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Abstract
This thesis investigates the system of compounding attested in the earliest written Latvian texts of the 16th and 17th centuries. The philological analysis presented in this work is the first systematic attempt to extensively treat compounds in Old Latvian. The purpose of this thesis is to thoroughly describe the system of compounding of the earliest period of written Latvian. One of the main aims of the analysis provided in this work is to determine whether the Old Latvian compounds were distinguished in terms of their meaning and form. This is why another important aim of this study is to discern the most characteristic formal properties of each category of compounds in Old Latvian. This study also addresses the morphological variation of the components of compounds and seeks to explain why one finds different tendencies of compounding in the texts of this period.

Firstly, it is shown in this thesis that compounds in Old Latvian were clearly distinguished in terms of their meaning. The main semantic types of Old Latvian compounds, which were analyzed in this study, are the determinative compounds, the possessive compounds, the verbal governing compounds, and the copulative compounds. Secondly, it is argued that the aforementioned types of compounds were clearly differentiated in terms of the formal properties of their components. A large number of possessive compounds and verbal governing compounds had the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-es (f.). By contrast, only a handful of determinative compounds had this suffix. In view of the distribution of the suffix found in the Old Latvian compounds, it is suggested that the suffix was originally restricted to adjectival compounds. Furthermore, the different types of compounds in Old Latvian were also distinguished in terms of the first component. In the majority of cases, both the possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds were coined without linking elements, while the determinative compounds had linking elements to a larger extent. Thirdly, it is proposed in this thesis that a part of linking elements used in the determinative compounds in Old Latvian originated from the original stem vowels of the first components. Thus, it is argued that stem compounds were still attested in the Old Latvian texts, although this Baltic model of coining compounds is no longer visible in Modern Latvian. Lastly, it is suggested that the tendencies of compounding found in the texts under discussion represent dialectal differences.

Another contribution of this study is that the Old Latvian compounds are not treated in isolation, but analyzed in drawing parallels with compounds in the other Baltic languages, Lithuanian in particular. Hence, by analyzing common features and similarities between the compounding systems, the Old Latvian compounds are positioned within the context of the Baltic system of compounding.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Relevance, purpose, aims

This is a philological study in which the system of compounding attested in the earliest written Latvian texts of the 16th and 17th centuries is described. The analysis presented in this work is the first systematic attempt to thoroughly investigate compounds of one particular period of Old Latvian by including material from both texts and dictionaries. In fact, very little has been done on the formation of compounds in Old Latvian. Previous descriptive studies only treated compounds found in the translation of pericopes (1640) by Georg Elger (cf. Amato, 1996) and in the first Latvian dictionary (1638) by Georg Mancelius (cf. Skujiņa, 2006). In this work, not only the compounds from the above-mentioned texts, but also material found in other sources of Early Written Latvian, are analyzed. Thus, compounds attested in the oldest religious texts and later works by Christoph Fürecker, Johann Langius, and the dictionary *Manuale Lettico-Germanicum* are treated for the first time in this study.

This thesis is also relevant due to its comparative aspect. The Old Latvian compounds and their characteristic features are not treated in isolation. Instead, they are considered with respect to compounds of the same categories used in the other Baltic languages, i.e., Lithuanian and Old Prussian. A number of common features and similarities of the composition systems of these languages are thus discussed in this work by drawing formal and semantic parallels. In this way, this thesis shows that the existence of some properties of compounds in Old Latvian (e.g., linking elements and the compositional suffix) cannot be explained without taking into account compounds in Lithuanian in particular.

In the most broad sense, the main purpose of this thesis is to determine what a compound and the compounding system in Old Latvian are. Thus, one of the main aims here is to thoroughly describe and present the system of compounding found in the texts and dictionaries of Early Written Latvian. The analysis of compounds presented in this work first investigates whether the Old Latvian compounds are differentiated in terms of their meaning and form. Secondly, it aims to identify characteristic formal properties of the different categories of compounds in Old Latvian. Thirdly, it seeks to discuss the morphological variation of the components of compounds. Last but not least, the
variation of compounding represented in the texts of the early period is also viewed from a dialectal perspective for the first time in this work.

### 1.2 What is covered in this thesis

In the following, I will present what will be treated in this work and which examples will not be considered. In this thesis, compound nouns and adjectives are analyzed from a semantic and formal point of view. However, compound verbs such as Latvian *vien-veid-o-t* (LLVVe) ‘to unify’ (← *vien-s* ‘one, single’ or *vienād-s* ‘alike, uniform’ + *veid-o-t* ‘to form, to shape’) are not included in this work. Nor are compound numerals and adverbs treated in this study, cf. Latv. *div-desmit* (LLVVe) ‘twenty’ (← *div-i* ‘two’ + *desmit* ‘ten’), Latv. *vien-reiz* (LLVVe) ‘once’ (← *vien-s* ‘one, single’ + *reiz-e* ‘time’), respectively.

Since one of the aims here is to trace back the original distribution of linking elements in compounds in Old Latvian, this work treats only those compounds that are formed from two independent lexemes. Thus, it does not cover words that contain prefixes as first components, cf. Latv. *bez-diev-is* (LLVVe) ‘atheist, infidel’ (← *bez* ‘without’ + *diev-s* ‘God’), Latv. *ne-darb-s* (LLVVe) ‘mischief, devilry’ (← *ne* ‘not’ + *darb-s* ‘work’), Latv. *pa-saul-e* (LLVVe) ‘world, universe’ (← *pa* ‘along, on, to, in’ + *saul-e* ‘sun’).

Moreover, this thesis does not involve such complex words as those having a formally ambiguous first component as in Latvian *priekš-vārd-s* (LLVVe) ‘preface, foreword, name’ (cf. *vārd-s* ‘word, term’). When treating instances of this type from a historical point of view, it is often difficult to determine whether the first component was originally a noun (e.g., *priekš-a* ‘front, forepart’) or an adverb (e.g., *priekšā* ‘in front of, ahead of’). Hence, this formal ambiguity makes it difficult to draw any reliable conclusion about the origin of linking elements in such cases, as shown in (1).

---

1 The hyphen “—” will be used for separating both the components and linking elements in compounds quoted in this work. For a more detailed presentation of compounds in this thesis, see section 1.4.

2 In my opinion, it is difficult to determine whether *pus*- functioned as an independent lexeme or a prefix in the Old Latvian texts. This is why examples with first components based on *pus- (< *pus-e* ‘half’) are not treated in this study, cf. Latv. *pus-brāl-is* (LLVVe) ‘step-brother’ (← *pus-e* ‘half’ + *brāl-is* ‘brother’).

3 In some works in Baltic linguistics, nouns and adjectives, including prefixes as first components, are treated as compounds (cf. Endzelīns, 1951, p. 256; Larsson, 2002b, pp. 215–216), while in other studies they are analyzed as prefixed derivatives (cf., e.g., MLLVG, 1959, pp. 181–190, 293–297; LKG, 1965, pp. 423–436, 587–590; Stundžia, 2016, pp. 3093–3095, 3098).

4 For a discussion about forms of this kind in Modern Latvian, cf. MLLVG (1959, pp. 183–184, 190–196).
(1) a. OLatv. *priekš-galv-a* ‘the front part of the head’ (cf. *galv-a* ‘head’)
   Latv. *<Preekʃch=ghallwa>* beside Germ. *<das forder theil des Haupts>* (PhL)\(^5\)

   b. OLatv. *priekš-a-zob-i* (Nom.pl.) ‘front teeth’ (cf. *zob-s* ‘tooth’)
   Latv. *<prekʃcha=johbi>* (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. *<die fordersten Zähne>* (PhL)

Only compounds with recognizable components are taken into consideration. Hence, etymologically opaque cases, when one of the components is obscure, are left aside for the sake of clarity. For instance, to the group of possessive compounds, which will be treated in this thesis in chapter 4, one could add *vien-mul-is* (F1, F2) ‘monotone, uneventful, flat’ (cf. *vien-s* ‘one’), which is found in the Old Latvian texts.\(^6\) However, the origin of the second component is unclear. Karulis (1992, pp. 522–523) has suggested that the stem of the second component *-mul-* may be associated with a noun *mal-a* ‘edge, brim’ that, under the influence of *vien-tul-is* ‘loner’, was changed into *-mul-*., cf. Lith. *vien-mal-is* (LKŻe) ‘flat, monotonous’ and *vien-mul-is* ‘id.’ (for more discussion, cf. Fraenkel, 1962–1965, p. 1241). Hence, not being able to determine the origin of the components of instances of this kind, one cannot make any further analysis.

Furthermore, in chapters 4 and 5, I will show that compounds with the adjectival suffix *-īg-* and agentival suffixes such as *-ēj-, -niek-, -tāj-* had influenced the development of compounds with the compositional suffix *-is* (m.)/*-e* (f.) in Old Latvian (see chapter 2 for compounds with the compositional suffix *-is* in the Baltic languages). However, compounds with other suffixes such as *-īb-, -šan-, -um-* will not be addressed in this thesis, as examples found in the texts of Mancelius have already been extensively treated in previous works. For instance, Frīdenberga (2016, p. 65ff.) has analyzed compounds with derivational suffixes in her dissertation on nominal word-formation in the works of Mancelius.\(^7\) Amato (1996, p. 288ff.) has also investigated compounds with derivational suffixes found in the text of Elger. An example of this type including *-īb-* is presented in (2).

(2) *trak-galv-īb-a* ‘derring-do’ (← *trak-s* ‘insane, possessed’ + *galv-a* ‘head’) Latv. *<trackghallwiba>* beside Germ. *<verwegenheit>* (L)

\(^5\) Note that in this thesis, original attestations of compounds from the Old Latvian texts will always be quoted in brackets “< >” alongside transliterated compounds. See section 1.4 for the presentation of compounds in this work.


\(^7\) For a discussion about derivatives with the suffix *-īb-* in Mancelius’ texts, cf. Frīdenberga (2012).
Finally, it needs to be pointed out that a large number of compounds in Old Latvian were borrowings from German in particular.\(^8\) Firstly, there are many loan translations (calques), as in (3), which were translated item-by-item. Secondly, there are loanblends like (4) in which only one of the components was translated into Latvian. Lastly, apart from the above-mentioned cases, several examples were clearly borrowed into Old Latvian without substituting or translating the components, as presented in (5).

(3) a. OLatv. vakar-ēdien-s ‘Holy Communion’ (← vakar-s ‘evening’ + ēdien-s ‘meal, course’) <Wackar=ehdens> (PhL)
   b. Germ. <Abendmahl> (PhL)

(4) a. OLatv. knop-adat-a ‘pin’ (cf. adat-a ‘needle’)
   Latv. <kňohp=addata> (L)
   b. LG knōp-nātel Germ. ‘Stecknadel’ (Sehwers, 1953, pp. 55–56)

(5) a. OLatv. <Jumprawa> (PhL) ‘maiden, young girl’
   < MLG junkvrowe Germ. ‘Jungfrau; Handramme’ (Sehwers, 1953, p. 44)
   b. OLatv. <Wihn= wahte> (LD) ‘wine-barrel’
   < MLG wīnvat Germ. ‘Weinfaβ’ (Sehwers, 1953, p. 159)

However, in this thesis, I will not address the question as to what extent the compounding system in Old Latvian was influenced by other languages, since this needs to be investigated in depth.\(^9\) This is why clear borrowings such as those in (5) will be excluded from this work.\(^10\) However, in chapter 3, I will briefly discuss a few loanblends in order to explain the lack of linking elements in compounds of this kind. Finally, loan translations (calques) will not be discussed separately and thus will be treated with other compounds that may be of Baltic origin,\(^11\) as it seems that even clear loan translations both

---

\(^8\) For a description of terms regarding different types of loanwords and a more detailed discussion about borrowing in general, cf., e.g., Haugen (1950), Haspelmath (2009, pp. 35–54).

\(^9\) To my knowledge, this issue has never been thoroughly treated. In this context, one must mention Sehwers (1953), who lists some examples of loaned Old Latvian compounds in his study of loanwords in Latvian, and Skujiņa (2006, pp. 118–121), who also provides a list of borrowed compounds found in the dictionary of Mancelius.

\(^10\) Note that clear borrowings like <Jumprawa> (PhL) ‘maiden, young girl’ cannot be further analyzed as compounds consisting of two recognizable components in Old Latvian.

\(^11\) The category of the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian is very significant in this respect (see chapter 5). In the dictionaries of Old Latvian of this early period, one often does not find a German counterpart that may indicate authenticity of the Old Latvian compound, cf. OLatv. vasar-audz-is ‘teenager, youth’ (← vasar-a ‘summer’ + cf. aug-t ‘to grow’): Latv. <waśśar audsis> beside Germ. <ein Kind so langsam wächst> (F1). In this case, there is a counterpart in Lithuanian and Old Prussian, too, that could indicate its Baltic origin, e.g., Lith. vasar-aug-is (LKZe) ‘offspring, sprout’ (← vāsar-a ‘summer’ + cf. aug-ti ‘to grow’). OPr.
formally and semantically correspond to the other Old Latvian compounds (see chapters 3, 4, and 5).

To sum up, only compound nouns and adjectives formed from independent lexemes will be treated in this thesis. Those words that have formally ambiguous and etymologically opaque components will be left out of consideration. Compounds with the adjectival suffix -īg- and agentival suffixes such as -ēj-, -niek-, -tāj- will be discussed in more detail here, whereas other compounds with suffixes like -īb-, -šan-, -um- will not be included in this study. Finally, the issue of the influence of other languages on the Old Latvian system of compounding will not be addressed in this thesis.

1.3 Sources and material

This work is based on a data collection compiled from the first texts and dictionaries of the Early Written Latvian of the 16th and 17th centuries. The material for this study was mainly collected from the online corpus of the Early Written Latvian texts, SENIE, and word indexes of the texts that were not represented in the corpus. In addition, original sources were also consulted (see Sources). Since many of these early texts were religious in topic and, to a great extent, translated from German, many instances were collected from the dictionaries of that period. In these sources, not only religious terms, but more diverse vocabulary items, i.e., those related to denoting characteristic features of living beings, food, various instruments and other things, were attested.

A number of early texts were, however, not covered in this dissertation. A careful selection of sources was made due to several reasons. Firstly, this study aims to compare data from the texts of different periods, namely to compare material attested in the texts from the oldest period (16th century – the first half of the 17th century) to instances found in the later texts (for the categorization of the Early Written Latvian, see section 1.3.1). Secondly, texts from different writing traditions are included in this work. Thirdly, I aimed at including material from the texts of those authors who were of local origin (albeit most of them were Germans).12 Being aware of different localizations of these writers, I was able to explore material from a dialectal perspective.

I also wish to make the reader aware of the fact that the oldest religious texts issued throughout the 16th century up until the first half of the 17th century are characterized by great variance and an inconsistent orthographic system (see section 1.3.2.1). This made it difficult to analyze scarce data found in these texts (for a more detailed discussion, see chapter 6). Hence, the main

---


12 As Rūķe-Draviņa (1977, p. 25) points it out, the first authors of Latvian texts of this early period were bilingual or trilingual.
results and conclusions of this thesis are based on exhaustive material attested in the later texts and dictionaries from the so-called middle period of Early Written Latvian (see chapters 3, 4, and 5).

The list below includes the sources used in this study.

1. Texts from the oldest period of Early Written Latvian:

   Catechismus Catholicorum (1585) (CC);
   Enchiridion. Der kleine Catechismus (1586) (Ench1);
   Evangelia vnd Episteln (1587) (EvEp1);
   Vndeutsche Psalmen vnd geistliche Lieder oder Gesenge (1587) (UP);
   Enchiridion. Der kleine Catechismus (1615) (Ench2);
   Evangelia vnd Episteln (1615) (EvEp2);
   Psalmen vnd geistliche Lieder (1615) (Ps)

2. Texts and dictionaries from the middle period of Early Written Latvian:

   G. Mancelius’ Lettus (1638) (L);
   G. Mancelius’ Phraseologia Lettica (1638) (PhL);
   G. Mancelius’ 10 sarunas (1638) (Run);
   G. Elger’s Evangelien und Episteln (1640) (EE);
   2 copies of Ch. Fürecker’s Lettisches und Teutsches Wörterbuch (F1), (F2);
   J. Langius’ Lettisch–Deutsches Lexicon (1685) (LD);
   Ch. Fürecker’s Vermehretes Lettisches Hand−buch (1685) (VLH)

For purposes of comparison, counterparts found in an anonymous manuscript of the dictionary Manuale Lettico−Germanicum (M, M/I, M/L, M/M) are also included in this work. For abbreviations used in this dictionary, see section 1.3.1.6.

In the following section, not only the sources used for this work, but also a general overview of the period of Early Written Latvian will be presented. For a further description of the texts of that time, see Ozols (1965, pp. 27–335), Rūķe−Draviņa (1977, pp. 28–45), Vanags (2008), and Larsson and Bukelskytė−Čepelė (forthcoming). A thorough overview of Latvian dictionaries from the 17th century onwards is provided by Zemzare (1961).

1.3.1 Early Written Latvian texts of the 16th and 17th centuries

Traditionally, Early Written Latvian texts are grouped into two groups according to the basis and orthography of the written language used in these texts, cf. Ozols (1965, p. 11), Kuškis (1997, pp. 127–128). Texts written and issued throughout the 16th century up until the first publications of Georg Mancelius (i.e., the handbook Lettisch Vade mecum printed in Riga, in 1631) belong to
the oldest period of written Latvian (Latv. senākais periods). Later texts, starting from G. Mancelius’ publications, issued until the year 1739 (when the second edition of the Bible was prepared), are from the so-called middle period (Latv. vidējais periods), cf. Ozols (1965, pp. 11–12).13

The most important publications of the period of Early Written Latvian were religious in topic, namely catechisms, pericopes, hymnals, collected sermons. Alongside religious texts, first dictionaries and grammars were also prepared over the course of the 17th century.

1.3.1.1 Texts of the oldest period (16th century – the first half of the 17th century)

In the beginning of the 16th century, Latvian started to be used for church services, which in turn paved the way for more extensive writings in the local language. The first literary monuments were religious texts written by local priests of German origin. These texts were written in the Latvian language spoken in Riga and based on the Middle Low German orthographic tradition used in Riga at that time (Blese, 1925, pp. 192–193; Kušķis, 1996; Vanags, 1997b). The language of these texts was heavily influenced by the German language, since the authors were of German origin and sought to keep their translations close to the original texts (Vanags, 2008, pp. 193–196).

Although the oldest surviving published book in Latvian dates back to the late 16th century, it is believed that Johannes Eck (†1552?) had already in the 1520s or ‘30s prepared the translation of the Lutheran Church handbook, which, at that time, was circulating in manuscript form (Vanags, 2000, p. 21ff.).14 This handbook was only published in 1585–1586 in Königsberg. It consisted of the following parts: Martin Luther’s Small Catechism, Enchiridion. Der kleine Catechismus, the pericopes Evangelia vnd Episteln, and the hymnal Vndeutsche Psalmen vnd geistliche Lieder oder Gesenge.

Alongside Lutheranism, Catholicism prevailed in the territory of Latvia during this early period. The Catholic Church was trying to re-Catholicize Latvian Livland, which had fallen under the rule of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a result of the Livonian War (1558–1582). Therefore, alongside Lutheran works created in Latvian Livland and Courland, Catholic texts were also produced, mainly in the eastern part of Latvian Livland. In fact, the oldest surviving book in Latvian is the translation of Petrus Canisius’ Catechismus Catholicorum issued in Vilnius in 1585. It has been suggested that the Catholic priest Ertmann Tolgsdorf (†1620) was the book’s translator.

13 The newest period of written Latvian (Latv. jaunākais periods), which is not covered in this thesis, includes publications issued from 1739 until the mid-19th century. This period is distinguished due to a new and standardized orthographic system, which was first introduced in the second edition of the Bible (1739), and the start of using new styles (e.g., popular, journalistic, etc.), cf. Ozols (1965, p. 12).
14 There are, however, indications of a much earlier book (from 1525) with a Latvian text, which unfortunately has not been found (Vanags, 2008, p. 174).

1.3.1.2 Georg Elger

Georg Elger (†1672) was another important Catholic author who originated in Valmiera/Wolmar. The written language of Elger was close to the texts of the oldest period of the 16th century. However, his orthographic system reflected Latvian sounds more precisely than other texts. It was a combination of Middle Low German traditions and features implemented from Polish orthography (Draviņš, 1952; Jēgers, 1979, pp. 67–68; Christophe, 2002). Even though it is unclear which dialect is represented in the texts of Elger, his written language could have been influenced by the language spoken in Riga and the Latvian Livland dialect, because he originated in this area (Vanags, 2008, p. 187).

Elger issued a hymnal, *Geistliche Catholische Gesänge*, which was printed in Braunsberg (now Branevo, Poland) in 1621. It is believed that he might have prepared and published a Catholic catechism and pericopes around this time (Kučinskis, 1986, p. 149). However, only a manuscript of pericopes, i.e., *Evangelien und Episteln*, dated 1640, has been preserved. In 1672, *Catechismus sev Brevis Institutio doctrinae Christianae* and *Evangelia toto anno singulis Dominicis* were issued. In 1673, one year after his death, a new edition of the hymnal *Cantiones spirituales* was published.

He also prepared a trilingual dictionary, *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottavicum*, which was issued a decade after his death in Vilnius in 1683. This dictionary was based on a dictionary of the Lithuanian author Konstantinas Sirvydas *Dictionarium trium lingvarum* (editions from 1642, 1677), and its Latin and Polish sections have parallels with the second edition of G. Knapijus’ *Thesaurus* (1643), cf. Judžentytė and Zubaitienė (2015, 2016); also cf. Zemzare (1961, p. 64). The dictionary of Elger contains around 14,000 entries.

1.3.1.3 Georg Mancelius

Born in Semgallen, Georg Mancelius (†1654) marks a new period of written Latvian and is regarded as the most significant scholar from this early period. He created a new orthography model to reflect Latvian sounds more precisely, and chose Latvian spoken in Semgallen and Livland as the basis for the written language (Vanags, 2008, p. 188ff.).

In 1631 in Riga, Mancelius issued a revised and improved edition of the Lutheran Church handbook: *Lettisch Vade mecum* (re-issued in 1643–1644, 1671–1673, 1685, etc.). The Book of Proverbs, *Die Sprüche Salomonis*, was, furthermore, issued as a separate edition in 1637. One of the most significant

---

contributions to the history of written Latvian was the three-volume collection of sermons *Langgewünschte Lettische Postill* (1654) by Mancelius. It was the first considerable original text prepared in the Latvian language (over 1,100 pages).

Mancelius was also the author of the first dictionary of the Latvian language, i.e., a German-Latvian dictionary: *Lettus, Das ist Wortbuch* (1638), which contained around 6,000 words. This work also included *Phraseologia Lettica*, a thematically organized collection of sentences and expressions in Latvian alongside their German translations. In the dictionary, one can find words related to body parts, names of animals, religious terms, kinship terms, etc. The third part comprised 10 parallel conversations in German and Latvian.

1.3.1.4 Christophor Fürecker

Christophor Fürecker (†~1685) was another influential author of this period. He was a local-born German from Courland. Although the basis of Fürecker’s written language is the same as that of Mancelius, the Latvian dialect from Courland is also reflected in his texts (Draviņš, 1965, pp. 106–113).

Fürecker prepared around 180 hymns printed in several hymnals published from 1671 onwards, in which he became the first to use syllabotonic meters (Bērziņš, 1928). Fürecker also translated some fragments of the New Testament, *Vermehretes Lettisches Hand=buch*, published in 1685.

Moreover, Fürecker wrote a manuscript of the Latvian grammar (Draviņš, 1943, pp. 58–59) and compiled a Latvian-German dictionary (*Lettisches und Teutsches Wörterbuch*), surviving in two copied manuscripts that were works of separate hands. The copies are very similar in content, although the second manuscript is alphabetized and contains more entries. The first copy has 319 pages, whereas the second consists of 555 pages. It is believed that Fürecker had taken much of the material from Mancelius’ dictionary (Zemzare, 1961, p. 77). Fürecker’s manuscripts and material are known to have been used in later works, for instance, in the Latvian grammar by Heinrich Adolphi published in 1685 (Draviņš, 1965, pp. 83–114; Vanags, 2008, p. 181), in the second grammar written by Georg Dressel, published in 1685 (Fennell, 1984; Vanags, 2008, p. 181), and in dictionaries prepared by other authors.

1.3.1.5 Johann Langius

Another pastor from Courland was Johann Langius (†1690). It is known that Langius was born in Liepaja, and he worked in the parishes of Nica and Barta in Lower Courland. Langius wrote his works in the Middle dialect, but it has also been suggested by Blese (1936/1987, p. 576ff.) that in the works of Langius one can find dialectal reflexes of the old Curonian language and the Tamian dialect.
Langius prepared a manuscript of a *Lettisch–Deutsches Lexicon* (1685), which contained around 7,000 words, was to some extent organized in alphabetical order, and also included a handwritten Latvian grammar, *eine kurze Lettische Grammatica* (1685). Langius is believed to have included a large part of material from Mancelius’ dictionary *Lettus* (1638), cf. Blese (1936/1987, p. 492ff.), Zemzare (1961, p. 84).

1.3.1.6 *Manuale Lettico-Germanicum*

An anonymous manuscript of the dictionary *Manuale Lettico-Germanicum* is believed to have been compiled at the end of the 17th century (cf. Fennell, 2001, pp. 33–34). Although it is uncertain who the compiler of the dictionary was, a few possible candidates have been suggested, cf. Zemzare (1961, p. 98), Fennell (2001, p. 34). The manuscript is based on different sources, as can be inferred from explicit acknowledgements that mark various words in the dictionary (Fennell, 2001, p. 34). For instance, “M” refers to the dictionary of Mancelius (1638), and “P” to the *Lang>=gewünschte Lettische Postill* by Mancelius; “L” indicates the dictionary of Langius (1685); “B”, “Bib.” or “Bibl.” refer to the Latvian translation of the Bible; while “J” indicates the dictionary of Fürecker. It is unclear, however, why “J” was chosen to refer to the latter dictionary and which copy was presumably used as the main source (Fennell, 2001, p. 34ff.). *Manuale Lettico-Germanicum* contains around 7,000 words.

1.3.1.7 Summary

In this section, sources used for this work were presented by dividing them into two groups, namely texts written and issued during the oldest period of written Latvian (the 16th century – the first half of the 17th century) and later texts that were issued until the year 1739. This section also provided the reader with a more general overview of the period of Early Written Latvian.

In the next section, the most characteristic orthographic features of the Old Latvian texts outlined above will be briefly presented. It will be shown how the texts of the oldest period differed from the later texts in terms of the orthography used for indicating Latvian sounds.

1.3.2 Orthography

In this section, a summary of characteristic orthographic features of the Old Latvian texts of the 16th and 17th centuries that are treated in this dissertation will be presented.16 It was noted above that the orthography of the oldest texts

---

differed from the one used in the texts of Mancelius and later authors. Therefore, the emphasis in this section will be on highlighting these differences, mainly describing the representation of vowels (e.g., length) and consonants (e.g., palatalization). These differences are important to take into account when spelling the Old Latvian compounds in the Modern Latvian orthography (for the presentation of material in this thesis, see section 1.4).

1.3.2.1 Texts of the oldest period (16th century – the first half of the 17th century)

The oldest writings of Early Written Latvian are characterized by a great variance and an inconsistent orthographic system that was patterned on the Middle Low German orthographic tradition used in Riga at that time (Ozols, 1965, pp. 75–79; Vanags, 2008, p. 184ff.). The orthographic system of the Latvian language was still developing, and authors of different texts used different systems, more or less influenced by inconsistency occurring in German orthography.

Writers of the first texts encountered difficulties in reflecting Latvian sounds in their works. In these texts, vowels in final syllables were indicated differently than those in nonfinal syllables. In final syllables, all short vowels were indicated <e> almost without exception, whereas long vowels were marked by the letter of the corresponding short vowel. However, in nonfinal syllables, Latvian sounds were represented more consistently. Regarding long vowels, the long /iː/ was not distinguished from the short one, and long vowels were in general not marked in an open syllable. Long vowels were sometimes indicated in a closed syllable either by gemination of the letter or by the addition of an <e> that followed the letter or was written above it. Short vowels were sometimes marked by doubling of the following consonants.

The diphthongs /ie/ and /uo/ were mostly indicated as <ee> and <oo>, respectively, also with vowel gemination <ee>, <oo> or by a following <e> or <h> (e.g., <eh>, <oh>). Mixed diphthongs consisting of combinations of /a/, /e/, /u/ and /u/, /i/ or the consonants /v/ and /j/ were fairly consistently reflected. More problematic in this respect was the representation of the diphthong [au] written as <au> and <ou>.

Consonants were usually spelled phonetically in the texts of this period taking account of positional changes (Vanags, 2008, p. 186). Palatal consonants, namely /ɣ/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/ (i.e., g, k, ť, n, r in Modern Latvian orthography) were not differentiated and were only rarely marked with the following <y> and <i>. Nor were the affricates /ts/, /dz/, /ʃʃ/, /ʒʒ/ (i.e., c, dz, č, dž in the Modern Latvian orthography), fricatives /ʃ/, /ʒ/ (i.e., š, ž in the Modern Latvian

---

17 Cf. Blese (1929, pp. 27–56) on orthographic features of personal names in the oldest writings.
orthography), or the opposition between voiced /z/ and unvoiced /s/ consistently marked and differentiated from similar sounds.

1.3.2.2 Georg Elger

Even though the written language of Elger resembled the language of the texts of the oldest period of the 16th century, his orthographic system was more precise to reflect Latvian sounds (Vanags, 2008, p. 187). Short vowels in final and nonfinal syllables were to the most extent spelled as they were in the oldest texts, but representation of long vowels was different. Long vowels /ɑː/ and /uː/ were represented as <â>, <û> and <û>, <û>, respectively, although long vowels /eː/, /æː/ and /iː/ were not distinguished from the short variants. The diphthongs /ie/, /uo/ were marked with the same diacritics <ê>, <é>, <è>, <ô>, <ó>, <ò>, respectively. Consonants were also differentiated to some extent; /ts/, /dz/, /ťʃ/, /ťʃ/, /ťg/ written as <c>, <dz>, <cz>, <β>, <ź>, <ż>, respectively. Although inconsistently, palatalization of consonants was sometimes indicated as in Polish and Lithuanian writings: <li>, <ni>, <ri>, <ki>.

1.3.2.3 Georg Mancelius

Mancelius revised and improved the existing written Latvian language by creating a new orthographic model that was more systematic than the previous one used in the texts of the oldest period, cf. Ózols (1965, pp. 162–170), Vanags (2008, p. 188ff.). One of his most significant contributions to the history of written Latvian was that his system reflected the quality and the quantity of both final and root syllables more precisely; the difference was made between closed /e/ (written as <e>) and open /æ/ (written as <ä>). Among innovations introduced by Mancelius, one must also mention an orthographic feature adopted from the High German written tradition of marking the length of vowels /ɑː/, /eː/, /æː/, /uː/ with a following <h>, in addition to /iː/ being marked as <ih> in word-initial position and <ie> in word-medial position. Vowels in locative endings were, however, represented inconsistently; /ɑː/ was spelled <â>, while other vowels were represented as <y>, <eh>, <uh>, <äh>. In order to avoid homonymous forms of accusative singular (-u) and genitive plural (-u) of nouns, adjectives, and pronouns, Mancelius used <o> to indicate the genitive plural ending. The diphthong /ie/ was marked <ee> in all positions, while the diphthong /uo/ was spelled <oh> mainly in root syllables.

Regarding the representation of consonants, Mancelius introduced the letter slash, most probably adopted from Polish or Lithuanian writings where <ł> was used (Vanags, 2008, p. 189). The letter slash was used to indicate palatal and palatalized consonants /ɨ/ , /ɨ/ , /ɹ/ – <l>, <n>, <r> respectively, and to distinguish the unvoiced /s/ from the voiced /z/, i.e., /S/, <ʃ> vs. /S/.

This new orthographic system introduced by Mancelius was used by later authors, albeit with small modifications.

1.3.2.4 Christophor Fürecker

While the most common orthographic system used during the second half of the 17th century was the old orthography developed by Mancelius, Fürecker used a somewhat different orthographic system (Fennell, 2000b, p. 69); also cf. Draviņš (1957ab), Zemzare (1961, pp. 73–83), Vanags (2008, p. 189ff.; 2010). For example, he used the letter slash introduced by Mancelius not only for indicating palatal consonants, but also long vowels \(<a/>, <e/>, <i/>, <u/>\). Long vowels in the locative endings were also marked with the letter slash and \(<^\text{a}>\), \(<^\text{e}>\), \(<^\text{i}>\), \(<^\text{u}>\). The short vowels were indicated by the gemination of the following consonant, e.g., \(<\text{kk}>\), \(<\text{zz}>\). The letter slash was also used for \(/f/ – <\text{ß}>/\) and \(/tʃ/ – <\text{z}>/\), whereas \(/ʒ/\) was indicated by \(<\text{ß}>/\), \,/ts/ – <\text{z}>/\) and \,/dz/ – <\text{ds}>/\).

1.3.2.5 Johann Langius

The base of orthography used in Langius’ manuscripts was the one introduced by Mancelius (Blese, 1936/1987, p. 504ff.). However, it was more primitive and differed in certain details (Vanags, 2008, p. 190). Langius, for instance, indicated long vowels only in root syllables by reduplication \(<\text{aa}>\), \,<\text{ee}>\), by inserting the letter \,<\text{h}⟩ – \,<\text{ah}>\), \,<\text{äh}>\), \,<\text{aeh}>\), \,<\text{ih}>\), \,<\text{uh}>\), \,<\text{oh}>\) or by an \,<\text{e}⟩ – \,<\text{ie}>\). However, this use was inconsistent. Short vowels were in some cases indicated by gemination of the following consonant.

Consonants were also marked in various ways, especially \(c, ć, dz, s, š, z\). The occlusive \(g\) was sometimes indicated by \(<\text{ğ}>; \,ŋ – <\text{ng}>\), \,<\text{nj}>\), \,<\text{η}>\), \,<\text{mp}>\); and \(j – <\text{i}>; <\text{y}>\) instead of \,<\text{ij}>\).

1.3.2.6 Summary

In the following tables, the main differences between the representations of long and short vowels and the palatalization of consonants in the texts of the early period are presented. Note that Langius’ orthographic system is not included here, as it is mainly based on the system introduced by Mancelius, differing only in certain details presented above.

---

20 Due to technical limitations, the letter slash will be placed after the letter in this thesis, but I would like to make the reader aware of the fact that the letter slash was often drawn through the letters in original sources, cf., e.g., Draviņš (1957ab).
21 On the question as to whether spelling conventions introduced by Fürecker were used in printed works, cf. Vanags (2010).
**Table 1.1: The representation of short vowels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Modern Latvian</th>
<th>Oldest texts</th>
<th>Elger</th>
<th>Mancelius</th>
<th>Fürecker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ɑː/</td>
<td>&lt;ā&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ā&gt;, &lt;a&gt;,</td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;, &lt;ae&gt;,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;ä&gt;, &lt;aa&gt;,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;ah&gt;, &lt;ah&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/uː/</td>
<td>&lt;ū&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;u&gt;, &lt;v&gt;,</td>
<td>&lt;v&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;u&gt;, &lt;û&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;u&gt;, &lt;û&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;ue&gt;, &lt;û&gt;,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;uu&gt;, &lt;uh&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/eː/</td>
<td>&lt;ē&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ee&gt;,</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;he&gt;, &lt;eh&gt;,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;ê&gt;, &lt;ë&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æː/</td>
<td>&lt;ē&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ee&gt;,</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;he&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/iː/</td>
<td>&lt;ī&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;, &lt;ij&gt;,</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;, &lt;î&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;, &lt;î&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;y&gt;, &lt;ỳ&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.2: The representation of long vowels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Modern Latvian</th>
<th>Oldest texts</th>
<th>Elger</th>
<th>Mancelius</th>
<th>Fürecker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ɑː/</td>
<td>&lt;ā&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ā&gt;, &lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;, &lt;ae&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;a&gt;, &lt;ài&gt;,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/uː/</td>
<td>&lt;ū&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;u&gt;, &lt;v&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;v&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;u&gt;, &lt;û&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;u&gt;, &lt;û&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;ue&gt;, &lt;û&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;u&gt;, &lt;û&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;u&gt;, &lt;û&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/eː/</td>
<td>&lt;ē&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ee&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;he&gt;, &lt;eh&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æː/</td>
<td>&lt;ē&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ee&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;he&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;e&gt;, &lt;ê&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/iː/</td>
<td>&lt;ī&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;, &lt;ij&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;, &lt;î&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;, &lt;î&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;y&gt;, &lt;ỳ&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ê&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;, &lt;î&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;, &lt;î&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 The presentation of material in this study

Due to space considerations, only a selection of representative instances of Old Latvian compounds is quoted in the text. The complete collection of data used in this study is presented in the appendix.

All instances of compounds found in the Old Latvian texts are spelled in the Modern Latvian orthography and presented in the nominative case when possible, i.e., if a compound is attested in the nominative case in the Old Latvian texts or its reconstruction to the nominative case is unproblematic (i.e., the stem form of the second component is not ambiguous). Moreover, some compounds are not reconstructed to the nominative case with the aim of showing that a linking element was used. This is often the case for compounds where the first component is an adjective or a verbal stem, cf. liel-a-dien-as (Gen.sg.) ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’): <[...] prekʃʒan Lelade-nas [...] (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘before Easter day’.

Seeking to be close to original texts, the morphological form of words is not changed with respect to corresponding instances in Modern Latvian. For instance, a linking element used between the components in a compound is given as it appeared in original texts due to the following reasons. Firstly, it was sometimes not possible to determine the length of vowels that functioned as linking elements because of an inconsistent orthography. Secondly, final syllables of the first components of instances found in the oldest texts of Early...
Written Latvian (16th century – the first half of the 17th century) were indicated by <e> with only a few exceptions. Hence, it was not possible to determine which vowel was indicated by this letter <e>, cf. <thems lele kungems> (Dat.pl.) (EvEp1) ‘to those lords’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + kung-s ‘lord, master, gentleman’). Thirdly, a number of linking elements used in Old Latvian compounds are no longer present in their counterparts in Modern Latvian, thus it would have been misleading to transliterate them into Modern Latvian orthography.

Regarding the components of compounds, I sought to include original attestations in Old Latvian when possible. For instance, if there existed a few morphological variants of the same word (usually a noun) used in coining compounds, both forms are presented in the brackets alongside a transliterated compound, e.g., one finds variants such as jūr-is (m.) (LD) ‘sea’ beside jūr-a (f.) (F1, F2) ‘id.’, and jūr-e (f.) (PhL) ‘id.’ or mugur-a (f.) (L) ‘back’ beside mugur-s (m.) (PhL) ‘id.’. If a word was not found in the texts of that time, a word is quoted from Mühlenbach and Endzelin’s dictionary Lettsch-deutscher Wörterbuch (MEe) or other dialect dictionaries (see Sources). For a more detailed discussion about the morphological variants of uncompounded words in Old Latvian, see chapter 3.

Another important factor to take into account when researching Old Latvian texts is that clusters of consonants in the texts of this period were often indicated phonetically (cf. Bergmane, 1986, p. 84ff.). For instance, if the stem consonants t, d occur in front of the ending -s, they are assimilated into /ts/. Hence, in Old Latvian texts, one often finds an assimilation of the latter consonants indicated graphically by <tz>, <c>, etc., cf. <pac> (EE) (cf. MLatv. pat-s ‘self’), <Sirdtz> (L) ‘heart’ (cf. MLatv. sird-s ‘id.’), <swāhtz> (L) ‘holy, blessed’ (cf. MLatv. svēt-s ‘id.’). Moreover, clusters of consonants ss, šs, cs, zs, źs were often spelled as <ß, s>, <sch>, <tz, zz>, <ß, ss>, <sch>, respectively, cf. <Debbeß> (L) ‘heaven’ (cf. MLatv. debes-s ‘id.’), <Azz> (F1, F2) ‘eye’ (cf. MLatv. ac-s ‘id.’), <Mass> (LD) ‘small’ (cf. MLatv. maz-s ‘id.’), <Messch> (LD) ‘wood, forest’ (cf. MLatv. mež-s ‘id.’).

Likewise, in compounds in Old Latvian, the stem form of the second component was also sometimes spelled phonetically. For instance, in a compound <ween=atz> (L) ‘one-eyed’ the second component is based on a noun ac-s ‘eye’, although it is clear that the stem is spelled phonetically. In the case of its counterpart <ween azzis> (F1), the second component is also based on the same noun ac-s ‘eye’, but the compound is extended by the compositional suffix -is. Hence, in this study, compounds are transliterated taking account of phonetic spelling, cf. vien-ac-s (L) ‘one-eyed’ beside vien-ac-is (F1) ‘id’.

However, it must be added that due to the phonetic representation of consonants, it was sometimes difficult to make a distinction between compounds and noun phrases. Hence, it is unclear whether the first component is inflected or it occurs in its stem in several examples. For instance, one cannot decide

---

whether the first component in \(<\text{Atz}=\text{raugs}\>\) (L) ‘apple of an eye’ is based on a stem form \(ac\)- of a noun \(ac\)-s ‘eye’ or it is in the genitive case, i.e., \(ac\)-s. Both the positional assimilation of \(c\) and \(s\) and the stem consonant \(c\) were often indicated in the same way, i.e., \(<tz\>\), in the texts of this period. Similarly, in the following case, it is difficult to decide whether the first component is inflected or it is the stem form of a noun \(aus\)-s ‘ear’, cf. \(<\text{Auß}=\text{śahpes}\>\) (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘earache’ (cf. MLatv. \(aus\)-s (Gen.sg.) ‘ear’).

It is likewise problematic when the first component is based on an adjective. In the Old Latvian texts, one finds several examples where the first component can be interpreted in two ways, namely as the nominative case and the stem form of an adjective, cf. \(<\text{Wätz}=\text{tähws}\>\) (LD) ‘grandfather’ (cf. MLatv. \(vec\)-s ‘old’). Hence, in this study, I have decided not to include these ambiguous instances when it was not possible to distinguish between compounds and noun phrases due to the phonetic spelling of consonants.

Furthermore, compounds in the Old Latvian texts were spelled in three different ways, i.e., the components could be spelled separately, as one word or with the hyphen inserted between the components (for a more detailed discussion, see chapter 2), cf. \(<\text{Meln Azzis}\>\) (F1) ‘cross-eyed’ (← \(meln\)-s ‘black’ + \(ac\)-s (L), \(ac\)-is (EE), \(ac\)-e (LD) ‘eye’), \(<\text{trackghallwis}\>\) (L) ‘daredevil’ (← \(trak\)-s ‘insane, possessed’ + \(galv\)-a ‘head’), \(<\text{Strup=ausis}\>\) (F1) ‘having short ears’ (← \(strup\)-s ‘short’ + \(aus\)-s ‘ear’). In the transliterated examples this difference is ignored. The components are separated by the hyphen “-”. Other grammatical information (e.g., suffixes, or endings) is also marked by inserting the hyphen.

For the sake of clarity, I have also chosen to use the hyphen for separating linking elements, cf. \(av\)-\(i\)-\(kūt\)-s (EE) ‘sheepfold’ (← \(av\)-s (L), \(av\)-is (LD) ‘sheep’ + \(kūt\)-s ‘shed’). However, if the first component is inflected, as is the case for some compounds in Modern Latvian, the hyphen is used only for separating the components, cf. MLatv. \(zemes\)-\(māt\)-e (LLVVe) ‘Earth goddess’ (← \(zem\)-es (Gen.sg.) ‘earth, ground’ + \(māt\)-e ‘mother’).

To sum up, in this work, compounds found in the Old Latvian texts are presented as shown in (6), (7), and (8). Alongside a transliterated compound, each component of the compound is written with the letters and signs of Modern Latvian orthography. Attestations in Old Latvian in the original orthography are quoted as well, and the information in German (such as the translation

---

23 This intriguing question of the origin of the hyphen used in the Old Latvian texts and its use in compounds will not be addressed in more detail in this thesis, as it requires a thorough investigation. However, it can be noted that in the texts up to the first publications of Mancelius, hyphenated compounds are fairly rare. It might have been the case that this tradition of including the hyphen in Old Latvian compounds started to spread after the first texts of Mancelius. He might have implemented the hyphen from German texts of that time. Note also that the hyphen is rarely used in the texts of Elger. For a thorough account of the spelling of German nominal compounds found in sermons written in Early New High German between 1550 and 1710, cf. Solling (2012).

24 Latv. ‘[...] es fakka iums, kas pa tem durwem ne eţ ekfţan to awwikùti [...]’ (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘I say to you, who does not enter the sheepfold’.
of a Latvian counterpart) is also given if it was provided in original sources. However, only one original attestation is quoted in the text due to space considerations. The orthography used in the examples from original sources is the same as the one used in the corpus of Early Written Latvian texts and word indexes (see Sources). The only difference is that the grapheme <§> used in the online corpus is substituted by <ʃ> in this work. Abbreviations of original sources are indicated in the brackets (see Sources).

(6) *liel-galv-is* ‘big-headed’ (← *liel-s* ‘big’ + *galv-a* ‘head’)
Latv. *<leelghallwis>* beside Germ. *<großkopff>* (L)

(7) *māj-a-viet-a* ‘home, accommodation’ (← *māj-a* ‘house, building’ + *viet-a* ‘place, spot’)

(8) *ugun-kur-is* ‘fire, bonfire’ (← *ugun-s* ‘fire’ + cf. *kur-t* ‘to make fire’)
Latv. *<Uggun'kurris>* beside Germ. *<eine Feuer Heerde oder Feuer stätt>* (LD)

If a compound found in the Old Latvian texts is quoted in the running text, original attestations are provided in the footnote. Hence, in the running text, compounds are spelled only in Modern Latvian orthography.

1.5 Outline of the following chapters

In chapter 2, a general theoretical background of the investigation is presented. It includes definitions of terms, review of previous accounts of compounds in Old Latvian, and the presentation of the classification of compounds used for arranging compounds in Old Latvian in this study. In chapters 3, 4, and 5, the analysis of the different types of compounds in Old Latvian is presented. Chapter 3 treats the determinative compounds in Old Latvian. Possessive compounds are analyzed in chapter 4. The category of the verbal governing compounds are addressed in chapter 5. Compounding in the oldest religious texts of Early Written Latvian is considered in chapter 6. Lastly, the main findings and results of this study are presented and discussed in chapter 7.
2 Background

In this chapter, I will firstly introduce the preliminary terms and definitions applied in this study, including a discussion concerning delimiting compounds from noun phrases in both Modern and Old Latvian. Secondly, I will present and review previous accounts in which the formation of compounds in Old Latvian was addressed. Finally, the classification of compounds, which will be employed in this work to treat compounds in Old Latvian, will be outlined. The categories of compounds will be described in a broader context that includes a brief presentation of the system of compounding in the Baltic languages.

2.1 Definitions

In this section, basic terms such as compound, compounding and composition, and linking element, which will be employed in this thesis treating compounds in Old Latvian, are defined. In fact, the definition of a compound has always been much debated cross-linguistically and, due to this reason, different definitions of compounds are applied in the literature. In the following, the problematic aspects of defining a compound in Modern and Old Latvian will be discussed. Firstly, the main criteria that need to be taken into account when defining a compound in Modern Latvian will be presented. Secondly, the same criteria will be applied to compounds in Old Latvian, where it will be argued that some are problematic and cannot be applied at all.

Defining a compound in Modern Latvian is often problematic, as it relates to the issue of delimiting compounds from noun phrases. It is especially challenging when the first component is based on an inflected noun (1) or an adjective, as shown in (2).

1. `acu-zob-s` (LLVVe) ‘eye tooth’ (← `ac-u` (Gen.pl.) ‘eye’ + `zob-s` ‘tooth’)
2. `vecais-tēv-s` (LLVVe) ‘grandfather’ (← `vec-ais` (Nom.sg.m.def.) ‘old’ + `tēv-s` ‘father’)

---

25 For further discussion about the definitions of a compound and compounding, cf., e.g., Lieber and Štekauer (2011, pp. 3–14), Moyna (2011, p. 11ff.), Tribulato (2015, p. 14ff.).
Several criteria for determining when a lexical unit is considered to be a compound in Modern Latvian have been proposed in the literature, cf. MLLVG (1959, p. 198ff.), LVG (2013, p. 202, 250ff.). The criteria are listed below.

- **Phonetic and orthographic criteria:** a compound bears stress on the initial syllable of the first component and is spelled as one word, e.g., ‘saulespuķe’ ‘sunflower’ (← saul-es (Gen.sg.) ‘sun’ + puķ-e ‘flower’).

- **Morphological criteria:** the grammatical information is usually expressed only by the second component in a compound. The ending of the first component can be lost, shortened or kept. If the ending of the first component is preserved, it becomes an interfix.

- **Semantic criteria:** a compound has the meaning of a word that can be close to the meaning expressed by a corresponding noun phrase. However, a compound can also have a more specialized meaning that is not deduced from the meaning of its components, cf. a compound deviņ-vīru-spēk-s ‘mullein (a plant)’ (← deviņ-i ‘nine’ + vīr-u (Gen.pl.) ‘man’ + spēk-s ‘strength, force’) beside a phrase deviņ-u (Gen.pl.) vīr-u (Gen.pl.) spēk-s ‘strength of nine men’. A noun phrase often has more than one meaning, whereas a compound usually has only a single meaning.

- **Word-formation criteria:** new compounds are formed according to stable models of compounding, cf. tumš-brūn-s ‘dark-brown’ (← tumš-s ‘dark’ + brūn-s ‘brown’), tumš-dzelten-s ‘dark-yellow’ (← tumš-s ‘dark’ + dzelten-s ‘yellow’), tumš-zal-š ‘rifle green’ (← tumš-s ‘dark’ + zal-š ‘green’).

- **Syntactic criteria:** a compound behaves as a word in a sentence (for a more detailed discussion, cf. Ahero, 1955; Ahero, 1979).

Given the above-mentioned criteria, a word unit like vecais ’tēvs ‘father who grew old’ is considered to be a noun phrase due to the fact that it is stressed on the second component, cf. MLLVG (1959, p. 198). Moreover, the meaning of this word unit is easily deducible from its components. By contrast, its counterpart vecaistēvs is initially stressed and has a more specialized meaning, i.e., it means ‘grandfather’. Hence, the latter example is considered to be a compound in Modern Latvian, while the former one is not, cf. MLLVG.

Likewise, the following instance is not regarded as a compound, since it can be accented in two ways as follows: ‘Baltijas jūra ‘the Baltic sea’ and Baltijas ‘jūra ‘id.’ (MLLVG, 1959, p. 198ff.).

Ahero (1979, p. 175ff.), furthermore, distinguishes compounds not only from simple noun phrases (Latv. brīvā vārdkopa), but also from the so-called fixed word groups or phraseological units (Latv. nedalāmā vārdkopa) such as meln-ā kast-e ‘black box’ (cf. meln-ā (Nom.sg.f.def.) ‘black’ + kast-e ‘box’). She suggests that compounds can be delimited from the latter structures by only three criteria, namely phonological, morphological, and word-formation criteria, since in terms of semantics and syntactic behavior these units function as compounds. However, Ahero (1979, p. 176) points out that compounds in Modern Latvian can also have internal inflection, and, therefore, they cannot always be formally differentiated from phrases. Thus, she comes to the conclusion that in Modern Latvian, compounds are delimited from phraseological units mainly by the phonological criterion, i.e., stress. For instance, if a word unit bears one fixed stress and obeys the criteria mentioned above, it is a compound and, thus, is spelled as one word in Latvian, cf. rokasnauda ‘deposit, pledge’ (<— rok-as (Gen.sg.) ‘hand, arm’ + naud-a ‘money’).

To sum up, compounds in Modern Latvian can be distinguished from phrases in terms of several criteria based on the phonetic, orthographic, morphological, semantic, word-formation and syntactic properties of the word or phrases. In my opinion, however, the most crucial criterion for delimiting compounds with an internal inflection from noun phrases in Modern Latvian is the phonological criterion, i.e., stress. Thus, if a word unit has one initial stress and obeys the above-mentioned criteria, it is a compound in Modern Latvian. Compounds with an inflected first component in Modern Latvian will be referred to as case compounds in this work.

When it comes to the Old Latvian texts, the same issue of delimiting compounds from noun phrases exists here, too. In these texts, one finds numerous word units with both inflected components. If the first component is a noun, it is often in the genitive case as in (3), and if it is based on an adjective, the first component agrees with the second component in number, gender and case, as shown in (4)

---

28 According to Ahero (1979, p. 168), compounds with an inflected first component constitute around 3–4% of all compounds in Modern Latvian, cf. zemes-lod-e ‘globe’ (← zem-es (Gen.sg.) ‘earth, ground’ + lod-e ‘ball, sphere, globe’). The rest of the compounds (ca. 96–97%) have an uninflected first component, cf. bit-kop-is ‘bee-keeper’ (← bit-e ‘bee’ + cf. kop-t ‘to take care, to nurse’).

29 In works of historical linguistics, instances with an inflected first component are also called ‘unechte Komposita’ (‘secondary compounds’), cf., e.g., Carr (1939, p. 309ff.). They are also referred to as ‘juxtapositions’, cf., e.g., Larsson (2002b, pp. 214–216).
(3) **baznīc-**-**as kung-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘priest’ (cf. **baznīc-** (Gen.sg.) ‘church’ + **kung-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘master, lord, gentleman’)

<...[...] Baznīcas kungi [...]>(Nom.pl.) (EE)

(4) **liel**-**skung-s** ‘landlord, lord’ (cf. **liel-s** (Nom.sg.m.) ‘big’ + **kung-s** ‘master, lord, gentleman’)

Latv. <Leelskunx> beside Germ. <ein Fürst> (L)

On the one hand, it is possible to analyze examples of this kind as compounds due to their semantic and syntactic properties. For instance, they often have a more specialized meaning, as a compound is expected to have. Hence, an example like **diev-a grāmat-a** (PhL) (cf. **diev-a** (Gen.sg.) ‘God’ + **grāmat-a** ‘book’) does not denote a book that is possessed by the God, but it means the Bible.30 These word units can also behave as compounds from a syntactic point of view. For example, they are inseparable, since no other element can be inserted between the two parts, cf. **tiem baznīcas kungiem** (VLH) ‘to those priests’ (cf. **tiem** (Dat.pl.m.) ‘they’) vs. *baznīcas tiem kungiem*. Furthermore, the first part cannot be modified. Thus, it is not possible to modify an adjective in the first part in such instances as **lielskungs** (L) ‘landlord, lord’ (cf. **liel-s** (Nom.sg.m.) ‘big’) by an adverb *loti ‘very’*: *

*loti lielskungs.*

On the other hand, it becomes more complex when one tries to employ other criteria, namely the orthographic, morphological, and, most importantly, the phonological. Firstly, the orthographic criterion must be rejected due to the fact that units of this kind are spelled in three different ways in the Old Latvian texts, as presented in (5). This is why the orthographic criterion cannot be employed for defining a compound in Old Latvian.

(5) a. the parts are spelled separately:

<Leels Kungs> (M/L) ‘landlord, lord’

b. they are spelled as one word:

<Leelskungs> (L) ‘landlord, lord’

c. the hyphen can be inserted between the parts:

<Leela=kungha> (Gen.sg.) (PhL)

(cf. **liel-a** (Gen.sg.m.) ‘big’ + **kung-a** (Gen.sg.) ‘master, lord, gentleman’)

Secondly, in terms of the formal properties, these cases correspond to noun phrases with both inflected parts. It is thus impossible to determine whether an inflectional ending of the first part was functioning as a linking element in Old Latvian, which can also help considering them compounds.

Thirdly and most importantly, the phonological criterion cannot be employed in order to delimit compounds from noun phrases in Old Latvian, as

---

the place of the stress is never marked in the Old Latvian texts. As it was presented above, this criterion is the most crucial one in defining what a compound in Latvian is. Hence, not being able to check the prosodic information of word units of this kind, it is not possible to determine whether these examples were functioning as compounds in Old Latvian.

This is why, in my opinion, it is misleading to treat instances of word units with inflected parts as compounds in Old Latvian, as there are no sufficient reasons for proving their status as compounds. Therefore, I will not treat cases with internal inflection as compounds in Old Latvian in this thesis. Only those word units that have formally unambiguous components will be regarded as compounds in this work.31 Note that I will present my ideas about formally ambiguous word units based on two nouns, in which the first component is a noun of a masculine a-stem, in chapter 3.

Thus, following Bauer (2001, p. 695), I define a compound in Old Latvian as “a lexical unit made up of two or more elements which show some grammatical isolation from normal syntactic usage”.32 “The morphological process through which a compound is created” is called compounding or composition (Tribulato, 2015, p. 14).

Moreover, not only compounds formed from stems without inflectional endings, but also those in which the first component ends in an original stem vowel will be called stem compounds in this thesis.33 Finally, I will refer to a semantically empty element used between the components of a compound as a linking element.34 For further discussion about linking elements in compounds in Latvian and Lithuanian, see section 2.3.5.1.

In the following section, preceding studies that dealt with compounds in Old Latvian will be presented and reviewed. It will be shown why these previous accounts are problematic by addressing the definitions and analysis of compounds employed in these studies.

---

31 Cases where the first component ends in an obscure grapheme <e> found in the text of Elger will not be included in the analysis of this thesis, e.g., “[...] durweʃargs [...]” (EE) ‘doorkeeper’ (← durv-is (Nom.pl.) ‘door’ + sarg-s ‘guard, watch’). Examples of this type found in the oldest religious texts will be discussed in chapter 6.

32 Note that Bauer (2001, p. 695) also includes “phonological isolation” in his definition of a compound, but as it was argued above, one cannot check the prosodic information of lexical units in Old Latvian. Thus, in my opinion, it is not possible to determine whether a particular word unit in Old Latvian shows some phonological isolation or not, and such a determination could help in identifying their status as compounds.

33 See, e.g., Stang (1966, p. 175ff.) on the original stems and case system of nouns in the Baltic languages.

34 Linking elements are also referred to as interfixes (e.g., Bauer, 2011, p. 346; Stundžia, 2016, p. 3091), intermorphs (e.g., Szymanek, 2011, p. 466), composition vowels (e.g., Larsson, 2002b, p. 212) in the literature.
2.2 Previous accounts of compounds in Old Latvian

In this section, I will review previous works in which the formation of compounds found in texts of Early Written Latvian has been addressed. All in all, compounds in Old Latvian have hitherto been little studied. Some compounds are briefly treated in a few studies on the Old Latvian texts (e.g., Elksnīte, 2011, p. 27ff.; Frīdenberga, 2016, p. 65ff.). In addition, several instances of compounds of this early period are randomly quoted in general descriptions of the Old Latvian texts (e.g., Blese, 1936/1987, pp. 525–526; Grīsle, 1958, p. 300; Zemzare, 1961, p. 30ff.; Ozols, 1965, p. 81ff.; Veidemane, 2002, p. 454ff.).

It is also interesting to note that some examples found in Old Latvian texts have been especially debated. For example, an instance <ghuļļamakambaris> (L) ‘sleeping-room’ (← cf. gul-ē-t ‘to sleep, to lie’ + kambar-is (L), kambar-s (PhL) ‘room, chamber’) has been particularly controversial due to the form of the first component, which ended in <a>. Three different interpretations have so far been suggested, namely that it is a compound (cf. Blese, 1936/1987, p. 525; Veidemane, 2002, p. 454; Skujiņa, 2006, p. 73ff.), a noun phrase (cf. Elksnīte, 2011, p. 25) or even a misprint (cf. Zemzare, 1961, pp. 18–19). For more examples of this type in Old Latvian and a more detailed discussion, see chapter 3.

In fact, very little has been done on the formation of Old Latvian compounds, in particular. There are only two major descriptive accounts, namely an article by Amato (1996), who considers compounds found in the translation of pericopes by Elger (1640), and a short study by Skujiņa (2006), where compounds found in the dictionary by Mancelius are treated.35 In my opinion, there are a number of problematic aspects of both accounts that should be pointed out. Hence, in the following, I will review the above-mentioned works in more detail by highlighting the most debatable views presented there. I will focus mainly on the analysis of nominal compounds, as compounds of this kind will be treated in this thesis.

2.2.1 Skujiņa’s (2006) analysis

The form of compounds found in the dictionary of Mancelius is addressed by Skujiņa (2006) in her study Salikteni G. Manceļa vārdnīcā “Lettus” un krājumā “Phraseologia Lettica”. In the following, I will argue why this study is problematic and which views upheld by the author can be questioned.

35 Note that the same ideas and conclusions found in the study from the year 2006 are presented in the other articles by Skujiņa (1994, 2005, 2008). However, in this section, I will focus on her major study from 2006.
Firstly, the choice of what to regard as compounds taken in this study is controversial. Skujiņa (2006) does not provide the reader with satisfying criteria delimiting compounds from noun compounds in Old Latvian. For instance, Skujiņa (2006, p. 8) applies only the orthographic criterion and does not include separately spelled instances to her study. Thus, only those cases which are spelled together, i.e., written as one word, or hyphenated are considered to be compounds in this analysis.

However, as I have argued above in section 2.1, it is misleading to apply the orthographic criterion for delimiting compounds from noun phrases in Old Latvian due to the fact that the spelling of phrases was inconsistent, i.e., they could be spelled separately, as one word or with the hyphen inserted between the parts. What is, furthermore, not mentioned by Skujiņa is that the spelling of compounds in Old Latvian was inconsistent and differed from one author to the next, as shown in (6). Judging from the texts of Early Written Latvian, it is clear that there was no unified system of spelling compounds of this period. Thus, the components of Old Latvian compounds could be spelled in three different ways, as presented below.

(6) a. the components were spelled together:
<trackghallwis> (L) ‘daredevil’
(← irak-s ‘insane, possessed’ + galv-a ‘head’)

b. the components were spelled with a hyphen:
<Strup=ausis> (F1) ‘having short ears’
(← strup-s ‘short’ + aus-s ‘ear’)

c. the components were spelled separately:
<Meln Azzis> (F1) ‘cross-eyed’
(← meln-s ‘black’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)

Due to the lack of consistency in the spelling of compounds and noun phrases in Old Latvian, it is not sufficient to employ only the orthographic criterion when treating compounds of this period, as is done by Skujiņa (2006).

Furthermore, due to the fact that Skujiņa only applies the orthographic criterion for delimiting compounds from noun phrases in Old Latvian, all word units with both inflected components, which were spelled together, are treated as compounds rather than noun phrases in her work, cf. cūkas-tauk-i (Nom.pl.) (L) ‘pig fat’ (← cf. cūk-as (Gen.sg.) ‘pig’ + tauk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘fat’), bieza-putr-a (PhL) ‘porridge’ (← cf. biez-a (Nom.sg.f.) ‘thick, dense’ + putr-a ‘porridge, gruel’), pilns-bēd-u (Gen.pl.) (L) lit. ‘full of worries, i.e., worried, anxious’ (← cf. piln-s (Nom.sg.m.) ‘full’ + bēd-u (Gen.pl.) ‘trouble, care’).36

However, as it was argued above, the orthographic criterion, which is employed by Skujiņa (2006), cannot be used at all in delimiting compounds from

36 Examples quoted from works of other authors are spelled in Modern Latvian orthography in this work.
noun phrases in Old Latvian. Apart from the orthographic criterion, Skujiņa has not presented any other criteria for distinguishing compounds in Old Latvian.

Secondly, Skujiņa’s (2006) categorization of compounds is incoherent. For instance, the distinct between compounds used as nouns and adjectives drawn in this study can be questioned. As I will show in chapter 4 in this thesis, the so-called possessive compounds were ambiguous and thus were used both as adjectives and nouns in the Old Latvian texts. Skujiņa (2006, p. 108), on the contrary, regards compounds of this type only as nouns without taking into consideration different translations in the German language that clearly suggest their ambiguous use. For instance, to mention just one case found in the dictionary of Mancelius, *vien-roc-is* (L, PhL) is translated as <einhändig> (L) and <eine Korn Senʃe> (PhL) in the German language. Thus, it is misleading to regard the Old Latvian compounds of this category only as nouns.

Skujiņa (2006, pp. 17–18), moreover, follows the description of compounds provided by MLLVG (1959, p. 201ff.) and divides compound nouns into four groups with respect to the form of the corresponding phrases as follows: 1) compounds, in which the form of the components is unchanged; 2) compounds, in which the form of the first component is changed; 3) compounds, in which the form of the second component is changed; 4) compounds, in which the form of both components is changed. This division is, however, problematic, as firstly, it implies that all noun compounds must have originated from noun phrases that either preserved or lost their inflection. By contrast, in my opinion, it was not necessarily the case for the compound nouns in Old Latvian (for a more detailed discussion, see chapter 3). Secondly, when compounds are arranged in this respect, it becomes unclear whether this study treats compounds from a synchronic or historical point of view.

Another weak point of the study by Skujiņa (2006) is the analysis of the first component in many instances among the nominal compounds. Firstly, the author assumes that in a number of word units based on two nouns, in which the first component is a noun of a masculine *a*-stem, the first component is used in the genitive case, cf. *darba-dien-a* (PhL) ‘working day’ (cf. *darb-a* (Gen.sg.) ‘work’ + *dien-a* ‘day’). However, I will suggest in this thesis that the <a> used in the final syllable of the first component in some examples provided by Skujiņa (2006, pp. 20–57) was not necessarily the genitive ending, but it might have been an original stem vowel of the first component. For a more detailed discussion about the interpretation of the origin of the first components of Old Latvian compounds suggested by Skujiņa (2006), see chapter 3.

