

K. SHIELDS

THE LITHUANIAN IMPERATIVE SUFFIX *-k(i)*

In a series of recent articles [Shields 1981b, 1981c, 1982, 1983, Forthcoming a, Forthcoming b], I have attempted to explain the origin of a variety of inflectional and derivational suffixes attested in the verbal constructions of a number of Indo-European dialects by proposing that these elements derive from deictic particles added to verb forms. Specifically, I believe that after such deictics (*x*) were affixed to third person singular formations in *\*-ø*, two reanalyses were possible:

- (1) *\*-ø-x > \*-x*
- (2) *\*-ø-x > \*-x-ø*.

The first gave rise to inflectional markers, the second to derivational suffixes. Because the third person singular tends to impose its structure on other members of its paradigm, cf. Benveniste, 1971, these reanalyzed deictics were subject to analogical extension. In what follows, I want to use this same general theory to explain the origin of the Lithuanian imperative ending *-k(i)*.

Before I begin the main line of my argument, a few more words must be said about the theory just outlined. In the first place, Watkins [1962, 90–106; 1969, 49–50] also maintains that in early Indo-European *\*-ø* was the marker of the third person singular. Thus, he says: “Der funktionale Status der 3. Person als zéro- oder Nicht-Person hat die allgemeine sprachliche Tendenz zum formalen Ausdruck durch ein zéro-Zeichen zur Folge; das bedeutet, dass in der gegebenen syntaktischen Funktion des Prädikats eine Nominalform als Verbalform mit 3. Sg.-Endung *ø* (zéro) aufgefasst werden kann: Nomen *\*nek*” *t*→3. Sg. Verb *\*nek*” *t-ø*“ [1969, 49]. Moreover, Erhart [1970, 57–58] indirectly lends support to this idea when he observes: “In einem kleinen Teil der Fälle sind die Endungen der 3. Person Sg. akonsonantisch: aind. *a*, *e*, gr. *ei*, *e*, het. *i*, *a*, *ari*, toch. AB *ø*, got. *ø*, lit. *a* usw....; als ihre Bausteine sind der thematische Vokal und der Präsensdeterminativ *i* (bzw. *r*) zu erkennen.“ I consider such elements to be relics which attest to the use of *\*-ø* as a third-person desinence.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I also believe that number distinctions developed in verbal paradigms at a relatively late date, cf. Lehmann, 1974, 263–264. The lack of correspondence between attested non-singular suffixes lends much support to this hypothesis.

In actuality, I have committed myself elsewhere [Shields, 1979, 221; 1981b, 266–268; 1981c) to the view that \*- $\emptyset$  marked both the second and the third person of the verb. That is, „Indo-European originally possessed only two personal categories—a personal (first person) and a non-personal (second/third person)“ [Shields, 1981b, 266]. In support of this idea, I would point out that \*- $\emptyset$  appears as a second-person affix in the singular imperative (e. g., Skt. *ája*, Gk. *ἄγε*, Lat. *age* ‘lead’) and that Erhart [1970, 113], after a detailed analysis of the formal markers of person attested in the dialects, concludes: “... es bestand wohl damals noch kein Unterschied zwischen der 2. und der 3. Person ...“, cf. also Schmaling 1977, 1980, 107–108. Only gradually did the non-personal become two distinct categories; in fact, the existence of such undifferentiated second/third person (singular) verb forms as *tarnaš* ‘you left, he left’, *ešta* ‘you were, he was’, and *dāš* ‘you took, he took’ in the Hittite preterite gives direct support to the notion that “the rigid paradigmatic structure for the three persons of the singular, *-m(i)*, *-s(i)*, *-t(i)*, belongs only to the latest period of Common Indo-European, and was completely achieved only after the separation of the dialects“ [Watkins, 1962, 105].

