

ERIC P. HAMP

## ON BALTIC, LUWIAN AND ALBANIAN PARTICIPLES IN \*-m-

## I

In discussing the form of the participle in Luwian Benveniste has recently<sup>1</sup> pointed to an important fact of word formation in Indo-European. But there is more evidence that can be brought to bear, and the reasoning can, I believe, be carried further.

Benveniste makes it clear that the original form of the Luwian and Hieroglyphic Hittite (or, as I should prefer, Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian) participle in *-mi/ma-* was *-ma-*. The force, as Otten has shown, was medio-passive. The form is lacking in Hittite (but that does not assure us that it was not once there). Benveniste points to the parallel in Balto-Slavic *\*-mo-*, OCS *nesomъ*, Lith. *nėšamas*. He continues: „La première conséquence qui en découle est que cette forme en *-mo-*, n'étant plus limitée au slave et au baltique, ne peut plus servir d'argument en faveur de l'unité balto-slave” (28). Then he makes the point that Luwian and Baltic and Slavic could have independently imported this essentially nominal formation into the verbal system. Yet the formation, Benveniste cleverly sees, can be shown on the Indo-Iranian evidence to be one of „des quasi-participes de verbes intransitifs” (29). Only one form is broadly attested in Indo-European: *θερμός*, Avestan *garəma-*, Arm. *ǰerm*, Lat. *formus*, OHG *warm* etc., all adjectives. The Balto-Slavic formation, with pres. pass. value in the attested historical period, shows traces (30–31) of an older voiceless use with intransitives (*lakomъ* ‘greede’: *lakati* ‘to hunger’: *visimъ* ‘κρεμάμενος’). To these one might add parenthetically, from the Bzłgarski etim. rečnik 262–263, *goljām*, *gòlem*, Cz. *holemý*, *\*gol'ěmъ* (: Lith. *galėti*, *galiù*, Welsh. *gallu*) probably originally a participle in *-mъ* ‘mogžšt’ ... cf. *lakomъ*; it is also pertinent to note the voice of this formation. A further non-passive development is the appositional pres. act. II *-damas* (whatever its correct segmentation) in Lithuanian. Benveniste is surely right in claiming (31) that the Balto-Slavic change from a middle-intransitive use to a marked passive value is linked to the development of a symmetrical system of voice participles upon the loss of distinction of voice in the personal form of the verb.

Thus, for Benveniste, Luwian brings valuable evidence showing a) that the Indo-European origins of this participle are older than was supposed, and b) that Baltic

<sup>1</sup> É. Benveniste, *Hittite et indo-européen*, Paris, 1962, 27–32.

and Slavic were neither the first nor the only branches to incorporate it into the verbal system. From this he arrives (32) at two Indo-European dialect groups for the formation of the medio-passive participle: *\*-mno-* largely in Indo-Iranian and Greek, and *\*-mo-* in Luwian and Balto-Slavic. Finally, Luwian provides another argument against the derivation of Balto-Slavic *\*-mo-* from *\*-mno-*.

I find myself in agreement with all of Benveniste's positive arguments, so far as the evidence presented goes. But one important piece of evidence, namely the Albanian, seems regularly to be overlooked. Albanian verbs, as one knows, do not have an infinitive matching those of more familiar Indo-European languages; but there is a non-finite form that is used in certain phrasal constructions (*me hângër* 'to eat'). Additionally, there is a participle, or derived adjective, which may also be nominalized. In some Tosk dialects the formation of these participles has been largely levelled out. But in many Geg dialects several formations still share the field; of these, a participle in *-m* plays a prominent role. Participles in Albanian do not show voice.

The present class in *-j/n* (i. e. in *-N*) is the most productive class in the language. It forms participles in *-m*:

<i>me punue</i>	'work'	pple. <i>punuem</i>
<i>me la</i>	'wash'	<i>lam</i>
<i>me shkrî</i>	'melt'	<i>shkrîm</i>
<i>me bâ</i>	'make, do'	<i>bâm<sup>2</sup></i>
<i>me thye</i>	'break'	<i>thyem</i>

Also certain vowel stems, regardless of the present formation:

<i>me pi</i>	'to drink'	pple. <i>pimë</i>
<i>ngas</i>	'I run'	<i>ngam</i> (aor. <i>ngava</i> )
<i>pres</i>	'I cut'	<i>prem</i> (aor. <i>preva</i> )
<i>vras</i>	'I kill'	<i>vram</i> (aor. <i>vrava</i> )
<i>vê</i>	'I put'	<i>vûm</i> (really an <i>n</i> -stem)
<i>bie</i>	'I fall'	<i>ram</i> (aor. <i>ra-</i> )
<i>shof</i>	'I see'	<i>pam</i> (aor. <i>pa-</i> )

There are a few others:

<i>maj</i>	'I fatten'	pple. <i>majm</i> (aor. <i>maja</i> )
<i>lnur</i>	'I card wool'	<i>lnurm</i> (aor. <i>lnora</i> )

It is important to note that Tosk preserves traces of this formation too. In the enclaves of Greece the participle of *maan* 'maj' is *maajtur*; there is also an adjective 'fat'

<sup>2</sup> But *bënë* in Tosk, from *\*b(h)an-no-* (with a participle in *\*-no-*) < (schematically) *\*bhñ-* + *-no-*. The Geg *bâm*, *bam* must be < *\*bhñ-mo-*, and provides one more example for the regular development of IE *\*n* > Alb. *a* which I have argued elsewhere.

*i-maajmë*<sup>3</sup>. The present *thërras* 'I shout' has an aor. Geg *thërrita*, Tosk *thirra*; the participle is Geg *thërritun*, Tosk *thërritur*. Yet the enclaves of Greece lack the pan-Albanian word for 'voice', Geg *zâ*, Tosk *zë*; instead they have the noun *thirmë*<sup>4</sup>. It should not cause surprise that the last form occurs as a nominalization; it is also worth noting that the Albanian cognate of *θερμός* etc. is *zjarm* 'fire', noun.

The presence of such formations in Albanian has not escaped the notice of those occupied with this language: most recently perhaps, in point of publication, Jokl has remarked on them posthumously in *Die Sprache* IX (1963) 131. He claims this as an apparent agreement with Balto-Slavic and Armenian. However, he then goes on to try to explain the Alb. *-m(ë)* as a „Lautvariant“ of *\*-menos*; he attempts to buttress this argument by insisting that the normal development of *\*-mos* in Albanian is *-mp*. There are indeed some cases that are perhaps to be explained this way — though they are inevitably ambiguous — but as a general explanation a reduction of *\*-menos* to *-m* is unacceptable and unnecessary. Therefore I equate Alb. *-m* with the Balto-Slavic and Luwian suffixes<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> I cite from Greece, wherever possible, from my own notes from Sophikò (Korinthía), which is not only a conservative dialect, but also preserves Proto-Tosk vowel length — here indicated by a geminate. In a similar adjectival role, which is no doubt (strictly within Albanian) fossilized from the more general participial usage, we find within Sophikò dialect *i-ndëliem* 'the late, the regretted' (cf. *thyem* above), *i-deejm*, fem. *e-deejme* 'drunken'.

<sup>4</sup> Other nouns in Sophikò of this type, derived from clear verb roots of old standing, are *frimë* 'breath', *pësttimë* 'saliva', *bimë* 'shoot of grain'.

<sup>5</sup> It was only some considerable time after I had completed this article (1968) that I was able to see the valuable note by A. Xhuvani, BShkSh (Tirana) 1952, 6—8, entitled *Selectae: Prapashtesat -më, -imë, -im*. Xhuvani's presentation of the Albanian formations both agrees gratifyingly with and supplements my above remarks.

Xhuvani introduces the following data: verbal adjectives, which he traces to participles in *-m* used in Middle Albania, e. g. *mish i pjekëm* 'roast meat', *i dhanëm* 'devoted'. These are found especially in the Elbasan area in participial function: *kam pjekëm* 'I have roasted', *kam djegëm* 'I have burnt'; younger speakers tend now to say *kam pjekë*, *kam djegë*, etc. Xhuvani cites similar forms from the literature of the Tosk enclaves of southern Italy: (from Sicily) *ndë horë të lodhëme* (from De Rada, a writer of Calabria) *buzë të qeshëme*. I can easily parallel these from my own field notes of southern Italy. Although this formation persists mostly in Geg dialects, and especially in the Central dialects, traces can be cited from the Tosk of the Gjinokastër region: *do të bëj një të pabëme* (and not *të pabërë*) 'I will do (a thing) not done'.

