Did the Baltic verb have the augment?

WILLIAM R. SCHMALSTIEG

Following Vaillant's suggestion that the stress of such prefixed 3 sg. aorists as Serbo-Croatian *zȁ-plete* shows the trace of an earlier aorist with the augment, viz. *é-plete*, the author suggests that the retracted stress of Lithuanian *àt-nešė* may show the trace of an earlier thematic aorist with the augment, viz., *é-neš-e*.

I have proposed in many places (e.g., Schmalstieg: 1961, 1965, 1992) that the preterit ending of such Baltic primary *e/o*-stem verbs as (Lith.) *nèšti* 'to carry', *vèžti* 'to transport', *vèsti* 'to lead', *mèsti* 'to throw', *dègti* 'to burn', *kèpti* 'to bake', *tèpti* 'to smear', *lèsti* 'to pick up by pecking' has its origin in the thematic aorist. The Slavic cognates to this category have the thematic aorist in the 2/3 sg., *nes-e* 'carried', *vez-e* 'transported', *ved-e* 'led', *met-e* 'threw', *žьž-e* 'burned', *peče* 'baked', *tepe* 'struck' (*Codex Marianus*, Jagić edition, 392:5; no cognate for *lèsti*). On the basis of comparative evidence I have assumed then an etymological thematic aorist for the Baltic counterparts of these Slavic verbs. I propose then that 1 sg. **neš-am*, 2 sg. **neš-e(s)*, 3 **neš-e(t)*, through analogy with the verbs of the type 1 sg. **pirk-au* (< **pirk-āu*), 2 sg. **pirk-ai* (< **pirk-āi*), 3 **pirk-ā(t)* was transformed into 1 sg. **neš-eu*, 2 sg. **neš-ei*, 3 **neš-ē(t)* eventually giving the attested Lith. 1 sg. *neš-iaũ*, 2 sg. *neš-eĩ*, 3 *nẽš-ė*.

I would point out also that the originally athematic verb *ésti* 'to gobble down' has the old preterit conjugation: 1 sg. *édžiau*, 2 sg. *édei*, 3 *édė*, 1 pl. *édėme*, 2 pl. *édėte*. Although the Lithuanian preterit does not correspond with the Slavic athematic aorist one could compare the Baltic forms with the Old Indic imperfect 1 sg. *ā́dam* 'I ate', 2 sg. *ā́daḥ*, 3 sg. *ā́dat*, etc. If Baltic had a thematic aorist equivalent to the Old Indic imperfect, i.e., an original

1 sg. *ēd-om, 2 sg. *ēd-es, 3 *ēd-et, then one could assume a replacement of 1 sg. *ēd-om by *ēd-eu, 2 sg. *ēd-es by *ēd-ei, 3 *ēd-et by *ēd-ē and then remodeling of the paradigm to the attested 1 sg. édžiau, 2 sg. édei, 3 édė, etc. The long root vowel of édžiau, etc. could be explained as deriving from the augment *e plus the root *ed- and with later generalization to the present tense. Or, as with éjaũ 'I went' the long root vowel could be explained as having its origin in contact with a preceding negative ne- 'not'.

The etymological *je/o-stem verbs such as Lith. gérti 'to drink' also have the preterit in -ė, e.g.:

	Singular	Dual	Plural
1	gériau 'I drank'	géréva	gérème
2	gérei	gérėta	gérėte
3	gérė	—	—

Since the suffix *-j- marked transitivity in the Baltic verb one might suspect with Schleicher (1856:225) and many others after him that it was transferred to the preterit giving originally the conjugation: 1 sg. gér-jau 'I drank' (< *-jāu), 2 sg. *gér-jai (< *-jāi), 3 *gér-jā(t) (< *jā[t]). This conjugation was then assimilated in form to that *-ē (> Lith. -ė) conjugation which derived from the thematic aorist. Thus the attested gér-iau, gér-ei, gér-ė, etc. was created. Verbs of this class showing a lengthening of the root vowel in the preterit include: ginti 'to defend' (3 pres. gina, pret. gýnė), minti 'to trample down' (3 pres. mina [also mēna according to the Lith. Acad. Dict. VIII:232], pret. mýnė) = Latv. mīt (1 sg. pres. minu or miņu, pret. minu, mīnu or mīņu), tinti 'to whet by hammering' (3 pres. tina, pret. týnė), trinti 'to rub' (3 pres. trina, pret. trýnė) = Latv. trīt (1 sg. pres. trinu or triņu, pret. trinu or triņu), skinti 'to pluck' (3 pres. skina [also skēna, skima according to the Acad. Dict. XII:901], pret. skýnė), pinti 'to braid' (3 pres. pina [also pēna, pinti according to the Acad. Dict. IX:1053], pret. pýnė) = Latv. pīt (1 sg. pres. pinu, pret. piņu).

