

Aurelijus VIJŪNAS
National Kaohsiung Normal University

THE HISTORY OF LITHUANIAN *delčią* ‘WANING MOON’ AND SEVERAL RELATED MORPHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

1. The familiar Lithuanian noun *delčią* ‘waning moon’ can be found in a number of works dedicated to Lithuanian grammar and etymological studies, although it is rarely discussed at length. In E. Fraenkel’s etymological dictionary of Lithuanian, *delčia* is only briefly mentioned in the article dedicated to the noun *dalis* ‘part’, where it is said to be genetically related to the verb *dilti* ‘become blunt(er)’ and the nouns *pūsdilis* / *pūsdylis* (beside the more distantly related material). The two nouns, both literally meaning ‘the half-dull one’ (and both originally adjectival), are the less frequent variants of the noun *delčia* (see Fraenkel 1962, 81f.). The noun *delčia* can also be found in IEW, 195 and Ambrazas 1993, 48, but without any discussion of its formation, whereas this noun is not discussed at all in P. Skardžius’ *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba* (Skardžius 1943; only *deltija* ‘id.’ is mentioned on p. 82). Only in the more recent Lithuanian etymological dictionary by W. Smoczyński (2007) does the noun *delčia* (along with several of its variant forms) receive a brief etymological discussion (see op. cit., p. 100). However, the arrangement of the data in Smoczyński’s dictionary is somewhat unusual: the form *delčia* (the standard form of this word) is described in an article with the keyword *deltis*, although, in reality, *deltis* is a non-standard variant of *delčia* (and therefore the reverse arrangement would be expected).

In this article, I would like to return to this noun, its history, and the history of its variant forms once again.

2. At first sight, the etymological relationships of the noun *delčia* appear to be quite clear: from the semantic side, the connection with the verb *dilti* appears quite natural, and expressions like *mėnulis dyla* ‘the moon is waning’ (lit. ‘the moon is becoming blunter’) or *dylantis mėnulis* ‘waning moon’ are probably well familiar to most speakers of the language. From the synchron-

ic morphological perspective, *delčia*, too, is just one of quite many feminine nouns possessing the ending *-čia* in Lithuanian, cf. also *telyčia* ‘heifer’, *bažnyčia* ‘church’, *seklyčia* ‘sitting-room’, *gryčia* ‘house’, *erčia* ‘open space’, *meįgičia* ‘girl’, *virksčia* ‘vine, stem’, *apačia* ‘bottom part’, *kančia* ‘suffering’, *pasakčia* ‘fable’, *akčia* ‘harrow’ (pl.), etc. There also exist a number of adverbs and particles in Lithuanian ending in *-čia*, cf. *týčia* ‘on purpose’, *nakčia* ‘at night’, *(pa)slapčia* ‘secretly’, *vogčia* ‘stealthily’, *risčia* ‘at a trot’, *nejučia* ‘unwittingly, unawares’, etc.

At second sight, though, *delčia* reveals various problems: first of all, the verb *dilti*, which was said earlier to share the root with *delčia*, does not show the *e*-grade anywhere in its paradigm, at least in its standard inflection, cf. its fundamental forms: *dilti* (inf.), *dýla* (pres.; < **di-n-la*), *dilo* (pret.). There exists a non-standard present form *dela* (LKŽ; also see LIV, 114), but its direct connection to the *e*-grade of *delčia* is quite doubtful (see section 5 below).

Second, the ending *-čia* is seldom seen in truly archaic formations, i.e., those inherited from the Proto-Indo-European times; besides, their structure differs in significant ways from that of *delčia* (for a brief discussion, see section 3 below). The standard form *delčia* must have acquired its ending at some point of development, most likely in post-Proto-Indo-European times. Finally, *delčia* possesses a number of variant forms, cf. *delcius*, *delcis*, *dilcius* (all masculine), *delcē*, *diltis*, *deltis*, and *deltija* (all feminine; see LKŽ). Most of these forms are obviously secondary, but the standard form *delčia* itself is very likely secondary, too. In this article, I would like to investigate both the history of the standard form and to reconstruct the most plausible original form of this noun, if it appears to be possible.

3. First, several words need to be said about the ending *-čia* and its place in nominal derivation. The ending *-čia* reflects PIE **-tjā*, a formant that indeed existed at some stage of late Proto-Indo-European. However, it was hardly ever added to bare verbal roots in the Proto-Indo-European times. The formant **-tjo-* / *-tjā* was mostly added to particles or other non-inflectable words (although archaic examples are not numerous). The resulting formations eventually became substantives of some sort, cf. Vedic *ní-tya-* ‘one’s own’, Gothic *niþjis* ‘descendant’ (< **h₁ni-tjo-* ~ **h₁ni* ‘in’, cf. Greek ἐνί ‘in’), Ved. *ápa-tya-* ‘offspring’, Lith. *apačia* ‘bottom part’ (< virtual **h₂epo-tjeh₂* ~ **h₂epo*, cf. Gk. ἀπό ‘away from’), Lith. *svėčias* ‘guest’ (< **sue-tjo-* ~ **sue* ‘own’; for a discussion, see AiGr 2(2), 697ff.), etc.

