

The Indo-European Verbal Adjectives and their Reflexes in Latin

LUCIE PULTROVÁ (*Prague*)

Word-formation, the field of Latin linguistics the present article belongs to, has for a long time been rather neglected, and although recently particularly the French researchers have tried to fill in the blank space (putting stress rather at the semantic, not the formal features), what still remains the most comprehensive systematic survey on derivation of Latin nouns is the chapter *Stammbildung des Nomens* (p. 273-383) of Leumann's grammar book.¹ Leumann's survey stems from traditional Indo-Europeanist interpretations, classing the single derivative suffixes according to their phonological form. Such method is convenient for the purposes of comparative linguistics, at the same time, however, it brings forth a number of disadvantages: the reviews of that type, for example, when treating polyfunctional suffixes, explain functionally quite different word types side-by-side; they do not offer clear picture about what the given language prefers when choosing from the set of the IE suffixes, about the distribution of synonymous suffixes, etc. That is why I consider the method which has gained ground for example in Czech word-formation² to be preferable: in the first plan, the words are classified according to what part of speech they belong to; in the second plan, according to the part of speech the founding word belongs to (desubstantives, deadjectives, deverbatives); finally, in the third plan, the words are classified into the more or less traditional word-formative classes (e.g. agent-nouns, instrument-nouns, etc.). This function-based classification, however, does not prevent

¹ MANU LEUMANN, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, Lateinische Grammatik I*, München 1977 (hereafter LEUMANN 1977).

² Mainly MILAN DOKULIL, *Tvoření slov v češtině*, I, *Teorie odvozování slov*, Praha 1962. Similar approach is however suggested also by Leumann himself in his article *Gruppierung und Funktionen der Wortbildungssuffixe des Lateins* (in: *Kleine Schriften zur lateinischen, griechischen, indogermanischen und allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft*, Zürich 1959, p. 84-107).

the purely formal (i.e. in fact phonological) analysis I am attempting to make in the present and some other similarly aimed studies, the ideal result of which should be in fact a kind of algorithm for Latin word-formation where some types (and this is in fact already the outcome of the research) are direct successors of inherited PIE formations, some are to a great extent influenced by analogy, and yet some other are the purely secondary formations, originated in Latin.

The present article is concerned with one of the important classes of deverbative adjectives, the verbal adjectives. First, the terms of “deverbative adjectives” and “verbal adjectives” must be clearly defined. “Adjectives” are the words expressing the static features of substances, i.e. their qualities or relations towards them that do not proceed in time and are more or less permanent (unlike the verbs, expressing the dynamic features, i.e. the ones proceeding in time). Using the term “deverbative” I mean only the direct derivatives from verbs, or verb roots; I thus do not consider the derivatives like e.g. *captīvus* to be “deverbative”: it has a verb root in its base, but its direct founding word is the adj. *captus*, and the word must be classified as “de-adjective”, similarly as for example *fēstīvus* < *fēstus*. Thus I understand the term “deverbative adjectives” to be the words with formal signs of adjectives (nominal categories, the distinction of gender) that are derived by an adjectival suffix directly from the verbal root or stem.

By “verbal adjectives” I mean a set of words, in fact an intersection of deverbative adjectives and verbs; formally they are adjectives, but with specific presence of some verbal categories – voice, aspect and relative time; also they keep the government of the corresponding verb. The action described by them is defined in time, and thus it does not express a permanent feature of substance as other adjectives do. In Brugmann,³ it is the term “participle” that corresponds to the term verbal adjective.

In PIE, verbal adjectives were formed by the following suffixes:⁴ **-nt-* (active participles of all tenses except the perfect); **-ues-/*-uos-/*-us-* (part. pf. act.); **-mno-* and **-mo-* (part. mediopass.); also the adjectives in **-to-* and **-no-* (part. pf. pass.) have gained participle character; and finally, the IE adjectives with the suffix **-lo-* (in Slavic languages function as part. pret. act.), **-o-* and **-uo-* (active current action or state)⁵ can be regarded as verbal adjectives, too.

³ KARL BRUGMANN, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, II/1, *Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*, Strassburg 1906 (hereafter BRUGMANN 1906).

⁴ See *idem*, p. 651.

⁵ See *idem*, p. 148ff., 202ff.

The aim of the present article is to find out whether these basic IE types have direct successors in Latin and what formal or semantic shifts have eventually taken place there. The dictionary Pražák-Novotný-Sedláček⁶ was chosen as a basic set of Latin words for excerption (it restricts itself, suitable to our purposes, to archaic and classical vocabulary); if need be complemented by the material from various studies on single Latin suffixes and partly also from Gradenwitz' retrograde dictionary (although only to a limited extent, since the dictionary contains big number of later derivations, irrelevant to our purposes).⁷ The excerpted file contains only the really recorded adjectives, not the substantivized adjectives which do not appear in the function of adjectives in classical Latin. Also verbal adjective compounds were excluded from the present research, as they form a specific word-formative chapter and they will require a special study.

1. Adjectives with the suffix **-nt-*

Adjectives with the suffix **-nt-* had the function of active present participle in PIE and they still have this function in the absolute majority of individual IE languages. Same was the situation in Latin. For PIE, two forms of the *nt*-participle are reconstructed on the basis of comparison: 1/ a hysterokinetic paradigm for athematic verbs **R(z)-ént-*⁸ (e.g. **drk'-ént-* > Gr. δρακεῖς), 2/ an acrostatic paradigm for thematic verbs **R(e)-o-nt-* (e.g. **b^hér-ont-* > Gr. φέρων), where apparently the *o*-grade (in strong cases) and the zero-grade (in weak cases) alternate in the suffix.⁹

Latin ppa. are formed absolutely regularly and from the synchronic point of view they have the following structure: from the verbs of the 1st–3rd conjugation the present stem + *-nt-* (in the 3rd conjugation with lengthening before the *ns*), i.e. *ar-ā-ns*, *sed-ē-ns*, *leg-ē-ns*, in the verbs of the 4th conjugation the suffix *-nt-* is connected to the root by the group *-iē-*: *haur-iē-ns*. Certainly, the ppa. from the secondary verbs can be described like that; however, as far as the participles from the primary verbs are concerned, the question occurs: can we regard them to be the formations directly inherited from PIE, or are

⁶ JOSEF M. PRAŽÁK – FRANTIŠEK NOVOTNÝ – JOSEF SEDLÁČEK, *Latinsko-český slovník*, Praha 1955.

⁷ OTTO GRADENWITZ, *Laterculi vocum Latinarum*, Hildesheim 1966 (reprint 1904).

