

ON THE HISTORY OF BALTIC *u*-STEM ADJECTIVES

Indo-European languages have possessed adjectival *u*-stem nominals since ancient times. One must, however, consider them to have never made up a wide and active word formation pattern. In almost all language groups they have become extinct. In only some of them, including Baltic (esp. Lithuanian), *u*-stem adjectives are retained and have been activized. The older categorial meaning of these words has evidently encompassed the names of various antonymic qualities, possibly of colours as well (Specht, 1947, 108, 113–137; Hamp, 1984, 141). Those are the so-called *u*₁-stem words (Benveniste, 1955, 76–115; Mažiulis, 1970, 262, 306) the declension of which has been characterized by apophony of the vowel **u*: **eu-* (**ou-*), root vocalism in zero-grade, and stress on the ending (e. g. Brugmann, 1906 II² 1, 176; Meillet, 1938, 272; Hirt, 1929, 268–269). They made up an opposition to the so-called *u*₂-stem gen. neutr. nominals the stems of which used to end in non-apophonic *-u*, and the stress was on the root.

An old peculiarity of the *u*-stem adjectives is lack of distinction between the masculine and the feminine, which reflects the most ancient IE opposition gen. act. (> gen. masc.: gen. fem.): gen. pass. Facts from a number of languages evidence this: Hittite, Greek, Indo-Iranian, Germanic, Celtic. Relics of the system are also to be found in Baltic. A. Bezenberger (Bezenberger, 1877, 153) had noted in the translation of the Lithuanian Bible by J. Bretkūnas several cases of the use of *u*-stem adjectives in the meaning of the feminine. A use of this type does not seem to be random, because it has been recorded 18 times in selected works by Bretkūnas (Bretkūnas, 1983) which contain a tiny number of his writings, e. g.: nom. sg. *Er szinnai kaip Plattus Szeme ira?* (175); *Bet durna Moterischke, baugus, daugia plesganti, ir nieka ne ischmananti* (241); acc. sg. *...ir idant ios ischwescziau isch schos Szemes, ing gerą ir platų Szemę...* (39); *Puikų schirdį Ponas peikia* (253); nom. pl. *Akis tawa ligus ira akims ballandziu* (303). In a number of cases forms of this kind have been corrected replacing them with forms normative today, e. g.: *Ja schirdis ira drąsi* (corrected from *drąsus*) (216); *Nesa tawa ranka sunki* (corrected from *sunkus*) *buwa ant manęs dieną ir naktį...* (201); *Bei BeZaleel padare Skrinele isch medzio Setim pustreczio masta ilgą, pusanthro masto platę* (correct-

ed from *platu*) *ir aukschtq* (73). Beside this unusual *u*-stem usage in the meaning of the feminine we find the usual *iā-/ī*-stem forms.

This use of *u*-stem forms ought to be regarded as a language reality rather than error for the following reasons. Firstly, the *u*-stem is quite often used with a feminine noun. Secondly, these forms are found in sentences also beside *ā*-stem adjectives or participles, which allows us to be sure of the gender of the noun, e. g. *..moterischke apsidarusi rubu kekschies, kitra, bangus, ne pasiduodanti...* (237). Thirdly, only *u*-stem forms have been used near feminine nouns, while in a position like this there are no *o*- or *io*-stem forms, at least in the texts under discussion (there are no corrections, as in the case of *u*-stem forms). Fourthly, *u*-stems (as a relic) do not differentiate the gender in other IE languages either.

