M i g u e l   V I L L A N U E V A   S V E N S S O N
Vilnius University

TWO BALTIC IRREGULAR PRETERITES:
LITH. *dãvė* "GAVE", *ė̃mė* "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 S c h m i d 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 *-*i̯ā*-.[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. *veĩkti*, *veĩkia*, *veĩkė* "do") and causative-iteratives of the type *sakýti*, *sãko*, *sãkė* "say", the verbal classes in which a composite suffix *-*i̯ā*- (i.e., an *ā*-preterite added to a stem *-*i*- extracted from *ia*- and *i̯a*-presents) could have originated;

ii) the *ē*-preterite is also proper to some types of thematic presents (Lith. *vèsti*, *vẽda*, *vẽdė* "lead"; *málti*, *mãla*, *mãlė* "grind"; *gìnti*, *gìna*, *gýnė* "defend"; dial. *lìpti*, *lìpa*, *lìpė* "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. *mãlo*, Latv. *malu*; Lith. *lìpo*, 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. *vẽdė*, cf. Latv. dial. *vẹdu*, OPr. *weddē-din*), whereas in other it was a fairly recent development of some East Baltic dialects (Lith. *mãlė*);

iii) the regular length of the *ē*-preterite to TET- and TER-roots (Lith. *beřti*, *bẽria*, *bě̃rė* "strew, scatter"; *kùlti*, *kùlia*, *kū̃lė* "thrash"; *võgti*, *vãgia*,

---

[1] I refer to V i l l a n u e v a   S v e n s s o n 2005, with references, for a full argumentation of this view.

võgė "steal") is best explained as due to retraction of the ictus from **-ìi̯ā*. A parallel is furnished by the abstracts of the type *gẽris* "goodness" < **ger-ìi̯o-* (: *gẽras* "good"), cf. L a r s s o n 2004; V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n 2011b, 14f. As I will argue at length elsewhere, the pervasive tone variation of originally acute *ia*-presents like *grébia / grẽbia* "rakes", *spréndžia / 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. V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n 2005, 248ff.). In this article I will be concerned with two utterly problematic and yet unexplained cases: Lith. *dãvė* "gave" and *ė̃mė* "took".

Lith. *dãvė* "gave"

2. Apart from the preterite, the Baltic paradigm of the verb "to give" is perfectly clear: inf. **'dṓ-tĕi* (Lith. *dúoti*, Latv. *duõt/duôt*, OPr. *dāt*, *dātwei*), athem. pres. **dṓd-'mi* (OLith. *dúomi*, *dúosi*, *dúosti*, OLatv. 1 sg. *duõmu*, 2 sg. *duõs*, OPr. 3rd *dāst*; thematized modern Lith. *dúoda*, Latv. *duôdu*), fully corresponding to OCS inf. *dati*, pres. *damь*, *dasi*, *dastъ*. In the preterite there is more variation. Beside Lith. *dãvė* 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. *tavè* "you"; Latv. *revêt* ~ *ravêt*, Lith. *ravéti* "weed"). As observed by S t a n g (1966, 381), the antiquity of the stem **dav-* is almost proved by the vocalism of derivatives like Lith. *dovanà*, Latv. *dâvana* "gift", Lith. *dõvis* "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. *dãvė* continues the Proto-Baltic preterite of the verb "to give".

The main problem with *dãvė*, 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 *dãv-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*, *šlãvė* "sweep" and, with the *ā*-preterite, by the denominative type Lith. *mel-úoti*, *-úoja*, *-ãvo*, Latv. *mel-uôt*, *-uõju*, *-uõju*, dial. *-avu* "lie" (: Lith. *mẽlas*, Latv. *mẹli* "lie"). We will return to these formations below (§ 6).

3. In an Indo-European perspective it is customary to derive *dãvė* from a variant *deh_3u-* or *deu-* of the root *deh_3-* "to give".[2] *deh_3u-* (with zero grade *duh_3-* < *dh_3u-* and eventually a new full grade *$deuh_3$-*) could be interpreted as a *u*-enlargement of *deh_3-* perhaps going back, in the last instance, to a *u*-stem nominal or a *u*-present, whereas the existence of *deu-* beside *deh_3-* could be weakly justified by potential parallels like *$drem$-* ~ *$dreh_2$-* ~ *$dreu$-* "run".[3] There are several reasons to consider this a very unlikely solution.

