the goal NPs (such as in (18a)) are replaced either by infinitive clauses, as in (19a), or *that*-clauses, as in (19d) (cf. also a modern translation of (18a) with a factitive PCC in (1a) in the beginning of this paper).

(19) a. Old Lithuanian
   ir priwersfk ėiti
   and compel:imp.2sg come.in:inf
   ‘and compel them to come in’ (KJV)
   (BNT1580 Luke 14:23)

b. Latin
   et compelle intrare
   (Vulgata Clementina Luke 14:23)

c. German
   und nötige sie hereinzukommen
   (Luther1545 Luke 14:23)
d. Old Lithuanian

Ir **priwerte**, wiena **praenti** [...]
and compel: PST.3 one: ACC.SG.M pass.by: PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M

**idant** iam **Krißu** nefchtu

that 3SG.DAT.M cross: ACC.SG carry:IRR.3

‘And they compel one [...], who passed by, [...] to bear his cross’ (KJV)
(BNT1580 Mark 15:21)

e. German

Und zwangen einen, der vorüberging, [...], daß er ihm das Kreuz trüge.
(Luther1545 Mark 15:21)

A rare factitive PCC attested in both VlnE/EE1579 and the Prussian dictionaries is *(pri-)*syl-y-ti (also syl-in-ti C, j-syl-in-ti Lex, where the suffix -in- replaces -y-). The verb sylyti is most likely a direct copy from Slavic (Skardžius 1931, 197), but it could also be interpreted as a denominative formation from the Slavic borrowing syla ‘force’ (Fraenkel 1962, 785; Smoczynski 2018, 1168). Similar to versti, constructions with sylyti sometimes contain allatives (cf. (20a) where pri-sylyti is used alongside pri-versti); for a complement infinitive clause, see (20b), which contains the same phrase (Luke 14:23) as in (19a), but sylyti is used instead of priversti.

(20) a. Old Lithuanian

**newiens** ne-tur buti
no.one: NOM.SG.M NEG-have:PRS.3 be: INF

**priwerťas** ir
compel: PTCP.PST.PSS.NOM.SG.M and

**prifil[y]tas** wierośp
force: PTCP.PST.PSS.NOM.SG.M faith: ALL.SG

‘no one should be compelled and forced to faith’

(VlnE1579 5,1-2)

b. Old Lithuanian

ir **filyk** jeiti
and force: IMP.2SG come. in: INF

‘and compel them to come in’ (KJV)

(VlnEE1579 86,21 Luke 14:23)
4. Conclusions

The most frequent permissive PCC in Modern Lithuanian is based on *leisti* and is complemented by the marginally used construction with *duoti*, but in many Old Lithuanian sources the situation was the reverse. In all texts, except for DP1599 and SPS1629-44, PCCs with *duoti* are more frequent and it seems that the PCC with *leisti* spread geographically from east to west, although this needs to be researched further by including more sources. The majority of PCCs with *duoti* are permissive, but in Prussian Lithuanian, these PCCs also have a well-attested factitive function, which can be explained by the influence of German bifunctional (permissive/factitive) *lassen* constructions. The permittee/causee in *duoti* constructions is usually marked as dative, inherited from the source construction where it marks the recipient (*duoti* ‘give’ > ‘allow’), but the accusative marking is additionally found in Prussian Lithuanian. The use of the accusative is yet another case of interference from the German *lassen* (+ acc) construction. It is interesting to note that as the accusative competes with the dative in RPs1625, the accusative tends to be more frequent in factitive contexts.

PCCs based on *duoti* containing affixal reflexive (middle) markers are in general infrequent, with the exception of DP1599 where this construction may be linked to the productivity of corresponding PCCs in the Polish translation source, but this needs to be verified in further studies. The most frequent type of reflexive PCC with *duoti* is the one in which the affixal
reflexive marker is found on the matrix verb, while the construction with the affixal reflexive marker occurring on both the matrix verb and the subordinate infinitive is much less common, followed by a very rare type when the affixal reflexive marker is found on the subordinate infinitive only. In Modern Lithuanian, reflexive permissive PCCs are usually complemented by present passive participles, while in Old Lithuanian such complementation is absent, demonstrating that participial complements in permissive PCCs are a later development. In the majority of cases, reflexive PCCs with duoti are permissive, but some examples of factitive use exist and can be explained as copying the factitive function of German and Polish PCCs. In rare cases (BNT1580), reflexive factitive (curative) PCCs based on duoti employ PPs with nuog ‘from’ to mark the causee, which is a copy of the German reflexive lassen construction in which the causee is marked by a PP with von.