J. Bretkūnas was born in the hamlet of Bamboliai (Bambliai) not far from the town of Friedland, to the south-east of Königsberg (Bretkūnas, 1983, 8). Irrespective of his nationality, it was there that he learned Lithuanian. His native place was in the ancient Prussian land, thus the Lithuanians living there were localized on the very border of the language area and so could longer preserve the archaic language peculiarity discussed here. Afterwards J. Bretkūnas lived in Labguva and Königsberg, closer to the basic area of Lithuanian. In addition, the first spelling tradition had been formed there. That is why J. Bretkūnas might have tried to avoid (not to use, and later correct) in his writing the peculiar language constructions adopted in his native place but not used elsewhere. That *u*-stem forms have been closer to him than *iā-/ī*-stem forms is manifested also by the fact that originally *u*-stem endings were put down in the text, which were later replaced by *iā-/ī*-stem endings, and never vice versa. We should, ultimately, take into consideration that the forms could be corrected by the editors rather than J. Bretkūnas himself (Bretkūnas, 1983, 17, 22).

Denoting of the feminine is, evidently, a secondary function of the *iā-/ī*-stems (Sommer, 1916, 165–232; Specht, 1932, 126–131). Originally (beside *ā*-stems) they have denoted collective forms and, possibly, abstracts as well (Gamkrelidze, Ivanov, 1984 I, 284).

Regarding the origin and word formation types of the Baltic *u*-stem adjectives, one can notice that several words that are *u*-stems in other IE languages belong to other stems in Baltic, e. g. Skt. *laghú-* 'light', Gk. *ἐλαχύς* 'small': Lith. *leñgvas* 'light' (< **lengu-o-*). OPruss. seems to have retained the *u*-stem *preit-lāngus* 'kind, soft', unless this is actually a *-gus* < **-gvas*, the vowel of the last syllable vanishing. Skt. *tamú-* 'thin, kind', Gk. *τανυ-γλωσσος* 'long-tongued': Lith. *tėvas*, Latv. *tiēvs* (< **temu-o-*) 'thin'. Skt. *amhu-bhēdī* f. 'narrowly split', Goth. *aggwus* 'narrow' (< **aggus*): Lith. *añkštas* 'narrow' which might have originated from the *es*-stem, like Lat. *angustus* 'narrow'.

Thus the ancient IE *u*-stem adjectives have transferred, at least partially, into other stems in Baltic. This cannot be said about a widespread type of Baltic (esp. Lith.) *u*-stem adjectives associated with verbs and expressing a certain ability or tendency to perform the action denoted by the verb, e. g. Lith. *badùs* 'butting' – *badýti* 'butt' – *bèsti* 'stab', Lith. *platùs*, Latv. *plats* // *plašs* 'wide' – Latv. *platīt* 'spread' – Lith. *plēsti*, Latv. *plest*, *plèst* 'spread', Lith. *lankùs*, Latv. *luòks*² 'flexible' – Lith. *lankýti*, Latv. *lùocīt* 'bend' – Lith. *leñkti*, Latv. *liekt* 'bend'.

With its formation and meaning, this Baltic *u*-stem type is very similar to Gk. deverbal *o*-stem adjectives, e. g. φορός 'bringing' – φέρω 'bring', τομός 'sharp' – τέμω, τέμνω 'cut' (Schwyzer, 1939, 459). A pattern of this kind is also known in Skt., e.g. *kará-* 'doing' – *karóti* 'does', *codá-* 'driving' – *códati* 'drives' (Burrow, 1976, 118).

Apart from their adjectival meaning, words of this type may have the meaning of nomina agentis, which is etymologically closely connected with the adjectives, e. g. Gk. τροχός 'wheel; disc' – τρέχω 'run', τροφός 'tender' – τρέφω 'feed, strengthen', Skt. *plavá-* 'boat' – *plávate* 'floats', *ghaná-* 'club' – *hánti* 'hits'.

The meaning of nom. ag./adj. is characteristic also of the compound words the second part of which can be formed by *o*-stem nominals as well, e. g. Gk. κερσφόρος 'horned', Skt. *aja-gará-* 'devouring a goat; the boa', Lat. *carni-vorus* 'carnivorous' Russ. *водо-нос* 'water-carrier'. There are *o*-stems of this kind in Baltic too, e. g. Lith. *saulė-gražas* 'sunflower', *vilk-takas* 'werewolf' (Būga RR I, 207–222).

