BALTIC CONTEXT OF SOME ESTONIAN PERIPHRASTIC CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Jurgis Pakerys
Vilnius University

Abstract. I discuss 4 Estonian periphrastic causative constructions based on *laskma*, *andma*, *panema,* and *sundima* with respect to semantic shift from non-causative to causative use. These constructions have parallels in Baltic, and I suggest that *laskma* belongs to the largest area of development, 'release' > 'let', attested in many Finno-Ugric and Indo-European languages, notably, in Germanic, Baltic, and to some extent, Slavic. The verb *andma*, which evolved as 'give' > 'let' (> 'be possible'), belongs to a smaller area of similar changes that occurred in Finnic, Baltic, and Slavic, while *panema* as 'put' > 'make' belongs to the smallest area (some Finnic and some Baltic languages). The verb *sundima*, as a Slavic loan, has parallel borrowings in a number of Finnic and Baltic languages, but only in Estonian has the causative use of this predicate developed.

Keywords: periphrastic causative constructions, factitive causative constructions, permissive causative constructions, Finnic languages, Baltic languages, Circum-Baltic area

1. Introduction

It is well known that Finnic and Baltic languages have a number of common linguistic features also shared by some neighboring Germanic and Slavic languages; for an overview, see Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Wälchli (2001). In this article, I would like to discuss four Estonian predicates used in periphrastic causative constructions (hereafter, PCCs) within the context of the Baltic languages. I will focus on the semantic shift from non-causative to causative use paralleled by similar developments in the Baltic context and, when possible, I will also briefly mention the Finnic, Germanic, and Slavic context of corresponding PCCs.

The PCCs in this paper are understood as constructions with free verbal forms dedicated to the expression of causation, which can be either factitive, if the event is actively caused (cf. English *make*), or permissive, when the event is caused passively, that is, permitted, not blocked (cf. English *let*). The PCCs can be further subdivided into

monoclausal, if the causative verb functions as an auxiliary and forms a cohesive unit with the lexical verb (cf. English *make* and *let*), and biclausal, if the clause with the causative verb can be shown to be separate from the one which marks the caused event (cf. English *cause to*). In this article, only the distinction between factitive and permissive subtypes will be made, and the issue of mono-/bi-clausality will be left out of the discussion. For further discussion of factitive, permissive, and mono-/bi-clausal types of PCCs, see Nedjalkov and Sil'nickij (1973), Dixon (2000), Kulikov (2001).

I have chosen four Estonian PCCs for the discussion for the following reasons (the numbers in parentheses indicate the sections of this article): (2) *laskma* 'let' is paralleled by Latvian *ļaut, laist* and Lithuanian *leisti* 'let' (< 'release'); (3) *andma* 'be possible' (< 'let') is to be compared with Latvian *dot,* Lithuanian *duoti,* Old Prussian *dāt* 'let' (< 'give'); (4) *panema* 'put; make' corresponds to Latvian *likt* 'put; make' and Latgalian *stateit* 'place; make'; (5) *sundima* 'make', a loan-word from East Slavic, is paralleled by corresponding borrowings in all Baltic languages, where the causative use of these predicates has not developed. Estonian also has a number of other PCCs based on *ajama* 'make', *lubama* 'allow' and others, but the Baltic context of the constructions mentioned above are most relevant here. Further studies of Baltic and Finnic PCCs should reveal more possible parallels and important details of their development.

2. *laskma*

laskma exemplifies the rise of the permissive function 'let, allow' from 'release, let go', and both meanings coexist in modern Estonian: see the examples in (1a-b) as non-permissive vs. (1c) as permissive:

(1)   Estonian[1]

   a. *kraani-st*   *vett*   ***lask-ma***
      tap-ELA.SG   water:PRT.SG   pour-(m)INF

      'to pour water from tap'

   b. *vangi-d*   ***las-ti***   *vaba-ks*
      prisoner-NOM.PL   release-PST.PASS   free-TRA.SG

      'prisoners were released'

---

1   All examples in (1) are from EE-RU, *laskma*.

  c. ***lase***   *mind* / *mul*   ***tõus-ta***
      let:IMP.2SG   1SG.PRT   1SG.ADE   stand.up-(t)INF

      'let me stand up'

The development from 'release, let go' to 'let, allow' is also attested in Lithuanian, where both meanings co-exist synchronically, but the permissive function is clearly dominant and accounts for more than 70% of the use of this verb (Pakerys 2016: 439), cf. non-permissive (2a-b) vs. permissive (2c):

(2)   Lithuanian (constructed; own knowledge)

  a. ***leis-ti***   *iš*   *čiaup-o*   *vanden-į*
      pour-INF   from   tap-GEN.SG   water-ACC.SG

