

Curatives in the Old-Lithuanian Bible translations

Paweł Brudzyński

University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

Abstract. The subject of the paper is curatives, a special type of causative verbs in Lithuanian, in the Bible translations by Johannes Bretke (1579–1590), Samuel Boguslaw Chylinski (1660), Samuel Bythner (1701), Philipp Ruhig (1727) and Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis (1816). Curatives are a special type of causation implementing the causee-suppressing valency (CSP) pattern. In the analyzed texts, one can notice several morphological, semantic or syntactic features coinciding with contemporary curative constructions. However, in addition to the morphology and semantics of curatives, the article discusses also some rare and interesting cases that can be interpreted as expressing the causee and includes remarks on the lexicalization processes.

Keywords: curative, causative, Bible, Old-Lithuanian, valency, causee

1 Introduction

The article aims to characterize a special group of causative verbs called curatives in Lithuanian translations of the Bible produced from the 16th to the 19th century. The analysis includes examples from the texts by Johannes Bretke (1579–1590), Samuel Boguslaw Chylinski (1660), Samuel Bythner (1701), Philipp Ruhig¹ (1727) and Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis (1816). In addition, the selected fragments were compared with the contemporary translation by Rubšys and Kavaliauskas (1998). The article will discuss the morphology and

1 The translation was a collective work, but for ease of reference, Ruhig is mentioned as the main author.

syntax of the construction with particular emphasis on how the curatives affect the valence structure of the sentence and the possible ways of expressing the causee. Furthermore, the issue of the semantics of curative constructions and traces of the lexicalization process will be discussed. It should be noted that curatives are peculiar constructions and it is often difficult to distinguish them from the regular causative. Thus, their identification based solely on one criterion: morphological, semantic or syntactic, might prove problematic.

The base of the prototypical causative construction is an intransitive verb whose main argument (S)² is devoid of agentivity, volition and control over the event in question. During causation, a volitional agent (A) is introduced into the sentence structure and claims the semantic role of the causer. The primary subject of the base sentence becomes the patient (P) of the new causative construction: it claims the role of the causee and occupies the syntactic role of the direct object. In this way, the prototypical intransitive sentence becomes transformed into a prototypical transitive sentence. Such a transformation can be considered prototypical because it is both syntactically and semantically complete. Additionally, derivation from intransitive verbs is possible in any language that has morphological tools to express causation; in case of other verb classes, however, it is subject to additional restrictions (Kittilä 2009, 9). This situation is prototypical also for Old-Lithuanian, where the morphological causatives are derived with the suffixes *-(d)in-* and *-(d)y-*. Below I present the prototypical causativization of an intransitive verb, where a. is an intransitive sentence, b. a causative sentence, and c. a valency pattern:

- (1) a. Old-Lithuanian (ChB Genesis 4.18)

Ó *Enochuy* *gime* *Hirad...*
 and PN.DAT.SG born.PST.3 PN.NOM.SG(S_i)
 ‘And unto Enoch was born Irad...’

- b. Old-Lithuanian (ChB Genesis 4.18)

...*Hirad* *pa-gim-d-e* *Mechujaeli*
 PN.NOM.SG(A) PFX-beget-CAUS-PST.3 PN.ACC.SG(P_i)
 ‘...Irad begat Mehujael.’

- c. V_{INTR} < S_i:Sbj > → V_{CAUS} < Causer:A:Sbj; Causee:P_i:DO >

2 The study uses the terms S, A and P corresponding with the core semantics relations proposed by Comrie (1976; 1989, 110–111)

As can be seen, an additional argument A, the causer, is introduced into the structure of the causative sentence (1b) and it claims the position of the new subject. The original argument S, the causee, is moved to the position of the direct object.

2 The morphology and syntax of Curatives

Lithuanian seems to confirm the typological data from other languages and regularly creates morphological causatives based on intransitive verbs, while the derivation of causatives from a transitive base is limited by a number of restrictions. However, a small set of causatives can be derived from a transitive base (mainly ingestive verbs, but not only these; Nedjalkov & Sil'nickij 1973, 7–8; Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000, 13; Holvoet & Nau 2015, 26). In this context, the now-disappearing group of verbs called curatives is a particularly interesting case. Curatives describe the situation of indirect causation, in which the causer is not a direct cause of action but they only order someone to perform the action for them (Savičiūtė 1985, 236; Toops 1989, 249; Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 55–56; 81–82).

