

<i>Singul:</i>	<i>Plural:</i>	44
N. Ta Aivs /das Schaaf.	N. Tahs Aivis .	
G. Tahs Aivs /des Schaafs.	G. To Aivju .	
D. Tai Aivi /dem Schaaf.	D. Tahm Aivim .	
Ac. To Aivi /das Schaaf.	Ac. Tahs Aivis .	
V. Tu Aivs /du Schaaf.	V. Tuhs Aivis .	
Ab. No tahs Aivs /von dē	Ab. No tahm Aivim .	
Loc. Aivi /an oder in dem	Loc. Aivis .	
<i>Singul:</i>	<i>Plural:</i>	
N. Aufs /das Ohr.	N. Aufis /die Ohren.	
G. Aufs /des Ohrs.	G. Aufšu /derer Ohre	
D. Aufi /dem Ohr.	D. Aufim /denē Ohren	
Ac. Aufi /das Ohr.	Ac. Aufis /die Ohren.	
V. Aufs /du Ohr.	V. Aufis /ihr Ohren.	
Ab. Aufs /von dem Ohr.	Ab. Aufim /von den O:	
Loc. Aufi /an oder in dem	Loc. Aufis /an od in dem	
<i>Singul:</i>	<i>Plural:</i>	
N. Sirds /das Herz.	N. Sirdis /die Herzen	
G. Sirds /des Herzens.	G. Sirdšu /derer H:	
D. Sirdi /dem Herzen.	D. Si /denen H:	
Ac. Sirdi /das Herz.	Ac. Sirdis /die Herzen	
V. Sirds /du Herz.	V. Sirdis /ihr Herzen	
Ab. Sirds /von dem Herze	Ab. Sirdim /von denen	
Loc. Sirdi /an oder in dem	Loc. Sirdis /an oder in	
<i>Singul:</i>	<i>Plural:</i>	
N. Pirts /die Badstube.	N. Pirtis /die B.	
G. Pirts /der Badstube.	G. Piršu /derer	
D. Pirti /der Badstuben.	D. Pirtim /denen	
Ac. Pirti /die Badstube.	Ac. Pirtis /die Bad:	
V. Pirts /du Badstube.	V. Pirtis /ihr Bad:	
Abl. Pirts /von der Badstube.	Abl. Pirtim /von den	
Loc. Pirti /an oder in der B:	Loc. Pirtis /an oder	

Da Heinrich Adolf, *Erster Versuch einer kurtz-verfasseten Anleitung zur lettischen Sprache*, Mitau, 1685.

THE LATVIAN NON-PREPOSITIONAL GENITIVE - A CASE LOSING GROUND

STURLA BERG-OLSEN

Oslo

1. Introduction

As can be seen from any description of Latvian grammar, the genitive in this language is a case with many and quite diverse functions. Beside serving as the most common way to link nouns which stand in some kind of relationship to each other, the genitive can mark various kinds of verbal arguments and adjuncts. The purpose of this article is to discuss the status of the non-prepositional genitive case in a number of functions which may be characterised as *partitive* (involving a notion of 'part' or 'quantity') and/or *adverbial* (marking a verbal argument). The research underlying the article was motivated by observations that speakers of Latvian often avoid using the non-prepositional genitive in certain functions where it according to the grammars either must or may be used. A survey of Latvian newspaper texts and spoken Latvian in the Riga region show that the use of the genitive in these functions in modern Latvian is relatively restricted. Of special interest is the data from the spoken language, which on many points deviates clearly from the norms of the standard language. In my opinion, these are symptoms of an ongoing process of syntactic change, whereby the non-prepositional genitive in certain functions is being replaced with other cases (the nominative, the accusative) or prepositional phrases. In investigating this question I also make use of data from earlier sources of Latvian and from Lithuanian and more distantly related languages.

Interestingly enough, this question has until now not received much attention in the literature. The most thorough work on the variation between the genitive and other forms in Latvian has been done by Mühlenbachs (1891) and Lepika (1954 and 1959), and has almost exclusively concentrated on the choice of object case with negated verbs. With this article – essentially a summary of Berg-

Olsen 1999 – I hope to provide new insight in this field of study by giving an overview of the different changes involving the Latvian non-prepositional genitive and suggesting what the motivation for these changes may be.

2. The non-prepositional genitive in modern Latvian: an overview

In a large number of functions, the Latvian non-prepositional genitive is quite stable and does not meet much competition from other forms. With one exception, these are non-partitive adnominal functions, i.e. functions where the genitive serves to express a relationship between two nominals, but where the relationship does not involve a notion of quantification. The group of functions where the Latvian non-prepositional genitive is stable comprises: a) the adnominal partitive genitive with a noun head (*kilograms sviesta* "a kilogram of butter", *bundža ikru* "a tin of caviar"); b) the adnominal non-partitive genitive with a noun head, incorporating the possessive genitive in a strict (*brāļa mašīna* "brother's car") as well as in a broad (*rīta rasa* "morning dew") sense, the genitive of material (*dzintara gredzens* "a ring of amber"), the defining genitive (*Liepājas pilsēta* "the city of Liepāja"), the descriptive genitive (*liela auguma vīrietis* "a man of large stature"), the subjective genitive (*vilciena atiešana* "the departure of the train"), the objective genitive (*mājas celšana* "the construction of a house") and the genitive of emphasis (*paaudžu paaudzes* "many generations"); c) the adnominal non-partitive genitive with an adjective head (*zelta vērts* "worth its weight in gold"), d) the agentive genitive (*Saeimas pieņemtais likums* "the law passed by the Saeima") and, finally, e) the genitive with *žēl* "sorry" (*man žēl tā cilvēka* "I feel sorry for that man.").

However, there are also a number of functions where the non-prepositional genitive in modern Latvian is met by competition from other forms, or where it was used at an earlier stage, but is now archaic or used only infrequently. These are the functions of primary concern here. Without exceptions, we are here dealing with functions where the genitive is either *partitive* (i.e. expressing a part of something or a quantity) or *adverbial* (i.e. expressing an argument of a verb). In certain functions these two characteristics also combine.

2.1 The adnominal partitive genitive with a quantifier head

The term *quantifier* is here and in the following taken to include:

1) All numerals which cannot be declined for gender. They may be fully indeclinable, such as *desmit* "ten", *divpadsmit* "twelve", *simt* "hundred" and *divarpus* "two and a half", or have case forms, but not gender forms, such as *simts* "hundred",¹ and *tūkstotis* "thousand".

2) Indeclinable indefinite quantifiers, i.e. words expressing an indefinite quantity; these are elsewhere often referred to as adverbs. This group includes *daudz* "much, many", *maz* "little, few", *vairāk* "more", *mazāk* "less, fewer", *nedaudz* "a little, a few", *cik* "how much, how many" etc.

3) Numeral compounds formed by joining the prefix *pus-* "half" to ordinal numerals in the genitive or the nominative case, e.g. *pusotrs/ pusotra* "one and a half" (masc.), *pusotra/ pusotras* "one and a half" (fem.).

The partitive construction with quantifiers bears clear resemblance to the adnominal partitive construction with nouns expressing quantity, mentioned above. In principle one could certainly treat these two partitive functions together. The reason for their separate treatment here is first and foremost the fact that the syntactic properties of Latvian quantifiers are somewhat different from those of quantifying nouns, the genitive being compulsory in certain syntactic environments with nouns, but not with quantifiers. This division can probably be justified also on semantic grounds, the quantifiers being more abstract than most quantifying nouns.

In the presence of a quantifier the quantified element may be marked with the genitive case if the phrase occupies a syntactic position which is normally associated with the nominative or accusative case (hereafter called *nominative position* and *accusative position* respectively). This includes not only typical subjects and objects, but also for example phrases denoting a time period (an

¹ Endzelīns (1951:492, 494) mentions a feminine form *simta*, as well as a feminine form *desmita* of the declinable numeral *desmits* "ten". These forms are not in use in contemporary standard Latvian nor in the colloquial language of the Riga region.

accusative position) and the object of a verb in the debitive mode (a nominative position)

In both spoken and written contemporary Latvian the genitive in these environments is often replaced by the case normally associated with the syntactic position of the phrase concerned – thus the nominative may be used when the phrase occupies a nominative position (1a–b) and the accusative when it occupies an accusative position (2a–b):

(1)² a) [...] arvien vairāk kompāniju sāk veidot [...] stratēģijas [...] (gen.)
 “[...] more and more companies begin to form [...] strategies [...]”
 (*Dienas bizness* 27 March 1998, page 13)³

b) [...] arvien vairāk kompānijas sāk veidot [...] stratēģijas [...] (nom.)
 “[...] more and more companies begin to form [...] strategies [...]”
 (*Dienas bizness* 27 March 1998, page 12)

(2) a) ... ar vienu melodiju var daudz tekstu dziedāt ... (gen.)
 “you can sing many texts to one tune” (V.B., man, 57 years)⁴

b) ... vienā melodijā dzied daudz tekstus ... (acc.)
 “one tune is used for singing many texts” (same as 2a)

The norms of the Latvian standard language make a sharp distinction between numerals on the other hand and indefinite quantifiers (*daudz, maz, cik* etc.) on the other. With numerals the nominative and accusative may be used in place of the genitive (Mllvg I:489–495 and II:215), while with the indefinite quantifiers only the genitive is allowed (Mllvg I:495). These norms are mostly

² In this and the following examples the non-prepositional genitive under discussion or its competing form is underlined.

³ The investigated material of written Latvian consisted of eight newspapers published on 26 and 27 March 1998. For more detailed information on this survey cf. Berg-Olsen 1999:106–108.

⁴ The material of spoken Latvian consisted of recorded interviews with 24 native speakers. Cf. Berg-Olsen 1999: 117–123.

adhered to in the newspapers, but only to a lesser extent in the colloquial language, as illustrated in table 1.

Table 1. Case usage with quantifiers in the surveys of modern Latvian.

			Newspapers		Interviews	
			Total	Total (%)	Total	Total (%)
Nominative position	Numerals	Gen.	101	32 %	11	12 %
		Nom.	218	68 %	82	88 %
	Indefinite quantifiers	Gen.	70	92 %	67	57 %
		Nom.	6	8 %	51	43 %
Accusative position	Numerals	Gen.	71	37 %	6	14 %
		Acc.	123	63 %	37	86 %
	Indefinite quantifiers	Gen.	45	96 %	5	14 %
		Acc.	2	4 %	32	86 %

2.2 The adnominal partitive genitive with an adjective head

Latvian has a number of adjectives which may take a genitive complement. One may doubt the usefulness of dividing them into two groups, but I nevertheless choose to do so, distinguishing between those adjectives which involve a notion of partitivity and those that do not, much in the same fashion as in Mathiassen 1997. This distinction is supported by the fact that the adjectives without a notion of partitivity (e.g. *cieņīgs* “worthy”, *kārs* “greedy” and *vērts* “worth”) are always used with the genitive, while the adjectives involving a partitive element (e.g. *bagāts* “rich” and *pilns* “full”) are also used with other forms.

Although both *bagāts* and *pilns* are mentioned by the Academy grammar among the adjectives used with a genitive complement (Mllvg I:393 and II:323), they apparently may also be used with the (non-prepositional) instrumental and with the preposition *ar* “with”, requiring the accusative (Mllvg II:325). Also the Academy dictionary lists all three constructions (Llv II:21–22 and VI₂:185–188). The material from the survey was not large enough to provide ample evidence of which construction is the most frequent, but all three alternatives were attested – with *pilns* the genitive was used

once and *ar* was used four times, while the sole occurrence of *bagāts* had a non-prepositional instrumental complement.

