

# *Periphrastic causative constructions in Baltic.*

## *An overview*

---

**JURGIS PAKERYŠ**

Vilnius University

Periphrastic causatives in Latvian, Lithuanian, and Old Prussian are discussed to differentiate shared and language-specific constructions. It is shown that factitive constructions evolved independently, while the permissive ones are partly shared. One of the possible reasons for this is that the Baltic languages had a productive category of morphological factitive causatives and periphrastic factitives were less salient in the past. In contrast, permissive causation could not be expressed by morphological means and, as a result, permissive constructions reflect some common innovations. The permissives based on the predicate ‘give’ are a Baltic or even a Balto-Slavic development areally shared with the Finnic languages. Latvian and Lithuanian share two roots \**lėid-* ‘release’ and \**vėl-* ‘want’, which gave rise to permissive constructions, but their root ablaut or inflectional stems differ and reflect independent morphological developments. Of note is that Baltic \**lėid-* is a cognate of Germanic \**lēt-*, which is also used in permissive constructions (German *lassen*, English *let*, etc.) and is not found in Slavic. Only Latvian has fully developed permissive use of *ļaut*. Baltic periphrastic factitive constructions share some common paths of semantic shifts, but the verbs employed are unrelated and these developments are probably relatively late and individual.

**Keywords:** periphrastic causative constructions; permissive causatives; factitive causatives; Baltic languages

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The periphrastic causative construction (PCC) contains a free verbal form, which marks a causal relation between the agent, “causer”, and the caused event expressed by another free verbal form. Depending on the semantic character of the causation, these constructions can be termed “factitive”, if the events are understood as being actively caused, as in (1a), or “permissive”, if the agents assume a relatively passive role of causation, such as providing conditions, giving permission, and otherwise not preventing the event from happening, as in (1b)

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is one of the outcomes of the research project “Periphrastic causatives in Baltic” financed by the Research Council of Lithuania, agreement No. LIP-080/2016. I would like to sincerely thank Axel Holvoet, Bernhard Wälchli, and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful remarks and suggestions, which helped me improve the present version. I am also very grateful to Wayles Browne for correcting the English of my paper.

(Kulikov 2001, 886–887, 892). The patients affected by the causing factors are usually referred to as “causees” and “permittees” respectively, consider the role of *me* in (1a-b):

- (1) English  
 a. *They make me drink beer*  
 b. *They let me drink beer*

The Baltic branch of Indo-European languages is known to have a relatively well-developed category of morphological causatives (see Arkadiev & Pakerys 2015, Holvoet 2015, and Nau 2015 with further references). This category is no longer productive in modern Latvian and Lithuanian (Old Prussian is extinct), but compared to other Indo-European languages of Europe, the Baltic lexicons still contain comparatively large numbers of transparent morphological causatives. In this respect, the Baltic languages are similar to their Finnic neighbors, known for a well-developed category of morphological causatives (Nau & Pakerys 2016). As new causatives cannot be regularly derived, PCCs are productively used instead, and these constructions need to be studied from both the historical and the areal perspective. In general, Baltic PCCs have received little attention in the literature and this article is an attempt to sum up what is currently known and integrates previous research of the author. The main aims set out for this article are as follows: (1) to trace the source constructions of PCCs; (2) to single out shared and language-specific PCCs, (3) to outline some areal parallels, (4) to discuss the marking of the causee and permittee. A separate set of problems is posed by the Baltic reflexive (middle) PCCs, which are left out of the scope of the present paper; the reader is referred to the latest study of this topic by Holvoet (2016) and notes in Pakerys (2017c, forthc. a, forthc. b). Borrowed causative verbs are also not included in this study, see some notes on Old Lithuanian in Pakerys (forthc. a).

The analysis is subdivided into two main sections based on the division of PCCs into permissive (Section 2) and factitive (Section 3). The permissive PCCs are discussed in subsections according to their source constructions: ‘give’ (2.1), ‘release’ (2.2), ‘leave’ (2.3), ‘want’ (2.4). Here, the source construction is understood as a non-causal use of a predicate, which gradually acquired causal function, e.g. ‘give’ > ‘allow’, ‘release’ > ‘allow’, etc. Under ‘give’, Latvian *dôt*, Lithuanian *dùoti*, and Old Prussian *dāt* are discussed; under ‘release’, Latvian *laist*, *ļaut*, and Lithuanian *lēisti* are examined; under ‘leave’, Latvian *likt* is presented; and under ‘want’, Old Latvian *vēlēt* and Old Lithuanian *pa-vēlti* are discussed. Baltic

factitive PCCs share some semantic paths of development, but these constructions apparently have evolved independently and are based on different verbs. As a result, permissive PCCs are discussed in more detail in this article, while the factitive PCCs are briefly overviewed in separate subsections according to the language: Old Prussian *dāt*, *pobanginn-* (3.1), Latvian *likt*, *spīēst*, *piēdabūt* (3.2), Lithuanian *vēřsti*, *spāusti*, *spirti*, *stūmti*, *pastūmėti* (3.3).<sup>2</sup> Section 4 summarizes the main points of the paper.

## 2. Permissive PCCs

### 2.1. ‘give’-based PCCs

PCCs based on the verbs of transfer of possession are used in all three Baltic languages, albeit with a different frequency synchronically and diachronically. Old Prussian material is limited, but PCCs with *dāt* ‘give’ as ‘allow’ are securely attested (Pakerys 2017a). The use of Latvian *dot* ‘give’ in permissive PCCs is rare both synchronically and diachronically, and other permissive PCCs with *laist*, *ļaut*, and *likt* are more common (Pakerys 2016; Pakerys 2017c; Pakerys forthc. b). Lithuanian 16th and 17th-century sources show rather frequent use of PCCs with *duoti* ‘give’ on average, but the construction with *leisti* (‘release’ > ‘allow’) gradually gained ground and left *duoti* in a marginal position in modern Lithuanian (Pakerys 2016; Pakerys forthc. a). For an illustration of Baltic ‘give’ as ‘let’, consider Old Prussian *dāt* in (2a), which is a translation of the German passage presented in (2b):

- (2) a. Old Prussian  
*Dāiti*            *ftans*            *malnikikans*            *prē[=]mien*  
 give:IMP.2PL    DEM.ACC.PL.M    child:DIM.ACC.PL    to=1SG.ACC  
*perēit*  
 come:INF  
 ‘Let the little children come to me’ (Ench III 113, 2–3; Mark 10:14<sup>3</sup>)
- b. German  
*Laft*            *die*            *Kindlein*            *zu Mir*  
 let:IMP.2PL    ART.DEF.ACC.PL.N    child.DIM.ACC.PL    to 1SG.DAT

<sup>2</sup> For the sake of simplicity, accent marks will be omitted henceforth.

<sup>3</sup> When Bible passages are cited, English translations will be provided from KJV.

*komen*

come:INF

‘Let the little children come to me’ (Ench III 112, 2)

The periphrastic causative with ‘give’ is the only construction securely shared by all three Baltic languages, and could be a common-Baltic innovation. Moreover, permissives based on ‘give’ are widely attested in Slavic languages and can be seen as a common-Slavic development (von Waldenfels 2012a, 247). Given a close relationship between the two language branches in the past, one may even envisage a Balto-Slavic innovation, but parallel development cannot be excluded. From the areal perspective, one should note that ‘give’ as ‘let’ is also attested in the neighboring Finnic languages: Livonian, Estonian, Votic, Finnish, Ingrian, Livvi-Karelian, Veps. The large area of Finnic, Baltic, and Slavic languages featuring ‘give’ as ‘let’ speaks both for common genetic developments as well as for areal convergence (Pakerys 2017b). The shift ‘give’ > ‘let’ (and sometimes further to ‘make, have V-ed’) is attested in many diverse languages of the world, see Newman (1996, 171–179, 188–194), Haser (2000, 184), Heine & Kuteva (2002, 152), Leino (2012), Lord *et al.* (2002, 223–226, 232), Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002, 105), Soares da Silva (2007, 196), von Waldenfels (2012a; 2012b; 2015, 111–114, 116–118), Levshina (2015, 503).

The permittee in *give*-based PCCs in Baltic languages is marked by the dative inherited from the source construction, where it marks the recipient, see discussion of (3) below. Under the influence of the German *lassen*-construction, where the permittee is predominantly marked by the accusative, the same case marking can be transferred to Baltic constructions and is attested in Old Prussian, cf. (2a) and (2b), and in Old Lithuanian texts from Prussia (Pakerys *forthc.* a).