The proposal that enclitic deictic particles were incorporated into the verbal system of Indo-European and the early dialects is not new. Watkins [1962, 102–103] argues that \**i*, a deictic with ‘here and now’ signification, was frequently combined with various verbal suffixes, including the third person singular ending \*- $\emptyset$ : “When we speak of a 3 sg. ending as in *dhās- $\emptyset$* , this does exclude the further presence of some element or component which is non-personal in nature. One common such element in Indo-European was *-i*, the deictic particle of the *hic et nunc*. This particle was freely combinable with the personal endings, as in *-m/-mi*, *-t/-ti*, *-nt/-nti*. We know furthermore that the free combinability of this particle existed down through the period of the formation of the individual dialects, since these show divergent utilizations of *-i*. It has been suffixed to the perfect endings *-a*, *-tHa*, *-e* in Italic *-ai*, *-tai*, *-ei* > Lat. *-ī*, *-(is)tī*, *-ī(t)*. The same occurred independently in the Hittite *hi*-conjugation: *-ha*, *-ta*, (*\*, -e?*) → *-hi*, *-ti*, *-i*. In Slavic the same change *-a* → *-ai* is attested in 1 sg. *Bǝǝǝ*. We know as well that IE *-i* was combinable with a 3 sg. zero ending as is proved by the Greek thematic 3 sg. present *-ei* < *-e + i*, where *-e* is simply the thematic vowel. The Hittite *hi*-conjugation 3 sg. *-i* may also contain deictic *-i* suffixed to a zero ending. The deictic *-i* alone, suffixed to the bare root with zero ending, occurs finally in a very archaic category in Indo-Iranian: the 3 sg. aorist passive. The most archaic form of this class in the Rig Veda is *jani* ‘was born’, which shows the absence of the secondary *vṛddhi* as in *jāni*.” In Shields [1983, 121] I state that “Safarewicz [1974, 52] explains the motivation for the addition of this deictic particle to verbal forms: ‘The function of the element *-i* was to strengthen the formation in which this element appeared....

It may be supposed that by means of strengthening the indicators of the person in the present tense these endings gave it the meaning of actual present tense, that is to say, the present tense in precise meaning'.“ In other words, because the Indo-European verbal system was built on aspectual opposition, cf. Safarewicz [1974, 51–52] “tense and the time of action were not indicated by means of verbal affixes. Indications of the time of the action were given by means of particles or adverbs or were implicit in the aspects of the verb forms“ [Lehmann, 1974, 139]. It was only “in late PIE“ that “features of tense became predominant,“ with inflectional endings marking temporal distinctions (Lehmann, 1974, 189–190).

I have also proposed elsewhere [Shields, 1981b, 273–274; 1983, 122–123] that the Indo-European system of spatio-temporal relations was binary in nature—that is, it was organized simply as [ $\pm$ Proximal]. Traugott [1978, 374] explains: “As a deictic, tense is basically a Proximal-Distal relation . . . . In some languages [ $\pm$  Proximal] [i. e., now/not-now (then)] may be the only organization of tense, without any concept of time-line. . . . Orientation to a time-line involves division of **then** into past and future.“ “It is my belief that this latter development occurred only in late Indo-European and its dialects. In early Indo-European I feel that *\*i* expressed ‘now’ and that . . . other deictic particles denoted various degrees of distance from that temporal point“ [Shields, 1981b, 273]. Gonda [1956, 28–29] also ascribes the same binary system of **now/not-now** to Indo-European: „From various idioms it appears that, temporally as well as spatially, the main distinction often is between the near and the far, between the here-and-now, or here or now, and the not-here, there, or not-now . . . . In Sanskrit, *tatra* ‘there’ when used in a temporal sense, can refer to the past . . . and the future . . . . Cf. G. *πότε* ‘at some time or other’, *τότε* ‘at that time, then’ which are used in reference to the past as well as the future . . . . Do we err greatly if we consider these words to reflect an ancient distinction: now-here : not-now-here?“