As for the morphological criteria, curatives are usually formed on the basis of transitive verbs, with the morphology of causative verbs, mainly with the suffix *-(d)in-*. However, researchers often find that distinguishing curatives from causatives on the grounds of semantics and syntax might prove rather problematic. Below I present examples of curative constructions where a. is a transitive sentence, b. a curative sentence and c. a valence scheme:

- (2) a. Old Lithuanian (RNT Matthew 21.35)

Tai Winičininkai nutwėre jo Bėrnus,
 then vine-grower.NOM.PL take.PST.3 3SG.M.GEN servant.ACC.PL
wieną iβ-plakk-e, antrą užmuše...
 one.ACC.SG.M PFX-flog-PST.3 second.ACC.SG.M PFX.kill.PST.3
 ‘And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another.’

- b. Old Lithuanian (RNT Matthew 27.26)

[*Pilotas*] *Tadda iβléido jiems Barrabóβų bet Iėzų*
 PN.NOM.SG then release.PST.3 2PL.DAT PN.ACC.SG but PN.ACC.SG

nu-plak-din-ęs *padawe, kad butu*
 PFX-flog-CAUS-PST.AP.NOM.SG.M give.pst.3 that be.irr.3
nukriżawótas.
 crucify.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M

‘Then [Pilate] released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus he delivered him to be crucified.’

- c. $V_{TR} < A_i; Sbj; P_j; DO > \rightarrow V_{CAUS} < Causer; Sbj; P_j; DO; Causee; \emptyset >$

Curatives are created according to the causee-suppressing valency (CSP) pattern (Savičiūtė 1985, 242; Toops 1989, 260–275; Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 56). Interestingly, unlike causatives, they do not change the valence structure of the base sentence but reorganize it (Kittilä 2009). An external causer, fulfilling the syntactic role of the subject, is introduced into the causative sentence structure (2b). While the original argument P retains its function of the direct object, the original argument A is omitted and can be interpreted as a proper causee of the curative construction because the causer directly influences its actions.

At first glance, sentence (2b) might look like an ordinary causative sentence, where ‘Pilate’ is the causer and ‘Jesus’ is the causee. The situation, however, is not so obvious. ‘Jesus’ performs the semantic role of a Patient, but the actual causee of the sentence is suppressed. Based on pragmatic knowledge, we can assume that ‘Pilate’ did not flog ‘Jesus’ personally; he had to entrust the execution of the sentence to his subordinates. Therefore, we may consider ‘Pilate’ to be a causer, but the actual causee (the presumed executor of the judgment, the original argument A) is excluded from the syntactic structure of the sentence. Therefore, the curatives can be described in the following way: “the causer orders the causee to perform the action x” or, in other words, the curatives can be conventionally called “double causatives” (Savičiūtė 1985, 250, translation mine).

Apart from the more conventional curatives, the discussed texts include a number of sentences worth analysing. Let us consider the following example:

- (3) Old Lithuanian (BrB Song of Songs 3.9)

Karalius *Salamonas* *pa-dari-din-oia* *šaw* *węšimm{ą}*
 king.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG PFX-make-CAUS-PST.3 RPO.DAT chariot.ACC.SG

ifch medzio Libano
of wood.GEN.SG PN.GEN.SG
‘King Solomon made himself a chariot of the wood of Lebanon.’

The sentence can be understood as follows: “Solomon commissioned an undefined causee to make a chariot for himself.” Therefore, we can observe the coincidence of the Initiator of the action (the causer) and the Beneficiary. This sentence is an example of an autobenefactive construction (Geniušienė 1987; Kemmer 1993; Kulikov 2013) with a heavy marker *sau*. This marker is heavy both in the phonetic and syntactic sense and it is called “heavy” because it occupies a separate syntactic place in the sentence structure, contrary to the light middle voice marker *-si-*. By comparing this passage with a modern translation, one can see a shift from the domain of reflexivity to the middle voice:

- (4) Lithuanian (RKB Song of Songs 3.9)
- | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Karalius</i> | <i>Saliamonas</i> | <i>pa-si-dirb-din-o</i> | <i>nešama</i> |
| king.NOM.SG | PN.NOM.SG | PFX-RFL-make-CAUS-PST.3 | mobile.ACC.SG |
| <i>sostą</i> | <i>iš Libano</i> | <i>medžiu.</i> | |
| throne | of PN.GEN.SG | wood.GEN.PL | |
- ‘King Solomon made himself a chariot of the wood of Lebanon.’

As shown in example (4), the heavy marker *sau* has been replaced by the light *-si-* marker, thus moving from the domain of the natural reflexivity to the middle voice. Due to the removal of the one argument from the argument structure of the sentence, the roles of the causer and the beneficiary equate with each other.