⁸ The symbol R(z) denotes the root in a zero-grade, R(e) the root in a full *e*-grade, R(o) the root in an *o*-grade.

⁹ Cf. MICHAEL MEIER-BRÜGGER, *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin – New York 2000, p. 173 (hereafter MEIER-BRÜGGER 2000); BRUGMANN 1906, p. 454ff.

they rather analogical formations in which it is only the suffix *-nt-* that may be considered inherited, while the whole structure of the word had assimilated analogically to the present paradigm of Latin verb? Let us take for example one primary verb from each conjugation and see what Latin forms should issue from the reconstructed PIE forms according to the formulated Latin phonological laws:

arāre (LIV, p. 272): $*h_2rh_3\text{-ént-s}, *h_2rh_3\text{-nt-és} > **arōns,$ ¹⁰ *arantis*¹¹:
CRHRC > CRaRC

flēre (LIV, p. 87): $b^h lh_1\text{-ént-s}, b^h lh_1\text{-nt-és} > flēns,$ ***flantis*

legere (LIV, p. 397): $lég\text{-ont-s}, \text{gen. } lég\text{-nt-es} > **legōns,$ *legentis*

haurīre (LIV, p. 275): $h_2\text{éus-ont-s}, \text{gen. } h_2\text{éus-nt-es} > **haurōns,$ ***haurēntis.*

In the first three cases, at least one of the forms issuing from the reconstructed PIE is in accord with the actual existing form of Latin ppa., and we could thus consider mere analogical compensation within the paradigm, which is almost absolutely regular in Latin (typically, however, the form of strong cases assimilates to the form of weak cases, and the type *flēns* would thus not hold to the rule); but a glance at the ppa. from the verb of the 4th conjugation very clearly testifies to analogical form, i.e. one not inherited from PIE. What shows evidence of the secondary nature of Latin ppa. is moreover also the fact that they are of one form for all genders, i.e. the animate nominative *-s* penetrated into the neuter forms, and there is no special feminine form (there was a derived feminine form $*\text{-nt-ih}_2\text{-}$ in PIE). Perhaps the form of ppa. from the irregular verb *esse*: $*h_1s\text{-ént-s}, *h_1s\text{-nt-ós} > (ab\text{-})sēns,$ *(ab\text{-})sentis* may be considered original.¹²

2. Adjectives with the suffix **-ues-*

Besides active present participles, active perfect participles were formed in PIE, with the suffix $*\text{-ues-}/*\text{-uos-}/*\text{-us-}$; the paradigm is reconstructed as hysterokinetic, with a full *o*-grade, i.e. strong cases $*R(z)\text{-uós-}$, weak cases

¹⁰ By two asterisks I mark the formations which should have developed – according to the formulated sound laws – from the accepted reconstructions, but which in fact do not exist.

¹¹ See PETER SCHRIJVER, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*, Amsterdam – Atlanta 1991, p. 223f. (hereafter SCHRIJVER 1991).

¹² The form of ppa. from another irregular verb, *īre*, should have developed from the reconstructed PIE form into Latin as *iēns*, ***ientis* (< $*h_1i\text{-ént-s}, *h_1i\text{-nt-és}$; cf. LIV, p. p.

*R(z)-us-.¹³ Perfect active participles had not come down to Latin, undoubtedly due to the merger of the perfect and aorist stem. The only direct successor of this PIE formation in Latin is to be found in the adj. *memor*, *memoris* < **me-ṛn-uo̯s*, **me-mṛ-us-és*.

3. Adjectives with the suffix *-uó- and *-ó-

The IE verbal adjectives with the suffix *-uó- do not belong to the basic types of IE verbal adjectives (participles), nevertheless it is appropriate to mention them in this list, since in many IE languages the adjectives are formed by this suffix with the meaning very similar to that of the adjectives with the suffix *-nt- or *-ues- (cf. e.g. OInd. *rk-vás*, „celebrating“; OInd. *jī-vás*, OSl. *živь*, „alive“, etc.). Brugmann actually says the suffixes *-uó- and *-ues- are closely connected.¹⁴ The stress in *uo*-adjectives falls on the suffix, the root is in a zero-grade.

Formally different but functionally again very similar type is represented by the IE adjectives in the form *R(o)-ós, e.g. Gr. *τομός*, „cutting“. These adjectives often appear as a second component of compounds, which are not the subject of this article.¹⁵

In Latin there are to be found verbal adjectives ending in *-vus*, *-uus* and *-us*. In regard to the fact that the consonant *u* is highly unstable, we must be very careful when interpreting them. In the following list only those Latin adjectives in *-vus/-uus* a *-us* are given that are demonstrably deverbative (mainly the suffix *-vus* is polyfunctional and many different types of denominative adjectives are formed thereby) and they are not compounds.¹⁶

Latin adjectives in *-vus/-uus*:

arduus = “high, steep”; SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 69, reconstructs **h₃rd^h-uo̯s*; LIV does not mention any relevant root, according to IEW (p. 339) it is a ver-

232). BRUGMANN 1906, p. 456, note 2, explains the form of indirect cases *eunt-* by analogical assimilation to the *eunt*, *eundum*.

¹³ Cf. MEIER-BRÜGGER 2000, p. 173f.; BRUGMANN 1906, p. 53.

¹⁴ *Idem*, p. 563.

¹⁵ In Latin, there are to be found for example the adjectives as *maledicus*, *magnificus*, etc. (in the root, there however is not an *o*-grade, but a zero-grade); what testifies to their functional relation with the active *nt*-participles is also the fact their comparatives and superlatives are in the forms *-dicentior*, *-dicentissimus*; *-ficientior*, *-ficientissimus*, etc., i.e. as if were from the positives *-ficēns*, *-dicēns*, etc.

