

PAWEŁ BRUDZYŃSKI

University of Warsaw

ORCID id: [orcid.org/0000-0002-1850-0818](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1850-0818)

Fields of research: History of Baltic languages, morphology, syntax, semantics, voice, modality.

DOI: [doi.org/10.35321/all91-05](https://doi.org/10.35321/all91-05)

## DISAPPEARANCE OF THE AUXILIARY VERB *ESTI* IN THE LITHUANIAN PASSIVE

Pagalbinio veiksmažodžio *esti* išnykimas iš lietuvių kalbos neveikiamosios rūšies

### ANNOTATION

The prototypical passive voice in Lithuanian is an analytical construction consisting of a passive past participle and the auxiliary verb *būti* ‘to be’. Nowadays, the conjugation of this verb in the present tense is regular, except for the suppletive form of the third person *yra*, an East Baltic innovation, and historically, its original form was *esti*. Although the development and uses of the verb *yra* are well described, its development as a passive auxiliary verb has not received enough attention. The paper aims to trace the disappearance of the form *esti* from the function of an auxiliary verb in the passive constructions based on Old Lithuanian texts from 1547–1816, represented by prints from three historical dialects of Lithuanian.

KEYWORDS: Lithuanian (language), diachrony, passive, participle, auxiliary verb.

### ANOTACIJA

Lietuvių kalbos neveikiamosios rūšies prototipas yra analitinė konstrukcija, sudaryta iš neveikiamosios rūšies būtojo laiko dalyvio ir pagalbinio veiksmažodžio *būti*. Dabartinėje lietuvių kalboje šio veiksmažodžio esamojo laiko asmenavimas yra taisyklingas, išskyrus supletyvinę 3-iojo asmens formą *yra*, kuri – rytų baltų kalbų inovacija, o istoriškai pirminė jos buvusi forma – *esti*. Nors veiksmažodžio *yra* raida ir vartosena gerai aprašyta, jo, kaip neveikiamosios rūšies pagalbinio veiksmažodžio, raidai skirta nepakankamai dėmesio. Straipsnio tikslas – remiantis 1547–1816 metų senosios lietuvių kalbos tekstais, kuriuos

reprezentuoja trijų istorinių lietuvių kalbos tarmių spaudiniai, atsekti formos *esti*, kaip atliekančios pagalbinio veiksmažodžio funkciją, išnykimą neveikiamosiose konstrukcijose.

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: lietuvių kalba, diachronija, neveikiamoji nuosaka, dalyvis, pagalbinis veiksmažodis.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In formulating universals related to the nature of the passive, one must be careful because it may differ in structure and function from language to language (Siewierska 1984; Shibatani 1985; Geniušienė 2016). Of course, it is possible to identify several common features constituting the canonical passive voice in European languages (Holvoet 2001: 366). However, it is not easy to find universals that are common to all languages. The concept of the passive voice itself is usually associated with its prototypical, personal use (Siewierska 1984: 28), where the sentence has a corresponding construction in the active voice, it is possible to determine the subject and the subject of the passive construction corresponds to the patient of the active construction. However, in this paper, the passive is understood broadly as the so-called passive family (Nau *et al.* 2020), i.e., several different predicative constructions with a passive participle, which can be grouped based on formal and functional parameters, including personal, impersonal, actional, resultative or modal constructions. The prototypical passive voice in Lithuanian is an analytical construction consisting of a so-called passive past participle (*t*-participle) or passive present participle (*m*-participle) and the auxiliary verb *būti* ‘to be’. Nowadays, the conjugation of this verb in the present tense is regular, except for the suppletive form of the third person *yra*, an East Baltic innovation, and historically, its original form was *esti*.

The history of the new, suppletive form has been extensively documented (Stang 1947: 1970; Ford 1967; Ostrowski 2017a; 2017b; 2021). The verb *esti*, originally an existential verb, was replaced by the verb *yra* and now serves only a habitual function, similar to the form *būna* ‘usually is’ (*Genialiausios mintys esti paprasčiausios*. ‘The most genius ideas usually are the simplest ones.’). The original form of *yra* should be reconstructed as *\*ī-r-ā*, as indicated by the Old Baltic and dialectal forms (Endzelin 1922: 556; Ostrowski 2017b: 167; 2021 66–67). Etymologically, it is a formation based on the stem of the anaphoric pronoun *i*- (to be precise instr. sg. *\*h<sub>1</sub>i-h<sub>1</sub>*), and two locative postpositions *-r* and *\*-ā*. Initially, it was a local verb, which then acquired an existential meaning (as evidenced by texts from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries). This development path aligns with the typological data on the relationship between locational

and existential sentences (Lyons 1967: 390–396; Clark 1978: 85–126; Yong, Jie 2013; Ostrowski 2017b: 168; 2021: 67).

While the evolution and uses of the verb *yrā* have been extensively documented, its evolution as a passive auxiliary verb has been a relatively unexplored area. This study fills this gap by meticulously tracing the disappearance of the form *esti* from the role of an auxiliary verb in passive constructions. The research is based on Old Lithuanian texts from 1547–1816, which represent three historical dialects of Lithuanian. The paper will delve into frequency data, examining the distribution of individual forms of the third person of the verb *būti* ‘to be’ in combination with passive participles. This comprehensive analysis aims to present a detailed use of these constructions and, crucially, to explain the vanishing of the form *esti* in the auxiliary function.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

The results presented in the paper were based on a corpus created for the study, consisting of Old Lithuanian texts from the territories of various historical dialects of the Lithuanian language and written over almost 300 years. The texts were selected based on the publications of Zigmantas Zinkevičius (1987; 1988; 1990; 1998) as the most representative monuments of the Old Lithuanian language. Zinkevičius writes about three historical dialects: the Western dialect used on the territory of Prussia and dialects spoken in the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (lith. *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė* (LDK)) – the Central and the Eastern.<sup>1</sup> The period in which these dialects can be said to have existed lasted approximately until the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In addition to texts from this period, some later texts have also been included. Even though it is a kind of anachronism, for the study, these translations were included in the dialects mentioned above, based on the origin of the authors, and therefore as a natural way of developing the language they used. This simplification was intended to facilitate the description and comparison of texts and, thus, to trace the development of the studied construction. The table below shows the sizes of individual texts

---

<sup>1</sup> Full list of writings is attached in the abbreviation section.

TABLE 1: corpus size

DIALECT	TEXT	Word by text	Word by dialect	Total
Prussian (west)	1547MžK	7297	411255 (650170 with Quandt's NT)	2398569
	1573WP	183894		
	1579VE	40224		
	1579BB	166975		
	1612ZE	12865		
	1727KNT	238915		
LDK (central)	1599DP	419036	1222710 (1654968 with Bitneris' and Giedraitis' NT)	2398569
	1660MP	201170		
	1653KN	171861		
	1660ChB	430643		
	1701BtNT	228586		
	1816GNT	203672		
LDK (east)	1644ŠPS	68982	93431	2398569
	1647JE	24449		

As can be seen, the number of texts from individual dialects is not uniform. The main goal in creating the corpus was to diversify texts so that the results obtained were as reliable as possible and to exclude possible individual linguistic characteristics of authors. The only text from the 19<sup>th</sup> century represents the Central variant because the greatest diversity distinguished this dialect during the study. The last problem concerns the representation of texts from the Eastern dialect. This is because, as Zinkevičius states (1998: 252–255), this dialect is the least represented and developed. For this reason, although the data from both texts provide interesting information, they are the least reliable and important for the study. To eliminate significant numerical discrepancies further, percentage data will also be presented in the analysis in addition to numbers.

To find in the corpus described in the paper constructions, a formula was used consisting of:

- 1) third-person auxiliary verb *yro* or *esti*;
- 2) endings of the nominative singular and plural for both genders:
  - a. past passive participles (*t*-participle),
  - b. present passive participles (*m*-participle).