      'to pour water from tap'

  b. *kalini-ai*   *buv-o*   ***pa-leis-t-i***
      prisoner-NOM.PL   be-PST.3   PRF-release-PST.PASS.PTCP-NOM.PL.M

      'prisoners were released'

  c. ***leis-k***   *man*   ***atsisto-ti***
      let-IMP.2SG   1SG.DAT   stand.up-INF

      'let me stand up'

Latvian has *laist*, which shares its root with Lithuanian *leisti*, but features a different apophonic grade (/ai/ vs. /ei/). Permissive use of *laist* is marginal compared to that of *ļaut* (discussed below) and is attested in less than 12% of the tokens (Pakerys 2016: 453); see examples (3a-b) as non-permissive vs. (3c) as permissive:

(3)   Latvian

  a. ***lais-t***   *ūden-i*   *no*   *krān-a*
      pour-INF   water-ACC.SG   from   tap-GEN.SG

      'to pour water from tap' (EE-LV, *laskma*)

  b. ***Lais-t***   *slimniek-u*   *ārā*   *no*   *slimnīc-as*
      release-INF   patient-ACC.SG   outside   from   hospital-GEN.SG

      'to release patient from hospital' (MLLV, *laist*)

c. ***Lais-t***   *bērn-iem*   ***izskrie-ties***
let-INF   child-DAT.PL   have.a.good.run-INF.RFL

'to let the children have a good run (get tired with running about)'
(LLVV, *laist*)

It is worth noting that the Latvian permissive *ļaut* only allows dative coding of the causee ('permittee'), while *laist* allows accusative and dative, the first case being more frequent (see Pakerys 2016: 453). I have no data on the frequency of use of adessive and partitive in Estonian *laskma*-construcions (cf. these cases in (1c), *mind/mul*), but it seems that adessive is the default option, while partitive is less common[2]. As Klaas (1996: 56) notes, the use of adessive in this and some other constructions characterizes Estonian as being closer to the Indo-European pattern rather than the Finnic one. The gradual shift from non-dative marking of the causee to dative (= adessive in Estonian) may be related to the development of the manipulative meaning of the predicates discussed above and is in line with Givón's suggestion (2001: 66–68) that dative in some languages correlates with attempted manipulation (in our case, the manipulation is permissive).

Estonian *laskma* has given rise to the modal particle *las* < imperative *lase* (Metslang 2000: 59) and it is worth noting that identical developments have also occurred in Baltic. Despite the rarity of the use of permissive *laist* in modern Latvian, the imperative form of this verb developed into a modal particle *lai* < *laid* (Endzelin 1922: 690) and this demonstrates that the permissive semantics of *laist* may have been more prominent in earlier stages (that is, frequent enough to give rise to *lai*). Some Lithuanian dialects have also developed the particle *lai* (Fraenkel 1962: 329), which also points to an earlier use of the verb **laisti* (with /ai/ grade of the root) in Lithuanian. Old Prussian has a modal (conditional) suffix *-lai*, which, it has been suggested, may be related to the Lithuanian and Latvian particles discussed above, but this comparison is uncertain, see Stang (1966: 443), and no corresponding verb with the root **laid-/leid-* is attested in Old Prussian. For more examples of the development of modal particles from permissive verbs in Circum-Baltic and other languages, see Endzelin (1922: 690), Metslang (2000: 59–60); for a discussion and comparison of relevant constructions

---

2   Cf., for example, BED (http://www.eki.ee/dict/psv/index.cgi?Q=laskma&F=M). See an overview and a more detailed discussion of marking of the causee and the caused event in *laskma*-constructions in (Tamm 2012).

in Estonian, Livonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian, see Klaas-Lang and Norvik (2014: 599–600).

Latvian *ļaut* 'allow, let', currently the most commonly used permissive PCC, has no other synchronic uses, other than the idiomatic phrase *ļaut vaļu* + dative 'give way (for)'. Historically, Latvian *ļaut* also developed from 'release, let go' (Karulis 1992: 552[3]) and has correspondences in Lithuanian and Old Prussian, where it has not acquired a permissive function and means 'cease, stop' (Lithuanian reflexive *liauti-s*) or 'die' (Old Prussian prefixed *au-lāut*). It should also be noted that Estonian *laskma* differs from the Baltic counterparts in its ability to express factitive causation ('make; have smth. done') and verbal manipulation ('ask, order'); see Kasik (2001: 105–113), Tamm (2012).