Many other *tjo-* and *tjā-*formations are secondarily built to thematic *to-* participles, and are adjectival, cf. Gk. γνήσιος ‘legitimate’, Ved. *jātya-* ‘related’ (< **ǵnh₁-tjo-* ← **ǵnh₁-tó-* ~ √**ǵenh₁-* ‘bear’), Lith. *stāčias* ‘erect’ (adj.; < **stā₂-tjo-* ← **stā₂-to-* ~ √**steh₂-* ‘stand’, cf. Lith. *stātas*, Gk. στατός), probably also Lith. *pėsčias* ‘pedestrian’ (< **pēd-tjo-* ← **pēd-to-* ~ *pēstas* ‘id.’), etc.¹ It is unlikely, though, that the noun *delčia*, too, would have been built in this way, because, in order to derive *delčia* in this way, one would have to assume that before the creation of this noun, there would have existed an adjective **delčias*, which, however, is not attested. Besides, *tjo-*adjectives normally do not further develop into nouns.

The ending *-čia* of *delčia* is also different from the nouns of the *bažnyčia* and *telyčia* type mentioned in section 2 above, since the nouns of this class are borrowings from Slavic (for these two particular items, see Fraenkel 1962, 38; 1965, 1078). The noun *delčia*, though, is surely a Lithuanian formation, since it does not have clear cognates in other languages.

The ending of *delčia* is more likely to be related either to the ending *-čia* as seen in the adverbs *nakčia*, *slapčia*, and *tyčia*, or nouns of the *kančia*, *erčia*, *virksčia* type mentioned in section 2 above. However, also in these formations, the ending *-čia* is most likely fairly late, and its history is not entirely straightforward. I will discuss some of these formations in more detail in sections 9–14 below).

4. At the oldest stage, i.e., at the stage of its formation, the proto-form of the noun *delčia* most likely was a verbal abstract (“action noun”). Its base verbal root was the Indo-European verbal root **delh₁-* ‘divide’, which eventually also came to mean ‘lessen’, ‘become dull’ in Proto-Baltic (whence the intransitive Lith. *dilti* and Latvian *dilt* ‘become dull’).

Among the attested variants of *delčia*, the most primary-looking forms which can also be readily interpreted as original verbal abstracts are the forms *diltis* and *deltis*. Between these two, especially *diltis* with its zero grade of the root looks like a potential candidate to the title of the original form of *delčia*, because it is this form that can be reconstructed as a regular “classical” Proto-Indo-European *ti-*stem verbal abstract built to a *TeRT* root in the zero grade, viz. **dlh₁-ti-* ‘diminishing’.²

¹ The *ē*-grade may be secondary after the old root noun *pēdā* ‘foot’ (← PIE **pód-* / *péd-*, loc. sg. **péd*).

² This also seems to be Smoczyński’s opinion (Smoczyński 2007, 100).

As to when the ancestor of *diltis* was formed, it is not possible to say with precision. Since its shape resembles that of many *ti*-stems of Proto-Indo-European antiquity (cf. PIE **mṅ-ti-* ‘thought’, **mṛ-ti-* ‘death’, **bhṛ-ti-* ‘carrying’, etc.), it may be tempting to reconstruct a Proto-Indo-European *ti*-stem **dlh₁-ti-*, too. However, unlike the *ti*-stems shown above, all of which exhibit reflexes in a number of Indo-European daughter languages, cf. Lith. *mintis*, Skt. *matí-* ‘thought’, Latin *mēns* ‘mind’, Old Church Slavīc па-мѧтъ ‘memory’, etc. for PIE **mṅ-ti-*, Lith. *mirtis*, Skt. *mṛtí-*, Avestan *mərəti-*, La. *mōrs*, OCS сѣ-мрѣтъ ‘death’, etc. for PIE **mṛti-*, and so forth, *diltis* does not have any cognates in the other Indo-European dialects. Therefore, even if this item was formed during the Proto-Indo-European era, it would have been a dialectism. It is also entirely possible that *diltis* was built in post-Proto-Indo-European times, since the *ti*-suffix continued to be productive within the internal development of the Lithuanian language, and was used in many later (i.e., post-Proto-Indo-European) formations. These late “*ti*-stems” were derived directly from Lithuanian verbs, and no longer followed Proto-Indo-European ablaut patterns, cf. *baigtis* ‘end’ (← *baĩgti* ‘finish’), *lemtis* ‘fate’ (← *leĩti* ‘decide; pre-determine’), *iš-gąstis* ‘fear, fright’ (~ *iš-si-gąsti* ‘be frightened’; root *gand-*), *at-ei-tis* ‘future’ (~ *eĩ-ti* ‘go’; cf. also *pra-eitīs* ‘past’ and *iš-eitīs* ‘way out, solution’), etc.

The noun *deltis* would have been built in exactly this way, too, and it is most probably a dialectal creation, built from the root of the verb *dėlti* ‘make blunt, diminish’ and the suffix *-ti-*. The original meaning of this new formation would have been ‘making blunt’ or ‘diminishing’, but, as happens often with verbal abstracts built with the derivational suffix *-ti-*, it would have ultimately acquired a concrete meaning.³

5. Although the *e*-grade in the root of the noun *deltis* suggests that this *ti*-stem was most likely built from the root of the verb *delti* in post-Proto-

³ At some stage of the development of Lithuanian, the “default” suffix of verbal abstracts became the suffix *-im-* / *-ym-*, cf. *rāšymas* ‘act of writing’ (← *rašyti* ‘write’), *plaukimas* ‘swimming’ (← *plaukti*), *nešimas* ‘carrying’ (← *nešti*), etc. However, even such derivatives have occasionally undergone concretization, cf. *gėrimas* ‘drink’ (beside *gėrimas* ‘drinking’; both from *gėrti* ‘drink’), *ėjimas* ‘move’ (as in chess) or ‘going’ (verbal abstract; both from *ėiti*), *pūdymas* ‘fallow’ and ‘making rotten’ (abstract; from *pūdyti* ‘make rotten’), *arimas* ‘ploughed field’ or ‘act of ploughing’ (← *árti* ‘plough’), etc. (for a discussion, see Ambrazas 1993, 21ff.).

