J. HILMARSSON

ON THE BALTIC 2d Sg. THEMATIC ENDING

The East Baltic 2d sg. thematic ending represented by Lith. *-i* (reflexive *-ies(i)*) and Latv. *-i* (reflexive *-iês*) seems to point unambiguously to an original Baltic ending **-ĕi* which would reflect an Indo-European **-ei*. Most comparativists have agreed on this point. Thus Stang (Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen, Oslo 1966, p. 407) posits not only a Baltic but a Balto-Slavic 2d sg. thematic ending **-ei* on the evidence of the above-mentioned Baltic forms and the Old Church Slavonic ending *-(e)ši* which he sees as a contamination of **(ber)i* < **(bher)ei* and the athematic *(vidi)šь*, *(je)šь*. Furthermore he sees in the Old Prussian ending *-sei* a compromise between the thematic ending, **-ĕi* and the athematic ending *-si*. Meillet is of the same opinion in Le slave commun, Paris 1965, p. 316 f., and so is Endzelin in the article „О балтийском окончании 2-ого лица ед. ч.“ ИОРЯС XXII 1917, p. 85–116, and in Lettische Grammatik, Rīga 1922, p. 546–547.

But agreeing upon a Baltic or even Balto-Slavic ending **-ei* is not the same as placing this ending in an Indo-European perspective and traditional comparativists have been at a loss in that respect. Thus Stang says (op. cit., p. 409): ”Zweifelhaft ist die Frage nach dem Ursprung der balto-slav. themat. Endung **-ei*“. The usual citations of Greek φέρεις and Old Irish *·bir* supposedly from I. -E. **-ei* are not entirely convincing as these forms can be easily explained otherwise.

In later years such linguists as Mažiulis („Iš baltų veiksmažodžių fleksijos istorijos“, Baltistica I priedas, Vilnius, 1972, p. 95–100), Toporov („О некоторых архаизмах в системе балтийского глагола“, IJSLP V 1962, p. 31–57), Watkins (Indogermanische Grammatik III/1, 1969) and others have more or less kept to the traditional view of a Baltic ending **-ei*. On the other hand, they have tried to find a new place for this **-ei* (or **-e-i*) within the frame of Indo-European. Thus the thesis in general is that the Baltic ending at some time actually was **-ei*, but that this ending was composed of the thematic vowel *-e* plus a (deictic?) particle *-i*, i. e. that the 2d sg. originally was represented by the bare stem without any ending. This hypothesis, they maintain, is supported by the fact that in Hittite the hi-conjugation 2d sg. forms are not marked by the expected *-š*. Furthermore the Imperative of the type Gr. λέγε etc., which they maintain was originally identical with the 2d sg. Indicative, does not contain an *-s*, and shows only the bare stem. I do not intend to criticize this view in detail here and now, but in many ways it seems to me too daring and methodologically unsound. At least I would not like to accept this explanation of the Baltic thematic 2d sg. ending **-ei* until every other avenue

has been explored and found not convincing. The difference in time and space between the Hittite and Baltic texts is enormous and that fact alone ought to be a warning against exotic solutions. The Baltic forms should be explained within Baltic as far as possible.

Indeed there are some indices showing that the 2d sg. ending -*ei* may not be of Balto-Slavic origin or even of common Baltic origin. For the first, the ending *-ei* is not found in Slavic. For the second, the ending *-ei* or reflexes thereof are not found in Old Prussian as pointed out by Kazlauskas (Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika, Vilnius 1968, p. 297). Third, the only thematic 2d sg. ending found in Old Prussian is -*(a)si*. Fourth, the Old Prussian ending -*sei* may merely be an orthographical variant of -*si*. That is to say that *-ei* is unambiguously represented in Lithuanian and Latvian only.

