

NICOLE NAU (Kiel)

Introduction¹

1. The study of Latvian

„Das vorliegende Werk soll lediglich die lettische Sprache für die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft zugänglicher machen, als sie bisher es gewesen ist.“ (ENDZELĪNS 1922: v)

“The sole purpose of the work in hand is to render the Latvian tongue more amenable than has been heretofore the case.”

With this sentence, written almost 80 years ago, JĀNIS ENDZELĪNS introduces his grammar which is still the most comprehensive work on Latvian published in another language. During these 80 years, a lot of things have changed in linguistics. At the beginning of the 20th century, “vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft”, comparative linguistics, could only be understood as the study of linguistic relationships within a family or branch. The purpose of a grammar was to show how a particular language had developed from the common ancestor and how it differed from or was similar to its siblings. In our days, another kind of language comparison has become more important to general linguistics, namely language typology. Crosslinguistic similarities or peculiarities are sought and found in languages of different genetic affiliation. But one thing has remained constant: In modern linguistic typology, Latvian is at least as much neglected as it is in historical-comparative linguistics. One reason for this neglect is that typologists in general favor non-IE languages spoken outside Europe – which may be justified by the fact that most of these languages have long been completely ignored. But this doesn't explain why samples that contain a fair number of European languages rarely include Latvian, and even in research that is devoted to the typology of European languages, such as the EUROTYP project, Latvian is very scarcely represented.

It seems that Latvian, an Indo-European language spoken by about one and a half million people in the heart of Europe, is a well kept secret in linguistics. It might come as a surprise that this is so despite the fact that the language has been documented and described for more than 350 years. Each century has seen at least one outstanding grammar; we may cite HENRICO ADOLPHI's grammar for the 17th, GOTTFRIED STENDER's for the 18th, AUGUST BIELENSTEIN's two books for the 19th and JĀNIS ENDZELĪNS' above mentioned grammar for the 20th century (ADOLF 1685, 1978; BIELENSTEIN 1863; BIELENSTEIN 1863–1864; STENDER 1761). For a long time, those who studied and described Latvian were German clergymen, before native linguists took over at the end of the 19th century. In the 20th century the main language of publication also changed from German to Latvian. ENDZELĪNS' grammar was

¹ BERNHARD WÄLCHLI gave me many a good advice – thanks a lot!

translated into Latvian and published with minor modifications in 1951². In 1959 and 1962, the Latvian Academy of Sciences published a comprehensive grammar of the contemporary language in two volumes (MLLVG-I 1959; MLLVG-II 1962). While it is an important achievement for any language when native linguists publish in their own language, the neglect of other languages of publication contributed to the "secret"ness of modern Latvian. There are still some reliable sources available in German, Russian, and English.

German, though constantly losing its function as a metalanguage, still offers the best choice for linguists interested in Latvian. Besides ENDZELĪNS' grammar, there is the comprehensive dictionary by KARL MÜHLENBACH, edited and completed by JĀNIS ENDZELĪNS (ME 1923–1932); an internet version is currently under construction. An overview of Latvian phonology and morphology as well as a useful guide to further literature is contained in the book by RAINER ECKERT et al. (1994: 247–382). There is also a comprehensive textbook which focuses on the contemporary language and has very good sections on grammar (PRIEDĪTE & LUDDEN 1999). Linguists interested in more than the Standard variety will also appreciate ALFRĒDS GĀTERS' book on the dialects (GĀTERS 1977) and his extensive treatment of the syntax of Latvian folk-poetry (GĀTERS 1993).

In Russian, there are several textbooks; many have been written in the 1990s when, following the political changes, Latvian became more and more the second language of non-native inhabitants of Latvia whose first language is Russian. However, most of these textbooks do not provide a good source for quick reference on the grammar. For this purpose, the pedagogical grammar by GRUŽANE et al. (1995) suits better. There is also a small contrastive Latvian-Russian grammar (SEMENOVA 1966). In addition, Russian is an important metalanguage for special questions, due also to the fact that in Soviet times, for all dissertations at least an abstract in Russian was published (so-called "avtoreferat").

