Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON
Vilnius University

THE ORIGIN OF THE DENOMINATIVE TYPE
LITH. *-áuti*, *-áuja*, OCS *-ovati*, *-ujǫ*

1. Baltic and Slavic share a denominative formation that can be exempli-fied by Lith. *draug-áuti*, *-áuja*, *-ãvo* "be friends" (: *draũgas* "friend"), OPr. inf. *dīnkaut*, pres. 1 pl. *dīnkaumai*, *dinkauimai*, pret. *dinkowats*, *dīnkauts* "thank" (: **dinkā* "thanks", acc. sg. *dīnckun*), Sl. **kup-ováti*, **kup-űje-* "buy" > OCS, ORu. *kupovati*, *kupujǫ*, SCr. *kupòvati*, *kùpujē-*, Čak. *kupovàt*, *kupûje-*, Slvn. *kupováti*, *kupûje-*, Cz. *kupovati*, *kupuje-*, Ru. *-ováť*, *-úju*, etc. (: **kupъ* "buy, purchase").

This formation is fairly productive in Lithuanian and all Slavic languages. That this was also the case in Old Prussian is evidenced by the fact that in this language, like in Old Church Slavonic, most examples are loan words (e. g. **dinkā* from OPol. *dzięka* "gratiarum actio"). The major exception is Latvian, where the type Lith. *-áuti*, *-áuja* has been lost (potentially inherited verbs in *-áuti* typically surface as verbs in **-őti*, **-őja*, e. g. Lith. *uogáuti* "col-lect berries" ~ Latv. *uôguôt*, *-uõju*).[1] In both Baltic and Slavic denominatives in *-áuti/-ovati* are made from nouns and adjectives of all possible stems. I simply refer to the standard grammars for more information.[2]

---

[1] Several authors have actually maintained that the East Baltic denominative suffix **-őti*, **-őja* (Lith. *-úoti*, *-úoja*, Latv. *-uôt*, *-uõju*) is genetically related to the type Lith. *-áuti*, OCS *-ovati*. The idea was relatively popular in the past (e. g. B e z z e n b e r g e r 1903, 193f.; B r u g m a n n 1913, 220) and has been occasionally defended later (e. g. K o r t l a n d t 1995; somewhat differently V a i l l a n t 1966, 352f.). As I intend to argue at length elsewhere, the phonological development **-ōu- >* Lith., Latv. *-uo-* that this theory implies is simply false (**-ōu-* predictably yields Lith., Latv. *-áu-*). See for the moment V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n 2013, 230f., 233f., with references.

[2] In addition to its main function as a denominative suffix *-áuti/-ovati* is also used for iteratives in Baltic (Lith. *klỹkti*, *-ia* "shout" → *klýkauti* "shout (iter.)") and for de-rived imperfectives in Slavic (OCS pf. *sъkazati*, *sъkažǫ* "point out" → impf. *sъkazovati*, *sъkazujǫ*). This is known to be a secondary innovation (imperfectives in *-ovati* are still

The identity of the Baltic and Slavic suffixes has never been in doubt: Lith. pres. *-áuja* = Sl. *-ũjǫ*, Lith. pret *-ãvo* = Sl. aor. *-ovaxъ*. The infinitive stem Sl. *-ov-a-ti* is usually considered a secondary import from the aorist, thus implying that Lith. *-áuti*, *-áuja*, *-ãvo* faithfully continues the Balto-Slavic paradigm. But if one prefers projecting the Slavic paradigm into Balto-Slavic and reconstructs a paradigm with a second stem in $*-au̯-ā-$ (inf. $*-au̯-ā-tĕi$, aor. $*-au̯-ā-s-$) and not with an $ā$-aorist (inf. $*-áu̯-tĕi$, aor. $*-au̯-ā-$), this would not alter the main problem: which Indo-European or Balto-Slavic formation would yield a denominative suffix of the shape Lith. *-áu-*, Sl. *-ũ-* before consonants / Lith. *-ãv-*, Sl. *-ov-* before vowels?

2. The first idea that would come to every scholar's mind, to assume original denominatives from "normal" *u*-stems, has always been dismissed on two conclusive grounds: i) *u*-stem denominatives are regularly built to the zero grade of the suffix (e. g. Hitt. *šakruwe/a-* "water", Ved. *śatrūyáti* "be hostile", Gk. δακρύω "weep", Lat. *metuō* "be afraid"), ii) this wouldn't explain the acute intonation of Lith. *-áuja*, Sl. *-ũjǫ*. The theory that dominated the field until more or less the middle of the 20th century was that we are dealing with original denominatives to PIE stems in $*-ēu-$[3] (type Gk. ἱππεύς "horseman") or $*-ōu-$[4] (e. g. Gk. πάτρως "father's brother", OPers. *dahạyāuš* "land, country"), some scholars being undecided between both.[5] Starting from $*-ēu-i̯e/o-$ or $*-ōu-i̯e/o-$ would account for the acute of the present stem Lith. *-áuja*, Sl. *-ũjǫ*,[6] but everything else in this theory is problematic.