In theory, the auxiliary verb combined with the passive participle is the basis of the passive. All formulas took into account the orthography used by the

authors and the fact that the auxiliary verb could be in both postposition and preposition to the participles. Unfortunately, the results do not consider forms where the auxiliary verb could be in a further position relative to the participle. The obtained results were then manually filtered:

TABLE 2: Distribution of auxiliaries in passive constructions

Participle	<i>m</i> -participle		<i>t</i> -participle	
Auxiliary	<i>yra</i>	<i>esti</i>	<i>yra</i>	<i>esti</i>
<b>total</b>	232	314	2251	210
	546		2461	

As can be seen, the results for individual constructions differ significantly. Constructions with *t*-participles dominate, but the distribution of the auxiliary verb in constructions with *m*-participles attracts more attention. The following sections will discuss a detailed analysis of individual auxiliaries in the passive.

### 3. ANALYSIS

The tables below present numerical data on the distribution of *yra* and *esti*. Table 3 shows the absolute values of the occurrence of individual verbs in combination with *m*-participle and *t*-participle. These data are grouped into larger entities according to the century and dialect they represent. Table 4 shows the same data expressed as a percentage value.

TABLE 3: Total number of auxiliaries by dialect

DIALECT	Centu- ry	<i>m</i> -participle			<i>t</i> -participle	
		<i>yra</i>	<i>est</i>		<i>yra</i>	<i>est</i>
Prussian (Western)	XVI	38	1	39	437	55
	XVII	0	0	0	11	0
	XVIII	45	0	45	243	3
LDK (Central)	XVI	58	15	73	559	32
	XVII	8	263	271	490	67
	XVIII	41	34	75	216	46
	XIX	42	1	43	295	2
LDK (Eastern)	XVII	0	0	0	0	5

TABLE 4: Total percentage of auxiliaries by text

DIALECT	TEXT	<i>m</i> -participle			<i>t</i> -participle		
		<i>yra</i>	<i>est</i>	=	<i>yra</i>	<i>est</i>	=
Prussian (Western)	XVI	97	3	100	89	11	100
	XVII	0	0	0	100	0	100
	XVIII	100	0	100	99	1	100
LDK (Central)	XVI	79	21	100	95	5	100
	XVII	3	97	100	88	12	100
	XVIII	55	45	100	82	18	100
	XIX	98	2	100	99	1	100
LDK (Eastern)	XVII	0	0	0	0	100	100

A low number of occurrences of examples from the Eastern dialect of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania will be discussed in the next section. However, for obvious reasons, they are too statistically insignificant. The general picture that may emerge from the above data suggests that *esti* as an auxiliary was used marginally already in the times of the first written texts, especially in the case of the passive with the *t*-participle. However, a deeper analysis of individual texts may show interesting relationships between both forms. The following paragraphs will discuss the use of both verbs in combination with the passive based on the *t*-participle and the *m*-participle.

### 3.1. *t*-participle

According to Vytautas Ambrazas (2006: 353), initially, passive was based on the so-called passive past participle formed by adding the suffix *-t-* and the appropriate ending to the infinitive stem. This participle was initially used to create deverbal adjectives (e.g., *baltas* ‘white’ < *balti* ‘to whiten’), and eventually, it became the basis for the passive and has probably served this function since pre-literate times. In the oldest Lithuanian texts from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the form of the third person of the auxiliary is mostly *yra*. However, some constructions with *esti* still can be found:

(1) 1579VEE:

...	<i>ghiffai</i>	<i>yra</i>	<i>paskirtas</i>	<i>nūgi</i>
	3.sg.m.det	aux.prss.3	appoint.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	from
<i>Diewa</i>	<i>fudžia</i>			
God.gen.sg	judge.gen.sg			

‘...he is appointed by God-judge.’

(2) 1579VEE:

<i>Pagirtas</i>	<i>eft</i>	<i>waifus</i>	<i>βiwata</i>	<i>tawa</i>
bless.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	fruit.nom.sg	womb.gen.sg	poss.2.sg

‘Blessed is the fruit of thy womb.’

Observations related to the distribution of the third person forms of the verb *būti* are given in the tables below, where table 5 presents absolute numbers while table 6 – percentage data regarding the distribution in individual texts:

TABLE 5: Total number of auxiliaries by text

DIALECT	TEXT	<i>t</i> -participle		
		<i>yra</i>	<i>est</i>	TOTAL
Prussian (Western)	1547MŽK	0	3	3
	1573WP	237	27	264
	1579VEE	61	20	81
	1579BB	139	5	144
	1612ZE	11	0	11
	1727KNT	243	3	246
LDK (Central)	1599DP	414	6	420
	1660MP	145	26	171
	1653KN	0	12	12
	1660ChB	490	56	546
	1701BtNT	216	46	262
	1816GNT	295	2	297
LDK (Eastern)	1644ŠPS	0	4	8
	1647JE	0	1	1

TABLE 6: Total percentage of auxiliaries by text

DIALECT	TEXT	<i>t</i> -participle		
		<i>yra</i>	<i>est</i>	=
Prussian (Western)	1547MžK	0	100	100
	1573WP	90	10	100
	1579VE	75	25	100
	1579BB	97	3	100
	1612ZE	100	0	100
	1727KNT	99	1	100
LDK (Central)	1599DP	99	1	100
	1660MP	85	15	100
	1653KN	0	100	100
	1660ChB	90	10	100
	1701BtNT	82	18	100
	1816GNT	99	1	100
LDK (Eastern)	1644ŠPS	0	100	100
	1647JE	0	100	100

The overwhelming majority of examples use the auxiliary *yra* as the default one. As expected, a gradual disappearance of the passive with the verb *esti* can be noticed. However, this process differed slightly between the dialects of Prussia and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Based on the data, it can be assumed that the construction with *esti* as an auxiliary verb finally went out of use in Prussia in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the LDK in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. According to Ambraszas (2001: 15), this is probably related to the development of the passive itself, which was first fully grammaticalized in Western dialects and then gradually covered subsequent dialects to the East. This process in some eastern dialects was not fully completed until modern times (Ambraszas 2001: 15–16; 2006: 365–366). Below, the characteristics of the use of the mentioned verb forms in individual dialects will be discussed.

### 3.1.1. Prussian dialect

The oldest studied text represents the Prussian dialect, and at the same time, the oldest Lithuanian book is the Martynas Mažvydas' *Catechism*. During the corpus search, three examples of the passive with an auxiliary in the third person were found in the text mentioned above, and interestingly, all these examples are constructions with the verb *esti*:

(3) 1547MžK

...	<i>Baβniczie</i>	<b><i>padota</i></b>	<b><i>esti</i></b>	<i>Christui</i>
	church.nom.sg	give.pst.pp.	aux.pst.3	pn.dat.sg

(4) 1547MžK

<i>Szadis</i>	<i>Dewa</i>	[...]	<b><i>apraschitas</i></b>	<b><i>esti</i></b>
word.nom.sg	God.gen.sg		describe.pst.pp.nom.sg	aux.prs.3
<i>Tais</i>	<i>zadeis</i>			
this.ins.pl.m	word.ins.pl			

‘Word of God is described with these words.’