For a long time, the only sources on Latvian grammar published in English had been textbooks; one of them, at least, was fairly comprehensive (FENNELL & GELSEN 1980). Only recently, two small reference grammars written in English have appeared (MATHIASSEN 1997; NAU 1998). Meanwhile, information on Latvian phonology and morphology in English can also be found in the internet. An overview of Latvian and its dialects is currently in press (BALODE & HOLVOET in press).

Latvian is a Baltic language that has emerged and developed in close vicinity and intense contact to languages of other branches and families. Its structure and lexicon probably owe equally much to its areal relatedness as they do to its genetic relationship. Latvian's closest relative is its neighbor Lithuanian; other Baltic languages, such as Old Prussian, are extinct. For information on the Baltic language branch from a historical point of view see DINI (1997), a beautiful book that combines linguistic and cultural history and includes an impressively large bibliography. The best reference for the historical-comparative approach is STANG (1966). For shorter overviews, see ECKERT et al. (1994: 15–70 with an annotated bibliography) or SCHMALSTIEG (1998).

Latvian shows several peculiarities, some of which can be related to language contact and may even be treated as phenomena of a *sprachbund* in the Baltic area. The most comprehensive treatment of languages of the Baltic Sea area is given in the book edited by DAHL & KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM (in press), where MARIA KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM and BERNHARD WÄLCHLI

² In the present volume, reference to ENDZELĪNS' grammar will include the paragraph in addition to the page, so that the reader may find the locus in both the Latvian and the German version.

give a very thorough account of the areal perspective and its limits; for an earlier treatment with focus on Latvian and Estonian, see STOLZ (1991).

Given all these sources, we may conclude that Latvian cannot remain a secret language for linguistic typology for long. And there is indeed a lot to be discovered!

2. Issues in the grammar of Latvian

In this section, I will survey some features of Latvian which have been explored in the past or which in my eyes deserve further investigation. Of course, the list is far from exhaustive. Rather, it is meant to raise the reader's interest and make him or her wish for further information. Reference to treatments in Latvian will be given only occasionally, as I suppose that those who read Latvian are familiar with the relevant literature (which is often inaccessible outside of Latvia). Still, linguists should always keep in mind that phenomena that seem to be "undiscovered" may have been treated at length by native linguists.

I will concentrate on issues of grammar and leave phonology completely aside. Of course, there are several interesting features there, too, e.g. phonemic tone (pitch). Monographic treatments of the Latvian sound system have been written by STEINBERGS (1977), DAHLERUS (1994) and LAUA (1997).

Nouns and noun phrases

There are two genders (masculine, feminine) and two numbers (singular, plural) in Latvian. Noteworthy are pluralia tantum, which are quite frequent and may be classed into several semantic groups (KOPIJEVSKAJA-TAMM & WÄLCHLI in press). Gender in nouns is closely connected to declension class; for nouns denoting persons and animals, the gender almost always corresponds to the sex of the referent.

The case system of modern Latvian consists of nominative, genitive, dative, accusative and locative. There are some remnants of a former instrumental (see ANDRONOV, this volume, for an overview of Latvian case morphology). Case is the major and often the only means to indicate the syntactic function of a noun phrase. Each case is expressed by an inflectional ending, the form depending on number and declension class. There is no morphologically unmarked form in a nominal paradigm. Some nouns have a vocative form which is formed by the bare stem, but for me, vocative forms are not part of the case paradigm (see below and NAU, this volume; for a different view, see ANDRONOV, this volume).

In a noun phrase, case is generally marked on the head noun and on several of its modifiers: adjectives, determiners and some (but not all) quantifiers, which also agree in gender and number. Examples:

- (1) *Ir septiņ-as galven-ās tēm-as, kas interesē cilvēk-u.*
 be:PRS:3 seven-NOM.F.PL main-NOM.F.PL theme-NOM.PL what:NOM
 interest:PRS:3 human.being-ACC
 'There are seven main themes which interest humans.' (Kargins)

- (2) *kād-ā populār-ā arheoloģij-ai vēltī-t-ā rakst-ā*
 some-LOC popular-LOC archeology-DAT dedicate-PPP-LOC essay-LOC
 'in some popular essay dedicated to archeology' (Vijups)