From a comparative perspective it cannot be emphasized enough that the type ἱππεύς is only found in Greek. The unmarked reading of this fact is either that it was an exclusive coinage of this branch or, if inherited, that it

---

marginal in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian) and will be left out of consideration in what follows.

[3] E. g. Vondrák 1924, 718; Meillet 1934, 228; Fraenkel 1950, 260; Arumaa 1985, 49.

[4] E. g. Meillet 1902, 149; Brugmann 1913, 220; Stang 1942, 51, 173.

[5] E. g. van Wijk 1926, 76¹; Nahtigal 1963, 121.

[6] This statement entails accepting the view that PIE long vowels are reflected as acute long vowels in Balto-Slavic. If one prefers to follow the alternative view that PIE long vowels regularly acquired circumflex intonation, this would involve an additional argument against the "$*-ēu-/*-ōu$-theory". The issue cannot be pursued at greater length here.

had a marginal position in Indo-European.[7] If one nevertheless goes on to postulate a class of *ēu*-nouns for an early stage of Balto-Slavic, an original present *-ēu-i̯e/o-* would not directly yield Lith. *-áuja*, Sl. *-ŭ́jǫ* (one would expect Lith. †-'*áuja*, Sl. †-'*ujǫ*, with initial palatalization), whereas the preterit *-ēu-ā-* would have stayed as such (Lith. †-*éva*, Sl. †-*ĕvaxъ*). The Lithuanian preterit −*ãv-o* and the Slavic aorist *-ov-a-xъ* are usually explained as analogical to the present stem after this had become *-áu-i̯e/o-* via Osthoff's law, but the former analogical depalatalization of the present is decidedly less easy to motivate. Note, in addition, that the sound change *-*ĕuC- > *-'*auC-* was a late process that probably took place independently in (East) Baltic and Slavic (the same holds true for Osthoff's law).[8] It seems unlikely that the same non-trivial analogy operated independently in both branches to yield virtually identical paradigms.

The "*-*ōu*-theory" is equally problematic but for different reasons. The Indo-European pedigree of this formation is not in doubt. It is still preserved (although already quite rare) in Hittite and Old Iranian, and some items can be safely reconstructed to the parent language (*nek̂-ou-* "corpse", *ph₂tr-ou-* "father's brother", *meh₂tr-ou-* "mother's brother", *dem-ou-* "slave" and some other).[9] But whereas the Greek type ἱππεύς at least would provide a convenient starting point from both the semantic (cf. denominatives like βασιλεύς "king" → βασιλεύω "be king") and formal points of view (if the type ἱππεύς really goes back to a non-ablauting suffix *-*ēu-*), nouns like *nek̂-ou-* were inflected as amphikinetic stems *nék̂-ŏu-/*n̥k̂-u-és* (cf. Hitt. nom. sg. *ḫarn-āu-š* "birthing chair", gen. sg. *ḫarn-uw-aš*). It is difficult to imagine why the nom. sg. *-*ōu(-s)* was selected as the derivational base of denominatives, but the major problem is that amphikinetic *u*-stems look like a reliquary class already in Indo-European. The few nouns we can reconstruct do not qualify as a reasonable source for a denominative suffix, and none of them is actually represented in Balto-Slavic. If one nevertheless takes

---

[7] The origin of the type ἱππεύς cannot be discussed here. See R i x 1992², 147; S c h i n d l e r 1976; W i d m e r 2008, 626f.; d e V a a n 2009, 207 for different proposals.

[8] See V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n (fthc.), § 1, with references, for the development of *ĕu* in Balto-Slavic assumed in the text.

[9] See W e i t e n b e r g 1984, 221ff., 264ff., 352ff., 367ff. for a dossier of the Hittite facts and B e e k e s 1985, 85ff. for those of Avestan and Old Persian. Recent discussion of the Indo-European amphikinetic *u*-stems includes W i d m e r 2008; R a u 2011.

the unlikely step to postulate a class of *ōu*-nouns for an early stage of Balto-Slavic (with generalization of *-ōu- through the whole paradigm), the present stem Lith. *-áuja*, Sl. *-ǘjǫ* would pose no problems, but the aorist would still have to be accounted for as analogical. We will return to the aorist below (§ 3). For the time being it will be enough to observe that the existence of a Balto-Slavic *ā*-aorist *-ǒu̯-ā- is simply unexpected under the *-ōu-theory.

