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Extended uses of Old Prussian dāt ‘give’ are studied to demonstrate independent and German-influenced developments. The permissive function of this predicate is argued to be original and historically and areally shared by Baltic, Slavic and Finnic languages, while factitive and hortative constructions are regarded as copies of corresponding German lassen-constructions. The German influence is also seen in the coding of the causee when it is marked by the accusative instead of the original dative. In general, Old Prussian shows effects of interference with German lassen-constructions similar to the ones observed in West Slavic and western South Slavic languages (von Waldenfels 2015).
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1. Introduction

This article describes the use of the Old Prussian (OPr; Indo-European, Baltic, extinct in the early 18th c.) verb dāt ‘give’, which, alongside its main function as a verb of possession transfer, is also employed in causative and hortative constructions. The study is based on the analysis of Martin Luther’s catechisms and some additional texts translated from German into OPr and published in Königsberg in 1545 (2 editions) and 1561.

The development from ‘give’ to causative function, such as permissive ‘allow, let’ and factitive ‘make; have (someone do something)’ is quite well attested in many languages, while hortative use of this predicate seems to be much less frequent (see Section 2). It is argued in this article that the permissive function of dāt in OPr is archaic and original, perhaps a common-Baltic development, shared by neighbouring Slavic and Finnic languages. Factive and hortative uses of OPr dāt, however, are shown to be copies of corresponding German lassen-constructions. The base for copying was the equation of permissive OPr

---

1 This paper is one of the outcomes of the research project “Periphrastic causatives in Baltic” financed by the Research Council of Lithuania, agreement No. 11P-080/2016. I would like to sincerely thank two anonymous reviewers for their insightful remarks and suggestions, which helped me to significantly improve the present version.
dāt ‘let, allow’ with German lassen ‘let, allow’ and subsequent transfer of other functions of lassen over to dāt. To demonstrate similar influence (or lack thereof) seen in other Baltic languages, parallels from 16th c. translations of Luther’s catechisms and other texts into Latvian and Lithuanian will be provided. Where possible, similar cases of German influence on Slavic languages will be briefly reviewed based on the studies of von Waldenfels (2012a; 2015).

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, the literature on the development of causative and hortative functions from ‘give’ in different languages is briefly reviewed; in Section 3.1, the basic use of OPr dāt as a verb of possession transfer is discussed, in Section 3.2, causative (permissive and factitive) functions are analyzed, while Section 3.3 covers the hortative uses. In Section 4, a summary of the main findings is presented, followed by the Appendix where all causative and hortative uses of OPr dāt are listed alongside their German correspondences and some additional information.

2. On the development of causative and hortative functions of ‘give’ in the world’s languages

Periphrastic causative constructions (pccs) can be subdivided into permissive and factitive (Nedjalkov & Sil’nickij 1969, 28 = Nedyalkov & Silnitsky 1973, 10; Kulikov 2001, 892). The factitive pccs refer to the situations which are actively caused (cf. English make), while the permissive ones refer to passive causation, enablement of the situation, absence of an obstacle for the situation to occur, etc. (cf. English let, allow). If the chain of causation has an intermediary agent and/or action, such as a command, leading to the caused event (cf. English have someone do something), the construction is termed indirect (factitive) or curative causative (cf. Dixon 2000, 67–70; Kulikov 2001, 892; Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002).

The shift from ‘give’ to causative functions is well attested cross-linguistically. The permissive use (give as ‘enable’) is discussed by Newman (1996, 188–194) and illustrated by Russian, Polish, Bulgarian, Finnish, Mandarin, Thai, Cambodian, Indonesian, and (earlier) English examples. Indirect (‘have someone do something’) and direct factitive (‘cause’) constructions based on ‘give’ seem to be less common, see Newman (1996, 171–179) with examples from Finnish, Polish, Thai, and Cambodian; note that direct factitive with inanimate causees is attested only in the latter one. Heine and Kuteva (2002, 152) discuss causative use of ‘give’ in Thai, Vietnamesee, Khmer, Luo, Somali (> causative suffix), and Siroi, while Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002, 105) note the use of ‘give’ as ‘let’ in Marathi, Lord et al. (2002, 223–226) discuss permissive and factitive ‘give’

Von Waldenfels (2012a; 2015, 111–114, 116–118) provides a detailed description of permissive and factitive use of ‘give’ in Slavic languages, a branch closely related to Baltic. The permissive function, with varying frequency, is attested in Old Church Slavonic and in all modern languages, except for Czech; indirect factitive (curative) causative is attested in Polish (but no longer productive), Sorbian, Czech, Slovak and Slovenian, direct factitive use is attested in Sorbian. On Baltic, see notes in Pakerys (2016, 443–445, 454) where the permissive use of ‘give’ in Lithuanian and Latvian is discussed.

It should be also noted that reflexive permissive constructions based on ‘give’ may develop into modal passives (see, e.g., von Waldenfels 2012a, 153–185, 222–231, 239–241, 261–264, 272–277 on modal passives in Polish and Czech and von Waldenfels 2015, 119–121 on other West Slavic languages (Slovak, Sorbian) and western South Slavic languages (Slovenian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian)). This is a recurrent development of permissive constructions which does not seem to be related to their specific sources such as ‘release’, ‘give’, etc. In East Baltic, modal passives of this type have not developed, but some examples are attested in Lithuanian under the influence of Polish, see Holvoet (2016, 47–48).