Furthermore, Skujiņa included several loanwords in her study and analyzed the first component without taking into account the form of the first component in their counterparts in German. For instance, Skujiņa (2006, p. 85) assumes that the first component in *stunda-glāz-e* (PhL) ‘sandglass’ is in its original stem form. However, this example is a clear borrowing in which both components were loaned into Latvian from German, cf. Germ.
Moreover, Skujiņa (2006, p. 92, 95) added *knop-adat-a* (L) ‘pin’ and *vakt-meister-s* (PhL) ‘guard, watch’ to the list of compounds where the first component, according to her, had lost its stem vowel or the genitive ending. It is, however, clear that both of the aforementioned examples are loanwords (note that in the case of *knop-adat-a*, only the first component was borrowed), cf. *knop-adat-a* (L) ‘pin’ (cf. *adat-a* ‘needle’) < LG *knōp-nātel* ‘pin’ (Sehwers, 1953, pp. 55–56), *vakt-meister-s* (PhL) ‘guard, watch’ < LG *wacht-meister* (Sehwers, 1953, p. 150). Hence, in my opinion, the first component in examples of this kind could not have originally ended in its stem vowel. Nor is the interpretation of the first component originating from the genitive case possible.

Lastly, to her list of compounds, Skujiņa (2006) also added cases with suffixes like *-īb-, -īg-, -(e)niek-, -šan-*, cf. *seš-kant-īg-s* (L) ‘hexagon; having six sides and six angles’ (← *seš-i* ‘six’ + *kant-e* ‘edge’). In my view, examples of this type are often ambiguous, as it is unclear whether the suffix was added to the whole compound or the second component was derived with it as uncompounded word. In this thesis, I will elaborate on examples with the adjectival suffix *-īg-* and agentival suffixes such as *-ēj-, -niek-, -tāj* in chapters 4 and 5.

On the whole, the study by Skujiņa (2006) has a number of weaknesses. As I have argued in this section, one of the major disadvantages of the analysis is that the author did not provide the reader with clear and workable criteria distinguishing compounds from noun phrases in Old Latvian. Hence, a number of problematic examples were treated as compounds in this study despite the fact that they were clearly formally ambiguous. Lastly, apart from the other problematic aspects discussed above, this study addressed only the form of the Old Latvian compounds without taking into account their semantic interpretation. In the following section, I will address a very similar formal analysis of the Old Latvian compounds by Amato (1996), and problematic aspects of this study will be outlined immediately below.

2.2.2 Amato’s (1996) analysis

In the article *Contributo allo studio dei composti nominali nell’antico lettone*, Amato (1996) addresses compounds attested in the translation of pericopes by Elger (1640). As is formulated by Amato (1996, p. 285), the purpose of the morphological analysis presented in this article is to determine the formal models of the compounds by Elger and to compare them with those found in Modern Latvian and in the other Baltic languages.

As was also the case for Skujiņa’s (2006) analysis, the most problematic aspect of the study by Amato, in my opinion, is the lack of explicit criteria distinguishing compounds from noun phrases in Old Latvian. This is why it is unclear why some examples are included and treated as compounds in her study, while others are left out of consideration. Amato (1996, p. 286) seems
not to employ the orthographic criterion and thus includes separately spelled instances, as, in her view, they behave as compounds. However, Amato (1996, p. 286) excluded instances where both parts are in agreement in terms of number, gender, and case, which, according to her, behave as syntagms rather than compounds, cf. *lielksungs* ‘landlord, lord’ (cf. *liel-s* (Nom.sg.m.) ‘big’ + *kung-s* ‘master, lord, gentleman’). Despite this, Amato contradicts herself by including a few examples of this kind in her analysis, cf. *lieludien-u* (Gen.pl.) ‘Easter day’ (cf. *liel-u* (Gen.pl.f.) ‘big’ + *dien-u* (Gen.pl.) ‘day’).

Moreover, the author regards examples based on two inflected nouns as compounds without actually providing arguments for treating them as compounds in Old Latvian, cf. *namutēv-u* (Acc.sg.) ‘host’ (cf. *nam-u* (Gen.pl.) ‘home’ + *tēv-u* (Acc.sg.) ‘father’). As I have already discussed above in section 2.1, there are no sufficient reasons to regard lexical units with inflected components as clear cases of compounds in Old Latvian. Neither Amato (1996) nor Skujina (2006) addressed this issue in their studies.

What is, furthermore, not mentioned by Amato is that in the text by Elger, one also finds examples with an obscure grapheme *<e>* used between the components, cf. *<...> durweʃargs <...>* (EE) ‘doorkeeper’ (← *durv-is* (Nom.pl.) ‘door’ + *sarg-s* ‘guard, watch’). In these cases, one, in fact, cannot determine which vowel was indicated by the grapheme *<e>*, i.e., an original stem vowel or the inflectional ending. Hence, in my opinion, it is difficult to decide whether these instances were used as compounds or noun phrases in the text by Elger. Judging from her analysis, Amato (1996, pp. 296–304) treated examples of this kind in her study, but did not address the issue of the obscure grapheme *<e>* at all.

Furthermore, the analysis of the first component of some instances provided by Amato can be questioned. For example, Amato (1996, p. 287) assumes that the first component is an adverb in such cases as *priekš-a-zīm-e* (EE) ‘example, model’ (cf. *zīm-e* ‘sign, mark’), *virs-u-rakst-s* (EE) ‘title, headline’ (cf. *rakst-s* ‘writing, paper’). As I have discussed above in chapter 1, in cases of this kind one cannot actually decide whether the first component originated from a noun (e.g., *priekš-a* ‘front, forepart’) or an adverb (e.g., *priekšā* ‘in front of, ahead of’). Hence, due to the ambiguous first component, it is also difficult to determine the origin of linking elements used in the examples.

In fact, linking elements, which are one of the most crucial formal properties of Old Latvian compounds, are only briefly addressed in this study. Amato (1996, p. 289) claims that linking elements used in the compounds by Elger can have different origins, i.e., purely phonetic or morphological. Hence, she distinguishes compounds with linking elements that originate from the inflectional ending of the first component from the rest. What is left unexplained is whether the above-mentioned examples with an obscure grapheme *<e>* were taken into account when drawing conclusions about linking elements in the compounds presented by Elger.
Another view upheld by Amato (1996, p. 287), which will be disproved in this thesis, is that compounds with a deverbal first component are totally absent in Elger’s text. Hence, Amato (1996, p. 287) comes to the conclusion that these compounds fell into disuse in ancient times and were restored in the Modern Baltic languages. However, in view of the material collected and presented in chapter 3 in this thesis, I will argue that compounds with a verbal first component, on the contrary, prevailed more in Old Latvian texts than was previously believed. Even in the translation of pericopes that was analyzed by Amato, I have found at least one trustworthy example of this type where the first component ends in a linking element <a>, as shown in (7).

(7) *dedzam-a-upur-u* (Acc.sg.) ‘burnt offering’

(← cf. *deg-t* ‘to burn’ + *upur-s* (EE), *upur-is* (M/L) ‘sacrifice, offering, victim’) Latv. *<...> dædӡamma vppuru [...]*> (Acc.sg.) (EE)

I have also found another example of this type in the text by Elger, but it is unfortunately attested without any ending. It is clear, nevertheless, that it is a compound with a verbal first component where a linking element <a> is also used, cf. *rakstām-a-gald-in-[u]* (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘small writing board’ (← cf. *rakst-ī-t* ‘to write’ + *gald-s* ‘table’).\(^37\) For more examples of compounds of this type in Old Latvian and a more detailed discussion, see chapter 3.

Finally, Amato treated word units with derivational suffixes such as -īb-, -īg-, -šan- as compounds (called *pseudocomposti* here), cf. *visu-vald-īg-s* (EE) ‘sovereign’ (← *vis-s* ‘all, whole’ + cf. *vald-ī-t* ‘to rule, to govern’). As I have already discussed above, cases of this kind are problematic, as it is often unclear whether the second component was derived as an uncompounded word or the suffix was added to the whole compound. This issue is, however, not tackled in the study by Amato (1996).

All in all, due to the weaknesses discussed above, the analysis presented by Amato (1996) is highly problematic. In this purely descriptive study, compounds are analyzed only from a formal point of view without taking into account their semantic characteristics. Furthermore, it must be pointed out that although one of the main aims of this study was to draw parallels between compounds in Modern Latvian and in the other Baltic languages, the reader is only briefly provided with the information about the similarities and differences between the compounds in these languages.

2.2.3 Conclusion

In this section, I have reviewed previous studies in which the formation of compounds in Old Latvian was addressed. A number of weaknesses of these

\(^{37}\) Latv. *<...> wenu rakʃtamma galdin [...]*> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘one small writing board’.
studies were outlined and discussed. By contrast, in this thesis, I will treat compounds found in Old Latvian texts from a different perspective. Firstly, I will not use the orthographic criterion for delimiting compounds from noun phrases in Old Latvian. Secondly, cases which are formally ambiguous will be discussed separately and not treated as compounds in this work. Thirdly, compounds in Old Latvian will be analyzed not only in terms of their form, but also in terms of their meaning. Finally, Old Latvian compounds will be systematically compared to compounds in the other Baltic languages, Lithuanian in particular. This is why the compounds in Old Latvian will be arranged according to the categories that prevail in the Baltic languages. In the following section, the categorization of compounds, which will be used in this thesis for organizing Old Latvian compounds, will be presented in more detail.

2.3 The classification of compounds used in this thesis

In this work, I will organize the compounds in Old Latvian following the categorization of compounds employed by Olsen (1999, pp. 657–759; 2002) and Larsson (2002b, 2010a, forthcoming). The aim of this section is thus to introduce the reader with the main types of compounds treated in this study by presenting them in the wider context of the Baltic system of compounding, although the description is not intended to be exhaustive.

I would also like to make the reader aware of the fact that different schools of linguistics use various classifications of compounds depending on criteria taken as the basis for distinguishing categories. However, in this work, I do not seek to create a new classification or propose significant modifications to the existing ones, as doing so is beyond the scope of this study.


Compounds in Old Latvian will be classified according to internal semantic and formal relations between the components, a compound taken as a whole, and external relations to other parts of the sentence. Hence, the analysis of the Old Latvian compounds presented in this dissertation will combine both semantic and formal criteria, i.e., compounds will be analyzed in terms of their meaning (i.e., semantic interpretation) and form (i.e., formal properties).

The main categories that will be described in the following are the determinative compounds (also called endocentric\textsuperscript{39} in the literature), the possessive compounds (or bahuvrihis, literally ‘much-riced’, i.e., ‘having much rice’; also referred to as exocentric compounds,\textsuperscript{40} cf. Bauer, 2008; Haspelmath & Sims, 2010, pp. 140–141), the verbal governing compounds (also: synthetic compounds, cf., e.g., Bauer, 2001, pp. 701–702; Stundžia, 2016, pp. 3092–3093), and the copulative compounds. These compounds are also referred to as \textit{dvandva}, co-compounds (cf. Wälchli, 2005, 2015) or coordinate compounds (cf. Aikhenvald, 2007, p. 31) in the literature.

Each type of compound will be illustrated with examples from Modern Latvian, Modern Lithuanian, and Old Prussian (when possible). Compounds will be quoted from the above-mentioned works devoted to Baltic linguistics and the following dictionaries: Mühlenbach and Endzelin’s dictionary \textit{Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch} (MEe), and \textit{Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca} (LLVVVe) for Latvian; \textit{Lietuvių kalbos žodynas} (LKŽe), \textit{Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas} (DLKŽ) for Lithuanian.

2.3.1 Determinative compounds

Determinative compounds are widely attested in the Baltic languages. In compounds of this type, the first component determines the second component, which is the semantic head. The part-of-speech membership of these compounds in the Baltic languages depends on the final component, namely the semantic head, which is most often based on nouns, or adjectives more rarely. Hence, determinative compounds are generally nouns, although there are several adjectival compounds, cf. Latv. \textit{biez-pien-s} (LLVVVe) ‘curd’ (\leftarrow \textit{biez-s} ‘thick’ + \textit{pien-s} ‘milk’), Lith. \textit{krauj-ā-gysl-ē} (DLKŽ) ‘blood-vessel’ (\leftarrow \textit{krauja}s ‘blood’ + \textit{gysl-a} ‘vein’), Latv. \textit{snieg-balt-s} (LLVVVe) ‘snow-white’ (\leftarrow \textit{snieg-s} ‘snow’ + \textit{balt-s} ‘white’), Lith. \textit{žo\={l}-žal-ias} (LKŽe) ‘grass-green’ (\leftarrow \textit{žo\={l}}-\textit{ė} ‘grass’ + \textit{žal-ias} ‘green’). Determinative compounds can also take a verbal noun as the second component, which synchronically may or may not function as an uncompounded word in the Baltic languages, cf. Lith. \textit{ak-ı̀-mirk-a} (DLKŽ) ‘moment, twinkling of an eye’ (\leftarrow \textit{ak-ı̀s} ‘eye’ + cf. \textit{mirk-ti} ‘to wink’).\textsuperscript{41}

In addition to the general tendency of coining right-headed compounds in the Baltic languages, there are some determinative compounds which have

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{39} In the case of endocentric compounds, the semantic head is expressed by one of the components in a compound. This means that it is ‘inside’ the compound. Hence, the referent is the same as the referent of one of the components of the compound (Larsson, 2010a, p. 13).\textsuperscript{40} In exocentric compounds, the semantic head is not expressed by the components in a compound, and it is, therefore, ‘outside’ the compound. In other words, the referent is not the same as the referent of one of the components (Larsson, 2010a, p. 13).\textsuperscript{41} According to Larsson (2002b, p. 211), in those determinative compounds ending in \textit{-a}, the second component was most probably an original action noun.}
reverse order of the components. Thus, the head occurs as first component, cf. Lit. virš-ù-galv-is (DLKŽ) ‘top of the head’ (← virš-ùs ‘top’ + galv-à ‘head’) next to galv-à-virš-is (LKŽe) ‘id.’ and galv-ó-virš-is (LKŽe) ‘id.’.

Based on internal relations between the components in a compound, the determinative compounds can be further subdivided into smaller groups such as dependent determinative compounds and attributive determinative compounds.

Dependent determinative compounds or case compounds are based on two nouns for which the semantic relationship between the components is often that of a genitive and its complement. Examples of this type in the Baltic languages are: Latv. māj-viet-a (LLVVe) ‘home, accommodation’ (← māj-a ‘house’ + viet-a ‘spot, place’), Lith. darb-à-dien-is (DLKŽ) ‘working day’ (← dārb-as ‘work’ + dien-à ‘day’), OPr. malun-a-kel-an (Nom./Acc.sg.) (EV) ‘mill-wheel’ (← malun-is ‘mill’ + kel-an (Nom./Acc.sg.) ‘wheel’), cf. Larsson (2010a, p. 48).

In the attributive determinative compounds, the second component, i.e., the semantic head, is based on a noun, while the first component can often include an adjective and numeral, cf. Latv. liel-cel-š (LLVVe) ‘highway’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + cel-š ‘way, road’), Lith. sen-à-miest-is (DLKŽ) ‘old town’ (← sēn-as ‘old’ + miest-as ‘town’), OPr. grēiw-a-kaul-in (Acc.sg.) (III) ‘rib’, Latv. tres-dal-a (LLVVe) ‘one third, a third’ (← tres-ais ‘third’ + dal-a ‘part’), Lith. pirm-à-dien-is (DLKŽ) ‘Monday’ (← pirm-as ‘first’ + dien-à ‘day’). The first component is more rarely based on a pronoun or a verbal stem, Latv. paš-cien-a (LLVVe) ‘self-respect, dignity’ (← pat-s ‘self’ + cien-a ‘esteem, respect’), Lith. sav-i-meil-ė (DLKŽ) ‘egoism’ (← sav-as ‘own’ + meil-ė ‘love’), Latv. ēdam-istab-a (LLVVe) ‘dining-room’ (← cf. ēs-t ‘to eat’ + istab-a ‘room’).

2.3.2 Possessive compounds

Possessive compounds constitute a productive category in Latvian and Lithuanian, whereas compounds of this type are rarely attested in Old Prussian.43 In terms of structure, possessive compounds correspond to determinative compounds, but the difference is that possessive compounds are used exocentrically (cf. Olsen, 2000, p. 908). These compounds most often express a quality of a thing that is possessed by someone, understood as ‘having something’, cf. Latv. zeltmate meitene (LLVVe) ‘a golden-haired girl, i.e., a girl who has golden hair’: zelt-mat-is, -e ‘having golden hair’ (← zelt-s ‘gold’ + mat-s ‘hair’); Lith. auksaplatikė merginā (DLKŽ) ‘a golden-haired girl, i.e., a girl

---

42 For an etymology of this compound, cf. Larsson (2010a, pp. 52–53).
who has golden hair': *auks-a-plauk-is, -e ‘having golden hair’ (← *áuks-as ‘gold’ + *plauk-as ‘hair’).

Possessive compounds can generally be used as adjectives. However, compounds of this kind can also acquire substantivized meaning and thus are used as nouns in the Baltic languages. For instance, Lithuanian *ilg-a-piršt-is (← *ilg-as ‘long’ + *piršt-as ‘finger’) is an adjective implying a quality of a thing that somebody has, i.e., *having fingers that are long. In other contexts, this compound can denote a person who steals something from another person or place. Thus, possessive compounds in the Baltic languages can be nominalized.

The second component in the possessive compounds is usually a noun. The first component can sometimes be a noun, too, cf. Latv. *zelt-mat-is, -e (LLVVe) ‘having golden hair’ (← *zelt-s ‘gold’ + *mat-s ‘hair’), Lith. *auks-a-plauk-is, -e (DLKŽ) ‘having golden hair’ (← *áuks-as ‘gold’ + *plauk-as ‘hair’). It can also be an adjective or a numeral, cf. Latv. *balt-galv-is, -e (LLVVe) ‘having white, blond hair’ (← *balt-s ‘white’ + *galv-a ‘head’), Latv. *vien-kāj-is, -e (LLVVe) ‘having one leg’ (← *vien-s ‘one’ + *kāj-a ‘leg, foot’). In the Baltic languages, a small group of possessive compounds with pronouns as first components is also found. Examples of this kind are: Latv. *pat-galv-is, -e (MEe) ‘self-willed, wilful’ (← *pat-s ‘self’ + *galv-a ‘head’), Lith. *sav-a-darb-is, -e (DLKŽ) ‘self-made’ (← *sāv-as ‘own’ + *dārb-as ‘work’).

2.3.3 Verbal governing compounds

The verbal governing compounds constitute a fairly productive type of compound in the Baltic languages. They include a noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun or an adverb as first component. The second component is a verbal stem that may or may not exist as an uncompounded word, cf. Latv. *rok-peln-is, -e (LLVVe) ‘manual laborer’ (← *rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + cf. *peln-ī-t ‘to earn, to get’), Lith. *darb-dav-ỹs, -e (DLKŽ) ‘employer’ (← *dārb-as ‘work’ + cf. *dio-ti ‘to give’), OPr. *dag-o-aug-is (EV) ‘a shoot of a plant as it grows in one summer’ (← *dag-is (EV) ‘summer’ + cf. *aug- ‘to grow’), cf. Larsson (2002b, p. 218).

If the first component is a noun, it often functions as an argument of a verb that occurs in the second component. In cases of this kind, the first component is governed as the object by the verbal second component. Other internal relations, i.e., the first component is a subject, can also occur, but they are rare, as is stated in LKG (1965, p. 463). One finds other internal relations, too, when the first component is an adjective, numeral, pronoun or an adverb.

From a semantic point of view, the verbal governing compounds fall into three types in the Baltic languages, cf. MLLVG (1959, pp. 215–216), LKG (1965, pp. 463–464), Senn (1966, p. 341), Larsson (2002b, p. 217–218), and Stundžia (2016, pp. 3092–3093). Firstly, compounds of this category can have
a meaning of agent nouns that denote living beings, cf. Latv. *lab-dar-is, -e* (LLVVe) ‘well-doer, benefactor’ (← *lab-s* ‘good’ + cf. *dar-t* ‘to do, to perform’), Lith. *žmog-žud-ys, -ė* (DLKŽ) ‘murderer’ (← *žmog-ūs* ‘human being’ + cf. *žud-ūti* ‘to kill, to murder’). Secondly, they also indicate instruments by which an action is performed, cf. Latv. *druv-nes-is* (MEE) ‘dish in which food is carried to the workers in the fields’ (← *druv-a* ‘field’ + cf. *nes-t* ‘to carry, to bear’), Lith. *laĭk-rod-is* (DLKŽ) ‘clock’ (← *laĭk-as* ‘time’ + cf. *rőd-y-ti* ‘to show’). Thirdly, there is a group of action nouns that express the time when an action takes place, cf. Latv. *lap-krit-is* (MEE) ‘autumn; the season when leaves are falling’ (← *lap-a* ‘leaf’ + cf. *kris-t* ‘to fall, to drop’), Lith. *lin-ā-myn-is* (DLKŽ) ‘flax-breaking or flax-breaking season’ (← *lin-as* ‘flax’ + cf. *min-ti* ‘to break’).

However, it is not always possible to draw a clear line between the verbal governing compounds and other categories of compounds in Latvian and Lithuanian (Larsson, 2002b, p. 218). For instance, those compounds that have the verbal second component can also function as adjectives and thus can have an alternative analysis as possessive compounds, cf. an instance where the first component is a noun: Lith. *vabzdž-ia-ė̃d-is*44 *augalas* (DLKŽ) ‘insect-eating plant’ (← *vabzd-ys* ‘insect’ + cf. *ė̃s-ti* ‘to eat’); when the first component is a pronoun: Lith. *vis-a-rėg-ė̃s* *Dīvās* (DLKŽ) ‘all-seeing God’ (← *vis-as* ‘all, the whole’ + cf. *rėg-ė̃-ti* ‘to see’). From a formal point of view, compounds of this type correspond to the other verbal governing compounds, i.e., the second component is a verbal stem, and thus they are regarded as the verbal governing compounds in this thesis.

### 2.3.4 Copulative compounds


---

44 In synchronic descriptions of compounds in Lithuanian (e.g., LKG, 1965, p. 445ff.), -ia- is considered to be one of the linking elements used in forming Modern Lithuanian compounds. However, I would like to note that the grapheme <i>a</i> here only indicates the palatalization of the preceding consonant. In this example, it also implies that the first component is of an ja-stem origin.
In fact, in the Old Latvian texts, I have found only one trustworthy example of copulative compounds, cf. *miež-auz-i* (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2) ‘mixture of barley and oats’ (← *miež-* ‘barley’ + *auz-* ‘oat’). Arguably, the compositional suffix *-is* could have been added to this compound, which could show some degree of univerbation, cf. the above-mentioned Lithuanian example of this kind: *kōj-a-galv-iai* ‘dish of calves’ (see section 2.3.5.2 on the compositional suffix in the compounds in the Baltic languages). However, the fact that this Old Latvian compound is attested only in the plural form makes it difficult to decide whether the suffix was actually used in this case.

Due to the lack of attestations in Old Latvian, copulative compounds will not be treated in the following analysis of this thesis.

2.3.5 Compounds in the Baltic languages

2.3.5.1 The form of the first component

Compounds in the Baltic languages can have a linking element between their components. From a synchronic point of view, this is a semantically empty element used in forming compounds (cf. Urbutis, 2009, p. 280), cf. Lith. *kiet-a-kākt-is* ‘thickheaded’ (← *kiet-as* ‘hard’ + *kakt-à* ‘forehead’); Lith. *virš-ù-kaln-ė* ‘top/peak of a mountain’ (← *virš-ùs* ‘top, upper part’ + *kaln-as* ‘mountain, hill’).

Historically linking elements can be traced back to case forms or original stem vowels of the first component, cf. Skardžius (1943, pp. 405–407, 415–424), Endzelīns (1951, pp. 260–261), Urbutis (1961, p. 77ff.), Larsson (2002b, pp. 214–215). This distinction can be easiest seen from determinative compounds that are formed from two nouns. If the first component is inflected, the genitive case is most common. In Latvian, compounds of this kind are fairly loosely joined together when the components keep their stem form as uncompounded words, cf. Latv. *tautas-dziesm-a* (LLVVe) ‘folk song’ (← cf. *taut-as* (Gen.sg.) ‘nation, folk’ + *dziesm-a* (Nom.sg.) ‘song’). On the contrary, as it is suggested by Larsson (2002b, p. 215), one can see some degree of univerbation in compounds in Lithuanian when the compositional suffix *-is* (m.)/-*ė* (f.) is added (see section 2.5.4.2), e.g., *kōj-ų-gal-ės* ‘foot (of a bed)’ (← cf. *kōj-ų* (Gen.pl.) ‘leg, foot’ + *gāl-as* (Nom.sg.) ‘end’). An example of a compound with the genitive in the first component in Old Prussian is: *buttas-taws* (Nom.sg.) (III) ‘house-father’ (← cf. *butt-an* (Nom.sg.) ‘house’ + *tāw-s* ‘father’), cf. Larsson (2010a, p. 67).

Compounds in which the first component ends in an original stem vowel are also present in the Baltic languages. It has traditionally been claimed that

45 Latv. <Meesch=ausi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <gemanke, Mankkorn> (F1); Latv. <Meesch=Ausi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gemanck, mank=Korn> (F2).
these original stem vowels are mostly preserved in Lithuanian and Old Prussian, while in Latvian only a few relics remain, cf. Skardžius (1943, p. 406), Endzelīns (1948, p. 61; 1951, p. 259), Larsson (2002b, p. 222). However, it will be suggested in this thesis that one can find traces of the stem composition even in the Old Latvian texts (for a more detailed discussion, see chapter 3).

Some examples of the Lithuanian stem compounds grouped according to the original stem vowels are given in the following.46

(8) With an *a*-stem as first component:
Lith. *darb-ã-dien-is* (DLKŻ) ‘working day’ (← *darb-as ‘work’ + dien-ã ‘day’)

(9) With an *ā*-stem:
Lith. *dien-ó-vid-is* (LKŻe) ‘midday’ (← dien-ã ‘day’ + vid-ãs ‘inside’)

(10) With an *ē*-stem:
Lith. *žem-ē-lap-is* (LKŻe) ‘map’ (← žem-ē ‘earth, ground’ + lēp-ãs ‘sheet, page’)

(11) With an *i*-stem:
Lith. *av-ì-kail-is* (DLKŻ) ‘sheepskin’ (← av-ìs ‘sheep’ + kail-ìs ‘fur, skin’)

(12) With an *u*-stem:
 a. Lith. *virš-ù-galv-is* (DLKŻ) ‘top of the head’ (← virš-ìs ‘top’ + galv-ã ‘head’)

(13) With an old consonantal stem:
Lith. *šùn-žol-ë* (LKŻe) ‘dog-grass (a plant)’ (← cf. šůn-s (Gen.sg.) ‘dog’ + žol-ë ‘grass’)

Linking elements can also be omitted in compounds in the Baltic languages, cf. Skardžius (1943, pp. 424–429), Endzelīns (1948, pp. 63–64), Larsson (2002b, pp. 224–227). In Modern Latvian compounds, linking elements are considered to be lost to a great extent (cf. Endzelīns, 1951, p. 261), e.g., *dien-vid-ìs* (LLVVe) ‘midday’ (← dien-ì ‘day’ + vid-ìs ‘middle’), *bažnīc-kung-s* (LLVVe) ‘priest’ (← bažnīc-a ‘church’ + kung-s ‘master, lord, gentleman’).

46 Since this dissertation regards only Baltic material and does not aim at viewing it from a chronologically earlier perspective than the Common-Baltic, the following historical stem-titles of the Baltic nominal declension system are used here: masculine *a*-stem, feminine *ā*-stem, feminine *ē*-stem, masculine *u*-stem, *i*-stem, and the consonantal stem. On the origin of the Baltic *ē*-stems from stems in *-i[j̥]-*, cf. Stang (1966, p. 115, 201ff.), Larsson (2010b, p. 37ff.).
The state of linking elements in compounds in Lithuanian seems to be connected to the stress and original accent paradigm of their components. Larsson (2002b, p. 211ff.) has suggested that the accentuation of compounds in Lithuanian was based on a contrastive stress: possessive compounds (originally adjectives) had a stress on the second component, while determinative compounds (originally substantives) were stressed on the first component. Linking elements were thus retained in possessive compounds, cf. višt-a-galv-is ‘hen-headed’ (← višt-à ‘hen’ + galv-à ‘head’). However, they were lost in determinative compounds, when the stress rested on the first syllable in a compound, namely when the first component originally belonged to an immobile accent paradigm (AP 1, 2), cf. višt-kiauš-is ‘hen’s egg’ (← višt-à (AP 2) ‘hen’ + kiauš-as ‘egg’). In addition, linking elements could also be kept in determinative compounds if the first component belonged to a mobile accent paradigm (AP 3, 4). In compounds of this kind, the stress rested on the linking element and was, therefore, preserved, cf. darb-ã-dien-is ‘working day’ (← dárbs-as (AP 3) ‘work’ + dien-à ‘day’). This original distribution is no longer clearly visible in Modern Lithuanian, but it is still kept in the Old Lithuanian texts, as shown by Larsson (2002a). For a discussion about the original distribution of linking elements in Old Latvian and the correlation with stress, see chapter 7.

A summary of the accentuation of determinative and possessive compounds in Lithuanian as determined and represented by Larsson (2002b, p. 213) is presented in the following. Note that this scheme does not apply to all compounds, but it represents the general rules of accentuation applied for compounds with disyllabic components. The sign _ represents a syllable. If a syllable may not be present, it is designated as ( _ ). Then, the sign _́ represents a syllable with acute tone, while _ ̃ is used for indicating a syllable with circumflex tone. A syllable with either tone (acute or circumflex) is indicated by ˈ._

47 In addition, there are different tendencies towards the syncope of linking elements in Lithuanian varieties. The tendency to preserve or even restore linking elements is observed in the East-Aukštaitian dialect of Lithuanian, while a strong tendency to omit linking elements is seen in the Western varieties (i.e., West Aukštaitian and Žemaitian), cf. Skardžius (1943, p. 427ff.), Žinkevičius (1966, pp. 134–135), Grinaveckis (1980), Larsson (2002b, pp. 225–226), cf. EAukšt. nugar-ó-kaul-is (Kalt) ‘backbone’ (← nugar-a ‘back’ + kaul-as ‘bone’) vs. Žem. nugár-kaul-is (Kret) ‘id.’.
2.3.5.2 The form of the second component

The stem of the second component in compounds in the Baltic languages may preserve its original form, cf. Latv. *uguns-grēk-s* ‘conflagration’ (← *ugun-s* (Gen.sg.) ‘fire’ + *grēk-s* ‘sin’), Latv. *lin-sēkl-as* (Nom.pl.) ‘linseed’ (← *lin-s* ‘flax’ + *sēkl-as* (Nom.pl.) ‘seed’), Lith. *darb-y-laik-as* ‘working time’ (← *dārb-as* ‘work’ + *laik-as* ‘time’), cf. Endzelīns (1948, p. 64). An instance of a compound of this kind in Old Prussian is: *kel-laxd-e* (EV) ‘shaft of a spear’ (← *kel-ian* (Nom./Acc.sg.) ‘spear’ + *laxd-e* ‘hazel bush’), cf. Larsson (2010a, p. 46). Examples where the original form of the second component is preserved are usually attested in the dialects and they are also present in older texts, e.g., OLith. *rito-lit-us* ‘morning-rain’ (← *rīt-as* ‘morning’ + *liet-ūs* ‘rain’), cf. Larsson (2002b, p. 210).

However, a large number of compounds in the Baltic languages have the so-called compositional suffix: -is (m.)/-ė (f.) for Latvian compounds, -is (m.)/-ė (f.) for Lithuanian compounds, and -is (m.)/-ė (f.) for Old Prussian compounds.\(^{49}\) Examples of determinative compounds of this type are: Latv. *kāj-gal-is* (LLVVe) ‘foot (of a bed)’ (← *kāj-a* ‘leg, foot’ + *gal-s* ‘end, ending’) beside a variant without the suffix: *kāj-gal-s* (LLVVe) ‘id.’, Lith. *dal̄g-iā-kot-is* (DLKŽ) ‘scythe-handle’ (← *dal̄g-is* ‘scythe’ + *kot-as* ‘handle, grip’). Possessive compounds with the suffix are: Latv. *gar-kāj-is*,-ė (LLVVe) ‘long-legged’ (← *gar-š* ‘long’ + *kāj-a* ‘leg, foot’), Lith. *trump-a-kōj-is*, -ė (DLKŽ) ‘short-legged’ (← *trump-as* ‘short’ + *kōj-a* ‘leg,’

\(^{48}\) For a discussion about dialectal possessive compounds with acute tone instead of the expected circumflex tone in Lithuanian and further references, cf. Larsson (2002b, pp. 207–208).

\(^{49}\) For synchronic treatments of this compositional suffix, cf., e.g., Stundžia’s (2016, pp. 3091–3093) description of compounding in Modern Lithuanian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinative compounds</th>
<th>Possessive compounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stress on the 1st component</td>
<td>with spread of mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP1</td>
<td>[(_ _)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP2</td>
<td>[(_ _)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP3/4</td>
<td>[(_ _)]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: The accentuation of determinative and possessive compounds in Lithuanian
foot’). As for compounds in Old Prussian, a few determinative compounds may arguably have the compositional suffix, although it is more common to keep the stem form of the second component unchanged, e.g., greiw-a-kaul-in (Acc.sg.) (III) ‘rib’ (cf. caul-an[^50] (EV) ‘bone’), cf. Larsson (2002b, p. 210).

This compositional suffix is clearly a shared feature of the Baltic nominal compounds and might be inherited from East-Baltic or even Proto-Baltic (PB *-i̞jasi/*-i̞jā), cf. Larsson (2002b, pp. 205ff., 209–211); also cf. Endzelīns (1951, pp. 262–263), Forssman (2001, pp. 232–233). Possessive compounds with this suffix are found in other Indo-European languages as well (cf. Brugmann, as cited in Larsson, 2002b, p. 205).

The second component of the verbal governing compounds can also have the same compositional suffix added, cf. Latv. al-dar-is, -e (LLVVe) ‘brewer’ (← al-us ‘beer’ + cf. dar-ī-t ‘to do, to perform’), Lith. al-ū-dar-is, -ė (DLKŽ) ‘brewer’ (← al-us ‘beer’ + cf. dar-į-ti ‘to do, to perform’). However, it needs to be noted that a small group of compounds that denote agent nouns and end in -a, -as is also found. Examples of this type are: Latv. bad-mir-a (LLVVe) ‘starving person’ (← bad-s ‘hunger, famine’ + cf. mir-t ‘to die’), Lith. žod-lauž-a (DLKŽ) ‘person who is not carrying out promises’ (← žod-is ‘word’ + cf. ļauž-ti ‘to break’). Compounds ending in -a can sometimes denote both masculine and feminine gender.[^51]

A more detailed discussion about the formal properties of the components of compounds in the Baltic languages will be presented in the following chapters 3, 4, and 5, which treat compounds in the Old Latvian texts.

### 2.4 Summary

In the first section of this chapter, I introduced definitions such as compound, compounding, and linking element. These definitions will be applied in treating compounds in Old Latvian in this thesis. The first section also included a discussion on delimiting compounds from phrases in both Modern and Old Latvian, where different criteria were discussed. It was concluded that one cannot treat word units with both inflected components as compounds in Old Latvian, as there were no sufficient reasons for proving their status as compounds. Then, previous works on compounds in Old Latvian were reviewed by highlighting the most problematic aspects of these accounts. Lastly, the categorization of compounds employed in this thesis treating compounds in Old Latvian was described by presenting it in a broader context of the Baltic

[^50]: Larsson (2002b, p. 210) quotes Mažiulis (1988, p. 405), who argues that this compound has the suffix, but Larsson also draws attention to the fact that both forms kaul-ei (Nom.pl.) and kaul-ës (Acc.pl.) are attested in Old Prussian Catechisms.

system of compounding. In the following chapters of this thesis, the main categories of the Old Latvian compounds, i.e., the determinative compounds, the possessive compounds, and the verbal governing compounds, will be analyzed in more detail. Note that the scarce attestations of the Old Latvian copulative compounds were already addressed in this chapter; thus they will not be treated in the main analysis of this thesis.
In this chapter, determinative compounds found in the texts of the middle period of Early Written Latvian are treated. This category of compounds is the most productive category in comparison with the other types of Old Latvian compounds, i.e., ca. 72.3% of all Old Latvian compounds treated in this work are determinative compounds. The main aim of this investigation is to discern the most characteristic formal properties of determinative compounds found in Old Latvian texts. Another aim is to determine whether this type of compound was formally distinguished from the other categories of Old Latvian compounds, namely the possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds, which will be treated in the following chapters of this thesis. The formal properties of the determinative compounds in Old Latvian will also be discussed in comparison to the determinative compounds in Lithuanian.

This chapter is organized as follows: in the first section, formally ambiguous cases comprising two nouns are addressed. Then, groups of determinative compounds based on internal relations between the components are presented. In the following sections, the forms of the first and second components are treated with the main focus being on the state of linking elements and the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.). The main results of this investigation are summarized in the last section.

3.1 Formally ambiguous cases including two nouns

It will be argued in this chapter that many Old Latvian determinative compounds, which consist of two nouns, have a linking element between their components. One of the main aims of this chapter is thus to tackle the issue of the origin of these elements and to suggest the explanation for the distribution of linking elements in compounds of this category in Old Latvian.

I will, therefore, start this chapter by addressing the most problematic cases of word units found in the Old Latvian texts, namely instances based on two nouns where the first component is a noun of a masculine a-stem. From a synchronic point of view, the first component is identical to a corresponding uncompounded word in the genitive case. A few instances of this kind in Old Latvian are presented in (1).

That the first component is inflected in the above-mentioned examples, i.e., it is used in the genitive case, was, in fact, argued in previous works. For instance, Skujiņa (2006, pp. 20–69) suggests that such examples found in the dictionary of Mancelius must be regarded as compounds where the first component is in the genitive case, cf. *darba-dien-a* (PhL) ‘working day’ (cf. *darb-a* (Gen.sg.) ‘work’ + *dien-a* ‘day’).\(^52\) Furthermore, this productive type with genitive in the first component, according to Skujiņa (2006, p. 20; 2008, pp. 117–119), paved the way for the spread of the analogical genitive (i.e., *<a>*) to compounds with two nouns where the first component was of a different stem (e.g., *i*-stem), cf. *kara-vīr-s* (PhL) ‘soldier, warrior’ (cf. *kar-a* (Gen.sg.) *(a*-stem) ‘war’ + *vīr-s* ‘man’) beside *gova-pien-s* (PhL) ‘cow’s milk’ (cf. *gov-s* *(i*-stem) ‘cow’ + *pien-s* ‘milk’). For a more detailed discussion about compounds with an etymologically unexpected linking element *<a>*, see section 3.3.1.1 below.

However, in my opinion, the above-mentioned examples with nouns of a masculine *a*-stem in the first component are problematic for several reasons and thus must be carefully treated. First of all, it was already discussed in chapter 2 that due to the formally ambiguous first component one cannot clearly differentiate examples of this kind from noun phrases. Second of all, even if some of these instances with an ambiguous first component were already functioning as compounds, one cannot jump to a conclusion about the origin of the first component, although superficially it may seem to be in the genitive case, as suggested by Skujiņa (2006). Hence, in what follows, I will propose a different interpretation of the origin of the first component in the examples where the first component is a noun of a masculine *a*-stem ending in *<a>*. Firstly, it must be pointed out that some of these ambiguous first components were based on nouns that at that time existed both as masculine and feminine stems. This is why *<a>* used as the final syllable of the first component in cases of this kind cannot only be analyzed as a genitive ending of a noun of a masculine stem. In my opinion, it cannot be excluded that even in

\(^{52}\) Note that Skujiņa (2006) treats all hyphenated instances, and those in which components were written together, as compounds irrespective of the formal ambiguity of the first component.
some of these ambiguous instances, the first component occurred in an original stem. Hence, many examples of this kind, which were previously analyzed only as compounds with the first component in the genitive case, can be questioned. A representative list of instances, in which the first component was both of a masculine and feminine stems, is provided in (2). Note that the existence of morphological variants of nouns used in composition in Old Latvian was, in fact, overlooked in previous studies.


b. *alva-rīk-s* ‘tool, instrument made of tin’ (cf. *alv-s* (F1, F2), *alva* (L) ‘tin’ + *rīk-s* ‘tool, instrument’) Latv. <[... Allwa=rieku [...]> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <[... das Zinnen=zeug [...]> (PhL)


d. *bērza-tās-s* ‘birch-bark’ (cf. *bērza-s* (F1, F2), *bērza-is* (F1, F2), *bērza-a* (LD) ‘birchen’ + *tās-s* (F1, F2), *tās-as* (Nom.pl.) (PhL), *tās-is* (M/J) ‘birch-bark’) Latv. <Bähr=sa=tahs> beside Germ. <Bürcken=dawer> (LD)


g. *lapsa-kažok-s* ‘fox fur coat’ (cf. *laps-is* (M/L), *laps-a* (LD) ‘fox’ + *kažok-s* ‘fur coat’) Latv. <Lapʃa=kaʃchohx> beside Germ. <ein Fuchspeltz> (PhL)


Secondly, another important reason to doubt Skujiņa’s (2006, p. 20; 2008, pp. 117–119) analysis presented above is the origin of the first component in compounds of the same type in Lithuanian. It is clear that the first component in
the Lithuanian counterparts ends in an original stem vowel. Consider the following pairs of counterparts in Old Latvian and Lithuanian presented in (3) and (4).


   b. MLith. *darb-ä-dien-is* (DLKŻ) ‘working day’ (← *dár-b-as* ‘work’ + *dien-ä* ‘day’)


   b. MLith. *darž-ä-viet-ė* (LKŻe) ‘place, land of a former kitchen garden’ (← *darž-as* ‘kitchen garden’ + *viet-ä* ‘place, spot’)

Thirdly, I will argue in section 3.3.1 below that a number of Old Latvian determinative compounds have linking elements that can be traced back to the original stem vowels of the first components. Hence, it will be proposed that in the Old Latvian texts of this period, one still finds relics of stem composition that are no longer visible in Modern Latvian. This is why we cannot rule out the possibility that even in the aforementioned cases, the first component based on a noun of a masculine stem ended in a stem vowel originally.

On the whole, it is clear that one cannot jump to a conclusion about the origin of the first component in word units of this kind in Old Latvian, as a part of the first components might also have ended in an original stem vowel. However, judging from the evidence attested in the Old Latvian texts, it is not possible to discern whether the first component in instances of this kind was originally a stem vowel or an inflectional ending. It might have been the case that examples of both types, i.e., compounds with the first component occurring in its stem and examples with an inflected first component, gradually coalesced due to the identical form of the first component. Hence, due to the ambiguous state of the form of the first component found in the Old Latvian texts, I have decided not to treat examples of this type as clear cases of determinative compounds in the following and have instead left them aside for the sake of clarity.
3.2 Groups of determinative compounds

In this section, groups of determinative compounds arranged into smaller subgroups according to the internal relations between the components are presented. Since in the Old Latvian texts one finds a large number of the determinative compounds, only a representative selection of instances, which will be discussed in greater detail in this chapter, is listed in this section. The full collection of determinative compounds found in Early Written Latvian texts is presented in the appendix. Note that formally ambiguous instances with the first inflected component discussed above are not listed in the following subgroups of Old Latvian determinative compounds.

By far, the largest group of determinative compounds in Old Latvian comprises the dependent determinative compounds, the components of which are nouns. Another smaller subgroup consists of attributive determinative compounds, in which the first component is typically an adjective, numeral or a verbal stem, and the second component is a noun.

Determinative compounds in Old Latvian generally include two components. Hence, formations of three components are comparatively rare in the Old Latvian texts. An example of this type is: aukst-baznīc-kung-s (LD) ‘high priest’ (← aukst-s ‘high’ + baznīc-a ‘church’ + kung-s ‘lord, master, gentleman’). Note that they will not be listed in the following groups.

3.2.1 Dependent determinative compounds

N+N

- ac-a-mirk(s)-is ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + mirk(s)-is ‘blink, instant’) Latv. <Atza=mirckslis (Atza=mircklis)> beside Germ. <ein Augenblick> (LD)
- ac-a-zob-i (Nom.pl.) ‘eyeteeth’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + zob-s ‘tooth’) Latv. <tee Atza=ʃohbi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Augenzähne> (PhL)
- asin-i-sērg-a ‘dysentery’ (← asin-s (L), asin-is (LD) ‘blood’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’) Latv. <Aʃśiniśährgha> beside Germ. <rohte Ruhr> (L)
- av-i-kūt-s ‘sheepfold’ (← av-s (L), av-is (LD) ‘sheep’ + kūt-s ‘shed’) Latv. <[..] es fakka iums, kas pa tem durwem ne eēt ekjzan to awwikûti [..]> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘I say to you, who does not enter the sheepfold’

- baznīc-a-kung-s ‘priest’ (← baznīc-a ‘church’ + kung-s ‘lord, master, gentleman’) Latv. ⟨ [...] Bažnicakungu [...] ⟩ (Gen.pl.) (EE)
- dārz-ābol-s ‘garden apple’ (← dārz-s ‘garden’ + ābol-s ‘apple’) Latv. <Dahrs=Ahboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gärten Äpfel> (F1)
- degun-aut-s ‘handkerchief’ (← degun-s ‘nose’ + aut-s ‘binding’) Latv. <Dāggun=autz> beside Germ. <Schnuptuch> (PhL)
- gald-aut-s ‘tablecloth’ (← gald-s ‘table’ + aut-s ‘binding’) Latv. <Ghalld=auts> beside Germ. <Tiʃchtuch> (L)
- galv-a-sāp-e ‘headache’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’) Latv. <Ghallwa=šahpe> beside Germ. <Hauptweh> (PhL)
- galv-a-virs-s ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s (KIV) ‘surface’) Latv. <Ghallwawirß> beside Germ. <der Wirbel> (PhL)
- gult-a-viet-a ‘bed, sleeping-place’ (← gult-a ‘bed’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’) Latv. <Ghullta=weeta> beside Germ. <ein Bett> (PhL)
- kāj-a-sāp-es (Nom.pl.) ‘leg ache’ (← kāj-a ‘leg, foot’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’) Latv. <Kahja=śahpes> (Nom.pl.) beside <Podagra> (L)
- kāz-drēb-es (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding garment’ (← kāz-as (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding’ + drēb-es (Nom.pl.) ‘cloth’) Latv. ⟨ [...] vnd eredʒæia tur wenu cilvæku næapterptu ar kaʒadræbes⟩ (Instr.pl.) (EE) ‘and saw there a man who had no wedding garment’
- māj-a-viet-a ‘home, accommodation’ (← māj-a ‘house, building’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’) Latv. <Mahjeweeta> beside Germ. <Behauʃung> (L)
- muit-a-nam-s ‘custom-house’ (← muit-a ‘customs’ + nam-s ‘house, home’) Latv. <Muita=Namß> beside Germ. <Zollhauß> (PhL)
- rok-a-dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) ‘quern’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’) Latv. <Rohka=dʃirrnus> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Handmüle> (L)
- sān-kaul-s ‘rib’ (← sān-s ‘side’ + kaul-s ‘bone’) Latv. <Śahnkauls> beside Germ. <Ribbe> (L)
- vid-u-gavēn-i (Nom.pl.) ‘mid-Lent’ (← vid-us ‘middle’ + gavēn-is (PhL), gavēn-e (L) ‘fast’) Latv. <Widdu=ghaweni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Mitfaʃten> (PhL)
3.2.2 Attributive determinative compounds

A+N

- garīg-a-dziesm-ems (Dat.pl.) ‘hymn’ (← garīg- ‘spiritual, ecclesiastical’ + dziesm-a (LD), dziesm-is (PhL) ‘song’)
  Latv. <[...] garrigadžiems [...]> (Dat.pl.) (EE)
- gar-kūl-is ‘long and straight straw’ (← gar- ‘long’ + kūl-is ‘sheaf’)
  Latv. <Garīgadži> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lang Stroh> (PhL)
- liel-a-dien-as (Gen.sg.) ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)
  Latv. < [...] prekʃjan Leladenas [...] > (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘before Easter day’
- saus-sīl-k-e ‘smoked herring’ (← saus-s ‘dry’ + sīl-k-e (LD), sīl-k-is (L) ‘herring’)
  Latv. <Śauss=sillke> beside Germ. <Bück Blaue=ling> (LD)
- svē-dien-a ‘Sunday’ (← svēt-s ‘holy, blessed, sacred’ + dien-a ‘day’)
  Latv. <Śwehdeena> beside Germ. <Sontag> (PhL)
- tiev-gal-is ‘thin end’ (← tiev- ‘thin, slim’ + gal-s ‘end, ending’)
  Latv. <Teew=gallis> beside Germ. <das schmalle Ende> (F1)

Num+N

- pirm-bērn-is ‘first child, offspring’ (← pirm-ais ‘first’ + bērn-s ‘child’)
  Latv. <Pirm=behrnis> beside Germ. <Ein erstes Kindt> (F1)
- pirm-dien-a ‘Monday’ (← pirm-ais ‘first’ + dien-a ‘day’)
  Latv. <Pirmdeena> beside Germ. <Montag> (PhL)

V+N

- adām-a-dat-as (Nom.pl.) ‘knitting-needle’ (← cf. ad-ī-t ‘to knit’ + adat- ‘needle’)
  Latv. <Addama=addatas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Knüttʃpieʃʃe> (PhL)
- guļam-a-kambar-is ‘sleeping-room’ (← cf. gul-ē-t ‘to sleep, to lie’ + kambar-is (L), kambar-s (PhL) ‘room, chamber’)
  Latv. <guļamakambaris> beside Germ. <Schlaffkammer> (L)
- lūdzam-a-nam-s ‘praying house’ (← cf. lūg-t ‘to ask, to plead’ + nam-s ‘house, home’)
  Latv. <Mans Nams irr weens Nams tahs Luhgsčanas (weens luhdʃama=NAMS) [...] > (VLH) ‘My house is a house of prayer (a praying house)’
3.3 The form of the first component

In this section, the form of the first component of determinative compounds in Old Latvian is considered. As will be shown in the following, a number of determinative compounds contain linking elements between their components, i.e., they comprise around 38.4% of all determinative compounds found in Old Latvian texts. However, one can also find numerous instances of compounds of this type that are coined without linking elements (ca. 61.6% of the total number of determinative compounds). In addition, there are several pairs of determinative compounds when the same compound is used with and without a linking element. The following analysis, thus, discusses this morphological variation of the first component of Old Latvian determinative compounds and investigates the distribution and origin of linking elements used in this category.

3.3.1 Determinative compounds with linking elements

Linking elements are found in a number of determinative compounds attested in the Old Latvian texts, mostly in compounds found in the texts of Mancelius. A linking element is one of the formal properties differentiating compounds from noun phrases with the first inflected part in Old Latvian. Compare a compound in (5a) and a phrase in (5b). Note that there is no change in meaning.
(5) a. compound: māj-a-viet-u (Acc.sg.) (L) ‘home, accommodation’
   \[\text{← māj-a ‘home’ + viet-u (Acc.sg.) ‘spot, place’}\]
   Latv. <Mahjawetu doht> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <beherbergen> (L)

b. phrase: māj-as (Gen.sg.) viet-u (Acc.sg.) (VLH) ‘home, accommodation’
   Doddaites cits citam Mājas=vietu bez Kurnēšanas. (VLH)
   <Dohdatees zits zittam Mahjas=weetu bes Kurnešchanas>
   ‘Provide home to one another without grumbling’

Furthermore, linking elements are mainly used in the determinative compounds, whereas they rarely occur in compounds of other categories (see chapters 4 and 5). Hence, a linking element is one of the main formal properties which distinguishes the determinative compounds from the possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian, as shown in (6).

(6) a. determinative compound:
   galv-a-virs-s ‘top of the head’
   \[\text{← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s (KIV) ‘surface’}\]
   Latv. <Ghallwawirß> beside Germ. <der Wirbel> (PhL)

b. possessive compound:
   trak-galv-is ‘daredevil’
   \[\text{← trak-s ‘insane, possessed’ + galv-a ‘head’}\]
   Latv. <trackghallwis> beside Germ. <verwegen/ kühn> (L)

c. verbal governing compound:
   pup-zīd-is ‘infant’
   \[\text{← pup-s (PhL), pup-a (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. zīs-t ‘to suckle’}\]
   Latv. <pup=sihdihs> beside Germ. <ein Zitzen=Säuger> (F1)

Linking elements are mainly used in those Old Latvian determinative compounds in which the first component is a noun. The largest group includes dependent determinative compounds that contain two nouns, cf. galv-a-virs-s (PhL) ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s (KIV) ‘surface’), muit-a-nam-s (PhL) ‘customs house’ (← muit-a ‘customs’ + nam-s ‘house, home’).\(^{54}\) As it was described in chapter 2, compounds of this kind are case compounds where the relationship between their components would often be of a genitive and its complement. Furthermore, as it will be argued in this chapter, many linking elements in Old Latvian compounds originate from the genitive endings or original stem vowels of nouns used as first components in dependent determinative compounds. This is why, in my opinion, one mostly finds linking elements in compounds of this kind in Old Latvian.

\(^{54}\) Latv. <Ghallwawirß> beside Germ. <der Wirbel> (PhL); Latv. <Muita=Namß> beside Germ. <Zollhaus> (PhL).
Attributive determinative compounds with adjectives and numerals as first components generally lack linking elements between their components. However, few rare attestations with the linking element \(<a>\) are found in the text of Elger (see section 3.3.1.2). These instances with the linking element \(<a>\) show a general tendency by Elger to coin compounds with linking elements. A more detailed discussion regarding the tendencies of compounding seen in the text by Elger is presented in chapter 7.

The only group where a linking element \(<a>\) is systematically used in the case of attributive determinative compounds include compounds with the verbal first component, i.e., the stem of the present tense passive participle, cf. *gulam-a-kambar-is* (L) ‘sleeping-room’ (← cf. *gul-ē-t* ‘to sleep, to lie’ + *kambar-is* (L), *kambar-s* (PhL) ‘room, chamber’).\(^{55}\) For a discussion of compounds of this type, see section 3.3.1.2.

In the following section, I will discuss the aforementioned distribution of linking elements in determinative compounds and address issues related to the origin of linking elements in this category of compounds in Old Latvian.

### 3.3.1.1 Dependent determinative compounds

By far the most common linking element used in determinative compounds in Old Latvian is \(<a>\). Compounds with other elements such as \(<e>\), \(<i>\), \(<u>\) are more rarely attested in the Old Latvian texts. The distribution of these elements depends on the original stem of the first component, i.e., a noun. This is why the linking element \(<a>\) is mostly found in compounds where the first component is a noun of a feminine ā-stem.\(^{56}\) This group of compounds is the largest one among the other groups of determinative compounds with linking elements. Consider compounds of this kind in (7).

(7) a. *baznīc-a-kung-s* ‘priest’ (← *baznīc-a* ‘church’ + *kung-s* ‘lord, master, gentleman’) Latv. <[...]> Bažnicakungu [...] (Gen.pl.) (EE)

b. *bruņ-a-kambar-is* ‘armour room’ (← *bruņ-as* (Nom.pl.) ‘armour’ + *kambar-is* (L), *kambar-s* (PhL) ‘room, chamber’) Latv. <Bruņņakambaris> beside Germ. <Harniʃchkammer> (L)

c. *galv-a-bruņ-a* ‘helmet’ (← *galv-a* ‘head’ + *bruņ-as* (Nom.pl.) ‘armour’) Latv. <Vnd vʒiemmet a tas fwaetibas galwabrunnie [...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘and take the helmet of salvation’

---

\(^{55}\) Latv. <ghuļlamakambaris> beside Germ. <Schlafkammer> (L).

\(^{56}\) A linking element \(<a>\) is also used in the following instance, although the form of the second component is unclear: *dien-a-vid-u* (?) (F1, F2) ‘noon’ (← *dien-a* ‘day’ + *vid-us* ‘middle’): Latv. <Deena widdu> (?) beside Germ. <der mittag> (F1). Also cf. *dien-a-vid-us* (Gen.sg.) vējs (F2) ‘south wind’ (← *dien-a* ‘day’ + *vid-us* ‘middle’): Latv. <Deena widdus wehjs> beside Germ. <Südwind> (F2).
d. galv-a-virs-s ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s (KIV) ‘surface’) Latv. <Ghallwawirß> beside Germ. <der Wirbel> (PhL)
e. gult-a-viet-a ‘bed, sleeping-place’ (← gult-a ‘bed’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’) Latv. <Ghullta=weeta> beside Germ. <ein Bett> (PhL)
f. iev-a-kok-s ‘bird-cherry (tree)’ (← iev-a ‘bird-cherry’ + kok-s ‘tree’) Latv. <Ewa kohks> beside Germ. <faulbaum> (F1)
g. kāz-drēb-es (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding garment’ (← kāz-as (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding’ + drēb-es (Nom.pl.) ‘cloth’) Latv. <[...] vnd eredgœia tur wenu cilvœku næapterptu ar kaðadrœbes> (Instr.pl.) (EE) ‘and saw there a man who had no wedding garment’
h. liep-a-krij-s ‘linden bark’ (← liep-a ‘linden’ + krij-s (F1, F2), krij-is (LD), krij-a (LD) ‘bark’) Latv. <Leepea krihœs> beside Germ. <linden borke> (F1)
i. māj-a-viet-a ‘home, accommodation’ (← māj-a ‘house, building’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’) Latv. <Mahjaweeta> beside Germ. <Behauʃung> (L)
j. naud-a-kul-e ‘money bag’ (← naud-a ‘money’ + kul-e ‘bag, sack’) Latv. <Nauda= kulle> beside Germ. <ein Beutel> (LD)
k. nom-a-naud-a ‘rent money’ (← nom-a ‘lease, rental’ + naud-a ‘money’) Latv. <Nohma= nau=da> beside Germ. <die Schatzung, Zinβ=Geld> (LD)
l. rok-a-dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) ‘quern’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’) Latv. <Rohka=dʃirrnus> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Handmûle> (L)
m. slav-a-dziesm-a ‘hymn’ (← slav-a ‘glory, fame’ + dziesm-a (LD), dziesm-is (PhL) ‘song’) Latv. <[...] vnd tauwam wardam flawadʒeʃma dʒedat> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘and singing hymns to your name’

Furthermore, a few compounds, in which the first component is a noun of a consonantal /i/-stem, have <i> as linking element. 57 Hence, a linking element corresponds to the stem vowel of the first component, as presented in (8).

57 In the Old Latvian texts, I have found several unclear examples with <i> and <e> used in the final syllable of the first component that is a noun of an a-stem, e.g., <Drudse=sahles> (Nom.pl.) (F1) ‘Linaria vulgaris (a plant)’ (← drudz-is ‘fever, heat’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’); <Preddicke=krahºtis> (PhL) ‘sermon chair’ (← predik-s ‘sermon, preaching’ + kœsl-s (F1, F2), kœsl-is (L) ‘chair’); <Ratti dsirnawas> (Nom.pl.) (F1) ‘watermill’ (← rat-s ‘wheel’ + dzirnav-as (Nom.pl.) ‘hand mill, quern’); <Rohni Tauki> (Nom.pl.) (F1) ‘seal fat’ (← ron-is (F1, F2), ron-is (LD) ‘seal’ + tauk-s ‘fat’). The origin of <i> and <e> here is obscure.
a. *ac-i-kakt-in-š* ‘corner of the eye’ (← *ac-s* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’ + *kakt-s* ‘corner’) Latv. *<Azzi kaktinsch>* beside Germ. *<augenwinckel>* (F1)


c. *av-i-kūt-s* ‘sheepfold’ (← *av-s* (L), *av-is* (LD) ‘sheep’ + *kūt-s* ‘shed’) Latv. *<...> es fākka iums, kas pa tem durwem ne eē ekfjan to awwikūti [...]>* (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘I say to you, who does not enter the sheepfold’

d. *ūden-i-trauk-s* ‘water vessel’ (← *ūden-s* ‘water’ + *trauk-s* ‘vessel’) Latv. *<Bet ta āfwa atʃtaia āfwa vdennitrauku [...]>* (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘But the woman left her water vessel’

e. *ugun-i-liesm-a* ‘fire flame’ (← *ugun-s* ‘fire’ + *liesm-a* ‘flame’) Latv. *<...> aiʃto es āʃʃu lē las mô kas ekʃʒan ʃʒas vgguni lēʃmas>* (Acc (?).sg.) (EE) ‘for I am in anguish in this flame’

A few more compounds with a linking element <e> are also attested in the Old Latvian texts. 58 In these compounds, the first component is a noun of an ō-stem.


c. *vīģ-e-kok-s* ‘fig-tree’ (← *vīģ-e* ‘fig’ + *kok-s* ‘tree’) Latv. *<...> Rauget to fygekōku [...]>* (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘Look at the fig-tree’

Finally, in one compound in (10), in which the first component is a noun of an ŭ-stem, a linking element <u> is used.


I consider the above-mentioned compounds with the linking elements <a>, <e>, <i>, <u> to be examples of the stem composition still attested in the

58 For the sake of clarity, examples with an obscure grapheme <e> used in the final syllable of the first component of other stems by Elger are not included here.
Old Latvian texts under discussion. In compounds of this type, linking elements originate from original stem vowels of the first component. As discussed in chapter 2, stem compounds with the first component ending in an original stem vowel prevail in Lithuanian. Examples in Modern Lithuanian with an a-stem are: broli-a-vaik-is (LKŽe) ‘brother’s child’ (← bró-is ‘brother’ + vaïk-as ‘child’), darb-a-dien-is (LKŽe) ‘working day’ (← dár-b-as ‘work’ + dien-a ‘day’); with an ā-stem: dien-o-vid-is (LKŽe) ‘midday’ (← dien-a ‘day’ + vid-ūs ‘inside’), with an i-stem: ak-i-mirksn-is (LKŽe) ‘moment, instant’ (← ak-is ‘eye’ + mirksn-is ‘blink of an eye, moment’), with an u-stem: vid-u-nakt-is (LKŽe) ‘midnight’ (← vid-ūs ‘inside’ + nakt-is ‘night’).

In Modern Lithuanian compounds, these original stem vowels are now used as composition vowels (Urbutis, 2009, p. 280), and the most frequent one is the stem vowel -a (LKG, 1965, p. 444ff.). In Modern Latvian compounds, on the contrary, these stem vowels are lost (Endzelīns, 1948, p. 61). However, as was just suggested above, one still finds some relics of stem composition in the texts of Early Written Latvian. Thus, I would like to suggest that stem composition, as one of the compositional models of coining compounds, also prevailed in Latvian in an earlier period and is still the case for Modern Lithuanian. Consider a few examples of this type in both languages in (11)–(14).

(11) a. OLatv. ac-i-kakt-iņ-s ‘corner of the eye’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + kakt-s ‘corner’) Latv. <Azzi kaktinsch> beside Germ. <augenwininkel> (F1)
   b. Lith. ak-i-duob-ė (LKŽe) ‘eyehole’ (← ak-is ‘eye’ + duob-ė ‘hole’)

(12) a. OLatv. av-i-kūt-s ‘sheepfold’ (← av-s (L), av-is (LD) ‘sheep’ + kūt-s ‘shed’) Latv. <[...]> (EE) ‘I say to you, who does not enter the sheepfold’
   b. Lith. av-i-kail-is (LKŽe) ‘sheepskin’ (← av-is ‘sheep’ + kāil-is ‘fur’)

(13) a. OLatv. galv-a-virs-s ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s (KIV) ‘surface’) Latv. <Ghallwawirß> beside Germ. <der Wirbel> (PhL)
   b. Lith. galv-ā-virš-is, galv-ó-virš-is (LKŽe) ‘top of the head’ (← galv-ā ‘head’ + virš-ūs ‘top’)

(14) a. OLatv. ugun-i-liesm-a ‘fire flame’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + liesm-a ‘flame’) Latv. <[...] aiifto es cēfju lēlas mōkas ekfjān fjas vugguni lēfmas> (Acc sg.) (EE) ‘for I am in anguish in this flame’
   b. Lith. ugn-i-kaln-is (LKŽe) ‘volcano’ (← ugn-is ‘fire’ + kaln-as ‘mountain, hill’)
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In addition, several determinative compounds with the linking elements <a> and <e> seem to have originated from the contraction of noun phrases in which the first part was used in the genitive case. In these cases, the linking elements <a> and <e> originally belonged to the genitive ending -as or -es of the first component of the feminine ā- and ē-stems. Due to the assimilation of the s occurring at the final position of the first part and the initial position of the second one, a and e were reanalyzed as linking elements. In this way, noun phrases fused into compounds. Consider a few pairs of this kind below.

(15) a. cūkas-sar-i (Nom.pl.) ‘pig bristle’ (← cūk-as (Gen.sg.) ‘pig’ + sar-š (F1, F2), sar-ı (Nom.pl.) (PhL), sar-ı (LD) ‘bristle’) Latv. <Zuhkasšarī> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Bürste> (L)

b. cūk-a-sar-i (Nom.pl.) ‘pig bristle’ (← cūk-a ‘pig’ + sar-š (F1, F2), sar-ı (Nom.pl.) (PhL), sar-ı (LD) ‘bristle’) Latv. <Zuhkašarī> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Bürste> (PhL)

(16) a. drānas-susekl-is ‘cloth brush’ (← drān-as (Gen.sg.) ‘cloth, material’ + susekl-is ‘brush’) Latv. <Drahnasšuseklis> beside Germ. <Kehrbürsten> (L)

b. drān-a-susekl-is ‘cloth brush’ (← drān-a ‘cloth, material’ + susekl-is ‘brush’) Latv. <Drahašuseklis> beside Germ. <Kehrbürsten> (PhL)

(17) a. galvas-sāp-e ‘headache’ (← galv-as (Gen.sg.) ‘head’ + sāp-e ‘ache, pain’) Latv. <Gallwasšape> beside Germ. <Hauptwehe> (L)

b. galv-a-sāp-e ‘headache’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’) Latv. <Gallwašape> beside Germ. <Hauptwehe> (PhL)

(18) a. vasar-as svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘Pentecost’ (← vasar-as (Gen.sg.) ‘summer’ + svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘festivity’) Latv. <Wasāras Šwehtki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Pfingsten> (M/L)

b. vasar-a-svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘Pentecost’ (← vasar-a ‘summer’ + svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘festivity’) Latv. <Wajšarašwehtki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Pfingsten> (L)

(19) a. zemes-soģis ‘governor’ (← zem-es (Gen.sg.) ‘earth, ground’ + soģ-is ‘judge’) <[...] zemmesjôgi [...]> (Gen.sg.) (EE)

b. zem-e-soģ-is ‘governor’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + soģ-is ‘judge’) Latv. <Tad atbildēja tas zemmesjôgis [...]> (EE) ‘then the governor answered’
In the following instances, the first component might also have been used in the genitive case, but the final s was assimilated, cf. galv-a-smadzen-es (Nom.pl.) (L) ‘brain’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + smadzen-es (Nom.pl.) ‘brain’), gūž-a-sāp-es (Nom.pl.) (LD) ‘hip pain’ (← gūž-as (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘hip’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’), kāj-a-sāp-es (Nom.pl.) (L) ‘leg ache’ (← kāj-a ‘leg, foot’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’).