Although Kazlauskas points out the fact that the ending *-ei* is not to be found in Old Prussian and actually suggests (op. cit., p. 298) that the attested O. Pr. thematic 2d sg. ending -*(a)si* is derived from the I. -E. primary ending *-(e)si*, he still maintains that East Baltic actually had the 2d sg. thematic ending *-ei*, which in Baltic (East Baltic?) times was composed of two elements i. e. the pure stem -*e* plus the element -*i* (p. 299). The element -*i* in Lithuanian and Latvian he maintains can have been taken from the athematic ending -*si* which quite early must have melted together with the verb's root (in such verbs as *esi*) so that the ending could be interpreted as -*i*. This view, that Baltic, let alone East Baltic, had preserved an endingless 2d sg. thematic form seems to me, as already mentioned, too far-fetched and should not be preferred to an internal Baltic solution if there be any.

It seems to me that Schmalstieg (in the article "Primitive East Baltic *-uo-*, *-ie-* and the 2nd Sg. Ending" in Lingua X, p. 369 – 374 and later in An Old Prussian Grammar and in Studies in Old Prussian) methodologically is on the right way although I do not approve of his theory as a whole or in detail. In An Old Pr. Gr., p. 150 – 151 he suggests a phonemic analysis of the East Baltic vowel system, where the diphthongs *uo* and *ie* are treated as sequences of two short vowels. The long vowels can also be analyzed as sequences of short vowels. At this period, he maintains, the contrast between /e/ and /a/ was neutralized if they occurred as the second element of a long vowel or a diphthong. The neutralized element can be written as A. Thus /ie/ = /iA/, /ee/ = /eA/, /aa/ = /aA/ and /ua/ = /uA/ (the diphthong *uo* being phonemically analysed as /ua/). On the basis of this phonemic analysis Schmalstieg defines the Lithuanian reflexive forms in the following way:

1st sg.	(-*u*)	-*uos(i)*	=	/-u-As(i)/
2d sg.	(-*i*)	-*ies(i)*	=	/-i-As(i)/
1st du.	(-*va*)	-*vās(i)*	=	/-va-As(i)/
2d du.	(-*ta*)	-*tās(i)*	=	/-ta-As(i)/
1st pl.	(-*me*)	-*mēs(i)*	=	/-me-As(i)/
2d pl.	(-*te*)	-*tēs(i)*	=	/-te-As(i)/

"It is now evident", he says, p. 150, "that Lith. *duomies* is merely the athematic first singular *duomi* to which the reflexive ending -*es* = *-As(i)* has been added". This is logical. But I do not quite follow him when he on p. 151 maintains that "there is no need to posit a Baltic second person singular ending (i. e. *-ei*, JH.)

21

to explain the Lithuanian reflexive form. The second singular reflexive -*iesi* merely shows the ending *-i* plus the allomorph of the reflexive *-As(i)*". The reason for positing a reflexive allomorph *-As(i)* was that a form such as *-ies(i)* phonemically could be analyzed as /-*i*-*As(i)*/ which resulted in the subsequent spreading of the allomorph *-As (i)* to cases where it originally did not belong, as f. ex. the athematic 1st sg. *duomies*. In other words, the allomorph *-As(i)* came into being because it was already genetic and phonetically correct in the 1st and 2d persons of the thematic verb. The very analysis of the form *-ies(i)* results in the establishment of a new allomorph *-As(i)*. But if the form *-As(i)* is a result of the analysis of the 1st and 2d person forms, how can it then at the same time be used to explain them historically? How can a synchronous analysis be taken as a historical explanation? On the whole the assumption of an allomorph *-As(i)* seems to me dubious. Why does it not for example occur in the 3d person? And generally if this analysis of the reflexive forms is correct, one would expect that identical analysis would be valid in other cases where the alternation *uo : u, ie : i* occurs. But f. ex. in the Acc. pl. masc. of the Adjective it is not applicable. From the pair *jaunuosius : jaunus* one would have to deduct the Acc. pl. masc. ending *-(u)s* with allomorph *-(u)As!*

