

Norbert OSTROWSKI

Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie

## ON THE LITHUANIAN PRIVATIVE PREFIX *ap-*

**Abstract.** This paper discusses two examples of Lithuanian verbs with the privative prefix *ap-*, which is a continuation of the IE ablative adverb *\*h<sub>2</sub>épo* ‘from’. The examples discussed are *apgauti* ‘to deceive’ and *apakti* ‘to go blind’. Parallels in other languages can help to establish these verbs’ original meanings: Lat. *dēcipere* ‘to deceive’ and Fr. *aveugle* ‘blind’.

**Keywords:** Lithuanian; etymology; prefixal derivation.

This article is a supplement to earlier remarks on the privative prefix *ap-* in the Lithuanian language (see Ostrowski 2006, 64–65; 2014). In at least two instances, the Lithuanian prefix *ap-* is a continuation of the IE ablative adverb *\*h<sub>2</sub>épo* / *\*h<sub>2</sub>pó*, as demonstrated, for example, in Old Greek preposition ἀπό ‘from, away from’ and prefix ἀπο-: ἀπόκειμαι ‘to be laid away; to be laid in store’, ἀποκάθηναι ‘to sit apart’, ἀποκαλύπτω ‘to uncover; to reveal’: καλύπτω ‘to cover with; to put over as a covering’; Latin *ab-*: *abdō* ‘to hide’, *abscindō* ‘to chop off’; Gothic *afleīþan* ‘to go away’, *\*afswairban* ‘to wipe away’ (see Schwyzler 1988, 444–445). The IE adverb *\*h<sub>2</sub>épo* has been preserved in Lith. *apačią* ‘underside’ < *\*apa-tyā*, cf. Old Indic *ápā-tyam* ‘offspring’ from *ápa* ‘fort, hinweg, ab’ (Smoczyński 2007, 19), but the literature on the subject ignores the fact that reflections of *ap-* can also be found in the prefixal derivation. These examples are: *ap-gauti* ‘to deceive’ and *ap-akti* ‘to go blind’.

Lith. *apgauti* ‘to deceive’ is etymologically related to *gauti* ‘to get’. However, these verbs do not form an aspectual pair due to the difference in meaning. In other words, Lith. *apgauti* is not a perfective verb from *gauti*. They are two different lexemes because they have two different lexical meanings. In order to explain the difference in meaning, one should refer to the hypothesis about the privative prefix *ap-*, which is a continuation of the adverb *\*h<sub>2</sub>épo* ‘from’. A brilliant semantic parallel is provided by Latin *dē-cipere* ‘to deceive; to cause

something by deceit; catch; deprive of hope’, a derivative with the privative prefix *dē-* from *capiō*, *-ere* ‘to seize, to take in possession’ (Latin *dē-cipere* ‘to deceive’ > French *décevoir* > Eng. *deceive*). See other Latin examples with the privative prefix *dē-*: *esse* ‘to be’ vs *dē-esse* ‘not to have something’; *armō*, *-āre* ‘to arm’ : *de-armō* ‘to disarm’. In other words, Lith. *gauti* ‘to get’ relates to *ap-gauti* ‘to deceive’ like Latin *capere* ‘to seize’ to *dē-cipere* ‘to deceive’. The privative prefix *dē-* is etymologically connected with the ablative preposition *dē* ‘from’, so the semantic relationship between privative *dē-* and ablative *dē* ‘from’ resembles the relationship between ablative preposition ἀπό ‘from, away from’ and the Lithuanian privative prefix *ap-*.

The next case, concerning Lith. *àkti*, *añka* and *ap-àkti*, *ap-añka* ‘to go blind’, requires a much broader commentary. Synchronically, Lith. *apàkti*, *apañka* is a derivative from *àkti*, *añka* ‘to go blind’, but for several reasons their diachronic relationship seems to be different, i.e. *apàkti* → *àkti*; about deprefixation in Lithuanian see Ostrowski (2014). Firstly, *àkti*, *añka* in Old Lithuanian is not attested, unlike *apàkti*, *apañka* (see Ostrowski 2014). Secondly, infixed denominatives in Lithuanian are formed from adjectives, not from nouns, cf. *plinku* ‘lyšieję (I’m losing my hair)’ SD<sup>3</sup> 160 (: *plikas* ‘bald’), *szlumpu* (syn. *sumirkstu*) ‘moknę na deszczu (I’m getting wet in the rain)’ SD<sup>3</sup> 178 (: *ślāpias* ‘wet’), *zilu* (syn. *zilstu*) ‘šiwieję (I’m greying)’ SD<sup>1</sup> 166 (: *žilas* ‘grey’). Thirdly and finally, the expected meaning for the inchoative *àkti*, *añka* is \*‘to regain sight’ rather than ‘to lose sight’. To explain the development of *apàkti*, *apañka*, Ostrowski (2014) referred to the model proposed by Hauzenberga-Šturma (1970) for the emergence of Latvian denominatives on *-sta-*. Hauzenberga-Šturma, analysing the Latvian adjectival verbs with *-sta-* contained in Mühlenbach’s Latvian-German dictionary (ME), noticed that a significant number of them occurs only in the form of the prefixed ptc. pret. act. Prefixed preterites are also more common than their non-prefixed correlates. Present forms, if attested, are more likely to appear unprefixed. In order to explain these tendencies, the author assumes the following development on the example of *sa-skābt* ‘to sour’ (derivative from adjective *skābs* ‘sour’). The starting point was a sentence like *piens kļuvis skābs* ‘milk has turned sour’. The adjective *skābs* is used here predicatively, but the phrase can be transformed into *sa-skābis piens* ‘sour milk’, where ptc. pret. act. *saskābis* appears in the attributive order, and the prefix *sa-* indicates a perfective aspect. In this way, the predilection for prefixed participles and preterites is explained: the participles became the starting point for the formation of the preterite form (*piens saskāba* ‘milk

turned sour’). Secondarily, the unprefixated present form was added to the preterite with the prefix, which in Latvian indicates the perfective aspect, removed. The entire development can be summarized as follows:

