

ESTABLISHING THE AGE OF THE LATVIAN DEBITIVE MOOD: THE EVIDENCE OF LATGALIAN¹

Simon Fries, Eugen Hill

University of Cologne

1. Introduction

1.1. The debitive mood of Latvian as innovation

As is widely known, the conjugation systems of both East Baltic languages Lithuanian and Latvian are very similar to each other. As is not unexpected for closely related languages, Lithuanian and Latvian have a similar set of morphosyntactic categories grouped along the same dimensions of person, tense, mood, and voice. Moreover, the distinctions between the categories are mostly encoded by means of etymologically identical markers which are, therefore, inherited in both languages from their hypothetical common ancestor, Proto-East-Baltic.

However, this similarity between the conjugation systems of Lithuanian and Latvian does not mean identity. In several parts of their conjugation the languages deviate from each other in different ways. In particular, Lithuanian and Latvian are known to differ, for instance, in the very composition of their dimension of mood.

¹ Research for this paper was conducted in the scope of project B08 “Non-canonical alignment and agreement patterns in East Baltic” of the CRC 1252 “Prominence in Language” (Project-ID 281511265) based at the University of Cologne and funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

Both languages share the indicative, the subjunctive, and the imperative moods but the so-called debitive mood of Latvian has no Lithuanian counterpart.

Most generally, such differences between two closely related languages can be explained in two ways. The category in question may be either secondarily lost in one language or it may be acquired anew by the other. In the case of Latvian the debitive (henceforth DEB), the complete absence of any trace of this mood and/or construction in Lithuanian (including the 16th–19th c. sources and all contemporary dialects) seems to indicate its recent origin in Latvian somewhere after its separation from Lithuanian. This is the *communis opinio* which has been repeatedly expressed in the literature (cf. most recently Vanags 2000; Holvoet 1998; 2001b, 9–15, 21–27; 2007, 185–193; Balode & Holvoet 2001, 6; Seržant & Taperte 2016, 210–211).

From a purely synchronic perspective, the debitive mood of contemporary Standard Latvian – featuring a chiefly necessitative meaning corresponding to English ‘must, have to’ – is encoded by a periphrastic construction consisting of two parts. The first part is the third person copula which inflects for tense and is also capable of assuming the subjunctive form. The second part is the so-called DEB-gerundive (a term suggested in Seržant & Taperte 2016, 200) or simply *debitive* (as it is henceforth called). The debitive, which does not inflect, can be formed to every lexical verb out of either its INF. (in the case of *būt* ‘to be’) or out of its 3PRES. combined with the formative *jā-*. Usually, the subject or agent referent of the DEB-construction appears in the DAT. These properties of the DEB-construction in contemporary Standard Latvian are illustrated for Latv *strādāt* ‘to work’ in (1), cf. recently Holvoet (2001a, 229–230), Auziņa et al. (2015, 486–489); on syntax and semantics see especially Holvoet (1997; 2001b: 28–62; 2007: 173–193; 2013) and Lokmane & Kalnača (2014).

- | | | | |
|------|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (1a) | <i>man</i>
1SG.DAT. | <i>ir</i>
COP.3PRES. | <i>jā-strādā</i>
work.DEB. |
| | ‘I have to work’ | | |
| (1b) | <i>man</i>
1SG.DAT. | <i>bija</i>
COP.3PRET. | <i>jā-strādā</i>
work.DEB. |
| | ‘I had to work’ | | |
| (1c) | <i>man</i>
1SG.DAT. | <i>būs</i>
COP.3FUT. | <i>jā-strādā</i>
work.DEB. |
| | ‘I will have to work’ | | |
| (1d) | <i>man</i>
1SG.DAT. | <i>nav</i>
NEG.COP.3PRES. | <i>jā-strādā</i>
work.DEB. |
| | ‘I don’t have to work’ | | |
| (1e) | <i>man</i>
1SG.DAT. | <i>būtu</i>
COP.SUBJ | <i>jā-strādā</i>
work.DEB. |
| | ‘If I had to work’ | | |

There is reason to assume that this system of encoding the debitive may be secondary. First, there is a clear asymmetry between the present tense form of the DEB-construction (as given in 1a) and its other forms (given in 1b to 1e). The corpus-study conducted by Daugavet (2017) reveals that in present day colloquial Latvian the DEB-construction is much more frequent in the present tense (ca. 80% of occurrences for *darīt* ‘to do’) than in the other tenses (ca. 5% each). In earlier Latvian dialect and folklore texts recorded during the 19th c., the past and future time reference in the DEB are mostly either encoded by the present tense form of the DEB-construction as in (1a), or expressed by means of a similar but different construction (third person copula plus INF., see Endzelin 1901a, 2; 1901b, 68; Gāters 1993, 322–327; Ozols 1993, 90; Holvoet 2007, 195–216). Secondly, as in other similar constructions of Latvian, the copula can be omitted in the DEB-construction in the present tense. Daugavet’s (2017) corpus study reveals that in contemporary colloquial Latvian the present tense of the DEB without copula (i.e., just the DEB-gerundive *jā-dara* in the case of *darīt*) is three times as frequent as the same construction containing the copula (i.e., *ir jā-dara*).

(2)	<i>rītā</i>	<i>jums</i>	<i>jā-izcep</i>	<i>gailītis</i>
	morning.LOC.SG.	2PL.DAT.	bake.DEB.	rooster.NOM.SG.
	‘In the morning you will have to bake a rooster.’			(Endzelin 1922, 42)

These observations indicate that in 19th-century spoken Latvian and later, debitives functioning as the predicates of clauses all by themselves were synchronically much closer to finite verb forms than to nominal constituents of truly periphrastic constructions (such as, for instance, the passive; cf. Auziņa et al. 2015, 502–506; Holvoet 2015). This observation (cf. Metuzāle-Kangere & Boiko 2001, 489) fits to the fact that the second component of the Latvian DEB-gerundive (*jā-strādā*, *jā-dara* etc.) is in all but two verbs (*būt* ‘to be’ and *iet* ‘to go’) clearly formed with the 3PRES. of the relevant lexical verb. The occurrence of the DEB-gerundive as the second part of a copula-periphrasis may thus reflect a recent development, made possible by analogy with truly periphrastic constructions in which the copula may, but need not be omitted in the present tense (cf. Kalnača 2016). Further research into the origin of the Latvian DEB-construction should therefore also focus on the usage displayed in (2) above, where the predicate of the whole DEB-clause is encoded solely by the debitive of the relevant lexical verb.

1.2. Towards a comprehensive diachronic explanation of Latvian debitive

In order to understand the origin and subsequent evolution of the Latvian DEB-construction one has to address and clarify the following three essential points.

(A) The Latvian DEB-construction exhibits structural variation on two parameters. The first parameter is the structure of the debitive which, as already mentioned above, may be either based on the INF. or on the 3PRES. of the lexical verb. The second parameter is the case-form of the O/P-argument of a transitive debitive predicate, which may either assume the NOM. or the ACC.

Interestingly, the variation on these parameters is observed both within the same local dialect of Latvian and between different dialects. So, in most Latvian dialects *būt* is the only verb whose debitive is clearly based on the INF. (i.e. *jā-būt*), while all other verbs either use the 3PRES. or are ambiguous (cf. *jā-iet* of INF. *iet*, 3PRES. *iet* ‘to go’). However, Endzelin (1923, 684–685) attests for a system with a 3PRES.-based debitive *jā-ir* (in Mazgramzda). Which pattern of the debitive formation is more original remains unclear (cf., for some discussion, already Endzelin 1901a, 4–5; 1901b, 67, 70–72; Prellwitz 1904 and Mühlenbach 1907, recently Vanags 2000, 153; Wälchli 2000, 206; Holvoet 2000, 106–107; 2001b: 15–21; Seržant & Taperte 2016, 215–217).

Similarly, in most of Latvian the O/P-argument of a transitive DEB-predicate assumes the NOM. when it is expressed by a noun and the ACC. when it is expressed by a personal or reflexive pronoun. However, Endzelin (1923, 753) mentions a system where only the NOM. is used for all nominals (in Valmiera). At the same time, the use of the ACC. also with nouns is widely attested for both 19th c. dialects and contemporary colloquial speech (cf. already Mühlenbach 1907, 313; recently Holvoet 2007, 174; Seržant 2013, 349; 2016, 163–169; Holvoet & Grzybowska 2014; Lokmane & Kalnača 2014, 184–187; Seržant & Taperte 2016). Which pattern of the O/P-argument encoding is more original remains, again, to be clarified.

(B) Since the DEB-construction is an innovation of Latvian, it must have developed out of a different inherited syntactic pattern. This source of the DEB-construction is far from being securely identified. In 16th–18th c. Old Latvian writings, two distinct *mihi est*-type constructions are attested which contain the debitive and have, accordingly, been repeatedly suggested as a potential source of the DEB-construction as such in the literature (cf. recently Andronovs 1998; Vanags 2000; Wälchli 2000, 200–207; Holvoet 1998; 2001b, 9–15, 21–27; 2007, 185–193; Balode & Holvoet 2001, 6; Seržant & Taperte 2016, 210–211).

However, neither of these constructions is attested in texts representing contemporary spoken Latvian. Given the nature of Old Latvian texts, most of which are attempts at translating from German by German-speaking writers, both constructions may be calques, themselves based on the DEB-construction. The German equivalent of Lat *mihi est* and Latv *man ir* etc. with an existential meaning (‘there is sth. for sth.’, ‘es gibt etw. für jmd.’, ‘il y a qc. pour qn.’) is a *have*-construction which, at the same time, functions as a constituent of a *have to*-construction with necessitative semantics (with particle *zu* + INF.). It cannot be excluded that Old Latvian translators mechanically substituted the Latvian debitive (taken from the DEB-construction) for German *zu* + INF. also in the *mihi est*-type construction, cf. (3a) below. A similar substitution of the Latvian debitive for German *zu* + INF. may be assumed for contexts as given in (3b).

- | | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------------|
| (3a) | <i>gyr</i> | <i>jums ...</i> | <i>kas</i> | <i>ja-ehde?</i> |
| | <i>Habt</i> | <i>ihr</i> | <i>was</i> | <i>zu essen?</i> |
| | ‘Do you have something to eat?’ | | | (Endzelin 1923: 753) |

(3b)	<i>gir ...</i>	<i>mylige</i>	<i>ya</i>	<i>klouse</i>
	<i>ist</i>	<i>lieblich ...</i>	<i>zu</i>	<i>hören</i>
	‘... is lovely to listen to.’			(Vanags 2000, 147)

Finally, a phenomenon potentially related to this complex is the use of the debitive as an attributive complement of nouns (type *krāsls jā-sēd* ‘chair to sit on’ etc., cf. (4)). This construction is attested in Selonian dialects of High Latvian (cf. Kauliņ 1889, 123–124; Mühlenbach 1907, 316–326; Endzelin 1923, 753–754 and, most recently, Holvoet 2000, 106–107; Vanags 2000, 143–145). However, the exact nature of the probable relation remains unclear. As of today, neither the direction of change (from attributive debitive to predicative debitive or vice versa) nor the necessary bridging contexts have been established.

(4a)	<i>viņam</i>	<i>nebij</i>	<i>krāsla</i>	<i>ju-sād</i>
	3SG.DAT.M.	NEG=COP.3PRET.	chair.GEN.SG.	sit.DEB.
	‘He had no chair to sit on.’			
(4b)	<i>paņam</i>	<i>pavadu</i>	<i>zirgu</i>	<i>ju-sapin</i>
	take.2SG.IPV.	rein.ACC.SG.	horse.ACC.SG.	tie_up.DEB.
	‘Take the rein to tie up the horse!’			

(C) The age of the debitive remains unknown. Theoretically, there would be three possible scenarios by which the debitive could have come into being in Latvian: it could be (I) an independent innovation of all dialects dating from after the split-up of Proto-Latvian into the dialects; (II) a post-Proto-Latvian innovation of only one dialect or dialect area secondarily spreading to the other dialects through migration or dialect mixing, later also propagated by print media and school education; or (III) a common innovation of all Latvian dialects dating back to Proto-Latvian times. Most recently, Seržant & Taperte (2016, 209) have argued for scenario (II): they assume that the Latvian debitive emerged in Central and/or Livonian Latvian “shortly before the literary tradition, i.e. around the 14th–15th c.”. The reason for this particular localisation of the origin of the Latvian debitive in time and space is their observation that the construction “is only barely found in High Latvian, which regularly employs the synonymous local predicate *vajadzēt* [...]” (cf. similarly already Cibuļš & Leikuma 2003, 83). This is an assumption, however, that has met with criticism (cf. Nau 2011, 54 on Latgalian) and still needs to be thoroughly tested.

1.3. Aim and structure of the present paper

In the present paper, we attempt to contribute to the clarification of point (C) by means of a systematic historical investigation of the debitive in Latgalian, i.e. the variety of High Latvian dialects spoken in the territory of Latgale (Polish Livonia) that historically belonged to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Russian

Empire before joining the Latvian nation state at the beginning of the 20th century. While the debitive in older Standard and Central Latvian sources has been studied extensively, the debitive in older Latgalian sources has not met with equivalent interest yet.² It is against this backdrop that the present article seeks to provide a systematic historical survey of the debitive as attested in 18th and 19th-century Latgalian sources. Our investigation will show that the debitive is well-attested in Latgalian since the very beginning of its written record in the 18th century, and that it has most likely always formed a genuine part of Latgalian morphosyntax. These findings have major implications for establishing the age of the debitive, because Latgalian developed free from Standard/Central Latvian influence up until the 20th century. The cooccurrence of the debitive in both Standard/Central Latvian and Latgalian/High Latvian favours the assumption that the debitive is a shared innovation of the dialects dating back to Proto-Latvian times.

The paper is organised as follows: in section 2, we will demonstrate by the example of written texts stemming from different chronological layers that the debitive is diachronically stably attested in Latgalian between the 18th century, marking the beginning of its documented history, and the 19th century. Its continuous attestation over several centuries leads to the conclusion that the debitive has always been in use in Latgalian and that it may thus be inherited from Proto-Latvian. This is set forth in the concluding section 3 which also discusses further implications regarding the question of the origin of the DEB-construction raised above.

2. The debitive in the documented history of Latgalian

The aim of this section is to demonstrate that the debitive has been established as a morphosyntactic category in Latgalian ever since the beginning of its documented history. For that purpose, we will discuss examples of the DEB-construction attested in a corpus of various texts stemming from different chronological layers of the dialect that span the first two centuries of its historically accessible development: the famous evangeliary from 1753 (here abbreviated EvTA, edited by Stafecka 2004), a book of religious prayers and songs issued in 1771 (abbreviated Nab), calendars issued between 1862 and 1871 (abbreviated ILK), and a collection of Latgalian fairytales and songs published by Stefania Ulanowska between 1891 and 1895 (Ulanowska 1891–1895).

Given the over-all situation of early Latgalian sources, these texts allow us to paint a fairly representative diachronic picture of the dialect, because they cover a variety of genres (religious and profane) over a period of two centuries, namely

² The present-day morphological situation of the debitive in Latgalian has been treated by Nau (2011, 53–54, 86–88; 2014, *passim*) and will not play a role in our investigation. A more comprehensive investigation of the modern Latgalian debitive might lead to interesting diachronic insights; but for the time being it remains a task for future research.

the 18th and 19th century. The attestation of the debitive in all these texts strongly implies that it has always formed a genuine part of the morphological system of Latgalian (a possibility seemingly hinted at already by Nau 2011, 54). Our investigation will take its outset from a comprehensive discussion of the debitive as it is attested in the 1753 evangeliary and, based on the insights gained from this discussion, will then turn to a survey of a few representative examples of the DEB-construction attested in the remaining texts.

2.1. The debitive in the 18th century

It is a significant observation that the beginning of the documented history of the debitive in Latgalian coincides with the beginning of the documented history of Latgalian as such: the very first genuine Latgalian text that we can access, the famous evangeliary issued in 1753 by the Society of Jesus in Vilnius (Stafecka 2004; cf. SLV, 106, no. 216 with lit.), already features a few very clear cases of the debitive. As the title page of the book indicates, the Latgalian text of the evangeliary is a translation, but the identity of the translator (cf. Stafecka 2004, 320–321 on speculations regarding this) and the original gospel text on which the translation is based remain unknown.

In our view, it is highly probable that the gospel passages featured in the 1753 evangeliary were directly translated from the Latin of the Clementine Vulgate promulgated in 1592 by Pope Clement VIII (henceforth abbreviated CV). Ever since the Council of Trent (1545–1567), the Latin Vulgate has been the official Bible edition of the Roman Catholic Church, and in the past all other bible translations had to conform to it (cf. Conc. Trid. sess. IV. Decretum de Editione et Usu Sacrorum Librorum; De libris prohibitis regulae decem a Pio IV. comprobatae. Reg. III, IV). Therefore, it is to be assumed with utmost probability that the Latgalian text of the evangeliary was translated on the basis of the official version of the Latin Vulgate that was in use at the time, for otherwise it would not have received the printing permission from the Church. This version would have been the Clementine Vulgate promulgated in 1592, which remained in use until 1979, when the New Latin Vulgate was promulgated by Pope John Paul II. One may, of course, speculate about other bible editions or translations that the text of the evangeliary might be based on (e.g. an earlier Central Latvian, German or Polish translation), but we lack certain indication thereof, and other (Central) Latvian translations (such as Elger 1672, on which cf. SLV, 51, no. 34) are sufficiently different from the Latgalian text to assume that they played no role in its making. In the course of the following discussion, we will further elaborate upon the point that – at least with regard to the debitive – the Latgalian text of the evangeliary is obviously essentially independent from Central Latvian influence (on the linguistic authenticity of the 1753 evangeliary cf. also Stafecka 2004, 321–324).

In turning to our discussion of the debitive now, it must first be noted that the 1753 evangeliary attests 5 secure cases of the debitive. This makes the debitive

a relatively rare but still rather well-attested construction in the text; potential reasons for this will be discussed below. The first debitive of interest to us is found in a passage from the Gospel of Matthew intended to be read on the fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost, where we can read (Mt. 6,25): *Topec sôku jums[,] nafibadoit ap dzieywi fowu, ku byus jums jo-ad, ni ap mifu fowu, ar ku byus apfitierptis. Way tod dwefele nawa wayrok, ne kay ednis, un mifa wayrok ne kay drebies?* (EvTA, 62) – ‘Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, **what ye shall eat**, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?’ (KJV)

The part relevant for our investigation is the one presented in (5):

(5) Mt. 6,25

<i>Topec</i>	<i>sôku</i>	<i>jums[,]</i>	<i>nafibadoit</i>	<i>ap</i>	<i>dzieywi</i>
thus.ADV.	say.1SG. PRES.	2PL.DAT.	NEG=fear. 2PL.IPV.REFL.	for.PREP.	life.ACC.SG.
<i>fowu,</i>	<i>ku</i>	<i>byus</i>	<i>Jums</i>	<i>jo-ad,</i>	<i>[...]</i>
POSS.ACC.SG.	REL.ACC.SG.	COP.3FUT.	2PL.DAT.	eat.DEB.	

‘Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, **what ye shall eat**, [...]’

It is obvious that the DEB-construction is embedded in the relative clause *ku byus jums jo-ad* with COP.3FUT. *byus* and the anchoring debitive *jo-ad* (hyphenated spelling in the original) functioning as the predicate of the clause. The whole complex itself functions as a syntactic complement to the main clause *nafibadoit ap dzieywi fowu*. Although the formal makeup of the DEB-construction is rather straightforward, it is nonetheless quite interesting. There can be no doubt that ACC.SG. *ku* fills the syntactic position of the direct object of *jo-ad* so that its referent functions as the patient of the action expressed by the predicate. On the other hand, 2PL.DAT. *jums* fills the position of the subject so that its referent functions as the agent of the action expressed by the predicate. The occurrence of the copula 3FUT. *byus* may seem unexpected at first, but it is easily motivated from the fact that the translator wanted to provide a semantically fitting translation of the original Latin expression. The relevant passage in the text of the Clementine Vulgate reads as follows (Mt. 6,25): *Ideo dico vobis, ne fol[l]iciti fitis animæ vestræ quid manducetis, neque corpori vestro quid induamini. Nonne anima plus est quàm efca: & corpus plus quàm vestimentum?* (CV, 906)

We observe that the Latgalian expression *ku byus jums jo-ad* mirrors the Latin relative clause *quid manducetis* ‘what you may/shall eat’, and the DEB-construction *byus jums jo-ad* thus renders the predicate 2PL.PRES.SUBJ.ACT. *manducetis* ‘you may/shall eat’ (itself a translation of the Greek 2PL.AOR.SUBJ.ACT. φάγητε, cf. NA, 16). It seems that the copula 3FUT. *byus* was used here to render the implicit future meaning of the subjunctive *manducetis*: the bare debitive *jo-ad* or the debitive construed with the present copula *ir* would have had a present meaning instead of the implicitly

futurate meaning that the Latin subjunctive expresses ('what you have (available) to eat' instead of 'what you shall eat (now and in the future)'). Choosing the future tense copula *byus* thus allowed the translator to render the intended meaning of the Latin original much more accurately than he could have done by resorting to a present tense copula or the bare debitive. Latin *quid manducetis* was therefore rather faithfully translated into Latgalian as *ku byus jums jo-ad* 'what you will/shall have (available) to eat.'

