

On the modal functions of Lithuanian verbs of coming

Erika Jasionytė-Mikučionienė

Department of the Lithuanian Language

Vilnius University

Universiteto g. 5

LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania

E-mail: erika.jasionyte@gmail.com

Abstract

The verbs of coming and going as a means of modality have been investigated in a number of languages: Russian (Majsak 2005; Bourdin 2014), Latvian (Wälchli 1996, 2000), Estonian (Penjam 2006), Finnish (Kangasniemi 1992) and others. However, with the exception of some observations made by Wälchli (1996) or Nau (2012), the realization of modality by ‘come’ or ‘go’ verbs in Lithuanian has not been thoroughly examined. Thus, the present paper is concerned with a diachronic as well as synchronic variation pertaining to two Lithuanian verbs of motion that contain the root ‘go’, i.e. *pareiti* ‘come home, return’ and *prieiti* ‘approach on foot’ as well as their reflexive counterparts. The article seeks to establish to what extent the verbs under analysis have developed modal meanings in Contemporary Lithuanian as well as the earliest period of the language (16th–17th centuries) and to account for the possible diachronic evolution of modal meanings. It focuses on both qualitative as well as quantitative parameters.

The data have been collected from the old written Lithuanian texts (16th–17th centuries) and the corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language, namely its subcorpus of fiction texts.

The text sample on which the study is based shows that the modal constructions with the Lithuanian verbs of motion based on the root ‘go’ appear in the 16th century. It is only the reflexive forms *pareitis(i)* (‘PREF-go-REFL’) and *prieitis(i)* (‘PREF-go-REFL’) that have potential to realise non-epistemic modality: the analysed material did not reveal any instances where non-reflexive forms *pareiti* and *prieiti* are used to convey modality. The predominant modal meaning of the reflexive verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* concerns the meaning of participant-external as well as deontic necessity.

As for Contemporary Lithuanian, the ‘go’-derived necessive constructions are rather marginal in the contemporary system of modality: the verbs under analysis are more

common in spoken Lithuanian or dialects than in written Lithuanian. Moreover, semantic distribution among the reflexive verbs under consideration differs in Old and in Contemporary Lithuanian. Deontic necessity takes the leading position among the reflexive verb *pareitis(i)* in Old Lithuanian, whereas participant-external necessity predominates among the reflexive verb *prisieiti* in Contemporary Lithuanian.

Keywords: verbs of coming, participant-external necessity, modal and non-modal meanings, neccessive constructions, old Lithuanian texts, corpus-based analysis

1 Introduction

As has been observed in the latest studies on ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs in Russian, Latvian, Estonian, Finnish and other languages, the majority of them tend to evolve into grammatical markers of tense, aspect, mood or modality (cf. Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994; Heine & Kuteva 2005; Majsak 2005 and others). As modal markers, the verbs of coming are typically used for the expression of non-epistemic necessity. The structural patterns in which these verbs occur and the modal meaning of participant-external necessity share one feature in common – an infinitival complement, e.g.:

Latvian:

- (1) *Mums nāk-a-s aiz-braukt-t.*
 we.DAT come.3PRS.REFL away-travel.INF
 ‘We have to leave.’
 (Mathiassen 1996, 130–131, cited from Bourdin 2014, 150)

Estonian:

- (2) *Mei-l tuleb töö lõpeta-da.*
 we.ADESS come.3PRS.SG job.NOM finish.INF1
 ‘We have to finish the job.’
 (Penjam 2006, 167)

Russian:

- (3) *Mne prixodilos’ ne raz slyšat’*
 I.DAT come.3PRS.REFL no once listen.INF

slova kolleg.
 words.ACC colleagues.GEN
 ‘I had to listen more than once to the words of my colleagues.’
 (de Haan 1996, 99)

Moreover, the verbs of coming usually appear in impersonal constructions where the actor is marked with an oblique case (the adessive in Estonian and the dative in Russian and Latvian).

The impersonal necessitive constructions based on the ‘come’ (or ‘go’) verbs are widespread in the circum-Baltic area (namely, in Slavonic and Balto-Finnic languages; cf. Wälchli 1996, 44; also Hansen & de Haan 2009). As has been mentioned, one of their arguments (i.e. the agent) is coded in a dative or another oblique case. The latter structural restriction is backed up by certain kind of semantic constraints: impersonal modals tend to be restricted to non-epistemic modality, or in some languages, only to non-epistemic necessity (cf. Besters-Dilger, Drobnjaković, Hansen 2009, 189). Also, Nau (2012, 492) observes that in the circum-Baltic languages

- (i) the [‘come’-derived] construction¹ expresses only external necessity, but neither internal nor epistemic modality,
- (ii) the construction is rather marginal in the system of modal expressions, as it is less frequent and less general than other expression means of necessity,
- (iii) the verb never loses its non-modal and/or pre-modal meanings, there is no semantic bleaching.