Indo-European times, the ancestor of the verb *delti* itself may well be fairly old. The root of this verb, reconstructed as **delh₁-* (LIV, 114), is well attested throughout the Indo-European language family in many guises, and a number of old verbal formations are built to it. The history of this Lithuanian verb requires a brief comment, however.

Although the verbal root **delh₁-* appears in LIV, the verb *delti* itself is not mentioned there. Instead, a Žemaitian present tense form *delù* (1. sg.) is adduced, but interpreted as an inflected form of the verb *dìlti* ‘sich abnutzen, schwinden’ (LIV, loc. cit.). Alongside with this Žemaitian form, its Latvian equivalent *delu* is adduced, and this form, too, is said to have an infinitive *dilt* ‘abnehmen, sich verschleiben’. The two verbs show some kind of ablaut *e ~ i*, which, in the case of Baltic, would be most convenient to interpret as reflecting earlier *e ~ zero* alternation in roots containing resonants. The origin of the zero grade in the infinitives as well as the relationship between the two ablaut grades is not discussed in LIV, though.

Both present forms are considered to continue an original thematic type **délh₁-e-* (LIV, 114). However, this does not necessarily have to be so. The “thematic” ending *-ù* in Žemaitian is in many instances ambiguous, as it can easily be either inherited (i.e., reflecting earlier genuine thematic **-o-h₂*), or result from very late secondary thematization. Žemaitian underwent strong apocope of unstressed vowels, which produced a lot of endingless 3. person present tense forms, cf. Žem. *tik* ‘believe’ (cf. standard Lithuanian *tìk-i*), *tur* ‘have’ (~ Lith. *tùr-i*), *kriok* ‘cry’ (~ Lith. *kriòk-ia* ‘growl’), *dirb* ‘work’ (~ Lith. *dìrb-a*), etc.⁴ Since after apocope, the 3. person forms lost their main indicator of the inflectional class, a number of verbs moved to other classes, whence such secondarily thematized Žemaitian forms like *tikù* ‘believe’ (1. sg.; cf. standard Lithuanian *tikiù*), *áudu* ‘weave’ (~ standard Lithuanian *áudžiu*), etc. (Zinkevičius 1994, 103f.).

Essentially the same things may be said about Latvian, which underwent equally strong reduction of unstressed vowels as Žemaitian. Thus, the two forms adduced in LIV may not necessarily be inherited, even though they exhibit some kind of ablaut. This ablauting paradigm of the verb *dilt*, with *e*-grade in the present and *i*-grade in the infinitive (and preterite), may eas-

⁴ The spelling of the Žemaitian forms has been standardized, and no attention is paid here to the phonetic features of the vowels (lowering, diphthongization, etc.).

ily be secondary, analogical to verbs of the *pirkti* ‘buy’ and *sirgti* ‘be ill’ type, which form their present with the *e*-grade, cf. Žem. *perk*, *serg* (~ standard Lith. *perka*, *serga*), and are quite numerous. In Latvian, many verbs of this type even have competing present forms in the zero grade and the *e*-grade, cf. *sergu* ~ *sirgu*, *velku* ~ *vilku* ‘drag’, *dzemu* ~ *dzimu* ‘am born’, etc. (see Stang 1966, 330ff.).⁵

In standard Lithuanian, there are two clearly distinguished verbs: an intransitive *dilti* ‘become blunt(er)’ on the one hand, with present *dỹla* and preterite *dilo*, and transitive *dėlti* ‘make blunt’ on the other hand, with present *dėlia* and preterite *dėlė*. In the present tense, the former constantly exhibits historical zero grade, whereas the latter has the *e*-grade in all present forms.

The intransitive verb *dilti* ‘diminish, become dull’ with its zero grade derives from an older verb with infix present, **d-in-l-* (< **d-ŋ-l-*). It was most likely post-Proto-Indo-European, but belonged to a productive derivational pattern of building intransitive nasal inchoatives, as described in a recent study by Y. Gorbachov (2007, 200ff., especially p. 203). The original meaning of this intransitive inchoative would have been ‘begin to diminish, begin to become dull’, as opposed to the transitive meaning of the ancestor of the verb *delti* ‘to diminish sth., make smaller / blunter’. The intransitive **dinla* eventually developed into the modern standard *dyla* (< *dỹla*), whereas its preterite and infinitive show the nasal-less zero grade, *dil-* (pret. *dilo*, inf. *dilti*).⁶

The standard present inflection of *delti* with no ablaut (cf. 1. sg. *deliù*, 3. sg. / pl. *dėlia*, etc.) may well be inherited, and it may reflect the Proto-Indo-European *j*-presents of the type R(é)-*je-* (LIV, 19, **spék-je-* type). A comparable inherited *j*-present formation would be Latin *dolō*, *-āre* ‘process, treat, work on’ (LIV, 114).

