

William R. SCHMALSTIEG

A NOTE ON THE LITHUANIAN LOCATIVE SINGULAR ENDING IN *-e*

Stang, 1966, 183, writes that he is inclined to believe that the Lith. loc. sg. *butė* 'in the apartment' is derived from **butē* plus **en* (**e*), an explanation which either comes from Būga or was shared by the latter. Thus Stang says (fn. 2): 'Dies war Būga's Meinung, die er mir Juni 1924 mitteilte.' Kazlauskas, 1968, 150, writes that the inessive was formed with the addition of the postposition **en*, thus *miškė* 'in the forest' and eastern High Lithuanian *miškì* < **miškĭ* < **miškė* < **miškén*. Mažiulis, 1970, 132, proposes that an etymological **(nam-)ē*, which is the lengthened grade ablaut of the **e* of the thematic nouns merged with **-én* to produce **(nam-)én*. In the following I propose a different explanation which is closer to traditional notions of the origin of the **o*-stem declension, but an explanation which tries to suggest various chronological periods during each of which there was considerable analogical play.

For the **o*-stem nouns then I assume the etymological loc. sg. forms **(vŷr-)oi* and **(deiv-)oĩ*. Later, on their way to monophthongization they developed first into **(vŷr-)ei* and **(deiv-)eĩ* respectively. Nevertheless such forms as **(vŷr-)ei* and **(deiv-)eĩ* may merely reflect the **e*-grade ablaut (plus ending **-i*) of the thematic forms and it may be completely unnecessary to posit a preceding **(vŷr-)oi* and **(deiv-)oĩ*. Levin, 1975, has shown that the diphthongization of **ē* to *ie* was not common to Lithuanian and Latvian, so it seems to me that the preceding monophthongization of **ei* (< **ei* [and **ai?*]) to **ē* may not have been common to the two languages either. Thus I see no hindrance to positing a proto Lithuanian **o*-stem locative singular ending **(vŷr-)ei*.

Now Zinkevičius, 1982, 21, has written that the postpositional locatives are not the creation of a single epoch, but rather were formed over a long time, almost up to the beginning of the written period, when they began to disappear. Reading Zinkevičius' article one sees frequent cases of analogical influence of one form upon another. In addition one sees a constant renewal of morphological forms through analogical influence.

I propose then that the forms **(vŷr-)ei* and **(deiv-)eĩ* continued to exist, but that alternative forms with the postposition **-én* were also created so that **(vŷr-)ei + én*

passed to **(vȳr-)ejen* and *(deiv-)eĩ+én* passed to **(deiv-)e-jén*. Next from the form **(vȳr-)e-jen* an allegro form **(vȳr-)e* was created and from the form **(deiv-)e-jén* an allegro form **(deiv-)è* was created, the forms all existing side by side just as today we encounter *šakojè, šakōj* and *šakō* (Zinkevičius, 1982, 35). I assume that the stem-stress aided in the creation of **(vȳr-)e* and the fact that the other **o*-stem singular endings were monosyllabic also played a role in the creation of the allegro forms. The stress of **(deiv-)è* may have been analogical, thus **(vȳr-)e-jen* is to **(vȳr-)e* as **(deiv-)e-jén* is to **(deiv-)è*. J. Schmidt, 1895, 386, suggested a phonological development of **eje* to *-e* in the locative singular, but I see the ending *-e* was an allegro variant of **-ejen*. Stang, 1966, 182, writes: 'Man findet *Dieweie* Bretke, *Dieweie* MT, *Paneie* „in domino“ (Mažv.) u.a. Wahrscheinlich hat sich ein archaischer Lok. auf *-ie* in der religiösen Sprache lange erhalten. Später sind **dievie*, **ponie* durch *-je* erweitert worden.'

Although this explanation may be correct I see no reason why the preceding forms could not reflect /*dieveje, paneje*/ from **(deiv-)-e-jén*, etc.

In contemporary Lithuanian, however, nothing remains of the **o*-stem endings **(vȳr-)e-jen* and one encounters only *(vȳr-)e* and *(diev-)è*, but these latter endings were apparently at one epoch felt to be the equivalent of the older ending in *-en* so that, adopting the nasal, they passed to **(vȳr-)en* and **(diev-)én* explaining such dialect forms as eastern High Lithuanian *miškì*.

REFERENCES

- K a z l a u s k a s J., 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius.
 L e v i n J. F., 1975, *Dynamic linguistics and Baltic historical phonology*, – *General Linguistics*, XV, 144–159.
 M a ž i u l i s V., 1970, *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai*, Vilnius.
 S c h m i d t J., 1885, *Indogermanisches \bar{o} aus $\bar{o}i$ in der Nominalflexion*, – *KZ* XXVII 369–397.
 Z i n k e v i č i u s Z., 1982, *Lietuvių kalbos postpoziciniai vietininkai*, – *Blt* XVIII (1) 21–38.