The path of development from 'release, let go, leave' to 'let' is widely attested in Finno-Ugric[4] and many Indo-European languages; of special interest from the areal perspective is the common Germanic development of **lēte/a-*, cf. Gothic *letan*, Old Norse *láta*, Old High German *lâzan*, among others (see EWahd 5 1073–1074). The Slavic languages also have some examples of this development, cf. Bulgarian *puskam* + *da*-clause, Slovenian *puščati* + Inf-clause (Levshina 2015), Polish *do-puścić* + *by*-clause, Russian *do-pustit'* + *čtoby*-clause, among others. More data are needed, but it seems that in the Slavic languages, the development 'release' > 'let' may have occurred later in comparison with other Circum-Baltic languages (for example, in many cases presented above, only finite subordinate clauses are available and infinitive clauses are not yet allowed). In this respect, (East) Baltic languages seem to be closer to Finnic and Germanic languages, with a fully developed shift from 'release, let go' to 'let' allowing infinitival complements.

---

3   The Indo-European base of this verb is either **leh₁-* 'nachlassen, (zu)lassen' (see LIV² 399 with the Baltic data), or **leu̯H-* 'abschneiden, lösen' (see Smoczyński 2007: 349); on this root, see LIV² (417), where the Baltic data are not included; see also ALEW (1 576).

4   See UED (http://www.uralonet.nytud.hu/eintrag.cgi?id_eintrag=450) and EED (*laskma*). I have not checked the data of individual languages and have assumed the possibility of the permissive function based on the translations of meanings by German *lassen*. However, given the polysemy of *lassen*, not all Finno-Ugric verbs translated this way would necessarily be used in PCCs proper.

3. *andma*

andma belongs to the chain of development from 'give' to 'let', and judging from the information given in bilingual dictionaries, it is typically used in impersonal constructions marking possibility. For example, EE-LV and EE-RU translate this use of *andma* as 'be possible' (*būt iespējamam* in Latvian and *byt' vozmožnym* in Russian), cf. (4a-b) as impersonal vs. (4c) where the use of *andma* is personal ('allow'). The shift from 'allow' to 'be possible' is reminiscent of the development of passive modal constructions from permissive reflexive 'give' -constructions in Polish and Czech, see (von Waldenfels 2012: 153–185, 222–231).

(4)   Estonian

    a. *tema-ga*   ***anna-b***   ***rääki-da***
       3SG-COM   be.possible-PRS.3SG   talk-(t)INF

       'It is possible to talk with him' (EE-LV, *andma*)

    b. *teg-i-me*   *kõik,*   *mis*   ***teha***   ***and-is***
       do-PST-1PL   everything   what   do:(t)INF   be.possible-PST.3SG

       'We did everything possible' (EE-LV, *andma*)

    c. *kui*   *ilm*   ***anna-b,***   *jätka-takse*
       if   weather:NOM.SG   allow-PRS.3SG   continue-PRS.PASS

       võistlus-t
       competition-PRT.SG

       'Weather permitting, the competition will be continued' (EE-RU, *andma*)

Give-based PCCs are attested in all Baltic languages, but their use in modern Lithuanian and Latvian is marginal. Before turning to these East Baltic languages, let us briefly review the data of Old Prussian. The corpus of this extinct West Baltic language is limited, but luckily enough, the use of PCCs with *dāt* 'give' is attested. Due to the influence of German *lassen*-constructions, *dāt* can refer not only to permissive, but also to factitive situations (similarly to the Estonian *laskma*-construction discussed above)[5], cf. (5a) as permissive vs. (5b) as facti-

---

5   Due to limited data, we do not know if the factitive use of *dāt* was widespread, or if we are dealing with just an occasional translation of the German *lassen*-construction.

tive (before the English translations, the original German sentences which were translated into Old Prussian are given):

(5)   Old Prussian

a. ***Dāiti***   *ſtans*   *malnijkik-ans prē[ ]mien*   ***perēi-t***
   let:IMP.2PL   DEM:ACC.PL.M child-ACC.PL   to   1SG.ACC   come-INF

   'Last die Kindlein zu Mir komen' (Ench 113, 2–3; 112, 2) = 'Let the children come to me' (ESVB, Mark 10:14)

b. *Stwi* ***dai***   *Deiw-s*   *ain-an*   *gill-in*
   Here   let:PST.3   god-NOM.SG   one-ACC.SG.F   deep-ACC.SG.F

   maigg-un   ***krū-t***   *no[ ]ſtan*   *ſmunentin-an*
   sleep-ACC.SG   fall-INF   on   DEM:ACC.SG.M   man-ACC.SG

   'Da ließ Gott der HERR einen tieffen Schlaff fallen / auff den Menschen' (Ench 101, 12; 100, 10–11) = 'So the LORD God caused a deep sleep fall upon the man' (ESVB, Genesis 2:21)

In Lithuanian and Latvian, *give*-based PCCs are used marginally, alongside the main PCCs with *leisti* in Lithuanian and *ļaut* in Latvian (Pakerys 2016: 443–445, 454), cf. (6a) and (6b):