As the analysis of the Lithuanian verbs of coming show, all features listed above are relevant to the Lithuanian modal verbs based on the stem meaning ‘go’ (see Section 4 and 5).

It is generally accepted in linguistic literature that, cross-linguistically, the motion verb ‘come’ is deictic and therefore the most “grammaticalizable” (cf. Majsak 2005; Rakhilina 2004). The motion the verbs of coming denote is directional and goal-oriented: the goal is the implicit location of the speaker. Thus, the verbs refer to the motion towards the location of the speaker: the starting point is a location distant from the speaker and the endpoint is the speaker herself. According to Bourdin (2014), there is a conceptual link between goal-orientedness (i.e. lexical meaning) and necessitive modality (i.e. grammatical meaning); what is more, this link is of a metonymic nature: “moving towards a goal is an activity that people typically do not engage in unless they need to (and/or want to)” (Bourdin 2014, 118). This seems to be one of the main reasons why the grammaticalization path ‘approaching the goal’ > ‘future’ or ‘possibility’ or ‘necessity’ is possible and well documented cross-linguistically.

The features, that the Lithuanian verbs with the root ‘go’ share with verbs of coming in other languages are impersonality as well as the reflexive suffix. It is the 3rd person forms of the Lithuanian verbs *pareiti* and *prieiti*, namely, their reflexive counterparts that are found in impersonal constructions in Contemporary Lithuanian, e.g.:

¹ Nau (2012) focuses on the meaning ‘come’ in a broad sense: all (prefixed) verbs, either containing the root ‘come’ or the root ‘go’, are considered to be ‘come verbs’.

- (4) *Tada man prisiejo keisti planą.* (CCLL-Fic)
 Then I.DAT come.3PST.REFL change.INF plan.ACC
 ‘Then I had to change the plan.’

The given constructions typically realise participant-external necessity and they seem to be one of the most frequent modal realisations in Old Lithuanian. Previous studies have yielded important clues to the origin as well as to the development of the necessitive impersonal constructions in the circum-Baltic languages (see Wälchli 1996, 2000; Heine & Kuteva 2005; Nau 2012). Such constructions are said to be “characteristic to the [language] systems, it is an old inherited feature that arises again and again with different lexical material” (Nau 2012, 495). However, Lithuanian impersonal constructions with the verbs of coming and going have not been investigated in a corpus-based and systematic way. The current paper aims at filling this gap and providing a more in-depth corpus-based examination of the impersonal constructions with the Lithuanian verbs *par-si-eiti* ‘PREF-REFL-go’ (the old form is *par-eiti-s(i)* ‘PREF-go-REFL’) and *pri-si-eiti* ‘PREF-REFL-go’ (the old form is *pri-eiti-s(i)* ‘PREF-go-REFL’).

In the present paper, the framework of modality proposed by van der Auwera & Plungian (1998) has been adopted (see Table 1).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-epistemic modality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – participant-internal modality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * participant’s ability or capacity * participant’s internal need – participant-external modality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * external circumstances that make the state of affairs possible * external circumstances that make the state of affairs necessary – deontic modality (subtype of participant-external modality) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * permission * obligation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • epistemic modality

Table 1. Domains of modality in van der Auwera & Plungian (1998)

The central notion is non-epistemic necessity which embraces participant-internal and participant-external necessity, including the latter’s subtype of deontic necessity.

2 Data and method

Sets of data that have been analysed in the given study are synchronic as well as diachronic. To sketch the usage as well as types of meanings of the verbs under analysis in the earlier stages of Lithuanian, old written Lithuanian texts have been studied (16th–17th centuries). The concordances of the Old Lithuanian texts have been extracted from the Database of Old Writings set up by the Institute of the Lithuanian Language (<http://www.lki.lt/seniejirastai/>). A more detailed analysis of Jonas Bretkūnas' *Postilė* (BP; 1591), Mikalojus Daukša's *Postilė* (DP; 1599), *Knyga nobažnystės krikščioniškos* (KN; 1653) and Kleinas' hymnbook *Naujos giesmių knygos* (KING 1666; and its later editions by Rikovijus (RG; 1685) and Šusteris (ŠG; 1705)) has been carried out. *Postilė* by Jonas Bretkūnas is the first printed collection of Lithuanian sermons, which includes original and compiled texts. *Postilė* by Mikalojus Daukša is a translation from Polish. Kleinas' hymnbook comprised not only the old 16th century repertoire of Lithuanian hymns that was renewed, but also new Lithuanian Baroque hymns for the Lutheran Church. The hymnbook was republished in 1685 and 1705 (as the Rikovijus' and Šusteris' hymnals), with each subsequent edition expanded. *Knyga nobažnystės krikščioniškos* is the biggest Lithuanian book of the 17th century. It is a collection of Evangelical Reformed Church texts, translated from Polish.