Leaving Baltic aside, the main evidence for a root *deh_3u-* (*vel. sim.*) comes from some Italic modal forms: OLat. subj. *duim*, *duam*, Fal. *douiad*, Um. *purdouito,* **purtuvitu** "let him offer" (< *por-$douītōd$). Other alleged verbal reflexes (Gk. Cypr. inf. *dowenai*, 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" (< *duh_3-es-), OIr. *dúas* f. "reward given to poets" (< *deh_3u-s-tah_2-), or Lat. *dautia, -ōrum* "hospitality gifts" (< *doh_3u-et-io-, *vel sim.*). These, in any case, could be explained as secondary derivatives from an obsolete *u*-stem *$dó/éh_3u$-* "gift", later replaced by the familiar *doh_3-no-*, *doh_3-ro-*.[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 *deh_3u-* 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 as suppose, for a moment, that Balto-

---

[2] E.g. E n d z e l i n 1923, 679; S t a n g 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. *dãvė*, like the idea that *-ou-* was the regular reflex of *-e/oh_3-* before vowels (e.g. S t a n g 1966, 76, with reference to Martinet), or Schmalstieg's reconstruction of the root "to give" as *dou-*, later monophthongized into *$dō$-* (S c h m a l s t i e g 2000, 79f., 192).

[4] The Cyprian infinitive *dowenai* may be directly equated with Ved. inf. *dā-váne* "to give" or derive from *$dŏ$-$enai$* with secondary glide. The optative *duwanoi* probably does not exist, cf. C o w g i l l 1964, 352ff. Sl. *$davắti$* (OCS *-davắti*, 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* C o w g i l l 1964, 355; V a i l l a n t 1966, 485).

[5] Cf. W o d t k o, I r s l i n g e r, S c h n e i d e r 2008, 61, 65f.[21-30], with references.

[6] See V i n e 2006, 239f., with references, for a brief discussion.

Slavic inherited a PIE root aorist *$déh_3u$-t "gave" (*vel sim.*) beside the "normal" paradigm pres. *$dé$-deh_3-ti, aor. *$déh_3$-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 *$dṓ$- beside pres. *$dṓd$-'mi and inf. *'$dṓ$-těi. It is hard to see what could be the motivation to replace a perfectly acceptable preterite *$dṓ$-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 *dãvė* does not embrace the obviously related Lith. *šlãvė*, *mel-ãvo* (: *šlúoti*, *mel-úoti*). These would have to be explained either as analogical to *dãvė* or in some other way (see below § 6). This is needless to say unattractive.

In brief, the relative popularity of the idea that Lith. *dãvė* 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 *dãvė*, the only option left seems to be a direct equation with the Vedic perfect 1/3 sg. *dadáu* "gave" (e.g. S t a n g 1942, 195ff.; K o r t l a n d t 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. *stovéti*, *stóvi* "stand" ~ Ved. *tastháu*, Gk. ἕστηκα).[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. *dãvė*).

4. In general terms, it is difficult to imagine that Baltic could have inherited anything else than a root aorist *$dṓ$- or sigmatized *$dṓ$-s- (: OCS *da(stъ)*), which in principle should have ended up as pret. *$dō$-jā (Lith. †*dúojo*). This implies that *dãvė* (as well as *šlãvė*, *sapnãvo*) must reflect a specifically Baltic development that is still to be discovered. I am aware of the following inner-Baltic accounts of *dãvė*, 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 *dãvė* was the idea that the variant *$devē$ goes back, in the last instance, to the reduplicated perfect participle *$dedv$- (: Ved. *dadvás*-), e.g. E n d z e l i n 1923, 679, with references; S t a n g 1942, 195ff. Criticism in S t a n g 1966, 381.

Va i l l a n t (1966, 452) suggests that Lith. *dãvė* was secondarily built to the infinitive stem **dúo-* with the alternation *uo : av* of the type Lith. *-úoti, -úoja, -ãvo*. 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-*.

B a m m e s b e r g e r (1982, 246ff.) proposes that **dav-* originated in the preterite participle. The nom. sg. **da-u̯ōs* or **dō-u̯ōs* was reanalyzed as **dau̯-ōs/*dōu̯-ōs* on the model of roots ending in a labial (e.g. **lip-u̯ōs > *lip-ōs*), later triggering a remodeling of the oblique stem **daus-* (< **da-us-* or **dō-us-*) as **dau̯-us-*, to which the new preterite **dau̯-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.