The development of permissive function of the predicate ‘give’ is based on the interpretation of giving the object to a recipient as an enablement to carry out action with that object (cf. Newman 1996, 185–186; von Waldenfels 2012a, 281–283). Further actions of the recipient can be left unspecified, as in (3a), or mentioned explicitly by the infinitive of purpose, as in (3b). Type (3b) is quite common and is labeled by Newman as a *give someone a book to read*-type, but only some languages make a further step by allowing constructions illustrated in (3c), where the permitted action specified by the infinitive is interpreted as a complement and the original object NP can be omitted (see von Waldenfels 2012a, 282–283 for a more detailed discussion and Leino 2012, 239–242 for a Finnish context of this development).

- (3) Lithuanian (own example)
- a. *Tėvas davė vaikui peiliuką*  
 father:NOM.SG give:PST.3 child:DAT.SG pocket.knife:ACC.SG  
 ‘Father gave a pocketknife to the child’
- b. *Tėvas davė vaikui peiliuką*  
 father:NOM.SG give:PST.3 child:DAT.SG pocket.knife:ACC.SG  
*pažaisti*  
 play:INF  
 ‘Father gave a pocketknife for the child to play with’
- c. *Tėvas davė vaikui dar truputį pažaišti*  
 father:NOM.SG give:PST.3 child:DAT.SG still a.little play:INF  
 ‘Father allowed the child to play a little bit more’

As to later separate minor developments in Baltic languages, some cases of factitive use of *give*-constructions are attested in Old Prussian and in Old Lithuanian of Prussia, see Section 3.1 and 3.3.

## 2.2. ‘release’-based PCCs

Permissive PCCs based on predicates of releasing are attested both in Latvian and Lithuanian. First, the constructions containing the etymologically related verbs Latvian *laist* and Lithuanian *leisti* (common root *\*lēid-*) will be discussed, and then PCCs with *ļaut* attested mostly in Latvian will be examined. It is known that predicates denoting ‘release’ may develop the sense ‘allow’ directly or via an intermediate stage of ‘leave (tr.)’, i.e. ‘release’ (> ‘leave’) > ‘allow’ (Soares da Silva 2007, 185–192). In this section, only the predicates with the development ‘release’ > ‘allow’ are discussed; see the following section (2.3) for the analysis of the shift from ‘leave’ to ‘allow’.

First of all a few historical notes are in order with regard to the formal relationship between Lithuanian *leisti* and Latvian *laist*. These verbs differ in root apophony, and it is possible that Latvian *laist* was originally an iterative formation to *\*leist* (= Lithuanian *leisti*), but later it assumed the form of the quasi-primary verb (Smoczyński 2007, 332; Villanueva-Svensson forthc.) and gradually pushed its base *\*leist* out of use. The root in both verbs is *\*lēid-* and one should note that the same root is seen in Germanic permissive verbs, such as Gothic *letan*, German *lassen*, English *let*, etc. < Germanic *\*lētan* < *\*leh<sub>1</sub>d-* (EWahd 5 1070–1075; Kroonen 2013, 332). The remodeling of *\*lēd-* to *\*lēid-* is a Baltic innovation and both the Baltic and Germanic roots are possibly based on Indo-

European \**leh*<sub>1</sub>- ‘release, ease (up), let’ extended with *-d-*, which originally could be a present stem marker (Villanueva-Svensson forthc.). The permissive function of \**léid-* in Baltic may have been inherited from an earlier stage, but more research is needed to determine the details of this process. In any case, the use of the same root in permissive PCCs is a certain Baltic-Germanic parallel not attested in the Slavic branch. We should also bear in mind that there is no evidence of Old Prussian permissive \**léid-*, but the corpus of this language is very limited and if \**léid-* had permissive function, it could be simply too rare to be reflected in the surviving texts (the root \**léid-* ‘release’ itself can be probably seen in, e.g. *-laims* ‘rich’<sup>4</sup>).

Permissive PCCs in modern Lithuanian typically employ the verb *leisti*, while *duoti* discussed in Section 2.1 plays only a marginal role (Pakerys 2016, 439–445). In the 16th–17th c. the situation was different, because *duoti* was still quite common, but gradually it gave way to the construction with *leisti* (Pakerys forthc. a). One may suspect that the use of *give*-based permissives could be supported by their direct correspondence to Polish *give*-based constructions in the sources of translations (Polish *dać* = Lithuanian *duoti*), but the data of the texts published in Prussia, which are typically based on German sources, also show rather frequent use of *give*-permissives. The Latvian texts of 16th–17th c. contain few cases of *give*-based PCCs and we observe only a competition among permissive PCCs with *laist*, *ļaut*, *likt*, and (rare) *vēlēt*.

This situation can be interpreted as follows: for a reason that is currently unclear to me, *give*-based permissives were falling out of favor in East Baltic, but Old Lithuanian followed a more conservative path than Old Latvian. Both Old Lithuanian and Old Latvian had *release*-based constructions sharing the root \**léid-* (Lithuanian *leisti*, Latvian *laist*), but their competing constructions were different. In Lithuanian, *leisti* competed with *duoti* and finally pushed it to a marginal position,<sup>5</sup> while Latvian *dot* was already marginal in the 16th–17th c. and its main competitors were *laist*, *ļaut*, and *likt*. In this respect, Latvian can be interpreted as more modern than Lithuanian, because the *give*-based construction was going out of use at a faster pace and also new *likt-* and *ļaut-* constructions were introduced at some point. The data of Old Prussian are limited, but they

<sup>4</sup> See LEW 333. Mažiulis (2013, 520) disagrees with this view and suggests derivation from \**lēi-* / \**lei-* ‘release, ease (up)’. Old Prussian also has a conditional suffix *-lai*, which has been suggested as related to \**léid-* (cf. particle *lai* in Latvian and Lithuanian), but this comparison does not seem to be secure (Stang 1966, 443).

<sup>5</sup> Permissive PCCs with *pa-veltī* are also attested in Old Lithuanian of Prussia, but they play only a marginal role, see Section 2.4.

possibly show an archaic stage of the Baltic languages when *give*-based permissives played the main role and competing constructions were marginal. Having low frequency of use, these Old Prussian PCCs fall below the radar of a limited corpus, but are clearly seen in Old Lithuanian and Old Latvian. An instructive case is Martin Luther's *Enchiridion* (and some accompanying texts) translated into all three Baltic languages. Here, Old Prussian permissive PCCs are invariably based on 'give' (less than ten times), Old Lithuanian has an equal number of *give*- and *release*-based constructions (four times with *duoti* 'give' as 'allow' and four times with *(per-)leisti* 'release' as 'allow'), and Old Latvian shows a competition between *likt* 'leave' as 'allow' (four times) and *laist* 'release' as 'allow' (once) (the total number of PCCs is not the same for all languages mainly due to some differences in the sources of the translations).

The development of the permissive meaning of the predicates originally denoting releasing seems to be well attested, but secure examples currently known to me are mostly European, e.g. Latin *sinere*, *laxare*, *per-mittere* with the correspondents of the latter two in modern Romance languages (Soares da Silva 2007, 189); Bulgarian *puskam*, Slovenian *puščati*, Finnish *päästää*, etc. (Levshina 2015, 503); of other Finnic languages areally close to Baltic, Livonian *laskõ* and Estonian *laskma* 'release; allow, etc. can also be added. Of non-European languages, Kannada *biḍu* 'let loose; allow; quit; go away' could be another parallel, but Haser (2000, 184–185) lists it under 'leave' > 'permit'; Soares da Silva (2007, 188) interprets this shift as 'release' > 'leave' + 'let/permit'.

For all Baltic *release*-based PCCs, I propose the following model consisting of three stages of development presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Stages of development of PCCs from 'release' to 'allow'

Stage	Features of the PCC
I	Only non-manipulative predicate 'release' is used Patient is marked by accusative Adjunct infinitive clause of purpose can be added, e.g. 'release them' + 'to go home'
II	'release' is interpreted as a manipulative predicate, e.g. 'release to go' > 'allow to go', (human) patient is treated as a manipulee (= permittee) <sup>6</sup> Adjunct infinitive clause becomes a complement clause Dative is introduced alongside accusative to mark permittee <sup>7</sup>
III	Dative of permittee becomes default marking Accusative of permittee is marginal or no longer used

For Lithuanian *leisti* ‘release’ > ‘allow, let’, Stage I is not attested (it could be quite archaic, see some notes below) and permissive function alongside ‘release’ is found already in the earliest sources. For the illustration of primary use of *leisti*, consider (3):

- (3) Lithuanian (own example)  
*Tėvas leidžia alų į qdoti*  
 father:NOM.SG release:PRS.3 beer:ACC.SG to pitcher:ACC.SG  
 ‘Father releases (i.e. pours) beer into the pitcher’

In Stage II, the permissive function is already available, and the permittee can be coded by the original accusative and the newly introduced dative. Old Lithuanian is between Stage II and Stage III, the Prussian variety of Lithuanian apparently being closer to Stage II (accusative is usually more frequent than dative), while the varieties of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania belong to Stage III (accusative is rare) (Pakerys *forthc.* a). As the majority of examples with the accusative come from Prussia, one should note that sources of the translations are typically German, as in (4). In this case, one cannot deny the possibility of influence from German *lassen*-constructions, where permittees most frequently are marked by accusatives;<sup>8</sup> this type of influence is also evident in Old Prussian *give*-based PCCs, as mentioned above with regard to (2) in Section 2.1. However, some accusatives are also found in the texts translated from Polish in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, as illustrated in (4d–e), where prefixed *pri-leisti* is used. I conclude that the accusative at least in (4d)<sup>9</sup> is original and archaic, but I also acknowledge the possible influence of German either as a factor contributing to preserving original marking or as a case of morphosyntactic borrowing in Lithuanian texts of Prussia.