In the analysed Old Lithuanian texts, 183 examples have been filtered out for the verb *pareiti(s(i))* and 126 examples for the verb *prieiti(s(i))*. It must be noted that the discussion about the semantic development of Lithuanian verbs causes some problems since not all texts of Old Lithuanian are the original ones. Moreover, they are written in different language variants. So, only tentative observations could be made with regard to the evolving tendencies of their semantic development.

The synchronic data have been collected from the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL) (<https://donelaitis.vdu.lt>). Currently, the size of the CCLL is 140 million words. Only two types of sub-corpora have been used, namely, fiction texts (18,461,597 tokens) and spoken register (557,822 tokens). The CCLL is not annotated, for this reason, the linguistic analysis had to be carried out manually, though the data search itself (i.e. form extraction) was automatic.

3 General remarks concerning Lithuanian verbs of coming

To begin with, the non-reflexive prefixed verbs *pareiti* and *prieiti* under analysis typically encode motion in a certain direction. *Pareiti* and *prieiti* are derived from the verb *eiti* 'go', which denotes motion on foot. The Lithuanian prefixes *par-* and *pri-* have a

meaning of the directed motion and derive originally from prepositions: *pri-* comes from the preposition *prie* ‘at, near, by’, thus, the derivative *prieiti* carries a meaning ‘approach on foot’, while *par-* originates from the preposition *par* ‘homewards’ and the derivative *pareiti* has a meaning of ‘come home, return’. Thus, in the case of the verb *pareiti*, the meaning ‘come’ derives by adding the prefix *par-* to the root ‘go’. Also, the motion endpoint coincides with the speaker, thus, *pareiti* is used deictically in Lithuanian, while the verb *prieiti* is non-deictic. Combining *eiti* ‘go’ with prefixes *par-* and *pri-* also has an aspectual effect: *par-* and *pri-*prefixed forms are perfective.

The verbs *pareiti* and *prieiti* have reflexive counterparts: *pareiti-s(i)* and *prieiti-s(i)* in Old Lithuanian and *par-si-eiti* and *pri-si-eiti* in the contemporary language. It should be noted that the reflexive forms of the verbs of coming are not semantically as close to their non-reflexive counterparts as, for example, the pair of the non-reflexive and reflexive verbs *norėti* and *norėtis* in the examples *Aš noriu X* ‘I want X’ and *Man norisi X* ‘I feel like X-ing’ (an analogical case is in Russian with *xotet’ X* ‘want X’ and *xotet’ s’ja X* ‘feel like X-ing’; cf. Bourdin 2014, 143). Nevertheless there is a conceptual link between motion and modality, the meaning of the reflexive forms *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* cannot be simply inferred from the meaning of the non-reflexive counterparts *pareiti* and *prieiti*: the analysed data show that the reflexive forms are specialized for modality and the non-reflexive forms are used for expressing motion or the meaning that can be defined as ‘be due to; belong to’. According to Gerritsen (1990, 206), the reflexive suffix *-s(i)* has an abstract meaning: it refers to the “‘force’ (fate or circumstance)” responsible for the “necessity” that “comes” to the individual denoted by the nominal in the dative case. Thus, the emergence of the reflexive forms encoding modality may be interpreted as a result of lexicalization and the reflexive forms *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* might be seen as separate lexical items specialized for the expression of non-epistemic necessity (see Section 4).

One of the crucial factors that leads the reflexive forms *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* towards modalization seems to be a prefix: it has been observed that the verbs of coming have grammaticalized into necessity markers by prefixation (Bourdin 2014, 138). As has been mentioned, the Lithuanian reflexive forms *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* (resp. *parsieiti* and *prisieiti*) are based on the non-prefixed reflexive form *eitis(i)* ‘go’, which is normally not used for expressing modality; thus, the prefixes *par-* and *pri-* seem to be the main prerequisite for the emergence of pre-modal as well as modal meanings of the verbs under analysis in Lithuanian. Besides, as the analysed data show, the structural pattern with infinitival complementation is also an important precondition for the rise of modal meanings.

4 The verbs of coming in Old Lithuanian

The Lithuanian verbs of coming under analysis (i.e. the non-reflexive forms *pareiti* and *prieiti* as well as the reflexive forms *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)*) come from the earliest written Lithuanian texts (the 16th–17th centuries). It should be noted that only reflexive forms of the verbs of coming are capable of expressing modality in Old Lithuanian: the analysed material did not reveal any instances where non-reflexive forms *pareiti* and *prieiti* are used to convey modality. Thus, the focus of the analysis is on the reflexive forms. The material of old written language revealed 158 occurrences of the reflexive form *pareitis(i)* and 29 occurrences of the reflexive form *prieitis(i)*. Table 2 reflects the distribution of the reflexive verbs of coming across the analysed old Lithuanian texts.