Latvian noun phrases may be very intricate when it comes to determining the head of the construction. Head features³ may be scattered over several constituents. The following example is somewhat extreme in this respect:

- (3) *kad vēl ne-bij-a iestāj-uš-ies mītisk-ie*
 when yet NEG-BC:PRT-3 scl.in-PAP-M.PL mythical-M.PL.NOM.DEF.
septiņsimt verdzīb-as gad-u
 seven hundred slavery-GEN year-M.PL.GEN
 'when the mythical seven hundred years of slavery hadn't yet set in' (Vijups)

In this example, the noun *gadu* 'year' (masculine; pl., gen.) is the semantic center of the phrase and the subcategorizand of the verb *iestāties* 'to set in' (for it is 'years' that set in, not 'seven hundreds' or 'mythicals'). It is also the determiner of concord for this verb and for the adjective *mītiskie* (both are marked masculine and plural in agreement with 'years'). The noun *gadu* is also a governor, as it determines the case (genitive) of the dependent noun *verdzība* 'slavery'. But it is in turn governed by the numeral '700', which calls for the genitive instead of the nominative, which is the case of the phrase. Therefore, the form *gadu* cannot be a distributional equivalent of the NP. One might argue that the numeral '700', besides being a governor, is also a determiner of concord, being inherently plural and triggering number agreement (cf. STOLZ & URDZE, this volume, footnote 23). The adjective *mītiskie* is dependent both semantically and morphosyntactically, as its form is determined by other elements. But it is also the sole locus where **all** categories of the phrase are marked: its inflectional ending expresses gender (masculine), number (plural), case (nominative) and definiteness. It may also serve as a distributional equivalent, though this might be semantically odd.

As seen in the above examples, Latvian is one of the IE languages where definiteness is encoded in the ending of adjectives. Apparently, the grammaticalization of definiteness by this means is more pronounced in Latvian than in its sisters and cousins (see LYONS (1999: 82–85); for Lithuanian, see AMBRAZAS (1997: 142–147)). Both definite and indefinite endings are used with adjectives within the NP. If the noun phrase contains a determiner which is inherently definite or indefinite, the adjective in modern Standard Latvian agrees with it. If there is no such determiner, the adjectival ending is the only means to express definiteness⁴. In some varieties of spoken Latvian, the demonstrative *tas* 'that' is used almost as a definite article; more rarely, the use of the indefinite pronoun and numeral *viens* 'one' may fulfill the function of an indefinite article (for examples, see NAU 1998: 22 f.). In my eyes, further investigation of the use and the various functions of definite and indefinite endings as well as the use of determiners in modern Latvian is sorely needed, especially research considering colloquial styles.

³ For the features referred to as "head features" (as **subcategorizand, governor, morphosyntactic locus, determinant of concord** etc.) cf. ZWICKY (1985) and HUDSON (1987).

⁴ For some problems of the syntactic analysis see SPENCER (2000: 183 f.).

Verbal categories

At first glance, the Latvian verb system seems to be familiar from a European point of view. Grammar books list six tense forms, of which three are simple and three are compound, a range of moods, and a passive voice. But there are several features that deserve a closer look.

Future tense is marked by a suffix, *-s-* or *-š-*, which is not common in European languages (cf. DAHL 2000), e.g. *es dziedāš-u* 'I will sing', *mēs dziedāš-im* 'we will sing'. The distinction between present and past, on the other hand, is expressed by a change of the stem and/or the selection of an ending, depending on conjugation class (see ANDRONOV 2000 for a new view on conjugation classes in Latvian). The use of the tense forms differs considerably in different varieties. In the written Standard, there is a fairly high correspondence between tense (present, past, and future) and time reference. In spoken varieties – dialects, colloquial standard and substandard – this varies. It is very common to use the present tense alongside the past tense when speaking about events in the past. This phenomenon is commonly referred to by the term "historical present", but in my eyes it goes far beyond what this term covers in other languages (e.g., spoken German). On the other hand, in some varieties, past tense is also used in general statements independent of the time frame, and even with reference to future events (cf. ENDZELIN 1922: 748 ff. [§ 755]; GÄTERS 1993: 307–309). A thorough investigation of tense in contemporary spoken Latvian would be highly desirable.

