

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Vilnius University

TWO BALTIC IRREGULAR PRETERITES:**LITH. *dāvė* “GAVE”, *ėmė* “TOOK”****Introduction**

1. As is well-known, the Baltic preterite is formed with just two suffixes, **-ā-* and **-ē-*. Both stand in complementary distribution with each other and are, with few exceptions, entirely predictable from the present and/or infinitive stem (see especially Schmid 1966).

The strong regularity of the Baltic preterite system strongly suggests that it is the result of a radical set of innovations in the prehistory of this branch. According to a major theory, the *ē*-preterite arose through contraction of an earlier composite suffix **-iā-*.¹ It may be convenient at this point to briefly survey the main arguments in favor of this view:

i) the *ē*-preterite is clearly original among *ia*-presents (Lith. *veikti*, *veikia*, *veikė* “do”) and causative-iteratives of the type *sakýti*, *sāko*, *sākė* “say”, the verbal classes in which a composite suffix **-iā-* (i.e., an *ā*-preterite added to a stem **-i-* extracted from *ia-* and *iā*-presents) could have originated;

ii) the *ē*-preterite is also proper to some types of thematic presents (Lith. *vėsti*, *vėda*, *vėdė* “lead”; *malti*, *māla*, *mālė* “grind”; *ginti*, *gina*, *gynė* “defend”; dial. *lipti*, *lipa*, *lipė* “climb”), but in virtually all cases there is evidence indicating that it has replaced an older *ā*-preterite (Latv. dial. *daga* < **degā* “burned (intr.)”; Lith. dial. *mālo*, Latv. *malu*; Lith. *lipu*, Latv. *lipu*). It thus seems that the *ē*-preterite underwent a certain expansion among typically transitive verbal classes. In some cases this certainly goes back to Proto-Baltic (Lith. *vėdė*, cf. Latv. dial. *vėdu*, OPr. *weddē-din*), whereas in other it was a fairly recent development of some East Baltic dialects (Lith. *mālė*);

iii) the regular length of the *ē*-preterite to TET- and TER-roots (Lith. *beĩti*, *bėria*, *bėrė* “strew, scatter”; *kũlti*, *kũlia*, *kũlė* “thrash”; *võgti*, *vãgia*,

¹ I refer to Villanueva Svensson 2005, with references, for a full argumentation of this view.

vōgē “steal”) is best explained as due to retraction of the ictus from **-ijā*. A parallel is furnished by the abstracts of the type *gēris* “goodness” < **ger-ijō-* (: *gēras* “good”), cf. Larsson 2004; Villanueva Svensson 2011b, 14f. As I will argue at length elsewhere, the pervasive tone variation of originally acute *ia*-presents like *grēbia* / *grēbia* “rakes”, *sprēndžia* / *spreñdžia* “decides” etc. most probably arose through the same sound law.

This scenario accounts for the vast majority of *ē*-preterites that we actually have. Exceptions do occur, but they are remarkably few (cf. Villanueva Svensson 2005, 248ff.). In this article I will be concerned with two utterly problematic and yet unexplained cases: Lith. *dāvė* “gave” and *ėmė* “took”.

Lith. *dāvė* “gave”

2. Apart from the preterite, the Baltic paradigm of the verb “to give” is perfectly clear: inf. **dō-tēi* (Lith. *dúoti*, Latv. *duōt/duôt*, OPr. *dāt, dātwei*), athem. pres. **dōd-'mi* (OLith. *dúomi, dúosi, dúosti*, OLatv. 1 sg. *duōmu*, 2 sg. *duōs*, OPr. 3rd *dāst*; thematized modern Lith. *dúoda*, Latv. *duōdu*), fully corresponding to OCS inf. *dati*, pres. *damь, dasi, dastь*. In the preterite there is more variation. Beside Lith. *dāvė* we have a preterite **devē* in Latvian and dialectal Lithuanian (parts of Žemaitian and Eastern Aukštaitian). In spite of its distribution, **devē* is generally regarded as secondary, due to a fronting **av* > **ev* before palatalized *v* (cf. acc. sg. Latv. *tevi* ~ Lith. *tavė* “you”; Latv. *revēt* ~ *ravēt*, Lith. *ravėti* “weed”). As observed by Stang (1966, 381), the antiquity of the stem **dav-* is almost proved by the vocalism of derivatives like Lith. *dovanà*, Latv. *dāvana* “gift”, Lith. *dōvis* “id.”, OLatv. *dawibes* “generosity”. The Old Prussian preterite *dai(ts)*, on the other hand, goes back to **dō-jā*. Since OPr. *dai(ts)* is predicted in the system (Baltic preterites to stems ending in a long vowel are regularly formed with **-jā*), it seems clear that it represents a secondary regularization and that the irregular Lith. *dāvė* continues the Proto-Baltic preterite of the verb “to give”.

The main problem with *dāvė*, of course, is the stem **dav-*. In principle one would expect a preterite **dō-jā* (Lith. †*dúojo*). If the presentation of the *ē*-preterite outlined above is correct (§ 1), the tense formant of *dāv-ė* must be regarded as problematic as well. The odd alternation **dō-* : **dav-*, to be sure, is not entirely isolated. An exact parallel is furnished by Lith. *šlúoti, šlúoja, šlāvē* “sweep” and, with the *ā*-preterite, by the denominative type Lith. *mel-úoti, -úoja, -āvo*, Latv. *mēl-uôt, -uōju, -uōju*, dial. *-avu* “lie” (: Lith. *mēlas*, Latv. *mēli* “lie”). We will return to these formations below (§ 6).

3. In an Indo-European perspective it is customary to derive *dāvē* from a variant **deh₃u-* or **deu-* of the root **deh₃-* “to give”.² **deh₃u-* (with zero grade **duh₃-* < **dh₃u-* and eventually a new full grade **deuh₃-*) could be interpreted as a *u*-enlargement of **deh₃-* perhaps going back, in the last instance, to a *u*-stem nominal or a *u*-present, whereas the existence of **deu-* beside **deh₃-* could be weakly justified by potential parallels like **drem-* ~ **dreh₂-* ~ **dreu-* “run”.³ There are several reasons to consider this a very unlikely solution.

Leaving Baltic aside, the main evidence for a root **deh₃u-* (*vel. sim.*) comes from some Italic modal forms: OLat. subj. *duim*, *duam*, Fal. *douiad*, Um. *purdouito*, **purtuvitu** “let him offer” (< **por-douūtōd*). Other alleged verbal reflexes (Gk. Cypr. inf. *downai*, opt. *duwanoi*, OCS *-davati* “give”) are probably false, or at least too insecure to seriously count as supportive evidence.⁴ One can add a few isolated nominals like Ved. *dúvas-* n. “reward” (< **duh₃-es-*), OIr. *dúas* f. “reward given to poets” (< **deh₃u-s-tah₂-*), or Lat. *dautia*, *-ōrum* “hospitality gifts” (< **doh₃u-et-īo-*, *vel. sim.*). These, in any case, could be explained as secondary derivatives from an obsolete *u*-stem **dó/éh₃u-* “gift”, later replaced by the familiar **doh₃no-*, **doh₃ro-*.⁵ In the end the evidence for a “real” verbal root comes down to the Italic forms quoted above, which constitute a traditional crux on their own. The issue cannot be discussed at length here.⁶ For present purposes it is enough to stress that the existence of a root variant **deh₃u-* or **deu-* can hardly be regarded as certain.

A second and more important objection concerns the alleged creation of a “suppletive” paradigm in Baltic. Let us suppose, for a moment, that Balto-

² E.g. Endzelin 1923, 679; Stang 1966, 76, 381; IEW, 225f.; LIV, 107, among others.

