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):

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 (= Für1650–70; 14,611 words);
5) Georg Mancelius, *Lang=gewünschte Lettische Postill*, part two, 1654 (= Manc1654II; 99,649 words);
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

---

1 This article is one of the outcomes of the research project “Periphrastic causatives in Baltic” financed by the Research Council of Lithuania, agreement No. LIP-080/2016. I would like to thank anonymous reviewers for a number of important suggestions that helped me improve the present version of the article. I am also sincerely grateful to Cristina Aggazzotti for editing the English of my article.

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. \[\text{Laid tawai Širrdei turr buht}\]
\[\text{let: IMP.2SG poss.2SG.DAT.F heart: DAT.SG there be: INF}\]

'M Let your heart be there’

Manc1654II 262{242}30

b. \[\text{laidi mann papreekšchu no=ee}t/ un}\]
\[\text{let: IMP.2SG 1SG.DAT/ACC first}\]
\[\text{śawu Tehwu aprakt}\]
\[\text{poss.RFL.ACC.SG.M father: ACC.SG bury: INF}\]

'suffer me first to go and bury my father’

JT1685 Matthew 8:21

German

c. \[\text{erlaube mir, daß ich hingehe und zuvor meinen Vater begrabe}\]

Luther 1545 Matthew 8:21

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

\[\text{In most cases I provide German parallels for JT1685 taken from Luther 1545 because they can be used to demonstrate the influence the German constructions had on (Old) Latvian. I do not claim, however, that the passages from JT1685 cited in this paper were necessarily translated from German because their translation history is much more complicated due to the use of the Greek original (Latin Vulgate could also have been used) and earlier Latvian translations from German; see the most recent treatment of this question in Kazakėnaitė (2019). When necessary, Greek and Latin parallels will be mentioned in addition to the German ones.}\]
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 1754–5

German
e. *eine dirne berahten befreijen*  

\(^1\)Für1650–70 1754

The PCCs with *laist* should have developed from the primary use ‘release, let go’, which is well-attested in the 17\(^{th}\) 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 1\(^{st}\) or 2\(^{nd}\) 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 \textit{liktie-s} (see Section 2.5 and 3), and in Luther’s Bible translation it is equivalent to German \textit{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
\begin{verbatim}
Atgreezeetes no Grehkeem/ un laifchatee-s
turn.back:IMP.2PL.RFL from sin:DAT.PL and let:IMP.2PL-RFL
ikweens kriﬆitee-s
everyone:NOM,M baptize:INF-RFL
\end{verbatim}
‘Repent, and be baptized [literally: have yourself baptized] every one of you’
JT1685 Acts 2:38

b. German
\begin{verbatim}
Tut Buße, und lasse sich ein jeglicher taufen
\end{verbatim}
Luther 1545 Acts 2:38

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

(4) Old Latvian
\begin{verbatim}
pa-laidee-ß us to Kunghu JEfum
Chriﬆum / no wiﬁšas Sirads
Christ:ACC from all:GEN.SG,F heart:GEN.SG
\end{verbatim}
‘Rely on the Lord Jesus Christ from the bottom of your heart’
Manc1654II 131\textsuperscript{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: \textit{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 \textit{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

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{To} & \text{Waidu} & \text{nhe} & \text{laid} & \text{mums} \\
\text{DEM.ACC.SG.F} & \text{misfortune:ACC.SG} & \text{NEG} & \text{let:IMP.2SG} & \text{1PL.DAT/ACC} \\
\text{wairahk} & \text{redfeht!} \\
\text{more} & \text{see:INF} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Do not let us see that misfortune anymore!’

Manc1654II 19518–19

Seventeenth century sources also use various forms of the imperative of \textit{lai\textit{st}} in 3\textsuperscript{rd} person optative and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person and 1\textsuperscript{st} person plural hortative constructions.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{lai\textit{st}}, imperative forms are quite frequent, as reflected in (2) through (5) above. The tendency to use permissive \textit{lai\textit{st}} in imperative contexts appears to have played an important role in the process of turning the imperative form \textit{laid(i)} into the optative/hortative 3\textsuperscript{rd} person marker \textit{laid}, which was further abbreviated to \textit{lai}. In modern Latvian \textit{lai} is combined with the present 3\textsuperscript{rd} 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 16\textsuperscript{th} c. sources, modal constructions with \textit{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 17\textsuperscript{th} c. sources the constructions with the infinitive drop in frequency. For example, in the Gospel of Mark in JT1685, out of sixteen constructions with \textit{lai}, only one occurs with the infinitive (Mark 9:35), while the rest have the present 3\textsuperscript{rd} person indicative form, cf. (6a) and (6c):