2.3 The adverbial partitive genitive

This is the function which the Lithuanian grammatical tradition often calls "the genitive of indefinite quantity" (*neapibrėžto kiekio kilmininkas*, cf. Šukys 1998:100), a term which accurately describes the semantic meaning of the genitive element in these constructions. The genitive may be used with certain verbs to express a subject or object which appears in an indefinite quantity. While the adverbial partitive genitive is very commonly used in Lithuanian, in modern Latvian it is quite rare. In the newspaper texts no examples were found, while four occurrences of the genitive in the interviews belonged in this category, among them these two:

- (3) ... ja atliek laika ... "if (some) time remains"
(S.A., woman, 31 years)
- (4) ... darba vēl ... vēl tādā ziņā būs ... "in that respect there will still be work [to be done]" (J.R., man, 70 years)

This kind of indefinite subjects expressed by the genitive seems to be largely restricted to the colloquial language, and even there they are not frequent. The possibility of using the genitive to express indefinite objects with certain verbs (e.g. *ēst* "eat", *dzert* "drink" and *dot* "give") is mentioned by the Academy grammar (Mllvg I:394 and II:283), but as noted by Ceplīte and Ceplītis (1991:16), nowadays it is almost completely replaced by the accusative.

2.4 Subjects in the genitive with negated existential verbs

The verb *būt* "be" always takes a nominative subject when not negated (except when a partitive genitive subject is used in order to express indefiniteness, as mentioned in section 2.3). When the verb is negated, however, the norms of standard Latvian require the subject to be genitive-marked *when the existence of the subject is part of the scope of the negation* – that is to say, when it is the existence of the subject which is negated, and not for instance a characteristic the

subject has. Lagzdina (1997) has pointed out the need to distinguish the existential use of *būt* from its other uses. Apart from the verb *būt*, genitive subjects can also be encountered with other verbs such as *atlikt* "remain", *sanākt* "succeed" and *iznākt* "appear" when negated, as well as in sentences with the combination *nevar būt* "cannot be".

As mentioned, the genitive is required in this function by the norms of the standard language (Mllvg I:395 and II:205–206), although the Academy grammar also mentions that the nominative is sometimes encountered, ascribing this to dialect interference. As a matter of fact, the survey of spoken language in the Riga region shows that the nominative is used quite frequently – approximately in 50 % of the occurrences of negated existential *būt* and the combination *nevarēt būt*, as shown in table 2. The table shows that the nominative is indeed found also in written language, although the newspapers to a large extent follow the norm here.

Table 2. Case usage with negated existential *būt* and *nevarēt būt* in the surveys of modern Latvian.

	Newspapers		Interviews	
	Total	Total (%)	Total	Total (%)
Genitive	175	94 %	111	49 %
Nominative	12	6 %	115	51 %

To illustrate these results, a few examples with the nominative from the survey material are provided:

- (5) [...] sieviešu volejbolam Latvijā nav skatītāju pievilšanas spēks [...] "[...] female volleyball in Latvia does not have the power to attract spectators [...]" (*Vakara Ziņas* 26 March 1998, page 18).
- (6) ... olām man nav ... ētiski argumenti, kāpēc neēst olas ... "as for eggs, I don't have ... any ethical arguments why you shouldn't eat eggs" (L.A., girl, 19 years).
- (7) ... cilvēkiem nav nauda ... "people don't have any money" (D.S., woman, 54 years).
- (8) ... es aizmirsu apstīties uz spidometru, bet policija nebija ... "I forgot to look at the speedometer, but the police weren't there" (H.A., woman, 56 years).

2.5 Objects in the genitive with negated verbs

The default case for objects in Latvian is the accusative, but when any verb taking an accusative object is negated, the object may either appear in the genitive or the accusative. The Academy grammar (Mllvg II:286–289) lists a number of criteria favouring each of the cases. Thus the genitive is e.g. favoured by the occurrence in the sentence of one or more negative pronouns or negative adverbs emphasising the negation (such as *neviens* “no one”, *nekas* “nothing” or *nekur* “nowhere”), while the accusative is favoured if the genitive form of the object is ambiguous because of homonymy between different morphological forms. Ceplīte and Ceplītis (1991:16, 141) for their part note that objects of negated verbs may be put in the genitive, but go on to say that there is a strong tendency in favour of the accusative.

Ceplīte and Ceplītis’ statement was indeed confirmed by the survey of written and spoken modern Latvian; the results are presented in table 3:

Table 3. Case usage on objects of negated verbs in the surveys of modern Latvian.

	Newspapers		Interviews	
	Total	Total (%)	Total	Total (%)
Genitive	8	2 %	8	4 %
Accusative	454	98 %	176	96 %

As a matter fact, all the 16 instances of the genitive occurred in sentences with an emphatic negation, either in the form of pronouns such as *nekas* or *neviens* or the emphatic negative particle *ne* (as in 9 below; this is also an idiomatic expression where the genitive may be presumed to survive longer than elsewhere).

- (9) Skandāls degungalā, taču partijas līderi nece] ne ausu [...] “The scandal is imminent, but the party leaders do not care at all [...]” (literally: “[...] do not even lift their ears”) (Diena 27 March 1998, page 2)
- (10) ... nekā neatceros ... “I don’t remember a thing” (G.Ā., man, 30 years)

When a negated verb has a subordinate clause which contains an infinitive, the object of the infinitive in the subordinate clause may be genitive-marked, but the Academy grammar (Mllvg II:287) notes that the accusative is more frequent also here. This was confirmed by the results of my survey, as no examples of the genitive in this environment was found, neither in the newspapers nor in the interviews.

2.6 Lexically required genitive objects

There are a number of verbs in Latvian which are said to require a genitive object without regard to whether the verb is negated or whether this argument expresses an indefinite quantity. The verbs requiring genitive objects belong to a limited number of semantic categories; the verbs of this category mentioned in the Academy grammar may be divided into four groups (Mllvg I:395):

– The non-prepositional genitive or the preposition *pēc* “after”, requiring the genitive, is used with *ilgoties* “long, yearn”, *tvīkt* “thirst, long”, *alkt* “thirst, crave”, *kārot* “desire” and *slāpt* “thirst”.

– The non-prepositional genitive, the accusative or different prepositions are used with *gribēt* “want”, *prasīt* “ask, demand”, *lūgt* “ask, pray”, *gaidīt* “wait” and *meklēt* “seek”. This group, as well as the preceding one, contains verbs of the semantic sphere ‘striving towards’.

– The non-prepositional genitive or the preposition *no*, requiring the genitive, is used with *bēgt* “run away, avoid”, *baidīties* “be afraid”, *bīties* “fear”, *vairīties* “avoid”, *kaunēties* “be ashamed”, *kautrēties* “be shy” and *sargāties* “beware”. With these verbs, which belong to the semantic sphere ‘avoiding’, the genitive is claimed to be establishing itself as the preferred variant.

– The genitive must be used with *vajadzēt* “need, require”; similarly the two verbs *trūkt* “lack” and *pietikt* “suffice, be sufficient” must be used impersonally with genitive objects.

Elsewhere (Mllvg II:282) the verbs *dzīties* “pursue”, *gribēties* “want” and *iežēloties* “feel sorry” are also claimed to take genitive objects; for these verbs no alternative constructions are mentioned.

The list of verbs which must take genitive objects is shorter in Ceplīte and Ceplītis 1991 than in the 30 years older Academy

grammar. According to Ceplīte and Ceplītis (1991:15–16) only *trūkt* and *pietikt* firmly require genitive objects. *Vajadzēt* is now placed in the group of verbs which most frequently take the accusative, but at times also the genitive. Thus one may conclude that presently the norms require genitive objects only with two verbs: *trūkt* (presumably also the prefixed *pietrūkt*) and *pietikt*.

In the investigated newspaper texts the norm is followed consistently here: 25 instances of *(pie)trūkt* and 13 of *pietikt* were found, and everywhere the verbs were used impersonally and with the genitive. In the interviews, however, the picture was somewhat different. With *(pie)trūkt* there were seven instances of impersonal constructions and the genitive, but also seven instances where the verb was used personally and the argument appeared as a nominative subject. *Pietikt* occurred only twice, once with a genitive and once with a nominative. The two competing constructions are illustrated by these examples:

- (11) a) ... bērniem šodien pietrūkst pacietības ... (gen.)
 "today the children lack patience" (S.A., woman, 31 years)
- b) ... burtiski trūkst godīgi cilvēki ... (nom.)
 "literally speaking, there is a lack of honest people" (E.K., man, 57 years)

With verbs other than these two, all of the material from the survey showed only three genitive objects: one with *baidīties*, one with *ilgoties* and one with *vajadzēt*. All these occurred in the written material. Noticeably, no genitive objects were found with verbs such as *gaidīt* (21 occurrences in the texts, three in the interviews), *gribēt* (four times in the texts, 30 times in the interviews) and *meklēt* (64 times in the texts, 13 times in the interviews).

2.7 The genitive in connection with verbs of motion

We now come to those functions where the genitive is not found in modern standard Latvian or the modern colloquial language, but where it is preserved in older literature (folklore) and to some extent in dialects.

The genitive occurring in connection with verbs of motion – either as the object of an infinite verb or as an adjunct with the meaning of goal or purpose – is well-known from Lithuanian. Examples such as these show that similar constructions have been present in Latvian (indeed they still are found in some dialects, and mentioned in a Latgallian grammar by Bukšs and Placinskis [1973:296]):

- (12) Puiši bija aizgājuši auzu pļaut. "The boys had gone out to cut the oat." (Mllvg II:283)
- (13) es ieš[u] siena telītēm "I will go and get (some) hay for the calves" (Endzelīns 1951:559)

2.8 The genitive in time expressions with *ik* "every"

The particle *ik* "every" is sometimes found to take the genitive in temporal expressions, although the default case for such expressions denoting frequency is the accusative, and the accusative is indeed more frequent than the genitive in the contemporary language. Both the singular and the plural are encountered; formal homonymy between the accusative singular and the genitive plural or the accusative plural and the genitive singular in certain declension classes often makes it impossible to determine which case is used. I have not found any statement as to which case is used with *ik* in the normative grammars, however there is one example of an unambiguous genitive in the Academy dictionary: *ik.acumirkļa* "every moment" (Llvv III:445). The newspaper material presented 19 instances of *ik* in time expressions, but all of them could be analysed as accusatives (true, eight instances were ambiguous between the accusative and the genitive). The interviews did not provide a single example of this construction.

2.9 The adverbial ablativic genitive

This construction, in which the non-prepositional genitive expresses an origin or source, is not found in modern Latvian. To my knowledge, it is not known in Lithuanian either. Some examples are provided by the Latvian folk-songs, but often there are variants

of the same song where a prepositional phrase with *no* "from" is used instead of the non-prepositional genitive, as here:

- (14) Kuras elles tu islihdī⁵ (gen.)
 "Which hell did you creep out of" (LD 382,13, variant)
- (15) Waj no elles tu islihdī (no + gen.)
 "Did you creep out of hell" (LD 382,13, various variants)

3. Is anything changing?

From the data presented above one may conclude that the genitive case in modern Latvian seems to be under pressure in a number of functions which may be described as partitive, adverbial or both partitive and adverbial. A key question is whether this can be shown to be the product of a process of change. At the one hand, it is an established fact that synchronic variation in a language often reflects diachronic change (cf. for instance Labov 1972). On the other hand, one cannot in principle exclude that synonymous syntactic constructions may exist side by side in a language for a certain period of time. As pointed out by Birnbaum (1984:29), the establishing of syntactic innovations is a process which typically occurs over a certain time span, leading to the innovation and the old construction occurring side by side at least for some time. According to Birnbaum, "[s]yntactic synonymy, that is to say, the occurrence and virtual interchangeability of functionally identical or nearly identical formal means, in part conditioned and qualified only by stylistic and other not strictly grammatical considerations, is thus the norm rather than the exception at any given stage in the diachronic variation of a linguistic system". Below I will examine some arguments in favour of and against the view that the Latvian non-prepositional genitive is in the process of losing ground.

