

Old Prussian *dāt* ‘give’ in causative and hortative constructions

JURGIS PAKERYS

Vilnius University

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).

Keywords: verbs of possession transfer, periphrastic causative constructions, periphrastic hortative constructions, language contact, Old Prussian, German

1. Introduction¹

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. Factitive 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. LIP-o80/2016. 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, Vietnamese, 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’

in Thai and Akan (cf. also a summary on causative use of ‘give’ in Asian and African languages in Lord *et al.* 2002, 232); for a discussion of Finnish causative ‘give’, see Leino (2012) and von Waldenfels (2012b).

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 *duôt*, 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*.² The recipient of *dāt* is marked by the dative while the patient is in the accusative, cf. DAT.PL *ftēimans* ‘(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) a. Old Prussian

tu dāfe ftēimans / tennēifon landan
 2SG give:PRS.2SG 3PL.DAT.M 3PL.GEN.M food:ACC.SG
 ‘You give them their food’

III 83₈₋₉

b. German

du gibst jnen jre Speyfe
 2SG give:PRS.2SG 3.PL.DAT 3PL.GEN.F food:ACC.SG
 ‘You give them their food’³

III 82₈₋₉

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’

Ench1586, [F iiiij verso]₉₋₁₀

d. Lithuanian

tu dūfi penukfchla yu
 2SG give:PRS.2SG food:ACC.SG 3.PL.GEN.M
 ‘You give [them] their food’

VlnE1579 37₁₁

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-

² For a full list of reflexes of the Indo-European **deh₃* - ‘give’, see IEW 223–225 and LIV² 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.

³ Cf. ‘You give them their food’ (Psalms 145:15; LSM1986, <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 89₁₂) = *Rechenſchaft geben* (III 88₁₁₋₁₂) ‘give account’, *reddewijdikaufnan dātwei* (III 33₁₅) = *falsche zeugnus geben* (III 32₁₄) ‘give false testimony’, *fien ſkellānts dātunsi* (III 65₁₈) = *ſich ſchuldig geben* (III 64₁₇₋₁₈) ‘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 *fien* [...] *dātunsi* (III 65₁₈) with double reflexive markers: *fien* (orthotonic) and *si* (enclitic, i.e. *dātun=si*). The majority of the remaining forms correspond to German (*sich*) *lassen* (14 attestations, 25%), while 2 cases do not have direct verbal correspondences: *polaipinfnan dāuns* ‘[has] given order’ (III 121₁₇) corresponds to *befolhen* [...] *hat* (III 120₁₄₋₁₇) ‘has ordered’ (one could expect *Befehl geben*), while *Daiti noumans tālis Madlit* ‘Let us pray further’ (III 119₇₋₈) curiously corresponds to *Ein ander Gebet* (III 118₆) ‘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 2013² (search for ‘lassen’ in the full text of the dictionary) and beside *dāt* mentioned above, only the verb *powiērp* 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 pccs 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 *laist*, Lithuanian *lėisti*, common root **leid-*) or are attested in one of them only (Latvian *ļaut*) 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 *powiēript* = 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:

(1) 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’;

(2) factitive use can be paraphrased as ‘veranlassen, bewirken (dass etwas geschieht)’ = ‘cause (something to happen)’, cf. *jemanden warten lassen* ‘make somebody wait.’⁵

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.⁶ 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):⁷

(2) a. Old Prussian

<i>kai</i>	<i>tans</i>	<i>noūmans</i>	<i>erfinnat</i>	<i>daft</i> [...]
that	3SG.NOM.M	1PL.DAT	recognize:INF	give:INF ⁸

⁵ Definitions and examples are taken from *Duden* dictionary available online at <<https://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/lassen>>, accessed in March, 2017.

⁶ The permittee acts as a recipient of the permission, enablement, cf. Newman (1996: 190–193).

⁷ 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).

⁸ 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 [...]’