It should be noted that many of the Lithuanian verbs mentioned in the preceding paragraph have an iterative as follows: gỹnioti (also gýnioti, gynióti) 'to defend constantly' (3 pres. gỹnioja, pret. gỹniojo), mýnioti 'to trample down constantly' (3 pres. mýnioja, pret. mýniojo), trỹnioti 'to rub slowly' (3 pres. trỹnioja, pret. trỹniojo), pýnioti 'to braid frequently, a little'

(3 pres. pỹnioja, pret. pỹniojo), skỹnioti (also skýnioti and skynióti according to the Acad. Dict. XII:900) 'to peel frequently, a little' (3 pres. skỹnioja, pret. skỹniojo). The Lith. 1 sg. pret. forms mýniau, pýniau, skýniau, trýniau, have the following Latv. dialect counterparts: mīņu, pīņu, šķīņu, trīņu (Endzelīns 1971:para. 390a).

I propose that originally the present tense of these iterative verbs was athematic, i.e., that the present was conjugated without the endings -ju, -ji, -ja, etc. One can compare the 3 pres. kýbo 'hangs' beside the thematic innovation kýboja or the 3 pres. klū̃po 'is kneeling' beside the thematic innovation klū̃poja. Thus the present tense of iteratives such as mýnioti and the preterit tense of verbs such as minti may derive from a single conjugation: 1 sg. *mýniau, 2 sg. *mýnei [< *mýniai], 3 *mýnio, etc. This single paradigm had an intensive meaning (as a result of the iconic lengthening of the root vowel) which functioned both as an iterative of the present and as a preterit tense. The two meanings were separated when the iterative meaning adopted the thematic conjugation (i.e., as *mýnio was replaced by mýnioja and the rest of the conjugation followed this pattern, thus sg. [1] mýnioju, [2] mýnioji, etc.). Thereupon the preterit meaning was adapted to the conjugation of the old thematic aorist, thus 1 sg. mýniau [cf. Latv. dial. mīņu], 2 sg. mýnei, etc.

It should be remarked, however, that Køłłn (1969:31) finds it highly unlikely that the present formant -j- would have spread to the preterit, in view of the fact that no other present formants have. But the -j- could possibly have been felt more as a marker of transitivity rather than a marker of the present tense.

Kazlauskas (1968:66-67), after analyzing the nouns derived from prefixed verbs, concludes that the Baltic languages must have gone through a stage when verbs used with prefixes were in enclitic position. One can compare the fact that in Vedic Sanskrit the preverb, which is still separable from the rest of the verb, takes the stress in a main clause, e.g., ní-padyate 'descends', á-gacchati 'comes', whereas in a subordinate clause where there is a closer bond between the preverb and the verb itself one encounters the stress ni-pádyate, ā-gácchati (Kazlauskas 1968:88; Vaillant 1966:550), the difference being that in Baltic the verb was always enclitic no matter what kind of clause it was in according to Kazlauskas.

Specifically rejecting such a notion as the above Vaillant (1950:228; 1966:550) says that Lithuanian verbs with stressed prefix are not to be compared with the Vedic type 3 sg. pres. prá bharati 'carries forward' and Gk.

1 sg. πάρειμι 'I am present'. According to Vaillant the Lithuanian shift of stress to the prefix or the negative particle *ne-* (1 sg. pres. *ariù* 'I plow' vs. the prefixed present *ùž-ariu*, negative *nè-ariu*, pret. *ùž-ariau*) must be recent because the accent does not lengthen the *a* of the verbal prefix as the earlier accent does, cf. the 1 sg. pres. *prà-menu* 'I name' vs. the noun *prã-monė* 'industry'. In addition Vaillant believes that we should expect at least the morphological effects of de Saussure's law in the 1 and 2 singular of the prefixed forms (the alternation would be morphological, similar to that of the noun where we encounter nom. sg. *ašakà* 'fish-bone' vs. acc. sg. *ãšaką*).