3 The causee expression

As has been mentioned, although the causee is not directly expressed in the sentence syntax, it is always backgrounded. From the point of view of semantics, curative verbs express the causal distance between an agent (the causer) and an event that takes place not because of the direct participation of an agent (the causer) but through the mediation of an indirect participant in the background, the causee (Savičiūtė 1985; Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 82–83). Indirect causatives based on the causee-suppressing pattern, such as Lithuanian curatives, are attested cross-linguistically, e.g. in Hindi-Urdu, and correspond to the

non-valency increasing causatives, called covert causativization (Nedjalkov & Sil'nickij 1969, 50; Kittilä 2009, 75–79; Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 83).

According to Kittilä (2009, 78), covert causativization is usually based on ditransitive verbs, which accommodate three participants in the event, and the fourth argument is beyond the limitations of many languages. However, the situation is different in Lithuanian. Although in most cases the causee is not expressed at all, there are some cases in modern Lithuanian where the causee might be interpreted as expressed indirectly by several tactics, including locative phrases (5), prepositional constructions with *pas* (6) or *per* (7), or the instrumental (8) (Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 83–86):

- (5) Lithuanian (Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 84)

Pastarieji euru monetas planuoja kal-din-ti
 latter.NOM.PL.M.DEF Euro.GEN.PL coin.ACC.PL plan.PRS.3 mint-CAUS-INF
Suomijoje.
 PN.LOC
 ‘The latter (Estonians) are planning to order the minting of the Euro coins in Finland.’

- (6) Lithuanian (Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 84)

...siū-din-o-si pas gerus siuvėjus.
 sew-CAUS-PST.3-RFL at good.ACC.PL.M tailor.ACC.PL
 ‘...[he] ordered his clothes at good tailors.’

- (7) Lithuanian (Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 86)

...IV Europos lietuviškųjų studijų savaitės
 IV PN.GEN Lithuanian.GEN.PL.DEF study.GEN.PL week.GEN.SG
dalyviams rašytame laiške iš
 participants.DAT.PL write.PST.PP.LOC.SG.M letter.LOC.SG from
Niujorko ir siųs-din-t-ame per...
 New_York.GEN and send-CAUS-PST.PP.-LOC.SG.M through
prof. Zenoną Ivinskį.
 prof. PN.ACC.SG PN.ACC.SG
 ‘...in the letter written from New York to the participants in the IV European Week of Lithuanian studies and sent through... Prof. Zenonas Ivinskis.’

- (8) Lithuanian (Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 85)

Teismas priėmė sprendimą at-ves-din-ti
court.NOM.SG accept.PST.3 decision.ACC.SG PRF-lead-CAUS-INF

D. Lideikienė su policija.
PN.ACC.SG with police.INS.SG

‘The court decided to have D. Lideikienė brought by (lit. with) police.’

However, according to Arkadiev & Pakerys (2015, 85), the only instance of the genuine expression of the causee is sentence (6) with the preposition *pas*.

In the analyzed texts, the number of constructions that can be interpreted as expressing the causee is limited. As in the modern language, they do not explicitly express the causee, but background it. The first such construction is similar to example (5) and uses locative phrases:

- (9) Old Lithuanian (BrB 2 Chronicles 36.10)

O kaip praschoka mėtai, nusiunte Nebukadnezar, ir
and when jump_over.PST.3 year.NOM.PL send.PST.3 PN.NOM.SG and

at-gaben-din-a għi Babilionia su
PFX-transport-CAUS-PST.3 3.SG.M.ACC PN.ILL with

brangeis Indais Namu.
expensive.INS.PL.M vessels.INS.PL house.GEN.PL

‘And when the year was expired, king Nebuchadnezzar sent, and brought him to Babylon, with the goodly vessels of the house of the LORD.’

We can conclude that if Nebuchadnezzar ordered to bring people to Babylon, the Babylonian soldiers are likely to be the causee. Unfortunately, as in the case of sentence (5), interpreting a locative phrase as the actual causee, is very questionable. It should rather be said that the sentence refers to the place where the activity was performed or, more precisely, in the case of the illative, to the destination where the activity will be concluded.

In the context of the expression of the causee discussed above, the following sentences seem peculiar:

- (10) Old Lithuanian (BrB 2 Samuel 12.26–27)

...karriawa Joab priefch Rabbā waiku Ammon, (...)
fight.PST.3 PN.NOM.SG against PN.ACC.SG children.GEN.PL PN

Jr nu-fiunt-e pašlus Dowidop, ir
 and PFX-send-PST.3 messenger.ACC.SG PN.ALL and
pa-faki-din-a iem, efch kariawau prifch
 PFX-say-CAUS-PST.3 3SG.M.DAT 1SG.NOM fight.PST.1SG against
Rabba, bei ifchgaleiau Miestą
 Rabbah.ACC.SG and claim.PST.3 city.ACC.SG

‘And Joab fought against Rabbah of the children of Ammon, and took the royal city. And Joab sent messengers to David, and said, I have fought against Rabbah, and have taken the city of waters.’

