PERIPHRASTIC CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN 17TH CENTURY LATVIAN[1]

Jurgis PAKERYS
Vilnius University

1. Introduction

The periphrastic causative constructions (PCCs) of 16th c. Latvian were analyzed in my earlier study, and to avoid repetition of the introductory matters, I refer the reader to Pakerys (2017a: 87). In this paper I continue the study of Latvian PCCs based on the following selection of 17th c. sources (246,090 words in total[2]):

1) Georg Elger, *Geistliche Catholiche Gesänge*, 1621 (= Elg1621; 17,284 words);
2) Georg Mancelius, *Lettus*, 1638 (= Manc1638L; 9,517 words);
3) Georg Mancelius, *Phraseologia Lettica*, 1638 (= Manc1638PhL; 8,687 words);
4) Christoph Fürecker, *Lettisches und Teutsches Wörterbuch*, ms. 1, 1650–1670 (= ¹Für1650–70; 14,611 words);
5) Georg Mancelius, *Lang=gewünschte Lettische Postill*, part two, 1654 (= Manc1654II; 99,649 words)[3];
6) Ernst Glück, *Tas Jauns Testaments*, 1685 (= JT1685; only the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles were used for data collection, 96,342 words).

The analysis is divided into two parts according to the semantic type of the PCCs: permissive ('allow, let') and factitive ('make, have V-ed'). Section 2 covers the permissive constructions based on the verbs *laist* (2.1)*, dot* (2.2)*, ļaut* (2.3)*, (at-)vēlēt* (2.4), and *likt* (2.5), while Section 3 is devoted to factitive constructions with the verbs *likt* (3.1) and *(pie-)spiest* (3.2). The discussion of *laist* (2.1) also includes notes on the imperative/optative 3rd person and the

---

[2] In my earlier study of Latvian PPCs in 16th century texts (Pakerys 2017a) I did not provide the word counts of the sources and I would like to correct that shortcoming here: CC1585 – 4,552 words, Ench1586 – 7,068 words, EvEp1587 – 32,520 words, UP1587 – 13,062 words (57,202 words in total); in all cases, only Latvian words are counted.

[3] This book of sermons consists of three parts: the first is the longest, the third is the shortest, and the second one is of medium length, which is the main reason it was chosen as the data source.

hortative 1st person plural constructions with the markers *lai(d)* and *laidiet*, which are more or less fossilized imperative 2nd person singular and plural forms of *laist*. The main points of the study are summarized in the conclusion (Section 4).

2. Permissive PCCs

2.1. *laist*

Permissive *laist* plays only a marginal role in modern Latvian (Pakerys 2016: 453, 455), but was quite common in the 16th c. alongside rarer *likt*, which could be used both as 'allow' and 'make, have V-ed' (Pakerys 2017a: 94–100). In 17th c. sources the use of permissive *laist* is much lower in frequency and only Elg1621 has comparatively more uses of permissive *laist* (eight) with respect to the total number of words in the text, while other texts and lexicographic sources have rather limited attestations of this PCC (two to five cases); see the data in Table 1 at the end of this section. Some examples of permissive *laist* are provided in (2):

(2)   Old Latvian

a.   **Laid**   *tawai*   *Śirrdei*   *turr*   **buht**
     let:IMP.2SG   POSS.2SG.DAT.F   heart:DAT.SG   there   be:INF
     'Let your heart be there'

                                                              Manc1654II 262{242}$_{30}$

b.   **laidi**   *mann*   *papreekśchu*   **no=eet**/   *un*
     let:IMP.2SG   1SG.DAT/ACC   first   PFX–go:INF   and
     śawu   *Tehwu*   **aprakt**
     POSS.RFL.ACC.SG.M   father:ACC.SG   bury:INF
     'suffer me first to go and bury my father'[4]

                                                              JT1685 Matthew 8:21

German

c.   ***erlaube** mir, daß ich **hingehe** und zuvor meinen Vater **begrabe**[5]*
                                                              Luther 1545 Matthew 8:21

---

[4]   All quotations from the Bible are provided with English translations taken from the King James Version (KJV), unless otherwise indicated.

[5]   In most cases I provide German parallels for JT1685 taken from Luther 1545 because they can be used to demonstrate the influence the German constructions had on (Old) Latvian. I do not claim, however, that the passages from JT1685 cited in this paper were necessarily translated from German because their translation history is much more complicated due to the use of the Greek original (Latin Vulgate could also have been used) and earlier Latvian translations from German; see the most recent treatment of this question in Kazakėnaitė (2019). When necessary, Greek and Latin parallels will be mentioned in addition to the German ones.

Old Latvian

d. *Meitu*   **laist**   *wihrohp*   **eet**
    girl:ACC.SG   let:INF   man:ALL.SG   go:INF
    'To allow the girl to get married'

                                          [1]Für1650–70 175$_{4–5}$

German

e. *eine dirne berahten* **befreijen**

                                          [1]Für1650–70 175$_4$

The PCCs with *laist* should have developed from the primary use 'release, let go', which is well-attested in the 17ᵗʰ c.; see Table 1 at the end of this section. In constructions such as (2b), the infinitive clause marking directed motion was initially optional, i.e. 'release me (to go)', but after the reinterpretation of the construction as manipulative, the infinitive clause became obligatory, i.e. 'allow me to go'. So, for example, (2d) could also be interpreted as initially having the optional infinitive *eet* 'go', which was reinterpreted as a complement; note that the infinitive occurs in final position where we would expect it to be if it extended the original construction *meitu laist wihrohp*, literally 'release a girl to a man'.

The direct object, expressing the permittee, inherited the accusative of the transitive source construction, as seen in (2d), but in modern Latvian, the permittee can also sometimes be marked with the dative, just as in the Old Latvian example in (2a). The dative, instead of the accusative, appears to be an innovation related to the manipulative (permissive) use of the construction[6]; see an overview of the stages of the development of this marking both in Lithuanian and in Latvian in Pakerys (2019: 117–121). When 1ˢᵗ or 2ⁿᵈ person singular or plural pronoun forms are used in Old Latvian, one usually cannot discriminate between dative and accusative, as in (2b), so these examples cannot be interpreted as evidence for dative marking with *laist* and are marked as DAT=ACC in Table 1.[7] The syncretism of these pronominal forms is a well-known phenomenon; see Vanags (1996: 75) and Vanags (1998: 43–44) on Old Latvian where it is argued that these forms are a copy of case syncretism of Low German pronominal forms, and see Endzelīns (1951: 505, 510, 516) for the corresponding syncretic forms in the Latvian dialects. The unambiguous dative of the permittee with *laist* occurred only once in my data sample and is presented in (2a).

A PCC with the reflexive (middle) *laistie-s* was attested only once in my data sample and is presented in (3a). It corresponds to more frequent

---

[6]   The dative correlates with non-implicative/attempted manipulation and higher agency of the manipulee, which retains a certain amount of control over the event and is less directly affected; see Cole (1983), Verhagen, Kemmer (1994), and Givón (2001: 66–68).

[7]   The same applies for Tables 2 and 3.

constructions of the same type based on *liktie-s* (see Section 2.5 and 3), and in Luther's Bible translation it is equivalent to German *sich lassen* constructions, the difference being that double reflexive markers in the Latvian construction are added both to the permissive verb and to the subordinate infinitive; see a discussion of this phenomenon in Holvoet (2016: 17–18, 21–22). Functionally these expressions can be curative ('have something done'), a subtype of factitive PCCs, as seen in (3), and are most likely a copy of a corresponding German construction, cf. a discussion of curative PCCs in Slavic languages based on 'give' in von Waldenfels (2015: 116–117).

(3)   a.   Old Latvian
    Atgreezeetees   *no*   *Grehkeem/*   *un*   **laiſchatee-s**
    turn.back:IMP.2PL.RFL   from   sin:DAT.PL   and   let:IMP.2PL–RFL
    ikweens   **kriſtitee-s**
    everyone:NOM.M   baptize:INF-RFL
    'Repent, and be baptized [literally: have yourself baptized] every one of you'

                                               JT1685 Acts 2:38

    b.   German
    Tut Buße, und **lasse sich** *ein jeglicher* **taufen**

                                        Luther 1545 Acts 2:38

I have not found any other instances of reflexive *laistie-s*, but one should note that prefixal and reflexive *pa-laistie-s* is used in the meaning 'rely (upon), trust', as illustrated in (4):

(4)   Old Latvian
    pa-laidee-ß   *us*   *to*   *Kunghu*   *JEſum*
    PFX–release:IMP.2SG–RFL   on   DEM.ACC.SG.M   lord:ACC.SG   Jesus:ACC
    Chriſtum /   *no*   *wiſśas*   *Śirrds*
    Christ:ACC   from   all:GEN.SG.F   heart:GEN.SG
    'Rely on the Lord Jesus Christ from the bottom of your heart'

                                     Manc1654II 131$_{9–10}$

More data are needed, but cases like (4) are important for the history of reflexive permissive constructions because one of their paths of development could have been as follows: *laistie-s* (release:INF-RFL) 'release oneself (on)' > 'rely upon, trust' (no complementation by infinitive clauses, but adjunct infinitives are possible, e.g. 'trust someone to V') > 'allow oneself (to be V-ed)' (complemented by infinitive clauses).