III 53₆₋₇

b. German

das er vns erkennen laffe [...]
 that 3SG.NOM.M 1PL.ACC recognize:INF let:3SG.IRR
 ‘that he lets us recognize [...]’⁹

III 52₅

c. Latvian

ka tas mums [...] adβyt leke
 that 3SG.NOM.M 1PL.DAT recognize:INF leave:PRS.3¹⁰
 ‘that he lets us recognize [...]’

Ench1586 [A iiij verso]₁₈₋₁₉

d. Lithuanian

ieng ghis tatai dūtu mumus
 that 3SG.NOM.M it give:IRR.3 1PL.DAT
paβinti
 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 Waldenfels 2012a, 44, 103–109; 2012b, 214–216; 2015, 118–119). Newman (1996, 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 provided 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 cannot 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 cognition 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

⁹ Cf. ‘That God would lead us to realize this’ (LSM1986, <http://catechism.cph.org/en/lords-prayer.html>).

¹⁰ 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*-construction, which assigns accusative.¹¹ 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),¹² cf. (3a). 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 ftans malnikikans 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’

III 113₂₋₃ (Mark 10:14)

b. German

Laft 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 112₂

c. Latvian

Laydeth tös Bherninges py man
 let:IMP.2PL DEM.ACC.PL.M child:DIMIN.ACC.PL to 1SG.DAT
nāckt
 come:INF

¹¹ This has been noted also in the colloquial Upper Sorbian construction with *da(wa)ć*, see von Waldenfels (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 (3), (5a), (7), <http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemma=lassen>).

¹² 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’

Ench1586 I₁₃₋₁₄

d. Lithuanian

Leifket waikelus manęp eiti

let:IMP.2PL child:DIMIN.ACC.PL 1SG.ALL go:INF

‘Let the little children come to me’

VlnE1579 62₉₋₁₀

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 130₁₁, 131₁₂) and have translated and marked them here and in the Appendix as permissive/factitive:

(4) a. Old Prussian

Deiws / fchien Malnijkan prēi[=]ftan

god:NOM.SG DEM.ACC.SG.M child:ACC.SG to=DEM.ACC.SG.F

Crixtifnan aft etnīwings pereit

baptism:ACC.SG AUX.PRS.3 gracious:NOM.SG.M come:INF

dāuns

give:PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M

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

III 131₇₋₉

b. German

Gott diß Kindlein / zu der

god:NOM.SG DEM.ACC.SG.N child:DIMIN.ACC.SG to ART.DEF.DAT.SG.F

Tauff[...] hat genediglich kommen lassen

baptism:DAT.SG AUX.PRS.3SG graciously come:INF let:INF

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

III 130₇₋₉

c. Lithuanian

Diewas tq Kudikeli Chrikftop [...]

god:NOM.SG DEM.ACC.SG.M baby:DIMIN.ACC.SG baptism:ALL.SG

malonei dawes eft ateiti

graciously give:PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M AUX.PRS.3 come:INF

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

MŽF1559, 112₃₋₆

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

Deiws ni daft fien bebbint
 god:NOM.SG NEG give:3PRS PRN.RFL.ACC mock:INF
 ‘God does not allow himself to be mocked’¹³

III 87₂₄ (Galatians 6:7)

b. German

Gort [= Gott] lefft sich nicht spotten
 god:NOM.SG let:PRS.3SG PRN.RFL.ACC NEG mock:INF
 ‘God does not allow himself to be mocked’

III 86₂₁

c. Latvian –

d. Lithuanian

Dievas neperleidz išch fawes iūka
 god:NOM.SG not.allow:PRS.3 from PRN.RFL.GEN joke:GEN.SG
dariti
 make:INF
 ‘the God does not allow to make a joke about himself’

VlnE1579 39₂₀₋₂₁

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.¹⁴ 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

¹³ Cf. ‘God cannot be mocked’ (LSM1986, <http://catechism.cph.org/en/table-of-duties.html>).

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 *dać*-constructions, see Holvoet 2016, 47–48).