³ Here I am tacitly disregarding other proposed accounts of the *-u-* of OLat. *duim*, Lith. *dāvē*, like the idea that **-ou-* was the regular reflex of **-e/oh₃-* before vowels (e.g. Stang 1966, 76, with reference to Martinet), or Schmalstieg’s reconstruction of the root “to give” as **dou-*, later monophthongized into **dō-* (Schmalstieg 2000, 79f., 192).

⁴ The Cyprian infinitive *downai* may be directly equated with Ved. inf. *dā-vāne* “to give” or derive from **dō-enai* with secondary glide. The optative *duwanoi* probably does not exist, cf. Cowgill 1964, 352ff. Sl. **davāti* (OCS *-davati*, Ru. *davát’* etc.) is almost certainly a recent replacement of OCS *dajati* on the model of imperfectives with etymological *-v-* like *byvati* “be” (cf. Tedesco *apud* Cowgill 1964, 355; Vaillant 1966, 485).

⁵ Cf. Wodtko, Irslinger, Schneider 2008, 61, 65f.²¹⁻³⁰, with references.

⁶ See Vine 2006, 239f., with references, for a brief discussion.

Slavic inherited a PIE root aorist **déh₃u-t* “gave” (*vel sim.*) beside the “normal” paradigm pres. **dé-deh₃-ti*, aor. **déh₃-t* (Ved. *dádāti* : *ádāt*, Gk. *δίδωμι* : *ἔδωκα*). Since the later is directly continued in OCS pres. *damъ* (3 sg. *dastъ*), aor. *daxъ* (3 sg. *da(stъ)*), it follows that Baltic must have inherited a preterite stem **dó-* beside pres. **dód-'mi* and inf. **'dó-těi*. It is hard to see what could be the motivation to replace a perfectly acceptable preterite **dó-jā* in the prehistory of Baltic. I am not aware of any scenario explaining this, and it is indeed an extremely difficult position to maintain.

A final problem is that this account of *dāvē* does not embrace the obviously related Lith. *šlāvė, mel-āvo* (: *šlúoti, mel-úoti*). These would have to be explained either as analogical to *dāvē* or in some other way (see below § 6). This is needless to say unattractive.

In brief, the relative popularity of the idea that Lith. *dāvē* continues a *u*-variant of the root “to give” is quite undeserved. If one continues looking for an Indo-European origin of the *-v-* of *dāvē*, the only option left seems to be a direct equation with the Vedic perfect 1/3 sg. *dadáu* “gave” (e.g. Stang 1942, 195ff.; Kortlandt 1995, 142).⁷ The problems surrounding the perfect type *jajñáu* need not be discussed here. The fatal objection, of course, is that the Baltic preterite otherwise never continues PIE perfects (preserved PIE perfects regularly surface as independent verbs, e.g. Lith. *stovėti, stóvi* “stand” ~ Ved. *tastháu*, Gk. *ἔστηκα*).⁸ In addition, this solution would leave us with the problem of finding a rationale for the presence of two different preterite stems in Balto-Slavic, one predictably going back to the PIE root aorist (OCS *daxъ*), the other an isolated relic of the PIE perfect (Lith. *dāvē*).

4. In general terms, it is difficult to imagine that Baltic could have inherited anything else than a root aorist **dó-* or sigmatized **dó-s-* (: OCS *da(stъ)*), which in principle should have ended up as pret. **dō-jā* (Lith. *†dúojo*). This implies that *dāvē* (as well as *šlāvė, sapnāvo*) must reflect a specifically Baltic development that is still to be discovered. I am aware of the following inner-Baltic accounts of *dāvē*, none of them particularly satisfactory:

⁷ To be sure, the verb “to give” almost certainly did not make a perfect in the parent language. It nevertheless remains possible that a perfect had been created in the prehistory of Balto-Slavic.

⁸ A curious variant of the “perfect approach” to *dāvē* was the idea that the variant **devē* goes back, in the last instance, to the reduplicated perfect participle **dedo-* (: Ved. *dadvās-*), e.g. Endzselin 1923, 679, with references; Stang 1942, 195ff. Criticism in Stang 1966, 381.

Vaillant (1966, 452) suggests that Lith. *dāvė* was secondarily built to the infinitive stem **dúo-* with the alternation *uo : av* of the type Lith. *-úoti, -úoja, -āvo*. Although the neo-ablaut *uo : av* is a fact in East Baltic (see below § 5.2), I fail to see the motivation to replace the expected preterite **dō-jā*.

Bammesberger (1982, 246ff.) proposes that **dav-* originated in the preterite participle. The nom. sg. **da-ūōs* or **dō-ūōs* was reanalyzed as **daū-ōs/*dōū-ōs* on the model of roots ending in a labial (e.g. **lip-ūōs > *lip-ōs*), later triggering a remodeling of the oblique stem **daus-* (< **da-us-* or **dō-us-*) as **daū-us-*, to which the new preterite **daū-ē-* would be a retrograde formation. The preterite participle, however, is not otherwise known to have exercised any influence on the Baltic preterite. Bammesberger's scenario, in any case, involves too much analogy to be credible.

Cowgill (1964, 355), building on Mahlow (1879, 83), starts from the assumption that the diphthongization **ō > uo* passed through an intermediate stage **ō^u* ([o^u]). The preterite suffixes **-ā-*, **-ē-* were added precisely at this stage: **dō-t-*, **sapn-ō-t-> *dou-t-*, **sapn-o^u-t- → *dou-ē-*, **sapn-o^u-ā- > dāvē, sapnāvo*. In spite of its inherent attractiveness, this scenario creates severe problems of relative chronology. The diphthongization of **ō* is a relatively late East Baltic phenomenon. The rebuilding of the preterite system, on the other hand, seems to be an accomplished fact already in Proto-Baltic.

5. To conclude, at present there is no entirely satisfactory account of *dāvė*. Before proceeding further, it may be convenient to briefly remember the main points that a proper explanation of *dāvė* should necessarily fulfill: i) Baltic can hardly have inherited anything else than a preterite stem **dō-* (or sigmatized **dō-s-*), ii) the creation of a preterite stem **dav-* must be somehow related to the general rebuilding of the preterite system, iii) *šlāvė, sapnāvo* should reflect the same process (put it otherwise, the pattern inf. **ó-tēi-* : pret. **óav-* is systematic, a fact indicating that the development leading to **dav-* must have targeted all verbal stems ending in **ō-*).

Schematically, I propose the following development: **dō(-s)- → *dō-vā- → *dōv-jā- > *dav-jā- → *dav-ē-*.

5.1. The first two steps (**dō(-s)- → *dō-vā- → *dōv-jā-*) are best seen in connection with the generalization of the *ā*-preterite to (virtually) all verbs in the prehistory of Baltic. This obviously created a problem in the case of verbal stems ending in a vowel (**dē-*, **stā-*, deverbatives and denominatives in **-ē-*, **-ā-*, etc.), where the necessity to avoid an odd hiatus **dē-ā-*, **stā-ā-*, **bud-ē-ā-*, **bij-ā-ā-* must have been felt quite early. The solution adopted by

Baltic, as is well known, was to generalize an allomorph **-jā-* to all stems in **^oĒ-*: **dē-jā-*, **stā-jā-*, **bud-ē-jā-*, **bij-ā-jā-* (Lith. *dėjo*, *stójo*, *budėjo*, *bijójo*, inf. Lith. *dėti* “put”, *stóti* “stand up”, *budėti* “be awake”, *bijóti* “be afraid”). The allomorph **-jā-* was most probably extracted from roots ending in **^oj-* (e.g. Lith. dial. *lieti*, *lėja*, *lėjo* “pour”, *lýti*, *lýja*, *lįjo* “rain”), but the ultimate origin of this variant is not of prime importance in our present context. Roots ending in **^oū-* and **^ov-*, on the other hand, predictably made a preterite in **^ov-ā-* (e.g. Lith. *púti*, *pústa*, *pùvo* “rot”; *siúti*, *siúva*, *siùvo* “sew”; *káuti*, *-ja/-na*, *kóvė*, dial. *kāvo* “beat; fight”; denom. *uogáuti*, *-áuja*, *-āvo*), where, descriptively, *-v-* takes the place of the more common *Hiatusstilger -j-*.