Xhuvani adduces feminines of these formations used as abstract nouns (*e arthmja* 'the future', *e folmja* 'the speech, manner of speaking') alongside neuters such as *të ardhurit të folurit* (Geg), *të ardhurit të folurit* (Tosk). These feminine formations can also take on a concrete sense, e. g. *e lame* (formed from *lâ lë* 'leave, let') 'payment, tax'. Such formations also occur without the preposed particle of concord, the feature that betrays their derivation from adjectival (or participial) formations; in this connexion Xhuvani then mentions the very nouns cited above in footnote 4. Furthermore, dialect differences in the mode of nominalization show that these nouns in *-më* come from participles; thus, for 'room (in a house)' beside Elbasan *e kthyeme* (from the verb *kthye* 'return') we find Tirana *kthinë* (feminine).

The Albanian evidence will of course not inform us on a voice correlation for this form. It is noteworthy that, contrary to the Balto-Slavic development underlined by Benveniste, Albanian, while failing to differentiate participles for voice, retains the active-middle distinction in the personal forms of the verb. In this context we see that Balto-Slavic and Albanian agree to about the same extent in employing *\*-t-*<sup>6</sup>, *\*-n-*, and *\*-m-* in participial formations. In the sense of this special agreement in the syndrome of these participles I therefore differ with Benveniste and see this as a sup-

---

Xhuvani then gives examples of parallel participle formations in *-m*, *-n*, and *-t*: *kam pim(ë)*, *kam pin*, *kam pit* 'I have drunk' (the last two examples from Buzuku, 16th century, which illustrates the competition of these forms over time); *kam ranë*, *kam ram(un)*, *jam rat(ë)* 'I have fallen'. These forms should be compared with my remarks in footnote 6.

Then after discussing the spread and productivity of such noun formations, Xhuvani turns to masculine nouns similarly formed; *blem* 'treg' (*ble* 'I buy'), *tharm* (*thar*, *ther* 'prick, sting'), Elbasan *terëm* 'dried out area' (from the verb *me terë*), among many others.

Finally, after this rehearsal of the attested types, Xhuvani declares that an Indo-European background for these suffixes cannot be specified. Here I disagree with Xhuvani. The participial formation, regardless of gender, can readily be traced, as I argue in the present article, to an IE participle suffix which we also find in Luwian as well as in the traditional accounts of Baltic and Slavic; this also has, as Benveniste has shown, a much broader, though morphologically not dominant and slenderly attested, IE background represented by  $\theta\epsilon\rho\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  and Alb. *zjarm*. The Albanian adjectives, and from then the abstract nouns and certain of these that have been concretized, can in turn be easily explained internally within Albanian, as Xhuvani has done, from the participles.

It is, however, worth recalling that for the nouns another source, also good Indo-European, can be suggested for formations made from verbal roots. Action nouns were formed in *\*-m-*, and show up prominently among the verbal nouns (used in lieu of infinitive) in the Celtic languages. Thus in Old Irish we find masculines in *\*-mu-*, which are formed on roots in long vowel (laryngeal): *gním* 'deed' < *\*ǵnē-mu-* (OWelsh *gnim* 'labor'), *fognam* 'service' < *\*upo + ǵnēmu-* (Welsh *gweini* < *\*uogn-īm-*); *foéssam* 'protecting' (Welsh *gwaessaf* 'guarantee', with concrete meaning) < *\*upo + +sistā-mu-*. And then there are feminines in *\*-mā-*, which I consider as matching the Hittite *-ima-* found with intensive verbs: *cretem* < *\*k'reddemā* 'believing', *ac(c)aldam* 'addressing' < *\*ad + +glādamā*, *sechem* 'following' < *\*sekwemā*. Thus we see basically two terminations in Celtic, *\*-V̄-mu-s* and *\*(-e/o)-mā*; the latter may be compared to Skt. *so-ma-* 'juice' ( $\sqrt{su-}$ ), *sto-ma-* 'song' ( $\sqrt{stu-}$ ). These *-m-* formations have had a considerable success in British Celtic, their successors becoming the most productive mode of forming verbal nouns; this is in large part due, no doubt, to the fact that when added to derivative stems the suffix used was frequently the one that properly applied after long vowel. Thus we find Welsh *moli* OWelsh *molim* 'praise', *erchi* < *erchim* < *\*(p)rk'-sk'-ē-m-* 'ask', Bret. *d'ibri*, Mid. Bret. *dibriff*, OBret. *diprim* 'eat', Welsh *gwisgaw* (Mid. Bret. *guisquaff*) 'dress' < *\*uēs-sk'-ā-m-* (cf. *llaw* 'hand', OBret. *lom-rod* 'don de la main', OIr. *lám*, OE *folm*,  $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta$ , for normal loss of *\*m > v̄* after *\*ā > aw*); Welsh *ed-lynu* 'smear', OBret. *linom* gl. *lituram* < *\*li-n-o-m-* (the stem type here is less clear). In short, there is ample IE background for verbal nouns in *\*-m-* to account for Alb. *-im*, and to have joined the nominalized participles in *-m*.