Furthermore, the linking element <a> is used in quite a few Old Latvian compounds, in which the first component is based on nouns of other stems, namely when the first component originated from an i-, ē- or u-stem. Hence, the use of the linking element <a> in these compounds cannot be explained etymologically. Due to this reason, this linking element <a> might have been analogically introduced from the other types of compounds. The largest group includes instances where the first component is of an old consonantal /i/-stem origin, as presented in (20).

(20) a. ac-a-mirkl-is ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + mirkl-is ‘blink, instant’) Latv. <Atza=mircklis> beside Germ. <Augenblick> (L)

b. ac-a-sāp-es (Nom.pl.) ‘eye pain’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’) Latv. <Atza=śahpes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Augenwehe> (L)

c. ac-a-vāk-s ‘eyelid’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + vāk-s ‘lid, cover’) Latv. <Atza=wahx> beside Germ. <Augenlid> (L)

d. ac-a-zob-i (Nom.pl.) ‘eyeteeth’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + zob-s ‘tooth’) Latv. <Atza=wahx> beside Germ. <Augenlid> (L) in annot be explai

e. avj-a-drēb-es (Nom.pl.) ‘sheep’s clothing’ (← av-s (L), av-is (LD) ‘sheep’ + drēb-e ‘cloth’) Latv. <Atza=dræbes pe iam naka [...]> (Loc.pl.) (EE) ‘who come to you in sheep’s clothing’

f. dakš-a-dzij-a ‘wick-yarn’ (← dakt-s ‘wick’ + dzij-a ‘wool, yarn’) Latv. <Atza=dtachgarn> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Tachtgarn> (L)

g. dzelz-a-krekl-is ‘armour’ (← dzelz-s (F1, F2), dzelz-e (L) ‘iron’ + krekl-is ‘shirt, undershirt’) Latv. <Atza=krecklis> beside Germ. <ein Pantzer> (LD)

h. gov-a-pien-s ‘cow’s milk’ (← gov-s (PhL), gov-a (LD) ‘cow’ + pien-s ‘milk’) Latv. <Ghohwa=peenß> beside Germ. <Kuhe=Milch> (PhL)

Apart from the aforementioned compounds with the first component originating from a consonantal /i/-stem, an unexpected linking element <a> is also used in a few compounds, in which the first component is a noun of an ē-stem (21) and ū-stem (22).

(21) a. biš-a-trop-s ‘beehive’ (← bi-t-e ‘bee’ + trop-s ‘hive’)
   Latv. <Biʃʃcha=Trohps> beside Germ. <ein Jm ͂ enʃtock> (PhL)

   b. viģ-a-kok-s ‘fig-tree’ (← viģ-e ‘fig’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
   Latv. <Wiega=Kohx> beside Germ. <Feigenbaum> (L)

(22) a. klep-a-zāl-e ‘herb used when coughing’ (← klep-us ‘cough’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’) Latv. <Nhe ʃinni tu Kläppa=ʃahles> (Gen.sg.)
   Germ. <weiʃtu nicht was man für Kraut wiedern Huʃten ge- braucht?> (PhL)

   b. Vid-a-zem-e60 ‘Livland’ (← vid-us ‘middle’ + zem-e ‘earth, ground’)
   Latv. <Widda=seme> beside Germ. <Lieff=Land, weil es mitten zwischen ReußLand, Pahlen u. Preussen gelegen> (LD)

Finally, a few more compounds of this type are based on a first component with different stems, i.e., ē- and ā-stems, cf. aps-a-malk-a (L) ‘aspen wood’ (← aps-e (M/J), aps-a (PhL) ‘asp’ + malk-a (LD), malk-s (M) ‘wood, firewood’).61 In view of the aforementioned material, I would like to suggest that the linking element <a> had replaced the original stem vowels of the first components of some of the Old Latvian determinative compounds. Hence, the linking element <a> is found in compounds where originally it was not expected to occur.

However, several instances where the first component is a noun of a consonantal /i/-stem ending in -a are ambiguous, since variants with a hard and palatal stem consonant are found. For instance, the following doublets in (23), (24), and (25) are found in the texts under discussion.

---

(23) a. akmina-trauk-s ‘stone container’ (← akmin-s (EE), akmin-is (F1, F2)
‘stone’ + trauk-s ‘container, vessel’) Latv. <Ackminatraux> beside Germ. <Erdengefäss> (L)

b. akmin-a trauk-s ‘stone container’ <[...] Akmiņa=Trauki [...]>
(Nom.pl.) (VLH)

(24) a. asina-sērg-a ‘dysentery’ (← asin-s (L), asin-is (LD) ‘blood’ + sērg-a
‘epidemic disease’) Latv. <Assina sehrga> beside Germ. <der blut gang> (F1)

b. asiņ-a sērg-a (M/L) ‘dysentery’ Latv. <Assiņa Sehrga> beside Germ. <blutgang>

(25) a. ugun-a puķ-es (Nom.pl.) ‘maiden pink (a plant)’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ +
puk-e (F1, F2), puk-is (LD) ‘flower’) Latv. <ugguna puķķes>
(Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <horn fuß, feur bluhme> (F1)

b. uguņ-a puķ-es (Nom.pl.) ‘maiden pink (a plant)’ Latv. <Ugguņa
Puķķes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Feurblumen, Hahnenfuß>
(M/J)

On the one hand, the aforementioned instances with the palatal <ņ> can indi-
cate that the first component is in the genitive case. On the other hand, non-
palatalization of the consonant might also suggest that even in these cases the
spread of the linking element <a> is seen. Compare more instances with non-
palatalized stem consonants found in the Old Latvian texts in (26).

(26) a. mātera-zāl-e ‘fewerfew (a plant)’ (← māter-es62 (Nom.pl.) (PhL)
‘fewerfew’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’) Latv. <Mutterkraut> beside
Germ. <Mutterkraut> (PhL)

b. rudena-jēr-s ‘autumnal lamb’ (← ruden-s ‘autumn’ + jēr-s ‘lamb’)
Latv. <Ruddena=Jährs> beside Germ. <Spetling> (PhL)

In fact, the same process of replacing original stem vowels with other linking
elements is also seen in Lithuanian, cf. Skardžius (1943, p. 422ff.), Larsson
(2002b, pp. 223–224).63 The linking element a, which originally was a stem
vowel, is found in a number of compounds in Lithuanian, although it does not
belong to the first component, from an etymological point of view, cf. the
following variants: brol-iā-vaik-is (LKŽe) ‘brother’s child’ (← brōl-is
‘brother’ + vaik-as ‘child’) next to brol-ā-vaikis (LKŽe) ‘id.’; galv-ō-virš-is
(LKŽe) ‘top of the head’ (← galv-ā ‘head’ + virš-us ‘top’) next to

62 Cf. Lith. mó ter-is (LKŽe) ‘woman’.
63 Aleksandrow (1888, p. 80ff.) in his study on Lithuanian nominal compounds argues that a
stem final vowel -a- was analogically used as compositionsvocal in numerous compounds of
originally different stems.
galv-ã-virš-is (LKŽe) ‘id.’; ugn-i-kaln-is (LKŽe) ‘volcano’ (← ugn-is ‘fire’ + kaln-as ‘mountain, hill’) next to ugn-ã-vieté (LKŽe) ‘fireplace’ (← ugn-is ‘fire’ + viet-ã ‘place, spot’); turg-ã-dien-is (LKŽe) ‘market day’ (← turg-us ‘market’ + dien-ã ‘day’); šun-ã-žol-ė (LKŽe) ‘grass suitable for feeding animals’ (← šun-s (Gen.sg.) ‘dog’ + žol-ė ‘grass’).

The linking element a, which originally was a stem vowel, was the most common linking element used for coining compounds already in Old Lithuanian (cf. Drotvinas, 1967, p. 185). Furthermore, the tendency of replacing the original stem vowels with a was seen in compounds found in the Old Lithuanian texts of the 16th–18th centuries (cf. Drotvinas, 1967, p. 197ff.), cf. instances with the first component of an ė-stem: karion-a-viet-ė ‘place of a war’ (← karion-ė ‘war’ + viet-ã ‘place, spot’), žvak-a-gal-is ‘candle-end’ (← žvak-ė ‘candle’ + gãl-as ‘end’); with an i-stem: blužn-a-žolë ‘the alternate-leaved golden-saxifrage (a plant)’ (← blužn-is ‘spleen’ + žol-ė ‘grass’); with an u-stem: turg-a-viet-ė ‘marketplace’ (← tur̃g-us ‘market’ + viet-ã ‘place, spot’).

Finally, after having shown that the same process of replacing the original stem vowels of first components with the linking element <a> has taken place in compounds in both Old Latvian and Lithuanian, a few compounds of this type in both languages can be considered.

(27) a. OLatv. ac-a-vāk-s ‘eyelid’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + vāk-s ‘lid, cover’) Latv. <Atza=wahx> beside Germ. <Augenliede> (L)
   b. Lith. ak-ia-viet-ė⁶⁴ (LKŽe) ‘eyehole’ (← ak-is ‘eye’ + viet-ã ‘place, spot’)

(28) a. OLatv. biš-a-trop-s ‘beehive’ (← bit-e ‘bee’ + trop-s ‘hive’) Latv. <Biʃʃcha=Trohps> beside Germ. <ein Jm͂ enʃtock> (PhL)
   b. Lith. bič-ia-kor-is (LKŽe) ‘honeycomb’ (← bit-ė ‘bee’ + kor-ỹs ‘honeycomb’)

(29) a. OLatv. dzelz-a-krekl-is ‘armour’ (← dzelz-s (F1, F2), dzelz-e (L) ‘iron’ + krekl-is ‘shirt, undershirt’) Latv. <Dselsa=kreck=lis> beside Germ. <ein Pantzer> (LD)
   b. Lith. gelež-ã-gal-is, gelež-a-gal-ỹs (LKŽe) ‘piece of metal’ (← gelež-is ‘iron’ + gãl-as ‘end’)

Given that the linking element <a> was the most common linking element in compounds in Old Latvian, it can be suggested that the etymologically unexpected <a> was used by analogy to those determinative compounds that were formed from two nouns and had the linking element <a>. However, an issue

⁶⁴ The accent is not indicated in LKŽe.
that arises when treating compounds with the unexpected <a> between their components is the origin of this element, since formally it points to different directions. In sum, two explanations of the origin of the linking element <a> used in the Old Latvian compounds have been proposed in the previous literature.

On the one hand, the linking element <a> in determinative compounds could originally have been a stem vowel of the first component. Blese (1936/1987, p. 525) proposed that in some instances found in the dictionary of Langius the middle <a> could be a shortened stem vowel of the feminine ā-stem, cf. naud-a-kul-e ‘money bag’ (cf. naud-a ‘money’), jūr-a-ziv-is ‘sea fish’ (cf. jūr-a ‘sea’). He also noted that an instance of gušam-a-kambar-is ‘sleeping-room’ (cf. guš-ē-t ‘to sleep, to lie’), in which the first component is based on a participle, contains the stem vowel <a>.

Likewise, Skujiņa (2006, p. 79ff.) analyzed compounds with the first component of a feminine ā-stem ending in <a> as stem compounds that she had collected from the dictionary of Mancelius, cf. muit-a-nam-s ‘custom-house’ (cf. muit-a ‘customs’). Skujiņa (2006, p. 84) also pointed out one instance found in the same dictionary where an unshortened stem vowel of a feminine ā-stem could be presumably attested, cf. <Rohkā=dohbums> ‘palm’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + dobum-s ‘hollow, cavity’). She also noted that the first component might end in the locative case, but compounds with a locative case in the first component were not common.

On the other hand, the linking element <a> might have been reanalyzed from formally ambiguous cases where the first part corresponded to the genitive case of nouns of a masculine a-stem. As discussed in chapter 2, noun phrases having the same meaning as compounds were common in the Old Latvian texts of that time. Hence, Fennell (1991, p. 340ff.) proposed that the above-mentioned instances attested in the dictionary of Langius could not be explained as relics of the stem composition as was proposed by Blese (1936/1987, p. 525), since the same etymologically unexpected vowel occurs in examples where the first component is not of an ā-stem, cf. krūš-a-sērg-a ‘breast disease’ (cf. krūt-s ‘breast’). According to Fennell (1991, p. 340), such forms with the <a> ending like nom-a-naud-a ‘rent money’ (cf. nom-a ‘rent’) could be “a rather undiscriminating attempt, not at a genitive singular, but at a genitive plural”. However, as he pointed out himself, the latter assumption may be hard to prove. In his later article, Fennell (2015, p. 6) also assumes that instances like <Bruņņa=Zeppure> ‘helmet’ (← cf. bruņ-as (Nom.pl.) ‘armour’ + cepur-e ‘cap, hat’) found in the dictionary of Depkin contained the first part, which ended in the genitive singular instead of a required genitive plural.

On the same note, Skujiņa (2008, pp. 117–119) treated compounds with the etymologically unexpected <a> as cases of the spread of an analogical genitive from compounds which first component is a noun of a masculine a-stem, cf. kara-vīr-s (PhL) ‘soldier, warrior’ (← kar-a (Gen.sg.) ‘war’ + vīr-s ‘man’) and gova-pien-s (PhL) ‘cow’s milk’ (← gov-s ‘cow’ + pien-s ‘milk’).
However, in my opinion, the aforementioned examples containing the unexpected \(<a>\), both from the grammatical and etymological point of view, cannot be considered to be genitive constructions for several reasons. To start with, examples with the first component originating from nouns of feminine stems and ending in \(<a>\) can hardly be analyzed as genitive endings. In the Old Latvian texts, I have found a number of pairs clearly showing that compounds with the linking element \(<a>\) existed alongside noun phrases with the same meaning, as presented in (30)–(33).

(30) a. galv-a-virs-s ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s
(KIV) ‘surface’) Latv. <Ghallwawirß> beside Germ. <der Wirbel> (PhL)
b. galvas-virs-s ‘top of the head’ (cf. galv-as (Gen.sg.) ‘head’)
Latv. <Ghallwas=wirß> beside Germ. <Scheitel> (L)

(31) a. gult-a-viet-a ‘bed, sleeping-place’ (← gult-a ‘bed’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’) Latv. <Ghullta=weeta> beside Germ. <ein Bett> (PhL)
b. gult-as viet-a ‘bed, sleeping-place’ (cf. gult-as (Gen.sg.) ‘bed’)
Latv. <Gultas weeta> beside Germ. <bett, bettstell> (M/L)

(32) a. muit-a-nam-s ‘custom-house’ (← muit-a ‘customs’ + nam-s ‘house, home’) Latv. <Muita=nams> beside Germ. <Zollhauß> (PhL)
b. muitas-nam-s ‘custom-house’ (cf. muit-as (Gen.sg.) ‘customs’)
Latv. <Muitas=nam̃s> beside Germ. <ein Zollhauß> (LD)

(33) a. rok-a-dzirn-is ‘hand mill, quern’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + dzirn-us
(Nom.pl.) (L), dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’
Latv. <Rohka dsirnis> beside Germ. <eine HandMühle> (LD)
b. rok-u dzirn-is ‘hand mill, quern’ (cf. rok-u (Gen.pl.) ‘hand, arm’)
Latv. <Rohku Dsirnis> beside Germ. <Handmühle> (M/L)

Furthermore, it was shown above that several instances of compounds of other stems (e.g., an i-stem), which keep the original stem vowel unchanged, are attested in the Old Latvian texts. These cases can also be regarded as relics of the stem composition still found in the texts of that time. Thus, as was already shown by the comparison with the Lithuanian material, the Old Latvian compounds based on first components of a feminine ā-stem can be regarded as stem compounds where the middle \(<a>\) reflects a shortened stem vowel of the ā-stem. The same idea was also proposed by Blese (1936/1987) and Skujiņa (2006).

Examples with the etymologically unexpected linking element \(<a>\) cannot be genitive constructions either, as shown by the following doublets in (34), (35), and (36), where the first component is a noun of an i- and ē-stem. Instead, in my opinion, they may be considered to be cases of the spread of
the linking element <\textipa{a}>, which replaced original stem vowels of the first component. The same process, as was suggested above, had taken place in Old Lithuanian as well (cf. Drotvinas, 1967, p. 197ff.).

(34) a. \textipa{ac-\textipa{a}-vāks} ‘eyelid’ (← \textipa{ac-\textipa{s}} (L), \textipa{ac-\textipa{i}s} (EE), \textipa{ac-e} (LD) ‘eye’ + \textipa{vāks} ‘lid, cover’) Latv. <\textipa{Atza}=wahx> beside Germ. <Augenliede> (L)
   b. \textipa{acu-vāks} ‘eyelid’ (cf. \textipa{ac-\textipa{u}} (Gen.pl.) ‘eye’) Latv. <\textipa{Azzu}=wahks> beside Germ. <Augenlied> (M)

(35) a. \textipa{biš-a-trop-s} ‘beehive’ (← \textipa{biš-e} ‘bee’ + \textipa{trop-s} ‘hive’) Latv. <\textipa{Biʃʃcha}=Trophs> beside Germ. <\textipa{ein Jhentʃtock}> (PhL)
   b. \textipa{bišu-trop-s} ‘beehive’ (cf. \textipa{biš-u} (Gen.pl.) ‘bee’) Latv. <\textipa{Biʃʃcho}=Trophs> beside Germ. <\textipa{Bienʃʃtock}> (L)

(36) a. \textipa{vīģ-a-kok-s} ‘fig-tree’ (← \textipa{vīģ-e} ‘fig’ + \textipa{kok-s} ‘tree’) Latv. <\textipa{Wiega}=Kohx> beside Germ. <\textipa{Feigenbaum}> (L)
   b. \textipa{vīģes-kok-s} ‘fig-tree’ (cf. \textipa{vīģ-es} (Gen.sg.) ‘fig’) Latv. <\textipa{Wiegeskohx}> beside Germ. <\textipa{ein Feigenbaum}> (PhL)

However, the question as to which type was the trigger of the spread of the analogical linking element <\textipa{a}> still remains open. The possible explanation could be that both compounds with the first component in its original stem (i.e., stem compounds with -\textipa{a}) and genitive constructions (also ending in -\textipa{a}) at some point coalesced due to the identical form. This caused analogical spread of the \textipa{a} to compounds with the first component of other stems. This is why, in my opinion, it is misleading to treat instances with etymologically unexpected <\textipa{a}> as noun phrases without taking into account that stem compounds were still attested in Old Latvian texts, as they could also have served as a composition model for coining other compounds. Moreover, in some of the formally ambiguous cases discussed in section 3.1, the first component was a noun that in Old Latvian was used as both masculine \textipa{a}-stem and feminine \textipa{ā}-stem. Hence, although the first component seemed to coincide with the genitive case of uncompounded word, <\textipa{a}> used at the final syllable of the first component might also have originated from an original stem vowel.

It can be concluded that in Old Latvian texts, one finds a number of determinative compounds where linking elements are preserved to a greater extent than it was previously thought. Furthermore, one still finds several Old Latvian compounds coined according to the model of stem composition that is best preserved in the texts of Mancelius. However, this composition model is no longer visible in Modern Latvian (for a more detailed discussion, see chapter 7).

The following section considers the attributive determinative compounds in Old Latvian and discusses the origin and distribution of the linking element <\textipa{a}> used in compounds of this type.
3.3.1.2 Attributive determinative compounds

Generally attributive determinative compounds with an adjective and numeral as first component contain no linking element in Old Latvian. Exceptions are rare, but they are found in the text by Elger.

(37) a. garīg-a-dziesm-ems (Dat.pl.) ‘hymn’ (← gar-īg-s ‘spiritual, ecclesiastical’ + dziesm-a (LD), dziesm-is (PhL) ‘song’)
   Latv. <[...]> garrigadžejems [...] (Dat.pl.) (EE)

   b. liel-a-dien-u (Acc.pl.) ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)
   Latv. <[...]> paec Leladenu [...] (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘after Easter day’

Apart from the above-mentioned instances, the linking element <a> is systematically found in one group of the attributive determinative compounds (38), namely in compounds where the first component is the stem of the present tense passive participle and the second one is a noun. It is noteworthy that compounds of this type without linking elements are mainly found in the dictionary of Langius (for a discussion, see section 3.3.2.3).

(38) a. adām-a-adat-as (Nom.pl.) ‘knitting-needle’ (← cf. ad-ī-t ‘to knit’ + adat-a ‘needle’) Latv. <Addama=adatas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Knüttʃpieʃʃe> (PhL)

   b. gulam-a-kambar-is ‘sleeping-room’ (← cf. gul-ē-t ‘to sleep, to lie’ + kambar-is (L), kambar-s (PhL) ‘room, chamber’)
   Latv. <ghuļļamakambaris> beside Germ. <Schlaffkammer> (L)

   c. lūdzam-a-nam-s ‘praying house’ (← cf. lūg-t ‘to ask, to plead’ + nam-s ‘house, home’) Latv. <Mans Nams irr weens Nams taho Luhgšchanas (weens luhʃjama=Nams) [...] > (VLH) ‘My house is a house of prayer (a praying house)’

   d. plaujam-a-laik-s ‘harvest time’ (← cf. plau-t ‘to cut, to scythe’ + laik-s ‘time’) Latv. <Plaujama=laix> beside Germ. <Ernd> (L)

   e. saucam-a-bals-s ‘calling voice’ (← cf. sauk-t ‘to call, to shout’ + bals-s (F1, F2), bals-e (F1, F2) ‘voice’)
   Latv. <[...]> Es esmu šauzama Balš [...] > (VLH) ‘I am the calling voice’

   f. svaidām-a-zāl-es (Nom.pl.) ‘grass or a herb used for ointment’ (← cf. svaid-ī-t ‘to smear’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’)
   Latv. <[...]> pirke Maria Madleena / in Maria Jehkaba (Mahte) in Salama dahrgas śwaidama Sahles [...] > (Acc.pl.) (VLH) ‘Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices’
Old Latvian compounds of this morphological type, in fact, correspond to compounds with a verbal first component in Lithuanian. Both the attributive determinative compounds and possessive compounds with verbal first components can occasionally contain a linking element -(i)a- in Lithuanian (LKG, 1965, pp. 459–460), cf. determinative compounds: kirt-ã-viet-ė ‘wood-cutting area’ (← cf. kirš-ti ‘to fell’ + viet-à ‘spot, area’), siurb-ã-kirm-is ‘liver fluke’ (← cf. siurb-ti ‘to suck, absorb’ + kirm-is, kirm-is ‘worm’). The linking element -(i)a- is more common in Lithuanian possessive compounds with the stem of the passive participle, cf. īškišt-a-dañt-is ‘having protruding teeth’ (← cf. īš-kiš-ti ‘to put out’ + dant-is ‘tooth’), pakelt-a-rañk-is ‘pugnacious person’ (← cf. pa-kél-ti ‘to raise, lift’ + rank-à ‘hand, arm’), pérskelt-a-galv-is ‘scapegrace’ (← cf. pér-skél-ti ‘to cleave, split’ + galv-à ‘head’).65 Compounds with a verbal first component and a linking element a are attested in Old Lithuanian texts as well (Drotvinas, 1967, p. 202ff.), cf. čiaud-a-žol-ė ‘a grass which smell evokes sneezing’ (← cf. čiaud-ė-ti ‘to sneeze’ + žol-ė ‘grass’), nu-leist-a-strén-is ‘having lowered loins, i.e., a careless, untidy person’ (← nu-léis-ti ‘to let down, lower’ + strén-os (Nom.pl.) ‘loins, the small of the back’).

Compounds with first components based on the present tense passive participle in Old Latvian have been only briefly treated in earlier works, in which the focus of the discussion was on the form of the first component. Since this component ended in a linking element that did not agree with the second component, Zemzare (1961, pp. 18–19) considered examples of this kind found in the dictionary of Mancelius as misprints or as slips of the writer’s pen, cf. guļam-a-kambar-is (L) ‘sleeping-room’. Moreover, in Elksnīte’s (2011, pp. 25, 60ff.) dissertation, the same instances with non-agreeing participles attested in the texts of Mancelius were analyzed as noun phrases in which the first part, according to her, had an indefinite ending of the nominative case. By contrast, in other works, cases with non-agreeing participles as first components attested in the dictionary of Mancelius as well as in the dictionary and grammar of Langius were considered compounds. However, opinions on the form of the first component, namely the origin of the middle <a>, differ here, too. For instance, Veidemane (2002, p. 454) presented the same instances found in the dictionary of Mancelius and briefly noted that the middle <a> could have only functioned as a linking element between the components. Skujiņa (2006, pp. 73–77) proposed that Mancelius chose to coin compounds of this kind according to the genitive case ending of the first component of a masculine a-stem, since he was not a native speaker of Latvian, cf. darba rīks ‘tool, instrument’ (cf. darb-a (Gen.sg.) ‘work’) and rakstāma-rīk-s ‘writing material’ (cf. rakst-t-t ‘to write’).

65 Compounds with verbal stems as first components prevail in Modern Lithuanian dialects (Drotvinas, 1967, p. 202ff.).
Blese (1936/1987, p. 525) mentioned one instance of this type found in the dictionary of Langius and regarded it as a compound, cf. *gulam-a-kambar-is* ‘sleeping-room’ (cf. *gul-ē-i* ‘to sleep, to lie’). He has suggested that the middle `<a>` could be a stem vowel of the first component. Grīsle (1958, p. 300), following Blese, proposed that the aforementioned compound found in the grammar of Langius was formed according to the model of archaic stem compounds, cf. *naud-a-kule* ‘money bag’ (cf. *naud-a* ‘money’).

After having discussed different interpretations of instances with non-agreeing participles as first components, I would like to suggest that examples of this kind are compounds from a formal point of view. They existed alongside noun phrases that were used with the same meaning in Old Latvian texts. Consider formally different instances expressing the same notion, one of which is a compound in (39a) and (40a), while another one in (39b) and (40b) is a phrase.\(^{66}\)

(39) a. compound: *plaujam-a-laiks* (Nom.sg.) ‘harvest time’

> [...] tad nāks tas *Plaujama Laiks*? (JT)

> <[...] tad nahks tas *Plaujama Laiks*>? (JT)

‘Then the harvest-time is approaching?’

b. phrase: *plaujam-s* (Nom.sg.m.) *laik-s* (Nom.sg.) ‘harvest time’

> [...] *kad tas plaujams Laiks nāks* [...]. (LP1)

> <[...] *kad taß plaujams Laix nahx* [...].> (LP1)

‘That the harvest-time is approaching’

(40) a. compound: *dzeram-a-naud-u* (Acc.sg.) ‘tip, gratuity’

> [...] *dod Sudmalniekam šo dzerama=naudu* / *tad viņš tev steigs*. (PhL)

> <[...] *dohd S ́ udmallneekam ʃcho dʃerŗama=naudu* / *tad wings töw ʃleiʃ.*> (PhL)

‘Give this gratuity to a miller, then he will hurry for you’

b. phrase: *dzeram-u* (Acc.sg.f.) *naud-u* (Acc.sg.) ‘tip, gratuity’

> *Es tev Dzeramu=naudu došu* [...]. (Run)

> <Es töw Dʃeŗŗamo=naudu doʃchu [...].> (Run)

‘I will give you gratuity’

The linking element `<a>` in examples (39a) and (40a) cannot be a case ending, since the first component does not agree with the second component in num-

---

\(^{66}\) There were, however, ambiguous cases where the second component was a noun of the feminine gender, and it seemed that the preceding participle was used in the nominative case. These instances were left aside for the sake of clarity, cf. *<Aŗŗama Semme>* (F1) ‘arable land’, *<Dellama Šārģa>* (LD) ‘tuberulosis’, *<Ghuļļama=šārģha>* (PhL) ‘sleepiness, drowsiness (disease)’, *<Knihtama= Šār=ģa>* (LD) ‘epilepsy’, *<liepama Šārģha>* (PhL) ‘epidemic disease’, *<Rakkama=dseeśma>* (F1) ‘funeral hymn’, Latv. *<Škreiamā Sulla>* beside Germ. *<fliegend Safft oder Suppe>* (LD), *<Śchujama addata>* (F1) ‘sewing needle’.
ber, gender or case. It stays unchanged when the whole construction is in-
lected showing that only the second component is marked for inflection. Oth-
wise, if it were used as a phrase, the first component must have agreed with
the second one, as shown in examples (39b) and (40b).

Nor is the interpretation of the first component used in the genitive case
logical here, since compounds of this kind are attributive determinative com-
pounds where the first component functions as attribute of the second one.
Thus, the first component, i.e., the stem of the present tense passive participle,
modifies the second component, which is a noun, as in other attributive deter-
mative compounds where the first component is an adjective or a numeral.
Hence, in my view, the internal <a> functions as linking element in the above-
mentioned instances with non-agreeing participles as first components.

As was shown above in the case of Lithuanian, determinative and pos-
sessive compounds with verbal first components can contain a linking element
a that seems to be a stem vowel originally. Following Blese (1936/1987, p.
525 and Grīsle (1958, p. 300), I would like to suggest that the linking element
<a> found in Old Latvian compounds with the present tense passive participle
as first component could also be a stem vowel that functioned as a linking
element in the texts of that time. We cannot, of course, rule out the possibility
that a model for coining this type of compound was the determinative com-
pounds that contained two nouns and a linking element <a>.

Finally, in view of the material presented above, it is clear that such ex-
amples with non-agreeing present tense passive participles as first components
were more widely attested in the Old Latvian texts of this period than it was
previously thought. As I have argued in this section, instances of this kind
cannot be treated as simple misprints, and thus they need to be distinguished
as one of the subtypes of the determinative compounds in Old Latvian.

By contrast, in Modern Latvian, determinative compounds with the stem
of the participle in the first component are generally coined without linking
elements, cf. ēdam-gald-s ‘dining table’ (← cf. ēs-t ‘to eat’ + gald-s ‘table’),
cf. MLLVG (1959, p. 206). A very clear tendency to lose linking elements in
this category of compounds is already seen from the dictionary of Langius.
Thus, the following section deals with Old Latvian determinative compounds
without linking elements and in particular addresses issues related to the de-
terminative compounds found in the dictionary of Langius.

3.3.2 Determinative compounds without linking elements

The tendency of compounds in Latvian to lose linking elements (cf. Endzelins,
1951, p. 259ff.) is clearly seen in the Early Written Latvian texts, as a large
part of the dependent determinative compounds including two nouns do not
contain linking elements. Moreover, the attributive determinative compounds
based on adjectives or numerals as first components generally have no linking
elements except for a few rare cases.
However, as it will be argued in this section, many determinative compounds, especially those including two nouns, might have had linking elements originally, but they were lost due to different reasons. For instance, a compound sān-kaul-s (L) ‘rib’ (← sān-s ‘side’ + kaul-s ‘bone’) found in the dictionary of Mancelius could arguably have contained a linking element. In the oldest texts from the late 16th century, one finds a variant that ends in a vowel unfortunately indicated by an obscure grapheme <e>, as many other short vowels in final syllables in the texts of that time.

(41) a. 1586: <Sane koule> (Acc.sg.) (Ench1) ‘rib’

b. 1638: sān-kaul-s ‘rib’
Latv. <Sahnhkauls> beside Germ. <Ribbe> (L)

Furthermore, a number of compounds in Old Latvian fused from noun phrases, i.e., genitive constructions mostly, which lost their case endings in the first part. This process of losing case endings might have presumably taken place after noun phrases were reanalyzed as compounds and acquired one stress. Hence, it will be suggested in the following that sometimes it can be difficult to decide whether the lost vowel was a case ending of the first part of the noun phrase or the stem vowel of the first component of the compound.

The largest number of determinative compounds without linking elements are attested in the dictionary of Langius. These compounds will be discussed separately (see section 3.3.2.3). Hence, the results of the following sections 3.3.2.1 and 3.3.2.2 will be based on material found in the texts and dictionaries of Mancelius, Fürecker, and Elger.

3.3.2.1 Compounds originally coined with linking elements

Despite the aforementioned difficulties, one can see that in some determinative compounds coined from two nouns, linking elements disappeared due to phonetic reasons. Firstly, the final vowel of the first component, i.e., mostly a noun of a masculine -stem, was contracted, since the initial vowel of the second component was a.

(42) a. dārz-ābol-s ‘garden apple’ (← dārz-s ‘garden’ + ābol-s ‘apple’) Latv. <Dahrs=Ahboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gärten Äpfel> (F1)

b. dārz-apin-is ‘hop (a plant)’ (← dārz-s ‘garden’ + apin-i (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2), apin-s (LD) ‘hop’) Latv. <Dah[r]s appini> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <hopfen garten> (F1)

c. gald-aut-s ‘tablecloth’ (← gald-s ‘table’ + aut-s ‘binding’)
Latv. <Ghalld=autz> beside Germ. <ein Tischtuch> (PhL)
d. *kriev-ābol-s* 'cucumber; pumpkin' (← *kriev-s* (L), *kriev-is* (LD) ‘Russian’ + *ābol-s* ‘apple’) Latv. <Kreew=aboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gurcken> (F2)

e. *vāc-ābol-s* ‘Seville orange, bitter orange’ (← *vāc-is* ‘German’ + *ābol-s* ‘apple’) Latv. <Wahtz=aboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Pomerantzen> (L)

f. *vilk-ābel-e* ‘hawthorn’ (← *vilk-s* ‘wolf’ + *ābel-e* ‘apple tree’) Latv. <Wilkahbele> beside Germ. <eine Hecke> (F2)

g. *zirg-ārst-e* ‘horse doctor’ (← *zirg-s* ‘horse, steed’ + *ārst-s* (LD) ‘physician, doctor’) Latv. <Sirrghahrʃte> beside Germ. <Viehe oder Roßartz> (L)

As was just mentioned above, it can sometimes be difficult to trace back the origin of the lost vowel, namely if it was a stem vowel or the case ending of the first component. However, it is likely to be the case that the aforementioned compounds in (42) mostly originated from noun phrases due to the fact that phrases with the same meaning were still used alongside compounds in the texts of that time, as presented in (43) and (44). In one instance (45), the first component originated from the nominative case.


(44) a. *degun-aut-s* ‘handkerchief’ (← *degun-s* ‘nose’ + *aut-s* ‘binding’) Latv. <Däggun=autz> beside Germ. <Schnuptuch> (PhL)

b. *deguna-auts* ‘handkerchief’ (cf. *degun-a* (Gen.sg.) ‘nose’) Latv. <dägguna=autz> beside Germ. <NaßTuch> (L)

(45) a. *pieduram-adat-a* ‘pin’ (← cf. *pie-dur-t* ‘to touch’ + *adat-a* ‘needle’) Latv. <peeduŗŗam addata> beside Germ. <Steck nadel> (F1)

b. *pieduram-a adat-a* ‘pin’ (cf. *pie-dur-t* ‘to touch’) Latv. <Peeduŗŗama Addata> beside Germ. <Steck=Nadel> (F2)

Moreover, the tendency of avoiding a collision of vowels between the components is also seen from the following cases of determinative compounds.

(46) a. *dzīrn-akmin-s* ‘millstone’ (← *dzīrn-us* (Nom.pl.) (L), *dzīrn-is* (LD) ‘hand mill’ + *akmin-s* (EE), *akmin-is* (F1, F2) ‘stone’) Latv. <Dʃirrn=Ackmins> beside Germ. <Mühlʃtein> (PhL)
b. mat-aukl-e ‘hairband’ (← mat-s (F1, F2), mat-e (F2) ‘hair’ + aukl-a (LD), aukl-is (L) ‘string, cord, line’)
   Latv. <Mattauckle> beside Germ. <Haarʃchnur> (L)

c. mež-ābol-s ‘crab apple’ (← mež-s (LD), mež-a (LD) ‘wood, forest’ + ābol-s ‘apple’)
   Latv. <Mesch Ahboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <busch=Holz=ãpfel> (F2)

d. mež-apin-is ‘hop (a plant)’ (← mež-s (LD), mež-a (LD) ‘wood, forest’ + apin-i (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2), apin-s (LD) ‘hop’)
   Latv. <MeschAppini> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <wilder Hopffen> (M/J)

e. vakar-ēdien-s ‘Holy Communion’ (← vakar-s ‘evening’ + ēdien-s ‘meal, course’)
   Latv. <wackar=ehdens> beside Germ. <Nacht-mahl> (L)

The absence of a linking element in a compound jūd-zem-es\(^{67}\) (Gen.sg.) (LD) ‘mile’ (← jūdz-e (L), jūdz-s (LD) ‘mile’ + zem-e ‘earth, ground’) may be explained in two ways. If the first component was a noun jūdz-e (L), the final vowel e disappeared due to haplology. However, in the Old Latvian texts, another morphological variant of the same noun, i.e., jūdz-s (LD), is found. If the first component was based on the latter noun, there was no linking element originally, which suggests that this compound fused from a noun phrase. In this case, the first part was in a nominative case and the second one was in the genitive case, namely jūdz-s (Nom.sg.) zem-es (Gen.sg.). This compound seems to be coined according to the corresponding German compound <Meilwegs> (LD).\(^{68}\)

Secondly, even the short vowel in the genitive ending -us was dropped out in a few cases: (47) and (48).

(47) a. gad-s-kārt-s or gad-s-kārt-a ‘full year’ (← gad-us (F1, F2), gad-s (PhL) ‘year’ + kārt-a (LD), kārt-s (M/J) ‘layer, course’)
   Latv. <Tas Elles gabbls to labbibu ne warretu gads=Kahrta ̂ apehst, ko tas te apskehrsh> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <der höllen=brand konte das Getraide das Jahr über nicht verzehren, was Er zu un nütze verthan> (F1)

---

\(^{67}\) Latv. <Juhdsemmes> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <eine Meil, Meilwegs> (LD).

\(^{68}\) Likewise, a few formally opaque examples like sula-ziv-is (PhL) (← sul-a ‘juice, sap’ + ziv-is (Nom.sg.) (PhL) ‘fish’) might have been directly translated from German, cf. Latv. <Sulla=Siwis> beside Germ. <Suppenfische> (PhL); also cf. pasaul-laž-u (Gen.pl.) (F1, F2) ‘world of people’ (← pasaul-e ‘world’ + laž-u (Gen.pl.) ‘people, folk’): Latv. <pašaul=lauschu> (Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <Eine welt volks> (F1).
b. *gadus-kārt-ā* (Loc.sg.) ‘full year’ (cf. *gad-us* (Gen.sg.) ‘year’)


In these compounds, clearly originating from noun phrases, the *s* functions as a linking element. Compounds with the linking element *s*, which originally belonged to the genitive ending of the first part, e.g., *-as* or *-us*, are also found in Modern Latvian (MLLVG, 1959, p. 202; Forssman, 2001, p. 291), cf. dial. *dien-s-vid-us* ‘noon’ (← *dien-as* (Gen.sg.) ‘day’ + *vid-us* ‘middle’) beside Stand. Latv. *dien-vid-us* ‘id.’; *sēt-s-vid-us* ‘the middle of the yard’ (← *sēt-as* (Gen.sg.) ‘yard, court’ + *vid-us* ‘middle’); *vid-s-pus-e* (MEE) ‘inside’ (← *vid-us* (Gen.sg.) ‘inside’ + *pus-e* ‘land, place’). After the loss of the vowel in the genitive ending, *s* was reanalyzed as a linking element. This is why it is found in compounds, for which synchronically it is not expected to appear.

Thirdly, compounds with the components originating from words of three or more syllables tend to lose linking elements, as in (49) and (50), or they are often coined without linking elements, as shown in (51).

(49) a. *baznīc-a-kung-s* ‘priest’ (← *baznīc-a* ‘church’ + *kung-s* ‘lord, master, gentleman’) Latv. *<... Baʒnicakungu [...]>* (Gen.pl.) (EE)

b. *vasar-svēkt-i* (Nom.pl.) ‘Pentecost’ Latv. *<... Wajʃarʃwertku [...]>* (Gen.pl.) (EE)

(51) *sautrum-sakn-e* ‘*Angelica archangelica* (a plant)’ (← *sautrum-a* ‘*Angelica archangelica* (a plant)’ + *sakn-e* (F1, F2), *sakn-a* (EE), *sakn-is* (LD) ‘root’) Latv. *<Sautrum Saknes>* (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. *<Angelic. Wurtzel>* (F2)

This can be explained by the general tendency of coining compounds of mostly three or four syllables in Old Latvian. Compounds, which have more
than four syllables and contain a linking element, are rare in the Old Latvian texts.

Lastly, there is a small group of determinative compounds where the absence of linking elements cannot be explained by the reasons suggested above. A few characteristic features of compounds of this kind must be pointed out. Firstly, there are no noun phrases existing alongside these compounds, as presented in (52).\textsuperscript{69} Secondly, some of these compounds have the compositional suffix \textit{-is} (m.)/\textit{-e} (f.), as in (53), which could show some degree of univerbation. Thirdly, the translation in German often does not match with the meaning of the components of these compounds in Old Latvian, as presented in (54), (55), and (56).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(52)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{sān-kaul-s} ‘rib’ (← \textit{sān-s} ‘side’ + \textit{kaul-s} ‘bone’)
\begin{itemize}
\item Latv. \textit{<Sahnkauls>} beside Germ. \textit{<eine Riebe>} (PhL)
\end{itemize}
\item b. \textit{rīt-dien-a} ‘tomorrow’ (← \textit{rīt-s} ‘morning’ + \textit{dien-a} ‘day’)
\begin{itemize}
\item Latv. \textit{< [...] Riht=deena [...]>} (VLI)
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\item[(53)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{lin-sēkl-is} ‘linseed’ (← \textit{lin-s} ‘flax’ + \textit{sēkl-a} ‘seed’)
\begin{itemize}
\item Latv. \textit{<Linn=šehkļi>} (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. \textit{<Flachsʃaamen>} (PhL)
\end{itemize}
\item b. \textit{jūr-mal-is} ‘seaside, seashore’ (← \textit{jūr-is} (LD), \textit{jūr-a} (F1, F2), \textit{jūr-e} (PhL) ‘sea’ + \textit{mal-a} (F1, F2), \textit{mal-s} (LD) ‘edge, brim’)
\begin{itemize}
\item Latv. \textit{<Juhrmallis>} beside Germ. \textit{<das Vfer des Mährs>} (PhL)
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\item[(54)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. OLatv. \textit{galv-gal-i} (Nom.pl.) ‘head of the bed’ (← \textit{galv-a} ‘head + gal-s ‘end, ending’)
\begin{itemize}
\item <Galw=galli> (Nom.pl.) (F1)
\end{itemize}
\item b. Germ. \textit{<zum häupten>} (F1)
\end{enumerate}
\item[(55)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. OLatv. \textit{kāj-gal-i} (Nom.pl.) ‘foot of the bed’ (← \textit{kāj-a} ‘leg, foot’ + \textit{gal-s ‘end, ending’})
\begin{itemize}
\item <kahj=galli> (Nom.pl.) (F1)
\end{itemize}
\item b. Germ. \textit{<Zunfüßen>} (F1)
\end{enumerate}
\item[(56)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. OLatv. \textit{kap-sēt-a} ‘cemetery, churchyard’ (← \textit{kap-s} (F1, F2), \textit{kap-a} (PhL) ‘grave’ + \textit{sēt-a} (L), \textit{sēt-e} (L) ‘fence, yard’)
\begin{itemize}
\item <Kapp=sähta> (LD)
\end{itemize}
\item b. Germ. \textit{<ein Kirchhoff, Gottes Acker>} (LD)
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{69} A few cases of the corresponding noun phrases with the same meaning are attested in the \textit{Manuale Lettico-Germanicum}. However, in this dictionary, we find a general tendency to resolve compounds taken from previous works as phrases. For a more detailed discussion, see chapter 7.
The above-mentioned compounds might have been coined at an older period and contained linking elements originally that were later lost. One of the triggers of the loss of linking elements in these cases might have been initial stress.

To summarize, it was suggested in this section that many Old Latvian determinative compounds originally contained linking elements, but they were lost due to the reasons discussed above. First, many linking elements disappeared due to phonetic reasons. It was argued that in several compounds, the vowel of the first component was contracted or lost to avoid a collision of vowels. As discussed above, in some instances, it was difficult to decide whether the first component was originally a case or stem form. Then, some compounds, in which the first components originated from words of three or more syllables, seem to be subject to syncope with linking elements. Lastly, determinative compounds in which the loss of linking elements could not be explained by the reasons suggested above were discussed. In the next section, I present and discuss determinative compounds in Old Latvian that, in my view, were originally formed without linking elements.

3.3.2.2 Compounds originally coined without linking elements

After having discussed determinative compounds that were coined with linking elements originally, I will now turn to two groups of determinative compounds that, in my opinion, were compounded without linking elements. This can firstly be said about a few loanblends where the first component was clearly borrowed from German. Thus, the form of the first component was modeled after the form of the first component in the German counterpart. Consider a few compounds of this type in (57)–(60).

(57) a. OLatv. āland-sakn-is ‘root of a horseheel (Inula Helenium, a plant)’
    (← āland-s (LD), ālant-s (PhL) ‘horseheel (Inula Helenium, a plant)’ + sahn-a (EE), sahn-is (LD), sahn-e (F1, F2) ‘root’) <Āland=Sačnis> (LD)

    b. Germ. <Alant=Wurtzel> (LD)

(58) a. OLatv. knop-adir-a ‘pin’ (← knop-e (PhL), knop-e (LD) ‘knot’ + adir-a ‘needle’ <knohp=adāt> (L)

    b. LG knōp-nātel ‘pin’ (Sehwers, 1953, pp. 55–56)

(59) a. OLatv. pik-adir-a70 ‘pin’ (← cf. spik-ē-t Germ. ‘spicken, mit Speck bestecken’ (Sehwers, 1953, p. 116) + adir-a ‘needle’) <pikādāt> (F2)

Note that the word-initial consonant cluster, i.e., sp-, is not retained in the first component of the Latvian example, although it appears in the German counterpart. Sehwers (1953, p. 116)
b. Germ. <Spicknadel> (F2)

(60) a. OLatv. skot-viet-is ‘Scot’ (← skot-s ‘Scot’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’) <Skottweetsis> (L)

b. Germ. <Schottländer> (L)

Second of all, there is a group of determinative compounds with first components based on nouns that originated from an old consonantal /i/-stem. Compounds of this type in (61) might have been originally coined without linking elements. There is no palatalization of the stem consonant, which may indicate that these compounds were originally coined without linking elements.71

(61) a. krāsn-priekš-a ‘stoking-hole’ (← krāsn-s (F1, F2) krāsn-is (PhL) ‘stove’ + priekš-a ‘front, forepart’) Latv. <Krahns=preeksha> beside Germ. <das Ofenloch> (LD)

b. nakt-sarg-s ‘night-watch’ (← nakt-s (LD), nakt-is (EE) ‘night’ + sarg-s ‘guard, watch’) Latv. <[...] naktjargu [...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE)

c. sun-sūd-s ‘dog excrement’ (← sun-s ‘dog’ + sūd-s ‘excrement, junk, trash’) Latv. <Śunn=śuhtz> beside Germ. <Hundscreck> (PhL)

d. ūden-kroz-a ‘ewer’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + kroz-a (ME) ‘ewer’) Latv. <[...] Pepildaita tās vdenkrôžas ar vdeni> (Acc.pl.) (EE) ‘Fill up those ewers with water’

e. ūden-tulzn-is ‘water blister’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + tulzn-a (F1, F2), tulzn-is (VIV) ‘blister’) Latv. <Vdenntulʃnis> beside Germ. <Waʃʃerblaʃe> (L)

f. ūden-viln-is ‘water wave’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + viln-a (LD), viln-is (EE) ‘wave’) Latv. <[...] vden wilnems> (Dat.pl.) (EE)

g. ugun-liesm-a ‘fire flame’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + liesm-a ‘flame’) Latv. <[...] vgunsleʃmas [...]> (Acc.pl.) (EE)

Likewise, Larsson (2002b, p. 226) has shown that in Old Lithuanian texts one finds compounds with first components originating from an i-stem that lack a quotes another example found in the dictionary of Depkin where the consonant cluster is, in fact, preserved, cf. OLatv. spik-adat-a ‘pin’.

71 On the other hand, we cannot rule out the possibility that some of these cases without linking elements originated from the contraction of phrases where the ending -s of the first component fused with the initial consonant -s of the second component, cf. sun-sūd-s ‘dog excrement’ (← cf. sun-s (Gen.sg.) ‘dog’ + sūd-s ‘excrement’) <Śunn=śuhtz> (PhL); nakt-sarg-s ‘night-watch’ (← cf. nakt-s (Gen.sg.) ‘night’ + sarg-s ‘guard, watch’) <[...] naktjargu [...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE); pil-sāt-s ‘town, city’ (← pil-s ‘palace, castle’ + sāt-s (MEe), sāt-a (MEe) ‘fence, farm, yard’) <Pilsahts> (M/J) beside pil-sāt-s ‘id.’ (cf. pil-s (Gen.sg.) ‘palace, castle’) <Pils-sаhts> (F1). However, it is more likely to be the case that examples with the genitive case are later cases, and here one is dealing with an old consonantal /i/-stem in the first component.
linking element between their components, cf. *ak-mirk-is* (BrP) ‘moment, twinkle of an eye’ (cf. *ak-is* ‘eye’), *šird-perš-a* (K) ‘heartbreak’ (cf. *šird-is* ‘heart’). Larsson (2002b, p. 226), furthermore, suggested that these first components of an *i*-stem originated from consonantal stems or root nouns, and the stem marker *-i* seems to have been added at a later stage.72

However, it may be noted that alongside compounds with linking elements *<a>* and *<i>*, noun phrases with the same meaning existed in the Old Latvian texts of that time. For instance, alongside *sun-sūd-s* (PhL) ‘dog excrement’, a variant *sun-u* (Gen.pl.) ‘dog’ was also used.73

In fact, this morphological variation of the first component of Old Latvian compounds is now reflected in Modern Latvian where variants of the same nouns used as first components are found, as shown in (62) and (63).

(62) a. *suns-ābel-e* (MEe) ‘crab apple’ (← cf. *sun-s* (Gen.sg.) ‘dog’ + *ābel-e* ‘apple tree’)
   b. *suns-ābel-e* (MEe) ‘crab apple’ (< *suns-a* (Gen.sg.) (?) ‘dog’)

(63) a. *sun-nagl-is* (MEe) ‘furuncle’ (← *sun-s* ‘dog’ + *nagl-a* ‘nail’)
   b. *suns-nagl-a* (MEe) ‘furuncle’ (cf. *sun-s* (Gen.sg.) ‘dog’)75

It may be concluded that several determinative compounds, which were coined without linking elements originally, are found in the Old Latvian texts. Compounds of this type are a few loanblends where the first component is clearly adopted from German and thus no linking element is inserted between the components. Another group of this kind includes determinative compounds where the first component originated from an old consonantal / *i*-stem. Thus, these compounds were first formed without linking elements, which seem to have been added at a later period.

As previously noted, the largest number of determinative compounds without linking elements are attested in the dictionary of Langius. Thus, in the following section, I will discuss this strong tendency of coining determinative compounds without linking elements represented by Langius and suggest an explanation for it.

---

73 Latv. *<...> Šunņo=śuhdeem>* (Dat.pl.) beside Germ. *<...> Hundsdreck* (PhL).
74 Even in the genitive constructions in Old Latvian, the variation of the form of the first part occurs, cf. instances with an older genitive *-s* and *-a*, which was introduced by analogy to nouns of a masculine -ijja-stem, cf. *sun-s* ‘the dog-star’ (cf. *sun-s* (Gen.sg.) + *zvaigzn-e* (LD), *zvaigzn-a* (EE) ‘star’) <Śuńas=jwiagʃne> (L) vs. *suņa zvaigzne* ‘id.’ (cf. *suņ-a* (Gen.sg.) ‘dog’) <Ś unņa swaigsne> (LD). On the history of the genitive case in Latvian, cf., e.g., Forssman (2001, p. 121).
75 Cf. *sun-a nagl-a* (LLVVe) ‘furuncle’ (cf. *sun-a* (Gen.sg.) ‘dog’).
3.3.2.3 Compounds without linking elements in the dictionary of Langius (1685)

In the last part of this section, numerous determinative compounds without linking elements found in the dictionary of Langius are addressed. It will be shown that in terms of the form of the first component, the compounds of Langius differ from their counterparts attested in the other dictionaries of this period. In the following, I will, therefore, seek to explain why this variation of the first component occurs.

It has been pointed out in previous works that in the texts of the oldest period in particular, short vowels in word final position of the polysyllabic words are sometimes reduced or not indicated at all (cf. Rosinas, 2005, p. 113). However, in the dictionary of Langius, many disyllabic words are as well given without endings, especially if the word is found in larger contexts like phrases or sentences. One can consider a few examples of this kind in (64) found in the dictionary of Langius. Note that Langius sometimes uses a dia-critic mark <'> or more rarely <"> to indicate the omission of sounds.

(64) a. visu Dien' (cauru Dien) (Acc.sg.) (LD) ‘all day long’ (cf. dien-u (Acc.sg.) ‘day’) Latv. <wissu Deen' (zauru Deen)> beside Germ. <den gantzen Tag> (LD)

b. cepta Gaļ (LD) ‘cooked meat’ (cf. gal-a (Nom.sg.) ‘meat’) Latv. <zepta G/aļļ> beside Germ. <gebraten fleisch> (LD)

c. Lai mēs Diev' bijāmies (LD) ‘Let us be God-fearing’ (cf. diev-a (Gen.sg.) ‘God’) Latv. <Lai mähs Deew' bijammes> beside Germ. <Last uns Gott fürchten> (LD)

d. No Akmin, Kok', Rutk' jeb Svin͂ ' darīts (LD) ‘made of stone, tree, radish or lead’ (cf. akmin-s (Gen.sg.) ‘stone’, kok-a (Gen.sg.) ‘tree’, rutk-a (Gen.sg.) ‘radish’, svin-a (Gen.sg.) ‘lead’) Latv. <No Ackmin, Kohk', Rutk' ji Ś wiń' darrihts> untranslated (LD)

Furthermore, as was noted above, many compounds found in the dictionary of Langius do not contain linking elements, whereas they are present in their counterparts attested in other dictionaries of this period. This formal difference of the first component is seen most clearly when one compares Langius’ compounds with their counterparts found in the dictionary of Mancelius, since it is considered that Langius included a large part of the material from the texts of Mancelius, cf. Blesé (1936/1987, p. 492), Zemzare (1961, p. 84). Consider some instances in (65)–(68).

b. Lang. *muia-naud-a* ‘customs duty’ (*→* *muia* ‘customs’)

(66) a. Manc. *ac-a-mirkls* ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (*→* *ac* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’) Latv. *<Atza=mirkkls>* beside Germ. *<Augenblick>* (L)

b. Lang. *ac-a-mirkls* ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (*→* *ac* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’) Latv. *<Atza=mirkkls>* beside Germ. *<ein Augenblick>* (LD)

c. Lang. *ac-mirkls* ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (*→* *ac* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’) Latv. *<Atza=mirkkls>* beside Germ. *<ein Augenblick>* (LD)


In some cases, as shown in (69) and (70), even the ending in a compound is not indicated by Langius.


Latv. <Knohp=addat> beside Germ. <eine StulNa=del, weil an einem Ende ein Knöpflein ist> (LD)

Langius’ material, furthermore, suggests that not even linking elements in compounds, but also endings of the inflected first part of noun phrases, were dropped out in some cases. Hence, it is clear that some of the compounds attested in Langius’ dictionary were fused from phrases.


b. Lang. *jūd-ļaud-is* (Nom.pl.) ‘Jewish people’ (← *jūd-s* ‘Jew’)
Latv. <Juhd= (Judd’) Lauðis> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Einwohner des gelobten Landes> (LD)

(72) a. Manc. *muižas-kung-s* ‘estate manager, steward’ (cf. *muiž-as* (Gen.sg.) ‘estate, manor house’ + *kung-s* ‘lord, master, gentleman’)
Latv. <Muiʃchaskunkx> beside Germ. <Amptmann> (L)

b. Lang. *muiž-kung-s* ‘estate manager, steward’ (← *muiž-a* ‘estate, manor house’)
Latv. <Muisch=kunǵs> beside Germ. <ein Ampt=mann, der das Ampt in seines Herren Hoff verwaltet. Vorzeiten hieβ ein solcher Jun=ckers> (LD)


b. Lang. *maiz-kurv-is* ‘breadbasket’ (← *maiz-e* ‘bread’)
Latv. <Mais’kurwis> beside Germ <ein Brod=Korb> (LD)

However, judging from the examples found in Langius’ dictionary, it can sometimes be difficult to decide whether the lost sound was originally a case ending of the first part of the phrase or the stem vowel of the first component of the compound. Consider the following formally ambiguous cases with first components in (74) and (75), which include nouns of a masculine *a*-stem.
In view of the counterparts presented above, it is clear that a very strong tendency to reduce the form of the components of determinative compounds is represented in Langius’ dictionary. In this respect, Langius’ dictionary differs from other dictionaries of the early period. As was presented above in chapter 1, authors of the Old Latvian texts used different dialectal bases for their written language. For instance, Mancelius used Latvian spoken in Semgallen and Livland as the basis for the language of his texts (Vanags, 2008, p. 188ff.). The characteristic feature of Langius in coining compounds without linking elements and losing short unstressed vowels in word-final position in many uncompounded words suggest that his dictionary reflects traces of a different dialect.

It is known that Langius originated from the southwestern part of Courland (Blese, 1936/1987, p. 482ff.). Although he wrote his works in the Middle dialect, reflexes of the old Curonian language and the Tamian dialect are represented in this dictionary, as suggested by Blese (1936/1987, p. 576ff.). The loss of short vowels in word-final position reflected in the dictionary can be considered to be a trace of the Tamian dialect, which might have influenced Langius during his stay in those areas (Blese, 1936/1987, p. 576). Furthermore, as pointed out by Blese (1936/1987, p. 576), one cannot find this influence of the Tamian dialect in the texts of Mancelius where scarce instances of the loss of short vowels in final position can be explained by other factors, such as the lack of knowing the precise form of some words or the influence of German. Hence, it can be suggested that the very strong tendency to lose short unstressed vowels in word-final position and coin compounds without linking elements is a dialectal phenomenon reflected in Langius’ dictionary. For a more detailed discussion about the different tendencies of compounding represented in the Old Latvian texts, see chapter 7.
3.4 The form of the second component

It is noteworthy that in terms of the form of the second component, determinative compounds in Old Latvian differ from the other categories of Old Latvian compounds. The majority of determinative compounds are unsuffixed. Hence, the stem form of the second component is kept unchanged, as shown by the following examples (76).

(76) a. ac-a-vāk-s ‘eyelid’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + vāk-s ‘lid, cover’) Latv. <Atza=wahx> beside Germ. <die Augenlieder> (PhL)

b. gald-aut-s ‘tablecloth’ (← gald-s ‘table’ + aut-s ‘binding’) Latv. <Ghalld=autz> beside Germ. <ein Tischtuch> (PhL)

c. muit-a-naud-a ‘customs duty’ (← muit-a ‘customs’ + naud-a ‘money’) Latv. <Muita=Nauda> beside Germ. <Zoll> (PhL)

d. pirm-dien-a ‘Monday’ (← pirm-ais ‘first’ + dien-a ‘day’) Latv. <Pirmdeena> beside Germ. <Montag> (PhL)

e. svē-dien-a ‘Sunday’ (← svēt-s ‘holy, blessed, sacred’ + dien-a ‘day’) Latv. <Śwäh=deena (swähta Dee=na)> beside Germ. <der Sonntag> (LD)

f. treš-dien-a ‘Wednesday’ (← treš-ais ‘third’ + dien-a ‘day’) Latv. <Tresch=deena> beside Germ. <die Mitwoch> (LD)

g. ūden-sērg-a ‘oedema’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’) Latv. <Uhden=śährgıa> beside Germ. <die Wasser=sucht> (LD)

The tendency to keep the stem form of the second component unchanged distinguishes the determinative compounds from the possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian. As it will be argued in the following chapters 4 and 5, the majority of the possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds have the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-ė (f.). This suffix is considered to be a shared feature of the Baltic nominal compounds (PB *-i̞jas/*-i̞jā; MLith. -is, -į̄s (m.)/-ė (f.), MLatv. -is (m.)/-ė (f.), OPr. -is (m.)/-ė (f.)), cf. Endzelīns (1951, pp. 262–263), Forssman (2001, pp. 232–233), Larsson (2002b, pp. 205, 209–211).

Consider the following instances of unsuffixed determinative compounds in (77a) and (78a) vs. the possessive compound (77b) and the verbal governing compound (78b), which have the compositional suffix -is.

76 Instances without endings found in Langius’ dictionary were left out of consideration, cf. <Aps’ malck’> (LD) ‘aspen wood’ (← aps-e (M/J), aps-a (PhL) ‘asp’ + malck-a (LD), malck-s (M) ‘wood, firewood’), <Śeṇ̄ grihd> (LD) ‘underfloor’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + grīd-a ‘floor’), etc.
(77) a. liel-dien-a ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’) Latv. <Dewitā Śwehdeenā preeksč Leeldeenas [...] > (Gen.sg.) (VLH) ‘on the ninth Sunday before Easter’

b. vārg-dien-is ‘wretched, misfortune person’ (← vārg-s ‘sickly, infirm’ + dien-a ‘day’) Latv. <Wahrgdeenis> beside Germ. <elend. kränklich. der sich täglich plagen muß. ein Kränk ling> (M/J)

(78) a. vasar-a-svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘Pentecost’ (← vasar-a ‘summer’ + svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘festivity’) Latv. <Waʃśara=jwehtki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Pfingſten> (L)

b. vasar-audz-is ‘teenager, youth’ (← vasar-a ‘summer’ + cf. aug-t ‘to grow’) Latv. <waśśar audsis> beside Germ. <ein Kind so langsamen wächst> (F1)

In the Old Latvian texts, I have found only a handful of examples of determinative compounds that have the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) (they comprise only 2.5% of all Old Latvian determinative compounds analyzed in this work). The complete list of instances of suffixed determinative compounds in Old Latvian is presented below in (79), (80a), (81a), and (82a).77 Note that three of the suffixed compounds in (80a), (81a), and (82a) have variants without the suffix in (80b), (81b), and (82b).

(79) a. lin-sēkl-is ‘linseed’ (← lin-s ‘flax’ + sēkl-a ‘seed’) Latv. <Linn=śehkļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Flachsʃaamen> (PhL)

b. mat-aukl-e ‘hairband’ (← mat-s (F1, F2), mat-e (F2) ‘hair’ + aukl-a (LD), aukl-is (L) ‘string, cord, line’) Latv. <Mattauckle> beside Germ. <Haarʃchnur> (L)

c. pirm-bērn-is ‘first child, offspring’ (← pirm-ais ‘first’ + bērn-s ‘child’) Latv. <Pirm=behrnis> beside Germ. <ein erstes Kind> (F2)

d. tiev-gal-is ‘thin end’ (← tiev-s ‘thin, slim’ + gal-s ‘end, ending’) Latv. <Teew=gallis> beside Germ. <das schmalle Ende> (F1)

(80) a. celf-mal-is ‘roadside’ (← cel-f ‘way, road’ + mal-a (F1, F2), mal-s (LD) ‘edge, brim’) Latv. <[...] śehdeja weens Aklš (Neredʃigs)

77 To the list of the suffixed compounds, one can add a few instances containing the suffix -is, although the basis of their formation is unclear. It could have been that they were translated according to their counterparts in German, cf. skot-viet-is ‘Scot’ (← skot-s ‘Scot’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’): Latv. <Skottweetis> beside Germ. <Schottländer> (L); taut-viet-is ‘foreigner’ (← taut-a ‘people, nation’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’): Latv. <Tautweetis> beside Germ. <ein Frembdling, Auß=länder> (LD) beside a variant taut-viet-s ‘id.’: Latv. <Tautweets> beside Germ. <Außländิʃch> (L).
Zeļļmallī [...] (Loc.sg.) (VLH) ‘a blind man was sitting by the roadside’

b. cēļ-mal-a ‘roadside’ (← cēļ-š ‘way, road’ + mal-a (F1, F2), mal-s (LD) ‘edge, brim’) Latv. <Zeļļmallas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <weg breiten. am weg> (F2)

(81) a. jūr-mal-is ‘seaside, seashore’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + mal-a (F1, F2), mal-s (LD) ‘edge, brim’)
Latv. <Juhrmallis> beside Germ. <des Meeres Ufer> (LD)

b. jūr-i-mal-a ‘seaside, seashore’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + mal-s (LD), mal-a (F1, F2) ‘edge, brim’)
Latv. [...] vnd JESUS jtuawieiu ytwens pe iurimallas [...]> (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘and Jesus was standing alone on the seashore’

(82) a. pil-sāt-e ‘town, city’ (← pil-s ‘palace, castle’ + sāt-a (MEe), sāt-s (MEe) ‘fence, farm, yard’)
Latv. <Ahran Pilsates> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <außer der Stadt> (LD)

b. pil-sāt-a ‘town, city’ (← pil-s ‘palace, castle’ + sāt-a (MEe), sāt-s (MEe) ‘fence, farm, yard’)
Latv. <Pillsahta> beside Germ. <ei=ne Stadt. Kompt her vom Pill’ und liittawschen Wörtlein Šaht’, welches heist ein Dorff> (LD)

However, it may be pointed out that in the Old Latvian texts, one also finds several determinative compounds that superficially seem to contain the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.). However, the following compounds did not have the compositional suffix originally. Firstly, these are determinative compounds, in which the second component is a noun that already ended in -is/-e as an uncompounded word and thus cannot be treated as suffixed compounds. Consider a few compounds of this kind in (83).