Quite interestingly, this DEB-construction finds no parallel in the corresponding passages from the numerous Central Latvian translations of the gospels that predate the publication of our 1753 Latgalian evangeliary: in the evangeliary from 1587 (abbreviated EvEp, cf. SLV 40f., no. 4), we find *ko yuus ehfeth* "what you shall/will eat" (EvEp, [176]) with a simple, rather archaic 2PL.FUT. *ehfeth* 'you will/shall eat'. Similarly Georg Mancelius's Protestant *Vade mecum* from 1631 (Mancelius 1631, on which cf. SLV, 44, no. 12) gives *ko juhß âhndieffeeta* "you will/shall eat" (Mancelius 1631, 173) with an innovated 2PL.FUT. *âhndieffeeta*. The same phrasing is found in Georg Elger's 1672 Catholic translation (Elger 1672, on which cf. SLV, 50f., no. 34), where we read *ko iûs edifetá* (Elger 1672, [189]) with 2PL.FUT. *edifetá* = *âhndieffeeta*. A few years later, the anonymous translation of the New Testament published in Rīga in 1685 (JT, on which cf. SLV, 60, no. 59) reads *ko juhs ehdiheet* with the shortened form 2PL.FUT. *ehdiheet* (JT, 12). Thus it seems that the early Central Latvian translations all feature simple forms of the second person plural future indicative of the verb 'to eat' (*ehfeth*, *âhndieffeeta*/*edifetá*, *ehdiheet*), while the Latgalian translation features a futurate debitive form of this verb (*jo-ad*). This strongly indicates that the Latgalian translation of this passage reflects an independent use of the debitive free from Central Latvian influence, since otherwise it would be expected that it also featured a bare 2PL.FUT. form of the verb, which obviously it does not.

What is rather remarkable about the debitive in our example (5) is that it must be conceived of as having an existential meaning ('you have sth. to eat') rather than the necessitative/jussive meaning that it usually has nowadays ('you have to eat sth.'): it refers to the future potential existence of things to eat. This meaning, though no longer encountered today, has been attested for the debitive in other High Latvian dialects (e.g. in Vējaiva) and older texts written in Central Latvian as well (cf. Endzelin 1923, 685, 753–754 and our discussion in section 1.2 with lit.). In fact, our very evangeliary features other cases of such a debitive. One of them is attested in a passage from the Gospel of Luke intended to be read on Easter Tuesday as given in (6).

(6) Lk. 24,41 (cf. EvTA, 37)

<i>way</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>jums</i>	<i>fze,</i>	<i>kas</i>	<i>jo àd</i>
if.CONJ.	COP.3PRES.	2PL.DAT.	here.ADV.	REL.NOM.SG.	eat.DEB.

'Have ye here any meat [i.e. food]?' (KJV)

In this example, the DEB-construction *kas jo àd* is embedded in a relative clause functioning as a complement to the main clause *way ir jums fze* the subject of which it supplies. The Latgalian expression renders the original Latin *habetis hic aliquid, quod manducetur?* (CV, 978) with the DEB-construction *kas jo àd* translating the relative clause *quod manducetur*. In doing so, NOM.SG.M. *kas*, which has the function of a relative, interrogative and indefinite pronoun in Latgalian (even today, cf. Nau 2011, 38f.), functions as the Latgalian counterpart of Latin *quod*, while the debitive *jo àd* translates Latin 3SG.PRES.SUBJ.PASS. *manducetur* (itself a translation of Greek ACC.SG.N. βρώσιμον ‘edible’, cf. NA, 290). In doing so, *kas* fills the syntactic position of the subject of the relative clause, while *jo àd* functions as a predicative to the subject and thus constitutes the main predicate of the relative clause. On the conceptual level, the referent of *kas* thus functions as the patient of the action expressed by the predicate *jo àd*, while the potential agent of this action remains unexpressed. It becomes clear that the debitive here has no necessitative meaning but rather an existential meaning, because it refers to the availability of something that can be eaten (‘sth. that one can eat/is available to be eaten’), not the necessity to eat something (‘sth. that must be eaten/is to be eaten’). In this regard, the debitive in (6) is very similar to the one in (5). One major difference between the two constructions, however, is that the debitive in (5) reflects a personal construction in that it is construed with a referential subject (*jums*) the referent of which functions as the agent of the action expressed by the predicate, while the debitive in (6) reflects an impersonal construction lacking a referential subject with a referent functioning as the agent of the action expressed by the predicate. The nominative form *kas* in *kas jo àd* only serves the function of a non-referential expletive subject, because in Latgalian the relative clause that the debitive is embedded in needs to be realised with an overt relative pronoun either functioning as the subject or object of the clause; as we have already seen above, the referent of *kas* does not function as the agent of the action expressed by the predicate, but rather functions as its patient.

This impersonal construction of the debitive can be interpreted as a sign of the linguistic authenticity of the Latgalian translation of the gospels that our evangelist provides. It also explains the different morphological makeup of the relative pronouns ACC.SG. *ku* in (5) and NOM.SG. *kas* in (6) that one would not expect if the translation followed the Latin original slavishly without paying attention to the principles of Latgalian morphosyntax. It is a well-known fact that Latin neuters use the same morphological form for the NOM. and ACC., and indeed the relative pronouns used in the Latin passages underlying the respective Latgalian DEB-constructions in (5) and (6) are neuters: we encounter NOM./ACC.SG. *quid* rendered by ACC.SG. *ku* in (5) and NOM./ACC.SG. *quod* translated as NOM.SG. *kas* in (6). Had the translator slavishly followed the Latin original, one would expect only one Latgalian form for both Latin *quid* in (5) and *quod* in (6), i.e. either NOM.SG. *kas* or ACC.SG. *ku* in both constructions,

because the Latin pronouns equally allowed for both analyses. As it seems, however, the translator was guided by the genuine principles of Latgalian morphosyntax so that he morphologically differentiated between the relative pronoun functioning as an object and the relative pronoun functioning as an expletive subject, which led to different translations of the relative pronoun in (5) and (6): as the relative clause had to be introduced by an overtly expressed relative pronoun and the impersonal DEB-construction in (6) inherently lacked a referential subject/agent, the relative pronoun had to be realised as an expletive subject and thus assumed the NOM., because this is the case by which subjects are marked by default in Latgalian. This resulted in the choice of NOM.SG. *kas* for Latin *quod*, which might have been helped by the fact that this also functions as the subject in the original Latin passive expression *quod manducetur*. In contrast to (6), the personal DEB-construction in (5) had an overtly expressed referential subject/agent (*jums*) so that the subject position was filled and thus not eligible to being filled by the relative pronoun. Instead, the relative pronoun was realised as the direct object/patient of the transitive debitive form *jo àd* and therefore had to assume the ACC., because this is the case by which direct objects are usually marked in Latgalian. This led to the choice of ACC.SG. *ku* for Latin *quid*, which might have been helped by the fact that this also functions as the object in the original Latin expression *quid manducetis*. Therefore, in rendering original Latin text from the Clementine Vulgate, the DEB-constructions in (5) and (6) mirror the general principles of Latgalian syntax and, in our view, provide a rather authentic picture of the contemporary idiom.

Interestingly, the earlier Central Latvian translations of this passage conform to our Latgalian one in (6) in that they also feature a DEB-construction here. The passage in the 1587 evangeliary reads *ir jums fcheit kas yaehde?* (EvEp, [111f.]) with *kas yaehde* '(sth.) that (is there) to be eaten' directly corresponding to the Latgalian expression *kas jo àd*. We find the same construction in Mancelius's *Vade mecum*, where we read *Gir jums fcheitan kas ja=àhd?* (Mancelius 1631, 122) and *kas ja=àhd* obviously corresponds to *kas yaehde* in the 1587 evangeliary. Elger's 1672 translation also features a debitive here in that it reads *Jr jums βæ kas ia æda?* (Elger 1672, [154]) with *kas ia æda* corresponding to Mancelius's *kas ja=àhd* and *kas yaehde* found in the 1587 evangeliary. Given this rather striking uniformity, it will come as no surprise that the translation of the New Testament published in 1685 also features a debitive in our passage: it reads *Jrrag jums fche kas ja=ehd?* (JT, 180) with *kas ja=ehd* corresponding to *kas ia æda* ~ *kas ja=àhd* ~ *kas yaehde*. This illustrates that both the Central Latvian and the Latgalian translations obviously employ the debitive to express the meaning of the passage. One may interpret this as an indication that the later Latgalian translation might have been influenced by the earlier Central Latvian translations here, but given the over-all linguistic character of the 1753 evangeliary and the fact that it was obviously not influenced by the Central Latvian translations in rendering the comparable passage given in (5) above, this seems rather

unlikely.³ It is much more probable that the Central Latvian and the Latgalian translations made independent use of the debitive in translating the passage in (6), because the debitive was functionally the most suitable formation to capture the meaning of the passage that each of the Latvian dialects possessed at the time. This suggests that the debitive may be a common feature of the Latvian dialects that they inherited from their common ancestor.

The independent use of the debitive in our Latgalian evangeliary is furthermore illustrated by another passage featuring an instance of an existential debitive. The following example in (7) presents the relevant part of a passage from the Gospel of John intended to be read on the fourth Sunday after Easter:

(7) Joh. 16,12 (cf. EvTA, 42)

<i>Ir</i>	<i>maņ</i>	<i>wel</i>	<i>daudz,</i>	<i>kas</i>	<i>jo runoy</i>	<i>jums,</i>
COP.3.	1SG.DAT.	further.	much.	REL.NOM.	speak.	1PL.
PRES.		ADV.	QUANT.	SG.M.	DEB.	DAT.
<i>bet</i>	<i>nawaryt</i>	<i>paneft</i>	<i>tagad.</i>			
but.CONJ.	NEG=can.	endure.	now.ADV.			
	2PL.PRES.	INF.				