Interpersonal acts of permission belong to the domain of deontic modality (von Waldenfels 2012a, 30) and the same predicates may be also used in the imperative-hortative systems. However, judging by the available literature, the use of ‘give’ in these systems is much less widespread compared to the causative extension discussed above, and perhaps this is the reason why imperative-hortative function of ‘give’ is omitted in Heine, Kuteva (2002, 149–155). Newman (1996, 194–195) reviews the hortative function of forms of ‘give’ in Italian, Russian, Bulgarian, and Hungarian, and von Waldenfels (2012a, 2, 41–45, 87–93, 118–119, 248–249; 2015, 121–122) discusses them in detail in Russian and notes similar, but less advanced developments in other Slavic languages.

3. Basic and extended uses of OPr dāt

3.1. Basic use of OPr dāt

The basic use of OPr dāt refers to the transfer of possession, which is an archaic inherited meaning, cf. etymological cognates Latvian duōt, Lithuanian dúoti, Old Church Slavonic dati, Latin dare, etc.; in the sources of the translation, OPr dāt
in its basic use corresponds to German *geben*.

The recipient of *dāt* is marked by the dative while the patient is in the accusative, cf. *dat.pl fēimans* ‘(for) them’ and *acc.sg landan* ‘food’ in (1a) corresponding to the same cases in Latvian (1c) and Lithuanian (1d) (the recipient is omitted here):

\[(1) \quad \text{a. Old Prussian} \]
\[tu \ dāfē \ fēimans / tennēfon \ landan \]
\[2SG \ give:PRS.2SG \ 3PL.DAT.M \ 3PL.GEN.M \ food:ACC.SG \]
\[‘You give them their food’ \]

\[(1) \quad \text{b. German} \]
\[du \ gibft \ jnfen \ jre \ Speyfe \]
\[2SG \ give:PRS.2SG \ 3.PL.DAT \ 3.PL.GEN.F \ food:ACC.SG \]
\[‘You give them their food’ \]

\[(1) \quad \text{c. Latvian} \]
\[tu \ dhos \ tems \ winge \ Barribe \]
\[2SG \ give:PRS.2SG \ 3PL.DAT.M \ 3.PL.GEN.M \ food:ACC.SG \]
\[‘You give them their food’ \]

\[(1) \quad \text{d. Lithuanian} \]
\[tu \ dūfi \ penukschla \ yu \]
\[2SG \ give:PRS.2SG \ food:ACC.SG \ 3.PL.GEN.M \]
\[‘You give [them] their food’ \]

The meaning of transfer of possession is well attested in the language of all OPr catechisms and the infinitive *doyte* (Mažiulis 1975, 130) in this sense is also used in the Basel Epigram (14th c. or later inscription, see Ardoino 2013); the form *Dam* in the phrase *Dam thor* ‘Ich wils euch geben’ in Simon Grunau’s dictionary (copy G, 16th c.) may be interpreted as *prs.1sg*, but it is problematic, see a discussion and further references in Smoczyński (2005, 74–75).

OPr *dāt* also has some abstract uses and functions as a light verb, for ex-

---

\(^1\) For a full list of reflexes of the Indo-European *deh* - ‘give’, see HEW 223–225 and LIV 105–106. It is worth noting that this root is not attested in Germanic; perhaps it was ousted by *”geban” give* (German *geben*, English *give*, etc.) at an early stage.

\(^2\) Cf. ‘You give them their food’ (Psalms 145:15; 1SM1086, http://catechism.cph.org/en/daily-prayers.html). Here and further, passages from the English translation of Luther’s *Small Catechism* and some other texts will be provided for comparison, see also the Appendix.
ample, reckenaufnan dāt (III 891,11) = Rechnenschaft geben (III 888,11–12) ‘give account’, reddewijdikaufnan dātwei (III 333,9) = falsche zeugnus geben (III 324,7) ‘give false testimony’, fiën fkelānts dātunsi (III 653,9) = sich schuldig geben (III 647,17–18) ‘plead guilty’, etc. Many of these cases can be explained as copies of German constructions with geben, but they are not directly relevant for the present article and will not be discussed further.

All in all, OPr dāt corresponds to German geben in the source of the translation in 41 cases (72%) out of 57 attestations (the infinitive of the Basel Epigram is not counted); in one of these cases the German reflexive construction sich [...] geben is translated as fiën [...] dātunsi (III 653,9) with double reflexive markers: fiën (orthotonic) and si (enclitic, i.e. dātun=sî). The majority of the remaining forms correspond to German (sich) lassen (14 attestations, 25%), while 2 cases do not have direct verbal correspondences: polaipinsan dāuns ‘[has] given order’ (III 121,17) corresponds to befölhen [...] hat (III 120,14–17) ‘has ordered’ (one could expect Befehl geben), while Daiti noumans tālis Madlit ‘Let us pray further’ (III 1197,9) curiously corresponds to Ein ander Gebet (III 1185) ‘Another prayer’ (see details of this case in Section 3.3). I have also checked possible translations of German lassen into OPr by using the electronic version of Mažiulis 2013 (search for ‘lassen’ in the full text of the dictionary) and beside dāt mentioned above, only the verb powiērpt is used twice to translate German lassen, but the meaning in this case was ‘leave, abandon’ (cf. German verlassen); as a result, we see that the only correspondent of causative and hortative uses of German lassen is OPr dāt (in the data collection available to us).

In the corpus of OPr, two prefixal formations of dāt are also attested: au-dāt sien ‘geschehen; happen’ (reflexive)4 and per-dāt ‘verkaufen; sell’; Smoczyński (2005, 74) also proposes reconstruction of *prei-dāt with a separable prefix mimicking the use of German 2nd person imperative gebt d(a)rauf. All these formations are not directly relevant for the present study and will not be discussed further.

