

Norbert OSTROWSKI
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

ONCE AGAIN ON THE POSTPONED NEUTER PRONOUN *-ti* ‘THIS’

This paper aims to point to two new instances of the postponed neuter pronoun *-t(i)* ‘this’ – instances overlooked earlier by Ostrowski (*forthcoming*). On the basis of new data I hope to strengthen the thesis that in Lithuanian there existed the enclitic pronoun *-ti*, which comes from the monophthongisation of the neuter pronoun *-tai*, i. e. **-tai > -tie > -ti > -t*. In section 1 I shall address a few issues regarding the development of the postponed neuter pronouns *-tai* and *-kai* in Lithuanian. Section 2 discusses the origin of the Lithuanian presentative particles *aĩskat*, *tàskat* and *šĩskat* ‘behold’, ‘here is’, ‘look over there’. In determining their etymology, I start from Petit’s (2010) description. In section 3, I shall try to explain the twofold shape of the Old Lithuanian connective *idanti / idante* ‘in order to’. The article ends with remarks on the origin of the Lithuanian adverb *čią* ‘here’ (section 4).

1. On the allomorphs *-tai-g(i) : -t#* and *-kai-g(i) : -k#* in Lithuanian

Ostrowski (*forthcoming*) has described the conditions in which the allomorphs *-tai-g : -t#* and *-kai-g : -k#* arose in the Lithuanian adversative conjunction *bèt* ‘but’ and the particle *jùk* ‘after all’. The distribution of *-tai-* and *-t* (and *-kai-* / *-k*) is complementary, i. e. *-tai-* (and *-kai-*) appears in stressed position before the focus particle *-g(i)*, whereas *-t* (/ / *-k*) appears in word-final position (*-#*), cf.:

OLith. *beltai-g : beti* (hapax) / *bèt / bèt* ‘but’¹,
and respectively:

¹ All the variants come from Daukša’s *Postill*, cf. 1x <Bėti> (DP 336, 21). The notation <betáig> points to OLith. *beltai-g*, e. g. DP 521, 52. On the origin of the Lith./Latv. *bet* ‘but’ see Hermann 1926, 335–6; Fraenkel 1962–1965, 41; Nau, Ostrowski 2010, 21; Ostrowski 2011.

OLith. *julkai-g* : **juki* / *jùk'* / *jùk* 'after all'.

In Old Lithuanian texts *jùk* was recorded in three variants:

- a) *julkai-g*, cf. *iukáig* from Daukša's *Postilla* (1599),
- b) *juk'* / *juk* – also in Daukša's *Postilla* (1599),
- c) (*hapax legomenon*) *juki-g* from Morkūnas' *Postilla* (1600), cf. LKŽ 4, 374.

The *hapax* <jukag>, which is quoted by some authors (Fraenkel 1962–1965, 196; Smoczyński 2007, 236; LKŽ 4, 374) and documented in *Summa (...) Ewangeliv* (1653), is, actually, a typo instead of the common *jukaig* and therefore cannot be borne in mind (Hermann 1926, 244).

The shape <juk'> is relatively frequent in Daukša's *Postilla* (1599), e. g. *O iuk' parašîta*: 'A wszak napisano' (DP 226₄₇) 'One has been written, is it not?'. Daukša used an apostrophe to mark the palatalisation of the final consonants, cf.:

- a) dat. sg. pronoun <man'> 'me' (e. g. DP 169₁₁) : <Mánig> (DP 287₂₆),
- b) imperative form <eik'> 'go' (e. g. DP 355₃) : OLith. *eiki*,
- c) preposition <ik'> 'to' (e. g. DP 144₃₀) alongside <iki> (DP 177₃₄).

Equations of the type <ik'> : <iki> allow us to reduce the variant <juk'> to the older **juki*, testified directly in <jukig> (Morkūnas' *Postilla* 1600). The shape *jukai-g* is preserved in Daukša's *Postilla*, cf. notations <iukáig> and <Iukáig> (DP 111₄₋₅; DP 242₁₂; and DP 468₄₆). The superposed acute in <iukáig> indicates stress, so conditions for the proclitic shortening *juo-* > *ju-* existed. This fact, in turn, let us find a way to retrace the older shape of the particle *jùk* 'after all' as **juo-|kai* 'particularly when', a conflation of the intensifying sentence adverb *juo* 'especially, even more' and the connective *kai* 'when', cf. *juoba, kad* (1) in contemporary Lithuanian:

- (1) *Ar nemanai mesti to pavojingo amato – júoba, kad taip senas?* (LKŽ 4, 389)
'Do you not think about quitting this dangerous craft, **particularly as** you are so old?'

