

Norbert OSTROWSKI

Uniwersytet Jagielloński

“NATURAL COORDINATION” AND THE ORIGIN OF THE LITHUANIAN CONJUNCTION *beĩ* ‘AND’, WITH COMMENTS ON OLD PRUSSIAN–LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE CONTACT

Abstract. Productivity of the Lithuanian conjunction *beĩ* ‘and’, marker of so called “natural coordination”, is strictly connected to the area of Lithuania Minor (former East Prussia). Lithuanian *beĩ* comes from conflation of the common Baltic conjunction *bè* ‘and’ and an additive particle *ir* ‘also’. The conflated form **beir* has been further reduced to *beĩ* in accordance with Lithuanian phonotactic rules that do not tolerate group VRR (V = Vocal, R = Resonant). There are some traces that suggest that Lithuanian *beĩ* ‘and’ came into existence in the bilingual, Old Prussian–Lithuanian environment.

Keywords: Lithuanian; Old Prussian; historical syntax; etymology; language contacts.

The Lithuanian conjunction *beĩ* ‘and’ is used “in order to combine words with related meanings: *Tévas beĩ móтина* ‘Father and mother’, *Dienà beĩ naktis* ‘Day and night’, *Tévaĩ turéjo dù vaikù, súnų beĩ dùkterį* ‘Parents had two children, son and daughter’”¹. These examples reveal *beĩ* as a marker of so-called “natural coordination”. The structure of the paper is as follows: in section I, I will present the geographical scope of *beĩ*. This section will show that productivity of the Lithuanian conjunction *beĩ* ‘and’ is strictly connected to the area of Lithuania Minor (former East Prussia). Moving eastward, the frequency of *beĩ* reduces dramatically. This suggests that *beĩ* ‘and’ in modern Lithuanian is a borrowing from Lithuania Minor dialects. The next section describes how *beĩ* was used in Old Lithuanian texts. Analysis in this section is based on works by authors from former East Prussia (Lithuania Minor), where

¹“do łączenia wyrazów o znaczeniach pokrewnych: *Tévas beĩ móтина* ‘Ojciec i matka’, *Dienà beĩ naktis* ‘Dzień i noc’, *Tévaĩ turéjo dù vaikù, súnų beĩ dùkterį* ‘Rodzice mieli dwoje dzieci, syna i córkę’” (Otrębski 1956, 359).

beĩ displays the utmost frequency and functional diversity. The conducted analysis shows that *beĩ* often occurred as a kind of focalizer ‘and also, and besides, as well as’ (2.3., 2.4.), and sometimes appeared as a translation of Latin *atque* ‘and’. It also occasionally introduced a new topic in narrative text (2.2.). In section 3, I will defend the thesis that *beĩ* comes from a conflation of the common Baltic conjunction *bè* ‘and’ and additive particle *iř* ‘also’, i.e. **be ir* ‘and also’. This explanation elucidates well the aforementioned focalizing function of *beĩ* ‘and’. The change **beir > beĩ* illustrates the Lithuanian phonotactic rule that does not allow phonemic groups of the type *VRR#* (Vocal + Resonant + Resonant; or more precisely *Vjr#*). The geographical scope of *beĩ* as well as some details of the Old Prussian language (function words *be* <bhe> ‘and’ and *ir* ‘also’) suggest that *beĩ* came into existence in the Old Prussian-Lithuanian language community.

1. *Beĩ* in 16th / 17th cent. Lithuanian texts – geographical scope

In modern Lithuanian, *beĩ* ‘and’ can be found only in written language, especially in the daily press (Miliūnaitė 2007). However, in 19th century, the conjunction *beĩ* was much more widespread, particularly in the territory of Lithuania Minor. This statement is supported by the extensive description (nearly a whole page) of *beĩ* in Kurschat’s grammar (1876, 436). Kurschat’s depiction also emphasises the use of *beĩ* as a conjunction combining “words with related meanings”:

„Die Verbindung durch *beĩ* gilt als die engste, etwa wie im Lateinischen die durch *-que* und im Griechischen die durch $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ und wird meistens nur bei Verbindung von zwei zu einem Paar gehörigen Dingen gebraucht. Bsp. Vater und Mutter sind nicht zu Hause, *tėws beĩ mótyna ne-namėj* (...). Doch setzt man gegenwärtig selbst in diesen und ähnlichen Fällen ein *iř* statt *beĩ*. (...)”

Analysis of the geographical scope of *beĩ* in Old Lithuanian texts is very illuminating. Lithuanian Jesuit priest Konstanty Szyrwid (Lith. Konstantinas Sirvydas) from East Lithuania, writing in East-Aukštaitian dialect, in the first edition of his dictionary (1620), describes only the conjunction *iř* ‘and’. It is true that, in the third edition of his *Dictionarium* (1642), Szyrwid included *beĩ* as a synonym of *iř*, but all (numerous) instances of usage are only provided for *iř*, e.g.: *Ampulká / ampulla* (...). *Sudelis iz kurio winu / iř wundeni kielikan pila prieg miřiey* (page 2), (lit.) ‘A little vessel, from which wine **and** water are poured into the chalice during a Holy Mass’. In the first part of Szyrwid’s *Punktai sakymų* (1629), *beĩ* does not appear a single time. On this basis, one

can assume that Szyrwid knew of *beĩ* only passively, as in East Lithuania, *beĩ* was not used. It is striking also, that in *Wolfenbütteler Postill* (1573), which displays numerous East-Aukštaitian features, *beĩ* occurs only once. This fact can be easily explained by the influence of later scribes and proofreaders. *Beĩ* has not also been recorded in the East-Aukštaitian dialect of Lazūnai (see Petrauskas, Vidugiris 1985). The archaic dialect of Zietela does not show traces of *beĩ* either (see Rozwadowski 1995; Vidugiris 1998).