3.1 Previously made assumptions

The field of diachronic syntax has not received much attention from scholars of Latvian, perhaps due to the scarcity of reliable sources of

⁵ Here and elsewhere where sources printed in Gothic are quoted, the following rules of transcription are followed: f=s, š=s, f=š, C=S, Š=Š.

older Latvian. A few assumptions of the historic development in the field of case usage have nevertheless been made. Thus Mühlenbachs (1891) is of the opinion that the use of genitive objects with negated verbs is the result of a secondary development, and that in Latvian (and Lithuanian) the accusative and the genitive have been used side by side over a long period of time, the genitive never completely ousting the original accusative. Rudzīte (1960:227–228) on the other hand, commenting on the partitive adverbial genitive, lexically required genitive objects and the genitive found in connection with verbs of motion, notes that these constructions with the genitive are commonly encountered in dialects and folklore, even if they are rare or completely absent from the standard language. Although her assumptions in this field is very cautious, she seems to be of the opinion that the constructions with the genitive are older than the alternative constructions; for instance she mentions that the adverbial genitive with verbs of motion is no longer commonly used, and claims that the construction with the preposition *pēc* "after" is newer. She supports this claim with an observation that there is a transition from the non-prepositional genitive to *pēc* during the second half of the 19th century (although she does not provide any examples of this), as well as with the fact that this construction is frequent in Lithuanian, which generally is perceived as more archaic than Latvian.

3.2 Early texts and grammars

Although the earliest preserved Latvian texts are from the 16th century, these texts are of limited value for studies of case usage, simply because the orthography used often makes it impossible to distinguish the word endings and thus the case forms employed. From the 17th century onward this is less of a problem, but there are still a number of uncertainties related to the texts, and perhaps especially to the syntax used in them. As a matter of fact, many scholars are of the opinion that the texts from the 17th and 18th centuries are of little value as evidence of earlier stages in the history of the language, simply because the authors had a rather shallow understanding of Latvian and made little effort to bring the written language closer to the language spoken by native Latvians. There is no doubt that the syntax of the early Latvian texts is

heavily influenced by German; however, although this fact must be kept in mind, it cannot be a valid argument for totally discarding the value of the early texts in diachronic studies.

Lepika (1959) performs a thorough investigation of object case-marking with negated verbs in early texts and grammars, concluding that with exception of certain specific constructions the accusative completely dominates in this function throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. In order to get a picture of the situation pertaining to the other functions as well, I have performed a limited survey of translations and original texts by Georg Mancelius (1593–1654), Johannes Reuter (?1632–?1695/97), Ernst Glück (1652–1705) and Gotthard Friedrich Stender (1714–1796).⁶

A further source to the state of the language in earlier periods are the early Latvian grammars, the first of which were published in the middle of the 17th century. All the early grammars to a greater or lesser extent endeavour to give a description of the phonetics and morphology of Latvian, while the syntax is treated quite superficially, if at all. The grammars undoubtedly contain a lot of inaccuracies and erroneous claims, both because of the authors' lacking knowledge of the language they are trying to describe and the practice, common at that time, of regarding the classical languages, and Latin in particular, as the ideal pattern to which grammars of all other languages should conform. But even if the grammars mostly fail to make precise accounts of case usage, they provide quite a few examples giving a certain insight into the matter. The 17th and 18th century grammars of greatest value in this respect are Adolphi 1685, Langius 1685, Szpungianski 1732 and Stender 1783. The investigation of older grammars further included Bielenstein 1863 and Endzelins and Mühlenbach 1907.

3.2.1 *The adnominal partitive genitive with a quantifier head*

Both in the texts and the grammars both alternative constructions are used – one encounters both the genitive and the case associated with the syntactic position of the phrase (nominative or accusative). Thus Adolphi (1685:33) explicitly states that both [*d*]auds *jaudis* and

⁶ For a detailed account of the investigated material cf. Berg-Olsen 1999:34–38 and 202–203.

dauds jauschu are possible translations of German *viel Leute*. Further down he writes *mas Labbibas* "little grain" using the genitive, but *Tee dešmits Deewa Baušli* "God's ten commandments" with a nominative. Similar examples can be found other places in the book. Langius and Stender are also not consistent on this point. The texts show a certain contrast between phrases containing numerals and phrases containing indefinite quantifiers. With numerals the genitive is rarely used – only one example was found:

- (16) [...] *tas bija tam dešmits tuhksčocho Pohdo parradā*. "[...] he owed him ten thousand talents." (Matt. 18,24. Glück 1689 II:40).

With indefinite quantifiers, the genitive is used about as often as the competing forms. As mentioned above, a similar discrepancy between numerals and indefinite quantifiers is observed in the norms of the modern Latvian standard language.

3.2.2 *The adnominal partitive genitive with an adjective head*

The number of occurrences of this construction in the texts is not very large, and the only adjective found is *pilns* "full". The forms used with this adjective vary greatly; it is found with a non-prepositional genitive seven times, with *ar* and the accusative three times, with *ar* and the genitive once, with *no* and the genitive twice, with a (non-prepositional) instrumental once and with the nominative (sic!) four times. The most probable conclusion to be drawn from this is that there was a certain amount of confusion among the German writers as to what kind of complement *pilns* "full" could take; although the material is small, it seems likely that there was a certain variation in the language of the native speakers as well. As for the grammars, they do not provide many examples of this function; Langius (1685:217a) has one examples with *pilns* and the genitive, and another with *bagāts* "rich" and a prepositional phrase with *no* "from" and the genitive. Stender (1783:259) also lists one example with *pilns* in his list of Latvian riddles; here the complement is marked with the non-prepositional instrumental.

3.2.3 The adverbial partitive genitive

As mentioned above, this function is rare or non-existent in modern Latvian, and it does not seem to be common in the old texts either; this is especially true of partitive genitive *subjects*, which did not occur in the investigated texts at all. However, in Stender's grammar there are a few occurrences:

- (17) Šcho gadd buhs ohgu (*scilicet* papilnam) "This year there will be berries (implicitly: in abundance)" (Stender 1783:169).
- (18) Kad man irr šahls un maises / Kam buhs man turreht raises! "When I have salt and bread / Why should I have any worries!" (Stender 1783:286).

In contrast to the scarcity of examples in the texts stands Bielenstein's remark (1863:280) that the partitive genitive is very commonly used with existential impersonal verbs. Further on (1863:281) Bielenstein states that nominative-marking of the subjects of such verbs indicate definiteness – thus, he outlines the situation in Latvian much in the same way as one could describe the modern state in Lithuanian.

Partitive genitive *objects* are somewhat more frequent. Reuter (1675) uses it three times, e.g. here:

- (19) No ka sów noturrådameesz/ iusz labba darrisit. "In abstaining from this, you will do well". (Acts 15,29. Reuter 1675:6).

Lepika (1959:531) lists some similar examples from Glück's Bible translation. The construction is also found in the 17th century grammars. Stender (1783:171) provides this example:

- (20) Zittam jauna oder škahdes darriht. "To do somebody evil or harm".

Bielenstein (1863:281–282) gives several examples of partitive genitive objects with verbs meaning 'take' and 'give'. He states that the accusative is used to express definiteness, much as in modern Lithuanian and in correspondence with his view on the

contrast between nominative and genitive-marking of subjects of existential verbs. Endzelīns and Mühlenbachs (1907:171) seem to agree with Bielenstein.

3.2.4 Subjects in the genitive with negated existential verbs

Also in this function, which primarily encompasses occurrences of negated existential *būt* "be", the early sources indicate a certain degree of variation between the genitive and the alternative form – here the nominative. The picture in the texts is as follows:

Table 4. Case usage with negated existential *būt* and with *nevarēt būt* in the investigated early texts.

	Mancelius	Reuter	Glück	Stender
Genitive	0	3	8	1
Nominative	2	0	6	4

As can be seen, the genitive is not used consistently in this function. Among the examples with the nominative are these two:

- (21) Tee šautz/ bett turr nhe gir Palliēgs [...]. "They call, but there is no one to help [...]". (Mancelius ?1696–?99 I:171)
- (22) Un ta tuda] usdihge/ tapehz ka tai Semmes Dzillums ne bija. "And it immediately sprang up, because the soil was shallow." [literally: "because it did not have the depth of the earth."] (Matt. 13,5. Glück 1689 II:27).

An interesting point is that Reuter, the only one of the four writers who perhaps is a native Latvian,⁷ in the examined text *ÜbersetzungsProbe* (Reuter 1675) exclusively uses the genitive in this function. This could indicate that the use of the nominative is a result of misapprehension or foreign, probably German influence, but regrettably Reuter's text is so short that one cannot draw any certain conclusions regarding this matter.

⁷ Reuter is commonly believed to have been a Latvian, but, as pointed out by Jēgers (1975:35), this has not been finally proved.

The 17th century grammars do not mention anything about subjects of negated existential verbs being genitive-marked, but Stender (1783) has a few examples of it, for instance 23. But examples with the nominative are also found in his grammar, e.g. 24.

- (23) Kam nawa našīn,⁸ lai ehd ar nadsīņ "Who lacks a knife must eat with his nail". (Stender 1783:245).
- (24) Wiņņam ne ešsoht ne kahdi sirgi, nei arri buhšchoht. "As it seems, he does not have any horses, and will not get any either." (Stender 1783:191).

Bielenstein (1863:280–281) some eighty years later makes a clear statement in favour of the genitive: He mentions the genitive with *nav* under the heading "partitive genitive", and specifies that this is the only type of partitive genitive subject which can never be replaced by the nominative, due to the negation. Endzelīns and Mühlenbachs (1907:172) write that existential *nebūt* as a rule is used with the genitive, but they also make the important observation that the nominative is used in some dialects, particularly those in the northern part of Kurzeme.

3.2.5 Objects in the genitive with negated verbs

The historical development of object case-marking with negated verbs is extensively treated in Lepika 1959. After investigating a broad range of early texts and grammars, Lepika concludes that the accusative completely dominates in this function throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. She finds three exceptions: 1) The word *ne nieka* "nothing", written in several ways, appears in the genitive rather than in the accusative. 2) The first and second person singular personal pronouns sometimes appear in the genitive (*manis* and *tevis*) instead of in the accusative (*mani* and *tevi*), but this occurs also in affirmative sentences. 3) There are a number of verbs

⁸ This should read *našīņ*; in the facsimile, however, the last letter looks like <n>. Although the final vowel is lacking, *našīn* must be interpreted as a genitive singular corresponding to modern standard Latvian *naziņa*.

which have genitive objects regardless of whether they are negated or not – these are instances of lexically determined case-marking and thus essentially of a different kind. My own investigation of early texts to a large extent supports Lepika's findings (lexically determined genitive objects are of course disregarded here):

Table 5. Case usage on objects of negated verbs in the investigated early texts.