<sup>6</sup> For the definition of manipulation verbs and manipulees, see Givón (2001a, 151–153).

<sup>7</sup> Dative is known to correlate with non-implicative/attempted manipulation, i.e. success is not implied and the manipulee retains (more) control (Givón 2001b, 66–68; see also Cole 1983 and Kemmer & Verhagen 1994).

<sup>8</sup> I would like to thank Axel Holvoet for this observation. Dative is also available in German *lassen*-constructions, see Grimm’s dictionary, <http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemma=lassen>, under II (3), (7), etc. I was unable to check all passages in the sources of Lithuanian translations, but in the ones I reviewed, accusative was used. I also could not find studies discussing the use of dative/accusative in *lassen*-constructions to check if dative is used similarly to some Dutch and French examples cited in Kemmer & Verhagen (1994, 134, 136–137). When Kemmer & Verhagen (1994, 151) say that causees cannot be marked by the dative in German, they have modern standard German in mind.

<sup>9</sup> Accusative > genitive under negation.



- (4) Old Lithuanian
- a. *Leifket Bernelus manępi eiti*  
 let:IMP.2PL child:ACC.PL 1.SG.ALL go:INF  
 ‘Let the children come to me’ (Mažvydas, *Forma Chrikstima*, 1559, 96, 14; Mark 10:14)
- b. *Last die Kindlein zu Mir*  
 let:IMP.2PL ART.DEF.ACC.PL.N child.DIM.ACC.PL to 1SG.DAT  
*komen*  
 come:INF  
 ‘Let the little children come to me’ (Michelini 2000, 158)
- c. *Da-láifkiī waikélamus yr ně dráuškīī*  
 PRF-let:IMP.2PL child:DIM.DAT.PL and NEG forbid:IMP.2PL  
*iū manęp̃ eit*  
 3.GEN.PL 1SG.ALL go:INF  
 ‘Permit the children and do not forbid them to come to me’  
 (Daukša, *Kathechismas*, 1595, 5, 13)<sup>10</sup>
- d. *ne pri-láidžia io níekam’ géro*  
 NEG PRF-let:PRS.3 3.GEN.SG.M nobody:DAT.SG good:GEN.SG  
*darīī*  
 do:INF  
 ‘(It) does not let him do good for anyone’ (Daukša, *Postilla*, 1599, 114, 41)  
 Middle Polish
- e. *nie dopuści mu nikomu dobrze*  
 NEG let:PRS.3.SG 3.DAT.SG.M nobody:DAT.SG well  
*czynić*  
 do:INF  
 ‘(It) does not let him do good for anyone’ (Wujek, *Postilla*, 1590, 116, 1–2)

Modern Lithuanian is in Stage III, where dative of permittee is default marking, but some optional accusatives still occur when verbs of movement are used, and these cases reflect the original construction ‘release to move, go’, as illustrated in (5):

<sup>10</sup> Note that accusative (> genitive of negation *ju*) is used in the construction of the manipulative *drausti* ‘forbid’ alongside dative of *leisti* ‘let’. Modern Lithuanian uses *drausti* ‘forbid’ with dative only.

## (5) Lithuanian

[*vaikinas*]            *ne-leidžia*            ***manęs***            *eiti*            *į*  
 boyfriend:NOM.SG    NEG-let:PRS.3    1SG.GEN            go:INF        to  
*gėlių*                    *skyrių*  
 flower:GEN.PL        department:ACC.SG  
 ‘[the boyfriend] does not allow me to go to the floral department’<sup>11</sup>

Latvian *laist* is attested only in Stage II and differs from Lithuanian in that accusative is much more frequent than dative (Pakerys 2016, 453). The primary meaning ‘release’ of *laist* is securely attested both in old and modern Latvian, as in (6a), and coding of the permittee by accusative and dative is illustrated respectively in (6b) and (6c):

## (6) Latvian

- a. *Viņš*            *laiž*                    *vannā*                    *ūdeni*  
 3.NOM.SG.M    release:PRS.3    bathtub:LOC.SG        water:ACC.SG  
 ‘He is filling bathtub with water’ (LVK2013)
- b. [...] *laiž*        *četrgadīgu*                    ***mazuli***                    *rāpties*  
 let:PRS.3    4.year.old:ACC.SG.M    kid:ACC.SG            climb:INF.RFL  
*tur*            *augšā*  
 there        up  
 ‘[They] let 4-year-old kid climb up there’ (LVK2013)
- c. *Viņa*            *laiž*                    ***viņam***                    *vest*                    *viņu*  
 3.NOM.SG.F    let:PRS.3        3.DAT.SG.M            lead:INF            3.ACC.SG.F  
*pa*                    *krogiem*  
 round.to        pub:DAT.PL  
 ‘She lets him take her round to the pubs’ (Cedriņš, *Pasaka par vakariem*, 1986<sup>12</sup>)

The dative marking of permittee appears already in 16th-c. texts, but given the use of Latvian dative forms of pronouns instead of accusative there, only one instance could be interpreted as non-ambiguous dative (Pakerys 2017b, 95). In the 17th c., the use of *laist* drops in frequency and accusative of permittee is typically used (Pakerys forthc. b), as illustrated in (7a), cf. Old Lithuanian in (4a) above, but rare datives are also found, as in (7b):

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.supermama.lt/forumas/index.php?showtopic=425139&st=360> (forum post, 26 May, 2008, diacritics added, genitive of negation = accusative in non-negated VP).

<sup>12</sup> [http://jaunagaita.net/jg168/JG168\\_Cedriņš.htm](http://jaunagaita.net/jg168/JG168_Cedriņš.htm) (August 1988).

## (7) Old Latvian

- a. *Laideet tohs Behrniņus pee mannim*  
 let:IMP.2PL DEM.ACC.PL.M child:DIM.ACC.PL to 1.SG.INS  
*nahkt*  
 come:INF  
 ‘Let the children come to me’ (Glück, *Tas Jauns Testaments*, 1685;  
 Mark 10:14)
- b. *Laid tawai Širrdei turr buht*  
 let:IMP.2SG POSS.2.DAT.SG.F heart:DAT.PL there be:INF  
 ‘Let your heart be there’ (Mancelius, *Postill* 2, 1654, 262 [242],  
 29–30)

One should note that in Latvian folksongs, dative with *laist* is also used alongside accusative (Gāters 1993, 115), but a separate study is needed to determine the frequency of use of these cases.

Now let us turn our attention to Latvian *ļaut* ‘allow’. This verb is not attested in the base meaning \*‘release; ease (up)’, but it must have been primary from the historical perspective: \**lēu-* ‘nachlassen’ = ‘ease (up)’ (IEW 682), \**leuH-* ‘abschneiden, lösen’ = ‘cut off, release’ (LIV<sup>2</sup> 417<sup>13</sup>); see also LEV 1 552. Only Latvian seems to have fully developed the permissive function of this root, while other meanings are the same or very close in Latvian and Lithuanian, e.g. Lithuanian *liauti(-s)* ‘stop’ < ‘ease (up), release’ and *pa(si)liauti* ‘rely on, confide in’ < ‘release (oneself) onto’ have direct correspondents in Latvian. Old Prussian *aulāut* ‘die’ is probably an extension of ‘stop’, cf. also Lithuanian *nu-si-liauti* ‘die’ (LKŽe) and Latvian *ļautie-s* ‘die’ (EH I 769).

It should be mentioned that two examples of Lithuanian permissive *liauti* ‘allow’ are attested in LKŽe and two more are found in a reference provided in EH I 769. In one case, Latvian influence is evident, because the LKŽe example comes from a location very close to the Lithuanian-Latvian border (Žeimelis). Another example from LKŽe is found in a text by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay published in Lithuanian,<sup>14</sup> but I could not find out if the use of *liauti* as ‘allow’ is to be attributed to Baudouin de Courtenay himself or to some Lithuanian editor. Finally, EH has a reference to the dictionary of texts by Antanas Smetona

<sup>13</sup> The attempt to link Latvian *ļaut*, Lithuanian *liauti*, etc. via *u*-present stem to the root \**leh<sub>1</sub>-* (LIV<sup>2</sup> 399) discussed above with relation to Lithuanian *leisti*, Latvian *laist*, etc. does not seem to be secure (Villanueva-Svensson 2011, 214<sup>19</sup>).