¹⁶ There exists a relatively important group of adjective compounds (i.e. in the form prefix + root + suffix) with the suffix *-uus*, e.g. *contiguus*, *dividuus* and similar, which

bal root meaning “be high, grow”; the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin; the adjective has the meaning of the original stative perfect:¹⁷ “what has grown and is therefore high”

arvus = “ploughed, arable”; formally corresponds to the construction $*h_2rh_3-uo\acute{s}$ (LIV, p. 272: $*h_2\acute{e}rh_3-$, “plough”); the verb *arāre* is transitive in Latin, the meaning of adj. *arvus* is simply passive: “what is ploughed”, or that of passive possibility: “what may be ploughed, arable”

cavus = “hollow, hollowed out”; SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 109, reconstructs the verbal root $*keuH-$ (cf. IEW, p. 588: $*keu-$, $*keu\theta-$) and the adj. *cavus* as an adj. of the type $\tau\omicron\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, i.e. $*kouH-\acute{o}s$; according to LIV (p. 339) the verb root has the form $*k'ueh_1-$ (“swell, heave up”), *uo*-adjective from the given root would thus have the structure $*k'uh_1-uo\acute{s}$ > $**c\bar{u}vus$ or $**cuvus$ or *cavus*;¹⁸ the corresponding primary verb does not exist in Latin (*cavāre* is the denominative from *cavus*), the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “what has heaved up and is therefore bulging, swollen”

curvus = “curved”; IEW (p. 935) reconstructs the root $*(s)ker-$, “bent (one-self)” (LIV nor SCHRIJVER 1991 list this adjective and the verbal root); adj. *curvus* corresponds formally to the reconstruction $*(s)k^{(')}r-uo\acute{s}$; the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “what has bent and is therefore curved”

fatuus = “inept”; according to IEW (p. 111) verbal root $*b^h\acute{a}t-$: $*b^h\acute{\theta}t-$ (i.e. $*b^heh_2t-$) with the meaning “hit, punch”; the meaning of the adjective is according to IEW “hit, punched”, i.e. “dull, inept”; the corresponding pri-

have the meaning of passive possibility. The deverbative adjective compounds will be treated in an individual study.

¹⁷ The perfect in PIE was originally formed only from intransitive verbs, expressing the state of the subject (= stative perfect, *bibī* = “I have drunk”); the so called resultative perfect from transitive verbs (expressing the state in relation to the object, *bibī alqd* = “I have drunk something”) is the matter of the later development. H. Kurzová has formulated a theory claiming that the cornerstone of PIE verbal system was the opposition of “active” and “non-active” diathesis. Active verbs express imperfective (= present) or perfective (= aorist) actions (where the subject is the agent and is not directly affected by the action), non-active verbs do not have an object, the subject is both the agent and the recipient of verbal action, it is directly affected by the action; they express processes (= medium) and states (= perfect); see HELENA KURZOVÁ, *From Indo-European to Latin. The Evolution of a Morphosyntactic Type*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia 1993.

¹⁸ According to SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 232ff., the group *CuHC* in Latin yields either *CūC*, or *CuC*. That is, however, not the only possible development – e.g. the verb *quatīō* comes from $*(s)kuh_1t-i\acute{e}-$, i.e. here, the root vowel *u* together with the preceding initial velar formed the labiovelar (> $*k^u h_1t-i\acute{e}-$). Similar development may have taken place also in the adj. *cavus*: $*k'uh_1-uo\acute{s}$ > $*k^u h_1-uo\acute{s}$ > *qua uos* > by dissimilation *cavus*.

mary verb does not exist in Latin, the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “who has hit himself into head and is therefore inept”

(*gnāvus* = “diligent, active”; formally corresponds to the reconstruction **gnh₃-uós* (LIV, p. 168: **g’neh₃-*: “get to know, learn”); the verb appears in Latin as inchoative (*gnōscō*; the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “who has learned something and is therefore experienced”, eventually “who knows how to do something”, “efficient”

mortuus = “dead”; formally corresponds to the reconstruction **mr-t-uós* (LIV, p. 430: **mer-*, “die”); Latin has the deponent verb *morior*, the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “who has died and is therefore dead”¹⁹

mūtuis = “mutual, on loan”; according to LIV (p. 430) the verbal root meaning “change” sounds **mei_hth₂-*, *uó*-adjective should then have the form **mith₂-uós* > ***mituus*; in Latin there is the transitive *mūtāre* (where the root vowel *ū* reflects the *o*-grade *oi*), the adj. has a simple passive meaning: “exchanged, lend”, or the meaning of a passive possibility “interchangeable, borrowable”

nocuus = “noxious”; formally clearly secondarily formed to Lat. *nocēre*, “harm” (adj. *nocuus* is used only once in classical Latin, by Ovid); the verbal root is **nek’-* (“to get lost”, LIV, p. 451; **n₆k’-uós* > ***necus*); the meaning of the adjective is active non-actual, ascribing a remarkable, excessive quality to the subject (similarly to e.g. the Czech *hravý*, etc.)

pāscuus = “used or suitable for pasture”; according to LIV (p. 460) the verbal root **peh₂(i)-* meaning “pasture, graze”, hence the inchoative verb **ph₂-sk’é-* > *pāscere*; adj. *pāscuus* is thus evidently secondary, with simply passive meaning: “where we pasture”, or the meaning of passive possibility: “where we can pasture”

prāvus = “crooked, perverse”; IEW (p. 843) with uncertainty (the records are only from Latin and some Celtic languages) reconstructs the root **prā-*, “bend”; LIV does not mention such root, and neither does SCHRIJVER 1991; if we rewrite the form given in IEW using laryngeals, then we have to count with the root **preH-* or **perH-*; i.e. **prH-uós* > *prāvus*; the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect “who has bent and is therefore crooked”

¹⁹ Concerning the suffix *-t-* before *-uo-* in the Latin form (but also for example in Slavic languages), it is usually explained as follows (e.g. BRUGMANN 1906, p. 448): the original participle with the meaning “dead” was **mr-tós* (see e.g. OInd. *mrtá-*), eventually enlarged by the suffix *-uo-*, analogically to the form *vīvus*.

riguus = “irrigating, irrigated”; LIV (p. 498) with uncertainty gives the root **reg-*, “flow, drip”, *uó*-adjective should then have the form **r_eg'-uós*, which should yield ***reguus* in Latin; Lat. transitive verb *rigāre* has the meaning “to supply with water” and it is a secondary decompound from *irrigāre* (the same verb type as the compounds *-ficāre*, *-spicāre*, etc.); the adjective can have both active and passive meaning

torvus = “grim, terrifying”; formally corresponds to the reconstruction **trg^u-uós* (LIV, p. 632: **terg^u-*, “terrify”); corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the meaning of the adjective is active non-actual (similar to the previously mentioned *nocuus*)

vacuus = “empty”; formally corresponds to the reconstruction **h₁uh₂-k-uós* (IEW, p. 345 gives the root **uā- : *uə-*, in Italic languages with the enlargement *-k-*, with the meaning “lack, be empty”, which corresponds to the meaning of Latin verb *vacāre*; LIV, p. 254 gives the same verb root **h₁ueh₂-* with the meaning “leave, empty”); the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “who has lost/is lacking everything and is therefore empty”

viduus = “widowed, lonely”; formally corresponds to the reconstruction **h₂uid^h-uós* (IEW, p. 1127f. gives the root **ueid^h-* with the meaning “separate”, which in my opinion much better illustrates the meaning of the derivatives in other languages than the meaning “afflict deadly”, which is ascribed to the same root, in the form **h₂uied^h-*, by LIV, p. 294); the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “who has (been) separated and is therefore lonely”

vīvus = “alive”; formally corresponds to the reconstruction **g^uih₃-uós* (LIV, p. 215: **g^uieh₃-* “live”); Latin has the verb *vīvere*, “live”, the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “who has come into the world and is therefore alive”