Still, as Kazlauskas (1968:62) points out, in the old Lithuanian writings the longer forms of *nu-* and *pri-*, viz. *nuo-* and *prie-* are encountered, e.g., *nů-grȩsze* 'turned to' Mažvydas 217₁₇, *nů-leme* 'determined' EE 26₁, *prie-augs* 'will attain one's majority' Mažvydas 116₂, *prie-pile* 'filled' (= *pripýlė*) Mažvydas 315₂, etc. So the stress on the root could be old, as Kazlauskas suggests.

Vaillant has proposed (1966:551), however, that the Slavic prefix stress in the thematic aorist derives from an earlier, but now lost stressed augment. He suggests that Slavic had a 3 pret. **é-plete* in which the augment **e-* could have been absorbed into the prefix giving Slavic *za-plete*, Serbo-Croatian *zȁ-plete*. Vaillant compares the situation in Modern Greek where the stress pattern of 1 sg. λαβαίνω 'I receive' vs. the 1 sg. aor. ἔ-λαβα [with the augment] is reproduced when the the prefix κατα- is used, thus 1 sg. pres. κατα-λαβαίνω 'I understand' vs. the 1 sg. aor. κατά-λαβα. In Vaillant's view one might expect the augment to have existed in Slavic since Slavic has so many traits in common with its Iranian and Thaco-Phrygian neighbors [which includes Armenian] both of which have the augment. I suggest that Baltic may have originally had the augment too.

Those etymological **-e/o-stem* conjugation verbs with a preterit in *-ė* shift the stress to the prefix in both the present and the preterit, e.g., *iš-bárti* 'to scold', *ìš-bara*, *ìš-barė*; *nu-kálti* 'to forge', *nù-kala*, *nù-kalė*; *už-dègti* 'to set fire', *ùž-dega*, *ùž-degė*; *at-nèšti* 'to bring', *àt-neša*, *àt-nešė*; *nù-vesti* 'to lead away', *nù-veda*, *nù-vedė*; *nu-vèžti* 'to take away (by vehicle), *nù-veža*, *nù-vežė*; *nu-lèsti* 'to peck up completely, *nù-lesa*, *nù-lesė*; *nu-mèsti* 'to throw down', *nù-meta*, *nù-metė*, *iš-kèpti* 'to bake', *ìš-kepa*, *ìš-kepė*.

As mentioned above the Serbo-Croatian counterparts retract the stress to the prefix in the 2-3 sg. aorist, thus, for example, one might see a parallel between the stress of the S.-Cr. 2-3 sg. aorist *zȁ-mete*, *dȍ-nese* (Ma-

retić 1963:242-243) and the Lith. 3 preterit *nù-metė, àt-nešė.* Following Vaillant's notion according to which the prefix stress is derived from the stress of the old augment of the thematic aorist above, I propose that the prefixal stress of such 3 preterits as *ìš-bar-ė, nù-kal-ė, ùž-deg-ė, àt-neš-ė, nù-ved-ė, nù-vež-ė, nù-les-ė, nù-met-ė, ìš-kep-ė* might imply that there had originally been thematic aorists with the augment of the form **é-bar-e, *é-kal-e, *é-deg-e, *é-neš-e, *é-ved-e, *é-vež-e, *é-les-e, *é-met-e, *é-kep-e*, etc. For the thematic verbs the preterit in *-ė* reflects the old thematic aorist *-e*, whereas the preterit in *-ė* for the verbs with a lengthened grade root vowel such as *ap-gýn-ė* 'defended', *pra-skýn-ė* 'cleared away', *nu-pýn-ė* 'wove', *pa-kór-ė* 'hung', *iš-gér-ė* 'drank', *nu-skél-ė* 'split off' *at-skýr-ė* 'separated', *į-dúr-ė* 'pricked' and for those such as *pa-mãt-ė* 'saw' from *pa-mat-ýti*, *pa-prãš-ė* 'asked for' from *pa-praš-ýti* with an infinitive in *-yti* is to be derived originally from **-jā* or **-ijā* (Michelini 1977:254).