Besides, this analysis would leave us with a second person singular thematic ending *-i*, which I have not found explained in Schmalstieg's An Old Prussian Grammar nor Studies in Old Prussian. However in his article in Lingua X, p. 372 he suggests that the athematic ending *-si* spread to all classes of verbs. Those verbs which had root-final sibilant or dental dropped the root-final consonant when *-si* was added as ending. The form thereby became obscure and the root-final consonant was restored while the *-s-* of the ending was dropped instead. Thus an ending *-i* was established and later spread to all thematic and semi-thematic verbs. This theory is on the whole unlikely. For example, one would expect to find remnants of such forms as **mesi, *vesi* (beside *meti, vedi*) at least in Old Lithuanian where one finds exclusively the athematic *duosi* etc. The type *duosi* is replaced by *duodi* only in modern Lithuanian.

Methodically, however, Schmalstieg's approach seems to me justifiable as it attempts to explain the Lithuanian and Latvian forms within the framework of Baltic.

Toporov in his article in IJSLP V, p. 31 — 57 propounds the theory that Baltic never had any secondary endings and that (apart from the athematic verb) the Baltic verb in the singular only knew the endings *-ō, -ĕi, -ø* (zero). But as Stang (op. cit., p. 421) has pointed out, the ending *-ō* is an unknown phenomenon in preterital tenses in Indo-European. Furthermore, the 2d sg. secondary ending *-s* is actually attested in the Old Prussian Imperative, cf. *gerbais < *-ois, immais, wedays/wedeys* etc. Although this ending is not directly attested in Lithuanian or Latvian, it is a reasonable possibility that it was known to the Common East Baltic, or at least to the Common Baltic language, as the ending is attested in Prussian.

If that be so, then again the supposedly Baltic ending **-ei* comes into unfavourable light, because one would have to operate with two different thematic endings in the second person singular, i. e. *-(e)si/-(e)s* and *-(e)i*. That is an unreasonable assumption for a single language.

Let us suppose now that Baltic and also Proto East Baltic indeed had secondary endings in the 2d and 3d singular of the thematic verb and let us see what possibilities that assumption opens. Indo-European *$ued hes$, *$ued het$ would in Baltic change into *$vedes$, *$vede$ and these forms would remain unchanged into Common East Baltic period. The reflexive forms corresponding to *$vedes$, *$vede$ would be *$vedes$-si and *$vede$-si. (The reflexive particle which at that time probably had the form *-sei is here written -si for the sake of commodity.) At this point the possibilities open for analogical changes. The 2d sg. form *$vedes$-si contains a geminate which would not be tolerated in Baltic. The geminate would therefore at once be simplified and the form would become *$vedesi$. This procedure makes the 2d sg. and 3d sg. reflexives identical in form. But not only the reflexives are now identical. Morphemic analysis of the 2d sg. form *$vedesi$ segments *$vedesi$ into *$vede$ plus the reflexive particle -si, because the morpheme-boundary has changed after the simplification of the geminate. Thus a new analysis of the reflexive form *$vedesi$ (2d sg.) gives rise to a new non-reflexive second singular form *$vede$. And this non-reflexive form is also identical with the corresponding (non-reflexive) third singular form. Identity of 2d and 3d person singular is usually not tolerated in any language. Therefore a further change was likely to occur. The third person is the unmarked member of the paradigm whereas the second person is marked. It was therefore natural that the second person form should be further marked, but not the third person.

What reasonable possibilities stood to the disposition of the language to mark off the second person? The athematic verbs had the 2d sg. ending -si. But it was not altogether convenient to add -si to the form *$vede$. A form *$vedesi$ would require a reflexive form *$vedesisi$ which one, with a rather unweighty argument, might call "an unlikely form". More important, however, is the fact that *$vedesi$ would be rhythmically out of tune with the bi-syllabic 1st sg. *$vedō$ and 3d sg. *$vede$. But there was another possibility. In some athematic verbs the ending -si had merged with the root-final consonant of the verb. Thus the very frequent verb "to be" had the second singular form esi which morphemically could be analyzed as es- plus the ending -i. Likewise, verbs with root-final dental consonant would in the second singular (and not only there) lose that dental and the morpheme boundary would become ambiguous leaving the possibility open to interpret the ending as -i and not -si, cf. f. ex. $duosi, desi, ėsi, giesi, rausi, kliesi$. This -$i$ then was borrowed from the athematic verbs and added to the new 2d sg. form of the thematic verbs. Thus *$vede$ became *$vedei$ which later became *$vedę$ > *$vedie$ > mod. Lith. $vedi$. As to the acute accent, it can easily be explained as analogical with the acute of the 1st sg. cf. *$vedō$ > $vedù$.