In spite of its relative popularity, I conclude that the "*-ēu-/*-ōu-theory" has very little to recommend itself. Other proposals never acquired such a broad acceptance. Only for completeness do I mention here the earlier views of B r u g m a n n (1892, 1133f.), according to whom we are dealing with original denominatives to nouns in *-e-u̯o-, *-e-u̯ā-, and B e z z e n b e r g e r (1903, 193[1]), who started from a *u*-stem loc. sg. *-ōu.[10] M a c h e k (1937, 277) identified the Slavic passive participle *cěl-ov-anъ* with the Vedic type *tak-av-āna-*. The whole paradigm was then back formed to *cěl-ov-anъ* on the model of other verbs with inf. *-ati* : pass. ptcp. *-anъ*. The acute intonation was analogically taken from denominatives in *-áti, *-éti, etc. But leaving aside the vast analogy that this theory requires, the Vedic type *tak-av-āna-* is a very rare type found almost exclusively among proper nouns (cf. D e b r u n n e r 1954, 275). There is no reason to project it back into Proto-Indo-Iranian and even less to suppose that it continues a complex suffix conglomerate *-eu̯-eh₂-no-. Vaillant attempted two different approaches to the type *-áuti/-ovati*: i) from denominatives to "normal" *u*-stems in *-ū-i̯e/o- (cf. Ved. *śatrūyáti*, Gk. aor. ἐδάκρῡσα), latter replaced by an alternation pres. *-ěu̯-i̯e/o- : inf.-aor. *-ū- (on the model of the type OCS *pьsati, piše-*), with final generalization of the vocalism of the present stem (V a i l l a n t 1942, 157f.); ii) from denominatives to *ū*-stems (i. e., *uh₂*-stems) in *-uh₂-i̯e/o- > *-ū-i̯e/o-, with a subsequent development essentially identical to the one just sketched (V a i l l a n t 1966, 354). But even granting the first step *-ū-i̯e/o-/*-uh₂-i̯e/o- (the suffix length

---

[10] Bezzenberger's suggestion bears a strange resemblance to some recent "delocatival" approaches to the type ἱππεύς and the amphikinetic *u*-stems (W i d m e r 2008; d e V a a n 2009). As far as the Balto-Slavic denominative type *-áuti/-ovati* is concerned, it is difficult to imagine how such an approach could actually work. Continuing with the "decasuatival" approach, a possibility that has never been entertained is to start from an instrumental *-eu-h₁. But leaving aside the fact that the Balto-Slavic instr. sg. of the *u*-stems was *-u-mi, it is well known that only *-u-h₁ and *-u̯-eh₁ can be reconstructed to the parent language (including the proterokinetic *u*-stems).

of *śatrūyáti*, ἐδάκρῡσα is clearly language specific), the secondary introduction of a full grade in the present stem is difficult to understand (why should primary verbs like *pьsati*, *piše-* have exercised any influence?). In addition, Vaillant's approach has to face similar formal problems to those of the "*-ēu*-theory".

3. To sum up, none of the proposed accounts of the denominative type *-áuti/-ovati* is even remotely acceptable. The skepticism of scholars like S t a n g (1966, 366) or A i t z e t m ü l l e r (1978, 216ff.) is thus more than justified and probably represents the current *communis opinio* (I am not aware of a new proposal since Vaillant and the origin of the type *-áuti/-ovati* is usually simply left unaccounted for). It may be convenient at this point to highlight the main points on which my own proposal will be made:

i) As already stressed by S t a n g (1966, 366), the only *lautgesetzlich* way to reconcile the allomorphs pres. Lith. *-áu-ja*, Sl. **-ű-jǫ* / aor. Lith. *-ãv-o*, Sl. **-ov-a-xъ* is an early Balto-Slavic suffix of the shape **-au̯H-* or **-ou̯H-*. Our first goal should thus be to find a plausible candidate of precisely this structure.

ii) The Lithuanian preterit *-ãv-o* and the Slavic second stem in **-ov-a-* clearly point to a Balto-Slavic *ā*-aorist or to a second stem in **-ā-*. Baltic is ambiguous as a consequence of the general restructuring of its preterit system, but in Slavic this stands in overt contradiction to the morphology of *all* denominative stems ending in a vowel (OCS *-jǫ*, *-i-ti*, *-i-xъ*; *-ě-jǫ*, *-ě-ti*, *-ě-xъ*; *-a-jǫ*, *-a-ti*, *-a-xъ*). The closest *comparandum* is the (rare) Slavic denominative type *glaglol-jǫ*, *glagol-ati* "speak" (: *glagolъ* "word"). It would be desirable that an account of *-áuti/-ovati* could integrate the peculiar aorist stem as well.

iii) Finally, the type *-áuti/-ovati* is simply there as far back as we can trace Balto-Slavic and the previous observations only highlight its antiquity. The absence of a conceivable source in Balto-Slavic combined with its obvious antiquity, I believe, allow us to operate with Indo-European elements that have otherwise been lost in Baltic and Slavic.