(6) a. Old Latvian

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{tas} & \text{lai} & \text{buht} & \text{wi\textsuperscript{\textit{\`s}}\textsuperscript{o}} & \text{pehdigajs} \\
\text{DEM.NOM.SG.M} & \text{PTCL} & \text{be:INF} & \text{all:GEN.PL} & \text{last:NOM.SG.M.DEF} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘the same shall be last of all’

JT1685 Mark 9:35

\textsuperscript{8} Alternatively, these forms are labeled “imperative”.
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 muhfchighe /
name:NOM,SG forever
laid wifšahm Semmehm pillahm kluht
PTCL all:DAT,PL,F land:DAT,PL full:DAT,PL,F become:INF
no winja Ślahwu und Gohodu 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 98,7–7 (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

_Laß 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 _Catechismus 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 _Catechismus 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 _laß(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 **wyffems** precatės
   
   PTCL 1PL.DAT/ACC all:DAT.PL10 rejoice:INF
   
   ‘Let’s rejoice everyone’

   Elg1621 173

b. **laideet** mums **ehšt/ un** lihgsmeem **buht**
   
   PTCL 1PL.DAT/ACC eat:INF and happy:DAT.PL.M11 be:INF
   
   ‘let us eat, and be merry’

   JT1685 Luke 15:23

German

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

   Luther 1545 Luke 15:23

Old Latvian

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

   JT1685 Mark 1:38

German

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

   Luther 1545 Mark 1:38

It is worth noting that Mancelius in his *Phraseologica Lettica* translates the German hortative *laß uns 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 Endzelins (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).

### Table 1

**laist(ies) in the 17th c. sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elg1621</th>
<th>Manc 1654II</th>
<th>JT1685</th>
<th>Manc 1638L</th>
<th>Manc 1638PhL</th>
<th>¹Für 1650–70</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘release, leave, go, etc.’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3[13]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3[14]</td>
<td>23 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘let’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT=ACC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘have’ (curative; reflexive)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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/dev** 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 611

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 611

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 485

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>give:IMP.2SG</th>
<th>mums/ 1PL.DAT/ACC</th>
<th><em>ka</em></th>
<th>mehs 1PL.NOM</th>
<th><em>šehdeht</em> sit:INF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**warram**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>be.able:PRS.1PL</th>
<th>eeksch</th>
<th>tawas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Gohdibas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>glory:GEN.SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘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 | žäleftybe [...]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM.NOM.SG.F</td>
<td>saint:GEN.SG.M</td>
<td>spirit:GEN.SG</td>
<td>grace:NOM.SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Däw**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>give:PST.3</th>
<th>yz-runnat</th>
<th>wallodems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEM.DAT.PL.M</td>
<td>PFX-speak:INF</td>
<td>language:DAT.PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


In the dictionary of Mancelius, an interesting use of *dot* is found in the entry of German *säugen* ‘suckle’: *fäu gen*/ fieft dohdt/ dieliet/ fiedenaht (Manc1638L 1508–9). Here the phrase *fieft dohdt* (= *zīst dot* in modern spelling) ‘give to suck’ corresponds to the morphological causative *zīd-enā-t* (fiedenaht) ‘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 ėst/dzert dot (eat:INF/drink:INF give:INF) ‘give, provide food/drinks’). One such case is also found in Manc1638PhL 362, Sirrgham djerrt 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’

b. O Gott gib das ich wider dich nicht murre

Old Latvian
c. Deews dohd mannam behrnam tà
god:VOC.SG give:IMP.2SG poss.1SG.DAT.M child:DAT.SG so
no-śirmoht 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’

German
d. Gott lasse mein Kind so grau u. alt werden

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):

\[(13) \text{Old Latvian} \]
\[
\text{nhe buhß mums us muhfsö Prahtu}
\]
\[\text{NEG be:FUT.3 1PL.DAT/ACC on POSS.1PL.GEN reason:ACC.SG dohtee-ß} \]
\[\text{give:INF-RFL} \]
\[\text{‘We should not rely on our reason’} \]

\[\text{Manc1654II 166\text{28–29}}\]

\textit{dot in the 17th c. sources}\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elg 1621</th>
<th>Manc 1654II</th>
<th>JT 1685</th>
<th>Manc 1638L</th>
<th>Manc 1638 PhL</th>
<th>\textsuperscript{1}Für 1650–70</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘give, grant + NP, etc.’</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>525 (94.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘let, grant + INF/that-clause’</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘make’ (cognition/perception)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{2.3. laut}

