PERIPHRASTIC CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
IN 16TH CENTURY LATVIAN[1]

Jurgis PAKERYS
Vilnius University

1. Introduction

Periphrastic causative constructions (PCCs) employ free verbal forms to mark causative situations and can be subdivided into factitive (= English *make*) and permissive (= English *let*) types (Nedjalkov & Sil'nickij 1969: 28; Nedyalkov & Silnitsky 1973: 10; Kulikov 2001: 886–887, 892). In modern Latvian, factitive PCCs are most frequently based on the verb *likt*, while permissive PCCs typically employ the verb *ļaut*, cf. (1a) and (1b). PCCs based on other predicates are used only marginally, namely with the verbs *spiest* 'make' and *dot, laist* 'let' (Pakerys 2016: 446–455). The affected participants of the causative situation are termed "causee" and "permittee" respectively and are marked as dative in *likt*- and *ļaut*-constructions:

(1) a. *Smēķēšana*   **liek**   **sašaurināties**
         smoking:NOM.SG make:PRS.3 contract:INF.RFL

     asinsvadiem
     blood.vessels:DAT.PL

                                                          LVK2013

     'Smoking makes blood vessels contract.'

     b. **Ļauj**   *viņai*   **palikt**   *pie*   *manis*
        let:IMP.2SG 3.DAT.SG.F stay:INF at   1SG.GEN

                                                          LVK2013

        'Let her stay with me.'

A preliminary overview of Latvian 16th and 17th century texts revealed that at an earlier stage, PCCs differed from their current use in a few ways. For example, it was not uncommon to use *likt* in some permissive contexts. Additionally, the PCCs with *laist* occurred more frequently, while those with *ļaut* were rare. This paper aims to describe Latvian PCCs based on a collection

---

of 16th c. texts. (Seventeenth century data will be presented in a separate later study.) The data analyzed in this study are collected from an electronic database of early Latvian texts[2] and include the main Latvian printings of the 16th century:

1. *Catechismvs Catholicorum* [...], Vilnius: Lancicius, 1585 (= CC1585)
2. *Enchiridion* [...]*,* Königsberg: Osterberger, 1586 (= Ench1586)
3. *Euangelia vnd Epiſteln* [...], Königsberg: Osterberger, 1587 (= EvEp1587)
4. *Vndeudsche Psalmen* [...], Königsberg: Osterberger, 1587 (= UP1587)

I reviewed non-lemmatized indices of these texts with the aim of finding all forms of *likt, laist, spiest, dot* and *ļaut* used in PCCs. The orthography of 16th c. Latvian varies considerably, but I hope to have collected the majority of forms, although some omissions are, of course, possible. The analysis presented below is organized according to the verbs used in the PCCs: *likt* (Section 2), *laist* (Section 3), *dot* (Section 4) and *spiest* (Section 5). I also searched for PCCs with *ļaut*, but found no examples. The main findings are summarized in the final section (Section 6).

2. Permissive and factitive *likt*

PCCs with *likt* are typically used as factitive 'make' in modern Latvian, and thus far, I have not found a good (non-ambiguous) modern example of a permissive construction with *likt*. The permissive function of *likt* in the 16th c. texts can be exemplified by (2a):

(2) a. Latvian
Touwe   *wärde*   **nhe**   **lecke**
POSS.2SG.ACC.M   word:ACC.SG   NEG   let:PRS.3

te te ſcham[=teſcham[3]]   **buut**
really   be:INF

(lit.) 'They do not really let your word to be [here].'

UP1587 LB$_{26\text{-}27}$

b. Low German[4]
*Dyn wort men **leth nicht bebben** [= **hebben**] war*

Vanags 2000: 216

---

3 Vanags 2000: 216.
4 Here and further, exact or textually close sources of Latvian translations will be given to show corresponding PCCs in High and Low German.

Out of 43 examples of PCCs with *likt*, twelve (27.9%) are permissive, as exemplified in (2a), while the remaining 31 (72%) are factitive. I also reviewed another use of *likt,* as 'put, set, lay, leave', and found 37 examples (46.25%) out of total of 80 forms of *likt* found in the corpus; this means that in more than half of the cases, *likt* was used in a PCC (see Table 1 at the end of this section). Distinguishing factitive function from permissive function is not straightforward in some contexts; I used the conservative approach of marking the construction as permissive only if it could not be interpreted as factitive. The majority of these permissive PCCs had negation, with the exception of one case presented in (3a). A clearly factitive use of *likt* is shown in (4a).

(3) a. Latvian

    es   *eſme* [...]   *Greeke*   **litczis**

    1SG.NOM   be:PRS.1SG   sin:ACC.SG   let:PST.ACT.PTCP.NOM.SG.M

    notickt

    happen:INF

    (lit.) 'I have [...] let the sin happen.'