‘I have **yet many things to say unto you**, but ye cannot bear them now.’ (KJV)

Similar to the example in (6), the DEB-construction here is embedded in the relative clause *kas jo runoy jums* that functions as an attribute to the predicative *daudz* in the main clause *ir maņ wel daudz*. The whole sentence construction renders the Latin phrase *adhuc multa habeo vobis dicere, sed non potestis portare modo* (CV, 996). It is worth noting that the syntax of the Latgalian translation deviates from the Latin original considerably. The Latin episode consists of a simple main clause with a finite predicate (1SG.PRES.IND.ACT. *habeo*), a direct object (*multa*) and an INF. (*dicere*) with a DAT. complement (dativus commodi, *vobis*). Its Latgalian counterpart, however, does not consist of such a simple main clause with a finite predicate and direct object but rather consists of an impersonally constructed main clause lacking a referential subject that features a nominal predicate (*daudz*) and a relative clause functioning as an attribute to the nominal predicate (*kas jo runoy jums*). The relative clause itself contains an impersonal construction with the debitive (*jo runoy*) as its predicate and a DAT. complement (dativus commodi, *jums*). It is worth noting here that, just as in

³ Some Central Latvian (Livonian) elements have been identified in the language of the evangeliary (cf. Sta-
fecka 2004, 323–324 who speaks of ‘Low Latvian’), but it largely remains unclear whether this reflects true
Central Latvian influence or archaisms of the mid-18th-century Latgalian idiom that it shares with Central
Latvian. In some cases (such as the use of DEM.NOM.SG.M. *viņš* alongside *jis*), it is rather probable (though by
no means certain) that we are dealing with Central Latvian influence, because the respective features are not
attested in later records of the spoken Latgalian vernacular (especially Ulanowska 1891–1895). However, this
does not hold true for the debitive, because starting with the 1753 evangeliary this is featured by the ear-
lier and later records alike so that its existence in Latgalian is most probably not owed to Central Latvian
influence.

example (6), the impersonal character of the DEB-construction in (7) obviously determines that the relative pronoun *kas* appears in the NOM. rather than the ACC., because it functions as the expletive subject of the relative clause and not as the direct object of the debitive; on the conceptual level, the referent of *kas* functions as the patient of the action expressed by the predicate *jo runoy*, while this obviously lacks an agent. In any case, the very different syntactic makeup of the Latgalian translation and its Latin original makes it rather clear that the syntax of the former is by no means dependent on the syntax of the latter but rather follows its own principles. We may thus conclude that, on the morphosyntactic level, the text of the evangeliary faithfully reflects a contemporary Latgalian idiom here.

This is also indicated by the fact that the Latgalian text differs from the corresponding Central Latvian translations structurally as well as lexically. These also feature a DEB-construction, but they form it to another verb and treat it differently in syntactic terms. In the 1587 evangeliary, we read the simple main clause *Man gir jums wehl doudtcze yaßacke* (EvEp, [121]), where the debitive *yaßacke* '(sth.) to be said' is formed to *sacīt* 'say' and syntactically treated as an attribute to the nominal predicate *doudtcze* 'much'. The same phrasing is found in Mancelius's translation, where we read *Mann gir jums wehl dauds ja=facka* (Mancelius 1631, 129) with the debitive *ja=facka*, and in the translation of the New Testament issued in 1685 that reads *Man wehl daudf jums ja=fakka* (JT, 220) with *ja=fakka* corresponding to *ja=facka*. Elger's translation deviates from these translations only marginally in that it adds a copula and changes the order of some of the constituents. It reads *Wel daudzu man iums ir iafakka* (Elger 1672, [160]) with *iafakka* corresponding to *ja=fakka* ~ *ja=facka* ~ *yaßacke*. In spite of the obvious semantic and morphological similarities between these Central Latvian translations of the passage and their Latgalian counterpart, the lexical and syntactic makeup of the DEB-construction in the Central Latvian texts differs considerably from the one featured by the DEB-construction in the Latgalian passage presented in (7). The Latgalian debitive *jo runoy* is formed to the verb *runāt* 'speak', not to *sacīt* as in the Central Latvian translations. Moreover, it constitutes the predicate of a relative clause (*kas jo runoy jums*) that functions as an attribute to the nominal predicate (*daudz*) of the superordinate main clause. This relative clause has no equivalent in the Central Latvian rendering of this passage that employs the debitive as the attribute of the nominal predicate in the main clause directly. It is, therefore, readily conceived that the Latgalian translation is not influenced by the Central Latvian translations here but rather reflects an independent use of the debitive. This further strengthens the assumption that the debitive was inherited by the Latvian dialects from their common ancestor.

Another case of an existential debitive structurally and semantically very similar to the one in (7) is given in (8). However, we will see that this semantically extends into the domain of necessity usually expressed by the debitive nowadays. In a passage from the Gospel of Luke intended to be read on the Feast of St. Mary Magdalene,

we read Jesus's words addressed to Saint Peter with which he expresses his desire to speak to him:

(8) Lk. 7,40 (cf. EvTA, 91)

<i>Simon,</i>	<i>mań</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>tiew</i>	<i>kas</i>	<i>jo sòka.</i>
Simon.VOC.	1SG.DAT.	COP.3PRES.	2SG.DAT.	INDEF.NOM.	say.DEB.
SG.				SG.M.	

'Simon, I have **somewhat to say unto thee.**' (KJV)

We are here dealing with an impersonal construction in which INDEF.NOM.SG. *kas* functions as the non-referential expletive subject to the predicate constituted by COP.3PRES. *ir* and the existential debitive *jo sòka* which thus functions as a predicative of the subject. Furthermore, 1SG.DAT. *mań* functions as a DAT. complement (dativus commodi) to the predicate, while 2SG.DAT. *tiew* fills the syntactic position of an indirect DAT. object to the predicative debitive *jo sòka*. As in the previous examples (6) and (7), the action denoted by the debitive lacks an overtly expressed agent referent, while the referent of the subject *kas* functions as its patient. The Latgalian passage translates the Latin original *Simon, habeo tibi aliquid dicere* (CV: 957), where 1SG.PRES.IND. ACT. *habeo* is obviously rendered as *mań ir* and *tibi aliquid dicere* as *tiew kas jo sòka*.

What is interesting about the debitive in (8) is that in addition to the default existential interpretation it allows for a necessitative interpretation due to its pragmatic context: in pragmatic situations such as the present one where the speaker (Jesus) approaches the listener (Saint Peter) and says something like 'I have something to say to you', the speaker often expresses his desire to speak about something to the listener. In such a context, an originally existential utterance like 'I have something to say to you' acquires a voluntative/cupitive connotation and thereby means something like 'I would like to talk to you about something'. In cases where the speaker is driven by an intense desire to speak to the listener, the voluntative/cupitive meaning can concur with a necessitative meaning so that 'I have something to say to you' can mean 'I need/must talk to you about something.' This concurrence of the voluntative/cupitive and necessitative meaning can even have the effect that originally necessitative expressions acquire a voluntative/cupitive meaning so that, for instance, utterances like 'We need to talk (about something)' (originally necessitative) can mean 'I would like us to talk (about something)' (voluntative/cupitive). It is, therefore, frequently observed that originally existential expressions and originally necessitative expressions become (more or less) synonymous in voluntative/cupitive use. This can be illustrated especially well by the example of contemporary German 'Ich habe dir (et)was zu sagen' ('I have something to tell you', originally existential) as against 'Ich muss dir (et)was sagen' ('I must tell you something', originally necessitative): both are semantically equivalent in voluntative/cupitive use and can express something like 'Ich möchte/will dir (unbedingt) etwas sagen' ('I (really) wish/want to tell you something'). It is thus very well conceivable that pragmatic situations such as the one underlying the example

in (8) provided a context where debitives either (a) developed their necessitative meaning from an original existential meaning or (b) developed their existential meaning from an original necessitative meaning or (c) developed both their existential and necessitative meaning from an original voluntative/cupitive meaning. However, which of the three scenarios it was by which the debitive developed its functionality can only be determined through a more detailed investigation that would by far exceed the scope of the present paper and must, therefore, remain a task for the future.

In any case, it is worth noting here that the existential use of the debitive in (8) semantically extending into the domain of necessity is shared by Latgalian and Central Latvian alike. The Central Latvian translations of the passage in (8) make use of the same construction. While the earlier Protestant evangeliary from 1587 and Mancelius's *Vade mecum* from 1631 do not feature the passage at all, Elger's 1672 evangeliary and the 1685 translation of the New Testament both render it. In Elger's translation, we read *man ir teuw kas iafakká* (Elger 1672, [225]) with the debitive *iafakká*, and in the 1685 translation of the New Testament, we find the identical phrasing *man tew kas jafakka* (JT, 131) with *jafakka* = *iafakká*. It is obvious that these two constructions directly correspond to the Latgalian expression *man ir tiew kas jo sòka* given in (8). This shows that Central Latvian and Latgalian shared the use of the debitive in pragmatic contexts such as the one featured by example (8), which makes it rather probable that this continues one of the original uses of the debitive.

Be that as it may, it is an interesting observation that formally and semantically the debitive in (8) lines up with the other three debitive cases ((5)–(7)) that we discussed above. None of them, it seems, exhibits the explicit necessitative meaning that we usually find in later and contemporary debitives. In this regard, our 18th-century Latgalian texts side with older Central Latvian texts featuring an existential meaning of the debitive as well (cf. our discussion in section 1.2 with lit.). Future research will have to establish whether this use of the debitive really reflects a German calque, as tentatively assumed in our discussion in section 1.2, or a genuine feature of the Latvian debitive.

In any case, given the observation that none of the Latgalian debitives discussed so far exhibits an explicit necessitative meaning, one may be tempted to draw the conclusion that such necessitative debitives did not exist in the Latgalian idiom of the evangeliary at all. This assumption, however, cannot be maintained in light of one very clear instance of a necessitative debitive that the evangeliary attests in a passage from the Gospel of Matthew intended to be read on the feast of Michaelmas that is given in (9):

(9) Mt. 18,7 (cf. EvTA, 97)

<i>Ayfto</i>	<i>byus</i>	<i>jo àtìt</i>	<i>apgrezynofzonom</i>
since/surely.ADV/CONJ.	COP.3FUT.	come.DEB.	temptation.DAT.PL.
‘[F]or it must needs be that offences come. ’ (KJV)			

The debitive here is embedded in a simple main clause. Just as in (5), the predicate of the clause is constituted by COP.3FUT. *byus* and the debitive *jo àtīt*, while the DAT.PL.*apgrezynofzonom* functions as the referential agent/subject to the predicate. The Latgalian translation renders the original Latin expression *Neceffe est enim vt veniant scandala* (CV, 917). It is obvious that *ayfto* is the Latgalian counterpart of Latin *enim*, while the DEB-construction *byus jo àtīt apgrezynofzom* translates *Neceffe est vt veniant scandala*. Given the over-all context and the phrasing of the Latin original (*Neceffe est*), it is obvious that the debitive here has a necessitative meaning, namely expressing the necessity that during their lifetime humans will inevitably be confronted with temptations. As in the previous examples, the non-trivial syntactic differences between the Latin original and its Latgalian translation indicate that this authentically reflects a contemporary Latgalian idiom: the Latin expression consists of an impersonally construed main clause (*Neceffe est enim*) and a subordinate complement clause that paraphrases the subject of the main clause (*vt veniant scandala*), while the Latgalian translation only features a sole main clause with the debitive as its predicate.