My claim is that verbal stems ending in **^oō-* did not at first insert **-j-* between the stem vowel and the tense marker, but **-v-*: **dō-vā-*, **ślō-vā-*, **sapn-ō-vā-*. Put it otherwise, the hiatus-breaking glide was at first dependent on the quality of the stem vowel. This rule probably did not last for long. At a later stage the rule was generalized that all stems ending in a vowel presented the allomorph **-jā-*. My second claim is that **dō-vā-*, **ślō-vā-*, **sapn-ō-vā-* were not regularized as **dō-jā-*, **ślō-jā-*, **sapn-ō-jā-*, as one could perhaps expect, but added **-jā-* to the already existing preterite stems **dō-vā-*, **ślō-vā-*, **sapn-ō-vā-*, thus giving rise to **dōv-jā-*, **ślōv-jā-*, **sapn-ōv-jā-*. The newly obtained preterites **dōv-jā-*, **ślōv-jā-*, **sapn-ōv-jā-* were subsequently shortened to **dav-jā-*, **ślav-jā-*, **savn-av-jā-* according to the Baltic version of Osthoff’s law.

5.2. The last statement (the only one in this scenario that operates with regular sound law and not with analogy) requires a brief excursus in view of the widespread idea that the *lautgesetzlich* result of **ōu* in Lithuanian and Latvian was *uo*.⁹ The main arguments for this view are i) the *u*-stem loc. sg. Žem. *-ōu*, *-ū*, Latv. dial. *-uo* < EBL. **-ō* < **-ōu*, ii) the presence of *uo* in the *u*-series of ablaut, e.g. *duobē* “pit, hole”, *dúobti/duōbti* “hollow out” : *daubà* “hollow” : *dubùs* “deep”, *duburýs* “waterhole”; *kúopa* “heap, pile”, *kuōpti* “pile up, cleanse” : *kaūpas* “heap, pile”, *kaūpti* “heap up, accumulate” : *kupetà* “stack”, etc. There are well over forty such cases.

The probative value of the locative singular, however, is immediately compromised by the contrast between thematic dat. sg. **-ōi* > **-uoi* > Lith.

⁹ See specially Būga 1921[1959], 349–362, whose position is followed in most handbooks, e.g. Endzelin 1923, 39; Stang 1966, 47, 75ff. It is immaterial in our present connection whether **ōu* > Lith., Latv. *uo* would imply an early Baltic reduction **ōu* > **ō* or was a specifically East Baltic process **ōu* > **uou* > *uo*.

-ui and inst. pl. *-ōis > Lith. -ais, which indicate that long diphthongs were preserved in absolute final position after they had been shortened in tautosyllabic position. As for the second argument, what we have are doublets with -uo- and -au- displaying basically the same meaning (*spúogas* “pimple” : *spáugas* “id.”, *kúogė* “hay-stack” : *káugė* “id.”, *laupyti* “tear” : *luopyti* “id.”, etc.), -uo- being usually of a narrower dialectal distribution than -au-.¹⁰ It is clear that this type of material is fully irrelevant to determine the original reflex of *ōu in Baltic. The ō-grade, in any case, was comparatively rare in Indo-European and I am not aware of any attempt to trace back a single instance of -uo- to a *bona fide* Indo-European, Balto-Slavic or even Proto-Baltic source with *-ōu-.¹¹ The few instances of inherited *-ōu- one can seriously discuss, as expected, actually surface as -áu- (e.g. *pláusti*, -*džia* “wash” < **plōud-eje/o-* < **ploud-éje/o-* [Winter’s law], *pláuti*, -*ja/-na* “wash”, Latv. *laūks* “field”, if from Narten causative **plōu-eje/o-* and *vřddhi* derivative **lōuk-o-*, respectively). The list of problems associated to the “*ōu > uo theory” could easily be extended (part of the material traditionally included in the *uo* : (*i*)*au* : *ũ* series of ablaut, for instance, is etymologically dubious), but what has been said suffices to view it with outmost skepticism.¹²

5.3. There is thus, I believe, no particular obstacle to assume that **dōv-jā-*, **ślōv-jā-*, **sapn-ōv-jā-* regularly gave **dav-jā-*, **ślav-jā-*, **sapn-av-jā-*. The resulting preterites were still unsatisfactory, as they involved an allomorph *-*jā-* that was otherwise exclusive of roots ending in a long vowel. The oddity of **dav-jā-*, **ślav-jā-*, **sapn-av-jā-* must have become particularly urgent when *-*ijā* was contracted to *-*ē*, thus giving rise to the *ē*-preterite (**lek-ijā* > **lēk-ē* > Lith. *lėkė* “flew, ran”, etc.). This left **dav-jā-*, **ślav-jā-*, **sapn-av-jā-* without support in the system. The only solutions left were either to rebuild them entirely as **dō-jā-*, **ślō-jā-*, **sapn-ō-jā-*, or to replace the *-*jā-* of **dav-jā-*, **ślav-jā-*, **sapn-av-jā-* with either the *ā-* or the

¹⁰ See Karaliūnas 1987, 206ff. for the dialectal distribution and relative chronology of -uo- : -au- doublets.

¹¹ An exception is Karaliūnas 1987, 189ff., 200ff., but his reconstruction of a PIE paradigm 1 sg. **plōu-ō*, 3 sg. **plōu-e/o*, 1 pl. **ploū-mé* cannot be upheld.

¹² A different question is how -uo- (< *-ō-) came to be included in the *u*-series of ablaut. The best option is probably Kuryłowicz’s proposal that it was analogical to the newly created *i*-series of ablaut **ē* : *ei*, *ai* : *ĩ* after the monophthongization **ei*, **ai* > **ē* (> *ie*) in some contexts (Kuryłowicz 1956, 122ff.; followed by Mažiulis 1970, 49 or Smoczyński 2007, 133 and *passim*).

\bar{e} -preterite. The first option is the one found in Old Prussian *dai(ts)*, but it is impossible to determine which Proto-Baltic form (**dav-jā-* or **dav-ē-*) did pre-Prussian **dō-jā* actually replace. As mentioned above (§ 1), once established in the system the \bar{e} -preterite began to spread to other transitive verb types. Most of this process is fairly recent, but at least in the case of *e*-grade thematic presents like Lith. *vėsti, vėda, vėdė* “lead” it seems to have taken place already in Proto-Baltic. It is reasonable to suppose that the earliest expansion of the \bar{e} -preterite targeted some irregular transitive verbs as well. The preterite of the verb “to give” (**dav-jā-* → **dav-ē-* > Lith. *dāvė*) was probably one of those cases. It may well have been supported by its antonym **ēm-ē* “took” (Lith. *ėmė*), in all probability one of the first non-original \bar{e} -preterites as well (see below § 10).

6. In the preceding section I have tacitly assumed that the preterites Lith. *šlāvė, mel-āvo* arose in the same way as *dāvė*. Unfortunately, both items present serious problems of their own.