<sup>14</sup> A. a. Kunigo vyskupo Antano Baranausko laiškai į profesorių Joną Baudouin'ą de Courtenay, *Lietuvių tauta* 1.3, 1909, 410.

(Masiliūnas 1934, 88) where two more examples are found. The verb *liauti* as ‘allow, tolerate’ is included in the section of “borrowed” lexemes which Smetona used following other authors or which were taken from dialects other than his own, but no details are provided on why exactly *liauti* is considered “borrowed” here. I conclude that rare use of *liauti* as a permissive verb in Lithuanian dialects cannot be ruled out, but the evidence is very limited.

In Latvian texts of the 16th c. no attestations of *ļaut* were found and even in 17th-c. sources this verb is still rare (Pakerys forthc. b). Further studies are needed, but it seems that *ļaut* gained popularity at a later stage and gradually became the main permissive predicate in modern Latvian, pushing other competing PCCs aside. Despite the scarcity of the material, Old Latvian *ļaut* can be classified as belonging to Stage II, where the accusative of the permittee is used alongside dative, as illustrated in (8). One should note, however, that similar to the case of Lithuanian *leisti* and Latvian *laist*, one cannot rule out that the accusative can be either supported by or copied from German *lassen*-constructions.

- (8) Old Latvian
- a. *meintiņas*<sup>5</sup>      ***puišchus***    *ne*      *ļauj*      *apģēhrbtees*  
 girl:DIM.NOM.PL    boy:ACC.PL    NEG    let:PRS.3    dress:INF.RFL  
 ‘die mädlein Sich die jungens nicht laßen ankleiden’ = ‘the girls are not allowing the boys to get dressed’ (Fürecker, *Wörterbuch*, 1650 (ms. 1), 77, 18–19)
- b. *in*      *ne*      *ļahwa*      ***teem***      ***Ļaudim***  
 and    NEG    allow:PST.3    DEM.DAT.PL    people:DAT.PL  
*Grehku*      *darriht*  
 sin:ACC.SG    do:INF  
 ‘and withheld the people from sin’ (Mancelius & Adolphi, *Syrach*, 1685, 71v, 23–24; Sir 46:7)

Modern Latvian is already in Stage III, where the accusative of permittee is completely ousted and *ļaut* is used only with the dative, as shown in (9):

- (9) Latvian
- Liktenis*      ***viņām***      *ļauj*      *iepažīt*      *dzīves*  
 fate:NOM.SG    3.DAT.PL.F    let:PRS.3    get.to.know:INF    life:GEN.SG

---

<sup>5</sup> = *meitiņas*.

ciešanas

suffering:ACC.PL

‘Fate allows them to come to know the sufferings of life’ (LVK2013)

## 2.3. ‘leave’-based PCCs

The verb *likt* is used only in factitive contexts in modern Latvian and also means ‘order’, but in Old Latvian it also served as a base of permissive PCCs, see both functions illustrated in (10) from 17th-c. texts. The permissive function must have been primary (see below), while the factitive one either developed independently or was influenced by bifunctional German *lassen*-constructions;<sup>16</sup> it should be noted that the permissive function was generally more rare than the factitive one already in the 16-17th c. (Pakerys 2017c, 89; Pakerys forthc. b).

(10) Old Latvian

- a. *ne leezeet wiņņam wairs ne neeka*  
 NEG allow:IMP.2PL 3.DAT.SG.M anymore NEG nothing:GEN.SG  
*šawam Tehwam jeb šawai*  
 POSS.RFL.DAT.SG.M father:DAT.SG or POSS.RFL.DAT.SG.F  
*Mahteī darriht*  
 mother:DAT.SG do:INF  
 ‘And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother’ (Glück, *Tas Jauns Testaments*, 1685, Mark 7:12)
- b. *Mielāftiba mums leek wiß*  
 love:NOM.SG 1PL.DAT/ACC make:PRS.3 everything  
*labbu šawam Tuwakam darriet*  
 good:ACC.SG.M POSS.RFL.DAT.SG.M next.of.kin:DAT.SG do:INF  
 ‘Love makes us do all good to our next of kin’ (Mancelius, *Postill 2*, 1654, 292(272), 16–17)

As suggested in ME (II 469; cf. LEV I 536), the permissive meaning of Latvian *likt* developed from ‘leave’ (cf. Lithuanian *pa-likti* and other parallels below) and from this the “active” function developed. The authors of ME and LEV do not discuss the possibility of influence from German *lassen*-constructions with regard to the development of factitive meaning, but it may have played a certain role.

<sup>16</sup> Livonian *laskō* and Estonian *laskma* are close areal parallels for the development ‘let’ > ‘have done’. Here, German influence is also likely.

Typologically, the shift ‘leave’ > ‘let, allow’ is well known and is noted by Heine & Kuteva (2004, 193) for German *lassen*, Haitian Creole *kité* (< French *quitter*), and Bulgarian *ostavjam* (see also Levshina 2015, 503). Soares da Silva (2007, 189) lists Latin *re-linquo*,<sup>17</sup> modern Greek αφήνω, the data from the Germanic languages (German *lassen*, English *let*, etc.),<sup>18</sup> colloquial American English *leave*, and Church Slavonic *ostaviti*. Of non-Indo-European languages, Soares da Silva (2007, 189) lists Hausa *bari*, Ge’ez *xadaga*, Kannada *bidu*, Hungarian *hagy* (see also Levshina 2015, 503), Dami *-tor-*, Lango *wèkkò*, Swahili *acha*, Yoruba *fisilè* (all originally from Haser 2000, 184–185), Miskitu *swi* (originally from Pederson 1991, 261). Latvian *likt* also means ‘put’ (< ‘leave’) and interestingly enough, neighboring Finnic languages have factitive PCCs based on the predicates of putting (Estonian *panama*, Finnish *panna*, Livonian *pānda*). Despite the synchronic coexistence of ‘put’ and ‘make’ in Latvian and Finnic languages, Latvian followed a different path (‘leave’ > ‘allow’ > ‘make’) and Finnic ‘put’ constructions lack permissive use, so if any interference occurred, it had to be relatively late and based on the link ‘put’ – ‘make’.

The causee in PCCs with *likt* is marked by the dative in modern Latvian, and, supposing the permissive meaning to be original, one could suggest the change of marking from accusative to dative as outlined above for the *release*-based PCCs. However, the semantics of ‘leaving’ allows two options: the recipient-oriented model and the patient-oriented model of development (here, recipient and patient of the source construction correspond to permittee in the derived permissive construction).

In the case of the recipient-oriented model, an indirect object had to be introduced, schematically, *to leave something for someone (to do)*, e.g. *mother left an apple for me to eat*, with further development where the recipient is interpreted as a permittee and the direct object can be omitted, e.g. *mother left (literally) for me to eat*, i.e. ‘mother allowed me to eat’. In this case, the dative of the permittee would be original, similarly to *give*-based PCCs. This configuration is attested in rare Lithuanian constructions with *pa-likti* ‘leave’ (identical to Latvian *likt*,

<sup>17</sup> Having the same root as Latvian *likt*, Lithuanian *likti*, etc., see IEW 669, LIV<sup>2</sup> 406.

<sup>18</sup> In an earlier paper (Pakerys 2017b) I assumed the shift ‘release’ > ‘allow’ for the Germanic languages based on the etymological meaning of the root (see Section 2.2), similar to the development of Latin *laxare*, etc., but the shift ‘leave’ > ‘allow’ is also possible as discussed here. At the moment, I am unable to find conclusive evidence showing which path (‘release’ > ‘let’ vs. ‘leave’ > ‘let’) should be preferred for the Germanic languages. If ‘release’ > ‘let’ can be proved, this would be a strong Baltic-Germanic parallel; if ‘leave’ > ‘let’ is preferred, only the use of the same verbal root in Baltic and Germanic PCCs (\**léd-* and \**lét-*) is worth noting. In the case of ‘leave’ > ‘let’ (or just ‘leave; let’) a parallel between German and Latvian is also striking, having in mind their intensive contacts.

except for the prefix<sup>19</sup>); it is typically used with the INF-complement *spręsti* ‘decide’, but other predicates also occur, as illustrated in (11a). In (11b), we see an example with the NP followed by the infinitive of purpose (‘freedom to choose’) which probably was a source construction from which the type (11a) developed.

The recipient-oriented configuration is also seen in the construction with Latin *relinquo* ‘leave’ as ‘allow’, illustrated in (11c):

- (11) Lithuanian
- a. *pa-likime*                    *jiems*                    *džiaugtis*                    *tuo* [...]
   
