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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.
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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 Slavie 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 *laut, 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)  

| Estonian¹ |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|
| 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.PTCP-PASS-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 *laut* (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* slīnniek-u ārā no slīnnīc-as
      release-INF patient-ACC.SG outside from hospital-GEN.SG
      ‘to release patient from hospital’ (MLLV, 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-constructions (cf. these cases in (1c), mind/mul), but it seems that adessive is the default option, while partitive is less common. 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).

Latvian ļaut ‘allow, let’, currently the most commonly used permissive PCC, has no other synchronic uses, other than the idiomatic phrase ļaut valu + dative ‘give way (for)’. Historically, Latvian ļaut also developed from ‘release, let go’ (Karulis 1992: 552) 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 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 lāta, Old High German lāzan, among others (see EWahd 5 1073–1074). The Slavic languages also have some examples of this development, cf. Bulgarian puskam + da-clause, Slovenian pušcati + 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 infinitival 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 *leuH- ‘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.nytd.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 rāāki-da
   3SG-COM be.possible-PRS.3SG talk-(t)INF
   ‘It is possible to talk with him’ (EE-LV, andma)

b. teg-i-me kōik, 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, jātka-takse
   if weather:NOM,SG allow-PRS.3SG continue-PRS.PASS
   vōistlus-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. **Dāıtī fııns malnijık-ans prē[ ĵmien perē-ı-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-ı-t nof ıfian f̱muentin-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 Men-

   schen’ (Ench 101, 12; 100, 10–11) = ‘So the LORD God caused a
depth 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 *laut* in Latvian (Pakerys 2016: 443–445, 454), cf. (6a) and (6b):

(6) a. Lithuanian

   *[Jis] dažnai duod-ı vairuo-ti automobil-ı**

   3SG.NOM often allow-PRS.3 drive-INF car-ACC.SG

   **kit-iems asmen-ıms**

   other-DAT.PL.M person-DAT.PL

   ‘[He] frequently allows other persons to drive his car’

b. Latvian

   **Bērn-ıem tagad dod vadī-ı-t autobus-u?**

   child-DAT.PL now allow:PRS.3 drive-INF bus-ACC.SG

   ‘Do they now allow children to drive buses?’

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

---

7 http://www.tvnet.lv/auto/satiksme/357628_pie_lido_no_kupenas_izvelk_autobusu_kura_brauc_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 and Finnic languages. In Finnic, ‘give’ > ‘let’ is attested in Livonian, Votic, Finnish, Ingrian, Livvi-Karelian, and Veps. 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. 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), 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).
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(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 mõitle-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 attested14, 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, Livo-
nian pānda, etc.). From the areal point of view, Finnic interference in

13 http://www.marcisjencitis.lv/zinas/draudzes-zinas/pecaizlugsanaskluvatikvieg-
likaaizmirusparslimibu, August 16, 2016.
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, |
| Pref-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 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 Belarusian), 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-statytì*).

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 + sǎ + 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 (*s*odi/*s*diti ‘judge’); see EED (*sundima*) and Blokland (2005: 377)\(^\dagger\). This verb was also borrowed into other Finnic languages (Livonian *sun*d, Votic *sun*tiä, Finnish *sun*ti, see EED (*sundima*)), but none of these seems to have developed causative use. Blokland (2005: 377) notes that the meaning of the corresponding noun *sun*di†ja (borrowed from Old Russian *sun*duja ‘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 *so*đit ‘punish’, Latgalian *so*deit ‘punish’, (dialectal and earlier written) Lithuanian *sū*dyti ‘judge’; cf. reborrowing in (dialectal) Estonian, see fn. 16), while West Baltic (Old Prussian) borrowed Polish *s*ądzić > *s*ūd*ītvei > *s*ūnd*īntvei ‘strafen = punish’ (incorrectly printed as *s*ūnd*īntvti 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 *leis*ti, Latvian *laut, 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 *la*, and this development is paralleled in Baltic (Lithuanian *lai*, Latvian *lai*), as well as in neighboring Germanic and Slavic languages.

\(^\dagger\) It was later reborrowed once again as (dialectal) Estonian *sudi(ta)ma* ‘to force, etc.’ < Russian *sudi-1*-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’).
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