6. The rest of the attested forms are probably secondarily derived from either *deltis* or *diltis*. From the derivational point of view, it may be possible to classify the rest of the attested forms of *delčia* into several groups, the forms with the *e*-grade of the root ultimately deriving from *deltis*, and those with

⁵ Such pairs also occur in Lithuanian, cf. the colloquial *jemù* ‘take’ (3. sg. *jėma*) beside *(j)imù* (standard *imù*; inf. *imti*), the pair *sniŋga* ~ *sneŋga* ‘snow’ (3. sg.; inf. *snigti*), etc.

⁶ For more examples, see Gorbachov op. cit.

the *i*-grade (i.e., historical zero grade) deriving from *diltis*. I will discuss them in separate sections below.

7. The masculine nouns *delčius* and *delčis* are closely related to each other, and the latter most likely derives from the former.

The noun *delčius* formally resembles Lithuanian nouns of the type *milčius* ‘miller’ (lit. ‘flour producer’), *šluočius* ‘broom-maker’, *turčius* ‘wealthy man’, *sukčius* ‘swindler’, etc. All these derivatives are all built to *to*-formations of one sort of another, although they belong to different semantic groups, cf. *milčius* ← *mltai* ‘flour’ (< **m̃lh₂-to-*; old *to*-participle), *sukčius* ← *suktas* ‘wily, sly’ (< ‘crooked’ < **suk-to-*, *to*-ptc.), *šluočius* ← *šluota* ‘broom’ (< virtual **k̃loh₁-teh₂*; tool noun), and *turčius* ← *turtas* ‘wealth’ (< **turH-to-*), etc. Among these derivatives, it is especially nouns of the *sukčius* type that are semantically close to *delčius*. The original meaning of the noun *sukčius* was ‘the crooked (“*suk-ta-*”) one’, and the same semantic analysis may be applied to the noun *delčius*, which originally would have meant ‘the blunted (“*del-ta-*”) one’.

The noun *delčis* must be a later reformation of *delčius*, in spite of the fact that in Lithuanian, the usual derivation goes in the opposite direction, i.e., (*i*-st. >)⁷ *io*-st. > *iu*-st., cf. *spiētis* ‘swarm’ > *spiėčius* (also *spiečius*), *m̃yris* ‘dying’ > *myrius*, *gėltis* ‘yellow-coloured’ (of animals) > *gelčius*, *ámžis* ‘age’ > *amžius*, *p̃yktis* ‘anger’⁸ > *pykčius*, etc. At some stage of development, a fair number of such pairs must have been created, and perhaps in certain cases, this derivational pattern may have even been reversed. One clear example of this latter type is the noun *būčis* ‘fish-trap’, which must derive from the older *būčius*. The reason for thinking so is that if the derivation had gone in the opposite direction, instead of *būčis* one should expect **būtis* (cf. *spietis*, *pyktis*, etc. above). In certain cases, it is hardly possible to tell whether the given *iu*-stem comes from an older *io*-stem, or vice versa (this even affects borrowed vocabulary), cf. *vylis* ‘fraud, deception’ ~ *vylis*, *sielis* ‘raft’ ~ *sielius*, *pilvotis* ‘fat person’ ~ *pilvočius*, *durnis* ‘fool’ ~ *durnius* (← Slavic, cf. Russian дурень), etc.⁹

The noun *delčis* must have developed from an earlier *delčius* in the same way as *būčis* from the older *būčius*, because otherwise, there should exist a masculine noun **deltis*, but it is not attested.

⁷ Including original *t(i)*-stems.

⁸ There also exists the feminine form *pyktis* (*ti*-stem), which must be older.

⁹ For several additional examples, see Skardžius 1943, 79f.

8. The noun *dilčius* was built in the same way as *delčius*, i.e., from a *to*-participle. Such a participle, **diltas*, is not attested, in fact, but it probably existed at that stage of development when the ancestor of the currently intransitive verb *dilti* could still form a *to*-participle.¹⁰ This makes it more likely that the noun *dilčius* may be older than its relatives with the *e*-grade of the root, *delčius* and *delčis*.

9. The standard form *delčia* most likely goes back to the *ti*-stem *deltis* (see section 4 above), and developed its own paradigm via paradigmatic split. This split was product of a slow process whereby historical (*t*)*i*- and consonantal stems in Lithuanian developed endings similar to – or directly borrowed from – thematic and *ē*-stems. Resulting paradigmatic similarities caused a large number of splits, and parallel paradigms may be observed among many Lithuanian nouns, e.g., *pỹktis* ‘anger’ (gen. *pỹkčio*; ← *pyktis*, gen. *pyktiės*), *sėšė* ‘sister’ (gen. *sėsės*; ← *sesuō*, gen. *seseřs*), the colloquial *vinys* ‘nail’ (gen. *vinio*; ← *vinis*, gen. *viniės*), etc.

