LITHUANIAN *TEKĖTI* AND RELATED FORMATIONS

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

Erdvilas Jakulis' thorough, detailed and comprehensive study (2004) is an important contribution to our reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic verbal system. The following remarks are intended to complement his findings from a Slavic perspective.

Jakulis demonstrates that the type of Lith. *tekėti*, *teka* 'flow' is largely of East Baltic provenance. He finds it difficult to identify the same type in Old Prussian. This is clearly because preterit forms are very scarce in the sources which have come down to us. There are two instances which I find quite convincing: *skellānts* 'schuldig' beside *skallīsnan* 'Pflicht', which is identical with Lith. *skelė́ti* 'be indebted', and the verb *giwīt*, *giwa* 'leben', which Jakulis does not mention. Two more examples are provided by the imperatives *kīrdeiti*, *kirdijti* 'hört', Lith. *girdė́ti*, and *dereis*, *endirīs* 'siehe', Lith. *dyrė́ti* (cf. Kortlandt 1982: 7, 1987: 106). In Slavic we should expect to find examples partly in the class of simple root verbs, such as *tek-*, and partly in the class of primary verbs in *-ěti*. Both of these classes require some discussion.

In a largely forgotten but highly innovative article, Herman Kølln has argued that Slavic root verbs originally had a sigmatic aorist if they were both transitive and non-terminative but a thematic aorist if they were either intransitive or terminative, or both (1961: 269). The only intransitive root verbs with a sigmatic aorist in Old Church Slavic are *cvisti* 'bloom' and *tešti* 'flow', which evidently had a different preterit at an earlier stage. Kølln identifies these verbs with the type of Lith. *tekėti*, adducing three additional pieces of evidence: Russian *bežát'*, 1sg. *begú*, 3pl. *begút* 'run', which is semantically close to Lith. *tekė́ti*, *tekù*, further Upper Sorbian *kćěć*, *ktu* 'bloom', which is identical with Latvian *kvitêt*, *kvitu*, and Čakavian (Novi) *žīvȉt*, *žīvén* 'live'. The last example is also found elsewhere (e.g. Vrgada, Mostar, Posavian, cf. Jurišić 1973: 247) and can now be identified with Old Prussian *giwīt*, *giwa*.

Slavic primary verbs in *-ěti* represent different formations (cf. Kortlandt 1989: 109, 1992: 374). Since all of these have an *i*-present, some of them may have had a thematic present at an earlier stage, e.g. Russ. *bežít* 'runs', SCr. *žívī* 'lives' (cf. already Meillet 1906: 365). Jakulis lists twenty Slavic verbs in *-ěti* which have Baltic cognates of the type of Lith. *tekėti* (2004: 117-124). Almost all of these denote events which strongly affect the senses (sound, light, smell, stress). The largest subgroup are verbs with an original *ske*-present, e.g. OChSl. *pištati* < *-skē-* (with an *i*-present), *pište-* < *-ske-* (inf. *piskati*), Lith. *pyškė́ti*, *pýška* 'squeak', which ap-

parently gave rise to presents in *-ke-* and *-zge-* as well (cf. Meillet 1906: 369, Vaillant 1966: 395-398). This was evidently a Balto-Slavic development already. Other verbs belonging here are *grъměti* 'thunder', *svъtěti sę* 'shine', **smъrděti* 'stink', **pъzděti* 'fart', Lith. *gruméti, švitéti, smirdéti, bezdéti*.

Thus, it appears that the type of Lith. *tekèti, teka* goes back to Balto-Slavic times in the case of intransitive verbs denoting non-terminative dynamic processes such as flowing, running, living, blooming, shining, thundering, smelling. Here we may add Lith. *sravéti* 'flow' (cf. Vaillant 1966: 198) and Slavic **pъlzěti, *pъlze-* 'crawl' (cf. Vaillant 1966: 386) and *letěti, *lekte- < *lekste-* 'fly', which is to be compared with Lith. *lakstýti* (cf. Vaillant 1966: 393). The *ē*-preterit was evidently taken from the Indo-European type of stative verbs with an *i*-present denoting a state of being, e.g. Lith. *budéti* 'be awake', *judéti* 'be in movement', Slavic *mьněti* 'be in thought', *dъržati* 'be in control', Vedic *búdhya-, yúdhya-, mánya-, dṛ́hya-*, which were semantically close enough to supply a new imperfect to present stems of non-terminative intransitive verbs when the earlier imperfect developed into an aorist. Slavic *kypěti* 'bubble, be seething', Lith. *kūpéti, kupéti*, Vedic *kúpya-* seems to belong to both semantic classes. For Slavic *viděti* 'see', which has an acute root vowel as a result of Winter's law, we can reconstruct an *ē*-preterit on the basis of Latin and Germanic, a thematic aorist **vide-* on the basis of Greek and Indo-Iranian, and a suppletive present tense represented by Slavic *zъrěti*, Lith. *regéti*, Prussian impv. *dereis*. This high frequency verb may have played a major role in the extension of the *ē*-preterit to verbs with a thematic aorist at an early stage.

At the same time, transitive verbs denoting non-terminative dynamic actions such as OChSl. *bere-* 'gather', *žene- < *gene-* 'hunt', *ište- < *iske-* 'search', *mete-* 'throw', *tъče- < *tъke-* 'weave', *kove-* 'forge', *zove-* 'call' developed an *ā*-preterit (cf. Kølln 1961: 275), which was probably taken from an Indo-European type of verbs denoting determinate movement (cf. Kortlandt 1984: 184). This was clearly a Balto-Slavic innovation because the East Baltic transitive root verbs with a thematic present and an *ā*-preterit belong to the same semantic class, e.g. Lith. *reñka, riñko* 'gather', *siùva, siùvo* 'sew', *sùka, sùko* 'twist' (cf. Stang 1966: 385). Later the *ā*-preterit replaced the thematic aorist in East Baltic, where it was subsequently generalized as the preterit of intransitive verbs par excellence. On the other hand, the sigmatic aorist of transitive root verbs was replaced by an *ē*-preterit, which then became the characteristic preterit of transitive verbs in East Baltic. Thus, I agree with Stang that "sowohl der intransitive Charakter des *ā*-Prät. als der transitive Charakter des *ē*-Prät. sekundär ist" (1966: 388). The motivation for the latter development is far from obvious and requires some discussion.