As can be seen from the previous list, a vast majority of Latin adjectives corresponds in the meaning to the stative perfect, i.e. to the meaning thought to be carried in PIE by the suffix **-ues-* (which, as was mentioned previously, is regarded as closely related to the suffix **-uo-*). The adjectives from the list actually carrying this meaning agree at the same time also formally with the PIE reconstruction **R(z)-uós*: *arduus*, *cavus*, *curvus*, *fatuus*, *gnāvus*, *mortuus*, *prāvus*, *vacuus*, *viduus*, *vīvus*.

What goes beyond the scope of the system functionally are firstly the two adjectives with the meaning of active non-actual process (*nocuus* and *torvus*), and then the passive adjectives *arvus*, *mītuus*, *pāscuus* and the active/passive *riguus*; the last three mentioned adjectives and the adj. *nocuus* are even formally evidently not original.

In respect to the form of the suffix, following a vowel or *r* (other sonants are not recorded), *u* is non-syllabic (-*vus*), following a stop, there is a syllabic *u* (-*uus*).

Latin adjectives in -*us*:

[PIE adjectives in *-*ós* are reconstructed, as was said previously, with the root in the *o*-grade. However, in respect to the fact that Latin compounds which demonstrably belong to the type do not have the root in the *o*-grade but apparently in the zero-grade – e.g. *magni-ficus*, *vāti-cinus*, etc., see above the note 15 –, we must verify two possibilities: *R(o)-*ós* and *R(z)-*ós*.]

fidus = “faithful, reliable”; according to LIV (p. 71) the verbal root is **b^heid^h-*, “commit oneself to, gain confidence”, i.e. **b^hid^h-ós* > ***fidus* / **b^hoid^h-ós* > ***foidus*; Latin has the verb *fidere*, “trust”, the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect “who has gained confidence and is therefore faithful/reliable”

lippus = “festering, sticky”; according to LIV (p. 408) the verbal root is **leip-*, “be sticky”, i.e. **lip-ós* > ***lipus* / **loip-ós* > **loepus*; IEW (p. 670) interprets -*pp-* as expressive gemination; the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the meaning of the adjective is stative

merus = “pure, unalloyed”; according to IEW (p. 733) in the base of this adjective there is the verbal root **mer-* with the meaning “sparkle”, LIV does not mention this root and judging from the other words of the same word base listed in IEW it is highly disputable whether it is really a verbal root; if it is, then **m_r-ós* > *merus* / **mor-ós* > ***morus*; the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the meaning of the adjective (originally perhaps “shiny”, “bright”) is stative

parcus = “thrifty”; according to LIV (p. 476) the verbal root **perk-*, “fill up” (the semantic shift probably “fill up” → “gather stocks” → “be thrifty”; IEW does not mention this verbal root, according to WH it has the meaning “economize, leave out, hold back”), i.e. **prk-ós* > *parcus*²⁰ / **pork-ós* > ***porcus*; Latin has the verb *parcere*, “spare”, the meaning of the adject-

²⁰ Although according to the traditional interpretation, the sonant *r* yields *or*, and only in some cases *ar* in Latin (according to LEUMANN 1977, p. 58, before a vowel; cf. also GERHARD MEISER, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt 1998, p. 64), the development *r* > *ar* is in fact much more frequent; cf. LUCIE PULTROVÁ, *The Vocalism of Latin Medial Syllables*, Praha 2006, p. 92 (all the primary Latin verbs with the PIE root *CrC*, i.e. *CrC* in the zero-grade, researched in this work have *CarC* in Latin in the initial syllable: *spargō* < **sp^hrh₂-g-é-*, *pariō* < **prh₃-jé-*, *arceō* < **h₂rk^(ʷ)-éjé-*, *carpō* < *(*s*)*krp-*).

- tive is apparently stative again: “who is thrifty”, or (suppose we accept the meaning given in LIV) active non-actual: “who gathers stock” (the first variant seems to us to be more concise in respect to the fact that the Latin verb is intransitive)
- sāgus* = “prophetic”; according to LIV (p. 520) the verbal root is **seh₂g^(ʰ)-*, “track”, i.e. **sh₂g^(ʰ)-ós* > ***sagus* / **soh₂g^(ʰ)-ós* > ***sōgus*; the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the meaning of the adjective is active non-actual
- siccus* = “dry”; according to LIV (p. 523) the verbal root is **seik^u-*, “pour out”, i.e. **sik^u-ós* > ***sicus* (-*quo-* > -*co-*, see LEUMANN 1977, p. 137) or **soik^u-ós* > ***soecus*; the corresponding primary verb does not exist in Latin (only the deadjective *siccāre*), the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “what has been poured out/lost liquid, and is dry now”
- truncus* = “mutilated”; according to LIV (p. 649) the verbal root is **trenk-*, “press” (IEW, p. 1093: “press down, compress”), i.e. **trnk-ós* > ***trencus* / **tronk-ós* > *truncus* (see LEUMANN 1977, p. 48f.); the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the meaning of the adjective is passive
- uncus* = “crooked”; according to LIV (p. 268) the verbal root is **h₂enk-*, „bend, fold“, **h₂nk-ós* > ***ancus* (see SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 59ff.) / **h₂onk-ós* > *uncus*; the corresponding verb does not exist in Latin, the adjective has the meaning of the stative perfect: “what has bent and is therefore crooked”
- vagus* = “wandering”; according to IEW (p. 1120) it belongs to the root **uāg-* : **uāg-*, “be curved”; LIV does not mention any such root; WH connects the adj. *vagus*, “wandering, unstable”, and the verb *vagārī*, “hang around, sprawl”, to the Gr. ἄγνυμι, which is classed with the root **ueh₂g^(ʰ)-*, “break” by LIV (p. 664) (in IEW on p. 1110, **uāg-*, “cover”); i.e. apparently **uh₂g^(ʰ)-ós* > *vagus* / **uoh₂g^(ʰ)-ós* > ***vōgus*; the verb *vagārī* is denominative, the adjective apparently has the active, non-actual meaning: “who often wanders”