What is traditionally called mood in Latvian is actually a set of forms which differ considerably both in form and in function and do not stand in close paradigmatic opposition: the imperative, subjunctive, evidential, and debitive (see HOLVOET, this volume). The status of the imperative as a separate mood is rather weak in Latvian. In the standard variety, there is a special imperative form only for the second person plural, e.g. *dzied-iet!* 'sing! (PL)'. In many non-standard varieties, however, the same form is used for indicative and imperative, as is always the case for the second person singular. The subjunctive (or conditional) is marked by the suffix *-tu* for all persons. It has several functions in main and subordinate clauses (see NAU 1998: 34 f. and HOLVOET, this volume).

The Latvian evidential, traditionally called oblique or relative mood, has gotten some attention as an areal phenomenon. There are no morphological means to mark evidentiality in western European languages, but the phenomenon is found in the Balkan as well as in the Baltic area, namely in the Baltic languages Latvian and Lithuanian and the Balto-Finnic languages Estonian and Livonian (cf. STOLZ 1991: 45–50; WÄLCHLI 2000). The Latvian evidential developed from participles. There are forms for the present, future and past tense. The function of these forms is to report hearsay knowledge. It is used in independent as well as dependent clauses, but it is never obligatory. Example:

- (4) *Cit-i sak-a- tu es-ot visai skarb-s tip-s.*
 other-PL say:PRS-3 2SG **be-EVI** very harsh-NOM.SG.M fellow-NOM
 'Some say – you are a rather harsh fellow.' (Mielavs)

In some dialects, other forms of evidentiality markers have developed, and sometimes other kinds of evidentiality are covered, too. According to ANCFIJS (1977: 266–270), the dialect of Aknīste, which belongs to the High Latvian dialect group, has grammaticalized both an "auditive" (hearsay knowledge) and a "presumptive" (knowledge by inference).

The debitive is probably the most peculiar form of Latvian verbs. It is an invariable form built by a prefix and the stem and its meaning is obligation, e.g. *jā-dzied* 'has/have to sing'.

It involves a change of valency and may therefore be classified as a voice (cf. NAU 1998)⁵. The original subject turns into a dative argument, and direct objects are marked nominative instead of accusative. Example:

- (5) *Bet tai grāmat-ai bij-a jā-rāda maiņ-as.*
 but this:DAT.F book-DAT be:PRI-3 DEB-show change-NOM.PL
 'But this book had to show the changes.' (Sodums)

The debitive construction has been much debated, especially concerning the problem of subjecthood, as both the dative argument and the nominative argument have subject properties (FENNELL 1973; STOLZ 1987; SCHMALSTIEG 1990; HOLVOET 1993, and BERG-OLSEN, this volume).

Latvian is also rich in so called non-finite verb forms: there are four participles, three converbs, an infinitive, and a verbal noun (see EICHE (1983) for a corpus-based investigation of Latvian participles and converbs). Comparing these forms to the modals discussed above, the question arises as to how the notion of finiteness should be applied in Latvian. Disregarding the imperative, only indicative verb forms (the tenses) receive personal endings in agreement with the subject, but these are not the only forms one would wish to call finite from the point of view of syntax. It is questionable whether the division into finite and non-finite forms is at all important for the syntax or morphology of Latvian. A generalization that holds is that finite forms are restricted to predicative function. But this is also true for the debitive, which is non-finite, as it combines with a finite auxiliary. Moreover, the past active participle is also mainly used as a predicate, and it often appears without an accompanying auxiliary. Even a converb can be used as a predicate⁶, e.g. *kurp brauk-dam-i?* 'where are you going to?' (where.to go-CV2-PL.M). This example exhibits also the general tendency that finite wordforms develop out of non-finite (cf. KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM 1994); it also hints at the fact that the division of finite and non-finite forms is somewhat shaky.