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

(6) a. Old Prussian

Daiti ioumas pomirit / kai ious [...]
 give:IMP.2PL 1PL.DAT think:INF that 2PL.NOM
 ‘Let yourself think that you [...]

III 95₁₄ (Ephesians 6:7)

b. German

Laft euch düncken / das jr [...]
 give:IMP.2PL 1PL.ACC seem:INF that 2PL.NOM
 ‘Let it seem to you that you [...]

III 94_{12–13}

c. Latvian

domadamme ka yuus [...]
 think:CVB.CTP.PL.M that 2PL.NOM
 ‘thinking that you [...]

Ench1586 [G iiij]_{7–8}

d. Lithuanian

tikiedamiefi iog yus [...]
 believe:CVB.CTP.PL.M.RFL that 2PL.NOM
 ‘hoping that you [...]

VlnE1579 43₁₂

Here, OPr *pomirit* ‘think’ reflects German impersonal *dünken* used with the accusative pronominal form *euch*,¹⁵ 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-

¹⁵ I would like to thank one of the reviewers for pointing this out to me. German *dünken* can be also used with the dative (as in *mir dünkt* ‘it seems to me’), but for the period in question, only accusative was used, see DWB s.v. *dünken*, <http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemma=duenzen>.

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

Stwi dai Deiws ainan gillin
(t)here give:PST.3 god:NOM.SG one:ACC.SG.F deep:ACC.SG.F
maiggun krūt no[=]ftan fmunentinan
sleep:ACC.SG fall:INF on=DEM.ACC.SG.M man:ACC.SG
‘(T)here, God caused a deep sleep to fall onto the man’

III 101₁₂

b. German

Da ließ Gott der HERR
then let:PST.3SG god:NOM.SG ART.DEF.NOM.SG.M lord
einen tieffen Schlaff fallen /
ART.INDEF.ACC.SG.M deep:ACC.SG.M sleep:ACC.SG fall:INF
auff den Menschen
on ART.DEF.ACC.SG.M man.ACC.SG
‘Then the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall onto the man’

III 100_{10–11}

c. Latvian

Tad licke Dews tas Kunx
then leave:PST.3 god:NOM.SG 3:NOM.SG.M lord:NOM.SG
wene czille Mege krift
one:ACC.SG.M deep:ACC.SG.M sleep:ACC.SG fall:INF

¹⁶ <https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Genesis-Chapter-2/>.

vs to Czilwheke

on DEM.ACC.SG.M man:ACC.SG

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

Ench1586 H *verso*_{16–17}

d. Lithuanian

Perleida tada Ponas Diewas didi

release:PST.3 then lord:NOM.SG god:NOM.SG great:ACC.SG.M

miega ant Adoma

sleep:ACC.SG onto Adam:ACC.SG

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

VlnE1579 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 *likt* in (7c), which is also formally ambiguous (‘let’ vs ‘make’), while the Lithuanian translator chose to use VP *perleisti miegą* ‘release, provide, give sleep’ in (7d), cf. the fully-fledged (i.e. complemented by the infinitive clause) PCC with *perleisti* in (5d) above.

Speaking of the direct factitive function of *give*-based PCCs, we know that in some languages permissive *give*-based constructions acquire this interpretation due to interference with German *lassen*-constructions. A case in point is Sorbian, where *give*-based PCCs express not only curative (indirect factitive), but also direct factitive causation (von Waldenfels 2015, 116). Curative causation in *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 *dāt* reflects German construction (*etwas*) *genug sein lassen*, which is rather idiomatic and seems to be on the borderline between permissive and factitive reading,¹⁷ that is, ‘let it be enough’ ≈ ‘do so that it is enough’, ‘stop, end it’, etc. Lithuanian translator decided to rendered this construction using IMP.3 in (8c):

(8) a. Old Prussian

Bhe tīt dais panfdau zuit bouton.

and so give:IMP.2SG then enough be:INF

¹⁷ I owe this interpretation to one of the reviewers.