(6) a. Lithuanian
    [Jis]   *dažnai* ***duod-a***   *vairuo-ti*   *automobil-į*
    3SG.NOM   often   allow-PRS.3   drive-INF   car-ACC.SG

    kit-iems   *asmen-ims*
    other-DAT.PL.M   person-DAT.PL

    '[He] frequently allows other persons to drive his car'[6]

   b. Latvian
    Bērn-iem   *tagad* ***dod***   *vadī-t*   *autobus-u?*
    child-DAT.PL   now   allow:PRS.3   drive-INF   bus-ACC.SG

    'Do they now allow children to drive buses?'[7]

Restricted use of permissive *give*-based PCCs is most probably due to the expansion of *leisti* in Lithuanian and *ļaut* in Latvian. The Old

---

6   http://eteismai.lt/byla/179371597263552/II-78-718, 2016-04-15.
7   http://www.tvnet.lv/auto/satiksme/357628_pie_lido_no_kupenas_izvelk_autobusu_ kura_brauca_berni/ comments, 2010-12-12.

Prussian data show that the shift 'give' > 'let' could be either a common Baltic innovation, or an independent (parallel) development shared by a number of neighboring Slavic[8] and Finnic languages. In Finnic, 'give' > 'let' is attested in Livonian, Votic, Finnish, Ingrian, Livvi-Karelian, and Veps[9]. Again, this may be either an archaic (common-Finnic?) development, or a later parallel shift, but in both cases, the Finnic languages belong to a larger area of Baltic and Slavic languages characterized by the development 'give' > 'let'.

Compared to the shift 'release' > 'let', the development 'give' > 'let' has a different distribution in Europe with respect to Germanic and Slavic languages. As noted earlier, 'release' > 'let' is widely attested in Germanic, while 'give' > 'let' seems to be less common[10]. Slavic languages, on the other hand, share an early development 'give' > 'let' (the change 'release' > 'let' is also attested, but it may be less archaic, cf. above). In this context, Baltic and Finnic languages seem to form a transitional zone. On the one hand, Finnic features the 'release' > 'let' shift shared by many Finno-Ugric languages, while the development 'give' > 'let' is shared by Finnic languages only. The Baltic languages (Latvian and Lithuanian) are characterized by the 'release' > 'let' shift, which also occurred in Germanic languages (the roots of corresponding verbs are slightly different, but could ultimately go back to the same source[11]), and at the same time, the Baltic languages also feature a 'give' > 'let' development shared with Slavic languages (the verb is etymologically the same).

4. *panema*

In the case of *panema*, the meaning 'put, place' synchronically coexists with 'make', and the causative use is noted as the most frequent of all grammatical functions of this verb (Tomson 2016: 70–71), cf. (7):

---

8   In light of the possibility of a shift from 'give' > 'let' in Proto-Slavic, one could also even imagine a common Balto-Slavic development, but this change could have occurred independently, reflecting areal trends. See von Waldenfels (2012: 2, 247) on 'give' > 'let' as a Proto-Slavic change.

9   I have counted the languages for which the meaning 'lubada' (= 'let, allow') was indicated in EED (http://www.eki.ee/dict/ety/index.cgi?Q=andma&F=M).

10 See Newman (1996: 189–190) on English *give* as 'enable, permit' (19th c. examples) and on German and English constructions belonging to the "give someone to think" type (Newman 1996: 186–187).

11 See (Fraenkel 1962: 352, ALEW 1 567).

(7)   Estonian

    a. *ta* **pan-i** *raamat-u* *laua-le*
       3SG   put-PST.3SG book-GEN.SG table-ALL.SG

      'He put the book on the table' (EE-LV, *panema*)

    b. *probleemi-d* **pan-i-d** *meid* **mõtle-ma**
       problem-NOM.PL make-PST-3PL 1PL:PRT think-(m)INF

      'The problems made us think' (EE-LV, *panema*)

Neighboring Latvian exhibits the same polysemy with *likt,* which means 'make' alongside 'put' (it should be noted that dictionaries tend to present this as a case of homonymy), cf. (8):

(8)   Latvian

    a. *Es* *konspekt-us* *un* *grāmat-as* **lik-u** *zem* *spilven-a*
       1SG notes-ACC.PL and book-ACC.PL put-PST.3 under pillow-GEN.SG

      'I put [lecture] notes and books under the pillow'[12]

    b. *veselīb-as* *problēm-as* **lik-a** **aizdomā-ties**
       health-GEN.SG problem-NOM.PL make-PST.3 think-INF.RFL

      par *garīg-ām* *liet-ām*
      about spiritual-DAT.PL.F thing-DAT.PL

      'Health problems made [me] think about spiritual things [...]'[13]

