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Abstract

The class of adverbs formed late in Indo-European languages, and it is rather heterogeneous. Some scholars argue that there is nothing common between adverbial systems in different Indo-European languages. However it seems to be useful to compare the system of adverbs in Sanskrit with such system in Old Irish. It appears necessary to find common types of word formation in these languages to make hypothesis about Proto-Indo-European adverbs. Semantic of adverbs, their importance for translation and variety of derivational patterns allow us to consider adverbs as a separate class of words. Diachronic review of this class helps us to understand the process of grammaticalization and to select criteria for relating words to this part of speech. For good translation of Sanskrit and Old Irish texts it is also worth to divide this class into semantic groups and subclasses.
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Introduction

Adverbial system in Indo-European languages formed late. Genetically the class of adverbs is related to nouns, adjectives, pronouns, prepositions (preverbs) and particles. O. Jespersen argues that the adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections can be united into one group called “particles”, because many adverbs are used also as prepositions or as conjunctions.

This problem has a long history. According to “Aṣṭādhyāyī” by Pāṇini (4th century BC), adverbs should be referred to the same class as particles and conjunctions, because all of them are indeclinable. His method is too formalist, because he only tries to represent the language as a system, without appealing to semantic of words and their collocations. However, semantic is extremely important for translation, so we have to take it into account.

The conceptions of time and space are fundamental for both modern scientific / philosophical worldview and archaic outlook. As adverbs usually denote time and place of action, we have to declare significance of this lexical-grammatical category for Sanskrit, Old Irish and other Indo-European languages.

Adverbs vs. Nouns with Prepositions

The adverb has its own grammatical meaning (it qualifies the meaning of the verb) and it can make relationship with other words in the sentence, so we can say that adverbs form an independent class of words. Some formal criteria for distinguishing adverbs from combinations “preposition+noun” are determined for Indo-European languages having case government.

1. Lexical-semantical criterion: if the case form of a noun becomes an adverb, it loses some old definitions or gains new;
2. Morphological: the word loses other case forms / plural forms; the word stress comes to another syllable;
3. Syntactical: syntagmatic dealings break;
4. Old word formation patterns destroy and new ones appear.

The result of these changes is full adverbialization of the form.

So adverbs have rich syntactic, stylistic and communicative potential and they should be considered as an independent part of speech. This system is flexible and changeable, it can be enriched with new words from dialectal and professional lexical layers.
Indo-Iranian and Celtic Languages

A. Meillet argues that every language creates its own adverbial system during its history, and there is nothing common between adverbs in various Indo-European languages.

However it seems possible to find common features in adverbial systems of Sanskrit and Old Irish. Does the comparison of Indo-Iranian and Celtic languages make sense?

1) These languages are not closely related;
2) the gap in time between Sanskrit and Old Irish texts is enormous.

Previously such research was undertaken by Joseph Vendryes, Myles Dillon and Victor Kalygin. In their works they came to the conclusion that lots of archaisms can be found at the utmost western and eastern points of Indo-European area. The conservatism of Sanskrit and Old Irish language is to be taken into account. Both languages are conservative and sacred. They were not influenced by any other language and they have rich literary tradition. Coincidences found in these languages can give us a chance to make hypothesis about Proto-Indo-European state of language. Literary tradition gives us a lot of different texts related to various genres and periods, so we can look at the evolution of the adverbial system. Here we have to remember that the quantity of compared languages should be restricted to two or three, because similar archaic constructions can hardly be found in all Indo-European languages. So the comparison of these languages can be helpful in making hypothesis about Proto-Indo-European adverbs, because lots of archaisms are found at the utmost western and eastern points of Indo-European area.

Problems

Describing adverbs in modern languages, we are able to use our linguistic feeling and carry experiments with collocations of the word to understand whether it is an adverb or not. Actual division of the sentence, its intonation and word order can also help us in classification of the words as parts of speech. Otherwise, these methods do not work if we deal with dead languages which are not spoken nowadays (like Sanskrit and Old Irish). Here we should also remember that Sanskrit sutras have free word order, so these criteria are not helpful in determination of part of speech. There is no doubt we can look it up at the dictionary to be convinced if we have an adverb or a case form of a noun. But sometimes the dictionary gives us conflicting information. It means that dictionary entry says that this word can be both adverb and case form of a noun. So we can see that adverbialization is in process. Here we meet other questions. How can we date the moment when the case form of a noun absolutely petrifies and becomes an adverb? What texts use this word as an adverb? How often do we meet this word in adverbial meaning? So we have to
find special criteria that will help us, and these criteria will be different for different languages.

Word Formation

In that conditions word formation has decisive meaning. In most Indo-European languages every part of speech has its specific word-formative patterns, which are not usual for other parts of speech. If we compare Old Irish and Sanskrit adverbial word formation, we shall see archaic patterns, which are still used in modern languages.