4. What all theories surveyed in § 2 have in common is the assumption that the origin of the type *-áuti/-ovati* must be sought in some subtype of the Indo-European *u*-stems. This is of course perfectly reasonable. False segmentation from a nominal stem is the first (and usually the only) place where we would look for the origin of a new denominative suffix. But when

all possible variants of the "*u*-stem approach" turn out to be so prohibitively problematic, I think we are entitled to attempt a different, less standard approach. In brief, I propose seeing in *-áu-ti/-ov-a-ti* not a nominal suffix, but a verbal root, more specifically the root *h_2euh_1-* of Ved. *ávati* "help", Lat. *(ad)iuuāre* "id.", *auēre* "desire", etc.

That verbal roots can become derivational suffixes is by no means surprising. Among the old Indo-European languages one can mention almost transparent nominal suffixes like *-h_3k^w-o-*, *-$h_2n̥k$-*, *-$ĝn(h_1)$-o-*, *-$pl(h_2)$-o-*, *-$b^h u(H)$-o-*, *-$b^h(h_2)$-o-*, or *-h_1g^w-* (see e. g. B a l l e s 1999, 9ff.; P i n a u l t 2000, 94ff. for a brief treatment), not to mention less clear cases in the parent language itself (e. g. Hoffmann's suffix) or similar developments in the modern languages (Germ. *-schaft*, etc.). Closer to our present problem, it is well known that Latin denominatives in *-ĭgāre* and *-cināre* underwent a certain expansion starting from nominal compounds with second element *-ag-* (probably still *-$h_2ĝ$-* or *-h_2g-*, cf. D u n k e l 2000), *-can-* (: *agō*, *-ere* "drive", *canō*, *-ere* "sing"; see e. g. B e n e d e t t i 1988, 196ff., with references). An even closer parallel is provided by the extremely productive Old Irish denominative suffix *-(a)igithir*, *-(a)igidir* and its Brittonic cognates, ultimately going back to compounds with second element *-sag-* "the act of seeking" (PIE *seh_2g-* "track; seek", LIV, 520), cf. J o s e p h (1987, 154ff.).

There is thus no obstacle from a typological perspective. Our next task will be to see how such an approach may work in the concrete case of Bl.-Sl. *-áuti/-ovati*.

5. The reconstruction of the root as *h_2euh_1-* (following G a r c í a R a m ó n 1996; P i n a u l t 2006, 389ff.) requires some emphasis in view of LIV's reconstruction *h_1euH-* "helfen, fördern" (LIV, 243) and of the fact that part of the material that the LIV includes under a different root *h_2eu-* "genießen" (LIV, 274) in my opinion belongs here as well.

LIV's reconstruction of the initial laryngeal as *h_1°* depends exclusively on Puhvel's inclusion of the obscure Hitt. *iyawa-* "?" in the set (P u h v e l 1984, 353), which is extremely dubious (see the criticism of Melchert *apud* P i n a u l t 2006, 397). The evidence included under LIV's "*h_1euH-*" is ambiguous as far as the identification of the laryngeals is concerned (Ved. *ávati* "helps, favors", *avitár-* "helper", *ūtí-* "help, support", etc., Lat. *(ad)iuuō*, *-āre* "help" < *$Hi-H(e)uH(-e/o)$-*, OIr. *conói* "protect" < *$au̯-ī$-* < *$Hou(H)-éi̯e/o$-*), but Gk. Dor. ἀΐτᾱς "eromenos" (< *$au̯-ītās$*), Hom. ἐνηής "kind" (< *$en-āu̯és$-*,