6.1. Lith. *šlúoti* “sweep” is traditionally derived from a root **k̂leu-*, **k̂leuH-* or **k̂leHu-* (e.g. IEW, 607; LIV, 335), otherwise only known from Lat. *clo(u)āca* “sewer, underground drainage” (ultimately from **k̂leu[H]-o-?*, cf. Vine 2006, 216f.) and, extended with **-d-*, from Gmc. **hlūtra-* “pure, clean” < **k̂luH-d-ro-* (Go. *hlūtrs*, OE *hlūt(t)or*, OHG *hlūt(t)ar*) and Gk. *κλύζω* “wash, clean” < **k̂lu-d-je/o-*, which actually diverge in vocalism. Other alleged material is too problematic to be included in the discussion.¹³ In Baltic there is evidence both for a diphthongal root in *°u-* and for an otherwise unknown base **sló-*. The later is that of the primary verb inf. *šlúoti*, pres. *šlúoja* and of derivatives like iter. *šlúostyti* “wipe”, Lith. *šlúota*, Latv. *sluōta* “broom”. The former is found in the weakly attested Žemaitian present *šlāva* and in a number of derivatives that could in principle be dependent on the preterite *šlāvė*: Lith. *šlavinėti* “sweep (iter.)”, abstract *šlavimas* “sweeping”, Latv. pl. *slāumi, slaūmi* “sweepings” (< **slavumi*). The antiquity of the diphthongal root is moderately supported by Lith. *šliaūkti* “brush off, sweep off; strike”, *šlaukyti* “sweep (iter.)” (: Latv. *slāukt, slāucīt*) which, interestingly, point to an *aniṭ* root **k̂leu(-k)-*. EBl. **sló-* has been predictably derived from **k̂lōu-*, but we have already seen that the sound law **ōu* (> **ō*) > *uo* is almost certainly

¹³ Lat. *cluere* (Plin. nat. 15, 119), *cloāre* (Serv. auct. Verg. A. 1, 720) are attested only once each and are strongly suspect of being grammarians constructs (cf. Ernout-Meillet DELL 128). W. *clir* “clear, bright, pure” (usually derived from **k̂lū-ro-*) is probably a loan word from English *clear* (cf. Zair 2012, 115).

false (§ 5.2) and would anyway leave us with the problem of accounting for an \bar{o} -grade in the infinitive(-aorist) stem. Reconstructions like $*\hat{k}leh_3u-tei-$ or $*\hat{k}louH-tei-$ will not help either, as these would have given Bl. $*\acute{s}l\acute{a}u-$. Analogy with the preterite $\acute{s}l\acute{a}v\acute{e}$ on the model of $d\acute{u}oti : d\acute{a}v\acute{e}$, as sometimes assumed (e.g. Stang 1966, 360; Smoczyński 2007, 647), is equally problematic. Had Baltic only inherited a diphthongal root (be it $se\check{t}$ or $ani\check{t}$), it is difficult to imagine why a paradigm like $*\acute{s}l\acute{a}uti$, $*\acute{s}l\acute{a}va$, $*\acute{s}l\acute{a}v\acute{a}$ should have been reshaped analogically instead of simply joining the dominant type $bli\acute{a}uti$, $bli\acute{a}uja/-na$, $bli\acute{o}v\acute{e}$. If the traditional etymology is accepted and the rare Žem. $\acute{s}l\acute{a}va$ is really the original primary present and not a late neologism, one has to accept that Baltic inherited an aorist-infinitive stem $*\acute{s}l\acute{o}-$ (most naturally derived from a PIE aorist $*\hat{k}l\acute{e}h_3-t$) beside a variant $*\acute{s}l\acute{a}u-$ that could perhaps inherit a u -present $*\hat{k}leH-u-$.¹⁴ The extra-Baltic evidence is probably compatible with such an account, but its problematic nature automatically undermines any attempt to reconstruct even the Indo-European root shape.

To return to pret. $\acute{s}l\acute{a}v\acute{e}$, even if the observations presented above are incorrect the identity of the infinitive and preterite stems is so systematic in Baltic that it immediately favors a scenario accounting for $\acute{s}l\acute{u}oti : \acute{s}l\acute{a}v\acute{e}$ in the same way as $d\acute{u}oti : d\acute{a}v\acute{e}$ over one operating with suppletivism or analogy. The selection of the \bar{e} -preterite was probably due to the transitivity of $\acute{s}l\acute{u}oti$, eventually supported by the present $\acute{s}l\acute{u}o-ja$ (if old) and by $d\acute{a}v\acute{e}$ itself. But it is actually uncertain that the Proto-Baltic preterite was $*\acute{s}l\acute{a}v-\bar{e}$ and not $*\acute{s}l\acute{a}v-\bar{a}$.

6.2. We can distinguish two main positions concerning the origin of the denominative suffix Lith. $-\acute{u}oti$, $-\acute{u}oja$, $-\acute{a}vo$, Latv. $-u\acute{o}\check{t}$, $-u\acute{o}\check{ju}$, $-u\acute{o}\check{ju}$ (dial. $-avu$):

i) EBl. $*-\acute{o}ti$, $*-\acute{o}ja$, $*-av\acute{a}$ is genetically related to the denominative suffix Lith. $-\acute{a}uti$, $-\acute{a}uja$, $-\acute{a}vo$, both stemming through paradigm split from a unitary Balto-Slavic paradigm cognate with OPr. $-aut$, OCS $-ovati$, $-uj\check{o}$; e.g. Vaillant 1966, 352f.; Kortlandt 1995;

ii) EBl. $*-\acute{o}ti$, $*-\acute{o}ja$, $*-av\acute{a}$ is (in)directly related to the Greek denominative type $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{o}\omega$ “enslave”. The suffix “ $*-\bar{o}-\acute{i}e/o-$ ” was independently back formed in both languages from deinstrumental to -adjectives like Lith. $rag\acute{u}otas$ “horned”, Gk. $\chi\omicron\lambda\omega\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ “angry”, Lat. $aegr\acute{o}tus$ “sick” (< $*-oh_1-t\acute{o}-$); e.g. Endzelin 1923, 627f.; Stang 1966, 364.

The first option entails operating with some version of the $*\bar{o}u > uo$ theory (as Vaillant 1950, 121 and Kortlandt, *loc. cit.*, actually do), but we have

¹⁴ Similarly (but with a different reconstruction of the morphology) Rasmussen 1989, 71.

already seen that such a sound law hardly stands scrutiny. Leaving the preterite **-avā* aside, the main argument for assuming a common origin of Lith. *-úoti* and *-áuti* is the absence of the former in Old Prussian and Slavic, but in these languages a suffix **-ō-īe/o-* would have merged with the larger group of denominatives and deverbatives in **-ā-īe/o-* and it would now be virtually impossible to identify it. As for the second option, it will be enough here to note that the case for an Indo-European denominative suffix **-oh₁-īe/o-* has been considerably strengthened in recent years due to the discovery of its possible existence in Old Phrygian (3 sg. opt. *kakoioi*, *kakuioi*), Gaulish (1 sg. fut. *marcosior*), eventually in other languages as well (see Peters 1999, 310⁴⁴ for Anatolian, Indo-Iranian and Germanic; Malzahn 2010, 401ff. for Tocharian). I refer to Peters 1999 for a full treatment. Although the issue cannot be regarded as definitively settled, I see no serious obstacle for assuming that Lith. *-úoja* continues a formation of considerable antiquity.

As for the preterite *mel-āvo*, its relationship to pres. *-uoja*, inf. *-uoti* can now be straightforwardly understood: Bl.-Sl. aor. **-ō-s-* (*vel. sim.*) → Bl. pret. **-ō-vā-* → **-ōv-jā-* > **-av-jā-* → **-av-ā-*. There is thus no necessity to discuss former accounts of pret. **-avā* within the “**-ō(īe/o)*-theory” (for which see Endzelin, Stang, *loc. cit.*). At any rate, it cannot anymore be used to back a connection between *-uoti* and *-auti*. The selection of the *ā*-preterite was probably due to the fact that **-ā-* was the only preterite suffix among denominatives, and it was eventually supported by the preterite of the type *-áuti*, *-áuja*, *-āvo*.