C o w g i l l (1964, 355), building on M a h l o w (1879, 83), starts from the assumption that the diphthongization **ō > uo* passed through an intermediate stage **ōᵘ* ([ou̯]). The preterite suffixes **-ā-*, **-ē-* were added precisely at this stage: **dō-t-, *sapn-ō-t-> *dou̯-t-, *sapn-ou̯-t- → *dou̯-ē-, *sapn-ou̯-ā- > dãvė, sapnãvo*. 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 *dãvė*. Before proceeding further, it may be convenient to briefly remember the main points that a proper explanation of *dãvė* 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) *šlãvė, sapnãvo* should reflect the same process (put it otherwise, the pattern inf. **°ó-tĕi-* : pret. **°av-* 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 *°Ē-: *dē-jā-, *stā-jā-, *bud-ē-jā-, *bij-ā-jā- (Lith. déjo, stójo, budéjo, bijójo, inf. Lith. déti "put", stóti "stand up", budéti "be awake", bijóti "be afraid"). The allomorph *-jā- was most probably extracted from roots ending in *°j- (e.g. Lith. dial. líeti, lė̃ja, léjo "pour", lýti, lỹja, lìjo "rain"), but the ultimate origin of this variant is not of prime importance in our present context. Roots ending in *°ū- and *°v-, on the other hand, predictably made a preterite in *°v-ā- (e.g. Lith. pū́ti, pū́sta, pùvo "rot"; siū́ti, siùva, siùvo "sew"; káuti, -ja/-na, kóvė, dial. kãvo "beat; fight"; denom. uogáuti, -áuja, -ãvo), where, descriptively, -v- takes the place of the more common *Hiatustilger* -j-.

My claim is that verbal stems ending in *°ō- 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-, *sapn-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. -ọ̃u, -ũ, Latv. dial. -uo < EBl. *-ọ̄ < *-ōu, ii) the presence of *uo* in the *u*-series of ablaut, e.g. duobė̃ "pit, hole", dúobti/duõbti "hollow out" : daubà "hollow" : dubùs "deep", duburỹs "waterhole"; kúopa "heap, pile", kuõpti "pile up, cleanse" : kaũpas "heap, pile", kaũpti "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 B ū g a 1921[1959], 349–362, whose position is followed in most handbooks, e.g. E n d z e l i n 1923, 39; S t a n g 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.", *laupýti* "tear" : *luopýti* "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-ei̯e/o-* < **ploud-éi̯e/o-* [Winter's law], *pláuti*, *-ja/-na* "wash", Latv. *laũks* "field", if from Narten causative **plōu-ei̯e/o-* and *vṛddhi* 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* : *ŭ* 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 **-ē̃*, thus giving rise to the *ē*-preterite (**lek-ìi̯ā* > **lẽk-ē* > Lith. *lė̃kė* "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 K a r a l i ū n a s 1987, 206ff. for the dialectal distribution and relative chronology of *-uo-* : *-au-* doublets.

[11] An exception is K a r a l i ū n a s 1987, 189ff., 200ff., but his reconstruction of a PIE paradigm 1 sg. **plōu̯-ō*, 3 sg. **plōu̯-e/o*, 1 pl. **plou̯-mé* cannot be upheld.

[12] A different question is how *-uo-* (< **-ō̧-*) 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 **ȩ̄* : *ei*, *ai* : *ĭ* after the monophthongization **ei*, **ai* > **ȩ̄* (> *ie*) in some contexts (K u r y ł o w i c z 1956, 122ff.; followed by M a ž i u l i s 1970, 49 or S m o c z y ń s k i 2007, 133 and *passim*).

ē-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 *ē*-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. *vèsti*, *vẽda*, *vẽdė* "lead" it seems to have taken place already in Proto-Baltic. It is reasonable to suppose that the earliest expansion of the *ē*-preterite targeted some irregular transitive verbs as well. The preterite of the verb "to give" (**dav-jā- → *dav-ē- >* Lith. *dãvė*) was probably one of those cases. It may well have been supported by its antonym **ḗm-ē* "took" (Lith. *ḗmė*), in all probability one of the first non-original *ē*-preterites as well (see below § 10).