with compound lengthening) are perfectly compatible with a meaning "support, help", must depend on an old *s*-stem cognate with Ved. *ávas-*, Av. *auuah-* "help, support", and clearly imply initial *$h_2°$. Pinault's attractive etymology of Gk. ἄ(ϝ)εθλον "prize of a contest" < *h_2euh_1-d^hlo- (P i n a u l t 2006, 397ff.) simply proves the reconstruction *h_2euh_1- to which G a r c í a R a m ó n (1996, 45) had already arrived. The rest of the evidence (which the LIV mostly includes under a weakly grounded root *h_2eu-) is eminently compatible with *h_2euh_1- (note the pervasive initial *a°*): Lat. *aueō, -ēre* "desire" (< *$Hou(H)$-$éie/o$-), *auidus* "desirous", *auārus* "miser; greedy", Ved. *ā́vayas, ā́vayat* "ate" (suppletive 2/3 sg. imperfect of *átti* "eats"), *avasá-* "food", *aviṣyú-* "greedy", *aviṣyā́-* "greediness". To these can be added a number of more isolated nominals: W. *ewyllys*, OBret. *aiul*, Corn. *awell* "will" (< *$auislo$-), Go. *awi-liuþ* "thanks", *awi-liudon* "thank", Arm. *aviwn* "lust". Note that Ved. *aviṣyú-, aviṣyā́-* are best explained as continuing a weakened stem *$HáuH$-s- of the *s*-stem In.-Ir. *$HáuH$-as- < PIE *$h_2éuh_1$-es- (Ved. *ávas-*, Gk. ἐνηής), as per L i t s c h e r (2007, 111), and that the problematic -*ā*- of Lat. *auārus* can have been "normalized" from *$auăro$- < *$h_2(e)uh_1$-ro- on the model of *amārus, clārus, cārus*, etc.

Put it otherwise, there is every reason to join LIV's "*h_1euH-" and "*h_2eu-" under a common root *h_2euh_1-. The complex semantics of its derivatives were satisfactorily explained by G a r c í a R a m ó n (1996, 42ff.): the *Grundbedeutung* /give preference, appreciate/ was realized as [help, favor] with animate objects, as [be pleased with, prefer] with inanimate objects. Meanings like "desire", "be eager" are easily understood secondary developments of the latter.

6. Turning back to -*áuti*/-*ovati*, the root *h_2euh_1- provides a source for the suffix *-*a/ouH*- that the Balto–Slavic internal evidence actually demands. There are two ways in which this may have happened: i) univerbation, ii) denominatives from compounds with root noun as the second member.

6.1. Univerbation.

The Indo-European *averbo* of the root *h_2euh_1- can be reconstructed with a reasonable degree of certainty. The Vedic *iṣ*–aorist *ā́vīt* "helped" no doubt rests on an inherited root aorist *$h_2éuh_1$-t. Lat. *(ad)iuuāre* "help" clearly continues a reduplicated present, in spite of some uncertainties in the details. It is the best candidate for continuing the Indo-European present of this root. A PIE iterative *h_2ouh_1-$éie/o$- seems also very reasonable in view of its

presence in three branches (Lat. *auēre*, OIr. *conói*, Ved. *ā́vayat*). The Indo-Iranian thematic present Ved. *ávati*, GAv. *auuāmī* may or may not be old. In principle it could be a displaced aorist subjunctive (OIr. *conói* does not continue a thematic present, cf. G a r c í a R a m ó n 1996, 42, with references).

If the primary verb was preserved in early Balto-Slavic, the root aorist *$h_2$éuh$_1$-t* would be expected to surface as a full-grade aorist of one or another sort: root aor. *HauH-t*, s-aor. *HauH-s-t*, or ā-aor. *HauH-ā-t*. Although the ā-aorist seems to be originally linked to present roots, it was probably extended to some aoristic roots with a *i̯e/o*-present at an early date (e. g. OCS *pьsati*, *pišǫ* "write", Lith. *piẽšti*, –*ia* "draw", to the aoristic root *peik̑-*, LIV, 465f.).[11] Sooner or later the PIE reduplicated present *h_2i-h_2(e)uh$_1$(-e/o)-* would have been replaced with a different present stem, a *i̯e/o*-present *HauH-i̯e/o-* being the likeliest candidate. Although all this is a matter of (educated) guess, it is conceivable that early Balto-Slavic possessed a paradigm pres. *HauH-i̯e/o-*, aor. *HauH-ā-*, inf. *HauH(-ā)-tĕi*, i. e., a paradigm identical to that of the denominative type *-áuti/-ovati*.

Within this approach one would further assume that the putative Bl.-Sl. *HauH-* entered into some frequent collocations that eventually became fixed phrases with concomitant bleaching of the meaning of the primary verb. Thus, a collocation like *d^hroug^hom HauHi̯oH* "I help/support/desire friend" (*vel sim.*) would have become a fixed phrase with a meaning essentially similar to "I am friends, I am on friendly terms, I keep company (with)", the actual meaning of Lith. *draug-áuti*.[12] In due time, perhaps when the primary verb was being lost or was already lost, some phrases like *d^hroug^hom HauHi̯e/o-* would be univerbated as *d^hroug^hHauHi̯e/o-* and further reanalyzed as *d^hroug^h-HauH-i̯e/o-*. At this point the language acquired a new denominative suffix that actually enjoyed a notorious success.