		Mancelius	Reuter	Glück	Stender
VNEG +	Genitive	4	0	6	1
object	Accusative	45	18	66	12
VNEG +	Genitive	1	2	1	0
V + object	Accusative	13	4	17	6

Out of the total 15 genitives, 12 are occurrences of *ne nieka* and one of the first person singular personal pronoun *manis*. The remaining two are from Reuter 1675, which Lepika did not have at her disposal, as it was only rediscovered in 1974. Interestingly enough, in both occurrences in Reuter's text the object is not an argument of the negated verb itself, but of an infinite verbal complement to the negated verb:

- (25) Tõw nã busz sów Ālka darrit [...] "You shall not make any idol [...]". (Exod. 20,4. Reuter 1675:3).
- (26) [...] tu nã warri weena Matta balta nãdsz mälla padarrit. "[...] you cannot make even one hair white or black." (Matt. 5,36. Reuter 1675:12).

Lepika (1959:533) states that the first grammar to mention genitive objects with negation is Szpungianski 1732. Szpungianski, who apparently was a native Latvian, notes that objects appearing in the accusative with affirmative verbs are changed into the genitive if the verb is negated, and compares this to the similar rule in Polish. An important fact is that Szpungianski's grammar is clearly influenced by Latgallian dialects (cf. Stafecka 1995:44–45), where genitive objects of negated verbs also today are more common than in the Latvian standard language. Stender does not make any

similar statement, although he notes (Stender 1783:170) that the Latvians use the genitive in sentences such as *Ne ņemm ugguns* "Do not take the fire", in which the genitive object *ugguns* probably is not partitive, but dependent on the negated verb. Stender's grammar also contains examples with the first person singular genitive personal pronoun *manis* with negated verbs, cf. 27. The fact that this pronoun is used in the genitive also in non-negated sentences such as 28, however, suggests that the negation is not a genitive-triggering element in 27 and similar examples.

(27) Tur tu mannis ne weddi. "Do not lead me there". (Stender 1783:256).

(28) Waddi mannis. "Lead me". (Stender 1783:171)

Bielenstein (1863:284–285) notes the propensity of negated verbs to take genitive objects, but he also remarks that this rule no longer seems to be observed strictly. Endzelīns and Mühlenbachs' (1907:175) statement regarding this matter is more specific: In Kurzeme the accusative is more common than the genitive, while the opposite is the case in Vidzeme. The first and second person singular personal pronouns are often put in the genitive (*manis* and *tevis*), while the corresponding plural ones (*mūsu* and *jūsu*) are hardly ever used.

3.2.6 Lexically required genitive objects

In the early texts there are a number of verbs appearing with genitive objects without a negation and without there being any notion of partitivity involved. However, all of these verbs apparently also take objects in other forms than the genitive, and the genitive is in no way dominating. The verbs found to take non-prepositional genitive objects are: *bīties/bijāties* "be afraid, fear" (twice with the genitive, 14 times with other forms), *dabūt* "get, obtain" (once with the genitive, 13 times with other forms), *gaidīt* "wait" (once with the genitive, four times with other forms), *iekāroties* "(begin to) desire" (three times with the genitive, once with other forms), *iežēloties* "(begin to) feel sorry" (once used impersonally with a genitive object, three times used personally with *pahr*

and the accusative), *trūkt* "lack" (once used impersonally with a genitive object, three times used personally with the corresponding argument appearing as a nominative subject) and *vajadzēt* "need, require" (three times with the genitive, three times with other forms⁹)

As for *lūgt* "ask, pray", Lepika (1959:529) writes that this verb is used with a genitive object in the writings of Christoph Fürecker (1613/15–1685?). In the texts investigated by me, however, *lūgt* is exclusively used with the accusative, while the reflexive *lūgties* is used twice with a genitive complement in Reuter (1675). It can be noted that Reuter's relatively short text also provided all examples of genitive objects with *bīties/bijāties* and *iekāroties*. Lepika (1959:529–531) further reports that there are genitive objects with *meklēt* "seek" in Fürecker's writings and *gribēt* "want" in both Fürecker's and Mancelius', and with *atminēties* and *pieminēt*, both meaning "remember", in Glück's Bible translation. A more thorough search of texts would probably lead to the discovery of yet more verbs with genitive objects.

The grammars of the 17th and 18th centuries do not make any explicit statements about certain verbs requiring a genitive object, but it still is possible to find examples of such constructions there. Thus in Adolphi's grammar genitive objects occur with *bīties* "fear" (Adolphi 1685:258), *iegribēties* "(begin to) want" (251) and *lūgties* "pray, implore" (252). Langius gives an example of a genitive with *gribēt* (Langius 1685:222a), while Stender gives examples with *bīties* (1783:171) and *lūgties* (170). But, as in the texts, examples of other cases or prepositional phrases are also often found with the same verbs.

Judging from the sources examined, there seem to have been quite a number of verbs which could take a genitive complement in the Latvian of the 17th and 18th centuries. But at the same time the non-prepositional genitive is never the only form occurring with a verb, and it is seldom the most used form. It would be unlikely if this were only due to the writers' poor knowledge of the language or to misunderstandings – there certainly existed some

⁹ Four times the word *vajag(a)* is used as an adjective; twice it takes a genitive complement, and twice it is used with the nominative.

degree of variation in which cases or prepositional constructions were used with the mentioned verbs. This is at least partially supported by the grammars of the 19th and early 20th century: Bielenstein (1863:281) mentions that *trūkt* can be used both impersonally with a genitive complement, giving an indefinite meaning, and personally with a nominative subject, resulting in a definite meaning. For *bities* (1863:283) he approves of both genitive and accusative objects, but writes that the construction *bities no* does not seem Latvian. Finally he notes (1863:284) that objects of *maksāt* "pay" may be in the genitive or the accusative. Endzelīns and Mühlenbachs (1907:171–173) give a yet more comprehensive list of verbs taking genitive complements, although some of these verbs, such as *iet* "walk" and *braukt* "drive" clearly do not require a genitive object; thus e.g. their example *uhdens, saļū eet* "go for water, medicine" (1907:172) rather contains an adverbial genitive expressing the goal of a verb of motion. But among the truly genitive-requiring verbs there are several for which the authors mention that there are alternatives to the genitive: *kaunēties* "be ashamed", *atcerēties*, *atgādaties*, *atminēties*, all three meaning "remember", *lūgt*, *gribēt* and *kārot* "desire" are used either with the genitive or the accusative, while with *prasīt* "ask, demand", *gaidīt* and *meklēt* either the genitive, accusative or the preposition *pēc* "after" with the genitive is used; in Kurzeme *vajadzēt* takes accusative objects, or alternatively *vajaga* can be used as an ordinary adjective, while many places in Vidzeme the verb requires the genitive; *trūkt* is used impersonally with the genitive in Vidzeme, but personally with a nominative subject in northern Kurzeme; *bijāties* and *baidīties*, as well as *bēgt* "run away, avoid" is constructed with the genitive, the accusative or with *no* "from" and the genitive. Similar observations of variation in the pattern of object case-marking are found in Mühlenbachs' dictionary (Mühlenbachs 1923–1932). This, together with the evidence from the 17th and 18th century texts, indicates that alternative constructions with many of the verbs have existed for a long period of time, probably for several centuries.

3.2.7 The genitive in connection with verbs of motion

As mentioned above, genitive objects are sometimes used with infinite verbs which are subordinate to a verb of motion. In the corpus of early texts, however, only accusative objects were found in these environments. The only grammar to mention this construction is Endzelīns and Mühlenbachs'; the authors write (1907:172) that objects in the mentioned syntactic environment may be marked with either the genitive or the accusative.

As already stated, Rudzīte (1960:228) claims that the adverbial non-prepositional genitive expressing the goal of a verb of motion was gradually ousted by prepositional phrases with *pēc* during the 19th century – thus one would expect to find it in earlier sources. But in the examined texts only a single sentence was found in which at first glance a genitive seems to be used in this way:

- (29) Un viņšc dauds tho Wariseēro un Sadduzeēro eeraudsijis pee viņņa Kristibu nahkam/ šazzija us teem: [...]
- a) *Kristibu* = GEN PL: "And, seeing that many Pharisees and Sadducees came to him to be baptised, he said to them: [...]"
- b) *Kristibu* = ACC SG: "And, seeing that many Pharisees and Sadducees came to his baptism, he said to them: [...]"
(Matt. 3,7. Glück 1689 II:4)

In 29 the object *Kristibu* could be interpreted as the genitive of *kristības* "baptism", which in modern Latvian is mostly used only as a plurale tantum – this would render translation a. Against this speaks the fact that elsewhere in Glück's translation of the gospel according to Matthew this noun is used in the singular, for instance in 30:

- (30) No kurrjen bija Jahņa Kristiba? "From where did John's baptism come?" (Matt. 21,25. Glück 1689 II:47).

Other examples are found on page 44 (Matt. 20,22 and 20,23). Moreover, the genitive plural ending in this translation of the gospel according to Matthew is consistently rendered as <o>, the ending <u> being reserved for the accusative singular, as pointed

out by Lāme (1933:105–107, quoted in Ozols 1965:270–271). In light of these facts, the form *Kristibu* must be regarded as an accusative singular, governed by the preposition *pee*, which is used with this case also elsewhere in the text. The correct translation of the sentence is then translation b, and 29 does not provide an example of adverbial non-prepositional genitive. In Langius' grammar two examples of the genitive in this function were found:

- (31) *Ey Uhdēn'* "Go for water" (Fennell's translation).
(Langius 1685:222)
- (32) *Brautz Šāhk'* "Drive off for greenfeed" (Fennell's translation).
(Langius 1685:222)

Uhdēn' "water" in 31 should probably be taken as an abbreviation of the genitive *ūdens* or *ūdeņa*, and *Šāhk'* "greenfeed" in 32 of the genitive *sēka*. It is interesting that Langius in connection with 31 remarks that it is incorrect to say *Ey pāhts Uhdēn'* using a prepositional phrase with *pēc* "after". The next grammar to give this construction a treatment is Bielenstein's (1863:282), while only Endzelīns and Mühlenbachs (1907:172) mention the construction with *pēc* along with the non-prepositional genitive.

Rudzīte's claim that the adverbial non-prepositional genitive was regularly in use with verbs of motion until the 19th century is thus not supported by the data examined here, as it is never used in the text corpus and only mentioned once in the grammars of the 17th and 18th centuries. One could of course again assume that this is due to the authors' scanty knowledge of Latvian. More credible is probably the assumption that beside the non-prepositional genitive there already prior to the 19th century existed alternative, competing constructions which were preferred by the German writers, perhaps because of their greater similarity to German constructions.

3.2.8 The genitive in time expressions with *ik* "every"

A total of 24 instances of time expressions with *ik* "every" were found in the text corpus; of these the great majority, 18 instances, consisted of a construction corresponding to modern Latvian *ik dienas* "every day", in which *dienas* formally might be either geni-

tive singular or accusative plural. This formal homonymy in principle makes it impossible to determine which case is used. However, as remarked by Lāme (1933:105–107, quoted in Ozols 1965:270–271), in Glück's translation of the gospel according to Matthew an effort is made to distinguish the genitive singular and the accusative (and nominative) plural in *ā*-stems such as *diena*: The genitive singular ending is written <as>, the accusative and nominative plural ending <ahs>. This enables one to claim that in 3.58 and 3.59, the only two examples of the construction found in the excerpt of the Bible text, the genitive is used:

- (33) *Ikdeenas* ešmu es pee jums šehdejs [...] "I have sat by your side every day [...]" (Matt 26,55. Glück 1689 II:62)
- (34) [...] es ešmu pee jums *ikdeenas* lihds Pašaules Gallam. "[...] I am with you every day until the end of the world." (Matt 28,20. Glück 1689 II:68)

Apart from the examples with *ik dienas*, unambiguous instances of the accusative (three times) and the locative (twice) were found.