Of course, the examples found are not numerous enough to be considered statistically significant. However, it is worth noting that in the text of *Postilla* from 1573, only 28 years after the *Catechism*, the dominant form of the auxiliary is *yra*, and *esti* occurs in only 10% of total examples (27 out of 264). However, despite this overwhelming discrepancy, there is no apparent difference in the use of the two forms. They can be used both in resultative meanings (5a) and (5b) and in actional meanings with an expressed agent (6a) and (6b):

(5) Resultative:

a. 1573WP

<b><i>Priliginta</i></b>	<b><i>est</i></b>	<i>karaliste</i>	<i>dangaus</i>	<i>βmagu</i>
equate.pst.pp.nom.sg.f	aux.pst.3	kingdom.nom.sg	heaven.gen.sg	man.dat.sg
<i>kareliu</i>				
king.dat.sg				

‘The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king...’

b. 1573WP

<b><i>Priliginta</i></b>	<b><i>ira</i></b>	<i>karaliste</i>	<i>Dangaus</i>	<i>βmagu</i>
equate.pst.pp.nom.sg.f	aux.pst.3	kingdom.nom.sg	heaven.gen.sg	man.gen.pl
<i>seiancʒiam</i>	<i>gieru</i>	<i>sekly</i>		

sow.prs.ap.dat.sg.m good.gen.pl.m seed.gen.pl

‘The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed...’

(6) Actional:

a. 1573WP

<i>Diewas</i>	[...]	<b><i>regetas</i></b>	<b><i>est</i></b>	<i>nog</i>
God.nom.sg		see.pst.ap.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	from
<i>angelu</i>				
angel.gen.pl				

‘...God was [...] seen of Angels.’

## b. 1573WP

<i>Jesus</i>	<b><i>dotas</i></b>	<b><i>ira</i></b>	<b><i>mumis</i></b>	<b><i>nog</i></b>
pn.nom.sg	give.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	1.pl.dat	from
<i>Diewa</i>				

God.gen.sg

‘...Jesus is given to us by God...’

It is worth mentioning, however, that although both types of construction occur with both verb forms, the constructions with *esti* seem more actional than those with *yra*. Of course, this is difficult to state unambiguously because the level of grammaticalization of the Lithuanian passive is much lower than, for example, English (Brudzyński, Spraunienė 2021: 179–180); however, this can be proven by the fact that the agent in this type of constructions is expressed 6 times out of 27, while in constructions with *yra* only 5 out of 237. This could suggest that the fully developed passive, which has both resultative and actional uses, initially used the auxiliary *esti*. With the rise of *yra*, the verb gradually took over the initial role of *esti*, starting with attributive and resultative uses, thus retracing the path of passive development (Bybee *et al.* 1994: 63–69). A similar situation is still visible in Baltramiejus Vilentas’ 6 years older text, where constructions with *esti* account for 25% of all uses and play the role of a more actional passive. In contrast, constructions with *yra* mainly refer to the attributive or resultative meaning, often using mostly lexicalized forms such as *pagirtas* ‘praised,’ *priligintas* ‘compared,’ or *paschlowintas* ‘blessed’:

## (7) 1579VEE:

<i>Ir</i>	<b><i>regietas</i></b>	<b><i>eft</i></b>	<b><i>nūg</i></b>	<b><i>Cefajcha</i></b>
and	see.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	from	pn.gen.sg

‘And that he was seen of Cephas...’

## (8) 1579VE:

<b><i>Paschlowinti</i></b>	<b><i>yra</i></b>	<b><i>vbagai</i></b>	<b><i>Dwasseje</i></b>
bless.pst.pp.nom.pl.m	aux.prs.3	poor.nom.pl	spirit.loc.sg

‘Blessed are the poor in spirit...’

Interestingly, the proportions between both auxiliary verbs are different in the text of Jonas Bretkūnas’ Bible, which was translated from 1579 to 1590. In this text, the passive with *esti* appears only five times out of 144, and all examples with the expressed agent are limited only to the construction with *yra*.

(9) 1579BB

<i>Iesus</i>	<b><i>regetas</i></b>	<i>ira</i>	<i>nūg</i>	<i>Cephoschaus</i>
pn.nom.sg	seen.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	from	pn.gen.sg

‘Jesus was seen of Cephas.’

Therefore, it should be recognized that the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century was a critical moment in the disappearance of the passive based on the auxiliary *esti*. In addition to Bretkūnas’ text, in which this verb appears sporadically, this fact may be proven by the Lozorius Zengštokas’ *Enchiridion*, which is several years older, in which this construction does not appear at all. It is worth noting that 100 years later, in the text of the Quandt’s Bible from 1727, the passive with *esti* appears 3 times out of 246:

(10) 1727KNT

<i>Man</i>	<i>[...]</i>	<b><i>dūta</i></b>	<b><i>esti</i></b>	<i>βi</i>
1.sg.dat		give.pst.pp.nom.sg.f	aux.prs.3	this.nom.sg.f
<i>Mallon</i>				
grace.nom.sg				

‘Unto me [...] is this grace given.’

(11) 1727KNT

<i>Bet</i>	<i>kiekwienam</i>	<i>iβ</i>	<i>musu</i>	<b><i>dūta</i></b>
but	every_one.dat.sg	from	1.pl.gen	give.pst.pp.nom.sg.f
<b><i>esti</i></b>	<i>Mallone</i>			
aux.prs.3	grace.nom.sg			

‘But unto every one of us is given grace...’

(12) 1727KNT

<i>Surinkimas</i>	<b><i>padūtas</i></b>	<b><i>esti</i></b>	<i>Kristui</i>	<i>taipo</i>
congregation.nom.sg	give.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	pn.dat.sg	so
<i>ir</i>	<i>Moteres</i>	<i>sawo</i>	<i>Wyrams</i>	
and	woman.nom.pl	rposs	man.dat.pl	

‘...the church is subject unto Christ, so *let* the wives *be* to their own husbands...’

It is worth adding that all these uses are rather resultative, which may indicate that the 17<sup>th</sup> century was a critical period in which *esti* finally fell out of use as the primary auxiliary verb in passive constructions of the Prussian dialect.

### 3.1.2. Dialects of LDK

The development of the third-person auxiliary in the case of LDK dialects is somewhat similar, but some chronological differences can be noticed. Similarly to Prussia, based on the data presented, we can assume a gradual disappearance of the auxiliary *esti*. However, the first visible difference is that these forms have been preserved in the territory of the LDK, both in the Central and Eastern dialects, longer than in Prussia. Looking at the data, this thesis could be contradicted by the distribution of auxiliary verbs in Mikalojus Daukša's *Postill* (1599), who is considered a leading representative of the Central dialect and one of the most influential authors in the context of the development of the literary language (Zinkevičius 1998: 246). In the text, it can be noticed that out of 420 constructions with a *t*-participle, only six use *esti* as an auxiliary, while in Jokūbas Morkūnas' text, which is only a year younger, this proportion is 26 examples out of 171:

(13) 1599DP

<i>Prámintas</i>	<i>est</i>	<i>tieg</i>	<i>wârdas</i>	<i>io</i>
call.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	therefore	name.nom.sg	3.sg.gen.m
<i>Iésus</i>	<i>kurís</i>	<b><i>prámintas</i></b>	<b><i>êst'</i></b>	<i>nûg</i>
pn.nom.sg	which.nom.sg.m	call.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	from

*Angelo*  
angel.gen.sg

‘He was given the name Jesus, which was given by the Angel.’

(14) 1599DP

<i>Ir</i>	<b><i>pramintas</i></b>	<i>yra</i>	<i>wârdas</i>	<i>io</i>
and	call.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	name.nom.sg	3.sg.gen.m
<i>Iesus</i>				
pn.nom.sg				

‘He was given the name Jesus.’

Zinkevičius (1998: 247) accuses Morkūnas of numerous errors, but this discrepancy seems too large to be a simple linguistic error. The answer to this significant difference in distribution may lie in the origin of the Daukša. The author came from Samogitia, which is geographically close to the territory of Prussia. Therefore, it can be assumed that the influence of the Western Dialect, and thus the development of the passive, on the author's language was much more significant than on the language of other authors using the Central and Eastern Dialects. This relationship is particularly evident in the case of the distribution of auxiliary verbs with the *m*-participle, which will be discussed in the next section. This fact may, therefore, be evidence of the gradual development of

the passive, which was territorially dependent, and at the same time, confirms the analysis presented in the previous chapter, which states that the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries was the moment when this construction finally fell out of use in the territory of Prussia, and Daukša himself was potentially one of the reasons for the spread of the new construction into the territory of LDK.