Finally, it is worth mentioning that one case of the PCC with *laist* complemented by the verb of perception 'see' was found in Manc1654II and

I interpreted it as permissive, as shown in (5). It is known that such constructions sometimes have factitive interpretations; see notes in Section 3.1 and a discussion of factitive/permissive Slavic PCCs with verbs of cognition and perception in von Waldenfels (2012: 103–106, 150–152, 218–221).

(5) Old Latvian

To	*Waidu* [...]	**nhe**	**laid**	*mums*
DEM.ACC.SG.F	misfortune:ACC.SG	NEG	let:IMP.2SG	1PL.DAT/ACC

wairahk	**redſeht**!
more	see:INF

'Do not let us see that misfortune anymore!'

Manc1654II 195₁₈₋₁₉

Seventeenth century sources also use various forms of the imperative of *laist* in 3ʳᵈ person optative and 3ʳᵈ person and 1ˢᵗ person plural hortative constructions.[8] Due to the larger size of the corpus and time restrictions, I could not count the frequency of these modal constructions and limited myself to the general observations presented below.

First, it should be noted that in the permissive PCCs with *laist*, imperative forms are quite frequent, as reflected in (2) through (5) above. The tendency to use permissive *laist* in imperative contexts appears to have played an important role in the process of turning the imperative form *laid(i)* into the optative/hortative 3ʳᵈ person marker *laid*, which was further abbreviated to *lai*. In modern Latvian *lai* is combined with the present 3ʳᵈ person indicative, but the future indicative is also possible (Holvoet 2007: 42, fn. 12) and past forms are attested in folk songs (Endzelīns 1951: 893). In the 16ᵗʰ c. sources, modal constructions with *lai(d)* + infinitive are attested and are even more frequent than the ones with the present indicative; quite possibly they reflect an earlier stage of development of this optative/hortative construction from the permissive one (Pakerys 2017a: 97–100, with further references). In the 17ᵗʰ c. sources the constructions with the infinitive drop in frequency. For example, in the Gospel of Mark in JT1685, out of sixteen constructions with *lai*, only one occurs with the infinitive (Mark 9:35), while the rest have the present 3ʳᵈ person indicative form, cf. (6a) and (6c):

(6) a. Old Latvian

tas	**lai**	**buht**	*wiśśo*	*pehdigajs*
DEM.NOM.SG.M	PTCL	be:INF	all:GEN.PL	last:NOM.SG.M.DEF

'the same shall be last of all'

JT1685 Mark 9:35

---

8 Alternatively, these forms are labeled "imperative".

b. German
*der **soll** der Letzte **sein***

Luther 1545 Mark 9:35

c. Old Latvian

Bet	*tas*	*leelakais*	*no*	*jums*
but	DEM.NOM.SG.M	big:CMP.NOM.SG.M.DEF	of	2PL.DAT

lai	***irr***	*juhśo*	*Śullainis*
PTCL	be:PRS.3	2PL.GEN	servant:NOM.SG

'But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant'

JT1685 Matthew 23:11

d. German
*Der Größte unter euch **soll** euer Diener **sein***

Luther 1545 Matthew 23:11

A very interesting passage is found in Manc1654II, presented in (7a) below, where three optative 3rd person constructions occur in a row. The first one has *laid* + infinitive, the second one has *laid* + present indicative, the third one again has *laid* + infinitive and the subject is marked by the dative (instead of the nominative), similar to rare cases of permissive constructions with dative permittees. As mentioned earlier, the dative replaces the accusative in permissive PCCs, so this cannot be an old type of the construction; a more archaic 3rd person optative/hortative with an accusative subject (the original permittee) is found in the 16th c. sources (Pakerys 2017a: 97–98). As we see in (6) and (7a–b), Latvian constructions cannot be interpreted as influenced by the corresponding German constructions and perhaps if any German interference is seen in *laid* + infinitive, it might only stem from examples like (7c–d).

(7) a. Old Latvian

Tapehtz	***laid***	*nu*	***buht***	*teiktz*
therefore	PTCL	PTCL	be:INF	praise:PST.PSS.PTCP.NOM.SG.M

taß	*Kungs* / [...]
DEM.NOM.SG.M	lord:NOM.SG

und	***laid***	*teiktz*	***tohp***	*winja* [...]
and	PTCL	praise:PST.PSS.PTCP.NOM.SG.M	become:PRS.3	3.GEN.SG.M

Wahrds	*muhſchighe* /
name:NOM.SG	forever

laid	*wiſśahm*	*Semmehm*	*pillahm*	***kļuht***
PTCL	all:DAT.PL.F	land:DAT.PL	full:DAT.PL.F	become:INF

no	*winja*	*Ślahwu*	*und*	*Ghohdu*
from	3.GEN.SG.M	glory:ACC.SG	and	honor:ACC.SG

'Blessed be the LORD God, [...] And blessed be his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with his glory'

Manc1654II 98$_{4-7}$ (Psalms 72:18–19)

b. German
   Gelobet sei *Gott der HERR* [...] *und* ***gelobet sei*** *sein herrlicher Name ewiglich; und* ***alle Lande müssen*** *seiner Ehre voll* ***werden***!

Luther 1545 Psalms 72:18–19

c. Old Latvian

Lai	*nu*	*ta*	***buht***
PTCL	now	so	be:INF

'Suffer it to be so now'

JT1685 Matthew 3:15

d. German
   Laβ *jetzt also* ***sein***

Luther 1545 Matthew 3:15

It should be mentioned that Elg1621 differs from other sources in using a particle of a slightly different form, namely *lei*[9], as illustrated in (8a) below. This particle is also attested once in another text of the Catholic tradition, to which Elg1621 belongs, namely *Catechismvs Catholicorum* of 1585 (Pakerys 2017a: 97). Endzelīns (1951: 892, fn. 577 with further references) notes that this particle is known from a number of dialects, such as in Lizums and Rauna. Rauna is close to Cēsis where Georg Elger, the author and editor of Elg1621, was born and worked for some time and also not far from Valmiera where Erdmann Tolgsdorf, a likely translator of *Catechismvs Catholicorum*, worked for a certain period.

Similar to the 16th c. texts, the authors of the 17th c. sources use the 1st person plural hortative construction with *lai(d), ley* (Elg1621; alongside rarer *layd*), which were originally the 2nd person singular imperative forms; see (8a) with *ley*. Forms *laideet(a)* or *laydät* (Elg1621), which were originally the 2nd person plural imperative forms, could be also combined with the 1st person plural pronoun (dative/accusative) and the infinitive, consider (8b). This construction is likely a direct copy of the German hortative *laβ(et) uns* + infinitive, cf. Holvoet (2001: 63–64, fn. 1–2) and Holvoet (2007: 112). In rare cases, the 1st person plural hortative has the 1st person plural pronoun in the nominative followed by the present 1st person plural indicative form, as illustrated in (8c); see also JT1685 Mark 9:5. The construction with the present

---

[9] *lei* < *leid*, infinitive *leist*, cf. Lithuanian permissive verb *léisti*. Imperative *leid* is reflected as particle *leid* in EH (I 731) from Ērgļi.

indicative form could be seen as much more independent from its German counterpart (pronoun in nominative + present indicative), but the use of the periphrastic construction itself (vs. the synthetic one, see below) could have been supported by the German parallel.

(8) Old Latvian

    a. **Ley**   *mums*   *wyſſems*   **precatés**
       PTCL   1PL.DAT/ACC   all:DAT.PL[10]   rejoice:INF
       'Let's rejoice everyone'

<div align="right">Elg1621 17₃</div>

    b. **laideet** *mums*   **ehſt/**   *un*   *lihgśmeem*   **buht**
       PTCL   1PL.DAT/ACC eat:INF   and   happy:DAT.PL.M[11]   be:INF
       'let us eat, and be merry'

<div align="right">JT1685 Luke 15:23</div>

  German

    c. **lasset** *uns* **essen** *und fröhlich* **sein**

<div align="right">Luther 1545 Luke 15:23</div>

  Old Latvian

    d. **Lai** *mehs*   **no=eetam**   *tuwakâs*   *Meeſtâs*
       PTCL 1PL.NOM   go:PRS.1PL   close:CMP.LOC.PL.F   town:LOC.PL
       'Let us go into the next towns'

<div align="right">JT1685 Mark 1:38</div>

  German

    e. **Laßt** *uns in die nächsten Städte* **gehen**

<div align="right">Luther 1545 Mark 1:38</div>

It is worth noting that Mancelius in his *Phraseologica Lettica* translates the German hortative *laß vns fiſchen gehen* 'Let us go fishing' as *eima ſweioht*, where *eima* is an archaic 1st person plural present form of 'go' serving as a 1st person plural hortative.[12] Mancelius explains that *eima* [is used here] *pro laid-eeta mums eet* (Manc1638PhL 284₁₈₋₁₉; cf. also *laſt vns e[t]c* [= *mit Schillingen an die Wand werffen*] translated as *Eima klimpeht* 'Let us play (a certain game with coins) Manc1638PhL 368₂₂). This means that at least in *Phraseologica Lettica*, Mancelius preferred to use the synthetic HORT.1PL instead of the copy of the German construction. I could not estimate at the moment how frequent

---

[10] This form disambiguates *mums* as a dative.