<sup>6</sup> An example of an adjective in *-t-* from a base attested synchronically as a verb in Albanian is *i-óaatë* 'dry'; other etymologically verbal derivatives are *i-ngroxëtë* 'hot' (*\*en-g<sup>w</sup>hrē-sk'-e-t-*) and *i-ftoxëtë* 'cold' (*\*ue-tēp-sk'-e-t-*). Examples are cited for clarity from Sophikò dialect.

port to the hypothesis of Balto-Slavic unity; moreover, it seems to me that this constitutes one more piece of evidence to the growing list linking Balto-Slavic and Albanian. On the other hand, the Luwian development in this single participle ending appears to be an independent innovatory spread.

Yet, while the incorporation of the *\*-m-* participle into the central paradigm is to be viewed as an innovation supporting Balto-Slavic and Albanian dialect unity, I agree with Benveniste that the formation is, especially now on the Luwian testimony, an old one; and I feel that his identification of the „quasi-participial“ adjectives represented by *gharma-* / *warm* /  $\theta\epsilon\rho\rho\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  / *zjarm* as the source formation is correct. In light of this, we are not then compelled to see the sharing of this old formation by Luwian and Balto-Slavic and Albanian as pointing to a common dialect basis in contrast to the *\*-meno-* dialects. We are then free to accept Stang's judgment (*Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, 1966, 446), *pace* Benveniste, that OPruss. *poklausīmanas* is not an error for *\*poklausīman* (to which Stang offers a well founded objection), and that it represents a precious correspondence to Skt. *-māna-*, Gk. *-μενο-*, Toch. A. *-mām*. Thus, despite the growth in the new paradigm of participles, Old Prussian attests a remnant of the other, widespread (Lat. *alumnus*) formation. The two formations do not automatically imply separate dialect areas.

Finally, as Benveniste has recognized, and as I have had reason recently to emphasize (*Die Sprache* XIV (1968) 156 – 159), there is no evidence or plausibility to the claim that *\*-mo-* results from a reduction of *\*-mno-*.

## II

In the above perspective, we may now perhaps approach another Baltic manifestation of the participles in *\*-m-*, the well known and problematic formation in *-damas*. This has become considerably clarified since Tamara Buch's treatment of the question in her fine article, *IJSLP* IX (1965) 106 – 13. There she showed that the formation in *-damas* is simply the predicative modifier of the subject, in complementary distribution with the present active participle, *-as*, *-is*. Thus, *vyras grižo sveikas* || *vyras grižo sirgdamas*. We see then in the *-damas* formation a predicative, or adverbial, transformation of an attributive of the subject.

Tamara Buch has further made it seem likely that there was a connexion between the expansion of the Lithuanian participial system and the great rise and subsequent decline in the 17 – 18th centuries of the conjunction *kad*, a shortened form of the interrogative adverb *kada*. This suggests to us that the element *-da-* of the participle is perhaps the same as the *-da* seen on *kada*.

Let us now consider *idant*, Eastern variant *adunt* ( $\sim idanti(g) \sim -e$ ) 'kad'. The M. Petkevičius Catechism *id* has been treated by J. Palionis, *Lietuvių literatūrinė*

kalba XVI–XVII a., Vilnius, 1967. Fraenkel, after Hermann, has for this stem *\*i-d(h)o/a*, the equivalent of the well known Indo-Iranian forms, and (for the Eastern variant) *\*o-*. It seems to me inherently unlikely that for such a particle we must depart from two separate original bases; I would prefer to see one variant a recently revised form of the other. Perhaps *adunt* has its vocalism revised under the influence of *kada*.

In all of the above I propose to see structures which result from an adverbial transformation giving the surface structure

Verb }  
Pronoun } -*da* (+participle inflexion)

Because of the syntactic source no oblique case inflexion would arise; if the base (i. e. verb stem) permitted it, only an automatic nominative concord would be imposed.