However, the question of how to explain the difference *ju-kai-g* : **ju-ki* arises. Bearing in mind that *-tai-* / *-kai-* appear in stressed position before the focus particle *-g(i)*, whereas *-t* / *-k* appear in word-final position (*-#*), Ostrowski has assumed the monophthongisation of the diphthong /ai/, i. e.:

**juo-|kai* > **juo-|kie* > **ju-kì* > *jùk'* (accent retraction + apocope /i/)² > *jùk*.

In this way we gain a brilliant parallel for the change:

**be-|tai* ‘and this’ > **beltie* > *beti* > *bèt'* (accent retraction + apocope /i/) > *bèt*.

The hapax *jukig* may be explained easily as a secondary form with the added enclitic particle *-g(i)* before the shortening **juki* > *juk'*. On the other hand, if monophthongisation took place in the final, stressed syllable, i. e. **ju|kai#* > **juki#* (and respectively **be-|tai#* > *beti#*), then the question is, what is the reason for the lack of monophthongisation in *ju|kai-g(i)*³ and *beltai-g(i)*? Ostrowski (2014) assumes that *-kai* and *-tai* have come from the neuters **-ka-ja* (cf. OCS *koje* ‘which’) and *-ta-ja* (*ka-* < IE **kʷo-d*, cf. Latin *quod*; *ja* < IE **Hyo-d*, cf. Old Indic *yád* and *ta-* < IE **to-d*). The underlying reason for the different development before *-g(i)* and *-#* was the relative chronology of the two processes:

- 1) the disappearance of the unstressed /a/ before *-#* and *-g(i)*,
- 2) the monophthongisation of /ai/ > /ie/.

The apocope of the unstressed /a/ before *-#* had to take place earlier than the syncope of /a/ before *-gi*. The change **juo|kaja-gi* > **juo|kai-gi* took place only after the monophthongisation /ai/ > /ie/ had expired.

The presented hypothesis also makes it possible to explain OLith. *tať* ‘this’⁴ (2) as the result of the change **ta-|tai* > **ta-|tie* > **ta-|ti* > *tať* > *tat*. The contemporary form *ta-taĩ* ‘this’ replaced the older **tati* as can be seen through the analogy of *tatai-g(i/u)*. A parallel for such a scenario is provided

² Also in *bèt* we have to take into account the proclitic shortening **bē-|tai*, cf. Samogitian *biēt* ‘but’ (Kuršėnai). **bē-* relates to Lithuanian *be* ‘and’ (OPr. *bhe* ‘and’), see Rosinas 1988, 226, and further probably to the Baltic past form *bē* ‘was’ < **bjā* < **bijā*, cf. OLatv. subjunctive *būtu-be-m*, Lith. dial. *sùktum-bē-mės* ‘I wish we could whirl’ and OLith. *jei-be-g* ‘if’ (Kazlauskas 2000[1968], 397; Nau, Ostrowski 2010, 21; Ostrowski 2010, 147). For a thorough investigation of the origin of the Baltic conditional see Stang 1966, 430; Holvoet 2002, 2010.

³ **jukaigi* is visible in *jukaigei* < **ju-kai-gi-ai* (MTP 39, 16).

⁴ Cf. the notations <Bet’> (DP 226, 48) alongside <Bęti> ‘but’ (DP 336, 21), <but’> (DP 622, 5) alongside <butí> ‘to be’ (DP 48, 24) and aforementioned pairs like <ik’> : <iki>.

by *betai* ‘but’, documented in *Summa (...) Ewangeliv* (1653) alongside the more common *bet’ / bet*. The ratio *betai* to *betaig / bataig* in *SE* is 3 : 78⁵. In texts by other authors (Mosvid, Daukša, Willent, Szyrwid) there is an exclusive distribution of *bet / bet’ : betaig(i/a)*.

(2) *túrime žinói ioğ zódis Díéwo yra’ ne tiektái **tat’** kas Biblióieğ yra parašíta.* (DP 99₉)
Pol. ‘mamy wiedzieć / żeć słowo Boże iest nie tylko **to** co w Bibliey stoi napisano.’

Engl. ‘We have to know that the word of the Lord is not only **that** which has been written in the Bible.’

The subsequent instance of the change *-tai > -ti > -t’ > -t* is the intensifying adverb *ít*, cf.:

(3) *Man jau **it** nieks nesekas.* (LKŽ 4, 263)
‘I am doing **completely** badly.’