The facts given here make one seek for a connection between the Baltic *u*-stem adjective type *lankùs* and the *o*-stem adj./nom. ag. type φορός, characteristic of other IE languages (esp. Gk. and Skt.). According to E. P. Hamp, 1984, 141–142, this Baltic *u*-stem pattern has originated from the *o*-stem. He has, however, but expressed the idea without giving any proof. E. P. Hamp has not explained why such stem change has taken place. There is an attempt at solving the problem in the present paper.

In explaining the connection between Baltic *u*-stem and Gk.-Skt. *o*-stem adjectives one must take into consideration that Gk. and Skt. possess (beside this adj./nom. ag. type) also nouns of abstract meaning which usually differ from the adjectives as to the place of stress. Adj./nom. ag. are usually oxytones – Gk. φορός, τομός, Skt. *kará-*, *codá-*, whereas nomina abstracta are barytones – Gk. φόρος 'tax', τόμος 'cut-off piece', Skt. *códa-* m. 'whip', *yáma-* m. 'driver; bidle-rein' (: *yamá-* 'twinned') et al. (Brugmann, 1906 II² 1, 27–28; Hirt, 1929, 220–223; Schwyzer, 1939, 459; Burrow, 1976, 116–120).

The Baltic languages also possess *o*-stem nouns of this type, most frequently those are words of abstract meaning, e. g. Lith. *smárdas*, Latv. *smāřds* 'malodour', Lith. *braņdas* 'maturity', Latv. *bruòds* 'knop; summer lightning', but sometimes al-

so nom. ag., e. g. Lith. *sākas* 'follower', Lith. *sārgas*, OPruss. *-sargs*, Latv. *saŕgs* 'guard' (Skardžius, LKŽD, 32–33). The main bearers of the active meaning of this type in Baltic, however, are *u*-stem adjectives (or their reflexes), e. g. Lith. *smardūs* 'stinking', *brandūs* 'ripening', Latv. *bruōžs* 'ripe, swollen', Lith. *sargūs* 'cautious', *sakūs* 'finding the road'. Thus, Baltic has a kind of nominal opposition different from the Gk.-Skt. φορός : φόρος, namely, *smārdas* : *smardūs*, *sākas* : *sakūs*.

The nominal oppositions in Baltic and in Gk.-Skt. differ, firstly, as to what is being contrasted. In Gk.-Skt. there is an opposition of nom. ag./adj. : nom. abstr. Therefore the adjective as a particular category is not at all singled out. In Baltic, on the contrary, the opposition is formed by the classes of adjectives and nouns – *smardūs* : *smārdas*. In addition, the nouns can be not only nom. abstr. but also nom. ag., as Lith. *sārgas*, Latv. *saŕgs* et al.

Secondly, the formal side of the opposition is not even. In Gk.-Skt. the opposition is formed by a different place of stress – barytone nom. abstr. : oxytone nom. ag./adj., whereas in Baltic the opposition is made by stem differences – *o*-stem nouns : *u*-stem adjectives. Varieties of the place of stress are not usually found. Most words, both nouns and adjectives, are oxytones.

What is then the connection of the two opposition pairs? One must think that this Baltic opposition is newer than the opposition of the Gk.-Skt. type, and is very likely to have replaced it in Baltic. Firstly, the contrast noun : adj. in the earlier IE languages was not so clearly expressed morphologically as in the modern languages. In Gk. and Skt. these classes of words are not clearly dissociated. „Die Kategorien Substantiv und Adjektiv stehen einander nicht so scharf gegenüber wie im Deutschen, sondern das Verhältnis ist ähnlich wie in den klassischen Sprachen“ (Wackernagel, 1905, 1). But in the Baltic languages to only one part of Gk.-Skt. nom. ag./adj. type words do the *u*-stems correspond, namely adjectives. Thus, the Balts have severed completely this class of words from the noun.