Another area where it is difficult to draw a line is the distinction between lexical and grammatical meaning, regarding two morphological devices that are very active in Latvian: verbal prefixes and the reflexive marker. In Latvian linguistics both are often said to express "lexico-grammatical" categories. Reflexive verbs are the only phenomenon of Latvian that have been treated extensively within a monograph in a typological framework, namely that of the Lithuanian linguist EMMA GENIUŠIENĒ (1987); see also BERG-OLSEN, this volume, for a subclass of these verbs and their relation to voice. Prefixation of verbs affects the actionality of the lexeme and is thereby related to the grammatical category of aspect. For example, while *kopēt* 'to copy' designates the process of copying without reference to its borders, the prefixed form *no-kopēt* is either resultative or highlights the time frame within which the process is done. In such cases, the difference between the simplex and the prefixed verb is considered grammatical rather than lexical. However, such correspondences are not fully systematic and grammaticalized. The aspectuality of a given form is determined by an interplay of several factors: the semantics of the base, the prefix, the tense form, the case frame, accompanying adverbs and particles, and probably other factors. For some discussion of

⁵ Another interpretation is suggested by AXEL HOLVOET (1997 and this volume), who sees the debitive as a verbform with an incorporated modal auxiliary.

⁶ Thanks to STURLA BERG-OLSEN for drawing my attention to this fact and attesting the example to be still alive!

aspect in Latvian, see HAUZENBERGA-STURMA (1979) and STALIMANE (1958; 1959). Functionally related to prefixes are words (adverbs or verbal particles) such as *nost* 'down', *augšā* 'up' and many more, which are not found in Lithuanian and the neighboring Slavic languages, but abound in Estonian, German (Low and High) and the Scandinavian languages. Several lexical parallels suggest language contact having left its mark here (cf. NAU 1996; WÄLCHLI in press). In the present volume, BERNHARD WÄLCHLI discusses differences between prefixes and particles and their interplay as means expressing displacement in Latvian.

Clause structure

Again, on first view, Latvian clause structure seems to be similar to that of other European languages. Verbal clauses may be successfully described with a model of dependency grammar, where the verbal predicate is the head that determines the number of arguments along with their morphosyntactic and semantic properties (see LAGZDIŅA in preparation; URDZE 1998, and STOLZ & URDZE, this volume). But there are several features that distinguish Latvian clauses from those of, for example, Germanic and Romance languages.

For one, arguments that we might suppose to be obligatory may also be omitted. This goes far beyond what often is called "pro-drop", the omission of personal pronouns when there is person-marking on the verb. Given that the context allows identification of who does what, 1st and 2nd person subject pronouns are not obligatory even if the verb is in a form without agreement-marking (cf. STOLZ & URDZE, this volume). Principally, this is also true for the 3rd person, though here, this kind of "pro-drop" is admittedly very rare. In case of general reference ("zero-subject"), subjects are usually left unspecified. The following example shows omission of objects and zero-subjects. The transitive verb *uzlabot* 'to make better, to improve' is used two times without any argument; the patient is 'anything that is good', recovered from the preceding sentence, while the underlying agent and subject of all predicates in the second sentence is 'one, whoever':

- (6) *Kas ir lab-s, tas jā-saglabā.*
 what:NOM be:PRS:3 good-NOM, that:NOM DEB-preserve.
Var tikai uzlabo-t, bet, lai uzlabo-tu, jā-atrod,
 be.able:PRS:3 only improve-INF but CNJ improve-SUB DEB-find
taisni ko no tā vis-a uzlabo-t.
 exactly what:ACC of that:GEN all-GEN improve-INF
 'What is good has to be preserved. [One] may only improve [it], but, in order to improve [it/something], [one] has to find exactly what [part] of all that [should be] improved.'
 (Mozgis)

The non-obligatoriness of arguments is one of several features that make the distinction of grammatical relations such as subject and direct object less straightforward than in other European languages. In the present volume, this will be explored in more detail by STURLA BERG-OLSEN.

In addition to verbal clauses, Latvian makes frequent use of non-verbal predication and of existential clauses (see NAU 1998: 51–55 for a classification and examples). Possession is also expressed by an existential clause, with the possessed as a nominative subject and the possessor in the dative (there is no verb meaning 'have'). Examples:

- (7) *Taisnīb-a tiem, kas salīdzin-a televīzij-u ar narkotik-u.*
 truth-NOM those:DAT who:NOM compare:PRS-3 television-ACC with dope-ACC
 'Those who compare television with dope are right.' (BETA)
- (8) *Tāču šai versij-ai piekritēj-u faktiski nav*
 however this:DAT.F version-DAT supporter-GEN.PL actually NEG:be:PRS:3
 'However, this version doesn't actually have adherents.' (Liberija)

In negated clauses of this type, the subject is often turned into an argument in the genitive case (see ex. (8)). While this rule holds fairly well for the written language, in spoken varieties the nominative is used alongside the genitive, probably with equal frequency (cf. BERG-OLSEN 1999).