Therefore, considering the assumptions presented above, it can be concluded that *esti* has been preserved as an auxiliary verb in the territory of the LDK for longer than in Prussia. In the text mentioned above by Morkūnas, as many as 15% of passive constructions are still passives with *esti*, which are mostly actional (14). Passives with the form *yra*, although they can also be actional and can have an expressed agent, are mostly resultatives or used attributively:

(15) Actional (1660MP)

a	<i>Kás</i>	<i>mumus</i>	<i>tobułay</i>	<i>irá</i>	<i>ižguldita</i>
	what	1.pl.dat	perfectly	aux.prs.3	explain.pst.pp.n
	<i>nuog</i>	<i>Powiła</i>			
	from	pn.gen.sg			
b	<i>Mumus</i>	<i>est</i>	<i>duota</i>	<i>nuog</i>	<i>Pono</i>
	1.pl.dat	aux.prs.3	give.pst.pp.n	from	lord.gen.sg
	<i>musu</i>				
	1pl.gen				

‘It is given by our Lord.’

(16) Resultative (1660MP)

<i>Tas</i>	<i>krauías</i>	<i>ira</i>	<i>prálietas</i>
this.nom.sg.m	blood.nom.sg	aux.prs.3	spill.pst.pp.nom.sg.m

‘This blood is spilled...’

Interestingly, in the approximately half-a-century older text of the *Knyga nobažnystės*, similarly to the text of Mažvydas, the only auxiliary verb in the passive constructions with a *t*-participle was *esti*.

(17) 1654KN

<i>Numiria</i>	<i>teypagi</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>bágocius</i>	<i>ir</i>
die.pst.3	therefore	and	rich_man.nom.sg	and
<i>pakastas</i>	<i>esti</i>			
bury.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3			

‘...the rich man also died and was buried.’

It is worth noting, however, that the examples in the text convey the meaning of the result, and there is no attested construction with an overtly expressed

agent. At this point, it is also worth noting that the above example, unlike the modern construction, has an obvious past tense meaning, which indicates an earlier stage of development of the passive. Similar examples can also be found in a number of other texts described in this study (Brudzyński, Spraunienė 2021).

In the text of the Samuelis Boguslavas Chylnskis' Bible published in 1660, the status of *yla* as the default form of the third person in constructions with the *t*-participle is already well established. However, a significant part (10%) are still constructions with *esti*. Moreover, Chylnskis' text is characterized by several intriguing features. A general observation is the position of the auxiliary verb. In the case of the form *yla*, 386 out of 490 examples (79%) put the verb in postposition, while in the case of *esti*, it is only 8 out of 55 (15%). This is perhaps related to the use of the verb *esti* itself. Most of the examples found are negations (18) or hortatives (19) (44 out of 54 examples have a prefix next to the auxiliary verb, and among the remaining ten, 4 have a prefixed participle):

(18) negation

a. 1660ChB

...	<i>dar</i>	<i>n'est</i>	<i>apirejszkita</i>	<i>ko</i>
	however,	aux.prs.3.neg	reveal.pst.pp.n	what.ins
<i>busime</i>				
be.fut.1.pl				

‘...yet it is not revealed what we will become.

b. 1660ChB

<i>Nepažynta</i>	<i>est</i>	<i>galibe</i>	<i>jo</i>
known.pst.pp.nom.f.neg	aux.prs.3	might.nom.sg	3.sg.m.gen

‘Indeed his might is not known.’

(19) hortatives

a. 1660ChB

...	<i>t'est</i>	<i>prakiaykta</i>	<i>žiame</i>	<i>del</i>
	aux.prs.3.hort	curse.pst.pp.nom.f	earth.nom.sg	because
<i>tawęs</i>				
2.sg.gen				

‘...cursed is the ground for thy sake...’

b. 1660ChB

<i>Totmesta</i>	<i>est</i>	<i>nog</i>	<i>jusu</i>	<i>wisokia</i>
throw.away.pst.pp.nom.sg.f.hort	aux.prs.3	from	2.pl.gen	all.nom.sg
<i>kartibe</i>				
bitterness.nom.sg				

‘Let all bitterness [...] be put away from you...’

Among the remaining examples, one can also find actional passives with an expressed agent:

(20) 1660ChB

a...	<b><i>est</i></b>	<b><i>pamusztas</i></b>	<b><i>Izrael</i></b>	<b><i>nog</i></b>
	aux.prs.3	defeat.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	pn.nom.sg	from
	<i>Filistynu</i>			
	pn.gen.pl			
'...Israel was defeated by Philistines...'				
b	<i>[Abimelach]</i>	<i>žęklingey</i>	<i>nog</i>	<i>Diewa</i>
	pn.nom.sg	significantly	by	god.gen.sg
	<i>pakorotas</i>			aux.prs.3
	punish.pst.pp.nom.sg.m			

'[Abimelach] significantly was punished by the God.'

These examples, although few, suggest that the passive with *esti* was still used. However, the question remains whether the negation and hortative forms of the verb *esti* developed naturally as specialized constructions or whether they were an independent attempt by Chylińskis to systematize the grammar. Due to the fact that it was not possible to find similar constructions in other authors, the second option seems more likely.

Moving on to the 18<sup>th</sup> century, it can be noticed that while the construction with *esti* practically disappeared in Prussia, it was still used in LDK dialects, an example of which is the text of Samuelis Bitneris' New Testament (1701). In the text, as many as 46 out of 295 constructions with *t*-participle (18%) use *esti* as an auxiliary, and they can be both actional and resultative:

(21) 1701BNT

a	<i>O</i>	<i>jau</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>kirwis</i>	<b><i>pridētas</i></b>
	exclam	already	and	axe.nom.sg	laid_onto.pst.pp.nom.sg.m
	<b><i>esti</i></b>	<i>βakniēsp</i>	<i>médio</i>		
	aux.prs.3	root.all	tree.gen.sg		

'And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the tree.'

b	<i>Nes</i>	<i>netikis</i>	<i>wijras</i>	<b><i>paβwestas</i></b>	<b><i>esti</i></b>
	for	believe.prs.ap.nom.sg.m.neg	man.nom.sg	sanctify.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3
	<i>per</i>	<i>moteri</i>			
	by	woman.acc.sg			

'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife...'

Among the constructions with *yra*, there are more attributive, resultative, and impersonal uses, just like in Morkūnas' text. This may suggest that at the

beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, *esti* was still a productive auxiliary used in a fully-fledged passive, while the passive with *yla*, although numerous, was less developed.

The status of the form *esti* has changed over 100 years, and in Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis' text, only two uses of it in the passive construction can be found. Interestingly, both examples, similarly to Chylinskis', are negations:

(22) 1816GNI

a [Jog jums duota ira zinot pasleptinės karalistes dangaus:]

<i>o</i>	<i>jemis</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>est</i>	<i>duota</i>
exclam	3.pl.m.dat	neg	aux.prs.3	give.pst.pp.n

‘[Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,] but to them it is not given.’

b [Daug teypogi ir kitu stebuklu padare Jezus po akimis mokitiniu sawo,]

<i>kurie</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>esti</i>	<i>parasziti</i>	<i>tose</i>
which.pl.m	neg	aux.prs.3	write.pst.pp.nom.pl.m	this.loc.pl
<i>knigose</i>				
book.loc.pl				

‘[And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples,] which are not written in these book.’

The very low frequency of *esti* (1%) may suggest that the form is probably used for stylistic reasons, and most likely somewhere between the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, *esti* as an auxiliary verb in the territory of the LDK finally fell into disuse.