Secondly, that the meaning of nom. ag./adj. might have been expressed by a nominal *o*-stem, is manifested in the nouns given – nom. ag., e. g. Lith. *sākas*, *sārgas*, *vādas* 'driver, leader'. The nom. ag./adj. meaning can also pertain to the second part of compounds, e. g. Lith. *áiti-varas* 'dragon', *arklā-ganas* 'handle of the plough', *pirma-lakai* 'best grain'. This meaning is also inherent in the second parts of compound person names, e. g. Lith. *Gėd-gaudas*, *Gir-kantas*, *Jó-skaudas* (Būga RR I, 201–223; Skardžius, LKŽD, 438–440).

Thirdly, that *o*-stem adjectives have been feasible beside nouns of the same root is manifested in prefixed Lith. adjectives, e. g. *ātkaras* 'drooping', *atālankas* 'bent back', *ātvaras* 'open' (Skardžius, LKŽD, 35).

In Baltic, one can find also remains of the Gk.-Skt. type stress-place opposition. Contrary to the domineering oxytonic (Balt. changeable) accent, some nouns of

this type may have barytonic (though often paralleled to oxytonic) stress as well. As a rule they are, as one might expect, nouns of abstract meaning. Besides, several of them have accent parallels in other IE languages, e. g. Lith. *kaĩpas* 2, 4 'scrap; gap', Gmc. **skárfaz* (with an *s* mobile) > MLG. *scharf* 'a shiver'; Lith. *saĩkas* 2, 4 'a grain measure': Gmc. **sáihaz* > Oícel. *sār* 'tub'; Lith. *tānas* 2, 4 'tumour': Gk. *τόνος* 'rope; stretching'; Lith. *skālas* 2, 4 'splinter'; Lith. *svāras* 2, 4 'weight' et al. (Skardžius, LKŽD, 26–32; Illich-Svitych, 1963, 30–37).

Baltic nom. ag. of this type are mostly oxytones. They too, may have parallels in other IE languages, e. g. Lith. *gānas* 4 'shepherd': Skt. *ghaná-* 'which kills'; Lith. *vaĩkas* 4 'two-branched tree for drying furs': Gk. *ὄλκος* 'strap' < **suolkós*; Lith. *sárgas* 3, Latv. *saĩgs*; Lith. *úodas* 3, Latv. *uõds* 'gnat' et al. (Skardžius, LKŽD, 32; Illich-Svitych, 1963, 37–40). Separate Lith. nom. ag. are also barytones, although it seems to be a new phenomenon, e. g. Lith. *klėdas* 1 'windbag, dreamer', *maĩmas* 2 'who talks alone'.

Although in much smaller numbers, there are traces of stress opposition in the closely related languages — Slav. (Illich-Svitych, 1963, 111–119; Dybo, 1981, 21–26) and Gmc. (Hirt, 1929, 221). The recurrent deviations from this original opposition are explained by H. Hirt (1929, 284; 1931, 152) by the influence of the base-words, as well as that of the gen. neutr. adjective forms which are said to have always been barytonic.

Thus, not only in Gk. and Skt. but also in Balt., Slav. and Gmc. there was a contrast of nominals according to the place of stress — nom. abstr. : nom. ag./adj. This does not mean, however, that the law was made absolute.

All the facts presented here evidence once again that morphological forming of adjectives as a special class of words (irrespective of how this actually happened) is a newer phenomenon than the contrast of nom. abstr. : nom. ag. This is also displayed by the forming of special means for denoting adjectives, exactly in those languages where the old contrast has disappeared. Pronominal declension in Balt. and Slav., weak declension in Gmc. Various special suffixes to denote adjectives are also widely used, e. g. Gmc. *-ig-* : OHG. *sculd* 'debt' and 'needed' : *sculdig* 'needed'; Oícel. *skyld* n. and *skyldr* adj. : *skyldugr*; OHG. *sālig* 'happy' : Goth. *o*-stem *sēls* 'happy'; OHG. *gōrag* 'unhappy' : Goth. *o*-stem *gaurs* 'unhappy' (Zhirumunsky, 1966, 41, 49). Some Gmc. adjective suffixes have come even from parts of compounds, e. g. *-bar*, *-haft*, *-lich*, *-sam*.

