

L. PALMAITIS

NOTES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF BALTIC DECLENSION

1. A number of recent eccentric theories concerning the position of Baltic within Indo-European¹ enables us (taking into account dialectal distinctions) to identify Baltic with Proto-Indo-European on the eve of the split of the latter². Such "Baltic" Indo-European must have existed in the very period after preflexional, because the same case inflections (cf. *-(e/o)s*, *-(e/o)m*, *-i*) are widely spread all over the Indo-European areal. Since the formant *-(e/o)s* may be connected with nominative case and *-(e/o)m/n* — with accusative case in the same areal, it goes without saying that the nominative construction of the sentence had been already existing at that time.

On the other hand, evident relics of the ergative construction in the historic Indo-European languages³ allow us to assume its existence⁴ in the same period, considering this period to be an intermediary stage of combined cases⁵. At the same time the historic types of stems were being formed — new inflections were being added to derivative suffixes which had already abandoned their previous (semantical or morphological) destination; the thematic stem arose by generalizing the vocalic allophone of zero ending⁶.

2. While functioning as nominative system cases, combined cases (arisen out of the more older inflections) were manifested as nominative, genitive, dative and accusative forms, on the basis of which four-case paradigms were starting to develop. Besides the combined cases there existed old dative/locative **-i* inherited from the

¹ First and foremost Иванов В. В. и Топоров В. И. К постановке вопроса о древнейших отношениях балтийских и славянских языков. М., 1958; W. P. Schmid. Baltisch und Indogermanisch. — „Baltistica“, 1976, t. XII(2) are in view.

² In other words Baltic at that stage must have retained all the main features on the basis of which both internal and external concentric circles of languages (see Schmid. Op. cit., § 3) had developed.

³ As for Hittite see Иванов В. В. Хеттский язык. М., 1963, 132 f.; Idem. Общиневропейская, праславянская и анатолийская языковые системы (ОПА). М., 1965, p. 54; for Old Prussian see V. Mažiulis. Zum baltischen *o*-stämmigen genitivus singularis. — ABSI, 1966, t. III, p. 107–112.

⁴ Using not very accurate term of G. Klimov — the existence of the "active" construction, i. e. such, which (not as its historic variant named by Klimov "an ergative") was determined by semantic opposition (fiens : stivus) and not by morphologic opposition of transitivity: intransitivity — cf. Климов Г. А. Очерк общей теории эргативности. М., 1973, p. 263, 261, 260.

⁵ совмещающих — Климов. Op. cit., p. 189.

⁶ See L. Palmitis. Dar dėl ide. fleksinės sistemos atsiradimo. — „Baltistica“, 1975, t. XI(1), p. 31–33; at that time the category of gender was also being formed — ibid.

former system as being irrelevant both to ergative (“active”) or nominative structure. Therefore in the new system it became a redundant form, which being non-paradigmatic gained polysemy (e. g. it might denote genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental and locative⁷, i. e. it might become common non-nominative form) and later in some of its meanings might enter into paradigms of separate languages (e. g. cf. paradigmatic locatives Sl. *vělkě*, Skr. *vṛke*).

3. Besides dative/locative *-i in the previous system there existed ergative and absolutive cases, the former probably being sigmatic⁸ and (a sign of earlier verbal structure⁹) asigmatic. The latter (absolutive case) could be realized either in bare stem or by adding nasal formant¹⁰. As for absolutive, the new paradigmatic dative (thematic stem lengthened), nominative/accusative neutral (thematic stem non-lengthened, nasal formant often added) and accusative communis (thematic stem non-lengthened, nasal formant added as a rule)¹¹ were developing from the bare stem of it.