Pragmatics: diminutives and vocatives

Diminutives are very frequent in spoken Latvian. Every noun may receive a diminutive suffix, occasionally also words of other lexical classes. Example:

- (9) *Šobrīd man ir ne-liel-s korpus-iņ-š*
 at.present 1SG:DAT be:PRS:3 NEG-big-NOM.M corpus-DIM-NOM
un arī konkordanc-es programm-iņ-a ir
 and also concordance-GEN program-DIM-NOM be:PRS:3
 'At present, I have [only] a small corpus, and there is also a [little] concordance program' (EVERITA MILČONOKA, personal email)

Latvian diminutives have been studied mainly from a morphological and lexicological point of view (RŪKE-DRAVIŅA 1953; 1959). The functions of this device in modern spoken Latvian deserve further investigation. As in other languages, the diminutive is used far beyond its "literal" meaning of diminution. It is a typical means to show affection and endearment. But it is also used in conversations outside the private sphere, e.g. between customer and clerk; here, it marks politeness. A related use which in my eyes is quite remarkable is found in terms of address in combination with the vocative⁷. For example, it is common to address a (female) physician as *dakterīt!* and a (male or female) conductor as *šoferīt!*; in these forms, *-īt* is the diminutive suffix and the vocative is marked by zero-ending. A special vocative cannot be formed from all nouns; the diminutive suffix increases the possibilities for this form considerably. For example, female names with monosyllabic stems (like *Baib-a, Aij-a, Ilz-e*) are normally not used with a zero-ending vocative form (? *Baib! Ilz!*), but with a diminutive suffix, these are usual (*Baib-iņ! Ilz-īt!*). This cannot be explained by phonological reasons alone, as other monosyllabic vocatives are possible, e.g. *māt!* < *māt-e* 'mother', *siev!* < *siev-a* 'wife'. On the whole, the use of vocatives seems to be a very interesting topic, and research on it should probably include investigations on the diminutive.

⁷ Thanks to OLITA RAUSE and EVERITA MILČONOKA for consultancy on vocatives!

3. Typological approaches: the contributions to this volume

The macroperspective of large-scale typological investigations has to be complemented by the microperspective of in-depth studies of individual languages: this is the credo of the present volume in a nutshell. All contributors have a profound knowledge of the Latvian language and are familiar with several of its varieties. For the purpose at hand, we chose to focus on the standard language and to gather our data mainly from written sources, but there are also side-glances at other varieties as well. Our common approach is to take up an issue of general interest in linguistics, especially in the field of typology, and to explore in detail how it is treated in Latvian.

ALEKSEY V. ANDRONOV (St. Petersburg) surveys the Latvian case system from a morphological point of view, based on a method developed by A. A. ZALIZNJAK. Some problematic issues discussed are the status of the instrumental and the vocative as case forms.

STURLA BERG-OLSEN (Oslo) discusses the notion of subject and its application to several kinds of arguments in Latvian, taking into account a variety of factors and valency-changing mechanisms. Worth noting is also his method of data collection: he found all his examples in the internet. If any proof were needed for the claim that Latvian is a fully-fledged modern European language, here it is.

AXEL HOLVOET (Vilnius) explores the expression of modality in Latvian, covering not only the moods in a stricter sense, but also the debitive, modal verbs and modal particles. His study is based on a broad collection of examples drawn from 20th century prose and drama.

My own paper (NICOLE NAU, Kiel) is devoted to the distinction between inflectional and derivational morphology and its correlation to the split between the fusional and the agglutinative language type.

THOMAS STOLZ and AINA URDZE (Bremen) investigate head-marking and dependent-marking strategies in clauses and phrases, following the parameters laid out by J. NICHOLS. Their approach is strictly corpus-based, each claim supported with examples found in their corpus of contemporary Latvian prose.