In my view the form of the etymological preterit in **-jā* (in post-consonantal position) was then assimilated to the preterit in **-ē* (from the thematic aorist **-e*), since both would have shared the 1 sg. preterit ending *-jau* (resulting from the merger of **-jāu* and **-eu*), although the stress pattern for the two types may have been kept separate. This would explain the fact that the prefixal stress is found for the old original *-ė* preterit tense of thematic verbs whereas root stress is common for the verbs in *-yti*, and for verbs with the lengthened grade root (see Kazlauskas 1968:70).

One might wonder if in some of these verbs the prefix stress in the present tense is new. Only in Daukša's writings do we encounter verbs with a short root vowel which stress the verbal component, e.g., *ne dêra* 360₂₉ 'is not fitting', *pridéra* 459₁₉ 'is fitting', *uzgéma* 585₃₁ 'is born', *numéta* 585₂₆ 'throws down', *atnésza* 606₃₁ 'brings', etc. According to Kazlauskas (1968:69) some of these verbs may have been incorrectly accented, but certain of them such as *pridéra* and *uzgéma* could indeed stress the verbal component and such a stress pattern may have arisen following the model of the stress of verbs which do not have the stress on the particle *ne*, since verbs such as *dêra* 69₁₃ and *gêma* 42₅ are less commonly used with prefixes having an adverbial origin.

In some Lithuanian dialects the prefix of some verbs is stressed in the present tense because of the influence of the preterit: instead of standard 3 pres. *nu-braũkia* 'wipes off' we encounter *nù-braukia* on the basis of the pret. *nù-braukė*; and instead of standard 3 pres. *nu-šviẽčia* 'illuminates', we

encounter *nù-šviečia* on the basis of the pret. *nù-švietė*, etc. (Lith. Acad. Gram. II:310). One might suggest then that the stress of the present forms *àt-neša* 'brings' and *nù-meta* 'throws down' is later than that of *atnēša* and *numēta*, etc. and is a result of assimilation to the stress of the preterit (old thematic aorist) *àt-neš-ė*, *nù-met-ė*.

There seems to be no completely satisfactory single solution to every question regarding the accentuation of the Baltic verb, but one should at least consider the possibility of applying Vaillant's notion to the Baltic as well as to the Slavic verbal paradigm.

References

Endzelīns, J. (1971), *Comparative phonology and morphology of the Baltic languages.* English translation of *Baltu valodu skaņas un formas* (Rīga, 1948) by William R. Schmalstieg and Benjamiņš Jēgers, The Hague: Mouton.

Kazlauskas, J. (1968), *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Køln, H. (1969), *Oppositions of voice in Greek, Slavic and Baltic*, Copenhagen: Munksgaard (Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, bd. 3,4).

Lith. Acad. Dict. = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (A-šliuožti), XIV vols. 1956 ff., Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Lith. Acad. Gram. = *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, Vol. I (1965), Vol. II (1971), Vol. III (1976), Vilnius: Mintis (I, II), Mokslas (III).

Maretić, T. (1963), *Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb, Matica hrvatska.

Michelini, G. (1977), Il destino dei 'suffissi' in nasale indoeuropei nelle lingue baltiche (con particolare riferimento al lituano), *Baltistica* 13, 349-351.

Schleicher, A. (1856), *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*, I. Prague (quoted here from Kazlauskas 1968:359).

Schmalstieg, W. R. (1961), The Lithuanian preterit in -ė, *Lingua* 10, 93-97.

— (1965), Again the Lithuanian preterit in -ė, *Annali, Istituto orientale di Napoli* 6, 123-126.

— (1992), Marginalia to the Baltic verb, *Linguistica Baltica* 1, 25-33.

Vaillant, A. (1950), *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, Vol. I, Paris, Lyon: Edition I A C.

— (1966), *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, Vol. III, *Le verbe*, Paris: Editions Klincksieck.

The Pennsylvania State University
Dept. of Slavic Languages
213 Sparks
University Park, Pa. 16802, USA   *William R. Schmalstieg*