In *Postill* (1599) by Mikołaj Dauksza (Lith. Mikalojus Daukša), who came from the Kėdainiai district and used what is known as the middle Lithuanian variant of the 16th century literary Lithuanian language, *beĩ* appears 12 times, first of all, as a conjunction in noun phrases (see instances [1]-[2]). By contrast, in the similarly sized *Postill* (1591) by Johannes Bretke (from Lithuania Minor), *beĩ* occurs well over 350 times. The same conjunction is also widespread in texts by other authors working in the area of Prussian Lithuania (Mosvidius, Wilentas, Waischnoras). I do not have detailed data concerning the Samogitian dialect, but in *Ziwatas Pona yr Diewa musu Jezusa Christusa* (1759), the conjunction *beĩ* does not occur at all (Girdenis, Girdenienė 1997).

As we can see, the frequency of *beĩ* increases as we travel from East to West Lithuania. I do not have at my disposal data concerning the presence of *beĩ* in the South-Aukštaitian dialect, however, the dictionary of the South-Aukštaitian dialect of Druskininkai (Naktinienė, Paulauskienė, Vitkauskas 1988) does not report *beĩ*. According to my informants, *beĩ* is also unknown in the language of the older generation of residents of Puńsk (where the South-Aukštaitian dialect is used). All these facts suggest that the frequency of *beĩ* was tightly connected to Lithuania Minor. This observation corresponds with remarks by Palionis (1995, 72). Of course, the last word should be given to dialectologists, who would verify, on the basis of current dialects, the distribution of *beĩ* noticed in Old Lithuanian texts.

As a side note, I would like to add that there are more similar downsides in the description of Lithuanian dialects. For example, the sentence ‘John no longer has time’ may be expressed in Lithuanian in three ways: *Jonas jau neturi laiko* / *Jonas nebeturi laiko* / *Jonas jau nebeturi laiko* (*turi* ‘has’, *laikas* ‘time’, *jau* ‘already’). What arises due to the analysis of the oldest texts is that *nebe-* and *jau nebe-* ‘no longer’ occur side by side exclusively in texts from Lithuania Minor. Mikołaj Dauksza (coming from middle Lithuania) used *nebe-* (twice in his *Postill*), but never *jau nebe-*, while Szyrwid (from

East Lithuania) knew only *jau ne-*, a counterpart of the Polish *już nie* ‘no more’ (Ostrowski 2011; 2016)². In the future, this philological observation should also be confronted with data from dialects.

2. Functions of *beĩ* in Old Lithuanian texts

2.1. *Beĩ* as a marker of “natural coordination”

In all descriptions of *beĩ* ‘and,’ one ascertainment is repeated: that *beĩ* combines words with related meanings, in other words, *beĩ* is a marker of “natural coordination”, see the definition by Wälchli (2005, 5):

“(…) NATURAL COORDINATION, coordination of items which are expected to co-occur, which are closely related in meaning, and which form conceptual units, such as ‘father and mother’, ‘husband and wife’, ‘hands and feet’, ‘eat and drink’, ‘read and write’, rather than ‘the man and the snake’, ‘toe and belly’, ‘knife and hammer’, ‘eat and read’, ‘read and swim’, which are instances of ACCIDENTAL COORDINATION, coordination of items which are not expected to co-occur, and which do not have a close semantic relationship.”

Below, I have gathered examples from *Postill* (1599) by Dauksza (1)–(2), *Evangelias bei epistolas* (1579) by Wilentas (3), *Postill* (1591) by Bretke (4) and *Margarita Theologica* (1600) by Simonas Waisznoras (5):

(1) (...) / *ne miłėkimes̃ žódžeis* / **bei** *liežuwiu tiektái beĩ dárbu ir tiefa*. (DP 336, 15–16)
 ‘(...) / nie miłuyemy się SLOWY / **a** IĘZYKIEM tylko: ale uczynkiem i prawdą.’ (Wujek’s *Postill*)

‘Do not let us love each other with WORDS **and** TONGUE only, but deed and truth.’

(2) *Tas’ kartúsis málkas úxufo bei tulŕžiėš pafmėrkia wifsús apfirijmús ir girtáwimuwís / ir pútás tawás*. (DP 178, 7)

‘Ten gorzki trunek OCTU **y** ŻOŁĆI potępia wszystkie obżarstwa / opilstwa / y bieśiadu twoie.’ (Wujek’s *Postill*)

‘This bitter drink consisting of ACID **and** GALL condemns any your gluttony, drunkenness and all your banquets.’

(3) *Ir kitas awys turiu kurios neesti isch tos awiniczas / ir tas paczas turiu esch atwesti / ir mana balsa klausys / ir bus wienas GŪTAS bei wienas PIEMŪ*. (VEE 66, 5–7)

² The difference between all three variants boils down to the difference between INTER and OUTER NEGATION. Sentences with *nebe(-)* involve outer negation, whereas sentences with *jau ne-* involve inter negation; *be-* is the Old Lithuanian continuative prefix (‘still’). Parallel development can be found in Old Greek οὐκ-έτι ‘no more’, formed from sentence negation οὐ(κ) and continuative adverb έτι ‘still’; see Ostrowski (2011; 2016).