3.2. Causative use of OPr dāt

The original use of OPr dāt in rccs has to be regarded as permissive and this function of ‘give’ is attested in other Baltic and Slavic languages. It is quite possible that this use of dāt in OPr is inherited from proto-Baltic or even proto-Balto-Slavic, but one should be very cautious and keep in mind the possibility

4 As suggested by one of the reviewers, this could be a calque of German sich begeben ‘happen’.
of parallel development. From the areal perspective, it should be also noted that the same shift from ‘give’ to ‘let’ occurred in neighbouring Finnic languages. Other permissive pccs based on etymologically related predicates are common only for two East Baltic languages (Latvian laîst, Lithuanian léisti, common root *leid-) or are attested in one of them only (Latvian laît) and not shared by the Slavic languages. One should also note that in modern East Baltic languages, give-based permissive pccs are only marginally used compared to other constructions (Pakerys 2016, 443–445, 454–455). If their productivity was higher in the earlier stages, it could have been lowered by the rise of productivity of other permissive pccs.

As mentioned in Section 3.1, 14 cases of OPr dāt correspond to German lassen-constructions; examples of OPr powiērpt = German (ver-)lassen are out of the scope of this study. These German constructions have a wide range of uses, but for the purposes of the present section, only causative ones have to be defined and illustrated:

(i) permissive use can be paraphrased as ‘zulassen, erlauben; dulden; nicht an etwas hindern’ = ‘let, allow; permit; not to hinder something’, cf. das Licht über Nacht brennen lassen ‘let the light be on during the night’;

(ii) factitive use can be paraphrased as ‘veranlassen, bewirken (dass etwas geschieht)’ = ‘cause (something to happen)’, cf. jemanden warten lassen ‘make somebody wait’.

The majority of OPr pccs with dāt (10 cases out of 15 of non-basic use, that is 67% or 18% out of a total of 57 attestations) are permissive or factitive, the rest are hortative (see Section 3.3). The original marking of the causee (permittee) is dative, which is taken from the transfer construction where it marks the recipient. This marking is used in all Baltic pccs based on ‘give’, cf. OPr in (2a) and Lithuanian in (2d) (Latvian in (2c) employs a different permissive verb):

\(2\) a. Old Prussian

\[kai \quad tans \quad noûmans \quad erînnat \quad daft [...]

that 3SG.NOM.M 1PL.DAT recognize:INF give:INF\]

---

1 Definitions and examples are taken from Duden dictionary available online at <https://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/lassen>, accessed in March, 2017.


3 The same marking (dative) is also used in permissive constructions based on ‘give’ in Slavic, with the exception of (colloquial) Upper Sorbian (von Waldenfels 2015, 112).

4 Here and further the extended uses of OPr dāt will be glossed as ‘give’ and their actual function will be evident from the translation.
‘that he lets us recognize […]’

b. German
das er vns erkennen laffe […]
that 3SG.NOM.M 1PL.ACC recognize:INF let:3SG.IRR
‘that he lets us recognize […]’

III 52–5

c. Latvian
ka tas mums […] adþyt leke
that 3SG.NOM.M 1PL.DAT recognize:INF leave:PRS.3
‘that he lets us recognize […]’

Ench1586 [A iiij verso]18–19

d. Lithuanian
ieng ghis tatai dûtu mumus
that 3SG.NOM.M it give:IRR.3 1PL.DAT
paþinti
recognize:INF
‘that he lets us recognize it’

VlnE1579 234–6

(2) illustrates a specific semantic type of PCC, namely that of causation of
cognition, which can be interpreted as factitive rather than permissive (von
187–188) actually separates the type ‘give someone to think’ from ‘enable’ and
emphasizes a strong connection of this construction with the basic use of ‘give’
as a predicate of possession transfer. Further support for this separation is pro-
vided by the fact that many European languages which do not use ‘give’ as a
verb of permission, use ‘give to understand’ type constructions (von Waldenfels
2015, 119). However, if a language employs ‘give’ as verb of permission, one can-
not rule out the possibility that the permissive (give-based) construction can be
used with the verbs of cognition, cf. other (non give-based) PCCs used with cog-
nition predicates (see von Waldenfels 2012a, 105–106 with further references.)
I consider (2) and another similar case discussed below, (6a), as rather factitive
and also mark them as ‘factitive (cognition)’ in the Appendix. Further research

   html).

*0 Glossing here follows the suggestion that Latvian causative likt could have developed from ‘leave’
   (ME II 469, cf. also Karulis 1992, 536).
on these constructions in Baltic is needed, but in OPr they seem to be directly copied from German; however, the factitive reading of causation of cognition could be an independent phenomenon per se.

The permittee in OPr dāt constructions can be also expressed by the accusative, due to the influence of the German lassen-constructon, which assigns accusative. Out of 7 instances in OPr when the permittee is overtly expressed, 2 NPs (personal pronouns) are marked by the dative, cf. (2a) and (6a), the rest, 5 NPs, are in the accusative (4 nouns and 1 reflexive pronoun). In Latvian and Lithuanian, other permissive verbs are used in this passage: Latvian laist (+ ACC) and Lithuanian leisti (+ ACC), see (3c) and (3d) respectively:

(3) a. Old Prussian
_Dāiti_ fi_ _tans_ mal_nijkikans_ prē[=]mien
give:IMP.2PL DEM.ACC.PL.M child:DIMIN.ACC.PL to=1SG.ACC
perēit
come:INF
‘Let the little children come to me’

b. German
_Laſt_ die_ Kindlein_ zu
let:IMP.2PL ART.DEF.ACC.PL.N child:DIMIN.ACC.PL to
_Mir_ komen
1SG.DAT come:INF
‘Let the little children come to me’

III 113

(3) c. Latvian
_Laydeth_ tös_ Bherninges py man
let:IMP.2PL DEM.ACC.PL.M child:DIMIN.ACC.PL to 1SG.DAT
näckt
come:INF

---

*This has been noted also in the colloquial Upper Sorbian construction with da(wa)k; see von Wal-denfels (2012a, 313, 2015, 112, with further reference to Toops 2012, 327). Dative of permittee in lassen-constructions is also possible, but this marking is not attested in the German texts discussed here (see DWB s.v. lassen: II (5), (5a), (7), http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/?lemma=lassen).