6. In the preceding section I have tacitly assumed that the preterites Lith. *šlãvė*, *mel-ãvo* arose in the same way as *dãvė*. 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. V i n e 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-i̯e/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 **śl̄ṓ-*. The later is that of the primary verb inf. *šlúoti*, pres. *šlúoja* and of derivatives like iter. *šlúostyti* "wipe", Lith. *šlúota*, Latv. *sluôta* "broom". The former is found in the weakly attested Žemaitian present *šlãva* and in a number of derivatives that could in principle be dependent on the preterite *šlãvė*: Lith. *šlavinéti* "sweep (iter.)", abstract *šlavìmas* "sweeping", Latv. pl. *slàumi*, *slaũmi* "sweepings" (< **slavumi*). The antiquity of the diphthongal root is moderately supported by Lith. *šliaũkti* "brush off, sweep off; strike", *šlaukýti* "sweep (iter.)" (: Latv. *slàukt*, *slàucît*) which, interestingly, point to an *aniṭ* root **k̂leu(-k)-*. EBl. **śl̄ṓ-* 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. E r n o u t - M e i l l e t DELL 128). W. *clir* "clear, bright, pure" (usually derived from **k̂lū-ro-*) is probably a loan word from English *clear* (cf. Z a i r 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 $*\hat{k}leh_3u\text{-}tei$- or $*\hat{k}louH\text{-}tei$- will not help either, as these would have given Bl. $*\acute{s}l\acute{a}u$-. Analogy with the preterite $\check{s}l\tilde{a}v\dot{e}$ on the model of $d\acute{u}oti : d\tilde{a}v\dot{e}$, as sometimes assumed (e.g. S t a n g 1966, 360; S m o c z y ń s k i 2007, 647), is equally problematic. Had Baltic only inherited a diphthongal root (be it *seṭ* or *aniṭ*), it is difficult to imagine why a paradigm like $*\acute{s}lauti$, $*\acute{s}lava$, $*\acute{s}lav\bar{a}$ should have been reshaped analogically instead of simply joining the dominant type *bliáuti*, *bliáuja/-na*, *blióvė*. If the traditional etymology is accepted and the rare Žem. *šlãva* is really the original primary present and not a late neologism, one has to accept that Baltic inherited an aorist-infinitive stem $*\acute{s}l\acute{\bar{o}}$- (most naturally derived from a PIE aorist $*\hat{k}l\acute{e}h_3\text{-}t$) beside a variant $*\acute{s}lau$- that could perhaps inherit a u-present $*\hat{k}leH\text{-}u$-.[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. *šlãvė*, 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 *šlúoti : šlãvė* in the same way as *dúoti : dãvė* over one operating with suppletivism or analogy. The selection of the $\bar{e}$-preterite was probably due to the transitivity of *šlúoti*, eventually supported by the present *šlúo-ja* (if old) and by *dãvė* itself. But it is actually uncertain that the Proto-Baltic preterite was $*\acute{s}lav\text{-}\bar{e}$ and not $*\acute{s}lav\text{-}\bar{a}$.

6.2. We can distinguish two main positions concerning the origin of the denominative suffix Lith. *-úoti*, *-úoja*, *-ãvo*, Latv. *-uôt*, *-uõju*, *-uõju* (dial. *-avu*):

i) EBl. $*\text{-}\acute{\bar{o}}ti$, $*\text{-}\acute{\bar{o}}ja$, $*\text{-}av\bar{a}$ is genetically related to the denominative suffix Lith. *-áuti*, *-áuja*, *-ãvo*, both stemming through paradigm split from a unitary Balto-Slavic paradigm cognate with OPr. *-aut*, OCS *-ovati*, *-ujǫ*; e.g. V a i l l a n t 1966, 352f.; K o r t l a n d t 1995;

ii) EBl. $*\text{-}\acute{\bar{o}}ti$, $*\text{-}\acute{\bar{o}}ja$, $*\text{-}av\bar{a}$ is (in)directly related to the Greek denominative type δουλόω "enslave". The suffix "$*\text{-}\bar{o}\text{-}\underset{\cdot}{i}e/o$-" was independently back formed in both languages from deinstrumental *to*-adjectives like Lith. *ragúotas* "horned", Gk. χολωτός "angry", Lat. *aegrōtus* "sick" ($< *\text{-}oh_1\text{-}t\acute{o}$-); e.g. E n d z e l i n 1923, 627f.; S t a n g 1966, 364.