	BP (1589)	DP (1599)	KN (1653)	KING (1666)	RG (1685)	ŠG (1704)
<i>pareitis(i)</i>	138	0	2	5	6	7
<i>prieitis(i)</i>	0	25	2	1	1	0

Table 2. The distribution of the Lithuanian reflexive verbs of coming across the analysed old Lithuanian texts (16th–17th centuries)

The two reflexive verbs of coming are not equally likely to express modal meanings in Old Lithuanian: in 140 cases the reflexive form of the verb *pareitis(i)* was used modally (89% of all the occurrences of the reflexive form in the old written language), while the modal semantics conveyed by the reflexive form of the verb *prieitis(i)* takes up 24% of the overall use of the reflexive form.

4.1 Structural properties

The reflexive prefixed forms *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* correspond to the non-reflexive forms *pareiti* and *prieiti* respectively: in Old Lithuanian, the suffix *-s* or *-si* predominantly² takes the word final position. The reflexive verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* can take the nominal phrase (5), the infinitive (6) or the subordinate clause with the complementizer *idant* ‘so that; in order to’ (7) as their complements. Lexical meanings are typically realized in the constructions with nominal complements or with the *idant*-clause, whereas modal meanings are expressed by the constructions with infinitival or clausal complementation (the *idant*-clause as well).

² In Old Lithuanian, the position of the reflexive marker in prefixed verbs was much freer than in the contemporary standard language, e.g., with the reflexive marker occurring both between the second prefix and the root as well as in word final position.

- (5) *Bet' tōii galibę nepriėitis žmonėmus <...>* (DP 203, 24)
 but that power NEG.[<go>].3PRS.REFL people.DAT
 ‘But that power does not belong to people.’
- (6) *[P]areitiŝi koŝna ŝmogui Idant Diewui*
 [<go>].3PRS.REFL every.DAT person.DAT that God.DAT
dakawotu uŝu io <...> dowanās. (BP II 358, 21–22)
 thank.SBJV for his gifts.ACC
 ‘Everybody has to thank God for his gifts.’
- (7) *Kaipo pareitiŝi melŝti.* (BPII 97, 12)
 ADV [<go>].3PRS.REFL pray.INF
 ‘What is the proper way to pray?’

The “subject” of the constructions with the verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* is in the dative. Thus, according to the syntactic criterion, the Lithuanian modal constructions with the reflexive verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* may be considered as impersonal. As has been noticed in the literature, impersonality and the oblique coding of the nominal bearing the role of Agent/Experiencer are characteristic to almost all ‘come’- or ‘go’-derived necessity constructions (cf. Bourdin 2014, 132). It is worthwhile paying attention to the close interplay between impersonality and the modal meaning of necessity. In their study on impersonal modals of necessity in the Slavonic languages, Besters-Dilger, Drobnjaković and Hansen (2009, 190) provide a semantic explanation of the given interplay: “Necessity is felt as something outside the person, hard to influence, therefore it was originally not expressed by a personal verb which would reflect a certain freedom of action of the individual.” This explanation is also valid for the Lithuanian impersonal modals: not only are the impersonal forms of the verbs of coming used to encode non-epistemic necessity in Old Lithuanian, but other verbs of necessity such as *reikėti* (‘need’), *derėti* (‘fit’) or the neuter form of adjectives like *privalu* (‘obligatory’) are used impersonally as well (see in Holvoet 2007; Jasionytė-Mikučionienė 2014).

The paradigm of the reflexive forms of the Lithuanian verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* can be regarded as defective because it is only third-person athematic forms that are found to function in constructions (see Examples (5)–(7)). Moreover, impersonal verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* are reflexive, so they (like Russian *prijtis* ‘have to’ and *prixodit’ sja* ‘have to’) form the so-called “impersonal reflexive” predicates.

4.2 The meaning and functions

The reflexive forms *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* can express both non-modal and modal readings. As for non-modal semantics, it has been observed that both verbs encode the

meaning ‘be due to; belong to’ (‘something (X) belongs to someone’; see Example (8)). The meaning under discussion is expressed by impersonal structures.

- (8) *Dūket* *mešlewa* *kam* *mešlewa* ***pareitis***. (BPII 18–19)
 give.2IMP.PL tribute.ACC whom tribute.NOM [*<go*].3PRS.REFL
 ‘Pay tribute to whom tribute is due.’