*It is very interesting to note that personal pronouns retain the original dative marking while nouns (and a reflexive pronoun in one case) are prone to German influence and are marked by the accusative. In other words, OPr personal pronouns stand higher on the scale of resistance to the influence of the marking used in the contact language, cf. the animacy hierarchy (note that in German, first and second plural personal pronouns which are used in the relevant passages have homonymous forms of dative and accusative: uns and euch; cf. also 1.PL hortative constructions in Section 3.3 where the original OPr dative is also retained).
'Let the little children come to me'

**Old Prussian**

\[ \text{Deiws / schien Malnijkan prēi} \]
\[ \text{god: NOM.SG} \quad \text{DEM.ACC.SG.M} \quad \text{child: ACC.SG} \quad \text{to=DEM.ACC.SG.F} \]
\[ \text{Crixtifnan aft etniwings pereit} \]
\[ \text{baptism: ACC.SG AUX.PRS.3} \quad \text{gracious: NOM.SG.M} \quad \text{come: INF} \]
\[ \text{dāuns} \]
\[ \text{give: PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M} \]

‘God has graciously let/had this child come to the baptism’

**VlnE1579 62**

\[ \text{dūti} \quad \text{let’} \quad (\text{< ‘give’}) \]

Lithuanian *duoti* ‘let’ (< ‘give’) is used in another passage translated by Martynas Mažvydas in 1559 (absent in VlnE1579), which corresponds to the use of OPr *dāt* and German *lassen*; the permittee in the Lithuanian passage in (4c) is also notably marked by accusative due to copying of the German pattern. I have received varying interpretations from some native (expert) speakers of German with regard to permissive/factitive interpretation of this and another example of *lassen* in the same passage (III 130, 131) and have translated and marked them here and in the Appendix as permissive/factitive:

(4) a. Old Prussian

\[ \text{Deiws / schien Malnijkan prēi[=]fiăn} \]
\[ \text{god: NOM.SG} \quad \text{DEM.ACC.SG.M} \quad \text{child: ACC.SG} \quad \text{to=DEM.ACC.SG.F} \]
\[ \text{Crixtifnan aft etniwings pereit} \]
\[ \text{baptism: ACC.SG AUX.PRS.3} \quad \text{gracious: NOM.SG.M} \quad \text{come: INF} \]
\[ \text{dāuns} \]
\[ \text{give: PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M} \]

‘God has graciously let/had this child come to the baptism’

**III 131**

b. German

\[ \text{Gott diß Kindlein / zu der} \]
\[ \text{god: NOM.SG} \quad \text{DEM.ACC.SG.N} \quad \text{child: DIMIN.ACC.SG} \quad \text{to ART.DEF.DAT.SG.F} \]
\[ \text{Tauf[...]} \quad \text{hat} \quad \text{genediglich kommen laff} \]
\[ \text{baptism: DAT.SG AUX.PRS.3SG} \quad \text{graciously} \quad \text{come: INF} \quad \text{let: INF} \]

‘God has graciously let/had this little child come to the baptism’

**III 130**

c. Lithuanian

\[ \text{Diewas tq Kudikeli Chrikstop [...]} \]
\[ \text{god: NOM.SG} \quad \text{DEM.ACC.SG.M} \quad \text{baby: DIMIN.ACC.SG} \quad \text{baptism: ALL.SG} \]
\[ \text{malonei dawes eft ateit} \]
\[ \text{graciously give: PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M AUX.PRS.3} \quad \text{come: INF} \]
'God has graciously let/had this little baby come to the baptism'

MŽF1559, 112_3–6

Now let us look at two cases where German *lassen* is used in reflexive constructions and where the permittee is co-referential with the permitter. First, we will consider (5a):

(5) a. Old Prussian

\[ \text{Deiws ni daſt ſien bebbint} \]

\[ \text{god:NOM.SG NEG give:3PRS PRN.RFL.ACC mock:INF} \]

‘God does not allow himself to be mocked’

III 87_24 (Galatians 6:7)

b. German

\[ \text{Gort [= Gott] leſſt ſich nicht ſpotten} \]

\[ \text{god:NOM.SG let:PRS.3SG PRN.RFL.ACC NEG mock:INF} \]

‘God does not allow himself to be mocked’

III 86_21

c. Latvian

d. Lithuanian

\[ \text{Diewas neperleidʒ iſch ſawes iůka} \]

\[ \text{god:NOM.SG not.allow:PRS.3 from PRN.RFL.GEN joke:GEN.SG make:INF} \]

‘the God does not allow to make a joke about himself’

VlnE1579 39_20–21

Reflexive constructions like (5b) gave rise to the German modal passive (‘can be V-ed’), and actually in the English rendering of (5b) provided in Footnote 13, the translator opted for the modal version rather than the permissive. These constructions are related by the link ‘X does not allow her-/him-self to be V-ed’ ≈ ‘X cannot be V-ed’, but for a true modal passive to develop, the construction needs to allow inanimate subjects (von Waldenfels 2012, 297).