In Adolphi's grammar there are examples of both the genitive, the accusative and the locative in time expressions, while in Stender's grammar one even finds a dative (38):

- (35) *Ik Mehnešchu* (gen.) "every month" (Adolphi 1685:225).
- (36) *Ik brihdi* (acc.) "every moment" (Adolphi 1685:225).
- (37) *Ik rihtā* (loc.) "every morning" (Adolphi 1685:225).
- (38) *ik brihšcham* (dat.) "every moment" (Stender 1783:132).

The data from the text corpus and the grammars does not allow any firm conclusions to be drawn on this point; it seems that the genitive was indeed used, but so were several other forms.

3.2.9 The adverbial ablativic genitive

No traces of the non-prepositional genitive being used adverbially have been found in the corpus of early texts or in the pre-20th century grammars. The first reference to this function is made in Endzelīns and Mühlenbachs (1907:173) – here the authors note that a genitive of ablativic origin is used to express notions such as ‘out of’ and ‘from’. They remark that the non-prepositional genitive in this function is mostly encountered in folk-songs, and that in the contemporary language it is replaced by the preposition *no*; indeed, all their examples seem to be taken from folk songs.

3.3 Folk-songs

The oral literature, and especially the folk-songs, make up a very important part of the Latvian cultural heritage, and has often been used as a key source by linguists investigating different aspects of the Latvian language. The value of the folk-songs in a study of historical syntax is however for several reasons somewhat doubtful. Firstly, it has so far proven impossible to give even an approximate dating of the songs. At least some of the songs, most of which were written down during the late 19th and early 20th century, can be presumed to be of a substantial age, judging from their contents as well as from the presence of archaic linguistic forms. But providing secure criteria for dating the folk-songs seems a quite insuperable task, also because they probably changed as they were passed down from one generation to the other. Secondly, there are several sources of error linked to the process of collecting and cataloguing the songs: It is a well-known fact that e.g. Krišjānis Barons received songs from amateur folklorists all over Latvia. It is somewhat hard to believe that all these different people treated their material with the same degree of rigour. Actually, Barons himself in the introduction to *Latwju Dainas* remarks that “[...] dseešmu usrakstītāji dialektus, ja mas, tad višai pawiršchi, nepilnigi un nekonsekventi eewehrojušchi. Wiņū leelakà daļa pat no wideem, kur walda it noteikta šawada islokšne, usrakstijušchi dseešmas muhšu rakstu walodā ar retām islokšchņu peedewām [...]” (Barons 1922 I:XVI). Thirdly, the folk-songs are of course poetry, with a well-defined structure, a strict metre, and very often other literary means such as

alliteration and repetitions. Word endings are cut off, new syllables added, conjunctions left out and marked word orders used – all to make the text conform to the form and rhythm of the songs. Indeed, most of the songs have several variants, in which competing syntactic constructions are often represented. These are all serious obstacles to making firm statements about the syntax of the folk-songs, and particularly to deciding whether certain constructions occur more often than other, competing ones.

Still one cannot deny that the folk-songs provide a lot of interesting linguistic data. Moreover, they admittedly represent a purely Latvian literary tradition, as opposed to the German-dominated written literature. A limited survey of folk songs published in *Latwju Dainas* (Barons 1922) and the compilation *Latviešu tautasdziesmas* (Ltdz, 1979) showed that the evidence from the folk-songs is all but unambiguous. Certainly one does find all the mentioned constructions with the genitive, even the very archaic adverbial ablativic genitive, and when compared to the early texts and the pre-20th century grammars, the folk-songs seem to bear witness to a more consistent use of the genitive in all of the functions covered here. But undoubtedly the genitive meets with competition here, too – there is case variation in all of the functions, and in some of them the genitive is apparently used less frequently than the alternatives.¹⁰ Considering the methodological difficulties one is faced with when using the folk-songs as evidence of earlier stages in the history of the language, it is not at all clear what is the reason behind the relatively high frequency of genitives. A tempting – and probably at least partially correct – supposition is that the folk-songs in this respect reflect a past stage at which the genitive was used more consistently in certain functions than it is today. But at the same time one cannot exclude the possibility that the number of genitives at least in *Latwju Dainas* may be too high due to methodological errors made by the people who recorded the songs, and possibly also by Krišjānis Barons himself. An important point to bear in mind here is that there was a propensity to use a high proportion of genitives in written standard Latvian in the end

¹⁰ For a more detailed treatment of the folk-songs as well as examples cf. Berg-Olsen 1999:66–74.

of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century – i.e. the period when most of the folk-songs were committed to paper (cf. Lepika 1954:10–12).

These factors indicate that the evidence from the folk-songs should not be evaluated alone, but rather in connection with what the early written sources can tell us. The fact that both the written sources and the oral literature represented by the folk-songs indicate a certain variation in the use of forms in the functions dealt with here, suggests that there indeed has been a process of change going on in the language. But this must also be tested against evidence from Lithuanian as well as other, less closely related languages.

3.4 Syntactic reconstruction

There are several serious obstacles to the reconstruction of Proto-Baltic or even Proto-East Baltic syntax. We have virtually no written material in the Baltic languages older than the 16th century, and the earliest sources are few and often of poor quality. The early written material is almost exclusively translations and, except for the Lithuanian material, written by non-native speakers with a limited knowledge of the language. The syntax in these early texts is heavily influenced by foreign languages.

In spite of all this, I am of the opinion that it is indeed possible to gain a certain impression of traits of the syntax of earlier Baltic by comparing phenomena in the modern languages, including dialects, with data from early texts and folklore, and of course also with data from other branches of Indo-European. Thus I would argue that if there is evidence that the genitive is or has been used in the functions of current interest in Lithuanian as well as in other branches of Indo-European, this speaks in favour of reconstructing the same for earlier stages of Baltic, although it certainly is no conclusive proof.

3.4.1 The partitive genitive

Both the adnominal and the adverbial partitive genitive is found in many branches of Indo-European, and is commonly regarded as being inherited from Proto-Indo-European (Zinkevičius 1984–95 I:55). In modern Lithuanian the partitive genitive with quantifiers

is well-established and seemingly does not meet competition from other forms. With a large number of verbs the norms of the Lithuanian standard language requires subjects or objects to be genitive-marked if expressing an indefinite quantity, although the genitive to some extent is replaced by the nominative or accusative in colloquial language (Šukys 1998:106, Ambrazas 1971).

3.4.2 The genitive with negation

The genitive-marking of subjects of negated existential verbs and objects of certain other negated verbs is known primarily from the Baltic and Slavic languages, but it also occurs in Germanic. Streitberg lists several examples of genitive with negation from Gothic, e.g. these:

(40) ni was im barne
not be-PRET 3SG them-DAT child-GEN PL
“they had no children” (Luke 1,7. Streitberg 1905/06:403)

(41) swe lamba ni habandona hairdeis
as lamb-NOM PL not have-PRES ACT shepherd-
PTCP NEUT NOM PL GEN SG
“as lambs without a shepherd” (Matt. 9,36. Streitberg 1905/06:403)

According to Streitberg, constructions such as those in 3.1 and 3.2 are archaic in Gothic, and the genitive is in the process of being ousted by the nominative (in subjects) and accusative (in objects). Some scholars are of the opinion that the genitive with negation is a Balto-Slavic or Balto-Slavo-Germanic innovation, possibly a development of the partitive genitive (e.g. Stang 1968 I:24, Thomson 1911/1912:256–257). But it has also been postulated that this is an originally Proto-Indo-European construction that was later lost in most of the Indo-European dialects and kept only in Baltic, Slavic and Germanic (Hirt 1934:60).

In Lithuanian the genitive with negation has a quite strong position; apparently the only major exception to this is formed by certain dialects in Suvalkija, where both accusative and genitive objects are encountered with negated verbs (Šukys 1998:110, Senkus 1959:183).

literature. To my knowledge, this construction is also unknown in Lithuanian.

3.5 Conclusions

As shown, the diachronic data on the position of the adverbial and partitive genitive in Latvian is quite heterogeneous. On the one hand the early texts and grammars, and also the folk-songs, seem to present a picture of widespread case variation, actually not unlike the variation found in modern Latvian. On the other hand there are several indications that the genitive is more archaic than the alternative forms – notably the strong position of the genitive in Lithuanian, the fact that other branches of Indo-European to some extent present evidence of similar constructions with the genitive and finally the relatively high frequency of the genitive in the folk songs.

I do acknowledge that the Baltic facts at our disposal probably may be given a satisfactory explanation by assuming that the genitive and the alternative forms have a long history of coexistence in the functions under discussion. Still I prefer to explain the facts by postulating that the non-prepositional genitive is the form originally used in all or most of the functions in question, and that one or more processes of change has been at work to replace it with alternative forms. This view is partly based on the diachronic data already presented, and partly on the consideration that the continuous coexistence of two or more synonymous constructions in a language seems theoretically indefensible. Indeed, on the basis of the modern Latvian data presented in the previous section of this article I draw the conclusion that these processes of change to some extent are still active – i.e. where the change has not yet been brought to an end. I will now turn to possible explanation of the changes.

4. Problems and possible explanations

4.1 On explaining linguistic change

As pointed out by Faarlund (1990:34–37), explanations of linguistic change must necessarily refer to some other domain than that in which the change takes place, in order to avoid that the explanation

is reduced to a pure description or generalisation. The question of what can cause some part of the system of a language to change has been debated for quite some time, and a number of proposals have been made. Still it seems justifiable to say that our knowledge of the reasons and processes involved in linguistic change is relatively limited; although it is often possible to indicate some factors that are likely to have triggered a change, when it comes to the exact way these factors work, a lot remains unclear. Among the factors that most often are presumed to trigger linguistic changes are ease of processing as well as of perception, incomplete language learning and language contact.

The task of explaining linguistic change is complicated by the fact that any change is likely to be the result of several factors working at the same time. In the opinion of Harris and Campbell (1995:317), "most changes have more than one cause". It is for instance quite common for external influences to intensify tendencies that are already internally manifest in a language. When trying to explain a change, one should clearly be prepared to acknowledge the possibility of such *multiple causation*.

The notions of *explanation* and *prediction* are usually closely connected. In diachronic linguistics, however, even if it is possible to find the cause(s) of a change, it is not possible to predict that a certain change will take place. As Faarlund (1990:41) puts it: "[...] whatever cause we are able to establish, that cause never seems to be a sufficient condition for the event. We can always find languages where the change does not seem to have taken place [...]". This inability to predict future changes may be seen as a deficiency of the present theories of linguistic change. In the opinion of Harris and Campbell (1995:321), though, certain aspects of change are indeed open to prediction, such as how a change will proceed if it does take place and what changes cannot occur in a given situation. The fact that we cannot predict whether a change will occur or not certainly does not make the search for plausible explanations of changes futile. I choose to divide the mechanisms of linguistic change into these two categories:

Internal mechanisms of change are mechanisms driven by features within the system of a language at a certain synchronic stage. What induces the changes in the first place can be one or

more of a number of factors, such as the pressure to make speech production and speech perception more effective – two tendencies which are often found to pull in opposite directions, producing series of successive changes. I follow Harris and Campbell (1995) in assuming that all mechanisms of syntactic change operating within the system of a language may be analysed as either *reanalysis* or *extension*, reanalysis being the changing of the underlying structure of a syntactic pattern and extension being the changing of the surface manifestation of such a pattern. Other notions which are frequently used in discussions of language change, such as analogy and grammaticalisation, can be treated successfully within this theoretical framework, which provides a uniform and constrained basis for analysing syntactic change.