(11) Old Lithuanian (RNT Matthew 11.2–3)

O Ionas Kallejime iβgirdęs Kristaus
 and PN.NOM.SG prison.LOC.SG hear.PST.AP.NOM.SG.M PN.GEN.SG
Darbus, nu-fiunt-e du sawo Mokitiniu. Ir
 work.ACC.PL PFX-send-PST.3 two.ACC.M RPO disciple.GEN.PL and
faky-din-o jam: Ar tu efi ans
 say-CAUS-PST.3 3.SG.DAT Q 2SG.NOM be.PRS.2SG that.NOM.SG
Ateifeis, arba dar kitto laukfim’.
 come.FUT.AP.NOM.SG.M Q still another.GEN.SG wait.FUT.1PL

‘Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, And said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?’

Such constructions can only be found in the translations by Bretke and Ruhig, and are always combined with the verbs *siusti* ‘send’ and *sakydinti* ‘order to tell’. The example mentioned above may raise doubts as to whether *sakydinti* can be interpreted as a curative verb at all. However, let us recreate the deep structure of the curative sentence (10) as proposed by Savičiūtė (1985, 237):

Causer (‘Joab’) + P1 (‘sent’) → Causee (‘messengers’) + P2 (‘so they say’) → Object (‘to David’) + P3 (‘that Joab have taken the city’)

As evident above, although the performer is not explicitly expressed in the sentence structure but only by an ellipsis to the previous sentence, we can see that the causees are ‘messengers’ (10) and then ‘disciples’ (11). Therefore, *sakydinti* in the above sentences can be understood as ‘to tell one someone

else's words', 'to tell one something that another person asked us to'. A curative construction of this type assumes the causation of a complex predicate. In this case, we deal with the mixed curative: apart from the morphological coding in the form of the curative verb *sakydinti*, it includes also the analytical coding using the verb *siųsti* 'to send'. In the modern translation of the Bible, examples (10) and (11) are expressed using purpose sentences:

(12) Lithuanian (RKB 2 Samuel 12.27)

Joabas nusiuntė pas Dovydą pasiuntinius pasakyti:
 PN.NOM.SG send.PST.3 to PN.ACC.SG messengers.ACC.PL say.INF
 „*Puoliau Rabą ir jau paėmiau vandens*
 fight.PST.1SG PN and already take.PST.1SG water.GEN.SG
šaltinio tvirtovę.
 spring.GEN.SG stronghold.ACC.SG
 'And Joab sent messengers to David, and said, I have fought against Rabbah, and have taken the city of waters.'

(13) Lithuanian (RKB Matthew 11.2–3)

Jonas, išgirdęs kalėjime apie Kristaus
 PN.NOM.SG hear.PST.AP.NOM.SG.M prison.LOC.SG about PN.GEN.SG
darbus, nusiuntė savo mokinius jo paklausti:
 work.ACC.PL send.PST.3 RPO disciple.ACC.PL GEN.SG.3 ask.INF
 „*Ar tu esi tas, kuris turi ateiti,*
 Q 2SG.NOM be.PRS.2SG that which should.PRS.2SG come.INF
ar mums laukti kito?“
 Q 1PL.DAT wait.INF another.GEN.SG
 'Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, And said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?'

In addition to the examples quoted above, the analyzed texts include a similar type of the construction with the verb *sakydinti* and the preposition *per*:

(14) Old Lithuanian (BrB 1 Chronicles 9.4–5)

[*Tadda emęš Hanon Tarnus Dowido, ios apškutta, ir nupiowe ių Rubusikki Strenų, ir paleida ios.*]

Ir anis nueia, ir pa-fsaki-din-a tatai Dowidui
 and 3PL.NOM.M go.PST.3 and PFX-say-CAUS-PST.3 this PN.DAT.SG
Per Wirus.
 through man.ACC.PL

[‘Wherefore Hanun took David’s servants, and shaved them, and cut off their garments in the midst hard by their buttocks, and sent them away.] Then there went certain, and told David how the men were served.’

The sentence can be understood as follows:

Causer (‘servants’) + P1 (‘tell’) → Causee (‘through men’) + P2 (‘so they tell’) → Object (‘to David’) + P3 (‘what happened’)

In other words: ‘The servants made the men pass information to David.’ Assuming that the base sentence would be (15a), the sentence pattern should look as follows (15b):

(15) Lithuanian (own example)

a. *Vyrai pa-sak-ė tatai Dovidui.*
 man.NOM.PL PFX-say-PST.3 this PN.DAT.SG
 ‘Men told this to David.’

b. $V_{TR} \langle A_i; Sbj; P_j; DO; Experiencer: IO \rangle \rightarrow V_{CAUS} \langle Causer: Sbj; P_j; DO; Causee; OO; Experiencer: IO \rangle$

Contrary to sentence (7) where the person expressed by the prepositional phrase did not send the letter himself, but only delivered it (Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 85), ‘the men’ in sentence (14) may be interpreted as direct ‘messengers’ who passed on information to ‘David’ on behalf of the agent, ‘servants’.