Nomina agentis in *-ós* in IE languages are typically formed from active verbs and have an active meaning (cf. also the Latin compounds of this type mentioned in the note 15) – of the excerpted deverbative adjectives in *-us*, it is only *sāgus* (a very rare, poetical adjective – related to the common feminine noun *sāga*, “witch”) and *vagus* that agree with this characteristic. One adjective from the list, *truncus*, has passive meaning. All the remaining adjectives may be described as stative, which does not correspond to the original meaning of the IE *ó*-adjectives. Formally, the excerpted adjectives are also problematic: *o*-grade in the root may be reconstructed only in two instances, the passive *truncus* and *uncus*. A zero-grade perhaps may be recon-

structed in the adjective *parcus*, and then in the adjectives *merus* and *vagus*, although the latter two have very unclear etymologies. In the other adjectives, however, even the development from this form is problematic: **b^hid^h-ós* > ***fidus*; **lip-ós* > ***lipus*; **sh₂g^(')-ós* > ***sagus*; **sik^u-ós* > ***sicus* – in two cases there is the lengthened vowel in the root, in other two the doubled consonant in the root code. What, on the other hand, would be possible in all the cases except *vagus* and perhaps *truncus* and *parcus* is a full-grade (for the adj. *lippus* and *siccus* using so-called *littera*-rule).²¹ However, PIE does not form the adjectives in *-os* with the stress on the root. In respect to the fact that the majority of the adjectives of this type is semantically more or less identical with the previously described *uo*-adjectives and also in respect to the instability of the consonant *u*, we may consider one more variant, that is whether formally these are not the same adjectives (in the case of the adjectives with stative meaning) in which *u* was dropped in the group of consonants and subsequently the compensatory lengthening took place so that the length of the syllable was maintained:

**lip-uoós*: *pu* > *p* (see MEISER 1998, p. 121) + compensatory lengthening (according to the *littera*-rule the consonant is lengthened)

**sik^u-uoós*: *k^uu* > *k^u* > *c* (before *o*; see LEUMANN 1977, p. 137) + compensatory lengthening according to the *littera*-rule

b^hid^h-uoós*: this interpretation is more problematic, since the assumed development of the aspirate *d^h* in Latin in the position before *u* is into *b*,²² but apparently, there are exceptions to such development: *arduus*, *viduus*; the question remains, however, why such adjective would not develop rather into *fiduus*

**prk-uoós*: similar development as in *siccus*, i.e. *k^u* > *k^u* > *c*, the root syllable is long by position

Similar reconstruction may be accepted also in the adj. *sāgus* (although the stative meaning cannot be clearly identified here): **sh₂g^(')-uoós* – the development of the group *g^u* must be assumed to be analogical to the development of the group *k^u* (> *k^u* > *c*), i.e. *g^u* > *g^u* + loss of the labial element before *o*, i.e. > *g* (with compensatory lengthening).

²¹ See LEUMANN 1977, p. 183.

²² See HEINER EICHNER, *Indogermanisches Phonemsystem und lateinische Lautgeschichte*, in: *Latein und Indogermanisch*, Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.-26. September 1986, (Hrsg.) OSWALD PANAGL – THOMAS KRISCH, Innsbruck 1992, p. 55-79, here p. 59.

Concerning the adj. *uncus* and *truncus*, it is rather improbable for them to have maintained the original *o*-grade in the root which is recorded in no other case (nor in the corresponding compounds). In the adj. *uncus* we may consider the following development: in Latin, we have records of the rare adj. *ancus* of the same meaning from the same root (< **h₂nk-*) and the common subst. *uncus*, “hook” (with the stressed *o*-grade in the root, cf. Gr. τόμος, “cut, slice”); the adj. in the form *uncus* may thus have been formed secondarily by the assimilation to the mentioned substantive. Concerning the adj. *truncus* the following may be said: the group *enk* (which would reflect R(z) here) is unstable in Latin and changes into *ink*;²³ suppose the original form of the given adjective was **trnk-uós*, perhaps the labial element following the velar could have led to the change of the vowel *e* not into *i*, but into the rounded *u*.

The adj. *vagus* is apparently the direct successor of the PIE *ó*-adjective (from the corresponding base, also numerous compounds similar to those mentioned in the note 15 are formed, e.g. *montivagus*, *circumvagus*, etc.). Concerning the adj. *merus* I tend to the view that it is not a deverbative.

4. Adjectives with the suffix *-ló-

Another important type of PIE verbal adjectives is represented by the adjectives with the suffix *-ló-*, which for example in Slavic languages play the role of preterite active participle (*-*lb*, e.g. Czech *seděl*, *bil*, etc.). Is there to be found any class of Latin adjectives functionally and formally corresponding to PIE *R(z)-*ló-*? Brugmann classes with this type Latin adjectives in *-ulus*;²⁴ we have excerpted the following adjectives with this suffix which have verbal root:

bibulus = “fond of drinking” (< *bibere* = “drink”); *crēdulus* = “credulous” (< *crēdere* = “believe, trust”); *garrulus* = “talkative, garrulous” (< *garrīre* = “chatter”); (*ē-*)*minulus* = “projecting” (< *ē-minēre*, “project”); *patulus* = “wide-open” (< *patēre*, “be open”); *pendulus* = “hanging, pendulous” (< *pendēre*, “hang”); *querulus* = “full of complaints” (< *querī* = “complain”); *strīdulus* = “that makes a high-pitched sound” (< *strīdēre/strīdere*, “make a high-pitched sound”); *tinnulus* = “ringing” (< *tinnīre*, “ring”); *tremulus* = “trembling” (< *tremere* = “tremble”)

²³ See LEUMANN 1977, p. 45.

²⁴ See BRUGMANN 1906, p. 373.

All the listed adjectives are active non-actual (actual *bibēns* = “who is drinking now” × non-actual *bibulus* = “who drinks often”), i.e. ones describing a typical quality of the subject, sometimes with a slightly pejorative touch (× the original *ló*-adjective from the corresponding verb should have had the meaning of “who was drinking” or “who had a drink”).

In all probability, it is also the adj. *aemulus* = “emulous, rival” that ranks with the same type; its etymology is, however, quite unclear: WH states that adj. *aemulus* has the root the ablaut variant of which is in the verb *imitārī*, but he does not specify the root any further; according to IEW (p. 10) the adjective belongs to the root **ai-*, “attribute”, although the shift in meaning of the adjective would be considerable and moreover, the *-m-* in the suffix is difficult to explain. LIV lists neither the adjective *aemulus* nor the verb *imitārī*.