(83) a. galv-a-sāp-e ‘headache’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’)
Latv. <Ghallwa=šahpe> beside Germ. <Hauptweh> (PhL)

b. gar-kūl-is ‘long and straight straw’ (← gar-š ‘long’ + kūl-is ‘sheaf’)
Latv. <Garķuši> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lang=Stroh> (F1)

c. skutam-naz-is ‘razor’ (← cf. skus-t ‘to shave’ + naz-is ‘knife’)
Latv. <Skuttam= nassis> beside Germ. <ein Scheer Messer> (LD)

d. šķēr-vārt-is (Nom.pl.) ‘barrier, fence, gate’ (← šķērs-is ‘obstacle’ + vārt-s (MEe), vārt-i (Nom.pl.) (LD), vārt-i (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2) ‘gate’) Latv. <Schkährwahrtis> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ein Schlagbaum> (LD)
e. zem-e-soģ-is ‘governor’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + soģ-is ‘judge’)
Latv. <Tad atbildæia tas žemmeøjgis [...] (EE) ‘then the governor answered’

Secondly, there are quite a few determinative compounds in Old Latvian that end in -is or -e, but due to the morphological variation of uncompounded words, one cannot actually decide whether the compositional suffix was added. However, it is more likely to be the case that the second component was based on a word that already ended in -is or -e before composition.

(84) a. remes-cirv-is ‘woodworker’s axe’ (← remes-s (LD), remes-is (F1, F2)
‘woodworker’ + cirv-is (PhL), cirv-s (F1, F2) ‘axe’)
Latv. <Reñess’= Zirwis> beside Germ. <ein Ziñer=Beil> (LD)
b. saus-sīļķ-e ‘smoked herring’ (← saus-s ‘dry’ + sīļķ-e (LD), sīļķ-is (L)
‘herring’) Latv. <Šauss=sīļke> beside Germ. <Bück Blaue=ling> (LD)
c. sautrum-sakn-e ‘Angelica archangelica (a plant)’ (← sautrum-a ‘Angelica archangelica (a plant)’ + sakn-e (F1, F2), sakn-a (EE),
sakn-is (LD) ‘root’) Latv. <Sautrum Saknes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Angelica. Wurtzel> (F2)

Thirdly, there are a few counterparts of Old Latvian determinative compounds that have variants with second components based on nouns of different stems. It seems that both variants were used in coining compounds, and hence one finds morphological variants of the same compound. Due to this reason, the following compounds ending in -is (m.)/-e (f.) in (85b), (86b), and (87b), in my opinion, do not have the compositional suffix.

(85) a. sēj-a-putn-s ‘curlew’ (← sēj-a ‘sowing’ + putn-s (F1, F2), putn-is (LD)
‘bird’)
Latv. <Sehja=Puttns> beside Germ. <ein braach=Vogel> (F1)
b. sēj-a-putn-is ‘curlew’ (← sēj-a ‘sowing’ + putn-s (F1, F2), putn-is (LD)
‘bird’)
Latv. <Śehja Putnis> beside Germ. <brachvogel> (M/J)

(86) a. kap-sēt-a ‘cemetery, churchyard’ (← kap-s (F1, F2), kap-a (PhL)
‘grave’ + sēt-a (L), sēt-e (L) ‘fence, yard’) Latv. <Kapp=sāhta>
beside Germ. <ein Kirchhoff, Gottes Acker> (LD)
b. kap-sēt-e ‘cemetery, churchyard’ (← kap-s (F1, F2), kap-a (PhL)
‘grave’ + sēt-e (L), sēt-a (L) ‘fence, yard’) Latv. <Kapp=śehte>
beside Germ. <Kirchhoff> (L)
Finally, the following determinative compounds (88) are ambiguous, as they are attested only in the plural form, and there is no indication of the palatalization of the stem consonant <l> of the second component, which could indicate that these instances have the compositional suffix. However, both interpretations of the form of the second component are possible, since variants with the suffix and without it are found in Modern Latvian, cf. galv-gal-is (MEe) ‘head of the bed’ and galv-gal-s (MEe) ‘id.’, kāj-gal-is (MEe) ‘foot of the bed’ and kāj-gal-s (MEe) ‘id.’, sēt-mal-is (MEe) ‘fence, hedge’ and sēt-mal-a (MEe) ‘id.’.

(88) a. galv-gal-i (Nom.pl.) ‘head of the bed’ (← galv-a ‘head + gal-s ‘end, ending’) Latv. <Galw=galli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <zum häupten> (F1)

b. kāj-gal-i (Nom.pl.) ‘foot of the bed’ (← kāj-a ‘leg, foot + gal-s ‘end, ending’) Latv. <kahj=galli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Zunfüßen> (F1)

c. sēt-mal-iem (Dat.pl.) ‘fence, hedge’ (← sēt-a (L), sēt-e (L) ‘fence, yard’ + mal-a (F1, F2), mal-s (LD) ‘edge, brim’) Latv. <In tas Kungs såzzija us to Kalpu: Is=eij us teem leeleem Zeļļeem / in pee Šehtmalleem [...]> (Dat.pl.) (VLH) ‘And the Lord said to the servant: go out into those highways and hedges’

Given that there are only a few unambiguous determinative compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), it may be concluded that the process of adding this suffix did not target determinative compounds to a greater extent in Old Latvian. Hence, in the Old Latvian texts, one finds a very clear tendency to coin determinative compounds by keeping the stem form of the second component unchanged (with no suffixes added). It must be said that the process of adding this suffix did not occur entirely, as determinative compounds in Modern Latvian usually keep the stem form of the second component unchanged (cf. MLLVG, 1959, p. 200ff.), cf. balt-maiz-e ‘white bread’ (← balt-s ‘white’ + maiz-e ‘bread’), maz-meit-a ‘granddaughter’ (← maz-s ‘small, little’ + meit-a ‘girl’), mež-sarg-s ‘forester’ (← mež-s ‘forest’ + sarg-s ‘guard, watch’), stāv-zvaigzn-e ‘fixed star’ (← cf. stāv-ē-t ‘to stand’ + zvaigzn-e ‘star’).
Likewise, in Latvian folk songs (Latv. *tautasdziesmas*), one finds compounds that include two nouns, where the stem form of the second component is usually preserved as in uncompounded words (cf. Ozols, 1961, p. 81), e.g., *jūr-mal-a* 'seaside' (not *jūr-mal-e* or *jūr-mal-is*) (← *jūr-a* 'sea' + *mal-a* 'edge, brim'). According to Ozols (1961, p. 81), counterparts with the compositional suffix *-is* (m.)/*-e* (f.) and without it are only occasionally found in folk songs, cf. *žog-mal-a* 'place next to the fence' (← *žog-s* ‘fence’ + *mal-a* ‘edge, brim’) beside *žog-mal-is* ‘id.’ and *žog-mal-e* ‘id.’. For more compounds with a variable second component found in Latvian folk songs, cf. Kalniņš (1933).

The following chapter will treat possessive compounds found in the Old Latvian texts where the origin and distribution of the compositional suffix *-is* (m.)/*-e* (f.) will be discussed in greater detail. It will be suggested that this suffix originally belonged to the adjectival compounds when it was first added to the possessive compounds and only later spread to some of the determinative compounds in Old Latvian, but the process did not occur entirely, as was argued in this chapter.

### 3.5 Summary

In this chapter, determinative compounds found in the Old Latvian texts were analyzed from a formal point of view. The main aims of this investigation were to discern the most characteristic formal properties of compounds of this category and to determine whether the determinative compounds could be distinguished from the other types of Old Latvian compounds. The discussion about the formal properties also drew parallels with compounds in Lithuanian.

The first section presented different groups of Old Latvian determinative compounds where the compounds were organized according to the internal relations between their components. The following groups were distinguished: the dependent determinative compounds and the attributive determinative compounds.

The second section included an analysis of the formal properties of determinative compounds based on the groups distinguished in the first section. The form of the first component was considered in the first part of this section where compounds with linking elements were treated. It was argued that a linking element was one of the characteristic formal features of determinative compounds that distinguished them from their corresponding noun phrases. Furthermore, in terms of the use of linking elements, the determinative compounds differed from the other categories of Old Latvian compounds, namely the possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds that generally were coined without linking elements. This section also included a discussion about the origin of linking elements where it was proposed that one could still find relics of the stem composition best preserved in the texts of Mancelius.
The second part of this section considered determinative compounds without linking elements. It was argued that many determinative compounds, especially those coined from two nouns, had linking elements originally, but they were lost due to factors such as phonetic environment. In addition, many determinative compounds in Old Latvian originated from noun phrases. Thus, it was difficult to determine whether the lost sound was a case ending or the stem vowel of the first component. This section also presented two groups of determinative compounds that could arguably have been formed without linking elements originally, namely loanblends and examples in which first components were nouns of an old consonantal /i/-stem origin. Furthermore, this section discussed numerous compounds without linking elements that are found in the dictionary of Langius. It was suggested that the characteristic tendency of Langius to lose linking elements could have preserved a trace of the Tamian dialect, which might have influenced Langius during his stay in those areas that spoke the dialect.

In the last part of this chapter, the form of the second component was analyzed. It was shown that the majority of the determinative compounds in Old Latvian keep the stem form of the second component unchanged. Only a few formally unambiguous compounds contained the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.). In this way, the determinative compounds differed from the other categories of Old Latvian compounds where the compositional suffix was more often used.
4 Possessive compounds in Old Latvian

In this chapter, the possessive compounds, another category of compounds found in the Old Latvian texts of the early period, are investigated from a semantic and formal point of view. The possessive compounds cannot be compared to the richly attested determinative compounds (see chapter 3), but instances of this category are fairly frequently attested in the Old Latvian texts. Possessive compounds comprise around 12.9% of all Old Latvian compounds analyzed in this thesis.

The first aim of this chapter is to discuss the use of possessive compounds as adjectives and nouns in Old Latvian. The second aim of this investigation is to define the most characteristic formal properties of this type of Old Latvian compound. Lastly, it seeks to determine whether the possessive compounds can be formally differentiated from the other categories of nominal compounds found in the Old Latvian texts.

This chapter is organized as follows: firstly, the use of possessive compounds in the Old Latvian texts is addressed in which there is an ambiguous use of compounds of this kind as adjectives and nouns. Then, the form that possessive compounds of this period take is analyzed. Note that in terms of the internal relations between components, possessive compounds mostly correspond to the attributive determinative compounds, but there are also a few compounds that correspond to dependent determinative compounds. However, this investigation is concerned with determining the formal properties of possessive compounds. Therefore, instances are grouped and discussed according to the form of the second component, i.e., possessive compounds that have the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), possessive compounds without suffixes, and compounds with an ambiguous second component. In each of these groups, the compounds are organized in terms of the part of speech of each component (e.g., A+N, Num+N, N+N). This section also includes a discussion about adjectival compounds with the suffix -īg-. In the last two sections, the form of the first and second components of Old Latvian possessive compounds is approached by including a discussion about the formal properties of possessive compounds in Lithuanian. The main results of this chapter are summarized in the concluding section.
4.1 The use of possessive compounds: adjectives vs. nouns

I will start this chapter by discussing the use of possessive compounds in the Old Latvian texts. Possessive compounds behave both as adjectives and nouns in these texts. It is interesting to note that occasionally authors of the Old Latvian texts sought to distinguish between adjectival and substantival possessive compounds by using capital initial letters for nouns and small initial letters for adjectives as in the counterparts in German, as shown below in (1) and (2).\(^78\) However, this use is inconsistent.

(1) a. adjective: *vien-roc-is* ‘one-handed’ (← *vien-s* ‘one’ + *rok-a* ‘arm, hand’) Latv. *<ween=rohzis>* beside Germ. *<einhändig>* (L)
   b. noun: *Vien-roc-is* ‘sickle, reaping hook’\(^79\)
      Latv. *<Ween=rohzis>* beside Germ. *<eine Korn Senʃe>* (PhL)

(2) a. adjective: *trak-galv-us* (Acc.pl.) lit. ‘having a head which is possessed, i.e., having an insane mind’ (← *trak-s* ‘insane, possessed’ + *galv-a* ‘head’)
   
   Dievs grib tādus neklausīgus und trakgalaus Ļaudis / katri ne liekās ar Dieva Vārdu rādīties und mācīties / ar lielu Nelaim sodīt / [...]. (LP1)\(^80\)
   ‘God wants to punish with great misfortune such disobeying and daredevil people, who do not seem to appear with the word of God and to learn about it’
   
   b. noun: *Trak-galv-u* (Instr.sg.) ‘daredevil’
   Ne staigā ar kādu Trakgalvu / ka viņš tev Nelaimē ne ievedis [...]. (Syr)\(^81\)
   ‘Do not wander with some daredevil / so that he would not bring you into misfortune’

It was argued above in chapter 2 that possessive compounds show a characteristic feature of a thing that somebody possesses and they can be used attributively as adjectives. This can be illustrated with the aforementioned instance *vien-roc-is*, which can have the meaning of ‘having a hand which is one, i.e.,

\(^{78}\) Rūķe-Dravīna (1977, p. 60) notes that Mancelius, following the German tradition, used capitals in all substantives.

\(^{79}\) In the dictionary of Langius, Latvian *pļautava* ‘sickle, reaping-hook’ is added in brackets beside the above-mentioned compound, clearly suggesting that the compound is used as a noun, cf. Latv. *<Weenrohzis (Plau=tawa)>* beside Germ. *<eine Sichel>* (LD).

\(^{80}\) *<Deews ghribb tahdus neklaufʃighus und trackgalaus Ļaudis / katri nhe leekahʃ ar Deewa Wahrdu rahditeef und mahziteef / ar leelu Nhelaim şohdiet / [...].> (LP1).*

\(^{81}\) *<Nhe ʃtayga ar kahdu Trackgalwu / ka wings töw Nhelayme nhe eweddis [...].> (Syr).*
one-handed’.

Those possessive compounds that act as nouns, on the contrary, denote somebody who has a thing that is characterized by the first component in a compound, e.g., *vien-ac-is* (F1, F2) (∵ *vien-s* ‘one’ + *ac-s* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’) lit. ‘one who has an eye which is one, i.e., a one-eyed person’.

Ambiguous instances of possessive compounds behaving both as adjectives and nouns show that substantival compounds of this type originated from the corresponding adjectival compounds. Hence, it must be viewed as a later development. In Modern Latvian a number of possessive compounds of this type (the so-called *bahuvrīhi* compounds) are now frequently used as nouns (cf. MLLVG, 1959, p. 212), e.g., *gar-aus-is* ‘one who has long ears’ (∵ *gar-s* ‘long’ + *aus-s* ‘ear’), *zil-ac-is* ‘one who has blue eyes’ (∵ *zil-s* ‘blue’ + *ac-s* ‘eye’). Likewise, it is pointed out in the Grammar of Modern Latvian (MLLVG, 1959, p. 212) that these substantival compounds of the *bahuvrīhi* type are old formations that seem to have their origin in adjectives that ended in *-is* (m.)/*-e* (f.). Thus, historically substantival compounds of this kind are later substantivizations of original adjectival possessive compounds.

Furthermore, a few Old Latvian possessive compounds used as nouns show that they had acquired even more obscure lexical meaning. These are typical cases of compounds that denote plant names, animal names, instruments, or other things. Due to their formal properties, it is clear that compounds of this kind originate from adjectival possessive compounds. Consider a few instances (3) below.

(3) a. *mel-miz-is* lit. ‘having bark which is black, i.e., black alder’ (∵ *meln-s* ‘black’ + *miz-a* ‘bark, peel’) Latv. <Mel=Mischi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Eine schwartze Eller> (F1)

b. *vien-radz-is* ‘unicorn’ (∵ *vien-s* ‘one’ + *rag-s* ‘horn’)

Latv. <Ween=radsis> beside Germ. <ein Einhorn> (LD)

In fact, compounds including two nouns and denoting plant names are borderline cases between the possessive and determinative compounds. Although semantically they are clearly of the *bahuvrīhi* type, a few compounds of this kind can be analyzed as determinative compounds from a formal point of view.

---

82 Langius, for instance, provided descriptions in Latvian for a few possessive compounds in German, cf. Germ. <vier=fussig> (LD) beside Latv. *ar četr-am kāj-ams* (Dat.pl.): <ar tschettram Kahjams> (Dat.pl.) (LD) lit. ‘with four legs’; Germ. <barfuß> (LD) beside Latv. *ar plik-am kāj-am* (bass) (Dat.pl.): <Ar plickam kah=jam (Baß)> (Dat.pl.) (LD) lit. ‘with bare foot (barefooted)’.

83 Latv. <ween azsis> beside Germ. <Ein Ein äugiger> (F1).

84 As in the case of a later substantivization in Lithuanian where an originally adjectival possessive compound *ožk-a-baržd-ís* (adjective) ‘having a goat’s beard’ (∵ *ožk-à* ‘goat’ + *barzd-à* ‘beard’) is now also used as a noun *ožk-a-baržd-ís* ‘one who has a goat’s beard, anemone’ (Larsson, 2002b, p. 208).

(see chapter 3), as occasionally they contain linking elements and lack the compositional suffix, as shown below in (4). However, as it will be suggested in this chapter, the most typical formal properties of possessive compounds in Old Latvian are the lack of linking elements and the use of the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.). Hence, compounds of this type can lack linking elements and have the compositional suffix as well. Consider the following compounds of this semantic type in (4) (note that the first component in a few compounds has a palatalized stem, which indicates that a linking element or a case ending was lost).

(4) a. bezdelīg-ac-tiņ-as\(^87\) (Nom.pl.) lit. ‘swallow’s eye, i.e., Bird’s-eye primrose (a plant)’ (← bezdelīg-a ‘swallow’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’) Latv. <Besdellig=Aztiņas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Heil dreyßigkeit blumen> (F1)

b. biš-a-krēsl-in-i (Nom.pl.) lit. ‘bee’s chair, i.e., tansy (a plant)’ (← bit-e ‘bee’ + krēsl-s (F1, F2), krēsl-is (L) ‘chair’) Latv. <Biʃʃcha=krehßliņi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Reinfaaren> (PhL)

c. dzeguz-e-sietav-as (Nom.pl.) lit. ‘cuckoo’s sieve, i.e., butterwort (a plant)’ (← dzeguz-e ‘cuckoo’ + sietav-as (Nom.pl.) ‘sieve’) Latv. <Dsegguśe=śeetawas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Knaben kraut mit braunen düpplen> (F1)

d. kaķ-pēd-es (Nom.pl.) ‘cat’s foot (a plant)’ (← kak-e (LD), kak-is (F1, F2) ‘cat’ + pēd-a ‘foot’) Latv. <kaķpehdes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Reinfaaren> (F1)

e. kaķ-pēd-is ‘cat’s foot (a plant)’ (← kak-e (LD), kak-is (F1, F2) ‘cat’ + pēd-a ‘foot’) Latv. <Kaķpehdis> beside Germ. <Rheinfaaren> (M/J)

f. ķēv-pup-s ‘Verpa (a fungus)’ (← ķēv-e (L), ķēv-a (LD) ‘filly, mare’ + pup-s (PhL), pup-a (L) ‘breast, nipple’) Latv. <Kehw=puppi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Morcheln> (F2)

g. lāc-auz-is lit. ‘bear’s oat, i.e., brome-grass (a plant)’ (← lāc-is ‘bear’ + auz-a ‘oat’) Latv. <Lahzau=schi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Dresp> (LD)

---

\(^{86}\) Another borderline example between the determinative compounds and possessive compounds is caur-a-mais-s ‘insatiable, glutton’ (← caur-s ‘with holes’ + mais-s ‘bag, sack’): Latv. <zaura=maiss> beside Germ. <ein Nißersatt, den mann nicht füllen kan> (LD). As is the case for many determinative compounds in Old Latvian, the above-mentioned compound has a linking element and keeps the stem form of the second component unchanged. However, it is used excentrically as a possessive compound.

\(^{87}\) Cf. bezdelīgas-ac-tiņ-as (Nom.pl.) lit. ‘swallow’s eye, i.e., Bird’s-eye primrose (a plant)’ (← bezdelīg-as (Gen.sg.) ‘swallow’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’): Latv. <Besdelligas=Aztiņņas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Heil dreßigkeitblumen> (F2).
h. lāč-auz-as (Nom.pl.) ‘brome-grass (a plant)’ (← lāc ‘bear’ + auz-as (Nom.pl.) ‘oat’) Latv. <Dirrschas und lahdsch=Ausas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Schmilge und drespe> (F2)

i. ūden-i-ķērs-es (Nom.pl.) ‘hedge-mustard (a plant)’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + ķērs-es (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2) ‘cress’) Latv. <Uhdeni Kehrses> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <brunkreß leffel=kraut> (F1)

j. ūden-kērš-i (Nom.pl.) ‘hedge-mustard (a plant)’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + kērš-i (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2) ‘cress’) Latv. <Vhden=Kehrʃchi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Brunnen=Kreß> (L)

k. vēž-aus-is ‘lily of the valley (a plant)’ (← vēz-is ‘crayfish’ + aus-s ‘ear’) Latv. <Wehsch auschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Tahl=li-lilien, Meyen blühmlein> (F1)

It must, however, be added that sometimes it can still be difficult to determine whether a particular possessive compound was used as an adjective or a noun in the Old Latvian texts. For instance, I have found two examples of a Latvian compound liel-lūp-is (← liel-s ‘big’ + lūp-a ‘lip’) which can be understood as an adjective meaning ‘having big lips’ or a noun denoting one who has big lips, as shown in (5).

(5) a. Latv. <leel=luhpis> beside Germ. <der große Lefftzen hat> (L)

b. Latv. <Leel=luhpis> beside Germ. <der große Lippen hat> (LD)

It may be concluded that in many cases the choice of the use of a particular Old Latvian possessive compound was context-dependent. Hence, in the following section addressing the form of possessive compounds in Early Written Latvian texts, both adjectival possessive compounds and those who could have behaved as nouns are treated together irrespective of their use. Likewise, those aforementioned nouns of more obscure lexical meaning are listed alongside the other possessive compounds. However, borderline cases between the possessive compounds and the determinative compounds discussed above are not treated in the following section where it will be argued that both adjectival and substantival possessive compounds exhibit the same formal properties of their components.

4.2 The form of possessive compounds

In this section, possessive compounds attested in the Old Latvian texts are analyzed and discussed from a formal point of view. Although possessive compounds found in these texts constitute a relatively smaller group, one finds
an interesting consistency in their formal properties, which are presented in the following.

4.2.1 Groups of compounds according to the form of the second component

Possessive compounds treated in this chapter are arranged into the following groups, according to the form of the second component: possessive compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.)\(^88\), compounds without suffixes, and compounds with an ambiguous second component. The formation of adjectival compounds with the suffix -īg- will also be discussed in this section. Note that only a selection of examples are presented in the following groups. The full collection of possessive compounds found in the Old Latvian texts is presented in the appendix.

In each of the groups, the possessive compounds are subdivided according to the parts of speech of their components. The first component of possessive compounds can be an adjective or a numeral (more rarely a pronoun or a noun). The second component is usually a noun. I have found only one instance where the second component is an adjective.

4.2.1.1 Compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.)

A+N

- **balt-galv-is** (m.)/-e (f.) ‘having white, blond hair’ (← Balt-s ‘white’ + galv-a ‘head’) Latv. <Balt=galwis, we> beside Germ. <Ein weiskopf> (F1)

- **gar-kāj-is** ‘long-legged’ (← gar-š ‘long’ + kāj-a ‘leg, foot’) Latv. <gharr=kajis> beside Germ. <langfüʃʃig> (L)

- **liel-galv-is** ‘big-headed’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + galv-a ‘head’) Latv. <leelghallwis> beside Germ. <großkopf> (L)

---

\(^88\) To the list of the suffixed possessive compounds, one must add spulg-a-ac-is ‘bright-eyed’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’): Latv. <Spulga=azzis> beside Germ. <eine frische glänzende, Klahre augen hat> (F1). However, this instance will be excluded from the following discussion due to its formally ambiguous first component. In both copies of Fürecker’s dictionary, this instance is inscribed alongside a noun spulģ-is, which is translated as <der Morgen=Stern> (F2) in German. The first component spulg- might have been associated with the noun spulģ-is by the copyists of the dictionary and thus used in the genitive case. However, this idea cannot be proven, as in the description in German, spulg-a-ac-is is explained as <der frische glänzende klare augen hatt>. Moreover, there is no palatalization of the stem consonant <g>, which could indicate that the first component is in the genitive case. Thus, the first component was most probably the adjective spulg-s (MEe) ‘bright, radiant’ rather than the noun spulģ-is, cf. MLatv. spulģ-ās ac-is (MEe) ‘bright eyes’.
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• *liel-lūp-is* ‘having big lips’ (← *liel-s* ‘big’ + *lūp-a* ‘lip’)
  Latv. <Leel-lu̯hpis> beside Germ. <einer der großen Lippen hat> (PhL)

• *mel-miz-is* ‘black alder’ (← *meln-s* ‘black’ + *miz-a* ‘bark, peel’)
  Latv. <Mel=Mischi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Eine schwartze Eller> (F1)

• *mīkst-čaul-is* ‘soft, fragile, having a soft shell’ (← *mīkst-s* ‘soft, tender’ + *čaul-s* (MEe) ‘husk, shell’)
  Latv. <Mihkst zu̯l̯is, mihkzaula pauts> (Nom.sg., Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <Ein weich schalig E̯> (F1)

• *trak-galv-is* ‘daredevil’ (← *trak-s* ‘insane, possessed’ + *galv-a* ‘head’)
  Latv. <Trackghallwis> beside Germ. <Waghalß> (L)

• *zveir-ac-is*89 ‘cross-eyed’ (← *zveir-s* ‘squinty’ + *ac-s* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’)
  Latv. <Śweir=azzis> beside Germ. <glaß augen> (F1)

Num+N

• *tri-kāj-is* ‘tripod’ (← *trī-s* ‘three’ + *kāj-a* ‘leg, foot’)
  Latv. <Trikahjis> beside Germ. <Ein dre̯fuß> (F1)

• *vien-ac-is* ‘one-eyed’ (← *vien-s* ‘one’ + *ac-s* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ace* (LD) ‘eye’)
  Latv. <ween azzis> beside Germ. <Ein Ein äugiger> (F1)

• *vien-radz-is* ‘unicorn’ (← *vien-s* ‘one’ + *rag-s* ‘horn’)
  Latv. <Ween=radʃis> beside Germ. <ein Einhorn> (PhL)

• *vien-roc-is* ‘one-handed person; sickle, reaping hook’ (← *vien-s* ‘one’ + *rok-a* ‘hand’)
  Latv. <ween-rohzis> beside Germ. <einhändig> (L)

• *vien-ties-is* ‘simple-minded, naive’ (← *vien-s* ‘one’ + *ties-a* (L), *ties-s* (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’)
  Latv. <weenteeʃśis> beside Germ. <-einfältig> (L)

N+N

• *vilk-ac-is* ‘werewolf’ (← *vilk-s* ‘wolf’ + *ac-s* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’)
  Latv. <Wilk=azzis> beside Germ. <ein bärwolf> (F1)

89 Note that instances with the second component -acis will be treated as suffixed possessive compounds, as an older form of the nominative case of an i-stem noun (i.e., *ac-s* ‘eye’) is attested only in the text of Elger, while in the other texts one finds *ac-s* ‘id.’ Another reason to treat instances of this kind as suffixed compounds is that none of these examples were found in the text of Elger. Moreover, in the other texts, a few variants of unsuffixed possessive compounds based on a noun *ac-s* ‘id.’ are found.
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Pron+N

- *pat-galv-is* ‘arbitrary, wilful’ (← *pat-* ‘self’ + *galv-* ‘head’)
  Latv. <pattghallwis> beside Germ. <halßtarrig> (L)

4.2.1.2 Compounds without suffixes

A+N

- *liel-degun-s* ‘having a big nose’ (← *liel-* ‘big’ + *degun-* ‘nose’)
  Latv. <leel=dägguns> beside Germ. <der ein groß Nafen hat> (L)

- *liel-sird-s* ‘noble-minded’ (← *liel-* ‘big’ + *sird-* ‘heart’)
  Latv. <leelširrds> beside Germ. <großmütig> (L)

- *liel-vēder-s* ‘potbelly’ (← *liel-* ‘big’ + *vēder-* ‘stomach, belly’)
  Latv. <Leel Wāhders> beside Germ. <der einen dicken Bauch hat> (LD)

- *mīkst-čaul-s* ‘soft, fragile, having a soft shell’ (← *mīkst-* ‘soft, tender’ + *čaul-* (MEe) ‘husk, shell’)
  Latv. <miextʃchauls> beside Germ. <zart> (L)

- *zveir-ac-s* ‘cross-eyed’ (← *zveir-* ‘squinty’ + *ac-* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’)
  Latv. <Sweirazz> beside Germ. <Glaβaugen> (M/J)

Num+N

- *trī-kāj-a* ‘tripod’ (← *trī-* ‘three’ + *kāj-* ‘leg, foot’)
  Latv. <Trihkah=ja> beside Germ. <ein Dreyfuß> (LD)

- *vien-ac-s* ‘one-eyed’ (← *vien-* ‘one’ + *ac-* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’)
  Latv. <ween=atz> beside Germ. <Einäugig> (L)

N+N

- *vilk-ac-s* ‘werewolf’ (← *vilk-* ‘wolf’ + *ac-* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’)
  Latv. <Wilk=Atz> beside Germ. <ein Warwolf> (LD)

4.2.1.3 Compounds with ambiguous second components

N+N

- *laps-ast-e* ‘dissembler, sycophant’ (← *laps-* (LD), *laps-is* (M/L)
  ‘fox’ + *ast-e* ‘tail’)
  Latv. <Laps=ast> beside Germ. <ein Heuchler, Fuchβ=schwäntzer, Metaph:> (LD)
• sun-purn-is lit. ‘one having a dog’s snout; manlike ogre with a dog’s snout (folklore)’ (← sun-s ‘dog’ + purn-is (PhL), purn-s (F1, F2) ‘snout, muzzle, nose’)
Latv. <Sunpurnis> beside Germ. <Ein Wilder Mensch. Ein Wundergeburt. Meervunder> (F1)

A+N

• plik-sprākl-e ‘naked man’ (← plik-s ‘naked, nude’ + sprākl-e (MEe)
Germ. ‘der Hintere’)
Latv. <plick=sprahk=le> beside Germ. <blosse Hinderst, da nicht zum besten> (LD)

Num+A

• vien-tiesn-is ‘simple-minded, naive’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + tiesn-is (LD)
‘fair, reasonable, honest’)
Latv. <weentees=nis> beside Germ. <einfältig> (LD)

4.2.1.4 Compounds with the adjectival suffix -īg-

In the Old Latvian texts existed another type of adjectival compound that had the adjectival suffix -īg-. These formations are problematic for several reasons, and thus in this section, I will address issues related to the form of these compounds.90

The first component of these compounds is often an adjective, numeral, or a pronoun. Consider the following compounds of this kind in (6) where the second components seem to be derived from nouns and numerals.91

(6) a. lab-prāt-īg-s ‘willing, voluntary’ (← lab-s ‘good’ + prāt-s ‘mind, sense’) <[...] labprahtigs [...]> (VLH)
   b. laun-dab-īg-s ‘malignant’ (← laun-s ‘evil, bad’ + dab-a ‘nature’)
Latv. <Laun=dabbiǵs> beside Germ. <unartig, ungü=tig> (LD)

90 On the problem of the formation of the so-called synthetic compounds (Germ. Zusammenbildung) built of at least three morphemes in Modern German (e.g., blauäugig ‘blue-eyed’), cf. Neef (2015).
91 It is interesting to note that formations of this kind with both inflected components are attested in Elger’s text. For instance, if the second component was used in the accusative case, the first component was also inflected in the same way, cf. pilnu-nākīg-u (Acc.sg.m.) Germ. ‘vollkommen, völlig, mächtig’ (← piln-u (Acc.sg.) ‘full’ + cf. nāk-t ‘to come’): <[...] pilnunakigu [...]> (EE). In addition, many adjectival compounds with the suffix -īg- contained an obscure <e> between their components in Elger’s text, cf. <[...] mileʃirdigs [...]> (EE) ‘kind, generous’ (← mīļ-š ‘dear, endearing’ + sird-s ‘heart’).
The adjectival suffix -īg- was used productively in the texts of Early Written Latvian, where it was frequently used for deriving new adjectives.92 Some of these derived adjectives with the suffix -īg- were used as uncompounded words alongside compounds that included the same adjectives as second components, as presented in (7) and (8).

(7) prāt-īg-s ‘intelligent, wise’ <Prahtiegs> (L)
    lēn-prāt-īg-s (LD) ‘gentle, meek’
    (← lēn-s ‘slow’ + prāt-s ‘mind, sense’)
    Latv. <Lahnprahīgs> beside Germ. <sanftmütig seyn> (LD)

(8) spēc-īg-s ‘strong, powerful’ <ʃpehziegs> (L)
    vis-spēc-īg-s (L) ‘almighty, omnipotent’
    (← vis-s ‘all, the whole’ + spēk-s ‘force, strength’)
    Latv. <wiʃʃpehziex> beside Germ. <Allmächtig> (L)

However, it is usually difficult to determine whether instances with the suffix -īg- must be treated as derivatives or compounds, namely in deciding whether the suffix was added to the whole compound after it was coined or the second component already had the suffix before composition. In view of the instances presented above, it may be suggested that the second component contained the suffix before composition.

The same can be said about several adjectival compounds with the suffix -īg- where the second component seems to be derived from a verbal stem, cf. diev-tic-īg-s (LD) ‘pious, religious’ (← diev-s ‘God’ + cf. tic-ē-t ‘to believe’), lab-dar-īg-s (LD) ‘benevolent’ (← lab-s ‘good’ + cf. dar-i-t ‘to perform, make’), maz-tic-īg-s (VLH) ‘having little faith’ (← maz-s ‘little’ + cf. tic-ē-t

---

92 The suffix -īg- is the most productive adjectival suffix in Modern Latvian, and it has been productively used in Latvian texts of all periods (Blinkena, 2002, p. 168ff.). Adjectives with this suffix “denote the possession in great quantity of whatever quality or thing which the basic noun from which they are derived signifies” (Endzelīns, 1948/1971, pp. 119–120). Adjectives with this suffix can be derived not only from nouns, but also from other adjectives and verbs. For a discussion about the semantic difference between the suffix -īg- and other adjectival suffixes, for instance -isk-, cf. Blinkena (2002, p. 168ff.). Also cf. Achero (1955) for a more detailed description of the formation of compound adjectives in Modern Latvian.
to believe'). In these cases, it is also difficult to determine whether the second component contained the suffix as an uncompounded word or it was added to the whole compound. If the second component was derived with this suffix before composition, one must treat the second component as a deverbal adjective. Thus, the formation of this type of example may be as follows: diev- ‘God’ + ticīg-s ‘believing’ → diev-tiċīg-s ‘pious, religious’. This idea can be strengthened by a few cases of the corresponding noun phrases where ticīg-s is clearly used as an uncompounded word, cf. dieva ticīgs (F1, F2) ‘pious, religious’ (cf. diev-a (Gen.sg.) ‘God’) or lēti ticīgs (M/L) ‘credulous, unwary’ (cf. lēti ‘cheap, low’).

However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the suffix was added to the whole compound, since in cases like lab-dar-īg-s ‘charitable, beneficent’ the second component darīgs might not have existed as an uncompounded word in the Old Latvian texts. This is why the second component must have been a verbal stem where the suffix was added only later, cf. counterparts in Modern Latvian: lab-dar-is (noun) (LLVVe) ‘benefactor, well-doer’ (← lab-s ‘good’ + cf. dar-t-t ‘to perform, make’) vs. lab-dar-īg-s (adjective) (LLVVe) ‘charitable, benevolent’.

Moreover, the use of the adjectival suffix -īg- in some of these adjectival compounds in Old Latvian, in my opinion, was directly influenced by the corresponding suffixed compounds in German, as presented in (9).

(9) a. ciet-sird-īg-s ‘hard-hearted, cruel’ (← ciet-s ‘hard’ + sird-s ‘heart’) Latv. <Zeet=Śirdigs> beside Germ. <hart=herztzig, hart hörig, hart näckisch> (F1)
   b. diev-tic-īg-s ‘pious, religious’ (← diev-s ‘God’ + cf. tic-ē-t ‘to believe’) Latv. <Deew=titzigs> beside Germ. <Gott=gläubig> (LD)
   c. trijād-ven-īg-s Germ. ‘Gott Vater, Sohn und Heiligen Geist in sich vereinigend’ (← trijād-s, trejād-s ‘of three kind’ + vien-s ‘one’) Latv. <Triahd=weeniǵs> beside Germ. <dreyeinig> (LD)
   d. trīs-kant-īg-s ‘triangular’ (← trī-s ‘three’ + kant-e ‘edge’) Latv. <trieß=kantiegs> beside Germ. <drey=eckicht> (L)
   e. vis-spēc-īg-s ‘almighty, omnipotent’ (← vis-s ‘all, the whole’ + spēk-s ‘force, strength’) Latv. <Wiľfpehziex> beside Germ. <Allmächtig> (L)

Likewise, Šmits (1908, p. 26), in his description of the Latvian translation of the Bible by E. Glück, regards this type of adjectival compound as clear loan

93 Latv. <Deew=titzigs> beside Germ. <Gott=gläubig> (LD); Latv. <Labbdarrīgs> beside Germ. <wohl=thätig> (LD); <[..] maj=tizzigi [..]> (Voc.pl.) (VLH).
94 Latv. <deewa Tizzigs> beside Germ. <Gotts=fürchtig> (F2); Latv. <Lehti tizzigs> beside Germ. <leichtgläuf=big> (M/L).
translations from German, cf. OLatv. vis-u-vald-īg-s beside Germ. <allmächtig>. Hence, adjectival compounds of this kind in Old Latvian were simply word-for-word translations from the German language.

Due to this clear connection to the counterparts in German and the formal ambiguity of the second component, adjectival compounds with the adjectival suffix -īg- will not be treated as clear cases of possessive compounds and thus will be excluded from the following discussion about the form of possessive compounds in Old Latvian. However, it will be shown in the following section 4.2.3.2 that the adjectival suffix -īg- was clearly added to at least some of the unsuffixed possessive compounds and compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) to overtly mark their use as adjectives.

Alongside the above-mentioned adjectival compounds attested in Early Written Latvian texts, one finds several instances that were also used attributively and had the adjectival suffix -īg-, but were different from both a formal and semantic point of view, cf. elkadievīgs (L) ‘idolatrous’ (← elk-s ‘idol, God’ + diev-s ‘God’), ūdenssērdīgs (PhL) ‘oedematous; affected or characterized by oedema’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’).96

The aforementioned formations are problematic for several reasons as well. Although they are used as adjectives, it is often unclear whether they were formed from two nouns by adding the suffix -īg- or from a noun and a derived adjective that had the suffix -īg-. However, alongside these formations, examples of word units with two nouns existed in the same texts. In my opinion, the suffix -īg- was simply added to the whole word unit of two nouns to mark its adjectival use. Note that the form of the first component, i.e., a noun, is kept unchanged when the adjectival suffix is added to the whole unit (10).

(10) a. noun: elkadiev-s ‘idol, God’ (← elk-s ‘idol, God’ + diev-s ‘God’) Latv. <Ällkadeews> beside Germ. <Abgott> (L)

b. adjective: elkadiev-īg-s ‘idolatrous’ (← elk-s ‘idol, God’ + diev-s ‘God’) Latv. <Ällkadeewigs> beside Germ. <Aberglaubijch> (L)

Some instances of this kind, where the stem consonant is not palatalized as expected, clearly show that the suffix was added to the whole unit of two

#95 A compound adjective sirds-žēl-īg-s (LD) ‘compassionate, soft-hearted’ (← sird-s ‘heart’ + žēl-s ‘sad, sorrowful’) will also be excluded from the following discussion about the formal properties of possessive compounds in Old Latvian. This compound rarely occurs in the Old Latvian texts, and it must be regarded as an instance with reversed components order of a more common compound found in the same texts, cf. žēl-sird-īg-s ‘compassionate, soft-hearted’ (← žēl-s ‘sad, sorrowful’ + sird-s ‘heart’) <[...] flēlîrîdys [...]> (UP). Both compounds are clear loan-translations from German, cf. Latv. <Sīrd=schālīģs> beside Germ. <barmhertzig, jarnherziger> (LD).

#96 Latv. <Āllkadeewigs> beside Germ. <Aberglaubijch> (L); Latv. <Vdennsērdīģs> beside Germ. <Waţferfūchtig> (PhL).
nouns, and thus the second component was not originally derived with the suffix. For instance, the stem consonant <g> in the second component in the following instances in (11) found in the text of Elger must have undergone regular palatalization if the second component was derived with the suffix -īg-, cf. sērg- ‘epidemic disease’ + -īg- → sērdz-īg-s ‘ill, diseased’. However, as discussed above, this was not the case for some instances that had non-palatal stem consonants and included the adjectival suffix -īg-, as shown in (11).

(11) a. ūden-sērg-īg-s ‘oedematous; affected or characterized by oedema’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’) 
< [...] vdenʃærgigs [...]> (EE)

b. melmenu-sērg-īg-s ‘paralyzed’ (← melmen-i (Nom.pl.) ‘two muscles at the lower part of the backbone behind the kidneys’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’) < [...] måelmnuʃærgigs [...]> (EE)

Furthermore, the formation of this type of adjective in Old Latvian was influenced by the form of their counterparts in German, which had adjectival suffixes (e.g., <ig>, <isch>), too, and expressed the same notions. Consider a few counterparts in Old Latvian and German in (12) and (13).

(12) a. Latv. ūdens-sērg-a ‘oedema’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’) 
Latv. <Vdens=fährgha> beside Germ. <Waʃʃerʃucht> (PhL)

b. Latv. ūdens-sērdz-īg-s ‘oedematous; affected or characterized by oedema’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’) 
Latv. <Vdenssēhrdʃiegs> beside Germ. <Waʃʃerʃüchtig> (PhL)

(13) a. Latv. elkadiев-s ‘idol, God’ (← elk-s ‘idol, God’ + diev-s ‘God’) 
Latv. <Ällkadeews> beside Germ. <Abgott> (L)

b. Latv. elka diev-īg-s ‘idolatrous’ (← elk-s ‘idol, God’ + diev-s ‘God’) 
Latv. <Aelka deewigs> beside Germ. <abergläubig, abgöttisch> (LD)

In my opinion, the aforementioned adjective formations are clearly connected to their German equivalents and must be regarded as instances of word-for-word translations from German. Hence, they will be excluded from the following discussion about the form of possessive compounds in Old Latvian.

4.2.2 The form of the first component

It was previously indicated in the text above that in Old Latvian the possessive compounds comprised a relatively smaller group in comparison to the determinative compounds. However, compounds of this type exhibit an interesting
consistency in their formal properties. One of the main characteristic formal features of the possessive compounds in Old Latvian is the lack of linking elements between the two components.

First of all, it must be said that the lack of linking elements is a formal feature that distinguishes the possessive compounds from the determinative compounds of the early period, which were coined with linking elements in many cases, as was argued in chapter 3. Consider a possessive compound in (14a) and a determinative compound in (14b) below.

(14) a. *vien-ac-s* ‘one-eyed’ (← *vien-s* ‘one’ + *ac-s* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’) Latv. <ween=atz> beside Germ. <Einäugig> (L)
   b. *ac-a-zob-i* (Nom.pl.) ‘eyeteeth’ (← *ac-s* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’ + *zob-s* ‘tooth’) Latv. <tee Atza=ʃohbi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Augenzähne> (PhL)

Second of all, the lack of linking elements also differentiated possessive compounds from noun phrases found in the same Old Latvian texts, as shown in (15) and (16).

(15) a. compound: *liel-sird-s* ‘noble-minded’
   (← *liel-s* ‘big’ + *sird-s* ‘heart’)
   Latv. <leel=śirrds> beside Germ. <Großmütig> (L)
   b. phrase: *liel-a sird-s* ‘generosity’ (cf. *liel-a* (Nom.sg.f.) ‘big’ + *sird-s* ‘heart’)
   Latv. <leela=śirrds> beside Germ. <Großmäßigkeit> (L)

(16) a. compound: *balt-galv-is* (m.), -e (f.) ‘having white, blond hair’
   (← *balt-s* ‘white’ + *galv-a* ‘head’)
   Latv. <Balt=galwis, we> beside Germ. <Ein weiskopf> (F1)
   b. phrase: *balt-a maiz-e* ‘white bread’ (cf. *balt-a* (Nom.sg.f.) ‘white’ + *maiz-e* ‘bread’)
   Latv. <ballta Maiʃe> beside Germ. <Weiβbrod> (L)

It is also important to note that the same situation with regard to the form of the first component is in possessive compounds in Latvian folk songs. In view of the material presented by Ozols (1961, pp. 69–70), it is clear that possessive compounds in folk songs tend to be coined without linking elements, cf. *gaŗ-kāj-e* ‘long-legged’ (← *gar-š* ‘long’ + *kāj-a* ‘leg, feet’), *liel-valod-e* ‘talkative, garrulous’ (← *liel-s* ‘big’ + *valod-a* ‘language’). Note that possessive compounds in folk songs often have the diminutive suffix, cf. *migl-ac-īt-s* ‘one who cannot see clearly’ (← *migl-a* ‘fog, mist’ + *ac-s* ‘eye’), *sārt-vaidz-īt-e* ‘blusher’ (← *sārt-s* ‘pink, rosy’ + *vaig-s* ‘cheek’). Likewise, judging from...

---

97 Cf., e.g., Ozols (1961, p. 30ff) on the use of diminutive suffixes in Latvian folk songs.
the examples quoted in the grammar of Modern Latvian (cf. MLLVG, 1959, p. 212ff.), possessive compounds are also coined without linking elements in Modern Latvian.

After having shown that the Old Latvian possessive compounds generally contain no linking elements between their components, it can be concluded that compounds of this category were formally differentiated from the determinative compounds of that time, in which linking elements were found in many cases. In the following section, I will show that the possessive compounds in Old Latvian were also differentiated in terms of the form of the second component.

4.2.3 The form of the second component

4.2.3.1 Compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) and unsuffixed examples

It was argued in the previous chapter that determinative compounds in Old Latvian were mostly coined without suffixes. Hence, the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) was present only in a small group of Old Latvian determinative compounds, cf. jūr-mal-is (LD) ‘seaside, seashore’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + mal-a (F1, F2), mal-s (LD) ‘edge, brim’).

By contrast, the aforementioned compositional suffix was more often used to coin possessive compounds in Old Latvian, as the majority of compounds of this category (i.e., ca. 68.7%) had the suffix. Consider possessive compounds in (17), which have the suffix when the second component is based on the following nouns: galv-a ‘head’, kāj-a ‘leg, foot’.

(17) a. balt-galv-is (m.), -e (f.) ‘having white, blond hair’ (← balt-s ‘white’ + galv-a ‘head’) Latv. <Balt=galwis, we> beside Germ. <Ein weiskopf> (F1)
   b. gar-kāj-is ‘long-legged’ (← gar-s ‘long’ + kāj-a ‘leg, foot’) Latv. <garr=kahjis> beside Germ. <langfüssig> (LD)
   c. liel-galv-is ‘big-headed’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + galv-a ‘head’) Latv. <eelghallwis> beside Germ. <großkopf> (L)
   d. tri-kāj-is ‘tripod’ (← trī-s ‘three’ + kāj-a ‘leg, foot’) Latv. <Trikahjis> beside Germ. <Ein dreyfuß> (F1)

Only a few Old Latvian possessive compounds have an ambiguous second component, as it consists of a word that already ended in -is or -e, cf. laps-ast-e (LD) ‘dissembler, sycophant’ (← laps-a (LD), laps-is (M/L) ‘fox’ + ast-e ‘tail’), plik-sprākl-e (LD) ‘naked man’ (← plik-s ‘naked, nude’ + sprākl-e

As it was argued above in chapters 2 and 3, the compositional suffix -is is considered to be a shared feature of the Baltic nominal compounds (e.g., Endzelīns, 1951, pp. 262–263). As suggested by Larsson (2002b, p. 205ff.), it must first have become a productive suffix in possessive compounds, since nowadays almost all possessive compounds in Lithuanian and Latvian have the suffix. The process of adding the suffix could have started in the possessive compounds and spread later to the determinative compounds in the Baltic (Larsson, 2002b, p. 210ff.).

The distribution of the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) in the Old Latvian compounds, i.e., the suffix is mainly used in the possessive compounds and not in the determinative compounds, clearly suggests that the suffix was originally an adjectival suffix that was firstly added to possessive compounds to mark their adjectival use in Latvian. It was only later used in coining determinative compounds, although to a lesser extent than in the case of possessive compounds, as can be inferred from the Old Latvian texts.

By contrast, in Modern Lithuanian, the compositional suffix is now productively used in both categories of compounds (cf. Larsson, 2002b, pp. 205, 209–210), cf. determinative compounds with the suffix -is: sen-a̞-miest-is ‘old town’ (← sēn-as ‘old’ + miest-as ‘town, city’), šōn-kaul-is ‘rib’ (← šōn-as ‘side’ + kāul-as ‘bone’); cf. possessive compounds in Lithuanian with the same suffix: ilg-a-kōj-is ‘long-legged’ (← ilg-as ‘long’ + kōj-a ‘leg, foot’), vien-a-rānk-is ‘one-handed man’ (← vīen-as ‘one’ + rank-ā ‘hand’). Thus, in Lithuanian, the compositional suffix had spread beyond its original distribution and is now also used to coin determinative compounds (cf., e.g., Stundžia, 2016, p. 3091). In contrast to this situation in Modern Lithuanian, determinative compounds in Modern Latvian usually keep the stem form of the second component unchanged, as can be inferred from the description of determinative compounds in the grammar of Modern Latvian (cf. MLLVG, 1959, pp. 200–210). Hence, the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) was generalized for coining the possessive compounds, but not the determinative compounds in Latvian, and as I have argued above in this chapter, this original distribution is clearly reflected in the Old Latvian texts.

Moreover, possessive compounds, where the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) is lacking, are more rarely used than the suffixed compounds in the

99 Latv. <Laps=aste> beside Germ. <ein Heuchler, Fuchβ=schwäntzer, Metaph.:> (LD); Latv. <plick=sprahk=le> beside Germ. <blosse Hinderst, da nicht zum besten> (LD); Latv. <Sun-purnis> beside Germ. <Ein Wilder Mensch. Ein Wunder=geburt. Meerwunder > (F1); Latv. <weentees=nis> beside Germ. <einfältig> (LD).
Old Latvian texts. Possessive compounds without the suffix comprise only around 23.5% of all compounds of this type where a few unsuffixed possessive compounds have counterparts with the suffix, as shown in (18)–(22). Note that there is no change meaning.

(18) a. mīkst-čaul-s ‘soft, fragile, having a soft shell’ (← mīkst-s ‘soft, tender’ + čaul-s (MEE) ‘husk, shell’)
   Latv. <miekstčauls> beside Germ. <zart> (L)

   b. mīkst-čaul-is ‘soft, fragile, having a soft shell’ (← mīkst-s ‘soft, tender’ + čaul-s (MEE) ‘husk, shell’)
   Latv. <Mihkst zaulis, mihkzaula pauts> (Nom.sg., Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <Ein weich schalig Ey> (F1)

(19) a. trī-kāj-a ‘tripod’ (← trī-s ‘three’ + kāj-a ‘leg, foot’)
   Latv. <Triekaja> beside Germ. <Dreyfuß> (L)

   b. tri-kāj-is ‘tripod’ (← trī-s ‘three’ + kāj-a ‘leg, foot’)
   Latv. <Trikahjis> beside Germ. <Ein dreyfuß> (F1)

(20) a. vien-ac-s ‘one-eyed’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
   Latv. <ween=atzi> beside Germ. <Einäugig> (L)

   b. vien-ac-is ‘one-eyed’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
   Latv. <Ween=Azzis> beside Germ. <Ein Einäugiger> (F1)

(21) a. vilk-ac-s ‘werewolf’ (← vilk-s ‘wolf’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
   Latv. <Wilk=Atzi> beside Germ. <ein Warwolf> (LD)

   b. vilk-ac-is ‘werewolf’ (← vilk-s ‘wolf’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
   Latv. <Wilk=azzis> beside Germ. <ein bärwolf> (F1)

(22) a. zveir-ac-s ‘cross-eyed’ (← zveir-s ‘squinty’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
   Latv. <Sweirazz> beside Germ. <Glaßaugen> (M/J)

   b. zveir-ac-is ‘cross-eyed’ (← zveir-s ‘squinty’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
   Latv. <Sweir=azzis> beside Germ. <Glaß=Augen> (F2)

100 Unsuffixed possessive compounds can also be found in the Lithuanian dialects, cf. šimt-a-kój-a ‘having a hundred feet’ (← šiunt-as ‘hundred’ + kój-a ‘leg, foot’), cf. Larsson (2002b, p. 208).

101 Note that occasionally the second component with the compositional suffix could be abstracted from compounds and used in the corresponding phrases. For instance, in the second copy of Fürecker’s dictionary, a phrase mīkst-s čaul-is <mihksts Zaulis (tschaulis):> (F2), with the same meaning, is attested alongside mīk-čaul-a (Gen.sg.) paut-s: Latv. <mikhzaula pauts> beside Germ. <ein weich Ey> (F2).
In view of the distribution of the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) presented above, I would like to suggest that the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) was originally an adjectival suffix that was firstly added to the Old Latvian possessive compounds to mark their adjectival use. Furthermore, it is clear that the process of adding the suffix targeted the possessive compounds in Old Latvian to a greater extent, but did not spread to the determinative compounds. By contrast, in compounds in Lithuanian, the compositional suffix is now productively used not only in the possessive compounds, but also in the category of determinative compounds.

4.2.3.2 The spread of the adjectival suffix -īg-

It was previously discussed in section 4.2.1.4 that adjectival compounds with the suffix -īg- were often found in the Old Latvian texts. It was argued that in some cases, the use of this suffix was clearly influenced by the suffixed compounds in German. Furthermore, I have also proposed above that some of these adjectival compounds were clear loan translations from German.

It was also suggested in this chapter that both morphological types of adjectival compounds, i.e., with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) and with the suffix -īg-, coexisted in the same Old Latvian texts. However, it must be pointed out that the authors of the early texts started to add the adjectival suffix -īg- to the possessive compounds of the former type, i.e., examples with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), or to the unsuffixed compounds. As suggested in section 4.1, the unsuffixed possessive compounds and those with the suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) were ambiguous and thus were used both as adjectives and nouns, depending on their context in the Old Latvian texts. This is why, in my opinion, the adjectival suffix -īg- was presumably added to some Old Latvian possessive compounds, as in (23), (24), and (25) below, to mark their use as adjectives.

(23) a. liel-sirds-s ‘noble-minded’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + sirds-s ‘heart’) Latv. <Leel=sirds> beside Germ. <großmütig> (LD)
   b. liel-sirds-īg-s ‘noble-minded’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + sirds-s ‘heart’) Latv. <Leelśirdigs> beside Germ. <großmüthig> (M/J)

(24) a. trak-galv-is ‘daredevil’ (← trak-s ‘insane, possessed’ + galv-a ‘head’) Latv. <trackghallwis> beside Germ. <verwegen/ kühn> (L)
   b. trak-a-galv-īg-s ‘daredevil’ (← trak-s ‘insane, possessed’ + galv-a ‘head’) <[... ] trakkagalwigems [...]> (Dat.pl.m.) (EE)

(25) a. vien-ties-is ‘simple-minded, naive’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ties-a (L), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’) Latv. <weenteeʃśis> beside Germ. <einfältig> (L)
b. *vien-ties-īg-s* ‘simple-minded, naive’ (← *vien-s* ‘one’ + *ties-a* (L), *ties-s* (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’) <[...] wentēği […]> (Nom.pl.m.) (EE)

A similar process of adding external adjectival suffixes to possessive compounds is observed in the Germanic languages. Kastovsky (2011, p. 337) points out that in the Germanic languages the adjectival *bahuvrīhis* like English *barefoot* have been replaced by *bahuvrīhis* that were extended by adjectival suffixes -ed (e.g., *hunchbacked* < *hunchback*) or -īg, as in German *dick-köpf < Dickkopf* ‘pig-headed’, hence overtly marking their part-of-speech membership as adjective. This process, as suggested by Kastovsky (2011, p. 337), had already started in Old English and Old High German.102

Taking into account that the Old Latvian texts of the early period were experiencing a great influence of the German language (cf. Vanags, 2008, pp. 193–196), it can be suggested that the use of the adjectival suffix -īg- was triggered by the corresponding suffixed possessive compounds in German. It must be said that in Modern Latvian one finds both types of compounds, i.e., with the adjectival suffix -īg- used as adjectives, and with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) now mostly used as nouns (cf. Achero, 1955, pp. 49–50; MLLVG, 1959, p. 315), cf. *mīkst-sird-īg-s* (adjective) ‘soft-hearted’ (← *mīkst-s* ‘soft, tender’ + *sird-s* ‘heart’) beside *mīkst-sird-is* (noun) ‘one who is soft-hearted’; *stūr-galv-īg-s* (adjective) ‘stubborn’ (← *stūr-s* ‘persistent’ + *galv-a* ‘head’) beside *stūr-galv-is* (noun) ‘a stubborn person’.

A conclusion can be drawn that in terms of the formal properties, which were discerned and discussed in this chapter, the possessive compounds in Old Latvian were formally distinguished from another category of Old Latvian nominal compounds, i.e., the determinative compounds. In the following chapter, the verbal governing compounds attested in the early texts will be treated. It will be argued that in terms of the formal properties, the Old Latvian verbal governing compounds primarily resemble the possessive compounds analyzed in this chapter.

4.3 Summary

In this chapter, possessive compounds found in the Old Latvian texts were investigated from both a semantic and formal point of view. The aims of this chapter were: a) to discuss the use of possessive compounds in Old Latvian;

---

b) to discern the most characteristic formal properties of this type of Old Latvian compound; c) to determine whether possessive compounds were formally differentiated from the other categories of Old Latvian compounds, the determinative compounds, in particular.

In the first section, the use of possessive compounds was discussed. It was suggested that possessive compounds were used both as adjectives and nouns in the Old Latvian texts. However, in some cases it was difficult to decide whether a particular instance acted as an adjectival or substantival compound. Hence, it was concluded that their use was clearly context-dependent.

The formal analysis of possessive compounds aimed to determine the most characteristic formal properties of this type of Old Latvian compound. This is why compounds were organized in different groups according to the form of the components. The issue of the formation of adjectival compounds with the suffix -īg- was also discussed in this section, where it was argued that many instances of this kind were word-for-word translations from the German language. Due to this reason and the ambiguous form of the second component, compounds with the suffix -īg- were not treated as possessive compounds in this chapter.

Furthermore, the possessive compounds were analyzed in terms of the formal properties of both components. It was suggested that one of the main characteristic formal properties of Old Latvian possessive compounds was a lack of linking elements. In this way, the possessive compounds were formally distinguished from the determinative compounds of that time, which often included linking elements.

Possessive compounds were also analyzed in terms of the form of the second component where they were subdivided into possessive compounds that had the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), compounds that kept the stem form of the second component unchanged, and those that had an ambiguous second component.

The largest number of possessive compounds found in Old Latvian had the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), which, on the contrary, was rarely used in the Old Latvian determinative compounds. The compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) used in many possessive compounds was another formal property that distinguished them from the determinative compounds of that time. The distribution of the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) in Old Latvian compounds revealed in this chapter, i.e., the compositional suffix was mostly found in possessive compounds and not in determinative compounds, suggested that this originally adjectival suffix did not spread to the determinative compounds in Old Latvian as was the case for Lithuanian compounds.

It was also argued in this chapter that some of the possessive compounds were superseded by the compounds with the adjectival suffix -īg-. It was concluded that the process of adding the suffix -īg- was triggered by the suffixed counterparts in German.
This chapter addresses another category of Old Latvian compounds, i.e., the verbal governing compounds. The aims of this chapter are similar to those of the previous chapters, in which the determinative compounds and the possessive compounds were investigated. Firstly, it aims to describe and analyze the verbal governing compounds from a semantic point of view. Secondly, the formal analysis seeks to identify the most characteristic formal properties of this type of Old Latvian compound. Thirdly, the results of the formal analysis of this category of compounds are discussed with regard to the formal properties of the determinative and possessive compounds discerned in the previous chapters 3 and 4.

This chapter is organized as follows: firstly, the meaning of the verbal governing compounds is considered and the semantic groups of this type of compound discussed. Then, the form of the verbal governing compounds is analyzed by presenting different groups and discussing the formal properties of the components of compounds of this category. The results of this chapter are summarized in the last section.

5.1 The meaning of the verbal governing compounds

As previously described in chapter 2, the verbal governing compounds include a verbal stem as the second component that may or may not exist as an uncompounded word in Old Latvian. The syntactic relations between the two components depend on the transitivity of a verb used as the second component. If the second component is a stem of the transitive verb, the first component, usually a noun, can function as an argument. Thus, the first component can be viewed as an object governed by the verbal stem included in the second component. Hence, vēst-nes-is (LD) 'messenger, herald' (← vēst-s (F1, F2), vēst-is (LD), vēst-a (LD), vēst-e (L) 'message, news' + cf. nes-t 'to carry, to

103 The verbal governing compounds constitute around 14.5% of all Old Latvian compounds treated in this study.

bear’) can be understood as the one who carries or brings news or messages.  
If the second component is a stem of an intransitive verb, other syntactic relations occur between the components, cf. vasar-audz-is (F1, F2) (← vasar-a ‘summer’ + cf. aug-t ‘to grow’) is literally one who grows during summer, but it means ‘teenager, youth’.  

The majority of the verbal governing compounds found in the Old Latvian texts are agent and instrument nouns from a semantic point of view. For instance, bad-mir-is (L) (← bad-s (L), bad-us (F1, F2) ‘famine’ + cf. mir-t ‘to die’) is one who is dying of famine, i.e., this compound denotes a ‘starving person’, or kann-dar-s (LD) (← kann-a ‘can, pot’ + cf. dar-i-t ‘to do, to perform’) is one who makes cans or pots, i.e., the compound means ‘pot-maker’. Likewise, pat-mal-as (Nom.pl.) (PhL) (← pat-s ‘self’ + cf. mal-t ‘to grind, to mill’) denotes one that grinds itself, i.e., it is a windmill or a watermill.  

Instances of this kind are basically used as nouns in the Old Latvian texts, as can be shown with the following compounds in (1): dzirn-kal-is ‘millstone cutter’ (← dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’ + cf. kal-t ‘to forge, to hammer’), mel-kul-is ‘tale-teller/liar’ (← mel-i (Nom.pl.) ‘lie’ + cf. kul-t ‘to thresh, to flail’).  

(1) a. Latv. Dzirnkalis (Dat.sg.) vajag to kapināt109 beside Germ. <der Steinhacker muß ihn scharfen> (LD)  
b. [...] tas viens Melkulis [...]110 ‘that one liar’  
Latv. <[...] tas weens Melkulis [...]> (VLH) ‘that one liar’  

I have found only a few examples that can be interpreted as action nouns expressing the time when an action takes place. Consider the following instances of action nouns (2) in Old Latvian.  

(2) a. mies-met-is ‘Shrovetide’ (← mies-a ‘flesh, body’ + cf. mes-t ‘to throw’) Latv. <Mees=Meschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <das päbstische fasten> (F2)
b. *zem-lik-a* ‘the evening of the feast of Sts. Simon and Jude when food offerings are left for the spirits’ (← *zem-e* ‘earth, ground’ + cf. *lik-t* ‘to put, to place’) Latv. *<Semlikka>* beside Germ. *<soll Simon Judae Abend sein das Sie den Seelen allerlej Korn auftragen zur Speise>* (F1)

The following instance of an action noun (3a) has a counterpart (3b) that differs both semantically, i.e., it is an agent noun, and formally, i.e., there is a linking element used between the components. For a more detailed discussion about the form of the first component of Old Latvian verbal governing compounds, see section 5.2.2.

(3) a. action noun: *pup-a-kār-is* ‘time (moment) when a child wants to be breastfed’ (← *pup-s* (PhL), *pup-a* (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. *kār-o-t* ‘to desire, to long for’) Latv. *<Tam behrnam uhseet puppa=kahris>* beside Germ. *<dem Kind verlanget nach der Zitzen>* (F1)

b. agent noun: *pup-kār-is* ‘child who wants to be breastfed’ (← *pup-s* (PhL), *pup-a* (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. *kār-o-t* ‘to desire, to long for’) Latv. *<Pupp=kahris>* beside Germ. *<ein Zitzen=Naßcher>* (F1)

As shown above in chapter 2, the same semantic types of the verbal governing compounds prevail in Lithuanian where the compounds of this category are used as agent nouns, instrument nouns, and action nouns (cf., e.g., Senn, 1966, p. 341).

5.2 The form of the verbal governing compounds

5.2.1 Groups of compounds according to the form of the second component

In this section, the morphological types of the verbal governing compounds found in the Old Latvian texts are presented. Note that only a representative selection of instances is listed in the following. These instances will be discussed in more detail in this chapter.