                   Ench1586 F2B$_{19-20}$

   b. German

    hab [ich] [...] *ſchaden* ***laſſen geschehen***

                   WA 30.1 385

(4) a. Latvian

    Tad   **licke**   *Dews* [...]   *wene*   *czille*

    then   make:PST.3   god:NOM.SG   one:ACC.SG.M   deep:ACC.SG.M

    Mege   **kriſt**   *vs*   *to*   *Czilwheke*

    sleep:ACC.SG   fall:INF   on   DEM.ACC.SG.M   man:ACC.SG

    'Then God caused a deep sleep fall onto the man' (Genesis 2:21)

                   Ench1586 HB$_{16-17}$

   b. High German

    Da **ließ** *Gott [...] einen tieffen Schlaff* **fallen** */ auff den Menſchen*

                   III 100$_{10-11}$[5]

PCCs with verbs of cognition and perception ('let' + 'know', 'recognize', 'see', etc.) may resemble permissive PCCs, but they are best analyzed as factitive

---

[5] Only the German version of the wedding ceremony published in the Old Prussian *Small Catechism* was accessible to me.

(von Waldenfels 2012: 104). There were 8 cases of cognitive causation out of 31 factitive PCCs, cf. (5a):

(5) a. Latvian

mhes	*yums*	***ßinnat***	***lickam***
1PL.NOM	2PL.DAT/ACC	know:INF	let:PST.3

to Speetczibe vnde to atnäckſchenne [...]
'we let you know the power and the coming [...]'

<div align="right">EvEp1587 207₄₋₅ 2 Peter 1,16</div>

b. German
*wir euch **kundgetan haben** die Kraft und Zukunft*

<div align="right">LB1545 2 Peter 1:16</div>

The marking of causee and permittee in *likt*-constructions formally seems to fluctuate between dative and accusative (see Table 1 at the end of this section), but the majority of datives are in pronominal form, which can also be accusative. The forms showing this ambiguity are 1SG, 2SG, 1PL, 2PL, and RFL pronouns, cf. (5a) where *yums* is etymologically dative, but can be also used as accusative, as in (6a):

(6) a. Latvian

NHe thurretes	***yums***	*paſſchems*	*pär*	*Guddres.*
NEG hold:IMP.2PL.RFL	2PL.DAT/ACC	self:DAT.PL	for	wise.ACC.PL.M

<div align="right">EvEp1587 36₁₄ Romans 12:17</div>

'Do not estimate yourself to be wise'

b. German
*Haltet **euch** nicht selbst für klug.*

<div align="right">LB1545 Romans 12:17</div>

This type of case use is known not only in early Latvian texts where it can be interpreted as reflecting influence of Low German where homonymous pronominal forms are used (Vanags 1998: 43–44); this phenomenon is also noted in some dialects (see Endzelīns 1951: 510, 516). The only non-pronominal dative form is found in UP1587 L4₈: *tems greekems* 'these sins' (DAT.PL).

An interesting example is (7a), where *likt* is used in a reflexive construction[6] and the actual permittee is introduced by a PP with *no* 'from':

---

[6] Note that this type of reflexive construction is a copy of the German model to mark reflexivity (cf. Vanags 1993, 167); the expected original Latvian form would be *ßöw* for all persons.

(7) a. Latvian

> *nhe ledtcz thöw nhe **no** **wene** ʃaymoth*
> NEG let:IMP.2SG 2SG.DAT/ACC NEG from one:GEN.SG despise:INF
>
> EvEp1587 13$_8$ Titus 2:15
>
> 'Do not let yourself to be despised by anyone.'

b. High German

> *Laß dich **niemand** verachten*
>
> LB 1545 Titus 2:15

c. Low German

> *Lath dy **nemande** vorachten*
>
> LB 1599 [1545] Titus 2:15

As we see in (7b–c), the corresponding passage in Luther's Bible translation does not have a PP: either the translator used a different source or the Latvian PCC with PP *no* was already established to some extent in early written Latvian. An exact German correspondence can be seen in (8b):

(8) a. Latvian

> [...] *kha thas ßöw **no** **to***
> that DEM.NOM.SG.M RFL.DAT/ACC from DEM.ACC.SG.M
>
> *kruʃtyt lyckte*
> baptize:INF make:IRR.3
>
> EvEp1587 222$_{24}$–224$_1$ Matthew 3:13
>
> '[...] that he would be (lit. have himself) baptized by him.'

b. High German

> [...] *daß er sich **von ihm** taufen ließe*
>
> LB 1545 Matthew 3:13

c. Low German

> [...] *dat he **van em** do^{e}pen lethe*
>
> LB 1599 [1545] Matthew 3:13

PP-marking in similar PCCs is also known in Slavic languages (see von Waldenfels 2012: 134, 138–140, 187, 196, 260, 271) on PPs with Polish *przez* (also *od* in earlier texts) and Czech *od* (also *podle, skrze* in earlier texts). Latvian agent PPs with *no* 'from' were also used in passive constructions until the 19th c. following the German pattern of PPs with *von* (Holvoet 2016: 27); the same PPs with *no* in PCCs seem to reflect another instance of copying of the German model. In the case of morphological reflexives, syntactic

restructuring may also have taken place and facilitated borrowing (Holvoet 2016: 23–28), but it seems that the German parallel of the type illustrated in (8) probably played a crucial role.