[11] This form also disambiguates *mums* as a dative.

[12] This type of hortative is noted in Endzelīns (1951: 891) alongside the usual FUT.1PL form (used as the hortative).

the synthetic HORT.1PL is in 17th c. texts, but *eima* 'let us go' is used twice in Manc1654 II (45_{25} and 242_{18}).

laist(ies) in the 17th c. sources

	Elg1621	Manc 1654II	JT1685	Manc 1638L	Manc 1638PhL	¹Für 1650–70	Total
'release, leave, go, etc.'	0	0	10	3^{13}	7	3^{14}	23 (55%)
'let'	8	5	3	0	0	2	18 (43%)
Permittee — DAT	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Permittee — DAT=ACC	5	3	1	0	0	0	
Permittee — ACC	0	1	2	0	0	1	
Permittee — Omitted	3	0	0	0	0	1	
'have' (curative; reflexive)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1 (2%)
Total	8	5	14	3	7	5	42

2.2. *dot*

The verb *dot* is quite frequent in its basic meaning 'give' and to make the review of the material more manageable, I limited my data to the forms of INF *dot*, PRS.2/PRS.3/IMP.2SG *dod(i)*, and PST.3 *deva/deve* in all sources, except for Manc1638L, Manc1638PhL, and ¹Für1650–70 where all forms were reviewed; quantitative data are provided in Table 2 at the end of this section. I have also reviewed all tokens of reflexive *dotie-s* in all sources of my sample, but no PCCs were found, and as a result, the data on *dotie-s* were not included in Table 2.

It should be said in advance that permissive *dot* is rare in modern Latvian, and the 16th c. sources also have limited attestations of this PCC (Pakerys 2017a: 100–102). Of the 17th c. texts, only Elg1621 stands out by having a comparatively more frequent use of *dot* as a permissive predicate. For example, out of the 72 forms of *dot* reviewed in this source, nineteen (26%) were used in permissive contexts, such as (9a–b) below. In thirteen cases, subordinate clauses were infinitival, like (9a), while four examples had finite complement clauses with *ka* 'that', as in (9b); note that (9a) and (9b) are used in the same hymn and lexically are almost identical. In one case of the above-mentioned

---

[13] This count does not include one polysemous case when German *lassen* is translated as Latvian *laist* and no examples with PCCs are provided in the dictionary.

[14] This count does not include another polysemous case, i.e. *laist = lassen* and no examples with PCCs are given in the dictionary entry.

nineteen examples, the perception predicate *redzēt* 'see' was used in a PCC with negation and was interpreted as permissive (Elg1621 138$_{14-15}$); another PCC had a participle of 'know' and was interpreted as potentially factitive, i.e. 'grant/allow to be known' = 'reveal'; see (9c) and cf. example (12a) with *laist* 'let' + 'known' + 'be' in Pakerys (2017a: 95).

(9) Old Latvian

    a.   **Dôd**   man   yſten   ar   teuw   **roudat**
       give:IMP.2SG 1SG.DAT/ACC really with 2SG.DAT/ACC weep:INF
       'Let me really weep with you'

                                                            Elg1621 61$_3$

    b.   **Dôd**   ka   es   ar   teuw
       give:IMP.2SG that   1SG.NOM with 2SG.DAT/ACC
       war   **roudát**
       be.able:PRS.1SG   weep:INF
       (literally) 'Grant so that I can weep with you'

                                                            Elg1621 61$_{11}$

    c.   *To*   **zynnam**   **dôd**
       DEM.ACC.SG.F know:PRS.PSS.PTCP.ACC.SG.F give:IMP.2SG
       touwe   *cèßen*
       POSS.2SG.ACC.F suffering:ACC.SG
       'Let your suffering be known'

                                                            Elg1621 48$_5$

In Manc1654II, permissive *dot* is very rare: out of the 237 forms reviewed, only four (2%) could be interpreted as PCCs, with either infinitival complements (three cases) or a finite *that*-clause (one case). In JT1685, only five potentially permissive PCCs were found out of the 149 forms of *dot* reviewed (3%), and Latvian *dot* corresponds to German *geben* 'give, grant' in respective passages of the New Testament, as illustrated in (10):

(10) Old Latvian

    a.   *ittin*   *ka*   *teem*   *tas*   *Gars*
       as   how   DEM.DAT.PL.M DEM.NOM.SG.M spirit:NOM.SG
       dewe   **is-runnaht**
       give:PST.3   PFX–speak:INF
       'as the Spirit gave them utterance'

                                                            JT1685 Acts 2:4

    German
    b.   *nachdem der Geist ihnen **gab auszusprechen***

                                                  Luther 1545 Acts 2:4

Old Latvian

c. **_Dohd_**   _mums/_   **_ka_**   _mehs_   _śehdeht_
   give:IMP.2SG   1PL.DAT/ACC   that   1PL.NOM   sit:INF

   warram   _eekśch_   _tawas_
   be.able:PRS.1PL inside   POSS.2SG.GEN.F

   Gohdibas
   glory:GEN.SG

   'Grant unto us that we may sit [...] in thy glory.'

                                              JT1685 Mark 10:37

German

d. **_Gib_** _uns, daß_ **_wir_** _sitzen_ [...] _in deiner HERRLIchkeit_

                                              Luther 1545 Mark 10:37

If the corresponding passages of JT1685 in the Latin Vulgate and Greek New Testament are consulted, the verbs _dāre_ and διδόναι 'give, grant' are found, but it should be noted that this type of PCC is rather rare in Latin, Greek, German, and some other European languages. This construction is frequently used in the context where divine authority is conceptualized as an enabler (< giver) of a certain situation (von Waldenfels 2012: 245–246). Judging by the use of 'give' in permissive PCCs in other Baltic languages (Lithuanian and Old Prussian), the permissive _dot_ in Latvian can be interpreted as the original. We see, however, that in JT1685, Latvian _dot_ is strongly tied to the sources of the translation, similar to the case of the 16th c. sources (Pakerys 2017a: 102), so the use of _dot_ as 'allow' could have been induced by the sources of the translation. In this context, studying the sources of the translations of Elg1621 in the future should shed light on the use of _dot_ in this hymnal; for instance, consider (11) where a passage close to Acts 2:4 (as cited above in (10a)) also includes _dot_:

(11) Old Latvian

   _TA_   _Swäte_   _Garre_   _źäleſtybe_ [...]
   DEM.NOM.SG.F   saint:GEN.SG.M spirit:GEN.SG   grace:NOM.SG

   Däw   _tems_   **_yz-runnat_** _wallodems_
   give:PST.3   DEM.DAT.PL.M   PFX-speak:INF   language:DAT.PL

   'The grace of the Holy Ghost gave them ability to speak languages'

                                     Elg1621 115$_{1-4}$ (cf. Acts 2:4)

In the dictionary of Mancelius, an interesting use of _dot_ is found in the entry of German _säugen_ 'suckle': _ſäugen/_ **_ſieſt dohdt/_** _dieliet/ ſiedenaht_ (Manc1638L 150$_{8-9}$). Here the phrase _ſieſt dohdt_ (= _zīst dot_ in modern spelling) 'give to suck' corresponds to the morphological causative _zīd-enā-t_ (_ſiedenaht_) 'suckle' and can be interpreted as possibly permissive or even factitive. However, this construction is related to feeding and can also be interpreted as 'provide

(something) for someone for consumption', similar to the cases of *ēst/dzert dot* (eat:INF/drink:INF give:INF) 'give, provide food/drinks''. One such case is also found in Manc1638PhL 362₍₂₁₋₂₂₎: **Sirrgham dſerrt doht** (horse:DAT.SG drink:INF give:INF) 'give to drink to a horse' as a translation of German *in die Trencke reiten*. In Table 2, these two constructions were not counted as canonical PCCs, but they are important for understanding the development of PCC with *dot* ('provide, grant' > 'allow').