A detailed historical analysis of Proto-Indo-European (*t*)*i*-stems in Baltic is not yet available, although a lot of very useful information and lengthy lists of Old Lithuanian and dialectal data can be found in a series of works.¹¹ The Indo-European protolanguage possessed various types of (*t*)*i*-stem formations, differing in ablaut and accentuation,¹² and it is yet to be elucidated what processes in the development of Lithuanian (*t*)*i*-stems took place between the Proto-Indo-European times and the earliest attested texts. Perhaps such future studies will be able to provide an explanation to problems only briefly addressed in earlier works, e.g., the development of (*t*)*i*-stem datives or instrumentals, and the shape of these cases in early Proto-Baltic.¹³ The existing (*t*)*i*-stem data show forms that at times are hard to reconcile with corresponding forms from other Indo-European dialects, e.g., the Lithua-

¹⁰ There exist more examples of such archaic *to*-participles built to intransitive verbs, cf. *gimtas* ‘native’ (← *gimti* ‘be born’), *šiltas* ‘warm’ (← *šilti* ‘be[come] warm’), or the neuter past passive participles of the *eita* ‘gone, passed’, *plaukta* ‘swum’, *mirta* ‘died’ type, as in *čia briedžio eita* ‘an elk (gen. sg.) must have passed here’, etc.

¹¹ Skardžius 1943; Stang 1966; Kazlauskas 1968; Zinkevičius 1987; Ambrazas 1993 et al.

¹² For an extremely brief but illustrative overview see Widmer 2003.

¹³ Both are discussed in Kazlauskas 1968, 138ff. and 194ff., but the issues raised there have not yet received proper attention.

nian dative forms in *-ie* or *-i*, which perhaps do not derive from **-eġ-eġ* (see a discussion in Kazlauskas 1968, 139ff.). Also the instrumental (*t*)*i*- and consonantal stem ending *-ia* (type *nakčġa* ‘night’, *širdžġa* ‘heart’), which at first sight looks just like the instrumental ending of *iā*-stems, ultimately may prove to be an independent ending.¹⁴

10. A major rôle in the development of a separate paradigm of a noun *delčġa* from the paradigm of the more archaic *deltis* must have been played by some of the oblique cases, primarily the dative case. In some cases, also instrumental must have played a certain rôle (see section 12 below), but it is not clear whether this was the case in the development of the noun *delčġa*, too. In the following paragraphs, I would like to return to the histories of these two cases in a brief way (without repeating what has already been said in earlier, more comprehensive, works [Stang 1966; Kazlauskas 1968, etc.]).

11. Beside the ending **-imi*, (*t*)*i*-stem instrumentals had a competing ending in **-iān* (< **-iā* + *-m*). Instrumentals with the reflex of this ending are attested in different quantities in different texts, but even though they do not occur in Mažvydas’ texts (Kazlauskas 1968, 194), ample evidence for them in other early texts shows that such instrumentals were fairly widespread already then.

The definitive answer about the origin of this ending is yet to be provided, but I find Kazlauskas’ opinion that these instrumentals in *-iā* are ultimately comparable to Sanskrit instrumentals in *-yā* very attractive (op. cit., p. 198). Although in Sanskrit itself, this ending must have been intruded into a number of instrumentals by analogy – including *matyā* ‘thought’ itself (this example was used by Kazlauskas),¹⁵ – in some forms, such an ending was inherited. The instrumental ending *-ā*, reflecting PIE **-éh₁*, originally was at home in hystero- and amphikinetic formations, which normally had accented endings in the full grade in the weak forms. Instrumentals with this ending are not uncommon in Sanskrit, although many have undergone

¹⁴ This issue is not discussed in Stang 1968 and Zinkevičius 1987, but see Kazlauskas 1968, 197f.

¹⁵ Since Skt. *matī*- ‘thought’ is normally reconstructed as a proterokinetic formation, its ancestral instrumental in Proto-Indo-European should have had an ending in the zero grade, i.e. **-h₁* vel sim. (cf. idealized PIE **m_ṛ-tēġ-h₁*). Reflexes of such an instrumental ending in the zero grade are to be seen in Ved. *ūtī* ‘aid’ < **h₂uH-tī-h₁*, etc.

secondary accentual / ablaut reformations, or posit other problems,¹⁶ e.g., Vedic *rāyá* ‘wealth’ (< virtual **reh₁-ī-éh₁* from **rēh₁-i-*),¹⁷ further Ved. *sákhyā* ‘companion’ (accentuation is secondary; ← **sok^hh₂-ī-éh₁*; cf. also Young Avestan *haša* ‘id.’). This ending has also spread to words continuing other ablaut types, e.g., Ved. *pátyā* ‘lord’ (< virtual **pótīeh₁*),¹⁸ *ūtyá* ‘aid’, etc., which shows that it enjoyed certain – although perhaps limited – productivity.

It is impossible to say how wide-spread such instrumentals were in Proto-Baltic (and whether they existed at all), before an in-depth analysis of the relevant data becomes available. A large number of the attested Lithuanian *-ia* instrumentals are certainly secondary, e.g., *širdžia* ‘heart’, which, if it had developed regularly, should have become **širde* vel sim. (as if < **k̃rd-éh₁*), or *seseria* ‘sister’ likewise should have become **ses(e)re*,¹⁹ etc. However, at least some of the forms must have been inherited, and the ending *-ia* would have spread from there.

12. That instrumentals in *-ia* must have existed among Lithuanian (*t*)*i*-stems already at an early stage may also be suggested by adverbial forms of the type *nakčią* ‘at night’, (*pa*)*slapčią* ‘secretly’, *vogčią* ‘stealthily’, probably also *týčia* ‘on purpose’, etc. These adverbs are without doubt frozen instrumentals, at some stage of development pushed out of the corresponding nominal paradigms by the less marked forms ending in *-imi*, or, in the case of *tyčia*, probably being sole survivors of ancient full paradigms.

