Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON
Vilnius University

A NOTE ON THE BALTIC FUTURE PARTICIPLE

1. In spite of its synchronic regularity, the Baltic future is beset with problems of every possible sort from a historical point of view. In this article I will deal with the morphological lack of fit between the indicative forms (3rd person *duõs*, 1 pl. *dúosime*, etc.) and the participle *dúosiant-*. In order to see the problem in its proper perspective it will be convenient to begin with a brief discussion of the future finite forms.

2. Standard Lithuanian presents an endingless 3rd person *duõ-s* beside *i*-inflection in the plural: 1 pl. *dúo-si-me*, 2 pl. *dúo-si-te*.[1] In the singular 1 *dúo-siu*, 2 *dúo-si* are ambiguous between *-i-* and *ia*-inflection. The paradigm of Latvian agrees perfectly with that of Lithuanian: 3rd person *duôs*, 1 sg. *duôšu*, 2 sg. *duôsi*, 1 pl. *duôsim*, 2 pl. *duôsit* (*-iet*).

In addition, Lithuanian dialects present athematic plural forms in two non-contiguous areas (Žemaitian and East Aukštaitian): 1 pl. *dúo-s-me*, 2 pl. *dúo-s-te*.[2]

3. We can distinguish three main theories concerning the origin of the Baltic future:[3]

---

[1] The dual patterns with the plural (1 du. *dúo-si-va*, 2 du. *dúo-si-ta*; dial. *dúo-s-va*, *dúo-s-ta*). Here and below "plural" thus stands for "plural and dual".

[2] Cf. Zigmas Z i n k e v i č i u s, *Lietuvių dialektologija*, Vilnius: Mintis, 1966, 360. Dialectal variants like Lith. *dúo-sia-me*, *dúo-sa-me* are easily understood innovations and need not delay us here. The few Old Prussian data do not contribute to our present problem.

[3] No effort is made in this article to discuss all relevant facts and the ample literature on the subject. I refer to Eugen H i l l, Die sigmatischen Modus-Bildungen der indogermanischen Sprachen. Erste Abhandlung: Das baltische Futur und seine Verwandten, *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 1, 2004, 69–171, for a richly documented study of the Baltic future and its *comparanda* elsewhere in the family.

i) From the injunctive of the sigmatic aorist.[4] Although doubtless attractive from a formal point of view (e.g. 3rd person *duõs* < *$d\bar{o}$-s-t*), this theory entails a peculiar development and forces us to reckon with such an archaic category as the injunctive in the last stages of Proto-Balto-Slavic. This is unlikely. Most scholars thus prefer deriving the Baltic future from a PIE desiderative in *-(h_1)s-:[5]

ii) From a desiderative in *-$s\underset{.}{i}e/o$-.[6] The PIE pedigree of this formation is not in doubt: Indo-Iranian *$s\underset{.}{i}a$*-future (Ved. *yakṣyá-* "will sacrifice", GAv. *vaxšiia-* "will say"), Gaulish *pissíumí* "I will see", probably Gk. κείω "I will lie, I desire to lie" (<*$\hat{k}ei$-$h_1s\underset{.}{i}é/ó$-).[7] But the 3rd person *duõs* and the entire plural can of course not stem directly from *-$s\underset{.}{i}e/o$- (1 sg. *dúo-siu*, 2 sg. *dúo-si* are ambiguous).

iii) From an athematic desiderative in *-s-. This theory accounts for the 3rd person *duõs* (< *$d\bar{o}$-s-ti*, with *i*-apocope),[8] the main point of debate being the plural forms. If Lith. dial. 1 pl. *dúo-s-me*, 2 pl. *dúo-s-te* are derived directly from 1 pl. *$d\bar{o}$-s-me* etc.,[9] their subsequent renovation as *$d\bar{o}$-si-me* (rather

---

[4] E.g. Johannes S c h m i d t, *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra*, Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1889, 424ff.; Frederik K o r t l a n d t, Innovations which betray archaisms, *Baltistica* 18(1), 1982, 6ff., among others.

[5] The PIE desiderative presented two allomorphs: *-h_1s- after resonants, *-s- after stops (see Miguel V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n, Baltic *sta*-presents and the Indo-European desiderative, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115, 2010, 204–233, for a possible reflex in Baltic). Since this is irrelevant for our present problem, in what follows I will schematically note it as *-s-.

[6] E.g. Warren C o w g i l l (rev.), Jaan Puhvel, Laryngeals and the Indo-European verb, *Language* 39, 1963, 264; Carlos G a r c í a C a s t i l l e r o, Eine Bemerkung zur Flexion des baltischen Futurums, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 104, 1999, 214ff., among others.