There are no more OPr examples of the type illustrated in (5a), but we know that some Slavic languages developed fully-fledged modal passives from the reflexive permissives based on ‘give’ in West Slavic (Polish, Czech, Slovak, Sorbian) and western South Slavic (Slovenian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian), and all

---


14 In Geniušienė (1987, 161, 166), English *allow* is chosen in the translation of the OPr sentence.
these languages are known to have been influenced by German (von Waldenfels 2015, 119–121); cf. the somewhat similar development in Estonian andma ‘give’ > ‘let’ > ‘be possible’ (in impersonal constructions and without the reflexivization; see a note in Pakerys 2017, 184). It is interesting to note that East Baltic languages have not developed a productive modal passive (with inanimate subjects) based on the reflexive permissive constructions, but occasional uses are attested in, for example, Lithuanian (under the influence of Polish dacé-constructions, see Holvoet 2016, 47–48).

Another reflexive construction with OPr dāt is seen in (6a):

(6) a. Old Prussian

\[
\begin{align*}
Daiti & \quad \text{ioumas pomīrit} / \quad \text{kai ious} \ldots \\
give:IMP.2PL & \quad \text{1PL.DAT think:INF that 2PL.NOM} \\
\text{‘Let yourself think that you [...]’} \\
\text{III 95_14 (Ephesians 6:7)}
\end{align*}
\]

b. German

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Laft} & \quad \text{euch düncken} / \quad \text{das jr} \ldots \\
give:IMP.2PL & \quad \text{1PL.ACC seem:INF that 2PL.NOM} \\
\text{‘Let it seem to you that you [...]’} \\
\text{III 94_12-13}
\end{align*}
\]

c. Latvian

\[
\begin{align*}
domadamme & \quad \text{ka yuus} \ldots \\
think:CVB.CTP.PL.M & \quad \text{that 2PL.NOM} \\
\text{‘thinking that you [...]’} \\
\text{Ench1586 [G iiij]_7-8}
\end{align*}
\]

d. Lithuanian

\[
\begin{align*}
tikiedamiefi & \quad \text{iog yus} \ldots \\
believe:CVB.CTP.PL.M.RFL & \quad \text{that 2PL.NOM} \\
\text{‘hoping that you [...]’} \\
\text{VlnE1579 43_12}
\end{align*}
\]

Here, OPr pomīrit ‘think’ reflects German impersonal dünnen used with the accusative pronominal form euch, but the OPr personal pronoun ioumas keeps the original dative assigned by dāt. From the semantic point of view, we are dealing with causation of a cognitive process which can be interpreted as facti-

\[\text{\textsuperscript{6}}\text{I would like to thank one of the reviewers for pointing this out to me. German dünnen can be also used with the dative (as in mir düntk ‘it seems to me’), but for the period in question, only accusative was used, see DWB s.v. dünnen, http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemma=duenken.}\]
tive: ‘let it seem to you’ is translated as ‘let yourself think’ = ‘think’. Probably this might be one of the reasons why the Latvian translation simply has the lexeme ‘think’ while the Lithuanian translator chose ‘hope’ (reflexive of ‘believe’); other factors also probably played a role here, but they do not seem to be relevant for the discussion of OPr in (6a).

As mentioned earlier, some OPr pccs allow both permissive and factitive readings, see the comment regarding example (4) above. The construction in (7a-b) might be formally treated in a similar way, ‘God let/made the deep sleep fall onto the man’, but the context shows that the process was intentionally caused and not permitted or allowed: God makes the man fall asleep to take one of his ribs. Factitive interpretation is chosen in the majority of English translations of this passage, cf. the King James Version: *And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam* (Genesis 2:21):16

(7) a. Old Prussian

\[
\text{Stwi dai Deiws ainan gillin (t)here give:PST.3 god:NOM.CG one:ACC.CG deep:ACC.CG.F maiggun krüt no[=]fian fmuentinan sleep:ACC.CG fall:INF on=DEM.ACC.CG.M man:ACC.CG.}
\]

‘(T)here, God caused a deep sleep to fall onto the man’

b. German

\[
\text{Da ließ Gott der HERR then let:PST.3SG god:NOM.CG ART.DEF.NOM.CG.M lord einen tieffen Schlaff fallen / ART.INDEF.CG.M deep:ACC.CG.M sleep:ACC.CG.F fall:INF auff den Menschen on ART.DEF.CG.M man:ACC.CG.}
\]

‘Then the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall onto the man’

c. Latvian

\[
\text{Tad licke Dews tas Kunx then leave:PST.3 god:NOM.CG 3:NOM.CG.M lord:NOM.CG wene czille Mege krift one:ACC.CG.F deep:ACC.CG.M sleep:ACC.CG.F fall:INF}
\]

---

16 https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Genesis-Chapter-2/.
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vs to \textit{Czilwheke}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{dāt} & in causative and hortative constructions & vs to & \textit{Czilwheke} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\text{ON} & \text{DEM.ACC.SG.M} & \text{man:ACC.SG} & \\
\end{tabular}

‘Then the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall onto the man’

\textit{Ench}1586 H \textit{verso} 16–17

d. Lithuanian

\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\textit{Perleida} & \text{tada} & \text{Ponas} & \text{Diewas} & \text{didi} \\
\text{release:PST.3} & \text{then} & \text{lord:NOM.SG} & \text{god:NOM.SG} & \text{great:ACC.SG.M} \\
\text{miega} & \text{ant} & \text{Adoma} & \\
\text{sleep:ACC.SG} & \text{onto} & \text{Adam:ACC.SG} & \\
\end{tabular}

‘Then the Lord God released a great sleep onto Adam’

\textit{VlnE}1579 50 16–17

As to morphosyntax of this example, the causee is marked by the accusative following the German pattern; in other Baltic languages, different constructions are used: Latvian has \textit{likt} in (7c), which is also formally ambiguous (‘let’ vs ‘make’), while the Lithuanian translator chose to use \textit{VP perleisti miega ‘release, provide, give sleep’} in (7d), cf. the fully-fledged (i.e. complemented by the infinitive clause) PCC with \textit{perleisti} in (5d) above.