Reflexive constructions of *likt* are also interesting in that they show a doubling of the reflexive marker; in general this is a well-known phenomenon in early Latvian texts (see Vanags 1993: 169). For example, the reflexive marker may occur just once as a morphologically independent form *ßöw*, as in (9a), or it can be doubled, as in (9c) and (9e), where *ßöw* is used and the reflexive morpheme *-s* is attached to the predicate of the INF-clause. It is interesting to note that the lines of (9a) and (9c) are close to each other yet differ in the presence/absence of *-s*. (The translator was not sure about the form of the reflexive construction at the same passage.)

(9) a. Latvian

vs	*to*	*ka*	*täs*	***ßöw***
on	DEM.ACC.SG.M	that	DEM.NOM.SG.M	RFL.DAT/ACC

mheſlote	*lickte*
tax:INF	tax:INF

EvEp1587 14₈ Luke 2:5

'that he would be taxed (lit. have himself taxed).'

b. German
*auf daß er **sich** schätzen ließe*

LB 1545 Luke 2:5

c. Latvian

ka	*the*	***ßöw***	*mheſlote-**s***	*lickte*
that	DEM.NOM.PL.M	RFL.DAT/ACC	tax:INF-RFL	make:IRR.3

EvEp1587 14₂₋₃ Luke 2:3

'so that they would be taxed.'

d. German
*daß er **sich** schätzen ließe*

LB 1545 Luke 2:3

e. Latvian

Dews	*nhe*	*leke*	***ßöw***	*apmhedite-**s***
god:NOM.SG	NEG	make:PRS.3	RFL.DAT/ACC	mock:INF-RFL

EvEp1587 176₃₋₄ Galatians 6:7

f. German
*Gott läßt **sich** nicht spotten!*

LB 1545 Galatians 6:7

Another technique to render the German reflexive construction *sich lassen* is to use the morphological reflexive *liktie-s*, but it should be noted that the syntactically independent reflexive *ßöw* is retained in all 3 attested cases of this type. An example of one such case is in (10a):

(10) a. Latvian

    Ka[s] titcz   *vnd* **ßöw**   *chruſtyt*   *leka-**s***
    who   believe:PRS.3   and   RFL:DAT/ACC   baptize:INF   make:PRS.3-RFL

                                            UP1587 K3A$_{17\text{-}18}$

    'who believes and has him-/her-self baptized.'

   b. German

    *Wer glaubt und **sich** taufen lässt*

                                          LB 1545 Mark 16:16[7]

German *sich lassen* (as a causative construction) can thus be rendered in Latvian in three ways:

    a) a syntactically independent reflexive marker *sev* is used (1 example)[8]
    b) same as (a), but the morphological reflexive marker *-s* is also added to *likt,* which is the predicate of the matrix clause (6 examples), or
    c) same as (a), but the morphological reflexive marker *-s* is also added to the transitive predicate of the subordinate infinitive clause (two examples).

In (b) and (c) we see that the locus of affixation of the reflexive marker fluctuates, but there is some preference to adjoin it to the matrix verb. As Holvoet (2016: 17) explains, the "reflexive marker is associated with the matrix clause verb in virtue of being controlled by its subject and with the embedded infinitive in virtue of being assigned a semantic role by it". There is also a third option when both the matrix verb and the embedded infinitive are affixed, but it was not attested in the analyzed texts (see Holvoet 2016: 17–18, 21–22 on Latvian constructions with reflexive *ļautie-s* and *liktie-s*).

---

[7]   This line is absent in the source presented in Vanags (2000: 62) so I have selected a corresponding passage from the Bible translation.

[8]   I counted only 3rd person reflexives, because 1st and 2nd person pronouns, which are used according to the German pattern (that is, *mich, dich*, etc.), never occur in constructions of the type (b) and (c).

Table 1

likt(ies) in 16ᵗʰ c. Latvian texts

	CC1585	Ench1586	EvEp1587	UP1587	Total
'put, set, lay, leave'	3	3	27	4	37 (46.25%)
'let'	0	**4**	**5**	**3**	**12** (15%)
Permittee — DAT	0	0	0	1	1
DAT=ACC	0	2	3	0	5
ACC	0	2	0	2[9]	4
PP *no*	0	0	1	0	1
Omitted	0	0	1	0	1
'make; have done; order, etc.'	0	**3**	**16**	**12**	**31** (38.75%)
Causee — Cognitive causation	0	1	3	4	8
DAT	0	0	0	2	2
DAT=ACC	0	2	1	3	6
ACC	0	1	4	2	7
Omitted	0	0	10	5	15
PP	0	0	1	0	1
Total	3	10	48	19	80

3. Permissive, hortative and optative *laist*

PCCs with *laist* are only marginally used in modern Latvian compared to those with *ļaut* (Pakerys 2016: 453, 455), but in 16ᵗʰ c. texts the situation is quite different: *laist* is well-attested and *ļaut* was not found in any of the texts surveyed for this study. I will start by discussing the basic permissive function of *laist* and then turn to its use in hortative and optative constructions. A typical permissive use is seen in (11a):

(11) a. Latvian

    Laydeth   *tös*   *Bherninges*   *py*
    let:IMP.2PL   DEM.ACC.PL.M   child:DIMIN.ACC.PL   to

    man   **_näckt_**
    1SG.DAT/ACC   come:INF

                                     Ench1586 I₁₃₋₁₄ (Mark 10:14)

    'Let the little children come to me.'