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

---

[14] Similarly (but with a different reconstruction of the morphology) R a s m u s s e n 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-i̯e/o*- would have merged with the larger group of denominatives and deverbatives in *-*ā-i̯e/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-i̯e/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 P e t e r s 1999, 310[44] for Anatolian, Indo-Iranian and Germanic; M a l z a h n 2010, 401ff. for Tocharian). I refer to P e t e r s 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-ãvo*, 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(i̯e/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*, -*ãvo*.

Lith. *ẽmė* "took"

7. The reconstruction of "to take" is more involved than that of "to give". Beside the standard (and fully irregular) Lithuanian paradigm *im̃ti*, *ìma*, *ẽmė* a present *(j)ẽma* is well established in Žemaitian. Other dialectal variants (pret. *ẽmė*, *ìmė*) 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) *jem̃t/jem̂t/jim̂t*, *jẹmu/jemju*, *jẽmu/jêmu/jèmu*²(ē), b) *nem̂t*, *nẹmu*, *nêmu*, c) *ņem̂t/ņem̃t/ņim̂t*, *ņemu*, *ņêmu/ņẽmu/ņèmu*(ē). In contrast with Lithuanian and Latvian, Old Prussian only presents zero grade of the root: inf. *īmt*, pres. 1 sg. *imma*, 1 pl. *immimai*, 2 pl. *immati* (Ench.), pret. *ymmits*, *jmmitz* (1st Catechism), *ymmeits*, *ymmeyts* (2nd Catechism), *imma(ts)* (Ench.).

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

scholars have taken the present Lith. dial. *(j)ẽma* (: Latv. *jęmu*) 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. **im̃-tei-*, pret. **ĕm-ē*, it is difficult to imagine why Prussian generalized the vocalism of the infinitive stem instead of simply replacing it with **em̃-tei-*. The creation of Lith. *ìma* would be equally problematic. In principle one would expect the paradigm to be regularized either as †*em̃ti*, *ẽma*, *ẽmė/ĕ̃mė* or as †*im̃ti*, *ẽma*, *ìmė/ìmo* (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* : *vémė*, *lẽmia* : *lĕ̃mė*, etc.; inf. *vémti* "vomit", *lem̃ti* "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 *jem̂t/jem̃t/jim̂t* was most probably taken from its synonym *nem̂t/nem̃t/ņim̂t*, whose thematic present *nęmu* is certainly old (: Gk. νέμω "deal out, distribute", Go. *niman* "take").[16] The creation of pres. *jęmu* must thus have been strongly supported (if not directly determined) by the previous existence of *nęmu*. 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. *im̃ti*, *ìma*, *ẽmė* is so unique that it almost proves the antiquity of pret. **ĕ̃m-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/jêmu*, we have already seen that it was most probably taken from *ņêmu/ņẽmu*. The replacement of inf. **(j)im̃ti* by **(j)émti* on the model of **némti* almost automatically entailed a parallel rebuilding of the preterite. Note, finally, the circumflex variant *ņèmu* (*jèmu*[2]), presumably to be equated with Lith. *ẽmė*.[17]

---

[15] E.g. K a z l a u s k a s 1968, 360; P e t i t 2004, 338f.; LIV, 236; S m o c z y ń s k i 2007, 220, among others.

[16] The prehistory of *nemt/ņemt/ņimt* is discussed in V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n 2011a, 321.

[17] *Pace* T r e m b l a y (2005, 657[85]) *<ėmjau>* in Klein's *Compendium* does not imply acute *émiau*, as Klein also uses *<ė>* in unstressed position, cf. Š i n k ū n a s 2010, 75ff., 92ff.

I thus conclude that Lith. *im̃ti*, *ìma*, *ẽmė* faithfully continues the Proto-Baltic paradigm of the verb "to take", as already clearly seen by S t a n g (1942, 117; 1966, 381). The problem is not the preterite *$\tilde{e}m$-$\bar{e}$ itself (cf. Lith. *lė̃mė*, *rė̃mė*, etc.), but the whole paradigm to which it belongs.

