**ACTIVE PARTICIPLES IN BALTIC**

**Abstract.** The nom. pl. form of the active participles continues the original neuter sg. form, e.g. Lith. *jái nuo dárbo rankàs sukàs*. It is an impersonal predicative form to be compared with the Proto-Indo-European uninflected predicative form in *‑om* that has been preserved in Old Prussian.
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Following Endzelin (1913, 125) and Cowgill (1970), Marek Majer has recently (2017) maintained that the Lith. nom. pl. form of the active
participle *veda* continues the Proto-Balto-Slavic finite 3rd pl. present form *wedanti < *-onti* and that the corresponding preterit form veda is analogical to the present form *veda*. This hypothesis requires an early apocope of *-i* not shared by Slavic followed by the loss of final *-t*. These developments are disproved by the preservation of *-nt(is)* in the gerund, the athematic 3rd sg. ending *-ti*, and the inst. sg. ending *-mi*. Majer comments (2017, 22f.):

“The apocope in question is an elusive phenomenon, often invoked for both Balt. and Sl. in different positions, but with contentious and intensely debated details. This is of minor importance for the derivation of Lith. veda from PBSl. *wedanti*, however. The operation of the apocope (prior to the loss of the now word-final *-t*) in the Balt. present paradigm is clear, as proved by the inevitable derivation of 3. sg. pres. veda from *wedeti* – despite the non-phonological generalization of the thematic vowel *-a-* and the stabilization of columnar stress on the root – both well-known, sweeping innovations.”

This should have been a warning that he is on the wrong track. The evidence shows that there was no early apocope of *-i* and that the 3rd sg. form veda must not be derived from *wedeti*.

Disregarding the counter-evidence to the apocope of *-i* and the thematic present endings and without discussing the Slavic evidence (for which see Kortlandt 1979, 59–63; 2009, 157–160), Majer dismisses the forms *esq* and *ēja* as irrelevant (2017, 1220) and does not even mention the Prussian evidence, calling the nom. sg. form *esints* “unattested” and the attested patterns of vowel alternation in Old Prussian and Old Lithuanian “unverifiable”, in spite of the fact that Prussian nom. sg. -sins, dat. sg. -sentismu and OLith. nom. sg. ēsqs, ējas, nom. pl. ēsq, ēja beside obl. sant-, ent- < *jent- leave nothing to be desired. Endzelin’s suggestion that the original 3rd pl. form was preserved in such instances as Lith. nebeturim kas valgq ‘wir haben nichts mehr zum Essen’, jis žinos kas darq ‘er wird wissen, was zu machen ist’ (1913, 125) cannot be maintained in view of the nominative kas. The nom. pl. form of the participle continues the original neuter sg. form, as in *jai nuo dárbo rankas suką* *(she said) her arms ache from work* (Ambrazas 1997, 371), which is evidently an impersonal predicative form to be compared with the Proto-Indo-European uninflected predicative form in *-om* that has been preserved in Old Prussian, e.g. Stai gannai housei pomeston swaain wijrin ‘Die Weiber sein vnterthan jren Mennern’, Greek οὐκ ἀγαθόν πολυκοιρανίη ‘the
rule of many is not a good thing’ (Kortlandt 2009, 118, 122; 2017). The syntactic construction with an oblique subject and an accusative object may be compared with Russian lodku uneslo vetrom ‘the boat (acc.) was carried away by the wind (inst.’). Since Majer’s theory is clearly wrong, I shall not discuss the accentological aspects.

VEIKIAMIEJI DALYVIAI BALTŲ KALBOSE

Santrauka

Veikiamųjų dalyvių nom. pl. forma tęsia pirminę neutr. sg. formą, pvz., lie. jái nuo dárbo rankás sukā. Tai yra beasmenė predikatyvinė forma, kurią galima palyginti su ide. nekaitoma predikatyvine forma su *-om, išlikusia prūsų kalboje.
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