Speaking of the direct factitive function of \textit{give}-based PCCs, we know that in some languages permissive \textit{give}-based constructions acquire this interpretation due to interference with German \textit{lassen}-constructions. A case in point is Sorbian, where \textit{give}-based PCCs express not only curative (indirect factitive), but also direct factitive causation (von Waldenfels 2015, 116). Curative causation in \textit{give}-based PCCs is more widely attested, especially in the languages where the contacts with German have played a role: this construction is known in Czech, Slovak and Slovenian, where it is productive, while in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian it is also productive, but of limited frequency; in Polish, the construction has been in decline since the 18th c., while in Russian and Bulgarian it is not productive (von Waldenfels 2015, 116).

Finally, in one instance OPr \textit{dāt} reflects German construction \textit{(etwas) genug sein lassen}, which is rather idiomatic and seems to be on the borderline between permissive and factitive reading,” that is, ‘let it be enough’ \approx ‘do so that it is enough’, ‘stop, end it’, etc. Lithuanian translator decided to rendered this construction using \textit{IMP.3} in (8c):

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
\text{Bhe tīt dais} & \text{panfdau zuit} & \text{bouton.} & \\
\text{and so give:IMP.2SG} & \text{then} & \text{enough be:INF} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{17} I owe this interpretation to one of the reviewers.
‘And so let it be enough’

b. German

Alſo laſſe es genug fein
so let:IMP.2SG 3SG.ACC.N enough be:INF
‘So let it be enough’

c. Latvian

—

d. Lithuanian

A[=]taipo tefio gan
and=so stand:IMP.3 enough
‘And so let it be enough’

It should be noted that the majority of cases of OPr causative use of dāt are restricted to animate participants, with the exception of the non-specified, but clearly non-animate causee/permittee in (8a). Slavic languages seem to show a similar trend, but a more detailed review of this variation is still needed (von Waldenfels 2015, 113–114). As to polarity, two OPr examples, (5a) and the one in III 109.14 (see the Appendix) have negation, and von Waldenfels (2012a, 247; 2015, 113) notes a tendency (possibly an archaic trait) to use give-based permissive constructions under negation in Slavic. A similar trend is observed in Lithuanian (Pakerys 2016, 443–444), but OPr data are simply too limited (and dependent on German sources) to draw any conclusions in this respect.

3.3. Hortative use of OPr dāt

Hortative constructions express a wish of the speaker and make an appeal to the addressee to help make that wish come true. On the one hand hortatives are different from optatives which also express a wish, but do not appeal to the addressee, and on the other hand, they differ from the imperative situations where only the addressee is in control of the desired situation, cf. van der Auwera et al. (2004; 2013) and their English examples in (9):

---


*b* The corresponding passage in the Latvian translation of Luther’s catechism of 1586 is missing, see F ii verso–F iij. The translation has a short order of confession (eine kurze Form zu beichten) stemming from the editions based on the edition of the catechism of 1529 (or: before 1531 when the order of confession titled Wie man die Einfältigen soll lehren beichten was introduced).
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(9) English

| a. May he live a hundred years! (optative) |
| b. Sing! (imperative) |
| c. Let’s sing! (hortative) |
| d. Let him sing! (hortative) |

(van der Auwera et al. 2013)

Optatives left aside, it is clear that imperatives and hortatives are in complementary distribution with regard to person: imperatives are second person while hortatives are first and third person. If the system has to be referred to in its entirety, one may use a compound term, ‘imperative-hortative’ (cf. van der Auwera et al. 2004), however, in what follows, only first and third person constructions will have to be discussed and for the sake of brevity the term ‘hortative’ will be used; as to glossing of the synthetic morphological forms, the label ‘IMP’(erative) is chosen.

The hortative use of OPr *dāt* is limited to 4 cases, which are all first-person plurals (7% of all attestations of *dāt* and of 29% of all cases when OPr *dāt* = German *lassen*). The German construction of first-person plural *lass(e)t uns* + INF (= English *let us* + INF) is directly transferred into OPr 3 times, and it is worth noting that original dative *noūmans/noumans/nūmas* ‘(for) us’ is consistently used in all examples, cf. (10a) and (11a). It should be noted that the Latvian translation in (10c) can be interpreted as a copy of the German construction (cf. Holvoet 2007, 42, fn. 11), while the Lithuanian translation has a synthetic form in (10d):

(10) a. Old Prussian

*Da*tti *noūmans* *tīt* *madlīt*.

give:IMP.2PL 1PL.DAT so pray:INF

‘Let us pray so’

III 117

b. German

*La*ff *vns* *alfo* *Beten*.

let:IMP.2PL 1PL.ACC so pray:INF

‘Let us pray so’

III 116

c. Latvian

*La*ydeth *mums* *luuckt*

let:IMP.2PL 1PL.DAT pray:INF

‘Let us pray’

Ench1586 [H iiij],

129
An interesting case is (11a) below, where the parallel text printed in German on the opposite page of III is *Ein ander Gebet* ‘Another [different] prayer’, (11b), while judging from the OPr translation (*Daiti noumans tālis Madlit* ‘Let us pray further’), one expects hortative in German, something like *lass(e)t uns weiter beten* (for the correspondence of German *weiter* = OPr *tālis*, cf. *weiter* III 68,20 = *tāls* III 69,21). Hortative constructions are found in corresponding passages in Latvian in (11c) (periphrastic, cf. German in (10b)) and Lithuanian (synthetic) in (11d), just like in (10c–d) above:

(11)  

a. Old Prussian

*Daiti noumans tālis Madlit*

give:IMP.2PL IPL.DAT further pray:INF

‘Let us pray further’

III 119

b. German

*Ein ander Gebet*

ART.INDEF.NOM.SG.N other:NOM.SG.N prayer:NOM.SG

‘Another prayer’

III 118

c. Latvian

*Laydet mums luuckt*

let:IMP.2PL IPL.DAT pray:INF

‘Let us pray’

Ench1586 [H iiiij]21

d. Lithuanian

*Melskemofe*

pray:IMP.1PL.RFL

‘Let us pray’

VlnE1579 6016

The passage of interest to us is found in the form of baptism and, first of all, it should be noted that in *Das Taufbüchlein verdeutscht* (1523), the German text reads *Laft uns beten*, but without *weiter* or any similar adverb (WA12: 43); the same text remains in the renewed edition of 1526 (see WA19: 539; the Latvian and
Lithuanian translations in (11c-d) also do not have this extension and correspond to hortative constructions in German. However, we know that the forms of the baptism and wedding ceremonies published in the 3rd OPr catechism should have been taken from the Church Order of the Duchy of Prussia of 1558 (KO1558), see the introduction of the catechism (III 10 φ ν), and the comparison of the German text printed in the 3rd catechism with that of KO1558 by Bechtel (1881). We also know that the form of the baptism was published as a separate booklet, Form der Tauff, in Königsberg in 1559 (with some differences from the text presented in KO1558) and it was the base for the Lithuanian translation of the form of baptism by Mažvydas in 1559 (Stang 1976; Dini 2010). In the passage of interest to us, both KO1558 (page 4 of the baptism form) and FT1559 (page [A iii] verso) have Ein ander Gebet (this phrase has a correspondence in the Lithuanian translation of the form of baptism by Mažvydas, see mžf1559 103 : Antra Malda ‘second prayer’).

Thus far we can conclude that the OPr phrase Daiti nounans tãlis Madlit may have been used independently from the German source if it was KO1558 or FT1559. However, it should be noted some forms of baptism published in German actually have hortative constructions modified by ferner/weiter in the corresponding passage of the text (the examples will be limited to the 16th c. only), cf.: Laffet vns ferner Beten (KO1573 xx ii), Laffet vns weiter beten (HB1580 A ii), etc. (however, it should be noted that a number of textual elements of the baptism form in these books differ from the form presented in the KO1558 and FT1559). This means that either the OPr phrase Daiti nounans tãlis Madlit was used in the translation independently from the German source (which had Ein ander Gebet), or we should assume that a text (or part of it) was used for the translation of the OPr baptism form which had some slight differences from KO1558 and FT1559.

It is interesting to note that of Slavic languages, Slovenian and Sorbian hortative constructions have likely experienced German influence as well (von Waldenfels 2015, 122–123). In Sorbian, even the accusative of 1.PL pronoun is used (not like the dative in OPr), but note that the verbal form is 2SG (unlike 2PL in OPr):

(12) Lower Sorbian

\[ \text{Daj nas hyś.} \]

let.imp.2sg 1pl.acc go.inf

‘Let us go’

(von Waldenfels 2015, 123 from Fabian Kaulfürst, p.c.)
4. Conclusions

1. The basic and most frequent use of OPr dāt refers to transfer of possession and it corresponds to German geben in the source of the translation (72% out of 57 attestations of dāt in the OPr catechisms). In this construction, the recipient is consistently marked by the dative while the patient is assigned the accusative.

2. The use OPr dāt ‘give’ as permissive ‘allow, let’ is original and is also attested in other Baltic languages. The permissive function of ‘give’ is either a common Baltic development or a parallel innovation related to areal tendencies and language contacts. The same shift from ‘give’ to ‘let’ is also known in Slavic (a common Slavic or, theoretically, even a Balto-Slavic development) and Finnic (an early common or contact-related development). Whatever the details of the history of these constructions are, the Baltic, Slavic and Finnic languages form a continuous area where the predicates of transfer of possession are used in permissive constructions, but with varying degrees of productivity.

3. In total, 10 OPr constructions with dāt can be regarded as causative, that is 67% out of 15 cases of use of dāt which correspond to German lassen, or 18% out of total of 57 attestations. Permissive reading is securely attested while factitive function largely depends on the interpretation of original German constructions. When the causee/permittee is overtly expressed in OPr causative constructions (8x in total), it is more frequently marked by the accusative following the German pattern (6x), while original marking by the dative is less frequent (2x, both are pronominal forms).

4. The hortative function of OPr dāt is the least frequent and was noted in 4 cases (27% out of 15 cases which correspond to German lassen, and 7% out of 57 attestations), all of them were 1st person plurals (the form of dāt is 2nd person plural). These constructions are copies of German lassen(t) uns V-en ‘let’s V’ construction, but the pronominal form retains the original OPr dative marking in all cases.