PRF-leave:IMP.1PL    3.PL.DAT.M    be.happy:INF.RFL    DEM.INS.SG.M
   
‘Let’s allow them to be happy with what [...]’<sup>20</sup>
- b. *Pa-likime*                    *jiems*                    *laisvę*                    *spręsti*
  
PRF-leave:IMP.1PL    3.PL.DAT.M    freedom:ACC.SG    decide:INF
   
*patiems*
  
EMPH.DAT.PL.M
   
‘Let’s leave them the freedom to decide for themselves’<sup>21</sup>
- Latin
- c. *dum* [...] *nobis*                    *tantundem*                    *haurire*                    *relinquas*
  
while                    1PL.DAT                    just.as.much                    draw:INF                    leave:PRS.SBJ.2SG
   
‘while you would leave (allow) us to draw just as much [...]’
   
(Horatius, *Sermones*, I.1, 52)<sup>22</sup>

In the patient-oriented model, the direct object of leaving can be interpreted as a permittee, i.e. *leave something/someone to do something/to be affected by a process* > *allow something/someone to do something/to be affected by a process*, e.g. ‘mother left the milk to sour’ > ‘mother allowed the milk to sour, did not prevent the milk from souring’. Here, the dative can be introduced to mark a certain degree of control retained by animate permittees, as mentioned above for *release*-based PCCs. Later, as factitive function develops, dative marking would still be retained despite the possible semantic conflict.

<sup>19</sup> *likti* ‘leave, remain, etc.’ in modern standard Lithuanian is used intransitively, while the transitive meaning is conveyed only by prefixed *pa-likti*. Historically, non-prefixed *likti* could also be used transitively (see LKŽe).

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.zemaitijosgidas.lt/kaip-iskepti-garsiausia-ir-skaniausia-pasaulyje-napoleono-torta/>, news website, 21 March, 2016.

<sup>21</sup> <http://visisavi.weebly.com/reikalingi.html>, website of financial services, not dated, last checked on 9 July, 2018.

<sup>22</sup> See Godwin, ed. (2018, 39, 102) for Horace’s *relinquo* as ‘allow’.

The data of 16th and 17th-c. Latvian show that accusative of permittee/causee was most frequently used, but dative is also attested, especially in the 17th-century texts (Pakerys 2017c, 90; Pakerys forthc. b). If we assume that the recipient-oriented model was in place, accusative is unexpected and the patient-oriented model of development could be preferred. However, as we have to deal with the possibility of influence from German *lassen*-constructions, accusative in Old Latvian is not necessarily original and archaic. The study of folklore material could provide additional data, because we expect the interference of other languages to be much lower compared to that observed in written Latvian of the 16th-17th c. I was able to cast only a cursory glance at the folksongs, but I could not find any cases of accusative with *likt* in PCCs thus far. I conclude that given the parallel of Lithuanian *pa-likti* and Latin *relinquo* as ‘allow’ with the dative of permittee and the absence of accusative in the limited folklore data set, the recipient-oriented model seems to be more probable, i.e. the Latvian construction *likt* ‘leave’ + DAT of recipient + ACC of patient + optional INF of purpose developed into *likt* ‘allow’ + DAT of permittee + INF complement clause.

#### 2.4. ‘want’-based PCCs

In Old Latvian and Old Lithuanian, rare permissive PCCs based on the verb with the same root \**vēl*-<sup>23</sup> and the base meaning ‘want, wish’ are used, in Lithuanian it is *pa-vel-ti* and in Latvian, it is *(at-)vēl-ēt*, both illustrated in (12) below. These PCCs did not survive into the modern stages of Baltic languages, but Latvian still uses the verb *vēlēt* as ‘wish; instruct; elect’ nowadays. In Old Lithuanian, the verb is attested only in 16th-c. texts from Prussia, there is reflexive *velti-s* ‘want, wish’ (no permissive use) and permissive prefixed *pa-velti* ‘allow’ (attested in Wolfenbüttel Postilla, the texts of Bretkūnas and the dictionary Clavis Germanico-Lithvana; see ALEW 1214 and Pakerys forthc. a).

- (12) a. Old Lithuanian
- |                  |                 |              |                  |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| <i>Mofefchus</i> | <i>pa-wele</i>  | <i>iumus</i> | <i>škirties</i>  |
| Moses:NOM.SG     | PRF-allow:PST.3 | 3.DAT.PL.M   | separate:INF.RFL |
| <i>nūg</i>       | <i>Moteru</i>   |              |                  |
| from             | woman:GEN.PL    |              |                  |
- ‘Moses [...] suffered you to put away your wives’ (Bretkūnas, *Nauias Testamentas*, 1580, Matthew 19:8)

<sup>23</sup> Indo-European \**uelh*- ‘wollen, (aus)wählen’ = ‘want, choose’ (IEW 1137; LIV<sup>2</sup> 677).



## b. Old Latvian

<i>Jrra-g</i>	<i>wehlehts/</i>	<i>tam</i>
be:PRS.3-PTC	allow:PST.PSS.PTCP.NOM.SG.M	DEM.DAT.SG.M
<i>Keiferam</i>	<i>Mešlus</i>	<i>doht [...]</i> ?
Caesar:DAT	tax:ACC.PL	give:INF

‘Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar [...]?’ (Glück, *Tas Jauns Testaments*, 1685, Matthew 22:17)

The authors of ALEW (1214) suggest that the development of the meaning ‘erlauben’ = ‘allow’ occurred during the Balto-Slavic stage, but the given verb with the permissive function seems to be restricted to Lithuanian and Latvian and this is presumably a separate semantic shift which occurred in (East) Baltic only (no data on \**věl-* in Old Prussian are available). One should also note that the Latvian verb differs from the Lithuanian counterpart by having the suffix *-ē-* in the infinitive and past stems, and in this respect, it is closer to the Slavic INF *vel-ě-ti*, PRS.1SG *vel-jŭ* ‘want, order’: Latvian INF *věl-ē-t*, PRS.1SG *věl-u*, PST.1SG *věl-ēj-u*; the Lithuanian verb differs from the Latvian counterpart by archaic present athematic inflection, e.g. PRS.3 *pa-wel-t* ‘allows’, Bretkūnas. The same root, but with *o*-grade ablaut and *i*-conjugation is seen in Slavic permissive \**sъ-vol-iti* ‘express one’s will, permit’ < \**vol-iti* ‘express one’s will, choose’ (Borys 2005, 747) which shows the same semantic development as in Baltic (‘want, wish’ > ‘allow’), but this is a separate Slavic development. At this moment, I am unable to find more parallels of the type ‘want, wish’ > ‘allow’, except for Slavic and Latin *volo* (also having the same root) discussed below. Levshina (2015, 503) lists Russian *pozvoljat*’ under ‘letting is releasing and/or leaving’, but it reflects Slavic \**sъ-vol-iti* and belongs to the ‘want, wish’ > ‘allow’ type.

The development of permissive PCC with \**věl-* ‘want’ in the Baltic languages can be imagined as follows. In the first stage, ‘want’ has a patient coded by the accusative and the optional infinitive of purpose (‘want’ + ACC + INF), as in the Latin example with *volo* in (13a). In the following stage, ‘want, wish’ is interpreted as ‘permit, allow’ and the coding remains the same and infinitive becomes a complement (‘allow’ + ACC + INF), as in Latin example in (13b). Then, as seen in the Baltic examples above in (12), the original accusative can be replaced by the dative to reflect the control of the event held by the permittee, as argued earlier for the case of *release*-based PCCs. In the earliest texts of Latvian and Lithuanian, only dative of permittee with \**věl-* verbs is used (Pakerys forthc. a, forthc. b).

- (13) Latin
- a. *hoc volo scire te*  
 this want:PRS.1SG know:INF 2SG.ACC  
 ‘I wish you to know this’ (Plautus, *Curculio*, 1, 2, 46)
- b. *petere ut eum [...] publicae etiam curae ac velut tutelae vellent esse*  
 ask:INF that 3.SG.ACC.M public:DAT.SG also care:DAT.SG  
 and just.as protection:DAT.SG want:SBJ.IMP.3PL be:INF  
 ‘to ask that they would allow him to be [...] also under public care and protection’ (Livius, *Ab urbe condita*, 42, 19, 5)<sup>24</sup>

### 3. Factitive PCCs

#### 3.1. Old Prussian

First of all it should be mentioned that Old Prussian *dāt*, discussed as a permissive predicate in Section 2.1, is also sometimes found in factitive contexts. This use can be explained by interference with the German causative *lassen*-construction, which has both permissive and factitive functions (Pakerys 2017a), and similar developments are attested in Slavic languages which had close contacts with German (von Waldenfels 2015, 116–117). Finnish *give*-based PCCs with *antaa* also acquired factitive uses (Leino 2012, 229–232), but I have been unable to find out if language contact may have played a role in this case (cf. bifunctional German *lassen* and Swedish *låta* constructions; see also von Waldenfels 2012b, 216–217). In Levshina’s study (2015, 504), (indirect) factitive use of *give*-based predicates was noted in Czech, Slovenian, and Estonian<sup>25</sup>.