4 Semantic shifts and lexicalization

As has been already mentioned, Lithuanian curatives are a unique construction because they suppress the causee in the sentence structure. However, as reported in the literature (Naktinienė 2011, 158; Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, 87–88), there are some deviations from what one could call the prototypical curative.

In addition to the prototypical meaning presented in example (2), the analysed texts include interesting and rare constructions meaning: “the causee performs the action x on behalf of the causer”:

- (16) a. Old Lithuanian (ChB Genesis 4.25)

Kain nes ghi už-mufz-e.
 PN.NOM.SG for 3SG.M.ACC PFX-kill-PST.3
 lit. ‘For Cain slew him [Abel].’

- b. Old Lithuanian (ChB 1 Samuel 14.12–13)

[*Jonathan tare fzarwu-nefzotojop sawo: Lipk paskuy mane, padawe nes jos WIESZPATS rąkoń. (...) fzarwu-nefzotojas ejo pařkuy ghi: ir pole [prieszay] po weydu Jonahtano,*]

ó fzarwu nefzotojas jo už-muř-dyn-o
 a armour.GEN.PL bearer.NOM.SG 3.SG.GEN.M PFX-kill-CAUS-PST.3
jos pařkuy jo.
 3.PL.ACC.M after 3.SG.GEN.M

‘[And Jonathan said unto his armourbearer, Come up after me: for the LORD hath delivered them into the hand of Israel. And Jonathan climbed up upon his hands and upon his feet, and his armourbearer after him: and they fell before Jonathan;] and his armourbearer slew after him.’

- c. $V_{TR} \langle A_i; Sbj; P_j; DO \rangle \rightarrow V_{CAUS} \langle Causer: \emptyset; Causee_i; Sbj; P_j; DO \rangle$

The difference between sentences (2) and (16) lies in the degree of the agent’s control over the described situation. In sentence (2), ‘Pilate’, who ordered his soldiers (not expressed in the syntactic structure of the sentence causee) to flog ‘Jesus’, was both the causer and the subject of the sentence. Sentence (16) presents the opposite situation. It might be interpreted that the causee, ‘armourbearer’, kills enemies on the orders of the causer, ‘Jonathan’. However, in sentence (16), the causee takes the role of the argument A and the causer is suppressed. Therefore, here we can talk about a rare type of valency pattern – let us call it the *causer-suppressing pattern*. In the case of sentence (16), the syntactic structure is not reorganized at all, and the causer, ‘Jonathan’, is backgrounded only by the ellipsis to the previous sentence.

In example (16), the action is performed by the agent, the causee. However, since the curative verb is used, it is implied that the driving force of the action

must have been some external causer. However, due to the already very flexible usage in the 17th century, the verb *užmušdinti* ‘to kill by order’ could be used both in the usual prototypical curative context based on the CSP model (17) and as an ordinary transitive verb with a controlling agent (18):

(17) Old Lithuanian (ChB 1 Kings 18.13)

...kq padarau kad už-muž-dyn-o Izebel Pranařzus
 Q do.PST.3 that PFX-kill-CAUS-PST.3 PN.NOM.SG prophet.ACC.PL
WIESZPATIES?
 Lord.GEN.SG
 ‘... what I did when Jezebel slew the prophets of the LORD?’

(18) Old Lithuanian (ChB Revelations 6.4)

[...*tamuy kursey sedejo and jo dota ira (galibe) idand atymtu pakaju*
isz ziames]
ir idand wieni kitus uz-musz-dyn-tu...
 and that one. NOM.PL.M another.ACC.PL.M PFX-kill-CAUS-IRR.3
 ‘...and power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from
 the earth, and that they should kill one another.’

Of course it is worth to keep in mind already mentioned flexibility of the curatives in the 17th century. One could argue that *užmušdinti* in (16) is used in the same manner as (18). This fact only proves the abovementioned difficulties in the interpretation of the curatives.