In Fürecker's dictionary, there are two cases of permissive *dot*: in one sentence it corresponds to German *geben* 'give', as already seen in the examples in (10), but in the other, Latvian *dot* matches German *lassen* 'allow, let':

(12) Old Latvian
    a.   *Deews*   **dohdi**,   **kà**   *es*   *prett*
        god:VOC.SG   give:IMP.2SG   that   1SG.NOM   against
        tew   **ne**   **kurneju**
        2SG.DAT/ACC   NEG   grumble:PRS.1SG
        'Oh God, grant (me) that I do not grumble against you'
                                           [1]Für1650–70 119₍₁₉₋₂₀₎

German
    b.   *O Gott **gib das** ich wider dich **nicht murre***
                                        [1]Für1650–70 119₍₂₀₋₂₁₎

Old Latvian
    c.   *Deews*   **dohd**   *mannam*   *behrnam*   *tà*
        god:VOC.SG   give:IMP.2SG   POSS.1SG.DAT.M   child:DAT.SG   so
        no-ſirmoht   *in*   **no-wezzoht**
        PFX-get.grey.hair:INF   and   PFX-get.old:INF
        'Oh God, allow my child to get grey hair and to get old'
                                        [1]Für1650–70 257₍₂₉₋₃₁₎

German
    d.   *Gott **laße** mein Kind so **grau** u. **alt werden***
                                        [1]Für1650–70 257₍₃₁₋₃₂₎

The permittee in *dot* constructions should be marked by the dative inherited from the source construction *dot* 'give' where it marks the recipient (see notes in Pakerys 2019: 114). Many permittees, however, are syncretic dative/accusative 1st and 2nd person pronominal forms like in (9a) or (10c). Only unambiguous forms like the ones seen in (10a), (11), and (12c) prove that the marking of the permittee is certainly dative.

Reflexive *dotie-s* was not found in any PCCs, but some examples from Manc1654II are worth mentioning because they are similar to the reflexive

pa-laistie-s 'trust' (also from Manc1654II) presented in (4) in the previous section (and see respective comments there). Typically *doties* means 'go (in some direction), get (into something)', but in these examples the meaning 'rely, trust' can be seen, as illustrated in (13):

(13) Old Latvian

nhe	*buhß*	*mums*	*us*	*muhſso*	*Prahtu*
NEG	be:FUT.3	1PL.DAT/ACC	on	POSS.1PL.GEN	reason:ACC.SG

dohtee-ß
give:INF–RFL
'We should not rely on our reason'

Manc1654II 166$_{28-29}$

Table 2

dot in the 17th c. sources[15]

	Elg 1621	Manc 1654II	JT 1685	Manc 1638L	Manc 1638 PhL	¹Für 1650–70	Total
'give, grant + NP, etc.'	52	237	144	35	22	35	525 (94.4%)
'let, grant + INF/that-clause'	19	4	5	0	0	2	30 (5.4%)
'make' (cognition/ perception)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 (0.2%)
Total	72	241	149	35	22	37	556

2.3. ļaut

In modern Latvian, *ļaut* is the most frequently used permissive verb, but it is not attested in the 16th c. sources and it is still rare in the 17th c. sources. Similar to the 16th c. texts, Elg1621 has no attestations of *ļaut*, while other sources have a few examples. Mancelius translates German *erlauben* as *ļaut/ attwehleht/ wehleht* (=*ļaut, atvēlēt, vēlēt*) and *verhängen*[16], *zulassen* as *ļaut/ waļļu doht* (= *ļaut, vaļu dot*; Manc1638L 112v$_5$, 193v$_8$).[17] This means that *ļaut*

---

[15] For Elg1621, Manc1654II, and JT1685, only the forms INF *dot*, PRS.2/PRS.3/IMP.2SG *dod(i)*, and PST.3 *deva/deve* were reviewed; for other sources, all forms were reviewed.

[16] German *verhängen* is used here as permissive (= *zulassen*); see (3) in DWB, http://www. woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemma=verhangen.

[17] *At-vēlēt* is discussed in the following section (2.4); the idiomatic phrase *vaļu dot* (freedom. to.act:ACC.SG give:INF) 'grant the freedom to act' has a variant with *ļaut* (see an example from JT1685 given in the paragraph before (15a) below).

'allow' had to be known to Mancelius; nevertheless, he used it rarely in his texts. The verb *ļaut* is absent from Manc1638PhL and appears only twice in Manc1654II, an example of which is in (14a). The dictionary of Fürecker contains one example in which *ļaut* is used in the sentence to illustrate the verb *apģērbties* 'get dressed', as shown in (14b).

(14) Old Latvian

    a.   *Wings*   *nhe*   *ghribbeja*   **ļaut** /   *Świehta*   *Deenà*
        3.SG.NOM.M NEG want:PST.3 allow:INF saint:LOC.SG.F day:LOC.SG

        nhekahdu   *Darrbu*   **ſtradaht**
        none:ACC.SG.M work:ACC.SG work:INF

        'He did not want to allow [the people] to be engaged in any work on the saint day (=holy day)'

                                                  Manc1654II 316{296}[25–26]

    b.   [...] *meitiņas{meintiņas}*   *puiśchus*   **ne**   **ļauj**
        girl:DIM.NOM.PL   boy:ACC.PL   NEG   let:PRS.3

        ap-ģehrbtees
        PFX-dress:INF.RFL

        'the girls do not allow the boys to get dressed'

                                            [1]Für1650–70 77[18–19]

    German

    c.   [...] *die mägdlein* **Sich** *die jungens* **nicht laßen ankleiden**
                                            [1]Für1650–70 77[19–21]

One should note that the permittee in (14b) is marked by the accusative instead of the dative, which is the only possible coding of the permittee in *ļaut* constructions in modern Latvian. This accusative perhaps reflects the original and archaic marking inherited from the transitive use of *ļaut* (formerly as 'release', cf. the case of *laist* above and see a discussion in Pakerys (2019: 121–123)); alternatively, the accusative of the permittee could be regarded as copied from German *lassen* constructions where permittees are usually marked by the accusative. (Note, however, that the dative can be used with prefixed *zu-lassen*, as in (15d).) The dative is found with *ļaut* in JT1685 and is illustrated in (15a), where the infinitive clause is omitted; in the following verse in (15c), *ļaut* is used again with the dative of the permittee, but instead of the infinitive clause, the pronoun *to* 'this (i.e. baptism)' (DEM.ACC.SG.M) is found in the direct object position, so strictly speaking, this is not a canonical PCC. Another similar construction (an idiomatic phrase) without the infinitive is seen in JT1685 Luke 22:51: *Ļaujeet teem Waļļas* (let:IMP.2PL DEM.DAT.PL.M freedom.to.act:ACC.PL), literally 'allow them the freedom to act' (= 'let them'), cf. *vaļu dot* from Manc1638L mentioned at the beginning of this section.

(15) a.   Latvian
    Bet   *Jahnis*   *ne*   *ļahwe*   ***tam***
    but   John:NOM   NEG   allow:PST.3   DEM.DAT.SG.M
    'But John forbad him [to be baptized]'

                            JT1685 Matthew 3:14

   b.   German
    *Aber Johannes wehrete **ihm***

                            Luther 1545 Matthew 3:14

   c.   Latvian
    Tad   *ļahwe*   *wiņśch*   ***tam***   *to*
    then   allow:PST.3   3.SG.NOM.M   DEM.DAT.SG.M   DEM.ACC.SG.M
    'Then he suffered him'

                            JT1685 Matthew 3:15

   d.   German
    *Da ließ er's **ihm** zu*

                            Luther 1545 Matthew 3:15

As for reflexive (middle) constructions, only one example was found in Fürecker's dictionary where the morphological marker -s appears both on the permissive verb and on the embedded infinitive, as seen in (16):

(16) Old Latvian
   a.   *laujee-**s***   *Peeluhgtee-**s***
    allow:IMP.2SG-RFL   ask:INF-RFL
    'Allow to be asked'

                            ¹Für1650–70 139₁₄

   b.   German
    *laß **dich** erbitten*

In sum, we see that *ļaut* is rarely used in 17ᵗʰ c. Latvian, with approximately seven attestations (counting only cases with actual or possible subordinate clauses here, including one reflexive construction); the permittee can be marked by the accusative (one instance – (14b)) or dative (one instance in (15a), cf. also (15c)). Prefixed *at-ļaut* (used in Modern Latvian) was not attested in any of the sources.

2.4. *(at-)vēlēt*

At an earlier stage, Latvian had the permissive verb *(at-)vēlēt*, which is currently no longer used for the meaning 'allow, let'. In Pakerys (2017a), permissive *(at-)vēlēt* was not taken into account, but I have reviewed the 16ᵗʰ c. sources used in that study now and none of them have attestations of PCCs

with this verb; in *Vndeudsche Psalmen* (1587), *vēlēt* is used twice as 'wish' (INF *whelet* I4r$_{14}$; PRS.3 *whele* I2v$_8$).