Lith. *ẽmẽ* “took”

7. The reconstruction of “to take” is more involved than that of “to give”. Beside the standard (and fully irregular) Lithuanian paradigm *iĩnti*, *ĩma*, *ẽmẽ* a present (*j*)*ẽma* is well established in Žemaitian. Other dialectal variants (pret. *ẽmẽ*, *imẽ*) are rare and clearly secondary. The Latvian facts are particularly complicated because of the contamination between *jemt* (**h₁em-*) and *nemt* (**nem(h₁)-*). ME (s.v.) gives the following paradigms for dial. *jemt*, *nemt* and standard *ņemt*: a) *jeĩnt/jẽĩnt/jiĩnt*, *jẽmu/jẽmju*, *jẽmu/jẽmu/jẽmu²(ẽ)*, b) *neĩnt*, *ņẽmu*, *nẽmu*, c) *ņeĩnt/ņeĩnt/ņiĩnt*, *ņemu*, *ņẽmu/ņẽmu/ņẽmu(ẽ)*. In contrast with Lithuanian and Latvian, Old Prussian only presents zero grade of the root: inf. *ĩmt*, pres. 1 sg. *imma*, 1 pl. *immimai*, 2 pl. *immati* (Ench.), pret. *ymmĩts*, *jmmĩtz* (1st Catechism), *ymmeyts*, *ymmeyts* (2nd Catechism), *imma(ts)* (Ench.).

The evidence raises several issues, especially concerning the present and the preterite (only the reconstruction of inf. **iĩn-tei-* seems fairly certain). Several

scholars have taken the present Lith. dial. *(j)ẽma* (: Latv. *jẽmu*) to be older than Lith. *ìma* (: OPr. *imma*),¹⁵ but I fail to see how this can be correct. Had the Baltic paradigm been pres. **em-a*, inf. **iĩ-tei-*, pret. **ẽm-ē*, it is difficult to imagine why Prussian generalized the vocalism of the infinitive stem instead of simply replacing it with **eĩ-tei-*. The creation of Lith. *ìma* would be equally problematic. In principle one would expect the paradigm to be regularized either as †*eĩti*, *ẽma*, *ẽmė/ẽmė* or as †*iĩti*, *ẽma*, *imė/imo* (the infinitive regularly patterns with the preterite). To be sure, starting from **im-a* the creation of Žem. *(j)ẽma* is not absolutely clear either (but decidedly less strange than **ema* → **ima* in Prussian and Aukštaitian). Parallels for pres. *e* : pret. *ē* are of course not lacking (*vẽmia* : *vėmė*, *lẽmia* : *lėmė*, etc.; inf. *vėmti* “vomit”, *leĩti* “predetermine”), but they regularly involve *ia*-presents, not *a*-presents. They may anyway have provided a model to regularize, at least in part, a fully aberrant paradigm. The case of Latvian is different. The acute intonation of *jeĩt/jeĩt/jĩt* was most probably taken from its synonym *neĩt/neĩt/ņĩt*, whose thematic present *ņemu* is certainly old (: Gk. *véμω* “deal out, distribute”, Go. *niman* “take”).¹⁶ The creation of pres. *jẽmu* must thus have been strongly supported (if not directly determined) by the previous existence of *ņemu*. One could speculate that a lost **nẽma* was responsible for Žem. *(j)ẽma* as well.

The reconstruction of the present as **ima* is important for determining the original preterite. The paradigm Lith. *iĩti*, *ìma*, *ẽmė* is so unique that it almost proves the antiquity of pret. **ẽm-ē*. The generalization of the zero grade in Old Prussian is an easily understood innovation. Curiously, the Enchiridion presents an *ā*-preterite *imma(ts)* in contrast with the *ē*-preterite of the 1st and 2nd Catechisms. It must represent a secondary regularization, perhaps imputable to Abel Will alone. As for the acute intonation of Latv. *jẽmu/jẽmu*, we have already seen that it was most probably taken from *ņẽmu/ņẽmu*. The replacement of inf. **(j)iĩti* by **(j)ėmti* on the model of **neĩti* almost automatically entailed a parallel rebuilding of the preterite. Note, finally, the circumflex variant *ņẽmu (jẽmu²)*, presumably to be equated with Lith. *ẽmė*.¹⁷

¹⁵ E.g. Kazlauskas 1968, 360; Petit 2004, 338f.; LIV, 236; Smoczyński 2007, 220, among others.

¹⁶ The prehistory of *nemt/ņemt/ņimt* is discussed in Villanueva Svensson 2011a, 321.

¹⁷ Pace Tremblay (2005, 657⁸⁵) <*ẽmjau*> in Klein’s *Compendium* does not imply acute *ẽmiau*, as Klein also uses <*ė*> in unstressed position, cf. Šinkūnas 2010, 75ff., 92ff.

I thus conclude that Lith. *iĩti*, *ĩma*, *ẽmẽ* faithfully continues the Proto-Baltic paradigm of the verb “to take”, as already clearly seen by Stang (1942, 117; 1966, 381). The problem is not the preterite **ẽm-ẽ* itself (cf. Lith. *lẽmẽ*, *rẽmẽ*, etc.), but the whole paradigm to which it belongs.

8. Before returning to **ẽm-ẽ* it will be convenient to discuss the Indo-European averbo of **h₁em-* “to take” (LIV, 236), attested with certainty only in Italo-Celtic and Balto-Slavic.¹⁸ Italic and Celtic agree in having a thematic present **h₁ẽm-e/o-* (Lat. *emō*, OIr. *-eim*), but otherwise disagree. The Old Irish *t*-preterite *-ét* has been derived from a sigmatic aorist **h₁ẽm-s-t* (e.g. Schumacher 2004, 65f., 292), but can also derive from a root aorist (or imperfect?) **h₁em-t* (e.g. Jasanoff 2012, 133). Lat. *ẽmĩ* is traditionally derived from a perfect **h₁e-h₁(o)m-*, but its interpretation will naturally depend on one’s views concerning the Latin long-vowel preterite. Meiser (2003, 199) considers Lat. impv. *em* “take!” a relic of the original root aorist, but *em* can simply be an irregularly shortened imperative of the type *fac*, *dĩc*, *dũc*. Finally, Os. perf. fut. 3 sg. *pert-emust*, perf. 3 pl. **emmens** probably stem from **em-* (< **h₁em-t*), but **ẽm-* (: Lat. *ẽmĩ*) is not categorically excluded, cf. Meiser 2003, 73, 199, with references.

In Slavic we find an unusual aspectual contrast between OCS perfective *imŏ* (< **jbmŏ*), *jeŕti*, aor. *jeřsb*, *jeřtb* “take” and imperfective *jemljŏ*, *imati*, *imaxb* (< **jbm-a-*), both seemingly primary verbs.¹⁹ Unfortunately, whereas the present *imŏ* fully agrees with Bl. **ima*, inf. *jeŕti* and aor. *jeřtb* are ambiguous between **im-* (: Lith. *iĩti*) and **ẽm-* (: Lith. *ẽmẽ*). If, as seems likely (see below), **h₁em-* was an aoristic root, one would favor **em-* (cf. e.g. OCS *žbrŏ*, *žřeti*, *žřětb* “swallow” [to the aoristic root **g^werh₃₋*, LIV, 211f.] vs. *trb(j)ŏ*, *trbtĩ*, *trb* “rub” [to the present root **terh₁₋*, LIV, 632f.]), but this criterion is not conclusive. As for *jemljŏ*, *imati*, Vaillant (1966, 310; followed by LIV, 236) considers it a fairly old type of derived imperfective (iterative), later replaced by the familiar type with lengthened grade. I am not aware of any independent evidence supporting such a derivational analysis of *jemljŏ*. This seems to leave us with two alternatives: i) Slavic inherited two primary presents, **im-e-* and **em-je-*, that somehow came to be opposed as perfective : imperfective when the Slavic aspectual system was formed (e.g. Tedesco 1948, 366);

¹⁸ I omit Hitt. *wemiya-mi* “find” (whose analysis as preverb **u* + **h₁em-* is quite uncertain, cf. Kloekhorst 2008, 999) and Toch. A *yom-*, B *yānm-* “achieve, reach” (which may belong to **iem-* [LIV, 312], cf. Malzahn 2010, 796).