In Slav., too, to distinguish adjectives from nouns, suffixes are used. Evidently, the suffix *-kũ-* served exactly for this purpose. Cf., e. g. Slav. **xraqstũ* > OCS. *hrqstũ* 'locust', Czech. *chrust*, Russ. *xpɣem* 'crackle': Slav. **xraqstũ(kũ)* > Serb. *hrust* 'hard', Russ. dial. *xpɣcmkũ* 'hard'; Slav. **soldũ* 'malt' > Serb. *slād*, Czech. *slad*, Russ. *сóлод* : Slav. **soldũ(kũ)* 'sweet' > Ukr. *солодũ*, OCS *sladũkũ*, Russ.

солóдкий et al. Therefore we must, in this case, drop the traditional statement that all (or most) Slav. adjectives with *-ŷkŷ* are the continuation of the old *u*-stems. Without denying that part of the old *u*-stems entered this group, we ought to consider the morphological formation of the ancient *o*-stem nominals as adjectives to be the main function of the suffix (Yakubinsky, 1952, 52–60; Zverkovskaya, 1986, 79); which is analogous to the usage of suffixes in other languages.

The Baltic languages recognize various specific adjective suffixes, e. g. Lith. *-inis*, *-iškas*, *-ingas*, Latv. *-isks*, *-īgs* et al. Beside suffixes, in Baltic the *u*-stem has become one of the forming elements of the adjective class. Partial transition into *u*-stems could be promoted also by the fact that accentuation of the discussed *o*-stem nominals (barytones and oxytones) did not essentially differ in the singular. If the oxytone Balt. nom. sg. **lankàs* (Kazlauskas, 1968, 34) which was opposed to nom. sg. **lañkas* has actually existed, at the moment when **lankàs* > *lañkas* the accentuation of barytones and oxytones (words with shifting stress) was the same in the main singular case forms: nom. sg. **lañkas*, gen. sg. **lañkā*, acc. sg. **lañkan*. Gen. and acc. sg. forms have possibly never been oxytonic. In a situation like this changes could easily occur. That is why in adjectival usage *u*-stem forms started appearing in the paradigm. It helped, on the one hand, retain ending stress also in nom. sg. and gen. sg., which was characteristic of the words of adjectival meaning, and, on the other hand, adjectives obtained a particular declension type — *u*-stem, and thus differed clearly from the nouns of the same root.

Although difficult to prove, one must think that, before such a massive *o*-stem transition into *u*-stems, *u*-stems were a small but important group of words characterized exactly by adjectival meaning. As it was stated, part of the IE *u*-stems have transferred into other stems in Baltic, but during the period of a new necessity to make use of this stem there ought to have been a definite group of words. It might have consisted of hard-to-etymologize or at least peculiarly coined words, like, e. g. Balt. **gilus* (Lith. *gilùs*, Latv. *dziļš*, OPruss. acc. sg. *gillin* ‘deep’), **tālus* (Lith. *tolùs*, Latv. *tāls* // *tāļš* ‘far’, OPruss. *tālis* ‘farther’), **ašus* (Latv. *ass* // *ašs* ‘sharp’), **benžus* (Latv. *biezs* // *biežs* ‘thick’), **artus* (Lith. *artùs* ‘near’), and some other.

First the *u*-stem forms were acquired by non-affixed *o*-stem adjectival nominals, apart from which there were corresponding verbs and nouns with nom. abstr. or nom. ag. meanings. It had to happen quickly and long before the age of writing in proto-Baltic or East-Baltic.

Much later the transition of the affixed adjectives of the same type into *u*-stems started. This process being newer is manifested in the paralleled variants of the suffixes in Lith. *-no-* : *-nu-*, *-lo-* : *-lu-*, *-ro-* : *-ru-* et al. (Skardžius, LKŽD, 163, 165, 217, 223 et al.). The transition could begin at the time of the fission of East-

Baltic or even in Lith., as Latv. possesses no clear marks showing these suffixes originally to have been *u*-stems – *o*- and *īo*-stem variation is not usually observed.