‘Und ich habe andere Schafe, die sind nicht aus diesem Stalle. Und dieselben muß ich herführen, und sie werden meine Stimme hören, und wird EINE HERDE **und** EIN HIRTE werden. (Luther’s *Bibel*, 1545)

‘And other sheepe I haue, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall heare my voyce; and there shall be ONE FOLD, **and** ONE SHEPHEARD.’ (John 10, 16)³

- (4) *Pradzoie BVWA Szodis / tatai esti / Kristus iau buwa be esans / kada Diewas DANGU bei SZEME sutwere.* (BP I 54, 13–15)

‘In the beginning was the Word, i.e. Christ had already existed when God created HEAVEN **and** EARTH.’

- (5) *ir wifsi TENAI bei fCHIA ant žemes* (MTP 36v, 10)

‘and all of them THERE [in heaven] **and** HERE on the earth’

Since coordinands in “natural coordination” are intimately linked to culture (Wälchli 2005, 8), it is not surprising that in religious texts, such pairs as ‘heaven’ and ‘earth’ (4), ‘body’ and ‘blood’ (of Christ) or ‘bread’ and ‘wine’ (cf. *ant duonas bei wina* MT 25v, 22) are combined with *beĩ*. The very title of the work by Wilent, *Evangelias bei epistolas* (“Gospels **and** Apostolic Letters”) is a good example.

Languages with a separate marker of “natural coordination” are very rare (e.g. the Malagasy language as noticed by Wälchli (2005, 47), and Lithuanian is another example of this kind. However, more detailed analysis of Old Lithuanian texts shows that even authors coming from East Prussia used *iĩ* (less often) also, in order to combine words with related meanings. In other words, *iĩ* was a common, unmarked marker of coordination and *beĩ* marked, e.g. instances of (*kūnas*) ‘body’ / (*kraujas*) ‘blood’ (of Christ) in (6)–(7):

- (6) (...) *draugifta tikinczuiu fu Chriftumi / kurri netiektai wiera nuβdūstifsi / bet ir Sacramentifchku priemimu KUNA bei KRAUIA Chriftaus.* (MT 158v, 15–18)

‘Bond of people, who believe in Christ, emerges not only in their belief, but also in taking BODY **and** BLOOD of Christ.’

- (7) *næra ko abeioti / ghi fu kitais mokitineis nafrais fawa KUNA ir KRAUIE Chriftaus priemufsi* (MT 156v, 6–8)

there is no doubt, that he [Judas] together with other disciples have taken with their own mouth BODY **and** BLOOD of Christ.’

³ The English renderings come from the King James Version (<http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org>).

Problematic is instance (8), where the phrase ‘sons and daughters’ (gen. pl.) is coordinated with *ir*. It is possible that here the choice was determined by the plural of both nouns.

- (8) *Bet koszna Moterischke turrez nug sawa Kaiminkos ir Susiedkos praschiti, sidabrinus ir auksinus Jndus, bei Rubus, tus ius ant sawa SUNU ir DUKTERU uszdesite.* (Bretke’s *Bible*)

‘sondern ein jeglich Weib soll von ihrer Nachbarin und Hausgenossin fordern silberne und güldene Gefäße und Kleider; die sollt ihr auf eure SÖHNE **und** TÖCHTER legen und den Ägyptern entwenden.’ (Luther’s *Bible*, 1545)

‘But euery woman shal borrow of her neighbour, and of her that soiourneth in her house, iewels of siluer, and iewels of gold, and rayment: and ye shall put them vpon your SONNES **and** vpon your DAUGHTERS, and yee shall spoile the Egyptians.’ (Exodus 3, 22)

“Natural coordination” concerns not only nouns, but also verbs, e.g. ‘write and read’, and even sentences (Mithun 1988). In example (9), the verbs *pastatyti* ‘to establish, to set’ and *paskirti* ‘to lay down’ pertain to the overarching activity of legislating:

- (9) *Dabokites faka ant Senuiu, ir kq Senowe PASTATE bei PAFKIRE, to nereike prafstoti, nei iù iftatimus atmainiti:* (MT XXVIII, 20–22)

‘Look[PL], they say, at these ancient people, and this, what antiquity has ESTABLISHED **and** LAID DOWN; this cannot be either simplified, or changed.’

In (10), the verbs *rasti* ‘to find’ and *gauti* ‘to get, to achieve’ both pertain to eternal redemption:

- (10) *iog Chrifthus wiena karta efti ijeiç ing fchwentibe per fawa paties krauie / ir AMŽINAGHI ATPIRKIMA jra RADES bei GAWES.* (MTP 5r, 9–12)

Germ. *daß Christus einmal in das Heylige eyngangen durch sein eigen Blut / und ein ewige Erlösung zu wegen BRACHT unnd ERLANGT HABE.*

‘that Christ staped in his sanctity through his own blood and he HAS FOUND **AND** ACHIEVED eternal redemption.’

In (11), both clauses are subparts of a single event:

- (11) *kurie mudrei apiu*kie moxla dangifchkaghi / kaip fskaititine numirufse / bei papeik rafchtus Praraku ir Apafchtolu* (MT 5v, 14–17)

‘[anabaptists], who have derided in sophisticated way the heavens science, as though it would be a dead letter **and** blame writings of prophets and apostles’

The subject, i.e. Anabaptists, is coreferential in both clauses – the direct objects (*moxla dangifchkaghi* ‘heaven’s science’ and *rafchtus* ‘writings’) pertain to canon writings of Christianity. Similar cases, where the marker of coordination is the sentence intonation (strictly speaking “no intonation break”), were discussed by Mithun (1988, 335):

„Those [clauses – NO] conjoined with no intonation break typically describe subparts of what is conceived of as a single event. One clause typically sets the stage for the other by positioning a major participant. (...) By contrast, clauses separated by comma intonation typically represent conceptually distinct aspects of an action, event, or scene. The conjoined clauses most often describe sequential actions (...).”