I believe that a deictic particle in *\*k* existed in Indo-European. Markey (1980: 280–281) argues that “an archaic deictic particle . . . *\*k* . . . figures in the formation of, for example, Lat. *ci-s*; Gmc. *hē-r*, O. E. *hē*, Goth. *hi-mma*, OHG. *hi-tumum* (cf. Lat. *ci-timus*), Goth. *hi-dre* (cf. Lat. *ci-tra*); OIr. *ce-n*, Corn. *ke-n*, Gaul. *du-ci*; Hitt. *kāš*, *ki-ššan*, directly comparable to Lat. *ci-s*; Gk. *\*ky-* in Ion. *σῆτος* = Att. *τῆτος*; Lith. *šis*; OCS *si*; Arm. *s-* (radical of the 1st pers. demonstrative, ‘this’ *hic*, near the speaker, opposed to *d-*=near the person spoken to, ‘that’ *iste*, *n-*=near a third person, far from the speaker and person spoken to, ‘that’ *ille*). Note, further, OIr. *ol-chen(a)e* ‘besides’, lit. ‘beyond (and) on this side of it’, where *ol-* is comparable to OLat. *ollus* > *ille*; possibly also in OIr. *bith-cé* ‘this world’; OIr. *cen-alpande*=Lat. *cis-alpine* . . . .“ The original deictic force of *\*k* seems to have been „Ich-Deixis,“ cf. Brugmann [1911, 322] and Friedrich [1974, 134–

135], as the Armenian data indicate,<sup>2</sup> although the dialectal evidence generally points to “Dieser-Deixis,” cf. Shields Forthcoming b.<sup>3</sup> The problem of identifying the original signification of \**k* is emphasized by Markey [1980, 291] when he says that “there is hardly semantic identity within and across dialects for deictic elements,” cf. Specht [1947, 303; 309]. Still, I would suggest that \**k* originally possessed “Ich-Deixis” and then began to lose some of its deictic force, perhaps as a result of competition with \**i* to determine the primary marker of the ‘here and now’. As \**i* became the principal exponent of this function, \**k* shifted its primary meaning to “Dieser-Deixis”, though some relic occurrences of \**k* with stronger deictic force give testimony to its original signification. In short, when \**k* was affixed to verb forms, it was a non-present indicator.

It is this deictic particle \**k* with reduced deictic force which I believe is found in the Lithuanian imperative suffix *-k(i)*.<sup>4</sup> It may perhaps be objected, however, that deictic \**k* was subject to the satem palatalization in Pre-Baltic, as Lith. *šis* implies. But the palatalization of \**k* here is a result of the fact that in Indo-European the [k̄] allophone of the phoneme \*/k/ appeared before a following front vowel, cf. Allen [1978, 101], and that this allophone was subject to the satem palatalization.<sup>5</sup> In absolute final position, the tendency to palatalize was not as great, although I must admit that “unmotivated conversions of velar to palatal” [Allen, 1978, 104], i. e., the palatalization of non-fronted allophones of \*/k/, are attested. Still, the suggestion that the deictic particle \**k* is realized in Lithuanian as both *š* and *k* is in keeping with the existence of other such palatalized and non-palatalized doublets in Baltic and Slavic, “e. g. OCS *клонити, слонити*, Lith. *klānas*,

<sup>2</sup> Brugmann [1911, 322–323] presents additional dialectal evidence “für die alte ich-deiktische Natur der *k̄*-Pronomen,” but the only direct evidence he cites is provided by Armenian. More significantly, Friedrich [1974, 135] notes that the Hittite demonstrative *kā-* can be used in reference to the speaker.

<sup>3</sup> In terms of deictic force, Schmid [1972, 10] characterizes “Dieser Deixis” as *p<sub>3</sub>* on a scale of *p<sub>1</sub>* to *p<sub>6</sub>*, with *p<sub>1</sub>* constituting the ‘here and now’ (“Thema: Sprecher”) and *p<sub>6</sub>* constituting extreme distance from that point and time (“nicht näher bestimmt”).

<sup>4</sup> Although Kerns and Schwartz [1971, 14] and Endzelīns [1971, 242] view Lith. *-k(i)* as an original particle, they offer no explanation as to how or why it appears in the Lithuanian imperative. Indeed, Kerns and Schwartz [1971, 14] merely say that the Lithuanian imperative marker *-k(i)* “possibly” derives from “an asservative particle” \**qe-*,” while Endzelīns makes no attempt at identifying the element.

<sup>5</sup> I thus subscribe to the hypothesis of Meillet [1964, 91–95] and Lehmann [1952, 8] that Indo-European possessed only two voiceless velar consonant phonemes – /k/ and /kʷ/ – with *k̄* constituting an allophone of /k/. As Allen [1978, 104] points out: “... it is a general characteristic of most satem languages, persisting into their individual histories, to palatalize the velar consonants before front vowels.” See Shields, 1981a, for a further discussion of my views regarding the satem palatalization.