This explanation of the ending *-ei has the obvious advantage that it simultaneously explains the 2d sg. of the semi-thematic verbs without having to make use of further analogical changes. In the same way as one assumes a secondary 2d sg. ending for the thematic verb and a development from a form *$vedessi$ > *$vedesi$ to *$vede$ + si, one may assume the same thing for the types ($sakýti$) $sãko, sãkė$ and ($turėti$) $tùri$. Thus:

*$sakāssi$ > *$sakāsi$ → *$sakā$(+ si) → *$sakāi$
*$sakēssi$ > *$sakēsi$ → *$sakē$(+ si) → *$sakēi$
*$turissi$ > *$turisi$ → *$turi$(+ si) → *$turii$

The forms *sakāi, *sakēi result phonetically in the actual Lithuanian forms sakaĩ, sakeĩ. The type *turii (= *turiį) should become *turī, but in high (Aukštaitic) Lithuanian it has been changed in analogy with the thematic type and has the form turì (reflexive turíes(i)). However, the expected form *turī is actually attested and is the normal form in low (Žemaitic) Lithuanian, (more specifically: in North-West Žemaitic), cf. mî·l'i and torís (reflexive form) < *turī+s. Besides, in Old Latvian (Lettische Postille, herausgegeben von G. Manzelius, 1653) the form dzirdīg < *girdī plus the particle -g(i) is attested, testifying as to the old ending -ī < *-iį.

Another interpretation of the 2d sg. thematic reflexive form *vedessi is tempting but fallacious. Namely that the geminate was simplified with subsequent compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel resulting in *vedę̄ + si. This -ę̄ would be identical with the vowel arising from the monophthongization of the diphthongs ai/ei and would further develop into the diphthong -ie. Thus the form vedì (vedíesi) would be accounted for. But this interpretation is fallacious, however. Primarily because compensatory lengthening is an unknown phenomenon in Baltic and secondarily because if there really was a compensatory lengthening the result would rather have been ē which later developed into Lith. ė.

The fact that the 3d person in modern Lithuanian actually has the ending -a whereas the 2d person singular has the form -i < -ie supposedly from *-e + i does not necessarily contradict our argument that at a certain period the 2d and 3d singular were identical in form. Schmalstieg in Lingua X, p. 374 assumes that the phonemic distinction between -a- and -e- in Primitive East Baltic was neutralized after palatalized consonants. Similarly A. Girdenis has suggested to me that depalatalization was a regular feature in unstressed syllables. Būga already mentions this possibility in his Aistiški Studijai I, p. 69 – 74, cf. also his RR vol. II, p. 21. Thus the 3d person would formerly have had the ending *-e which changed into -a as a result of depalatalization, which eliminated the distinctive factor which made /e/ an independent phoneme apart from /a/. Such forms as Old Lith. mekstaisi, rupinais (Bretkūnas) which seem to trouble Stang (Vergl. Gr., p. 407) because of the ending -ai- which he assumes is an archaic form eventually deriving from -*ei, could thus show the same depalatalized and neutralized vowel colour as is seen in the 3d person ending -a. Especially interesting is the fact that these two examples of the ending -ai- both occur in barytone verbs. This fact harmonizes well with the above-mentioned assumption of Būga and Girdenis that depalatalization is an expected feature in unstressed syllables.