As Arkadiev & Pakerys (2015, 90) noted, the semantic change may be caused by the fact that the base verb may be relatively polysemic. Therefore, the addition of a causative suffix may result in the new, specialized meaning. This assumption can be confirmed by the example of the verbs *nukirsti* (‘to cut’) (19) and *nukirsdinti* (‘to behead’) (19):

(19) Old Lithuanian (BrB Matthew 26.51)

[*Ir fchitai, wienas kurfai buwo fu Jefumi, ifctieře ranka, ir ifchtrauke*
Karda sawa, ir muřche Wiriaufioio kunigų Tarna,]
ir nu-kirt-a iam Aufi.
 and PFX-cut_off-PST.3 3SG.M.DAT ear.ACC.SG

‘[And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest’s,] and smote off his ear.’

(20) Old Lithuanian (BrB Luke 9.9)

Iana afch nu-kirf-din-aiau [nu-kirt-aw]...
 PN.ACC.SG 1SG.NOM PFX-behead-CAUS-PST.1SG PFX-cut-PST.1SG
 ‘John have I beheaded...’

As can be seen in example (19), the verb *nukirsti* acts like a normal transitive verb. In the case of sentence (20), however, we can notice that the author of the translation had doubts about the correct form of the verb. Although Bretke intuitively used a curative construction with *nukirsdinti*, he still left the variant with a non-derived transitive verb *nukirsti*. Interestingly, a similar problem can be found in later translations:

(21) Old Lithuanian (ChB Luke 9.9)

Jonaš tey ira, kuri nu-kirs-dyn-au,
 PN.NOM.SG this be.PRS.SG.3 which.ACC.SG.M PFX-cut-CAUS-PST.1SG

(22) Old Lithuanian (BtNT Luke 9.9)

Ionq aß tiefa nu-kirt-au.
 PN.ACC.SG 1SG.NOM truly PFX-cut-PST.1SG

(23) Old Lithuanian (RNT Luke 9.9)

Eródas táre: Ionq nu-kirf-din-au...
 PN.NOM.SG say.PST.3 PN.ACC.SG PFX-cut-CAUS-PST.1SG

(24) Old Lithuanian (GNT Luke 9.9)

Jonq asz nu-kirt-au.
 PN.ACC.SG 1SG.NOM PFX-cut-PST.1SG

(25) Modern Lithuanian (RKB Luke 9.9)

Jonui aš nu-kirs-din-au galvą.
 PN.DAT.SG 1SG.NOM PFX-cut.CAUS-PST.1SG head.ACC.SG

As can be seen above, Bretke's translation includes two variants, while the translations by Bythner and Giedraitis include only a transitive verb variant, which would indicate that Herod carried out the execution himself. Interestingly, Chylinski and Ruhig also used the curative variant, and eventually, the curative variant prevailed as the modern translation also uses the curative *nukirsdinti*, indicating that Herod was the one ordering the beheading of John the Baptist. Thus, this version has lexicalized and assumed a specialized meaning.

At this point, it is worth adding that translations by Bythner and Giedraitis do not include curatives at all, allegedly, due to the sources of both translations. Although there has been no detailed research on the sources of Bythner's translation of the New Testament, it is assumed that he translated from Greek, Polish and German. The history of the sources used by Giedraitis also has not been fully explored, however, according to the historical data, the New Testament was published by the Protestant Bible Society in Vilnius and had to be compared with Bythner's text³. Let us compare some longer passages of the Gospel of Luke with the text of the Gdańsk Bible (1632), one of the most important Protestant translations of the Bible into Polish:

(26) *kirsti*:

a. Old-Lithuanian (BNT Lk 9.9)

Tada táre Herodas: Ioną aþ tiefa
 then say.PST.3 PN.NOM.SG PN.ACC.SG 1SG.NOM truly
nu-kirt-au.

PFX-cut-PST.1SG

Bet kasgi tai tas efi ape kuri
 but who this that.NOM.SG.M be.PRS.3 about which.ACC.SG.M
aþ tokius girdþiu dáiktus?
 1SG.NOM such.ACC.PL.M hear.PRS.1SG thing.ACC.PL

b. Old-Lithuanian (GNT Lk 9.9)

Ir sake Herodas: Joną asz nu-kirt-au.
 and say.PST.3 PN.NOM.SG PN.ACC.SG 1SG.NOM PFX-cut-PST.1SG
O kas ira tas, ape kuri asz
 and who be.PRS.3 that.NOM.SG.M about which.ACC.SG.M 1SG.NOM

3 Information confirmed thanks to the courtesy of Gina Kavaliūnaitė.

tokius dayktus girdziu?
 such.ACC.PL.M thing.ACC.PL hear.PRS.1SG

c. Old-Polish (GdB Lk 9.9)

Tedy rzekł Herod: Janamci ja
 then say.PST.3 PN.NOM.SG PN.ACC.SG_2SG.DAT 1SG.NOM

ściął;

cut.PST.1SG.PFV

któż wždy ten jest, o którym
 who Q that.NOM.SG.M be.PRS.3 about which.ACC.SG.M

ja takie rzeczy słyszę?