5. The influence of German lassen-constructions on the development of give-based periphrastic constructions has been noted in many West Slavic and western South Slavic languages (von Waldenfels 2015), and OPr can be added to this group as one of the Baltic languages showing a similar imprint of German. The original function of these constructions is permissive, and factitive use should be ascribed to German, probably with the exception of causation of cognitive
processes; copying of morphosyntactic marking is seen in the use of accusative of causee/permittee instead of the original dative.
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## APPENDIX

**Table 1. Periphrastic causative constructions based on OPr dāt ‘give’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Prussian</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Causee marking in OPr</th>
<th>Form of OPr dāt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhe Ꞙwaian rikin niqoitā daton perēit (III 51&lt;sup&gt;15–16&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>vnd fein Reich nicht komen laffen wollen (III 50&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>do not want [...] let His kingdom come&lt;sup&gt;a0&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>permissive</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>INF/SUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mes madlimai enfchan mad-lin / kai tans noūmans erfinnatt daſt (III 53&lt;sup&gt;6,7&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Aber wir bit-ten in dieſem Gebet / das er vns erken-nen laſſe (III 52&lt;sup&gt;4–3&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>but we pray in this petition that God would lead us to realize this</td>
<td>factitive (cognition)</td>
<td>DAT (PRN)</td>
<td>PRS.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afmai pertenniuns bhe fkūdan dāuns feggit (III 69&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Habe verfeumet vnd schaden laſſen gefchehen (III 68&lt;sup&gt;2–3&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>I have been negligent and allowed damage to be done</td>
<td>permissive</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>PST.ACT.PTCP. NOM.SG.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhe tīt dais panďau zuit bouton (III 69&lt;sup&gt;27–28&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Alſo laſſe es genug fein (III 68&lt;sup&gt;25–26&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Let that be enough</td>
<td>permissive/factivitive</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>IMP.2SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deiws ni daſt fien bebbint (III 87&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>Gott [=Gott] leſſt fich nicht fpotten (III 86&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>God cannot be mocked (Galatians 6:7)</td>
<td>permissive</td>
<td>ACC (RFL.PRN)</td>
<td>PRS.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a0</sup> This and the following five passages in English are taken from LSM1986.
### Continuation of Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Prussian</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Causee marking in OPr</th>
<th>Form of OPr dāt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daiti ioumas pomīrit / kai ious fēfmu Rikijan / bhe ni fēfimans fmunentins schlūfītī (III 95_{14-16})</td>
<td>Laß euch dūncken / das jër dem Herrn vnnd nicht den Menfchen dienet (III 94_{12-14})</td>
<td>Serve whole-heartedly, as if you were serving the Lord, not men (Ephesians 6:7)</td>
<td>factitive (cognition)</td>
<td>DAT (PRN)</td>
<td>IMP.2PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stwi dai Deiws ainan gīl-lin māiggun krūt noſtan fmunentinan (III 101_{12-13})</td>
<td>Da ließ Gott der Herr einen tiefen Schlaff fallen / auff den Menfchen (III 100_{10-12})</td>
<td>And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam (Genesis 2:21)(^{21})</td>
<td>factitive</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>PST:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu quōtitlaifi ftaufidan twaian teikūfīnan / enfadinfnan / bhe abfignafnen / ni dāt kumpīnt neg-gi pogadīnt (III 109_{12-15})</td>
<td>du wöléft folch dein Gschöpf Ordnung vnd Segen / nicht laffen verrucken / noch ver-derben (III 108_{11-13})</td>
<td>that thou wouldst not permit this thy creation, ordinance and blessing to be disturbed or destroyed</td>
<td>permissive</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāiti fīans mālnījikiks prēmien perēt (III 113_{2-3})</td>
<td>Laß die Kindlein zu Mir komen (III 112)</td>
<td>Suffer the little children to come unto me (Mark 10:14)</td>
<td>permissive</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>IMP.2PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) This and the following two passages in English are taken from the translation of Luther’s *The Order of Baptism Newly Revised* (1526) and *The Order of Marriage for Common Pastors* (1529) published in LW53: 107–109, 111–115 (note that they differ in a number of respects from the German versions of III and some passages are absent, cf. bellow).
Continuation of Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Prussian</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Causee marking in OPr</th>
<th>Form of OPr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flas wiſsemukin Deiws / fſchos Malni-jkan prēiftan Crixtifin / Noūfan mi-jlas Rikijas Jheſu Chriſti / aſt etnīnings pereit dāuns (III 131,7–9)</td>
<td>der All-mechtig Gott diſß Kindlein / zu der Tauff vnſers lieben Herrn Jefu Chriſti / hat gedeniglich kommen laſſen (III 130,7–9)</td>
<td>–22</td>
<td>permissive/factitive</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>PST.ACT.PTCP. NOM.SG.M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai tāns febbei quotilai / ftan malnijki-kan en wiſſan etnīſtin polaipinton dat bout (III 131,11–12)</td>
<td>das Er jhm wolle das Kindt inn allen Genaden befohlen fein laſſen (III 130,10–11)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>permissive/factitive</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 I could not find this and the following passage in English translations of The Order of Baptism available to me.
Table 2. Periphrastic hortative constructions based on OPr dāt ‘give’ (all OPr verbal forms are IMP.2PL and all 1PL pronouns are in DAT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Prussian</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titet dāiti nūmans kirdīt / ſtan Ebangelion (III 11117−18)</td>
<td>So laffet vns hören das Euangelion (III 11117)</td>
<td>Let us hear the holy Gospel of St. Mark(^{23})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiti noūmans tīt madlīt (III 117(_{15}))</td>
<td>Laft vns alſo Beten (III 111(_{17}))</td>
<td>Let us pray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiti noūmans źalis Madlīt (III 119(_{7}))</td>
<td>Ein ander Gebet (III 111(_{17}))</td>
<td>Let us pray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiti noūmans dijgi gērbt / ſtan madlin (III 121(_{14}))</td>
<td>Laft vns auch ſprechen das Gebet (III 111(_{17}))</td>
<td>–(^{24})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{23}\) The following three passages in English are taken from LW53: 107−109 (see also fn. 21).

\(^{24}\) I could not find this passage in English translations available to me.