‘And so let it be enough’¹⁸

III 69₂₈

b. German

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

III 68₂₅₋₂₆

c. Latvian

—¹⁹

d. Lithuanian

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

VlnE1579 31₁₂

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 109₁₄ (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):

¹⁸ Cf. ‘Let that be enough’ (LSM1986, <http://catechism.cph.org/en/confession.html>).

¹⁹ 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 kurtze Forma 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).

(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

Daiti noūmans tīt madlīt.
 give:IMP.2PL 1PL.DAT so pray:INF
 'Let us pray so'

III 117₁₅

b. German

Laft vns alfo Beten.
 let:IMP.2PL 1PL.ACC so pray:INF
 'Let us pray so'

III 116₁₃

c. Latvian

Laydeth mums luuckt
 let:IMP.2PL 1PL.DAT pray:INF
 'Let us pray'

Ench1586 [H iiij]₅

d. Lithuanian

Melskemofe

pray:IMP.1PL.RFL

‘Let us pray’

VlnE1579 60₁

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 1PL.DAT further pray:INF

‘Let us pray further’

III 119₇

b. German

Ein ander Gebet

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

‘Another prayer’

III 118₆

c. Latvian

Laydet mums luuckt

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

‘Let us pray’

Ench1586 [H iiij]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 10₉₋₁₇), 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 103₁₅: *Antra Malda* ‘second prayer’).

Thus far we can conclude that the OPr phrase *Daiti noumans tālis 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 ij), *Laffet vns weiter beten* (HB1580 A ij), 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 noumans tālis 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

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 *lass(e)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.

Jurgis Pakerys

Vilnius University

Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic

Universiteto g. 3, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania

jurgis.pakerys@flf.vu.lt

ABBREVIATIONS

1 — 1st person, 2 — 2nd person, 3 — 3rd person, ACC — accusative, ACT — active, ALL — allative, ART — article, AUX — auxiliary, CTP — contemporaneity, CVB — converb, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, DEM — demonstrative, DIMIN — diminutive, F — feminine, GEN — genitive, IMP — imperative, INDEF — indefinite, INF — infinitive, IRR — irrealis, M — masculine, N — neuter, NEG — negation, NOM — nominative, PL — plural, PRN — pronoun, PRS — present, PST — past, PTCP — participle, RFL — reflexive, SG — singular, SUP — supine.

REFERENCES AND SOURCES

- ARDOINO, DIEGO. 2013. Per una datazione della Traccia di Basilea in prussiano antico. *Res Balticae* 12 (*Baltica Pisana in memoria di Nikolai Mikhailov*), 5–24.
- AUWERA, JOHAN VAN DER, NINA DOBRUSHINA & VALENTIN GOUSSEV. 2004. A semantic map for imperative-hortatives. In: Dominique Willems, Bart Defrancq, Timothy Coleman & Dirk Noël, eds., *Contrastive Analysis in Language. Identifying Linguistic Units of Comparison*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 44–66.
- AUWERA, JOHAN VAN DER, NINA DOBRUSHINA, VALENTIN GOUSSEV. 2013. Imperative-hortative systems. In: Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath, eds., *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at <<http://wals.info>>, last accessed in April, 2017.
- BECHTEL, FRIEDRICH. 1881. Zum Altpreußischen Enchiridion. *Altpreußische Monatsschrift* 18, 310–319.