In the 17th c. sources, *(at-)vēlēt* is attested, but the frequency of use is rather low. It is not attested in Elg1621 and Fürecker's dictionary only lists it with the meaning 'wish' (*Wehleht, gönen. wünschen* [1]Für1650–70 296$_3$). Mancelius's dictionary (MancL1638), in contrast, has nine attestations in total; permissive *vēlēt* is mentioned four times and *atvēlēt* is used five times. (Both verbs typically occur in the same dictionary entry, for example, *erlauben/ ļaut/ attwehleht/ wehleht* Manc1638L 112B$_{5–6}$; here, only tokens of the permissive function were counted.) MancPhL1638 bears no examples of *(at-)vēlēt* and the second part of Mancelius's book of sermons has only one example of *at-vēlēt*, presented in (17a). This example is interesting in that *darbs* 'work' functions as an argument of *atvēlēt* 'allow' and *darīt* 'do' is used as an adjunct, i.e. active *atvēlēt darbu (darīt)* 'allow the work (to do)' versus passive *darbs ir atvēlēts (darīt)* 'the work is permitted (to do)', cf. (17b) where *at-vēlēt* is complemented by the direct object in the accusative case (but the infinitive is not adjoined in this case).[18]

(17) Old Latvian

a.
töw	**att-wehlähtz**		*gir* [...]
2SG.DAT/ACC	PFX–allow:PST.PSS.PTCP.NOM.SG.M		be:PRS.3
Darrbs /	*Świehtà=Deenà*		**darriet**
work:NOM.SG	saint:LOC.SG.F-day:LOC.SG		do:INF

Manc1654II 314{294}$_{21–22}$

(literally) 'the work is allowed for you to do on the saint day' = 'you are allowed to do the work on the holy day'

b.
wiśśi	*tee* [...]	*wiśśu*	*ļaun*	**att-wehļ**
all:NOM.PL.M	DEM.NOM.PL.M	all:ACC.SG.M	bad	PFX–allow:PRS.3

Manc1654II 213$_6$

'all these [persons] [...] permit (do not hinder) all bad things'

A canonical use of the permissive PCC with a complement infinitive clause is seen in (18a), where it should be noted that the Latvian construction with the participle *wehlehts* (*vēlēts*) 'is allowed' is semantically closer to Latin *licet* and Greek ἔξεστι than to German *recht*. (The same construction is also used in Mark 12:14 and Luke 20:22.) In total, JT1685 has four attestations of *vēlēt* 'allow' and in one case not mentioned thus far, the NP again appears as being governed by *vēlēt* in a passive construction, as shown in (18e).

---

[18] I should mention that *at-vēlēt* perhaps could be also interpreted as 'wish' in (17b), but I have not found any other unambiguous uses of prefixed *at-vēlēt* used as 'wish' in my sample.

(18) a. Latvian

Jrra-g	***wehlehts*/*		*tam*
be:PRS.3-PTCL	allow:PST.PSS.PTCP.NOM.SG.M		DEM.DAT.SG.M
Ķeiſeram	*Meślus*	***doht*** [...]*?*	
Caesar:DAT	tax:ACC.PL	give:INF	

'Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar [...]?'

JT1685 Matthew 22:17

b. German

*Ist's **recht**, **daβ** man dem Kaiser Zins **gebe** [...]?*

Luther 1545 Matthew 22:17

c. Latin

licet *censum **dare** Cæsari [...]?*

Vulgata Clementina Matthew 22:17

d. Greek

ἔξεστι δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι [...]?

Textus Receptus Matthew 22:17

e. Old Latvian

Tee	*bij* [...]	***wehleti***	*ehſt*
DEM.NOM.PL.M	be:PST.3	allow:PST.PSS.PTCP.NOM.PL.M	eat:INF

'One was allowed to eat them'

JT1685, translator's comment for Matthew 3:4

Historically the permissive function of *(at-)vēlēt* should have developed from its primary meaning 'want, wish' ('I want you to go', 'I want it to happen' > 'I allow you to go', 'I let it happen', etc.); see Pakerys (2019: 126–128) for a wider context of this development. Initially the permittee had to be marked by the accusative, which was later replaced by the dative, similar to the case of *laist* discussed earlier in Section 2.1. It should be recognized that the form *töw* in (17a) is formally ambiguous (dative/accusative), but we see that *Darrbs* (which is nominative due to the passive construction) fills the direct object position; as a result, *töw* should be treated as an indirect object marked by the dative.

In sum, we see that the PCC with *(at-)vēlēt* is not really frequent in a given sample of 17th c. Latvian texts. Prefixed *at-vēlēt* appears to be attested only in the permissive function (seven cases), while *vēlēt* means either 'allow, let' (eight cases) or 'wish' (21 cases). In total there are fifteen permissive PCCs with *(at-)vēlēt*. Reflexive constructions of *(at-)vēlēt* were not found in PCCs and were not included in the given counts.

2.5. *likt*

In modern Latvian, PCCs with *likt* are only factitive, but this verb was also used in permissive constructions at an earlier stage; see, for instance, Pakerys (2017a: 88–94) on the 16ᵗʰ c. sources. The permissive function of *likt* is still quite common in the 17ᵗʰ c. sources and appears in 19% of the examples, while 34% are factitive and 47% are other uses. Table 3 at the end of Section 3.1 displays these results.[19] The permissive PCC with *likt* is illustrated in (19a) with a corresponding construction in (19c) already based on modern Latvian *at-ļaut*.

(19) a.   Old Latvian
  ne   leezeet   *wiņņam*   *wairs*   *ne*   *neeka*
  NEG allow:IMP.2PL 3.DAT.SG.M anymore NEG nothing:GEN
  śawam   *Tehwam*   *jeb*   *śawai*
  POSS.RFL.DAT.SG.M father:DAT.SG or POSS.RFL.DAT.SG.F
  Mahtei   ***darriht***
  mother:DAT.SG do:INF
  'And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother'
  JT1685 Mark 7:12

   b.   German
  *Und so **laßt** ihr hinfort ihn nichts **tun** seinem Vater oder seiner Mutter*
  Luther 1545 Mark 7:12

   c.   Modern Latvian
  *tad jūs viņam **atļaujat** nenieka vairs **nedarīt** tēvam vai mātei [...]*
  LB1965[20] Mark 7:12

In (19a), the permittee is marked by the dative, just as in modern Latvian, but such marking is rare in the 16ᵗʰ and 17ᵗʰ c. sources, in which the accusative prevails. As to which case was archaic and original, two explanations are possible: a patient-oriented model or a recipient-oriented model. The permissive use of *likt* probably developed from its original archaic meaning 'leave' (ME II 469; cf. LEV I 536), and thus the permittee could initially have been either the direct object, i.e. 'mother left the milk:ACC to sour' > 'mother allowed the milk:ACC to sour' (patient-oriented model), or the indirect object, i.e. 'mother left milk for me (DAT) to drink' > 'mother allowed me:DAT to drink milk' (recipient-oriented model; cf. the development of the permissive PCC from 'give' to 'allow': 'gave me milk to drink' > 'allowed me to drink milk'). If the patient-oriented model

---

[19] To reduce the time needed for the analysis, only the INF *likt*, PRS.3 *liek*, and PST.3 *lika* forms were reviewed in Manc1654II; in other sources, all forms were reviewed.

[20] *Latviešu Bībeles 1965. gada izdevuma revidētais teksts* [*A revised text of the Latvian Bible published in 1965*], Latvijas Bībeles biedrība, http://www.bibelesbiedriba.lv/latviesu-bibele/markaevangelijs/Markaevangelija07.htm. Accessed on May 27, 2019.

is preferred, the dative can be interpreted as a secondary development (cf. the case of *laist* with the original accusative and secondary dative discussed in Section 2.1); if the recipient-oriented model is chosen, the accusative can be seen as secondary and copied from German *lassen* constructions where permittees/causees are typically marked by the accusative. The variation of the dative/accusative with *laist* is supported by both modern use and folklore data (Gāters 1993: 115); to check the possibility of a similar fluctuation in case marking with *likt*, I did a short pilot survey of Latvian folksongs, but I have not yet found clear instances of the accusative with *likt* in PCCs. This fact lends at least some support to the theory that the dative with *likt* could have been archaic and original; see also parallels from other languages (Lithuanian and Latin) in Pakerys (2019: 124–125) where the dative is used in permissive PCCs based on 'leave'. We should also bear in mind that the development of the factitive function of the Latvian *likt* construction was possibly influenced by its German counterpart[21] and in this context, morphosyntactic copying is also quite likely.[22] Further study of folklore data and 18th and 19th c. sources is needed to provide more details on the development of the Latvian *likt* construction and I would not exclude the possibility that the patient-oriented source construction could still be shown to have played a role in the development of PCCs with *likt*.