[7] Cf. Patrick Henry H o l l i f i e l d, Homeric κείω and the Greek desideratives of the type δρāσείει, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 86, 1981, 173ff.

[8] Cf. Lith. 3 sg. *vẽda*, Sl. *vede* (beside *vedetъ*, *-tъ*) < *$\underset{.}{u}éd^h$-e-ti; Sl. 1 sg. *berǫ* < *$b^hér$-$\bar{o}$-mi; Bl.-Sl. *ā*-stem instr. sg. *-ān* < *-ā-mi (contrast *-u-mi, *-i-mi). The exact conditioning of the Balto-Slavic *i*-apocope is still debated; see most recently Hans Henrich H o c k, Morphology and *i*-apocope in Slavic and Baltic, in Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela Della Volpe (eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference* (= *Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series* 53), Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 2007, 65–75.

[9] E.g. Antanas J a k u l i s, Lietuvių kalbos būsimojo laiko formantų raida, *Baltistica* 2(1), 1966, 60ff.; Jonas K a z l a u s k a s, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis, 1968, 368ff.; H i l l, *Op. cit.*, 95ff.

than *dō-sa-me or *dō-si̯a-me) remains unclear. It is equally uncertain why the 1 sg. *-s-mi should have been renewed as *-si̯ō and not *-sō. According to a different approach, to which I also adhere,[10] the *i*-inflection originated in a resegmented 3 pl. *-s-n̥ti > *-sinti (whence 1 pl. *-s-me → *-si-me etc.). We could then posit a Balto-Slavic paradigm 1 sg. *dō-s-mi, 2 sg. *dō-(s-)si, 3 sg. *dō-s-t(i), 1 pl. *dō-si-me, 2 pl. *dō-si-te, 3 pl. *dō-si-nt(i). The Baltic singular forms must be secondary after the plural *i*-inflection (doubtless favored, in the case of 1 sg. *dōsi̯ō, by the earlier replacement of Bl.-Sl. 2 sg. *dōsi by Bl. *dōsei, *vel sim.*). Lith. dial. 1 pl. *dúo-s-me*, 2 pl. *dúo-s-te* are best taken as analogical to the 3ʳᵈ person *duõs* after the model of pres. *vẽda* : *vẽda-me*, pret. *vẽdė* : *vẽdė-me*, etc.[11]

Apart from Baltic, a PIE athematic desiderative is found in the Sabellian future (Um. **ferest** "feret", Os. *deiuast* "iurabit"), in potential relics like Ved. *cáṣṭe* "looks at" (< *kʷék̂-s-) or Hitt. *ganēss-ᵐⁱ* "recognize" (< *ĝn̥éh₃-s-), and, perhaps, in the Old Irish unreduplicated future (*seiss* "will sit", *-ré* "will run", etc.).

4. We can now turn to the participle. Most Lithuanian dialects present an active future participle *dúosiant-* (nom. sg. masc. *dúosi̯as*, fem. *dúosianti*, etc.), also well attested in Old Lihuanian.[12] Latv. *duôšuot* (< *dōsi̯anti*) agrees perfectly with Lith. *dúosiant-*.

The passive future participle presents *i*-inflection: Lith. *-si-mas* (*bū́simas* "about to be"), Latv. dial. *nãksim*, but there are clear examples of *-si̯a-ma- in old texts (e.g. OLith. *-semas* Margarita Theologica, OLatv. *būšam* Stender).[13]

---

[10] Jānis E n d z e l ī n s, *Baltu valodu skaņas un formas*, Rīga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība, 1948, 204; William R. S c h m a l s t i e g, The vocalism of the Lithuanian sigmatic future, *Slavic and East European Journal* 16, 1958, 123ff.; Jay H. J a s a n o f f, *Stative and middle in Indo-European*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1978, 103ff.; I d e m, in Alfred Bammesberger (ed.), *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1988, 233; I d e m, *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, 133; V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n, *Op. cit.*, 219ff. As per Jasanoff, this account implies that the PIE athematic desiderative displayed Narten ablaut.

[11] E.g. Christian S. S t a n g, *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*, Oslo: Dybwad, 1942, 204; I d e m, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsö: Universitetsforlaget, 1966, 399.

[12] Analogical *i*-inflection *dúosint-* occurs in the dialects, but is definitely rare, cf. Z i n k e v i č i u s, *Lietuvių dialektologija*, 77, 383f.

[13] Cf. Christian S. S t a n g, Partizipium futuri pass. im Litauisch-Lettischen, *Scando-Slavica* 5, 1959, 3–6.

