

P. VANAGS

## ON LATVIAN ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS HAVING A ROOT-END

*k, g*

In East Baltic beside *u*-stem adjectives there were adverbs derived from them, and characterized by the formant *-ai* and the consonant *-j-* placed between the root of the word and the adverb formant. This situation is still preserved in Lithuanian, e. g. *drąsūs* 'bold' — *drąsiai* 'boldly', *gardūs* 'tasty' — *gardžiai* 'tastily'. There is no such correspondence in Latvian any longer, neither are there *u*-stem adjectives, they have changed into *o*-stems. Alongside with the transition of all *u*-stem adjectives into *o*-stems, an unstable situation was created in the language, as beside some *o*-stem adjectives there were adverbs with *-j-* before the formant *-ai*, while beside other ones there were adverbs lacking this *-j-*. This discordance was levelled, but the dialects of Latvian had different ways. In High Latvian adverbs, beside all *o*-stem adjectives the consonant *-j-* was generalized, e. g. *drūoss* — *drūoši*, *gaŗds* — *gaŗži* (from the old *u*-stem), as well as *reŗts* 'rare' — *reŗi* 'rarely', *lŗts* 'cheap' — *lŗši* 'cheaply' (from the old *o*-stems). In Low Latvian, on the contrary, the difference between the stem-end consonants of the adjectives and the adverbs was levelled by choosing either one or the other variant, e. g. *drūoŗs* — *drūoŗi*, *tūmŗs* 'dark' — *tūmŗi* 'darkly', or *gaŗds* — *gaŗdi*, *saŗds* 'sweet' — *saŗdi* 'sweetly'.

A special problem is created by those adjectives and adverbs whose stems end in the consonants *k* and *g*. It seems that no adverbs (neither those derived from the old *u*-stems nor those derived from the *o*-stems) have the expected consonant *c* or *dz*. There are but two exceptions: adjective *lŗdzs* 'similar; level' — adverb *lŗdzi* 'along, together with', and *smalķs*, also *smalķs* 'fine' — *smalķi* 'finely'. These words will be discussed below.

Thus both in literary Latvian and in Low Latvian we have only *k* and *g*, e. g. *jaũķs* 'nice' — *jaũķi* 'nicely', *smags* 'heavy' — *smagi* 'heavily', *maĩgs* 'tender' — *maĩgi* 'tenderly', et al. In High Latvian *k* and *g* are just palatalized before the adverb formant *-i*, but there is no consonant iotation. This has even been noted in dialect descriptions, e. g. at Aknĩste *mĩŗeĩgi* 'quietly', *gũŗeĩgi* 'honestly', *smagi*, *il'gi* 'for a long time', *smuķi* 'nicely', *smalķi* (Ancĩtis, 1977, 131, 206); at Dignāja *smalķi*, *ilģi*, *gũŗeĩgi*, *mĩŗeĩgi* (Indāne, 1986, 88–89); *dòargi* 'expensively', *mòuŗeĩgi* 'eternally', *smagi*, *smalķi* at Susēja (FBR VII 144), *smagi*, *dũŗeĩgi* 'bravely', *ticeĩgi*

'piously' at Birži (FBR XII 89); *smāļki* at Barkava (FBR XIII 30); *dõrgi*, *smagi* at Zasa (FBR XIII 90); *smāļki*, *dõušēigi* at Sunākste (FBR XVI 54); *smāgi*, *smāļki* at Nereta (FBR XIX 110); *smagi*, *šmuki*, *skāudeīgi* 'enviously', *siřdeīgi* 'angrily', *balleīgi* 'timidly' at Lubāna (FBR XVII 133); *smagi* at Prauliena (FBR VI 113), et al. In the dialects of Latgale forms like *dūordži* 'expensively', *smāļči* 'finely' may appear, but the *-dži*, *-či* in these words have arisen from *-gi* and *-ki*, not from *-dzi* and *-ci* (cf. Endzelīns, La. gr., 187).