In addition, the verb *prieitis(i)* is also capable of realising the directed motion (9); in realizing motion, *prieitis(i)* comes in personal constructions, cf.:

- (9) ***Prieikites*** *iop* *ir* *būkite* *apšwiešti* (DP 576, 28)
 [*<go*].2IMP.PL he.LOC and be.2IMP.PL enlighten.PTCP
 ‘Come ye to him and be enlightened.’

When the object position is fulfilled by the infinitive, the modal semantics is realised. Participant-external necessity is predominant in the use of the analyzed Lithuanian verbs of coming. The experiencer in the dative with the impersonal form of the verb is regarded as a non-volitional undergoer of the states of affairs: the referent of the dative argument experiences necessity emanating from some external source, e.g.:

- (10) *...tejp ir* *mumus* ***pareitis*** *darit...* (KN SE 76, 28)
 ADV we.DAT [*<go*].3PRS.REFL do.INF
 ‘We have to behave in the same way.’

- (11) *Krikščionimus* ***pareytis*** *nemaž* *nukientet* (KN SE 30, 21)
 christians.DAT [*<go*].3PRS.REFL much suffer.INF
 ‘Christians have to suffer a lot.’

In (10)–(11), the necessity encoded by the reflexive form *pareitis(i)* is due to circumstances outside the individual’s control or, in other words, is inevitable (cf. Majsak 2005, 212). Typically, the infinitive is an obligatory complement of the verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)*, though at times it can be omitted. However, in such cases the infinitive can still be (elliptically) implied, e.g.:

- (12) *Garbinam* *jį* *jo* *tarnai*
 worship.1PRS.PL he.ACC his servants.NOM

Kaip ***pareitis*** [*garbinti*] *mums...* (KING 277, 2)
 ADV [*<go*].3PRS.REFL worship.INF we.DAT
 ‘We, his servants, worship him as we are obliged to.’

As has been observed in other languages, namely in Russian, the individual is coerced into action by extraneous circumstances or a “concrete occurrence” rather than being

guided by some moral precept or ethical principle (Hansen 2001, 200, also Bourdin 2014, 147). The latter observation seems to be compatible with the Lithuanian data, though it has been observed that the reflexive verb *pareitis(i)* is more frequent in realising deontic necessity, where an addressee is committed to a specified set of moral principles and urged to comply with some moral standard, cf.:

- (13) *Kaipo* *pareitiffi* *melfti*. (BP11 97, 12)
 ADV [<go>].3PRS.REFL pray.INF
 ‘What is the proper way to pray?’

As a rule, deontic interpretation arises in a prototypical deontic context: the human dative subjects and the semantics of the infinitival complements are typical indicators for non-epistemic interpretation of necessity. The infinitives that complement the reflexive verbs of coming denote actions. The dative argument is semantically determined by the embedded infinitive that always denotes actions carried out by the referent of the dative argument. To put it differently, the active verb requires the “subject” with human reference. What is more, the verbs under consideration in necessity constructions are mostly in the present.

Since the use of the impersonal constructions with *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* is restricted to religious contexts, the modal constructions mainly convey ‘objective’ obligation: the ‘speaker’ is not the source of modality; rather, (s)he reports the set of the rules regarding one’s behaviour according to the religious convention or to God’s will. The modal meaning may be paraphrased as ‘it is the right or correct thing to do’ (see Example 13). This does not appear to contradict the observation made by Bourdin (2014, 133) who claims that necessities derived from ‘come’ or ‘go’ by prefixation (e.g. *become*, *convenir* etc.) overwhelmingly typify weak necessity. Following von Fintel and Iatridou (2008, 119), Bourdin claims that weak necessity is associated with implication that the course of action “is better than all alternatives”, whereas in the case of strong necessity one has to pick out the only candidate (Bourdin 2014, 110). As noted previously, deontic meaning of the analysed Lithuanian verbs of coming may be defined as “it is the right or correct thing to do”, hence, the Lithuanian ‘go’-derived necessities can also be associated with weak necessity.

It appears in the studied material of the old written language that the agent of modality can be both overt and covert: the examples with the explicitly represented oblique argument make up 53% of the overall use of the affirmative as well as negated verbs of coming with infinitival complementation. The latter point seems to be compatible with the nature of necessity the verbs of coming conveys: the dative subject is overt in the sentence since obligation is directed at a specific addressee, or in other words, the modal target is specific. Thus, the overt dative subjects are most frequent with the deontic meaning, cf.:

- (14) *Pareitiffi* *mumus* *idant* *grieku*
 [<go>].3PRS.REFL WE.DAT that sins.GEN

liautumbimes (BPII 441, 4)

stop.SBJV.1PL

‘We must stop sinning.’