Special character is that of the adj. *strāgulus*, “used for covering”, which could be described sooner as a purpose adjective functionally related to the subst. in *-ulum*: *cingulum*, “girdle, i.e. what is used for girdling”, *iaculum*, “spear, i.e. what is used for throwing”, etc.; there even exists the substantive *strāgulum*, “covering for a bed”; the adjective is thus more likely to have been derived from this substantive and it cannot be regarded as directly deverbative.²⁵

Concerning the formal aspect of the excerpted adjectives:

The following adjectives may have issued directly from the reconstructed PIE form:

ēminulus: **-m_h-lós* (LIV, p. 437) > **-minlos* + anaptyxis *-nl-* > *-nul-* (anaptyxis of the vowel *u* is common in Latin in the groups consisting of a stop + *l*, see LEUMANN 1977, p. 102, but we may possibly consider it also in the *nl* group)

pendulus: **(s)pn_hd-lós* (LIV, p. 578) > **pendlos* + anaptyxis *-dl-* > *-dul-*

querulus: **k_uǵ-s-lós* (LIV, p. 341) > **queslos* + anaptyxis *-sl-* > *-sul-* (the rhotacism would have had to follow)

tremulus: **tr_m-lós* (LIV, p. 648) > **tremlos* + anaptyxis *-ml-* > *-mul-* (although the common development of the *ml* group in Latin is *mpl*, see LEUMANN 1977, p. 213)

²⁵ According to NIELSEN, Latin instrument noun-suffix *-ulum* is a mere conditional variant of *-culum* (< PIE **-tlo-*), cf. *poculum*, etc.; see BENEDICTE NIELSEN, *On Latin instrument-nouns in */-lo-*, in: *Indo-European Word Formation*, Proceedings of the Conference held at the University of Copenhagen October 20th–22nd 2000, (edd.) JAMES CLACKSON – BIRGIT ANETTE OLSEN, Copenhagen 2004, p. 189–213.

With great doubts, the following adjectives could reflect *R(z)-lós:

patulus: **p_eth₂-lós* (LIV, p. 478) > **patlos*?; the vowel *a* is not systemic here (we would expect *e*), but the same situation appears with the base verb *patēre*; concerning the development of the laryngeal in this formation – interconsonantal laryngeal according to the generally accepted theory changes into *a*, but it is nevertheless obvious that this does not hold in all cases; according to the theory quoted also by SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 330ff., the laryngeals in the position between two stops in medial syllables drop, e.g. *passim* < **pVth₂-ti-*; although in the present case we do not have two stops, the *l* in this position could be possibly regarded as phonetically relevant.

crēdulus: **-d^hh₁-lós* (LIV, p. 136) > **-dlos* + anaptyxis *dl* > *dul* (suppose we concede the possibility that the laryngeal drops, as in the previous example of *patulus*, which, however, is very hard to imagine in fact in the root of the type CeH, where in such case only the initial consonant would remain); or > **-dalos* (CHC > CaC) > *-dulus*, suppose we concede the possibility of the vowel change *al* > *ul* in medial syllable

The following adjectives certainly do not reflect the original PIE form:

bibulus: verbal root **peh₃-* (LIV, p. 462); **ph₃-lós* should yield ***palus*, or ***pulus* (present verbal stem is reduplicated: **pi-ph₃-é-* > **pib-* > *bib-*)

garrulus: LIV (p. 161) gives the verbal root **g^{ar}-*, i.e. **g^ar-lós* > ***garulus* – the double *-rr-* is not in accord with the PIE reconstruction

strīdulus: LIV does not list the verb, according to IEW (p. 1036) it is an onomatopoeic verb with the root **streid^(h)-*; i.e. **strid^(h)-lós* > ***stridulus*; the long *ī* in the root is not in accord with the PIE reconstruction

tinnulus: LIV does not mention the verbal root, and nor does IEW, WH says only that it is an onomatopoeic verb; in any case, the double *nn* is difficult to explain

The adjectives *bibulus*, *garrulus*, *strīdulus* and *tinnulus* are apparently not inherited formations, but only secondarily formed ones by adding the suffix to the root in the form in which it exists in Latin present stem. The remaining adjectives can be judged as directly issuing from the PIE *R(z)-lós, but at the same time it must be said that in no single case there is anything preventing us from the same interpretation as with the previously mentioned four adjectives – from the synchronic point of view their roots have identical form as the roots in present stem of the corresponding Latin verbs. Also the semantic shift is evident. Latin adjectives in *-ulus* thus cannot be considered to be inherited formations from the original verbal adjective in **-lós*. The truth, how-

ever, is that the semantic shift of this adjectival suffix is of more general nature, since similar adjectives with the same meaning can be found also in other, e.g. Germanic languages,²⁶ but surprisingly also in Slavic languages where the suffix *-l̥* otherwise plays the role of preterite active participle (e.g. *přišel*): in Czech there are to be found the adjectives in *-lý* from imperfective verbs, describing a characteristic (permanent) quality, e.g. Czech *dbalý* = “who (always) cares”, *lesklý* = “what (permanently) shines” and similar (× adjectivized preterite participle in *-lý* is formed only from perfective verbs, e.g. *přišlý* = “who has come”).

What can be, on the other hand, regarded as the formation definitely inherited from the PIE **R(z)-lós* is apparently another Latin adjective, *amplus* = “large, ample”, i.e. “who has occupied large space?” (LIV does not list the given verbal root, IEW, p. 35 has the root *am-* : *mē-*, “hug, grip”; **am-los* > *amplus*, see LEUMANN 1977, p. 213).

5. Adjectives with the suffix **-tó-*

The PIE verbal adjectives with the formant *-to-* came to many individual IE languages, same as to Latin, bearing the function of past passive participle. The reconstruction of IE *to-*adjective is, based on the comparison, absolutely clear: the suffix was stressed, and the root was in the zero-grade, that is **R(z)-tós*. For instance, the Latin ppp. *factus*, *status*, *datus* (< **d^hh₁-(k)-tó-*, **sth₂-tó-*, **dh₃-tó-*), often given as examples by the authors of grammar books when explaining the development of interconsonantal laryngeal in Latin into *a*, correspond to this reconstruction. On the other hand, there exist a considerable number of Latin ppp., also from primary verbs, which at first sight evidently do not correspond to this reconstruction, e.g. *doctus* (with *o*-grade in the root), *plānctus* (with *n*-infix from the present stem) and many others. The question therefore remains whether Latin ppp. issued directly from the original PIE adjectives with the reconstructed structure **R(z)-tós*, or whether they inherited only the suffix from PIE, but the words as a whole were then formed secondarily, analogically, as we have seen in the case of the Latin ppa. with the suffix *-nt-*.