The compounds are arranged into three groups according to the form of the second component. The majority of the examples of verbal governing compounds have the compositional suffix *-is* (m.)/-*e* (f.). Furthermore, several

---

111 This sentence can be understood as ‘the child wants to be breastfed’. Note that the translation in the German language does not exactly match the Latvian sentence in an original source.
compounds end in -a and -s.\textsuperscript{[112]} Instances having other agentival suffixes like -ēj-, -niek-, -tāj-, which were used for deriving agent nouns in Old Latvian, are not listed in these groups, but are treated in the following discussion about the second component of the verbal governing compounds (see section 5.2.3.4).

In each of the groups, compounds are, furthermore, organized depending on the part of speech of each component. The first component of the verbal governing compounds is typically a noun and the second a verbal stem. In only a few cases, the first component is a numeral, pronoun or an adverb. Finally, I have found only two compounds with a reversed component order where the first component is a verbal stem and the second is a noun.

5.2.1.1 Compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.)

N+V

- \textit{abr-a-kas-is} ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ (← \textit{abr-a} (L), \textit{abr-s} (M), \textit{abr-is} (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. \textit{kas-i-t} ‘to scrape, to scratch’)
  Latv. <\textit{Abra kahsis}> beside Germ. <das nachschraapels. it. die Trog schraap> (F1)

- \textit{abr-kas-is} ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ (← \textit{abr-a} (L), \textit{abr-s} (M), \textit{abr-is} (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. \textit{kas-i-t} ‘to scrape, to scratch’)
  Latv. <\textit{Abbrkasśis}> beside Germ. <eine Trogschape> (M/J)

- \textit{ād-a-min-is} ‘skinner’ (← \textit{ād-a} ‘skin, leather’ + cf. \textit{mī-t} ‘to tread, to step) Latv. <\textit{Ahda=minnis}> beside Germ. <der ledertreter, gerber> (F1)

- \textit{ād-min-is} ‘skinner’ (← \textit{ād-a} ‘skin, leather’ + cf. \textit{mī-t} ‘to tread, to step)
  Latv. <\textit{Ahd=minis}> beside Germ. <Lehdergerber> (L)

- \textit{bad-mir-is} ‘starving person’ (← \textit{bad-s} (L), \textit{bad-us} (F1, F2) ‘famine’ + cf. \textit{mir-t} ‘to die’) Latv. <\textit{baddmiris}> beside Germ. <hungerig> (L)

\textsuperscript{[112]} There are two instances of Old Latvian verbal governing compounds that unfortunately must be ignored due to the unclear form of the second component. One of these is attested only in the plural form, which makes it difficult to determine the original form of the compound. cf. \textit{pat-mal-i} (Nom.pl.) ‘windmill, watermill’ (← \textit{pat-s} ‘self’ + cf. \textit{mal-t} ‘to grind, to mill’): Latv. <\textit{Pat=mail}> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <eine Windmühle> (LD). Another example has an etymologically unclear second component, cf. \textit{sird-ēst-s} ‘heartache’ (← \textit{sird-s} ‘heart’ + cf. \textit{ēs-t} ‘to eat’): Latv <\textit{Sīrd=ehsts}> beside Germ. <Küferniß, noht, anliegen> (F1). Note that there is a variant of this compound used in Modern Latvian, cf. \textit{sirds-ēd-as} (Nom.pl.) (LLVVe) ‘id.’ (cf. \textit{ēs-t} ‘to eat’).
• **dzirn-kal-is** ‘millstone cutter’ (← **dzirn-us** (Nom.pl.) (L), **dzirn-is** (LD)
  ‘hand mill’ + cf. **kal-t** ‘to forge, to hammer’
  Latv. <Džirmkallis/ kaņļ Ackminūs kappina> beside Germ. <einer der die Steine soll zersägen> (PhL)

• **lok-tur-is**113 ‘handrail’ (← **rok-a** ‘hand, arm’ + cf. **tur-ē-t** ‘to hold, to keep’)
  Latv. <lokturris> beside Germ. <bühner> (F1)

• **mat-pīn-is** ‘braid’ (← **mat-s** (F1, F2), **mat-e** (F2) ‘hair’ + cf. **pī-t** ‘to braid, to weave’
  Latv. <Matīspīnis> beside Germ. <Haar=frisur> (L)

• **mel-kul-is** ‘tale-teller/liar’ (← **mel-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘lie’ + cf. **kul-t** ‘to thresh, to flail’
  Latv. <Mālkkulis> beside Germ. <Lügener> (L)

• **mēl-nes-is** ‘tale-teller/liar’ (← **mēl-e** ‘tongue’ + cf. **nes-t** ‘to carry, to bear’
  Latv. <Mēlnes=cis> beside Germ. <Meerlintrager> (L)

• **mies-met-is** ‘Shrovetide’ (← **mies-a** ‘flesh, body’ + cf. **mes-t** ‘to throw’
  Latv. <Meesmetis> beside Germ. <fasten. wend.> (F2)

• **pup-a-kār-is** ‘time (moment) when a child wants to be breastfed’ (←
  **pup-s** (PhL), **pup-a** (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. **kār-o-t** ‘to desire, to long for’
  Latv. <Tam behn nam uheet puppa=kahris> beside Germ. <dem Kind verlanget nach der Zitzen> (F1)

• **pup-kār-is** ‘child who wants to be breastfed’ (← **pup-s** (PhL), **pup-a** (L)
  ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. **kār-o-t** ‘to desire, to long for’
  Latv. <Puppe=kahris> beside Germ. <ein Zitzen=Naßcher> (F1)

• **pup-zīd-is** ‘infant’ (← **pup-s** (PhL), **pup-a** (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. **zīs-t** ‘to suckle’
  Latv. <Puppe=sidhs> beside Germ. <ein Zitzen=Säuger> (F1)

• **sul-laiz-is** Germ. ‘Schmarotzer’ (← **sul-a** ‘juice, sap’ + cf. **laiz-ī-t** ‘to lick’
  Latv. <Sūl=laisis> beside Germ. <ein Schmarotzer> (F1)

• **ties-nes-is** ‘judge, justiciary, magistrate’ (← **ties-a** (L), **ties-s** (F1, F2)
  ‘truth, verity’ + cf. **nes-t** ‘to carry, to bear’
  Latv. <Tiefreshis> beside Germ. <Richter> (L)

• **ugun-a-kur-is** ‘fire, bonfire’ (← **ugun-s** ‘fire’ + cf. **kur-t** ‘to make fire’
  Latv. <Iggauna= semmāsh nhe drihs plam ickattre ugguna= kurry cet> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <in Estland darff man nicht in einer jeden Stadt gehen. Manc:> (LD)

113 Dissimilated from **rok-tur-is** (MEe) ‘handrail; handle, knob’ (← **rok-a** ‘hand, arm’ + cf.
  **tur-ē-t** ‘to hold, to keep’).
• *ugun-kur-is* ‘fire, bonfire’ (*ugun-s* ‘fire’ + *kur-t* ‘to make fire’) Latv. *<Uģģun’kurris>* beside Germ. *<ein Feuer stadt, Feuerheerd>* (LD)

• *vasar-audz-is* ‘teenager, youth’ (*vasar-a* ‘summer’ + *aug-t* ‘to grow’) Latv. *<Wassar audsis>* beside Germ. *<ein Kind so langsam wächst>* (F2)

• *vēst-nes-is* ‘messenger, herald’ (*vēst-s* (F1, F2), *vēst-is* (LD), *vēst-a* (LD), *vēst-e* (L) ‘message, news’ + *nes-t* ‘to carry, to bear’) Latv. *<Kāhnīga jeb Leelakunkā Wähst=nessis (Wähstneeks, San=tis)>* beside Germ. *<ein Königl. oder Fürstlicher Gesandter>* (LD)

• *zem-tur-is* ‘peasant, farmer’ (*zem-e* ‘earth, ground’ + *tur-ē-t* ‘to hold, to keep’) Latv. *<Sem=turris>* beside Germ. *<ein gesinds=Kerl. Kerl. ein wirt der land=hält>* (F1)

• *zīm-lem-is* ‘prophet, fortune teller’ (*zīm-e* ‘sign, symbol’ + *lem-t* ‘to decide, to resolve’) Latv. *<Sihm=lemmis>* beside Germ. *<ein Zeichen=deuter>* (F2)

5.2.1.2 Compounds ending in -a

• *pirm-dzim-is* ‘person’s first child’ (*pirm-ais* ‘first’ + *dzim-t* ‘to be born’) Latv. *<Pirmdsimis>* beside Germ. *<der erstge=borner>* (LD)

• *pat-maļ-i* (Nom.pl.) ‘windmill, watermill’ (*pat-s* ‘self’ + *mal-t* ‘to grind, to mill’) Latv. *<Pattmaļi>* (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. *<Waʃʃermüle>* (L)

5.2.1.2 Compounds ending in -a

N+V

• *abr-a-kas-a* ‘the remaining dough; instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ (*abr-a* (L), *abr-s* (M), *abr-is* (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + *kas-ī-t* ‘to scrape, to scratch’) Latv. *<abbrakaśśa>* beside Germ. *<der ausgekazte Teig>* (F2)

• *cel-tek-a* Germ. ‘ein Landstreicher, Landfahrer’ (*cel-š* ‘road, way’ + *tec-ē-t* ‘to flow, to trickle’) Latv. *<Zel[jeb Sehm=tekka]* beside Germ. *<ein Landstreicher>* (F1)
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• zem-lik-a ‘the evening of the feast of Sts. Simon and Jude when food offerings are left for the spirits’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + cf. lik-t ‘to put, to place’) Latv. <Seņliška> beside Germ. <soll Simon Judae Abend sein das Sie den Seelen allerlej Korn auftragen zur Speise> (F1)

• zem-tek-a Germ. ‘ein Landstreicher, Landfahrer’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + cf. tec-ē-t ‘to flow, to trickle’) Latv. <Zēlī> beside Germ. <ein Landstreicher> (F1)

Another instance which belongs to this group is pel-ād ‘bat’ (← pel-e ‘mouse’ + cf. ės-t ‘to eat’): Latv. <Pellād> beside Germ. <Fledermauß> (PhL). The original ending could arguably have been *-a as in Lithuanian pel-ė́d-a (LKZe) ‘owl’ (← pel-ė́ ‘mouse’ + cf. ė́s-ti ‘to eat (usually refers to animals)’).114 In addition, there is a variant which has the compositional suffix -e found in Manuale Lettico-Germanicum, cf. pel-ād-e ‘bat’: Latv. <Pellāde> beside Germ. <fle=dermauß> (M).

Pron+V

The following compound is attested only in the nominative plural where it is indicated as <as>, which suggests that originally it ended in -a in nominative singular.

• pat-mal-as (Nom.pl.) ‘windmill, watermill’ (← pat-s ‘self’ + cf. mal-t ‘to grind, to mill’) Latv. <Pattmalas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <eine Waʃʃermüle/ Vhdens=dʃirnas. [Die Sehlburger/ vnd andere dort hinauff/ nennens Pattmalas.>] (PhL)

5.2.1.3 Compounds ending in -s115

N+V

114 Cf. Latv. pel-ād-a (MEe) ‘bat’.
115 To this list of compounds ending in -s, two more compounds must be added. These instances seem to have a reversed component order where the verbal stem occurs as the first component and a noun as the second one, cf. valb-ac-s ‘one who is rolling his/her eyes’ (← cf. valb-ī-t ‘to roll one’s eyes’ + cf. ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’): Latv. <wallbatz> beside Germ. <überfichtig> (PhL). Another compound is: ŝņug-degun-s lit. ‘one who is blowing his/her nose’ (← cf. šņūk-t or šņauk-t (?) ‘to blow, to snuff’ + degun-s ‘nose’): Latv. <Schnugdegguns> beside Germ. <Rotzleffel> (M). The first component in the latter example is problematic, since it might also be based on šņuk-ā-t ‘to sniff, to smell’ which could be related to German schnucken ‘to sob’ (cf. Sehwers, 1953, pp. 138–139). Hence, this compound can be a loanblend. However, it must be pointed out that the verbal governing compounds with a reversed component order are rarely found in the Baltic languages, cf. Latv. groz-galv-is (LKv) ‘wryneck (bird)’ (← cf. groz-ī-t ‘to wag, to wiggle’ + galv-a ‘head’) beside Latv. galv-groz-is (LKv) ‘id.’. For more examples of this kind in the Baltic languages, cf. Larsson (2002b, p. 219).
5.2.2 The form of the first component

The verbal governing compounds exhibit an interesting consistency in their formal properties, as was also the case for the possessive compounds found in the Old Latvian texts (see chapter 4). The majority of the verbal governing compounds are coined without linking elements between their components, as shown by the following examples in (4).

(4) a. dzirn-kal-is ‘millstone cutter’ (← dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’ + cf. kal-t ‘to forge, to hammer’) Latv. <Djirnkallis/kaß Ackmiņus kappina> beside Germ. <einer der die Steine jährffet> (PhL)

b. mat-pin-is ‘braid’ (← mat-s (F1, F2), mat-e (F2) ‘hair’ + cf. pī-t ‘to braid, to weave’) Latv. <Matt=pinis> beside Germ. <Haarjähnur> (L)

c. zīm-lem-is ‘prophet, fortune teller’ (← zīm-e ‘sign, symbol’ + cf. lem-t ‘to decide, to resolve’) Latv. <Sihm=lemis> beside Germ. <ein Zeichen=deuter> (F1)
This formal feature, i.e., a lack of linking elements, suggests that from a formal point of view, the verbal governing compounds resemble possessive compounds that were generally coined without linking elements. On the contrary, determinative compounds in Old Latvian were often coined with linking elements, as presented in (5).

(5) a. verbal governing compound: *vasar-audz-is* ‘teenager, youth’

\[(\leftarrow \text{vasar-a ‘summer’} + \text{cf. aug-t ‘to grow’})\]

\[\text{Latv.} \ <\text{waśśar audsis}> \text{beside Germ.} <\text{ein Kind so longsam wächst}> (\text{F1})\]

b. determinative compound: *vasar-a-svētk-i* (Nom.pl.) ‘Pentecost’

\[(\leftarrow \text{vasar-a ‘summer’} + \text{svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘festivity’})\]

\[\text{Latv.} \ <\text{Wajšara=jwehtki}> (\text{Nom.pl.}) \text{beside Germ.} <\text{Pfingštten}> (\text{L})\]

Exceptions to the verbal governing compounds without linking elements are only a few where a linking element <a> is used. Apart from one case (6), all other compounds with a linking element <a> in (7)–(10) have a variant without a linking element. Consider the following morphological variants of the first component of the verbal governing compounds.

(6) *katl-a-lāp-s* ‘tinker’ \[(\leftarrow \text{katl-is (LD), katl-s (F1, F2) ‘pot, kettle’ + cf. lāp-ī-t ‘to mend, to repair’})\]

\[\text{Latv.} <\text{Kattla=lahps (Lahpeis)> beside Germ.} <\text{ein Kesselflicker}> (\text{LD})\]

(7) a. *abr-a-kas-is* ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ \[(\leftarrow \text{abr-a (L), abr-s (M), abr-is (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. kas-ī-t ‘to scrape, to scratch’})\]

\[\text{Latv.} <\text{Abra kahsis}>_{116} \text{beside Germ.} <\text{das nachschraapels. it. die Trog schraap}> (\text{F1})\]

b. *abr-kas-is* ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough; kneading dough’ \[(\leftarrow \text{abr-a (L), abr-s (M), abr-is (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. kas-ī-t ‘to scrape, to scratch’})\]

\[\text{Latv.} <\text{Abbrkasśis}> \text{beside Germ.} <\text{eine Trogschrape}> (\text{M/J})\]

c. *abr-a-kas-a* ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough; the remaining dough’ \[(\leftarrow \text{abr-a (L), abr-s (M), abr-is (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. kas-ī-t ‘to scrape, to scratch’})\]

\[\text{Latv.} <\text{Abbra= kassa} > \text{beside Germ.} <\text{ein Trog=scharr oder schrap}> (\text{LD}); \text{Latv.} <\text{abbrakaśśa}> \text{beside Germ.} <\text{der ausgekazte Teig}> (\text{F2})\]

---

116 Fennell (1997, p. 6) notes that <h> in the second component is an afterthought.
(8) a. ad-a-min-is ‘skinner’ (← ad-a ‘skin, leather’ + cf. mi-t ‘to tread, to step’) Latv. <Ahda=minnis> beside Germ. <der ledertreter, gerber> (F1)

b. ad-min-is ‘skinner’ (← ad-a ‘skin, leather’ + cf. mi-t ‘to tread, to step’) Latv. <Ahd=minnis> beside Germ. <der Leder=treter, gerber> (F2)

(9) a. pup-a-kār-is ‘time (moment) when a child wants to be breastfed’
   (← pup-s (PhL), pup-a (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. kār-o-t ‘to desire, to long for’) Latv. <Tam behnan umhseet puppa=kahris> beside Germ. <dem Kind verlanget nach der Zitzen> (F1)

b. pup-kār-is ‘child who wants to be breastfed’ (← pup-s (PhL), pup-a (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. kār-o-t ‘to desire, to long for’) Latv. <Pupp=kahris> beside Germ. <ein Zitzen=Naßcher> (F1)

(10) a. ung-a-kur-is ‘fire, bonfire’ (← ung-s ‘fire’ + cf. kur-t ‘to make fire’) Latv. <Iggauna= sammah nhe drihs applam iekattru ugguna= kurry eet> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <in Elst=land darff man nicht in eines jeden Feuer stadt gehen. Manc:> (LD)

b. ung-kur-is ‘fire, bonfire’ (← ung-s ‘fire’ + cf. kur-t ‘to make fire’) Latv. <Uggun’kurris> beside Germ. <ein Feuer stadt, Feuerheerd> (LD)

The aforementioned compounds with a linking element <a> raise the question as to whether this element originally belonged to these compounds or was analogically introduced from the other compounds with linking elements. The compound in (6), which has no variant without the linking element <a>, in my view, was formed by analogy with another morphological type of agent noun in Old Latvian where the first component was in the genitive case and the second one had the agentival suffix (such as -ēj-, -tāj-), cf. katla-kal-ēj-s (PhL) ‘tinker’ (← katl-a (Gen.sg.) ‘pot, kettle’ + cf. kal-t ‘to forge, to hammer’), kattlu-kal-ēj-s (L) ‘id.’ (← katl-u (Gen.pl.) ‘pot, kettle’). Note that lāp-ēj-s (LD) is also given alongside a compound kal-lāp-s (LD), hence supporting the idea that <a> was analogically introduced from this different morphological type of agent noun in Old Latvian. In section 5.2.3.4 below, I will discuss the interplay between the different types of agent nouns in Old Latvian.

However, counterparts in (7)–(10) need to be discussed in more detail. It can be tentatively suggested that in these scarce attestations of the verbal governing compounds, the first component, i.e., a noun, is in the original stem form, as was the case for some of the determinative compounds in Old Latvian. Hence, abr-a-kas-is (F1, F2) ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest

---

of the dough off a kneading trough’, *abr-a-kas-a* (F2) ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough; the remaining dough’, *ād-a-min-is* (F1) ‘skinner’ can be considered stem compounds. In my opinion, this idea can be strengthened by the following counterpart in Lithuanian in (11b).

(11) a. OLatv. *ād-a-min-is* ‘skinner’ (← *ād-a* ‘skin, leather’ + cf. *mī-t* ‘to tread, to step’) Latv. <Ahda=minnis> beside Germ. <der leder-treter, gerber> (F1)

b. Lith. *od-a-min-y̱s* (LKŻe) ‘skinner’ (← *ód-a* ‘skin’ + cf. *mint-i* ‘to tread, to step’) beside *ad-min-y̱s* (LKŻe) ‘id.’

As it is claimed in a Grammar of Modern Lithuanian (cf. DLKG 2005, p. 163ff.), if linking elements are used in the verbal governing compounds in Modern Lithuanian, they are mainly dependent on the original stems of nouns included in the first components. By far the most frequent one is ‘-a’, cf. *auks-a-kas-ys* (LKŻe) ‘gold-digger’ (← *auks-as* ‘gold’ + cf. *kās-ti* ‘to dig’), *ginkl-a-kal-ys* (LKŻe) ‘gunsmith’ (← *ginkl-as* ‘weapon’ + cf. *kāl-ti* ‘to hammer’).

Likewise, a linking element <a> is found in the following Old Latvian compound (12a) with a noun of an *i*-stem origin, as the linking element <a> was the most common linking element used in compounds in Old Latvian.

(12) a. OLatv. *ugun-a-kur-is* ‘fire, bonfire’ (← *ugun-s* ‘fire’ + cf. *kur-t* ‘to make fire’) Latv. <Iggauna= semmäh nhe drihs aplam icakatra u̱ggu̱na= kury eet> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <in Ehst=land darff mann nicht in eines jeden Feuer stadt gehen. Manc: > (LD)

b. Lith. *ugn-á-kur-is, ugn-ì-kur-is* (LKŻe) ‘fire, bonfire’ (← *ugn-is* ‘fire’ + cf. *kur-ti* ‘to make fire’)

Moreover, a linking element <a> in (7) might have been kept due to phonetic reasons, i.e., to avoid a consonant cluster. Thus, *abr-a-kas-is* (F1, F2) ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ and *abr-a-kas-a* (F2) ‘the remaining dough’ are used alongside *abr-kas-is* (M/J) ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’. A compound without a linking element (cf. *abr-kas-is* (LLVVe) ‘id.’) and a variant with a linking element are retained in the Modern Latvian dialects (cf. *abr-a-kas-is* (ĒIV) ‘id.’).

---

118 Note that in the *Manuale Lettico-Germanicum*, a compound without the linking element (i.e., *abr-kas-is*) is marked by “J”, which indicates that this example originally appeared in the dictionary of Fürecker. However, in Fürecker’s dictionary, this compound is attested with the linking element <a>.
Lastly, I would like to suggest that in a compound provided in (9a), a linking element <a> is used to avoid homonymous forms, namely to differentiate between an agent noun denoting a child who wants to be breastfed and an action noun expressing a time (moment) when a child wants to be breastfed, cf. pup-kār-is (F1, F2) ‘child who wants to be breastfed’ (← pup-s (PhL), pup-a (L) ‘breast, nipple’) vs. pup-a-kār-is (F1, F2) ‘time (moment) when a child wants to be breastfed’ (← pup-s (PhL), pup-a (L) ‘breast, nipple’). Note that another compound (an agent noun), in which the first component is a noun pup-s ‘breast, nipple’, is also used without a linking element in the same dictionary, cf. pup-zūd-is (F1, F2) ‘infant’ (← pup-s (PhL), pup-a (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. zīs-t ‘to suckle’).

In sum, different interpretations regarding the form of the first component of verbal governing compounds were proposed in this section. One instance seemed to have introduced a linking element <a> by analogy with another morphological type of agent noun in Old Latvian where the first component was in the genitive case and the second one had agentival suffixes such as -ēj-, -tāj-. Other exceptional cases with a linking element <a> were more problematic. Nevertheless, it was shown in this section that generally the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian were coined without linking elements and the aforementioned cases with a linking element <a> were rare.

5.2.3 The form of the second component

5.2.3.1 Compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.)

The largest number of the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian (ca. 65% of all compounds of this category) have the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), as presented in section 5.2.1.1 above. The same compositional suffix is also used in forming the verbal governing compounds in Lithuanian. Compare the following counterparts of the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian and Lithuanian in (13), (14), and (15), which include the same second component and have the compositional suffix -is.

(13) a. OLatv. lok-tur-is ‘handrail’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + cf. tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’) Latv. <lohkturris> beside Germ. <eine lehne an der Treppen> (F1)

b. Lith. rańsk-tūr-is (LKŽe) ‘handle, knob’ (← rank-ā ‘hand, arm’ + cf. tur-ē-ti ‘to have, to keep’)

Both copies of Fürecker’s dictionary are considered to be works of separate hands, and the second copy includes a large number of additions from the 18th century (cf. Fennell, 1997 p. 3; 1998, p. 3; 2000a, p. 3). However, these morphological variants of the compounds based on pup- in the first component seem to be inscribed by the same copyist, Lukas Kannenberg.
I have argued in the previous chapters 3 and 4 that the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-ė (f.) was present in a number of possessive compounds in Old Latvian, whereas it was not productively used in the determinative compounds found in the same Old Latvian texts. This distribution of the compositional suffix found in the Old Latvian compounds clearly shows that the suffix had its origin in possessive compounds, i.e., originally it was an adjectival suffix that was firstly used in coining the possessive compounds.

The adjectival origin of this suffix can also be seen from those verbal governing compounds that contain the suffix and are used with adjectival meaning. Endzelīns (1971/1948, p. 83) points out that compounds that end in -is (-ĩs) (m.)/-ė (f.) in Lithuanian and -is (m.)/-ė (f.) in Latvian were used with adjectival meaning in the beginning. As he notes, it can still be visible in some Lithuanian compounds, cf. a verbal governing compound that is used as an adjective dūon-kep-is pečius lit. ‘a stove for baking bread’ (← dūon-a ‘bread’ + cf. kėp-ti ‘to bake’) vs. a noun dūon-kep-is ‘a stove for baking bread; baker of bread’; an adjective dūon-riek-is peiļis (LKŽe) ‘carving knife’ (← dūon-a ‘bread’ + cf. riek-ti ‘to slice’) vs. a noun dūon-riek-is (LKŽe) ‘carving knife; one who is slicing bread’.

In view of the material presented and analyzed above, it may be concluded that the majority of the verbal governing compounds contain the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-ė (f.) and lack linking elements between their components as do many possessive compounds in Old Latvian. Hence, from a formal point of view, the verbal governing compounds found in the Old Latvian texts resemble possessive compounds.

5.2.3.2 Compounds ending in -a

In the Old Latvian texts, I have found several instances of the verbal governing compounds that end in -a (East Baltic *-ā). It has been noted in chapter 2 that compounds of this type are agent nouns from a semantic point of view, and the ending -a denotes both masculine and feminine gender, cf. MLatv. bad-mir-a (MEe) m./f. ‘starving person’ (← bad-s ‘famine’ + cf. mir-t ‘to
die’), MLith. ak-î-plḕš-a (LKŽe) m./f. lit. ‘eye-tearer, i.e., an insolent person’ (← ak-is ‘eye’ + cf. plḕš-ti ‘to tear’). Consider a few instances of this kind in Old Latvian below.

(16) a. cel-tek-a Germ. ‘ein Landstreicher, Landfahrer’ (← cel-š ‘road, way’ + cf. tec-ē-t ‘to flow, to trickle’) Latv. <Zelļ jeb Seņ=tēkka> beside Germ. <ein Landstreicher> (F1)

b. zem-tek-a Germ. ‘ein Landstreicher, Landfahrer’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + cf. tec-ē-t ‘to flow, to trickle’) Latv. <Zelļ jeb Seņ=tēkka> beside Germ. <ein Landstreicher> (F1)

Other examples of the verbal governing compounds ending in -a found in the Old Latvian texts suggest that there was an alternation between the above-mentioned compositional suffix -is and -a. This is shown by the following instances in (17).

(17) a. abr-î-kas-a ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ (← abr-a (L), abr-s (M), abr-is (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. kas-ī-t ‘to scrape, to scratch’) Latv. <Abbra= kassa> beside Germ. <ein Trog=scharr oder schrap> (LD)

b. abr-î-kas-is ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ (← abr-a (L), abr-s (M), abr-is (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. kas-ī-t ‘to scrape, to scratch’) Latv. <Abra kahsis> beside Germ. <das nachschaapels. it. die Trog schraap> (F1)

The same vacillation between the two morphological types of the verbal governing compounds is observed in Lithuanian. Larsson (2010b, p. 129) points out that in Old Lithuanian texts, one can usually find cases without the compositional suffix -is that have counterparts with the suffix in Modern Lithuanian, cf. OLith. kard-neš-a (LL) Germ. ‘Gehencke (lit. ‘sword-bearer’)’ (← kārd-as, karđ-as ‘sword’ + cf. nḕš-ti ‘to carry, to bear’) and MLith. kard-neš-ỳs ‘id.’; OLith. sviest-muš-a (LL) Germ. ‘Butterfä̀ß’ (← svięst-as ‘butter’ + cf. mū̀š-ti ‘to beat’) and MLith. sviest-muš-é, sviest-muš-ỳs Germ. ‘Butterfä̀ß, Butterschläger’.120

Given that only a few instances of the verbal governing compounds ending in -a were found in the Old Latvian texts, we may conclude that it was not a productive type of Old Latvian nominal compound. It is also clear that the

120 Cf. more instances of this alternation in Modern Lithuanian: žòd-lauž-a (LKŽe) ‘person who is not carrying out promises’ (← žòd-is ‘word’ + cf. lauž-ti ‘to brake’) next to žòd-lauž-ỳs (LKŽe) ‘id.’; bób-lauž-a (LKŽe) ‘womanizer’ (← bób-a ‘woman’ + cf. lauž-ti ‘to brake’) beside bób-lauž-is (LKŽe) ‘id.’.
verbal governing compounds ending in -a did not gain any productivity during later periods, as only a small group of the verbal governing compounds ends in -a in Modern Latvian (cf. MLLVG, 1959, p. 216).

5.2.3.3 Compounds ending in -s

Apart from a number of cases of the verbal governing compounds having the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) and those ending in -a, there are several Old Latvian compounds which end in -s. It is interesting to note that there has been an attempt to regard an instance ād-min-s (L) ‘skinner’ (← ād-a ‘skin, leather’ + cf. mī-t ‘to tread, to step’) as a mistake. Skujiņa (2006, p. 111) has assumed that this compound found in the dictionary of Manclès is a mistake, since, according to her, deverbal compounds do not have this ending in Old Latvian. However, the ending -s in the verbal governing compounds cannot be erroneously written, as there are a few more compounds of this type in Old Latvian. In my opinion, these instances ending in -s can simply show that originally they contained the compositional suffix -is, but a vowel /i/ was lost. One can compare the following pair in (18) found in the same dictionary by Manclès where one compound (18a) is used with the compositional suffix -is, while its counterpart ends in -s (18b).

(18) a. ād-min-is ‘skinner’ (← ād-a ‘skin, leather’ + cf. mī-t ‘to tread, to step’) Latv. <Ahd=mins> beside Germ. <Lehdergerber> (L)

b. ād-min-s ‘skinner’ (← ād-a ‘skin, leather’ + cf. mī-t ‘to tread, to step’) Latv. <Ahdmins> beside Germ. <Gerber> (L)

Other instances of the verbal governing compounds ending in -s lack counterparts with the suffix -is being attested in the Old Latvian texts. They can, nevertheless, be compared to compounds having the same second component and the suffix -is in Modern Latvian and Modern Lithuanian. Note that the following instances ending in -s in (19a) and (20a) are found in the dictionary of Langius. Thus, the reduction of the second component can also be due to the general tendency by Langius to shorten the stem of the second component (see chapter 3).

(19) a. OLatv. kann-dar-s ‘pot-maker’ (← kann-a ‘can, pot’ + cf. dar-ī-t ‘to do, to perform’) Latv. <Kann=dars> beside Germ. <bey den bauren ein Kannen=Macher> (LD)

b. Latv. al-dar-is (MEe) ‘brewer’ (← al-us ‘beer’ + cf. dar-ī-t ‘to do, to perform’)

---


(20) a. OLatv. *katl-a-lāp-s* ‘tinker’ (← *katl-is* (LD), *katl-s* (F1, F2)
’pot, kettle’ + cf. *lāp-ī-t* ‘to mend, to repair’) Latv. <Kattla=lahps (Lahpeis)> beside Germ. <ein Kesselflicker> (LD)

b. Latv. *dirs-lāp-is* (MEe) lit. ‘one who is repairing, mending arse’ (← *dirs-a* ‘arse’ + cf. *lāp-ī-t* ‘to mend, to repair’)

c. Lith. *sagon-lōp-is* (LKŽe) ‘metal plate used for mending pots, cans’ (← *sagon-as* ‘large pot made of cast iron’ + cf. *lōp-y-ti* ‘to mend, to repair’)

A conclusion can be drawn that even these scarce instances of the Old Latvian verbal governing compounds ending in -s originally contained the compositional suffix -is, but a short vowel was lost due to phonetic reasons. The trigger for the disappearance of this short vowel might have been the initial stress. Although the place of the stress is never marked in the texts of Old Latvian, the verbal governing compounds are initially stressed in Modern Latvian (cf. LVPPV, 1995), cf. ‘ād-min-is ‘skinner’, ‘dzir-kal-is ‘millstone cutter’, ‘mel-kul-is ‘tale-teller/liar’, ‘ties-nes-is ‘judge, justiciary, magistrate’, ‘vasar-audz-is ‘young stock; teenager, youth’, ‘vēst-nes-is ‘messenger, envoy’, ‘zelt-nes-is ‘ring finger’, ‘zem-tur-is ‘landholder’.

The following examples of the Old Latvian verbal governing compounds ending in -s (21a), (22a), and (23) suggest a different interpretation of the form of the second component. In my view, the following instances must be connected to another type of verbal governing compound discussed above, i.e., compounds ending in -a. Consider the following pair in (21) found in the Old Latvian texts where the first compound ends in -s, while the second one contains -a.


Another compound in Old Latvian ending in -s (22a) has a counterpart in Modern Latvian also ending in the same -a, as shown in (22b).

(22) a. OLatv. *var-māk-s* ‘oppressor, violator, despot’ (← *var-a* (L), *var-s* (LD) ‘power, authority, rule’ + cf. *māk-t* ‘to oppress, to overpower’) Latv. <warr=maks> beside Germ. <Ein plager> (F1)
b. Latv. var-māk-a (MEe) ‘oppressor, violator, despot’ (← var-a (L),
var-s (LD) ‘power, authority, rule’ + cf. māk-t ‘to oppress, to over-
power’)

The following example in (23) lacks a counterpart with -a in both Old and
Modern Latvian. However, this compound also ends in -s and belongs to the
same group of compounds.

(23) šķīb-raug-s ‘cross-eyed’ (← šķībi ‘askew’ + cf. raudz-ī-t ‘to look at’)
Latv. <Škihb=Raugs> beside Germ. <Ein Schiler> (F2)

On the contrary to what has been suggested for the examples in (18), (19),
and (20), the ending -s in compounds in (21a), (22a), (23) cannot originate from
the compositional suffix -is, since then the preceding stem consonants /k/ and
/g/ must be palatalized, cf. instances of this kind that contain the compositional
suffix -is and show the palatalization of the stem consonants /k/ and /g/: var-māc-is (MEe) ‘oppressor, violator, despot’ (cf. māk-t ‘to oppress, to over-
power’), vasar-audz-is (MEe) ‘teenager, youth’ (cf. aug-t ‘to grow’).

Given that there is no palatalization of the stem consonant, I would like
to suggest that the ending -s used in the Old Latvian verbal governing com-
 pounds in (21a), (22a), and (23) is a shortened variant of an original suffix
*-as that is still retained in compounds in Lithuanian, cf. Lith. aūs-kar-as
(LKŽe) ‘earring’ (← aūs-is ‘ear’ + cf. kār-t ‘to hang’) next to Latv. aus-kar-s
(MEe) ‘earring’ (← aus-s ‘ear’ + cf. kār-t ‘to hang’). Moreover, as was just
presented above, two of the above-mentioned compounds ending in -s, i.e.,
(21a) and (22a), show an alternation between -a and -s. Likewise, variants
with -a and -as with the same meaning are also sometimes used in Lithuanian,
as presented in (24).

(24) a. ak-i-plēš-a (m./f.) (LKŽe) lit. ‘eye-tearer, i.e., an insolent person’ (←
ak-is ‘eye’ + cf. plēš-ti ‘to tear’)
b. ak-i-plēš-as (m./f.) (LKŽe) lit. ‘eye-tearer, i.e., an insolent person’ (←
ak-is ‘eye’ + cf. plēš-ti ‘to tear’)

Thus, in my opinion, the above-mentioned cases of Old Latvian verbal gov-
erning compounds ending in -s, namely šķīb-raug-s (F2) ‘cross-eyed’,
var-māk-s (F1, F2) ‘oppressor, violator, despot’, and zem-tek-s (L) Germ. ‘ein
Landstreicher, Landfahrer’, originally had the suffix *-as and existed beside
regular counterparts that ended in -a.

The following compound ending in -s (25a) suggests two different inter-
pretations of the form of the second component. On the one hand, it might
originally have ended in *-as beside a variant with -a, as shown in (25b). On
the other hand, one finds a counterpart with the compositional suffix -is (25c)
attested, too, which may indicate that i in (25a) was lost. It is also noteworthy
that the above-mentioned morphological variants of this compound, namely the endings -s, -a and -is, are found in Modern Latvian, as shown in (25d), (25e), and (25f).

(25) a. OLatv. slep-kav-s ‘killer’ (← slepu(s) ‘secretly’ + cf. kau-t ‘to murder’) Latv. <śleppkaws> beside Germ. <Mörder> (L)
   b. OLatv. slap-kav-a ‘killer’ Latv. <[..] bet iūs aējseti to par wēnas slap-kauwas bēdēre darriujgi> (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘but you have made it to a cave of a killer’
   c. OLatv. slep-kav-is ‘killer’ Latv. <Ślepkawis> beside Germ. <Mörder> (M)
   d. MLatv. splek-kav-s (MEe) ‘killer’
   e. MLatv. splep-kav-a (MEe) ‘killer’
   f. MLatv. splep-kav-is (MEe) ‘killer’

It can be summarized that apart from numerous instances of the verbal governing compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), several instances of compounds ending in -a and -s were also found. I have also shown in this section that there was a vacillation between the above-mentioned types of the verbal governing compounds. However, it must be emphasized that the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) was the most productive suffix used in coining the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian.

In the next section, another morphological type of agent noun with suffixes like -ēj-, -niek-, -tāj- will be discussed. In the Old Latvian texts, examples of this kind coexist with the verbal governing compounds of the aforementioned types.

5.2.3.4 Other suffixes used in forming agent nouns

Alongside the verbal governing compounds ending in the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), -a and -s, a different morphological type of agent noun with suffixes such as -ēj-, -niek-, -tāj- prevail in the Old Latvian texts, cf. Ozols (1965, pp. 174–175). From a formal point of view, instances of this kind behaved both as compounds and phrases lexicalized to some extent where the first part was used in the genitive case. Consider a few instances of both types in (26) and (27).

---

122 For a thorough account of derivatives formed with these suffixes found in the texts of Mancelius, cf. Fridenberg (2016, p. 107ff.).
(26) compounds:

a. nast-nēs-ēj-s ‘load carrier’ (← nast-a ‘burden, load, pack’ + nēs-ēj-s ‘bearer, carrier’, cf. nes-t ‘to carry, to bear’)
   Latv. <Nast>nēsesis> beside Germ. <ein Lastträger> (LD)

b. sudrab-kal-ēj-s ‘silversmith, goldsmith’ (← sudrab-s ‘silver’ + kal-ēj-s ‘smith, blacksmith’, cf. kal-t ‘to forge, to hammer’)
   Latv. <Sūdribkalēis> beside Germ. <Goldschmied> (L)

(27) phrases:

a. maižu-cep-ēj-s ‘bread baker’ (cf. maiž-u (Gen.pl.) ‘bread’ + cep-ēj-s ‘baker’, cf. cep-t ‘to boil, to bake’)
   Latv. <Maižo> zepēsis> beside Germ. <ein Brodbecker> (LD)

b. mauku-dzin-ēj-s ‘procucer’ (cf. mauk-u (Gen.pl.) ‘whore’ + dzin-ēj-s ‘driver’, cf. dzī-t ‘to chase away, to drive’)
   Latv. <Mauko> dsinēsis> beside Germ. <ein Hurenjäger> (LD)

c. zāles tais-ī-tāj-s ‘pharmacist’ (cf. zāl-es (Gen.sg.) ‘grass, herb’ + tais-ī-tāj-s ‘one who prepares, makes ready’, cf. tais-ī-t ‘to make, to construct’)
   Latv. <Śahles taisītāis> beside Germ. <Apotheker> (F1)

Agent nouns with the suffixes -ēj-, -niek-, -tāj- are problematic for several reasons. The line between real compounds and syntactic phrases, which have these suffixes, is not clear-cut, and thus it is often difficult to determine whether some instances of this type were used as compounds or phrases in Old Latvian. For instance, in the texts of Mancelius, one finds a number of examples of this type that can be analyzed as word units, in which the first component is in the genitive case or it ends in a stem vowel. By contrast, in counterparts attested in the dictionary of Langius, the first component is sometimes used in the shortened stem (see chapter 3 on the reduction of the form of compounds found in the dictionary of Langius).

(28) a. Manc. ceļa-rād-ī-tāj-s ‘road-sign, signpost’ (cf. cel-a (Gen.sg.) ‘road, way’ + rād-ī-tāj-s ‘pointer, indicator’, cf. rād-ī-t ‘to point, to show’)
   Latv. <Zelja> Rādītāis> beside Germ. <Führer> (L)

b. Lang. ceļa-rād-ī-tāj-s road-sign, signpost’ (cf. cel-a (Gen.sg.) ‘road, way’ + rād-ī-tāj-s ‘pointer, indicator’, cf. rād-ī-t ‘to point, to show’)
   Latv. <Zeljaraahdlītāis> beside Germ. <ein Weg=weiser> (LD)

123 Cf. an instance with the same meaning found in the second copy of the dictionary of Fürecker where the vowel in the genitive ending of the first component was syncopated: zāl-s-tais-ī-tāj-s ‘pharmacist’ (cf. zal-es (Gen.sg.) ‘grass, herb’): Latv. <Śahls> Taisītāis> beside Germ. <Apotheker> (F2).
Latv. <Zeļļ= rahdi=tais> beside Germ. <ein Führer, Be=leiter, Geleitsmann, Gefehrte, bey oder Vor=gänger, der den Weg zeigt> (LD)

Another issue regarding cases like *nast-nes-ēj-s* (LD) ‘load carrier’ is related to the compositional or derivational steps involved in forming instances of this kind. On the one hand, it is possible to analyze them as compounds where the second component had already been derived with the suffix before compounding, i.e., *nast-* ‘burden, load, pack’ + *nes-ēj-s* ‘carrier, bearier’ → *nastnesējs* ‘load carrier’. On the other hand, the second component did not necessarily have the suffix as an uncompounded word. Hence, the suffix might have been added to the whole compound, cf. *nastnes- + ēj-* → *nastnesējs* ‘load carrier’. Both analyses seem to be plausible, and thus it can be concluded that it is often difficult to determine whether one is dealing with compounding or derivation in these cases. 124

However, in the Old Latvian texts, I have found a few examples which suggest that the above-mentioned suffixes were clearly added to at least some of the verbal governing compounds containing the compositional suffix *-is* (m.)/*-e* (f.). In my opinion, these suffixes were added to overtly mark the agentival use of the verbal governing compounds. Consider the following pairs in (29), (30), and (31) where one instance has the compositional suffix *-is*, while its counterpart with the same meaning includes the agentival suffix *-ēj-*.


(30) a. *ties-nes-is* ‘judge, justiciary, magistrate’ (← *ties-a* (L), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’ + cf. *nes-t* ‘to carry, to bear’) Latv. <Teeßneʃśis> beside Germ. <Rechtfinder> (PhL)

b. *ties-nes-ēj-s* ‘judge, justiciary, magistrate’ (← *ties-a* (L), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’ + cf. *nes-t* ‘to carry, to bear’) Latv. <Teeßnesseis> beside Germ. <ein Rechtfin=der, Urtheilsprecher> (LD)

(31) a. *vēst-nes-is* ‘messenger, herald’ (← *vēst-s* (F1, F2), vēst-is (LD), vēst-a (LD), vēst-e (L) ‘message, news’ + cf. *nes-t* ‘to carry, to bear’)

---

124 On the problem and discussion of this type of compound in other languages, e.g., English compounds that end in the deverbal suffix *-er* (cf. *church-goer*) or German compounds that end in *-er* (cf. *Schuh-macher* ‘shoemaker’), cf., e.g., Booij (2012, pp. 92–94), Olsen (2015, p. 370ff.).
Latv. <Kāhnigā jeb Leelakunģa Wāhst=nessis (Wāhstneeks, San=tis)> beside Germ. <ein Königl. oder Fürstlicher Ge-
sandter> (LD)

b. vēst-nes-ēj-s ‘messenger, herald’ (← vēst-s (F1, F2), vēst-is (LD),
vēst-a (LD), vēst-e (L) ‘message, news’ + cf. nes-t ‘to carry, to
bear’) Latv. <Keh=niņa jeb leela Kunga Wehstnesseis, 
Wehstneeks, Santis> beside Germ. <ein königl. oder fürstl. Ge-
sandter> (M/L)

Another example (32) found in the dictionary of Langius suggests that both
types of agent nouns were used interchangeably in Old Latvian, as both vari-
ants of the second component, namely with the compositional suffix -is and
with the suffix -ēj-, are listed together. Note that the ending -s in the compound
is a shortened variant of the compositional suffix -is, as it was proposed above
in section 5.2.3.3.

(32) katl-a-lāp-s (lāpējs) ‘tinker’ (← katl-is (LD), katl-s (F1, F2) ‘pot, kettle’
+ cf. lāp-ī-t ‘to mend, to repair’) Latv. <Kattla= lahps (Lahpeis)>
beside Germ. <ein Kesselflicker> (LD)

The same process of adding an external adjectival suffix -īg- to the possessive
compounds in Old Latvian was discussed in chapter 4. I have proposed that
the addition of this external marker was influenced by the counterparts in Ger-
man. Likewise, the use of the agentival suffixes -ēj-, -niek-, -tāj- in Old Lat-
vian might have been triggered by the corresponding instances of agent nouns
in German, as presented in (33) and (34).

(33) a. OLatv. nast-nes-ēj-s ‘load carrier’ (← nast-a ‘burden, load, pack’ +
nes-ēj-s ‘bearer, carrier’, cf. nes-t ‘to carry, to bear’)
Latv. <Nast=nesseis> (LD)

b. Germ. <ein Lasttrager> (LD)

(34) a. OLatv. cel-u laup-ī-tāj-s ‘highwayman’ (cf. cel-u (Gen.pl.) ‘road, way’
+ laup-ī-tāj-s ‘plunderer, robber’ + cf. laup-ī-t ‘to rob, to plun-
der’) Latv. <Zellu laupitais> (F2)

b. Germ. <ein Straßenräuber> (F2)

In the following instance (35a), where the second component is based on a
verb tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’, the suffix -ēj- was clearly added to the root of
the verb in the second component, presumably taking account of the German
counterpart. Otherwise, the second component would be formed as tur-ē-tāj-s,
as shown by a variant in (35b) found in the same dictionary by Langius.
(35) a. nam-tur-ēj-s ‘householder, landlord’ (← nam-s ‘house, home’ + cf. tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’) Latv. <Naņ=turreis> beside Germ. <ein Haußhal=ter> (LD)

b. nam-tur-ē-tāj-s ‘householder, landlord’ (← nam-s ‘house, home’ + tur-ē-tāj-s ‘holder, keeper’, cf. tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’) <Naņ=turrāhtais> (LD)

That the suffix was added to the stem of the compound nam-tur- in (35a) can be explained by the following. Firstly, the second component tur-ēj-s does not exist as an uncompounded word in Old Latvian. Secondly, in the Old Latvian texts, one finds a verbal governing compound with a corresponding second component with the compositional suffix -is, cf. zem-tur-is (F1, F2) ‘peasant, farmer’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + cf. tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’).

In view of the material presented and discussed above, it can be concluded that the verbal governing compounds ending in -is were occasionally superseded by agent nouns with the suffixes like -ēj- in Old Latvian. As was the case for the possessive compounds in Old Latvian, the use of these external suffixes was modeled after the counterparts in German. However, I have argued in this chapter that one of the most characteristic formal properties of the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian was the use of the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.). As shown above, this suffix is also used in coining compounds of the same category in Lithuanian.

5.3 Summary

In this chapter, several aspects concerning the meaning and form of the verbal governing compounds found in the Old Latvian texts were addressed. The main aims of this chapter were: a) to present and discuss the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian from a semantic point of view; b) to determine the most characteristic formal properties of this category of Old Latvian compounds; and c) to compare and discuss the formal properties of the verbal governing compounds in connection with the formal properties of the other categories of compounds found in the Old Latvian texts.

In the first section, the meaning of the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian was considered. It was shown that instances of this kind were mostly used as nouns and often denoted agent and instrument nouns. In addition, a few compounds were used as action nouns.

Then, the material was grouped into three groups according to the form of the second component, i.e., compounds with the compositional suffix -is.

125 Latv. <Sem=turris> beside Germ. <ein gesinds=Kerl. Kerl. ein wirt der land=hält> (F1).
(m.)/-e (f.), compounds ending in -a, and compounds ending in -s. The analysis of the formal properties of the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian determined that one of the most characteristic formal properties of this category of compounds was a lack of linking elements, with only a few exceptions. It was, furthermore, argued that another characteristic formal property of the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian was the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) used in the majority of cases. Only several cases ended in -a and -s. A vacillation between the above-mentioned types of compounds was also discussed where it was shown that compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) could alternate with compounds ending in -a without a change in meaning. Furthermore, a few compounds ending in -s suggested that originally they had the compositional suffix -is, but the vowel i was lost due to phonetic reasons. It was also proposed that the ending -s originated from the Baltic *-as in a few Old Latvian verbal governing compounds.

It was, furthermore, shown in this chapter that alongside the verbal governing compounds of the above-mentioned types, another model of forming nomina agentis, i.e., by adding suffixes such as -ēj-, -niek-, tāj-, prevails in the Old Latvian texts. It was proposed that in a few cases, the verbal governing compounds ending in -is were superseded by agent nouns with suffixes like -ēj-, which were added to overtly mark their meaning as agent nouns.

It was concluded that due to the general tendency of coining the verbal governing compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) and without linking elements, compounds of this category formally resembled possessive compounds in Old Latvian. Furthermore, these formal properties differentiated the verbal governing compounds from the determinative compounds of that time, which, on the contrary, were coined with linking elements in numerous cases and did not include the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) as often as the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian.
Compounding in the oldest texts of Latvian (16th century – the first half of the 17th century)

Previous chapters 3, 4, and 5 addressed a number of aspects concerning the form and meaning of compounds attested in the texts of the so-called middle period of Early Written Latvian, namely in the texts and dictionaries from the 17th century. In this chapter, compounds found in the oldest texts (i.e., 16th century – the first half of the 17th century) will be discussed. From a chronological point of view, it might seem as an oddity to discuss compounds found in the oldest texts only after the presentation of compounds of the middle period. However, without actually understanding the system of compounds found in the later texts, one cannot evaluate evidence attested in the oldest texts. Furthermore, the picture that one finds in the oldest texts is often blurred by the inconsistent orthography of this early period. Thus, only by taking into account compounds attested in the later texts is it possible to draw at least some conclusions with regard to the form of compounds found in the oldest texts.

The aims of this chapter are as follows: firstly, to discuss an issue of distinguishing between compounds and phrases found in the oldest Latvian texts; secondly, to discuss the formal properties of the compounds from the oldest texts with regard to compounds attested in the later texts; thirdly, to draw parallels between Latvian compounds found in the oldest texts and their counterparts in German attested in the original sources.

Compounds found in the oldest religious texts are not many in number and are limited in their semantics, as they generally denote abstract notions that were often translated from the source language. It will be shown in this chapter that compounds of this period were mainly determinative compounds. The specific type of literature and the fact that the earliest religious texts were mostly translations might have limited the use of the possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds in these texts.

126 Compounds attested in the texts of the oldest period have never been subjected to a thorough analysis. To my knowledge, such analysis is mainly restricted to a few paragraphs in the general description of the Old Latvian texts by Ozols (1965, p. 81).
6.1 Compounds vs. phrases

The first problem that one inevitably encounters when treating the texts of the oldest period is how to make a distinction between compounds and noun phrases. The situation is often encumbered by the imprecise orthography of the texts. As was pointed out in chapter 1, writers of the first texts encountered difficulties in reflecting Latvian sounds, which resulted in many imprecisions and inconsistencies. For instance, in final syllables, all short vowels a, e, i, u were indicated by the same grapheme <e> with only a few exceptions. According to Rosinas (2005, pp. 116–117), <e> was used to indicate the reduced vowels a, e, i, u that originated from long -V and -VC sequences in final syllables, e.g., <Dewe> (Acc.sg.) ‘God’ (cf. MLatv. diev-u (Acc.sg.) ‘id.’), <grecke> (Gen.pl.) ‘sin’ (cf. MLatv. grēk-u (Gen.pl.) ‘id.’), <koule> (Nom.pl.) ‘bone’ (cf. MLatv. kaul-i (Nom.pl.) ‘id.’), <Rokes> (Nom.pl.) ‘hand, arm’ (cf. MLatv. rok-as (Nom.pl.) ‘id.’), <ßewes> (Gen.sg.) ‘wife, woman’ (cf. MLatv. siev-as (Gen.sg.) ‘id.’), <Semme> (Acc.sg.) ‘earth’ (cf. MLatv. zem-i (Acc.sg.) ‘id.’).127

Since the same obscure grapheme was used in the final syllable of the first part of word units, it was difficult to draw a clear line between noun phrases and compounds attested in the oldest texts. From a phonological point of view, linking elements occur at the end of the first components. Thus, they were also indicated <e> just like almost all endings in uncompounded words in the oldest texts of Latvian. This can be said about numerous examples that included two nouns or an adjective and a noun. For instance, in the following example (1a), <e> used at the final syllable of the first component may indicate that the first component was used in the genitive case, as shown by the counterpart in (1b). However, <e> in (1a) might also have denoted a linking element <a>, as in a compound (1c) found in the later dictionary of Mancelius.

(1) a. <attze mirckle> (Gen.sg.) (Ps) ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + mirkl-is ‘blink, instant’)

b. <atczu mirckli> (Acc.sg.) (Ps) ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (cf. ac-u ‘Gen.pl.’ ‘eye’)

c. Manc. ac-a-mirkl-is ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + mirkl-is ‘blink, instant’)

Latv. <Atza=mircklis> beside Germ. <Augenblick> (L)

Likewise, one actually cannot determine whether the following instance (2a), which was based on an adjective and a noun, was used as a compound or a phrase with both inflected parts. Note that the distinction is sometimes visible

in the later texts, as shown in (2b), where <a> between the two components functioned as a linking element that stayed unchanged when the whole unit was inflected.

(2) a. <lele dene> (Gen.pl.) (Ps) ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)
   b. liel-a-dien-u (Gen.pl.) ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)

Latv. <[...] Leladēnu [...]> (Gen.pl.) (EE)

In addition, I have found a few cases such as (3a) and (3b) where <e> is kept when the second component is inflected even in the oldest texts of Latvian. Hence, we cannot exclude the possibility that examples of this kind were used as compounds where <e> denoted a linking element as in compounds found in the later texts, as presented in (3c).

(3) a. <leledenan> (Ill.sg.) (Ps) ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)
   b. <darge ackmennems> (Dat.pl.) (Ps) ‘precious stone’ (← dārg-s ‘expensive’ + akmen-s ‘stone’)
   c. liel-a-dien-as (Gen.sg.) ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)

Latv. <[...] prekʃʒan Leladenas [...]> (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘before Easter day’

Another formal property that can indicate that a particular instance is a compound is the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.). However, the same grapheme <e> is used in final syllables of second components of numerous examples. Thus, it is not possible to decide whether the compositional suffix was added. For instance, in Modern Latvian, variants of the same compound are sometimes used, cf. an unsuffixed sān-kaul-s (MEe) ‘rib’ (← sān-s ‘side’ + kaul-s ‘bone’) beside sān-kaul-is (KIV) ‘id.’ (cf. kaul-s ‘bone’) which has the compositional suffix -is. Unfortunately, in the same instance (4) attested in the oldest texts, the second component ends in <e>. This is why one cannot draw any reliable conclusion about the form of the following example.

(4) <Sane koule> (Acc.sg.) (Ench1) ‘rib’ (← sān-s ‘side’ + kaul-s ‘bone’)

Apart from the aforementioned ambiguous cases, I have found only a few instances that suggest that they might have behaved as compounds in the oldest Latvian texts. These are the following cases in (5a), (6a), (7a), which are used without the obscure grapheme <e>. In fact, they correspond to compounds in (5b), (6b), and (7b) found in the later texts.

(5) a. <Mhelkullis> (EvEp2) ‘tale-teller/liar’ (← mel-i (Nom.pl.) ‘lie’ + cf. kul-t ‘to thresh, to flail’)
   b. Manc. mel-kul-is ‘tale-teller/liar’ (← mel-i (Nom.pl.) ‘lie’ + cf. kul-t
‘to thresh, to flail’
Latv. <Mällkulis> beside Germ. <Lügener> (L)

(6) a. <pekdenan> (Ill.sg.) (CC) ‘Friday’ (← piekt-ais ‘fifth’ + dien-a ‘day’)
   b. Manc. piek-dien-a ‘Friday’ (← piekt-ais ‘fifth’ + dien-a ‘day’)
   Latv. <Peekdeena> beside Germ. <Freytag> (PhL)

(7) a. <Sweedenan> (Ill.sg.) (EvEp1) ‘Sunday’ (← svēt-s ‘holy, blessed, sacred’ + dien-a ‘day’)
   b. Lang. svē-dien-a ‘Sunday’ (← svēt-s ‘holy, blessed, sacred’ + dien-a ‘day’)
   Latv. <Śwäh=deena jaświnn> beside Germ. <den Sonntag muss man feyren> (LD)

Moreover, there are several examples of word units with the adjectival suffix -īg- that, in most cases, were used as compounds in the texts under discussion. The issue of the formation of examples of this kind was already discussed in chapter 4. Compare the following examples from the oldest texts in (8a), (9a) with their counterparts in (8b), (9b) attested in the later texts.

(8) a. <wentiʃyx> (Ench1) ‘simple-minded, naive’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ties-a (L), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’)
   b. vien-ties-īg-s ‘simple-minded, naive’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ties-a (L), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’) <[...] wentiʃigi [...]> (Nom.pl.m.) (EE)

(9) a. <labpratyx> (EvEp1) ‘willing, voluntary’ (← lab-s ‘good’ + prāt-s ‘mind, sense’)
   b. lab-prāt-īg-s ‘willing, voluntary’ (← lab-s ‘good’ + prāt-s ‘mind, sense’) <[...] labprahtigs [...]> (VLH)

However, the obscure grapheme <e> occurring in a number of word units, which included two nouns or an adjective and a noun, does not allow us to conclude that these formations were used as compounds. Nor is it possible to infer from the form of the second component about the use of the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.), which may indicate that an instance behaved as a compound. In the following section, I will draw attention to several cases where the distinction between compounds with linking elements and noun phrases with an inflected first part can in a way be seen by comparing examples from the oldest texts with their counterparts found in the later texts.
6.2 The form of the first component

As was argued above, due to the imprecise and variable orthography of the oldest texts, almost all word units based on two nouns had <e> at the end of the first component, cf. <Dewekalps> (CC) ‘servant of God’ (← diev-s ‘God’ + kalp-s ‘servant’). Only very rarely does one find examples where the first component does not end in <e>, cf. a determinative compound where a linking element is, in fact, not expected to be used, as the first component is a noun that originated from a consonantal / i-stem: <aʃʃen grekems> (Dat.pl.) (Ps) ‘incest’ (← asen-s ‘blood’ + grēk-s ‘sin’). Hence, it is often difficult to propose any reasonable interpretation of the origin of the first component that ended in <e>.

On the other hand, if one compares some of the oldest examples with their counterparts attested in the later texts, at least some tentative suggestions with regard to the form of the first component can be made. In the oldest text of Latvian, I have found one instance (10a) where <a> is used instead of the middle <e>, as in (10b). The <a> used in (10a) clearly corresponds to a linking element <a> used in a determinative compound (11) found in the later texts.

(10) a. <Maiawete> (Gen.sg.) (EvEp1) ‘home, accommodation’
   (← māj-a ‘house, building’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)
   b. <Mayewete> (Gen.sg.) (EvEp1) ‘home, accommodation’

(11) Manc. māj-a-viet-a ‘home, accommodation’ (← māj-a ‘house, building’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’) Latv. <Mahjaweetu doht> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <behebergen> (L)

It has been proposed in chapter 3 that a part of the determinative compounds in Old Latvian were stem compounds that were used alongside noun phrases with the same meaning. This distinction was most clearly seen from examples where the first component was based on the ā-, ē-, ī-, and u-stems, while instances where the first part originated from a masculine a-stem were formally ambiguous. Likewise, if examples of some feminine words of an ā-stem found in the oldest texts are taken into account, it can tentatively be proposed that <e> could sometimes function as a linking element <a>, as shown in (12a), (13a), and (14a), while <es> denoted the genitive ending, cf. <Szewes> (Gen.sg.) (Ench1) ‘wife, woman’ (cf. MLatv. siev-as (Gen.sg.) ‘id.’). Consider the following examples from the oldest texts in (12a), (13a), and (14a) and instances with the same first components in (12b), (13b), and (14b) attested in the later Old Latvian texts.

(12) a. <Bajnice kunx> (Ench1) ‘priest’ (← bavnīc-a ‘church’ + kung-s ‘lord, master, gentleman’)


b. baznīc-a-kungs ‘priest’ (← baznīc-a ‘church’ + kungs ‘lord, master, gentleman’) Latv. <[...] Bažnicakungu [...]>(Gen.pl.) (EE)

c. baznīcas-kungs ‘priest’ (cf. baznīcs (Gen.sg.) ‘church’) Latv. <Bajnizas-kunx> beside Germ. <Prediger> (L)


c. nom-as naud-a ‘rent money’ (cf. nom-as (Gen.sg.) ‘lease, rental’ + naud-a ‘money’) Latv. <Nohmas nauda> beside Germ. <Zinses münze> (M/L)

(14) a. <galwe gabbals> (Ench1) Germ. ‘Hauptstück’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + gabal-s ‘piece, bit’)

b. galv-a-virs-s ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s (KIV) ‘surface’) Latv. <Ghallwawirß> beside Germ. <der Wirbel> (PhL)

c. galvas-virs-s ‘top of the head’ (cf. galv-as (Gen.sg.) ‘head’) Latv. <Ghallwas=wirß> beside Germ. <Scheitel> (L)

Furthermore, if the following instance in (15a) contained a linking element a denoted by <e>, it might have originated from the contraction of a noun phrase (15b). As shown in chapter 3, this was the case for some Old Latvian determinative compounds presented in (15c) and (15d).

(15) a. <Barribe ʃargam> (Dat.sg.) (EvEp1) ‘larderer’ (← barīb-a ‘food, nutrition’ + sarg-s ‘guard, watch’)

b. <Barribeʃʃarx> (EvEp1) ‘larderer’ (cf. barīb-as (Gen.sg.) ‘food, nutrition’)

c. barīb-a-sarg-s ‘larderer’ (← barīb-a ‘food, nutrition’ + sarg-s ‘guard, watch’) Latv. <Bet kad tas Barribajargs to wynu baudia [...]>(EE) ‘But the larderer tasted the wine’

d. barīb-as sarg-s ‘larderer’ (cf. barīb-as (Gen.sg.) ‘food, nutrition’) Latv. <Barribas Šahrgs> beside Germ. <Speisemeister> (M/L)

However, one has to admit that the material discussed above is too meager to draw any reliable conclusion about the form of the first component. Hence, the aforementioned ideas must be regarded only as tentative suggestions, as the picture is blurred by an obscure grapheme <e>. In the following section,
the form of the second component will be addressed, and the issue of the same grapheme <e> will be tackled.

6.3 The form of the second component

As in the case of the first component, <e> was often used in the final syllable of the second component of numerous word units. Hence, it is also difficult to analyze the form of the second component and thus to determine whether the second component was unsuffixed or the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) was added. Only a few instances may indicate that the second component had no suffix, i.e., the stem form of the second component was not changed. As was shown in chapter 3 in this thesis, the determinative compounds found in the later texts of Old Latvian were mostly coined without the compositional suffix. Hence, these rare instances of the determinative compounds in (16) from the oldest texts could support the latter idea. However, the evidence is too scanty to make any generalizations.

(16) a. <pekdenan> (Ill.sg.) (CC) ‘Friday’ (← piekt-ais ‘fifth’ + dien-a ‘day’)  
    b. <Bajnicekunx> (Ench1) ‘priest’ (← baznīc-a ‘church’ + kung-s ‘lord, master, gentleman’)  
    c. <Sweedenan> (Ill.sg.) (EvEp1) ‘Sunday’ (← svēt-s ‘holy, blessed, sacred’ + dien-a ‘day’)

In fact, in the oldest religious texts, I have found only one trustworthy example of the verbal governing compounds (17) that clearly indicates that the compositional suffix -is was added.

(17) mel-kul-is ‘tale-teller/ liar’ (← mel-i (Nom.pl.) ‘lie’ + cf. kul-t ‘to thresh, to flail’) <Mhelkullis> (EvEp2)

In addition, it needs to be pointed out that in the oldest texts, there are a few more instances that superficially might seem to have the compositional suffix -is and thus could be regarded as the verbal governing compounds. However, the following examples in (18a) and (19a) cannot be treated as compounds. In my opinion, the second part in instances of this kind was the past tense participle derived from the verbal constructions in (18b), (19b), and (19c). Note also that there are no compounds used in the corresponding sentences from the source texts in German, as shown in (18a) and (19a). One can also com-

128 The source texts in German are quoted from Vanags (2000).
pare constructions of the same type in (18c) and (19d) found in the Bible edition from the 20th century where cases of this kind are clearly not used as compounds.