The only trace of a synthetic future in Slavic is precisely the fossilized participle RuCS. *byšǫšt-* / *byšęšt-* "about to be", ORu. *sъ-byšjuč-*, OCz. *pro-byšúcný* "useful". Internal Slavic evidence does not permit deciding which of both variants is older, *byšǫšt-* (< *-sịo-nt-*) or *byšęšt-* (< *-s-ṇt-*).[14] *byšęšt-* is in any case easier to generate as an innovation than *byšǫšt-*.[15] Comparison with Baltic favors *byšǫšt-*.

5. We can thus reconstruct an active future participle *-sịo-nt-* for Balto-Slavic, hard to reconcile with the Baltic (Balto-Slavic) finite forms.

The participle has always figured among the main arguments supporting the "*sịe/o*-theory". The problem, of course, is that the finite forms cannot derive from *-sịe/o-*. Several scholars have thus presented "suppletive theories" on the Baltic future. Cowgill (*loc. cit.*), for instance, derives the 3rd person *duõs* from an athematic desiderative, the participle and the singular from *-sịe/o-* (the plural *i*-forms would be secondary). Similarly Hill (*loc. cit.*), who derives dial. 1 pl. *dúosme* etc. from an athematic desiderative as well. In a partially different vein Stang (*loc. cit.*) derives all forms except for the 3rd person from a "semithematic" suffix *-si-* / *-sịo-*. Meillet's theory of a PIE "semithematic" inflection, however, can now be confidently qualified as obsolete.

For scholars deriving the Baltic future from an athematic desiderative the participle poses an almost insurmountable obstacle. One could reasonably expect only *-sint-* (< *-s-ṇt-*), or *-sant-* (< *-s-ont-*). Some scholars have proposed that *-siant-* is somehow secondary: Pedersen starts from *-s-ent-*, Schmalstieg from *-s-int-* (< *-s-ṇt-*), Kazlauskas from *-s-ont-*.[16] *-siant-* would then be analogical to the *ia*-presents, to 1 sg. *-sịō*, or to 1 pl. *-sime* etc. But, as we have seen, Bl.-Sl. *-sịont-* is firmly anchored in the data. In addition, the replacement of a perfectly stable participle in *-sint-* or *-sant-* (cf. Lith. *vẽdant-* to *vẽda* "leads", *mýlint-* to *mýli* "loves") is unmotivated. Within the "suppletive approach", Jasanoff (*loc. cit.*) derives the finite forms from an

---

[14] Discussion in Henrik Birnbaum, The Church Slavonic future participle from a comparative perspective, *Die Welt der Slaven* 40, 1995, 85ff., with references.

[15] See Christian S. Stang, Partizipium Futuri im Baltischen, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 5, 1932, 86 (= Idem, *Opuscula linguistica*, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsö: Universitetsforlaget, 1970, 133); Hollifield, *Op. cit.*, 169; Hill, *Op. cit.*, 105f., for different scenarios.

[16] Holger Pedersen, *Études lituaniennes*, Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1933, 18; Schmalstieg, *Op. cit.*, 127; Kazlauskas, *Op. cit.*, 371.

athematic Narten desiderative, the participle from a *si̯e/o*-desiderative. While surely more attractive, the motivation for the creation of such a paradigm in Balto-Slavic still remains to be found.[17]

6.1. In my view the path towards a proper understanding of the presence of 3rd person *duõs*, 1 pl. *dúosime* etc. beside ptcp. *dúosiant-* comes from serious consideration of the following facts:

i) It is probably safe to conclude that the finite forms and the participle cannot possibly derive from the same source, but this does not automatically allow us to postulate a historically suppletive paradigm for the finite forms as well. Since a PIE athematic desiderative with Narten ablaut accounts for the whole finite paradigm, it is better to keep apart the participle alone.

ii) It is well known that PIE possessed a large number of desiderative formations: *-se/o- (Gk. ἐλεύσομαι "I will come", Lat. *quaesō* "seek, request"), reduplicated (Ved. *cíkitsati* "desires to know", OIr. *-cicherr* "will put"), as well as *-s- and *-si̯e/o-. Their distribution is unclear, but I can see only two (not mutually exclusive) possibilities: i) there was some type of difference in meaning between them, ii) they were in lexical distribution, each verb selecting one or another formation for reasons that are at present irrecoverable (but see below).

iii) Finally, the future participle is a form of very modest occurrence in actual speech. Although in Old Lithuanian it was of broader use than it is today,[18] there is no reason to suppose that it was ever particularly common except for some verbs like "to be", "to come", "to give birth", "to die", and perhaps in some specific syntactic constructions.[19] It is surprising that this fact has never been noticed in connection with our present problem.