The ancestor of the Lithuanian noun *naktis* ‘night’ was an acrostic *t*-stem **nók^h-t-* / **nék^h-t-*, and at an early stage, its instrumental would have been **nék^h-t-h₁*.²⁰ However, this poorly marked instrumental was remade probably in all Indo-European dialects, adopting the endings of more prolific morphological classes, or the noun itself would completely move to another class. Thus, in Baltic and Slavic, the ancestor of the ‘night’ word eventually adopted the inflection of *i*-stems.

¹⁶ Here, it is primarily Skt. *rayí-* ‘wealth’ (~ Latin *rēs* ‘matter’), which has been interpreted as an original amphikinetic formation (Tichy 2000, 74), but does not exhibit the usual *ō*-grade of the suffix in the nominative singular (i.e., there are no known reflexes of a nom. sg. ***rēh₁-ōī*).

¹⁷ Also *rayínā* is attested.

¹⁸ Ved. *pátī-* originally must have been acrostic, cf. Gk. *πόσις* ‘husband’ (< **póti-*). The *-inā* variant *pátinā* is attested, too.

¹⁹ The original Proto-Indo-European instrumental form should have been **sue-sr-éh₁*.

²⁰ See Vijūnas 2009, with further references to earlier scholarship.

Whether Proto-Balto-Slavic possessed any amphikinetic or hysterokinetic *i*-stems, comparable to the Hittite *udnē* ‘land’ (< **ud-n-ē̃*; hysterokinetic), *lingaiš* ‘oath’ (< **léng-ō̃*; amphikinetic), Latin *fidēs* ‘faith’ (< **bhidh-ē̃*; hysterokinetic), or Greek *πειθῶ* ‘persuasion’ type (< **bhēidh-ō̃*; amphikinetic), it is not entirely certain. However, in one way or another, the Baltic ancestor of the ‘night’ word at some stage became infected with the mobile type *iā*-instrumental ending, and regularly developed into Lith. *nakčią* < Proto-Baltic **nakt-iān*. At a certain stage, the competing instrumental *naktimi*, which was characterized by a less marked instrumental ending, pushed out *nakčia* from the paradigm, and the latter became adverbialized, and is now mostly used as a temporal adverb.

The development of the adverbs (*pa*)*slapčia*, *vogčia*, and *tyčia* must have been comparable, although they were not necessarily built at the same time. The adverb *vogčia*, due to the shape of its root, may be fairly late, and built from the verb *vogti* ‘steal’ (< **uāg-*). The noun **vogtiš* ‘theft’ is not directly attested, but it might have existed (cf. also *vogtė* ‘id.’, and word-pairs of the *musiš* ~ *musė* type as shown in section 14 below).

Beside the adverb *paslapčia*, there exists a noun *paslaptis* ‘secret’, as well as a somewhat less frequent *slaptis* ‘id.’, and the corresponding adverbs would have developed out of them in the same way as *nakčia* out of *naktis*.

More problematic is the adverb *tyčia*, which, according to the scenaria laid out above, should have developed out of some noun **tytiš* ‘purpose’ or ‘doing sth. on purpose’. Such a noun is not attested, and there is no comparable verb **tyti*. However, there exist two curious formations, *týtinti* (attested in XVII c.) and *týtyti* (Daukša), both meaning ‘scorn’ (the oldest meaning?), ‘try to eavesdrop’, or ‘put off’ (LKŽ).²¹ They may ultimately be connected to the adverb *tyčia*.²² These two verbs must be variants of one verb, and are comparable to other Lithuanian verb pairs with *-y-* / *-in-* suffixes, cf. also *táikyti* ~ *táikinti* ‘reconcile’, *rūkýti* ~ *rūkinti* ‘smoke’ (of meat), etc. (cf. Skardžius 1943, 545ff.). The verbs *tytinti* and *tytyti* do not have well studied etymologies, and the shape of their root is ambiguous. On the one hand, the shape of Lithuanian *in*-derivatives like *vaišinti* / *váišinti* ‘treat’ (~ *vaiš-ės* ‘treat; feast’),

²¹ Skardžius only has the meaning ‘scorn; tease, annoy’ (1943, 547).

²² Cf. also Būga apud Fraenkel 1965, 1103.

grāžinti ‘embellish’ (*graž-us* ‘beautiful’), and especially the deverbative *auginti* ‘grow (*vt*), raise’ (~ *aug-ti* ‘grow’ [*vi*]), *lipinti* ‘make stick’ (~ *lip-ti* ‘stick’) etc. would imply that the root of the verb *tytinti* is **tyt-*. In such case, the base verb should have been **tysti* (i.e., < **tyt-ti*). Such a verb is not attested, however, and a putative *ti*-stem, if derived from such a verb, would have become **tystis* (a corresponding adverb would have been **tysčia*).