---

9 Including one case of genitive of negation.

b. German
*Laſt die kindlin ʒu myr **komen***

<div align="right">WA 12 45</div>

In two cases PCCs with *laist* were used with predicates of cognition, which can be interpreted as factitive, cf. above on *likt*, for example (note that the construction is passive):

(12) a. Latvian

Juuſe	*Laipnybe*	***laideth***
1PL.GEN	kindness:ACC.SG	let:IMP.2PL

ßinnamme	***buuth***	*wueſſims*	*czilwhekims*
know:PRS.PSS.PTCP.ACC.SG.F	be:INF	all:DAT.PL	man:DAT.PL

<div align="right">EvEp1587 10$_{22-23}$ Philippians 4:5</div>

'Let your kindness be known to all people.'

b. German
*Eure Lindigkeit **lasset kund sein** allen Menschen.*

<div align="right">LB 1545 Philippians 4:5</div>

Similarly to PCCs with *likt*, many permittees formally seem to be marked as dative, but the vast majority of them are expressed by pronominal forms (see Table 2 at the end of this section), which can also be used as accusative, except for one case of the noun in non-ambiguous dative in (13a):

(13) a. Latvian

Layd	***Atczems***	*yempt*	*ßouwe*	*Mege*
let:IMP.2SG	eye:DAT.PL	take:INF	POSS.RFL.ACC.SG.M	sleep:ACC.SG

<div align="right">UP1587 H2A$_{25}$</div>

'Let the eyes take their sleep.'

b. Low German
*Lath **ogen** nemen eren ſlaep*

<div align="right">Vanags 2000: 64</div>

In one reflexive construction, the actual permittee is coded by PP with *no*, cf. the discussion of this type in Section 2 above. Two High and Low German editions of the Luther's Bible translation were checked but they do not have PPs in this passage, as shown in (14b) and (14c). As mentioned previously, either other sources were used for the translation or the construction was used by the translator independently from the source.

(14) a. Latvian

Nhe	*laideth*	*yums*	*nhe*	**no**	**wene**	*pewilth*
NEG	let:IMP.2PL	1PL.DAT	NEG	from	one:GEN.SG	deceive:INF

EvEp1587 59,24 Ephesians 5:6

'Do not let yourselves be deceived by anyone.'

b. High German

*Lasset euch **niemand** verführen*

LB 1545 Ephesians 5:6

c. Low German

*Latet yuw **nemande** vorvoᵉren*

LB 1599 [1545] Ephesians 5:6

Latvian also has a 3rd person hortative/optative construction[10], which consists of the modal periphrastic marker *lai* and the present indicative[11]. The marker *lai* is a shortened form of *laid*, the 2nd person imperative of the permissive verb *laist* (see Endzelīns 1951: 893 with further references). This type of modal construction is attested in UP1587 and corresponds to the German subjunctive, as shown in (15a) and (15b) (cf. also *Layde gir* UP1587 H2₁₇ = Low German *sy*, see Vanags 1993: 173). In (15c), Latvian *laid* + PRS.3 corresponds to the German permissive construction, but the translation slightly differs.

(15) a. Latvian

Layd	**nake**	*touwe*	*walſtybe*
PTCL	come:PRS.3	POSS.2SG.NOM.F	kingdom:NOM.SG

UP1587 K3B₁₉

'May your kingdom come.'

b. Low German

*Idt **kame** dyn rick*

Vanags 2000: 166

---

[10] Following van der Auwera et al. 2013, I understand hortative (here, in 3rd person) as a construction that expresses the wish of the speaker and appeals to the addressee for the help to fulfill that wish; in contrast, the optative merely expresses the wish, but does not appeal to the addressee, cf. English 3rd person singular hortative *let him sing* vs. optative *may he live long*. In practice, however, it is not always easy to make a strict judgment on whether an appeal to the addressee is made.

[11] The past indicative is attested in folk songs (Endzelīns 1951: 893) and the future indicative can also be used in some cases (Holvoet 2007: 42, fn. 12).

c. Latvian

Laid _tems_ **_noteke_** _ko_ _the_
PTCL DEM.DAT.PL happen:PRS.3 what DEM.NOM.PL.M

doma
think:PRS.3

UP1587 LB₅₋₆

'Let their thoughts [lit. what they think] happen to them.'

d. Low German

Lath ſe drepen _ere böſe ſake_

Vanags 2000: 236

In total there are three instances of optative/hortative _laid_ + PRS.3; the rest are functionally hortative/optative, but are used with the infinitive. For example, in (16) the German subjunctive was first translated as the present indicative (Latvian _nake_ for Low German _kame_), but then the form _laid_ + INF was used to translate Low German _bliuen_ (also subjunctive):

(16) a. Latvian

Thaes _ßeeleſtibes_ _Walſtibe_ **_nake_**
DEM.GEN.SG.F mercy:GEN.SG kingdom:NOM.SG come:PRS.3

mums _kläth_ _vnd_ **_laid_** _exkan_ _mums_ **_pallickt_**
1PL.DAT/ACC near and PTCL inside 1PL.DAT/ACC stay:INF

UP1587 K4B₆

'May the kingdom of mercy come to us and may stay within us.'

b. Low German

Dat rike der gnaden **kame** vns tho / vnde do in vns **bliuen**

Vanags 2000: 225

In (17) the German subjunctive form _sei_ was translated into a full Latvian permissive construction with the permittee in the accusative, which corresponds to the German nominative; cf. also CC1585 62₅ where a shorter form _leij_ is used with the accusative. This use might illustrate the starting point of the development of optatives/hortatives with _laid_ (cf. Holvoet 2001: 63): the construction is formally permissive, but it can fulfill the function of the 3rd person hortative[12]:

---

[12] Note that there are more German forms of the subjunctive in the passage in EvEp1587 33–34, but a PCC with _laist_ was used only once.