¹⁹ I leave out of consideration the utterly problematic *imamb*, *iměti* “have”, which has no direct impact on Baltic.

ii) Slavic inherited a Baltic-like paradigm pres. **em-(j)e-* or **im-(j)e-*, inf. **im-ti*, aor. **em-t* (*vel sim.*) that split into two independent verbs (e.g. Petit 2004, 339f.). Both possibilities entail complicated scenarios and are liable to various objections. Here I would only like to stress the following points: i) internal reconstruction clearly points to a Baltic zero-grade present **ima*, which practically proves the Balto-Slavic antiquity of OCS *imǫ*; ii) the Baltic preterite **ē̃m-ē̃* favors deriving OCS aor. *jetv* from full-grade **em-* or lengthened-grade **ēm-*; iii) even if the Baltic infinitive **im-tei-* is inherited from Balto-Slavic, the null hypothesis for Slavic is that OCS inf. *jeti* continues **ē̃m-ti*, with the same vocalism as the aorist. Put it otherwise, a strict Balto-Slavic perspective only strengthens the equation Lith. *ima*, *iṃti*, *ē̃mė* = OCS *imǫ*, *jeti*, *jetv* (as correctly appreciated by Stang 1966, 381). OCS *jemljǫ*, *imati* is admittedly not accounted for under this reconstruction. It may indeed continue an old present (: Lat. *emō*, OIr. *-eim?*) that simply went out of use in Baltic. As a final possibility (but one that is bound to remain controversial), I would suggest a contamination of **h₁em-* and **nem(h₁)-* parallel to that of Latvian and, perhaps, Žemaitian. A present root like **nem(h₁)-* (PIE pres. **ném(h₁)-e/o-*) would most probably have given Bl.-Sl. pres. **nemH-e-ti*, inf. **nṃH-tei-*, aor. **nṃH-ā-* and subsequently (pre-)Sl. **nem-(j)e-*, **nim-ā-ti*, **nim-ā-s-*.²⁰ If this verb was kept long enough in the prehistory of Slavic, it seems perfectly possible to me that it was analogically reshaped as **jem-je-*, **jbm-a-*, with secondary adoption of the anlaut of **jbm-e-*, **je-*. The aspectual contrast between them can perhaps be explained in this way.

The aspectual profile of the root **h₁em-* is not absolutely certain. The present stems Italo-Celtic **em-e/o-* and Balto-Slavic **im-e/o-* could be routinely joined under a PIE athematic present **h₁ém-ti/*h₁m-énti* (e.g. Ernout-Meillet DELL 196), but the preterites OIr. *-ét*, Os. *pert-emust*, OCS *jetv*, Lith. *ē̃mė* are most naturally derived from a root aorist **h₁ém-t* (e.g. LIV, 236). If the later option is correct, Bl.-Sl. **im-e/o-* would be an innovated present according to an established pattern in this family (see below § 10), whereas It.-Celt. **em-e/o-* would be best taken as a displaced root aorist subjunctive (as stated above, the evidence for a Balto-Slavic present **em-(i)e/o-* is extremely fragile). Put it otherwise, the root **h₁em-* either did not make a present in the parent language or, if it did, it cannot be reconstructed on the available evidence.

²⁰ I cannot here devote the necessary space to argue for this reconstruction, cf. Villanueva Svensson 2011a, 318ff.

9. We can now return to Bl. $*\tilde{e}m\bar{e}$ (Lith. $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$). In an Indo-European perspective it has been customary to equate Lith. $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$ with Lat. $\bar{e}m\bar{i}$. On the ultimate source there is more controversy. Beside the more or less traditional derivation from a perfect $*h_1e\text{-}h_1\acute{o}m\text{-}/\text{*}h_1e\text{-}h_1m\text{-}'$ (e.g. Meiser 2003, 152³), proposed sources include a root aorist with monosyllabic lengthening in the 2nd and 3rd sg. (Kortlandt 2007, 154), a Narten aorist (Tremblay 2005, 657), and a Narten imperfect (Jasanoff 2012, 128), all of them starting from PIE 3 sg. $*h_1\acute{e}m\text{-}t$.²¹

The “perfect approach” is the most easily dismissed, as Baltic preterites and Slavic aorists otherwise never go back to PIE perfects. In addition, the presence of a root aorist (OCS $j\acute{e}tv$) beside a perfect (Lith. $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$) in the last stages of Balto-Slavic would be hard to motivate. All other proposals operate with non-standard PIE reconstructions that cannot be properly discussed within the limits of this article. While generally sympathetic with the view that some long-vowel preterites in Latin and some other languages continue displaced Narten imperfects (cf. Jasanoff 2012, with references), in this particular case the only evidence pointing to a “Narten profile” of $*h_1em\text{-}$ is the putative equation $\tilde{e}m\acute{e} \sim \bar{e}m\bar{i}$ itself, the probative force of which is undermined by the fact that Lat. $\bar{e}m\bar{i}$ is too trivially derived from a perfect $*h_1e\text{-}h_1m\text{-}$. The last handicap applies to Kortlandt’s and Tremblay’s proposals as well.

But the whole issue of Lith. $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$ is in my view incorrectly formulated if it is framed in terms of Indo-European inheritance. The Baltic preterite system is an exclusive creation of this branch. In spite of numerous attempts to derive preterites like $b\acute{e}r\acute{e}$, $v\acute{e}m\acute{e}$, $\acute{l}\acute{e}m\acute{e}$, $k\acute{u}l\acute{e}$, $v\acute{o}g\acute{e}$, etc. from a PIE source (sigmatic aorists, perfects, Narten aorists or imperfects), it cannot be stressed enough that the long-vowel \bar{e} -preterite is completely regular to ia -presents from $^{\circ}ER\text{-}$, $^{\circ}EU\text{-}$ and $^{\circ}ET\text{-}$ roots. Such systematicity strongly speaks in favor of a relatively recent origin. Lith. $\grave{i}ma$, $\acute{i}m\acute{t}i$, $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$, to be sure, is an irregular verb, but irregularities in the Baltic preterite are usually explainable within Baltic and reflect the individual prehistory of a given verb or class. With the possible exception of OPr. $b\acute{e}\acute{i}$, OLith. $bit(i)$, Latv. $bija$ “was”, I am not aware of a single example demanding an Indo-European or even Balto-Slavic explanation.²²

²¹ I will not here discuss the intonation of $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$, as in my view this is an exclusively Baltic coinage (see below). If PIE $*h_1\acute{e}m\text{-}t$ is believed to give Bl. $*\acute{e}m\text{-}$, the intonation of $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$ must have been taken from inf. $\acute{i}m\acute{t}i$.

²² To give just an example, the irregular preterite of $mir\acute{t}i$, $m\acute{i}r\acute{s}ta$, $m\acute{i}r\acute{e}$ “die” depends on an inherited present $*mir\acute{i}a < *m\acute{r}\text{-}j\acute{e}\text{-}tor$. It certainly does not require something like PIE aor. $*mr\text{-}\acute{e}h_1\text{-}t$ or $*mr\text{-}\acute{e}\text{-}t$.

