M. L. PALMAITIS

WHY DOES BALTIC HAVE THE UNMARKED VERBAL FORM OF THE 3rd PERSON?

It looks as an anomaly amongst all inflective Indo-European languages that in Baltic the lst and 2nd persons are regularly distinguished in the singular, as well as in the plural, though the 3rd person has no formant and is a bare stem: Lith. *dìrba* vs. *dìrba-me, mýli* vs. *mýli-me, rãšo* vs. *rãšo-me* are the 3rd persons „work(s)“, „love(s)“, „write(s)“, irrespective of the number. Many hypotheses have been (and are being) constructed about the origin of unmarkedness of the 3rd person in Baltic. They are sufficiently known and, while not persuasive, do not need to be mentioned now. Two things, however, must be emphasized. First, Baltic really knows the marker of the 3rd person *-t(i)* (the Indo-European singular inflection, the Baltic singular and plural inflection). Secondly, the said hypotheses treat either the problem of the unmarked person, or the problem of the unmarked number.

In many V. Ivanov's works the fientive („active“, lst) and the inertive („inactive“, 2nd) series of Indo-European personal inflections are reconstructed and their reflection in the Baltic verb is shown. The endings of the lst series *-m(i), -s(i), -t(i)*, corresponding to the Nessite *mi*-conjugation, are evident in all Baltic languages as remnants of the athematic paradigm (cf. Lith. 3rd pers. *eĩti*, Latv. *iêt*, O. Pruss. *ēit* „go(es)“). As for the 2nd series (the Nessite *ḫi*-conjugation), V. Ivanov and Th. Gamkrelidze have shown in their recent work that the complete inertive paradigm could not exist in Indo-European, since the lst and 2nd persons were never inert („inactive“). The only „3rd person“ primarily functioned as an attributive predicate identical with the adjective. Although V. Ivanov and Th. Gamkrelidze reconstruct the 2nd series plural inflection **-r* of the 3rd person, in those dialects, where it existed, it could be nothing else but the nominal derivational element[1]. Some typological data (cf. the origin of the Afro-Asiatic stative) support the idea that there could be no difference between the attributive predication and the attributive syntagm in Indo-European. **nebhes leukh-e* equally meant „the sky shines“ as well as „the sky is shiny“ = „the shiny sky“. As in my previous papers, I treat any

---

[1] I am inclined to see here the material identity with the Kartvelian collectivity → plural formant **-(e)ra* in Svan.

Indo-European vocalic formant as belonging to the vocalized stem-ending consonant, i. e. as a bare-stem ending. The reconstructed 2nd series „formant" *-e (of the bare stem) manifests itself in Baltic in its apophonic species-a. Thus Lith. vanduõ vérda „the water is boiling" is to be reconstructed *u̯at'an u̯ērdha, meaning also „the boiling water". For the nominal nature of vérda (the root *u̯er-/*u̯r̥-) cf. such nouns with the same suffix as Lith. klõ-da-(s) or feminized žaizdà. The suffix *-d(h)a is a Balto-Slavic innovation, possibly of different sources. One of the sources might have been the voicing of -ta- as in žaizda < *žaid-tă(?). If so, J. Kazlauskas' reconstruction vir̃sta „turn(s) round" < *u̯r̥t-ta also gets here as a nominal derivative. The later generalization of -sta in verbs without the radical -d, -t > -s (nók-sta, though also -(i)a!) was parallel with the voicing of -ta < -da generalized [vér-da, žaiz-dà ‖ (further also) mó-sto, mõ-sta-s]. I see the proof in Latv. verd ‖ virst (with the generalized *-sta in Meņģele, Bērzaune, Barkava, Rūjiena). The -na derivatives may be also mentioned, e. g. Lith. bū̃-na „is", „are" vs. šalnà „frost" ≃ šą̃la < *ārai šal-na „the outsides (= weather) get(s) colder" with the subsequent J. Kazlauskas' metathesis. As I have shown in Baltistica 20(2), the Baltic 3rd person retains many nominal features (cf. Lith. kas yrà? „what is the matter?" or „masdar" nèrà kas dã-ro „there is nothing to do = of doing", Latv. man bija jābrauc „I had to drive = of driving") even nowadays[2].