*šliėti*; ... Lith. *kleīvas*, *šleīvas*; Lith. *glibti*, *žlibti*; *kliuūkti*, *šliaūkti*; *glėgžnas*, *žlėgžnas* [Kortlandt, 1978, 240], cf. Shields, 1981a, 211.

Of course, “in Lithuanian now the usual (for the second and first person) imperative forms are made from the infinitive stem with the particle *-ki*, e. g. second person sg. imperat. *eīk(i)* ‘go’ (cf. Lat. *ī* ‘go’), second person plur. imperat. *eīkite* (dual *eīkita*), first person plur. imperat. *eīkime* ‘let’s go’ (dual *eīkiva*),” while in the third person imperative of Modern Lithuanian “generally the particle *te-*, *tėgu-* (*tegū-*), *tėgul-* (*tegūl-*) is prefixed to ... [the] indicative form,” e. g., *tėperka* ‘may he buy’ [Endzelīns, 1971, 242]. But “in the oldest Lithuanian texts there occur imperative forms of the third person in *-k* or *-ki* alongside of second person singular forms in *-k* or *-ki*,” e. g., *Buk walia tawa kaip Dangui taip ir Szeme* ‘May your will be both in heaven and on earth’ [Ford, 1970, 71–72].<sup>6</sup> This third person suffix in *-k(i)* eventually “was replaced ... by the permissive formation with *te-*,” which “does not occur in the oldest Lithuanian manuscript text” [Ford, 1970, 74]. The secondary nature of the *-i* component of the ending is demonstrated by its optional use. *-ki* probably originated from a contamination of *-k* with an imperative marker in *-i*. Endzelīns [1971, 243] points out that “in old Lithuanian texts and in dialects here and there we find second person singular forms with *-i* which have the meaning of an imperative,” e. g., *vedī* ‘lead’.

I would now like to suggest that there existed in Indo-European a second/third person non-present verbal formation in *\*-ø-k* which was reanalyzed as *\*-k*. The original unity of the second and third persons naturally explains the “very strange” fact “that the same formant *-k(i)* should serve for both the second person singular and third person singular imperative” [Ford, 1970, 71]. From the second/third person, *\*-k* was extended to other members of the verbal paradigm, as suffixes like Lith. *-kime* attest. The limitation of the non-present construction in *\*-k* to imperative function is a result of the general principle that “the indication of the imperative seems typically to intersect with deictic categories” [Weinreich, 1963, 151]. “Thus, in his study of universals regarding the nature of future tenses, Ultan [1978, 102–104] confirms that one of the most common atemporal functions of the future tense is the indication of imperative mood (as well as a number of other modal categories). He explains this phenomenon as resulting from ‘the fact that most modal categories refer to differing degrees of uncertainty, which correlates with the element of uncertainty inherent in any future event ...’ [1978, 105]. Since the meaning of the particle ... [*\*-k*], as I have described it, would have embraced the concept of futurity, as well as that of past time [in the Indo-Euro-

<sup>6</sup> Ford [1971, 74] argues convincingly against Stang’s view [1929, 177] that the third person singular imperative forms in *-k(i)* are a result of Polish influence.

pean binary system of spatio-temporal relations], this particle, too, would have expressed inherent uncertainty. Because of this fact, it bore a natural affinity to existing markers of the imperative mood“ and was integrated into the imperative paradigm [Shields, 1983, 123]. What this means is that the Lithuanian imperative element *-k* had essentially the same origin as the *u*-element found in the imperative of, e. g., Hittite (3 sg. imper. *-u*, *-tu*, etc.) and Sanskrit (3 sg. imper. *-tu*, etc.). [See Shields, 1983, for details.]<sup>7</sup>