In modern Latvian, \textit{laut} is the most frequently used permissive verb, but it is not attested in the 16\textsuperscript{th} c. sources and it is still rare in the 17\textsuperscript{th} c. sources. Similar to the 16\textsuperscript{th} c. texts, Elg1621 has no attestations of \textit{laut}, while other sources have a few examples. Mancelius translates German erlauben as \textit{laut}/attwehleht/ wehleht (\textit{=laut, atvēlēt, vēlēt}) and verhängen\textsuperscript{16}, zulassen as \textit{laut}/wålłu doht (\textit{=laut, vaļu dot}; Manc1638L 112v\textsubscript{s}, 193v\textsubscript{s}).\textsuperscript{17} This means that \textit{laut}

\textsuperscript{15} For Elg1621, Manc1654II, and JT1685, only the forms INF \textit{dot}, PRS.2/PRES.3/IMP.2SG \textit{dod(i)}, and PST.3 \textit{deva/devæ} were reviewed; for other sources, all forms were reviewed.

\textsuperscript{16} German verhängen is used here as permissive (\textit{=zulassen}); see (3) in DWB, http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemma=verhangen.

\textsuperscript{17} At-vēlēt is discussed in the following section (2.4); the idiomatic phrase \textit{vaļu dot} (freedom. to.act:ACC.SG give:INF) ‘grant the freedom to act’ has a variant with \textit{laut} (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 \textit{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 \textit{ļaut} is used in the sentence to illustrate the verb \textit{apģērbties} ‘get dressed’, as shown in (14b).

(14) Old Latvian

a. \textit{Wings} nhe ghribbeja \textit{ļaut} / Šwehta Deenā
   3.sg.nom.m neg want:pst.3 allow:inf saint:loc.sg.f day:loc.sg
   nhekahdu Darrbu \textit{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)’
   \textit{Manc1654II} 316\{296\}\textsubscript{25–26}

b. $\left[\ldots\right]$ meitiņas\{meintiņas\} puišchus \textit{ne \textit{ļauj}}
   girl:dim.nom.pl boy:acc.pl neg let:prs.3
   \textit{ap-ģērbtees}
   pf\textsubscript{x}-dress:inf.rfl
   ‘the girls do not allow the boys to get dressed’
   \textsuperscript{1}Für1650–70 77\textsubscript{18–19}

German

c. $\left[\ldots\right]$ die mägdlein \textbf{Sich} die jungens \textbf{nicht laßen ankleiden}
   \textsuperscript{1}Für1650–70 77\textsubscript{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 \textit{ļaut} constructions in modern Latvian. This accusative perhaps reflects the original and archaic marking inherited from the transitive use of \textit{ļaut} (formerly as ‘release’, cf. the case of \textit{laist} above and see a discussion in Pakerys (2019: 121–123)); alternatively, the accusative of the permittee could be regarded as copied from German \textit{lassen} constructions where permittees are usually marked by the accusative. (Note, however, that the dative can be used with prefixed \textit{zu-lassen}, as in (15d).) The dative is found with \textit{ļaut} in JT1685 and is illustrated in (15a), where the infinitive clause is omitted; in the following verse in (15c), \textit{ļaut} is used again with the dative of the permittee, but instead of the infinitive clause, the pronoun \textit{to} ‘this (i.e. baptism)’ (\textit{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: \textit{Ļaujeet teem Wallas} (let:imp.2pl dem.dat.pl.m freedom.to.act:acc.pl), literally ‘allow them the freedom to act’ (= ‘let them’), cf. \textit{vaļu dot} from Manc1638L mentioned at the beginning of this section.
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.  *laįjē-s Peeluhgtee-s*
   allow:IMP.2SG-RFL ask:INF-RFL
   ‘Allow to be asked’

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), velēt is used twice as ‘wish’ (inf whelet I4r14; prs.3 whele I2v8).