If so both the Indo-European forms of the 3rd person, i. e. the fientive („active") in *-t(i) and the nominal inertive (stative) of the bare stem, are reflected in Baltic, what was the reason of nearly total generalization of the bare-stem form there (while it was the t-form which has tended to win the competition of the zero form in almost all the remaining Indo-European)? The reason was the absence of the nominal plural paradigm in the Baltic kernel of Indo-European. Even the known plural marker -s appears to be a remnant of the fientive („active") case inflection after the lengthened stem-vowel in forms, later used for the dual / plural [cf. Baltic (= Latin) acc. *u̯írō-s (with no *-n-!) = Gothic nom. dagô-s, etc.]. Balts retained the archaic way to express plural — they expressed it with the form of collectivity. The latter certainly required no plural of the finite form. Only pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons were plural, besides singular, therefore the Baltic verb does differentiate number in these persons. The question, why it was namely zero-, not the t(i)-, form, which mostly suited for the concord with the nominal collectivity form, is connected with the nature of the ai(oi)/ei- plural in Baltic and Indo-European.

I am sure, there were no „pronominal" and „nominal" patterns of the plural in Indo-European. It is sufficient to confront Baltic or Greek with Oscan to see

---

[2] The most apparent material evidence still seems to be such pairs as Lith. kaĩto ≃ kaità < *kā́itā, etc.

that a language could choose either the *ai (oi)/ei*-pattern or the *ōs*-pattern for the nominative plural of nouns. The statement of later generalization of either the „pronominal", or of the „nominal" pattern in all the groups, except Aryan and Germanic, seems to be much more venturesome. The non-personal pronouns really tended to the *ai(oi)/ei*-pattern since they were deprived of the fientive (marked) semantics of their own (forms based on the sigmatic stem could be created due to the concord with the corresponding nominal forms). On the other hand, the possibility of generalizing -*s* in the nouns existed since this marker retained its connection with the fientive semantics peculiar to nouns, not to the non-personal pronouns. Thus the occasional distribution between the sigmatic plural in nouns and the „pronominal" plural in pronouns and adjectives became regular in Aryan and Germanic.

In his study of 1970 V. Mažiulis has revealed the role of the adverbial non-paradigmatic forms in developing the Baltic and Indo-European declensional paradigms. The mythical „Indo-European locative", or „Indo-European instrumental", „case" appears to have used the lengthened stem -*ō* (+ pl. -*s*-) or the -*ai(oi)/-ei* (+ pl. -*s*-) patterns from the very beginning with the uniform effect [cf. Latv. adv. *(bell)ō=(bell)ĭ*, Slav. adv. *(dom)a*=loc. *(dom)ĕ*, Skr. adv. *(div)ā*=loc. *(vṛk)e*, Lith. dial. loc. *(gal)ù<*-ō* „at the end" / apoph. loc. *(vilk)è<*-ĕ́+én*=adv. *(nam)iẽ* „at home", allat. *Dievie-p(i)* „by God", etc.].

In IF 86 I have joined here the form of the nominative plural in -*ai(-oi)/-ei*, too. There is only apophonic difference between Lith. *(nam)iẽ* („at home") < *-ei* and *(nam)aĩ* („houses"). It is not accidental that the same is seen in Greek between „loc." sg. οἶκοι / οἴκει and nom. pl. οἶκοι. Note that the same difference also exists between Lith. nom. pl. *tiẽ* „they", „these" and sg. „neutr." *taĩ* „that" .The Samogitian oxytonic plural form, which means collectivity, suits to show the collectivity meaning of *taĩ*, cf. *tiẽ vókiečiai* „these Germans" vs. *taĩ vokiečiaĩ* (literally) „that (is!) Germans". On the other hand, Baltic and Slavic use the same -*ai/ -ei* form for the adverbs, but this form is only the apophonic species of the nominative plural, cf. Lith. *(ger)aĩ*, Slav. *(dobr)ĕ* vs. *(ger)ì*, *(dobr)i < *-ei*. Here is the mirror ratio of the Lith. *(nam)iẽ* vs. *(nam)aĩ* showing the uniform nature of the adjective *(geraĩ)* and the nominal *(namiẽ, bellĭ)* adverbial forms. Therefore, since the adjective adverbial forms rival the so-called „neuter-gender" adjective predicates of the Lithuanian *(gĕr)a* type (cf. Lith. *mán blõga, mán blogaĩ* „I am unwell"), the connection of the *(nam)aĩ* type of the plural and the „neutral" (i.e. inertive) meaning (as well as the collectivity meaning -cf. *taĩ/tiẽ*) is diachronically clear.