(17) a. Latvian

Gir kadã paprexke ßluddenaſchenne /

thad	**laide**	**to**	*tay*	*titczibe*
then	let:IMP.2	DEM.ACC.SG.M	DEM.DAT.SG.F	faith:DAT.SG

lydtcze	**buuth**
similar:DAT.SG.F[13]	be:INF

'If one has [a gift of] prophecy then let it be similar to the faith'

EvEp1587 33$_{22\text{-}23}$ Romans 12:6

b. High German

*Hat jemand Weissagung, so **sei sie** dem Glauben **ähnlich***

LB 1545 Romans 12:6

c. Low German

*Hefft yemandt wyſſegginge / ſo **sy se** dem geloven **gelick***

LB 1599 [1545] Romans 12:6

A further step towards the later version of the hortative/optative could be as follows. First, the permittee originally coded by the accusative (or dative) would acquire nominative case (cf. Holvoet 2001: 63) to mark its prominence as a new subject of the construction. (Note that imperative constructions typically lack overtly expressed subjects so former permittees can assume the role of subject.) A similar change in case marking from direct object (accusative) to subject (nominative) is attested in the Russian modal *pust'*-constructions (Dobrušina 2016); cf. also the introduction of the nominative instead of the oblique case in Dutch *laten*-hortative, see Holvoet (2001: 63, fn. 1). At this point the infinitive may have still been retained; however, since it conflicts with the nominative subject, the infinitive may have then been replaced by the present indicative. The frequency of the use of *laist* in imperative forms might also have played a role in the formation of the optative/hortative with *laid*. For example, in UP1587, out of 32 permissive uses of *laist*, one third (11) were imperative 2nd person singular and plural forms.

---

[13] The last two datives are glossed following the demonstrative *tay* which bears unambiguous case marking of the entire NP; on dative with *-e*, see Vanags 1994: 127–128.

The final construction is the 1st person plural hortative, which is most likely a copy of the German *lass(e)t uns* + INF construction (cf. Vanags 1993: 174; Holvoet 2007: 42: authentic or influenced by German; see Pakerys 2017 on this construction in Old Prussian). In most cases, the 2nd person plural form *laidiet,* corresponding to the German *laß(e)t* as in (18a), is used, but in some cases the 2nd person singular form *laid(i)*, corresponding to the German 2nd person singular imperative *lass(e)* as in (18d), occurs:

(18) a. Latvian

     laydeet   **mums**   *nu*   **noedth**

     let:IMP.2PL   1PL.DAT/ACC   now   go:INF

                                   EvEp1587 15$_{19-20}$ Luke 2:15

     'Let us go now.'

   b. High German

     Laßt uns *nun* **gehen**

                                     LB 1545 Luke 2:15

   c. Low German

     Lathet *ʋns* *nu* [...] **gahn**

                                 LB 1599 [1545] Luke 2:15

   d. Latvian

     NV **laide**   **mums**   *to*   *Muerrone*   **aprackt**

     now let:IMP.2SG 1PL.DAT/ACC   DEM.ACC.SG.M corpse:ACC.SG bury:INF

                                   UP1587 M3A$_{22}$

     'Now let us bury the corpse.'

   e. Low German

     NV **lath** *ʋns* *den Lyff* **begrauen**

                                   Vanags 2000: 189

laist in 16th c. Latvian texts

	CC1585	Ench1586	EvEp1587	UP1587	Total
'release'	0	0	7	1	**8** (8.99%)
'let'	2	1	10	29	**42** (47.19%)
DAT	0	0	0	1	1
DAT=ACC	2	0	0	19	21
ACC	0	1	9	5	15
PP *no*	0	0	1	0	1
Omitted	0	0	0	4	4
'make' (cognitive causation)			2		**2** (2.25%)
Causee ACC			2		
Hortative 1st plural	0	3	16	8	**27** (30.34%)
laidiet:IMP.2PL		3	16	6	25
laid(i):IMP.2SG				2	2
Optative/hortative 3rd person	4	0	2	4	**10** (11.24%)
+PRS				3	3
+INF	4		2	1	7
Total	6	4	37	42	89

(Left margin rotated label for the 'let' sub-rows: *Permittee*)

4. Permissive *dot*

The verb *dot* 'give' is only marginally used as the permissive 'let, allow' in modern Latvian (Pakerys 2016: 454). In the studied corpus of 16th c. texts, perhaps only one case of a PCC with Latvian *dot* can be interpreted as permissive. However, this construction does not seem to be independent from the source of the translation. When compared with one of the versions of the catechism of Petrus Canisius, it is clear that the passage in question renders the German construction *sich zu erkennen geben*, cf. (19):

(19) a. Latvian

    Ka **doed** *ceuw*   *tha*   *milib* **paſiſth**

    how give:PRS.3 RFL.DAT/ACC DEM.NOM.SG.F love recognize:PRS.3[14]

                                          CC1585 14₄₋₅

    (lit.) 'How does love give itself to be recognized.'