8. Before returning to *$\tilde{e}m$-$\bar{e}$ it will be convenient to discuss the Indo-European averbo of *h_1em- "to take" (LIV, 236), attested with certainty only in Italo-Celtic and Balto-Slavic.[18] Italic and Celtic agree in having a thematic present *$h_1ém$-e/o- (Lat. *emō*, OIr. *-eim*), but otherwise disagree. The Old Irish *t*-preterite *-ét* has been derived from a sigmatic aorist *$h_1\bar{e}m$-s-t (e.g. S c h u m a c h e r 2004, 65f., 292), but can also derive from a root aorist (or imperfect?) *h_1em-t (e.g. J a s a n o f f 2012, 133). Lat. *ēmī* is traditionally derived from a perfect *h_1e-$h_1(o)m$-, but its interpretation will naturally depend on one's views concerning the Latin long-vowel preterite. M e i s e r (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*, *dīc*, *dūc*. Finally, Os. perf. fut. 3 sg. *pert-emust*, perf. 3 pl. **emmens** probably stem from *em- (< *h_1em-t), but *$\bar{e}m$- (: Lat. *ēmī*) is not categorically excluded, cf. M e i s e r 2003, 73, 199, with references.

In Slavic we find an unusual aspectual contrast between OCS perfective *imǫ* (< *$j\check{b}mǫ$), *jęti*, aor. *jęsъ*, *jętъ* "take" and imperfective *jemljǫ*, *imati*, *imaxъ* (< *$j\check{b}ma$-), both seemingly primary verbs.[19] Unfortunately, whereas the present *imǫ* fully agrees with Bl. *ima, inf. *jęti* and aor. *jętъ* are ambiguous between *im- (: Lith. *im̃ti*) and *$\check{e}m$- (: Lith. *ẽmė*). If, as seems likely (see below), *h_1em- was an aoristic root, one would favor *em- (cf. e.g. OCS *žьrǫ*, *žrěti*, *žrětъ* "swallow" [to the aoristic root *g^werh_3-, LIV, 211f.] vs. *tьr(j)ǫ*, *trъti*, *trъ* "rub" [to the present root *$terh_1$-, LIV, 632f.]), but this criterion is not conclusive. As for *jemljǫ*, *imati*, V a i l l a n t (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 *jemljǫ*. 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. T e d e s c o 1948, 366);

---

[18] I omit Hitt. *wemiya-*[mi] "find" (whose analysis as preverb *u + *h_1em- is quite uncertain, cf. K l o e k h o r s t 2008, 999) and Toch. A *yom*-, B *yänm*- "achieve, reach" (which may belong to *iem- [LIV, 312], cf. M a l z a h n 2010, 796).

[19] I leave out of consideration the utterly problematic *imamь*, *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 *ẽm-ē favors deriving OCS aor. *jętъ* from full-grade *em- or length-ened-grade *ēm-; iii) even if the Baltic infinitive *im-tei- is inherited from Balto-Slavic, the null hypothesis for Slavic is that OCS inf. *jęti* continues *ěm-ti, with the same vocalism as the aorist. Put it otherwise, a strict Balto-Slavic perspective only strengthens the equation Lith. *ìma, im̃ti, ẽmė* = OCS *imǫ, jęti, jętъ* (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. *nm̥H-tei-, aor. *nm̥H-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-, *jьm-a-, with secondary adoption of the anlaut of *jьm-e-, *ję-. 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 routine-ly 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 *jętъ*, Lith. *ẽmė* 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 innovat-ed 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 recon-structed 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. $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$). In an Indo-European perspective it has been customary to equate Lith. $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ with Lat. $\bar{e}m\bar{\imath}$. On the ultimate source there is more controversy. Beside the more or less traditional derivation from a perfect *h_1e-$h_1\acute{o}m$-/*h_1e-h_1m-´ (e.g. M e i s e r 2003, 152³), proposed sources include a root aorist with monosyllabic lengthening in the 2ⁿᵈ and 3ʳᵈ sg. (K o r t l a n d t 2007, 154), a Narten aorist (T r e m b l a y 2005, 657), and a Narten imperfect (J a s a n o f f 2012, 128), all of them starting from PIE 3 sg. *$h_1\acute{e}m$-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 *jętъ*) beside a perfect (Lith. $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$) 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. J a s a n o f f 2012, with references), in this particular case the only evidence pointing to a "Narten profile" of *h_1em- is the putative equation $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ ~ $\bar{e}m\bar{\imath}$ itself, the probative force of which is undermined by the fact that Lat. $\bar{e}m\bar{\imath}$ is too trivially derived from a perfect *h_1e-h_1m-. The last handicap applies to Kortlandt's and Tremblay's proposals as well.