The negated forms of the reflexive verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* are very rare in the necessive constructions: the analyzed material includes only 6 constructions where the verbs under consideration are in the negated form. Generally speaking, negation of modality can take two forms: it is possible to negate the main verb or the modal verb (de Haan 1997). However, the combination of the negative prefix with the infinitive (i.e. ‘come’ verb + *ne-V_{INF}*) is extremely rare in the Old Lithuanian texts. A similar tendency has been witnessed for the Russian verb *prixodit’sja* ‘have to’: negation markers tend to come before the modal verbs, regardless of the scope of interpretation (see de Haan 1996, 101). It has been observed that the negation of ‘go’-constructions means the negation of the infinitive in Old Lithuanian; this is likely to result in the semantics of prohibition of the construction, cf.:

- (15) *Nepareitis* *mumus* *Angelu* *meltiffi* (BPII 440, 13)
 NEG.<go>.3PRS.REFL WE.DAT angels.GEN pray.INF
 ‘We are not to pray to angels.’

It is obvious from the example that the speaker does not want the listener to take the course of action, i.e. to pray to angels.

It has been observed that the reflexive verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* are not used side by side in old Lithuanian texts: *pareitis(i)* as a modal marker is more often found in the original texts of Old Lithuanian (e.g. Bretkūnas’ *Postilė* or Kleinas’ hymnbook) while *prieitis(i)* appears to be more frequent in the translations (e.g. Daukša’s *Postilė*). Besides, *pareitis(i)* seems to be more advanced within non-epistemic domain. Based on this observation, we could draw the following conclusions: firstly, the reflexive verb *pareitis(i)* might have come into existence as a result of language-internal development; secondly, it may be hypothesized that the modal use of the verb *prieitis(i)* could have been influenced by the source language of the translation. However, according to Hansen (2001, 371–394), in Slavonic languages there is no written record of the ‘come’-derived necessives before the 18th century, which suggests that the Lithuanian verbs of coming under analysis emerged as modal verbs significantly earlier than their correspondences in some other languages did. Besides, if we looked at the examples of modal *prieitis(i)* in Daukša’s *Postilė* and compared them with its correspondences in the source language,

i.e. Polish, we could see that *prieitis(i)* is a translational correspondence of the Polish verb *należy* ‘it is necessary to’ which is not a ‘come’- or ‘go’-derived necessity and which meaning is defined as ‘belong to’ (cf. Hansen 2001, 328), e.g.:

- (16) LT-trans: ...*jog iiémus priešios turét’ pirmą vietą...* (DP 483, 11)
 PL-orig: ...*ze im należało mieć pierwsze miejsce...*
 ‘...that they had to take the first place...’

To sum up, the predominant modal meaning of the Lithuanian reflexive verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* concerns the meaning of participant-external necessity. However, the analysis of the use of both verbs shows that the verb *pareitis(i)* is more common in realising modal meanings than the verb *prieitis(i)*.

5 The verbs of coming in Contemporary Lithuanian

The CCLL has altogether 531 occurrences of the verb *par(si)eiti* and 3,103 occurrences of the verb *pri(si)eiti*. As in Old Lithuanian, the non-reflexive forms *pareiti* and *prieiti* do not show any potential to express modality. The reflexive counterparts *parsieiti* and *prisieiti* that are respectively based on the forms *pareiti* and *prieiti* are relatively infrequent in Contemporary Lithuanian: the total number of the occurrence of the reflexive form *prisieiti* in the CCLL is 32, while the reflexive form *parsieiti* has not been found in the corpus at all. As in Old Lithuanian, there is a direct correlation between the reflexive forms and potential for realizing modality. However, the status of the reflexive verbs *parsieiti* and *prisieiti* as modal markers is peripheral: the Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language (www.lkz.lt) indicates that the verbs under consideration are more common in spoken Lithuanian and dialects than in written Lithuanian.

5.1 Structural properties

As in Old Lithuanian, the *par-* and *pri-*prefixed forms under discussion encode motion in a certain direction: *pareiti* has a meaning of ‘come home, return’, while *prieiti* carries a meaning of ‘approach to something’. The verbs *pareiti* and *prieiti* are found to function in lexical personal constructions (see Examples (17)–(18)). The reflexive counterpart *prisieiti* acquires a modal meaning in combination with an infinitive and, like its cognate in Old Lithuanian, is used in impersonal constructions with the agent in the dative (see Examples (19)–(20) in Section 5.2). Moreover, the morphological paradigm of *prisieiti* is defective. In Contemporary Lithuanian, the reflexive marker is not a postfix anymore, but it is regularly placed between prefix and stem.

- (17) *Namo* *parėjau* *apie* *pietus.* (CL-Fic)
 home.ADV [<go].1PST.SG around noon.ACC
 ‘I came home towards noon.’