(18) a. <loune darrys> (EvEp1), <louna darris> (Ps)\textsuperscript{129}

OLatv. <prexkan töw eʃmo es louna darris [...]>. (Ps)
Germ. [...] dy heb ick öuel gedan [...]>
‘In front of you I have been doing evil’

b. OLatv. [...] Prettib tam kas man | louna darre.> (PS)\textsuperscript{130}
Germ. [...] Zu dem der mich verletzt [...]>
‘Opposite to that one who harmed me’

c. MLatv. Bet Pilāts tiem sacīja: „Ko tad viņš launa darījis?“ [...].
‘But Pilate said to them: “What evil has he done?”’

(103. Psalms; Bībele, 1966, p. 1033)

(19) a. <labbe darrys> (UP), <labbe darris> (Ps)\textsuperscript{131}

OLatv. <No Nawe gir Chriʃtus auxkam czelis tho gir | tas mums par labbe darris [...]>. (Ps)
Germ. <Vam dode is Chriʃtus vpgethan / | Dat hefft he vns tho güde gedahn.>
‘The Christ has risen from the dead and he has done it through kindness to us’

b. OLatv. [...] labbe darryth [...]>. (UP)
OLatv. [...] lab darrith [...]>. (Ps)
Germ. [...] benedyen [...]>
‘to give help, show kindness for others’

c. [...] Vnde thems nabbagemgs darrith labbe [...]>. (Ps)
‘and to give help for those poor’

d. MLatv. Teici to Kungu, mana dvēsele, un neaizmirsti, ko Viņš tev labu darījis!
‘Praise the Lord, my soul, and forget not that he has done good for you’

(103. Psalms; Bībele, 1966, p. 654)

By contrast, the above-mentioned example in (17) is not derived from a verb, as the verb with the stem *melkul- does not exist in Old Latvian. Hence, this

\textsuperscript{129} Cf. MLatv. laun-dar-is (LLVVe) ‘evildoer’ (← laun-s ‘evil, bad’ + cf. dar-ī-t ‘to do, to perform’).
\textsuperscript{130} Cf. MLatv. laun-dar-ī-t (MEe) ‘to do wrong, illegal or immoral things, harm others’.
\textsuperscript{131} Cf. MLatv. lab-dar-is (LLVVe) ‘well-doer’ (← lab-s ‘good’ + cf. dar-ī-t ‘to do, to perform’).
example is a compound that includes a noun and a verbal stem and has the compositional suffix -is.

Moreover, as was argued above in section 6.1, several adjectival compounds with the adjectival suffix -īg- were also found in the oldest texts. The use of this suffix, as was the case for many formations of this kind in the later texts, was often modeled after counterparts in the German language that also had the adjectival suffixes (e.g., <ig>, <ich>, etc.). Compare the following sentences attested in the oldest texts with the corresponding sentences from their source texts.

(20) Žēl-sird-īg-s ‘compassionate, merciful’ (← Žēl-s ‘sad, sorrowful’ + Sird-s ‘heart’) <ßelßirdyx> (UP)

OLatv. Lab tam / kas žēlsirdīgs ir [...]. (UP)
Germ. <Wol dem de barmhertich ys [...].> ‘He will do well who is merciful’

(21) Lēn-prāt-īg-s ‘gentle, meek’ (← Lēn-s ‘slow’ + Prāt-s ‘mind, sense’)

<lenpratix> (UP)

OLatv. [...] katers tu lēnprātīgs [...] esi [...]. (UP)
Germ. <[...] de du lanckmödich [...] byft [...].> ‘you, who is kind’

The use of the adjectival suffix -īg- even in uncompounded words might have been triggered by their counterparts in German, as shown in (22) and (23). This can be explained by the fact that the translators of the oldest religious texts sought to be close to original texts and thus might have formed adjectives with -īg- taking account of their counterparts in German.132

(22) OLatv. [...] tas Lēnīgs unde žēlīgs Kungs. (UP)

<[...] thas Lhenyx vnde ßeelyx Kunx.> (UP)
Germ. <[...] De gnedige vnd Barmhertige Here.> ‘the gentle and merciful Lord’

(23) OLatv. [...] viens liksmīgs uguns [...]. (UP)

<[...] wens lixmyx vgguns [...].> (UP)
Germ. <[...] eyn luftighe vür [...].> ‘one cheerful fire’

It is also interesting to note that there are no possessive compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) attested in the oldest texts. The only case

that could imply that a compound with the suffix -is (or without any suffix) was superseded by an adjectival compound with the adjectival suffix -īg- is presented in (24a). Consider also possessive compounds in (24b) and (24c) attested in the later texts of Old Latvian.

(24) a. vien-ac-īg-s ‘one-eyed’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’) <wenatczyx> (EvEp1); <wenatczyx> (EvEp2)

b. vien-ac-s ‘one-eyed’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’) Latv. <ween=atz> beside Germ. <Einäugig> (L)

c. vien-ac-is ‘one-eyed’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’) Latv. <ween azzis> beside Germ. <Ein Ein äugiger> (F1)

In view of the scarce material presented and discussed above, it may be concluded that one finds only a few reliable examples attested in the oldest texts that allow us to interpret the form of the second component. I have found only a few determinative compounds, in which the second component seems to keep the stem form unchanged, and one verbal governing compound with the compositional suffix -is. It was also shown in this section that several adjectival compounds had the adjectival suffix -īg-. However, due to the imprecise representation of the form of the second component, it was not possible to determine the original form of this component in most of the cases. Hence, it must be concluded that material discussed above is unfortunately too scarce to draw any general conclusions about the form of the second component of word units found in the oldest religious texts of Old Latvian.

6.4 Summary

In this chapter, material found in the oldest texts of Early Written Latvian was considered. In the first section, an issue of delimiting compounds from noun phrases was addressed. It was argued that the picture was often blurred by the imprecise orthography used in the texts of this period where final syllables of both components of numerous word units were indicated as <e>. Hence, it was concluded that it was often difficult to draw a clear distinction between compounds and phrases used in the oldest religious texts.

It was also suggested in this chapter that only several cases were clearly used as compounds. Through comparison with their counterparts found in the later texts their formal properties were discussed. It was tentatively suggested that <e> between the two components might have functioned as a linking element <a>, as in the compounds of the later period. Furthermore, the same obscure grapheme <e> was often used in the final syllable of the second component. This is why I was able to determine only a few cases of the determinative
compounds where the second component had no suffix. The evidence was, however, too scarce to make any reliable conclusion.

It was, moreover, shown in this chapter that adjectival compounds with the adjectival suffix -īg- were used in the oldest texts. It was also suggested that the use of this suffix was often modeled after the suffixed counterparts in the German language for both uncompounded words and compounds.
7 Discussion and conclusion

It has been demonstrated in this thesis that several types of Baltic nominal compounds, namely determinative compounds, possessive compounds, and verbal governing compounds, were richly represented in texts of Early Written Latvian. Compounds of these categories were analyzed in terms of their form and meaning where parallels with the compounding system in Lithuanian were also drawn. In what follows, the main findings and suggestions of this study will be presented and discussed.

7.1 The formal distribution of compounds in Old Latvian

The distinction between the categories of compounds in Old Latvian was indicated not only semantically, but also in terms of the formal properties of their components. The analysis of the form of the first and second components of compounds of each type reveals a distribution that is presented in the following.

7.1.1 The form of the second component

The possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian are clearly distinguished from the determinative compounds in terms of the form of the second component. First of all, in numerous cases, possessive compounds and verbal governing compounds have the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) added to the stem of the second component, as shown in (1).

(1) a. possessive compound:
   \textit{trak-galv-is} (L) ‘daredevil’
   \textit{(\textasciitilde trak-s ‘insane, possessed’ + galv-a ‘head’)}

\footnotesize
133 For the copulative compounds in Old Latvian, see chapter 2.
134 The original attestations of compounds are not provided in this chapter except for the compounds from \textit{Evangelia toto anno} (1753), which in this chapter are addressed for the first time in this work.
b. verbal governing compound:

\[ \textit{pup-}\ddot{z}\text{-}i\text{-}\textit{is} \text{ (F1, F2)} \text{ ‘infant’} \]

\[ (\leftarrow \textit{pup-}\textit{s} \text{ (PhL), pup-}\textit{a} \text{ (L)} \text{ ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. zīs-}\textit{t} \text{ ‘to suckle’}) \]

Second of all, several examples of verbal governing compounds also end in \textit{-a} and \textit{-s}. It was suggested in this thesis that \textit{-s} in a few verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian originated from an older unshortened variant \textit{*-as} that is still retained in compounds in Lithuanian, cf. Latv. \textit{aus-\textit{kar-}\textit{s} \text{ (MEe)} ‘earring’ \text{ (\leftarrow aus-}\textit{s} \text{ ‘ear’ + cf. kār-t ‘to hang’)} beside Lith. \textit{au̱s-}\textit{kar-}\textit{as} \text{ (LKŽe)} ‘earring’ \text{ (\leftarrow aus-}\textit{is} \text{ ‘ear’ + cf. kār-ti ‘to hang’)}. Consider instances of these types in Old Latvian below.

\[ (2) \]

2a. \textit{var-\textit{māk-}\textit{s} \text{ (F1, F2)} \text{ ‘oppressor, violator, despot’} \]

\[ (\leftarrow \textit{var-}\textit{a} \text{ (L), var-}\textit{s} \text{ (LD)} \text{ ‘power, authority, rule’ + cf. māk-}\textit{t} \text{ ‘to oppress, to overpower’}) \]

2b. \textit{zem-}\textit{tek-}\textit{a} \text{ (F1, F2) Germ. ‘ein Landstreicher, Landfahrer’} \]

\[ (\leftarrow \textit{zem}-\textit{e} \text{ ‘earth, ground’ + cf. tec-}\textit{ē-}\textit{t} \text{ ‘to flow, to trickle’}) \]

By contrast, the majority of determinative compounds in Old Latvian main- tained the stem form of the second component unchanged.\textsuperscript{135} Thus, the most common way of coining the determinative compounds in Old Latvian is by keeping the stem form of the second component as in the uncompounded word, as shown in (3).

\[ (3) \]

3. \textit{treš-}\textit{dien-}\textit{a} \text{ (PhL) ‘Wednesday’} \text{ (\leftarrow treš-}\textit{ais} \text{ ‘third’ + dien-}\textit{a} \text{ ‘day’})

In view of the formal distribution of the second component of Old Latvian compounds, it was concluded that the compositional suffix \textit{-is} (m.)/-\textit{e} (f.) was originally restricted to adjectival compounds. Hence, the suffix was firstly added to the possessive compounds to mark their adjectival use. Since the determinative compounds were originally nouns, the suffix did not spread to this category of compounds in Old Latvian to a greater extent.

It was also argued in this thesis that the possessive compounds in Old Latvian were often ambiguous and their meaning was context-dependent. Due to ambiguity, a few possessive compounds in Old Latvian, as presented in (4), were superseded by the adjectival compounds with the adjectival suffix \textit{-īg-} that overtly marked their use as adjectives.

\[ (4) \]

4a. \textit{liel-}\textit{sird-}\textit{s} ‘noble-minded’ \text{ (\leftarrow liel-}\textit{s} \text{ ‘big’ + sird-}\textit{s} \text{ ‘heart’)}

Latv. <Leel=\textit{sirds}> beside Germ. <großmütig> (LD)

\textsuperscript{135} Only a handful of examples of the determinative compounds in Old Latvian had clearly added the compositional suffix \textit{-is} (m.)/-\textit{e} (f.), cf. \textit{tiev-gal-}\textit{is} \text{ (F1, F2) ‘thin end’} \text{ (\leftarrow tiev-}\textit{s} \text{ ‘thin, slim’ + gal-}\textit{s} \text{ ‘end, ending’}).
b. liel-sird-īg-s ‘noble-minded’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + sird-s ‘heart’)
   Latv. <Leelsīrdigs> beside Germ. <großmütig> (M/J)

Furthermore, the same process of adding external agentival suffixes such as -ēj- to the Old Latvian verbal governing compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) was also presented and discussed.

(5) a. ties-nes-is ‘judge, justiciary, magistrate’ (← ties-a (L), ties-s (F1, F2)
   ‘truth, verity’ + cf. nes-t ‘to carry, to bear’) Latv. <Teeßneʃśis>
   beside Germ. <Rechtfinder> (PhL)

b. ties-nes-ēj-s ‘judge, justiciary, magistrate’ (← ties-a (L), ties-s (F1, F2)
   ‘truth, verity’ + cf. nes-t ‘to carry, to bear’) Latv. <Teeßnesseis>
   beside Germ. <ein Rechtfin=der, Urtheilsprecher> (LD)

It was concluded that the process of adding the above-mentioned external suffixes to both the possessive compounds and the verbal governing compounds in Old Latvian was triggered by their counterparts in German.

7.1.2 The form of the first component

7.1.2.1 The distribution of linking elements

I have argued in this thesis that the different types of Old Latvian compounds were consistently coined not only in terms of the second component, but also with regard to the first component. It was shown in this work that the possessive compounds were generally coined without linking elements. Likewise, the majority of the verbal governing compounds, as shown in (6), did not have a linking element. However, one of the most common ways of coining the determinative compounds in Old Latvian was by inserting a linking element between the components. The linking elements were mostly used in the determinative compounds coined from two nouns (<a> being the most common linking element).

(6) a. possessive compound:
   balt-galv-is (m.), -e (f.) (F1, F2) ‘having white, blond hair’
   (← balt-s ‘white’ + galv-a ‘head’)

b. verbal governing compound:
   vasar-audz-is (F1, F2) ‘teenager, youth’
   (← vasar-a ‘summer’ + cf. aug-t ‘to grow’)

c. determinative compound:
   vasar-a-svētk-i (Nom.pl.) (L) ‘Pentecost’
   (← vasar-a ‘summer’ + svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘festivity’)
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The distribution of the form of the first component in compounds in Old Latvian is, in fact, determined by the part of speech of words used as first components. Thus, linking elements are mainly used in those compounds where the first component is a noun, namely in the dependent determinative compounds formed from two nouns. In compounds of this type, which were also referred to as case compounds, the semantic relationship between the components could often be of a genitive and its complement, so that the first component defines and determines the second one (i.e., the head). As it was argued in chapter 3, linking elements in Old Latvian mostly originated from the genitive case endings or original stem vowels of nouns that occurred as first components of dependent determinative compounds. Hence, it is, in fact, expected to find a linking element in compounds of this kind. By contrast, this relation is not expressed by the components of the verbal governing compounds and the possessive compounds, and thus linking elements are rarely used in the Old Latvian compounds of these categories.

After the formal distribution of compounds in Old Latvian has been presented, one can raise the question as to whether the state of the first component reflects an original or a newer modified version of an older system. As proposed by Larsson (2002a), the original distribution of linking elements in Old Lithuanian compounds was clearly dependent on the place of stress and original accent paradigms of words used in compounding. Furthermore, the original accentuation of compounds in Lithuanian was based on contrastive stress, i.e., possessive compounds (originally adjectives) were accented on the second component, while determinative compounds (originally substantives) had the stress on the first one (Larsson, 2002b, p. 211ff.). Hence, as argued by Larsson (2002b, p. 207), the second component in possessive compounds carried the stress in early Baltic.136

As is well known, Modern Latvian has initial stress and compounds are generally initially stressed apart from a few exceptions (cf., e.g., Balode & Holvoet, 2001, p. 13). However, taking into account the distribution of linking elements found in Old Lithuanian, we cannot leave out the possibility that originally Latvian possessive compounds were also stressed on the second component, while the determinative compounds had the stress on the first. Hence, linking elements in some determinative compounds might have been stressed. This could explain why a number of determinative compounds in Old Latvian still have the linking elements. Unfortunately, one can only speculate about this, as it is hard to judge from Old Latvian texts due to the fact that the place of the stress is never marked. Thus, the question of the original distribution of linking elements in compounds in Latvian remains open to future research.

136 For a discussion about the original accentuation of compounds in Lithuanian and further references, cf. Larsson (2002b, p. 206ff.).
7.1.2.2 Stem composition in Old Latvian

It has traditionally been claimed that linking elements, which can be traced back to original stem vowels, are best preserved in compounds in Lithuanian, whereas they were lost in Latvian (cf. Endzelīns, 1948, p. 61; 1951, p. 259). However, it was argued in this thesis that stem compounds were still attested in the Old Latvian texts. A few stem compounds are listed below in (7) according to the original stem of a noun used as first component.

(7) a. when the first component is a noun of a feminine ā-stem:
   \textit{galv-a-virs-s} (PhL) ‘top of the head’
   \hspace{1cm} \leftarrow \textit{galv-a} ‘head’ \textit{+ virs-s} (KIV) ‘surface’

b. when the first component is a noun of a consonantal / i-stem:
   \textit{asin-i-sērg-a} (L) ‘dysentery’
   \hspace{1cm} \leftarrow \textit{asin-s} (L), \textit{asin-is} (LD) ‘blood’ \textit{+ sērg-a} ‘epidemic disease’

c. when the first component is a noun of an u-stem:
   \textit{vid-u-gavēn-i} (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘mid-Lent’
   \hspace{1cm} \leftarrow \textit{vid-us} ‘middle’ \textit{+ gavēn-is} (PhL), \textit{gavēn-e} (L) ‘fast’

Furthermore, it was suggested in this work that stem compounds in which the linking element <a> was used might have served as a model for coining other determinative compounds in Old Latvian.

However, the system of stem compounds maintained in the earliest texts and dictionaries had already started to disappear during the same period. Numerous instances with the first component in the genitive case had greatly contributed to the collapse of the system of stem composition in Old Latvian. As it was argued in this thesis, noun phrases with the genitive case expressing the same meaning were often used alongside compounds in the Old Latvian texts, as shown in (8).

(8) a. \textit{baznīc-a-kung-s} (EE) ‘priest’ (\leftarrow \textit{baznīc-a} ‘church’ \textit{+ kung-s} ‘lord, master, gentleman’)

b. \textit{baznīc-as kung-s} (LD) ‘priest’ (cf. \textit{baznīc-as} (Gen.sg.) ‘church’)

It has been noted above that in determinative compounds formed from two nouns, the semantic relationship between the components can often be of a genitive and its complement. Due to this, compounds of this kind were often resolved into genitive constructions. For instance, the tendency to split compounds into phrases is clearly seen in the anonymous dictionary \textit{Manuale Lettico-Germanicum} of the same period. Hence, it is clear that stem compounds were superseded by noun phrases that expressed the same meaning, as shown by the following pairs in (9) and (10).
(9) a. naud-a-kul-e (LD) ‘money bag’ (← naud-a ‘money’ + kul-e ‘bag, sack’)  
   b. naud-u kul-e (M/L) ‘money bag’ (cf. naud-u (Gen.pl.) ‘money’)  

(10) a. rok-a-dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill, quern’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + dzirn-is ‘hand mill’)  
   b. rok-u dzirn-is (M/L) ‘hand mill, quern’ (cf. rok-u (Gen.pl.) ‘hand’)  

In addition, stem vowels functioning as linking elements might have disappeared due to a strong initial stress (cf. Endzelīns, 1951, pp. 259–260). Since linking elements occurred in post-tonic position and were meaningless, they were subject to syncope. Thus, the disappearance of the model of stem composition was also caused by phonetic conditions.  

It may be concluded that stem compounds in which the first component occurred in the original stem disappeared completely over the course of later centuries, as this model of coining compounds is no longer used in Modern Standard Latvian. Judging from the description of determinative compounds that include two nouns in Modern Latvian (cf. MLLVG, 1959, p. 201ff.), only those linking elements corresponding to the genitive ending are used between the components. Other dependent determinative compounds are coined without linking elements, as presented below.  

(11) a. OLatv. galv-a-virs-s (L) ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s (KIV) ‘surface’)  
   b. MLatv. galv-virs-s (LLVVe) ‘top of the head’  
   c. Dial. Latv. galvas-virs-s (KIV) ‘top of the head’ (cf. galv-as (Gen.sg.) ‘head’)  

(12) a. OLatv. gult-a-viet-a (PhL) ‘bed, sleeping-place’ (← gult-a ‘bed’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)  
   b. MLatv. gultas-viet-a (MLVVe) ‘bed, sleeping-place’ (cf. gult-as (Gen.sg.) ‘bed’)  

(13) a. OLatv. māj-a-viet-a (L) ‘home, accommodation’ (← māj-a ‘house, building’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)  
   b. MLatv. māj-viet-a (LLVVe) ‘home, accommodation’  

(14) a. OLatv. asin-i-sērg-a (L) ‘dysentery’ (← asin-s (L), asin-is (LD) ‘blood’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’)  
   b. MLatv. asins-sērg-a (LLVVe) ‘dysentery’ (cf. asin-s (Gen.sg.) ‘blood’)
7.2 The reanalysis of noun phrases as compounds

As pointed out by numerous scholars (e.g., Elksnīte, 2011, pp. 27–31; Frīdenbergā, 2012, pp. 10–11), the line between noun phrases and compounds in Old Latvian was not always clear-cut. Nevertheless, I have demonstrated in this thesis that in the Old Latvian texts, compounds were differentiated from noun phrases in terms of their formal properties, such as linking elements or the compositional suffix *-is (m.)/-*e (f.). Hence, both compounds and noun phrases with inflected components, as shown in (15) and (16), were used to express the same meaning in Old Latvian.

(15) a. galv-a-virš-s (L) ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virš-s (KIV) ‘surface’)
   b. galvas-virš-s (L) ‘top of the head’ (cf. galv-as (Gen.sg.) ‘head’)

(16) a. svēt-dien-a (PhL) ‘Sunday’ (← svēt-s ‘holy, blessed sacred’ + dien-a ‘day’)
   b. svēt-a (Nom.sg.f.) dien-a (Nom.sg.) (PhL) ‘Sunday’

Moreover, as can be inferred from the dictionaries of this early period, German compounds were often translated into Latvian as noun phrases. Hence, many new word units were created in Old Latvian in this way.

(17) a. ābolu-koks (LD) ‘apple tree’ (cf. ābol-u (Gen.pl.) ‘apple’ + koks ‘tree’)
   b. Germ. <ein Apffelbaum> (LD)

Over the course of later centuries, a large number of noun phrases, mostly with the genitive case in the first part, were reanalyzed as compounds. A few important factors triggered the reanalysis of noun phrases in Latvian. Firstly, noun phrases of this kind in Old Latvian behaved as compounds in terms of their syntactic properties. For instance, they were inseparable, since no other element could be inserted between the two parts, cf. visi baznīcas kungi (EE) ‘all priests’ (cf. baznīc-as (Gen.sg.) ‘church’) vs. *baznīcas visi kungi. Furthermore, the first component could not be modified. For instance, an adverb ļoti ‘very’ cannot modify the first component in liels-kungs (L) ‘landlord,

---

137 Even the genitive endings were sometimes reanalyzed as linking elements that are now used unparadigmatically. For instance, in compounds in Modern Latvian dialects, e.g., the Tamian dialect, a linking element *s is used that originally belonged to the genitive ending, e.g., vakar-s-pus ‘late afternoon; west’ (← vakar-s ‘evening’ + pus-e ‘land, place’), cf. Rudžīte (1964, p. 203). For a discussion about the origin of the linking element *s used in compounds in the Modern Tamian dialect, cf. Endzelīns (1951, p. 261), Rudžīte (1964, p. 203).
lord’ (cf. liel-s (Nom.sg.m.) ‘big’): *lieti lielskungs. Secondly, word units of this type were often lexicalized, as they formed a semantic unit. Hence, meža-zirgs-s (L) (cf. mež-s (LD), mež-a (LD) ‘wood, forest’ + zirgs-s ‘horse, steed’) did not denote any horse in the woods, but meant a camel.

Thirdly, we cannot rule out the possibility that noun phrases in Latvian were reanalyzed as compounds after they had acquired fixed initial stress. In Modern Latvian, this phonological feature is used as one of the main criteria for treating cases with the first inflected component as compounds and distinguishing them from phrases. For example, the following instance is not considered to be a compound in Latvian, since it can be accented in two ways, cf. ’Baltijas jūra ‘the Baltic sea’ and Baltijas jūra ‘id.’ (MLLVG, 1959, p. 198ff.).

Due to the reasons mentioned above, new compounds were later analogically coined with an inflected first component. This type of compound must have become very productive in later centuries, since it is one of the most common types of the determinative compounds in Modern Latvian, e.g., vi-di-us-laik-i (Nom.pl.) ‘Middle Ages’ (← cf. vid-us (Gen.sg.) ‘middle’ + laik-i (Nom.pl.) ‘time, period’), cf. MLLVG (1959, p. 201ff.). Even in some attributive determinative compounds, the first component is in agreement with the second one, e.g., vecais-tēv-s ‘grandfather’ (← vec-ais (Nom.sg.m.def.) ‘old’ + tēv-s ‘father’), cf. MLLVG (1959, p. 204). Thus, it can be concluded that a number of determinative compounds in Latvian developed through reanalysis of noun phrases that clearly suggest their syntactic origins.

7.3 Different tendencies of compounding in Old Latvian

It has been demonstrated in this thesis that compounds and noun phrases were interchangeably used in the Old Latvian texts where even the same authors used both ways of expressing the same meaning. However, there was a variation in the use of compounds and phrases in the early texts. Furthermore, the form of the first component in determinative compounds was variable, which implied that compounds of this category were differently coined by different authors. In this section, it will be argued that the tendencies of compounding reflected in the Old Latvian texts represent dialectal differences.

In chapter 3, a strong tendency by Langius to reduce or lose short vowels in final syllables of both uncompounded words and compounds was presented and discussed. Following Blese (1936/1987, p. 576), it was proposed that the weakening or loss of short vowels in final syllables were due to the influence of the Tamian dialect. This is why noun phrases found in the texts of the other authors of the same period were often represented as compounds in Langius’ dictionary. Hence, the number of determinative compounds attested in this dictionary was much larger than in the texts of the other authors.
Moreover, the reduction of short vowels in word-final position also explains why the determinative compounds were mostly coined without linking elements by Langius in comparison to the compounds formed by the other authors of the same period. Consider counterparts found in the dictionaries by Mancelius in (18a) and Langius in (18b).

(18) a. Manc. *muit-a-naud-a* (PhL) ‘customs duty’ (← *muit-a* ‘customs’ + *naud-a* ‘money’)
   
b. Lang. *muit-naud-a* (LD) ‘customs duty’ (← *muit-a* ‘customs’ + *naud-a* ‘money’)

By contrast, determinative compounds without linking elements are used much less in the texts by Mancelius and Fürecker. In the determinative compounds found in the latter sources, linking elements disappeared due to other reasons presented in chapter 3.

Determinate compounds without linking elements occur even more rarely in the text by Elger. In this text, a compound with a linking element and a phrase with an inflected first component are often used alongside a compound without a linking element, as shown in (19).

(19) a. *baznīc-a-kung-s* (EE) ‘priest’ (← *baznīc-a* ‘church’ + *kung-s* ‘lord, master, gentleman’)
   
b. *baznīc-as kung-i* (Nom.pl.) (EE) ‘priest’ (cf. *baznīc-as* (Gen.sg.) ‘church’)
   
c. *baznīc-kung-s* (EE) ‘priest’ (← *baznīc-a* ‘church’ + *kung-s* ‘lord, master, gentleman’)

Furthermore, many compounds found in the other early texts are represented as loosely joint word units with both inflected components by Elger. Due to the variable form of the first component in particular, it is often difficult to make the distinction between compounds and noun phrases found in this text. Consider the following parallel sentences in the translations of pericopes by Elger in (20a) and (21a) and Fürecker in (20b) and (21b).

(20) MLatv. *sēt-mal-a*, *sēt-mal-e* (LLVe) ‘fence, hedge’  
(← *sēt-a* ‘fence, yard’ + *mal-a* ‘edge, brim’)
   
a. Elger (EE): *sētumalēms* (Dat.pl.)
   
Und tas Kungs saciJa tam kalpam: Izej uz tiems celiems und pie sētumalēms, und spiede tos šeit iekšan nākt, ka mans nams top piepilīts.\(^{138}\)

\(^{138}\) <Vnd tas Kungs faccion tam kalpam: Jvey v3 tems celiems vnd pe šētumalēms, vnd ūspede tōs fjet ekfšan nākt, ka mans nams tōp pepildīts.> (EE).
‘And the Lord said to the servant: go out into those roads and hedges and compel them to come here, that my house may be filled’

b. Fürecker (VLH): sētmalēm (Dat.pl.)

_In tas Kungs sacīja uz to Kalpu: Iz=ej uz tiem lieliem Cēljiem / in pie Sētmalēm / in spied tos šeit teksā nākt / ka mans Nams pilns top._

‘And the Lord said to the servant: go out into those highways and hedges and compel them to come here, that my house may be filled’

(21) MLatv. _cel-mal-a_ (LLVVe) ‘roadside, wayside’

(← _cel-š_ ‘road, way’ + _mal-a_ ‘edge, brim’)

a. Elger (EE): _cele maļu_ (Acc.sg.)

_Viens sējējs izgāja sēt sava sēkla; und sējejot, krita cita pie cele maļu, und tapa samīta, und tie putni apakšan debesu to aprīja._

‘One sower went out to sow his seed; and as he was sowing, this seed fell on the roadside and became trampled down and eaten by the birds under the skies’

b. Fürecker (VLH): _cel=malī_ (Loc.sg.)

_Viens Sējējs izgāja sāv Sēklu sēt / in sējot krita cita Cel=malī / in tāpi Putni apakš Debes apēde to._

‘One sower went out to sow his seed / and as he was sowing, this seed fell to the roadside / and became trampled down / and eaten by the birds under the skies’

In fact, similar tendencies of compounding seen in the text by Elger are represented by the later translation of gospels (i.e., _Evangelia toto anno_, issued in Vilnius in 1753), which was the first book printed in High Latvian or Latgalian. On the whole, compounds are used very rarely in this book. Consider a few compounds found in this text presented in (22).

(22) a. _bazneic-kung-s_ ‘priest’ (← _bazneic-a_ ‘church’ + _kung-s_ ‘lord, master, gentleman’) <Baznieyckungs> (ETA)

b. _Jordan-up-e_ ‘Jordan (river)’ (← _Jordan-s_ ‘Jordan’ + _up-e_ ‘river’) <Jordan-upes> (Gen.sg.) (ETA)

---

139 <In tas Kungs šazzija us to Kalpu: Is=ej us teem leeleem Zel|leem / in pee Šehtmalleem / in j|peed tohs šeieit ekkscha nakh / ka mans Nams pilns tohp.> (VLH).

140 <Wens jieieis ygaia fiêt fauwa fiêkla; vnd jieieiot, krita citta pe cellie mallu, vnd tappa jamytu, vnd te putni appak|jan debbesu to apria.> (EE).

141 <[...] Weens Šehjejs isgahja savu Šehklu šeht / in šehtoht kritte zitta Zel|=malli / in tappa samihta / in tee Putni appaks Debes aphehde to.> (VLH).
c. *lel-dīn-e*[^142] ‘Easter day’ (← *lel-s* ‘big’ + *dīn-a* ‘day’)  
<leldinie> (ETA)

d. *svāt-dīn-e*[^143] ‘Sunday’ (← *svāt-s* ‘holy, blessed, sacred’ + *dīn-a* ‘day’)  
<swadinie> (ETA)

Furthermore, in the later translation of gospels, noun phrases or uncompounded words are often used instead of compounds attested in the other works of the early period that were analyzed in this thesis.

(23) a. *kāz-a-drēb-es* (Nom.pl.) (EE) ‘wedding garment’  
(← *kāz-as* (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding’ + *drēb-es* (Nom.pl.) ‘cloth’)  

b. *kuoz-u* (Gen.pl.) *drēbj-u* (Gen.pl.) ‘wedding garment’  
<kòzu drebiu> (ETA)

(24) a. *ūden-viln-is* (EE) ‘water wave’ (← *ūden-s* ‘water’ + *viln-a* (LD), *viln-is* (EE) ‘wave’)  

b. *iudeņ-a* (Gen.sg.) *viln-es* (Nom.pl. (?)) ‘water wave’  
<yudenia wilnes> (ETA)

(25) a. *vīģ-a-kok-s* (L) ‘fig-tree’ (← *vīģ-e* ‘fig’ + *kok-s* ‘tree’)  

b. *fig-u* (Gen.pl.) *kūk-a* (Gen.sg.) ‘fig-tree’  
<figu kuka> (ETA)

Many word units of this kind found in the book in High Latvian were clearly loosely juxtaposed, as in some cases, their components did not have a fixed position, as presented in (26).

(26) a. *Dīv-a* (Gen.sg.) *vaļst-eib-as* (Gen.sg.) ‘the Kingdom of God’  
(cf. *Dīv-a* (Gen.sg.) ‘God’) <Diwa walſtibas> (ETA)  

b. *vaļst-eib-as* (Gen.sg.) *Dīv-a* (Gen.sg.) ‘the Kingdom of God’  
<walſtibas Diwa> (ETA)

In view of the material presented above, it may be suggested that the tendencies of compounding represented in the text by Elger and in the later translation in High Latvian correspond. Hence, I would like to suggest that the text by Elger represents the tendencies of compounding that are characteristic to

---

[^142]: Note that this compound has the compositional suffix *-e*, although it was not used in its counterpart found in the texts of the older period, cf. *liel-dien-a* (L) ‘Easter day’ (cf. *dien-a* ‘day’). Also cf. a suffixless variant in Modern Standard Latvian: *liel-dien-as* (Nom.pl.) (LLVVe) ‘id.’.

[^143]: The compositional suffix *-e* is added to this compound, cf. unsuffixed counterparts found in the texts from the middle period of Old Latvian and in the Modern Standard Latvian: *svēt-dien-a* (VLH) ‘Sunday’ (cf. *dien-a* ‘day’) and *svēt-dien-a* (LLVVe) ‘id.’, respectively.
the Eastern varieties of Latvian. This explains why even a few attributive determinative compounds found in the text of Elger in (27) were coined with the linking element `<a>`, although it was not used in compounds of this type by the other authors of the early period.

(27) a. garīg-a-dziesm-ems (Dat.pl.) (EE) ‘hymn’ (← gar-īg-s ‘spiritual, ecclesiastical’ + dziesm-a (LD), dziesm-is (PhL) ‘song’)

b. liel-a-dien-u (Gen.pl.) (EE) ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)\(^{144}\)

Finally, it must be pointed out that similar tendencies of compounding represented in the Old Latvian texts are also observed in Modern Latvian dialects. The main differences are seen when comparing compounds in High Latvian dialects and the Western varieties (i.e., the Tamian dialect) with compounds in Standard Latvian. First of all, as is pointed out by Rudzīte (1964, p. 328ff.), the number of compounds in High Latvian is, in fact, smaller than in the Standard Latvian. Hence, a noun phrase is often used in High Latvian instead of the corresponding compound in Standard Latvian, cf. Standard Latvian ciet-sird-īg-s ‘hard-hearted, cruel’ (← ciet-s ‘hard’ + sird-s ‘heart’) vs. a noun phrase in High Latvian: cīt-u sird-i (Acc.sg.) ‘id.’ (Rudzīte, 2005, p. 88). On the contrary, in the Modern Tamian dialect, compounding is considered to be one of the most widespread means of forming new words (Rudzīte, 1964, p. 201). This is why in this dialect, compounds are used even in those cases where the Standard language and other dialects have uncompounded forms, cf. a compound in the Tamian dialect ābel-kok-s ‘apple tree’ (← ābel-e ‘apple-tree’ + kok-s ‘tree’) vs. an uncompounded word in Standard Latvian: ābel-e ‘apple tree’ (Rudzīte, 1964, pp. 203–204).\(^{145}\) As it was demonstrated above, very similar tendencies of compounding in the Modern dialects are represented by Elger and Langius.

Second of all, in determinative compounds in High Latvian, the first component is usually inflected (cf. Gāters, 1977, p. 67), cf. nabagu muoja ‘alms-house’ (← nabag-u (Gen.pl.) ‘beggar, pauper’ + muoj-a ‘house’). As was the case for the text by Elger and the later book in High Latvian, it is unclear whether examples with internal inflection in Modern High Latvian may be treated as compounds or noun phrases. By contrast, in the western varieties,\(^{146}\)  

\(^{144}\) As for this compound, only one token without a linking element is found in the text by Elger, cf. lel-dien-u (Gen.pl.) (EE) ‘Easter day’.

\(^{145}\) Draviņš (1992, p. 145) has argued that these different tendencies of compounding between High and Low Latvian dialects are determined by the shortening or reduction of final syllables. Thus, in the Western varieties, where final syllables are more or less reduced, words tend to fuse into compounds more easily. By contrast, instead of compounds used by the speakers of the Western varieties, uncompounded words are used in the Eastern varieties where final syllables are clearly pronounced. For a discussion about the loss or shortening of unstressed vowels in the Modern Tamian dialect, cf. Rudzīte (1964, p. 150ff.), Balode and Holvoet (2001, p. 26ff.).
the first component has often a shortened form, cf. nabag-nam-s ‘almshouse’ (cf. Gāters, 1977, p. 67). Likewise, it was shown in chapter 3 that even noun phrases found in works of the other authors of the early period were often represented as compounds by Langius.

Moreover, compounds in the Central dialect of Latvian often correspond to compounds in the Standard Latvian (Rudzīte, 1964, p. 108). However, in this dialect, there are also compounds which have preserved a more archaic form, i.e., the first component ends in an original stem vowel (Rudzīte, 1964, p. 108; Ancītis, 1977, p. 143), e.g., abr-ā-kas-is ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough; the remaining dough’ (← abr-a ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. kas-t ‘to scrape, to scratch’), dien-a-vid-s ‘noon’ (← dien-a ‘day’ + vid-us ‘middle’). As demonstrated in this thesis, many stem compounds based on two nouns were coined by Mance-lius, who used Latvian spoken in Semgallen and Livland, which more or less correspond to Modern Central dialects, as the basis for the written language (cf. Vanags, 2008, p. 188ff.).

In view of the material presented and discussed above, it may be concluded that the tendencies of compounding reflected in the Old Latvian texts represent dialectal differences. As it was argued in this section, similar tendencies of compounding are also observed in the Modern Latvian dialects.

7.4 Future research

In this thesis, the system of compounding attested in Early Written Latvian texts was described by addressing a number of aspects concerning the form and meaning of the compounds. While this study has thoroughly analyzed compounds of one particular period of Latvian, there are many different approaches that can be used to investigate the development of the system of compounding in Latvian.

Firstly, it is worth investigating how the system of compounding in Old Latvian determined in this thesis changed over the course of later centuries. It has been suggested in this work that stem compounds had already begun to disappear in the same early period. Hence, one of the ways of tracing back the loss of this model of composition would be to examine later Latvian texts.

Secondly, it is clear that compounding in Modern Latvian dialects calls for further investigation. It has been discussed above that there exist different tendencies of compounding in Latvian dialects with regard to the form of the first component. In my opinion, it is also important to determine whether compounds in Latvian dialects differ in terms of the form of the second component. Addressing the form of the second component of compounds of different categories will reveal whether the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.) had spread beyond its original distribution determined in this thesis.
Thirdly, it is important to investigate whether the system of compounding attested in the earliest Latvian texts corresponds to the one found in Latvian folk songs. To my knowledge, apart from the list of compounds provided by Kalniņš (1933) and a few paragraphs in the general description by Ozols (1961, pp. 69–70), compounds in folk songs have never been subjected to a thorough investigation. It was pointed out in chapter 4 in this work that the Old Latvian possessive compounds formally corresponded to the possessive compounds in folk songs. Thus, it is important to investigate whether the categories of compounds in folk songs were also differentiated in terms of their form and meaning as was the case for the Old Latvian compounds described in this study.

Finally, the issue of the influence of different languages on the Old Latvian compounds needs to be investigated in more detail. The formation of compounds in Old Latvian was inevitably influenced by other languages, since authors of the first texts were multilingual and the oldest religious texts, in particular, were often translated with the aim of being as close as possible to original sources. It was determined in this thesis that several loanblends were attested in the Old Latvian texts, in which the form of the components was clearly modeled after their counterparts in German. It was also argued that the adjectival suffix -īg- and other agentival suffixes were added to several Old Latvian compounds by copying the form of their counterparts in German. One of the ways of investigating this issue would be to determine the extent to which the system of compounding in Old Latvian was influenced by the German system of compounding, for instance, by identifying Old Latvian compounds that were clearly loaned from the German language and categorizing them according to the taxonomy of loanwords presented and discussed by Haugen (1950) and Haspelmath (2009, pp. 35–54). Furthermore, taking into account that many authors of the early period were local Germans, it is important to explore whether the Old Latvian compounds had any influence on the form or meaning of the German compounds attested in the same texts. Last but not least, it may be valuable to make a chronology of borrowed compounds into Latvian.
Sammanfattning

Avhandlingsens övergripande syfte är att beskriva, analysera och presentera en systematisk genomgång av de nominalkomposita som förekommer i de tidigaste kända lettiska texterna från 1500- och 1600-talet. I avhandlingen presenteras den första genomgripande filologiska undersökningen av det samlade materialet från de tidigaste lettiska texterna. Ett av avhandlingens huvudsakliga syften är att hitta en definition för fornlettiska nominalkomposita samt att identifiera de olika semantiska och formella kategorierna av nominalkomposita som förekommer i materialet. I avhandlingen undersöks också den morfologiska variation som förekommer inom de olika nominalkategorierna och olika tendenser i utvecklingen kan skönjas mellan de olika texterna från den undersökta tidsperioden.

Det fornlettiska materialet kunde delas in i tydliga semantiska grupper: determinativa komposita, possessiva komposita, verbala rektionskomposita samt kopulativa komposita. Vidare kunde en rad formella drag identifieras och knytas till de olika typerna av komposita. Till exempel kunde det konstateras att en majoritet av både possessiva komposita och verbala rektionskomposita hade bildats med ett kompositionssuffix, -is (m.)/-e (f.), emedan determinativa komposita endast i några få undantagsfall hade bildats med detta suffix. Denna tydliga fördelning gällande hur detta suffix används indikerar att suffixet ursprungligen var hemmahörande i adjektiviska komposita. Vidare uppvisar olika typer av komposita skillnader när det gäller utformningen av det första ledet av sammansättningarna. I de allra flesta fall bildas såväl possessiva komposita som verbala rektionskomposita utan någon form av sammanlänkande element mellan kompositionsleden. Däremot tycks determinativa komposita bildas med någon form av sammanlänkande element mellan kompositionsleden i de flesta fall. I avhandlingen argumenteras för att en betydande del av dessa sammanlänkande element härrör från första ledets stamvokal. Det slås därmed fast att så kallade stamkomposita finns representerade i det fornlettiska materialet, trots att denna typ av komposita inte längre går att urskilja i den moderna lettiskan. Därtill uppvisar det fornlettiska materialet en rad dialektala skillnader vilka även behandlas i avhandlingen.

I avhandlingen behandlas det fornlettiska materialet ur ett jämförande perspektiv där nominalkomposita i de övriga baltiska språken, framförallt litauiska, utgör en viktig referensram. Genom en jämförande studie av gemensamma baltiska drag som återfinns i alla de baltiska språken (eller enbart i de östbaltiska språken) har det fornlettiska materialet kunnat
analyseras inom ramen för det gemensamma baltiska systemet för
nominalkomposition.
Sources

Old Latvian

Retrieved from an online corpus SENIE (Latviešu valodas seno tekstu korpus) http://www.korpuss.lv/senie/

1. Texts from the oldest period of Early Written Latvian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Catechismus Catholicorum</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ench1</td>
<td>Enchiridion. Der kleine Catechismus</td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ench2</td>
<td>Enchiridion. Der kleine Catechismus</td>
<td>1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvEp1</td>
<td>Evangelia vnd Episteln</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvEp2</td>
<td>Evangelia vnd Episteln</td>
<td>1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Psalmen vnd geistliche Lieder</td>
<td>1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>Vndeutsche Psalmen vnd geistliche Lieder oder Gesenge</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Texts and dictionaries from the middle period of Early Written Latvian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Christophor Fürecker’s Lettisches und Teutsches Wörterbuch</td>
<td>1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Christophor Fürecker’s Lettisches und Teutsches Wörterbuch</td>
<td>1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT</td>
<td>Tas Jauns Testaments</td>
<td>1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Georg Mancelius’ Lettus</td>
<td>1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>Georg Mancelius’ Lang=gewünschte Lettische Postill I</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Run Georg Mancelius’ *10 sarunas* (1638).

Syr Georg Mancelius’ *Das Haus=, Zucht= vnd Lehrbuch Jesu Syrachs* (1631).

VLH Christophor Fürecker’s *Vermehretes Lettisches Hand=buch* (1685).

Word indexes of Old Latvian texts


Other editions


**Old Lithuanian**

**BrP** Postilla tatai est Trumpas ir Prastas Ischguldimas Euangeliu... Per Jana Bretkuna... Isspausta Karaliaucziuie Jurgio Osterbergero. Maeta Pono 1591.


**Old Prussian**

**EV** The Old Prussian Elbing Vocabulary.

**GrF** Simon Grunau’s Old Prussian Vocabulary.

**III** The 3rd Old Prussian Catechism.

**Dictionaries**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Appendix

In the following, the collection of compounds used in this study is presented. The list below includes only those examples that were treated as compounds in this thesis, leaving formally ambiguous cases aside. The presentation of material largely follows the same structure as in the text. The compounds are arranged into four categories, namely determinative compounds, possessive compounds, verbal governing compounds, and copulative compounds. The compounds of each category are further subdivided into smaller subgroups.

In each category, examples are quoted as follows: first, the transliterated compound is written with the letters and signs of Modern Latvian orthography. Note that linking elements are not transliterated and given as they appeared in original sources. Then, the components of compounds are presented in the brackets. Attestations in the original orthography are quoted below. Translations or descriptions in German are also given if they were provided in original sources. Abbreviations of original sources are indicated in the brackets.

1 Determinative compounds

1.1 Dependent determinative compounds

N+N

ac-a-mirk(s)l-is ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + mirk(s)l-is ‘blink, instant’)
Latv. <Atza=mircklis> beside Germ. <Augenblick> (L);
Latv. <Atza=mirkklis> beside Germ. <Augenblick> (PhL);
Latv. <Atza=mirkklis> beside Germ. <ein Augenblick> (LD);
Latv. <Azza Mirkklis> beside Germ. <Augenblick> (M/M)

ac-a-sāp-es (Nom.pl.) ‘eye pain’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’)
Latv. <Atza=śahpes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Augenwehe> (L)
ac-a-vāk-s ‘eyelid’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + vāk-s ‘lid, cover’)
Latv. <Atz=waḥx> beside Germ. <Augenliede> (L);
Latv. <Atz=waḥx> beside Germ. <die Augenlieder> (PhL);
Latv. <Azza Wahks> beside Germ. <Augen=lidd> (M/M, M/L)

ac-a-zob-i (Nom.pl.) ‘eyeteeth’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + zob-s ‘tooth’)
Latv. <tee Atza=johbi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Augenzähne> (PhL);
Latv. <Atza sohbi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Augen Zähne. Sonsten heissen sie Iltis> (LD);
Latv. <Azza Sohbi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Augenzähne, sonst heißen sie Iltis> (M/L)

ac-i-kakt-in-š ‘corner of the eye’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + kakt-s ‘corner’)
Latv. <Azzi kaktinsch> beside Germ. <augenwininkel> (F1);
Latv. <Azzi kaktinsch> beside Germ. <augen=winkel> (F2)

ac-mirksl-is ‘moment, blink of an eye’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + mirksl-is ‘blink, instant’)
Latv. <Atz’mirkslis> beside Germ. <ein Augen blick> (LD)

ac-vāk-s ‘eyelid’ (← ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’ + vāk-s ‘lid, cover’)
Latv. <Atz’wahks> beside Germ. <ein Augen lied> (LD)

adat-a-ac-s ‘eye of a needle’ (← adat-a ‘needle’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <Addata=Atz> beside Germ. <Nadelöhr> (PhL);
Latv. <Addata=atz iʃʃuʃʃi> beside Germ. <die öhr ift außgebrochen> (PhL)

akn-a-des-a ‘liver sausage’ (← akn-is (Nom.pl.f.) (F1, F2) ‘liver’ + des-a ‘sausage’)
Latv. <Ackna=däʃśa> beside Germ. <Leberwurʃt> (L);
Latv. <Ackna= dessa> beside Germ. <ein Leber Wurst> (LD)

akn-a-des-a ‘liver sausage’ (← akn-is (Nom.pl.f.) (F1, F2) ‘liver’ + des-a ‘sausage’)
Latv. <Akŋa Dess ́a> beside Germ. <Leberwurst> (M/M)

āland-sakn-is ‘root of a horseheel (Inula Helenium, a plant)’ (← āland-s (LD), ālant-s (PhL) ‘horseheel (Inula Helenium, a plant)’ + sakn-a (EE), sakn-is (LD), sakn-e (F1, F2) ‘root’)
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Latv. <Alandsācknis> beside Germ. <Alantwurtz> (L);
Latv. <Aland=Šacknis> beside Germ. <Alant=Wurtzel> (LD)

alkšn-kok-s ‘alder’ (← alksn-is (F1, F2), alkšn-a (LD) ‘alder’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
Latv. <Alkschn’= Kohks> beside Germ. <Ellernholtz> (LD)

al-leģel-s ‘keg of beer’ (← al-us ‘beer’ + leģel-s (LD) ‘keg, firkin’)
Latv. <al]= leggels> untranslated (LD)

amat-vīr-s ‘craftsman’ (← amat-s (PhL), amat-a (PhL) ‘handicraft, profession’ + vīr-s ‘man’)
Latv. <A maté Wiihrs> beside Germ. <ein Handwercker, Künstler> (LD)

aps-a-kok-s ‘aspen tree’ (← aps-e (M/J), aps-a (PhL) ‘asp’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
Latv. <Ąpsa=kohx> beside Germ. <Aşpenbaum> (L)

aps-a-malk-a ‘aspen wood’ (← aps-e (M/J), aps-a (PhL) ‘asp’ + malk-a (LD), malk-s (M) ‘wood, firewood’)
Latv. <Ąpsa=malka> beside Germ. <Aşpenholtz> (L)

asin-grēk-s ‘incest’ (← asin-s (L), asin-is (LD) ‘blood’ + grēk-s ‘sin’)
Latv. <Assin G/rähki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <blut=schande> (LD)

asin-i-sērg-a ‘dysentery’ (← asin-s (L), asin-is (LD) ‘blood’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’)
Latv. <Ąśinišāhrgha> beside Germ. <rohte Ruhr> (L);
Latv. <[..] wena ķewa, kattru dywwipadešmitus gaddus āšsini ķērga gullēuša [...]>) (Loc.sg.) (EE) ‘a woman who had suffered from dysentery for twelve years’

auj-a-ād-a ‘sheep’s skin’ (← cf. auja-s (Gen.sg.) (LD) ‘sheep’ + ād-a ‘skin, leather’)
Latv. <Auja= Ahda> beside Germ. <ein Schaff=Fell> (LD)

auj-a-kažok-s ‘sheepskin coat’ (← cf. auja-s (Gen.sg.) (LD) ‘sheep’ + kažok-s ‘fur coat, pelt’)
Latv. <Auja=kažhohx> beside Germ. <Schaafspeltz> (PhL)

auj-a-pien-s ‘sheep’s milk’ (← cf. auja-s (Gen.sg.) (LD) ‘sheep’ + pien-s ‘milk’)
Latv. <Auja=peenb> beside Germ. <Schaaf=Milch> (PhL);
Latv. <Auja= peens> untranslated (LD)
austrum-zem-e ‘the East’ (← austrum-s (EE) ‘east’ + zem-e ‘earth, ground’) Latv. <[...] nāce tē guddri wīry no auſtrum ʒemme ekʃʒan Jeruʃalem […]> (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘wise men from the East came to Jerusalem’

av-i-kūt-s ‘flock; sheepfold’ (← av-s (L), av-is (LD) ‘sheep’ + kūt-s ‘shed’) Latv. <[...] vnd būs wens awwikut [...] (EE) ‘and there will be one flock’; Latv. <[...] es ʃakka iums, kas pa tem durwem ne eêt ekʃʒan to awwikutī [...] (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘I say to you, who does not enter the sheepfold’

avj-a-drēb-es (Nom.pl.) ‘sheep’s clothing’ (← av-s (L), av-is (LD) ‘sheep’ + drēb-e ‘cloth’) Latv. <[ [...] kattri awwia dræbes pe iums naka [...]> (Loc.pl.) (EE) ‘who come to you in sheep’s clothing’

barīb-a-kambar-is ‘dining-room’ (← barīb-a ‘food, nutrition’ + kambar-is (L), kambar-s (PhL) ‘room, chamber’) Latv. <Barriba=kambaris> beside Germ. <Speiʃekam ͂ er> (L)

barīb-a-sarg-s ‘larderer’ (← barīb-a ‘food, nutrition’ + sarg-s ‘guard, watch’) Latv. <[Bet kad tas Barribajargs to wynu baudia [...]>> (EE) ‘But the larderer tasted the wine’; Latv. <[ [...] aicena tas Barribajargs to Bruganu vnd ʃakka uʒ to [...]>> (EE) ‘the larderer called the bridegroom and said to him’; Latv. <[ [...] Smelleta nu, vnd neʃseta to tam barribajargam [...]>> (Dat.sg.) (EE) ‘Now draw some out and take it to the larderer’

baznīc-a-kung-s ‘priest’ (← baznīc-a ‘church’ + kung-s ‘lord, master, gentleman’) Latv. <[ [...] Baʒnicakungu [...]>> (Gen.pl.) (EE)

baznīc-kung-s ‘priest’ (← baznīc-a ‘church’ + kung-s ‘lord, master, gentleman’) Latv. <Sūtya te Jōde no Jeruʃalem Baznickungus vnd Leuitas [...]>> (Acc.pl.) (EE) ‘the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem’; Latv. <Basnihts'=kungo Tähws (Oldermaņs)> (Gen.pl.) beside <ein Superintendens> (LD); Latv. <Oldermanns, Zitto Bas=nihzkungo Uhsraugs in Padohm'=deweis> (Gen.pl.) untranslated (LD)
**biš-a-lod-a** ‘gun bullet’ (← *bis-e* (LD), *bis-a* (LD) ‘gun, shot-gun’ + *lod-a* (LD), *lod-e* (F1, F2) ‘bullet’)
Latv. <Bisscha lohda> beside Germ. <Büchsen Kugel> (LD);
Latv. <Bischa Lohda> beside Germ. <büchsenkugel> (M/L)

**biš-a-trop-s** ‘beehive’ (← *bit-e* ‘bee’ + *trop-s* ‘hive’)
Latv. <Biʃʃcha=Trohps> beside Germ. <ein Jm͂ enʃtock> (PhL)

**biš-a-zā-les** (Nom.pl.) ‘gunpowder’ (← *bis-e* (LD), *bis-a* (LD) ‘gun, shot-gun’ + *zāl-e* ‘herb, grass’)
Latv. <Biʃʃcha=fahles> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Büchfenpulver> (L);
Latv. <Biʃʃcha=fahles> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Büchfenpulver> (L);
Latv. <Biʃʃcha=fahles> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Büchfenpulver> (PhL);
Latv. <BischaBukscha Sahles> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <büchsen pulver> (M/L)

**bruņ-a-cepur-e** ‘helmet’ (← *bruņ-as* (Nom.pl.) ‘armour’ + *cepur-e* ‘cap, hat’)
Latv. <Bruņņa=zäppure> beside Germ. <Helm> (L);
Latv. <Bruņņa=zäppure> beside Germ. <Sturmhaube> (PhL)

**bruņ-a-kambar-is** ‘armour room’ (← *bruņ-as* (Nom.pl.) ‘armour’ + *kambar-is* (L), *kambar-s* (PhL) ‘room, chamber’)
Latv. <Bruņņakambaris> beside Germ. <Harnischkammer> (L)

**buš-a-zā-les** (Nom.pl.) ‘gunpowder’ (← *bus-a* (LD), *bus-e* (LD) ‘gun, shot-gun’ + *zāl-e* ‘herb, grass’)
Latv. <Bisscha= (Busscha=) sah=les> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Buchʃen-Pulver> (LD)

**cedar-kok-s** ‘cedar tree’ (← cf. *ciedr-s* ‘cedar’ + *kok-s* ‘tree’)
Latv. <[...] Cedarkoks [...]> (EE)

**cel-mal-a** ‘roadside’ (← *cel-š* ‘way, road’ + *mal-a* (F1, F2), *mal-s* (LD) ‘edge, brim’)
Latv. <Zellmallas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <weg breiten breiten> (F1);
Latv. <Zellmallas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <weg breiten. am weg> (F2);
Latv. <[...] Zellmallas [...]> (Loc.sg.) (VLH) ‘at the roadside’

**cel-mal-is** ‘roadside’ (← *cel-š* ‘way, road’ + *mal-a* (F1, F2), *mal-s* (LD) ‘edge, brim’)
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Latv. [...] šēdeja weens Akls (Neredjīgs) Zeļļmallī [...] (Loc.sg.) (VLH) ‘a blind man was sitting by the roadside’
Latv. [...] us tahm Gatwahm (teem Zeļļmallem) [...] (Dat.pl.) (VLH) ‘toward those streets (those roadsides)’
Latv. <Weens Šēhjejs isgahja šawu Šehklu šēht / in Šēhjoht kritte zitta Zeļ]=mallī [...]> (Loc.sg.) (VLH) ‘One sower went out to sow his seed / and as he was sowing, this seed fell to the roadside’

cepeš-pann-a ‘frying-pan’ (← cepeš-s (LD) ‘roast’ + pann-a ‘frying-pan’)
Latv. <Zeppesch=panna> beside Germ. <ei=ne Brat=pfanne> (LD);
Latv. <Zeppesch’ Panna> beside Germ. <bratpfanne> (M/L)

cūk-sar-i (Nom.pl.) ‘pig bristle’ (← cūk-a ‘pig’ + sar-s (F1, F2), sar-i (Nom.pl.) (PhL), sar-i (Nom.pl.) (LD) ‘bristle’)
Latv. <Zuhka=sārri> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Bürften/ feta> (PhL)

cūk-sar-i (Nom.pl.) ‘pig bristle’ (← cūk-a ‘pig’ + sar-s (F1, F2), sar-i (Nom.pl.) (PhL), sar-i (Nom.pl.) (LD) ‘bristle’)
Latv. <Zuhk’ sārri> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Sweinst borsten> (LD)

dakš-a-dzij-as/dziv-as (Nom.pl.) ‘wick-yarn’ (← dakt-s ‘wick’ + dzij-a ‘wool, yarn’ / dziv-a (LD), dziv-e (LD), dziv-is (LD) ‘yarn’)
Latv. <Dackʃcha=dʃijas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Tachtgarn> (L);
Latv. <Dackʃcha= dsijas/dsiwas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Dacht=garn> (LD);
Latv. <Dakʃcha Dsiwas Dsijas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lichtgarn> (M/L)

darb-dien-a ‘working day’ (← darb-s ‘work’ + dien-a ‘day’)
Latv. <Dahrb’ De=ena> beside Germ. <der Werckeltag> (LD)

darv-a-vācel-e ‘tar basket’ (← darv-a ‘tar, pitch’ + vācel-e ‘bast-basket’)
Latv. <Darrwa=wazele> beside Germ. <Therpudel> (PhL);
Latv. <ghaŋ jāmme karrajahß Darrwawahzele> beside Germ. <Es hengt niedrig gnug die Therpudel> (Run)

dārz-ābol-s ‘garden apple’ (← dārz-s ‘garden’ + ābol-s ‘apple’)
Latv. <Dahrs=Ahbolī> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gärten Äpfel> (F1);
Latv. <Dahrs=Ahbolī> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Garten=Äpfel> (F2)
dārz-apin-is 'hop (a plant)’ (← dārz-s ‘garden’ + apin-i (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2), apin-s (LD) ‘hop’)
Latv. <Dah[r]s appini> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <hopfen garten> (F1);
Latv. <Mes[ch] appiņi ar baltam galwina[m] pilni rupju šehklu paskah[bi] smird: dahrs appini dselteni jeb ruddy, teems gard[a] šmarscha> (Nom.pl.) untranslated (F1);
Latv. <Mesch-Appiņi ar baltahm Galwina[m] pilni rupju Šehklu paskahbi smird: Dahrs=Appini dselteni jeb ruddy, teems garda Šmarscha> (Nom.pl.) untranslated (F2);
Latv. <Mesch-Appiņi ar baltahm Galwina[m] pilni rupju Šehklu, paskahbi smird; bet Dahrs-Appiņi dselteni jeb ruddy, tam garda Šmarscha> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <der buschH. hat weiße Häuptchens, ist voll gro=ben Saamens und reucht sauerlich; aber der Garten Hopffen ist ge[l]b oder braun, eines anmuthigen Geruchs> (M/J)

dārz-augl-is 'garden fruit' (← dārz-s ‘garden’ + augl-a (EE), augl-is (EE), augl-s (EE) ‘fruit’)
Latv. <Darß Augli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Garten Gewächß> (LD);
Latv. <DahrsAugli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gar=tenFrüchte, Garten Gewächße> (M)

deg-aut-s 'handkerchief' (← degun-s ‘nose’ + aut-s ‘binding’)
Latv. <Degg=auts> beside Germ. <Nasetuch, Schnuptuch> (LD)

degun-aut-s ‘handkerchief’ (← degun-s ‘nose’ + aut-s ‘binding’)
Latv. <Däggunautz> beside Germ. <Facenetlein> (L);
Latv. <Däggun=autz> beside Germ. <Schnuptuch> (PhL);
Latv. <Deggunauts> beside Germ. <Schnupfftuch> (M)

dien-a-vid-us ‘noon’ (← dien-a ‘day’ + vid-us ‘middle’)
Latv. <deena widdus Wehjs> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <Südwind> (F2)146

dobum-kok-s ‘hollowed tree’ (← dobum-s ‘cavity, hollow’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
Latv. <Dohbum’ kohks> beside Germ. <ein hohler baum> (LD)

146 Cf. Latv. <Deena widdu> (?) beside Germ. <der mittag> (F1); Latv. <Deena widdu> (?) beside Germ. <der Mittag> (F2).
drān-a-susekl-is ‘cloth brush’ (← drān-a ‘cloth, material’ + susekl-is ‘brush’)
Latv. <Drahna=suṣeklis> beside Germ. <Keerbürglen> (PhL)

durv-sarg-s ‘door-keeper’ (← durv-is (Nom.pl.) ‘door’ + sarg-s ‘guard, watch’)
Latv. <Durw'= šahrgs> beside Germ. <ein Thür=Hüter> (LD)

durv-stab-s ‘door-post’ (← durv-is (Nom.pl.) ‘door’ + stab-s ‘post, pole’)
Latv. <Durw'=stabbs> beside Germ. <ein Thürpfoß> (LD)

dzelz-a-krekl-is ‘armour’ (← dzelz-s (F1, F2), dzelz-e (L) ‘iron’ + krekl-is ‘shirt, undershirt’)
Latv. <Dʃəllʃa=krecklis> beside Germ. <Pantzer> (PhL);
Latv. <Dselsa=kreck=lis> beside Germ. <ein Pantzer> (LD);
Latv. <Dselsa Kreklis> beside Germ. <Panzer> (M/L)

dzelz-a-pann-a ‘iron frying-pan’ (← dzelz-s (F1, F2), dzelz-e (L) ‘iron’ + pann-a ‘frying-pan’)
Latv. <dselsa= Pan=na> beside Germ. <eine eiserne Pfann> (LD)

dzelz-a-sārń-i (Nom.pl.) ‘iron dross’ (← dzelz-s (F1, F2), dzelz-e (L) ‘iron’ + sārń-i (Nom.pl.) ‘dross’)
Latv. <Dʃəllʃa śarrńi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Hammerʃchlag> (PhL)

dzelz-a-skritel-is ‘iron wheel’ (← dzelz-s (F1, F2), dzelz-e (L) ‘iron’ + skritel-is (PhL), skritel-s (L) ‘wheel’)
Latv. <Dʃəllʃa=ʃkrittelis> beside Germ. <ein Ratt mit Eynen beʃchlagen> (PhL)

dzelz-a-vārt-s ‘iron gate’ (← dzelz-s (F1, F2), dzelz-e (L) ‘iron’ + vārt-s (ME), vārt-is (Nom.pl.) (LD/M), vārt-i (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2) ‘gate’)
Latv. <[..] nāca te pe to dzelža warta […]> (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘they came to the iron gate’

dzirn-akmin-s ‘millstone’ (← dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’ + akmin-s (EE), akmin-is (F1, F2) ‘stone’)
Latv. <Dʃirrn=Ackmins> beside Germ. <Mühlʃtein> (PhL);
Latv. <Dsirn' ackmins> beside Germ. <ein Mühlstein> (LD);
Latv. <Dsirn=Ackmins> beside Germ. <ein Mühlstein> (M/L)

dzirnav-a-akmin-s ‘millstone’ (← dzirnav-as (Nom.pl.) ‘hand mill, quern’ + akmin-s (EE), akmin-is (F1, F2) ‘stone’)
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Latv. <Dširnawa=ackmins> beside Germ. <ein Mühlʃtein> (PhL)

ēzel-māt-e ‘female donkey’ (← ēzel-is (EE), ēzel-s (L) ‘donkey’ + māt-e (L), māt-a (EE) ‘mother’)
Latv. <[...] æzelmātes [...]>(Gen.sg.) (EE);
Latv. <[...] æzelmāta [...]>(Acc.sg.) (EE);
Latv. <[...] æzelmāte [...]>(Acc.sg.) (EE)