As to original Old Prussian factitive constructions, the data are very limited. Factitive lexemes such as German *nötigen*, *veranlassen*, *zwingen*, and Lithuanian (*pri*-)*versti* were checked in the dictionary of the Old Prussian corpus (Mažiulis 1981) and no fitting correspondences were found. Baltramiejus Vilentas, the translator of Luther’s catechism into Lithuanian, uses factitive PCCs with (*pri*(e)-)*versti* and (*pri*-)*silyti* (a Slavic borrowing), but they occur in passages which unfortunately are not available in Old Prussian. There is one German factitive PCC illustrated in (14) and I would like to thank Florian Sommer who has drawn my attention to it:

<sup>24</sup> Examples and the meaning of *volo* ‘consent, allow’ are taken from Lewis & Short (1879), <http://perseus.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/getobject.pl?c.2o:1257.lewisandshort>.

<sup>25</sup> The use of Estonian *andma* should be investigated in more detail with respect to factitive use. Tamm (2012, 263) notes that *andma* is generally restricted to idioms and cognitive causation.

- (14) a. Old Prussian  
*Afmai ftans [...] prei klantifnan*  
 be:PRS.1SG DEM.ACC.PL.M to cursing:ACC.SG  
*po-banginnons*  
 PRF-drive:PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M  
 ‘I have brought them to cursing’ (Ench III 67, 23–69, 2)
- b. Old Lithuanian  
*ant keikima anus at-wedziau*  
 on cursing:GEN.SG 3.ACC.PL.M PRF-lead:PST.1SG  
 ‘I have brought them to cursing’ (Vilentas, *Enchiridion*, 1579, 30, 12)
- c. German  
*Habe fie [...] zu fluchen bewegt*  
 have:PRS.1SG 3.ACC.PL to curse:INF bring:PST.PTCP  
 ‘I have brought them to cursing’ (Ench III 68, 1)

The German source in (14c) employs factitive PCC *bewegen* + INF,<sup>26</sup> but the translators of Old Prussian in (14a) and Old Lithuanian in (14b) chose the constructions complemented by PPs with action nominals (*prei klantifnan*; *ant keikima*) which cannot be interpreted as canonical PCCs with infinitive or finite subordinate clauses. The Old Prussian verb *po-banginn-* is attested only once and we do not know if it could have these types of complements<sup>27</sup>. It should be noted that the semantics of *po-banginn-* as ‘drive, move’ is compatible with the development ‘drive’ > ‘make’ known in other languages, cf. Bulgarian *karam*, *nakarvam*, Estonian *ajama*, etc. (Levshina 2015, 504).

### 3.2. Latvian

In modern Latvian, the main factitive PCC is based on *likt*, which in the 16th–17th c. was also used in permissive PCCs, see Section 2.3. As mentioned earlier, the causative function of *likt* presumably developed from ‘leave’ to ‘allow’ and from here, a factitive reading arose (‘allow’ > ‘have V-ed, make’). It is not clear if the bifunctionality of German *lassen* could have played a role, but at least it could support the use of Latvian *likt* as ‘allow’ and ‘have V-ed; make’. Differently from German, however, Latvian gradually limited the use of *likt* to factitive contexts.

<sup>26</sup> See the meaning (2f) of *bewegen* in Grimms’ dictionary: <http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemma=bewegen>.

<sup>27</sup> See Smoczyński (2005, 268), Mažiulis (2013, 726) and Dini (2017) for the history of this verb with further references.

Factitive PCCs with Latvian *spiest* ('press' > 'make') are only marginally used in old and modern Latvian, as illustrated in (15) (Pakerys 2016, 448–449; Pakerys 2017c, 102–103; Pakerys forthc. b). These PCCs have semantic parallels in Lithuanian (*spausti* 'press; make', see Section 3.3) and in a number of Germanic languages (German *zwingen*, Dutch *dwingen*, etc.) (Levshina 2015, 504). Finnic parallels can be also found, but further research is needed, consider Livonian *pīkstō*, Estonian (rare) *tōukama*, etc. (Miina Norvik, Geda Paulsen, p.c.). The causee is marked by accusative in this PCC and is inherited from the source construction where it marked direct object with optional infinitive of goal which became a complement, i.e. the construction 'pushed them (to go)' was interpreted as 'compelled them to go'. Apparently under the influence of frequent *likt*-constructions, causees can sometimes be marked by the dative (Pakerys 2016, 448–449), as seen in (15c). Thus far, no non-ambiguous datives have been found in *spiest*-constructions of the 16th–17th c. (Pakerys 2017c, 103; Pakerys forthc. b).

- (15) a. Old Latvian  
*und speed tohf fcheit eekfchan nahkt*  
 and press:2SG.IMP DEM.ACC.PL.M here inside come:INF  
 'and compel them to come in' (Mancelius, *Postill* 2, 1654, 30, 12; Luke 14:23)
- b. Modern Latvian  
*ekonomiskie apstākļi [...] cilvēkus*  
 economic:NOM.PL.M.DEF circumstances:NOM.PL person:ACC.PL  
*spiež strādāt garākas stundas*  
 press:PRS.3 work:INF long:CMP.ACC.PL.F hour:ACC.PL  
 'economic circumstances make people work longer hours'<sup>28</sup>
- c. Modern Latvian  
*Jaunajiem ārstiem [...] spiež strādāt*  
 young:DAT.PL.M.DEF doctor:DAT.PL press:PRS.3 work:INF  
*rēģionos*  
 region:LOC.PL  
 'young doctors are made to work in the (non-central) regions'<sup>29</sup>

<sup>28</sup> <https://www.vestnesis.lv/ta/id/56141>, state news website, 13 November, 2001.

<sup>29</sup> <https://www.delfi.lv/vina/veseliba/vesela-un-laimiga/jaunajiem-arstiem-pec-rezidenturas-spiez-stradat-regionos-puse-gatavi-doties-uz-arzemem.d?id=47104455>, news website, 24 February, 2016.

In modern Latvian, the verb *pie-dabūt* ‘get’ (> ‘make’) can be also used in some factitive PCCs, as in (16), but it is very rare (Pakerys 2016, 449–450) and has not been found in PCCs in 16th–17th-c. texts thus far. This construction has clear parallels in some Circum-Baltic languages, such as Finnish (*saada*), Estonian (rare) *saama* (Liina Lindström, p.c.), Norwegian, Swedish (*få*), and is also known in other areas, cf. English *get* (Levshina 2015, 504).

- (16) Modern Latvian
- |                         |                |                     |              |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|
| <i>citādi</i>           | <i>es</i>      | <i>ne-māku</i>      | <i>viņus</i> |
| otherwise               | 1SG.NOM        | NEG-be.able:PRS.1SG | 3.ACC.PL.M   |
| <b><i>pie-dabūt</i></b> | <i>strādāt</i> |                     |              |
| get:INF                 | work:INF       |                     |              |
- ‘I cannot make them work in any other way’<sup>30</sup>

### 3.3. Lithuanian

The main factitive construction used in old and modern Lithuanian is based on the verb (*pri-*)*versti* (Pakerys 2016, 436–438; Pakerys forthc. a), as illustrated in (17) where prefixed *pri-versti* is used in a 16th-c. passage and corresponds to Polish *przymuszać* ‘compel’ in the source of the translation (cf. the same passage in Latvian in (15a) above). Latvian has a direct etymological correspondent *vērst* ‘direct (towards), turn’, which is not complemented by infinitives and has not developed the causative function. The semantic shift observed in Lithuanian *versti* is from ‘topple, turn’ to ‘compel’ and belongs to the group of semantic development ‘cause to move’ > ‘cause’ (Levshina 2015, 504), cf. Latvian *spiest* mentioned in 3.2 and other Lithuanian factitive PCCs discussed below.

- (17) a. Old Lithuanian
- |                    |           |                          |              |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------|
| <i>Išėik</i> [...] | <i>ir</i> | <b><i>priwérfsk’</i></b> | <i>ieit’</i> |
| go.out:IMP.2SG     | and       | compel:IMP.2SG           | go.in:INF    |
- ‘go out [...] and compel (them) to come in’ (Daukša, *Postilla*, 1599, 274, 24; Luke 14:23)
- b. Middle Polish
- |                     |          |                         |              |
|---------------------|----------|-------------------------|--------------|
| <i>Wynidź</i> [...] | <i>á</i> | <b><i>przymuśay</i></b> | <i>wniść</i> |
| go.out:IMP.2SG      | and      | compel:IMP.2SG          | go.in:INF    |

<sup>30</sup> <https://www.triskrasas.lv/lv/ieva-granta>, website of an art education center, 21 October, 2008.