Together with these adjectives, or even later, only in Lith., did some non-motivated affixed and non-affixed adjectives start also acquiring *u*-stem forms, e. g. *gaĩlas* 'bitter, lamenting', *pĩgas* 'cheap', *puĩkas* 'nice', *smũlkas* 'fine, thin', *sũras* 'salty' (Skardžius, LKŽD, 33–35). In old Lith. writings parallel *o*- and *u*-stem forms of these words are often met (Zinkevičius, 1981 II, 23). The process is continuing in Lith., but now in dialects it is promoted by phonetic conditions, due to which several *u*- and *o*-stem forms coincide (Zinkevičius, 1966, 272–275). In addition, a number of *īo*-stem case forms have been introduced into the *u*-stem paradigm, under the influence of the feminine *īā*-stem.

In Latvian the development of *u*-stem adjectives differs from Lith. The present state of the language is to be judged from East-Baltic, i. e., *u*-stem adjectives which denote both the masculine and the feminine have no special feminine forms. The adverbs derived from these adjectives have also the suffix *-ī*.

One should think that the adverbs with *-īai* (as well as those with *-ai* from *o*-stem adjectives) originally are dat. sg. forms from *īā*- (or *ā*-) stem nominals which have not yet denoted the feminine but have been, as it was stated, abstract nouns. Therefore the form Lith. *mažai*, *gražiai* are etymologically corresponding to dat. sg. *rañkai*, *gāliai* and *mažái*, *gražíai*. They are not even differentiated by intonation, because Lith. dat. sg. *-ái* is according to the pattern of masculine *tám*, *gerám* – the dialect forms show an older circumflex *taĩ* 'tái', *geraĩ* 'gerái' (Zinkevičius, 1980 I, 190). That the *īā*-/*ī*-stem has not long ago had an abstract meaning is shown in the Žemaičiai adverbial forms: *kad tamsi ģr, nematáu; taĩ gražì važiúot; višq saũsĩ bjauri õs nebũvo* (Zinkevičius, 1966, 268), which are, probably, not to be etymologically associated with the new feminine meaning, but with the original abstract meaning.

In Latv. as it seems, *īā*-/*ī*-stem words have never obtained the feminine meaning of the *u*-stem adjectives, unlike in Lithuanian. The same *ā*-stem forms that denoted the feminine beside *o*-stem masculine forms began to be used as feminine forms beside *u*-stem masculine forms. Thus in Latv. a model adj. **platus* m., **platā* f., adv. **platīai* takes shape. The use of *ā*-stem in the feminine meaning, fusion of some case forms with the *o*-stem forms (acc. sg. and acc. pl., probably also dat. pl.) as well as the fusion of *u*-stem nom. sg. ending *-us* and nom. pl. ending **-ūs* (or **-aus*) after the shortening of the final syllables (if the nom. sg. ending *-us* really was phonetically preserved) promoted a gradual transition of the *u*-stem adjectives into *o*-stem. Then the following situation formed in Latv.: on the one hand **platas* m., **platā* f., adv. **platīai* (i. e. *plats*, *plata* – *plaši*), on the other hand **labas* m., **labā* f., adv. **labai* (i. e. *labs*, *laba* – *labi*). So, beside formally monotype adjectives there

are different adverbs – one group without *-ī-* (from original *o*-stems), one group with it (from original *u*-stems). Such a situation in language is unstable.

In Latv. there was a way out. But the High and Low Latv. dialects have had different courses of development. HLatv. has a general pattern according to which to all adjectives, irrespective of their original stem, correspond adverbs with an inserted *-ī-* before the ending, e. g. at Aknīste *týmss* – *tīmši* (Lith. *tamsùs*), *drùss* – *drūši* (Lith. *drasùs*), *gàuc* (-*ds*) – *gàuži* (Lith. *gaudùs*) and *lāns* – *l'ēņi* (Lith. *lēnas*), *rasnys* – *řešņi*, *zāms* – *žēmji* (Lith. *žėmas*) (Ancītis, 1977, 122–124, 199, 206), as well as in other HLatv. dialect variants (see, e. g. dialect descriptions in FBR). The *-ī-* of the root-end consonant can be absent (because of phonetic alteration) if the root ends in *p*, *b*, *m* or in *r* (*r* < *rj* has disappeared in HLatv.).