It is noteworthy that here, as in (5) above, the future form of the copula 3FUT. *byus* is used to express the implicit future meaning of an underlying Latin subjunctive form: together with the debitive *jo àtīt* it renders Latin 3PL.PRES.SUBJ.ACT. *veniant* which itself refers to the (inevitable) future advent of the temptations (*scandala*). The use of *byus* in (9) is thus best attributed to the translator's desire to somehow convey the future implications that the Latin original expresses. The comparison of the passage in (9) with the corresponding passages in earlier Central Latvian translations reveals that the 3FUT. form of the copula was also used in Central Latvian to express the implicit future meaning here. For our Latgalian expression *Ayfto byus jo àtīt apgrezynofzonom*, the 1587 evangeliary reads *Tur buus yo apgreτζibe nāckt* (EvEp, [222]). Here, 3FUT.COP *buus* functions as the predicate of the clause and has DAT. SG. *apgreτζibe* 'temptation' as a DAT. complement (*dativus commodi*) and INF. *nāckt* 'come' as an INF. complement. It seems that *buus apgreτζibe* is a futurate instantiation of the common Latvian template COP. + DAT. expressing possession and having (as in *man ir* 'I have'; cf. Endzelin 1923: 427) that together with the INF. complement *nāckt* constitutes a *have-to*-construction (a German calque?) referring to the future advent of the temptation: 'temptation will have to come'. The same construction is featured in Mancelius's *Vade mecum*, where we read *Apghrehჳibai buhჳ jo nahkt* (Mancelius 1635, 219f.), and in the 1685 translation of the New Testament that reads *Apghrehჳibai buhs jo nahkt* (JT, 39). Only Elger's translation deviates in its rendering of the passage in that it reads *Aifto waiag ir liáunas emæflas nákt* (Elger 1672, [234]), thus making use of the impersonal necessitative expression *waiag ir* + INF. complement (*liáunas emæflas nákt*) rather than a FUT. form of the copula. This striking deviance is most probably due to the fact that Elger's Catholic translation had to conform to the Latin Vulgate of the Church so that he opted for *waiag ir* as a rather literal translation of the original

Latin *Neceffe eft*. However, what is even more striking about the Central Latvian translations of this passage in general, is that in contrast to the Latgalian translation none of them features a DEB-construction: the 1587 evangeliary, Maneclius's *Vade mecum* and the 1685 translation of the New Testament all make use of a *have-to*-construction, and Elger's translation employs an impersonal construction with *wajag ir*. Therefore, the use of the debitive in (9) must be genuinely Latgalian and free from Central Latvian influence, thus vouching once more for the linguistic independence and authenticity of the Latgalian gospel translation featured in the 1753 evangeliary.

Be that as it may, there can be no doubt that (9) finally provides the missing attestation of a DEB-construction with a necessitative meaning in our evangeliary. It remains a striking fact, however, that existential debitives are much more common in the text than necessitative debitives. The language of the evangeliary usually employs verb-forms of *vajadzēt* 'ought to' to express necessity, just as it is observed in contemporary Latgalian (on which cf. Seržant & Taperte 2016, 209; Cibuļs & Leikuma 2003, 83). This may have diachronic implications and could favour the notion that the necessitative function was acquired by the debitive secondarily, but further and much more comprehensive research into the functional development of the debitive is needed to assess this properly. For the time being, it will suffice to conclude on the basis of the evidence provided by the 1753 evangeliary (a) that the contemporary Latgalian idiom already featured the debitive in its existential as well as necessitative function, and (b) that consequently the debitive had already developed its full functional spectrum by the middle of the 18th century.

This leads us to the discussion of the debitive as it is attested in the four remaining texts that we want to examine in the present paper. Based on our observations concerning the 1753 evangeliary, we would expect to find attestations of debitives with an existential or necessitative meaning in later Latgalian texts as well, and, indeed, it seems that we do consistently find them in such texts. In the following, we will discuss two representative examples of DEB-constructions from each of the remaining texts; in doing so, we will proceed in chronological order.

The first text that we shall discuss is a book of Catholic prayers and songs issued in 1771, almost 18 years after the publication of the 1753 evangeliary. This book was published by the Society of Jesus in Vilnius and bears the Polish title *Nabożeństwo ku czci i chwale Boga w Trojcy S. jedynego* (hence abbreviated Nab, transl. "Service to the Honour and Glory of the Triune God"). According to the title page and a short Latin note immediately preceding the preface (itself written in Polish), the book is a translation of a Polish original; this, however, has not been identified yet. The translator, though by many considered to have been the preeminent Jesuit Michael Roth (1721–1785), remains equally unknown (cf. Stafecka 2004, 324–325; SLV, 132, no. 307 with lit.). The book features a Latgalian idiom that is very close to the one displayed by the 1753 evangeliary, and it may very well be the case that both books were translated by the same person, although, of course, this remains

pure speculation, until we are better informed about the background of both texts. The *Nabożeństwo* shares the commonality with the evangeliary that the debitive is only rarely attested in the text but occurs frequently enough to allow for the conclusion that it constituted a genuine part of the morphological system of the Latgalian idiom that the text reflects. All in all, we count 8 secure cases of a debitive.⁴ In contrast to the debitives in the 1753 evangeliary, however, these only display a necessitative meaning, as the discussion of the two representative cases in (10) and (11) will show.

(10) Nab, 275,13–14

Kaydas pakutas mums jomekley nu Baznica Kunga?
 which.INT. repentance. 1PL.DAT. search.DEB. from.ADV. priest.GEN.SG.
 NOM/ACC. NOM/ACC.
 PL.F. PL.

‘What kind of repentances **should we request** [lit. search] from the priest?’

This question consisting of a simple main clause is featured in the short catechism at the end of the *Nabożeństwo* that generally follows a question-and-answer scheme. It attests a rather straightforward DEB-construction that is constituted by the debitive form *jomekley* functioning as the predicate of the clause, the 1PL.DAT. form *mums* functioning as the referential subject/agent of the predicate, and the NOM./ACC. PL. expression *kaydas pakutas* that fills the position of the direct object/patient of the predicate. It is worth highlighting here that the morphological makeup of *kaydas pakutas* is ambiguous in that both forms could equally well instantiate an *ā*-stem NOM. PL. or ACC.PL. It is therefore unclear whether the two forms are nominatives like *kas* in (6) and (8) above, or accusatives like *ku* in (5). However, in light of the fact that we are dealing with a personal construction featuring a referential subject/agent (*mums*) and thus corresponding to cases like (5) morphosyntactically, it is more likely that *kaydas pakutas* reflect original accusatives. Be that as it may, the pragmatic context (question-and-answer setting in the framework of religious instruction) implies that the construction here has a necessitative meaning: it expresses the religious obligation to seek for repentance with the priest and in doing so asks for the kinds of repentances that should be requested from the priest. However, an existential connotation can also be grasped very remotely: in addition to the main necessitative meaning (‘What should we request?’), the question also expresses an enquiry for the existence of an inventory of repentances that could be requested from the priest (‘What is there for us to request from the priest?’) and thereby essentially features an existential meaning. It is very well conceivable that the necessitative meaning developed out of

⁴ These are the following (here and in the following numbers in brackets refer to pages and lines in this specific order): *joli* (139,9–10), *jolik* (249,8), *jo žaloy* (267,14,16) and *jožaloy* (268,6), *jodor* (270,7 and 274,4), *jocifz* (275,16), *jomekley* (275,13–14), *jo runoy* (279,10). It seems that for some reason yet unknown debitives predominantly occur in the very last section of the *Nabożeństwo*, a very concise version of the Catholic catechism.

an original existential meaning in contexts such as the one under discussion; however, a more thorough investigation into this will be needed to account for the specific semantic development of the debitive in detail, as already pointed out in our discussion of example (8) above. For the time being, it will suffice to emphasise the fact that the 1771 Latgalian *Nabożeństwo* obviously features debitives with a necessitative meaning. This can also be shown by the example of (11).

(11) Nab, 249,8

<i>Kay</i>	<i>żeyme</i>	<i>kryfta</i>	<i>Swata</i>	<i>jolik?</i>
how.ADV.	sign.NOM.SG.	Christ.GEN.SG.	holy.GEN.SG.M.	make.DEB.

‘How is the sign of the Holy Cross [i.e. the sign of crossing oneself] **(intended) to be made?**’

The overall structure of this DEB-construction largely mirrors that in (10): it is embedded in a main clause that is formulated as a question, with the debitive *jolik* functioning as the predicate of the clause and NOM.SG. *żeyme* functioning as the subject of the clause. The construction in (11), however, differs from the one in (10) in one essential regard: it lacks a direct object. This is because the referent of NOM.SG. *żeyme* functions as the patient of the action expressed by the predicate so that there is no syntactic need for a direct object referring to the patient. In this regard, the DEB-construction in (11) parallels the ones in (6)–(8). Semantically, the debitive in (11) corresponds to the one in (10) in that it features a necessitative meaning as well: it refers to the religious obligation to perform the sign of crossing oneself in a specific manner. This and all the other DEB-constructions attested in the *Nabożeństwo* imply that the Latgalian debitive in general had acquired a chiefly necessitative meaning by the time of the publication of the *Nabożeństwo* in 1771, and that the older existential meaning attested in the 1753 evangeliary had been lost by then. This may also be indicated by the fact that cases of the debitive attested in later Latgalian texts from the 19th century chiefly feature a necessitative meaning as well, as the discussion of a few relevant examples from these texts shall illustrate.