1SG.NOM such.ACC.PL thing.ACC.PL hear.PRS.1SG

‘And Herod said, John have I beheaded: but who is this, of whom I hear such things?’

As can be seen above, the Polish text corresponds faithfully to the translations by Bythner and Giedraitis. It is worth noting that the Polish translation, just like Lithuanian translations, uses the non-causative verb *ściąć* ‘to cut off’. Polish does not have any morphological tools to express the curatives and therefore, the verb *ściąć* can also mean ‘to behead’.

Apart from the aforementioned examples, as has already been stated, both translations do not include curatives, perhaps due to the Polish influence. Of course, the analyzed texts include some verbs with the curative suffix *-in-*, however it is questionable whether they could be interpreted as curatives at all:

(27) *sodinti*

a. Old-Lithuanian (GNT Matthew 21.33)

Buwo mogus gaspadorius, kuris u-sod-in-o
 be.PST.3 certain.NOM.SG.M householder.NOM.SG who PFX-plant-PST.3
winiczią, ir aptwerie ję twora...
 vineyard.ACC.SG and hedge.PST.3 3SG.F.ACC fence.INS.SG

b. Old-Lithuanian (BNT Matthew 21.33)

Buwo Gaspadorus kursai i-fod-in-o winijčia
 be.PST.3 householder.NOM.SG who PFX-plant-PST.3 vineyard.ACC.SG
ir aptwère ję twora...
 and hedge.PST.3 3SG.F.ACC fence.INS.SG

- c. Old-Polish (GdB Matthew 21.33)
Człowiek niektóry był gospodarzem, który
 man.NOM.SG certain.NOM.SG.M be.PST.3 householder.NOM.SG who
nasadził winnicę, i plotem ją
 plant.CAUS.PST.3.PRF vineyard.ACC.SG and fence.INS.SG 3SG.F.ACC
ogrodził...
 hedge.PST.3.PFV
 ‘There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and
 hedged it round about...’

(28) *suvadinti*

- a. Old-Lithuanian (GNT Luke 15.6)
O parejės namon su-wadin-a prietelus ir
 and return.PST.AP.3.SG.M house.ILL PFX-call-PST.3 friend.ACC.PL and
susiedus...
 neighbour.ACC.PL
- b. Old-Lithuanian (BNT Luke 15.6)
O atėjės namū fu-wadin-a Prietelus
 and return.PST.AP.3.SG.M house.LOC.PL PFX-call-PST.3 friend.ACC.PL
ir fusiėdus...
 and neighbour.ACC.PL
- c. Old-Polish (GdB Luke 15.6)
A przyszedłszy do domu, zwołuje przyjaciół,
 and return.PST.AP to house.ACC.SG call.PST.3.IPFV friend.ACC.PL
i sąsiadów...
 and neighbour.ACC.PL
 ‘And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and
 neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found
 my sheep which was lost.’

Without the broader context, the examples quoted above perhaps might be interpreted as curatives. In example (27), it can be assumed that the agent did not build the vineyard on his own and perhaps he entrusted the task to someone or at least received some help. Similarly, in example (28), we can assume, using our knowledge about the world, that the agent invited ‘guests’ by sending

his servants. However, based on the derivational semantics of their base words, and by comparing the texts with the Gdańsk Bible, it should be assumed that these constructions are devoid of the semantic element of curativity and are lexicalized to some extent. Curative constructions are also found in Latvian, where many of the curatives have developed a new meaning by abandoning the causative element (*šūdināt* ← *šūt* ‘sew’; *darināt* ← *darīt* ‘make/do’) (Holvoet and Nau 2015, 27). A similar tendency can be observed in Lithuanian, therefore verbs *suvadinti* and *užsodinti* have assumed a specialized use and, at least in the idiodialects of the authors, they have moved from the word formation to the word-stock.

5 Conclusions

Curative constructions are a rare type of causativization derived from transitive verbs and are formed by adding the suffix *-din-* to the base verb. From the point of view of syntax, the characteristic feature of curatives is the fact that, unlike proper causatives, they do not increase the valency of a sentence, but only reorganize it. A new argument, the causer, is introduced into the sentence structure, but the original argument P, the causee, is removed. Interestingly, in the analyzed texts, there are a number of examples where the causee can be considered as expressed. Some of them, such as the locative expressions in (9), can be considered questionable because they indicate the place of action rather than the actual causee. However, the situation becomes clearer in examples such as (10) and (11), where the causee can be identified to some extent by the pronoun anaphora. This may prove that although the causee does not occupy a syntactic place in the sentence, it is still backgrounded in the semantics. An interesting example in this context is sentence (14), where the causee takes a separate syntactic place and is introduced into the sentence with the preposition *per*. Although such a construction can be seen only in Bretke’s translation, it may denote the process of the normalization of curative constructions created according to the CSP pattern.