Before making an attempt to explain the existence or absence of the nasal formant in the new case system, it is necessary to come to an agreement about the treatment of the origin of this formant and the role it played in the previous system. I regard this system to be the earliest stage of Indo-European as a part of the wider (Borealic, or Nostratic) community. There are no obstacles for thinking that the nasal formant was then inherent in some kind of absolutive case. This coincides well with the data of Nostratic linguistics, while propounding for the Boreal community the law of finalis $*-ma = -m = -N = -n = -na$ ¹² and identifying the previously mentioned nasal formant with that of pronouns, as the distinguishing functions of the latter may be traced out¹³. Since such functions appear to be a result of its origin from some deictic particle (pronoun)¹⁴, the postpositional nasal formant seems to have come from a kind of the definite article. Therefore, in the Boreal super-lan-

⁷ Cf. V. Mažiulis. Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai (=BK). V., 1970, § 74.

⁸ Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 248.

⁹ Климов. *Op. cit.*, 54, 165 f., 177.

¹⁰ Cf. Иванов. ОПА, 51 f.; *Idem.* Эргативная конструкция в общиндоевропейском. — In: Эргативная конструкция предложения в языках различных типов. Л., 1964, p. 19.

¹¹ Cf. Mažiulis. BK, § 67, 47, 48, 80.

¹² This law is connected with another Borealic law of finalis: $*-a||-\emptyset$ — see above foot-note 6 (*ibid.* look for the reinterpretation of traditional I.-E. $*-o$ as $*-a$); the existence of nasal archiphoneme is supported by Indo-European (see Иванов В. В. Тохарские языки. М., 1959, p. 24 f.) and Afro-Asiatic (the same definitive origin of mimation and nunation — see I. Diakonoff. *Semito-Hamitic Languages (SHL)*. Moscow, 1965, 61) facts.

¹³ Forms of the type Balt. *ma-ne*, Goth. *mei-na*, Celt. $*me-me$ (I.-E. apophony + the $-N$ law mentioned), Finn. *mi-nä*, Samoyed *ma-n*, Turk. *mā-n*, Kartv. *me-na* and Lith. *kie-no* “whose”, Finn. *ke-n* “who” (besides *mi-kä* “what”), Arabic and Aramaic *ma-n* “who” (besides *mā* “what”) are in view. The latter *ma-n* may be connected with mimation-nunation (coming back to pron. indef. *ma* — Diakonoff. SHL, 77) and in such a case is to be reconstructed as (reduplicated?) $*ma^m/n(a)$. It is pron. dem. *n-*, from which К. Майтинская (Основы финно-угорского языкознания (ОФУЯ). М., 1974, 379) derives the Uralic pronominal nasal postposition considering it to distinguish animate objects out of the world of inanimate things (Майтинская К. Е. Функция местоименного суффикса $-n$ в личных и вопросительных местоимениях финно-угорских языков. — In: Вопросы финно-угорского языкознания. Л., 1962, p. 79, 76).

¹⁴ See foot-note 13.

guage some status determinatus may be reconstructed, which should have been realized by adding postpositional determinant **ma*¹⁵.

So the logic of all said above makes it possible to consider primary Indo-European absolutive having had determinate and indeterminate forms, i. e. a form with a nasal postposition and a form without it. While nominative and genitive began to arise from the earlier ergative, the earlier absolutive was used to form accusative and the new dative, the latter manifested either as non-lengthened form of bare stem (e. g. cf. Hittite consonantal stem datives) or as its lengthened form (in case of thematic stems arisen). Non-lengthened form of bare stem was used for nominative/accusative neutral (the direct relic of former absolutive, because neutral had been formed out of the inert class nouns not able to be used in ergative case), while the form with nasal postposition – for accusative communis. Regarding nasal formant having been transferred into nominative/accusative neutral from accusative communis¹⁶, it is not difficult to assume that after merging with certain cases¹⁷ determinant began to indicate animate objects in contrast to indeterminate forms. Comparison with other Borealic languages confirms such an assumption and permits to suppose even the existence of Indo-European bare stem accusative in genus commune. The same is true for Uralic, where non-nasalized accusative (i. e. bare stem form coinciding with nominative) indicated inanimate objects¹⁸. Here as well the signifying of animate objects by nasalized accusative may be traced back as inheritance of earlier structure where nasalized case indicated definite objects and non-nasalized – indefinite. Such archaism is attested in Samoyed languages¹⁹.