The difference described by Marianne Mithun between two kinds of sentences (with “no intonation break” and with “comma intonation”) finds a fair exemplification in Lithuanian opposition *beĩ* [ex. (11)] and *iĩ* [ex. (12)]. In (12), Johannes Bretke (1536–1602) used *iĩ* to express sequential action:

(12) *Beĩ nueia Wiras isch Namu Leui, iĩ waede Dukterĩ Leui, iĩ ta Moterischke tapa nieschcze, iĩ pagimde Sunũ, iĩ regedama berneli santĩ graszũ, paslepe anã per tris menesius.* (Bretke’s *Bible*)

‘**Und** es ging hin ein Mann vom Hause Levi **und** nahm eine Tochter Levis. 2. **Und** das Weib ward schwanger **und** gebar einen Sohn. **Und** da sie sah, daß es ein fein Kind war, verbarg sie ihn drei Monden.’ (Luther’s *Bible*, 1545)

‘**And** there went a man of the house of Leui, **&** tooke to wife a daughter of Leui. **And** the woman conceiued, **and** bare a sonne; **and** when shee saw him that hee was a goodly childe, shee hid him three moneths.’ (Exodus 2, 1–2)

2.2. *Beĩ* as a sentence particle introducing new content

A sentence particle is a function word that ties new information with former discourse (Mithun 1988, 346). As Mithun noticed, in Iroquoian languages, such elements often occupy the beginning of the sentence and may be translated into English as ‘and so’, ‘so then’, ‘so now’, ‘now then’. In Bretke’s *Bible*, this function was fulfilled by *beĩ* and *a*, see (13a)–(13e) / (Exodus 2: 1–5):

(13a) *Beĩ nueia Wiras isch Namu Leui, iĩ waede Dukterĩ Leui, iĩ ta Moterischke tapa nieschcze, iĩ pagimde Sunũ, iĩ regedama berneli santĩ graszũ, paslepe anã per tris menesius.*

‘**Und** es ging hin ein Mann vom Hause Levi **und** nahm eine Tochter Levis. 2. **Und** das Weib ward schwanger **und** gebar einen Sohn. **Und** da sie sah, daß es ein fein Kind war, verbarg sie ihn drei Monden.’ (Luther’s *Bible*, 1545)

‘**And** there went a man of the house of Leui, & tooke to wife a daughter of Leui. **And** the woman conceiued, **and** bare a sonne: **and** when shee saw him that hee was a goodly childe, shee hid him three moneths.’ (King James Version)

(13b) *Jr io ilgiaus negaledama paslepti, padare ghi Skrineļę isch Truschu (...) ir uszlaiste tą moliu ir smalą, ir pagulde ing tha Bernelį, ir pagulde ghi ing Szalinus (...).*

‘**Und** da sie ihn nicht länger verbergen konnte, machte sie ein Kästlein von Rohr **und** verklebte es mit Ton **und** Pech **und** legte das Kind drein **und** legte ihn in das Schilf (...).’

‘**And** when shee could not longer hide him, she tooke for him an arke of bul-rushes, **and** daubed it with slime, **and** with pitch, **and** put the childe therein, **and** shee layd it in the flags (...).’

(13c) *A sessũ io stoweia isch talo, idant ischtirtų, kaip iem butu.*

‘Aber seine Schwester stund von ferne, daß sie erfahren wollte, wie es ihm gehen würde.’

‘**And** his sister stood afarre off, to wit what would be done to him.’

(13d) *Bei Dukte Pharaono nueija szeminiu, (...), ir ios panios waikschczoia ant kraschto wandinio. Jr ischwidusi Skrineļę Szalinošą, nusiunte ghi Tarnaite, ir atneschdinoia ię.*

‘**Und** die Tochter Pharaos ging hernieder (...); **und** ihre Jungfrauen gingen an dem Rande des Wassers. **Und** da sie das Kästlein im Schilf sah, sandte sie ihre Magd hin **und** ließ es holen.’

‘**And** the daughter of Pharaoh came downe (...), **and** her maydens walked along by the riuer side: **and** when shee saw the arke among the flags, she sent her maid to fetch it.’

(13e) *Jr kaip ana atwere, ischwida waikelį, bei schitai Bernelis werke. Tadda passigaileia iei, ir biloia. (...).*

‘**Und** da sie es auftat, sah sie das Kind; **und** siehe, das Knäblein weinete. Da jammerte es sie, **und** sprach: (...).’

‘**And** when she had opened it, she saw the childe: **and** beholde, the babe wept. And she had compassion on him, **and** said, (...).’

The conjunction *iĩ* combines events that follow one after the other, thus it has the function of a connective of sequential actions. The subject of the following clause is coreferential with the subject or the direct object of the former clause, e.g. (13a) and (13d). In turn, *beĩ* appears when a new character

is introduced to the narrative text, e.g. ‘a man of the house of Leui’ (13a), ‘the daughter of Pharaoh’ (13d). A comparison of (13d) and (13e) makes this clear. In (13d), someone new appears: ‘the daughter of Pharaoh’, and the clause starts with *beĩ*. However, at the beginning of (13e) is *iř*, because the subject in (13e) is already known to us from (13d) – ‘the daughter of Pharaoh’. The second person in (13e), who does not occur in (13d), is Mose himself, and the clause starts with *beĩ*. The clause ***bei schitai Bernelis werke*** ‘**and** behold, the babe wept’ marks a turning point of the tale, and after *beĩ*, the presentative particle *schitai* ‘behold’ is used⁴. We can find a very similar usage of connectives in Old English, where *ond* ‘and’ was a connective of sequential actions, whereas *þa* (Indo-European **to-*) introduced new information and occupied the initial position of the sentence (Hopper 1975, 28–29).

