

failed to carry the AUG from the beginning. They thus inversely confirm the monosyllabism which I claim was originally associated with AUG.

Quite apart from our interest in explaining some intricate Lithuanian and Baltic phenomena, the importance of this finding for Indo-European is obvious. It has often been asserted – indeed it is the prevailing view – that AUG in the shape of **e* was a dialectally restricted feature of IE. Of course, it is not without significance that Indo-Iranian on the one hand and Greek and Armenian on the other, each of which show features unifying them as late dialectal groups within IE, are marked off as continuing the use of AUG in something like its old function. Myles Dillon has shown that Old Irish *no*, the "empty" preverb that is preposed to all secondary tenses, is old, is to be equated with the Hittite sentence particle *nu*, and is the functional equivalent of AUG. In my 1970 paper I have shown also that the Albanian "reflexive pronoun" *u-* which marks specifically the preterite of middle voice inflexion must go back to **e-ue-*, i. e. AUG+REFLEXIVE (*s*)*ue*. Thus Albanian conceals, wrapped up with the reflexive pronoun in complementation with middle endings, a trace of AUG too. This Albanian evidence is interesting also in being one more fact binding it closely with Baltic and Slavic; not only do we find the shared evidence of **e* but also Albanian seems to hint at the clue to the replacement of middle voice inflexion by the reflexive pronoun, which was carried through completely in Baltic and Slavic.

As IE branches showing a reflex of AUG, I therefore propose that we now add to Indo-Iranian, Helleno-Armenian, Phrygian, Celtic, and Albanian the Baltic group on the basis of the evidence reviewed above. I further propose that this feature gives us a strong element to serve as an isogloss marking off the classically known IE languages from the Anatolian group, where *a* and *nu* function as sentence particles not yet bound up in the syntax of the verbal complex. The latter development would be a common innovation of the conventional "IE" languages. Therefore, the Baltic and Albanian evidence provides valuable testimony towards a new understanding of the so-called Indo-Hittite hypothesis.

SMULKMENOS

II

On the Baltic verbal ending *-ki*

V. Pisani, *Paideia* 18, 1963, 220, reports Топоров and Трубачёв (Лингвистический анализ гидронимов верхнего Поднепровья, Москва, 1962) as showing that Lithuanian *-k* (*dúo-k*) and Russian *-ka* (*daj-ka*) come from

the imperative *-k* in Finnish (*anna-k*). It is not clear to me that this must be a direct and complete borrowing. It seems equally possible, and more probably paralleled in bilingual contact diffusional situations, that the Finnish model has encouraged the formation but that the substance of the suffix has been drawn from native material; cf. Stang VGBS 427.

This same explanation would also account for the Old Lith. third person use of *-k(i)*, which Gordon Ford would see as original here and later transplanted to the second singular. I find such a switch in application to persons unmotivated, and therefore suggest that a single explanation that embraces the two instances is by far preferable. Now it is to be noted that Finnish *-k ~ ka ~ ko* applies to the whole imperative; cf. L. Hakulinen, *Structure and development of the Finnish language*, Indiana University Press, 1961, 160–1.

The last fact is to be coupled with the observation that the 3rd sing. *-:n* (*-sen ~ hen < *zen > :n*) is equated with the possessive suffix and the passive; the 3rd pl. corresponds with *-:t*, i. e. **-het < *-zet = -ze + pl. -t* as in nouns. One may find this set forth in SDFL 168–9.

We see then that these endings, both in Finnish and in Lithuanian, are not truly "personal endings", in the well known sense observed and elaborated by Benveniste. They thus agree in both languages in semantic and syntactic function.

Eric P. Hamp