There exists an alternative way to interpret these two verbs. On the one hand, *tytinti* can be interpreted like *in*-derivatives built to *to*-formations, cf. *báltinti* ‘whiten’ (← *baltas* ‘white’ ~ IE **bhelh₁-* ‘be shiny’), *káltinti* ‘accuse’ (← *kaltas* ‘guilty’ ~ IE **[s]kel-* ‘be guilty’), etc. In such case, the *t* of *tyt-* could be interpreted as part of an original participial suffix *-to-*, whereas the verbal root itself would be *ty-*. A *ti*-stem built to such a root would have been **tytis*. On the other hand, one could interpret the verb *tytyti* as the more original one variant, and apply the same historical interpretation to this verb as was proposed above for *tytinti*. The verb *tytyti* may have been built in the same way as Lith. *statýti* ‘build’ (i.e., *sta-t-y-ti*; ~ IE **steh₂-* ‘stand’) or *vėtyti* ‘winnow’ (*vė-t-y-ti*; ~ IE **h₂ueh₁-* ‘blow’). The formant *-t-* in these two verbs ultimately goes back to *to-* or *tu-*formations, cf. *statas*, *status* (< **stə₂-*), *vėtas* (< virtual **h₂ueh₁-to-*).

The meaning of the verb **tyti* (pres. **tyja*, pret. **tijo?*) would have been ‘do something on purpose’, ‘vex’ vel sim., and the original meaning of the *ti*-stem would have been ‘doing something on purpose’ vel sim. Indirect evidence for the reconstruction of this verbal abstract can be provided by the actually attested feminine noun *týčia* / *tyčia* ‘sth. done on purpose’. The ending *-čia* in this noun must be secondary, and the noun *tyčia* must have developed out of the paradigm on an earlier **tytis* in the same way as *delčia* out of *deltis* (rather than having developed out the adverb; for a more detailed discussion, see section 14 below).

13. In spite of all that has been said in favour of early Lithuanian instrumentals in *-ia*, the existence of the specific instrumental *delčia* (or Proto-Baltic **deltiān*) remains unprovable. First of all, unlike the adverbs described in section 12 above, an adverb **delčia* ‘during waning moon’ has never been formed. The noun *delčia* also does not appear to be used in the instrumental form whenever it occurs in situations referring to time (unlike the adverb *nakčia* which is frequently used in temporal sense, especially in the poetic

language). Instead, temporal accusative (with prepositions) or locative are normally used, cf. *reik medžius kirsti į delčią* (acc.; from *delčia*)... ‘one has to cut the trees during waning moon’; *delčiuoj* (loc.; from *delčius*) *pjauna gyvulius, kad būtų mėsa skanesnė* ‘(one) slaughters cattle during waning moon, so that the meat is tastier’; *per delčią* (acc.; from *delčia*) *žmogaus organizmas yra gana geros formos* ‘during waning moon, the human body is in a fairly good shape’; ...*jeigu delčioj* (loc.; from *delčia*) *apsikirpsi, tai plaukai neaugs...* ‘if you trim your hair during waning moon, the hair will not grow (well)’; *išvažiavome delčioje* ‘we left during waning moon’; *bulves sodindavo per delčią* ‘(they) used to plant potatoes during waning moon’; *skrandžio negalavimai priešpilnyje įveikiami lengviau nei delčioje* ‘it is easier to overcome stomach ailments during gibbous moon than during waning moon’, etc. (the examples are from LKŽ and the internet). I have not been able to find any sentences in which the instrumental (or adverbial) form *delčia* would be used in the temporal sense.

14. The much more secure source for the creation of the new paradigm of *delčia* from the older paradigm of *deltis* would have been the dative case.

Beside the inherited ending **-ie*, (*t*)*i*-stem datives in the course of time adopted the ending *-iai* from *īā*-stems, cf. *aviai* ‘sheep’ (older *avie*), *ugniai* ‘fire’ (older *ugnie*), etc. (Stang 1966, 208; Kazlauskas 1968, 146ff.; Zinkevičius 1987, 187). This new ending eventually pushed out the older ending altogether, at least in the standard language.

When the noun *deltis* still had its original dative *deltie*, its paradigm was regular and quite straightforward; however, as the competing form with the ending *-iai* was created, the stem-final consonant *t* appeared in a position before *ī*, and regularly changed into the affricate *č*. The resulting dative form *delčiai* (< **deltīāi*) created allomorphy within the paradigm of *deltis*, with most of the cases exhibiting the stem morpheme *delt-* and the dative singular exhibiting *delč-*. This allomorphy eventually brought about paradigmatic split, whereby beside the old paradigm of the (*t*)*i*-stem *deltis*, a new *īā*-stem paradigm developed, with the root morpheme *delč-* generalized throughout the paradigm, and the endings of *īā*-stems.

A number of other Lithuanian nouns have developed in this way, cf. *dėčià* ‘egg-laying time’ (← *dėtis* ‘id.’ < **dheh₁-ti-*; cf. also *dėtės* ‘ovary’ [pl.]), *musià* ‘fly’ (← *musis* ‘id.’, cf. also *mùsė*), *virškščià* ‘vine’ (← *virškštis* / *virkštis*

‘id.’), *dalià* ‘fate; part’ (← *dalìs* ‘part’), possibly also *kalčìà* ‘fault’ (~ *kaltìs* ‘id.’, cf. also *kaltē*), etc. (see also Skardžius 1943, 70).²³ Ambiguity of particular case forms has caused paradigmatic shifts many times in the history of Lithuanian, cf. the tendency of consonantal stems to become vocalic, and of *i*-stems to become *io*-stems (*pyktìs* → *pỹktis* type).²⁴ Such morphological transfers in Lithuanian, brought about by paradigmatic split, may require a separate study.