As the development of the PIE *tó*-adjectives was the subject of an individual study,²⁷ we can restrict ourselves to briefly summarizing its results here. Resulting from the work with the excerpted Latin primary verbs is a

²⁶ See BRUGMANN 1906, p. 374.

²⁷ LUCIE PULTROVÁ, *The Formation of the Latin Perfect Passive Participles*, Graecolatina Pragensia 21 (in print).

relatively simple theory based on the fact that ppp. (as the means of formation of passive past tense) make an inseparable couple with active perfect forms: Beside the perfect forms that Latin had inherited directly from the PIE (namely original root aorists, reduplicated perfects and *s*-aorists), there are the ppp. in Latin that are the direct successors of the PIE *R(z)-*tós*. On the other hand, beside the perfect forms that Latin had formed as neologisms (simple perfects, *u*-/*v*-perfects, some reduplicated perfects and some *s*-perfects) we can find the ppp. constructed purely analogically.

Examples:

root aorists: *fēcī* – *factus* (< **d^hh₁k-tós*), *iēcī* – *iactus* (< **H₁h₁k-tós*) and others

original reduplicated perfects: *vēnī* (< **g^ue-g^um-*) – *ventus* (< **g^um-tós*), *sēdī* (< **se-sd-*) – *sessus* (< **s_ed-tós*) and others

original *s*-aorists: *dūxī* – *ductus* (< **duk'-tós*), *fīnxī* – *fictus* (< **d^hig^h-tós*) and others

×

simple perfects: *scandī* – *scānsus* (**sknd-tós* > ***scēnsus*), *dēfendī* – *dēfēnsus* (**-g^{uh}η-tós* > ***-fentus*) and others

u-/*v*-perfects: *cēnsuī* – *cēnsus* (**k'Ŋs-tós* > ***cēnstus*), *sprēvī* – *sprētus* (**sp^hrH-tós* > ***sprātus*) and others

secondary reduplicated perfects: *spopondī* – *spōnsus* (**spnd-tós* > ***spēnsus*), *totondī* – *tōnsus* (**tnd-tós* > ***tēnsus*) and others

secondary *s*-perfects: *iūnxī* – *iūnctus* (**iug-tós* > ***iūctus*), *lūsī* – *lūsus* (**lid-tós* > ***lissus*) and others

6. Adjectives with the suffix *-*nó*-

The PIE adjectives with the suffix *-*nó*- had the function very similar to that of the adjectives with the suffix *-*tó*- and they came into some languages (e.g. Slavic) in the function of ppp.²⁸ In Latin, the ppp. is formed by the latter of the mentioned suffixes (-*tus*), but verbal adjectives in -*nus* appear in Latin too. Let us see whether they correspond to the reconstructed structure *R(z)-*nós* and what their function is in Latin.

²⁸ OLSEN says that though conclusive evidence is scarce, it seems that the suffix *-*no*- for the formation of ppp. was originally restricted to the position after stops and perhaps some cases of consonantal laryngeal; see BIRGIT ANETTE OLSEN, *The Complex of Nasal Stems in Indo-European*, in: *Indo-European Word Formation*, Copenhagen 2004, p. 215-248, here p. 223.

bonus = “good”, < archlat. *duonos* < *duenos*; IEW (p. 218) classes the adjective with the verbal root **deu-*: **du-*, “venerate” (i.e. *bonus* = originally “venerable, worshipped”); the same root is given in LIV (p. 123) in the form **deuh₂-* meaning “unite” (i.e. according to LIV the original meaning “who is in accord with the right course of things”?); i.e. **duh₂-nós* > **dūnus* or **dunus* or **duanus* (cf. above the note 18)

dignus = “worthy, suitable”; LIV (p. 110) has the verbal root **dek’-*, “welcome”, i.e. **dk’-nós* > *dignus* (*k* > *g* and *egn* > *ign*, see LEUMANN 1977, p. 45 and 199f.) = originally “welcome”?

egēnus = “needy”; LIV (p. 231) with uncertainty suggests the verbal root **h₁eg’H-*, “lack”, i.e. **h₁g’H-nós* > ***ganus*? (SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 17ff.: *h₁C-* > *C-*); the adj. nevertheless does not have the passive meaning (“what is needed, what is lacking”), but the active one or that of resultative perfect “who is lacking, who needs”²⁹

plānus = “flat, plain”; IEW (p. 806) suggests the root **pelā-*, **plā-*, “wide, widen”; LIV gives no verbal root, according to SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 182, the root reads **pleh₂-*, i.e. **plh₂-nós* > *plānus*; the adjective (if it is originally verbal) has the meaning of stative perfect: “who has become wide and is therefore wide”

plēnus = “full”; LIV (p. 482) suggests the verbal root **pleh₁-*, “fill o.s., be full”, i.e. **plh₁-nós* > ***plānus* or ***planus* (SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 172ff.);³⁰ the adjective describes a passive action quality, which is permanently present and time-unlimited³¹

sānus = “healthy, sane”; according to IEW (p. 880) the adj. *sānus* belongs to the root **sā-*, “satisfy, sate, be saturated”, in LIV (p. 520), this root is given in the form **seh₂(i)-*, i.e. **sh₂-nós* > ***sanus*; if we accept the relation of the adjective to the root with the meaning “saturate”, then it describes again a stable passive quality of the substance (“who is permanently saturated, made satisfied”)

²⁹ In Czech, the analogical adjective *potřebný* can have both passive and active meaning, “what is needed” and “who needs something”, respectively.

³⁰ SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 184, claims that in the adj. *plēnus*, the full-grade from the verb *plēre* was secondarily introduced to avoid homonymy with the adj. *plānus* (< **plh₂-*).