2.3. *Beĩ* as a connective-focalizer

Beĩ as a connective-focalizer is seen in (14)–(16). The focalized pronoun *tu* ‘you’ is marked with capital letters. All instances come from Bretke’s *Bible* (the end of the 16th century):

- (14) *Atmink praschau iog mane isch malio **sutwerei** (...), **bei** TU mane wel Szeme padarisi.*

‘Gedenke doch, daß du mich aus Leimen **gemacht hast, und** wirst mich wieder zu Erden machen.’

‘Remember, I beseech thee, that thou **hast made** me as the clay, and wilt THOU bring me into dust againe?’ (Job 10, 9)

- (15) ***Esch** taw tatai parodisiu, klausik manens. **Bei** **ESCH** taw pasakisiu ka (...) regeiau.*

‘**Ich** will dir’s zeigen, höre mir zu; **und** will dir erzählen was ich, gesehen habe.’

‘**I** will shew thee, heare me, **and** that which I haue seene, I wil declare,’ (Job 15, 17)

- (16) *Ghis ne issilaikis nesa ghis **nekisteie** sawa ira prigautas, **Bei** **NIKISTE** bus iem alga.*

‘Er wird nicht bestehen, denn er ist in seinem **eiteln Dünkel** betrogen, **und** EITEL wird sein Lohn werden.’

‘Let not him that is deceiued, trust in **vanitie**: for VANITIE shalbe his recompence.’ (Job 15, 31)

The focalized subject in postponed clauses is coreferential with the subject (14)–(15) or the adverb (16) of the first clause.

⁴ For more on presentative particles see Petit 2010.

2.4. *Beĩ* in correlative sentences *ir ... bei / bei ... bei* ‘both X, and Y’

Firstly, we will look at examples from Bretke’s *Bible*:

(17) (...) *ir tawe bei tawa Szmones Pawietriu ischtiksiu* (...)

‘(...) **und** dich **und** dein Volk mit Pestilenz schlagen (...)’ (Luther’s *Bibel*, 1545)

‘(...) I may smite thee and thy people, with pestilence (...)’ (Exodus 9, 15)

(18) *Bei Laedai sukule pra wissą Egyptu Szmeę, (...), bei Szmones bei Banda.*⁵

‘Und der Hagel schlug in ganz Ägyptenland alles, (...), **beide** Menschen **und** Vieh’

‘And the haile smote throughout all the land of Egypt, (...), **both** man **and** beast’ (Ex 9, 25)

This type of sentence is described by Haspelmath (2007, 14) as a “contrastive coordination, e.g. both A and B, either X or Y”:

“Many languages distinguish between normal coordination such as A and B. X or Y, and what might be called contrastive coordination: *both A and B, either X or Y*. The semantic difference is that in contrastive coordination, it is emphasized that each coordinand belongs to the coordination, and each of them is considered separately. Thus, (34) is felicitous only if there was some doubt over one of the conjuncts (...):

(34) *Both Guatemala and Belize are in Central America.*”

Looking at (17), we find the sequence *ir ... bei*, whereas the alternative order, i.e. **bei ... ir*, is not used. In some languages, the additive particle follows the second conjunction, e.g. Germ. *sowohl ... als auch* and Pol. *jak ... tak i również* (Haspelmath 2007, 15). Assuming Lith. *beĩ* to have had additive nuance (‘and also, as well as’), we can explain its focalizing value in (14)–(16). Moreover, we can find the reason why *beĩ* was never combined with enclitic focus particle *-gi*, i.e. **bei-gi*. The language simply avoided using an additional focus marker since *beĩ* was expressive enough. The emphasis of *beĩ* also allows us to understand why the replacement of *iĩ* with *beĩ* in Kurschat’s example *múfū karālius iĩ wokiētijos ciēcorius aukβtojė garbėjė laikomas* ‘unser König und Deutschlands Kaiser wird hoch verehrt’ (Kurschat 1876, 436) would suggest that *múfū karālius* ‘unser König’ and *wokiētijos ciēcorius* ‘Deutschlands Kaiser’ are two different people.

The ability to join parts of the sentence in an emphatic way is reminiscent of the Latin conjunction *atque* ‘and’ (Torrego 2009, 459), e.g. *regemque et*

⁵ *Bei* on the beginning of the sentence acts as a sentence particle (see 2. 2.).

socium atque amicum appellaret ‘... and he called him king, and ally, **even** friend’ (Tacitus *The Annals* 4, 26); cf. (19), where Lat. *atque* ‘and also, and besides’ has been translated to Lith. *beĩ*:

ir netiektai iu giwata ischlaika / bet ir giwin iũs/ amszinaie giwata/ bei papilda iũs sawa schwiesa ir Teisibe / irgi regimai BEI be tarpa jra regimas nũg iu. (MT Locus III 19, 10–14)

‘et conservat non tantum vitam eorum, sed **etiam** vivificat eos vita aeterna, **et** implet eos sua luce et Iustitia, **et** visibiliter **ATQUE** immediatè conspicitur ab eis’.

‘and not only [God] keeps them [angels and people] alive, but **also** resurrects them in eternal life, **as well as** fills them with his light and justice, **and** in a visible / obvious way, **as well as** directly is watched by them.’

The observation of the focal value of *beĩ* will be a point of departure for the etymology of *beĩ* in section 3. Assuming the correlative sentence *ir ... bei* to mean ‘both X, and also Y’, we get a parallel for the type *ne X, nei Y* ‘neither ... nor’ (20)–(21), lit. ‘not X and also not Y’ (Ostrowski 2014): “contrastive negative coordination” in Haspelmath’s terms (2007, 15–17), e.g.