The unshortened shape **li-ti* has been preserved in *ìti-n* (4). The final /-n/ traces back to the IE demonstrative pronoun *-n*⁶, which is testified in Lithuanian in a few lexemes with anaphoric-deictic functions, cf. Lith. *te-ñ* ‘there’ : *tè* ‘there’ (Latv. *te* ‘here’), OLith. *tas-ja-n* ‘exactly this’ (Chyliński) : OLith. *tas-ja / tas-ja-g* (Daukša)⁷; perhaps also in OLith. *ne-n-g* (Willent) ‘than’ and *ne-n-t* (Mosvid) ‘than’ : *ne* ‘not; than’.

(4) *Tas arklys **itin** geras.* (LKŽ 4, 268)
‘This horse is **extraordinarily** good.’

The presented elucidation of the postposition *-ti* opens up new prospects for a better understanding of some forms whose etymology has not yet been described in a satisfactory manner.

2. Particles *añskat*, *tàskat* and *šiskat*

Daniel Petit (2010), in his highly interesting paper devoted to the Lithuanian presentative particles *añskat*, *tàskat* and *šiskat* ‘behold’, ‘here is’, ‘look over there’, presented assumptions involving their origin. According to Endzelīns (DI 2, 499 [1913]), *-skat* is a trace of the Latvian verb *skatīt* ‘to

⁵ Cf. <http://www.lki.lt/seniejirastai/db.php> (*Corpus of Old Lithuanian texts*).

⁶ We most likely find the enclitic *-n* in Polish *ten* ‘this’ < **t_v-n_v*, cf. Rysiewicz (1956a[1934]; 1956b[1937]), who compared Pol. *ten* and a few other Slavonic forms to the Old Armenian suffixed pronoun of the 3rd person (see Jensen 1959, 164; Piszcz 2001, 80–81).

⁷ On the postponed neuter pronoun *-ja* see Ostrowski 2014.

see, to look'. A parallel is provided by the Modern French presentative particles *voici* and *voilà*, which both come from the imperative of the verb *voir* 'to see' in combination with the local particles *ci* 'here' and *là* 'there'. I agree with Petit that "the connection with the verbal root of Latv. *skatīt* must be seen as mistaken" (Petit 2010, 17). Endzelīns' hypothesis does not elucidate how the dialectal forms arose with the particle *-ga*⁸, cf. *ansga*, *tàsgati* etc. alongside *aĩskat*, *tàskat* and *šĩskat*. More promising seem to be Bezenberger's (1877, 175–176) and Fraenkel's (1962–1965, 11) assumptions. Both researchers derived *tàskat* / *tàsgat* etc. from a combination of the demonstrative pronoun *tàs*, etc. with the particle *-ka*⁹ and *-ga*. Their views differ, however, on the nature and origin of the final *-t*. In Old Lithuanian texts the endings *-kat* (e. g. *taskat* in *Wolfenbüttel Postilla*) and *-kate(gi)* (cf. *šiskate* and *taskateghi* in *Wolfenbüttel Postilla*) can be found, whereas in Lithuanian dialects *-g(a)* / *-gat(ė)s* / *-gati(s)* / *-gačiuos* (see Petit 2010, 13) appear. Fraenkel claimed that the primary forms are those with *-ti* (e. g. *tàsgati* in the dialect of Žemaičių Kalvarija), which reflects a second singular personal pronoun in the dative case (probably in the function of *dativous ethicus*). Petit quoted a number of examples that support such a development, but he claims (Petit 2010, 22) that the "typology itself is not an argument in etymological issues; it has only a confirmatory value".

Bezenberger, in turn, saw in *-ti* a deictic particle and that very assumption is, in my opinion, correct. As can be seen from the instances gathered by Petit, in the sixteenth century only forms with *-te* existed, never *-ti*, which appear only in dialects. Thus, philological analysis speaks for the primary character of *-te*. Secondly, in Lithuanian the local particle *tè* 'there' (cf. Latvian *te* 'here') is well evidenced, also as an enclitic pronoun, cf. OLith. *nete(gi)* 'if not' in Sirvydas's dictionary (1642), *sunuste* (5), *pratebrėkštant* 'as soon as

⁸ Cf. OLith. *nesanga* 'because', *betaiga* 'but'.