- DINI, PIETRO. 2010. Martyno Mažvydo *Formos Chrikštymo* (1559) vertimo originalas—*Form der Tauff* (1559). *Archivum Lithuanicum* 12, 71–82.
- DIXON, ROBERT M. W. 2000. A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. In: Robert M. W. Dixon, Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, eds., *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 30–83.
- DWB — *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*. 16 Bde. in 32 Teilbänden, Leipzig, 1854–1961. Available online at <<http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB>>. Last accessed in October, 2017.
- Ench1586 — *ENCHIRIDION* [...] *Der kleine Catechismus* [...] *Durch D. Martin. Luther. Nun aber aus dem Deudfchen ins vndeudfche gebracht* [...]. Königsberg: Georg Osterberger, 1586. Available online at <<http://www.korpuss.lv/senie/source.jsp?codificator=Ench1586>>. Last accessed in April, 2017.
- FT1559 — *Form der Tauff. Wie die in der Kirchenordnung des Hertzogthumbs Preuffen / vnd andern mehr / verffasset*. Königsberg: Hans Daubmann, 1559. Available online at <<http://resolver.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/SBB00016A6A00000000>>. Last accessed in April, 2017.
- GENIUŠIENĖ, EMMA. 1987. *The Typology of Reflexives*. Berlin-New York-Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HB1580 — *Handbüchlein Der Fürnembften Kirchengebrauch* [...]. Frankfurt am Main: Nikolaus Bassée, 1580. Available online at <<https://books.google.lt/books?id=ABk8AAAACAAJ>>. Last accessed in April, 2017.
- HEINE, BERND & TANIA KUTEVA. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2007. *Mood and Modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2016. Reflexive permissives and the middle voice. *Baltic Linguistics* 7, 9–52.
- IEW — Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern-München: Francke, 1959.
- III — *Der Kleine Catechismus Doctor Martin Luthers Deutch vnd Preuffisch* [...]. Königsberg: Johann Daubmann, 1561. Available online at <<http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt/tekstai/paieska/>>. Last accessed in April, 2017.
- KARULIS, KONSTANTĪNS. 1992. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* 1. Rīga: Avots.
- KO1558 — *Kirchen Ordnung*[.] *Wie es im Hertzogthumb Preuffen, beides mit Lehr vnd Ceremonien, fampt andern, fo zu Fürderung und Erhaltung des Predigampts, Chriftlicher zucht vnd guter Ordnung von nōten gehalten wird*. [...] Königsberg: Hans Daubmann, [vol. 1] 1558, [vol. 2] 1559.

- Available online at <<http://www.mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn=urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10201454-2>> [vol. 1], <<http://www.mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn=urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10201455-7>> [vol. 2]. Last accessed in April, 2017.
- KO1573 — *Kirchenordnung / Wie es mit der Reinen Lere Gottliches Worts / vnd aufteilung der Hochwirdigen Sacrament [...] in der Löblichen Graffschafft Oldenburg etc. Sol eintrechtiglich gehalten werden.* Jena: Donat Richtzenhan, 1573. Available online at <<https://books.google.lt/books?id=ZX5XAAAACAAJ>>. Last accessed in April, 2017.
- KULIKOV, LEONID. 2001. Causatives. In: Marin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raibl, eds., *Language Typology and Language Universals*, vol. 2, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 886–898.
- LEINO, JAAKKO. 2012. Analytical expressions for permissive causation in Finnish. In: Jaakko Leino & Ruprecht von Waldenfels, eds., *Analytical causatives: from 'give' and 'come' to 'let' and 'make'*, München: Lincom, 221–246.
- LIV² — *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben.* Unter der Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp und Brigitte Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- LORD, CAROL, FOONG HA YAP, SHOICHI IWASAKI. 2002. Grammaticalization of 'give': African and Asian perspectives. In: Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald, eds., *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 217–235.
- LSM1986 — *Luther's Small Catechism*, Concordia Publishing House, 1986. Available online at <<http://catechism.cph.org/en#>>. Last accessed in April, 2017.
- LW53 — *Luther's Works 53: Liturgy and Hymns*, ed. by Ulrich S. Leupold, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- MAŽULIS, VYTAUTAS. 1975. Seniausias baltų rašto paminklas. *Baltistica* 11.2, 125–131.
- MAŽULIS, VYTAUTAS. 2013². *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, 2-asis leid. [Etymological Dictionary of Old Prussian, 2nd ed.], Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras. Available online at <<http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt/zodynas/paieska>>. Last accessed in October, 2017.
- ME II — *K. Mühlenbachs lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch.* Redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von Jan Endzelin. Riga: Lettisches Bildungsministerium,