But the whole issue of Lith. $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ 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 *bė̃rė*, *vémė*, *lė̃mė*, *kū́lė*, *võgė*, 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 °ER-, °EU- and °ET-roots. Such systematicity strongly speaks in favor of a relatively recent origin. Lith. *ìma*, *im̃ti*, $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$, 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. *bė̆i*, 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 $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$, as in my view this is an exclusively Baltic coinage (see below). If PIE *$h_1\acute{e}m$-t is believed to give Bl. *$\acute{e}m$-, the intonation of $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ must have been taken from inf. *im̃ti*.

[22] To give just an example, the irregular preterite of *mir̃ti*, *mìršta*, *mìrė* "die" depends on an inherited present *$miria$ < *$m\mathring{r}$-$i\acute{e}$-tor. It certainly does not require something like PIE aor. *mr-$\acute{e}h_1$-t or *mr-$\acute{e}$-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-$\bar{e}$ → *$\tilde{e}m$-$\bar{e}$ on the model of the type $r\tilde{e}mia$: $r\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ (e.g. S m o c z y ń s k i 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 S t a n g (1942, 117; 1966, 381) and assume that the analogy with the preterite type $r\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$, $l\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ 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, P e t i t (2004, 338f.) suggests that the long vowel was extracted from the negative form: *$n\grave{e}$-$\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ > *$n\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ → $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$. This account has the disadvantage of operating with a fully incontrollable process. The well-known parallel of $\tilde{e}jo$ "went" (beside widespread dial. $\bar{e}jo$), is not as good as it may seem at first sight. Lith. $\tilde{e}jo$/$\bar{e}jo$ looks like a fairly recent coinage (note the Latvian suppletive pret. $g\tilde{a}ju$), whereas the antiquity of $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ is directly supported by Latv. $j\tilde{e}mu$/$j\hat{e}mu$ (Lith. dial. $\tilde{e}m\dot{e}$ 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 *-$i\underaccent{\smile}{i}\bar{a}$- > *-$\bar{e}$- 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 $\check{c}\underaccent{\smile}{b}t\rho$: $\check{c}is\underaccent{\smile}{b}$ "count" (: Latv. $\check{s}\underaccent{.}{k}ist$, $\check{s}\underaccent{.}{k}iet$ "seem"), $\check{z}\underaccent{\smile}{b}r\rho$: $\check{z}r\check{e}x\underaccent{\smile}{b}$ "swallow" (: Lith. $g\acute{e}rti$, $g\tilde{e}ria$ "drink"), -$n\underaccent{\smile}{b}r\rho$: -$nr\check{e}x\underaccent{\smile}{b}$ "submerge" (: Lith. $n\acute{e}rti$, $n\tilde{e}ria$, Latv. $n\grave{i}rt$, $niru$ "dive"), -$p\underaccent{\smile}{b}n\rho$: -$p\rho s\underaccent{\smile}{b}$[23] "stretch" (: Lith. $p\grave{i}nti$, $p\grave{i}na$ "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 ($g\acute{e}rti$, $p\grave{i}nti$). Variants like Lith. $n\acute{e}rti$ ~ Latv. $nirt$ suggest that some verbs kept the old ablaut until fairly recently, but cases like Latv. $\check{s}\underaccent{.}{k}ist$, $\check{s}\underaccent{.}{k}iet$, where the original ablaut has been fully inverted, point to a more complex prehistory (Bl.-Sl. pres. *nir-e/o- : aor.-inf. *ner- → Bl. *ner-a : *ner- → *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. *$p\rho ti$ "expand" points to full-grade *$penH$-$t\acute{e}i$-, cf. V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n 2011a, 304, with references.

RuCS *mlěsti*, *mlьzu* "milk" vs. Lith. dial. *mìlžti*, *mélža*, where the Baltic ablaut is the one expected from a PIE athematic present *$h_2$mélĝ-ti/*h_2m/ĝ-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. *im̃ti*, *ìma*, *ẽmė*, 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-ē* should be sought. The generalization of *-ā-* 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-ā*, as one may have expected, but as *em-ìi̯ā*, with *-ìi̯ā-* 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-ìi̯ā* would have given *ẽm-ē* by regular sound change. As an alternative, it is possible that the regularization of *em(-s)-t* took place after the *ē*-preterite had been created. "To take" may well have been one of the first verbs to adopt the recent *ē*-preterite instead of the expected *ā*-preterite: *em(-s)-t* → *ẽm-ē*. The length of *ẽm-ē* would then be due, as per S t a n g (1966, 381), to the fact that preterites in *°eR-ē* were unknown in the language. Put it otherwise, it was a side effect of the adoption of the *ē*-preterite.