If one assumes that the Lithuanian imperative in *-k(i)* derives from an original non-present formation, then it is easy to explain its relationship to other dialectal verbal constructions in *\*-k*. As Markey [1980, 290–291] observes, “the *k*-enlargement is found in Tocharian, Italic, Venetic, Greek (also Mycenaean), and Phrygian,” and in each of these dialects it is “initially preterital (perfect, aorist),“ e. g., Gk. (perf.) *δέδορκα* ‘I have seen’.<sup>8</sup> Of course, in late Indo-European and the early dialects, “both of the PIE perfective aspect forms, the aorist and the perfect, were shifted to preterite-tense forms as opposed to present-tense forms...” [Lehmann, 1974, 190]. I believe that during the time of this shifting, nonpresent verb forms in *\*-k* were integrated into the perfect and aorist systems of some dialects, although the late date of this integration results in much dialectal variation in the way the adaptation proceeded.<sup>9</sup> Lithuanian shows a somewhat greater divergence from other dialects in its unique specialization of non-present formations in *\*-k* in imperative function, but this specialization is quite consistent with the principles of linguistic evolution.

## REFERENCES

Allen, 1978 — Allen W. S. The PIE Velar Series: Neogrammarian and Other Solutions in the Light of Attested Parallels. — In: Transactions of the Philological Society, 1978, p. 87–110.

<sup>7</sup> On the existence of a deictic particle *\*u* with non-present signification, see also Hirt, 1927, 11–12.

<sup>8</sup> Kerns and Schwartz [1971, 14] briefly note that an etymological relationship may exist between the Greek “first perfect“ and “the *k*-extension of the Lith. imperative“.

<sup>9</sup> Markey, 1980, develops a very elaborate theory to explain the origin of the deictic marker *\*k* in the Greek aorist and perfect, but he says nothing about the Lithuanian imperative in *-k(i)*. Specifically, he argues that the deictic particle *\*k* “was employed to affirm a diathetic contrast; external-active vs. internal-middle“ (1980: 284). I leave open the question of the particular developments which led to the specialization of *k*-formations in other Indo-European dialects, although I do not feel that the original purpose of adding deictic *\*k* to verbs was to mark diathesis; rather, as I indicate above, I see the function of all deictics affixed to verb forms as temporal in nature. I should point out that in Shields Forthcoming b I argue that the deictic particle *\*k* appears in contamination with the non-singular marker *\*-s* in the iterative (cf. Dressler, 1968) verbal suffix *\*-sk-* (e. g., Gk. *-σκ-*, Lat. *-sc-*).

Benveniste, 1971 – Benveniste E. Relationships of Person in the Verb. – In: Problems in General Linguistics / Trans. by M. E. Meek. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971, p. 195 – 204.

Brugmann, 1911 – Brugmann K. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. – Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1911, vol. 2.2.

Dressler, 1968 – Dressler W. Studien zur verbalen Pluralität. – In: Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse 259. 1. Wien: Böhlau, 1968.

Endzelins, 1971 – Endzelins J. Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Baltic Languages / Trans. by W. Schmalstieg and B. Jegers. – The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Erhart, 1970 – Erhart A. Studien zur indoeuropäischen Morphologie. Brno: Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis Facultas Philosophica, 1970.

Ford, 1970 – Ford G. The Old Lithuanian Third Person Imperative in -k(i). – In: Baltic Linguistics / Ed. by T. Magner and W. Schmalstieg. University Park: Penn State Press, 1970, p. 71–74.

Friedrich, 1974 – Friedrich J. Hethitisches Elementarbuch. – Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1974, Bd. 1, 2. Aufl.

Gonda, 1956 – Gonda J. The Character of the Indo-European Moods. – Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1956.

Hirt, 1927 – Hirt H. Indogermanische Grammatik. – Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1927, vol. 3.

Kerns and Schwartz, 1971 – Kerns J., Schwartz B. A Sketch of the Indo-European Finite Verb. – Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Kortlandt, 1978 – Kortlandt Fr. I.-E. Palatovelars before Resonants in Balto-Slavic. – In: Recent Developments in Historical Phonology / Ed. by J. Fisiak. The Hague: Mouton, 1978, p. 237–243.

Lehmann, 1952 – Lehmann W. Proto-Indo-European Phonology. – Austin: University of Texas Press, 1952.

Lehmann, 1974 – Lehmann W. Proto-Indo-European Syntax. – Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974.

Markey, 1980 – Markey T. L. Deixis and Diathesis: The Case of the Greek *k*-Perfect. – In: IF, 1980, Bd. 85, S. 279–297.