Why are then all the other consonants iotated in adverbs, and why are *k* and *g* not? The answer to the question apparently ought to be associated with the Latvian phonetic process *\*kj*, *\*gj* > *c*, *dz* in general. The process (including *\*k*, *\*g* > *c*, *dz* preceding a front vowel *e* or *i*), as it was stated by J. Endzelīns (La. gr., 94, 171, 185), was the first phonetic change to separate Latvian from Lithuanian. Besides, other phonetic processes of the language show us that the consonants *c*, *dz* had very early lost their original palatal characteristics (Endzelīns, La. gr., 94). Therefore the combinations *\*kj*, *\*gj* soon differed, as to their place in the phonological system of Latvian, from other combinations of a consonant plus *j*. Associating all these phenomena with the history of the adverbs under discussion, we may presume that initially there has been the following situation in the language:

1. *\*druosjai*, *\*gardjai*, etc.: *\*jaukjai*, *\*smagjai*, etc. Then *\*kj*, *\*gj* turned into *\*ć*, *\*dź*-

2. *\*druosjai*, *\*gardjai* : *\*jaućai*, *\*smadžai*.

When the combinations of other consonants plus *j* turned into single phonemes, and *\*c*, *\*dz* lost their palatalization, the situation was like this:

3. *\*druo(š)'ai*, *\*gar(d)(ž)'ai* : *\*jaucai*, *\*smadzai*.

At that time the morphonological alternation of the root morphs of the derived adverb and the adjective was the following:

|*druo(š)'*| : |*druos*|, |*gar(d)(ž)'*| : |*gard*| and  
|*jauc*| : |*jauk*|, |*smadz*| : |*smag*|.

Thus here are two kinds of alternation chains. On the one hand, |palatal consonant| : |non-palatal consonant|, on the other hand |non-palatal consonant| : |non-palatal consonant|. Besides, the alternation *c:k*, *dz:g* in this case was not motivated by the phonetic position either — consonants *c* and *dz* in those adverbs were situated before the back vowel, i. e. formant *-ai*. Thus a perfectly suitable situation is created for the consonants *c* and *dz* to be pushed out of the adverbs and be replaced by *k* and *g*.

In general, the *k:c*, *g:dz* alternation may be long-living, too. It is observed in Latvian verbs, e. g. *jauk-t* 'to mix' : *jauc-u* 'I mix'; *luoc-īt* 'to bend' : *luok-a* 'bends'; *bēg-u* 'I flee' : *bēdz* 'you flee', et al., in derivatives, e. g. *jauk-t* : *jauc-enis* 'mixture';

*dārg-s* 'dear' : *dārdz-ināt* 'to raise the price', et al. Partly, of course, the alternation is supported by the phonetic position of the consonant *c*, *dz* before the front vowels. However, there are forms of a structure similar to the adverbs under discussion, e. g. *jauc* 'mixes' < \**jauc-a* < \**jaukj-a*, or *ļēc-u* 'I jump' < \**lekj-ō*, whose root *ę* shows that no secondary palatalization has occurred here.

It is manifested also by the data of Slavonic languages, that the alternations *k:c* and *g:z*, having arisen after the 2nd or 3rd palatalization may be well preserved; so it is in Ukrainian, Polish, Sorbian, Czech, and partly in other Slavonic languages. In this case it is not so very important, that a phonetically different alternation *g:z* corresponds to the Latvian alternation *g:dz*. Still, there is a certain tendency in Slavonic languages to level the paradigms of words, replacing the consonant *c* by *k* (or *z* by *g*); so it is in Russian, Slovak, Slovenian (cf. Bernštejn, 1974: 55, 66; Shevelov, 1964: 296).

One more trait differentiating the Latvian *k:c*, *g:dz* alternations from other *j*-determined alternations is the following: they do not function in one system. One must consider also the fact that the parts of other alternations have originated from consonant plus *j* combinations only, whereas *c* and *dz* have originated before a front vowel as well.