Despite synchronic similarity, the development of these meanings in Estonian and Latvian seems to be different. In the case of Estonian, 'put' probably gave rise to 'make' directly, whereas Latvian *likt* 'make' could have developed from 'leave' (cf. prefixed *pa-likt* 'leave') via the intermediate stage of 'let'; the same meaning ('leave') also gave rise to 'put' in Latvian (see ME II 469, cf. also Karulis 1992: 536). The change from 'leave' to 'let' is well attested[14], and the development 'let' > 'make' is also quite frequent (e.g. German *lassen*). This last change led to the synchronic coexistence of 'put' and 'make' in Latvian, paralleled in Estonian and some other Finnic languages (e.g. Finnish *panna*, Livonian *pānda*, etc.). From the areal point of view, Finnic interference in

---

12 http://cosmo.lv/forums/topic/141615-pirmseksamena-manticibas/, June 6, 2013.

13 http://www.marcisjencitis.lv/zinas/draudzes-zinas/pecaizlugsanaskluvatikvieg-likaaizmirsuparslimibu, August 16, 2016.

14 See Soares da Silva (2007: 185–192); for a list of languages with the development 'leave' > 'let', see p. 189.

the formation of this combination of meanings in Latvian seems likely, but further research is needed to establish the details of the development of causative use of Latvian *likt* and also of corresponding lexemes in the neighboring Finnic languages. An alternative scenario would be to assume direct change from 'put' to 'make' in Latvian following the Finnic pattern, but I currently lack evidence for this shift.

A direct change from 'put, place' to 'make' is attested in Latgalian and perhaps in dialectal Lithuanian, where etymologically identical verbs, Latgalian *stateit,* Lithuanian *statyti* 'put, place' (< 'put into vertical position'), acquired (or may acquire) this function. First, let us consider the Latgalian verb in (9a) as 'place' and (9b) as 'make':

(9)   Latgalian

a. ***statej-a***   *butel-i*   *iz*   *gold-a*
   put-PST.3 bottle-ACC.SG on   table-GEN.SG

   '[someone] placed a bottle on the table' (Reķēna 1998: 437)

b. *cyt-i*   *jū*   ***stot-a***   *kū nabejs*   ***darei-t***
   other-NOM.PL.M   3.ACC.SG.F   make-PRS.3 anything:ACC   do-INF

   'others make her do anything' (MuLa)

The factitive meaning of *stateit* ('make') is listed by a number of Latgalian dictionaries, and a preliminary search in the corpus of modern Latgalian (MuLa) confirms the current use of it, but it should be noted that *stateit* is used alongside the much more frequent *likt* (= Latvian *likt*). In the case of dialectal Lithuanian, data on the factitive use of *statyti* are very limited, and available examples seem to be still ambiguous, as one may interpret them as 'putting, placing' someone in a certain place of work, activity, as in (10):

(10) (dialectal) Lithuanian
   Pri-stat-ė   *riešut-ų*   ***mal-t*** –   *ne-pamali-au,*
   PRF-put-PST.3   nut-GEN.PL   grind-INF   NEG-be.able.to.grind-PST.1SG

   stat-ė   *žvirzd-ų*   *grūs-ti*   *ne-pagrūd-au*
   put-PST.3   gravel-GEN.PL   pound-INF   NEG-be.able.to.pound-PST.1SG

   'They made/put me (to) grind nuts and I could not grind them, they made/put me to pound gravel and I could not pound it' (LKŽe, *statyti*)

Among Slavic languages, one could note Russian *za-stavit'* 'make' alongside *stavit'* 'put into vertical position; place'. However, judging

from the data presented in the historical dictionary of Russian (SRJA 27: 177–180), the non-prefixed *staviti* never had a causative meaning ('make'), and probably only prefixed *za-staviti* acquired this function, which developed from 'block' (by putting, placing something as an obstacle) or similar meaning. More data are needed, but if that were the case, then the development 'put, place' > 'make' in Latgalian[15] and (dialectal) Lithuanian seems to be independent from East Slavic and not borrowed from it. However, it is also clear that Latgalian and Lithuanian, when in contact with East Slavic (Russian or Belarussian), show interference at the level of perfectivizing prefixation: Latgalian *aiz-stateit* 'make' (perfective) and Lithuanian (dialectal) *už-statyti* 'make' (perfective) directly correspond to East Slavic *za-stavit'* (alongside other prefixed perfective formations: Latgalian *da-stateit*, Lithuanian *pri-statyti*).