³¹ KIRCHER-DURAND compares the adj. *plēnus* with the ppp. *-plētus* (which is formed only from compounds, *complētus* and similar): in contrast with the in time defined (anterior) *-plētus*, the adj. *plēnus* has no relation to time; see CHANTAL KIRCHER-DURAND, *Les dérivés en -nus, -na, -num*, in: *Grammaire fondamentale du latin*, IX, *Création lexicale: la formation des noms par dérivation suffixale*, (éd.) CHANTAL KIRCHER-DURAND, Louvain – Paris – Dudley, MA, 2002, p. 125-160, here p. 132.

vānus = “empty, futile, groundless”; LIV (p. 254) gives the verbal root $*h_1ueh_2-$, “stop, leave”, i.e. $*h_1uh_2-nós > **vanus$; the adjective describes a passive action quality, which is permanently present and time-unlimited (similarly to the *plēnus* above)³²

With the exception of the adjectives *egēnus* and *plānus* (which is disputable as to whether it is a deverbative) we may say that all the adjectives express what corresponds to the function of imperfective (i.e. present) passive participle, in contrast to the adjectives in *-tus*, the meaning of which is always perfective (= aorist, anteriority). If there really is such a difference between the PIE suffixes in $*-nó-$ and $*-tó-$, then it is logical that the Slavic languages “chose” the suffix $*-nó-$ to form passive participle, since they tend to express perfectiveness/imperfectiveness mostly by word-formative means (in most cases, the verb has its basic imperfective form and its perfective counterpart is formed by a prefix: *psaný* – *napsaný*).

Formally, however, the Latin adjectives in *-nus* are problematic and only two of them can be directly derived from the reconstructed PIE $*R(z)-nós$: *dignus* and *plānus*. Concerning all the others (except *bonus*³³), it would be easier to reconstruct a full-grade in the root (which is possible also in the adj. *dignus* and *plānus*) – this would, however, not correspond to the assumed original state.

Concerning the adj. *plēnus*, a possible explanation of its root vowel is suggested above in the note 30, the other possibility (although rejected by SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 184) is to assume that the group CRHC did not generally yield CR \bar{a} C in Latin, but – same as in Greek – CR h_1 C $>$ CR \bar{e} C, CR h_2 C $>$ CR \bar{a} C and CR h_3 C $>$ CR \bar{o} C.

The adj. *sānus* and *vānus* have a long vowel in the root, which cannot be derived from R(z). However, concerning the adj. *sānus*, we are not sure about its actual etymology. If it does belong to the root $*seh_2(i)-$ suggested by LIV, then we can consider the following possibility, though quite unsystemic: the adjective would have developed in the following way: $*sh_2i-nós > *sai-nos > sānus$ (reduction of the *in* group + compensatory lengthening to pre-

³² The suffix *-nus* is to be found in two more possibly verbal adjectives *amoenus*, “graceful”, and *iēiūnus*, “greedy, hungry” – their etymology is, however, so unclear that nothing closer may be said on their behalf.

³³ We do not have a systematic explanation of the form *duenos* in the place of the expected $**duanos$. Nevertheless, such vocalic change is still an easier solution to accept than the reconstruction of R(e) in the root: $**deyh_2-nos > **deyanos$ or $**deunos$ (the form *duenos* could possibly develop from $*deyanos$, but through a very difficult process: change $a > e$ and the syncope of the first *e*, which, however, would have had to take place prior to the regular Latin change $eu > ou > ū$).

serve the length of the syllable). As for the adj. *vānus*, SCHRIJVER 1991, p. 308, concedes the possibility of the enlargement of the root (**ueh₂-*) by *-s-*, i.e. **u_h₂-s-nós* > **u_{as}nos* > *vānus*.³⁴

The adj. *egēnus* (which corresponds neither functionally to the assumed original formation) is clearly secondarily assimilated to the verb *egēre*.

7. Adjectives with the suffixes **-mno-*, **-mó-*

Medial verbal adjectives in PIE were formed by the suffix the reconstruction of which is not completely agreed on among the researchers;³⁵ mostly, however, it is the unstressed **-mno-* that is assumed. The adjectives with this suffix are not recorded in Latin (traditionally, the subst. *fēmina*, *alumnus*, sometimes also *damnum*, *vehemēns* are regarded as the successors of this form in Latin). Brugmann (1906, p. 230) says it is highly probable that the original suffix *-mno-* yielded the suffix *-mo-*.³⁶ Out of the Latin adjectives, we have excerpted the following three deverbatives with the suffix *-mus*:

almus = “life-giving, feeding”; LIV (p. 262) gives the verbal root **h₂el-*, “feed, bring up”; in the adjective there then could be either the full or the zero-grade in the root, since both **h₂el-* and **h₂l-* have the same result in Latin, *al-*; the adjective has the meaning of active non-actual process

firmus = “strong, firm”; LIV (p. 145) suggests the verbal root **d^her-*, “hold, fasten”; in the adjective, there is probably the full grade in the root (with the dialectal change in *ir*, see WH, IEW, p. 253), because **d^hr-* > ***for-*; the adjective can be considered medial: “who holds tight”

līmus = “transverse, oblique”; LIV does not mention the root, but IEW (p. 309) has **lei-*, “bend”; in any case, the root is rather in the full-grade, otherwise we would have to expect the short *-i-*; the adjective could be possibly regarded as originally medial: “what is moving/running diagonally”

Latin examples are so scarce that no general judgement may be drawn hence. However, the adjectives *firmus* and *līmus* could support the theory on development of **-mo-* from **-mno-*. Yet one more possibility may be hypothetically considered: in Lithuanian, the adjectives in *-mas* (< **-mo-* < **-mno-*)³⁷ have the function of the present passive participle (e.g. *nėšamas* =

³⁴ Cf. LEUMANN 1977, p. 206.

³⁵ For the recent bibliography on the topic see MEIER-BRÜGGER 2000, p. 174.

³⁶ BRUGMANN 1906, p. 230.

³⁷ See *idem*, p. 232.

“being carried”), i.e. exactly the function we have talked about in connection with the excerpted Latin adjectives in *-nus*. We have also mentioned that in most adjectives in *-nus* it would be easier to reconstruct the original R(e), and not the assumed R(z) in the root. It is therefore worth considering whether also Latin *-nus* had not in fact developed from the original **-mno-* (through *-mno-*; in colloquial Latin, the development *mn* > *nn* is common.³⁸ Even in respect to the distribution **-mno-* > *-nus* and **-mno-* > *-mus*, this theory is relatively attractive (although, as has been mentioned, the evidence is scarce): *-mus* comes following *r*, *l*, *i*, *-nus* following a long vowel, or laryngeal, and a stop.

Abbreviations

IEW: JULIUS POKORNY, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern – München 1959.

LIV: HELMUT RIX et al., *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden 2001.

WH: ALOIS WALDE – JOHANN BAPTIST HOFMANN, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1938-1956.

³⁸ See LEUMANN 1977, p. 213f.