There are three reasons why the ending of Lith. *vẽdė* 'led', which cannot be separated from the Slavic imperfect *veděaše*, cannot simply be identified with the formative suffix of *sěděti*, Slavic *sěděti*, Latin *sedēre* 'sit' (cf. Kortlandt 1986: 256). First, the latter formation designates a situation that is the result of an earlier process, which is denoted by the root **sed-*. It thus resembles the perfect. The

Balto-Slavic imperfect, on the other hand, expressed a process in the course of its completion. It rather resembles the English progressive form. Second, the stem **sēdē-*, which has an acute root vowel as a result of Winter's law, is common to all verb forms except the present tense, whereas the imperfect formation is limited to the preterit. Third, the tonal difference between the Lith. circumflex ending *-ė* and the acute formative suffix of "Zustandsverba" precludes their identification. To my surprise, I have been unable to find the latter, decisive objection in the existing literature.

It follows from the foregoing that Lith. *vẽdė* can be identified as a nominal formation (cf. already Meillet 1906: 370) which yielded the Slavic imperfect through composition with the original perfect **ōse* 'was' of the root **es-* (cf. Stang 1942: 82-84), which must be reconstructed for Indo-European on the basis of the Indo-Iranian and Greek evidence (cf. Kortlandt 1986: 255). Deverbal nouns in *-ē-* are found in Latin, e.g. *caedēs* 'slaughter', *sēdēs* 'seat', *vātēs* 'seer'. Thus, we can paraphrase Lith. *vẽdė*, Slavic *veděaše* as 'was leading', as opposed to Slavic *sědě* 'sat, was sitting', *sěde* 'sat (down)', Lith. *sėdėjo, sė́do* with a secondary *ā*-preterit. The two types of *ē*-preterit may ultimately both have a nominal origin because they can be compared with the Greek intransitive aorists in *-ē-* and *-thē-* (cf. Meillet 1906: 366-368, Chantraine 1961: 166-168), which may go back to deverbal nouns in *-ē-* and to the root noun which is represented in Lith. *-dẽ*, Vedic *-dhā́*, Latin *-dēs*, respectively.

In Prussian we find the intransitive *ē*-preterit in *ismigē* 'entschlief', Slavic *mьžati* < **migē-*, and the transitive *ē*-preterit in *weddē* 'brachte' and *pertraūki* 'verschloss', Lith. *vẽdė, tráukė*. The transitive *ā*-preterit was largely generalized in Prussian, as is clear from *bela* (I), *byla* (II), *billā* 'sprach', *prowela* (I, II) 'verriet', *lima* (I), *lymu* (II) 'brach', *poglabū* 'herzte', and especially *endeirā* 'sah an' and *teikū* 'schuf' because these have the *e*-grade root vowel of the present tense, as distinct from the zero grade root vowel in the infinitives *endyrītwei* 'ansehen' and *tickint* 'machen'. The infinitive *teickut* 'schaffen' evidently adopted the vocalism of the present stem, as did the infinitive *laikūt* 'halten', the participle *maysotan* 'gemischt', and the deverbal noun *perbandāsnan* 'Versuchung', Lith. *laikýti, maišýti, bandýti*. On the analogy of such verbs as *billē* < **-ēie* 'spricht', *billā* 'sprach', the *ā*-preterits *stallā* and *quoitā* were created beside *stallē* 'steht' and *quoitē* 'will' (cf. Kortlandt 1987: 108). It thus appears that the Prussian data support the reconstruction of a transitive *ā*-preterit and two different types of *ē*-preterit proposed above for the Balto-Slavic proto-language.

REFERENCES

Chantraine, Pierre
  1961   *Morphologie historique du grec* (Paris: Klincksieck).

Jakulis, Erdvilas
    2004   *Lietuvių kalbos* tekėti, teka *tipo veiksmažodžiai* [=*Baltistica* 38, 2003] (Vilnius: Universiteto leidykla).

Jurišić, Blaž
    1973   *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade*, II dio: *Rječnik* (Zagreb: JAZU).

Køllm, Herman
    1961   Die *e/o*-Verba im Slavischen. *Scando-Slavica* 7, 260-285.

Kortlandt, Frederik
    1982   Innovations which betray archaisms. *Baltistica* 18/1, 4-9.
    1984   Old Irish subjunctives and futures and their Proto-Indo-European origins. *Ériu* 35, 179-187.
    1986   The origin of the Slavic imperfect. *Festschrift für Herbert Bräuer* (Köln: Böhlau), 253-258.
    1987   The formation of the Old Prussian present tense. *Baltistica* 23/2, 104-111.
    1989   Lithuanian *statýti* and related formations. *Baltistica* 25/2, 104-112.
    1992   Le statif indo-européen en slave. *Revue des Études Slaves* 64 [Gs. Lépissier], 373-376.

Meillet, Antoine
    1906   Observations sur le verbe latin. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 13, 350-375.

Stang, Christian S.
    1942   *Das slavische und baltische Verbum* (Oslo: Dybwad).
    1966   *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget).

Vaillant, André
    1966   *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, tome III: *Le verbe* (Paris: Klincksieck).