Thus, at the time of common Baltic throughout all the Indo-European areal the case system was being reorganized as following: ergative → nominative, genitive; absolutive → dative, nominative/accusative, accusative (?); determined absolutive → accusative.

4. Therefore, in Baltic declension there existed the following combined cases: ergative/nominative, ergative/genitive, absolutive/accusative, absolutive/dative. Be-

¹⁵ According to A. Dolgopolsky Borealic pronouns in the function of determinandum were following determinatum (Долгопольский А. Б. Опыт реконструкции общеностратической грамматической системы. — In: Конференция по сравнительно-исторической грамматике индоевропейских языков. М., 1972, 34 (the V law)); in the final position this **ma* = **m* = **n(a)*.

¹⁶ Cf. Palvaitis. Op. cit., p. 33.

¹⁷ Cf. non-nasalized nominative/accusative indicating self-determined words (names of countries) in Hittite: *nusa* KURURU *Arzawa tarahhun* — the fact that such an archaism was preserved, the nasal formant having already been transferred into neutral from commune, shows that at the time of transferring it had not completely lost its determinative functions.

¹⁸ So В. Collinder and others — see ОФУЯ, 243.

¹⁹ If the author's idea about the same origin of Uralic genitive *-n* and accusative *-m* is correct (cf. Палмайтис Л.-М. Место уралоистики в разрешении бореальной гипотезы. — In: Soome-Ugri rahvad ja Idamaad. Tartu riiklik ülikool. Tartu, 1975, p. 62–63), it might be proved that the absence of nasalized genitive and accusative in some Fenno-Ugric languages is a reflex of indeterminate case: for both kinds of accusative there was generalized either determinate form of the animate class objects in the majority of languages, or indeterminate form of the inanimate class objects in Ugric-Permian languages. The similar phenomenon might have existed in Indo-European: determinate forms were generalized for all kinds of accusative communis when the determinative sense of them had been obscured. It is worth mentioning that in Altaic unmotivated vacillation of using nasalized and bare stem accusative is attested — cf. Аманжолов А. С. Глагольное управление в языке древнетюркских памятников. М., 1969, p. 23.

sides them earlier dative/locative *-(e/o)i* (already non-paradigmatic) was preserved. For that epoch such declension paradigms may be reconstructed:

	i₁-stem	i₂-stem²⁰
erg/nom.	avis	(see <i>abs/acc.</i>)
erg/gen.	aveis	dēti + -s from <i>i₁ avei-s</i>
abs/acc.	aviN	dēti
abs/dat(/loc.) ²¹	avei	dēti

The history of this stem is of special significance for other stems. Since dative/locative arisen in them was bare stem form coinciding with accusative (perhaps, not only with that of common gender – cf. above § 3), the case polysemy appeared. While “dat”/“loc.” *-i* (*-(e/o)i* of thematic stem) existed also in other stems (as adopted from *i*-stem long time before – see foot-note 21), it became possible to associate it with the “new” *i*-stem dat(/loc.) *-ei/i* and, therefore, to stimulate the paradigmaticization of the former in thematic stem (cf. *vṛke*), as well as to transfer that “new” *i*-stem dat (/loc.) *-ei/i* into paradigms of other stems.

	u₁-stem	u₂-stem
erg/nom.	sūnus	(see <i>abs/acc.</i>)
erg/gen.	sūnaus	medu + -s from <i>u₁ sūnau-s</i>
abs/acc.	sūnuN	medu
abs/dat.	sūnau	medu + <i>i</i> after <i>i₂ (dēt)i</i> and “dat”/“loc.”
“dat”/“loc.”	sūnau (?)	medui

	c₁-stem	c₂-stem
erg/nom.	(māters >) mātēr	(see <i>abs/acc.</i>)
erg/gen.	(māters ≧) māteres	akmen + es after <i>C₁ mātēr-es</i>
abs/acc.	(māterN _o =) māteriN	akmon ≧ akmōn after <i>C₁ mātēr</i>
abs/dat.	māter + <i>ei</i> after <i>i₁ (av)ei</i>	akmen + <i>i</i> after <i>i₂ (dēt)i</i> and “dat”/“loc.”
“dat”/“loc.”	māteri (?)	akmeni (?)