‘go out [...] and compel (them) to come in’ (Wujek, *Postilla*, 1590, 282, 1; Luke 14:23)

In addition to *versti*, Lithuanian has a number of marginal factitive PCCs based on other verbs which also denote caused motion: *spausti* ‘press’ (cf. Latvian *spiest* in 3.2), *spirti* ‘kick’ (see a short discussion in Pakerys 2016, 438), and *stumti* ‘push’, *pa-stūm-ėti* ‘push a little bit’.<sup>31</sup> Thus far, I have found no examples of PCCs with these verbs in 16th–17th c. texts, and I will limit myself to illustrating *stumti* and *pastūmėti*, which were omitted in my earlier article (Pakerys 2016):

(18) Modern Lithuanian

a. *Kas stūmė jį ir vėl nusikalsti?*  
 what:NOM push:PST.3 3.ACC.SG.M and again  
*commit.a.crime:INF*

‘What forced him to commit a crime again?’ (CML)

b. *Kokios priežastys [...] pastūmėjo vartoti narkotikus?*  
 what:NOM.PL.F reason:NOM.PL push.a.little.bit:PST.3  
 use:INF drug:NOM.PL

‘What reasons made him use drugs?’ (CML)

#### 4. Conclusions

Baltic languages are characterized by several shared and language-specific PCCs. The construction based on ‘give’ belongs to the oldest layer and is attested in all three Baltic languages. This type of PCCs is shared by the genetically closely related Slavic branch and neighboring Finnic languages. With respect to variety and frequency of *give*-permissives, the Baltic languages form a cline: Old Prussian features only *give*-constructions, Old Lithuanian still shows a strong use of these PCCs, but in modern Lithuanian, they play only a marginal role, while Latvian *give*-permissives are already hard to come by in 16th–17th c. and are also rarely used nowadays. The dative of permittee in this PCC is inherited from the source construction, where it marked the recipient.

<sup>31</sup> This is an attenuative formation derived by a combination of prefix *pa-* and suffix *-ėti*: *stum-ti* ‘push’ → *pa-stūm-ėti* ‘push a little bit’.

Another layer of PCCs developed out of predicates denoting releasing, but Latvian and Lithuanian share just verbal roots in these constructions (Lithuanian *leisti*, Latvian *laist*, \**lēid-* ‘release’ > ‘allow’). In Lithuanian, the PCC with *leisti* has gradually pushed the *give*-based PCC to the periphery, while in Latvian, the *laist*-construction competed with *ļaut* and *likt*, and *ļaut* eventually became the main permissive verb. The Latvian *ļaut*-construction, which also developed from \*‘release, ease (up)’, is attested from the 17th c. and can be treated as a specifically Latvian innovation, or at least only Latvian fully developed its use as a permissive PCC (data on Lithuanian *liauti* ‘allow’ are very limited). The permittee in Baltic *release*-based constructions was initially marked by the accusative inherited from the transitive source constructions. Due to the manipulative (permissive) interpretation of the construction, dative was introduced to show relative control of the caused event held by the permittee. During the historical period, the marking fluctuated and settled down as dative only in Lithuanian *leisti*- and Latvian *ļaut*-constructions, while Latvian *laist* still frequently occurs with accusatives of permittees. Semantic parallels for the development of permissives from *release*-predicates can be found in neighboring Slavic and Finnic languages and in more distantly related Romance and other languages.

It is worth noting that Baltic \**lēid-* is a cognate of Germanic \**lēt-*, which is also used in permissive constructions (German *lassen*, English *let*, etc.) The use of the same root in permissive PCCs is a possible Baltic-Germanic parallel not attested in the Slavic branch, but more details are needed on the semantic development of Germanic \**lēt-* as ‘allow’.

Both Latvian and Lithuanian share permissive PCCs based on the verbs with the root \**vēl-* ‘want’ > ‘allow’ (Lithuanian *pa-velti*, Latvian (*at-*)*vēlēt*) which are only rarely used in the early texts and did not reach the modern stage as permissives. The permittee is marked by the dative, which must have replaced earlier accusative inherited from the source construction. The development of permissive meaning of cognate verbs is attested in Latin and Slavic languages.

A separate innovation of Latvian is a fully developed *leave*-based PCC with *likt*. At an earlier stage, this construction was used both as permissive and factitive, but only the latter function remains in the modern language. Semantic parallels for the shift from ‘leave’ to ‘allow’ can be found in diverse languages and are also seen in rare uses of cognate Lithuanian *pa-likti* and Latin *re-linguo*. The permittee/causee is invariably coded by the dative in the modern stage, but the accusative was frequent in Old Latvian. Most probably the dative was original, and marked the recipient in the source construction with ‘leave’, but the accusative was used in PCCs due to the influence of German *lassen*-constructions.

There are no shared factitive PCCs in Baltic, and one of the reasons for this could be the fact that the Baltic languages had a productive category of morphological factitives. In contrast, permissive causation could not be expressed by morphological means and as a result, permissive constructions were much more salient and inheritable. Old Prussian factitive PCCs are limited to some cases of German-influenced use of the originally permissive construction with *dāt* ‘give’ and one potentially factitive PCC with *po-banginn-* ‘drive, move’. Latvian predominantly uses *likt*-constructions, which developed the factitive function from the permissive one either independently or due to influence from the bifunctional German *lassen*-constructions. Latvian factitive PCCs with *spiest* (‘press’ > ‘make’) are rare both in early and modern stages of Latvian, while the constructions with *piedabūt* (‘get’ > ‘make’) are marginally attested only in the modern stage. Lithuanian predominantly uses *versti* (‘turn, topple’ > ‘make’) in factitive PCCs of old and modern Lithuanian, while *spausti* (‘press’ > ‘make’), *spirti* (‘kick’ > ‘make’), *stumti*, *pastūmėti* (‘push’ > ‘make’) are only marginally attested. The majority of Baltic factitive PCCs have areal and typological parallels which can be subsumed under ‘make move’ > ‘compel, make’; Latvian *piedabūt* belongs to the type ‘get’ > ‘cause’ and has strong parallels in the Circum-Baltic area.

### Jurgis Pakerys

*Vilnius University*

*Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic*

*Universiteto g. 3, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania*

*jurgis.pakerys@flf.vu.lt*

## ABBREVIATIONS

1 — 1st person, 2 — 2nd person, 3 — 3rd person, ACC — accusative, ACT — active, ALL — allative, ART — article, CMP — comparative, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, DEM — demonstrative, DIM — diminutive, EMPH — emphatic (pronoun), F — feminine, GEN — genitive, IMP — imperative, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, IPFV — imperfect, LOC — locative, M — masculine, NEG — negation, NOM — nominative, PL — plural, POSS — possessive, PRF — prefix, PRS — present, PSS — passive, PST — past, PTC — particle, PTCP — participle, RFL — reflexive, SBJ — subjunctive, SG — singular.



## REFERENCES AND SOURCES

- ALEW – WOLFGANG HOCK, ed. *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Hamburg: Baar, 2015.
- ARKADIEV, PETER & PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2015. Lithuanian morphological causatives: A corpus-based study. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 39–97.
- BORYŚ, WIESŁAW. 2005. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- BRETKŪNAS, JONAS. 1580. *Nauias Testamentas*, ms. (cited from: Jochen D. Range, *Kommentierte Edition des Bandes 7 der altlitauischen Bibelübersetzung (Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte) von Joh. Bretke, Labiau 1580*, Habilitationsschrift. Münster, 1992).
- CML – *Corpus of Modern Lithuanian*. 140 million word-forms. Available online at <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt>.
- COLE, PETER. 1983. The grammatical role of the Causee in Universal Grammar. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49.2, 115–133.
- DAUKŠA, MIKALOJUS. 1595. *Kathechismas* [...]. Vilnius: [Academia Societatis Iesu]. Available online at <http://seniejirastai.lki.lt/db.php?source=1>.
- DAUKŠA, MIKALOJUS. 1599. *Postilla* [...]. Vilnius: Academia Societatis Iesu. Available online at <http://seniejirastai.lki.lt/db.php?source=2>.
- DINI, PIETRO. 2017. Zu apr. *pobanginnons* (Ench. 69,1-2) als Lehnschöpfung. *Baltistica* 52.2, 325–340.
- EH – JĀNIS ENDZELĪNS, EDĪTE HAUZENBERGA. *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu K. Mühlenbachs Lettisch-deutschem Wörterbuch*. Rīga: Kultūras fonds, 1934–1946. Available online at <http://tezaurs.lv/mev/>.
- Ench III – *Der Kleine Catechismus Doctor Martin Luthers Deutfch vnd Preuffifch* [...]. Königsberg: Johann Daubmann, 1561. Available online at <http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt/tekstai/paieska/?saltinis=III&puslapis=17>.
- EWahd 5 – ROSEMARIE LÜHR, ed. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. Bd. 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
- FÜRECKER, CHRISTOPH. 1650. *Lettisches und Teutsches Wörterbuch*, ms. 1 and ms. 2. Available online at [http://senie.korpuss.lv/source.jsp?codificator=Fuer1650\\_70\\_1ms](http://senie.korpuss.lv/source.jsp?codificator=Fuer1650_70_1ms) and [http://senie.korpuss.lv/source.jsp?codificator=Fuer1650\\_70\\_2ms](http://senie.korpuss.lv/source.jsp?codificator=Fuer1650_70_2ms).
- GÄTERS, ALFRĒDS. 1993. *Lettische Syntax: Die Dainas*, ed. by Hildegard Radtke. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Peter Lang.