    (= 'How can one recognize love.')

---

[14] Here, the 3rd person present tense form *pazīst* is used instead of the expected infinitive, *pazīt*.

    b. German
      *Wie **gibt ſich** die rechte Liebe **zuerkennen**?*[15]

In other cases, the use of *dot* can only to some extent be interpreted as permissive. These constructions are also closely tied to the sources and are of the type *God give* (IMP) + *that*-clause. In the sources of the texts of UP1587 (see Vanags 2000: 305 ff.), this construction in all cases (8 times) corresponds to Low German constructions with *gēven* or *vörlēhenen*: *Godt giff/vorlene vns dat* [...] (lit.) 'God give, provide us that', cf. (20). In these constructions, the interpretation may fluctuate between metaphorical transfer (giving, providing) of the event and allowing, permitting it.

(20) a. Latvian

dode	*mums /*	***ka***	*mhes*	*touwe*
give:IMP.2SG	1PL.DAT/ACC	that	1PL.NOM	POSS.2SG.ACC.M
myle	*Dhele*	***adβiſtam***	*vnde*	
beloved:ACC.SG.M	son:ACC.SG	recognize:PRS.1PL	and	
teitczam				
praise:PRS.1PL				

                                              UP1587 CA$_{11-13}$

(lit.) 'Give us so that we recognize and praise your beloved Son.'
(= 'Let us recognize and praise your beloved Son.')

    b. German
      giff *vns **dat** wy dinen leuen Sön **erkennen** vnde **pryſen***
                                      Vanags 2000: 306

This construction with a *that*-clause is also attested once in CC1585 and may correspond to the above-mentioned German constructions, but I could not locate the source of this passage:

---

[15] Petrus Canisius, *Catholischer Catechismus* [...], Köln: Maternus Cholinus, 1569, [97] (available online at: http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN816510229&PHYSID=PHYS_0005). The text on the given page in general differs from CC1585 14, but the question cited corresponds exactly to the Latvian passage and only the adjective *rechte* has no correspondence. See also Michelini (2001: 128, fn. 43) who compares this question with *Wie erzeigt sich unnd wird erkannt die wahre Christliche Liebe gegen dem Nechsten?* from the edition of the catechism of Canisius of 1584.

(21) a. Latvian

Dews	*dode*	*ka*	*Chriſto*	*tam*
god:NOM.SG	give:IMP.2SG	that	Christ:DAT.SG	DEM.DAT.SG.M

Kungam /	*cour*	*tho /*	*doudſe*
lord:DAT.SG	through	DEM.ACC.SG.M	many:?

cruſtites	*dweſceles*	*atweſte*
baptize:PST.PSS.PTCP.ACC.PL.F	soul:ACC.PL	bring:PST.PSS.PTCP.?[16]

war	*tapt*
be.able:PRS.3	become:INF

CC1585 4$_{19\text{-}21}$

lit. 'God give, so that many baptized souls can be brought to the Lord Christ through this.'

Other constructions containing *dot* complemented by an infinitive include the following, which also closely follow the sources and replicate the use of German *geben* (Low German *geven*): *kha tims tas Gars doeuwe Iſtreßeet* (EvEp1587 156$_{12\text{-}13}$) = *nachdem der Geist ihnen gab auszusprechen* (LB 1545 Acts of the Apostles 2:4), *darna alſe en de Geiſt gaff vththoſprekende* (LB 1599 [1545] Acts of the Apostles 2:4) 'as the Spirit gave them (ability) to speak', *Jums gir dota / ßinnath* (EvEp1587 50$_8$) = *Euch ist's gegeben, zu wissen* (LB 1545 Luke 8:10) = *Yuw yſſet gegeven tho wetende* (LB 1599 [1545] Luke 8:10) 'you are given to know'. This use is related to the permissive realm only to the extent that it can be interpreted as enablement.

5. Factitive *spiest*

In modern Latvian, *spiest* is only rarely used to express causation (Pakerys 2016: 448-449) and in 16th c. texts at least two clear cases of this use are attested: in (22a) *spiest* is complemented by INF-clause, and in (22d) a *that*-clause is adjoined. In both cases, the syntactic structure directly corresponds to the German constructions with (High German) *nötigen* and (Low German) *dwengen* (= High German *zwingen*) which equals Latvian *spiest*:

(22) a. Latvian

vnde	*ſpede*	*thos*	*ſcheit*	*exkan*	*näckt*
and	compel:IMP.2SG	DEM.ACC.PL.M	here	inside	come:INF

EvEp1587 143,14-144,1 Luke 14:23

'[...] and compel them to come here (inside).'