⁹ It is most likely that *-ka-* traces back to the interrogative/indefinite neuter pronoun **k^o-d* (Latin *quod*), instanced by Latv. *ka* 'that', a connective of complement clauses and Lith. *kà* 'that': *Aš tau sakiau, kà lauke lyja (...)* (LKŽ 5, 3) 'I have told you **that** it is raining outside'. The function of the interrogative pronoun *ka* 'what? / was?' is well documented in Old Prussian, e. g.: *Ka aft sta billiton?* 'Was ist das?' (Rosinas 1988, 190–193; Mažiulis 1993, 134–138). The parallel is displayed by the Lithuanian *-ja(g)*, a descendant of the neuter pronoun **Hyo-d* (Old Indic *yád*), which in Old Lithuanian texts was a focus particle in such examples as *tas-ja liežuvo-is* <*tafs-íia liežúw-is*> 'the very tongue' or *tie-ja-g pátis fánar-iei* 'exactly those limbs' (DP 7_{54–58}).

it dawned' (6), *pragitejódžiau* (7), see Nau, Ostrowski 2010, 24–26; Petit 2010, 22:

(5) *sunuste szmaniu eiti, kaip ape ghį raschita ira* (Wolfenbüttel Postill 133b.10; Hermann 1926, 386) 'The Son of Man goeth as it is written of him' (Matthew 26,24).

(6) *patôgi yrá karalįfte dagú žmógui húkinikui kuris ißêio pratebrékstant jamđitu darbiniku winįcion sawón.* (DP 92, 34–36) 'The Kingdom of Heaven is like a farmer who went out at daybreak to hire workers for his vineyard' (Matthew 20,1).

(7) *pragitejódžiau bérq žirgėli, (...) vis ažù tavo to gražumėlio* (Būga RR 3, 918) 'behold I have exhausted my bay horse, (...) and all this because of your beauty.'

As *-te* was a demonstrative enclitic pronoun with a similar meaning to the Polish *oto* and Russian *voť*, then I posit the same function for *-ti*.

Another example of the demonstrative enclitic pronouns *-te* / *-ta* and *-ti* are the polyfunctional conjunctions *ne-te*¹⁰ and *ne-ta*¹¹ 'but; unless; until; because; than', on the one hand, and the scalar additive particle *ne-ti* 'even' (19th cent.), on the other hand. The shape *neti* appears only in Olechnawicz's "Pasakos..." (1861), see Būga RR 1, 355¹². According to the etymology by Eduard Hermann (1912, 82–83), the postpositions *-ta* / *-te* included in *netá* / *nete* were anaphoric pronouns¹³. For this reason, I am also forced to explain the *-ti* in *ne-ti* as an anaphoric enclitic pronoun.

3. *idant* / *idante* / *idanti(gi)* 'in order to'

In the words *idant* / *idante* / *idanti(gi)*, all the endings, i. e. *-t*, *-te* and *-ti*, are already documented in the Old Lithuanian writings, cf. *Idanti negaletu newenas ius kaltinti*. (Mosvid's Catechism [1547] 30, 8) 'In order that no one could inculpate you' and *Stoiofi fmertėnàs: Idante mus izgánitu* (Knyga Nobažnystės [1653] 137₃₉) 'He became deadly in order to rescue us'. The explanation from the previous section applies to all of them.

¹⁰ Daukša's *Postilla* and Sirvydas' dictionary [1642].

¹¹ Wilent's *Euangelias bei Epistolas*.

¹² The Lith. scalar additive particle *net* 'even' developed from the conjunction *net* 'until', cf. Nau, Ostrowski 2010, 16, which also cites several cases of the change 'until' > 'even'.

¹³ "Die Bedeutung von *net(a)* ist zumeist 'sondern', diese muß man sich etwa so entstanden denken: *schitta kosanis netiktai wienims piemenims kalbama ira, net wissam swietui* (...) 'diese Predigt ist nicht nur zu den Hirten allein gesprochen, nein: zu der ganzen Welt'" (Hermann 1912, 82–83).

The development of *idant* is described by Hermann (1912, 16) as follows:

“Etymologisch ist es als Zusammensetzung eines Adverbiums *idan* + *t*- anzusehen; *id* bez. *idan*- ist dieselbe Bildung von **i*- wie *tad*, *tadan*- von **to*- und *kad*, *kadan*- von **q^üo*-. (...) Von Haus aus waren **idan*-, **adan*- Zeitadverbien, wie man sich an *kadq* aus **kadan* ‘wann?’ klar machen kann. **idan* hieß daher ‘jetzt’; bei dieser Bedeutung ist das indische *idā* stehengeblieben. Das Avestische hat *ida* ‘jetzt’ zu ‘von nun an, künftig’ weitergebildet, ebenso wie *ada* und *tada*, auch altind. *tadā* ‘dann’ und ‘darauf’ bedeuten”.