In LLatv. the situation changed differently. The stem difference between the adjective and the adverb derived from it was levelled. In many cases the adverb stem with *-ī-* gained the upper hand, e. g. *drùošs*, *drùoša* – *drùoši*, *tùmšs*, *tùmša* – *tùmši*, *gàužs*, *gàuža* – *gàuži*, although the stem without *-ī-* is also found, e. g. *gařds*, *gařda* – *gařdi* 'delicious', *salđs*, *salđa* – *salđi* 'sweet'.

Yet there are factors manifesting that this levelled situation is comparatively new. Firstly, *o*-stem forms of some adjectives appear in some LLatv. areas among *-īo*-stem forms, e. g. *dāils* is used throughout South Kurzeme (in other LLatv. dialect forms usu. *dāiļš* 'beautiful'; *tùmss* 'dark' in North Kurzeme at Dundaga, Puze, Užava. Moreover, old Latv. writings show that these forms were known by the authors in the spots where now only *tùmšs* is found – Mancelius from Zemgale, e. g. *tumšsa Nacktz*, Langius from South Kurzeme, e. g. *Tums tohp*, Elger from Valmiera, e. g. *abgaylmo lzo tumle palloul*.

Secondly, in LLatv. sometimes *īo*-stem forms are met beside the more widely used *o*-stem forms. So *smāļcs* 'fine, thin' is used in S. Kurzeme (in Langius, too), in other parts *smāļks*. The forms *gaũšs* 'slow', *ašs* 'sharp' used in Kurzeme are elsewhere *gaũss*, *ass*.

Thirdly, this is also shown by the variants with different meanings *ass* 'sharp' – *ašs* 'quick', *biezs* 'thick' – *biežs* 'often; recurrent', *plats* 'broad' – *plašs* 'wide, extensive'. Judging from the old writings the *o*-stem form is able to embrace in modern Latvian the semantics of the both stem forms. The origin of the semantic variants can be like this: originally *ass*, *asa* – *aši*, *biezs*, *bieza* – *bieži*, *plats*, *plata* – *plaši*, then in the adverbs a widening of the meaning occurs: *aši* 'sharply' > 'quickly', *bieži* 'thickly' > 'often', *plaši* 'in a broad manner' > 'widely, extensively'. Adverbs with different meanings are no longer perceived as derivatives, therefore no stem levelling takes place. Another process ensues: beside the adjectives *ass*, *biezs*, *plats* arise adverbs *asi*, *biezi*, *plati*, and beside the adverbs *aši*, *bieži*, *plaši* respective adjectives *ašs*, *biežs*, *plašs* with secondary meanings from the adverbs.

Adjectives and adverbs the root of which ends in *k, g* ought to be discussed separately. They preserve *k, g* in both High and Low Latv., e. g. at Aknīste *smogs* 'heavy' – *smāgi* 'very', *smoŕks* – *smāl'k'i* (Ancītis, 1977, 131); LLatv. *smagi* – *smags*, *smāki* – *smāks*. However, originally there ought to have been *c, dz* in the adverbs, but these sounds were later replaced by *k, g* from respective adjectives. This might have happened because of the peculiar place of *c, dz* in Latv. consonant system (cf. Endzelīns, La. gr., 94, 171, 185). Two adjectives still having root-end *c, dz* are – *smācs* – adv. *smāci* (in S. Kurzeme) and *līdzs* – adv. *līdzi* – and could be explained in the following way: *līdzs* 'alike; even' has acquired its *dz* from adv. *līdzi* which could retain *dz* due to various other adverbs and prepositions – *līdz, līdzā, līdzai*, etc. Adv. *smāci* (which gives adj. *smācs*) has retained its *c* either as a relic phonetically, or, in this case, a former distinction in the meaning has vanished (as in the case of *plaši : plati*). The process is to be discussed in another paper.