External mechanisms of change are mechanisms driven by features located outside the system of a specific language. In other words, changes which take place in connection with these mechanisms are induced by features of one or several linguistic systems other than the one which is changing. The most common mechanisms of external change are borrowing and interference resulting from language shift, i.e. when a group of speakers for some reason abandon their old language and begin to use a new one instead. Though the fact that linguistic features may be transferred from one language to another has long been acknowledged, a certain aversion against using external factors to explain changes still exists, especially in the field of syntax. For some reason many linguists have been inclined to regard internal explanations as “better”, or to consider external factors only as a last resort. I agree with Thomason and Kaufman (1988:57) in that “a weak internal motivation is less convincing as a cause than a strong external motivation” (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:57). One should certainly also keep in mind the possibility that internal and external factors may work together to bring about a certain change.

4.2 Possible explanations of the changes

Before turning to a discussion of the possible reasons for the decline of the Latvian non-prepositional genitive, I find it appropriate to give a short summary of the separate syntactic changes observed:

Table 6. Functions where the Latvian non-prepositional genitive has been or is in the process of being replaced by other forms.

Function	Form(s) replacing the genitive
The adnominal partitive genitive with a quantifier head	nom/acc
The adnominal partitive genitive with an adjective head	various prepositions
The adverbial partitive genitive	nom/acc
Subjects in the genitive with negated existential verbs	nom
Objects in the genitive with negated verbs	acc
Lexically required genitive objects	various prepositions, nom, acc
Genitive objects in connection with verbs of motion	acc
Adverbial genitive expressing purpose/goal with verbs of motion	<i>pēc</i> + gen
The genitive in time expressions with <i>ik</i> “every”	acc
The adverbial ablativic genitive	<i>no</i> + gen

A key question is how the different changes are interrelated. One could theoretically argue that they are independent, and that it is only by pure coincidence that they all involve the replacement of the non-prepositional genitive by other forms. A more likely and theoretically more satisfying position, though, is to view the changes as parts of a larger-scale development or ultimately as instances of a single change. Still, the ways in which this larger-scale development proceeds and the mechanisms at work may indeed be quite complex. After dealing with possible mechanisms for the different changes, I will turn to a discussion of how they may be interrelated in section 4.3.

4.2.1 Internal motivation

All the changes involve alterations of syntactic surface structure – in each instance we observe that the non-prepositional genitive is replaced by some other form, be it another non-prepositional case or a prepositional phrase. Sometimes, as with the verbs (*pie*)trūkt “lack” and *pietikt* “suffice, be sufficient”, the change affects not only the case-marking of the complements of the verb, but also the behaviour of the verb itself (from being an impersonal verb, it becomes a personal verb). In my opinion, all the changes may be analysed as being extensions, i.e. alterations of a surface pattern by the removal of a condition on a rule that exists in the language. As noted by Harris and Campbell (1995:80–81), extension typically occurs after an underlying pattern has been altered through reanalysis, bringing the surface pattern in line with the new underlying one. Reanalysis certainly has occurred prior to several of the changes observed in Latvian, although it should be made clear that reanalysis is not a necessary prerequisite for an extension to take place.

4.2.1.1 The adnominal partitive genitive with a quantifier head

The first step towards the change in the syntactic behaviour of quantifiers such as *desmit* “ten” and *daudz* “much, many” was the reanalysis of these words as adjectives:

Reanalysis: Q=N > Q=A

One motivation for the reanalysis may have been the fact that a large group of quantifying words – those which have separate masculine and feminine forms – already behaved as adjectives, agreeing with their quantified element and not requiring it to occur in the genitive or any other specific case form. There is also one environment in which constructions involving quantifiers of the *desmit* type potentially are structurally ambiguous – this applies when the phrase with the quantifier occurs in a position structurally associated with the genitive case, as here:

(47) *desmit stundu brauciens* “a ten hour journey”

In 47 the phrase containing the quantifier *desmit* “ten” is an attribute to the noun *brauciens* “journey”, and should thus be in the genitive case. The quantifier itself is indeclinable, but the quantified element (*stundu* “hours”) must be genitive-marked whether it is syntactically subordinate to the quantifier or the head of the phrase. Thus the reanalysis of quantifiers as adjectives in circumstances such as 47 would only lead to a reinterpretation of the underlying structure of such utterances – the surface pattern remains the same after the reanalysis. But in all other syntactic environments¹¹ the actualisation of the reanalysis would result in a change in the surface pattern as well – as was shown in examples 1 and 2.

4.2.1.2 The genitive as subject and object case

Under this heading I subsume all the functions where the non-prepositional genitive earlier was used to express the grammatical relations of subject and object, but where it has been or is in the process of being replaced either by the prototypical subject and object cases – nominative and accusative respectively – or by prepositional phrases. This includes the partitive adverbial functions, the functions in connection with negation, lexically required genitive objects and one of the two functions in connection with verbs of motion – where a genitive object of an infinite verb would indicate the intention or goal of an action expressed by a verb of motion.

Although the notions of “subject” and “object” are probably applicable to Latvian (although not easily definable), they are not uniformly marked by cases. Arguments of verbs may be marked

11 It should be noted that two small noun classes, the third and sixth declension (masculines ending in *-us* and feminines ending in *-s*), have homonymous forms in the nominative and genitive singular. Constructions with a quantifier and a singular noun belonging to one of these classes would thus look the same before and after reanalysis if the phrase containing the quantifier occupied a nominative position. An example would be the phrase *daudz medus* “a lot of honey”, in which the form *medus* may be either a nominative singular or a genitive singular. Such instances are quite infrequent due to the small number of nouns belonging to the two classes.

with several cases or with prepositions, depending on the semantic properties of the verb and of the sentence as a whole. Thus we have seen that the genitive is or has been used as both a subject and an object case to express '(indeterminate) quantity' (partitive functions) and 'absence' (functions connected with negation); several verbs with different semantics require genitive objects, and genitive objects are in certain environments used to express intent or goal. In Latvian these semantically determined fields of usage of the non-prepositional genitive are in the process of disappearing, and the default case-marking pattern – with nominative subjects and accusative objects – is replacing the semantically conditioned patterns. In other words, the constructions with the genitive is replaced by other constructions already more frequent in the language; the driving force behind these changes seems to be a strengthening of the default case-marking patterns of subjects (nominative) and objects (accusative or prepositional phrase).

All the aforementioned changes involving the abandoning of certain genitive constructions in favour of more frequent patterns may be regarded as extensions and formulated as removals of certain conditions on existing rules, as shown below:

- (48) (a) Use the genitive case on subjects
 (b) if the verb expresses 'existence' or 'change of state' and
 (b1) if the subject expresses an indefinite quantity or
 (b2) if the verb is negated *būt* "be".
- (49) (a) Use the nominative case on subjects
 (b) elsewhere

The removal of condition 48b1 eliminated the possibility of using partitive genitive subjects; this change is all but completed in most varieties of Latvian. The removal of condition 48b2, which seemingly is underway at least in the colloquial language of the Riga district, leads to the elimination of all of 48 and effectively to the replacement of all genitive subjects with nominative ones.

- (50)
 (a) Use the genitive case on objects
 (b) if the verb is infinite and subordinate to a verb expressing 'motion' or
 (c) if the verb is among the set [*ēst* "eat", *dzert* "drink", ... *dot* "give"] and the object expresses an indefinite quantity or
 (d) if the verb is negated
- (51)
 (a) Use the accusative case on objects
 (b) elsewhere

The conditions on rule 50 have been or are in the process of being removed; both 50b and 50c are seemingly non-existent in modern Latvian, while 50d is removed from most varieties of the language, but persists in some dialects, notably in the upper Latvian dialect area.

Also the changes observed with the verbs which formerly required a genitive object may be formally stated as the removal of conditions from a rule; the lexical genitive-marking of objects before the change was quite infrequent and peripheral in the language, and subsequently was replaced by default patterns. When the genitive was replaced by a prepositional phrase, the question of exactly which preposition steps in to fill the genitive's function is related to the semantics of the verb. What all these changes have in common, is the abandoning of genitive objects, a development in line with the gradual removal of rule 50.

The verbs (*pie*)*trūkt* "lack" and *pietikt* "suffice, be sufficient" after the change not only cease to take genitive objects; these genitive objects are turned into nominative subjects, and thus the constructions with these verbs change from impersonal to personal. This change must be analysed as consisting of two stages, a reanalysis followed by extension. The verbs normally have two arguments, a patient and an experiencer. The patient, formerly an object marked with a lexically conditioned genitive, is first reanalysed as a subject. Subsequently it undergoes extension and is marked with the default subject case, i.e. the nominative. The changes may be envisaged as follows:

1. Before reanalysis:

patient	object	genitive
experiencer	object	dative

2. After reanalysis, before extension:

patient	subject	genitive
experiencer	object	dative

3. After extension:

patient	subject	nominative
experiencer	object	dative

At stage 2 the change is not yet visible; it is only the grammatical relation realised by the patient argument, i.e. a part of the underlying structure, which has changed.¹² The process of extension, viewed as the removal of yet another condition on the rule assigning nominative case to subjects, alters the surface representation and brings it in line with the most frequently occurring pattern in the language.

Except for the case of the two verbs (*pie*)trūkt and *pietikt*, all the changes affecting genitive subjects and objects involve only extension, not reanalysis. The grammatical relations do not change, i.e. subjects remain subjects and objects remain objects at all times, but their genitive case-marking is replaced by more frequent patterns.

The changes undergone by constructions originally involving genitive subjects and objects were also in all probability partly induced by formal homonymy between case forms, a result of historical developments in Latvian phonology.¹³

¹² At this point, the case marking remains the same, but the patient argument has some of the structural traits pertaining to subject. One may envisage that a sentence at this point could have genitive-marking on the patient argument, but also subject-verb agreement. I have found no such sentences, but consider it likely that they may be found.

¹³ For the role of formal homonymy cf. Berg-Olsen 2000.

4.2.1.3 *The adverbial genitive*

This heading comprises two functions: the genitive expressing purpose or goal of verbs of motion and the adverbial ablativic genitive. Both types have been replaced by prepositional constructions; namely with the prepositions *pēc* "after" and *no* "from" respectively (both of which require the genitive). Although these developments cannot be explained as easily as the abandoning of the genitive as a subject and object case, they too seem to be part of a larger shift in the syntactic profile of the genitive case, largely limiting its sphere of usage to adnominal functions. In any case the two adverbial functions undoubtedly were relatively peripheral in the functional system of the genitive case, and thus vulnerable to change. Exactly which prepositions took over the role of the non-prepositional genitive in these functions is in all probability closely linked to the semantics of the two constructions.

4.2.1.4 *The genitive in time expressions with ik "every"*

The transfer from the genitive to the accusative in time expressions with the word *ik* "every" may be regarded as an extension of the dominant pattern for time expressions denoting frequency and duration, namely the non-prepositional accusative. One might choose to consider the word *ik* as a quantifier in line with *cik* "how much, how many" and *tik* "this much, this many" and assume that it originally was a noun, but at some point got reanalysed as an adjective, just like the quantifiers discussed above. Such a development would also result in the removal of the genitive-type construction through extension.