(20) *aß iĩemus nē liepiu / nei-g iumþ kalbēiau:* (DP 246, 36–37)

‘iam im **nie** roskazował / **anim** do nich mowił.’ (Wujek’s *Postill*)

‘I did **not** order them, **nor** said to them’

(21) (...) *anis man ne tikes, nei mano balsa klausis (...).* (Bretke’s *Bible*)

‘Sie werden mir **nicht** gleuben / **noch** meine stimme hören’ (Luther’s *Bible*, 1545)

‘they will **not** beleeeue mee, **nor** hearken vnto my voice’ (Exodus 4, 1)

Old Lithuanian correlative sentences *ne ... nei* ‘not ... nor’ (20)–(21) trace back to the conjunction of two clauses with narrow-scope negation, i.e. $\neg p$ & $\neg q$ (Haspelmath 2007, 16; Ostrowski 2014, 127–8). Such an analysis is allowed by Old Lithuanian examples with sentence negation *nei* ‘and not’ (22), a kind of sentence containing asyndetic clause-combining where the first clause does not contain a negation:

(22) *O Akis Piktũiu apalps, nei ischwengs.* (Bretke’s *Bible*)

‘Aber die augen der Gottlosen werden verschmachten / **vnd** werden **nicht** entrinnen mügen (...)’ (Luther’s *Bible*, 1545)

‘But the eyes of the wicked shall faile, **and** they shall **not** escape, and their hope shall be as the giuing vp of the ghost.’ (Job 11, 20)

As a parallel for (20)–(21), one can use the Latin *ne ... ne-que* and Gothic *ni... ni-h*, (lit. ‘no ... not and’ – see Ostrowski 2014), see (23):

(23) Gothic: **ni** *maurnáip sáiwalái izwarái hwa matjáip jah hwa drikgáip nih* *leika izwamma hwē wasjáip*.

Vulgate: **Ne** *solliciti sitis animae vestrae quid manducetis, neque* *corpori vestro quid induamini*.

OLith.: **nerupinkities** *apie βiwata yusu / kq turietumbite walgiti ir // gerti. Ney* *taipaieg apie kunq yūsu kũ turietumbite wilketi*. (VEE 111, 5–7)

‘Take **no** thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; **nor** yet for your body, what ye shall put on.’ (Matthew 6, 25)

The enclitic focus particle *-g(i)* always followed the second negation of the correlative structure *ne ... nei(gi)*, cf. *nei-g* in (20), and the whole sentence could be paraphrased along the lines of ‘not X, and not Y either’. There existed, thus, clear-cut correlation between two types: *ir ... beĩ* ‘both X, and also Y’ alongside *nē ... nei(gi)* ‘not X, and not Y either’.

The correlation *bei ... bei* (18) alongside *ir ... bei* can be compared to the innovative *nei(gi) ... nei(gi)* ‘neither ... nor’ instead of the older *ne ... nei(gi)*, cf. Lat. *ne-que ... ne-que / nec ... nec* ‘neither ... nor’ alongside *ne ... ne-que* (details in Ostrowski 2014).

3. Etymology

In the unanimous opinion of etymologists, *beĩ* results from a conflation of the conjunction *bē* ‘and’ and the demonstrative postposition *-i*. Its development is reminiscent of the origin of the negation *neĩ* (Fraenkel 1962–1965, 41; Otrębski 1956, 359). However, such an elucidation gives rise to at least one objection. While we find numerous etymological connections for Lith. *neĩ* in other IE languages, there is no such connection for *beĩ* even in remaining Lithuanian dialects. Due to this, a suspicion arises that *beĩ* is a Lithuanian innovation. Probably, this issue forced Zigmąs Zinkevičius (1981, 195) to treat *beĩ* as an analogical form, formed from *bē* ‘and’ with the pattern of *neĩ* ‘nor’. The weak point of this reasoning is a lack of sentences of the kind **bē ... beĩ* as a counterpart of the testified type *nē ... neĩ*, see (20)–(21). Secondly, Zinkevičius’ explanation does not elucidate other functions of *beĩ*, including the important function of *beĩ* as a marker of “natural coordination” in noun phrases.

Marianne Mithun (1988, 340) noticed that among sources of connectives of noun phrases, the most popular are comitatives, and, what is particularly interesting here, the additive particles ‘also, moreover’:

“Nominal conjunctions also frequently develop from a second source, an adverbial particle meaning ‘also, too, as well’. The original function of such a particle is to point out a parallelism between otherwise separate entities.”

Stassen (2001) noticed something similar. In section 2, I demonstrated that the conjunction *beĩ* occurs as a focalizer and may be compared to Lat. *atque* ‘and, and besides, even’. At this moment, I must introduce the additive particle *ir*, e.g.:

- (24) *An jos svodbos ir̃ buwau pakviestas.* (Christoph Jurkschat cited from LKŽ 4, 133)
 ‘I was **also** invited to her wedding’ (Galbraster dialect – Prussian Lithuania)

The majority of instances using the additive particle *ir* ‘also’ quoted by LKŽ come from former Lithuania Minor and West Lithuania (Marijampolė’s district), even though single testimonies have also been recorded in East Lithuania (Utena’s region). As an additive-scalar particle, *ir* ‘even’ is documented in writings by Daukantas (Samogitia) and in Latvia (ME 1, 708)⁶. As was shown in section 1, the use of *beĩ* was only found in Lithuania Minor. With the geographical scope of *beĩ* coincides with the presence of the additive particle *ir* ‘also’ in III Old Prussian Catechism (1561) – see Mažiulis (1981, 130):

- (25) *Deiwas riks pereit labbai essetennan subbai ir̃ bhe noūson madlan* [49, 16]
Gottes Reich kombt wol ----- ----- -- on vnser Gebet von ihm selbs
 ‘The kingdom of God comes independently **also** without our prayer.’