To conclude, the history of the development and coexistence of the meanings 'put, place' and 'make' in the area under discussion is more complicated than the cases of 'release' > 'let' and 'give' > let' described earlier. It is clear that we are dealing with a rather small area of development for 'put, place' > 'make' (or simply the coexistence of these meanings), compared to a large-scale area of development 'release' > 'let' (Finno-Ugric, Germanic, Baltic, etc.) and a middle-scale area for 'give' > 'let' (Finnic, Baltic, Slavic). The area of 'put, place' > 'make' includes some Finnic languages and some Baltic data (Latgalian, rarely, dialectal Lithuanian; in Latvian, 'make' does not seem to be directly derivable from 'put'). The development of *za-stavit'* in East Slavic belongs to a different type ('block' > 'make'), unless the rise of the *zastavit'*-construction can be explained otherwise (i.e. *stavit'* 'place' > 'make', with a subsequent perfectivization by *za-*). Of the other languages outside the Circum-Baltic area with a 'put' > 'make' shift, one might mention, for example, Romanian (*a pune* + *să* + V in subjunctive), see Levshina (2015).

---

15 Latgalian is considered to be one of the macrolanguages of Latvia, together with Latvian.

5. *sundima*

sundima 'make' is interesting in that it is a borrowing from East Slavic (< *sǫditi*/*sųditi* 'judge'); see EED (*sundima*) and Blokland (2005: 377)[16]. This verb was also borrowed into other Finnic languages (Livonian *suņd*, Votic *süntiä*, Finnish *suntia*, see EED (*sundima*)), but none of these seems to have developed causative use. Blokland (2005: 377) notes that the meaning of the corresponding noun *sundija* (borrowed from Old Russian *sųdьja* 'judge' or, less probably, derived from the borrowed verb *sundima*) acquired the meaning glossed in German as 'Triber' (< 'Richter') after the second half of the 17th c., which means that *sundima* may have also developed the sense 'make, force, etc.' around that time. The Baltic languages also copied the same Slavic verb: the East Baltic languages transferred it from East Slavic when the nasal vowels were already lost there (Latvian *sodīt* 'punish', Latgalian *sūdeit* 'punish', (dialectal and earlier written) Lithuanian *sūdyti* 'judge'; cf. reborrowing in (dialectal) Estonian, see fn. 16), while West Baltic (Old Prussian) borrowed Polish *sądzić* > **sūndītvei* > **sūndintvei* 'strafen = punish' (incorrectly printed as *sńndintwti* in Ench 39,1), Mažiulis 2013: 870). Contrary to Estonian and similarly to some Finnic languages mentioned above, the Baltic languages did not develop the meaning 'make, force' from this loanword. In this case, the shift from 'judge' to 'force, make' occupies the smallest area compared to other cases of semantic changes discussed in preceding sections.

6. Conclusions

1. Estonian *laskma* represents a shift from 'release' to 'let', widely attested in many Finno-Ugric and Indo-European languages, notably in neighboring Germanic and Baltic (Lithuanian *leisti*, Latvian *ļaut, laist*). More data are needed, but it may be the case that similar developments occurred comparatively later in Slavic languages. The imperative form of Estonian *laskma* gave rise to the modal particle *las,* and this development is paralleled in Baltic (Lithuanian *lai*, Latvian *lai*), as well as in neighboring Germanic and Slavic languages.

---

16   It was later reborrowed once again as (dialectal) Estonian *sudi(ta)ma* 'to force, etc.' < Russian *sudi-t'/-ti* (Blokland 2005: 377, fn. 260 with further reference).

2. Estonian *andma* belongs to the development from 'give' to 'let' (and further to 'be possible'). The shift 'give' > 'let' is also attested in other Finnic, Slavic and all Baltic languages, but the use of *give*-based PCCs in modern Latvian and Lithuanian is limited. With respect to Slavic and Germanic, Baltic and Finnic languages seem to form a transitional zone, where both developments ('give' > 'let' and 'release' > 'let') are well-attested.

3. Possible comparanda for Estonian *panema* ('put, place' > 'make') are Latvian *likt* 'put; make' and Latgalian *stateit* 'put, place; make'; the data of dialectal Lithuanian are scarce. However, it should be noted that Latvian 'make' may have evolved from 'let' (< 'leave'), which is a different path from that of Estonian and other Finnic languages, if we assume a direct shift from 'put' to 'make' there. Finnic influence on the formation of this set of meanings for Latvian *likt* is possible, but further research is needed to determine the details.

4. Slavic verbs meaning 'judge' were borrowed into a number of Finnic and Baltic languages, but only in Estonian has this loan acquired a causative function.

5. According to the size of the area in which a particular semantic shift (or coexistence of certain meanings) is attested, the Estonian predicates discussed in this article can be arranged in the following order: *laskma* ('release' > 'let') > *andma* ('give' > 'let') > *panema* ('put' > 'make', 'put' and 'make') > *sundima* ('judge' > 'make').