Erg/gen. **(māters ≧) mātrés > mātēres* has “thematized” *-es* (in place of older erg. *-s*) adopted from *e/o* -stem²².

	o₁-stem	o₂-stem
erg/nom.	vīras	(see <i>abs/acc.</i>)
erg/gen.	vīras	lapa + -s from <i>o₁ vīra-s</i>
abs/acc.	vīraN, vīra(?)	lapa, lapa + -N from <i>o₁ vīra-N</i>
abs/dat.	vīrō, vīra ²³	lapō, lapa
“dat”/“loc.”	vīrei	lapei

²⁰ For *i₁*, *i₂*, resp. *u₁*, *u₂*-stems see Mažiulis. BK, § 146–170; further in accordance with this pattern signs *C₁*, *C₂*, *o₁*, *o₂*, *ā₂* are introduced.

²¹ As mentioned above (§ 3), in the new (not pure ergative, intermediary) system bare stem dative appeared. The form of older dat/loc. *-i* forces regarding itself being adopted (at the times of older (pure ergative) system) from *i*-stem as a bare stem ending (derivative suffix). Thus, bare *i*-stem absolutive/dative of the new system coincided with dative/locative of the former system (therefore, non-paradigmatic “dative”/“locative”, as coincided with paradigmatic absolutive/dative, has not appeared in *i*-stem).

²² For that as well as for *mātrés > mātēres* see Mažiulis. BK, p. 247.

²³ Non-lengthened bare stem absolutive/dative is assumed because of the relic of short stem partitive in Old Prussian (see further § 5).

\bar{a}_2 -stem

The fact that in I.-E. \bar{a} -stem plural nominative coincides with accusative ($*\bar{a}s$) is an evidence of their formerly coincidence also in singular. The formation of \bar{a} -stem²⁴ in the Indo-European areal took place at the time discussed (i. e. that of common Baltic dialect – cf. above § 1) but after Anatolian had started to separate (the remaining of common gender in Anatolian is to be noticed)²⁵. Consequently, primary consonantal $C_2 = * - aH_2 (> \bar{a})$ -stem nouns belonged to the inert class, so it may be spoken only about \bar{a}_2 -stem:

erg/nom.	<i>abs/acc.</i> rankā
erg/gen.	rankā + -s <i>after a₁ vira-s</i>
abs/acc.	rankā + -N <i>after a₁ vira-N²⁶</i>
abs/dat.	rankā + i <i>after i₂ (dēt)i and "dat"/"loc."</i>
"dat"/"loc."	rankāi

5. The Indo-European community having finally splitted, the Slavic areal is formed and in the maternal Baltic areal the western groups of dialects alienate from the eastern groups. The ergative construction disappears completely and combined cases give place to the historic paradigms of the nominative system. Ergative/nominative turns into nominative, absolutive/accusative – into accusative, *o*-stem ergative/genitive singular – into genitive further excluded in eastern Baltic by partitive form, absolutive/dative turns into dative and partitive. Questions connected with the generalization of i_1 , u_1 or i_2 , u_2 -stem forms in one paradigm²⁷, with substitution of *o*-stem dat. sg. -uo (= *u*-stem -uo \leq $*-au$) by *u*-stem -ui²⁸ and many others are not discussed here, since after the works of prof. V. Mažiulis there is no more doubt about their solution. Therefore, I shall only touch upon the history of *o*-stem genitive, partitive and dative singular.