2.2. The debitive in the 19th century

The first sample of 19th-century Latgalian texts that we shall look at is a series of calendars issued by the famous scholar Gustav von Manteuffel (1832–1916) between 1862 and 1871, more than one hundred years after the publication of the 1753 evangeliary.⁵ The period of the publication of the calendars partly overlaps with

⁵ In the period between the publication of the 1753 evangeliary and the 1771 *Nabożeństwo* on the one hand and the calendars issued between 1862 and 1871 on the other hand, debitives are, of course, not wanting in Latgalian sources. During our survey, we encountered several debitives in the following two books on religious matters: the well-known *Wyssa Mocieyba Katolizska* (WM) issued by the Society of Jesus in Polotsk in 1805 and attributed to Michael Roth (i. a. *jo--tur* 55,16.22; *jo--it* 79,10f.; *jo--nustupiey* 98,14; *jo--iznas* 114,15–16), and the book bearing the title *Cytwaks jszkigs* (CJ) published by the Society of Jesus in Polotsk

the period of prohibition of publications in Latin script in the Russian Empire that lasted from 1865 to 1904 and also essentially affected Latgalian publications, because these were usually written in Latin script. The calendars appeared under the title *Inflantuziemies Lajkagromota aba Kalenders* and served several purposes: they provided profane information (e.g. pertaining to the lunar phases) as well as religious information (concerning the Catholic liturgical year) on the days of each respective year and featured a variety of prose and poetical texts relating to the everyday life in agricultural Latgale. This makes the calendars a very important and authentic source for information on the contemporary Latgalian idiom.

In light of this, it is a non-trivial observation that the calendars abundantly feature debitive constructions. For our study, we surveyed the 5 calendars issued in 1864, 1865, 1866, 1870 and 1871, respectively. All of these attest debitives several times; in total, we count 53 attestations.⁶ Quite interestingly, all these attestations feature a necessitative meaning. The following two cases of DEB-construction featured in (12) and (13) shall serve as representative examples illustrating the use of the debitive in the calendars.

(12) ILK 1865, 41,1

Kas	ir	jodor	kab	sirs	nebyutu	ryugts?
what.INT.	COP.3PRES.	do.DEB.	CONJ.	cheese.	NEG=COP.	bitter.NOM.
NOM.SG.M.				NOM.SG.	3SUBJ.	SG.M.

‘What needs to be done so that cheese does not get bitter?’

This sentence consists of a main clause constituted by *kas ir jodor* and a subordinate complement clause consisting in *kab sirs nebyutu ryugts*. It is formulated as a question that constitutes the title of a short practical guide dedicated to giving an answer to the eponymous question how it can be avoided that cheese gets bitter. The DEB-construction here is obviously embedded in the main clause *kas ir jodor* in that 3SG.COP. *ir* and the debitive form *jodor* function as the predicate of the clause.

in 1808 (i. a. *josasorgoy* [23,14–15]; *jo nustōwiew* [21,11]; *jokaryioy* [27,23–25]; *jō miekley* [43,12]; *jō walay* [55,7]; *jō beznuciejoy* [83,19]). In the interest of space and time, we must refrain from discussing the debitives in these sources in detail, but it is certainly worth mentioning them, because they vouch for the diachronic stability of the debitive in Latgalian.

⁶ The 1864 calendar (ILK 1864) attests 18 DEB-constructions to the following verbs: *jo-izsmierej* (41,5); *jo-dziejwoj*, *jo-moksoj* (50,3–5); *jopasałajž* (51,32–33); *jo-dora* (54,1–2); *jō-kop* (62,2–3); *jo-īt* (64,26); *jomoksoj* (67,4; 67,14–16; 67,17–18; 67,21–22; 67,23–24; 67,32; 68,4; 68,34; in the variant *jo-moksoj* 69,5–6); *jowad* (69,21–22); *jo-dzid* (77,2). – The 1865 issue (ILK 1865) features 13 DEB-constructions to the following verbs: *jodor* (41,1); *jomoksoj* (51,4; 51,14–16; 52,1–3; 52,6–7; 52,8–9; 52,17; 52,21; 53,24; 53,32–33; 54,3–4); *jowad* (54,16–17); *jo-dzid* (58,2). – In the 1866 calendar (ILK 1866), we find only three debitives: *jozawier* (50,34); *jōapbier* (52,22–23); *joworgoj* (56,7–8). – The 1870 issue (ILK 1870) attests 16 DEB-constructions to the following verbs: *jowielej* (41,10); *josoka* (42,27–28; 52,2–3; 52,28–30); *jobrauc* (52,27); *jostrodoj* (59,35–60,1); *jo-sin* (62,17–18); *jo-stiejdz* (62,19); *josiej* (62,20); *jołyukoj* (62,23); *jokul* (62,24); *jonubiejdz*, (62,27–28); *jogodoj*, *jowad* (62,37–38); *joswietiej* (69,25; 69,38–39). – In the 1871 calendar (ILK 1871), we count three occurrences: *jokajta* (41,10–12); *jozakauniej* (44,7–8); *jo-siej* (52,1–4).

As in (6)–(8) and (11), the construction lacks a direct object: the referent of the subject NOM.SG.M. *kas* serves as the patient of the action expressed by the predicate *ir jodor* so that there is no functional need for a direct object that would designate the patient. At the same time, the clause lacks morphosyntactic manifestation of the agent of the action expressed by the predicate.

The context makes it clear that we are here, again, dealing with a necessitative debitive: it refers to the things that there is a necessity to do when trying to avoid that cheese turns bitter. The same meaning is encountered in the other attestations of the debitive that the calendars provide. Our second example in (13) further illustrates this point.

(13) ILK 1871, 44,7–8

<i>tikwîn</i>	<i>natykuma</i>	<i>cyłwakam</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>jozakauniej</i>
only.ADV.	reprobation. GEN.SG.	human.DAT.PL.	COP.3PRES.	embarrass. REFL.DEB.

‘People must only be embarrassed for their reprobation.’

This DEB-construction encountered in a short aphorism section is interesting for two reasons: it (a) illustrates the necessitative meaning of the debitive in the 19th-century Latgalian calendars, and (b) shows that the debitive was fully integrated into the Latgalian morphological system as a distinct inflectional feature of the verb. The necessitative meaning of the DEB-construction here is rather straightforward and corresponds to the example in (12): it refers to the religious and moral demand that humans be ashamed of their reprobation. What is especially interesting here is the morphological makeup of the DEB-construction: we are dealing with a simple main clause the predicate of which is constituted by the copula 3PRES. *ir* and the reflexive debitive form *jozakauniej*, while the subject of the predicate is supplied by DAT.PL. *cyłwakam* the referent of which functions as the agent of the action expressed by the predicate. Quite interestingly, the predicate is complemented by a GEN. form, namely GEN.SG. *natykuma*. The morphosyntactic analysis of this form essentially depends on the status of the predicate *jozakauniej*: (a) if the predicate is taken as a truly reflexive, intransitive verb-form, the referent of the subject DAT.PL. *cyłwakam* functions as both the agent and patient of the action expressed by the predicate so that there is no functional need for a direct object and GEN.SG. *natykuma* must function as an adverbial GEN. form (*genitivus causae* or *genitivus criminis*); (b) if, however, the predicate is understood as a lexicalised reflexive, transitive verb-form, the referent of the subject DAT.PL. *cyłwakam* only functions as the agent of the action expressed by the verb so that the role of the patient of the verbal action could be filled by GEN.SG. *natykuma* which would then be expressed as a direct GEN. object. This issue cannot be decided here, but it shows that the debitive must have been fully established as an inflectional feature of the verb in Latgalian by the time of the calendars. We can conclude this from two observations. Firstly, the debitive

could obviously be formed from non-reflexive as well as reflexive verbs, as *jodor* in (12) and *jozakaunieĵ* in (13) illustrate. It was thus not restricted to a specific inflectional type of verb but could generally modify any verb morphologically.⁷ Secondly, the debitive conformed to the established agreement patterns of the verbs from which it was formed. The GEN- form *natykuma* in the construction in (13) is best motivated from the fact that the verb *kaunĕties* ‘be embarrassed’ underlying the predicate *jozakaunieĵ* usually governs the GEN. in Latvian (cf. LDW, s.v. *kāunĕt*). Thus it seems that the verb retained its original agreement pattern in Latgalian, when the debitive was formed from it, implying that the agreement pattern of a respective DEB-construction was determined by the underlying verb to some degree.⁸ On the synchronic level represented by the calendars, the debitive may therefore be regarded as a specific inflectional feature of the Latgalian verb. We can thus conclude rather faithfully that the debitive had already been established as a specific morpho-syntactic category of the verb in the 19th-century Latgalian idiom that the calendars represent. This is also indicated by the debitive cases that are featured in the second and last sample of 19th-century Latgalian texts that we shall now take a look at, namely a collection of Latgalian texts published by the Polish ethnographer Stefania Ulanowska (Ulanowska 1891–1895).

Ulanowska’s collection is a valuable and unique source for the study of late 19th-century Latgalian, because for the first time it presents a variety of contemporary Latgalian fairytales and songs that Ulanowska personally collected during her field trips through Latgale (Polish Livonia). Thereby, her collection provides an authentic picture of the contemporary vernacular spoken by the rural population. It is, therefore, no trivial observation that the texts in Ulanowska’s collection make abundant use of the debitive in a chiefly necessitative meaning.⁹ The two representative examples in (14) and (15) shall illustrate this.

⁷ The attestation of the reflexive debitive form *josasorgoy* in the *Cytwaks jszkĕgs* (cf. fn. 5) implies that the debitive could be formed from reflexive verbs already by 1808.

⁸ The validity of this claim is somewhat constrained by the synchronically non-canonical DAT. marking of subjects that we frequently find in the debitive instead of the expected NOM. marking, as the cases in (1) and (5)–(6) illustrate. This is most probably the remnant of an originally non-finite type of predication (cf. the discussion in section 1). It should, however, not go unnoticed that we also find the expected NOM. marking in the DEB-construction quite frequently, as the examples in (2)–(4) and (7)–(8) illustrate. This also indicates that the morphosyntactic makeup of DEB-constructions was at least partly determined by basic verbal agreement patterns.

⁹ All in all, we count 20 secure occurrences of DEB-constructions to the following verbs: *jōsadloj* (vol. 2, 137–138, 26.3–4); *jō-it’/jōit/jō-it* (vol. 2, (132), 40.5; vol. 3, 281,25–26.328,22.361,33.362,24–25.372,31–32); *[j]jō-za-ciel* (vol. 2, (132), 40.6); *jomal* (vol. 2, (132), 40.7); *jōsieĵaj* (vol. 2, (132), 40.8); *jōmiekleĵ* (vol. 3, 253,38–39); *jō-stajgoj* (vol. 3, 260,38–39); *jōdziewoj* (vol. 3, 275,40–41); *jōpamat* (vol. 3, 356,35); *jōbraūkoj* (vol. 3, 377,34–35); *jōgajda* (vol. 3, 394,42–395,22); *jōdud’* (vol. 3, 403,34–35); *jostopšt’* (vol. 3, 477,22–23); *jōcisz* (vol. 3, 487,26–27); *jō-plesz* (vol. 3, 491,36).