Acknowledgments

Address:
Jurgis Pakerys
Vilnius University
Faculty of Philology, Department of Baltic Studies
Universiteto 5
01513 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: jurgis.pakerys@flf.vu.lt

Abbreviations

1 – 1st person, 2 – 2nd person, 3 – 3rd person, ACC – accusative, ADE – adessive, ALL – allative, COM – comitative, CONNEG – connegative, DAT – dative, DEM – demonstrative, ELA – elative, F – feminine, GEN – genitive, IMP – imperative, INF – infinitive ((m)INF or (t)INF in Estonian), M – masculine, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PASS – passive, PL – plural, PRF – prefix, PRS – present, PRT – partitive, PST – past, PTCP – participle, RFL – reflexive, SG – singular, TRA – translative

References

Blokland, Rogier Philip Charles Eduard (2005) *The Russian loanwords in literary Estonian*. PhD thesis. University of Groningen. Available online at <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal/publications/the-russian-loanwords-in-literary-estonian(8264c9a9-7a21-4ce2-a526-d0c03bef17da)/export.html). Accessed on November–December, 2016.

Dixon, Robert M. W. (2000) "A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning". In Robert M. W. Dixon and Aleksandra Yu. Aikhenvald, eds. *Changing valency. Case studies in transitivity*, 30–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511627750.003.

Endzelin, Jan (1922) *Lettische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Fraenkel, Ernst (1962) *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Givón, Talmy (2001) *Syntax: An introduction* 2. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Karulis, Konstantīns (1992) *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* 1. Rīga: Avots.

Kasik, Reet (2001) "Analytic causatives in Estonian". In Mati Erelt, ed. *Estonian: Typological Studies* V, 77–122. (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 18.) Tartu.

Klaas-Lang, Birute and Miina Norvik (2014) "Balti areaali tüpoloogilisi sarnasusi morfosüntaksi valdkonnas." *Keel ja Kirjandus* 8–9, 590−608.

Klaas, Birute (1996) "Similarities in case marking of syntactic relations in Estonian and Lithuanian." In Mati Erelt, ed. *Estonian: Typological Studies* 1, 37−67. (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 4.) Tartu.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria and Bernhard Wälchli (2001) "The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach". In Östen Dahl, Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds. *Circum-Baltic languages* 2: *Grammar and typology*, 615–750. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kulikov, Leonid (2001) "Causatives". In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible, eds. *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook* 2, 886–898. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Levshina, Natalia (2015) "European analytic causatives as a comparative concept. Evidence from a parallel corpus of film subtitles". *Folia Linguistica* 49(2), 487–520.

Mažiulis, Vytautas (2013) *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras. Available online at <http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt/zodynas/paieska>. Accessed on December, 2016.

Metslang, Helle (2000) "Reflections on development of a particle in Estonian". In Mati Erelt, ed. *Estonian: Typological Studies* IV, 59–86. (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 14.) Tartu.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. and Georgij G. Sil'nickij (1973) "The typology of morphological and lexical causatives". In Ferenc Kiefer, ed. *Trends in Soviet theoretical linguistics*, 1–32. Dordrecht etc.: Reidel.

Newman, John (1996) *Give: A cognitive linguistic study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Orel, Vladimir (2003) *A handbook of Germanic etymology*. Leiden: Brill.

Pakerys, Jurgis (2016) "On periphrastic causative constructions in Lithuanian and Latvian". In Axel Holvoet and Nicole Nau, eds. *Argument realization in Baltic*, 427–458. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Reķēna, Antoņina (1998) *Kalupes izloksnes vārdnīca* 2: *N-Ž* [*Kalupe subdialect dictionary*]. Rīga: Latviešu valodas institūts.

Smoczyński, Wojciech (2007) *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Soares da Silva, Augusto (2007) "Verbs of letting: Some cognitive and historical aspects". In Nicole Delbecque and Bert Cornillie, eds. *On interpreting construction schemas. From action and motion to transitivity and causality*, 171–200. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stang, Christian S. (1966) *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo, Bergen, Tromsö: Universitetsforlaget.

Tamm, Anne (2012) "Let me introduce the Estonian analytical causatives: the permissive and factitive *laskma* 'let, make, have, allow, permit'". In Jaakko Leino, Ruprecht von Waldenfelds, eds. *Analytical causatives: from 'give' and 'come' to 'let' and 'make'*, 247−289. München: Lincom Europa.

Tomson, Kairit (2016) Panema-*verbi polüseemia ja kasutus grammatilistes konstruktsioonides*. MA thesis. University of Tartu. Available online at <http://dspace.ut.ee/bitstream/handle/10062/51758/Tomson._MAG.pdf>. Accessed on 09.02.2017.

von Waldenfels, Ruprecht (2012) *The grammaticalization of 'give' + infinitive: a comparative study of Russian, Polish, and Czech*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Sources

ALEW 1 = Wolfgang Hock, ed. *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1. Hamburg: Baar, 2015.