---

[16] Question marks refer to ambiguous inflection *-e*.

b. High German
*und **nötige sie hereinzukommen***

LB 1545 Luke 14:23

c. Low German
* vnde **nodige ſe** herin **tho kamende***

LB 1599 [1545] Luke 14:23

d. Latvian

to	***ſpede***	*the /*		***ka***	*tham*
DEM.ACC.SG.M	compel.PST.3	DEM.NOM.PL.M		that	DEM.DAT.SG.M

winge	*kruſte*	*neſt*	***bye***
3.GEN.SG.M	cross:ACC.SG	carry:INF	be:PST.3

EvEp1587 93,12-13

'[...] they compelled him, so that he had to carry his cross.'

e. Low German
den dwuᵉngen** ſe **dat** he emm syn Cruᵉtze dregen **moſte

Passio 1546 [52]

A similar construction to (22d) is attested also in UP1587 Ev₁₁₋₁₂ (*ſpeduſſe gir / Ka* [...] = *dwungen hat /dat* [...]; Vanags 2000: 83). The causee in *spiest*-constructions is marked by the accusative; in UP1587 Ev₁₁ the pronominal form *thöw*:2.SG is used, which formally could be dative, but these forms also serve as accusatives, as mentioned previously. In one case, the INF-clause is possible, but omitted, see Ench1586 CA₃.

6. Conclusions

Latvian periphrastic causative constructions in 16ᵗʰ c. texts differ from their modern use in three main respects: (1) *likt* is used in permissive contexts (notably with negation), (2) *laist* is a default permissive predicate, and (3) *ļaut* is unattested. The use of *dot* 'let' and *spiest* 'make' is marginal, which parallels the current situation in Latvian. Both *dot* 'let' and *spiest* 'make' seem to be rather closely tied to the (possible) sources of the translations.

As for causee/permittee marking, there is a fluctuation between dative and accusative, but it should be noted that although the majority of pronominals can be formally classified as datives, they are also used as accusatives. In some cases of reflexive constructions, actual causees/permittees were marked by PPs with *no,* which seems to reflect the German pattern of PPs with *von*. However, only some of these examples had corresponding German constructions, meaning that either other sources were used, or the translator was already accustomed to this construction.

The locus of affixation of the morphological reflexive marker in constructions with *likt* fluctuates, but the preferred place seems to be the matrix verb.

Related to the permissive use of *laist* are the 1ˢᵗ person plural hortative and 3ʳᵈ person optative/hortative constructions. The 1ˢᵗ person plural hortative is most likely a direct copy of the German *lass(e)t uns* construction, while the 3ʳᵈ person constructions seem to be at least a partly independent development of Latvian. Rare 3ʳᵈ person hortatives/optatives with infinitives, instead of with indicatives, may show an intermediate stage of development (cf. Holvoet 2001: 63): the original permittee was already marked by the nominative, but the infinitive was still kept and then subsequently replaced by the present indicative. Constructions with *laid* + present indicative (= modern use) are attested in only one source (UP1587).

Abbreviations

1 – 1ˢᵗ person, 2 – 2ⁿᵈ person, 3 – 3ʳᵈ person, ACC – accusative, ACT – active, DAT – dative, DEF – definite, DEM – demonstrative, DIMIN – diminutive, F – feminine, GEN – genitive, IMP – imperative, INF – infinitive, IRR – irrealis, M – masculine, N – neuter, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PL – plural, POSS – possessive (pronoun), PRS – present, PSS – passive, PST – past, PTCL – particle, PTCP – participle, RFL – reflexive (pronoun or affix), SG – singular.

Sources

16ᵗʰ c. Latvian texts[17]

CC1585 =	*Catechismvs Catholicorum* [...], Vilnius: Lancicius, 1585.
Ench1586 =	*Enchiridion* [...], Königsberg: Osterberger, 1586.
EvEp1587 =	*Euangelia vnd Epiſteln* [...], Königsberg: Osterberger, 1587.
UP1587 =	*Vndeudsche Psalmen* [...], Königsberg: Osterberger 1587.

Other

LB 1545 =	Luther's Bible translation of 1545, available online at https://unbound.biola.edu.
LB 1599 [1545] =	*Biblia Dat ys: De gantze hilige Schrifft, Sassisch, D. Mart. Luth.* [...], Wittenberg: Lorentz Säuberlich, 1599, available online at http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0002/bsb00024265/images/.
LVK2013 =	*Latviešu valodas līdzsvarotais korpuss* [Balanced corpus of Latvian], 4.5 million words, available online at http://www.korpuss.lv.
ME =	*K. Mühlenbachs lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von Jan Endzelin. Riga: Lettisches Bildungsministerium, 1923–1932, available online at http://tezaurs.lv/mev/.
Passio 1546 =	*Historia des lidendes* [...] *dorch D. Johannem Bugenhagen* [...]. Rostock: Ludwig Dietz, 1546, available online at http://digital.wlb-stuttgart.de/sammlungen/sammlungsliste/werkansicht/?no_cache=1&tx_dlf%5Bid%5D=5154&tx_dlf%5Bpage%5D=1.

---

[17] Electronic versions of Latvian texts available online at http://www.korpuss.lv/senie were used.

WA 12 =   *Dr. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 12. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1891.