(14) Ulanowska 1891–1895: vol. 2, (132), 40.5–8

<i>Gūlatu</i>	<i>mań</i>	<i>jō-it'</i> , //
sleep.SUP.	1SG.DAT.	go.DEB.
<i>Rējtu</i>	<i>āgri</i>	<i>[j]jō-za-ciel</i> , ¹⁰ //
tomorrow.ADV.	early.adv.	get_up.REFL.DEB.
<i>Smōlka</i>	<i>mājziejtia</i>	<i>jomal</i> , //
fine.NOM./ACC.SG.F.	small_bread.NOM./ACC.SG.	grind.DEB.
<i>Ostru</i>	<i>sītu</i>	<i>jōsiejaj</i> .
sharp.INSTR.SG.M.	sieve.INSTR.SG.	sift.DEB.
‘Spać mi trzeba iśc. //		‘ I have to go to sleep, //
Jutro rano wstać , //		get up early tomorrow, //
Drobno chlebek zmleć , //		grind the (small) bread finely, //
Ostrem sitem przeciać. ’		sift (it) through a sharp sieve.’

These four lines form the second half of a short song dedicated to householding duties. Each of them constitutes a main clause and displays a debitive functioning as its predicate: *jō-it'* in line 5, *[j]jō-za-ciel* in line 6, *jomal* in line 7 and *jōsiejaj* in line 8. The subject of each clause is 1SG.DAT. *mań* overtly expressed in line 5, but elliptically suppressed in the following lines. Its referent also fills the position of the agent of the action expressed by each predicate. Otherwise, the morphosyntactic structure is rather straightforward: the predicates *jō-it'* and *[j]jō-za-ciel* of the clauses in lines 5 and 6 are intransitive so that they do not require an object, while the predicates *jomal* and *jōsiejaj* of the clauses in lines 7 and 8 are transitive and may therefore be construed with a direct object. It seems that this object is supplied by NOM./ACC. SG.F. *smōlka mājziejtia* in line 7. These forms are ambiguous in that theoretically they could be analysed as NOM. or ACC. equally well. The overall morphosyntactic context, however, makes it rather probable that we are dealing with ACC. forms so that the case of *smōlka mājziejtia* would mirror that of *kaydas pakutas* in (10) above. In any case, the referent of *smōlka mājziejtia* must be conceived of as the patient of the action expressed by *jomal* in line 7, and it is also very likely that it functions as the patient of the action expressed by *jōsiejaj* in the clause of the following line 8. In this case, *smōlka mājziejtia* could be conceived of as the elliptically suppressed direct object of the clause so that both the subject/agent and object/patient of the predicate would be suppressed. Be that as it may, given the overall morphosyntactic structure and context of the DEB-constructions here, there can be no doubt that the meaning of the debitives is necessitative: they refer to the obligation of the speaker to go to sleep, get up in the morning, grind the bread and sift it through a sieve. We encounter

¹⁰ The form *pō-za-ciel* printed in Ulanowska's text is almost certainly a misprint for *jō-za-ciel*; there is no productive preverb *pō* (which would reflect Central Latvian *†pā*) in Latgalian which, as far as we can see, only features *pa*.

the same meaning and a similar morphosyntactic situation in the second example from Ulanowska's collection that we shall look at in (15).

(15) Ulanowska 1891–1895: vol. 3, 275, ll. 40–41

<i>Ni</i>	<i>zyrgu</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>cyŭkys</i>
NEG.	horse.ACC.SG.	NEG.	pig.ACC.PL.
<i>jôdziejwoj</i>	<i>taj</i>	<i>pat'</i>	<i>tagad!</i>
live.DEB.	so.ADV.	EMPH.	now.ADV.

'(We have) neither a horse nor swine (left), and **have to live** like this now!'¹¹

The debitive form *jôdziejwoj* is here embedded in the main clause *jôdziejwoj taj pat' tagad* the predicate of which it constitutes. As the predicate is intransitive, we do not expect the clause to feature a direct object. Quite interestingly, however, the clause also lacks a subject so that the agent of the action denoted by the predicate remains unexpressed; it must be inferred from the context pragmatically. We are thus dealing with an impersonal construction comparable to the cases in (6) and (7), showing that elliptic suppression of arguments and forming impersonal constructions are genuine features of the Latgalian debitive. Furthermore, there can be no serious doubt that the debitive here has a necessitative meaning: it expresses the inevitable necessity that without their livestock (swine and horse) the speaker (the man) and listener (his wife) have to live miserably, thus illustrating that by the time of Ulanowska's records the debitive had acquired a predominantly necessitative function.

With these observations we close our survey of debitives in Latgalian texts from the 18th and 19th century. It has shown that (a) the debitive had already been established as a morphosyntactic formation of the verb in Latgalian by the beginning of its written record in the middle of the 18th century, that (b) since then it was in active use during the remainder of the 18th century as well as during the 19th century even in the spoken vernacular of the rural population, that (c) it originally featured an existential as well as necessitative meaning, and that (d) over time it acquired a chiefly necessitative meaning. As already pointed out in the discussion in section 1, these findings have major diachronic implications for the development of the debitive in Latvian in general that shall be discussed in the concluding section 3 now.

¹¹ Ulanowska's (1891–1895: vol. 1, 275, l. 21) translation somehow obscures the original debitive: "Ani koni, ani ţwini, obral nas ze wszystkiego!" – "(We have) neither a horse nor swine (left), he deprived us of everything!"

3. Conclusion: the Proto-Latvian age of the debitive

It has already been pointed out in the introduction in section 1 that theoretically there are three possible scenarios by which the Latvian debitive could have come into being: (I) as an independent innovation of the dialects dating from after the breakup of Proto-Latvian, (II) as an innovation of only one dialect or dialect area from which it spread to other dialects/dialect areas secondarily, or (III) as a Proto-Latvian innovation that was inherited by the dialects after the breakup of Proto-Latvian. Our findings on the debitive in Latgalian finally allow us to test these three scenarios and establish the age of the debitive.

With regard to scenario (I), it must be noted that we only have sufficient reason to interpret the debitive as an independent innovation of the Latvian dialects if the debitive is attested rather late in the documented history of the dialects and does not occur in older sources but only in newer ones. This would indicate that the debitive was not present in the dialects since the beginning of their documentation so that it may have come into being in the recent history of the individual dialects. Otherwise, the debitive would be attested early enough to allow for the assumption that it was inherited from Proto-Latvian, so that it could not be regarded as an independent innovation of the individual dialects with sufficient probability. Something very similar holds true with regard to scenario (II), which can only claim sufficient probability under two conditions. Firstly, the debitive must be attested in one dialect or dialect area much earlier than in another dialect or dialect area so that we have reason to assume that it came up in the former before it came up in the latter, allowing for the possibility that it can have entered the latter through contact with the former. Otherwise, the chronology of the attestation of the debitive in the two dialects or dialect areas remains too similar to allow for such an assumption. Secondly, the contact of the two dialects or dialect areas in general must be established on independent grounds. Otherwise, there would be no need to surmise a contact situation of the two dialects or dialect areas at all.

Given these preconditions and the Latgalian findings presented in the discussion in section 2 above, it seems that neither (I) nor (II) are probable scenarios explaining the emergence and development of the debitive in Latvian. In the first place, there is no indication whatsoever that the debitive emerged in the dialects or dialect areas independently or that it came up in one dialect or dialect area first and entered another dialect or dialect area secondarily: our findings show rather clearly that the debitive is continuously attested in Latgalian since the very beginning of its written record in the 18th century so that we have no reason *a priori* to assume that it came up secondarily. Quite on the contrary, the early and continuous attestation of the debitive implies that it always constituted a genuine part of Latgalian morphology ever since its split-off from the other Latvian dialects. We can thus establish the debitive as a morphological formation in early strata of both Central Latvian as

later featured by the standard language and High Latvian as featured by Latgalian and Selonian dialects (cf. the discussion in section 1.2). While there still remains some very low probability that the debitive could have come up in these two branches of Latvian dialects independently, it is the most economical and historically adequate assumption that this early, common and continuous attestation of the debitive in the two branches is owed to the fact that these simply inherited the debitive as such from their common ancestor, i.e. Proto-Latvian. The advantage of this account over the alternative is that it needs to presuppose only one formation process of the debitive in Proto-Latvian times, while the alternative requires the assumption of at least two independent formation processes of the debitive in Central and High Latvian in post-Proto-Latvian times. Scenario (I) is therefore very unlikely.

The same holds true for scenario (II). Apart from the fact that the assumption of a Proto-Latvian development of the debitive is the most economical one, there is no clear evidence that the debitive might have entered one of the dialect branches through contact with the other branch, because both the Central and High Latvian branches feature the debitive early enough to assume that it always constituted a genuine part of their respective morphological systems. Theoretically, one could assume with Seržant & Taperte (2016, 209) that the debitive originated in the Central Latvian dialect area between the 14th and 15th century and that it entered the High Latvian branch secondarily. It is, indeed, conceivable that contact with dialects of urban centres largely based on Central Latvian as in Riga may have resulted in the adoption of the debitive by High Latvian dialects. However, this is probable only with regard to the High Latvian dialects spoken in the North-Western Livonian area (in the historical territory of the Duchy of Livonia and Swedish Livonia) and the Selonian area (in the historical territory of the Duchy of Courland and Semigallia) that remained administratively adjoined with Central Latvian dialect areas during their chequered political history.

Contact with Central Latvian dialects is very unlikely in the case of the High Latvian dialects spoken in Latgalian territory, because this is well-known to have been politically separated from the rest of Livonia, Semigallia and Selonia and the Central and High Latvian dialects spoken in these areas, when it came under the dominion of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the middle of the 16th century. This separation continued, when in the course of the First Partition of Poland Latgale came under the administration of the Russian Empire in 1772, and lasted until 1920, when ultimately it became part of the nation state of Latvia. These centuries of political and administrative separation fostered an independent development of the High Latvian dialects in Latgale free from Central Latvian influence. It is, therefore, a significant observation that Latgalian sources continuously attest the debitive since the very beginning of the documented history of the Latgalian idiom, because it is very unlikely that the debitive was adopted by Latgalian through contact with Central Latvian dialects or other High Latvian dialects that had acquired the debitive through

contact with Central Latvian dialects themselves. In line with this expectation, our comparison of relevant passages from the 1753 Latgalian evangeliary with the corresponding passages in earlier Central Latvian gospel translations in section 2.1 has indeed shown rather clearly that the use of the debitive in the Latgalian idiom featured in the 1753 evangeliary was independent and free from Central Latvian influence. This makes scenario (II) very improbable.