At the moment I can only add to this explanation, that the postponed *-da-* was productive yet in times after the break-up of the Proto-Baltic community, cf. Latvian *kā-d-s* ‘what kind of; someone / somebody’ (: *kā* ‘how?’) and Latgalian *kai-d-s* (: *kai* ‘how?’) alongside Lithuanian *ka-dai* and *ka-dan*-. However, four questions arise for the future:

- 1) If Latgalian *kaid*s is derived from the older neuter relative pronoun *kai* (cf. section 1), then should we not treat Lith. *ka-dai* and *ka-dan*- ‘when?’ as derivatives from the neuter pronoun *ka* < (IE **k^wo-d*)?
- 2) Is Lithuanian *-dan* connected to Latin *dum* (acc. sg. m./n.) ‘in the meantime, as long as’, cf. further *quīdum* ‘why?’, *primumdum* ‘in the first place?’ (For other compounds with *-dum* see de Vaan (2008, 160).) In such a way we would have in *ka-dan*- a coalescence of two neuters.
- 3) What is the origin of the shortened form *id* ‘in order to’, documented in Pietkiewicz’s *Catechism* (1598) and in *Kniga Nobaznistes* (1653)? Does this shortened form mean that we should presume an older **idai*, cf. *kadai*?
- 4) Where does the Lith. dial. particle *idai* ‘really?’ (see LKŽ 4, 7 – Gervėčiai) come from? Is *-dai* in *idai* ‘really?’ connected to the Old Greek particle *δαί*, often used after interrogatives, e. g. *τί δαί* ‘what? how?’ (Liddell-Scott Lexicon)? Such a usage would explain Lith. *ka-dai* ‘when?’ (interrogative pronoun + *-dai*).

4. Some answers and some new questions

OLith. *bet*, *tať*, *itin*, etc. point to the high regularity of the *-tai* > *-tie* > *-t(i)* change. Deviations such as *tataĩ* ‘this’ are apparent and one must treat them as innovations based on shapes with the particle *-gi*, cf. OLith. *tataig(i)*.

The question is, did the monophthongisation of the neuter pronoun as described in section 1 affect only the postponed *-tai*? This does not seem to be the case in the focus particle *tì* ‘this’, a synonym of *taĩ* in the following sentences: *Tì pasiutęs vaikas – neklauso.*¹⁴ ‘What a savage kid – it does not obey’; *Tì dėl ko [negali siųsti]?* (Daukantas) ‘So why [can you not send it]?’ (LKŽ 16, 160). Other examples of the particle *ti* are cited by Hermann (1926, 388). This particle, inordinately rare and evidenced only in dialects, had to be more common in the past. That is what the Lithuanian adverb *čia* ‘here’ < **tj-ā* points to. The etymologically obscure final vowel *-ā* requires a separate study and here I will limit myself only to some preliminary remarks.

Place adverbs sometimes include local particles, cf. Old Greek ἐνθάδε ‘thither, hither; here, there; now’ (Liddle-Scot’s Lexicon), which consists of the adverb ἐνθα ‘there’ and the postposition *-δε* denoting motion towards. Probably, the same postposition emerges in OCS *sv-de* ‘here’, from the conflation of the demonstrative pronoun *sv* ‘this’ and the enclitic particle *-de*, which we find also in Proto-Slavic **kb-de* ‘where’ (cf. Vasmer ESRJ 2, 89f.). The structure of Lith. *čia* ‘here’ < **tj-ā* (demonstrative pronoun + postposition) is similar to OCS *sv-de* ‘here’. Assuming that the postponed *-ā* expresses motion, we need to consider its relationship to the Indo-Iranian adverbial particle *ā*, cf. Old Indic *á* ‘near, besides; towards; from; in’ (Bubenik 2006, 108–109) and Avestan *ā* + acc. ‘to; in, on’, + loc. ‘on’, + abl. ‘since; (away) from, from’, + instr. ‘for, because’ (Martínez, de Vaan 2014, 77). In both languages *ā* could be used in ‘postnominal’ position, cf. Vedic *asmai hrđá á* ‘from our heart’ with *á* after abl./gen. *hrđá* (Bubenik 2006, 108–109) and Avestan *ā* after acc., e. g. *sārəm’a* ‘auf dem Kopf’ (Reichelt 1967, 269). The last example is strikingly familiar to the structure of the Baltic illative (acc. + postposition). However, the etymological equation of the Lithuanian *-ā* with the Indo-Iranian *ā* raises serious questions, if we look at the counterparts of the Indo-Iranian *ā* in Germanic (e. g. OHG *ā-wiggi* ‘Abweg [wilderness]’, OHG *uo-wahst* ‘Zuwachs, Zweig [twig]’) and Old Greek (ἤ ‘certainly, really’). Their Indo-European prototype was the instr. sg. **h₁eh₁* / **h₁oh₁* of the demonstratives **h₁e* / **h₁o* (EWA 1, 157; Klingenschmitt 2008, 413; Beekes 2010, 507; Harðarson 2014, 40), while the Lithuanian *-ā* points to **h₁eh₂* (collective?). Of course, the Indo-Iranian *ā* may be traced back to