At this point, a small sample of the eastern dialect is worth mentioning – namely texts by Konstantinas Sirvydas and Jonas Jaknavičius. In both texts, only five examples of the passive with the third person were found, and all use the verb *esti*.

(23) 1644ŠPS

<i>kayp</i>	<i>kiti</i>	<i>dárabay</i>	<i>Diewo</i>	[...]
as	other.nom.sg.m	work.nom.pl	god.gen.sg	
<i>esti</i>	<i>dariti</i>	<i>nuog</i>	<i>wifu</i>	<i>triiu</i>
aux.prs.3	made.pst.pp.nom.pl.m	from	all.gen.pl.m	three.gen.m
<i>Perfunu</i>	<i>Trayces</i>	<i>S[ventosios]</i>		
person.gen.pl	trinity.gen.sg	holy.gen.pl.f		

‘As other works of the God are made by all Holy Trinity.’

(24) 1647JE

<i>A</i>	<i>wienas</i>	<i>ig</i>	<i>iu</i>	<i>kad</i>
exclam	one.nom.sg	from	3.pl.gen	when
<i>iβwido</i>	<b><i>apčistitas</i></b>	<b><i>esti</i></b>	<i>[sugrio su balsu didžiu</i>	
realize.pst.3	cleanse.pst.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	<i>garbindamas Diewu.]</i>	

‘And one of them when realized that is cleansed, collapsed on earth and praised loudly the Lord.’

The absence of *yra* forms in the passive could suggest that the process of developing forms of the third person of the passive voice started in the West and moved to the East and the Eastern dialect was the last to fully develop the passive. This would confirm Ambrazas’ (2001: 15–16) observations on the development of the passive, but unfortunately, the sample is too small to be fully reliable. Nevertheless, it shows a certain tendency and is a starting point for further analysis.

### 3.2. *m*-participle

In addition to the *t*-participle, the Lithuanian passive may be based on the so-called present passive participle (*m*-participle), formed by adding the suffix *-m-* and an ending to the present tense stem. Historically, the participle was used to create adjectives (cf. lat. *firmus*, en. *warm*), and nowadays, constructions using it are characterized by a durative aspect. In this function, it is a Lithuanian innovation. The same participle is present in Latvian. However, it has not developed as the basis for the passive and instead has a modal meaning.

Interestingly, in the oldest texts from the territory of Prussia, the default auxiliary verb was *yra*, and *esti* appeared later, mainly in the territory of the LDK. The distribution of these forms is presented in the tables below:

TABLE 7: Total number of auxiliaries by text

DIALECT	TEXT	m-participle		
		<i>yra</i>	<i>est</i>	=
Prussian (Western)	1547MžK	0	0	0
	1573WP	1	0	0
	1579VE	7	1	8
	1579BB	30	0	30
	1612ZE	0	0	0
	1727KNT	45	0	45
LDK (Central)	1599DP	58	2	60
	1660MP	0	13	13
	1653KN	0	5	5
	1660ChB	7	257	264
	1701BtNT	41	34	75
	1816GNT	42	1	43
LDK (Eastern)	1644ŠPS	0	0	0
	1647JE	0	0	0

TABLE 8: Total percentage of auxiliaries by text

DIALECT	TEXT	m-participle		
		<i>yra</i>	<i>est</i>	=
Prussian (Western)	1547MžK	0	0	0
	1573WP	100	0	100
	1579VE	88	12	100
	1579BB	100	0	100
	1612ZE	0	0	0
	1727KNT	100	0	100
LDK (Central)	1599DP	97	3	100
	1660MP	0	100	100
	1653KN	0	100	100
	1660ChB	3	97	100
	1701BtNT	55	45	100
	1816GNT	98	2	100
LDK (Eastern)	1644ŠPS	0	0	0
	1647JE	0	0	0

The distribution mentioned above seems puzzling. As already mentioned, passive was first grammaticalized in the territory of Prussia. This is particularly important taking into account the passive with the *m*-participle because it first emerged in Prussia and only later spread to the territory of LDK, and according to Ambrazas (2001: 16), a passive of this type has not developed in some Eastern dialects to this day, which seem to be confirmed by the data collected for this study. Below, an analysis of individual examples found in the Prussian and LDK dialects will be discussed.

### 3.2.1. Prussian dialect

As already mentioned, the passive based on the *m*-participle is a Lithuanian innovation that first appeared on the territory of Prussia. In the oldest text – Mažvydas' *Catechism*, there were no examples of this type of use with an auxiliary. It is difficult to say how developed this construction was during this period, and it may not be attested. However, it can be assumed that it was still not fully grammaticalized as a passive, and the oldest attested example comes from Vilentas' text from 1579, where some different uses of the participle can be found:

(25) 1579VEE:

<i>Nējā</i>	<i>Agar</i>	<b><i>wandinamas</i></b>	<b><i>jra</i></b>	<i>Arabioie</i>
for	pn	call.prs.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3	pn.loc.pl
<i>kalnas</i>	<i>Sinai</i>			
mountain.nom.sg	pn			

‘For Mount Sinai is called Agar in Arabia.’

(26) 1579VEE:

<i>Wifī</i>	<i>daiktaī</i>	<i>taw</i>	<b><i>jra</i></b>	<b><i>galimi</i></b>
all.nom.pl.m	thing.nom.pl	2.sg.dat	aux.prs.3	can.prs.pp.nom.pl.m

‘All things are possible to you...’

(27) 1579VEE:

...	<i>vbagams</i>	<b><i>apfakoma</i></b>	<b><i>jra</i></b>	<i>Euangelia</i>
	poor.dat.pl	preach.prs.pp.nom.sg.f	aux.prs.3	gospel.nom.sg

‘...to the poor the gospel is preached.’

## (28) 1579VEE:

...	<i>kurie</i>	<i>nīg</i>	<i>iō [Dievo]</i>	<i>jra</i>
	which.nom.pl.m	from	3.sg.gen.m	aux.prss.3

*siuntemi*

send.prss.pp.nom.pl.m

‘...which are sent by him [the God]...’

Example (25) illustrates the attributive or resultative use, which typically marks the initial stage of the passive’s evolution (Bybee *et al.* 1994: 64; Ambrasas 2001: 12). Example (26) demonstrates a modal use. Examples (27) and (28) represent the actional passive, which shares the same meaning as the contemporary construction with the *m*-participle – namely, durative or habitual. Crucially, as shown in example (28), it is possible to express an agent in the construction, indicating that it is already fully developed, much like the passive based on the *t*-participle. It is worth noting that Vilentas’ text is the only examined Prussian Dialect text to feature construction with *esti*.

## (29) 1579VEE:

...	<i>dukte</i>	<i>mana</i>	<i>funke'</i>	<i>nūgi</i>
	daughter.nom.sg	1.sg.poss.nom.f	grievously	from
<i>Welna</i>	<i>estī</i>	<i>warginama</i>		

devil.gen.sg aux.prss.3 vex.prss.pp.nom.sg.f

‘... my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.’

As can be seen, it is a full-fledged actional construction with an expressed agent, but it is the only example of this type in the examined texts. The texts by Bretkūnas and Quandt (the only ones from the territory of Prussia where the construction occurs) only use the combination *yra* + *m*-participle. Please consider below examples:

## (30) BB1579:

30 <i>Mana</i>	<i>Duktie</i>	<i>nūg</i>	<i>Welno</i>	<i>piktai</i>
1.sg.poss.nom.f	daughter.nom.sg	from	devil.gen.sg	grievously
<i>ira</i>	<i>muczijma</i>			

aux.prss.3 vex.prss.pp.nom.sg.f

‘... my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.’