In reflexive (middle) permissive constructions, the permittee in the majority of cases is marked by a PP with *no* 'from', as illustrated in (20a). This marking is apparently a copy of the German construction *sich V-en lassen von*; see a discussion in Pakerys (2017a: 90–91) and for the Slavic context, see von Waldenfels (2012: 134, 138–140, 187, 196, 260, 271). It should also be noted that the model itself appears independently from the sources of translation in some cases, as seen in both the 16th c. texts (Pakerys 2017a: 91) and the 17th c. sources. For example, in (20b) we see that if the German text played any role in the translation of this passage, it had no PP with *von*. Example (20a) is also interesting in that the reflexive pronoun form *śew* (DAT/ACC) is used in addition to two manifestations of the morphological marker of middle (-s); in total, there are eight cases like (20a), but the most frequent type is the one where only double morphological markers (-s) are used (nineteen in total) and is illustrated in (20c). In one construction, the marker -s is found only on the predicate of the matrix clause (Manc1654II 89$_6$) and another case, -s is additionally affixed to *likt* in the matrix clause

---

[21] Cf. development of the factitive (mostly curative) function of *give*-based PCCs in Slavic languages, which experienced German influence and are discussed in von Waldenfels (2015: 115–116).

[22] Cf. colloquial Upper Sorbian where the causee is marked by the accusative instead of the original dative (Toops 2012: 327); the same phenomenon is also seen in Old Prussian (Pakerys 2017b: 122).

and the personal pronoun (2ⁿᵈ person plural) is used in reflexive function, following the German pattern (¹Für1650–70 200₂₄₋₂₅).

(20) Old Latvian

a.
ne	*leezee-**s***	***śew***	*pahrrunnatee-**s***
NEG	let:IMP.2SG-RFL	RFL.DAT/ACC	overpersuade:INF-RFL
no	***teem***		
from	3.PL.DAT.M		

'do not thou yield unto them'

JT1685 Acts 23:21

German

b. *traue **ihnen** nicht*

Luther 1545 Acts 23:21

Old Latvian

c.
Winji	*nhe*	*leekah-**β***	*mahzitee-**β***
3.PL.NOM.M	NEG	allow:PRS.3-RFL	teach:INF-RFL

'They do not allow themselves to be taught'

Manc1654II 178₂₅

3. Factitive PCCs

3.1. *likt*

Example (21a) illustrates the simple use of the PCC with *likt*, in which the inanimate causee is affected. However, a much more frequent case in the studied sample is when two human actors are involved and the relation between them is curative, i.e. the causer typically asks, orders, or otherwise seeks the action to be accomplished by the intermediary, the causee. For example, in (22c) John the Baptist asks Jesus a question through his disciples, and Luther expresses this mediated action by the German *lassen* construction, which is in turn translated by employing the *likt* construction in the Latvian tradition of the translation of this verse. In addition, Ernst Glück, who seeks to follow the Greek original, includes a note informing the reader that the Greek text simply reads 'said' rather than 'had [the disciples] say, asked to say'.

(21) Old Latvian

a.
winʃch	***leek***	*śawu*	*Śauli*	***uslehkt***
3.NOM.SG.M	make:PRS.3	POSS.RFL.ACC.SG.F	sun:ACC.SG	go.up:INF
[...]	*un*	***leek***	*Leetu*	***liht***
	and	make:PRS.3	rain:ACC.SG	rain:INF

'he maketh his sun to rise [...], and sendeth rain'

JT1685 Matthew 5:45

German

b. *er **läßt** seine Sonne **aufgehen** [...] und **lässet regnen***

<div align="right">Luther 1545 Matthew 5:45</div>

Old Latvian

c. | *Un* | ****likke*** | *tam* | ***śazziht*** | *(*Greek:* |
    |------|---------------|-------|---------------|-------------|
    | and | make:PST.3 | DEM.DAT.SG.M | say:INF | (Greek |
    | *Wall:* | *Śazzija* | *us* | *to)* | |
    | language[23] | say:PST.3 | to | DEM.ACC.SG.M | |

    'And said unto him' [literally: 'And had [them] say to him (in Greek: said to him)']

<div align="right">JT1685 Matthew 11:3</div>

d. *und **ließ** ihm **sagen***

<div align="right">Luther 1545 Matthew 11:3</div>

It should also be noted that sometimes Latvian *likt* can be translated as 'command, order', but this meaning is hard to distinguish from the curative function in many contexts and to be on the safe side, I provide total figures for 'make', 'have V-ed', and 'command' in Table 3 at the end of this section. JT1685 was easier to interpret in this respect due to the availability of sources and parallel translations and I could estimate that out of the twenty PCCs counted as factitive in Table 3, approximately seven can be interpreted as 'command, order, tell'. PCCs with predicates of cognition and perception were found only in Manc1654II (six in total) and all of them were interpreted as factitive, such as *leek* [...] *redſeht* (let:PRS.3 see:INF) Manc1654II 32_{10-11} 'lets see' = 'shows', *leek ſinnaht* (let:PRS.3 know:INF) Manc1654II 39_2 'lets know' = 'informs about', etc.

The causee in factitive PCCs with *likt* is usually marked by the accusative, as seen in (21a), but the dative is also found, as in (22):

(22) Old Latvian

Kas	***saweem***	***behrneem***	*ne*	*leek*	*mahzitees*
who	POSS.RFL.DAT.PL.M	child:DAT.PL	NEG	make:PRS.3	teach:INF.RFL
gramattas,	*jeb*	*strahdaht* [...]			
book:ACC.PL	or	work:INF			

'The ones who do not compel their children to study books or work [...]'

<div align="right">[1]Für1650–70 162_{6-7}</div>

---

[23] The phrase 'Greek language' is abbreviated and has no inflections.

In some cases the PP with *caur* 'through' could be interpreted as marking the causee in curative constructions, such as (23a) with an animate causee and (23b) with an inanimate one. All of these constructions (eight in total) are found in Manc1654II and are used only in contexts referring to mediated communication.

(23) Old Latvian

a. *Mahzetaji* /[...] / ***zaur*** *kattreem* *Deews*
    teacher:NOM.PL through which:DAT.PL.M god:NOM.SG
    mums ***leek*** ***śatziet***
    1PL.DAT/ACC make:PRS.3 say:INF
    '[...] the teachers [...] through which the God has [the following words] said to us'

    Manc1654II 34$_{21-22}$

b. *Kattru* *śawu* *Labbdarriśchanu* *Wings*
    each:ACC.SG.F POSS.RFL.ACC.SG.F good.doing:ACC.SG 3.SG.NOM.M
    mums ***leek*** ***zaur*** *to*
    1PL.DAT/ACC make:PRS.3 through DEM.ACC.SG.M
    Ewangelium *preekſcha* ***zellt*** / *und* ***dahwaht*** /
    gospel:ACC.SG in.front raise:INF and gift:INF
    'He has his good doings brought forward and gifted to us through the Gospel'

    Manc1654II 156$_{29-30}$

The same marking can be found in German *lassen* constructions appearing with the PP *durch*, such as *Gott läßt **durch** seinen Propheten verkünden* 'God has his Prophets announce', i.e. 'God announces through his Prophets'.[24] I suspect that the corresponding Latvian construction under discussion could be a copy of its German counterpart. It should also be mentioned that the same coding is found in 18th c. Czech where *skrze* 'through' is regularly used in passive constructions (von Waldenfels 2012: 260) and in Russian where *čerez* 'through' is found in 'let understand/know' constructions (von Waldenfels 2012: 105). Finally, I would like to note that in one case (also in reference to mediated communication) the causee can be interpreted as marked by a PP with *ar* 'with' (Manc1654II 275{255}$_{18}$).

---

[24] *Göttinger Predigten im Internet*, ed. by Thomas Schlag, http://www.theologie.uzh.ch/predigten/archiv-6/040215-3.html. Accessed on May 27, 2019.

When reflexive (middle) constructions of factitive *likt* are used, their meaning is frequently curative, i.e. 'have something done', as in (24a). A number of these constructions are also attested with predicates of perception and cognition, which are interpretable as factitive, as in (24c), where 'allow oneself to be seen (as)' equates to 'show oneself, appear (as)'.

(24) Old Latvian

    a.   *eß*   **lickſchoh-ß**   *to*   *Sohbu*

          1SG.NOM   make:FUT.1SG–RFL   DEM.ACC.SG.M   tooth:ACC.SG

          ißwillckt

          pull.out:INF

          'I will have my tooth pulled out'

<div align="right">Manc1638PhL 257₂₄</div>

    German

    b.   *Jch **wil mir** den Zahn **laſſen außziehen***

<div align="right">Manc1638PhL 257₂₃</div>

    Old Latvian

    c.   *Śwähtz*   *Gharrs*   **leekah-ß**   *ka*

          saint:NOM.SG.M   spirit:NOM.SG   allow:PRS.3–RFL   as

          Ballodis   **redſetee-ß**

          dove:NOM.SG   see:INF–RFL

          'The Holy Ghost appears as a dove'

<div align="right">Manc1654II 9₂₅</div>

Similar to permissive reflexive (middle) constructions, the most frequent option (eight cases in total) is to have two morphological markers (-*s*) that are affixed to the predicates of the main and subordinate clauses, as seen in (24c). In one case -*s* was added only to the predicate of the main clause, as shown in (24a), and in one case the reflexive pronoun was used in addition to two morphological markers, see (25).