Since Old Prussian catechisms were slavish translations of German texts, the deviation in (25) is conspicuous. This allowed Mažiulis (1993, 35) to see, in (25), a trace of the real usage of *ir* in Old Prussian.

In order to explain *beĩ*, I assume that *beĩ* traces back to a conflation of the conjunction *bè* ‘and’ and the additive particle *ir* ‘also’, i.e. **beir*. As is well known, Lithuanian consonant groups in the coda are mirror images of consonants appearing before the nucleus of a syllable, e.g. *STRVRTS* in *springs* ‘(s)he will suffocate’ (Ambrazas et al. 1994, 29–32). As Lithuanian phonotactic rules exclude the phonemic group **#rjV* and its counterpart in

⁶ On the origin of the Baltic *ir* < **ī-r*, see Ostrowski 2017; *forthcoming*.

the coda *Vjr#*, the reduction **beir > beĩ* is completely acceptable⁷. The role of phonotactic rules is very clear in the treatment of Baltic borrowings in Finnish, e.g. Latvian *znuõts* ‘son-in-law, brother-in-law’ : Finnish *nuode* ‘id.’; Lithuanian *šlúota* ‘broom’ : Finnish *luuta* ‘id.’; Lithuanian *briaunà* ‘edge, side, border’ : Finnish *reuna* ‘id.’ (Kallio 2008, 272, 274). I do not see any reason why phonotactic rules should not be taken into account when studying the past of Baltic languages.

A question arises. Could the emergence of **beir* be due to influence from Old Prussian? As always, when there are issues of language contact and language substrates, an unambiguous conclusion is difficult. We know very little about Old Prussian-Lithuanian language contact, but some Old Prussian loanwords in Lithuanian can be found, e.g. Lith. *saváitė* ‘week’ < Old Pr. *sawayte* ‘Woche’ EV₁₆ (Smoczyński 2000, 202; 2007, 537) and Lith. *mergà* ‘girl; young girl; maid’ < Old Pr. *mergo* ‘Juncvrouve’ EV₁₉₂ (Smoczyński 2000, 56–58; 2007, 389). There is one other fact that is also striking. The conjunction *bè* ‘and’ is recorded directly or indirectly in all Baltic languages. Its traces can be found, among others, in Lith. *bèt* ‘but’ (and Latv. *bet* ‘but’), which goes back to the conflation of *bè* ‘and’ and the neuter pronoun *-taĩ* ‘this’ – cf. OLith. *betaig* ‘but’ (Smoczyński 2007). For the change **betai > *betie > OLith. beti > bet’ > bèt*, see Ostrowski (2014a; 2015). Probably, *bè* ‘and’ gave rise to the causal conjunction *be* ‘as, since’, recorded in Mosvid’s *Catechism* (1547). However, only in Old Prussian was the conjunction *be* <bhe> ‘and’ widely used. Old Prussian *be* <bhe> ‘and’ also gave rise to the OPr. causal connective *beggi* ‘because / denn’. The presence of *be* ‘and’ (and *ir* ‘also’) in Old Prussian interacts, again, with the geographical scope of *beĩ*, and this is the last premise that makes me believe that the roots of *beĩ* can be found in the Old Prussian-Lithuanian language community.⁸

4. Conclusions

- 1) Productivity of Lithuanian conjunction *beĩ* ‘and’ is conceived to Lithuania Minor (Prussian Lithuania). Moving eastward, the frequency of *beĩ* reduces dramatically to such a degree that, coming from East Lithuania, Konstanty Szyrwid did not use it at all.

⁷ If someone is not content with the presented phonotactic explanation, an alternative elucidation refers to such changes as *dar* ‘still’ > dial. *dá / dà, dabar* ‘now’ > dial. *dabà*, and *ar* > dial. *à*.

⁸ As for *bè*, its origin is highly intriguing, but because of its complexity, requires separate study.

- 2) The functional diversity of *beĩ* is also connected to texts coming from East Prussia. The carried-out analysis suggests that the primary meaning of *beĩ* was ‘and also’.
- 3) The conjunction *beĩ* goes back to the conflation of *bè* ‘and’ with the additive particle *ir* ‘also’. Both function words were peculiar to Old Prussian and West-Aukštaitian dialects. **Beir* underwent regular reduction into *beĩ* in accordance with Lithuanian phonotactic, which does not allow groups *VRR*.

„NATŪRALUSIS SUJUNGIMAS“ IR JUNGTKO *beĩ* KILMĖ. PASTABOS DĖL PRŪSŲ IR LIETUVIŲ KALBŲ SANTYKIŲ

Santrauka

Analizuojant jungtuko *beĩ* vartoseną XVI–XVII a. tekstuose jau seniai pastebėta, kad jo produktyvumas ir funkcijų įvairavimas yra susijęs su Mažosios Lietuvos autoriais (Palionis 1995). Einant rytų link jo vartosenos dažnumas sparčiai mažėja. Pvz., Daukšos *Postilėje beĩ* aptinkamas vos 12 kartų. Sirvydo *Punktų sakymuose* jo visiškai nėra. Šis faktas leidžia daryti prielaidą, kad *beĩ* dabartinėje lietuvių kalboje yra Mažosios Lietuvos šnektų importas. Straipsnyje ginama tezė, kad *beĩ* atsirado prūsų ir lietuvių dvikalbėje aplinkoje, o išeities taškas buvo jungtuko *bè* ‘ir’ (pr. <bhe> ‘und’) ir dalelytės *ir* (pr. *ir* ‘irgi’) susiliejimas, t. y. **be ir* ‘ir taip pat’ > (po kontrakcijos) **beir* > *beĩ*. Supaprastinimas **beir* > *beĩ* įvyko dėl grupės *VRR#* (tiksliau, *Vjr#*) stokos lietuvių kalbos fonotaktikoje.