If this is what really happened some questions immediately arise. One may ask what happened with the *-om* of the hypothetical *d^hroug^hom HauHi̯e/o-*, but truncation phenomena of this sort are common among grammaticaliza-

---

[11] I cannot here devote the necessary space to argue for the assumptions on the early development of the Balto-Slavic verbal system made in the text, see V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n 2011.

[12] The choice of *d^hroug^h-o-* "friend" (Lith. *draũgas*, OCS *drugъ*) as an example is purely formulaic. The original core of *-áuti/-ovati* denominatives cannot be recovered from the available data.

tion processes like the one we are discussing. In my view a more serious objection (needless to say, in addition to the purely hypothetical nature of the whole process) is the apparent absence of reasonable parallels. Univerbation is by no means a rare process, but it is mostly found as a source of secondary tense suffixes (Italic *-$\beta\bar{a}$-imperfect, Germanic weak preterit, etc.). As such, the process demands the use of the verb as an auxiliary, which can hardly have been the case with *h_2euh_1-. The lack of parallels among the old Indo-European languages needs not be overrated, but all in all the "univerbation approach" is slightly less likely (or, rather, less controllable) than the one to be studied immediately.

6.2. Compounds with root noun as the second member.

The main advantage of this approach is that it is actually paralleled among cognate languages (see above § 4). In addition, it dispenses with the necessity to determine the paradigm that *h_2euh_1- may have displayed in early Balto-Slavic, as all we need is the existence of a primary verb from which a root noun *°*HauH*- could be extracted. Even this is perhaps not completely necessary, as we could simply start from a small number of inherited compounds.

Within this approach, then, a compound *d^hroug^ho-HauH- "friend helper/supporter/desirer" or "the act of helping/supporting/desiring friend" (*vel sim*.) would have served as the basis of a denominative *d^hroug^ho-HauH-ie/o-. In due time the original meaning would have been weakened into something like "be friends (with)" (alternatively, the semantic bleaching could have occurred already with the compound *d^hroug^ho-HauH-). The subsequent extraction of *-HauH-ie/o- as a denominative suffix would have been natural after the primary verb of the root *h_2euh_1- had been lost and, conceivably, after *Wurzelkomposita* like *d^hroug^ho-HauH- went out of use. There remain just a couple of formal issues to comment on.

The original morphology of the putative root noun cannot be determined with certainty. Nor is this actually necessary, as both full grade *°h_2euh_1- (> *°*HauH*-) and *o*-grade *°h_2ouh_1- (> *°*HouH*-) would have ended up as -*áu-ti*/-*ov-a-ti* anyway. Zero grade *°o-h_2uh_1- is probably not excluded either, through it is not completely certain what the regular outcome of aor. *-o-HuH-$\bar{a}$- would be. In addition, *°o-h_2uh_1- would dispense with the problem of accounting for the deletion of the stem vowel of *d^hroug^h-o-HauH-ie/o- that the suffix Lith. -*áu-ja*, Sl. *-*ű̃-jǫ* apparently demands (through, once

again, it is not completely certain that they cannot be *lautgesetzlich* from
*-*o-HauH-i̯e/o-*). But perhaps there is no problem at all. The Indo-Europe-
an principle that the stem vowel is not deleted before suffixes (S c h i n d l e r
1976, 351) was clearly not maintained in Balto-Slavic, where the stem vowel
is systematically deleted before suffixes beginning with a vowel. Once the
language had acquired a denominative suffix *-*ā́u̯-C°/*-au̯-V°*, it was only
expected that it would be directly added to the last consonant before the stem
vowel, as in Lith. *úoga* "berry" → *uog-áuti* "collect berries", OCS *milъ* "piti-
able" → *mil-ovati* "feel pity", etc. The process was doubtless supported by all
other denominatives beginning with a vowel.

As for the *ā*-aorist (or the second stem in *-*ā*-), we have already observed
that the Slavic denominative type *glaglol-i̯ǫ*, *glagol-ati* is the only *comparan-
dum* one can find among the Baltic and Slavic denominative formations.[13]
One may suppose, for instance, that denominatives with plain *-*i̯e/o*- (unlike
the more complex suffixes *-*e-i̯e/o*-, *-*ah₂-i̯e/o*-, *-*eh₁-i̯e/o*-, *-*oh₁-i̯e/o*-)
selected the *ā*-aorist when the need was felt to provide every verb with a full
paradigm. This seems the best option to me (although, unfortunately, it can
hardly be controlled) and implies that the paradigm pres. *-*(H)auH-i̯e/o*-,
aor. *-*(H)auH-ā*- was formed at a fairly early date, but already with exclusive
Balto-Slavic morphology (although the Indo-European background of the
Balto-Slavic *ā*-aorist remains unclear, the aorist type itself is a reality as far
back as we can trace this language family).