(25) Old Latvian

        und   *[Lydia]*   *lickah-**ß***   **ſöw**   *Chriſtitee-**ß***

        and   Lydia:NOM   make:PST.3–RFL   RFL.DAT/ACC   baptize:INF–RFL

        'and [Lydia] had herself baptized'

<div align="right">MancLPII 183 (cf. Acts 16:15)</div>

Table 3

likt(ies) **in the 17th c. sources[25]**

		Elg 1621	Manc 1654II	JT 1685	Manc 1638L	Manc 1638PhL	¹Fuer 1650–70	Total
'put, set, lay, leave; pretend (RFL)'		3	24	79	9	12	17	144 (45%)
Permittee	'let'	2	32	15	0	7	2	58 (18%)
	dat	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
	dat=acc	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	acc	2	6	10	0	3	0	21
	PP *no*	0	5	2	0	0	0	7
	Omitted	0	18	2	0	4	2	26
Causee	'make; have done; order'	2	79	29	1	3	2	116 (36%)
	dat	0	3	1	0	0	1	5
	dat=acc	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
	acc	1	23	3	0	1	1	29
	PP *caur, ar*	0	0	9	0	0	0	9
	Omitted	1	50	16	1	2	0	70
Total		7	135	123	10	22	21	318

3.2. *(pie-)spiest*

Factitive *(pie-)spiest* is quite rare in modern Latvian, but is attested at least twice in the 16th c. texts (Pakerys 2017a: 102–103). In my sample of 17th c. sources, I identified 24 examples of factitive *(pie-)spiest*, one of which is presented in (26); note that *spiest* 'compel' is already found in the same passage of the New Testament in the 16th c. (see Pakerys 2017a: 102), and the same construction remains in JT1685.

(26) a. Old Latvian
  ſpeed *tohß* *ſcheit* *eekſchan* **nahkt**
  make:IMP.2SG DEM.ACC.PL.M here inside come:INF
  'compel them to come in'

  Manc1654II 30$_{11-12}$ Luke 14:23

  b. German
  nötige *sie* ***hereinzukommen***

  Luther 1545 Luke 14:23

The permittee is invariably marked by the accusative, which stems from the source construction ('press' + ACC > 'compel, make' + ACC), with the exception of one passage from Fürecker's dictionary where the dative is used twice, as shown in (27); the infinitive clause is omitted, but it can be recovered from the context (*dot bērības* 'give grain duties'):

(27) Old Latvian

kam	*itt*	***pee-speed,***	*tas*	*dewe*
who:DAT	very	PFX-make:PST.3	DEM.NOM.SG.M	give:PST.3
behribas,	***kam***	*ne*	***pee-speed,***	*tas*
grain.duty:ACC.PL	who:DAT	NEG	PFX-make:PST.3	DEM.NOM.SG.M
pallikke	*tà*			
remain:PST.3	so			

'The grain duties were delivered by the ones who were strongly compelled [to deliver them], while the ones who were not compelled to, remained so [without delivering them]'

[1]Für1650–70 248$_{3-5}$

In modern Latvian the dative of the causee in PCCs with *spiest* is also possible and can be explained as being influenced by the most frequent factitive PCCs with *likt* where the dative of the causee is used (Pakerys 2016: 448). In the 17th c. sources, the dative with *likt* is rare, as we have seen in the previous sections, but it is interesting to note that Fürecker actually uses the dative with *likt*, as in (22) presented earlier. If using the dative with *spiest* in Fürecker's language could be interpreted as being influenced by *likt* with the dative, then *likt* should have also been quite frequently used with the dative. My data of Fürecker's use of *likt* are currently too limited to support such a claim so further research is needed. In other lexicographic sources one should note that Mancelius not only translates German *zwingen* as *ʃpeeʃt, peeʃpeeʃt* (= *spiest, piespiest*), but also notes that the verb is (= has the phonetic form) *ʃpieʃt* (= *spīst*) in *Roʃiten*, i.e. Rēzekne in Latgalia (Manc1638L 222v$_{14-15}$).

It is interesting that in the course of the development of factitive *(pie-) spiest*, PPs with *pi(e)* (note the correlating prefix *pie-*) seem to have played a role. In a notable number of cases (approximately five) *(pie-)spiest* is used with a PP with *pi(e)* without the subordinate infinitive, but the meaning 'force, compel' can already be clearly seen, cf. (28a) with a PP with *pi* but without the infinitive and (29b) with both a PP with *pi* and a subordinate infinitive clause:

(28) Old Latvian

a. *Pharao* *tohß* *Bährnus* *Jſräel* [...] ***py***
   pharaoh DEM.ACC.PL.M child:ACC.PL Israel to
   Darrbu [...] ***ſpeede***
   work:ACC.SG press:PST.3
   (literally) 'Pharaoh pressed the children of Israel to work$_N$'

b. *taß* ***ſpeede*** *tohß* *Beßdeewighus* ***py***
   DEM.NOM.SG.M compel:PST.3 DEM.ACC.PL.M godless.one:ACC.PL to
   Deewu ***nahkt***
   god:ACC.SG come:INF
   'He compelled the godless ones to come to God'

It should also be said that *spiest* typically has a strong connotation of force, while *likt* usually refers to a rather indirect factivity. This is in line with the proposal that the factitive function of *likt* developed out of the permissive one, but *spiest*, in contrast, was directly factitive from the start. This aspect could be addressed in more detail in a separate study by comparing the sources of translations of *spiest* and *likt* and by taking into account other factors, such as the animacy of the permittee/causee.

To return to the quantitative data, *spiest* as a factitive verb is found in eighteen cases, while in sixteen examples it is used as 'press' or in other similar meanings. (Note that constructions not complemented by subordinate clauses, but having a meaning close to 'force', as in (28a), were included in the latter count.) Prefixed *pie-spiest* in three cases is used as 'press (to)' and in six instances it is found in factitive PCCs. Reflexive constructions are not used in canonical PCCs with *(pie-)spiest* (with subordinate finite or infinitive clauses) so are not included in these counts.

4. Conclusions

In the permissive domain, Old Latvian of the 17th c. uses five constructions based on the verbs *dot*, *laist, ļaut, likt*, and *(at-)vēlēt*. The construction with *likt* is the most frequent (59 cases), which significantly differs from modern Latvian where *likt* is found only in factitive PCCs. Compared to the 16th c. sources, it is interesting to note that the frequency of *laist* is lower (eighteen examples) in comparison to *dot* (30 examples), which has very limited attestations in the 16th c. texts; it should be noted, however, that almost two-thirds of the PCCs with *dot* in the 17th c. sample were found in one source (Elg1621). PCCs with *(at-)vēlēt* and *ļaut* were not found in the 16th c. sample and they were also rare in my 17th c. corpus ((at-)vēlēt has fifteen attestations and *ļaut* is found in seven PCCs). Future productivity of

constructions with *(at-)vēlēt* and *ļaut* took different paths: in modern Latvian, the PCC with *ļaut* became the most productive one, while the PCC with *(at-)vēlēt* is no longer used. Reflexive (middle) permissive constructions in the 17th c. sources most frequently occur with *likt* and usually contain two affixal markers.

The permittee can be marked by the accusative, by syncretic pronominal dative/accusative forms, or by datives. The dative is certainly original in *dot* constructions and possibly original but rare in *likt* constructions; in other constructions, the dative of the permittee can be treated as an innovation and is used in place of the original accusative. In reflexive constructions with *likt*, the permittee can be marked by a PP with *no*, which is a copy of the corresponding German *lassen* construction with a PP with *von*.

In the domain of factitive PCCs, only two constructions are found. The most frequent one is based on *likt* (106 examples) complemented by a much rarer *(pie-)spiest* (24 examples). The causee in these constructions is usually marked by the accusative, which was original in transitive *(pie-)spiest* constructions, while in *likt* constructions, the accusative could be used following the model of German *lassen* constructions instead of the possibly original dative, but further research is still needed to clarify this aspect. In curative constructions with *likt* referring to mediated communication, the causee can be expressed by PP *caur*, which apparently reflects German PP with *durch*. Only PCCs with *likt* are found in reflexive (middle) constructions, which frequently have a curative function and bear two affixal middle markers. PCCs with *(pie-)spiest* always refer to direct factitive causation, while *likt* constructions seem to bear a link to indirect factivity. This is in line with the proposal that the latter factitive PCCs developed from *likt* permissives and this change was directly influenced, or at least supported, by the corresponding German *lassen* constructions, which also have permissive and factitive functions.

Abbreviations

1 – 1st person, 2 – 2nd person, 3 – 3rd person, ACC – accusative, ALL – allative, CMP – comparative, DAT – dative, DEF – definite, DEM – demonstrative (pronoun), DIM – diminutive, F – feminine, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, HORT – hortative, IMP – imperative, INF – infinitive, LOC – locative, M – masculine, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PFX – prefix, PL – plural, POSS – possessive (pronoun), PRS – present, PSS – passive, PST – past, PTCL – particle, PTCP – participle, RFL – reflexive (pronoun or affix), SG – singular.