Ēģipt-a-zem-e ‘Egypt’ (← Ēģipt-e ‘Egypt’ + zem-e ‘earth, ground’)
Latv. <[...] Egypţaʒemmē [...]>(Loc.sg.?) (EE)

gad-s-kārt-s ‘full year’ (← gad-us (F1, F2), gad-s (PhL) ‘year’ + kārt-a (LD), kārt-s (M/J) ‘layer, course’)
Latv. <Ghadskahrtz> beside Germ. <Jahr> (L)

gad-s-kārt-s or gad-s-kārt-a ‘full year’ (← gad-us (F1, F2), gad-s (PhL) ‘year’ + kārt-a (LD), kārt-s (M/J) ‘layer, course’)
Latv. <Tas Elles gabbls to labbibu ne warretu gads=Kahrta āp=ehst, ko tas te apschkehrsch> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <der höllen=brand konte das Getraide das Jahr über nicht verzehren, was Er zu un nütze verthan> (F1);
Latv. <Tas Elles Gabbls to labbibu ne warretu gads=kahrta āp=ehst, ko tas te apschkehrsch> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <der Höllen brand konte das Getraide das Jahr über nicht verzehren, was Er zu Unnütze verthan> (F2)

gald-aut-s ‘tablecloth’ (← gald-s ‘table’ + aut-s ‘binding’)
Latv. <Ghalldautz> beside Germ. <Difchtuch> (L);
Latv. <Ghalld=auts> beside Germ. <Tifchtuch> (L);
Latv. <Ghalldautz> beside Germ. <Tifchtuch> (PhL);
Latv. <Ghalld=autz> beside Germ. <ein Tifchtuch> (PhL);
Latv. <dohd fêckjeftu Ghalld=autu> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <gib ein rein Tifchtuch> (PhL);
Latv. <G/ald=auts> beside Germ. <ein Tisch=Tuch> (LD);
Latv. <Galdauts> beside Germ. <Tischtuch> (M)

galv-a-bruņ-a ‘helmet’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + bruņ-as (Nom.pl.) ‘armour’)
Latv. <Vnd yzejmmeta tas fwaetibas galwabrūnnie [...]>(Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘and take the helmet of salvation’

galv-a-sāp-e ‘headache’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’)
Latv. <Ghallwa=šahpe> beside Germ. <Hauptweh> (PhL);
Latv. <Ghallwa=fāhpe vs weenu puß> beside Germ. <Hauptwehe an einer feiten> (PhL)
galv-a-smadzen-es (Nom.pl.) ‘brain’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + smadzen-es (Nom.pl.) ‘brain’)
Latv. <Ghallwa=smadʃenes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Hirn> (L)

galv-a-virs-s ‘top of the head’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + virs-s (KIV) ‘surface’)
Latv. <Ghallwawirß> beside Germ. <der Wirbel> (PhL)

galv-gal-i (Nom.pl.) ‘head of the bed’ (← galv-a ‘head’ + gal-s ‘end, ending’)
Latv. <Galw=galli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <zum häupten> (F1);
Latv. <Galw=Galli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Zum Häupten> (F2);

gov-a-pien-s ‘cow’s milk’ (← gov-s (PhL), gov-a (LD) ‘cow’ + pien-s ‘milk’)
Latv. <Ghohwa=peenß> beside Germ. <Kuhe=Milch> (PhL)

grāmat-a-skap-is ‘bookcase’ (← grāmat-a ‘book’ + skap-is ‘wardrobe’)
Latv. <Ghramata=Śkappis> beside Germ. <ein Buchʃchapff> (PhL)

gult-a-drān-as (Nom.pl.) ‘nightwear, sleepwear’ (← gult-a ‘bed’ + drān-a ‘cloth, material’)
Latv. <Jemm tahß Ghullta=drahna s> (Acc.pl.) beside Germ. <Nim das Betzeug?> (Run)

gult-a-drēb-es (Nom.pl.) ‘nightwear, sleepwear’ (← gult-a ‘bed’ + drēb-e ‘cloth’)
Latv. <Ghullta=drehbes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Bettgewand> (PhL)

gult-a-viet-a ‘bed, sleeping-place’ (← gult-a ‘bed’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)
Latv. <Ghullta=weeta> beside Germ. <ein Bett> (PhL)

gūž-a-sāp-e ‘hip pain’ (← gūž-as (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘hip’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’)
Latv. <Ghuʃcha=sahpe> beside Germ. <Hufftwewe> (PhL);
Latv. <G/uschas=ahpes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Len=den Wehe, oder Hufft Wehe> (LD);
Latv. <Guhscha=ahpe> beside Germ. <die Hufft=wehe> (LD)

iev-a-kok-s ‘bird-cherry (tree)’ (← iev-a ‘bird-cherry’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
Latv. <Ewa kohks> beside Germ. <faulbaum> (F1);
Latv. <Ewa kohks> beside Germ. <faulbaum> (F2)
Izraēl-bērn-s ‘child of Israel’ (← Izraēl-a ‘Israel’ + bērn-s ‘child’)
Latv. <Īrael=Bārni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Kin=der Īrael> (LD)

jūd-ļaud-is (Nom.pl.) ‘Jewish people’ (← jūd-s ‘Jew’ + ļaud-is (Nom.pl.) ‘people, folk’)
Latv. <Juhd=(Judd) Ļaudis> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Einwohner des gelobten Landes> (LD);
Latv. <Juhd jūdli Ļaudis> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Einwohner des gelobt. landes> (M)

jūd(z)-zem-es (Gen.sg.) ‘mile’ (← jūdz-e (L), jūdz-s (LD) ‘mile’ + zem-e ‘earth, ground’)
Latv. <Juhdsjemmes> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <Meil> (L);
Latv. <Eß Tāhrbatas Tēfša dʃiewoju/ triež Juhds=jemmes no Tāhrbatas.> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Ich wohnete im Dörflichen Kreiʃfe/ drey Meilen von Dörpt.> (Run);
Latv. <[...] Juhd=Semmes [...] > (Gen.sg.) (VLH) ‘mile’;
Latv. <Juhdsemmes> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <eine Meile, Meinwegs> (LD);
Latv. <Juhds, Juhds Semmes> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <eine Meile, Meinwegs> (M/L)

jūr-ī-mal-a ‘seaside, seashore’ (← jūr-īs (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + mal-s (LD), mal-a (F1, F2) ‘edge, brim’)
Latv. <[...] vnd JESUS ʃtawæiu ytwens pe iurimallas [...] > (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘and Jesus was standing alone on the seashore’

jūr-kaķ-e ‘long-tailed monkey’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + kaķ-e (LD), kaķ-is (F1, F2) ‘cat’)
Latv. <Juhr'= kacke> beside Germ. <eine Meerkatz> (LD)

jūr-mal-is ‘seaside, seashore’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + mal-s (LD), mal-a (F1, F2) ‘edge, brim’)
Latv. <Juhrmallis> beside Germ. <das Vfer des Mährs> (PhL);
Latv. <Juhrmallis> beside Germ. <des Meeres Ufer> (LD);
Latv. <Juhrmallis> beside Germ. <am Meer spatzieren> (Loc.sg., Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <am Meer spatzieren> (LD);
Latv. <Juhrmalli oder ģarg Juhr‘mall' staigaht> (Loc.sg., Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <am Meer spatzieren> (M/L)

jūr-putn-is ‘mavis’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + putn-is (LD), putn-s (F1, F2) ‘bird’)
Latv. <Juhr'= Put=nis> beside Germ. <eine Mewe> (LD)
**jūŗ-sun-s** ‘seal’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + sun-s ‘dog’)  
Latv. <Juhŗ‘= Suns> beside Germ. <ein See oder Sal=Hund> (LD)

**jūŗ-ūden-s** ‘sea-water’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + ūden-s ‘water’)  
Latv. <Juhr‘= uhdens> beside Germ. <Seewasser> (LD);  
Latv. <Juhr‘Uhdens> beside Germ. <Seewasser> (M/L)

**jūŗ-ūden-s** ‘sea-water’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + ūden-s ‘water’)  

**jūŗ-viln-a/bang-a** ‘sea wave’ (← jūr-is (LD), jūr-a (F1, F2), jūr-e (PhL) ‘sea’ + viln-a (LD), viln-is (EE) / bang-a ‘wave’)  
Latv. <Juhr‘Wilnas/Bang ́as> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Die Meereswellen> (LD)

**kāj-a-sāp-es** (Nom.pl.) ‘leg ache’ (← kāj-a ‘leg, foot’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’)  
Latv. <Kahja=śahpes> (Nom.pl.) beside <Podagra> (L)

**kāj-gal-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘foot of the bed’ (← kāj-a ‘leg, foot’ + gal-s ‘end, ending’)  
Latv. <kahj=galli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Zunfüßen> (F1);  
Latv. <Kahj=Galli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <zum fußen> (F2)

**kap-sēt-a** ‘cemetery, churchyard’ (← kap-s (F1, F2), kap-a (PhL) ‘grave’ + sēt-a (L), sēt-e (L) ‘fence, yard’)  
Latv. <Kapp=sāhta> beside Germ. <ein Kirchhoff, Gottes Acker> (LD);  
Latv. <Kapšehta> beside Germ. <Kirchhoff Gottes Acker> (M/L);  
Latv. <Kapšchtu> (Acc.sg.) untranslated (M/L)

**kap-sēt-e** ‘cemetery, churchyard’ (← kap-s (F1, F2), kap-a (PhL) ‘grave’ + sēt-a (L), sēt-e (L) ‘fence, yard’)  
Latv. <Kapp=šehte> beside Germ. <Kirchhoff> (L);  
Latv. <Kapp=šehte> beside Germ. <Gotts Acker> (L);  
Latv. <Kapp=šehte> beside Germ. <Kirchhoff> (PhL)
**karāt-putn-is** ‘gallows-bird’ (← karātav-as (Nom.pl.) ‘gallows’ + putn-is (LD), putn-s (F1, F2) ‘bird’)  
Latv. <Karrat'putnis> beside Germ. <ein Galgenschwengel, Gal=genvogel> (LD);  
Latv. <Karratputnis> beside Germ. <Galgenvogel, Galgenschwen>gel> (M/L)

**kās-zāl-e** ‘herb used when coughing’ (← kās-a (PhL), kās-s (F2), kās-us (LD) ‘cough’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’)  

**kašķ-galv-a** ‘itchy head’ (← kašķ-is (ME), kašķ-e (LD) ‘itch, scabies’ + galv-a ‘head’)  
Latv. <Kaschk'= G'allwa> beside Germ. <ein krätzig häupt> (LD);  
Latv. <Kašchk' Galwa> beside Germ. <krätzig Haupt> (M/L)

**kaz-a-pien-s** ‘goat’s milk’ (← kaz-a ‘goat’ + pien-s ‘milk’)  
Latv <Kaʃa=peenß> beside Germ. <Ziegen=Milch> (PhL)

**kāz-a-drēb-es** (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding garment’ (← kāz-as (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding’ + drēb-es (Nom.pl.) ‘cloth’)  
Latv. [...] vnd eredzæia tur wenu cilväku næapterptu ar kažadræbes> (Instr.pl.) (EE) ‘and saw there a man who had no wedding garment’

**kāz-a-laud-is** (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding guests’ (← kāz-as (Nom.pl.) ‘wedding’ + laud-is (Nom.pl.) ‘people, folk’)  
Latv. [...] tems kažaliaudems [...] (Dat.pl.) (EE) ‘to those wedding guests’;  
Latv. [...] vnd yʃṣutia fauwus kalpust aicenata tős kažaliaudis [...] (Acc.pl.) (EE) ‘and sent his servants to call those who were invited to the wedding feast’

**klep-a-zāl-e** ‘herb used when coughing’ (← klep-us ‘cough’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’)  
Latv. <Nhe ḟinni tu Kläppa=fahles> (Gen.sg.) Germ. <weiʃtu nicht was man für Kraut wiedern Huʃten gebraucht?> (PhL);  
Latv. <kņohips=adatā> beside Germ. <Sticknadel> (L);
Latv. <kņohips=addata> beside Germ. <Stecknadel> (F1);
Latv. <kņohips=addata> beside Germ. <Stricknadel> (F2);
Latv. <kņohips=adderata> beside Germ. <Stecknadel> (M/L)

kok-iesmis ‘wooden spit’ (← kok-s ‘tree’ + iesmis (LD), iesm-s (F1, F2) ‘spit, skewer’)
Latv. <Kohk eesmis> beside Germ. <ein höltzerner [Bratspieß]> (LD)

kraš(n)-perska ‘stoking-hole’ (← krašn-s (F1, F2) krašn-is (PhL) ‘stove’ + perska ‘front, forepart’)
Latv. <Krahski=perskcha> beside Germ. <Ofenloch> (L);
Latv. <Krahsn= perskcha> beside Germ. <das Ofenloch> (LD)

kriev(-)ēbol-s ‘cucumber; pumpkin’ (← kriev-s (L), kriev-is (LD) ‘Russian’ + ēbol-s ‘apple’)
Latv. <leels Kree=ebols> beside Germ. <Kürbs> (L);
Latv. <Kreew ēhbohs> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gurken> (F1);
Latv. <Kreew ēhbohs> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gurken> (F2);
Latv. <leels Kree=ebols> beside Germ. <ein Kürbs> (LD);
Latv. <Gurkes (kriew= aboli, hat Mancelius)> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Cucumern> (LD);
Latv. <Kreew=Ahboli> (Nom.pl.) untranslated (M);
Latv. <KreewAhiboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gurcken> (M/L);
Latv. <Leels Kreew’Abhols> beside Germ. <Kür=bis> (M/L)

krūš-a-brūn-a ‘armour’ (← krūt-s (PhL), krūt-is (PhL) ‘breast’ + brūn-as (Nom.pl.) ‘armour’)
Latv. <[...] vnd apwilkti ar kružbrunni [...]> (Instr.sg.) (EE) ‘dressed with armour’

krūš-a-sērg-a ‘breast disease’ (← krūt-s (PhL), krūt-is (PhL) ‘breast’ + sērg-a ‘epidemic disease’)
Latv. <Kruhfscha=sērgsha> beside Germ. <Breufjeuche> (PhL);
Latv. <Kruhscha=Sērgša> beside Germ. <die Brust=Seuche> (LD)

liep-a-krij-is ‘linden bark’ (← liep-a ‘linden’ + krij-s (F1, F2), krijs (F1, F2), krij-is (LD), krija (LD) ‘bark’)
Latv. <Leepa Krihjis> beside Germ. <linden borck> (M/J)
liep-a-križ-s ‘linden bark’ (← liep-a ‘linden’ + križ-s (F1, F2), križ-s (F1, F2), križ-is (LD), križ-a (LD) ‘bark’)
Latv. <Leepa krihšs> beside Germ. <linden borke> (F1); Latv. <Leepa=krihšs> beside Germ. <linden=borck ich bin dir ein Splitter in den Augen - im Auge> (F2)

liet-s-üden-s ‘rainwater’ (← liet-us (L), lit-s (LD) ‘rain’ + üden-s ‘water’)
Latv. <Leets=vdenns> beside Germ. <Regenwasser> (L)

lin-sēkl-is ‘linseed’ (← lin-s ‘flax’ + sēkl-a ‘seed’)
Latv. <Linn=sēkļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Flachsamen> (PhL)

lok-ritin-š ‘wheel rim’ (← lok-s ‘bow, arch’ + ritin-š ‘wheel’)
Latv. <Lohk= rittingi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ge=bogen Räder> (LD);
<Lohk Rittingi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ge=bogene Räder> (M/L)

maiz-kurv-is ‘bread basket’ (← maiz-e ‘bread’ + kurv-is ‘basker’)
Latv. <Mais’kurwis> beside Germ <ein Brod=Korb> (LD);
Latv. <Mais’Kurwis> beside Germ. <brodkorb> (M/L)

maiz-milt-i (Nom.pl.) ‘bread flour’ (← maiz-e ‘bread’ + milt-i (Nom.pl.) ‘flour’)
Latv. <ballto Mais=millti> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Semelmahl> (L)

māj-a-viet-a ‘home, accommodation’ (← māj-a ‘house, building’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)
Latv. <Mahjaweeta> beside Germ. <Behaufung> (L);
Latv. <Mahjawetu doht> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <beherbergen> (L);
Latv. <Maja=weetu doht> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <beherben> (L);
Latv. <Maja=weetu doht> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <beherbergen> (L);
Latv. <Maja=weeta> beside Germ. <Herberg> (L);
Latv. <Ka Zellia=Laudis no Maja=weetas iβ=eet> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <Wie reisende Leute auf der Herberge wegreifen> (Run);
Latv. <Zellia=wiers luhds Maja=weetu/ vnnd kaß tam vajagha:
Wings runna arriedʃan ar śawu Ohrmanni.> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <Ein Reisender Mann bittet vmb Herberge vnd was er bedarff: Auch redet er mit feinem Fuhrmanne.> (Run);
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Latv. <Eß töw luhdʃohß/ dohd man jcho Nackti Maja=weetu.> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <Ich bitte dich/ beherberge mich dieʃe Nacht.> (Run);
Latv. <Kaß warr Zell=a=wieram Maja=weetu leekt.> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <Wer kan ein reifende Manne die Herberge verʃagen.> (Run);
Latv. <Nehe warr nhe weens Maja=weetu lieʃte neʃteeß.> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <Niemand kan jene Herberge mit jich führen.> (Run);
Latv. <Wehlieg tahɿe lieds Majaweetu?> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <Jʃts noch weit hin biß zur Herberge?> (Run);
Latv. <Palddeei par Majaweetu.> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <Hab danck für die Herberge.> (Run);
Latv. <[...] vnd maes pe to nakʃem, vnd maiaweta pe to darriʃem> (Acc.sg.) EE ‘and we will go there and prepare a place’

malk-vezum-s ‘wood cart’ (← malk-a (LD), malk-s (M) ‘wood, firewood’ + vezum-s ‘cart’)
Latv. <Malk=Wessums> beside Germ. <ein Fuder=Holtz> (LD)

mat-aukl-e ‘hairband’ (← mat-s (F1, F2), mat-e (F2) ‘hair’ + aukl-a (LD), aukl-is (L) ‘string, cord, line’)
Latv. <Mattauckle> beside Germ. <Haarʃchnur> (L);
Latv. <Mattauckland> beside Germ. <eine Haarschnur> (LD);
Latv. <Mattauck> beside Germ. <Haar Schnur> (M/L)

māter-a-zāl-e ‘fewerfew (a plant)’ (← māter-es (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘fewerfew’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’)
Latv. <Mahtera=fahle> beside Germ. <Mutterkraut> (PhL)

mēl-e-zāl-es (Nom.pl.) ‘Isatis (a plant)’ (← mēl-e ‘tongue’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’)
Latv. <Mehle šahle> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Weid weid Kraut. Isatis> (F1);
Latv. <Mehle=Sahle> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <weid Kraut. Isatis> (F2)

mež-ābol-s ‘crab apple’ (← mež-s (LD), mež-a (LD) ‘wood, forest’ + ābol-s ‘apple’)
Latv. <[Mesch] Ahboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <busch holtz Äpfel> (F1);
Latv. <Mesch Ahboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <busch= Holz=äppfel> (F2)
mež-apin-is ‘hop (a plant)’ (← mež-s (LD), mež-a (LD) ‘wood, forest’ + apiņ-i (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2), apiņ-s (LD) ‘hop’)
Latv. <Mes[ch] appiņ[i] ar baltam galwiņa[m] pilni rupju šēklu paskah[bi] smird; dahrs appini dselteni jeb ruddi, teems gard[a] šmarscha> (Nom.pl.) untranslated (F1);
Latv. <Mesch=Appiņ[i] ar baltahm Galwiṇnahm pilni rupju Šēklu paskahbi smird; Dahrs=Appinni dselteni jeb ruddi, teems garda Šmarscha> (Nom.pl.) untranslated (F2);
Latv. <Mesch Appiņ[i] ar baltahm Gal=wiṇahm, pilni rupju Šēklu, paskahbi smird; bet Dahrs=Appiņi dselteni jeb ruddi, tam garda Šmarścha> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <der buschH. hat weiße Häuptchen, ist voll gro=ben Saamens und reucht sauerlich; aber der Garten Hopfen ist ge[l]b oder braun, eines anmutigen Geruchs> (M/J);
Latv. <Mesch Appiņ[i]> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <wilder Hopfen> (M/J)

mež-junkar-s ‘forester’ (← mež-s (LD), mež-a (LD) ‘wood, forest’ + junkar-s (PhL) ‘younker’)
Latv. <Mesch=Junckars> beside Germ. <ein busch=wächter, Forstmeister> (LD)

mež-putn-is ‘grouse (tetraonidae)’ (← mež-s (LD), mež-a (LD) ‘wood, forest’ + putn-is (LD), putn-s (F1, F2) ‘bird’)
Latv. <Mesch=puttnis> beside Germ. <ein Wildpret, Wildthier> (LD);
Latv. <Mesch=putni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Wildbret> (LD);
Latv. <Meschputnis> beside Germ. <Wildpratt> (M/L)

milt-putr-a ‘flour porridge’ (← milt-i (Nom.pl.) ‘flour’ + putr-a ‘porridge, gruel’)
Latv. <Milt= puttra> beside Germ. <Brey von Meel. Muβ> (LD);
Latv. <Milt' Putra> beside Germ. <Mehl brey> (M/L)

misiņ-jost-a ‘brassy belt, waistband’ (← misiņ-š ‘brass’ + jost-a ‘belt, waistband’)
Latv. <Missinǵ= johsta> beside Germ. <ein Messing Gürtel> (LD)

muc-a-kattlis ‘kettle or pot of a ton’ (← muc-a (LD) + muc-e (LD) ‘barrel, cask’ + katl-is (LD), katl-s (F1, F2) ‘pot, kettle’)
Latv. <Mutza=kattlis> beside Germ. <[Kessel] von der gantzen Thonnen> (PhL);
Latv. <Mutza= kattlis> beside Germ. <ein Kessel von der gantzen Tonnen, ein Tonnen=kessel> (LD);
Latv. <Muzza Kat=lis> beside Germ. <ein Kessel von einer ganzen Tonne. ein Tonnen Kessel> (M/L)

**mui-ta-būd-a** ‘tax collector’s booth’ (↔ *mui-ta* ‘customs’ + *būd-a* ‘hut, cabin, hovel’)
Latv. <IN JEjus tahlaku eedams / redēja weenu Zilweku pee Muita=Buhdas sehrefhamu [...] > (Gen.sg.) (VLH) ‘As Jesus went on, he saw a man sitting at the tax collector’s booth’

**mui-ta-nam-s** ‘custom-house’ (↔ *mui-ta* ‘customs’ + *nam-s* ‘house, home’)
Latv. <Muita=nams> beside Germ. <Zollhaus> (L);
Latv. <Muita=nams> beside Germ. <Zollhaus> (PhL);

**mui-ta-naud-a** ‘customs duty’ (↔ *mui-ta* ‘customs’ + *naud-a* ‘money’)
Latv. <Muita=Nauða> beside Germ. <Zoll> (PhL)

**mui-ta-naud-a** ‘customs duty’ (↔ *mui-ta* ‘customs’ + *naud-a* ‘money’)
Latv. <Muit=nauda> beside Germ. <Zoll> (LD)

**muiž-kung-s** ‘estate manager, steward’ (↔ *muiž-a* ‘estate, manor house’ + *kung-s* ‘lord, master, gentleman’)
Latv. <Muisch=kuŋs> beside Germ. <ein Ampt=mann, der das Ampt in seines Herren Hoff verwaltet. Vorzeiten hieβ ein solcher Jun=ckers> (LD);
Latv. <Muischkuŋs> beside Germ. <Amtman. vor zeiten hieβ e. solcher Junkers> (M/L);
Latv. <Muisch Kungs Aschi Malku weddinahs Leepa=jā> beside Germ. <wird einen Fadem Holz nach libau fahren laßen> (M/L)

**nakt-sarg-s** ‘night-watch’ (↔ *nakt-s* (LD), *nakt-is* (EE) ‘night’ + *sarg-s* ‘guard, watch’)
Latv. <[...] naktʃargu [...] > (Acc.sg.) (EE)

**nam-kak-e** (‘?’) (↔ *nam-s* ‘house, home’ + *kak-e* (LD), *kak-is* (F1, F2) ‘cat’)

**naud-a-kul-e** ‘money bag’ (↔ *naud-a* ‘money’ + *kul-e* ‘bag, sack’)
Latv. <Nauda=kulle> beside Germ. <ein Beutel> (PhL);
Latv. <Nauda= kulle> beside Germ. <ein Beutel> (LD)

**nom-a-kaus-s** Germ. ‘Steuermünze’ (↔ *nom-a* ‘lease, rental’ + *kaus-s* Germ. ‘Dinar’ (cf. Draviņš & Ozola, 1976, p. 63))
Latv. <[...] nômakauʃu [...] > (Acc.sg.) (EE)
nom-a-naud-a ‘rent money’ (← nom-a ‘lease, rental’ + naud-a ‘money’)
Latv. <Nohma-nauda> beside Germ. <Schatzung> (PhL);
Latv. <Nohma-naud-a> beside Germ. <die Schatzung, Zinß-Geld> (LD);
Latv. <Nohma Nauda> beside Germ. <Schatzung. Zinsegeld> (M/L)

oš-kok-s ‘ash-tree’ (← os-is (F1, F2), oš-a (LD) ‘ash’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
Latv. <Ohsch'= kohki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Eschen=Holtz> (LD)

padzer-a-zāl-e ‘madwort (?) (a plant)’ (← padzir-as (Nom.pl.) (LKV) ‘hang-over’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’)
Latv. <Padsërřa Sahle> beside Germ. <Toll=kraut> (F1);
Latv. <Padsërřa Sahle> beside Germ. <Toll=Kraut> (F2)

pakš-akmin-s ‘corner-stone’ (← pakš-s (LD), pakš-k-is (F1, F2) ‘corner of the house’ + akmin-s (EE), akmin-is (F1, F2) ‘stone’)
Latv. <Packsch ackmins> beside Germ. <ein Eckstein> (LD)

pasaul-ļauž-u (Gen.pl.) ‘world of people’ (← pasaul-e ‘world’ + ļauž-u (Gen.pl.) ‘people, folk’)
Latv. <Pasaул=lauschu> (Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <Eine welt volks> (F1);
Latv. <Pasaул lauschu> (Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <alle welt=leute, volcks> (F2)

pērkon-akmin-s ‘thunderbolt’ (← pērkon-s ‘thunder, the Thunderer’ + akmin-s (EE), akmin-is (F1, F2) ‘stone’)
Latv. <Pähr=kon= Ackmins> beside Germ. <ein Donner=keil> (LD)

pērkon-gais-s ‘thunderstorm’ (← pērkon-s ‘thunder, the Thunderer’ + gais-s ‘weather’)
Latv. <Pährkon= gais-s> beside Germ. <Don=ner Wetter> (LD)

pērkon-lod-e ‘thunderbolt’ (← pērkon-s ‘thunder, the Thunderer’ + lod-e (F1, F2), lod-a (LD) ‘bullet’)
Latv. <Pehrkon=lohde> beside Germ. <doñerkeil> (F2)

pil-sāt-a ‘town, city’ (← pil-s ‘palace, castle’ + sāt-a (Mee), sāt-s (Mee) ‘fence, farm, yard’)
Latv. <Pillsahta> beside Germ. <ei=ne Stadt. Kompt her vom Pill’ und littawschen Wörtlein Saht’, welches heist ein Dorff> (LD);
Latv. <Ahran Pils=ta> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <außer der Stadt> (M/L);
Latv. <Pilshta> beside Germ. <Stadt> (M/L)

**pil-sāt-e** ‘town, city’ (← pil-s ‘palace, castle’ + sāt-a (MEe), sāt-s (MEe)
‘fence, farm, yard’)
Latv. <Ahran Pilsates> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <außer der Stadt> (LD)

**pil-sāt-s** ‘town, city’ (← pil-s ‘palace, castle’ + sāt-s (MEe), sāt-a (MEe)
‘fence, farm, yard’)
Latv. <Pils=tahts> beside Germ. <Stadt> (M/L)

**predikt-krēsl-is** ‘sermon chair’ (← predikt-s ‘sermon, preaching’ + krēsl-is
(L), krēsl-s (F1, F2) ‘chair’)
Latv. <Preddict=krēhslis> beside Germ. <ein Cantzel, Predig=stuel> (LD)

**putin-gais-s** ‘blizzard, snowstorm’ (← putin-s ‘blizzard, snowstorm’ + gais-s
‘weather’)
Latv. <Puttin’ gaiis> beside Germ. <ein ungestümi Wetter> (LD);
Latv. <Put=tin’ Gaiis> beside Germ. <ungestümi Wetter> (M/L)

**remes-cirv-is** ‘woodworker’s axe’ (← remes-s (LD), remes-is (F1, F2) ‘wood-
worker’ + cirv-is (PhL), cirv-s (F1, F2) ‘axe’)
Latv. <Rem̃ ess=Zirwis> beside Germ. <ein Zim̃ er(Beil) (LD);
Latv. <Remmes Zirwis> beside Germ. <Zimmer beil> (M/L)

**reten-sakn-is** ‘a root of a cinquefoil (?)’ (← cf. reteini (Nom.pl.) (L) ‘Poten-
tilla erecta (a plant)’ + sakn-is (LD), sakn-a (EE), sakn-e (F1, F2) ‘root’)
Latv. <Retten=šackni> (Nom.pl.) *untranslated* (LD);
Latv. <Retten Šakni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Tormentill würzl> (M/L)

**rīt-dien-a** ‘tomorrow’ (← rīt-s ‘morning’ + dien-a ‘day’)
Latv. <[...] Riht=deena [...]> (VLH)

**rok-a-dzirnav-as** (Nom.pl.) ‘hand mill, quern’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ +
dzirnav-as (Nom.pl.) ‘hand mill, quern’)
Latv. <Rohka=dįrnavas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <eine Handmühle> (PhL);
Latv. <Rohka dsirnawas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die hand mühle> (F1);
Latv. <Rohka dsirnawas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Hand=Mühle> (F2)

**rok-a-džirn-is** ‘hand mill, quern’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + džirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), džirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’)
Latv. <Rohka>džirnis> beside Germ. <eine HandMühle> (LD)

**rok-a-džirn-us** (Nom.pl.) ‘quern’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + džirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), džirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’)
Latv. <Rohka=džirrnus> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Handmühle> (L)

**roz-su₃uru-s** ‘rose sugar’ (← roz-e (LD), roz-a (EE) ‘rose’ + su₃ur-s (LD), su₃ur-is (PhL) ‘sugar’)
Latv. <Rohs’su₃u₃ur-s> beside Germ. <Rosen=zucker> (LD);
Latv. <Rohs’su₃u₃ur-s> beside Germ. <Rosen zucker> (M/L)

**roz-ūden-s** ‘rose water’ (← roz-e (LD), roz-a (EE) ‘rose’ + ūden-s ‘water’)
Latv. <Rohs=ūden-s> beside Germ. <Rosenwasser> (LD);
Latv. <Rohs Uhđens> beside Germ. <Rosen waṣer> (M/L)

**saderīb-a-naud-a** ‘money received on a pawn’ (← saderīb-a ‘concord’ + naud-a ‘money’)
Latv. <Saderriba=nauda> beside Germ. <Pfandʃchilling> (PhL)

**sak-a-svec-e** ‘torch’ (← sak-as (Nom.pl.) ‘resin’ + svec-e ‘candle’)
Latv. <[...]> nāce ar lukterims, ʃakkaʃweccems [...] (Instr.pl.) (EE) ‘went with lanterns, torches’

**salm-dekJ-is** ‘cover of straw’ (← salm-s ‘straw’ + dekJ-is ‘cover, top’)
Latv. <Salm’ deckis> beside Germ. <eine Daacken> (LD);
Latv. <Salm dekJis> beside Germ. <Stroh=decke> (M/L)

**salm-kaud-s** ‘straw pile’ (← salm-s ‘straw’ + kaud-s (LD), kaudz-e (LD) ‘pile’)
Latv. <Kad Salmkauds no Weerṣs ween appluhts, tad apsch=klährs> beside Germ. <wen man stroh nur von oben pflücket, so verdirbt es durch Nässe un=ten> (LD)

**salm-kūl-is** ‘straw sheaf’ (← salm-s ‘straw’ + kūl-is ‘sheaf’)
Latv. <Salm’ kuhlis> beside Germ. <ein Bundstroh> (LD);
Latv. <Salm Kuhlis> beside Germ. <ein bund Stroh> (M/L)
sān-cel-š ‘byroad, bypath’ (← sān-s ‘side’ + cel-š ‘way, road’)
  Latv. <Śahn’ Zelļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Abwege,
  Bey=wege> (LD);
  Latv. <Śahn zelļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Ab=wege,
  beywege> (M/L)

sān-kaul-s ‘rib’ (← sān-s ‘side’ + kaul-s ‘bone’)
  Latv. <Śahnkauls> beside Germ. <Ribbe> (L);
  Latv. <Śahnkauls> beside Germ. <eine Riebe> (PhL);
  Latv. <Śahn=kauls> beside Germ. <eine Ribbe> (LD);
  Latv. <Śahn’=kauls> beside Germ. <eine Riebe> (LD)

sān-sāp-es (Nom.pl.) ‘side ache’ (← sān-s ‘side’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’)
  Latv. <Śahn’= sahpes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die Seiten
  Wehe> (LD)

sautrum-sakn-e ‘Angelica archangelica (a plant)’ (← sautrum-a ‘Angelica
archangelica (a plant)’ + sakn-e (F1, F2), sakn-a (EE), sakn-is
(LD) ‘root’)
Wurtzel> (F2)

sēj-a-putn-is ‘curlew’ (← sēj-a ‘sowing’ + putn-s (F1, F2), putn-is (LD)
‘bird’)
  Latv. <Śehja Putnis> beside Germ. <brachvogel> (M/J)

sēj-a-putn-s ‘curlew’ (← sēj-a ‘sowing’ + putn-s (F1, F2), putn-is (LD) ‘bird’)
  Latv. <Śehja=Puttns> beside Germ. <ein braach=Vogel> (F1);
  Latv. <Śehja=Puttns> beside Germ. <ein braach=Vogel> (F2)

sērksen-e-mēnes-s ‘March’ (← sērksen-e ‘frozen snow’ + mēnes-s (L)
‘month’)
  Latv. <Sehrksne Mehnes> beside Germ. <der Mertz Monat.
Martiuss> (F2)

sēt-mal-iem (Dat.pl.) ‘fence, hedge’ (← sēt-a (L), sēt-e (L) ‘fence, yard’ +
mal-a (F1, F2), mal-s (LD) ‘edge, brim’)
  Latv. <In tas Kungs sazzija us to Kalpu: Is=eiج us teem leeleem
Zeļleem / in pee Šehtmalleem [...]> (Dat.pl.) (VLH) ‘And the
Lord said to the servant: go out into those highways and hedges’

skābar-kok-s ‘hornbeam’ (← skābar-s ‘hornbeam’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
  Latv. <Skahbar=kohks> beside Germ. <ein Büchen Holtz
oder Buchs=baum> (LD)
skot-viet-is ‘Scot’ (← skot-s ‘Scot’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)
Latv. <Skottweetis> beside Germ. <Schottländer> (L);
Latv. <Skottweetis> beside Germ. <ein Schott oder Schottländer> (LD);
Latv. <Skottweetis> beside Germ. <Schott, Schottländer> (M/L)

slav-a-dziesm-a ‘hymn’ (← slav-a ‘glory, fame’ + dziesm-a (LD), dziesm-is (PhL) ‘song’)
Latv. [...] vnd tauwam wardam [lawadʒeʃma dʒedat] (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘and singing hymns to your name’;
Latv. [...] slawadʒefmems [...] (Dat.pl.) (EE)

smilš-a-kalns ‘sand mountain’ (← smilts-is (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘sand’ + kalns ‘mountain’)
Latv. <Śmillʃcha Kallns> beside Germ. <Sandberg> (PhL);
Latv. <Śmilścha= kalns> beside Germ. <ein Sandt=berg> (LD);
Latv. <Śmilścha Kalns> beside Germ. <Sandberg> (M/L)

smilš-a-zem-e ‘sandy ground’ (← smilt-is (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘sand’ + zem-e ‘earth, ground’)
Latv. <Śmillʃcha Semme> beside Germ. <Sandig Land> (PhL)

snieg-kupen-s ‘snow pile’ (← snieg-s ‘snow’ + kupen-s (LD) ‘pile’)
Latv. <Śneek kup=pens> beside Germ. <ein Schnee Hauffen> (LD)

snieg-kupins-s ‘snow pile’ (← snieg-s ‘snow’ + kupins (LD) ‘pile’)
Latv. <Śneeg= kuppins> beside Germ. <ein Schnee=hauffe> (LD);
Latv. <Śneegkup=pins no=kussig> beside Germ. <hat abgedäuet> (LD);
Latv. <Śneeg Kuppins nokusśis> beside Germ. <hat abgedauet> (M/L)

spredik-krēsl-is ‘sermon chair’ (← spredik-s (M/L), spredik-is (LD), spredikt-s (LD) ‘sermon, preaching’ + krēsl-is (L), krēsl-s (F1, F2) ‘chair’)
Latv. <Spreddik= krähslis> beside Germ. <eine Cantzel> (LD);
Latv. <Spreddick'= krähslis> beside Germ. <ein Cantzel, Predigt=stuel> (LD)

sudrab-kann-a ‘can, pot made of silver’ (← sudrab-s ‘silver’ + kann-a ‘can, pot’)
Latv. <Śuddrab= kanna> beside Germ. <eine Silberne Kanne> (LD)
**sudrab-knop-e** ‘silver knot’ (← sudrab-s ‘silver’ + knop-e (PhL), knop-e (LD) ‘knot’) 
Latv. <Śūd=drab= knohpes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <silberne Knöpfe> (LD)

**sūd-vezum-s** ‘manure cart’ (sūd-s ‘excrement, junk, trash’ + vezum-s ‘cart’) 
Latv. <Suhd’= Wessums> beside Germ. <ein Fuder Mist> (LD)

**sun-sūd-s** ‘dog excrement’ (← sun-s ‘dog’ + sūd-s ‘excrement, junk, trash’) 
Latv. <Śunn=śuhtz> beside Germ. <Hundsdreck> (PhL)

**svec-purm-a** ‘form for making candles’ (← svec-e ‘candle’ + purm-a ‘form, shape’) 
Latv. <Swetz= purma> beside Germ. <ein Form, ein Liecht Form, dar=auß mann Liechte ziehet, machet> (LD);  
Latv. <Śwezz Pur=ma> beside Germ. <lichtform> (M/L)

**šķēp-dālder-is** ‘thaler’ (← šķēp-s ‘spear, lance’ + dālder-is ‘thaler’) 
Latv. <Wetz Dahl=deris (Schkāhp’ dahlderis, Juckum= dahlderis) beside Germ. <ein Reichs=thaler> (LD)

**šķēr-vārt-is** (Nom.pl.) ‘barrier, fence, gate’ (← šķērs-is ‘obstacle’ + vārt-s (ME), vārt-is (Nom.pl.) (LD/M), vārt-i (Nom.pl.) (F1, F2) ‘gate’)  
Latv. <Schkāhrwahrtis> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ein Schlagbaum> (LD);  
Latv. <ŚchkehrWahrtis> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Schlagbaum> (M/L)

**tap-a-ecēš-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘plug harrow’ (← tap-a ‘plug, peg’ + eceš-i (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘harrow’) 
Latv. <Lieduma ̀ nhe warr ar Tappa=Etzeʃcheem etzeht.> (Dat.pl.) beside Germ. <Jn Rödungen kan man mit Zapff=Egden nicht eggen.> (Run)

**taut-a-meit-a** ‘maiden (poetically)’ (← taut-a ‘people, nation’ + meit-a (PhL), meit-e (F1, F2) ‘daughter, girl’) 
Latv. <Tauta meita> beside Germ. <eine frembde dirne, die nicht befreundet, mit freundschaftf verwandt ist.> (F1);  
Latv. <Tauta Meita> beside Germ. <eine fremde dirne, die nicht befreundet mit freundschaftf verwant ist.> (F2);  
Latv. <Tauta Meita> beside Germ. <die fremd, die mit Freundschaft nicht verwandt ist.> (M/J)

**taut-viet-is** ‘foreigner’ (← taut-a ‘people, nation’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)  
Latv. <tautweetis> untranslated (F2);
Latv. <Tautweetis> beside Germ. <ein Fremdling, Außländere> (LD);
Latv. <Tautweetis> beside Germ. <Fremdling, Ausländer> (M/L)

taut-viet-s ‘foreigner’ (← taut-a ‘people, nation’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)
Latv. <Tautweets> beside Germ. <Außländifich> (L)

ābel-a-balod-as (Nom.sg.) ‘turtledove’ (← ābel-e ‘turtledove’ + balod-is (LD), balod-e (M/L) ‘pigeon, dove’)
Latv. <Tas vbellalododas [...] > (Nom.sg.) (EE)

ābel-balod-is ‘turtledove’ (← ābel-e ‘turtledove’ + balod-is (LD), balod-e (M/L) ‘pigeon, dove’)
Latv. <[...] vbelbalojus [...] > (Acc.pl.) (EE)

ūd-a-makšker- ‘fishing rod with a hook’ (← ūd-as (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘fish hook’ + makšker-es (Nom.pl.) (LD), makšker-s (L), makšker-is (PhL) ‘fishing rod’)
Latv. <Vhda=maxkeres> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Angel am Stricke gebunden/ die Wemgallen zu fahen> (PhL)

ūden-akmin-s ‘stream stone’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + akmin-s (EE), akmin-is (F1, F2) ‘stone’)
Latv. <Uhden=ackmins> beside Germ. <ein Bachstein> (LD);
Latv. <Uhden=ackmins Ugguni sprahgs[...] pusscham> beside Germ. <ein Bachstein platzet, zersprin=ge im Feuer> (LD);
Latv. <UhdenAkmens> beside Germ. <bachstein> (M/L);
Latv. <Uhden=akmins Ugguni sprahg puscham> beside Germ. <platz im Feur, zerspringet> (M)

ūden-dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) ‘watermill’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’)
Latv. <Uh=den=dsirnus> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ein Wasser Mühle> (LD);
Latv. <Uhendsirisnu> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Waßermühle> (M/L)

ūden-i-kroz-a ‘ewer’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + kroz-a (ME) ‘ewer’)
Latv. <[...] katters wena vdeni kroža næs [...] > (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘who is carrying an ewer’

ūden-i-trauk-s ‘water vessel’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + trauk-s ‘vessel’)
Latv. <Bet ta āwa atfaia ūauwa vdenitrauku [...] > (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘But the woman left her water vessel’
ūden-kroz-a ‘ewer’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + kroz-a (ME) ‘ewer’)  
Latv. < [...] Pepildaita tās vdenkrōžas ar vdeni> (Acc.pl.) (EE)  
‘Fill up those ewers with water’

ūden-pūslis ‘water bubble’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + pūsl-is ‘vesica, bladder’)  
Latv. <Uhden= puhslis> beside Germ. <Ein Wasserblase> (LD)

ūden-sērg-a ‘oedema; a disease when liquid collects in the spaces inside  
the body and makes it swell’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + sērg-a  
‘epidemic disease’)  
Latv. <Uhden= šāhrga> beside Germ. <die Wasser=sucht> (LD);  
Latv. <Uhden= Şehrga> beside Germ. <Wařersucht> (M/L)

ūden-skriemel-is ‘mass of water that spins around very fast’ (← ūden-s  
‘water’ + skriemel-is (PhL), skriemel-s (L) ‘vortex’)  
Latv. <Uhden= skree=melis> beside Germ. <der Wirbel im  
Wasser> (LD);  
Latv. <Uhden’ Skreemelis> beside Germ. <der Wirbel im  
Wařer> (M/L)

ūden-spann-is ‘water bucket’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + spann-is (M/L), spanņ-is  
(LD) ‘bucket’)  
Latv. <UhdenSpannis> beside Germ. <Was=ser Eimer> (M/L)

ūden-spanņ-is ‘water bucket’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + spanņ-is (LD), spann-is  
(M/L) ‘bucket’)  
Latv. <Uh=den’ Spanņis> beside Germ. <ein Wasser Eimer>  
(LD)

ūden-tulzn-is ‘water blister’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + tulzn-a (F1, F2), tulzn-is  
(VIV) ‘blister’)  
Latv. <Vdenntulʃnis> beside Germ. <Waʃʃerblaʃe> (L);  
Latv. <Uhden= tulsnis> beside Germ. <eine Wasser=blāse>  
(LD);  
Latv. <Uhden Tulsnis> beside Germ. <Waʃserblase> (M/L)

ūden-veln-s ‘rainbow’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + veln-s ‘devil’)  
Latv. <Uhden’welns> beside Germ. <so ist vorzei=ten der  
Regenbogen aus ungedult genen=net worden, wenn es offters u.  
lang gereg=net, aber übel. Sonsten wird der Regenbogen  
genennen Warr=więksne= siehe im Wörtlein Wiht> (LD);  
Latv. <Uhden welns> beside Germ. <ist vor Zeiten der  
Regenbo=gen aus Ungeduld genant worden, wenn es offters  
und viel ge=regnet hat. satius Warra Wihkśine> (M/L)
ūden-viln-is  ‘water wave’ (← ūden-s ‘water’ + viln-a (LD), viln-is (EE) ‘wave’)
Latv. <[...] vden wilnems> (Dat.pl.) (EE)

ūd-makšķer-e  ‘fishing rod with a hook’ (← ūd-as (Nom.pl.) (PhL) ‘fish hook’ + makšķer-es (Nom.pl.) (LD), makšķer-s (L), makšķer-is (PhL) ‘fishing rod’)
Latv. <Uhd= maxkeres> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ein Angel am Strick gebunden die Wemgallen zu fahen> (LD);
Latv. <Uhdmakkeres> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <angel am Strick gebunden, die Wemgallen zu fahen> (M/L);
Latv. <Uhdmakkeres> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <angel am Strick gebunden, die Wemgallen zu fahen> (M/L)

ugun-dzelz-e  Germ. ‘ein eisernes Gestell auf dem Herd zum Auflegen der Holzscheite’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + dzelz-s (F1, F2), dzelz-e (L) ‘iron’)
Latv. <Uggun= dselse (Brand=rohdas), kur katlus leek’ wirsson> beside Germ. <eine Brandt rute> (LD);
Latv. <Uggun dselse, Brandrohdus, kur Katluss leek wir=son> beside Germ. <brandruthe> (M/L)

ugun-grēk-s  ‘fire, conflagration’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + grēk-s ‘sin’)
Latv. <Ug=gun'= grähks> beside Germ. <eine Feuers=Brust, Brandschaden> (LD)

ugun-liesm-a  ‘fire flame’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + liesm-a ‘flame’)
Latv. <[...] aiʃto es cēʃju lēlas mōkas ekʃjanʃjas vgguni lēʃmas> (Acc (?).sg.) (EE) ‘for I am in anguish in this flame’

ugun-liesm-a  ‘fire flame’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + liesm-a ‘flame’)
Latv. <[...] vggunlēʃmas [...]> (Acc.pl.) (EE)

ugun-likst-a  ‘fire danger’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + likst-a ‘trouble, worries’)
Latv. <no Dsirxteles dascha reis’ tohp Uggun=lixta> beside Germ. <aus einem Funcken entsteht oftmals eine große Feuers Not> (LD)

ugun-vain-a  ‘stigma’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + vain-a ‘cause, fault, guilt’)
Latv. <Ug=gun'= waina> beside Germ. <ein Brandmahl> (LD);
Latv. <UggunWaina> beside Germ. <brandmahl> (M/L)

ugun-viet-a  ‘fireplace’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + viet-a ‘place, spot’)
Latv. <Uggun' weeta> beside Germ. <ein Feuer stadt, Feuerheerd> (LD);
Latv. <Uggun' weeta> beside Germ. <eine Feuer Heerde oder Feuer stätt> (LD);
Latv. <Uggun weeta> beside Germ. <feurstäte Feurheerd> (M/L);
Latv. <Uggunweeta> beside Germ. <feur=heerd. Feurstäte> (M/L)

vāc-ābol-s ‘Seville orange, bitter orange’ (← vāc-is ‘German’ + ābol-s ‘apple’)
Latv. <Wahtz=ahboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Pomerantzen> (L);
Latv. <[Wahz=Ahboli]> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <[Teutsche Garten=Äpffel]> (F1);
Latv. <Wahz=Ahboli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Teutsche Garten=Äpffel> (F2)

Vāc-zem-e ‘Germany’ (← vāc-is ‘German’ + zem-e ‘earth, ground’)
Latv. <Wahtz=semme> beside Germ. <Teutschland> (LD);
Latv. <Wahz=señe> beside Germ. <Deutsch=land> (LD);
Latv. <Wahdsemme> beside Germ. <Teutschl.> (M/L);
Latv. <WahzSemme> beside Germ. <deutschl.> (M/L)

vakar-ēdien-s ‘Holy Communion’ (← vakar-s ‘evening’ + ēdien-s ‘meal, course’)
Latv. <wackar=ehdens> beside Germ. <Nachtmahl> (L);
Latv. <taß śwähts Wackar=ehdens> beside Germ. <das heilige Abendmahl> (PhL);
Latv. <[...] ta Kunga Wakkar=Ehdeenu [...] (Acc.sg.) (VLH) ‘the Lord’s supper’;
Latv. <[...] pehz ta Wakkar=ehdeena [...] (Gen.sg.) (VLH) ‘after supper’;
Latv. <[...] pæc to wakkarædena [...] (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘after supper’;
Latv. <[...] tê tam tur taiʃia wakkarædeni> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘they are preparing him supper’;
Latv. <[...] ekʃʒan to wakkarædêni [...] (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘during the supper’;
Latv. <Wackar= ähdens> beside Germ. <Ein Abendmahl oder Nacht=Mahl> (LD);
Latv. <Wakkarehdens> beside Germ. <AbdM. NachtM.> (M)

vasar-a-svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘Pentecost’ (← vasar-a ‘summer’ + svētk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘festivity’)
Latv. <Wafšara=fwehtki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Pfingſten> (L);
Latv. <Wāšara=šwähtki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Pfingsten> (PhL);
Latv. <[...] pæc Wāšaraʃwetkus [...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘after Pentecost’

**vasar-svētk-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘Pentecost’ (← *vasar-a* ‘summer’ + *svētk-i* (Nom.pl.) ‘festivity’)
Latv. <[...] Wāšārʃwētku [...]> (Gen.pl.) (EE);
Latv. <[...] Wāšarʃwætku [...]> (Gen.pl.) (EE);
Latv. <[...] Wāšarʃwætkems [...]> (Dat.pl.) (EE);
Latv. <[...] Wāʃsarʃwætkus [...]> (Acc.pl.) (EE)

**vask-kār-a** ‘honeycomb’ (← *vask-a* (LD), *vask-s* (F1, F2), *vask-is* (LD) ‘wax’ + *kār-a* (LD) ‘honeycomb’)
Latv. <Bittes s ́chuh wask=kah=ras, kurŗahs wingās Meddu esseess> (Acc.pl.) beside Germ. <machen hangende Wachṣhäuβlein worinn sie honig einbringen> (LD);
Latv. <Bittes s ́chuh Waskaras, kurjās winŋas Med=du esseess> (Acc.pl.) beside Germ. <machen hangende Wachshäuslein, worin sie Honig einbringen> (M/L)

**vē-lok-s** ‘windsock’ (← *vēj-š* ‘wind’ + *lok-s* ‘bow, arch’)
Latv. <Wāllohks> beside Germ. <ein Fähnlein, auff der Spiete des Thurns oder Hauses, den Wind daran abzumercken> (LD)

**vērpel-katl-is** ‘kettle or pot of a quarter of a ton’ (← *vērpel-s* Germ. ‘eine Vierteltonne’ + *katl-is* (LD), *katl-s* (F1, F2) ‘pot, kettle’)
Latv. <Währpel=katliss beside Germ. <ein Kessel> vom vier=theil [Tonnen]> (LD);
Latv. <Wehrpel Katlis> beside Germ. <ein Viertheil> (M)

**Vid-a-zem-e** ‘Livland’ (← *vid-us* ‘middle’ + *zem-e* ‘earth, ground’)
Latv. <Widda=seme> beside Germ. <Lief=Land, weil es mitten zwischen ReußLand, Pohlen u. Preussen gelegen> (LD);
Latv. <WiddaSemme> beside Germ. <liefland, weil es mitten zwischen Pohlen, Reusl. u Preussen liegt> (M/L)

**vid-u-gavēn-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘mid-Lent’ (← *vid-us* ‘middle’ + *gavēn-is* (PhL), *gavēn-e* (L) ‘fast’)
Latv. <Widdu=ghaweni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Mitfaʃten> (PhL)

**Vid-zem-e** ‘Livland’ (← *vid-us* ‘middle’ + *zem-e* ‘earth, ground’)
Latv. <Widd=seme> beside Germ <Lief=Land> (LD);
Latv. <Wid=semme> beside Germ. <liefland> (M/L)
vīģ-a-koks ‘fig-tree’ (← vīg-e ‘fig’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
Latv. <Wiega=Kohx> beside Germ. <Feigenbaum> (L)

vīg-e-koks ‘fig-tree’ (← vīg-e ‘fig’ + kok-s ‘tree’)
Latv. <Tas figekoks ir jauwas ūgas nejsis> (EE) ‘This fig-tree has produced its own berries’;
Latv. <[..] Raugto at fygekoku [...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘Look at the fig-tree’

vilk-ābel-e ‘hawthorn’ (← vilk-s ‘wolf’ + ābel-e ‘apple tree’)
Latv. <wilkahbele> untranslated (F1);
Latv. <Wilkahbele> beside Germ. <eine Hecke> (F2)

vilk-ābol-e ‘hawthorn’ (← vilk-s ‘wolf’ + ābol-e ‘apple tree’)
Latv. <[Wilk=Ahbole]> beside Germ. <[Hagedorn] wilde> (F1);
Latv. <Wilk=Ahbole> beside Germ. <Hagedorn, wilde Rosen. Engel=Tier> (F2)

vilk-mēnes-s lit. ‘wolf month; December’ (← vilk-s ‘wolf’ + mēnes-s (L) ‘month’)

vīn-leģel-s ‘keg of wine’ (← vīn-s ‘wine’ + leģel-s (LD) ‘keg, firkin’)
Latv. <Wiihn= leġġels> untranslated (LD)

vīn-og-a ‘grape’ (← vīn-s ‘wine’ + og-a ‘berry’)
Latv. <Wien= ohgo kecka> (Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <eine Wein=traube> (LD)

zalš-ād-a ‘grass-snake skin’ (← zalt-is (PhL) ‘grass-snake’ + ād-a ‘skin, leather’)
Latv. <ēb attraddu Sallʃch=Ahdu> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <Ich hab eine Schlangenhaut gefunden> (PhL)

zem-e-soģ-is ‘governor’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + soģ-is ‘judge’)
Latv. <Tad atbildæia tas žemmeʃôgis [...]> (EE) ‘then the governor answered’;
Latv. <[..] žemmeʃôgis [...]> (EE);
Latv. <[..] Zemmeʃôgis [...]> (EE)

zirg-ārst-e ‘horse doctor’ (← zirgs ‘horse, steed’ + ārst-e (L), ārst-s (LD) ‘physician, doctor’)
Latv. <Sirrghahrʃte> beside Germ. <Viehe oder Roßartz> (L)
**zirg-sar-iem** (Dat.pl.) ‘horse bristle’ (← zirg-s ‘horse, steed’ + sar-s (F1, F2), sar-i (Nom.pl.) (PhL), sar-i (LD) ‘bristle’)

Latv. <Kad Jāhram astoņas Deenas wetzam ar Širg'-šarreem Pautiņus no=seen, tad wingš labbahke iβ=aug nhe ka uhsaudsis rahmihts> (Dat.pl.) beside Germ. <Wenn ein Lamb von 8. tagen mit Pferdthaaren abge=bunden wirdt, so wächst er besser, alβ wenn er groß worden, und denn geschnitten wirdt, Mancel: in Phras:> (LD)

**zirn-pākst-e** ‘pea pod’ (← zirn-is ‘pea’ + pākst-e (LD), pākst-s (F1, F2) ‘pod’)

Latv. <Širn= pahxtes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Erbs schoten> (LD);
Latv. <Širn' Pahkstes> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Erbsschoten> (M/L)

**zīš-drān-a/drēb-e** ‘silky cloth’ (← zīd-s, zīš-i (Nom.pl.) (LD) ‘silk’ + drān-a/drēb-e ‘cloth, material’)

Latv. <Śchiesch'=drahnas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ein Seiden Kleid> (LD);
Latv. <Sieśch= Drähbe/Drahna> beside Germ. <ein Seiden=Kleid> (LD);
Latv. <SieščDrahna> beside Germ. <ein Seiden Kleid> (M/L)

**zoben-zīv-is** ‘swordfish’ (← zoben-s ‘sword’ + zīv-is (PhL), zīv-s (M/L) ‘fish’)

Latv. <Sohbensiwis> beside Germ. <Schwerdfisch> (M/L)

**zoben-zūv-is** ‘swordfish’ (← zoben-s ‘sword’ + zūv-is (LD), zūv-s (M/L) ‘fish’)

Latv. <Sohben Suhwis> beside Germ. <ein Schwerdfisch> (LD)

**zob-sāp-es** (Nom.pl.) ‘toothache’ (← zob-s ‘tooth’ + sāp-e ‘pain, ache’)

Latv. <Wissa Mutte iβtuhskus no Sohb= sāhpems> (Dat.pl.) beside Germ. <das Maul ist ihm gantz auff geschwollen von Zahnwehe> (LD);
Latv. <Wissa Mutte istuhśkuśi no Sohbsāhpeem> (Dat.pl.) beside Germ. <der Maul ist ihm ganz aufgeschwollen von Zahn=weh> (M/L)

**žīd-skrihver-is** ‘Jewish scribe’ (← žīd-s ‘Jew’ + skrihver-is ‘scribe, clerk’)

Latv. <Schihd=skriweris> beside Germ. <der Acciḥ=Schreiber> (F1);
Latv. <Schid=Skrihweris> beside Germ. <der Accieβ=Schreiber> (F2);
Latv. <Schihd skrihve=ris ( Sidskrihweris> beside Germ. <Acciβ schreī=ber, weil d. Juden es inne haben> (M/J)
1.2 Attributive determinative compounds
A+N

garīg-a-dziesm-ems (Dat.pl.) ‘hymn’ (← garīg-s ‘spiritual, ecclesiastical’ + dziesm-a (LD), dziesm-is (PhL) ‘song’)
Latv. <[...] garradžēšmens [...]> (Dat.pl.) (EE)

gar-kūl-is ‘long and straight straw’ (← gar-š ‘long’ + kūl-is ‘sheaf’)
Latv. <Gharrkuhļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lang Stroh> (PhL),
Latv. <Gharr=kuhļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lang Stroh> (F1);
Latv. <Garkuli> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lang Stroh> (F2);
Latv. <G/arrkuhļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lang Stroh> (LD);
Latv. <Garkuļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lang Stroh> (M/L);
Latv. <Garkuļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <lang Stroh> (M/J);

jaun-ūgsl-is/augsl-is ‘young shoot’ (← jaun-s ‘new, young’ + cf. augl-a (EE),
augl-is (EE), augl-s (EE) ‘fruit’)
Latv. <Jaun=uhsglis, augslis> beside Germ. <Ein Jung bämchen> (F1)

liel-a-dien-a ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)
Latv. < [... ] prekʃjaŋ Leladenas [...] > (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘before Easter day’;
Latv. < [... ] tās Leladēnas [...] > (Gen.sg.) (EE);
Latv. < [... ] piec Leladēnu [...] > (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘after Easter day’;
Latv. < [... ] vʒ to Leladēnu [...] > (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘towards Easter day’;
Latv. < [... ] Leladēnu [...] > (Gen.pl.) (EE)

liel-dien-a ‘Easter day’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + dien-a ‘day’)
Latv. < Leeldeena > beside Germ. <Oftern> (L);
Latv. < Leel=deena > beside Germ. <OJertag> (PhL);
Latv. < Leldenu > (Gen.pl.) (EE);
Latv. < Leel=deena > beside Germ. <die Ostern> (LD);
Latv. < Leel=deena > beside Germ. <Ostern> (M);
Latv. < Leel=deenas= Jährs > (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <ein Osterlam> (LD);
Latv. < Leeldeenas Jehrs > (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <Osterlamm> (M/L);
Latv. < Pirmūs Leel=Deenas Šwehtkōs > (Gen.sg.) (VLH) ‘during the first Easter festivities’;
Latv. <Ohtrā Šwehdeenā pehz Leel=Deenas [...]> (Gen.sg.) (VLH) ‘on the second Sunday after Easter’;
Latv. <Dewitā Šwehdeenā preekšch Leeldeenas [...]> (Gen.sg.) (VLH) ‘on the ninth Sunday before Easter’

mēlen-dzij-a ‘blue yarn’ (← mēlen-s ‘blue’ + dzij-a (LD) ‘wool, yarn’)
Latv. <Mehlen dsijas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <blau Garn> (M/L)

mēlen-dzīv-is ‘blue yarn’ (← mēlen-s ‘blue’ + dzīv-is (LD), dziv-a (LD), dziv-e (LD) ‘yarn’)
Latv. <Mählen=dsiwis> beside Germ. <blau Garn> (LD)

migl-gais-s ‘foggy weather’ (← miglai-s ‘foggy, misty’ + gais-s ‘weather’)
Latv. <Miggli Gaiß> beside Germ. <nebe=> translation unfinished (LD);
Latv. <Miggli Gais> beside Germ. <nebe=licht wetter> (LD)

plān-al-us ‘light beer’ (← plān-s ‘thin, fluid’ + al-us ‘beer’)
Latv. <plahn allus> beside Germ. <gering bier> (F2)

plat-degun-s ‘wide nose’ (← plat-s ‘wide, broad’ + degun-s ‘nose’)
Latv. <plattdagguns> beside Germ. <flach Nafe> (L)

sarkan-roz-e ‘red rose’ (← sarkan-s ‘red’ + roz-e (LD), roz-a (EE) ‘rose’)
Latv. <sahrkan Ro=se> beside Germ. <eine rothe Rose> (LD)

sauš-silk-e ‘smoked herring’ (← sauš-s ‘dry’ + silk-e (LD), silk-is (L) ‘herring’)
Latv. <Shaussen-silké> beside Germ. <Bück Blaue=ling> (LD);
Latv. <Sauš Silke> beside Germ. <bückling> (M/L)

spalvain-putn-s ‘feathered bird’ (← spalvain-s ‘feathered’ + putn-is (LD), putn-s (F1, F2) ‘bird’)
Latv. <Spalwain Put=ni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <flücke Vögel> (LD)

svē(t)-dien-a ‘Sunday’ (← svēt-s ‘holy, blessed, sacred’ + dien-a ‘day’)
Latv. <Swehdeen> beside Germ. <Sontag> (PhL);
Latv. <[...] Swehdenu [...]> (EE);
Latv. <[...] Swechedas [...] > (Gen.sg.) (EE);
Latv. <[...] Swecheda [...] > (Acc.sg.) (EE);
Latv. <[...] Swehdenu [...] > (Acc.sg.) (EE);
Latv. <[...] jeb Strahdnecku Swehdeenese> (VLH) ‘or the Sunday of workers’;
Latv. <Śeʃtâ Śwehdeenâ pehz Waśśaras Śwehtku / Atśwehtes> (Loc.sg.) (VLH) ‘on the sixth Sunday after Pentecost’;
Latv. <Pirmâ Śwehdeenâ pehz Waśśaras Śwehtku Atśwehtes [...]>(Loc.sg.) (VLH) ‘on the first Sunday after Pentecost’;
Latv. <Septitâ padeśmitâ Śwehtdeenâ [...]>(Loc.sg.) (VLH) ‘on the seventeenth Sunday’;
Latv. <Śwäh=deena (swähta Dee=na)> beside Germ. <der Sonntag> (LD);
Latv. <Śwäh=deena jaświnn> beside Germ. <den Sonntag muß mann feyren> (LD);
Latv. <Śwehdeena |Śwehta dee=na|> beside Germ. <Sontag> (M);
Latv. <Śwehdeena> beside Germ. <Feiertag. Sontag> (M/L);
Latv. <Śwehdeena ja=świnn> beside Germ. <den ß/ man feieren> (M/L);
Latv. <Śwehdeenas Linześchana> (Gen.sg.) untranslated (M/L)

*tiev-gal-is* ‘thin end’ (*← tiɛv-s* ‘thin, slim’ + *gal-s* ‘end, ending’)
Latv. <Teew=gallis> beside Germ. <das schmalle Ende> (F1);
Latv. <Teew=Gallis> beside Germ. <das schmahl Ende> (F2)

*varen-sien-s* ‘firm, strong hay’ (*← varen-s* ‘mighty’ + *sien-s* ‘hay’)
Latv. <warren seens> beside Germ. <kräfftig heu> (F1);
Latv. <warren Šeens> beside Germ. <Kräfftig Heu?> (F2)

*zil-mēnes-is* lit. ‘blue month, i.e., August’ (*← zil-s* ‘blue’ + *mēnes-is* (F1, F2) ‘month’)
Latv. <Śillmehneśis> beside Germ. <der Augustmonat, weil in solchem die Heyde blüht> (M/L)

*zil-mēnes-s* lit. ‘blue month, i.e., August’ (*← zil-s* ‘blue’ + *mēnes-s* (L) ‘month’)
Latv. <Śillmähnes> beside Germ. <der Augst=Monaht, weil in dem selben die Heyde blüet> (LD)

Num+N

*cetur(t)-dien-a* ‘Thursday’ (*← ceturt-ais* ‘fourth’ + *dien-a* ‘day’)
Latv. <Zätturdeena> beside Germ. <Donnerʃtag> (PhL);
Latv. <leela Zettur=deena> beside Germ. <Grün Donnerʃtag> (PhL);
Latv. <Leela Zettor=Deenâ> (Loc.sg.) (VLH) ‘On the Maundy Thursday’;
Latv. <Tsettur=Deena> beside Germ. <der Doʃerʃtag> (LD);
Latv. <Leela Zetturt=deena> beside Germ. <der Grü=ne
Donnerstag> (LD);
Latv. <Leela Zettordeena> beside Germ. <Grün donnerstag>
(M/L)