In brief, we'll do well in looking for an inner-Baltic account of $*\tilde{e}m-\bar{e}$. The assumption of an analogy $*em-\bar{e} \rightarrow *\tilde{e}m-\bar{e}$ on the model of the type $r\tilde{e}mia : r\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$ (e.g. Smoczyński 2007, 220) is unlikely because it depends on the alleged antiquity of a present $*em-a$, which as we have seen is most probably false. Note, in addition, that it operates with a non-exact proportion. If one continues looking for an analogical explanation, it would be better to follow Stang (1942, 117; 1966, 381) and assume that the analogy with the preterite type $r\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$, $l\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$ etc. targeted the preterite $*em-\bar{e}$ alone, without there being any pivotal form at hand, simply because \bar{e} -preterites with short e before resonants do not otherwise occur. In a different vein, Petit (2004, 338f.) suggests that the long vowel was extracted from the negative form: $*n\bar{e}-\tilde{e}m\acute{e} > *n\tilde{e}m\acute{e} \rightarrow \tilde{e}m\acute{e}$. This account has the disadvantage of operating with a fully uncontrollable process. The well-known parallel of $\tilde{e}jo$ “went” (beside widespread dial. $\tilde{e}jo$), is not as good as it may seem at first sight. Lith. $\tilde{e}jo/$ $\tilde{e}jo$ looks like a fairly recent coinage (note the Latvian suppletive pret. $g\tilde{a}ju$), whereas the antiquity of $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$ is directly supported by Latv. $j\tilde{e}mu/j\tilde{e}mu$ (Lith. dial. $\tilde{e}m\acute{e}$ is very rare).

10. A major problem with all the proposals mentioned above is that the \bar{e} -preterite is simply taken for granted. But if the $*-i\tilde{a}- > *-\bar{e}-$ theory is correct, $*\tilde{e}m-\bar{e}$ is unexpected beside an old a -present $*im-a$. It would be desirable if an account of the length of $*\tilde{e}m-\bar{e}$ could at the same time account for the \bar{e} -preterite itself. We can now present our scenario. The pattern zero-grade pres. $*im-$: full-grade pret. $*em-$ is fully isolated in Baltic, but not in Slavic: OCS $\check{c}b\tau\grave{o} : \check{c}is\check{v}$ “count” (: Latv. $\check{s}\check{k}ist, \check{s}\check{k}iet$ “seem”), $\check{z}b\tau\grave{o} : \check{z}r\check{e}x\check{v}$ “swallow” (: Lith. $g\acute{e}rti, g\acute{e}ria$ “drink”), $-n\check{b}\tau\grave{o} : -nr\check{e}x\check{v}$ “submerge” (: Lith. $n\acute{e}rti, n\acute{e}ria$, Latv. $n\acute{irt}, n\acute{iru}$ “dive”), $-p\check{b}\tau\grave{o} : -p\check{e}x\check{v}$ ²³ “stretch” (: Lith. $p\grave{inti}, p\grave{ina}$ “weave, twine”), etc. In my view the full-grade infinitive-aorist stem continues PIE active root aorists ($*k^w\acute{e}it^s-t$, $*g^w\acute{e}rh_3-t$, $*n\acute{e}rH-t$, $*(s)p\acute{e}nh_1-t$, see LIV, s.v.) that acquired a secondary zero-grade thematic present in Balto-Slavic. This type was eliminated in Baltic, usually by generalizing one of the vocalisms ($g\acute{e}rti$, $p\grave{inti}$). Variants like Lith. $n\acute{e}rti \sim$ Latv. $n\acute{irt}$ suggest that some verbs kept the old ablaut until fairly recently, but cases like Latv. $\check{s}\check{k}ist, \check{s}\check{k}iet$, where the original ablaut has been fully inverted, point to a more complex prehistory (Bl.-Sl. pres. $*nir-e/o-$: aor.-inf. $*ner-$ \rightarrow Bl. $*ner-a : *ner-$ $\rightarrow *ner-a : *nir-$?). Needless to say, on occasion the innovation may have been on the Slavic side (e.g.

²³ The accentuation of Sl. inf. $*p\acute{e}ti$ “expand” points to full-grade $*penH-t\acute{e}i-$, cf. Villanueva Svensson 2011a, 304, with references.

RuCS *mlěsti*, *mlbzu* “milk” vs. Lith. dial. *milžti*, *mélža*, where the Baltic ablaut is the one expected from a PIE athematic present **h₂mélǵ-ti/*h₂mǵ-énti*). The origin and dialectal development of this type cannot be discussed within the limits of this article. For present purposes it is enough to observe that it was well-established in Balto-Slavic and that Lith. *iṁti*, *ima*, *ẽmẽ*, however transformed, is the only relic to survive into historical times in Baltic.

The high-frequency of the verb “to take” probably suffices to explain the archaism of its morphology. At some point, however, the inherited pret. **em-t* (or sigmatized **em-s-t*) had to be affected by the general restructuring of the Baltic preterite system. It is in this context, I believe, where the explanation of **ẽm-ẽ* should be sought. The generalization of **-ã-* as the only Baltic preterite suffix must have been a long process, one that targeted some particularly common verbs at a relatively late stage. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that **em(-s)-t* was one of those cases. It is further conceivable that **em(-s)-t* was not regularized as **em-ã*, as one may have expected, but as **em-ijã*, with **-ijã-* taken from the *ia*-presents. The motivation for such an unusual choice is unclear. It may have been favored by the fact that “to take” was already an irregular verb. In any case, **em-ijã* would have given **ẽm-ẽ* by regular sound change. As an alternative, it is possible that the regularization of **em(-s)-t* took place after the *ẽ*-preterite had been created. “To take” may well have been one of the first verbs to adopt the recent *ẽ*-preterite instead of the expected *ã*-preterite: **em(-s)-t* → **ẽm-ẽ*. The length of **ẽm-ẽ* would then be due, as per Stang (1966, 381), to the fact that preterites in **^oeR-ẽ* were unknown in the language. Put it otherwise, it was a side effect of the adoption of the *ẽ*-preterite.

In spite of the uncertainties surrounding the derivation of Bl. **ẽm-ẽ* from Bl.-Sl. **em(-s)-t*, in my view the most serious problem in the paradigm *iṁti*, *ima*, *ẽmẽ* is not the preterite **ẽm-ẽ* itself, but its relationship to the infinitive **iṁ-ti*. The infinitive and preterite (aorist) stems regularly pattern together in Baltic and Balto-Slavic (with the exception of the Slavic type *s*-aor. *věsb* [: *vedǫ*, *vesti* “lead”], which is irrelevant here). The pattern inf. **im-ti* : pret. **ẽm-ẽ* is as isolated in Baltic as that of pres. **im-a* : pret. **ẽm-ẽ*, with the difference that **im-ti* : **ẽm-ẽ* has no clear parallels in Slavic. I see two possibilities:

i) Baltic inherited an infinitive stem **em-tei-* (: OCS *jęti*) that analogically acquired the vocalism of pres. **im-a*. Such a unique innovation could be motivated by the irregular character of the verb “to take”. Thematic presents

otherwise display *e* : zero ablaut (Lith. *keĩpa*, *kiĩpti* “cut”, *gĩna*, *giĩnti* “drive”, etc.) or do not have any ablaut at all (*nĩša*, *nĩšti* “carry”, *auga*, *augti* “grow”, *lipa*, *lipti* “climb”, etc.). At an early stage they all selected the *ā*-preterite. It is conceivable that, once the preterite **ẽm-ē* was formed, the infinitive stem became free, so to speak, to be influenced by the present. If this took place before the types (Lith.) *lĩkti*, *lĩkia*, *lĩkĩ* “fly, run” and *gĩrti*, *gĩria*, *gĩrĩ* “drink” had acquired their actual form, but still had inf. **lek-ti*, pret. **gĩr-ē*, they could have provided additional support for a short-lived rule according to which long-vowel *ē*-preterites were opposed to a present and infinitive with short vowel.