BED = *Basic Estonian dictionary*. Eesti Keele Instituut, 2014. Available online at <http://www.eki.ee/dict/psv/>. Accessed on November–December, 2016.

EE-LV = *Eesti-läti sõnaraamat*, Eesti Keele Instituut, 2015. Available online at
   < http://www.eki.ee/dict/et-lv/>. Accessed on November–December, 2016.

EE-RU = *Eesti-vene sõnaraamat*. Eesti Keele Instituut, 1997–2009. Available online at
   <http://portaal.eki.ee/dict/evs/>. Accessed on November–December, 2016.

EED = *Etymological dictionary of Estonian*. Eesti Keele Instituut, 2012. Available
   online at < http://www.eki.ee/dict/ety/>. Accessed on November–December, 2016.

Ench = *Der Kleine Catechiſmus Doctor Martin Luthers Deutſch vnd Preuſſiſch* [...].
   Königsberg: Johann Daubmann, 1561. Available online at < http://www.prusistika.
   flf.vu.lt/tekstai/paieska/?saltinis=III&puslapis=17>. Accessed on December, 2016.

ESVB = *English standard version Bible*. Available online at
   <http://www.esvbible.org>. Accessed on December, 2016.

EWahd 5 = Rosemarie Lühr, ed. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen* 5
   (*iba – luzzilo*). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.

LIV² = Helmut Rix, ed. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Reichert,
   2001.

LKŽe = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20 [Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language], elec-
   tronic edition, ed. by Gertrūda Naktinienė (editor in chief), Jonas Paulauskas,
   Ritutė Petrokienė, Vytautas Vitkauskas, Jolanta Zabarskaitė. Vilnius: Lietuvių
   kalbos institutas, 2005–2008. Available online at: <http://www.lkz.lt>. Accessed on
   November–December, 2016.

LLVV = *Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca*. Apgāds "Zinātne", LU Matemātikas un
   informātikas institūts, LU Latviešu valodas institūts, 1972–2010. Available online
   at < http://tezaurs.lv/llvv/>. Accessed on November–December, 2016.

ME = *K. Mühlenbachs lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Redigiert, ergänzt und fort-
   gesetzt von Jan Endzelin. Riga: Lettisches Bildungsministerium, 1923–1932.
   Available online at <http://tezaurs.lv/mev/>. Accessed on December, 2016.

MLLV = *Mūsdienu latviešu valodas vārdnīca*, ed. by Ieva Zuicena, LU Latviešu valodas
   institūts, 2003–2013. Available online at <http://tezaurs.lv/mlvv/>. Accessed on
   November–December, 2016.

MuLa = *Mūsdienu latgaliešu tekstu korpuss*, 1987–2012 [Corpus of modern Latgalian,
   1987–2012]. Available online at < http://hipilatlit.ru.lv/bonito/run.cgi/first_form>.
   Accessed on November–December, 2016.

SRJA 27 = *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv.* 27. Moskva: Nauka, 2006.

UED = *Uralic Etymological Database*. Available online at
   <http://www.uralonet.nytud.hu>. Accessed on November–December, 2016.

**Kokkuvõte. Jurgis Pakerys: Mõnede eesti keele perifrastiliste kausatiiv-
konstruktsioonide balti kontekst.** Artiklis võetakse verbide *laskma*, *andma*,
panema ja *sundima* näitel vaatluse alla eesti keele perifrastiline kausatiiv-
konstruktsioon. Autor keskendub verbide tähendusnihetele mittekausatiivsest
kasutusest kausatiivse suunas. Konstruktsioonidel on vasted balti keeltes.
Autori hinnangul kuulub verb *laskma* ('lahti laskma' > 'laskma') suurimasse
muutusalasse, s.t seda leidub paljudes soome-ugri ja indoeuroopa keeltes, sh

germaani, balti, mingil määral ka slaavi keeltes. Verb *andma*, mis on läbi teinud arengu 'andma' > 'laskma'(>'võimalik olema'), kuulub väiksemasse läänemeresoome, balti ja slaavi keeltes toimunud sarnaste muutuste areaali. Verb *panema* ('panema' > 'sundima') kuulub kõige väiksemasse muutusalasse, esinedes vaid mõnes läänemeresoome ja balti keeles. Verbil *sundima* on slaavi laenuna vasteid mitmes läänemeresoome ja balti keeles, kuid kausatiivne kasutus on sel predikaadil välja kujunenud vaid eesti keeles.

Märksõnad: perifrastilised kausatiivkonstruktsioonid, faktitiivsed kausatiivkonstruktsioonid, permissiivsed kausatiivkonstruktsioonid, läänemeresoome keeled, balti keeled, Balti areaal