- GIVÓN, TALMY 2001a. *Syntax: An Introduction*. Vol 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- GIVÓN, TALMY 2001b. *Syntax: An Introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- GLÜCK, ERNST. 1685. *Tas Jauns Testaments* [...]. Rīga: Johann Georg Wilcken.  
Available online at <http://senie.korpuss.lv/source.jsp?codificator=JT1685>.
- GODWIN, JOHN, ed. 2018. *Horace Satires: A Selection*. London/New York etc.: Bloomsbury Academic.
- HASER, VERENA. 2000. Metaphor in semantic change. In: Antonio Barcelona, ed., *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HEINE, BERND & TANIA KUTEVA. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2015. Extended uses of morphological causatives in Latvian. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 147–177.
- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2016. Reflexive permissives and the middle voice. *Baltic Linguistics* 7, 9–52.
- IEW – JULIUS POKORNY. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern, München: Francke, 1959.
- KEMMER, SUZANNE & ARIE VERHAGEN. 1994. The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics* 5, 115–156.
- KJV – *King James Bible*. Available online at <https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org> and [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Bible\\_\(King\\_James\)](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Bible_(King_James)).
- KULIKOV, LEONID. 2001. Causatives. In: Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raibl, eds., *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Vol. 2. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 886–898.
- LEINO, JAAKKO. 2012. Analytical expressions for permissive causation in Finnish. In: Jaakko Leino & Ruprecht von Waldenfels, eds., *Analytical Causatives: From 'give' and 'come' to 'let' and 'make'*. Lincom Europa: München, 221–246.
- LEV – KONSTANTĪNS KARULIS. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. Vols. 1–2. Rīga: Avots, 1992.
- LEVSHINA, NATALIA. 2015. European analytic causatives as a comparative concept. Evidence from a parallel corpus of film subtitles. *Folia Linguistica* 49.2, 487–520.
- LEW – ERNST FRAENKEL. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1962–1965.

- LEWIS, CHARLTON T. & CHARLES SHORT. 1879. *Latin Dictionary* (founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary, revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short). Oxford: Clarendon Press. Available online at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0059>.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> – *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Unter der Leitung von H. Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von M. Kümmel, Th. Zehnder, R. Lipp, B. Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von M. Kümmel und H. Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- LKŽe – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, electronic edition. Vol. 1–20. Ed. by G. Naktinienė (editor in chief), J. Paulauskas, R. Petrokienė, V. Vitkauskas, J. Zabarskaitė. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005–2008. Available online at <http://www.lkz.lt>.
- LORD, CAROL, FOONG HA YAP, SHOICHI IWASAKI. 2002. Grammaticalization of 'give': African and Asian perspectives. In: Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald, eds., *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 217–235.
- LVK2013 – *Balanced corpus of modern Latvian*, 4.5 million word-forms. Available online at <http://www.korpuss.lv/id/LVK2013>.
- MANCELIUS, GEORG & HENRICUS ADOLPHI. 1685. *Das Haus-, Zucht- vnd Lehrbuch Jesu Syrachs [...]*. Mitau [Jelgava]: George Radetzky. Available online at [http://senie.korpuss.lv/static/VLH1685\\_Syr.html](http://senie.korpuss.lv/static/VLH1685_Syr.html).
- MANCELIUS, GEORG. 1654. *Langgewünschte Lettische Postill [...]*. [Teil 2]. Rīga: Gerhard Schröder. Available online at: [http://senie.korpuss.lv/source.jsp?codificator=Manc1654\\_LP2](http://senie.korpuss.lv/source.jsp?codificator=Manc1654_LP2).
- MASILIŪNAS, KAZIMIERAS. 1934. *Antano Smetonos raštų žodynas*. Kaunas: Švietimo ministerijos knygų leidimo komisija.
- MAŽIULIS, VYTAUTAS. 1981. *Prūsų kalbos paminklai*. T. 2. Vilnius: Mokslo.
- MAŽIULIS, VYTAUTAS. 2013. *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, 2-asis leid. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras. Available online at: <http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt/zodynas/paieska>.
- MAŽVYDAS, MARTYNAS. 1559. *Forma Chrikstima [...]*, Königsberg: Johann Daubmann (cited from Michelini 2000).
- ME – *K. Mühlenbachs lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von Jan Endzelin. Riga: Lettisches Bildungsministerium, 1923–1932. Available online at <http://tezaurs.lv/mev/>.
- MICHELINI, GUIDO. 2000. *Martyno Mažvydo raštai ir jų šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

- NAU, NICOLE. 2015. Morphological causatives in contemporary Latvian. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Voice and Argument Structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 99–146.
- NAU, NICOLE & PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2016. Transitivity pairs in Baltic: Between Finnic and Slavic. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 58.2, 83–126.
- NEWMAN, JOHN. 1996. *Give. A Cognitive Linguistic Study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2016. On periphrastic causative constructions in Lithuanian and Latvian. In: Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau, eds., *Argument Realization in Baltic*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 427–458.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2017a. Old Prussian *dāt* ‘give’ in causative and hortative constructions. *Baltic Linguistics* 8, 115–141.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2017b. Baltic context of some Estonian periphrastic causative constructions. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 8.1, 179–195.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. 2017c. Periphrastic causative constructions in 16th century Latvian. *Baltu filoloģija* 26.1, 87–106.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. forthc. a. Periphrastic causative constructions in 16th–17th century Lithuanian. *Baltistica*.
- PAKERYS, JURGIS. forthc. b. Periphrastic causative constructions in 17th century Latvian. *Baltu filoloģija*.
- PEDERSON, ERIC W. 1991. *Subtle Semantics: Universals in the Polysemy of Reflexive and Causative Constructions*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley (cited from Soares da Silva 2007).
- SHIBATANI, MASAYOSHI & PRASHANT PARDESHI. 2002. The causative continuum. In: Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 85–126.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2005. *Lexikon der altpreussischen Verben*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2007. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Wilno: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego.
- SOARES DA SILVA, AUGUSTO. 2007. Verbs of letting: Some cognitive and historical aspects. In: Nicole Delbecque & Bert Cornillie, eds., *On Interpreting Construction Schemas. From Action and Motion to Transitivity and Causality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 171–200.
- STANG, CHRISTIAN S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø: 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 Waldenfels, eds., *Analytical Causatives: Grom 'give' and 'come' to 'let' and 'make'*. München: Lincom Europa, 247–289.
- VILENTAS, BALTRAMIEJUS. 1579. *Enchiridion* [...]. Königsberg: Georg Osterberger (cited from electronic edition prepared at the Institute of the Lithuanian Language).
- VILLANUEVA-SVENSSON, MIGUEL. 2011. The origin of the type Lith. *bliáuti*, *bliáuja*, Latv. *blāūt*, *blāūju* in a Balto-Slavic perspective. *Baltistica* 46.2, 201–223.
- VILLANUEVA-SVENSSON, MIGUEL. forthc. Samprasāraṇa ablaut in the Balto-Slavic verb. In: *Proceedings of the 15th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 13-16 September 2016, Vienna*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- VON WALDENFELS, RUPRECHT. 2012a. *The Grammaticalization of 'Give' + Infinitive. A Comparative Study of Russian, Polish and Czech*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- VON WALDENFELS, RUPRECHT. 2012b. Finnish *antaa* and Russian *davat'* 'to give' as causatives: a contrastive analysis. In: Jaakko Leino & Ruprecht von Waldenfels, eds., *Analytical causatives: from 'give' and 'come' to 'let' and 'make'*. München: Lincom Europa, 187–220.
- VON WALDENFELS, RUPRECHT. 2015. Grammaticalized 'give' in Slavic between drift and contact: Causative, modal, imperative and existential constructions. In: Brian Nolan, Gudrun Rawoens & Elke Diedrichsen, eds., *Causation, Permission, and Transfer: Argument Realisation in GET, TAKE, PUT, GIVE and LET Verbs*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 107–127.
- WUJEK, JAKUB. 1590. *Postilla* [...], Kraków: Andrzej Piotrkowczyk (cited from Jonas Palionis, *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų Postilė ir jos šaltiniai*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2000).