In the 17th c. sources, (at-)velēt 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, göñen. wünschen ‘Für1650–70 296s3). Mancelius’s dictionary (MancL1638), in contrast, has nine attestations in total; permissive velēt is mentioned four times and atvelēt is used five times. (Both verbs typically occur in the same dictionary entry, for example, erlauben/ laut/ attwehleht/ wehleht Manc1638L 112B5–6; here, only tokens of the permissive function were counted.) MancPhL1638 bears no examples of (at-)velēt and the second part of Mancelius’s book of sermons has only one example of at-velēt, presented in (17a). This example is interesting in that darbs ‘work’ functions as an argument of atvelēt ‘allow’ and darīt ‘do’ is used as an adjunct, i.e. active atvelēt darbu (darīt) ‘allow the work (to do)’ versus passive darbs ir atvelēts (darīt) ‘the work is permitted (to do)’, cf. (17b) where at-velēt 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 
   Darbs / Śwehtā=Deenā 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. wiſśi tee [...] wiſśu laun att-wehļ 
   all:NOM.PL.M DEM.NOM.PL.M all:ACC.SG.M bad PFX-allow:PRS.3 
   Manc1654II 2136

   ‘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 (velēts) ‘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 velēt ‘allow’ and in one case not mentioned thus far, the NP again appears as being governed by velēt in a passive construction, as shown in (18e).

18 I should mention that at-velēt perhaps could be also interpreted as ‘wish’ in (17b), but I have not found any other unambiguous uses of prefixed at-velēt used as ‘wish’ in my sample.
(18) a. Latvian

\[\text{Irā-g wehlehts/ tam}\]
\[\text{be:PRS.3-PTCL allow:PST.PSS.PTCP.NOM.SG.M DEM.DAT.SG.M}\]
\[\text{Keiferam Mešlus doht [...]?}\]
\[\text{Caesar:DAT tax:ACC.PL give:INF}\]

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

JT1685 Matthew 22:17

b. German

\[\text{Ist’s recht, daß man dem Kaiser Zins gebe [...]?}\]

Luther 1545 Matthew 22:17

c. Latin

\[\text{licet censum dare Caesar [...]?}\]

Vulgata Clementina Matthew 22:17

d. Greek

\[\text{ἐξεστὶ δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι [...]?}\]

Textus Receptus Matthew 22:17

e. Old Latvian

\[\text{Tee bij [...] wehleti ehft}\]
\[\text{DEM.NOM.PL.M be:PST.3 allow:PST.PSS.PTCP.NOM.PL.M eat:INF}\]

‘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 tōw 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, tōw 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. 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 leezet wiņņam wairs ne neeka
NEG allow:IMP.2PL 3.DAT.SG.M anymore NEG nothing:GEN
śawam Tehwam jeb śawai
POS.RFL.DAT.SG.M father:DAT.SG or POS.RFL.DAT.SG.F
Mahtei darrīht
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 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.

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/causes 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 and in this context, morphosyntactic copying is also quite likely. 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 89c) 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 (Für1650–70 20024–25).

(20) Old Latvian

a. ne leezee-s śew pahrrunnee-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

b. traue ihnen nicht

   Luther 1545 Acts 23:21

Old Latvian

c. Winji nhe leekab-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. winfch leek śawu Šauli 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
   Luther 1545 Matthew 5:45

Old Latvian
c.  *Un *likke tam *szazziht* (*Greek: Wall: \Śazzija us to*)
   and make:PST.3 DEM.DAT.SG.M say:INF (Greek language23 say:PST.3 to DEM.ACC.SG.M
   ‘And said unto him’ [literally: ‘And had [them] say to him (in Greek: said to him)’]
   JT1685 Matthew 11:3

d.  *und ließ ihm sagen*
   Luther 1545 Matthew 11:3

   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* [...] *redfeht* (let:PRS.3 see:INF) Manc1654II 3210–11 ‘lets see’ = ‘shows’, *leek finnaht* (let:PRS.3 know:INF) Manc1654II 392 ‘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 [...]’

   ¹Für1650–70 1626–7

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 3421–22

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
   Evangelium 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 15629–30

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’. 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).

---

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. \( \text{ēβ} \text{ lickschoh-β} \text{ to} \text{ Sohbu} \)

\[ \text{1sg.nom} \text{ make:fut.1sg-rfl} \text{ dem.acc.sg.m} \text{ tooth:acc.sg} \]

\text{iβwillckt}

\text{pull.out:inf}

‘I will have my tooth pulled out’

Manc1638PhL 257_{24}

German

b. \text{Ich wil mir den Zahn laffen außziehen}

Manc1638PhL 257_{23}

Old Latvian

c. \text{Śwähtz Gharrs leekah-β ka} \]

\[ \text{saint:nom.sg.m} \text{ spirit:nom.sg} \text{ allow:prs.3-rfl} \text{ as} \]

\text{Ballodis redfète-β}

\text{dove:nom.sg} \text{ see:inf-rfl}

‘The Holy Ghost appears as a dove’

Manc1654II 9_{25}

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

\[ \text{und [Lydia] licksah-β sōw Chriftitee-β} \]

\[ \text{and Lydia:nom} \text{ make:pst.3-rfl rf.l.dat/acc baptize:inf-rfl} \]

