ERIC P. HAMP

ON -*ki* AND OTHER MATTERS

K. Shields has proposed (*Baltistica* 22 (1), 1986, 48—55) to trace the origin and development of the Lithuanian imperative -*k(i)*. He wishes to have it original **-k* with an imperative (?) -*i* (52); but surely the particle is **-ki*, with loss of -*i* by final apocope, but not internally.

I have no quarrel with the possibility of resegmentation with zero (48—9); such a diachronic development is banal. I do however differ with the claim (49) that the 2nd person was marked with zero, and that it thereby shares a categorial ancestry with the 3rd. Surely, the imperative is different in structure — paradigmatic range, oppositions of person, and syntactic options (witness the Old Irish prototonic form and lack of "deponent" endings, and the Vedic sentence order) — from other finite forms. Thus, while in these other paradigms the third, or non-, person was unmarked, in the imperative it was the second; indeed, in the imperative the other persons are handled quite apart.

A fair part of Shields's discussion (49—50) is occupied with the hic-et-nunc **-i*. I do not agree with Safarewicz that this element was a "strengtherer"; it was a straight locative → temporal in origin. But properly the topic of **-i* is not germane, I think, to the explanation of -*ki*.

I agree with Shields (50—1) that **k̂i* marked 'ich-deixis', but this surely did not compete with **-i*, which rather marked the 'speech scene' (defined originally by *•eĝ* and **tu*). I disagree with his idea (taken from Allen and others before; see footnote 5) that the palatal quality of **k̂*, etc. was allophonic (51); see my summary statement in *The New Sound of Indo-European: Essays in Phonological Reconstruction*, ed. Theo Vennemann (Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 1989), p. 209 f. The Baltic and Slavic doublets have a different explanation, largely inter-dialect borrowing from "centum" branches or Albanian (or 'its early kin). In any event, the admission by Shields and Allen (51) of "unmotivated conversions" essentially vitiates their argument.

Therefore -*ki* cannot be derived from **k̂i*, which, moreover, from the forms cited (50) is seen to have regularly contained / *i* /.

Turning now to *-ki*, we see in Shields's argument of "reduced deictic force" (51) and "non-present verbal formation" (52) a case of *lucus a non lucendo*. In this fashion *-ki* ends up (52—3) embracing futurity.[1] The final sentence (53) leaves me quite bewildered.

I cannot therefore abandon my position stated in *Baltistica* 12 (1), 1976, 29—30, as superseded by *Baltistica* 14, 1978, 110—1.[2]

---

[1] Incidentally, in δέδορκα κ belongs to the root.

[2] The latter revision was too late to be inserted in the proof of the former, and hence appeared separately.