In Old Prussian only one thematic verb is attested in the 2d sg., occurring three times in the III. catechism, once in the form gīwasi and twice in the form giwassi. Cf. (the examples are taken from Trautmann, Die altpreußischen Sprachdenkmäler, whereas the translation is taken from Schmalstieg, An Old Prussian Grammar, p. 340—341) 1) Alkīnisquai turei toŭ tien nostan pomaitat kuilgimai giwassi (p. 65, line 28) "with sorrow will you nourish yourself thereon as long as you live", 2) bhe ilga gīwasi nosemmien (p. 59, line 28) "and you will live a long time on earth", 3) bhe ilgi giwassi no semien (p. 25, line 3) "and you will live a long time on earth". As the German translation of the catechism unambiguously uses the 2d sg. in its version, Schmalstieg points out, there is no reason to assume with Endzelin (Senprūšu Valoda, p. 104) that these forms reflect a 3d person reflexive such as Russian

живётся /živ'ots'a/. The question is then if *giwassi* really reflects an I.-E. primary 2d sg. ending *-si*. Stang (Vergl. Gr., p. 408) doubts this as a short final *-i* probably would have been dropped, especially in the polysyllabic thematic form. He therefore interprets *giwassi* as **gīwasei*. It may be so that a final short *-i* was bound to disappear but it does not seem a far-fetched idea that this *-i* was later restored on the basis of, and in analogy with, the athematic ending *-si*, which possibly was accentuated in some cases and would therefore retain its *-i*.

The 2d sg. ending of the Old Prussian athematic verb presents a constant and probably unsolvable problem. It is represented in the forms *-sei* (10x), *-sai* (8x), *-si* (5x) and *-se* (7x). Stang (Vergl. Gr., p. 408) takes *-si* and *-se* as variants of *-sei* whereas in *-sai* he sees the influence of the 1st sg. *asmai*. He then goes on to explain the ending *-sei* as a contamination product of the athematic ending *-si* and the thematic ending **-ei*. Toporov is of the same opinion in IJSLP V, p. 50.

From the above it is clear that we cannot accept this solution. The **-ei* we have tried to explain differently, — and besides, **-ei* does not occur in Old Prussian. Kazlauskas (op. cit., p. 296 — 297) agrees with Stang that the 1st sg. *-mai* gave rise to 2d sg. *-sai* and 2d pl. *-tai*, but he goes further and maintains that the 1st sg. also gave rise to 2d pl. *-tei* (9x) instead of the expected *-te* (1x). The 2d pl. proportion *-tai*: *-tei* he maintains then gave rise to a similar proportion in the 2d sg., i. e. *-sai*: *-sei*. Thus the ending *-sei* would be an innovation and one avoids postulating an ending **-ei* for Old Prussian. Schmalstieg goes a step further in his Old Prussian Grammar, p. 151 where he reconstructs an Old Prussian 2d sg. primary ending /*-si*/ with *-sei*, *-sai*, *-se* only as orthographic variants. Indeed bearing in mind the dubious orthographic deviations of the Old Prussian texts, it is difficult to give great credibility to such forms as f. ex. 2d pl. *-tei* existing beside the expected *-te*, or for that matter 2d sg. *-sei* existing beside the expected *-si*, cf. the following variants which are only few out of hundreds:

ainaweydi, ainawīdai, ainawijdei = "likewise"
kanxtai, kanxtei = "proper"
twaisai, twaisei, twaise = "of your"
maldai, wertei (Nom. pl. ending)
wedais, weddeis, wedays (Imp. 2d sg. ending)
-te, -ti, -tai, -tei (Ind. 2d pl. ending)

It is therefore a not altogether unfounded assumption that *-si* and *-sei* merely are orthographic variants, the original being *-si*. Different accentuation (barytone vs. oxytone) may to some extent be responsible for the German scribe's orthographic hesitation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brugmann K. Zur Bildung der 2. Person Singul. Akt. in den idg. insbesondere den baltischen Sprachen. — IF, Bd. 17.

Būga K. Aistiški Studijai I d. St. Peterburg, 1908.