## (31) KNT1727:

<i>Mano</i>	<i>Dukte</i>	<i>funkiey</i>	<i>Wēlno</i>	<i>warginnama</i>
1.sg.poss.nom.f	daughter.nom.sg	grievously	devil.gen.sg	vex.prss.pp.nom.sg.f

‘... my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.’

Due to the scarcity of data, it is challenging to pinpoint when the grammaticalization of the passive based on the *m*-participle occurred. However, it is undeniably plausible that by the 16<sup>th</sup> century, in the Prussian territory, it was already fully developed, and from the outset, its default auxiliary verb was *yra*. This is likely linked to the fact that when this type of construction emerged in the language, the passive based on the *t*-participle was in the final phase of grammaticalization. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, *yra* was the dominant auxiliary. Most likely, the newly emerged passive construction with the *m*-participle automatically adopted the most frequent auxiliary during this period.

### 3.2.2. Central dialect

Based on the previously presented data regarding the *t*-participle, it could be assumed that the situation in LDK was analogous to that in Prussia. However, the data presented in Tables (7) and (8) seem to contradict this. The oldest of the examined texts – Daukša's *Postyll* – has a similar distribution to the texts of Prussian authors, and the only two examples out of 60 uses of the *m*-participle are constructions with *esti*:

(32) DP1599:

...	<i>numírelei</i>	<i>kârtais</i>	<i>giwúmpiumpi</i>	<i>šiuncžemi</i>
	dead.nom.pl	sometimes	life.all	send.prss.ppp.nom.pl.m
<i>est</i>				
aux.prss.3				

‘...dead sometimes are sent to life.’

(33) DP1599:

...	<i>anié</i>	<i>kurié</i>	<i>lûdintiemus</i>	<i>dâromi</i>
	3.pl.nom.m	which.nom.pl.m	witness.ins.pl	made.prss.ppp.nom.pl.m
<i>est'</i>				
aux.prss.3				

...those who are made witnesses...’

However, already a year later, in Morkūnas' text, the results are surprising, and the dominant auxiliary is *esti*, while *yra* with the *m*-participle does not appear at all:

## (34) 1600MP:

a. [Postilla LIETVWISZKA Tátáy est Ižguldímás prástás Ewángeliu ant kožnos Nedelios ir Sžwentes' per wisus metus]

<i>kurios</i>	<i>págál</i>	<i>budá</i>	<i>sená</i>	<i>Bážnicžiøy</i>
which.nom.sg.m	according	way.acc.sg	old.acc.sg.m	church.loc.sg
<i>Diewá</i>	<b><i>est</i></b>	<b><i>skáitomos</i></b>		
God.gen.sg	aux.prss.3	read.prss.ppp.nom.pl.f		

‘[This Lithuanian Postil is the simple explanation of the Gospel for every Sunday and holiday through the year], which according to the old tradition is read in the Congregation of the God.’

Zinkevičius (1998: 247) accuses Morkūnas of many mistakes, but the same cannot be said about Bitneris or Steponas Jaugelis Telega – renowned language experts of their time (Zinkevičius 1988: 216–223). In the 50 years older text of *Knyga nobažnystės*, the only construction expressing this type of passive is still *esti* + *m*-participle.

## (35) 1653KN

35...	<i>kita</i>	<i>irá</i>	<i>dángus</i>	<i>kurion</i>
	other.nom.sg.f	be.prss.3	heaven.nom.sg	which.ill.sg
<i>wisi</i>	<i>wierni</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>pábáni</i>	
all.nom.pl.m	faithful.nom.pl.m	and	devout.nom.pl.m	<i>žmones</i>
				people.nom.pl
<b><i>siunčiámi</i></b>	<b><i>esti</i></b>			
send.prss.ppp.nom.pl.m	aux.prss.3			

‘...different is the Heaven to which all faithful and devout people are sent.’

What this type of distribution of construction with *esti* can indicate? Of course, it can be assumed that somewhere between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, the verb *esti* reappeared once again as the default auxiliary for the *m*-participle, but this seems unlikely. The reason for such a large discrepancy between Daukša and the other authors from the LDK, as already mentioned, should be sought in the origin of the author of the *Postille*. Therefore, it can be assumed that Daukša’s text, which is a representative of the Central dialect, was at least influenced by the Western dialect in this respect, which seems to be confirmed by both the data regarding the *t*- and *m*-participles.

While the examples cited so far have not been numerous, the text of Chylińskis’ Bible seems to confirm the thesis that in the territory of the LDK, the construction of *yra* + *m*-participle has not yet been developed. In the mentioned translation, out of 266 examples, only seven constructions are combined with *yra*. Four are used with the participle *zynoma* ‘known’ and one

with *wadynama* ‘called’ and *notszaukiamas* ‘not called’ – so one should consider them as lexicalized attributive or modal uses rather than the actual passive.

(36) 1660ChB

a...	<i>ana</i>	<i>dirwa</i>	<i>ju</i>	<i>liezuwe</i>
	that.nom.sg.f	field.nom.sg	3.pl.gen.m	tongue.loc.sg
wadynama	<i>ira</i>	Akeldama		
call.prs.pp.nom.sg.f	aux.prs.3	pn.nom		

‘...that field is called in their proper tongue, Aceldama...’

b [Jog nes zymus zianklas padarytas *ira* per *jos*,]

<b>zynoma</b>	<b><i>ira</i></b>	<i>wisiemus</i>	<i>kurie</i>	<i>giwena</i>
know.prs.pp.n	aux.prs.3	all.dat.pl.m	which.nom.pl.m	live.prs.3
<i>Jeruzalej</i>				
pn.loc.sg				

‘[For that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them] is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem.’

Only one example can be interpreted as the actional passive:

(37) 1660ChB

[Bet teprasz joś wieroy, tas nes kursej abejoia ligus *ira*]

<i>Wilniey</i>	<i>mariu,</i>	<i>kursej</i>	<b><i>waromas</i></b>	<b><i>ira</i></b>
wave.dat.sg	sea.gen.pl	which.dat.sg	move.prs.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.3
<i>nog</i>	<i>wejaus</i>			
from	wind.gen.sg			

‘[But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like] a wave of the sea driven with the wind...’

Most examples (259) with a passive based on the *m*-participle in Chylinskis’ text use the verb *esti*. Among them, one can also find constructions with the participles mentioned in examples (36) and (37), but there are only 6 of them. The overwhelming majority are passive constructions corresponding to contemporary durative and habitual use of the *m*-participle.

(38) 1660ChB

a...[teywaniste]	<i>nog</i>	<i>Izaoka</i>	<i>paszławinime</i>	<i>jo</i>
	from	pn.gen.sg	blessing.loc.sg	3.sg.m.gen
<b><i>pažadama</i></b>	<b><i>ir</i></b>	<b><i>pastyprynama</i></b>	<b><i>est</i></b>	

promise.prs.pp.nom.sg.f and reinforce.prs.pp.nom.sg.f aux.prs.3

‘...[heritage] is promised and reinforced by Isaac’s blessing.’

b	<i>Israelitey</i>	<b><i>pamuszami</i></b>	<b><i>est</i></b>	<i>nog</i>	<i>Filistynu</i>
	pn.nom.pl	defeat.prs.pp.nom.pl.m	aux.prs.3	from	pn.gen.pl

‘Israelites was defeated by Philistines.’

c	<b><i>Pastyprynamas</i></b>	<b><i>est</i></b>	<i>asabliwu</i>	<i>apireyszkimu</i>
	reinforce.prs.pp.nom.sg.m	aux.prs.	3 peculiar.ins.sg.m	revelation.ins.sg

‘Was reinforced by peculiar revelation.’