ii) The infinitive *iĩnti* is a strong archaism of Balto-Slavic date. There is some evidence suggestive (but not probative) of an early independence of the infinitive and preterite stems, mostly in the form of fossilized past passive participles: Lith. *gĩrtas* “drunk” (: Lith. *gĩrti*, *gĩria* “drink”, OCS *žrĩti*, *žbrq* “swallow”), *statũs* “steep” (: Lith. *stĩti*, *stĩja*, OCS *stati*, *stanq* “stand up”), *stĩrta* “stack” (: OCS *strĩti*, *stbrjq* “spread out”), *tĩltas* “bridge”, etc., all of them to well-known aoristic roots (**g^werh₃-*, **steh₂-*, **sterh₃-*, **telh₂-*, see LIV, s.v.) that, when preserved, predictably present a full-grade aorist in Balto-Slavic. Lith. *iĩnti* could then be a relic dating back to a time when the infinitive stem had not yet adopted the vocalism of the aorist.

It is unclear to me, however, whether *gĩrtas*, *statũs*, etc. actually demand revisiting the close association between the aorist and infinitive stems in Balto-Slavic. In principle they could simply be PIE relics (**g^werh₃-tĩ-*, **steh₂-tĩ-*, etc.). I thus favor the first, inner-Baltic account of the infinitive *iĩnti*.

DU NETAISYKLINGI BALTŲ PRETERITAI: LIE. *dāvė*, *ẽmė*

Santrauka

Straipsnyje aiškinami du netaisyklingi baltų kalbų *ē*-preteritai (lie. *dāvė*, *ẽmė*) **-iā* > **-ē* teorijos kontekste. Lie. *dāvė* (taip pat lie. *šlāvė* ir denominatyvinį tipą *mel-āvo*) galima aiškinti tokiu būdu: **dō(-s)-* → **dō-vā-* (siekiant išvengti hiato **dō-ā-* įterpiamas **-v-* po užpakalinės eilės ilgųjų balsių) → **dōv-jā-* (pridedamas preterito formantas **-jā-* kaip prie visų ilgųjų balsių kamienų) > **dav-jā-* (Osthoffo dėsnis) → **dav-ē-* (**-jā-* eliminuojamas po **^ov-*, perėmus preterito priesagą **-ē-* arba **-ā-*). Lie. *ẽmė* ilgasis šaknies balsis veikiausiai atsirado kartu su pačiu *ē*-preteritu: **em(-s)-t* → **em-iā* > **ẽm-ē* (perėmus *ia*-prezensų preteritą **-iā*) arba tiesiai **em(-s)-t* → **ẽm-ē* (nes **^oeR-ē* struktūros preteritų nebuvo).

REFERENCES

- Bammesberger, Alfred 1982, Das litauische Paradigma der idg. Wurzel *dō- “geben”, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 87, 239–250.
- Būga, Kazimieras 1921, *Priesagos -ūnas ir dvibalsio uo kilmė*, Kaunas: Šviesa [= Idem, *Rinkiniai raštai 2*, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1959, 331–376].
- Cowgill, Warren 1964, The Supposed Cypriote optatives *duwánoi* and *dókoī* (with notes on the Greek infinitive formations), *Language* 40, 344–365.
- Endzelin, Jan 1923, *Lettische Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Ernout-Meillet DELL – Alfred Ernout, Antoine Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1967⁴.
- IEW – Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern, München: Francke, 1959.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2012, Long-vowel preterites in Indo-European, in H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Indo-European verb. Proceedings of the Conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies, Los Angeles 13-15 September 2010*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 127–135.
- Karaliūnas, Simas 1987, *Baltų kalbų struktūrų bendrybės ir jų kilmė*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Kazlauskas, Jonas 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin 2008, *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 1995, Lithuanian verbs in *-auti* and *-uoti*, *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 141–143.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2007, *Italo-Celtic origins and prehistoric development of the Irish language*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy 1956, Lotewsko-litewska monoftongizacja *ai, ei* ≥ *ie*, *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 15, 113–125.
- Larsson, Jenny H. 2004, Metatony and length in Baltic, in Adam Hyllested, Anders Richardt Jørgensen, Jenny Helena Larsson, Thomas Olander (eds.), *Per aspera ad asteriscos: Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 305–322.
- LIV – Helmut Rix (Hrsg.), *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- Mahlow, Georg Heinrich 1879, *Die langen Vokale a e o in den europaischen Sprachen*, Berlin: Hermann.
- Malzahn, Melanie 2010, *The Tocharian verbal system*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas 1970, *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai*, Vilnius: Mintis.
- ME – Karl Mühlenthal, Jānis Endzelins, *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca. Lettisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* 1–4, Rīga: Izglītības ministrija; Kultūras fonds, 1923–1932.

Meiser, Gerhard 2003, *Veni Vidi Vici: Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems*, München: Beck.

Nikolaev, Alexandr 2005, Toh. A *šamantār* i indoeuropejskij preterit s prodlennoj stupen'ju ablauta v korne, *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2005/5, 68–83.

Peters, Martin 1999, Gall(o-lat). *marcosior*, in Peter Anreiter, Erzsébet Jerem (eds.), *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica: Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*, Budapest: Archeolingua, 305–314.

Petit, Daniel 2004, *Apophonie et catégories grammaticales dans les langues baltiques*, Leuven, Paris: Peeters.

Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård 1989, *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Schmalstieg, William R. 2000, *The historical morphology of the Baltic verb*, Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Schmid, Wolfgang P. 1966, Baltische Beiträge IV. Zur Bildung des litauischen Praeteritums, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 71, 286–296.

Schumacher, Stefan 2004, *Die keltischen Primärverben: ein vergleichendes etymologisches und morphologisches Lexicon*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

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

Stang, Christian S. 1942, *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*, Oslo: Dypwad.

Stang, Christian S. 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.

Šinkūnas, Mindaugas 2010, *XVI–XVII amžiaus Mažosios Lietuvos raštų akcentografija*, Humanitarinių mokslų daktaro disertacija, Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas.

Tedesco, Paul 1948, Slavic *ne*-presents from older *je*-presents, *Language* 24, 346–387.

Tremblay, Xavier 2005, Zum Narten-Aorist. Apophonica 4, in Günter Schweiger (Hrsg.), *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsiebzigsten Geburtstag*, Tübingen: Schweiger VWT-Verlag, 637–664.

Vaillant, André 1950, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves 1: Phonétique*, Lyon: IAC.

Vaillant, André 1966, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves 3: Le verbe*, Paris: Klincksieck.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2005, The Baltic *ē*-preterit revisited, *Baltistica* 6 priedas, 239–252.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2011a, The accentuation of the infinitive type Latv. *kāļt*, Sl. **kōl̥ti* and the development of Indo-European *molō*-presents in Balto-Slavic, in Vytautas Rinkevičius (ed.), *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology* (= *Baltistica* 7 priedas), Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 301–326.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2011b, Indo-European long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 46(1), 5–38.

Vine, Brent 2006, On “Thurneysen-Havet’s Law” in Latin and Italic, *Historische Sprachforschung* 119, 211–249.

Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta Irslinger, Carolin Schneider 2008, *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexicon*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Zair, Nicholas 2012, *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Celtic*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Vilniaus universitetas

Universiteto g. 5

LT-01513 Vilnius

Lithuania

[*miguel.villanueva@flf.vu.lt*]