*ot(e)r-dien-a* ‘Tuesday’ (← *ot(e)rs* (MEe), *otr-is* (LD) ‘second’ + *dien-a* ‘day’)
Latv. <Ohterdeena> beside Germ. <Dinʃtag> (PhL);
Latv. <Ohtr=Deena> beside Germ. <der Dienstag> (LD)

*piek-dien-a* ‘Friday’ (← *piekt-ais* ‘fifth’ + *dien-a* ‘day’)
Latv. <Peekdeena> beside Germ. <Freytag> (PhL);
Latv. <leela Peekdeena> beside Germ. <ftił Freytag> (PhL);
Latv. <Peek=Deena> beside Germ. <der Freytag> (LD);
Latv. <Leela Peekdeena> beside Germ. <der stille Freytag>
(LD);
Latv. <Leela Peekdeena> beside Germ. <stille Freitag>
(M/L)

*pirm-bērn-is* ‘first child, offspring’ (← *pirm-ais* ‘first’ + *bērn-s* ‘child’)
Latv. <Pirm=behrnis> beside Germ. <Ein erstes Kindt> (F1);
Latv. <pirm=behrnis Awi, kasai> beside Germ. <der Erste
wurff. - wurff.> (F1);
Latv. <Pirm=behrnis> beside Germ. <ein erstes Kind> (F2);
Latv. <Pirm behrni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die
erstlinge{erstlingi}. erster wurff> (F1);
Latv. <Pirm Behrni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <der erste
Wurff.> (M/J);
Latv. <Pirmbehrni> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <der erste Wurf.>
(M/J)

*pirm-dien-a* ‘Monday’ (← *pirm-ais* ‘first’ + *dien-a* ‘day’)
Latv. <Pirrmdeena> beside Germ. <Montag> (PhL);
Latv. <Pariete Pirrmdeena!> beside Germ. <Vbermorgen haben
wir den Montag!> (Run);
Latv. <Pirrmdeena nhe redj[chʃɪ] tu nhe weenu py Darrbu/ ka
Wackarohβ nahk py Rijaß.> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <Am
Montage wirʃtu keinen Menʃchen zur Arbeit finden/ alʃ nur
auffın Abend kompt man zur Riegen.> (Run);
Latv. <Pirm=Deena> beside Germ. <der Montag> (LD)

*ses-dien-a* ‘Saturday’ (← *sest-ais* ‘sixth’ + *dien-a* ‘day’)
Latv. <Śeßdeena> beside Germ. <Sonnabend> (PhL);
Latv. <Scho deen Śeßdeena.> beside Germ. <Heute iʃt
Sonn=abend.> (Run);
Latv. <Śeβ=deena> beside Germ. <der Sonn=Abend> (LD)
**treš-dien-a** ‘Wednesday’ (← treš-ais ‘third’ + dien-a ‘day’)

Latv. <Trešchdeena> beside Germ. <Mittwoch> (PhL);
Latv. <Tresh-deena> beside Germ. <die Mitwoch> (LD);

**Adv+N**

**sen-dien-as** (Nom.pl.) ‘days of gone’ (← sen (LD) ‘a long time ago’ + dien-a ‘day’)

Latv. <Seenn=deenas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <schon längst, vor=längst> (LD);
Latv. <Šenn Deenas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <schon längst> (M/L)

**V+N**

**adām-a-adat-as** (Nom.pl.) ‘knitting-needle’ (← cf. ad-ī-t ‘to knit’ + adat-a ‘needle’)

Latv. <Addama=addatas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Knüttʃpieʃʃe> (PhL)

**bara-tēv-s** ‘nursing father’ (← cf. bar-o-t ‘to feed, to nurture’ + tēv-s ‘father’)

Latv. <Barro=tähvs> beside Germ. <ein Pflegvatter> (LD);
Latv. <Baŗŗo Tehws> beside Germ. <Pflegvater> (M/L)

**dedzam-a-upur-u** (Acc.sg.) ‘burnt offering’ (← cf. deg-t ‘to burn’ + upur-s (EE), upur-is (M/L) ‘sacrifice, offering, victim’)

Latv. <[...] dædӡamma vppuru [...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE)

**dzeram-a-naud-a** ‘tip, gratuity’ (← cf. dzer-t ‘to drink’ + naud-a ‘money’)

Latv. <dohd Śudmallneekam jcho dʃerŗama=naudu/ tad wings töw _fteix> (Acc.sg.) beside Germ. <gib dem Müller diß Trinckgeld/ fo wir er dich fordern> (PhL)

**ejam-rat-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘a walker, in which a child learns to walk’ (← cf. ie-t ‘to walk, to go’ + rat-s ‘wheel’)

Latv. <Eiam= ratti (Serperastrum)> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ein Gehwagen oder Kinder,schenen, darinnen die Kinder lernen gehen> (LD)

**gulam-a-drān-a** ‘bed-cloth’ (← cf. gul-ē-t ‘to sleep, to lie’ + drān-a ‘cloth, material’)

Latv. <Gullama drahna> *untranslated* (LD);
Latv. <Gullama Drahnas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Bett=Zeug, Bettgewandt> (LD);
Latv. <Gullama Drahna> untransluted (M)

**gulam-a-kambar-is** ‘sleeping-room’ (← cf. *gul-ē-t* ‘to sleep, to lie’ + *kambar-*is (L), *kambar-s* (PhL) ‘room, chamber’)
Latv. <Ghuļļama=kambaris> beside Germ. <Schlaffkammer> (L);
Latv. <ghuļļamakambaris> beside Germ. <Schlaffkammer> (L);
Latv. <G/ullama= kambaris> beside Germ. <Ein Schlaflkañer> (LD);
Latv. <Gullama Kambaris> beside Germ. <SchlafKañer> (M/L)

**gulam-drān-a** ‘bed-cloth’ (← cf. *gul-ē-t* ‘to sleep, to lie’ + *drān-a* ‘cloth, material’)
Latv. <Gullam drahna> untransluted (LD);
Latv. <Gullam'=drahna šajemt in eebahst> (Acc.pl.) beside Germ. <die bett Kleider zusam̋en nehmen undt einstecken> (LD)

**gulam-kambar-is** ‘sleeping-room’ (← cf. *gul-ē-t* ‘to sleep, to lie’ + *kambar-*is (L), *kambar-s* (PhL) ‘room, chamber’)
Latv. <G/ul=lam kambaris> beside Germ. <eine Schlaffkammer> (LD);
Latv. <Gullam' Kambaris> beside Germ. <Schlaffkam ̋er> (M/L)

**lūdzam-a-nam-s** ‘praying house’ (← cf. *lūg-t* ‘to ask, to plead’ + *nam-s* ‘house, home’)
Latv. <Mans Nams irr weens Nams tahs Luhgschanas (weens luhdʃama=Nams) [...]> (VLH) ‘My house is a house of prayer (a praying house)’

**pieduram-adat-a** ‘pin’ (← cf. *pie-dur-t* ‘to touch’ + *adat-a* ‘needle’)
Latv. <peeduŗŗam addata> beside Germ. <Steck nadel> (F1)

**pik-adat-a** ‘pin’ (← cf. *spik-ē-t* Germ. ‘spicken, mit Speck bestecken’ (Sehwers, 1953, p. 116) + *adat-a* ‘needle’)
Latv. <pikaddata> beside Germ. <Spicknadel> (F2)

**plaujam-a-laik-s** ‘harvest time’ (← cf. *plau-t* ‘to cut, to seythe’ + *laik-s* ‘time’)
Latv. <Plaujama=laix> beside Germ. <Ernd> (L);
Latv. <plaujama=laix> beside Germ. <mähung> (L);
Latv. <Plaujama laix> beside Germ. <der Schnitt> (PhL);
Latv. <[...] Laid abbi kohpa aug / lihdʃ plaujama Laikam [...]>
(Dat.sg.) (VLH) ‘Let both grow together until the harvest time’;
Latv. <Plaujama Laiks> beside Germ. <Ernte Zeit> (M)

plaujam-laiks-s ‘harvest time’ (← cf. plau-t ‘to cut, to scythe’ + laik-s ‘time’)
Latv. <Plaujam'laiks> beside Germ. <die Zeit der Mähung, die Ernted oder Ermdte Zeit> (LD)

rakstām-a-gald-in-[š] ‘small writing board’ (← cf. rakst-ī-t ‘to write’ + gald-s ‘table’)
Latv. <[...] wenu rakštamma galdin [...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘one small writing board’

rakstām-a-rik-s ‘writing material’ (← cf. rakst-ī-t ‘to write’ + rīk-s ‘tool, instrument’)
Latv. <Raxtama=Riex> beside Germ. <Blackhorn/ Dintenfaß> (L);
Latv. <Raxtama=Riex> beside Germ. <Dintenfaß> (L);
Latv. <Raxtama=riex> beside Germ. <Schreibzeug> (L);
Latv. <Raxtama=riex> beside Germ. <Dintfaß> (PhL);
Latv. <Rakstama Rihks> beside Germ. <Schreibzeug, dīn=tenfaß> (M)

rakstām-a-spalv-a ‘quill, pen, nib’ (← cf. rakst-ī-t ‘to write’ + spalv-a ‘feather’)
Latv. <Raxtama=jpallwa> beside Germ. <Schreibfeder> (L);
Latv. <Raxtama Spallwa> beside Germ. <Schreibfeder> (L);
Latv. <Raxtama=jpallwa> beside Germ. <Feder> (PhL);
Latv. <wiš=labbakas Raxtama=Spallwas gir Sohʃśo=jpallwas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <die beſte Federn/ zum Schreiben tätig/hat man von den Gänʃen> (PhL);
Latv. <rak=stama Spalwa> beside Germ. <eine Schreibfeder> (LD);
Latv. <Rakstama Spalwa> beside Germ. <Schreib=feder> (M/L)

rakstām-rīk-s ‘writing material’ (← cf. rakst-ī-t ‘to write’ + rīk-s ‘tool, instrument’)
Latv. <Rak=stam=rīhks> beside Germ. <ein Schreib=zeug, Dintfaβ> (LD)

rakstām-spalv-a ‘quill, pen, nib’ (← cf. rakst-ī-t ‘to write’ + spalv-a ‘feather’)
Latv. <Rak=stam Spalwa> beside Germ. <ein Schreib=feder> (LD)
saucam-a-bals-s ‘calling voice’ (← cf. sauk-t ‘to call, to shout’ + bals-s (F1, F2), bals-e (F1, F2) ‘voice’)  
Latv. <[...]> Es ešmu sauzama Balš [...]> (VLH) ‘I am the calling voice’

sējam-a-laik-s ‘seed-time’ (← cf. sē-t ‘to sow’ + laik-s ‘time’)  
Latv. <sēhjama laix> beside Germ. <zeit des Säens> (L);  
Latv. <sēhjama laix> beside Germ. <die Saat=zeit> (PhL)

sējam-laik-s ‘seed-time’ (← cf. sē-t ‘to sow’ + laik-s ‘time’)  
Latv. <Sāhjam'laiks> beside Germ. <die Saatzeit, oder Zeit zu säen> (LD);  
Latv. <Sāhjam' Laiks> beside Germ. <Saatzeit> (M/L)

skutam-naz-is ‘razor’ (← cf. skus-t ‘to shave’ + naz-is ‘knife’)  
Latv. <Skuttam= nassis> beside Germ. <ein Scheer Messer> (LD)

skutam-šķēr-es (Nom.pl.) ‘shaving scissors’ (← cf. skus-t ‘to shave’ + šķēr-es (Nom.pl.) ‘scissors’)  
Latv. <Skuttam Schkähres> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ein Pütz Scheee=re> (LD)

svaidām-a-zāl-es (Nom.pl.) ‘grass or a herb used for ointment’ (← cf. svaid-ī-t ‘to smear’ + zāl-e ‘herb, grass’)  
Latv. <[...] pirke Maria Madleena / in Maria Jehkaba (Mahte) in Salama dahrgas śwaidama Sahles [...]> (Acc.pl.) (VLH) ‘Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices’

velkam-rutk-i (Nom.pl.) ‘Ferula Asa foetida (a plant)’ (← cf. vilk-t ‘to pull, to drag’ + rutk-s (F1, F2), rutk-is (LD), rutk-a (L) ‘radish; a root of radish’)  
Latv. <Welkam'= rutki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Teuf=foels Dreck, herba> (LD)
2 Possessive compounds

2.1 Compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.)

A+N

balt-galv-is (m.), -e (f.) ‘having white, blond hair’ (← balt-s ‘white’ + galv-a ‘head’)
Latv. <Balt=galwis, we> beside Germ. <Ein weiskopf> (F1);
Latv. <Balt=galwis, -we> beside Germ. <ein weißkopf> (F2)

balt-miz-is ‘grey alder’ (← balt-s ‘white’ + miz-a ‘bark, peel’)
Latv. <Balt=mischer> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Eine weiße Eller> (F1);
Latv. <baltmischer> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <WeiβEllern> (M)

balt-vēdr-is lit. ‘having a white belly; wigeon’ (← balt-s ‘white’ + vēdr-as (F1, F2) ‘belly, stomach’)
Latv. <Baltwehdris> beside Germ. <weißbauch> (F1);
Latv. <Balt=wehdris> beside Germ. <weiß=bauch> (F2)

gar-kāj-is ‘long-legged’ (← gar-š ‘long’ + kāj-a ‘leg, foot’)
Latv. <gharr=kajis> beside Germ. <langfüʃʃig> (L);
Latv. <garr=kahjis> beside Germ. <langfüüssig> (LD);
Latv. <Garrkahjis> beside Germ. <langfüßig> (M/L)

liek-ac-is Germ. ‘grosse Maschen, Eingarn (beim Netze)’ (← liek-s ‘artificial, excessive ’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <Leek=atzis> beside Germ. <groʃʃe Maʃʃchen/ Eingarn> (PhL)

liel-galv-is ‘big-headed’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + galv-a ‘head’)
Latv. <leelghallwis> beside Germ. <großkopff> (L);
Latv. <Leel’galwis> beside Germ. <ein Groß Kopff> (LD);
Latv. <Leelgalwis> beside Germ. <Großkopff> (M/L)

liel-lūp-is ‘having big lips’ (← liel-s ‘big’ + lūp-a ‘lip’)
Latv. <leel=lūhpis> beside Germ. <der groʃʃe Lefftzen hat> (L);
Latv. <Leel=lūhpis> beside Germ. <einer der groʃʃe Lippen hat> (PhL);
Latv. <Leel=lūhpis> beside Germ. <der große Lippen hat> (LD);
Latv. <Leelluhpis> beside Germ. <der große lippen hat> (M/L)
**mel-miz-is** ‘black alder’ (← mel-s ‘black’ + miz-a ‘bark, peel’)
Latv. <Mel=Mischi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Eine schwarte Eller> (F1);
Latv. <Mel=mischi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <ein schwartz=Eller> (F2);
Latv. <Kad ar mel mischu - Alksnu lappa[m] tee peena=Spaņus suttinah, tad ir labbs peens, in ne welkahs> (Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <mit schwartz Ellern laub, bähe[t] man die milch spannen, so ist di[e] m[ilch] gut, zeicht sich nicht.>;
Latv. <Kad ar Melmischu Alksnu lappam tee peena=Spaņus suttinah, tad ir labbs peens in ne welkahs.> (Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <mit schwartz Ellern laub bähnet man die Milch=Spänne, so ist die Milch gut, zeucht sich nicht.> (F2);
Latv. <Ar Melmischu Lappahm tee PeenaSpan=nus śuttina, tad irr labbs Peens ir ne welkahs> (Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <Mit schwartz Ellern Holtz bähnet man die Milchspannen, so ist die Milch gut und zieht sich nicht> (M/J);
Latv. <Melmischi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <schwarz Ellern> (M/J);
Latv. <Ar Melmischu Lappahm tee PeenaSpan=nus śuttina, tad irr labbs Peens ir ne welkahs> (Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <Mit schwartz Ellern Holtz bähnet man die Milchspannen, so ist die Milch gut und zieht sich nicht> (M/J);

**mel(n)-ac-is** ‘cross-eyed’ (← meln-s ‘black’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <Meln Azzis> beside Germ. <Ein Schiler> (F1);
Latv. <Meln=Azzis> beside Germ. <Ein Schiler> (F2);
Latv. <Melazzis> beside Germ. <ein Schiele> (M/J)

**meln-sprākl-is** ‘the white stork’ (← meln-s ‘black’ + sprākl-e Germ. ‘der Hintere’)
Latv. <Meln=sprahlis> beside Germ. <Storch> (F1);
Latv. <Meln=Sprahlis> beside Germ. <Storch> (F2);
Latv. <Melnsprahklis> beside Germ. <ein Storch> (M/J)

**mīk(st)-čaul-is** ‘soft, fragile, having a soft shell’ (← mīkst-s ‘soft, tender’ + čaul-s (MEe) ‘husk, shell’)
Latv. <Mihkst zaulis, mihkzaula pauts> (Nom.sg., Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <Ein weich schalig Ë> (F1);
Latv. <mihkzaula pauts> (Gen.sg.) beside Germ. <ein weich Ë> (F2);
plik-galv-is 'slaphead’ (← plik-s ‘naked, nude’ + galv-a 'head’)
Latv. <Plik=pauris, =galwis> beside Germ. <ein Kahl=Kopff> (F1);
Latv. <Plik=Pauris = Galwis> beside Germ. <ein Kahl=Kopff> (F2);
Latv. <plikgalwis> beside Germ. <Kahlkopff> (M/J)

plik-paur-is 'slaphead’ (← plik-s ‘naked, nude’ + paur-e (F1, F2), paur-a (M/J) ‘top of the head’)
Latv. <Plik=pauris, =galwis> beside Germ. <ein Kahl=Kopff> (F1);
Latv. <Plik=Pauris = Galwis> beside Germ. <ein Kahl=Kopff> (F2);
Latv. <Plikpauris> beside Germ. <Kahlkopff> (M/J)

rud-mes-is 'milk cap (a fungus)' (← rud-s ‘reddish-brown’ + mies-a ‘flesh, body’)
Latv. <Rudmeśis, rudmeschu> (Nom.sg., Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <Rohte Reitzchen> (F1);
Latv. <Rudmesis, Rudmeschu> (Nom.sg., Gen.pl.) beside Germ. <Rohte Reitzchen> (F2)

rud-mies-is 'milk cap (a fungus)' (← rud-s ‘reddish-brown’ + mies-a ‘flesh, body’)
Latv. <Rudmeeschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Rohte Reitzchen> (F1);
Latv. <Rudmeeschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Rohte Reitzchen> (F2);
Latv. <Rudmeeschi oder Pirtkurriśchi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <rothe Rieschen> (M/J)

spulg-a-ac-is ‘bright-eyed’ (← spulg-s (?) ‘bright, radiant’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <Spulga=azzis> beside Germ. <eine frische glänzende, Klahre augen hat> (F1);
Latv. <Spulga=Azzis> beside Germ. <der frische glänzende klare augen hatt> (F2);
Latv. <Spulga Azzis> beside Germ. <der frische klare, glän=zende Augen hat> (M/J)
strup-ast-is (m., -e (f.) ‘short-tailed’ (← *strup*-s ‘short’ + *ast*-e ‘tail’)
Latv. <Strup=aste, is> beside Germ. <Stumpf, kurz schwantz> (F1);
Latv. <Struppastis> beside Germ. <stumpfenschwanz> (M/J)

strup-aus-is ‘having short ears’ (← *strup*-s ‘short’ + *aus*-s ‘ear’)
Latv. <Strup=ausis> beside Germ. <Ein stumpf, kurz öhrigter> (F1);
Latv. <Strup=ausis> beside Germ. <ein Stumpff -Kurtz -Öhrigter> (F2);
Latv. <Strupaussis> beside Germ. <dem die Ohren gekürzt sd.> (M/J);
Latv. <Strupausis> beside Germ. <dem die Ohren gekürzt sind> (M/J)

svabad-kaul-is lit. ‘having loose and jiggling bones’ (← *svabad*-s ‘free’ + *kaul*-s ‘bone’)
Latv. <Tu śwabbad=kauli, tew tee kauli tikkai klaustahs, tu ne=wiśśa strahdaht> (Voc.sg.) beside Germ. <du Schlodder hake, deine Knochen hängen dir nur an ein=ander, du zehmest ö zu arbeyleten.> (F1);
Latv. <Tu Śwabbad=Kauli, tew tee Kauli tikkai klaustahs tu ne wiescha strahdaht> (Voc.sg.) beside Germ. <du Schlodder Hake deine Knochen hängen dir nur an einander, du zähmest nicht zu - arbeiten> (F2);
Latv. <tu s ́wabbad kauli tew tee Kauli tikkai klaustahs, tu ne wisśa strahdaht> (Voc.sg.) beside Germ. <du zähmest dich nicht zu arbeiten> (M/J)

trak-galv-is ‘daredevil’ (← *trak*-s ‘insane, possessed’ + *galv*-a ‘head’)
Latv. <Trackghallwis> beside Germ. <verwegen/ kühn> (L);
Latv. <Trackghallwis> beside Germ. <Waghálß> (L);
Latv. <track=ghallwis> beside Germ. <verwegen> (L);
Latv. <Trackgalwis> beside Germ. <Doll=köpffisch, Verwägen, ein Waghals> (LD);
Latv. <Trakgalwis> beside Germ. <doll=köpffisch, verwegen, ein Waghals> (M/L)

värg-dien-is ‘wretched, misfortune person’ (← *värg*-s ‘sickly, infirm’ + *dien*-a ‘day’)
Latv. <Wahrgdeenis> beside Germ. <der sich täglich plagen muß. Ein Kränckling> (F1);
Latv. <Wahrgdeenis> beside Germ. <der sich täglich plagen muß. ein Kränckling> (F2);
Latv. <Wahrgdeenis> beside Germ. <elend. kränklich. der sich täglich plagen muß. ein Kränk ling> (M/J)

*zveir-ac-is* ‘cross-eyed’ (← *zveir-* ‘squinty’ + *ac-* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <Śweir=azzis> beside Germ. <glaß augen> (F1);
Latv. <Śweir=azzis> beside Germ. <Glaaß=Augen> (F2);
Latv. <ŚweirAzzis> *untranslated* (M/J)

**Num+N**

*tri-kāj-is* ‘tripod’ (← *trī-s* ‘three’ + *kāj-* ‘leg, foot’)
Latv. <Trikahjis> beside Germ. <Ein dreyfüß> (F1);
Latv. <Trikahjis> beside Germ. <ein dreifuß> (F2)

*tri-nīt-is* ‘woven of three heddles; a cloth woven in this way’ (← *trī-s* ‘three’ + *nīt-e* (LD), *nīt-a* (F1, F2) ‘heddle’)
Latv. <Trinnitis> beside Germ. <dreylich, it: Zwilich, it: verblühmt> (F1);
Latv. <Trinnitis> beside Germ. <dreilich. it: Zwilich. it: verblümt> (F2);
Latv. <Tu trinniti ween runna, runna ween kahrși> (Acc. (?)sg.) beside Germ. <du redest allein verblühmt, rede auch eins verständlich, gleich auß, ein fach> (F1);
Latv. <Tu trinniti ween runna, runna ween kahrși> (Acc. (?)sg.) beside Germ. <du redest allein verblühmt, rede auch eins verständlich, gleich auß, ein fach> (F2);
Latv. <Runna ween. Karschi ne trinniti> beside Germ. <rehd einfältig nicht zwei deutig> (F2);
Latv. <Trinnitis> beside Germ. <verblümt, doppeltes Ver=standes> (M/J);
Latv. <Tu trinniti ween run=na, runna ween kahrși> beside Germ. <du redest verblühmt, rede einfach, schlecht aus> (M/J)

*tri-zar-is* ‘three-pronged pitchfork’ (← *trī-s* ‘three’ + *zar-* ‘branch’)
Latv. <Trijarri> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <eine Gabel mit dreyen Zancken> (PhL);
Latv. <Trisarri> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <eine Gabel mit 3. Zancken> (LD)

*vien-ac-is* ‘one-eyed’ (← *vien-* ‘one’ + *ac-* (L), *ac-is* (EE), *ac-e* (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <ween azzis> beside Germ. <Ein Ein äugiger> (F1);
Latv. <Ween=Azzis> beside Germ. <Ein Einäugiger> (F2);
Latv. <weenazzis> beside Germ. <einäugig> (M/J)
vien-radz-is ‘unicorn’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + rag-s ‘horn’)
Latv. <Ween=radʃis> beside Germ. <Einhorn> (L);
Latv. <Ween=radʃis> beside Germ. <ein Einhorn> (PhL);
Latv. <Ween=radsis> beside Germ. <ein Einhorn> (LD);
Latv. <Weenradsis> beside Germ. <Einhorn> (M/L)

vien-roc-is ‘one-handed person; sickle, reaping hook’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + rok-a ‘hand, arm’)
Latv. <ween=rohzis> beside Germ. <einhändig> (L);
Latv. <Ween=rohzis> beside Germ. <eine Korn Senʃe> (PhL);
Latv. <Weenrohzis (Plau=tawa)> beside Germ. <eine Sichel> (LD);
Latv. <Ween=rohzis> beside Germ. <einhändig, der nur eine Hand hat> (LD)

vien-ties-is ‘simple-minded, naive’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + ties-a (LD), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’)
Latv. <weenteeʃśis> beside Germ. <einfältig> (L);
Latv. <Ween=teessis’ (weentees=nis)> beside Germ. <einfältig> (LD);
Latv. <Weentees ́is, weentees ́nis> beside Germ. <einfältig> (M/L)

N+N

grēk-dien-is ‘daily sinner’ (← grēk-s ‘sin’ + dien-a ‘day’)
Latv. <Grehk=deenis> beside Germ. <der da täglich sündiget> (F1);
Latv. <Grehk=deenis> beside Germ. <der da tägl. sündiget> (F2);
Latv. <Grehkdeenis> beside Germ. <der täglich sündiget> (M/J)

kram-aus-is lit. ‘scabby-eared’ (← kram-a (MEe) ‘scab’ + aus-s ‘ear’)
Latv. <Kramm=auśis> beside Germ. <Schorff= oder Kratz=Ohr. grindohr, Schorfinack, Schabhals> (F1);
Latv. <Kram=Auśis> beside Germ. <ein Schorff -Krätz - Ohr ein grind=Ohr. Schorffe nack. Schabhalß> (F2)

sik-spārn-e ‘bat’ (← siksn-a (L), siksn-e (M), siksn-is (LD) ‘strap, thong’ + spārn-s (LD), spārn-a (L) ‘wing’)
Latv. <Śickʃpahrne> beside Germ. <Fledermauß> (L);
Latv. <Śick=spahrne> beside Germ. <eine Fledermauß> (LD);
Latv. <Śikspahrne> beside Germ. <fle=dermauß> (M/L)
sik-spārn-is ‘bat’ (← siksn-a (L), siksn-e (M), siksn-is (LD) ‘strap, thong’ + spārn-s (LD), spārn-a (L) ‘wing’) 
Latv. <Śickʃpahrni> (Nom.pl.?) beside Germ. <Fledermauß> (PhL);
Latv. <Śiksśpahrnis> beside Germ. <fle=dermauß> (M/P)

vilk-ac-is ‘werewolf’ (← vilk-s ‘wolf’ + ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <Wilk=azzis> beside Germ. <ein bärwolf> (F1);
Latv. <Wilk=azzis> beside Germ. <ein bär=Wolf> (F2);
Latv. <kad teem wilk azzeem tahn meestis : tahn strehkis :| uhse=et, tahn tee tekk> (Dat.pl.) beside Germ. <wehn den bärwollen die flaage ankomt, so lauffen sie> (F1);
Latv. <kad teem Wilk=azzern tahn meestis (tahn strehkis) uhseeet, tahn tee tekk> (Dat.pl.) beside Germ. <Wenn den bär wollen die flaage ankomt, so lauffen Sie> (F2);
Latv. <Wilkazzis> beside Germ. <Warwolf> (M)

Pron+N

pat-galv-is ‘arbitrary, wilful’ (← pat-s ‘self’ + galv-a ‘head’)
Latv. <Pattghallwis> beside Germ. <halfstarrig> (L);
Latv. <Patt=ghallwis> beside Germ. <frech/ verweegen/ muhtwillig> (L);
Latv. <Patt=ghallwis> beside Germ. <eigen=ʃinniger kopff> (L);
Latv. <Patt=ghallwis> beside Germ. <eigeninniger kopff> (L);
Latv. <Patt=ghallwis> beside Germ. <halfstarrig> (L);
Latv. <Patt=ghallwis> beside Germ. <wiederʃpännig> (L);
Latv. <Parih=ǵalneeks> beside Germ. <Ein eigensinniger Kopff, halfstarrig, muthwillig, verweegen, Frech, wiederspännig, hartnäckig> (LD);
Latv. <Parihgalneeks, Patgalwis, Patgalw=neeks> beside Germ. <Ein eigensinniger Kopff, Halsstarrig, muthwillig, verweegen, frem, wiederspenstig, hartnackig> (M/L)

2.2 Compounds without suffixes

A+N

gud(e)r-degun-s ‘wise, intelligent’ (← cf. gudr-s (F1, F2), gudr-is (LD) ‘clever, brainy’ + degun-s ‘nose’) 
Latv. <ghudder=dāgguns> beside Germ. <Klügling> (L);
Latv. <ghudder=dāgguns> beside Germ. <Naʃwēiß> (L);
Latv. <G/udder=degguns> beside Germ. <ein Na=se=Weise, Klügling> (LD);

_kos-ac-s_ 'horse with white eyeballs; a nearsighted person’ (← _kos-s_ ‘clear, transparent; squinty’ + _ac-s_ (L), _ac-is_ (EE), _ac-e_ (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <Kohľ=Atz> beside Germ. <Glaß=Aug> (PhL);
Latv. <irr Kohsazz> beside Germ. <hat ein Glaßauge> (M/L)

_kiel-degun-s_ ‘having a big nose’ (← _liel-s_ ‘big’ + _degun-s_ ‘nose’)
Latv. <leel=dägguns> beside Germ. <der ein groß Nafjen hat> (L)

_kiel-sird-s_ ‘noble-minded’ (← _liel-s_ ‘big’ + _sird-s_ ‘heart’)
Latv. <leelširrds> beside Germ. <großmütig> (L);
Latv. <leel=širrds> beside Germ. <großmütig> (L);
Latv. <Leel=sirds> beside Germ. <Großmütig> (LD);
Latv. <Leelširds> beside Germ. <Großmütig> (M/L)

_kiel-vēder-s_ ‘potbelly’ (← _liel-s_ ‘big’ + _vēder-s_ ‘stomach, belly’)
Latv. <leel=wehders> beside Germ. <der ein dickē Bauch hat> (L);
Latv. <Leel Wähders> beside Germ. <der einen dicken Bauch hat> (LD);
Latv. <Leelweh=ders> beside Germ. <dick bauch> (M/L)

_meln-plauk-s_ Germ. ‘schwarzer Brand, Schmierbrand im Getreide’ (← _meln-s_ ‘black’ + _plauk-s_ (MEe) Germ. ‘Abgang von Wolle, Flachs (beim Brechen)’; cf. _plauk-a_ (MEe) ‘id.’)
Latv. <Meln=Plauki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <das schwartze Korn, brand=Korn, so im Roggen wächst> (F1);
Latv. <Meln=Plauki> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <das schwartze Korn brand=Korn, so im Korn ist u. wächset> (F2)

_mīkst-čaul-s_ ‘soft, fragile, having a soft shell’ (← _mīkst-s_ ‘soft, tender’ + _čaul-s_ (MEe) ‘husk, shell’)
Latv. <miextʃchauls> beside Germ. <zart> (L);
Latv. <Miekstšchauls> beside Germ. <weich, geschmeidig, gelin[d]> (LD);
Latv. <Mihkstšchauls> beside Germ. <weichschalig> (M)

_zil-galv-as_ (Nom.pl.) ‘self-heal (a plant)’ (← _zil-s_ ‘blue’ + _galv-a_ ‘head’)
Latv. <Silgalwas> (Nom.pl.) _untranslated_ (F2)

_zveir-ac-s_ ‘cross-eyed’ (← _zveir-s_ ‘squinty’ + _ac-s_ (L), _ac-is_ (EE), _ac-e_ (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <Swearazz> beside Germ. <Glaßaugen> (M/J)
2.3 Compounds with ambiguous second components

N+N

laps-ast-e ‘dissembler, sycophant’ (← laps-a (LD), laps-is (M/L) ‘fox’ + ast-e ‘tail’)
Latv. <Laps=aste> beside Germ. <Ein fuchß schwantz, it: Ein Schmeichler> (F1);
Latv. <Laps=aste> beside Germ. <ein fuchß=Schwantz. it. ein Schmeichler> (F2);
Latv. <Laps=aste> beside Germ. <ein Heuchler, Fuchß=schwantzer, Metaph:> (LD);
Latv. <Lapsaste> beside Germ. <fuchs schwantz> (M/J);
Latv. <Lapsaste> beside Germ. <Heuchler, fuchßschwänzer> (M/L)

sun-purn-is lit. ‘one having a dog’s snout; manlike ogre with a dog’s snout (folklore)’ (← sun-s ‘dog’ + purn-is (PhL), purn-s (F1, F2) ‘snout, muzzle, nose’)
Latv. <Sunn=purnis> beside Germ. <ein Hund=Maul. ist ein Mohr> (F1);
Latv. <Sunpurnis> beside Germ. <Ein Wilder Mensch. Ein Wunder=geburt. Meerwunder> (F1);
Latv. <Sunn=Purnis> beside Germ. <ein Hund=Maul= Ist ein Mohr> (F2);
Latv. <Ś unpurnis> beside Germ. <wilder Mensch, monstrum Mohr> (M/J)

A+N

**plik-sprākl-e** ‘naked man’ (← plik-s ‘naked, nude’ + sprākl-e Germ. ‘der Hintere’)
Latv. <plick=sprahk=le> beside Germ. <blosse Hinderst, da nicht zum besten> (LD);
Latv. <Pliksprahkle> beside Germ. <Kahler Kerl. bloßer Hinterster da nichts zum besten ist> (M/L)

Num+A

**vien-tiesn-is** ‘simple-minded, naive’ (← vien-s ‘one’ + tiesn-is (LD) ‘fair, reasonable, honest’)
Latv. <weentees=nis> beside Germ. <einfältig> (LD);
Latv. <weenteesnis> beside Germ. <einfältig> (M/L)
3 Verbal governing compounds

3.1 Compounds with the compositional suffix -is (m.)/-e (f.)

N+V

abr-a-kas-is ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ (← abr-a (L), abr-s (M), abr-is (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. kas-ī-t ‘to scrape, to scratch’)

Latv. <Abra kahsis> beside Germ. <das nachschraapels. it. die Trog schraap> (F1);
Latv. <Abbra=kahsis> beside Germ. <das nachschraappliz. item. ein trogshraape> (F2);
Latv. <Abbra kašsis> (F2)

abr-kas-is ‘instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ (← abr-a (L), abr-s (M), abr-is (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. kas-ī-t ‘to scrape, to scratch’)

Latv. <Abbrkasśis> beside Germ. <eine Trogshraape> (M/J)

ād-a-min-is ‘skinner’ (← ād-a ‘skin, leather’ + cf. mī-t ‘to tread, to step’)

Latv. <Ahda=minnis> beside Germ. <der ledertrete, gerber> (F1);
Latv. <Ahdaminīs> untranslated (F2)

ād-min-is ‘skinner’ (← ād-a ‘skin, leather’ + cf. mī-t ‘to tread, to step’)

Latv. <Ahd=minis> beside Germ. <Lehdergerber> (L);
Latv. <Ahd=minnis> beside Germ. <der Leder=treter, gerber> (F2)

bad-mir-is ‘starving person’ (← bad-s (L), bad-us (F1, F2) ‘famine’ + cf. mir-t ‘to die’)

Latv. <baddmiris> beside Germ. <hungerig> (L);
Latv. <Badd=mirris> beside Germ. <Hungerig, der Hunger leidet> (LD);
Latv. <Badmirris> beside Germ. <E. Hungerleider. Hungerig> (M/L)

dzirn-kal-is ‘millstone cutter’ (← dzirn-us (Nom.pl.) (L), dzirn-is (LD) ‘hand mill’ + cf. kal-t ‘to forge, to hammer’)

Latv. <Džirnkallis/ kaļ Ackmiņus kappina> beside Germ. <einer der die Steine führten> (PhL);
Latv. <Dsirm=kallim waiag to kappi=naht> (Dat.sg.) beside Germ. <der Steinhacker muß ihn schärfen> (LD);
Latv. <Dsirnkallim to wajaga kappinaht> (Dat.sg.) beside Germ. <der Stein hacker muß ihn hacken> (M/L)

**kok-tur-is** Germ. ‘Lehne an der Treppe’ (← kok-s ‘tree’ + cf. tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’)
Latv. <Kohkturris> beside Germ. <eine lehne an der Treppen> (F1);
Latv. <Kohkturris> beside Germ. <eine lehne an der Treppen> (F1);
Latv. <Kokturris> beside Germ. <lehne an der Trep=pe> (M/J)

**lāk-tur-is**147 ‘lantern’ (← läkt-e, läkt-s ‘bright fire, flame’ + cf. tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’)
Latv. <lahkturris> beside Germ. <ein Pergel=halter. leuchter> (F1);
Latv. <Lahkturris> beside Germ. <ein Pergel - halber=Leichter> (F2)

**lok-tur-is**148 ‘handrail’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + cf. tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’)
Latv. <lohkturris> beside Germ. <eine lehne an der Treppen> (F1);
Latv. <Lohkturris> beside Germ. <eine lehne an der Treppen> (F2);
Latv. <Lokturris> beside Germ. <lehne an der Trep=pe> (M/J)

**mat-pin-is** ‘braid’ (← mat-s (F1, F2), mat-e (F2) ‘hair’ + cf. pī-t ‘to braid, to weave’)
Latv. <Mattpinnis> beside Germ. <ein Haarschnur> (LD);
Latv. <Matt=pinnis> beside Germ. <Flechtband, eine Haarschnur, so eingeflochten wird> (LD);
Latv. <Mattpinnis> beside Germ. <flechtband> (M/L);
Latv. <Mattpinnis> beside Germ. <Haar Schnur> (M/L)

**mat-pīn-is** ‘braid’ (← mat-s (F1, F2), mat-e (F2) ‘hair’ + cf. pī-t ‘to braid, to weave’)
Latv. <Matt=pinis> beside Germ. <Haarʃchnur> (L);
Latv. <Mattpinis> beside Germ. <Haarʃchnur> (PhL)

---

147 This word might also be a borrowing from German, cf. MLG luchter (Sehwers, 1953, p. 73).
148 Dissimilated from rok-tur-is (MEe) ‘handrail; handle, knob’ (← rok-a ‘hand, arm’ + cf. tur-ē-t ‘to hold, to keep’).
**mel-kul-is** ‘tale-teller/liar’ (← *mel-* (Nom.pl.) ‘lie’ + cf. *kul-* ‘to thresh, to flail’)

Latv. *<Mälkulis>* beside Germ. *<Lügener>* (L);
Latv. *<Mäl=kulis>* beside Germ. *<Lügenmaul>* (L);
Latv. *[[...]]* tad būt es mēlkulis *[[...]]* (EE) ‘then I would be a liar’;
Latv. *<tas ir wens Māl=ku lis *[[...]]*> (EE) ‘That one is a liar’;
Latv. *<Māl=ku lis (kas Mālles kull jeb walka)>* beside Germ *<ein Lügner, Lügen Maul>* (LD);
Latv. *<[[...]]* es tahds Melkulis *[[...]]*> (VLH) ‘I am such a liar’;
Latv. *<[[...]]* tas weens Melkulis *[[...]]*> (VLH) ‘that one liar’;
Latv. *<Melkulisi ikas Mellus kull jeb Walka>* beside Germ. *<lügener>* (M/L)

**mēl-nes-is** ‘tale-teller/liar’ (← *mēl-* ‘tongue’ + cf. *nes-* ‘to carry, to bear’)

Latv. *<Mehlnesisis>* beside Germ. *<Meerlintrager>* (L);
Latv. *<Mehlnessisis>* beside Germ. *<Ein Zungen=träger>* (F1);
Latv. *<Mehl=nessisis>* beside Germ. *<Ein Zungen=träger>* (F2);

**mies-met-is** ‘Shrovetide’ (← *mies-* ‘flesh, body’ + cf. *mes-* ‘to throw’)

Latv. *<Mees=meschi>* (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. *<das Päpstliche fasten>* (F1);
Latv. *<Meesmettis>* beside Germ. *<fasten. wend.>* (F2);
Latv. *<Mees=Meschi>* (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. *<das päbstische fasten>* (F2);
Latv. *<Meeś-Meschi>* (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. *<Papstl. fasten>* (M/J);

**muš-mir-e** ‘mushroom; fly agaric’ (← *muš-* ‘fly’ + cf. *mir-* ‘to die’)


**muš-mir-is** ‘mushroom; fly agaric’ (← *muš-* ‘fly’ + cf. *mir-* ‘to die’)

Latv. *<Musch=mirris>* beside Germ. *<fliegen= Schwäme. auff Kohlengebraten, mit Milch beschmiert, ist den fliegen ein gifft>* (F1);
Latv. *<Muhisch=mirris>* beside Germ. *<fliegen=Schwäme. auff=Kohlen gebraten, mit Milch beschmiert ist den fliegen eine Gifft>* (F2);
Latv. *<Mussch=mirris>* beside Germ. *<Fliegen schwäme, davon sie sterben>* (LD);
Latv. <Mušchmirris> beside Germ. <fliegen schwämme. denn diese auf Kohlen gebraten und mit Milch beschmieret sind den fliegen ein Gifft> (M/J);
Latv. <Mušchmirris> beside Germ. <Fliegenschwammen, davon sie sterben> (M/L)

**pup-a-kār-is** ‘time (moment) when a child wants to be breastfed’ (← *pup-s* (PhL), *pup-a* (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. *kār-o-t* ‘to desire, to long for’)
Latv. <Tam behrnam uhseet puppa=kahris> beside Germ. <dem Kind verlanget nach der Zitzen> (F1);
Latv. <Tam behrnam uhhs eet puppa=kahris> beside Germ. <dem Kind verlanget nach der Zizzen> (F2)

**pup-kār-is** ‘child who wants to be breastfed’ (← *pup-s* (PhL), *pup-a* (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. *kār-o-t* ‘to desire, to long for’)
Latv. <Pupp=kahris> beside Germ. <ein Zitzen=Naßcher> (F1);
Latv. <Pup=kahris> beside Germ. <ein Zizzen=Nascher> (F2);
Latv. <Pupkahrdis> beside Germ. <Zitzennascher> (M/J)

**pup-zīdis** ‘infant’ (← *pup-s* (PhL), *pup-a* (L) ‘breast, nipple’ + cf. *zīs-t* ‘to suckle’)
Latv. <Pup=sihdihs> beside Germ. <ein Zitzen=Säuger> (F1);
Latv. <Pup=Sihdihs> beside Germ. <ein Zizzen=Säuger> (F2);
Latv. <Pupsihdis> beside Germ. <Zitzensauger> (M/J)

**pel-ād-e** ‘bat’ (← *pel-e* ‘mouse’ + cf. *ēs-t* ‘to eat’)
Latv. <Pellahde> beside Germ. <fle=dermauß> (M)

**saul-goz-is** ‘sunshine’ (← *saul-e* ‘sun’ + cf. *goz-ē-ties* ‘to bask, wallow’)
Latv. <Śaulghosis> beside Germ. <die Sohner läube. Sonnichter ort> (F1);
Latv. <Śaul=gohsi gulleht> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <Sich Sön nen an der Sonnen liegen> (F1);
Latv. <Śaul=gohsisis> beside Germ. <die Sohner=läube, Son nichter Ort> (F2);
Latv. <Śaul=gohsi gulleht> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <sich sönnen, an der Sonnen liegen> (F2);
Latv. <Śaul Gosi gulleht> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <sich sonnen und an der Sonnen liegen wie die lands knechte etc.> (M/J);
Latv. <Śaul Gosi gulleht> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <sich sonnen an der Sonnen liegen wie die Betler und faulen landsKnechte etc.> (M/J)
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saul-griež-i (Nom.pl.) ‘solstice’ (← saul-e ‘sun’ + cf. griez-ties ‘to revolve, to turn, to rotate’)
Latv. <Saul=greeschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Sonne-Wende> (F1);
Latv. <Saul=Greeschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Sonne=Wende> (F2);
Latv. <Sauglee=sci> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Sonnenwende> (M/J)

sēt-lož-i (Nom.pl.) ‘ground-ivy (a plant)’ (← sēt-a (L), sēt-e (L) ‘fence, yard’ + cf. lož-ā-t (MEe) ‘to crawl, to sneek’)
Latv. <Sehtloschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <hund petersilien> (F1);
Latv. <Seht loschi> (Nom.pl.) untranslated (F1);
Latv. <Seht=lohschi> (Nom.pl.) untranslated (F2)

sul-laiz-is Germ. ‘Schmarotzer’ (← sul-a ‘juice, sap’ + cf. laiz-ī-t ‘to lick’)
Latv. <Sull=laisis> beside Germ. <ein Schmarotzer> (F1);
Latv. <Sull=Laisis> beside Germ. <ein Schmarotzer. Lecken> (F2)

ties-lem-is ‘prophet, fortune teller’ (← ties-a (L), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’ + cf. lem-t ‘to decide, to resolve’)
Latv. <Teešlemmis> beside Germ. <ein wahrsgaerer> (F1);
Latv. <Teešlëmmis> beside Germ. <ein Wahrsager> (F2)

ties-lēm-is ‘prophet, fortune teller’ (← ties-a (L), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’ + cf. lem-t ‘to decide, to resolve’)
Latv. <Sihlineeks, Snitneeks, paredsetajs, Teeš=lēmmis> beside Germ. <Ein wahrsgaerer, Zeichen=deuter, Wicker> (F1);
Latv. <Sihlineeks, Snitneeks, Paredsetais, Teeš=lehmis> beside Germ. <Ein wahrsager, Zeichen=deuter, Wicker> (F2);
Latv. <Sihmlehmis, Teesslehis> beside Germ. <Wicker, Wahr=sager, Zeichen deuter> (M/J)

ties-nes-is ‘judge, justiciary, magistrate’ (← ties-a (L), ties-s (F1, F2) ‘truth, verity’ + cf. nes-t ‘to carry, to bear’)
Latv. <Teeßneʃśis> beside Germ. <Richter> (L);
Latv. <Teeßneʃśis> beside Germ. <Vrtheilʃprecher> (L);
Latv. <Teeßneʃśis> beside Germ. <Rechtfinder> (PhL)

ugun-a-kur-is ‘fire, bonfire’ (← ugun-s ‘fire’ + cf. kur-t ‘to make fire’)
Latv. <Iggauna= semmā nhe drihs applam iekatra uguuna= kury eet> (Loc.sg.) beside Germ. <in Ehst=land darff mann nicht in eines jeden Feuer stadt gehen. Manc:> (LD);
Latv. <Iggauna Semme ne drihs applam iikkatra Ugguna Kurrı cee> beside Germ. <in Ehstland etc.> (M/Manc.)

*ugu-n-kur-is* ‘fire, bonfire’ (← *ugu*n-*s* ‘fire’ + cf. *kur-t* ‘to make fire’)
Latv. <Uggun'kurris> beside Germ. <ein Feuer stadt, Feuerheerd> (LD);
Latv. <Uggun'kurris> beside Germ. <eine Feuer Heerde oder Feuer stätt> (LD);
Latv. <Uggun kurris> beside Germ. <feur=heerd. Feurstätte> (M/L);
Latv. <Uggun kurris> beside Germ. <feurstätte Feurheerd> (M/L)

*va-sar-audz-is* ‘teenager, youth’ (← *vasar-a* ‘summer’ + cf. *aug-t* ‘to grow’)
Latv. <waśśar audsis> beside Germ. <ein Kind so langsam wächst> (F1);
Latv. <Wassar audsis> beside Germ. <ein Kind so langsam wächst> (F2)

*vēst-nes-is* ‘messenger, herald’ (← *vēst-s* (F1, F2), *vēst-is* (LD), *vēst-a* (LD), *vēst-e* (L) ‘message, news’ + cf. *nes-t* ‘to carry, to bear’)
Latv. <Kāhnīga jeb Leelakunģa Wāhst=nessis (Wāhstneeks, San=tis)> beside Germ. <ein Königl. oder Fürstlicher Gesandter> (LD);
Latv. <Wehstnessiss> beside Germ. <bothe> (M)

*zelt-nes-is* ‘nobleman, landlord’ (← *zelt-s* ‘gold’ + cf. *nes-t* ‘to carry, to bear’)
Latv. <seltnēssis> beside Germ. <Vornehm, einer der Gold trägt> (F1);
Latv. <Seltnēssis> beside Germ. <Vornehmer, einer der da Gold träget> (F2);
Latv. <Augstmannis, Leelmannis, seltnessis, no augstas Ziltas, Sļakkas> beside Germ. <Ein großer Kerl, Einer aus dem baur Adel> (F1);
Latv. <Augstmannis. Leelmannis, Šeltnēssis. no augstas Ziltas, Sļakkas> beside Germ. <Ein roßer Kerl. einer auß dem baur=Adel> (F2);
Latv. <Seltnēssis> beside Germ. <Goldträger, reich vonnehm> (M/J);
Latv. <Augstais, Augstmannis, no augstas Zilts jeb Sļakkas, Šeltnēsis, Leelmannis> beside Germ. <Ein Großmann, Einer aus dem baren Adel> (M/J)

*zem-turis* ‘peasant, farmer’ (← *zem-e* ‘earth, ground’ + cf. *turē-t* ‘to hold, to keep’)
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Latv. <Sem=turris> beside Germ. <ein gesinds=Kerl. Kerl. ein wirt der land=hält> (F1);
Latv. <Semm=turris> beside Germ. <ein Gesinds Kerl.ein Wirth der Land hatt.> (F2)

ziem-ciet-is ‘wintergreen’ (← ziem-a ‘winter’ + cf. cies-t ‘to suffer, to grieve’)
Latv. <SeemZeeschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <winter=grün, und andere winter Kräuter> (F1);
Latv. <Seem=Zeeschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Winter=grün> (F2);
Latv. <Seem=Zeeschi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <allerlei Winter=Kräuter, so grünen> (F2);
Latv. <Semmzeeśchi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Wintergrün> (M/J)

ziem-lēm-is ‘prophet, fortune teller’ (← zīm-e ‘sign, symbol’ + cf. lem-t ‘to decide, to resolve’)
Latv. <Sihm=leņis> beside Germ. <ein Zeichen=deuter> (F1);
Latv. <Sihm=lemmis> beside Germ. <ein Zeichen=deuter> (F2)

ziem-lēmis ‘prophet, fortune teller’ (← zīm-e ‘sign, symbol’ + cf. lem-t ‘to decide, to resolve’)
Latv. <Sihmlehnis, Teesšlehmis> beside Germ. <Wicker, Wahr=sager, Zeichen deuter> (M/J)

Num+V

pirm-dzim-is ‘person’s first child’ (← pirm-ais ‘first’ + cf. dzim-t ‘to be born’)
Latv. <Pirmdsiņis> beside Germ. <der erstge=borner> (LD);
Latv. <Pirmdsimmis> beside Germ. <erst gebohren> (M/L)

Pron+V

pat-maļ-i (Nom.pl.) ‘windmill, watermill’ (← pat-s ‘self’ + cf. mal-t ‘to grind, to mill’)
Latv. <Pattmaļi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Waffermüle> (L);
Latv. <taiʃśeeș ghattaw/ töw buhß eet Šuddmalohß/Pattmaļohß> (Loc.pl.) beside Germ. <rüfte dich/ du folt zur Mülen fahren> (PhL)

Adv+V

slep-kav-is ‘killer’ (← slepu(s) ‘secretly’ + cf. kau-t ‘to murder’)
Latv. <Ślepkawis> beside Germ. <Mörder> (M)
3.2 Compounds ending in -a
   
N+V
   
*abr-a-kas-a* ‘the remaining dough; instrument which helps to scrape the rest of the dough off a kneading trough’ (← *abr-a* (L), *abr-s* (M), *abr-is* (L) ‘kneading trough; kneading dough’ + cf. *kas-i-t* ‘to scrape, to scratch’)
  
Latv. <abbrakaśsa> beside Germ. <der ausgekazte Teig> (F2);
Latv. <Abbra=kassa> beside Germ. <eintr Trogscharr oder schrap> (LD);
Latv. <Abbra kaśa> beside Germ. <eine Trogschrape> (M/L)

*cel-tek-a* Germ. ‘ein Landstreicher, Landfahrer’ (← *cel-š* ‘way, road’ + cf. *tec-i-t* ‘to flow, to trickle’)
  
Latv. <Zell jeb Šem=tekka> beside Germ. <ein Landstreicher> (F1);
Latv. <Zell= abber Šem=Tekka> beside Germ. <ein land streicher> (F2)

*pel-ād*149 ‘bat’ (← *pel-e* ‘mouse’ + cf. *ēs-t* ‘to eat’)
  
Latv. <Pell=ahd> beside Germ. <Fledermauß> (PhL);
Latv. <Pell=ahd’> beside Germ. <eine Fledermauß> (LD)

*zem-deg-a* ‘burned-out place, site after a fire’ (← *zem-e* ‘earth, ground’ + cf. *deg-i-t* ‘to burn’)
  
Latv. <Semdega> untranslated (F1);
Latv. <Semm=dega> untranslated (F2)

*zem-lik-a* ‘the evening of the feast of Sts. Simon and Jude when food offerings are left for the spirits; food offerings for the spirits’ (← *zem-e* ‘earth, ground’ + cf. *lik-t* ‘to put, to place’)
  
Latv. <Semmllickas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <aller Seelen Tag> (PhL);
Latv. <Seņnilikka> beside Germ. <soll Simon Judae Abend sein das Sie den Seelen allerlej Korn auftragen zur Speise> (F1);
Latv. <Semm=likka> beside Germ. <Soll Simon Judae Abend sein, das Sie den Seelen - Allerlei Korn auff=tragen zur Speise> (F2);
Latv. <Seņnilikka uhslikt, kas no semmis audsis> untranslated (F1);
Latv. <Semm=likka uhslikt, kas no semmis audsis> untranslated (F2);
Latv. <Weļļo laiks (Sem̃lickas)> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <aller Seelen> (LD);
Latv. <Weļļo laiks, Semmlikkas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <aller Seelen> (M/L)

zem-tek-a Germ. ‘ein Landstreicher, Landfahrer’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ + cf. tec-ē-t ‘to flow, to trickle’)
Latv. <Zell] Jeb Seņ=tekka> beside Germ. <ein Landstreicher> (F1);
Latv. <Zell]= abber Sem=Tekka> beside Germ. <ein land streicher> (F2);
Latv. <Semmttekka> beside Germ. <landstreiher> (M/J)

Pron+V

pat-mal-as (Nom.pl.) ‘windmill, watermill’ (← pat-s ‘self’ + cf. mal-t ‘to grind, to mill’)
Latv. <Pattmalas> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <eine Waʃʃermüle/ Vhdens=dʃirrnawas. [Die Sehlburger/ vnd andere dort hinauff/ nennens Pattmalas.>] (PhL)

Adv+V

slap-kav-a ‘killer’ (← slepu(s) ‘secretly’ + cf. kau-t ‘to murder’)
Latv. <[...] bet iūs æʃset to darriuiʒu par slapkauwas bæddre> (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘but you have made it to a cave of a killer’;
Latv. <[...] bet iūs æʃseti to par wēnas slapkauwas bæddre darriuiʒi> (Gen.sg.) (EE) ‘but you have made it to a cave of a killer’;
Latv. <[...] wyʃsi kattri nākuʃji ir prekʃʒan man, ʒaglı̂e vnd slap- kauwas ir [...]> (Nom.pl.) (EE) ‘All who came before me are thieves and killers’

3.3 Compounds ending in -s

N+V

ād-min-s ‘skinner’ (← ād-a ‘skin, leather’ + cf. mī-t ‘to tread, to step’)
Latv. <Ahdmins> beside Germ. <Gerber> (L);
Latv. <Ahdmins> beside Germ. <Gärber> (PhL);
Latv. <Ahdmins (kas Ahdas minn’)> beside Germ. <ein Gerber, leder Gerber> (LD);
Latv. <Ahdmins /kas Ahdas minn> beside Germ. <Ger=ber, le- dergerber> (M/L)
kann-dar-s ‘pot-maker’ (← kann-a ‘can, pot’ + cf. dar-ī-t ‘to do, to perform’)
Latv. <Kann=darrs> beside Germ. <bey den bauren ein Kann-
nen=Macher> (LD)

katl-a-lāp-s ‘tinker’ (← katl-is (LD), katl-s (F1, F2) ‘pot, kettle’ + cf. lāp-ī-t ‘to mend, to repair’)
Latv. <Kattla= lahps (Lahpeis)> beside Germ. <ein Kess-
selflicker> (LD);
Latv. <Katla=Lahps Lahpeis> beside Germ. <Keßelflicker> (M/L)

var-māk-s ‘oppressor, violator, despot’ (← var-a (L), var-s (LD) ‘power, au-
thority, rule’ + cf. māk-t ‘to oppress, to overpower’)
Latv. <warr=maks> beside Germ. <Ein plager> (F1);
Latv. <warr===maks> beside Germ. <ein PLAager> (F2);
Latv. <Wahrmaks> beside Germ. <Ein Plager, der einen bittend
plaget> (M/J)

zem-tek-s Germ. ‘ein Landstreicher, Landfahrer’ (← zem-e ‘earth, ground’ +
cf. tec-ē-t ‘to flow, to trickle’)
Latv. <jemmtäx> beside Germ. <Landstreicher> (L);
Latv. <Semtecks> beside Germ. <ein Landstreicher,
Umbtreiber, Umblauffer der an keinem Ort bleibet> (LD);
Latv. <Semteks> beside Germ. <Umlauer, landstreicher> (M/L)

Adv+V

slap-kav-s ‘killer’ (← slepu(s) ‘secretly’ + cf. kau-t ‘to murder’)
Latv. <[...] tas ir wens ʒaglis vnd slapkauws [...]> (EE) ‘that one
is a thief and a killer’;
Latv. <Kas ʃauwu brali enida, tas ir wens slapkauws> (EE) ‘An-
yone who hates his brother is a killer’;
Latv. <Vnd ius ʒinnat, ka wens slapkauws pe feuw ne war turret
to mūjiga dʒiwoʃʒanna> (EE) ‘And you know that no killer has
eternal life abiding in him’;
Latv. <[...] tappa winʃʒ duʃmigs, vnd yʃsutia ʃauwu karriupæku
likka tōs slapkauwus nomākt [...]> (Acc.pl.) (EE) ‘he became an-
gry and sent his troops and commanded to destroy those murder-
ers’

slap-kav-s or slap-kav-a ‘killer’ (← slepu(s) ‘secretly’ + cf. kau-t ‘to murder’)
Latv. <[...] ka vʒ wēnu slapkauwu [...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘as to a
killer’;
Latv. <[...] wēnu slawigu slapkauwu {ar wardu Barrabas} katters
[...]> (Acc.sg.) (EE) ‘an infamous killer {named Barrabas} who’
slap-kav-s or slap-kav-is 'killer' (← slepu(s) 'secretly' + cf. kau-t 'to murder')
Latv. <[...] wens no têms slapkauwems kattri [...]>(Dat.pl.) (EE) 'one of those killers who';
Latv. <[...] tam gaddyias ʃtarp tens slapkauwems [...]>(Dat.pl.) (EE) 'he fell among the killers';
Latv. <[...] kas ʃtarp tens slapkauwems gaddyias [...]>(Dat.pl.) (EE) 'who fell among the killers';
Latv. <[...] ekʃʒan lixtas no ʃlapkauwems [...]>(Dat.pl.) (EE) 'in danger from killers'

slep-kav-s 'killer' (← slepu(s) 'secretly' + cf. kau-t 'to murder')
Latv. <sleppkaws> beside Germ. <Mörder> (L);
Latv. <Śläppkaws> beside Germ. <Todtʃchläger> (L);
Latv. <[...] tas irre weens Saglis in Ślepkaws> (VLH) 'that one is a thief and a killer';
Latv. <Kas śawu Brahli nihd / tas irr Ślepkaws [...]>(VLH) 'Anyone who hates his brother is a killer';
Latv. <[...] kas ʃtarp Ślepkawus bij pullis?> (Acc.pl.) (VLH) 'who fell among the killers?';
Latv. <[...] in likke śchos Ślepkawus nokaut [...]>(Acc.pl.) (VLH) 'and commanded to kill these murderers';
Latv. <[...] In juhs ŋinnahht / ka Ślepkawam newa ta muhʃchiga Dʃihwɔšchan ʃekʃ ʃewim palekama> (Dat.sg.) (VLH) 'And you know that no killer has eternal life abiding in him';
Latv. <Slepaks> beside Germ. <ein Mörder> (LD);
Latv. <Slepks> beside Germ. <ein Mörder> (M/L)

slep-kav-s or slep-kav-a 'killer' (← slepu(s) 'secretly' + cf. kau-t 'to murder')
Latv. <Kas saweem behrnehm ne leek mahzitees gramattas, jeb strahdaht, jeb zittu kahdu labbu Ammatu, tas wiņņu mahzu sagt, in Ślepkauohs eet, jeb deedeleht, in ka neka ar negodu pelnitees> (Loc.pl.) untranslated (F1);
Latv. <kas saweem behrnehm ne leek mahzitees gramatas jeb strahdaht, jeb zittu kahdu labbu Ammatu, tas wiņņu mahzu sagt, in Ślepkauohs eet, jeb deedeleht, in ka neka ar Gohdu pelnitees> (Loc.pl.) untranslated (F2);
Latv. <Kas śawam Behram ne leek mahzitees Grahmataš, jeb strahdaht, jeb zittu kahdu labbu Ammatu, tas wiņņu mahza sagt, in Ślepkawōs eet, jeb arri deede=leht in ka neka ar Gohdu pelni=tees> untranslated (M/J)
**slep-kav-s** or **slep-kav-is** ‘killer’ (← slepu(s) ‘secretly’ + cf. kau-t ‘to murder’)
Latv. <[...] tee Sagli in Ślepkawi bijuśchi [...]>(Nom.pl.) (VLH) ‘they were thieves and killers’;
Latv. <[...] tam gaddijahs ftarp Ślepkaweem [...]>(Dat.pl.) (VLH) ‘he fell among killers’

**šķīb-raug-s** ‘cross-eyed’ (← šķībi ‘askew’ + cf. raudz-t ‘to look at’)
Latv. <Škihb=Raugs> beside Germ. <Ein Schiler> (F2)

3.4 Compounds with an ambiguous or etymologically unclear second component

**Pron+V**

**pat-mal-i** (Nom.pl.) ‘windmill, watermill’ (← pat-s ‘self’ + cf. mal-t ‘to grind, to mill’)
Latv. <Pat=mali> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <eine Windmühle> (LD);
Latv. <Šudmalli |Pitmalli, Wehja Dśirnus|> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Wind mühle> (M/L)

**N+V**

**sird-ēst-s** ‘heartache’ (← sird-s ‘heart’ + cf. ēs-t ‘to eat’)
Latv <Śird=ēhsts> beside Germ. <Küměrniß, noht, anliegen> (F1);
Latv. <Śird=ēhsts> beside Germ. <kümnëuß, Noht. Anliegen> (F2);
Latv. <Śird=ēhtōhs buht> (Loc.pl.) beside Germ. <im hertzleide seyn> (F1);
Latv. <Śird=ēhtōhs buht.> (Loc.pl.) beside Germ. <im hertz=leid sein> (F2);
Latv. <Śirdehsti kas Śird ehsch, Šuhriba> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Herzeleid, Kuñer Mühe> (M/L);
Latv. <Dauds Śirdehsti drihs širmus Mattus iswelk> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Kuñer Mühe und Herzeleid machen grau vor der Zeit> (M/L);
Latv. <Śirdehstōs buht> (Loc.pl.) beside Germ. <in bekümmerniß seyn> (M/J)
3.5 Compounds with reversed components order

V+N

šņug-degun-s lit. ‘one who is blowing his/her nose’ (← cf. šņūk-t, šņauk-t ‘to blow, to snuff’ or šņuk-ā-t ‘to sniff, to smell’ (?) + degun-s ‘nose’)
Latv. <Ka tahds Šnuh=deg=guns ģribb Šeeu’ jemt> beside Germ. <Wie wil ein solcher Rotzflegel ein Weib nehmen, der noch nicht weiβ die Nase rein zu halten> (LD);
Latv. <Ščņugdegguns> beside Germ. <Rotzleffel> (M);
Latv. <Kā tahds Ščņugdegguns ģribb Šeewu jemt> beside Germ. <wie will ein solcher Rotzflegel ein Weib nehmen, der noch nicht weiß die Nase rein zu halten?> (M/L)

valb-ac-s ‘one who is rolling his/her eyes’ (← cf. valb-ī-t ‘to roll one’s eyes’ + cf. ac-s (L), ac-is (EE), ac-e (LD) ‘eye’)
Latv. <walbatch> beside Germ. <vberʃichtig> (PhL);
Latv. <walb=atz'> beside Germ. <übersichtig> (LD);
Latv. <Walbazz> beside Germ. <über sichtig> (M/L)

4 Copulative compounds

N+N

miež-auz-i (Nom.pl.) ‘mixture of barley and oats’ (← miez-is ‘barley’ + auz-a ‘oat’)
Latv. <Meešch=ausi}> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <gemanke, Mankkorn> (F1);
Latv. <Meesch=Ausi> (Nom.pl.) beside Germ. <Gemanck, mank=Korn> (F2)
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