15. The form *delčė* has most likely developed out of *delčia* or *deltis* just like *musė* ‘fly’ from an earlier *musis*, or *kančė* ‘suffering’ has evolved out of *kančia* ‘id.’ (see section 14 above for several additional examples). Thus, it is a secondary formation as well.

16. The form *deltijà* is mentioned briefly in Skardžius 1943, and is said to be one of the “obscure” *-ija* formations, along with *govijà* ‘group, gang’, *žarijà* ‘live coal’, etc., and a number of place-names (op. cit., 82f.). As he correctly stated, derivatives with this suffix belong to diverse semantic fields (ibid.), but *deltija* may ultimately have been formed in the same way as the de-adjectival formations of the type *Juodijà* (hydronym; ← *juodas* ‘black’), *pilnijà* ‘full moon’ (← *pilnas* ‘full’), etc., which Skardžius described on the same page. The noun *deltija* might have been built from the participle *deltas*, to the stem of which the suffix *-ija* would have been added. It is not certain whether the formation of *deltija* was influenced by the existence of *pilnija*, or vice versa, but the two appear to have been formed exactly in the same way:

<i>pilnas</i>	→	<i>pilnija</i>
<i>deltas</i>	→	<i>deltija</i>

If the noun *deltija* was indeed derived in this way, this would mean that the participle *deltas* might have been used to describe the waning moon, and it could have been referred to not only as *delčia*, *deltis*, etc., but also as *deltas mėnulis*, i.e., ‘blunted moon’.

17. In the precedings paragraphs, I have discussed the development of the noun *delčia* and its variant forms. It is likely that the oldest among the existing variants is the feminine noun *diltis*, which formally can reflect a regular

²³ The pair *ántis* ‘duck’ ~ *Ančia* (hydronym) apparently do not reflect the same process, and the two are not synonymous. The noun *Ančia* most likely reflects a feminine abstract **antiā* built to an originally adjectival **anti-o-* ‘of ducks; possessing ducks’.

²⁴ For more examples, see Vijūnas 2009, 102.

Proto-Indo-European *ti*-stem **d̥h₁-ti-* ‘diminishing’, built from the verbal root **delh₁-* ‘diminish, split’. The modern standard form *delčia* must have evolved out of the variant *deltis*, which itself was probably built within the internal development of Lithuanian from the transitive verb *delti* ‘diminish, make blunt’ and the suffix *-ti-*. The paradigm of the new noun *delčia* developed via paradigmatic split, and the trigger for this split must have been the dative form *delčiai*. Whether any influence may have been exerted by a putative instrumental form **delčia* (< **deltiān*) remains uncertain, as this form, although morphologically and phonologically plausible, is not attested.

LIE. *delčia* ISTORIJA IR KELETAS SUSIJUSIŲ MORFOLOGINIŲ PROBLEMŲ

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama žodžio *delčia* ir įvairių jo variantų (*deltis*, *diltis*, *delčius* etc.) kilmė ir daryba. Bendrinės kalbos forma *delčia* veikiausiai yra išvestinė iš ankstesnių lyčių, kadangi archajiški lietuvių kalbos daiktavardžiai su galūne *-čia* paprastai yra išvesti iš nekaitomų kalbos dalių, pvz. *svečias* (< **sue* + *-tjo-*), *apačia* (< **h₂epo* + *-tjo-*) etc. Senesnės žodžio *delčia* formos galėjo būti *diltis* ir *deltis*, o lytis *delčia* veikiausiai išsirutuliojo paradigminio skilimo principu, moteriškosios giminės daiktavardžio *deltis* naudininkui įgijus analoginę formą *delčiai* (vietoje istorinio **deltie*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AiGr – Jakob Wackernagel, (Albert Debrunner), *Altindische Grammatik* 2(1)–2(2), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954–1957.
- Ambrasas, Saulius 1993, *Daiktavardžių darybos raida. Lietuvių kalbos veiksmožodiniai vediniai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- Fraenkel, Ernst 1962, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Fraenkel, Ernst 1965, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Gorbachov, Yaroslav Vladimirovich 2007, *Indo-European origins of the nasal inchoative class in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic*, PhD dissertation, Harvard University.
- IEW – Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern, München: Francke Verlag, 1959.

Kazlauskas, Jonas 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis (= Idem, *Rinkiniai raštai 1*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2000).

LIV – *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2001.

LKŽ – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas 1–20*, Vilnius, 1968–2002.

Skardžius, Pranas 1943, *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba* (= Idem, *Rinkiniai raštai 1*, parengė Albertas Rosinas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996).

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Stang, Christian S. 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.

Tichy, Eva 2000, *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für Studierende sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*, Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

Vijūnas, Aurelijus 2009, *The Indo-European primary t-stems*, Innsbruck (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 133).

Widmer, Paul 2003, *Das Korn des weiten Feldes. Interne Derivation, Derivationskette und Flexionsklassenhierarchie: Aspekte der nominalen Wortbildung im Urindogermanischen*, Innsbruck (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 111).

Zinkevičius, Zigmas 1987, *Lietuvių kalbos istorija 2: Iki pirmųjų raštų*, Vilnius: Mokslo.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas 1994, *Lietuvių kalbos dialektologija*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Aurelijus VIJŪNAS
English Department
National Kaohsiung Normal University
116 He-Ping 1st rd.
802 Kaohsiung
Taiwan
[vijunas@ncknu.edu.tw]