Finally, a note on the semantics is perhaps in order. Denominatives from
compounds with a root noun as the second member are admittedly uncom-
mon, but something similar to the process we have described clearly took
place in the prehistory of Italic (Lat. -*ĭgāre*, -*cināre*) and Insular Celtic (OIr.
-*(a)igithir*). Occasional denominatives of the same structure can be found
in other languages as well, e. g. Gk. χέϱ-νιψ "lustral water" → χεϱνίπτομαι
"wash one's hands with holy water", Ved. *go-pā́-* "(cow-)protector" → *gopāyáti*
"protect", both quoted by J o s e p h (1987, 155f.). If Lat. *agere* "drive" and *ca-
nere* "sing" could qualify as the source of second compound members that

---

[13] Among the Baltic primary *ia*-presents one encounters a number of original
denominatives (e. g. *švẽsti*, *šveñčia* "celebrate" ← *šveñtė* "holiday", *šveñtas* "holy").
It must remain a task for the future to determine whether we are dealing with the Baltic
pendant of the Slavic type *glagolati*, *glagloli̯ǫ* or with original denominatives in -*ýti*, -*ia*
(: OCS -*i-ti*, -*i̯ǫ* < PIE *-*ei̯e/o*-).

eventually became autonomous denominative suffixes, I don't see any reason why the root *h_2euh_1- could not qualify as well. It is surely relevant to observe that the roots *seh_2g- "track, seek" (OIr. -(a)igithir) and *peh_2- "protect, herd" (although not exactly comparable, note that go-pā́-, gopāyá- gave rise to a neo-root gop-/gup- "protect" in Vedic, cf. M a y r h o f e r EWAia 1, 499f.) present meanings partially similar to the attested meanings of *h_2euh_1-.

7. To sum up, the seemingly straightforward notion that the denominative type Lith. -áuti, -áuja, OCS -ovati, -ujǫ is based on some subtype of the PIE u-stems has repeatedly proven unfruitful. As an alternative that actually explains the formal properties of the suffix I propose that the type Lith. -áuti, OCS -ovati goes back to the verbal root *h_2euh_1- "give preference, appreciate". It became a denominative suffix either through univerbation or, more likely, through resegmentation of denominatives from compounds with a root noun of *h_2euh_1- as the second member. The latter development is actually attested as a source or new denominative suffixes in other Indo-European languages.

DENOMINATYVINIO VEIKSMAŽODŽIŲ TIPO
LIE. -áuti, -áuja, **S. SL.** -ovati, -ujǫ **KILMĖ**

S a n t r a u k a

Tradicinė idėja, kad denominatyvinio veiksmažodžių tipo lie. -áuti, -áuja, s. sl. -ovati, -ujǫ priesaga kilo iš denominatyvinių veiksmažodžių, padarytų iš kažkokio ide. -u-kamieno tipo, yra pernelyg problemiška ir nepaaiškina priesagos -áuti/-ovati formos (lie. -áu-, sl. *-ū́- prieš priebalsius / lie. -ãv-, sl. *-ov- prieš balsius). Kaip alternatyva yra siūlymas kildinti lie. -áu-ti/-ov-a-ti iš ide. veiksmažodinės šaknies *h_2euh_1- (s. i. ávati „gelbėti", lot. (ad)iuuāre „t. p.", auēre „trokšti" ir kt.). Denominatyvinė bl.-sl. priesaga *-HauH-i̯e/o- atsirado arba per univerbaciją iš frazeologizmų su *HauH- arba, veikiausiai, iš denominatyvinių veiksmažodžių, išvestų iš sudurtinių žodžių su antruoju dėmeniu *°H(a)uH-. Pastarasis procesas turi gerų paralelių kitose ide. kalbose.

REFERENCES

Aitzetmüller, Rudolf 1978, *Altbulgarische Grammatik als Einführung in die slavische Sprachwissenschaft*, Freiburg: Weiher.

Arumaa, Peeter 1985, *Urslavische Grammatik* 3: *Formenlehre*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Balles, Irene 1999, Lateinisch *sanguis* "Blut", in Heiner Eichner, Hans Christian Luschützky (eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, Prague: Enigma Corporation, 3–17.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1985, *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Benedetti, Marina 1988, *I composti radicali latini. Esame storico e comparativo*, Pisa: Giardini.