WA 30.1 =   *Dr. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 30.1:*Katechismuspredigten 1528; Großer und Kleiner Katechismus 1529*. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau's Nachfolger, 1910.

References

Dobrušina, Nina. 2016.   Konstrukcii s časticami *pusť* i *puskaj. Materialy dlja proekta korpusnogo opisanija russkoj grammatiki* (manuscript; available online at http://rusgram.ru/Конструкции_с_частицами_пусть_и_пускай).

Endzelīns, Jānis. 1951.   *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība.

Holvoet, Axel. 2001.   *Studies in the Latvian verb*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Holvoet, Axel. 2007.   *Mood and Modality in Baltic*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Holvoet, Axel. 2016.   Reflexive permissives and the middle voice, *Baltic Linguistics* 7, 9–52.

Michelini, Guido. 2001.   1585 m. latviško katekizmo šaltiniai. Józef Marcinkiewicz, Norbert Ostrowski, eds., *Munera linguistica et philologica Michaeli Hasiuk dedicata,* Poźnan: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, 121–129.

Pakerys, Jurgis. 2017.   Old Prussian *dāt* 'give' in causative and hortative constructions, *Baltic Linguistics* 8 (in press).

Van der Auwera, Johan,   Imperative-Hortative Systems. Matthew S. Dryer, Martin
Nina Dobrushina, Valentin   Haspelmath, eds., *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*.
Goussev. 2013.   Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, available online at http://wals.info/chapter/72.

Vanags, Pēteris. 1993.   Die möglichen Formen deutschen Einflusses auf die grammatische und syntaktische Struktur der ältesten lettischen Texte, *Linguistica Baltica* 2, 163–181.

Vanags, Pēteris. 1994.   Die Entwicklungstendenzen der Kasusendungen in den ältesten lettischen Sprachdenkmälern, *Linguistica Baltica* 3, 121–130.

Vanags Pēteris. 1998.   *Latvian texts from the earliest period (16th-early 17th century): translation sources and some problems of phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary*. Summary of the paper submitted for Dr. habil. degree. Vilnius: Vilnius University.

Vanags, Pēteris. 2000.   *Vecākā perioda (16. gs.–17. gs. sākuma) latviešu teksti: luterāņu rokasgrāmatas avoti*. Stokholma: Memento, Rīga: Mantojums.

von Waldenfels, Ruprecht.   *The Grammaticalization of 'Give' + Ininitive. A Comparative Study
2012.   of Russian, Polish and Czech*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Jurgis Pakerys
Baltistikos katedra
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 3, 01513 Vilnius, Lietuva
jurgis.pakerys@flf.vu.lt

KOPSAVILKUMS

Perifrastiskās kauzatīvās konstrukcijas 16. gs. latviešu valodā

Jurgis PAKERYS

Balstoties 16. gs. latviešu tekstu materiālā, rakstā aplūkoti perifrastiskie kauzatīvi ar darbības vārdiem *likt*, *spiest*, *laist* un *dot*. Noteikts, ka galvenās atšķirības, salīdzinot ar mūsdienu latviešu valodu, ir šādas: 1) konstrukcijas ar *likt* lietotas ne tikai faktitīvā, bet arī permisīvā nozīmē (īpaši ar noliegumu); 2) darbības vārds *laist* uzskatāms par galveno permisīvo predikātu; 3) permisīvās konstrukcijas ar *ļaut* avotos nav fiksētas. Darbības vārdi *dot* un *spiest*, līdzīgi kā mūsdienu valodā, kauzatīvajās konstrukcijās lietoti reti, šo darbības vārdu lietojums, šķiet, spēcīgi saistīts ar tulkojumu oriģināliem.

Kauzatīvās konstrukcijas objekts (angl. *causee*) var būt apzīmēts ar datīvu un akuzatīvu, bet jāpievērš uzmanība, ka vairumu datīva lietojumu veido vietniekvārdu formas (*man*, *tev*, *mums*, *jums*), kas lietotas gan datīva, gan akuzatīva nozīmē. Reizēm refleksīvo konstrukciju objekts var būt apzīmēts ar prievārdisku konstrukciju ar *no*. Refleksīvajās konstrukcijās morfoloģiskā refleksivitātes vieta variē, bet liekas, ka biežāk tā pievienota darbības vārda konjugējamai formai, nevis nenoteiksmei.

Ar permisīvajām darbības vārda *laist* konstrukcijām cieši saistītas arī optatīvās un hortatīvās konstrukcijas. Daudzskaitļa pirmās personas hortatīvs varētu atspoguļot atbilstošo vācu valodas konstrukciju, bet trešās personas hortatīvs/optatīvs var būt latviešu valodas patstāvīgas attīstības rezultāts. Šīs konstrukcijas reti sastopamās formas ar nenoteiksmi var atspoguļot attīstības starpstāvokli (sal. Holvoet 2001: 63). Bijušais atļaujas saņēmējs jau apzīmēts ar nominatīvu, bet nenoteiksme vēl saglabāta, tikai vēlāk tā aizstāta ar tagadnes trešās personas formu. Šādas konstrukcijas gan fiksētas tikai vienā avotā (UP 1587).