Meillet, 1964 – Meillet A. Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes. Reprint of 8th ed. – University: University of Alabama Press, 1964.

Safarewicz, 1974 – Safarewicz J. Linguistic Studies. – The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Schmalstieg, 1977 – Schmalstieg W. A Note on the Verbal Person Markers in Indo-European. – In: KZ, 1977, Bd. 91, S. 72–76.

Schmalstieg, 1980 – Schmalstieg W. Indo-European Linguistics: A New Synthesis. – University Park: Penn State Press, 1980.

Schmid, 1972 – Schmid W. Die pragmatische Komponente in der Grammatik. – In: Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Nr. 9. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1972.

Shields, 1979 – Shields K. The Gothic Verbal Dual in *-ts* and Its Indo-European Origins. – In: IF, 1979, Bd. 84, S. 216–225.

Shields, 1981a – Shields K. A New Look at the Centum / Satem Isogloss. – In: KZ, 1981a, Bd. 95, S. 203–213.

Shields, 1981b – Shields K. On Indo-European Sigmatic Verbal Formations. – In: *Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics, in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns* / Ed. by Y. Arbeitman and A. Bomhard. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1981b, p. 263–279.

Shields, 1981c – Shields K. The Indo-European Third Person Plural Verbal Suffix. In: *Linguistica*, 1981c, vol. 21, p. 105–118.

Shields, 1982 – Shields K. The Origin of the Germanic Dental Preterite: A New Proposal. – In: *Leuvense Bijdragen* 71, 1982, p. 427–440.

Shields, 1983 – Shields K. Hittite Imperative Endings in *-u* and Their Indo-European Origins. – In: *Hethitica* 5, 1983, p. 119–129.

Shields, Forthcoming a. – Shields K. The Hittite First Person Singular Imperative Suffix *-lu*. – In: *JIES*.

Shields, Forthcoming b. – Shields K. The Indo-European Verbal Suffix *\*-sk-*. – In: *Emerita*.

Specht, 1947 – Specht Fr. Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination. – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1947.

Stang, 1929 – Stang Chr. Die Sprache des litauischen Katechismus von Mažvydas. – Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1929.

Traugott, 1978 – Traugott E. On the Expression of Spatio-Temporal Relations in Languages. – In: *Universals of Human Language* / Ed. by J. Greenberg. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978, vol. 3, p. 369–400.

Ullian, 1978 – Ullian R. The Nature of Future Tenses. – In: *Universals of Human Language* / Ed. by J. Greenberg. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978, vol. 3, p. 83–123.

Watkins, 1962 – Watkins C. Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb. – Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1962.

Watkins, 1969 – Watkins C. Indogermanische Grammatik. – Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1969, vol. 3.1.

Weinreich, 1963 – Weinreich U. On the Semantic Structure of Language. – In: *Universals of Language* / Ed. by J. Greenberg 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: The M. I. T. Press, 1963, p. 142–216.

## SMULKMENA LVII

A. Antanavičius 1985.VII.22 laiške siūlo jotvingių žodynėlio (žr. *Baltistica* XXI (1), p. 61 tt.) *wikruoti* lenkiškąjį atitikmenį skaityti kaip vieną žodį *zwyciężyć*, o ne kaip du žodžius *zwycie* ir *żyć*, atskirtus kableliais (žr. p. 67, žodį 198 ir p. 81 s. v. *wikruoti*). Iš tikrųjų kablelis gali priklausyti raidei *e* ir rodyti, kad ji yra nosinė, nes panašiai *ę* raidė rašoma ir kitur, pvz., *zęb* 5, *szczęście* 31, *książyc* 62, *będę* 68, *tęcza* 81, *pamiętać* 122, *język* 124, *mięso* 146, *pięć* 178, *imię* 205. Plg. atitinkamą *ą* rašymą žodyje *ciąć* 82. Taigi A. Antanavičiaus pastaba verta dėmesio. Tuo atveju *wikruoti* turėtų reikšti ne ‘gyventi’ ar pan., bet ‘nugalėti, imti viršų (vikrumu)’. Sąsaja su lie. *vikrūs*, *wikruōlis*, *wikrėti* ir kt. šiuo atveju dar įtikinamesnė.

Z. Zinkevičius