1. As it was said earlier, case forms of nouns (pronouns, adjectives, numerals) can petrify and become adverbs. In Sanskrit this happens to nouns in:

- accusative, instrumental, ablative, dative cases (adverbs denoting time);
- locative case (adverbs denoting place).

\text{divā} (Instr.) ‘in the daytime’, from noun \text{div} ‘day’, \\
\text{pāṛçve} (Loc) ‘close to’, from \text{pāṛçva} ‘side’.

It is remarkable that Old Irish dative is a contamination of Proto-Celtic dative, instrumental, ablative and locative cases. So nouns in dative can (according to their semantic) turn into:

- adverbs denoting time (\text{nach thain} ‘anytime’);
- adverbs denoting place (\text{clìu do} ‘on the left’, ‘to the north’).

2. Adverbs can be formed by noun with a prefix. In Sanskrit prefixes or preverbs usually combine with nouns in accusative:

\text{ati-} (‘very’) + \text{mātra} (‘measure’) = \text{atimātram} (‘abundantly’).

The quantity of such prefixes is Sanskrit is rather huge. We can see the same pattern in Old Irish. Most of prefixes came from prepositions, so they combine with nouns in accusative or dative:

\text{i} (‘in’) + \text{noch}t (‘night’) = \text{innocht} (‘at night’).

Here it can be difficult to understand, if the word is a case form of a noun or an adverb. There is a decision of the problem, because here collocability can save the situation. If the word, that could be an adverb, coordinates with an adjective – so we can see a noun. For instance, instrumental case form \text{kālena} (Skr. \text{kāla} ‘time’) may turn into an adverb denoting time (‘on time’), but if we
can see a coordinated adjective *mahatā* ('big') close to it, we understand that *kālena* is a noun here.

Carrying over of an accent or changing the length of vowels also can tell us that the form adverbialized:

\[
\text{svapnāya} \quad \text{– dative form from } \text{svapna} '\text{dream}', \text{ and } \\
\text{svapnayā} \quad \text{– adverb 'in one's sleep'}.
\]

Suffixes are also used in adverbial word formation. In Sanskrit suffixes are added to pronoun stems, numerals, nouns and adjectives to form adverbs denoting:

- place, direction (-*tas*): *mukhatas* 'from mouth';
- time (-*dā*): *tadā* 'then';
- manner of action (-*dhā*): *dvidhā* 'two ways'.

In Old Irish this pattern is used only to form adverbs from adjectives. To be honest, there are few adverbs formed in such a way: *mór*án ‘many’, *becán* ‘few’.

In Sanskrit, there is a special form of verb called verbal adverb (gerund). It has a lot in common with adverb, so historically many verbal adverbs lose their verbal components of meaning and become adverbs. Etymologically, the word *pretya* 'in the Otherworld' is a gerund of the verb *i* 'to go, to depart' with the preverb *pra-*.

There is no such class in Old Irish, but this pattern is typical for most Indo-European languages having verbal adverbs or gerunds.

**Adverbs Denoting Time**

As we could see earlier, according to their semantic, adverbs can designate:

I. location of the object;
II. direction;
III. time;
IV. manner of action etc.

It is interesting to have a closer look at the adverbs denoting time, because they have some problems in classification.

In both languages adverbs denoting time have following functions.

[1] They show the time of action: ‘today’ (Sanskrit. *adya*, Old Irish *indiu*).
[2] They also denote the duration of action: ‘for a long time’ (Sanskrit. *dīrgham*, Old Irish *co cien*).
Some of these adverbs can mark the sequence of actions: ‘at first’ (Sanskrit ādau, Old Irish in chēntu).

There is also a special group of unstressed time markers, a kind of parenthetical words, remarks for the recipient of speech. These words usually mean ‘later’, ‘afterwards’ (Old Irish iarum, Sanskrit eva). The problem is to find out, if these words are just discourse markers or real adverbs. Their functions are to draw the recipient's attention and to keep the meter in poetry. They have mnemonic effect, and it is really important for oral tradition, so the time markers shouldn't be considered just as filler words. They meet rather frequently in both poetry and prose, so their semantic is partially erased. On the other hand, we can see them in archaic texts, so this group of adverbial words could be a Proto-Indo-European phenomenon.

Conclusion

Old Irish adverbial system is not as rich as Sanskrit system, but derivation patterns and functions of adverbs in the text are similar. Nouns usually petrify in accusative form, if prefixes are added in adverbialization process. In both Old Irish and Sanskrit prefixes are used for deriving adverbs of place and spatial orientation.

Since special research of Old Irish adverbial system has not been undertaken yet, it seems important to determine the borders of system in Old Irish in comparison to Sanskrit system. It could be useful in translation of Old Irish and Sanskrit texts. Hypothesis about productivity of derivation patterns could also be made.

Adverbs denoting time are extremely important for Indo-European languages. The conceptions of time and space are fundamental for archaic outlook. In Sanskrit and Old Irish languages, adverbs denoting time have equal functions and derivation patterns, so we can conclude that this lexical-semantic group of adverbs is an important archaic part of vocabulary.
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