In declension, the *k:c*, *g:dz* alternation appears in dialects in the paradigm of *o*-stem adjectives, e. g. at Skaista the nom. pl. *pelīēci* 'gray', dat. *pelīēcim* (Endzelīns, La. gr., 184). There is no other alternation in the paradigm of *o*-stems. Whereas in the paradigm of *iō*-stem nouns the *j*-determined alternation is found in the gen. sg. and in all the pl. cases, while there is no *k:c*, *g:dz* alternation; in all the cases you get *c*, *dz* only: *lācis* 'bear', *dadzis* 'burr' (in the gen. sg. and in the pl. there is even secondary iotation *c+j* > *č*; *dz+j* > *dž*: *lāča*, *dadža* et al.) Neither is there any *k:c*, *g:dz* alternation in *ē*-, *iā*-, *i*-stem paradigms; they, too, have only *c*, *dz* and secondary *č*, *dž*.

In the verbal system the use of the *k:c*, *g:dz* alternation and other *j*-determined alternations differs, too. In the *o*-stem paradigm we find only the *k:c*, *g:dz* alternation, e. g. *pērku* 'I buy' : *pērc* 'you buy', *dēgu* 'I burn' : *dedz* 'you burn'; there are no other alternations. Both kinds of alternations may be found in the *iō*-stem paradigm, though in different forms. As parts of the *k:c*, *g:dz* alternation, *k* and *g* are met in the infinitive stem only; in other forms there are *c* and *dz*, e. g. *jauk-t* 'to mix' : *jauc-u* 'I mix', *jauc* 'you mix', *jauc* 'mixes', *jauc-am* 'we mix', *jauc-at* 'ye mix'; *seg-t* 'to cover' : *sēdz-u* 'I cover', *sedz* 'you cover', *sēdz* 'covers', *sēdz-am* 'we cover', *sēdz-at* 'ye cover'. Other alternation chains have forms lacking *j* in the 2nd person sg., e. g. *cieš-u* 'I suffer', *cieš* 'suffers', *cieš-am* 'we suffer', *cieš-at* 'ye suffer' : *ciet* 'you suffer'; *beļ-u* 'I strew', *beļ* 'strews', *beļ-am* 'we strew', *beļ-at* 'ye strew' : *ber* 'you strew'; *plēšu* 'I tear', *plēš* 'tears', *plēš-am* 'we tear', *plēš-at* 'ye tear' : *plēs* 'you

tear'. In the *i*-stem paradigm there is a *c* or *dz* in all the forms — *redzu*, *redzi*, *redz*, *redzim*, *redzit* 'see', but other alternations are to be found, e. g. *sēžu* 'I sit' : *sēdi* 'you sit', *sēd* 'sits', *sēd-im* 'we sit', *sēd-it* 'ye sit'. (At present, *i*-stems are found in some dialects only, yet at the time when the consonant *c* or *dz* was replaced by *k* or *g* in adverbs, *i*-stem verbs were widely spread.) In the paradigm of *ā*-stem verbs the *k:c*, *g:dz* alternation originally contrasted the stems of the infinitive and the present, e. g. *luoku* 'I bend', etc. : *luocīt* 'to bend'. Later, though, this alternation is sometimes eliminated by generalizing the *c* of the infinitive (and past) stem instead of *k*: *luocu* 'I bend', *luoci*, *luoca*, *luocām*, *luocāt*. In *ā*-stem paradigms there is no other *j*-determined alternation. The rest of the verbal stems (*ājō-*, *ējō-*, *ījō-*, *ōjō-*) have no alternations at all.

Thus, as we see, the alternations *k:c* and *g:dz* differed from the other *j*-determined consonant interchanges not only as to their phonological characteristics but also as to their morphological use. For that reason, it is not so difficult to suppose that in Latvian, after in adverbs and corresponding adjectives the following alternation chains had formed:

\**druo*<sup>(š')</sup>-*ai* : \**druos-us*, \**gar*(*d*)<sup>(ž')</sup>-*ai* : \**gard-us* and  
 \**jauc-ai* : \**jauk-us*, \**smadz-ai* : \**smag-us*,

the further development was introduction of *k* and *g* into adverbs instead of *c* and *dz*:

\**jauk-ai* : \**jauk-us*, \**smag-ai* : \**smag-us*.