Sources

17th c. Latvian[26]

Elg1621 =	Georg Elger, *Geistliche Catholiche Gesänge* [...], Braunsberg: Schönfels, 1621.
¹Für1650–70 =	Christoph Fürecker, *Lettisches und Teutsches Wörterbuch*, ms. 1, 1650–1670.
JT1685 =	Ernst Glück, *Tas Jauns Testament* [...], Rīga: Wilcken, 1685.
Manc1638L =	Georg Mancelius, *Lettus* [...], Rīga: Schröder, 1638.
Manc1638PhL =	Georg Mancelius, *Phraseologia Lettica* [...], Rīga: Schröder, 1638.
Manc1654II =	Georg Mancelius, *Lang=gewünschte Lettische Postill* [...]. Ander Theil [...], Rīga: Schröder, 1654.

Other

Luther 1545 =	Luther's Bible translation of 1545. Available online at https://unbound.biola.edu.
Textus Receptus =	Greek text of the New Testament, based on the edition of Robert Estienne (1550), with variants of Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener (1894). Available online at https://unbound.biola.edu.
Vulgata Clementina =	Latin Vulgata Clementina, based on the edition of Alberto Colunga and Laurentio Turrado (1946). Available online at https://unbound.biola.edu.

References

Cole, Peter. 1983.	The grammatical role of the causee in Universal Grammar, *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49(2), 115–133.
DWB =	*Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*. 16 Bde. in 32 Teilbänden, Leipzig, 1854–1961. Available online at http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB.
EH =	Jānis Endzelīns, Edīte Hauzenberga. *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu K. Mühlenbachs Lettisch-deutschem Wörterbuch*. Rīga: Kultūras fonds, 1934–1946. Available online at http://tezaurs.lv/mev/.
Endzelīns, Jānis. 1951.	*Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība.
Gāters, Alfrēds. 1993.	*Lettische Syntax: die Dainas* (Herausgegeben von Hildegard Radtke). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
Givón, Talmy. 2001.	*Syntax: An Introduction* 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Holvoet, Axel. 2001.	*Studies in the Latvian verb*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

---

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

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.
Kazakėnaitė, Ernesta. 2019.	*XVI–XVII a. liuteronų latviškųjų Biblijos fragmentų sąsajos su Glücko Biblijos vertimu (1685–1694). Daktaro disertacija*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
LEV =	Konstantīns Karulis, *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* 1–2. Rīga: Avots, 1992.
ME =	*K. Mühlenbachs lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von Jan Endzelin. Riga: Lettisches Bildungs-ministerium, 1923–1932. Available online at http://tezaurs.lv/mev/.
Pakerys, Jurgis. 2016.	On periphrastic causative constructions in Lithuanian and Latvian. Axel Holvoet, Nicole Nau (eds.), *Valency, Argument Realization and Grammatical Relations in Baltic* 3, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 427–458.
Pakerys, Jurgis. 2017a.	Periphrastic causative constructions in 16th century Latvian, *Baltu filoloģija* 26(1), 87–106.
Pakerys, Jurgis. 2017b.	Old Prussian *dāt* 'give' in causative and hortative constructions, *Baltic linguistics* 8, 115–141.
Pakerys, Jurgis. 2019.	Periphrastic causative constructions in Baltic. An overview, *Baltic Linguistics* 9, 9–56.
Toops, Gary H. 2012.	Causative constructions in colloquial vs. literary Upper Sorbian. *Die Welt der Slaven* 57, 322–332.
Vanags, Pēteris. 1996.	Locījumu lietošanas īpatnības vecākajos latviešu rakstos, *Baltu filoloģija* 6, 71–78.
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.
Verhagen, Arie, Suzanne Kemmer. 1994.	The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events, *Cognitive Linguistics* 5, 115–156.
Waldenfels, Ruprecht von. 2012.	*The Grammaticalization of "Give" + Infinitive, A Comparative Study of Russian, Polish, and Czech*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
Waldenfels, Ruprecht von. 2015.	Grammaticalization of 'give' in Slavic between drift and contact: Causative, modal, imperative, existential, optative and volative constructions. Brian Nolan, Gudrun Rawoens, Elke Diedrichsen (eds.), *Causation, Permission, and Transfer: Argument Realisation in GET, TAKE, PUT, GIVE and LET Verbs*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 107–127.

Jurgis Pakerys
Department of Baltic Linguistics
Vilnius University
Universiteto 3, 01513 Vilnius, Lithuania
jurgis.pakerys@flf.vu.lt

KOPSAVILKUMS

Perifrastiskās kauzatīvās konstrukcijas 17. gs. latviešu valodā

Jurgis PAKERYS

Balstoties 17. gs. latviešu tekstu materiālā, rakstā aplūkoti perifrastiskie kauzatīvi ar darbības vārdiem *dot*, *laist, ļaut, likt*, *(at-)vēlēt* (ar permisīvu nozīmi) un *likt*, *(pie-)spiest* (ar faktitīvu nozīmi).

Permisīvā kontekstā visbiežāk tiek izmantota konstrukcija ar *likt* (59 gadījumi), kas ir liela atšķirība no mūsdienu latviešu valodas, kur *likt* perifrastiskajās konstrukcijās parasti lietots tikai faktitīvā nozīmē. Salīdzinot ar 16. gadsimta tekstiem, interesanti, ka biežāk par *laist* (18 gadījumi) tiek izmantotas konstrukcijas ar *dot* (30 gadījumi). Taču jāatzīmē, ka gandrīz 2/3 no permisīvajām konstrukcijām ar *dot* tika atrastas vienā avotā – Elgera 1621. gada dziesmu grāmatā. 16. gadsimta tekstos darbības vārds *dot* permisīvajās konstrukcijās lietots ļoti reti, konstrukcijas ar *(at-)vēlēt* un *ļaut* netika atrastas vispār. Rakstam izmantotajos 17. gadsimta avotos pēdējie divi darbības vārdi arī lietoti reti, bet jau droši: 15 permisīvas konstrukcijas ar *(at-)vēlēt* un 7 konstrukcijas ar *ļaut*. Turpmākā šo konstrukciju produktivitāte ir būtiski mainījusies: mūsdienu latviešu valodā konstrukcijas ar *ļaut* ir visizplatītākās, bet ar *(at-)vēlēt* vairs netiek izmantotas permisīvā nozīmē. Atgriezeniskajās (mediālajās) permisīvajās konstrukcijās 17. gadsimta avotos visizplatītākais ir darbības vārds *likt*, un pašā konstrukcijā refleksīvo afiksu parasti pievieno gan pie *likt*, gan infinitīva (piemēram, *nelieka-s mācītie-s*). Objekts permisīvajās konstrukcijās apzīmēts ar datīvu, akuzatīvu un vietniekvārdu sinkrētiskajām datīva-akuzatīva formām. Datīvs neapšaubāmi ir primārs konstrukcijās ar *dot* un, iespējams, primārs (bet reti izmantots) konstrukcijās ar *likt*. Citās konstrukcijās objekta datīvs uzskatāms par jauninājumu sākotnējā akuzatīva vietā. Refleksīvajās konstrukcijās ar *likt* objekts tiek apzīmēts ar prievārdu *no*, un šāds apzīmējums ir jāuzskata par vācu valodas konstrukcijas *sich V lassen von* kopiju.

Faktitīvā kontekstā tiek izmantotas tikai divas konstrukcijas: visbiežāk ar *likt* (106 gadījumi), daudz retāk ar *(pie-)spiest* (24 gadījumi). Objekts šajās konstrukcijās parasti tiek apzīmēts ar akuzatīvu, kas ir jāuzskata par primāru konstrukcijās ar *(pie-)spiest*, bet konstrukcijās ar *likt* akuzatīvs sākotnējā datīva vietā varēja parādīties vācu konstrukciju ar *lassen* ietekmes dēļ. Konstrukcijās ar *likt*, kas apraksta komunikatīvas situācijas ar starpniekiem, starpnieku apzīmē ar prepozīciju *caur*, pēc atbilstošajām vācu konstrukcijām ar prepozīciju *durch*. Refleksīvās (mediālās) faktitīvās konstrukcijas sastopamas tikai ar *likt*; tajās parasti izmantoti divi atgriezeniskie afiksi, un šādu konstrukciju nozīme parasti ir kuratīva. Konstrukcijas ar *(pie-)spiest* vienmēr apzīmē tiešu faktitīvo kauzāciju, savukārt konstrukcijas ar *likt* tiek lietotas, izsakot arī netiešo (kuratīvo) faktitīvu. Šāda saistība ir pilnībā izprotama, ņemot vērā faktitīvo konstrukciju ar *likt* iespējamo izcelsmi no permisīvajām; funkcijas maiņu no permisīvās uz faktitīvo, iespējams, tieši ietekmēja vai vismaz balstīja vācu konstrukcijas ar *lassen*, kurām arī ir gan permisīvā, gan faktitīvā funkcija.