6.2. These considerations, I believe, allow us to propose the following scenario:

In its way towards generalization as the only future tense formation the (pre-)Balto-Slavic athematic (future-)desiderative must obviously have passed through a period of competition and variation with other desiderative forma-

---

[17] Jasanoff's earlier suggestion that the complex suffix *-s-i̯e/o- was restricted to the participle in PIE (*Stative and Middle*, 105) is unattractive. Criticism in Jared K l e i n (rev.), Jay H. Jasanoff, Stative and middle in Indo-European, *Language* 60(1), 1984, 136f.

[18] Cf. Vytautas A m b r a z a s, *Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė*, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1979, 42f., 61f.

[19] To give just an example, in the R̥gveda, where the future in *-sya-* is the only way to express futurity in the participle, we have 29 examples from 12 roots.

tions. It is a reasonable assumption that some particularly common verbs resisted the spread of the athematic type for a longer time. Let us next suppose, for the sake of the argument, that some of them presented the following properties:

a) they built an (inherited?) $si̯e/o$-desiderative,

b) the participle was of relatively frequent use.

The verb "to be" would be the obvious choice, but "to come", "to die" and some other may well have belonged in this group as well.

If this is correct, we can speculate that a participle like $*b\bar{u}\text{-}si̯ont\text{-}$ "about to be" (and eventually $*g^{w}em\text{-}si̯ont\text{-}$ "about to come", $*mer\text{-}si̯ont\text{-}$ "about to die", etc.) was preserved after $*b\bar{u}\text{-}si̯e\text{-}ti$ was ousted by $*b\bar{u}\text{-}s\text{-}ti$. It would then be possible for a limited number of verbs with a pragmatically salient $si̯ont$-participle to impose their morphology on the whole category.

If this happened at a time when the Balto-Slavic future(-desiderative) had already acquired plural i-inflection, this could have favored the maintenance of the participle in $*\text{-}si̯ont\text{-}$ (or, at least, it would have been easier to tolerate in an uncommon paradigm).

6.3. A handicap with this scenario is that it is of a purely speculative nature and cannot be tested against the data. This is of course a general problem when studying the PIE desiderative. In contrast with the abundance of PIE formations, the languages usually present a single type of future tense and few or no clues about its prehistory. The case of Vedic (with two functionally distinct formations) or Celtic (with several future formations) is exceptional.

But there is perhaps a way out. As Jasanoff has pointed out, it is noteworthy that the desiderative tends to mirror the present stem formations (athematic, thematic, reduplicated, $*\text{-}i̯e/o\text{-}$, perhaps other).[20] Jasanoff further observes that it is possible that a given verb would have selected a given desiderative type depending on its present stem (Narten presents would pattern with Narten desideratives, reduplicated presents with reduplicated desideratives, etc.). While the correctness of this idea remains to be worked out (if this is possible at all),[21] it is interesting to observe that a $i̯e/o$-present from the root $*b^{h}uH\text{-}$ is abundantly attested: Gk. φύω, Lat. $f\bar{\imath}o$, OIr. $bíu$, OE $b\bar{e}o$, prob-

---

[20] J a s a n o f f, *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*, 135.

[21] The proper way to proceed would probably be to collect all potential examples of fossilized desideratives we find in the languages and compare them with the PIE *averbo* of their respective roots. It is uncertain whether such an enterprise would yield positive results.

ably from an *i*-present *b^huH-*i*-. If PIE *i*-presents tended to correlate with desideratives in *-*s*ie/o*-, this would support the antiquity of *b^huH-s*ie/o*- (: YAv. *būšiiaṇt*-). Note that potentially relevant roots like *g^wem- "come" (Gk. βαίνω, Lat. *ueniō*) or *mer*- "die" (Ved. *mriyáte*, Lat. *morior*) also built a *ie/o*-present in PIE.

PASTABA DĖL BALTŲ KALBŲ BŪSIMOJO LAIKO DALYVIŲ RAIDOS

Santrauka

Baltų kalbų būsimojo laiko morfologinį neatitikimą tarp asmenuojamųjų formų (lie. 3 as. *duõs*, dgs. 1 as. *dúosime* etc.) ir veikiamosios rūšies dalyvio (lie. *dúosiant*-, plg. sl. *byšǫšt*-), tęsiančių du skirtingus ide. dezideratyvų tipus (atematinį ir *-*s*ie/o*-), galima aiškinti taip: kadangi būsimojo laiko dalyvis yra retas, jis galėjo būti apibendrintas iš kelių itin dažnų veiksmažodžių („būti", „ateiti", „mirti" etc.), kur paveldėtasis *s*ie/o*-dezideratyvas buvo išlaikytas ilgiau nei kituose veiksmažodžiuose ir kur dalyvis buvo palyginti dažnas.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01513 Vilnius
Lithuania
[*miguelvillanueva@yahoo.com*]