¹⁴ After Vitkauskas “Šiaurės rytų dūninkų šnektų žodynas”.

the older **h₁eh₂*, but I do not see any functional justification for such a reconstruction.

There is, however, one more possible elucidation of the postponed *-ā* in Lithuanian. In Old Greek, *δε* appears in two functions: 1) of the enclitic particle denoting motion towards, e. g. *οἴκα-δε* ‘homewards’, 2) of the adversative connective *δέ* ‘but’ (cf. Klingenschmitt 2008, 411). The Lithuanian adversative connective *ō* ‘and, but, while, whereas’ has its exact counterpart in Slavonic, e. g. Polish *a* ‘and, but’. The Slavonic connective *a* is traditionally explained (cf. Vasmer ESRJ 1, 55) as a successor of the ablative of the demonstrative **h₁e* / **h₁o*, cf. Avestan *āaṭ* ‘so, then, and, but’ (see Reichelt 1967, 427). In my opinion, the “ablative” function of the Baltic *ā* is visible in Lith. *óda* (1) / *odà* (4) ‘skin’ and Latv. *āda* ‘skin’. I think that Baltic words are compounds that consist of *ā-* ‘from’ and **-dā* < **deh₂-* ‘separate, divide’, cf. Vedic *áva adāt* ‘hat abgetrennt’ (LIV, 86) and Lith. *do-* in *do-snus* ‘generous’ (Smoczyński 2007, 118). The primary meaning would be **‘this that has been separated from animals’ flesh (animals’ flayed skin)’*. In view of this, Finnish *vuota* ‘skin flayed from an animal’, a borrowing from Baltic **ādā* (Karulis 1992, 56), which nicely agrees with the etymology presented here, deserves serious attention. Parallels of the development ‘to cut off’ > ‘skin’ are numerous, cf. Old Greek *δέγμα* ‘skin, leather’ from *δέγω* ‘to skin, flay’ (Beekes 2010, 318): *ἀσκον δεδάσθαι* ‘to have one’s skin flayed off’ (Liddell-Scott), Old Indic *carman-* / Av. *čarəman-* ‘skin’ < **(s)kér-men-* ‘Abschnitt → abgezogene Haut’ from **(s)ker-* ‘cut’ (EWA 1, 537), Engl. *skin* < Middle Engl. *skynn*, ON *skinn* < **skind-* alongside OHG *scinten*, Germ. *schinden* ‘to flay, skin’ (Klein 1966, 1451–1452; Buck 1949, 200–201).

The difference in meaning between the presumed allative postposition *-ā* in **tj-ā* > *čìà* ‘here’ and the ablative *ā-* in **ādā* is an obstacle, but, on the other hand, such a variation is well documented in Lithuanian and other languages, cf. Lith. “ablative” prefix *at-* in *at-skirti* ‘to separate’ alongside “allative” *at-* in *at-važiuoti* ‘to come’, Latvian *iz* ‘from’: Latgalian *iz* ‘on’, Lithuanian *nuo* ‘from’: Polish (common Slavic) *na* ‘at, on’. The aforementioned Vedic *á* could be also, depending on the context, interpreted both as an “ablative” (8) and as an “allative” (9) adverb, as in two instances from Bubenik 2006, 108:

(8)	<i>imám</i>	<i>sú</i>	<i>asmai</i>	<i>hṛdá</i>	<i>á</i>	<i>sútaṣṭám</i>
	this	well	be+DAT	heart+GEN/ABL	near	well-fashioned+ACC

mántram *vocema* [RV ii.35.2]
 hymn+ACC utter+AOR+1PL

‘We would verily utter from our heart this well-fashioned hymn’

- (9) *áta* *á* *te* *ṛtasprśo* *ní* *ṣeduh* [RV iv.50.3]
 thence near you+Gen/DAT rite-cherishers down sit+PERF+3PL
 ‘from thence [coming] they have seated themselves for you’

In (9) “*á* hosts the pronominal clitic *te* (GEN/DAT) ‘you’ and has rather meaning towards (= Allative)” (Bubenik 2006, 108).