- (18) *Motina* *vėl* *priėjo* *prie* *lango.* (CL-Fic)
 mother.NOM again [<go].3PST at window.GEN
 ‘Mother approached the window again.’

5.2 The meaning and functions

In Contemporary Lithuanian, the use of the reflexive form *prisieiti* can be either modal or non-modal. The main meaning the reflexive form *prisieiti* expresses belong within participant-external modality, namely, participant-external necessity, e.g.:

- (19) *Jis* *suvokia* *tik* *viena –* *komedija* *baigta,*
 he.NOM know.3PRS only one comedy.NOM over

nei *ryt* *rytą,* *nei poryt*
 tomorrow morning.ACC

neprisieis *vaidinti* *agronomo* *rolės.* (CCLL-Fic)
 NEG.[<go].3FUT play.INF agronomist.GEN role.GEN
 ‘He knows only one thing: the comedy is over and neither tomorrow morning nor the day after tomorrow he will have to take the part of the agronomist.’

In contrast to the data of old Lithuanian texts, there are no examples of deontic necessity in Contemporary Lithuanian. Typically, the agent of obligation is not represented in the sentence: the examples with the covert dative argument make up 66% of the overall use of the affirmative as well as negated *prisieiti* forms with infinitival complementation. The latter point seems to be compatible with the nature of necessity the verb *prisieiti* conveys: there is no need to have the overt dative argument in the sentence since necessity is often general and the modal target is generic.

Besides the modal meaning of participant-external necessity, the reflexive form *prisieiti* has lexicalized a non-modal aspectual meaning of chance or accidental occurrence of some event that cannot be controlled by the Experiencer encoded in the dative, e.g.:

- (20) [*jis*] *patyrė* *tiek daug* *ir* *tokių* *dalykų,*
 he.NOM experience.3PST ADV and such things.GEN

kokių *kitajam* *per* *visą* *savo* *amžių*
 that other.DAT PREP all.ACC his life.ACC

neprisieina *patirti.* (CCLL-Fic)
 NEG[<go].3PRS.REFL experience.INF
 ‘He has experienced many such things that other people do not experience through all their lives.’

Accidentally experienced events or activities are not purposeful and can happen unintentionally, thus, the sense can be defined as ‘to have the occasion or opportunity’. A similar meaning is attested in Russian by Hansen (2001, 198–201) for the Russian semi-modal verb *prixodit'sja* ‘have to’ or in Lithuanian for the acquisitive verb *tekti* ‘be gotten’ (see Usoniene & Jasionyte 2010). The aspectual meaning of chance happening is triggered by the semantics of the role of the dative as an Experiencer, as discussed above. The non-volitional subject has no control of the situation: it happens to experience some event or activity without any effort. Besides, as seen in Example 15, the meaning under discussion appears to be strengthened by the combination of *prisieiti* + verbs of perception, such as *patirti* (‘experience’) or *girdėti* (‘hear’) or *matyti* (‘see’).

In the case of the reflexive form *prisieiti* it is possible to follow the semantic change of the form: in the old written language *prieitis(i)* could express either participant-external or deontic necessity. In Contemporary Lithuanian, the form *prisieiti* predominantly convey participant-external necessity, thus, one may tentatively assume that the modal reading shifted from the more subjective to the more objective one. Besides, in Contemporary Lithuanian, the verb under consideration shows lesser potential for conveying modality.

To sum up, the non-reflexive forms of the analyzed verbs of coming are associated with the meaning of motion or ‘belong to; be due to’ and the personal pattern, while the reflexive forms prefer modal semantics and impersonal constructions. However, the reflexive forms of the Lithuanian verbs are not equally likely to express modal meanings: the reflexive form *parsieiti* does not function as a modal marker in Contemporary Lithuanian.

5 Concluding remarks

The text sample on which the study is based shows that the modal constructions with the Lithuanian verbs of motion based on the root ‘go’ appear in the 16th century. The verbs under analysis, especially the reflexive *pareitis(i)* function as one of the main means for expressing non-epistemic modality in Old Lithuanian. It seems that from the very beginning the construction carried a clear modal function; thus, the language of the old Lithuanian texts does not enable us to follow the gradual development of the modality of the verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* on the basis of other senses.

In sentences with modal interpretation the semantics and the functions of the analyzed verbs of coming partly resemble those in the contemporary language. The non-reflexive forms *pareiti* and *prieiti* are associated with the meaning of motion and the personal pattern, while their reflexive counterparts prefer modal semantics and impersonal constructions. Thus, from the very beginning the verbs of coming in the necessive constructions were in the 3rd person.