As in the case of the *t*-participle, there are constructions with a hortative prefix (39a) and a negation prefix (39b). However, these are just five such examples:

(39) 1660ChB

a	<i>Wiezliwiste</i>	<i>jusu</i>	<b><i>t'est</i></b>	<b><i>pazystama</i></b>	<i>wisiem[us]</i>
	moderation.nom.sg	2.pl.gen	aux.prs.3.hort	know.prs.pp.nom.sg.f	all.acc.pl.m
	<i>zmonem[us]</i>				
	man.acc.pl				

‘Let your moderation be known unto all men.’

b...	<i>jeigu</i>	<i>wel</i>	<b><i>n'est</i></b>	<b><i>wadojama</i></b>
	if	again	aux.prs.3.neg	redeem.prs.pp.nom.sg.f
<i>tada</i>	<i>bus</i>	<i>pardot</i>	<i>pagal</i>	<i>apwertynima</i>
then	be.fut.3	sell.pst.pp.n	according to	estimation.acc.sg
<i>tawo</i>				
2.sg.poss				

‘...if it is not redeemed, then it shall be sold according to thy estimation.’

This may indicate that the verb *esti*, which could have specialized functions in constructions with a *t*-participle, is rather a default auxiliary in the case of an *m*-participle. This hypothesis may also be supported by the fact that many of the examples come not from the text of the Bible itself but from introductions to chapters that are not inspired by the source of the translation and reflect the idiolect of the author himself – and therefore the actual language of the Central dialect of the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

Bitneris’ text, which is 40 years older, the situation changes, and the distribution of both auxiliaries are almost equal (45% – *esti* and 55% – *yra*). There is no apparent difference between the use of both verbs, but the passive with *esti* seems more actional. At the same time, in combination with *yra*, there are more lexicalized or attributive forms.

## (40) 1701BNT

a...	<i>duktė</i>	<i>mano</i>	<i>sunkey</i>	<b><i>mucžijama</i></b>
	daughter.nom.sg	1.sg.poss.nom.f	grievously	vex.prss.ppp.nom.sg.f
<b><i>esti</i></b>	<i>nūg</i>	<i>Welnio</i>		
aux.prss.3	from	devil.gen.sg		

‘... my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.’

b [Grómata]	<b><i>skaitoma</i></b>	<b><i>ira</i></b>	<i>nūg</i>	<i>wisslî</i>
book.nom.sg	read.prss.ppp.n	aux.prss.3	from	all.gen.pl
<i>žmonū</i>				
man.gen.pl				

‘Book is read by all men.’

## (41) 1701BNT

a <i>Tegul</i>	<i>jumus</i>	<i>wissiemus</i>	<b><i>žinoma</i></b>	<b><i>esti</i></b>
shall	2.pl.dat	all.dat.pl.m	know.prss.ppp.n	aux.prss.3

‘Be it known unto you all...’

b <i>Nes</i>	<b><i>žinoma</i></b>	<b><i>ira</i></b>	<i>jog</i>	<i>Wießpats</i>
because	know.prss.ppp.n	aux.prss.3	that	Lord.nom.sg
<i>musu</i>	<i>iþéjo</i>	<i>iþ</i>	<i>plemēs</i>	<i>Iudos</i>
1.pl.gen	go.pst.3	from	tribe.gen.sg	pn.gen

‘For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda...’

This may indicate that the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries was when the *esti* construction began to fall into disuse. Giedraitis’ text has only one construction with the verb *esti* out of 43. It can, therefore, be assumed that this construction was no longer productive in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Although, as in the case of the Prussian dialect, the exact date of the grammaticalization of the construction with *ira* cannot be given, it must have occurred at the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries at the latest, i.e., over 100 years later. The data from the Eastern dialect are indeed fragmentary. However, the absence of the discussed construction in the examined texts may be a reason to claim that this construction must have developed and been grammaticalized even later.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

Historically, the third person of the Lithuanian verb *būti* ‘to be’ used the form *esti*, corresponding to other Baltic and Indo-European languages (cf. Prussian *ast*; Polish *jest*, Latin *est*, German *ist*, etc.). However, due to the semantic shift,

the place of the third person form was taken by the originally local verb *yra*, and this process must have started in the pre-literate period, as evidenced by the oldest Lithuanian texts and Latvian third person form *ir*. The original third person form *esti* already in the 16<sup>th</sup> century in the Western dialect served only as an auxiliary, and its original function was taken over by *yra*. However, *esti* as an auxiliary existed in the Central and probably Eastern dialects until the 18<sup>th</sup> century, which indicates apparent differences in grammaticalization timeline between individual dialects.

In Prussia, the passive, based on the verb *yra*, was grammaticalized earlier and was widely used in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Accordingly, the *m*-participle-based passive, which was a Lithuanian innovation that first appeared in Prussia, implicitly took the well-developed and widely used form *yra* as its auxiliary as soon as when it first appeared. It can, therefore, be assumed that both types of passive were grammaticalized at approximately the same time, i.e., at the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, because from that period, the productivity of *esti* decreased dramatically.

A completely different situation occurs in the central dialect. The process of grammaticalization of the passive began there later. *Esti*, as an auxiliary verb with the *t*-participle, began to disappear from this function at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. However, it was still present and seemed to be productive. What is worth mentioning is that the passive with *esti* seems more actional than the forms based on *yra*. The origin of both verbs may explain this. By origin, the local *yra*, which had a more stative meaning, initially appeared in attributive and resultative constructions. The genesis of the Baltic passive assumes a reanalysis of the originally stative meaning as a dynamic one and a semantic extension of meaning. This reanalysis develops the meaning of the past tense or perfect next to the original resultative meaning of the present tense (Brudzyński, Spraunienė 2021: 167–168). The passive based on the *m*-participle, which mainly has a durative and, therefore, actional meaning, has taken the auxiliary *esti*, which was more dynamic due to its original existential meaning, as a default. Therefore, the grammaticalization of both constructions did not co-occur. The *t*-participle began to be grammaticalized in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and the *m*-participle was only in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, but the process for both ended in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

One of the main evidence for differences in the grammaticalization of the passive in LDK and Prussia may be the text of Daukša, which can be considered a missing piece. The leading representative of the Central dialect has a distribution similar to the Western dialect, which may be due to geography, i.e., the location of Samogitia on the border of both dialects. Therefore, the passive form found in *the Postill* corresponds to the Western rather than the Central dialect and thus indicates that the process took place gradually from West to East.

It is also worth mentioning the admittedly poorly represented texts of the Eastern dialect, which, in any case, may provide interesting hypotheses. Despite the small number of occurrences in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the only form of the auxiliary verb with the *t*-participle was *esti*. At the same time, none of them appeared with the *m*-participle. Of course, this may be a coincidence, but it is likely a trace of the fact that this process was even more delayed in the eastern dialect compared to the other two dialects. However, more data is required to confirm this.

The departure from one of the forms of the third person present tense of the verb *būti* was probably caused by the redundancy and common ontology of both verbs. The relationship between a local sentence and an existential sentence is easy to understand, remembering that with an unmarked sentence order, the thematic-rematic structure of one is a mirror reflection of the other. Existence presupposes location (is where?), and location presupposes existence (where is it?) (Watkins 1967; 1994; Mikulskas 2009: 128). For this reason, the verb *yra* replaced the third person of the present tense as the default one, while *esti* initially moved to the function of auxiliary and ultimately by a semantic shift to the function of a habitual verb.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

1 – first person; 2 – second person; 3 – third person; ACC – accusative; AP – active participle; AUX – auxiliary; DAT – dative; DET – determined form; F – feminine; GEN – genitive; INS – instrumental; LOC – locative; M – masculine; NOM – nominative; PL – plural; PN – personal name; POSS – possessive pronoun; PP – past participle; PRS – present; PST – past; REFL – reflexive; RPOSS – reflective possessive pronoun; SG – singular; SUP – superlative; VOC – vocative

#### SOURCES

1547MžK – Mažvydas Martynas. *Katechismuso prasti žodžiai*, 1547.