SOURCE TEXTS

BB – *BIBLIA tatai esti Wissas Schwentas Raschtas, Lietuwischkai pergulditas per Janą Bretkuną [...] 1590*, in Jonas Palionis, Julija Žukauskaitė (eds.), *Jonas Bretkūnas. Rinktiniai raštai*, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1983.

BP – Ona Aleknavičienė (ed.), *Jono Bretkūno POSTILĖ: Studija, faksimilė ir kompaktinė plokštelė*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 2005.

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

DP – *Postilla Catholica. Tái est: Ižguldimas Ewangeliu kiekwienos Nedelos ir szwętes per wissús metús. Per Kúnigą Mikaloiv Dawkszą Kanoniką Médnikų... 1599*, in Jonas Palionis (ed.), *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų Postilė ir jos šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2000.

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

ME – *K. Mülenbacha Latviešu valodas vārdnīca*, rediģējis, papildinājis, turpinājis (/nobeidzis – 4) Jānis Endzelīns, 1–4, Rīga, 1923–1932.

MT(P) – *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.

VEE – Baltramiejus Willentas (1579). *Enchiridion* (VE) and *Euangelias bei Epistolas* (VEE), Karalaučius, in Adalbert Bezzenberger (ed.), *Litauische und Lettische Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts. Heft III*, Göttingen: Robert Peppmüller, 1992.

REFERENCES

Ambrazas, Vytautas et al., 1994, *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1962–1965, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Girdenis, Aleksas, Danutė Girdenienė 1997, *1759 metų „Ziwato“ indeksas*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Haspelmath, Martin 2007, *Coordination*, in Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description 2: Complex constructions*, Cambridge: CUP, 1–51.

Hopper, Paul J. 1975, *The syntax of the simple sentence in Proto-Germanic*, Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Kallio, Petri 2008, *On the “Early Baltic” loanwords in Common Finnic*, in Alexander Lubotsky, Jos Schaecken, Jeroen Wiedenhof (eds.), *Evidence and counter-evidence. Essays in honour of Frederik Kortlandt 1: Balto-Slavic and Indo-European Linguistics*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 265–277.

Kurschat, Friedrich 1876, *Grammatik der litauischen Sprache*, Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Weisenhauses.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1981, *Prūsų kalbos paminklai 2*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

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

Miliūnaitė, Rita 2007, *Jungtuko bei normos – užtemimui prasidedant, Gimtoji kalba* 10, 3–10.

Mithun, Marianne 1988, *The grammaticization of coordination*, in John Haiman, Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 181–225.

Naktinienė, Gertrūda, Aldona Paulauskienė, Vytautas Vitkauskas 1988, *Druskininkų tarmės žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

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, *From sentence negation to connective. Old Lithuanian nei(gi) ‘and not; nor; than; before’*, *Baltic Linguistics* 5, 123–143.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2014a, *Once again on the postponed neuter pronoun -ti ‘this’*, *Baltistica* 49(2), 265–278.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2015, *The origin of the Lithuanian particle juk*, in Artūras Judžentis, Stephan Kessler (eds.), *Contributions to syntax and morphology. Proceedings*

of the 4th Conference on Baltic Languages at the University of Greifswald, Berlin: Logos Verlag, 201–215.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2016, Lithuanian discontinuatives *nebe-* / *jau nebe-* ‘no longer’ and German-Lithuanian language contacts, *Folia Scandinavica Posnaniensia* 20, 175–179.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2017, Non-verbal predication in Baltic. Lithuanian *yrà*, in Michał Németh, Barbara Podolak, Mateusz Urban (eds.), *Essays in the history of languages and linguistics. Dedicated to Marek Stachowski on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, Kraków, 463–471.

Ostrowski, Norbert (forthcoming), Od comitativu do spójnika. O pochodzeniu słowiańskiego spójnika *i* oraz litewskiego *ir* ‘i; też’, *LingVaria* 2(22).

Otrębski, Jan 1956, *Gramatyka języka litewskiego 3: Nauka o formach*, Warszawa: PWN.

Palionis, Jonas 1995, *Lietuvių rašomosios kalbos istorija*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Petit, Daniel 2010, *On presentative particles in the Baltic languages*, in Nicole Nau, Norbert Ostrowski (eds.), *Particles and connectives in Baltic*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Asociacija “Academia Salensis”, 151–170.

Petrauskas, Jonas, Aloyzas Vidugiris 1985, *Lazūnų tarmės žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Rozwadowski, Jan, 1995, *Litewska gwara okolic Zdzięcioła na Nowodgródzczyźnie. Dzieło pośmiertne* (ed. Adam Gregorski), Kraków: Universitas.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2000, *Untersuchungen zum deutschen Lehngut im Altpreussischen*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Stassen, Leon 2001, Noun phrase coordination, in Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals 2*, Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1105–1111.

Torrego, Esperranza M. 2009, Coordination, in Philip Baldi, Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax 1: Syntax of the sentence*, Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 443–487.

Vidugiris, Aloyzas 1998, *Zietelos šnektos žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Wälchli, Bernhard 2005, *Co-compounds and natural coordination*, Oxford: UP.

Zinkevičius, Zigmantas 1981, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika 2*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Norbert OSTROWSKI

Instytut Językoznawstwa

Uniwersytet Jagielloński

al. Mickiewicza 3

PL-31-120 Kraków

Poland

[norbertas@poczta.onet.pl]