Periphrastic causative constructions in Livonian, Lutsi and Latgalian

For our investigation of morphosyntactic and semantic features in non-standard varieties, we have chosen periphrastic causative constructions (PCCs) and Latvia as a contact zone of Baltic, Finnic, Germanic and Slavic languages. In our talk we will discuss factitive (= English *make*) and permissive (= English *let*) PCCs in Latgalian, Livonian and Lutsi. We were particularly interested in the semantic development of PCCs and case-marking of the causee. For our study, we used the following corpus and dictionary data: EDC, EM IX, LLC, LLLV and MuLa.

Latgalian uses verbs *(at-)*-[sa-]*laut, *laist, dūt* in permissive PCCs and *likt, (da-/pi-)*-spīst in factitive PCCs similarly to standard Latvian *(at-)*-[sa-]*laut{-ies}, *laist, dot; likt, (pie-)*-spiest, but differs in employing *(aiz-)*-stateit and *(da-)*mīgt in factitive PCCs. The semantic development of *(aiz-)*-stateit as *'put in vertical position' > *'compel, make* has some parallels in East Slavic (Belarusian *za-stavīc*, Russian *za-stavit*) and Lithuanian dialects ((*pie-*/pri-)*-stytī); cf. also Northeastern Romani *(za-)*-čhov-el, *(za-)*čhuv- *'make' (Kirill Kozhanov, Anton Tenser, p.c.) One may also note partly similar development in Finnic from *'place, put' to *'make*, cf. Finnish *panna*, Estonian *panema*, Livonian *pānda*, etc. Latgalian *(da-)*mīgt has semantic parallels in Latvian ((*pie-)*spīst), Lithuanian ((*pri-)*spausti), Livonian *piķstō*; cf. partly similar development in Estonian tōukama *'make' < *'push'. Latgalian is also characterized by rare borrowed permissives *zvaleit, zvoleit, da-/pa-zvolēt* *'let, allow', cf. Polish *do-/po-zwolić*, Belarusian *dazvolic*, Russian *do-/po-zvolit*.

With respect to causee marking, Latgalian shows fluctuation between ACC and DAT in *(aiz-)*-stateit and *(da-)*-spīst constructions due to the influence of standard Latvian *(likt + DAT)*, but also shows rare cases of GEN in *(aiz-)*-stateit constructions (Lidija Leikuma, p.c.) which seems to correspond to PRT used in Finnic factitive constructions, cf. (standard) Estonian/Lutsi *panna* and Livonian *pānda*. To some extent similarly to standard Latvian, *laist* in Latgalian assigns DAT or ACC.

In permissive PCCs, Livonian uses *andō* and *laskō*. The first construction is rare and belongs to Baltic, Slavic and Finnic area unified by the development *'give' > *'allow'; in modern Estonian, PCC based on *anda* seems to be restricted to impersonal use. Similarly to Estonian and German, Livonian uses *laskō* both in permissive and factitive (curative, i.e. *'have something done') contexts, while *pānda* is only factitive. Probably due the influence of Latvian *likt* *'make; order'*, Livonian *pānda* also acquired the meaning of verbal manipulation (*'order') not attested in standard Estonian. In factitive contexts, Livonian also uses *piķstō* *'make' < *'press' which seems to be a copy of Latvian *spīst*, cf. more parallels above. As to marking of the causee, Livonian uses PRT and DAT, the latter case mimics the Latvian pattern, cf. *laut* *'let' + DAT, *likt* *'make' + DAT.

Lutsi, similarly to Livonian, uses *anda* (*'give' > *'let'*, but it is rare compared to *lasta* which was attested only in permissive PCCs in our sample of the texts (EM IX); in factitive PCCs, Lutsi uses *panna*. With respect to causee marking, we have not noticed any cases of Baltic influence on Lutsi PCCs.
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Abbreviations
ACC – accusative; DAT – dative; GEN – genitive; PRT – partitive.
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