At the present time the authenticity of O. Pr. gen. masc. -as is strongly queried. According to one opinion, it is the result of the "unification" of paradigms by German translators who used corrupt Prussian²⁹. Such an opinion does not seem to be persuasively grounded. According to another view, it is the innovation arisen by adding -s adopted from other stems' genitive to the short barytone ending -a, which practically could not be distinguished from accusative singular and genitive plural nasal endings -a reduced in barytone position³⁰. This idea of A. Girdenis and A. Rosinas is based upon their well argumentated hypothesis, which supposes in Old Prussian the existence of nasal vowels and secondary nasalization³¹. In Baltic, there are

²⁴ This question is observed by Palmaitis. Op. cit., p. 33 – 35.

²⁵ Cf. Савченко А. Н. Сравнительная грамматика индоевропейских языков. М., 1974, p. 230.

²⁶ \bar{a}_2 -stem nouns primarily denoting only inanimate objects or nomina collectiva could have never been determined.

²⁷ See Mažiulis. BK, § 161.

²⁸ Ibid., § 31, 154, 157, 65, 64, 162.

²⁹ See W. R. Schmalstieg. Prūsų kalbos autentiškumo problema. – In: Abstracts of Papers Presented to the III-d All-Union Conference on Baltic Linguistics. V., 1975, p. 54–57.

³⁰ A. Girdenis & A. Rosinas. Some remarks on the vocalism and morphology of Old Prussian. – "General Linguistics", 1977, V. 17, No 1.

³¹ See *ibid.*

no other examples, however, of the rebuilding of non-nasalized ending after the model of other stems' endings, while it coincides with denasalized endings. E. g. in the subdialect of Šiauliai environs *o*-stem gen. sg. *-a* coincides with *o*-stem acc. sg. *-a* (as well as with *ā*-stem nom. sg. *-a* and acc. sg. *-ā*) but nevertheless it does not change its form. So even accepting Girdenis and Rosinas' hypothesis doubts remain whether it suits to explain O. Pr. gen. masc. *-as*. On the other hand, the existence in Old Prussian of "usual" (i. e. that of eastern Baltic type) gen. masc. *-a* would seem to be supported by *Butta Tawas* III D 31₂, *Butta Rikians* III D 79₁₉ (besides *Buttas Taws*, e. g. III D 67₁) or BPT *nykoyte pēnega doyte* „nenori pinigo duoti“. Since *Butta Taw(as)* cannot be regarded being an obdurate expression — because of the existence of *Butta Rikians* (cf. Lat. *pater familiās* only), as well as of regular *Buttas Taws* — the using of "archaic" gen. *Butta* side by side with the "innovation" *Buttas* scarcely conforms to the very Girdenis and Rosinas' hypothesis: the form of genitive singular, once having coincided with that of accusative singular and genitive plural and therefore being substituted by some innovative form, is no more any genitive form. If the new genitive form *-as* has appeared, the former polysemantic form cannot be understood at all — to use it would be the same as speaking modern Latvian to use "archaic" *dodu *Aivaru* in the sense of *dodu Aivaram*. Therefore, the precedents *Butta Tawas*, *Butta Rikians* should be either a misprint or composite words as **buttataws* „butatēvis“. For all that the authenticity of BPT *pēnega* as a case form nevertheless can hardly be questioned. The assumption of V. Mažiulis that accusative *-n* or genitive *-s* might have been omitted here³² does not persuade in so far as it is not clear for what reason *-n* or *-s* have been omitted. A. Girdenis and A. Rosinas' remark on the possible reduction of nasalized vowels in barytone position³³ does not help either, because there is no precedent for such orthography in all much later writings (as to *Butta (Tawas, Rikians)*, it is not accusative). Therefore, it may be truly believed that BPT *pēnega* is connected with East Baltic genitive form³⁴. Since no motives may be found to query the fact of O. Pr. gen. masc. *-as* and since both Baltic and Slavic genitives are widely used as partitive (cf. Lith. *duok pinigų, noriu miego, nematau vilko* — Baltic-Slavic-Finnish isogloss), the following conclusions straightly suggest themselves to be drawn:

1 — BPT *penega* is a relic of partitive;

2 — gen. masc. *-as* had existed also in eastern Baltic, where it was excluded by partitive form Lith. *-o*, Latv. *-a* < Balt. **-ō*³⁵.