As meaning collectivity and inertness, the *ai(oi)/ei*-forms not only required no plural of the concorded 3rd person of the verbal predicate, but were naturally inclined to join the inertive form of the latter, i.e. the 2nd series bare-stem form.

Lith. *výrai dainúoja* „the men sing, are singing" firstly meant **dainuoja vyrijà* „the 'mankind sings* as well as *dainúoja geraĩ* „(they, he) sing(s) well" meant **dainuoja* (instr.) *gerýbe* „sings with high qualities"[3].

I have touched only upon nouns with the thematic stem because most of the Indo-European fientive („active") lexis get here. The *ā*-stems are secondary, and the consonantal stems are mostly inertive. Therefore, the plural developing, the collectivity plural of the thematic fientive nouns influenced the concord of the non--thematic fientive nouns with the singular verbal form of the 2nd series in their turn.

Thus, the *t*-form and the zero-form equally suiting for the concord with the singular subject, it was the zero-form which more than the *t*-form suited for the concord with the plural subject. As being wider used, the zero-form became more popular in Baltic.

KODĖL BALTAI TURI NEMARKIRUOTĄ VEIKSMAŽODŽIO 3 ASMENS FORMĄ?

Reziumė

Dviskaitos-daugiskaitos paradigma formavosi skirtingose ide. dialektų zonose nepriklausomai, bet analogiškai. Tematiniuose vardažodžiuose jai buvo vartojamos tos pačios prieveiksminės (ne-paradigminės) formos **-ō(+ -s-)*, **-ai(-oi)/-ei(+ -s-)*, kurios vartojamos vienaskaitos (be *-s*) lokatyvo ir instrumentalio variantams. Iš pradžių **-os*, **-ai(-oi)/-ei* turėjo ne daugiskaitinę, bet kuopinę reikšmę. Be to, nesigmatinė forma **-ai(-oi)/-ei* siejosi ir su inertyvine („inaktyvine") reikšme. Pasirinkę vardininkui formą **-ai/-ei*, baltai ilgą laiką išlaikė tas abi jos reikšmes, kurios nereikalavo veiksmažodinio predikato 3 asmens daugiskaitos ir (antroji reikšmė) linko į inertyvinės reikšmės 3 asmens formą, t.y. į Viač. Ivanovo II serijos grynakamienę *(-e/-a!)*, iš esmės varda-žodinę formą. Netematinių kamienų vardažodžiai buvo daugiausia inertyvai, todėl šitoks derini-mas įsigalėjo ir jų tarpe. Tiek I serijos *-t(i)-*, tiek II serijos grynakamienė forma vienodai derėjo prie vienaskaitinio veiksnio. Prie daugiskaitinio, t.y. kuopinio, kur kas labiau tiko grynakamienė forma, kuri dėl dažnesnio vartojimo ir ėmė išstumti pirmąją.

---

[3] Typologically cf. the personal *n*-plural and the non-personal *eb*-plural, easily reconstructed for the preliterary stage of O. Georgian. The formant *-eb* repeats the suffixes of abstracts *-eb(a)*, *-ob(a)* and, while joined to the non-person noun, requires the singular of the verbal predicate even in Modern Georgian. The *n*-plural could be never concorded with the verb in singular.