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

i) Baltic inherited an infinitive stem *em-tei-* (: OCS *ję̇ti*) 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. *keřpa*, *kiřpti* "cut", *gẽna*, *giñti* "drive", etc.) or do not have any ablaut at all (*nẽša*, *nèšti* "carry", *áuga*, *áugti* "grow", *lìpa*, *lìpti* "climb", etc.). At an early stage they all selected the *ā*-preterite. It is conceivable that, once the preterite *$*\tilde{e}m$-$\bar{e}* was formed, the infinitive stem became free, so to speak, to be influenced by the present. If this took place before the types (Lith.) *lẽkti*, *lẽkia*, *lẽkė* "fly, run" and *gérti*, *gẽria*, *gérė* "drink" had acquired their actual form, but still had inf. *$*lek$-$ti*, pret. *$*g\tilde{e}r$-$\bar{e}*, 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 *iñti* 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. *gìrtas* "drunk" (: Lith. *gérti*, *gẽria* "drink", OCS *žrěti*, *žъrǫ* "swallow"), *statùs* "steep" (: Lith. *stóti*, *stója*, OCS *stati*, *stanǫ* "stand up"), *stìrta* "stack" (: OCS *strěti*, *stъrjǫ* "spread out"), *tìltas* "bridge", etc., all of them to well-known aoristic roots (*$*g^werh_3$-*, *$*steh_2$-*, *$*sterh_3$-*, *$*telh_2$-*, see LIV, s.v.) that, when preserved, predictably present a full-grade aorist in Balto-Slavic. Lith. *iñti* 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 *gìrtas*, *statùs*, etc. actually demand revisiting the close association between the aorist and infinitive stems in Balto-Slavic. In principle they could simply be PIE relics (*$*g^w\llap{\underset{\circ}{r}}h_3$-$tó$-*, *$*sth_2$-$tó$-*, etc.). I thus favor the first, inner-Baltic account of the infinitive *iñti*.

DU NETAISYKLINGI BALTŲ PRETERITAI: LIE. *dãvė*, *ė̃mė*

Santrauka

Straipsnyje aiškinami du netaisyklingi baltų kalbų *ē*-preteritai (lie. *dãvė*, *ė̃mė*) *$*$-$i\llap{\raise1pt{\i}}\bar{a} > *$*$-$\bar{e}* teorijos kontekste. Lie. *dãvė* (taip pat lie. *šlãvė* ir denominatyvinį tipą *mel-ãvo*) galima aiškinti tokiu būdu: *$*d\bar{o}($-$s)$-* → *$*d\bar{o}$-$v\bar{a}$-* (siekiant išvengti hiato *$*d\bar{o}$-$\bar{a}$-* įterpiamas *$*$-v-* po užpakalinės eilės ilgųjų balsių) → *$*d\bar{o}v$-$j\bar{a}$-* (pridedamas preterito formantas *$*$-$j\bar{a}$-* kaip prie visų ilgųjų balsių kamienų) > *$*dav$-$j\bar{a}$-* (Osthoffo dėsnis) → *$*dav$-$\bar{e}$-* (*$*$-$j\bar{a}$-* eliminuojamas po *$*°v$-*, perėmus preterito priesagą *$*$-$\bar{e}$-* arba *$*$-$\bar{a}$-*). Lie. *ė̃mė* ilgasis šaknies balsis veikiausiai atsirado kartu su pačiu *ē*-preteritu: *$*em($-$s)$-$t* → *$*em$-$i\llap{\raise1pt{\i}}\bar{a} > *$*\tilde{e}m$-$\bar{e}* (perėmus *ia*-prezensų preteritą *$*$-$i\llap{\raise1pt{\i}}\bar{a}*) arba tiesiai *$*em($-$s)$-$t* → *$*\tilde{e}m$-$\bar{e}* (nes *$*°eR$-$\bar{e}* 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, *Rinktiniai raštai* 2, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1959, 331–376].

Cowgill, Warren 1964, The Supposed Cypriote optatives *duwánoi* and *dókoi* (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, Łotewsko-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 europaeischen 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 Mühlenbach, Jānis Endzelīns, *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 *śamantär* i indoevropejskij 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: Dybwad.

Stang, Christian S. 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, Bergen, Tromsö: 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 fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*, Taimering: 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. *kaĨt*, Sl. **kőlti* 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*]