To judge from O. Pr. *penega* West Baltic partitive must have developed from non-lengthened form of absolutive/dative (otherwise after back tongue *g* barytone **-ō* > O. Pr. **-ā* would have turned into O. Pr. *-ū*, *-ō* but not into *-a*). As separate paradigmatic case partitive had hardly ever functioned either in West, or in East Baltic. In both dialectal groups partitive was only one of the manifestations of absolutive/dative. Taking into consideration the baryton character of East Baltic *o*-stem genitive singular, it may be assumed that in East Baltic barytone form of

³² V. Mažiulis. Seniausias baltų rašto paminklas. — „Baltistica“, 1975, t. XI(2), p. 130 § 11.

³³ See Girdenis & Rosinas. Op. cit., p. 3.

³⁴ So Schmalstieg. Op. cit., p. 56.

³⁵ For barytone Balt. **-ō* > O. Pr. **-ā* see Mažiulis. BK, § 12.

absolutive/dative functioned as partitive/ablative while its oxytone form – as dative. As for West Baltic, dative and partitive were differentiated there not by tone but by the quantity of final vowel. Genitive functions arisen out of partitive functions in East Baltic, the older partitive began to compete with genitive – first and foremost with *o*-stem gen. *-as*, since in $\bar{a} = \bar{a}_2, C_2, i_2, u_2$ -stems there was no primary ergative/genitive form. Therefore, genitive form *-as* vanished as being redundant. Older existence of genitive *-as* is reflected by the relic of its ergativism – *o*-case functioning as genitivus auctoris. It is not clear in what way genitive functions may have arisen out of partitive functions. Perhaps it was due to the usage of some possessive partitive or due to the same origin of partitive and some possessive dative, e. g. dat. *vilkō* „vilkui“: dat. possess. *vilkō dantes* „(tai) vilkui dantys“ = part. *vilkō* „(būta) vilko“: part. possess. *x*; $x = \textit{vilkō dāntes} - \textit{„vilkō dantys“}$.

As similar processes had not taken place in West Baltic, the form of gen. masc. *-as* has there remained.

PASTABOS DĖL BALTŲ DEKLINACIJOS RAIDOS

Reziumė

Straipsnyje į baltų „prokalbę“ bandoma žiūrėti kaip į centrinę ide. arealinio bendrumo dalį prieš pat ide. „prokalbės“ skilimą. Todėl visi pagrindiniai procesai, vykę joje anuo metu, laikytini bendraindoeuropietiškais. Keliama mintis, kad tai buvo pereinamasis laikotarpis tarp ergatyvinės („aktyvinės“) ir nominatyvinės epochų ir kad tuo laikotarpiu deklinacijos sistemoje egzistavo kombinuojamieji linksniai, galėję aptarnauti tiek ergatyvinę, tiek nominatyvinę sandarą. Mėginama paaiškinti akuzatyvo nazalinio formanto kilmę iš archainio postpozicinio determinanto, kuris kiek ankstesnėje ide. „prokalbės“ epochoje buvo išriedėjęs į gyvųjų daiktų rodiklį. Remiantis visu tuo, pateikiamos ano meto baltų deklinacinių paradigmų rekonstrukcijos. Gale aptariama vėlesnių (nominatyvinių) laikų baltų *-o*-kamienio genityvo problema, spėjant, kad gen. *-as* egzistavęs tiek vakarų, tiek rytų baltuose, o BPT *pēnega* yra partityvinė forma. Rytų baltuose *o*-kamienio partityvo forma ėmė reikšti genityvą, išstumdama ankstesnę genityvinę *-as*.