- 1923–1932. Available online at <<http://tezaurs.lv/mev/>>. Accessed in December, 2016.
- MŽF1559 — *FORMA Chrikſtima. Kaip Baſſniczas Iſtatimæ Hertzikiftes Prufu / ir kitofu žemefu laikoma ira*. Königsberg: Hans Daubmann, 1559. Cited from: Guido Michelini, *Martyno Mažvydo raštai ir jų šaltiniai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2000.
- NEDJALKOV, VLADIMIR P. & Georgij G. SILNICKIJ. 1969. Tipologija morfologičeskogo i leksičeskogo kauzativov [Typology of morphological and lexical causatives]. In: Aleksandr A. Xolodovič, ed., *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. Morfologičeskij kauzativ* [Typology of Causative Constructions. Morphological Causative], Leningrad: Nauka, 20–50.
- NEDJALKOV, VLADIMIR P. & GEORGIJ G. SIL'NITSKY. 1973. The typology of morphological and lexical causatives. In: Ferenc Kiefer, ed., *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*, 1–32. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- NEWMAN, JOHN. 1996. *Give. A Cognitive Linguistic Study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2016. On periphrastic causative constructions in Lithuanian and Latvian. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Argument Realization in Baltic*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 427–458.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2017. Baltic context of some Estonian periphrastic causative constructions. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 8.1, 179–195.
- SHIBATANI, MASAYOSHI & PRASHANT PARDESHI. 2002. The causative continuum. In: Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 85–126.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2005. *Lexikon der altpreussischen Verben*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- TOOPS, GARY H. 2012. Causative constructions in colloquial vs. literary Upper Sorbian. *Die Welt der Slaven* 57, 322–332.
- VlnE1579 — *ENCHIRIDION [...] Catechifmas mažas [...] per Daktara Martina Luthera. O ifch Wokifchka lieſuwia ant Lietuwifchka [...] pergulditas / per Baltramieju Willentha [...]*. Königsberg: Georg Osterberger, 1579. Electronic text edited by Ona Aleknavičienė, Institute of the Lithuanian Language.
- WALDENFELS, RUPRECHT VON. 2012a. *The Grammaticalization of 'Give' + Initiative. A Comparative Study of Russian, Polish and Czech*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- WALDENFELS, RUPRECHT VON. 2012b. Finnish *antaa* and Russian *davat* 'to give' as causatives: a contrastive analysis. In: Jaakko Leino & Ruprecht von

Waldenfels, eds., *Analytical Causatives: From 'Give' and 'Come' to 'Let' and 'Make'*, München: Lincom, 187–220.

WALDENFELS, RUPRECHT VON. 2015. Grammaticalized 'give' in Slavic between drift and contact: Causative, modal, imperative and existential constructions. In: Brian Nolan, Gudrun Rawoens, Elke Diedrichsen, eds., *Causation, Permission, and Transfer: Argument Realisation in GET, TAKE, PUT, GIVE and LET Verbs*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 107–127.

WA12 — *Dr. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 12 [Hrsg. von Joachim Karl Friedrich Knaake *et al.*] Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1891.

WA19 — *Dr. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 19 [Hrsg. von Joachim Karl Friedrich Knaake *et al.*], Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1897.

APPENDIX

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

Old Prussian	German	English	Function	Causee marking in OPr	Form of OPr <i>dāt</i>
bhe fwaian rikin niqwoitā daton perēit (III 51 ₁₅₋₁₆)	vnd fein Reich nicht komen laffen wōllen (III 50 ₁₄)	do not want [...] let His kingdom come ²⁰	permissive	ACC	INF/SUP
mes madlimai enfchan madlin / kai tans noūmans erfinnat daft (III 53 ₆₋₇)	Aber wir biten in diefem Gebet / das er vns erkennen laffe (III 52 ₄₋₅)	but we pray in this petition that God would lead us to realize this	factitive (cognition)	DAT (PRN)	PRS.3
afmai pertennūns bhe fūkūdan dāuns feggīt (III 69 ₂)	Habe verfeumet vnd fchaden laffen gefchehen (III 68 ₁₋₂)	I have been negligent and allowed damage to be done	permissive	–	PST.ACT.PTCP. NOM.SG.M
Bhe tit dais panfdau zuit bouton (III 69 ₂₇₋₂₈)	Alfo laffe es genug fein (III 68 ₂₅₋₂₆)	Let that be enough	permissive/factitive	–	IMP.2SG
Deiws ni daft fien bebbint (III 87 ₂₄)	Gort [=Gott] lefft fich nicht fpotten (III 86 ₂₁)	God cannot be mocked (Galatians 6:7)	permissive	ACC (REFL.PRN)	PRS.3