And in this case no longer did the end-consonant of the root-morph of the *u*-stem adjectives and adverbs differ from the *o*-stem adjective and adverb root-morphs in *k*, *g*, e. g. \**mierīg-as* 'peaceful' : \**mierīg-ai* 'peacefully'. At the time when the adjectival declension was levelled, i. e., *u*-stems were replaced throughout by *o*-stems, the above-mentioned situation occurred, when beside some *o*-stem adjectives (originally) there were adverbs of *o*-stem extraction (now the discussed original *u*-stem adjectives in root-end consonants *k* and *g* were adapted to them, too). Beside other *o*-stem adjectives having originated from *u*-stems there were adverbs of *o*-stem extraction, characterized by the iotation of the stem-end consonant. This kind of difference could not be stable. A levelling started, which created today's situation.

Two adjectives and adverbs still having root-end *c*, *dz* are to be mentioned separately: *smalcs* and *līdzs*. The adjective *līdzs* 'similar; even', found in olden writings and in dialects (Saikava, Grauzdupe, Pļaviņas — EH I 747; *Klaiums* | *lydza zemme* (Elg. Dict. 234), *Lyka*, *naelydza*, *netailna waeta* [vieta] (Elg. Dict. 272), *Ta debbeso walltiba ir lydza wenam raugam*. (Elg. Ev. 28), *Ta Debbelo = Walltiba*

*irr lihdfa weenam Šinnepes Graudinam..* (Bib. JT 29), *..vnde khas neelitcze gir, buus litczam tapt* (Ev.<sup>2</sup> 190)), has obtained its *dz* from the adverb *līdzi* which, in its turn, could preserve the consonant *dz* under the influence of other adverbs and prepositions of this root, e. g. *līdz, līdza, līdzā, līdzai, līdzās, līdze, līdzu, līdzuōs* (ME II 479-482). They date back from the period of East Baltic, as these adverbs and prepositions are used in Lithuanian as well: *līg, lýg, līgi, lýgiai*. In addition, the use of *dz* in the adjective could be influenced by the suffixed words of the same root *līdžens* 'even, level', *līdzīgs* 'similar'.

The adjective *smāļcs* 'fine', used in South Courland (Bārta, Dunika, Kalēti, Priekule, Nīca – EH II 533; also in a dictionary by Langius of 1685 – *smalts Dweelis* (Lang. 64), *smalts Leetus* (Lang. 138), *smaltz Sahls* (Lang. 229), is likely to have obtained its *c* from the adverb *smāļci* which, in its turn, has preserved a relic *c* for reasons not known to us. Another explanation is possible: both in the adjective *smāļcs* and in the adverb *smāļci* the consonant *c* might have originated from the combination *t* (or probably *d*) plus *s* (cf., e. g. *smelte* 'siftings', *smiltis* 'sand'), rather than from the consonant *k*; the way it is in the adjective *vēcs* 'old' (cf. Li *vētušas*, OCS *vetъchъ*).

## REFERENCES

- Ancītis K., 1977 – Ancītis K. Aknīstes izloksne. Rīga, 1977.
- Bernštejn S. B., 1974 – Бернштейн С. Б. Очерк сравнительной грамматики славянских языков. М., 1974.
- Indāne I., 1986 – Indāne I. Dignājas izloksne. Rīga, 1986.
- Shevelov G. Y., 1964 – Shevelov G. Y. A Prehistory of Slavic. – Heidelberg, 1964.
- Bib. JT – Tas Jauns Testaments Muhfu Kunga Jefus Kristus... Riga, 1685.
- Elg. Dict. – Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaucum. Opus posthumum. R. P. Georgii Elger... Vilnae... 1683.
- Elg. Ev. – Evangelia Toto annosingulis Dominicis et festis diebus... Per R. P. Georgium Elger... Vilnae... 1672.
- Ev.<sup>2</sup> – Euangelia vnd Epifteln, aus dem Teutschhen in die Liefvländische Pawrsprache gebracht... Riga... 1615.
- Lang. – Jāņa Langija 1685. gada latviski-vāciskā vārdnīca. Izdevis E. Blese. Rīgā, 1936.