5. Conclusions

This paper aimed to strengthen the hypothesis about the existence of the enclitic demonstrative pronoun *-ti* in Lithuanian. Some new questions concerning the origin of Lithuanian *kadai* / *kadan-* ‘when’, *idai* ‘really?’, *idant* ‘in order to’ and their postponed elements *-dai* and *-dan* have also been raised. In the last section I proposed the etymology of the Lithuanian postposition *-ā*. At this moment, the offered etymology is only of a preliminary nature, but a thorough diachronic description of the Baltic illative, and perhaps other issues not taken into account so far such as the preposition *prō* ‘through’ (< *prā* : Latin *prō*), should shed some new light on the history of **tj-ā*.

DAR KARTĄ APIE POSTPOZICINIŲ BEVARDĖS GIMINĖS ĮVARDĮ *-ti* ‘TAI’

Santrauka

Autorius siūlo alomorfus *-tai-g* : *-t#* ir *-kai-g* : *-k#* (plg. slie. *beltai-g* : *bèt’* / *bèt* ir s. lie. *ju|kai-g* : *jùk’* / *jùk*) aiškinti kaip žodžio galo dvibalsio monoftongizacijos rezultatą, t. y. **be-|tai* ‘ir tai’ > **be|tie* > *beti* > *bèt’* > *bèt*. Monoftongizacijos nebuvimas formose *beltai-g* ir *ju|kai-g* aiškinamas dviejų procesų santykinė chronologija:

- 1) nekirčiuoto /a/ išnykimu prieš *-#* ir *-g(i)*,
- 2) monoftongizacija /ai/ > /ie/.

Apokopė /a/ prieš *-#* įvyko anksčiau nei sinkopė /a/ prieš *-gi*. Pakitimas **juo|kaja-gi* > **juo|kai-gi* įvyko tik pasibaigus /ai/ > /ie/ monoftongizacijai. Straipsnyje aptariami du pavyzdžiai su postpoziciniu *-ti*: dalelytė *tàskati* ir s. lie. jungtukas *idanti(g)*. Autoriaus nuomone, abiem atvejais *-ti* etimologiškai yra susijęs su bevardės giminės įvardžiu *taĩ*. Siūlomą aiškinimą patvirtina tarminė forma *tì* ‘tai’ (LKŽ 16, 160), kuri atveria naujas perspektyvas lietuvių prievoksmio *čià* < **tj-ā* etimologijai.

REFERENCES

- Beekes, Robert 2010, *Etymological dictionary of Greek*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Bezzenberger, Adalbert 1877, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Litauischen Sprache auf Grund litauischer Texte des XVI. und des XVII. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen: Verlag von Robert Peppmüller.
- Bubenik, Vit 2006, Cases and postpositions in Indo-Arian, in John Hewson, Vit Bubenik, *From Case to Adposition. The development of configurational syntax in Indo-European languages*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 102–130.
- Buck, Carl Darling 1949, *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages. A contribution to the history of ideas*, Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Būga RR – Kazimieras Būga, *Rinktiniai raštai* 1–3, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1958–1961.
- De Vaan, Michiel 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- DP – *Postilla Catholicka. Tái est: Izguldimas Ewangeliu kiekvienos Nedelos ir szwêtes per wissús metús. Per Kúnigą Mikaloiv Davkszą Kanoniką Médnikų... 1599*, in Jonas Palionis (ed.), *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų Postilė ir jos šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2000.
- EWA – Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1996.
- Fraenkel, Ernst 1962–1965, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Harðarson, Jón Axel 2014, Das andere Wort für Frau im Urindogermanischen, in Sergio Neri, Roland Schuhmann (eds.), *Studies on the collective and feminine in Indo-European from a diachronic and typological perspective*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 23–55.
- Hermann, Eduard 1912, *Über die Entwicklung der litauischen Konjunktionalsätze*, Jena: Fromannsche Buchdruckerei (Hermann Pohle).
- Hermann, Eduard 1926, *Litauische Studien. Eine historische Untersuchung schwachbetonter Wörter im Litauischen*, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Holvoet, Axel 2002, Notes on the development of the Lithuanian and Latvian conditional, *Linguistica Baltica* 10, 39–50.
- Holvoet, Axel 2010, Notes on complementisers in Baltic, in Nicole Nau, Norbert Ostrowski (eds.), *Particles and connectives in Baltic* (= *Acta Salensia* 2), Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Asociacija “Academia Salensis”, 73–101.
- Jensen, Hans 1959, *Altarmenische Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Karulis, Konstantīns 1992, *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* 1–2, Rīga: Avots.
- Kazlauskas, Jonas 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis (= Idem, *Rinktiniai raštai* 1, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2000).