Semantic distribution among the reflexive forms of the verbs under consideration differs in Old and in Contemporary Lithuanian. Nevertheless both *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* are capable of encoding deontic obligation and circumstantial necessity, deontic meaning takes the leading position among the reflexive verbs *pareitis(i)* and *prieitis(i)* in Old Lithuanian, whereas participant-external necessity predominates among the reflexive verb *prisieiti* in Contemporary Lithuanian.

The necessive constructions with the verbs of coming are rather marginal in the contemporary system of Lithuanian modality: the verbs under analysis may be more common in spoken Lithuanian or dialects than in written Lithuanian. This is because other markers that are used for realising non-epistemic necessity (e.g., *reikėti* ‘need (to)’, *turėti* ‘have to’, *privalėti* ‘must’ and others) are sufficient for the expression of non-epistemic necessity in Lithuanian.

Acknowledgements

The current study has been carried out within the project *Modality and Evidentiality in the Lithuanian language* (Project No MIP-062/2014) funded by the Research Council of Lithuania. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to anonymous reviewers for their valuable advice and suggestions how to improve the quality of the paper.

References

- Besters-Dilger, Juliane, Ana Drobnjaković & Björn Hansen. 2009. Modals in the Slavonic languages. *Modals in the languages of Europe: A reference work*. Björn Hansen & Ferdinand de Haan, eds. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 167–197.
- Bourdin, Philippe. 2014. When *come* and *go* go necessive. ‘*Come*’ and ‘*Go*’ off the *Beaten Grammaticalization Path*. Maud Devos & Jenneke van der Wal, eds. Berlin: De Gruyter. 103–164.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- von Fintel, Kai & Sabine Iatridou. 2008. How to say *ought* in foreign: the composition of weak necessity modals. *Time and Modality*. Jacqueline Guéron & Jacqueline Lecarme, eds. Dordrecht: Springer. 115–141.
- Gerritsen, Nelleke. 1990. *Russian Reflexive Verbs. In Search of Unity in Diversity*. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 15). Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- de Haan, Ferdinand. 1996. Strong modality and negation in Russian. *Using corpora to explore linguistic variation*. (Studies in corpus linguistics). Randi Reppen, Susan M. Fitzmaurice & Douglas Biber, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 91–111.
- de Haan, Ferdinand. 1997. *The Interaction of Modality and Negation: A Typological Study*. New York: Garland.

- Hansen, Björn. 2001. *Das slavische Modalauxiliar: Semantik und Grammatikalisierung im Russischen, Polnischen, Serbischen/Kroatischen und Altkirchenslavischen*. München: O. Sagner.
- Hansen, Björn & Ferdinand de Haan, eds. 2009. *Modals in the languages of Europe: A reference work*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2007. Mood and modality in Baltic. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Jasionytė-Mikučionienė, Erika. 2014. *Gramatinimas lietuvių kalboje: modalinių reikšmių susidarymas*. [Grammaticalization in Lithuanian: The rise of modal meanings]. Daktaro disertacija [PhD dissertation]. Vilnius: VU leidykla.
- Kangasniemi, Heikki. 1992. *Modal Expressions in Finnish*. (Studia Fennica Linguistica 2). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Majsak, Timur. 2005. *Tipologija grammatikalizacii konstrukcij s glagolami dviženija i glagolami pozicii*. [Grammaticalization of constructions involving verbs of motion and verbs of posture: A typology]. (Studia Philologica). Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskix kul'tur.
- Nau, Nicole. 2012. Modality in an areal context: the case of a Latgalian dialect. *Grammatical replication and grammatical borrowing in language contact*. Björn Wiemer, Bernhard Wälchli, Björn Hansen, eds. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 471–514.
- Penjam, Pille. 2006. Development of the modal function of the verb *tulema* ‘come’ in written Estonian. *Linguistica Uralica*. Vol. 42 (3), 167–191.
- Rakhilina, Ekaterina V. 2004. There and back: The case of Russian ‘go’. *GLOSSOS* 5, 1–33. <<http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/5/>>.
- Usoniene, Aurelija & Erika Jasionyte. 2010. Towards grammaticalization: Lithuanian acquisitive verbs *gauti* (‘get’) and *tekti* (‘be gotten’). *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 42 (2), 199–220.
- van der Auwera, Johan & Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. Modality’s Semantic Map. *Linguistic Typology* 2, 79–124.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 1996. Two Cases of Necessive Modality in the NEE Area: External Necessity Deriving from Modal Verbs and the Latvian-Livonian Debitive as a Case of Parallel Grammaticalization. *Narmon’Gi. Arbeitspapiere des Berner Projekts zur vergleichenden Darstellung der nordosteuropäischen Sprachen* 1. Simon Christen, Jan Peter Locher & Bernhard Wälchli, eds. Bern: Universität Bern. 42–51.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2000. Infinite predication as a marker of evidentiality and modality in the languages of the Baltic region. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 54 (3), 186–210.