The processes of normalization and lexicalization can also be seen in other translations. Constructions cited in Part 4 show that curatives, in addition to meaning “the causer orders the causee to perform the action x”, can take on specialized functions such as “the causee performs the action x on behalf of the causer”. Over time, verbs that have the curative morphology may take on

new meaning, devoid of the causative element, in order to distinguish them semantically from the base verb. This process, however, may take place with varying frequency.

Abbreviations

1—1st person, 2—2nd person, 3—3rd person, A—agentive argument of the canonical transitive verb, ACC—accusative, ALL—allative, AP—active participle, CAUS—causative, DAT—dative, ILL—illative, DEF—definite, DO—direct object, F—feminine, FUT—future, GEN—genitive, INF—infinitive, INS—instrumental, IO—indirect object, IPFV—imperfective, IRR—irrealis, LOC—locative, M—masculine, NEG—negation, NOM—nominative, Obj—object, Obl—oblique object, P—patientive argument of the canonical transitive verb, PP—passive participle, PFV—perfective PFX—prefix, PL—plural, PN—personal name, PRS—present, PST—past, Q—question marker, RFL—reflexive, RPO—reflexive possessive, S—single argument of the canonical intransitive verb, SG—singular, Sbj—subject

Data Sources

- BrB Lithuanian Bible, Pentateuch, ed. Friedemann Kluge, Jochen Dieter Range, Friedrich Scholze, Paderborn etc.: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996; New Testament, ed. Jochen Dieter Range & Friedrich Scholz, 1991. The electronic versions of part of the OT book at seniejirastai.lki.lt and Jochen Dieter Range's transcription of the Gospels and Acts (Paderborn etc.: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2017) have also been used.
- BNT The 1701 *Novum Testamentum Lithuanicum* at seniejirastai.lki.lt
- ChB Samuel Boguslaus Chyliński's *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Lithuanicâ linguâ donatum* at <http://www.chylinskibible.flf.vu.lt>
- GNT Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis' Naujas įstatymas from 1816, at seniejirastai.lki.lt
- RKB Antanas Rubšis' Old Testament translation and Česlovas Kavaliauskas' New Testament Catholic translation from 1998.
- RNT Naujasis Testamentas from 1727 at seniejirastai.lki.lt

References

- Arkadiev, Peter, Jurgis Pakerys. 2015. Lithuanian morphological causatives. *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Axel Holvoet, Nicole Nau, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 39–97.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-language similarities and differences. *Syntax and Semantics 6. The grammar of Causative*

- Constructions*. Masayoshi Shibatani, ed. New York: Academic Press. 261–312.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dixon, Robert, Alexandra Aikhenvald. 2000. Introduction. *Changing Valency*. Robert Dixon, Alexandra Aikhenvald, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1–29.
- Geniušienė, Emma. 1987. *The typology of reflexives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Holvoet, Axel, Nicole Nau. 2015. Voice in Baltic. *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Axel Holvoet, Nicole Nau, eds. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 1–38.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2009. Causative morphemes as non-valency increasing devices. *Folia Linguistica* 43(1), 67–94.
- Kemmer, Suzanne, 1993. *The middle voice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2009. Causative morphemes as non-valency increasing devices. *Folia Linguistica* 43(1), 67–94.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2013. Middles and Reflexives. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Syntax*. Silvia Luraghi, Claudia Parodi, red. London/New Delhi/New York/Sydney: Bloomsbury Publishing. 261–280.
- Naktinienė, Gertrūda. 2011. Parūpinamieji veiksmažodžiai Bendrinės lietuvių kalbos žodyne. [Curative verbs in the Dictionary of Contemporary Lithuanian Language]. *Kalbos kultūra* 84, 150–164.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P., Georgij G. Sil'nickij. 1969. Tipologija morfoložičeskogo i leksičeskogo kauzativov. [Typology of morphological and lexical causatives]. *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. Morfoložičeskij kauzativ*. [Typology of causative constructions. The morphological causative]. Aleksandr Xolodovič, ed. Leningrad: Nauka. 20–50.
- Savičiūtė, Gertrūda. 1985. Parūpinamųjų veiksmažodžių semantika. [Semantics of curative verbs]. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 24, 236–251.
- Toops, Gary H. 1989. The syntax and semantics of Lithuanian curative constructions. *The Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR*, vol. 5. Howard Aronson, ed. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers. 249–282.

Submitted: 14 February 2021