Klein, Ernest 1966, *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language*, Amsterdam, London, New York: Elsevier Publishing Company.

Klingenschmitt, Gert 2008, Lit. *úošvis*, *Baltistica* 43(3), 405–429.

LIV – Helmut Rix, Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Rainer Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer (Hrsg.), *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1998.

LKŽ – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20, Vilnius, 1968–2002.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1993, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas 2: I–K*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

MTP – *Margarita Theologica ... Zemczuga Theologischka ... Lituwischkai jra perguldita per Simona Waischnora warnischki ... Karaliaucziue ... 1600*, in Guido Michelini (ed.), *Zemczuga Theologischka ir jos šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1997.

Nau, Nicole, Norbert Ostrowski 2010, Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages, in Nicole Nau, Norbert Ostrowski (eds.), *Particles and connectives in Baltic* (= *Acta Salensia* 2), Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Asociacija “Academia Salensis”, 1–37.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2010, Latvian *jeb* ‘or’ – from conditional to disjunctive conjunction, in Nicole Nau, Norbert Ostrowski (eds.), *Particles and connectives in Baltic* (= *Acta Salensia* 2), Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas, Asociacija “Academia Salensis”, 135–150.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2011, Iš lietuvių kalbos istorinės morfologijos problemų (apie *nebe(-)* ir *bent* kilmę), *Lietuvių kalba* 5 (<http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php?id=186>).

Ostrowski, Norbert 2014, On the postponed neuter pronoun *-ja* in Baltic, in Tatjana Civjan, Marija Zavjalova, Artūras Judžentis (eds.), *Baltai ir slavai: doasinių kultūrų sankirtos / Балты и славяне: пересечения духовных культур*, Vilnius: Versmė, 242–253.

Ostrowski, Norbert (*forthcoming*), Lithuanian particle *jùk* ‘after all’ – its origin and related problems (on the allomorphs *-kai-g* : *-k#* and *-tai-g* : *-t#*), in Artūras Judžentis, Stephan Kessler (Hrsg.), *Contributions to syntax and morphology* (Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Baltic Languages at the University of Greifswald).

Petit, Daniel 2010, Old Lithuanian *aňskat*, *šiskat*, *tàskat* and cognates, *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 62–63, 11–25.

Pisowicz, Andrzej 2001, *Gramatyka ormiańska (Grabar-Aszcharabar)*, Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Reichelt, Hans 1967, *Avestisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Rosinas, Albertas 1988, *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Rysiewicz, Zygmunt 1956a, Zachodnio-słowiańskie *tъnъ*, *snъ*, *ъnъ*, in Idem, *Studia językoznawcze*, 65–70 (= Idem, *Księga referatów II Zjazdu Slawistów 1: Językoznawstwo*, Warszawa, 1934, 108–113).

Rysiewicz, Zygmunt 1956b, Kaszubskie *nen* i formacje pochodne, in Idem, *Studia językoznawcze*, 61–64 (= Idem, *Slavia Occidentalis* 15, 1937, 40–46).

Martínez, Javier, Michiel de Vaan 2014, *Introduction to Avestan* (= *Brill introductions to Indo-European languages* 1), Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Wilno: Uniwersytet Wileński.

Stang, Christian S. 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Vasmer ESRJ – Maks Fasmer [Max Vasmer], *Etimologičeskij slovarʹ russkogo jazyka*. Pervod s nemeckogo i dopolnenija O. N. Trubačeva, 1–4, Moskva: Progress, 1986.

Norbert OSTROWSKI
Instytut Językoznawstwa
Zakład Bałtologii
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
al. Niepodległości 4
PL-61-874, Poznań
Poland
[norbertas@poczta.onet.pl]
[ostrow@amu.edu.pl]