Būga K. RR. (=Rinktiniai raštai). V., 1959, t. II.

Эндзелин Я. О балтийском окончании 2-го лица ед. ч. — ИОРЯС („Известия отделения русского языка и словесности (императорской) Академии наук"), 1917, т. XXII, p. 85—116.

Endzelin J. Lettische Grammatik. Riga, 1922.

Endzelīns J. Senprūšu Valoda. Rīga, 1943.

Kazlauskas J. Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika. V., 1968.

Mažiulis V. Prūsų kalbos paminklai. V., 1966.

Mažiulis V. Iš baltų veiksmažodžių fleksijos istorijos. — „Baltistica". I priedas. V., 1972, p. 95—100.

Meillet A. Le slave commun. Paris, 1965.

Schmalstieg W.R. Primitive East Baltic *-uo-, *-ie- and the 2nd Sg. ending. — "Lingua", 1961, vol. X, p. 369—374.

Schmalstieg W.R. An Old Prussian Grammar. Pennsylvania, 1974.

Schmalstieg W.R. Studies in Old Prussian. Pennsylvania, 1976.

Stang Chr. Das slavische und baltische Verbum. Oslo, 1942.

Stang Chr. Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen. Oslo, 1966.

Топоров Н. В. О некоторых архаизмах в системе балтийского глагола. — IJSLP (= "International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics"), 1962, vol. V, p. 31—57.

Trautmann R. Die altpreußischen Sprachdenkmäler. Göttingen, 1910.

Watkins C. Indogermanische Grammatik. Bd. III/I. Heidelberg, 1969.

SMULKMENOS

XXXVI

M. Mažvydo katekizmo frazės *Jus anialai ſiligy* 63$_7$ žodis *ſiligy* naujausiame šio teksto leidime (Martynas Mažvydas. Pirmoji lietuviška knyga. Vilnius, 1974, p.209) transponuojamas *silijy*. Tai nesusipratimas. Teksto parengėjas nepagrįstai mano, kad čia raidė *g* žymi jotą (toks žymėjimas Mažvydo tekste dažnas). Tačiau šiame žodyje raidė *g* iš tikrųjų rodo ne jotą, bet priebalsį *g*. Taigi reikia skaityti *silingi* 'galingi' (slavizmas). Vietoj *in* Mažvydas neretai rašo *i*, pvz., *likſmik* 50$_{10}$ 'linksmink', *likſmai* 10$_8$ 'linksmai', *Milaſchirdigai* 62$_3$ 'mielaširdingai', *netigieiau* 68$_4$ 'netingėjau', 3. praet. *rika* 51$_{18}$ 'rinko', *ſilvartigus* 71$_{14}$ 'sielvartingus', *ig* 21$_{15}$ arba *igi* 29$_{24}$ 'į' (iš *ingi*) ir kt. Plg. atitinkamą *u* rašymą vietoj *un*: *Sukiei* 53$_3$ 'sunkiai', *ſukibe* 63$_{19}$ 'sunkybę' ir kt. Painiojama *in*, *un* ir *į*, *ų* (dėl netobulos spaudos yra *i*, *u*), nes nosinius balsius *į*, *ų* Mažvydas tarė su stipriu nosiniu rezonansu, panašiai kaip *in*, *un*. Plg. rašymą *rąkas* 11$_{10}$ 'rankas', *apdęgima* 37$_{21}$ 'apdengimą'.

Teksto parengėjas neteisingai Mažvydo raidę *g* suprato dar šiuose katekizmo žodžiuose: a. sg. *milaſchirdigiſte* 20$_{14}$ 'mielaširdingystę', g. sg. *milaſchirdigiſtes* 63$_{21}$ 'mielaširdingystės', loc. sg. (dat. sg. ?) *milaſchirdigiſtiei* 63$_{23}$ 'mielaširdingystėje', kuriuos transponavo (p. 123, 209) *milaširdijiste, milaširdijistes, milaširdijistei*.

Z. Zinkevičius