*piens kļuvis skābs* ‘milk has turned sour’ → *sa-skābis piens* ‘sour milk’ → *piens saskāba* ‘milk turned sour’ → *piens skābst* ‘milk turns sour’

Let us now turn to Lith. *àkti* / *apàkti* ‘to go blind’. As stated earlier, there is a lack in the Lithuanian language of examples of infixated denominatives formed from nouns. For this reason, it is tempting to hypothesise that the verb *apàkti* appeared first as a participle in an attributive construction, e.g. *apakęs žmogus* ‘blind man’ (< \*‘eyeless man’), from which the preterite *žmogus apako* ‘man went blind’ was derived, and the present form *apañka* ‘goes blind’ or deprefixated *añka* ‘goes blind’ appeared only secondarily. Schematically:

*apakęs žmogus* → *žmogus apako* ‘man went blind’ → *žmogus (ap)anka* ‘man goes blind’

The meaning of *apakęs žmogus* ‘blind man’ becomes clear if we assume that it originally meant \*‘man without eyes, bereft of eyes’. In the case of *ap-akęs* with the privative prefix *ap-*, we find a brilliant parallel in (Byzantine) Greek ἀπόμματος ‘blind’ < ὄμμα ‘eye; sight’ < \**op-ma* < \**ok<sup>w</sup>-mñ* (Buck 1949, 4–97). Another parallel can be found in French *aveugle* ‘blind’ and Old Italian *avocolo*, which Bloch, von Wartburg (1964, 48) derived from the prepositional phrase \**ab oculis* ‘bereft of eyes’. Watkins (1994, 693) considers Fr. *aveugle* ‘blind’ (< Lat. Vulg. \**ab-oculus*) a calque of Celtic (Gallic) *exsops* ‘blind’ < \**eks-ok<sup>w</sup>-*, where \**eks-* is etymologically related to the ablative Latin preposition *ex* ‘from’. Regardless of which explanation of French *aveugle* is correct, Lith. *apakti* ‘to go blind’ (→ [deprefixation] *akti*) is best elucidated as coming from *ap-ak-ęs* \*‘bereft of eyes’. From deprefixated *akti* come Lith. *aklas* ‘blind’ and Latv. *akls* ‘blind’.

## DĒL LIETUVIŲ KALBOS PRIVATYVINIO PRIEŠDĒLIO *ap-*

### *Santrauka*

Straipsnyje aptariami du lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių su privatyviniu priešdėliu *ap-*, kilusiu iš ide. abliatyvinio praeiksmio \**h<sub>2</sub>épo* ‘iš’, pavyzdžiai – *apgauti* ir *apakti*. Paralelės kitose kalbose – lo. *dēcipere* ‘apgauti’ ir pranc. *aveugle* ‘aklas’ – gali padėti nustatyti šių veiksmažodžių pirmines reikšmes.

## REFERENCES

Bloch, Oscar, Walther von Wartburg 1964, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

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.

Hauzenberga-Šturma, Edīte 1970, *Ergänzende Bemerkungen zum baltischen -sta-Präsens*, in: Velta Rūķe-Draviņa (ed.), *Donum Balticum. To Professor Christian S. Stang on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 181–187.

ME–Mühlenbachs, K[ārlis], *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca / Lettisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* 1–4, redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von J[ānis] Endzelīns, Rīga, 1923–1932.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2006, *Studia z historii czasownika litewskiego. Iteratiwa. Denominatiwa*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2014, Deprefiksacja czasownikowa w języku litewskim, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 38, 172–181.

Schwyzer, Eduard 1988, *Griechische Grammatik 2: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, Fünfte, unveränderte Auflage, München: Verlag C. H. Beck.

SD<sup>1</sup> – Kazys Pakalka (red.), *Senasis Konstantino Širovydo žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1997.

SD<sup>3</sup> – Kazys Pakalka et al. (ed.), *Pirmasis lietuvių kalbos žodynas. Konstantinas Širovydas. Dictionarium trium linguarum*, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1979.

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

Watkins, Calvert 1994, ‘Blind’ in Celtic and Romance, in Idem, *Selected Writings 2: Culture and Poetics*, ed. by Lisi Oliver, Innsbruck, 691–694.

Norbert OSTROWSKI

*Katedra Językoznawstwa Ogólnego i Indoeuropejskiego*

*Instytut Językoznawstwa, Przekładoznawstwa i Hungarystyki*

*Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie*

*al. Mickiewicza 3*

*PL-31-120 Kraków*

*Poland*

[norbert.ostrowski@uj.edu.pl]