²⁰ This and the following five passages in English are taken from LSM1986.

Continuation of Table 1

Old Prussian	German	English	Function	Causee marking in OPr	Form of OPr <i>dāt</i>
Daiti ioumas pomirit / kai ious stefmu Rikijan / bhe ni steimans fmunentins fchlūfiti (III 95 ₁₄₋₁₆)	Laßt euch düncken / das jr dem HERRN vnnd nicht den Menschen dienet (III 94 ₁₂₋₁₄)	Serve wholeheartedly, as if you were serving the Lord, not men (Ephesians 6:7)	factitive (cognition)	DAT (PRN)	IMP.2PL
Stwi dai Deiwš ainan gil- lin maiggun krūt noftan fmunentinan (III 101 ₁₁₋₁₃)	Da ließ Gott der HERR einen tiefen Schlaf fallen / auff den Menschen (III 100 ₁₀₋₁₂)	And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam (Genesis 2:21) ²¹	factitive	ACC	PST.3
tu quoitilaifi ftawīdan twaian teikūfnan / enfadinfnan / bhe absignafnen / ni dāt kumpint neg- gi pogadint (III 109 ₁₂₋₁₅)	du wölleſt folch dein Geſchöpf Ordnung vnd Segen / nicht laſſen verrucken / noch verderben (III 108 ₁₁₋₁₃)	that thou wouldst not permit this thy creation, ordinance and blessing to be disturbed or destroyed	permissive	–	INF
Dāiti ftans malnijkikans prēmien perēit (III 113 ₂₋₃)	Laßt die Kindlein zu Mir komen (III 112 ₂)	Suffer the little children to come unto me (Mark 10:14)	permissive	ACC	IMP.2PL

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. below).

Continuation of Table 1

Old Prussian	German	English	Function	Causee marking in OPr	Form of OPr <i>dāt</i>
ftas wiffemukin Deiws / schien Malni- jkan prēiftan Crixtifnan / Noūfan mi- jlas Rikijas Jhefu Chrifti / aft etniwings pereit dāuns (III 131 ₇₋₉)	der All- mechtig Gott diß Kindlein / zu der Tauff vnfers lieben Herrn Jefu Chrifti / hat genediglich kommen lassen (III 130 ₇₋₉)	— ²²	permissive/ factitive	ACC	PST.ACT.PTCP. NOM.SG.M
kai tās febbei quoitilai / ftan malnijki- kan en wiffan etniftin polaipinton dat bout (III 131 ₁₁₋₁₂)	das Er jhm wölle das Kindt inn al- len Genaden befohlen sein lassen (III 130 ₁₀₋₁₁)	—	permissive/ factitive	ACC	INF

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)*

Old Prussian	German	English
Titet dāiti nūmans kirdīt / ftan Ebangelion (III 111 ₁₇₋₁₈)	So laffet vns hōren das Euangelion (III 111 ₁₇)	Let us hear the holy Gospel of St. Mark ²³
Daiti noūmans tīt madlit (III 117 ₁₅)	Laft vns alfo Beten (III 111 ₁₇)	Let us pray
Daiti noumans tālis Madlit (III 119 ₇)	Ein ander Gebet (III 111 ₁₇)	Let us pray
Daiti noūmans dijgi gērbt / ftan madlin (III 121 ₁₄)	Laft vns auch fprechen das Gebet (III 111 ₁₇)	— ²⁴

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.