Permissive PCCs with leisti in the majority of cases are based on prefixed per-leisti and pri-leisti, which are not used in Modern Lithuanian PCCs. The permittee in PCCs with leisti is most frequently marked as dative, but the accusative is also found in almost one-third of the constructions. On the one hand, the accusative can be archaic (especially when complemented by eiti ‘go’) and inherited from the source construction where it marked the direct object of leisti ‘release’; on the other hand, the use of the accusative in Prussian Lithuanian may have been influenced by German lassen + ACC constructions. Reflexive PCCs based on leisti containing affixal reflexive markers are very rare and are found only in the texts from the GDL.

Two sources of Prussian Lithuanian (BNT1580 and C) contain a rare permissive PCC based on the archaic verb (pa)-velti; the permittee is invariably marked as dative in this construction. In addition, the permissive Slavic borrowings pa-velyti and pa-/pri-zvalyti are marginally attested, but in the corpus of this study, verbal complementation was attested only for pa-velyti.

Factitive PCCs are much more rarely used than permissive ones, which are also sometimes employed as factitive, as mentioned previously. Similar to Modern Lithuanian, the PCC with (pri-)versti is most frequently used, but the Slavic borrowing (pri-)syltyti is also attested. The frequent use of the prefix pri- (cf. also permissive pri-leisti) seems to indicate that particular spatial constructions showed a tendency to develop into PCCs, as seen in cases when the verb (pri-)versti is complemented by NPs coded by allatives and has a clear reference to forced action.
LIETUVIŲ KALBOS PERIFRASINĖS KAУZATYVINĖS KONSTRUKCIJOS XVI–XVII A. ŠALTINIUOSE

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos lietuvių kalbos perifrastinės kauzatyvinės konstrukcijos (PKK) remiantis XVI–XVII a. šaltinių duomenimis. Kitaip nei dabartinėje kalboje, matyti, kad anksčiau permisyvinės PKK su duoti daugelyje tirtų tekstų buvo pagrindinės ir tik kai kuriuose šaltiniuose jas lenkia PKK su leisti; be to, atrodo, kad PKK su leisti plitimio banga galėjo eiti iš rytų į vakarus. Pati dažniausia PKK su duoti reikšmė yra permisyvinė, bet šalia jos pasitaiko ir faktityvinė – paprastai ji randama Prūsijos tekstuose ir laikytina perimta iš vokiečių dvifunkcės (permisyvinės ir faktityvinės) PKK su lassen. PKK su duoti ir leisti objektai paprastai žymimi naudininku, bet šalia jo vartojamas ir galininkas, kuris taip pat turėtų būti perimtas iš vokiečių lassen + ACC konstrukcijos. Tiesa, galininkas su leisti bent kai kuriais atvejais gali būti senoviškas ir paveldėtas iš pradinės konstrukcijos leisti ‘duoti valią judėti’ + ACC. Straipsnyje taip pat trumpai aptaria archaiko permisyvinio veiksmažodžio (pa-)velti ir slavizmų pa-velyti ir pa-/pri-zvalyti vartosena. Dauguma sangražinių (medialinių) permisyvinio veiksmažodžių tirtuose šaltiniuose randama su veiksmažodžiu duoti, o sangražos afiksas paprastai jungiamas prie duoti, bet yra ir atvejų, kai papildoma afikšta gauna ir priklausomybių bendratis (labai retai tas afikštas jungiamas tik prie bendraties). Faktityvinės PKK tirtuose šaltiniuose yra retesnės už permisyvinės ir jose dažniausiai vartojamas veiksmažodis (pri-)gersti, bet kai kuriuose šaltiniuose pasitaiko ir slavizmas (pri-)svalyti. Tai, kad šių konstrukcijų perfecktyviniai veiksmažodžiai turi priešdelį pri- (plg. ir permisyvinį pri-leisti), rodo, kad kauzatyvinėmis buvo linkusios virsti tam tikros erdvinės konstrukcijos (su priešdeliu pri- ir aliatyvu).

ABBREVIATIONS

1 – 1st person
2 – 2nd person
3 – 3rd person
ACC – accusative
ACT – active
ALL – allative
CAUS – causative
DAT – dative
DEM – demonstrative
FUT – future
GDL – the Grand Duchy of Lithuania
GEN – genitive
ILL – illative
IMP – imperative
INF – infinitive
INS – instrumental
IRR – irrealis
LOC – locative
M – masculine
NEG – negation
NOM – nominative
PCC – periphrastic
pl – plural
POSS – possessive
PRS – present
PSS – passive
PST – past
PTCL – particle
PTCP – participle
Q – question particle
RFL – reflexive (pronoun or affix)
SG – singular
VOC – vocative
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