4.2.1.5 *The adnominal partitive genitive with an adjective head*

I cannot conceive of any obvious syntactic motivation for the change from non-prepositional genitive to prepositional phrases in the marking of the complement of the adjectives *pilns* "full" and *bagāts* "rich". As noted earlier, there are other adjectives which retain the genitive-marking of their complements, and the difference between the two groups is solely a semantic one; *pilns* and *bagāts* are exceptional in that they convey a notion of partitivity. The loss of genitive-marking with these adjectives is probably closely related

to a general tendency for the non-prepositional genitive to lose its partitive functions.

4.2.2 External motivation

It is a well-known fact that there has been close contact between speakers of Baltic and *Balto-Finnic* for a very long period of time, and it is commonly believed that the Latvian language displays several traces of a Balto-Finnic – probably Livonian – substratum. Zinkevičius (1984–95 I:181) mentions that it has been assumed that the Baltic construction with genitive objects after negated verbs is due to Balto-Finnic influence. Actually, it seems legitimate to view many of the constructions with the non-prepositional genitive reviewed earlier in this thesis as parallel to Balto-Finnic constructions with the partitive case. Thus, in Finnish, Estonian and Livonian the partitive case is used a) with uninflected numerals, b) with indefinite quantifiers, c) on subjects and objects expressing an indefinite quantity, e) on subjects of negated existential verbs, f) on objects of negated verbs and g) on objects of certain verbs with an inherently irresultative meaning. I consider it likely that such constructions were present in the language of the Finnic speakers who shifted to a Baltic language after the arrival of the Balts in the Baltic Sea region, and that the Finnic partitive at some point was identified with the Baltic genitive. There is reason to believe that some of the constructions with the genitive already existed in Baltic before the contact with Finnic, but the clear distinction between constructions with the partitive case and constructions with other cases in Finnic may have consolidated the existing functions of the genitive and possibly added some new functions. Interestingly enough, Larsson (1983:141–144) draws the opposite conclusion on the basis of evidence from Mordvinian as well as from Balto-Finnic and Baltic: He asserts that the Balto-Finnic partitive case originally had only a limited number of functions, but that it expanded as a result of the Balto-Finnic speakers' contact with Baltic. Larsson's proposal can certainly be defended, but in my opinion the fact that Balto-Finnic has a distinct partitive case (which Baltic lacks) and a wider and more consistent use of this case in the functions under investigation speaks in favour of an influence from Balto-Finnic to Baltic and not vice versa. The stable position of the Balto-Finnic

partitive in the mentioned functions is possibly a result of the partitive functions being the central functions of this case, while in Baltic the partitive meanings of the genitive case are relatively peripheral.

It is commonly believed that the Latvian language displays some clear traces of a Livonian substratum; these are phonological and syntactic features which are not shared by Lithuanian, or are only shared by Lithuanian dialects close to the Latvian border. In addition to this, the Livonian or Low dialects of Latvian show signs of an even more intensive Livonian influence than other dialects and the standard language; one here observes a weakening of the gender distinctions, and word-final vowels retained in other dialects are lost – i.e. the process of reduction is brought one step further than in the other dialects. This repeated reduction of word-endings has resulted in an even larger degree of formal homonymy in the Livonian dialects than in other varieties of Latvian. I consider it very likely that the large number of homonymous case forms in the Livonian dialects, ultimately triggered by the Balto-Finnic Livonian substratum, accounts for the fact that the non-prepositional genitive is all but ousted by alternative forms in these dialects (cf. Gāters 1977:160–162). The changes in Latvian can then be perceived as being an *indirect* consequence of Balto-Finnic influence; the changes cannot be a result of direct influence from Livonian or Estonian, as these languages show few signs of giving up the partitive case-marking in the functions parallel to those where the Latvian genitive is on the retreat.¹⁴

The contacts between Balts and *Slavs* are generally believed to be very ancient. In the functions under discussion here, the general picture is that the non-prepositional genitive is more consistently used in the neighbouring Slavic languages Polish and Russian than in Latvian, even though these languages at least in some areas are undergoing developments similar to those observed in Latvian. In

¹⁴ Tor Tveite (personal communication) reports that the object of negated verbs in Livonian can either be marked with the partitive or the genitive case, the choice of case possibly following the same pattern as in sentences without a negation. The question remains open whether Livonian has experienced a decrease in the use of the partitive case as a result of Latvian influence.

this respect Polish must be characterised as the most conservative of the two, having undergone fewer changes in this field than Russian. The Polish influence on the Latvian language was historically mostly confined to the eastern province of Latgale. The dialectal differences observed in Latvian, with the non-prepositional genitive remaining relatively strong in the east but declining in the west, can possibly be related to this historical political division, which has also left many clear cultural traces. Taking into consideration the profound Polish cultural influence exerted also on Lithuania through the centuries, it is tempting to view the strong position of the non-prepositional genitive in Lithuanian and in Upper Latvian dialects in connection with the Polish influence.

It is also a common claim that *German* has exerted some influence on Latvian syntax – thus for instance Endzelīns (1951:564) seems to indicate that the use of accusative objects of negated verbs in Livonian dialects is caused by German influence, while the retaining of genitive objects in this function in upper Latvian dialects is explained by the fact that this dialect has had less contact with German. The Baltic usage of the genitive in the functions within the scope of this thesis is indeed alien to modern German, and has been so for a long time. The dominant position of the Germans and the cultural pressure exerted upon the Latvian population undoubtedly left a considerable impact on the Latvian language, and one cannot rule out the possibility that certain aspects of Latvian case usage may have been altered due to German influence. The fact that the changes in the use of the genitive have affected the western dialects more deeply, while the eastern ones have remained stable, certainly indicates that the influence from German may have played a role in bringing about or stimulating the changes.

4.3 How are the changes interrelated?

As we have seen in the preceding sections, different kinds of motivating factors underlie the changes observed in the use of the Latvian non-prepositional genitive. On the one hand there is a tendency to generalise the default patterns of subject and object case marking and to treat all quantifiers as adjectives; this leads to the genitive-type constructions being replaced by patterns which are

generally more common in the language. At the same time this change probably has been stimulated by German influence in the western part of Latvia, while in the eastern part the genitive-type constructions to a larger degree have been retained, possibly assisted by Polish (and perhaps Lithuanian) influence.

A question which remains to be answered is why the non-prepositional genitive is being replaced in some functions, but remains stable in others. As a matter of fact, the declining functions, have some common characteristics which set them apart from the others and possibly make them more vulnerable to change:

First, the non-prepositional genitive is on the decline in all functions where it has been used to mark an argument – either external or internal – of a verb. Where it marks some kind of relationship between two nouns, the genitive remains stable. In other words, the Latvian genitive seems to be in the process of developing from being an adnominal *and* adverbial case to becoming exclusively adnominal. This is a development which is well-known from the history of other languages, such as Russian or English. The use of the genitive with adjectives presumably falls somewhere between the adnominal and adverbial uses, and we see that the genitive is retained with some adjectives, but not with others.

Secondly, the functions affected by the change are largely those where the genitive expresses some kind of partitivity; this includes partitive subjects and objects and the constructions with quantifiers and with adjectives such as *pilns* "full" and *bagāts* "rich". Characteristically, only with these adjectives is the genitive replaced with other forms, while with other adjectives, such as *vērts* "worth" and *cienīgs* "worthy", it remains stable. Only one partitive function is not affected by the change – the adnominal one where both the quantity and that which is quantified are expressed by nouns. As mentioned, the combination noun+noun is emerging as the primary domain of the genitive case, and thus it is no surprise that this function is unaffected by the change.

These two tendencies, the diminishing of the genitive's adverbial and partitive functions, can both be conceived as the elimination of functions which are somewhat peripheral to the genitive case. As shown by Nikiforidou (1991), the prototypical meaning of the

genitive in Indo-European languages is that of 'possession', while other meanings, such as that of 'partitivity', must be considered less central. This is reflected in the fact that the possessive meaning is retained longer than other meanings when the genitive is lost in a language (as for instance was the case in English and French [Nikiforidou 1991:161–163], as well as in the Scandinavian languages). The prototypical possessive meaning of the genitive in its turn is closely linked with the adnominal use of the case.

The loss of the genitive in time expressions with *ik* "every" and the abandoning of the adverbial use of the non-prepositional genitive are not readily related to the loss of partitive and adverbial functions. Still, they must surely be characterised as peripheral to the central meaning of the genitive case, and also these changes fit well into a pattern where the use of the genitive is becoming more restricted at the expense of its least typical functions. The developments observed in Latvian are probably ultimately related to a general shift from a more synthetic to a more analytic linguistic structure, with a decrease in the number and functional scope of non-prepositional cases. This tendency is present in practically all branches of Indo-European, though Baltic and Slavic still preserve a relatively high proportion of synthetic forms.

The striking contrast between Latvian and Lithuanian in the field of the non-prepositional genitive is accounted for by the fact that the factors triggering the changes in Latvian are mostly absent in Lithuanian: There is much less homonymy between genitive forms and other case forms in Lithuanian, and little potential ambiguity in constructions with the non-prepositional genitive. In addition to this, the German influence on Lithuanian has been limited to Prussia and the western part of Lithuania proper. Most parts of Lithuania have instead been under Polish cultural and political dominance for many centuries, and the influence from the Polish language has probably contributed to preserving the use of the genitive rather than changing it.

5. Conclusion

We have seen that there is a large degree of variation between the non-prepositional genitive and alternative forms in a number of functions in modern Latvian – especially in the colloquial language,

but also to some degree in texts. In several functions also the norms of the Latvian standard language allow other forms than the genitive. At the same time there is evidence that the non-prepositional genitive at an earlier point in time was used in certain functions where it is obsolete today. The functions concerned have certain traits in common: They are either adverbial or partitive, or indeed both adverbial and partitive. Moreover, with few exceptions the genitive case is the only possibility or at least have a very strong position in Lithuanian in all the functions under question. Although the Latvian material from earlier centuries presents a somewhat confusing picture, the evidence from the folk-songs together with data from Lithuanian and other, more distantly related languages indicate that the position of the genitive historically is declining in Latvian. Data from early Latvian texts do not contradict this, although they do indicate that the change in question must have been under way already in the 17th century – at least in some varieties of Latvian. As for the factors underlying the change, there are probably factors of both internal and external nature; a tendency towards a grammatical structure in which the grammatical relations of subject and object are marked more clearly and where quantifiers behave as adjectives combine with German influence to bring about the change.