BERNHARD WÄLCHLI (Bern & Stockholm) suggests a new typology of movement and displacement, crossing the border between lexical and grammatical means of expression. To exemplify his general claims, he uses a corpus of translations of the gospel according to Marc. His paper thus combines the macroperspective with a detailed study of a single language, Latvian.

The main objectives of the present volume are to make Latvian better known among general linguists and typologists and to generate further interest in the language. In addition, I hope that this collection will be of interest to our colleagues in Latvia, presenting as it does an outsiders' perspective on the Latvian language. We hope that in this manner we will stimulate further cooperation between linguists of all persuasions and native speakers.

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	INF	infinitive
CNJ	conjunction	LOC	locative
CV2	converb 2 (-dam-)	M	masculine
DAT	dative	NEG	negation
DEB	debitive	NOM	nominative
DEF	definite	PAP	past active participle
DIM	diminutive	PL	plural
EVI	evidential	PPP	past passive participle
F	feminine	PRS	present tense
GEN	genitive	PRT	preterite (past tense)
IE	Indo-European	SG	singular
		SUB	subjunctive

Sources

- Beta = Interview with model and fashion-artist Beatrice Gore, *Santa* 9/1999, 52–56.
 Kargins = Interview with Valērijs Kargins, bank director, *Rīgas Laiks* 9/2000, 9–13 + 51.
 Liberija = Essay by Lato Lapsa on a legendary library, *Rīgas Laiks* 9/2000, 30–35.
 Mielavs = Interview with the songwriter Ainars Mielavs, *Santa* 10/2000, 38–42.
 Mozgis = Interview with Dzintars Mozgis, surgeon and director of a children's hospital, *Rīgas Laiks* 11/1998, 42–49.
 Sodums = Interview with the poet and translator Dzintars Sodums, *Rīgas Laiks* 1/1998, 40–47.
 Vījups = Interview with archeologist Armands Vījups, *Rīgas Laiks* 6/2000, 16–19.

References

- ADOLF, HEINRICH (1978[1685]): *Erster Versuch einer kurz-verfassten Anleitung zur lettischen Sprache*. Unveränderter Nachdruck der Ausgabe Mitau 1685. Hrsg. und mit einem Vorwort versehen von HARALD HAARMANN. (Linguarum Minorum Documenta Historiographica 2). Hamburg: Buske.
 AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS (ed.) (1997): *Lithuanian grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
 ANČIŅIS, KRĪŠĀNIS (1977): *Aknīstes izloksne: izloksnes stātikā un dināmikā; ievads fonētikā, morfoloģijā*. Rīgā: Zinātne.
 ANDRONOV, ALEKSEY (2000): Some remarks on the system of Lithuanian and Latvian conjugation, in: *Linguistica Baltica* 8, 35–47.
 BALODE, LAIMUTE & HOLVOET, AXEL (in press): The Latvian language and its dialects, in: DAHL, ÖSTEN & KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM, MARIA (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
 BERG-OLSEN, STURLA (1999): A syntactic change in progress: The decline in the use of the non-prepositional genitive in Latvian, with a comparative view on Lithuanian. Magister artium, Departement of East-European and Oriental Studies, University of Oslo, Oslo.
 BIELENSTEIN, AUGUST (1863): *Handbuch der lettischen Sprache. I. Grammatik*. Mitau: Lucas.
 BIELENSTEIN, AUGUST (1863–1864): *Die lettische Sprache, nach ihren Lauten und Formen erklärend und vergleichend dargestellt. Erster Theil: Die Laute. Die Wortbildung. Zweiter Theil: Die Wortbeugung*. Unveränderter Nachdruck Zentralantiquariat der DDR, Leipzig 1972. Berlin: Dümmler.
 DAHL, ÖSTEN (2000): The grammar of future time reference in European languages, in: DAHL, ÖSTEN (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 309–328.
 DAHL, ÖSTEN & KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM, MARIA (eds.) (in press): *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
 DAHLERUS, LARS (1994): *Kortfattad lettisk uttalslära*. Lidingsö: Instructor.
 DINI, PIETRO U. (1997): *Le lingue baltiche* (Biblioteca di cultura 223. Lingue d'Europa 5). Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

