

Frederik KORTLANDT

Leiden University

## ACTIVE PARTICIPLES IN BALTIC

**Abstract.** The nom. pl. form of the active participles continues the original neuter sg. form, e.g. Lith. *jái nuo dárbo rankàs sukq̄*. It is an impersonal predicative form to be compared with the Proto-Indo-European uninflected predicative form in *\*-om* that has been preserved in Old Prussian.

**Keywords:** Baltic; Indo-European; historical morphology; active participle.

Balto-Slavic inherited from Indo-European the *nt*-participle for the present tense and the *us*-participle for the preterit. The *nt*-participle became lexicalized in Prussian, e.g. *dīlants* ‘Arbeiter’ (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 298). Its original paradigm was established by Robert Beekes (1985, 64–77), e.g. nom. sg. *\*ʔients*, acc. sg. *\*ʔientm*, gen. sg. *\*ʔintos* ‘going’, where we may add nom. pl. *\*ʔientes*, neuter *\*ʔeint*. The corresponding paradigm of the *us*-participle was nom. sg. *\*ueiduts*, acc. sg. *\*uiduetm*, loc. sg. *\*uidusi* ‘knowing’, nom. pl. *\*uiduetes*, neuter *\*ueidut* (cf. Pedersen 1933, 47–53; Beekes 1985, 209f.; Kortlandt 2009, 25f.). The apophonic alternation in the suffix was preserved in Prussian *emprijki-sins* ‘being present’ < *\*-sints*, dat. sg. *empriki-sentismu* < *\*-sent-*, reflecting nom. sg. *\*ʔesnts*, obl. *\*ʔsent-*. Old Lithuanian has preserved the apophonic alternation in the root in Daukša’s Postille, where we find nom. sg. masc. *es-* ‘being’ (62×, no exceptions), nom. pl. masc. *es-* (33×, no exceptions), other case forms *s-* (96× beside *es-* 40×), also nom. sg. / pl. masc. *ei-* ‘going’ (4×, no exceptions), other case forms *e-* < *\*je-* (14×, no exceptions). Thus, it is clear that we must reconstruct Proto-Baltic nom. sg. masc. *\*esints*, *\*eints*, nom. pl. masc. *\*esint*, *\*eint*, oblique case forms *\*sent-*, *\*jent-*, and that the nom. pl. form continues the original neuter. In the modern language, the *o*-vocalism of the thematic flexion was adopted in the forms *ēsqs*, *ēsq*, *ējqs*, *ējq* (cf. Zinkevičius 1981, 144–150).

Following Endzelin (1913, 125) and Cowgill (1970), Marek Majer has recently (2017) maintained that the Lith. nom. pl. form of the active

participle *vedq̃* continues the Proto-Balto-Slavic finite 3rd pl. present form *\*wedanti* < *\*-onti* and that the corresponding preterit form *vēdę* is analogical to the present form *vedq̃*. This hypothesis requires an early apocope of *-i* not shared by Slavic followed by the loss of final *\*-t*. These developments are disproved by the preservation of *-nt(is)* in the gerund, the athematic 3rd sg. ending *-ti*, and the inst. sg. ending *\*-mì*. Majer comments (2017, 22f.):

“The apocope in question is an elusive phenomenon, often invoked for both Balt. and Sl. in different positions, but with contentious and intensely debated details. This is of minor importance for the derivation of Lith. *vedq̃* from PBSl. *\*wedanti*, however. The operation of the apocope (prior to the loss of the now word-final *\*-t*) in the Balt. present paradigm is clear, as proved by the inevitable derivation of 3. sg. pres. *vēda* from *\*wed<sup>h</sup>eti* – despite the non-phonological generalization of the thematic vowel *-a-* and the stabilization of columnar stress on the root – both well-known, sweeping innovations.”

This should have been a warning that he is on the wrong track. The evidence shows that there was no early apocope of *\*-i* and that the 3rd sg. form *vēda* must not be derived from *\*wed<sup>h</sup>eti*.

Disregarding the counter-evidence to the apocope of *\*-i* and the thematic present endings and without discussing the Slavic evidence (for which see Kortlandt 1979, 59–63; 2009, 157–160), Majer dismisses the forms *ēsq* and *ějq* as irrelevant (2017, 12<sup>20</sup>) and does not even mention the Prussian evidence, calling the nom. sg. form *\*esints* “unattested” and the attested patterns of vowel alternation in Old Prussian and Old Lithuanian “unverifiable”, in spite of the fact that Prussian nom. sg. *-sins*, dat. sg. *-sentismu* and OLith. nom. sg. *ēsqs*, *ějqs*, nom. pl. *ēsq*, *ějq* beside obl. *sant-*, *ent-* < *\*jent-* leave nothing to be desired. Endzelin’s suggestion that the original 3rd pl. form was preserved in such instances as Lith. *nebeturim kas valgq* ‘wir haben nichts mehr zum Essen’, *jis žinos kas darq* ‘er wird wissen, was zu machen ist’ (1913, 125) cannot be maintained in view of the nominative *kas*. The nom. pl. form of the participle continues the original neuter sg. form, as in *jái nuo dárbo rankàs sukq̃* ‘(she said) her arms ache from work’ (Ambrazas 1997, 371), which is evidently an impersonal predicative form to be compared with the Proto-Indo-European uninflected predicative form in *\*-om* that has been preserved in Old Prussian, e.g. *Stai gannai bousei pomeston swaain wijrin* ‘Die Weiber sein vnterthan jren Mennern’, Greek οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη ‘the

rule of many is not a good thing’ (Kortlandt 2009, 118, 122; 2017). The syntactic construction with an oblique subject and an accusative object may be compared with Russian *lodku uneslo vetrom* ‘the boat (acc.) was carried away by the wind (inst.)’. Since Majer’s theory is clearly wrong, I shall not discuss the accentological aspects.

## VEIKIAMIEJI DALYVIAI BALTŲ KALBOSE

### *Santrauka*

Veikiamųjų dalyvių nom. pl. forma tęsia pirminę neutr. sg. formą, pvz., lie. *jai nuo darbo rankàs suką*. Tai yra beasmenė predikatyvinė forma, kurią galima palyginti su ide. nekaitoma predikatyvine forma su \*-om, išlikusia prūsų kalboje.

## REFERENCES

- Ambrasas, Vytautas (ed.) 1997, *Lithuanian grammar*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Beekes, Robert Stephen Paul 1985, *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection* (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46), Innsbruck: IBS.
- Cowgill, Warren 1970, The nominative plural and preterit singular of the active participles in Baltic, in Thomas F. Magner, William R. Schmalstieg (eds.), *Baltic linguistics*, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 23–37.
- Endzelin, Jan 1913, *Miszellen*, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 33, 119–127.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 1979, Toward a reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic verbal system, *Lingua* 49(1), 51–70.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2009, *Baltica & Balto-Slavica* (= *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 16), Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2017, On the origin of grammatical gender, *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 18, 95–104.
- Majer, Marek 2017, Lith. *vedq̄* = Sl. *\*vedq̄b̄*: The accentuation of the nom. pl. of active participles as further proof of finite origin, *Baltistica* 52(1), 5–32.
- Pedersen, Holger 1933, *Études lituaniennes* (= *Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser* 19(3)), København: Levin & Munksgaard.
- Zinkevičius, Zigmās 1981, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika* 2, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Frederik KORTLANDT  
Cobetstraat 24, NL-2313 KC Leiden  
The Netherlands  
[f.kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl]