What remains as the only option compatible with the Latgalian findings presented in our survey is scenario (III) which conforms to our observations very well: as the debitive (a) is independently and continuously attested in dialects from both the Central Latvian as well as the High Latvian (Selonian, Latgalian) branch since the earliest times, and (b) cannot have entered the Latgalian variety of High Latvian through contact with other dialects, the most straightforward and economical conclusion is that the dialects have inherited the debitive from their common ancestor, namely Proto-Latvian. The functional motivation and systemic conditions having led to the creation of the debitive will therefore have to be sought in the grammatical makeup of Proto-Latvian.

Grammatical Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person

ACC. = accusative

ACT. = active

ADV. = adverb

AOR. = aorist

CONJ. = conjunction

COP. = copula

DAT. = dative

DEB. = debitive

DEM. = demonstrative pronoun

F. = feminine

FUT. = future

GEN. = genitive

IND. = indicative

INDEF. = indefinite pronoun

INF. = infinitive

INT. = interrogative pronoun

IPV. = imperative

LOC. = locative

M. = masculine

N. = neuter

NEG. = negator/negation

NOM. = nominative

PASS. = passive

PL. = plural

POSS. = possessive form
PREP. = preposition
PRES. = present
PRET. = preterite
QUANT. = quantifier
REFL. = reflexive form
REL. = relative pronoun
SG. = singular
SUBJ. = subjunctive
VOC. = vocative

References

- Auziņa, Ilze et al. 2015. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. 2. izdevums. Rīga: Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Andronovs, Aleksejs. 1998. Vajadzības izteiksme latviešu valodas gramatiskajā tradīcijā. *Baltu filoloģija* 8, 154–177.
- Balode, Laimute & Axel Holvoet. 2001. The Latvian language and its dialects. Östen Dahl & Maria Koptevskaja-Tamm (eds.). *The Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and contact*. Vol 1. *Past and present*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 3–40.
- Cibuļs, Juris & Lidija Leikuma. 2003. *Vasals! Latgāliešu valodas mācība*. [Rīga:] n.i.m.s.
- CJ = *Cytwaks jszkigs aba mocieyba ab karrybom cytwaka*. Polotsk: Society of Jesus, 1808.
- CV = *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis*. Rome: Typographia Apostolica Vaticana, 1592.
- Daugavet, Anna. 2017. A corpus-based study of the Latvian debitive vs vajadzēt. *Baltic Linguistics* 8, 9–56.
- Elger, Georg[ius]. 1672. *Evangelia Toto Anno Singulis Dominicis & Festis diebus juxta antiquam Ecclesiae consuetudinem in Livonia Lothavis praelegi Solita*. Vilnius: Society of Jesus.
- Endzelin 1901a = Endzelīns, Jānis. Kā cēlies un lietojams latviešu valodas dēbitīvs? *Rakstu krājums* 13, 1–6 (reprinted in Endzelīns, Jānis. *Darbu izlase*. I, 138–142. Rīga: Zinātne, 1971).
- Endzelin, J[an]. 1901b. Ursprung und gebrauch des lettischen debitive. *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 26, 66–74 (reprinted in Endzelīns, Jānis. *Darbu izlase*. I, 143–150. Rīga: Zinātne, 1971).
- Endzelin, J[an]. 1922. *Lettisches Lesebuch. Grammatische und metrische Vorbemerkungen, Texte und Glossar*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Endzelin, J[an]. 1923. *Lettische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- EvEp = *Evangelia und Episteln aus dem deudfchen in undeudfche Sprache gebracht*. Königsberg: Osterberger, 1587.
- EvTA = *Evangelia Toto Anno Singulis Dominicis & Festis diebus juxta antiquam Ecclesiae consuetudinem in Livonia Lothavis praelegi Solita*. Vilnius: Society of Jesus, 1753 (ed. Stafecka 2004).
- Gāters, Alfrēds. 1993. *Lettische Syntax. Die Dainas*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Holvoet, Axel. 1997. Notes on the Latvian debitive. *Res Balticae* 3, 141–152.
- Holvoet, Axel. 1998. Notes on the rise and grammaticalisation of the Latvian debitive. *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 101–118.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2000. Infinitival relative clauses in Latvian: their structure, development and tendency towards lexicalisation. *Linguistica Lettica* 7, 99–116.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2001a. Mood and modality in Latvian. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 54 (3), 226–252.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2001b. *Studies in the Latvian verb*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

- Holvoet, Axel. 2013. Obliqueness, quasi-subjects and transitivity in Baltic and Slavonic. Ilija A. Seržant & Leonid Kulikov (eds.). *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subject*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 257–282.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2015. Latvian passives – personal, impersonal and evidential. Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.), *Voice and argument structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 367–394.
- Holvoet, Axel & Marta Grzybowska. 2014. Non-canonical grammatical relations in a modal construction. The Latvian debitive. Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.). *Grammatical relations and their non-canonical encoding in Baltic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 97–135.
- ILK = [Manteuffel, Gustav], ed. 1861[1862]–1871. *Infantuziemies ļaņķagromota aba kalenders*. 10 issues. JT = *Tas Jauns Testaments Muhfu Kunga Jesus Kristus*. Riga: Wilcken, 1685.
- Kalnača, Andra. 2016. Nenoteiksmē, modalitātē un verba nullformas latviešu valodā. *Valoda: nozīme un forma* 7, 41–49.
- Kauliņš, J. 1889. Ueber die (lettische) Mundart von Saussen und Feheln (Livland) (Schluss). *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 14, 116–151.
- LDW = Mühlenbach, K[arl] & J[an] Endzelin. 1923–1932. *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. 4 vols. Riga: Lettischer Kulturfonds.
- Lokmane, Ilze & Andra Kalnača. 2014. Modal semantics and morphosyntax of the Latvian debitive. Elisabeth Leiss & Werner Abraham (eds.). *Modes of modality. Modality, typology, and universal grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 167–191.
- Mancelius, Georg[ius]. 1631. *Lettisch Vade mecum*. Riga: Schröder.
- Metuzāle-Kangere, Baiba & Kersti Boiko. 2001. Case systems and syntax in Latvian and Estonian. Östen Dahl & Maria Koptevskaja-Tamm (eds.). *The Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and contact*. Vol 2. *Grammar and typology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 481–498.
- Mühlenbach 1907 = Мјуленбахъ, К. О debitive. *Izvēstija otdēlenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk* 12 (3), 313–333.
- NA = Aland, Barbara & Kurt et al., eds. 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Nab = *Naboženstwo ku czci i chwale Boga w Trojcy S. jedynego*. Vilnius: Society of Jesus, 1771.
- Nau, Nicole. 2011. *A Short Grammar of Latgalian*. München: LINCOM.
- Nau, Nicole. 2014. Differential object marking in Latgalian. Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.). *Grammatical Relations and their Non-Canonical Encoding in Baltic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 207–255.
- Ozols, Arturs. 1993. *Latviešu tautasdziesmu valoda*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- Prellwitz, W. 1904. Zur entstehung des lettischen debitivs. *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 28, 319.
- Seržant, Ilija A. 2013. The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects and subject-like obliques. Ilija A. Seržant & Leonid Kulikov (eds.). *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 313–360.
- Seržant, Ilija A. 2016. The nominative case in Baltic in a typological perspective. Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.). *Argument realization in Baltic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 137–198.
- Seržant, Ilija A. & Jana Taperte. 2016. Differential argument marking with the Latvian debitive. A multifactorial analysis. Axel Holvoet & Nicole Nau (eds.). *Argument realization in Baltic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 199–258.
- SLV = Šiško, Silvija & Aleksejs Apinis (eds.). 1999. *Seniespiedumi latviešu valodā, 1525–1855*. Rīga: Latvijas Nacionālā bibliotēka.
- Stafecka, Anna. 2004. *Evangelia toto anno 1753. Pirmā latgaliešu grāmata*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Ulanowska, Stefania. 1891–1895. *Łotyże inflant polskich a w szczególności z gminy Wielońskiej powiatu Rzeżyckiego*. 3 vols. Kraków: *Nakładem akademii umiejętności*.
- Vanags, Pēteris. 2000. Debitīva formu lietojums visvecākajos latviešu rakstos. *Baltu filoloģija* 9, 143–156.

Wälchli, Bernhard. 2000. Infinite predication as a marker of evidentiality and modality in the languages of the Baltic region. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 53 (2), 186–210.

WM = *Wyssa Mocieyba Katolizska*. Polotsk: Society of Jesus, 1805.

Simon Fries

Eugen Hill

Institut für Linguistik, Abt. Historisch-vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft

Universität zu Köln

D-50923 Köln, Deutschland

simon.fries@uni-koeln.de

eugen.hill@uni-koeln.de

KOPSAVILKUMS

LATVIEŠU VALODAS DEBITĪVA VECUMS: LATGALIEŠU VALODAS LIECĪBAS

Simon Fries, Eugen Hill

Rakstā mēģināts noteikt latviešu debitīva vecumu, sistemātiski izpētot tā lietojumu latgaliešu materiālos. Kamēr debitīvs senākajos vidus dialektā balstītajos latviešu valodas pieminekļos ir plaši pētīts, senākos latgaliešu avotos debitīvs līdzvērtīgu interesi vēl nav izpelnījies. Šajā rakstā ir mēģināts sniegt sistemātisku vēsturisku pārskatu par debitīvu, kas sastopams 18. un 19. gadsimta latgaliešu avotos. Pārskats rāda, ka debitīvs latgaliešu rakstos ir droši apliecināts jau kopš to aizsākuma un, visticamāk, tas vienmēr ir bijis īsts latgaliešu morfosintakses elements. Tā kā latgaliešu valoda līdz 20. gadsimtam attīstījās brīvi no vidus dialekta un tā rakstu ietekmes, šiem atklājumiem ir liela nozīme debitīva vecuma noteikšanā: debitīva sastopamība latgaliešu un vidus dialekta latviešu rakstu valodā liek domāt, ka debitīvs ir kopīgs latviešu dialektu jauninājums, kas datējams ar latviešu pirmvalodas laiku.