‘and [Lydia] had herself baptized’

MancLPII 183 (cf. Acts 16:15)
Table 3

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

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

3.2. *(pie–)spiest*

Factivive *(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

\[
\text{spiedt} \quad \text{tohß ſcheit eekſchan ſnahkt} \\
\text{make:IMP.2SG DEM.ACC.PL.M here inside come:INF}
\]

‘compel them to come’

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

b. German

\[
\text{nötige sie hereinzukommen}
\]

Luther 1545 Luke 14:23

---

25 Only the *INF likt*, *PRS.3 likt*, and *PST.3 lika* forms were reviewed in Manc1654II; in other sources, all forms were reviewed.
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

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{kam} & \quad \textit{itt} \quad \textit{pee-speed,} \quad \textit{tas} \quad \textit{dewe} \\
\text{who:DAT} & \quad \text{very} \quad \text{pfx-make:PST.3} \quad \text{DEM.NOM.SG.M} \quad \text{give:PST.3} \\
\textit{behribas,} & \quad \textit{kam} \quad \textit{ne} \quad \textit{pee-speed,} \quad \textit{tas} \\
\text{grain.duty:ACC.PL} & \quad \text{who:DAT} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{pfx-make:PST.3} \quad \text{DEM.NOM.SG.M} \\
\textit{pallikke} & \quad \textit{tà} \\
\text{remain:PST.3} & \quad \text{so}
\end{align*}
\]

‘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]’

\(^{1}\)Fürl650–70 2483–5

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 17\(^{th}\) 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 fpeeft, peefpeeft (= spiest, piespiest), but also notes that the verb is (= has the phonetic form) fpieft (= spīst) in Rofiten, i.e. Rēzekne in Latgalia (Manc1638L 222v\textsubscript{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* tohβ 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 workN’

b. ταβ *speede* tohβ Beβdeewighus *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-spies* 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 \(laut\) took different paths: in modern Latvian, the PCC with \(laut\) became the most productive one, while the PCC with \((at-)vēlēt\) is no longer used. Reflexive (middle) permissive constructions in the 17\textsuperscript{th} c. sources most frequently occur with \(likt\) and usually contain two affixal markers.

The permittee can be marked by the accusative, by syncreric 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**

Sources

17th c. Latvian26


Other

Luther 1545 = Luther’s Bible translation of 1545. Available online at https://unbound.biola.edu.
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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, laut, likt, (at-)vēlēt (ar permisīvu nozīmi) un likt, (pie-)spiest (ar faktītīvu nozīmi).


Atgriezeniskajās (mediālajās) permisīvajās konstrukcijās 17. gadsimta avotos visizplatākais ir darbības vārds likt, un paša 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 neapšaubāmī ar primārās konstrukcijās ar dot un, iespējams, primārs (bet reti izmantots) konstrukcijās ar likt. Citās konstrukcijās objekta datīvs uzskatāms par jauninājumu sākotnējā datīva vietā. Refleksīvās konstrukcijās ar likt objekts tiek apzīmēts ar prievārdi no, un šāds apzīmējums ir jauzskatā par vācu valodas konstrukcijas sich V lassen von kopiju.

Faktītīvā 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 jauzskatā par primāru konstrukcijās ar (pie-)spiest, bet konstrukcijās ar likt akuzatīvs sākotnējā datīva vietā vērēja parādīties vācu konstrukcijā ar lassen ietekmes dēļ. Konstrukcijās ar likt, kas apraksta komunikatīvas situācijas starpniekiem, starpnieku apzīmē ar prepozīciju caur, pēc atbilstošajām vācā konstrukcijām ar prepozīciju durch. Refleksīvās (mediālās) faktītīvas konstrukcijās sastopamas tikai ar likt; tajās parasti izmantoti divi atgriezeniskie afiksi, un šādu konstrukciju nozīme parasti ir kuratīva. Konstrukcijās ar (pie-)spiest vienmēr apzīmē tiešu faktītīvo kauzāciju, savukārt konstrukcijās ar likt tiek lietotas, iesakot arī netiešo (kuratīvo) faktītīvu. Šāda saišība ir pilnībā izprotama, ņemot vērā faktītīvo konstrukciju ar likt iespējamo izcelsmi no permisīvām; funkcijas maiņu no permisīvās uz faktītīvo, iespējams, tieši ietekmēja vai vismaz balstīja vācu konstrukcijās ar lassen, kurām arī ir gan permisīvā, gan faktītīvā funkcija.