REFERENCES

- Ancītis, 1977 – Ancītis K. Aknīstes izloksne. Rīga, 1977.
- Benveniste, 1955 – Бенвенист Э. Индоевропейское именное словообразование. 1955.
- Bretkūnas, 1983 – Bretkūnas J. Rinkiniai raštai. V., 1983.
- Brugmann, 1906 II² 1 – Brugmann K. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Zweite Bearbeitung. Strassburg, 1906. Bd. 2, T. 1.
- Burrow, 1976 – Барроу Т. Санскрит. 1976.
- Dybo, 1981 – Дыбо В. А. Славянская акцентология. 1981.
- Gamkrelidze, Ivanov, 1984 I – Гамкрелидзе Т. В., Иванов Вяч. Вс. Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы. Тбилиси, 1984. Т. 1.
- Hamr, 1984 – Hamr E. P. On the development of oxytone *o*-grade adjectives to *-u*-stems // Baltistica. T. 20(2). P. 141–142.
- Hirt, 1929 – Hirt H. Indogermanische Grammatik. Der Akzent. Heidelberg, 1929. T. 5.
- Hirt, 1931 – Hirt H. Handbuch des Urgermanischen. Heidelberg, 1931. T. 1.
- Illich-Svitych, 1963 – Иллич-Свитич В. М. Именная акцентуация в балтийском и славянском. 1963.
- Kazlauskas, 1968 – Kazlauskas J. Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika. V., 1968.
- Mažiulis, 1970 – Mažiulis V. Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai. V., 1970.
- Meillet, 1938 – Мейе А. Введение в сравнительное изучение индоевропейских языков. М.; Л., 1938.
- Schwyzler, 1939 – Schwyzler E. Griechische Grammatik. München, 1939. Bd. 1.
- Specht, 1932 – Specht F. Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik // KZ. 1932. Bd. 59. S. 126–131.
- Specht, 1947 – Specht F. Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination. Göttingen, 1947.
- Sommer, 1916 – Sommer F. Das Femininum der *u*- und *-i* Adjektiva im Rgveda und im Altiranisch // IF. 1916. Bd. 36. S. 165–232.

Wackernagel, 1905 – Wackernagel J. Altindische Grammatik. Göttingen, 1905. Bd. 2, T. 1.

Yakubinsky, 1952 – Якубинский Л. П. Из истории имени прилагательного // Доклады и сообщения Института языкознания АН СССР. 1952. № 1. С. 52–60.

Zinkevičius, 1966 – Zinkevičius Z. Lietuvių dialektologija. V., 1966.

Zinkevičius, 1980 I–1981 II – Zinkevičius Z. Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika. V., 1980; 1981. T. 1–2.

Zverkovskaya, 1986 – Зверковская Н. П. Суффиксальное словообразование русских прилагательных XI–XVII вв. М., 1986.

Zhirmunsky, 1966 – Жирмунский В. М. Категория имени прилагательного в древних германских языках // Сравнительная грамматика германских языков. М., 1966. Т. IV.

SMULKMENA LXXII

Klaipėdiškio lituanisto Valterio Fenclau, ištyrusio ir aprašiusio lietuviškų vietovardžių ir asmenvardžių vokišką tartį (Fenzlau W. Die deutsche Formen der litauischen Orts- und Personennamen des Memelgebiets. Halle–Saale, 1936), gimimo metai LTSR enciklopedijose ir lituanistinėje literatūroje nurodomi neteisingai „apie 1907“. Iš tikrųjų jis gimė 1911 m. vasario 11 d. Tai pats įrašė savo autobiografijoje, įdėtoje minėtos knygos pabaigoje.

Z. Zinkevičius