Literature:

- Adolphi, H (1685) *Erster Versuch/ Einer kurtz-verfasseten Anleitung/ Zur Lettischen Sprache* [...]. Facsimile edition: (1978) *Erster Versuch einer kurtz-verfasseten Anleitung zur lettischen Sprache* (Mitau 1685). Herausgegeben und mit einem Vorwort versehen von Harald Haarmann. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Ambrasas, V. (1971) "Nepamirškime dalies kilmininko", in: *Kalbos kultūra* 36 (33–35), Vilnius: Mintis.
- Barons, K. (ed.) (1922, first published 1894–1915) *Latwju Dainas* (vol. I–VI). Rīga: Waltera un Rapas akz. šab.
- Berg-Olsen, S. (1999) *A syntactic change in progress: The decline in the use of the non-prepositional genitive in Latvian, with a comparative view on Lithuanian*. Thesis submitted for the degree of magister artium in Baltic linguistics at the University of Oslo, Faculty of Arts, Department of East-European and Oriental Studies.
- Berg-Olsen, S. (2000) "The role of morphological homonymy in the development of case patterns in Latvian", in: A.V. Andronov (ed.): *Materialy XXIX mežvuzovskoj naučno-metodičeskoj konferencii prepodavatelej i aspirantov. Vypusk 1. Sekcija baltistiki* (10–12). St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta.
- Birnbaum, H. (1984) "Notes on syntactic change: Cooccurrence vs. substitution, stability vs. permeability", in: J. Fisiak (ed.) *Historical Syntax* (25–45). Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Bukšs, M. and J. Placinskis (1973) *Latgaļu volūdas gramatika un pareizraksteibas vārdneica*. 2. īspidums. Munich: P/s Latgaļu izdevniecība.
- Ceplīte, B. and L. Ceplītis (1991) *Latviešu valodas praktiskā gramatika*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- Endzelins, J. (1951) *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība.
- Endzelins, J. and K. Mühlenbachs (1907) *Latweeschu gramatika*. Rīga: K.I. Eichmana apgahdība.
- Faarlund, J.T. (1990) *Syntactic Change. Toward a Theory of Historical Syntax*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gäters, A. (1993) *Lettische Syntax: Die Dainas*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.

- Glück, E. (1689) (translator) *Ta Swehta Grahmata Jeb Deewa Swehtais Wahrd* [...]. Facsimile edition: *Bibele. Vecās un jaunās derības svētie raksti. Pirmās latviešu Bībeles jauns iespiedums* (1974). Latviešu Evaņģeliski-Luterisko Draudžu Apvienība.
- Goodwin, W.W. (1989, first published 1879) *A Greek Grammar*. Houndmills etc.: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Harris, A.C. and L. Campbell (1995) *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirt, H. (1934) *Handbuch des Urgermanischen. Teil III: Abriss der Syntax*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Labov, W. (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lagzdiņa, S. (1997) "Verbs *nebūt* morfoloģiskajā paradigmā un teikumā", in: *Savai valodai. Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas goda loceklim Rūdolfam Grabim veltīts piemiņas krājums* (165–200). Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis.
- Lāme, E. (1933) "Loģiskais princips Glikā rakstībā", in: *Filoloģijas materiāli* (104–110). Rīga: Ramave.
- Langius, J. (1685) *Lettisch-Deutsches Lexicon* [...] *Sampt einer Kurtzen Grammatica* [...]. Facsimile edition: T.G. Fennell (1987) *The Grammatical Appendix to Johannes Langius' Latvian-German Lexicon*. Melbourne: Latvian Tertiary Committee.
- Larsson, L.-G. (1983) *Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia 15. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- LD = Barons 1922.
- Lepika, M. (1954) "Par objektu pie noliegta transitīva verba latviešu literārajā valodā", in: *Valodas un literatūras institūta raksti III* (5–45). Rīga: LPSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.
- Lepika, M. (1959) "Par konstrukciju ar noliegtu pārejošu verbu latviešu literārās valodas sākumos", in: *Rakstu krājums. Veltījums akadēmiķim profesoram Dr. Jānim Endzelīnam viņa 85 dzīves un 65 darba gadu atcerei* (527–554). Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas izdevniecība.
- Llv = L. Ceplītis et al. (eds.) (1972–96) *Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca*. (vols. I–V + VI₁, VI₂, VII₁, VII₂ and VIII). Rīga: Zinātne.
- Ltdz = J. Kalniņš et al. (eds.) (1979) *Latviešu tautasdziesmas* (vols. I–IV + V₁ and V₂). Rīga: Zinātne.

- Mancelius, G. (?1696–?99) *Lang-gewūnschte / Lettische Postill* [...] (second edition). Facsimile edition: (1954) *Manceja Sprediķu izlase*. Copenhagen: Imanta.
- Mathiassen, T. (1997) *A Short Grammar of Latvian*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- Mllvg = R. Grabis et al. (1959–62) *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika* (vols. I–II). Rīga: LPSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas izdevniecība.
- Mühlenbachs, K. (1891) "Par akuzatīvu un genitīvu pie noliegtiem transitīviem verbiem", in: *Daži jautājumi par latviešu valodu I* (23–32). Jelgava: L.J. Draviņ-Dravnieka apgādība.
- Mühlenbachs, K. (1923–1932) *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* (vols. I–IV) (after Mühlenbachs' death in 1916 edited and revised by Jānis Endzelīns). Rīga: Izglītības ministrija.
- Nikiforidou, K. (1991) "The meanings of the genitive: A case study in semantic structure and semantic change", in: *Cognitive Linguistics* 22 (149–205) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ozols, A. (1965) *Veclatviešu rakstu valoda*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Reuter, J. (1675) (translator) *Eine ÜbersetzungsProbe* [...]. Facsimile edition: K. Karulis (1986) *Jānis Reiters un viņa tulkojums*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Rudzīte, M. (1960) *Latviešu valodas vēsturiskās gramatikas lekciju konspekts*, Rīga: Pēteru Stučkas Latvijas valsts universitāte, vēstures un filoloģijas fakultāte, latviešu valodas katedra.
- Schmalstieg, W. (1983) *An Introduction to Old Church Slavic. Second Edition. Revised and Expanded*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- Senkus, J. (1959) "Kai kurie ryškesnieji linksnių vartojimo atvejai pazanavykio kapsų tarmėje", in: *Lietuvos TSR mokslų akademijos darbai, serija A*, 2/7 (177–189).
- Spurkland, T. (1989) *Innføring i norrønt språk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Stafecka, A. (1995) "Ieskats latgaliešu rakstu valodas vēsturē", in: J. Kursīte and A. Stafecka (eds.) *Latgaliešu literatūra* (41–56). Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- Stang, C.S. (1968) *Forelesninger over russisk språkhistorie* (parts I–II). Oslo/Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.
- Stender, G.F. (1783) *Lettische Grammatik*. Mitau: Johann Fried. Steffenhagen.
- Streitberg, W. (1905/1906) "Got. ni waihts", in: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 18 (401–404). Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Szpungianski, Georg (1732) *Dispositio Imperfecti ad Optimum seu Rudimenta gramatices Lotavicae, ab imperfecto authore [...] cum adjuncta catechesi* [...]. Vilnius.

- Šukys, J. (1998) *Lietuvių kalbos linksniai ir prielinksniai: vartosena ir normos*. Kaunas: Šviesa.
- Thomason, S.G. and T. Kaufman (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- Thomson, A. (1911/1912) "Beiträge zur Kasuslehre. III. Zur Genetivreaktion des Verbuns im Baltischslavischen", in: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 29 (249–259). Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Woodcock, E.C. (1959) *A New Latin Syntax*. London: Methuen.
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1980–81) *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika* (vol. I–II). Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Zinkevičius, Z. (1984–95) *Lietuvių kalbos istorija* (vol. I–VII). Vilnius: Mokslas.

Latviešu valodas ģenitīvs bez prievārda – locījums kas daļēji zūd
Sturla Berg-Olsen (Oslo)

Kaut gan latviešu valodas ģenitīvam ir ļoti plašs funkcionāls spektrs, mūsdienās vērojama šī spektra sašaurināšanās. Šajā rakstā tiek parādīts, ka daudzās funkcijās ģenitīvs bez prievārda tiek lietots pārmijus ar citām formām – nominatīvu, akuzatīvu vai prievārdu konstrukcijām. Funkcijas, kurās vērojama šāda variācija, var raksturot kā partitīvas (kur izteikta kāda daudzuma attiecība) un/vai adverbālas (kur ģenitīvs izsaka kādu ar darbības vārda saistītu argumentu). Kā piemērus var minēt sekojošās funkcijas: 1) ar skaitļa vārdiem – te ģenitīvs mijas ar nominatīvu vai akuzatīvu atkarā no vārdkopas sintaksiskās funkcijas teikumā; 2) ar noliegtu *būt* gadījumos, kad šim darbības vārdam ir eksistenciāla nozīme – te ģenitīvs mijas ar nominatīvu; 3) objekts pēc noliegta pārejoša darbības vārda – te akuzatīvs lielā mērā jau izstumis ģenitīvu.

Tiek parādīti mūsdienu valodas pētījumu rezultāti, kuri pamatojas gan uz rakstu valodas, gan sarunvalodas datiem. Uz šī pamata tiek izdarīts secinājums, ka latviešu valodā ģenitīvs bez prievārda pakāpeniski zaudē vairākumu partitīvo un adverbālo funkciju, arvien lielākā mērā iegūstot tīru adnominālu raksturu.

Tālāk jautājums tiek apskatīts diahroniskajā skatījumā. Tiek analizēta ģenitīva un citu formu lietošana 17. un 18. gadsimta tekstos, kā arī seno latviešu valodas gramatiku materiālu. Nonāk pie secinājuma, ka minētās izmaiņas notiek jau ilgu laiku – tās varēja sākties jau 17. gadsimtā vai pat agrāk. Lai gan pastāv iespēja, ka paralēlās formas jau sen bijušas lietojumā blakus viena otrai, tiek nosaukti vairāki fakti, kas runā pret šo uzskatu. Gan tautasdziesmu, gan radniecīgu valodu dati rāda uz to, ka ģenitīvs apspriežamajās funkcijās ir senāks par alternatīvajām formām.

Raksta pēdējā daļā tiek runāts par to, kā minētās izmaiņas varēja rasties – kādi mehānismi noved pie tā, ka ģenitīvs zināmās funkcijās tiek retāk lietots un kādi iekšējie un ārējie iemesli varēja dot stimulu izmaiņām.

THE METRICS OF LATVIAN FOLK SONGS

ANTONS BREIDAKS

Rīga

I. *The quantity rule of the fourth syllable of trochaic dipody*

The paper gives a critical appraisal of the quantity rule of the fourth syllable of trochaic dipody in the light of Latvian folk song metrics as well as from the point of view of Latvian historical grammar and Indo-European comparative metric system.

In Latvian folklore studies at the end of the 19th century and in the first half of the 20th century two metric rules of trochaic songs were postulated without sufficient reason: the caesura rule and the quantity rule of the fourth syllable dipody (DV 18; Bērzkalne 1937, 3; Bērziņš 1940, 52; SV 191). These rules are almost universally recognized in Latvian folklore studies up to this day (LLV I 106; Rudzītis 1977, 810-875). The only exception was the folklore specialist J. Graubiņš who opposed these two rules (Graubiņš 1942, 1096-1103; see also Breidaks 1995, 13-16; 1997, 93-98). In his papers "The Language of Our Folk Songs" and "Observations on the Formal Aspects of Our Folk Songs" J. Endzelīns voiced his critical attitude towards the metre quantity rules which were prevalent in Latvian folklore studies in respect of folk songs; namely, towards several ideas expounded by L. Bērziņš in this area (Endzelīns 1980, 78-82, 119-123).

In this paper I will closely examine the quantity rule of the fourth syllable trochaic dipody and analyse its drawbacks. The essence of this law is: the fourth syllable of the four-syllabic trochaic dipody is always short.

However, nowadays the fourth syllable of the trochaic dipody is often long in folk songs which were composed in East Latvia. This is a common phenomenon in the High-Latvian songs with the so-called draw-over syllable, for example:

*Spodra saulīt' i lēkdama,
Jo spodrāka uzlēkdama,*

The sun is bright when rising,
Even brighter when risen,