1573WP – *Wolfenbüttelio postilė*, 1573.

1579BB – Bretkūnas Jonas. *Biblija*, 1579–1590.

1579VEE – Vilentas Baltramiejus. *Evangelijos bei Epistolos*, 1579.

1599DP – Daukša Mikalojus. *Postilė*, 1599.

1612ZE – Zengštokas Lozorius. *Enchiridionas*, 1612.

1644ŠPS – Sirvydas Konstantinas. *Punktai sakymų*, 1644.

1647JE – Jaknavičius Jonas. *Ewangelie Polskie y Litewskie*, 1647.

1653KN – Telega Steponas Jaugelis, Minvydas Samuelis, Božymovskis Jonas. *Knyga nobažnystės*, 1653.

1660ChB – Chylinskis Samuelis Boguslavas. *Biblja*, 1660.

1660MP – Morkūnas Jokūbas. *Postilė lietuviška* 1600.

1701BtNT – Bitneris Samuelis. *Naujasis Testamentas*, 1701.

1727KNT – Kvantas Jonas, publisher. *Naujasis Testamentas*, 1727.

1816GNT – Giedraitis Juozapas Arnulfas. *Naujas išstatymas*, 1816.

#### REFERENCES

Ambrasas Vytautas 2001: Lietuvių kalbos pasyvo raidos bruožai. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 45, 11–38.

Ambrasas Vytautas 2006: *Lithuanian Grammar*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

Brudzyński Paweł, Spraunienė Birutė 2021: The Lithuanian passive perfect and its history. – *Baltic Linguistics* 12(12), 167–207. DOI: [doi.org/10.32798/bl.923](https://doi.org/10.32798/bl.923).

Bybee Joan, Perkins Revere, Pagliuca William 1994: *The Evolution of Grammar Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Clark Eve V. 1978: *Locutionals. Existential, locative, and possessive constructions*. – *Universals of Human Language*, vol. 4: *Syntax*, eds. J. H. Greenberg, Ch. A. Ferguson, E. A. Moravcsik, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 85–126.

Endzelīns Jānis 1922: *Lettische Grammatik*, Riga: Lettisches Bildungsministerium.

Ford Gordon B. 1967: *esti* und *yra* in Vilentas' Enchiridion. – *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 30, 353–357.

Geniušienė Emma 2016: *Passive Construction in Lithuanian: Selected works of Emma Geniušienė*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Holvoet Axel 2001: Impersonals and passives in Baltic and Finnic. – *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact*, vol. 2: *Grammar and Typology*, eds. Ö. Dahl, M. Koptjewska-Tamm, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 363–389. DOI: [doi.org/10.1075/slcs.55.04hol](https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.55.04hol).

Lyons John 1967: A note on possessive, existential, and locative sentences. – *Foundations of Language* 3, 390–396.

Mikulskas Rolandas 2009: Jungties konstrukcijos ir jų gramatinis kontekstas. – *Acta linguistica Lithuanica* 61, 113–156.

Nau Nicole, Spraunienė Birutė, Žeimantienė Vaiva 2020: The Passive Family in Baltic. – *Baltic Linguistics* 11, 27–128. DOI: [doi.org/10.32798/bl.699](https://doi.org/10.32798/bl.699).

Ostrowski Norbert 2017a: Non-verbal Predication in Baltic. Lithuanian *yra*. – *Essays in the History of Languages and Linguistics. Dedicated to Marek Stachowski on the Occasion of his 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, eds. M. Nemeth, B. Podolak, M. Urban, Cracow, 463–471. DOI: [doi.org/10.12797/9788376388618.27](https://doi.org/10.12797/9788376388618.27).

Ostrowski Norbert 2017b: *Od comitativu do spójnika. O pochodzeniu słowiańskiego spójnika i oraz litewskiego ir ‘i; tez’*. – *LingVaria* 12(24), 165–176. DOI: [doi.org/10.12797/LV.12.2017.24.10](https://doi.org/10.12797/LV.12.2017.24.10).

Ostrowski Norbert 2021: The Baltic \*-ā-illative. – *Indogermanische Forschungen* 126, 65–84. DOI: [doi.org/10.1515/if-2021-004](https://doi.org/10.1515/if-2021-004).

Shibatani Masayoshi 1985: Passives and Related Constructions: A Prototype Analysis. – *Language* 61(4), 821–848.

Siewierska Anna 1984: *The Passive A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*, London, Sydney, Wolfeboro, New Hampshire: Croom Helm.

Stang Christian Sch. 1947–1970: Esti et *yra* dans les Punktay Sakimu de Szrywid. – *Norsk Tidsskrift for Språkvidenskap* 14, 87–97 [reprint.: idem, 1970, *Opuscula linguistica. Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, Oslo, 172–180].

Yong Wang, Jie Xu 2013: A Systemic Typology of Existential and Possessive Constructions. – *Functions of Language* 20(1), 1–30. DOI: [doi.org/10.1075/fol.20.1.01wan](https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.20.1.01wan).

Watkins Calvert 1967–1994: *Remarks on the Genitive*, in *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday* 3: 2191–2198, Hague, Paris [reprint.: idem, Oliver, L. (ed.) 1994, *Selected Writings, Language and Linguistics*, Innsbruck].

Zinkevičius Zigmantas 1987: *Lietuvių kalbos istorija* 2: *Iki pirmųjų raštų*, Vilnius: Mokslo.

Zinkevičius Zigmantas 1988: *Lietuvių kalbos istorija* 3: *Senųjų raštų kalba*, Vilnius: Mokslo.

Zinkevičius Zigmantas 1990: *Lietuvių kalbos istorija* 4: *Lietuvių kalba XVIII–XIX a.*, Vilnius: Mokslo.

Zinkevičius Zigmantas 1998: *The History of the Lithuanian Language*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

## Pagalbinio veiksmažodžio *esti* išnykimas iš lietuvių kalbos neveikiamosios rūšies

### SANTRAUKA

Remiantis 1547–1816 metų tekstais, parašytais trijomis istorinėmis lietuvių kalbos tar-  
mėmis, straipsnyje nagrinėjamas pagalbinio veiksmažodžio *esti* istorinis nykimas lietuvių  
neveikiamosios rūšies konstrukcijose. Straipsnį sudaro keturios dalys: įvadas, metodologija,  
analizė ir išvados. Istoriskai veiksmažodžio *būti* 3-iojo asmens forma buvo *esti*. Tačiau dėl  
semantinių poslinkių *yla*, iš pradžių buvęs vietas veiksmažodis, palaipsniui pakeitė *esti* šioje  
pozicijoje. Toks perėjimas greičiausiai prasidėjo dar prieš raštijos pradžią. Iki XVI amžiaus  
vakarų tarmėje *esti* buvo vartojoamas tik kaip pagalbinis veiksmažodis, o jo pirminę funkciją  
perėmė *yla*. Iki XVIII amžiaus vidurio ir galbūt rytinėje tarmėje *esti* buvo vartojoamas kaip  
pagalbinis veiksmažodis, atspindintis regioninius kalbos raidos skirtumus. Perėjimą nuo *esti*  
prie *yla* lėmė perteklius ir panašus abiejų veiksmažodžių vaidmuo vietas ir egzistenciniuose  
sakiniuose. Todėl *yla* tapo tipine 3-iojo asmens forma, o *esti* ėmė atliliki įprastą veiksmažo-  
džio funkciją.

Įteikta 2024 m. liepos 3 d.

PAWEŁ BRUDZYŃSKI

*University of Warsaw*

*Wydział Polonistyki, Katedra Językoznawstwa Ogólnego,*

*Migowego i Bałtystyki*

*Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28*

*00-927 Warszawa, Poland*

*[p.brudzynski@uw.edu.pl](mailto:p.brudzynski@uw.edu.pl)*