Bezzenberger, Adalbert 1903, Über das lange *i* einiger Ableitungs-Elemente, in Γεϱας. *Abhandlungen zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte August Fick zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 153–214.

Brugmann, Karl 1892, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* 2(2), Strassburg: Trübner.

Brugmann, Karl 1913, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* 2(3), 2. Bearbeitung, Strassburg: Trübner.

Debrunner, Albert 1954, *Altindische Grammatik* 2(2)*: Die Nominalsuffixe*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Dunkel, George E. 2000, Latin verbs in *-igāre* and *-īgāre*, in Michaela Ofitsch, Christian Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*, Graz: Leykam, 87–99.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1950, Zum baltischen und slavischen Verbum, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 20, 236–320.

García Ramón, José Luis 1996, Lat. *auēre* "desear", *(ad)iuuāre* "ayudar" e IE *h_2euh_1- "dar preferencia, apreciar", in Alfred Bammesberger, Friedrich Heberlein (eds.), *Akten des VIII. internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*, Heidelberg: Winter, 32–49.

Joseph, Lionel S. 1987, The origin of the Celtic denominatives in *-sag-*, in Calvert Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985): Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference*, Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 113–159.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1995, Lithuanian verbs in *-auti* and *-uoti*, *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 141–143.

Litscher, Roland 2007, Κϱέας, *kravíḥ* and the original nom.-acc. sg. of the IE *s*-stem neuters, in George Coulter, Matthew McCullagh, Benedicte Nielsen, Antonia Ruppel, Olga Tribulato (eds.), *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 107–120.

LIV – *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.

Machek, Václav 1937, Zur Herkunft der slavischen Verbalklasse auf *-ujǫ/-ovati*, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 14, 272–278.

Mayrhofer EWAia – Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* 1–3, Heidelberg: Winter, 1986–2001.

Meillet, Antoine 1902, *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave* 1, Paris: É. Bouillon.

Meillet, Antoine 1934, *Le slave commun, seconde édition revue et augmentée avec le concours de A. Vaillant*, Paris: Champion.

Nahtigal, Rajko 1963, *Slavjanskie jazyki*, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoj literatury [Russian translation of *Slovanski jeziki*, druga, popravljena in pomnožena izdaja, Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1952].

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2000, Védique *dámūnas-*, Latin *dominus* et l'origine du suffixe de Hoffmann, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 95, 61–118.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2006, Compétition poétique et poétique de la competition, in Georges-Jean Pinault, Daniel Petit (eds.), *La langue poétique indo-européenne. Actes du Colloque de travail de la Societé des Études indo-Européennes (Indogermanische Gesellschaft/ Society for Indo-European Studies), Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003*, Leuven, Paris: Peeters, 367–411.

Puhvel, Jaan 1984, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* 2: *E, I,* Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Rau, Jeremy 2011, Indo-European kinship terminology: *ph_2tr-oṷ-*, *$ph_2t\underset{.}{r}$-ṷ-* and its Derivatives, *Historische Sprachforschung* 124, 1–25.

Rix, Helmut 1992², *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schindler, Jochem 1976, On the Greek type ἱππεύς, in Anna Morpurgo Davies, Wolfgang Meid (eds.), *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the occasion of his 70. birthday June 5, 1976*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 349–352.

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

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

de Vaan, Michiel 2009, The derivational history of Greek ἵππος and ἱππεύς, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 37, 198–213.

Vaillant, André 1946 (rev.), Christian S. Stang, Das slavische und baltische Verbum, 1942, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 42(2), 154–158.

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

van Wijk, Nicolaas 1926, Zu den slavischen und baltischen Präteritalstämmen auf *-ā-*, *-ē-*, *Tauta ir Žodis* 4, 67–84.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2011, The origin of the type Lith. *bliáuti*, *bliáuja*, Latv. *b̦aût*, *b̦aûju* in a Balto-Slavic perspective, *Baltistica* 46, 201–223.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2013, Two Baltic irregular preterites: Lith. *dãvė* "gave", *ẽmė* "took", *Baltistica* 48, 225–244.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel (fthc.), Depalatalization in the *ia*-presents of the *u*-series of ablaut.

Vondrák, Václav 1924, *Vergleichende slavische Grammatik* 1: *Lautlehre und Stammbildungslehre, Zweite stark vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Weitenberg, Joseph Johannes Sicco 1984, *Die hethitischen* u-*Stämme*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Widmer, Paul 2008, Drei griechische *-ōu̯-Stämme, in Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart, Paul Widmer (eds.), *Chomalangma, Demawend und Kasbek. Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Halle (Saale): International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, 615–630.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01513 Vilnius
Lithuania
[*Miguel.Villanueva@flf.vu.lt*]