

*BALTISTICA LIV(1) 2019 47–62*

doi: 10.15388/Baltistica.54.1.2378

Norbert OSTROWSKI

*Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie***OLD LITHUANIAN *ischtirra* ‘FOUND OUT’ AND SOME NOTES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF BALTIC PRETERITE<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract.** The starting point for our considerations on the development of the Baltic preterite is the Old Lithuanian preterite <ischtirra> /ištira:/ ‘found out’, etymologically connected to *týrė* ‘examined’. In form, /ištira:/ and *týrė* match the Old Church Slavonic *otbre* (thematic aorist) and *trb* (sigmatic aorist). This, in turn, is an argument for the hypothesis proposed by Daniel Petit (2004) on the origin of the lengthening in the Baltic preterite. The second part of this paper discusses the traces of a coexistence of inflected aspect (based on the contrast of the past tenses of aorist : imperfect) and derivational aspect (based on the opposition of perfective : imperfective) in Lithuanian.

**Keywords:** Old Lithuanian; historical morphology; verb; aspect; tense.

**1. Introduction**

In the writings of Jonas Bretkūnas / Johann Bretke (the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century), there is, overlooked in “Lietuvių kalbos žodynas”, preterite *ištirā* <ischtirra> ‘found out’, which relates etymologically to *tirti*, *tiria*, *týrė* ‘to investigate’. Below, I provide instances from Bretke’s *Bible* (1)–(5) and his *Postil* (6)–(7):

(1) *Bei tatai ischtirra Pharaonas [Pharao], ir (ghis) tikoia Moseschaus, ieib ghi nuszawintu.* (Exodus 2, 15)

‘Und es kam vor Pharao, der trachtete nach Mose, daß er ihn erwürgete.’ (Luther 1545; [www.biblegateway.com/versions/Luther-Bibel-1545-LUTH1545](http://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Luther-Bibel-1545-LUTH1545))

---

<sup>1</sup> I owe special gratitude to an anonymous reviewer, whose comments on an earlier version of this article made me aware of some unfortunate formulations. Needless to say, the sole responsibility for any remaining misinterpretations or mistakes is mine.

- (2) *Jr mana schirdis daugia ischmoka ir ischtira.* (Ecclesiastes 1, 16)  
 ‘und mein Herz hat viel gelernt und erfahren.’ (Luther 1545)
- (3) *Neprietelei ischtirra, mane Murą pakurusį ir skilių nebesant* (Nehemiah 6, 1)  
 ‘Feinde erfuhren, daß ich die Mauer gebauet hatte, und keine Lücke mehr dran wäre...’ (Luther 1545)
- (4) *Kaip tada Hoitmanai, kurie ant Lauku flapes (laikes) fu fawa Szmonims ifchtirra, iog karalius Babilonios Gedalią Sunu Ahikam Wiriufiu Szemes iftatens buwa...* (Jeremiah 40, 7)  
 ‘Da nun die Hauptleute, so auf dem Felde sich hielten, samt ihren Leuten erfuhren, daß der König zu Babel hatte Gedalja, den Sohn Ahikams, über das Land gesetzt...’ (Luther 1545)
- (5) *O kaip Iohanan funus Kareah ifchtirra, ir wifsi Hoitmanai kario, kurie pas ghį buwa, wifsa piktenibe, kurę Ifmael funus Nethania padarens darens buwa* (Jeremiah 41, 11)  
 ‘Da aber Johanan, der Sohn Kareahs, erfuhr und alle Hauptleute des Heeres, die bei ihm waren, all das Übel, das Ismael, der Sohn Nethanjas, begangen hatte’ (Luther 1545)
- (6) *Tū cziesu ischtirra daug szmoniu Szidischku / Jesu Bethoniai santi.* (BP 12, 15)  
 ‘At that time many Jews have learned, that Jesus is in Bethany.’
- (7) *Tatai kaip ischtirra Jonas koschnodieia / apbara karaliu...* (BP 29, 5)  
 ‘And when John the Preacher found out about this, he reprovved the king...’

Old Lithuanian <ischtirra> /ištira:/<sup>2</sup> ‘found out’ is evidently different from the preterite *týrė* /ti:rę:/ ‘investigated’. Starting from the opposition of /ištira:/ ‘found out’ : *týrė* ‘investigated’, I shall defend the following thesis:

- 1) The opposition /ištira:/ : *týrė* comes from the older opposition of thematic aorist : sigmatic aorist (Kølln 1969). This in turn has its own consequences for the lengthening in the Baltic *-ē*-preterite (Petit 2004); see section 2.

---

<sup>2</sup> In line with German orthography, doubled letter <rr> marks the shortness of the previous letter. Similarly, in other instances in Exodus: <turreia> (2, 16) ‘he had’, <Kamme> (2, 20) ‘where’, <palikkote> (2, 20) ‘you left’, <passilikti> (2, 21) ‘to stay’, <wadinna> (2, 22) ‘he called’.

- 2) The exclusive use of the prefixed form <ischtirra> (lack of \*<tirra>) is an archaism and it finds good parallels in other Old Lithuanian and Old Church Slavonic/Old Russian verbs. These facts suggest that prefixed aorists were the first stage in the development of derivational aspect. Lithuanian data provide traces of the coexistence of the inherited inflected aspect (based on the opposition of aorist : imperfect) and the innovative derivational aspect (based on the opposition of perfective : imperfective); see section 3.

## 2. Thematic aorist vs. sigmatic aorist in the Proto-Baltic language

Endzelīns (1910, 18–19) noticed that there is the following repartition of preterital suffixes: intransitive verbs have *-ā*-preterite and intransitive ones *-ē*-preterite, e.g. Latvian dial. intr. *dega* ‘was on fire’ : tr. *dege*. This view has been accepted by others, including Stang (1942, 189), Kōlln (1969), and Barton (1980). Endzelīns’s observation is undoubtedly correct, and it is supported by the opposition between *-sta*-inchoatives and *-ja*-causatives, e.g. intr. pret. *lūžo* ‘cracked’ (pres. *lūžta*) : tr. pret. *láužē* (pres. *láužia*). The same repartition we also find in the opposition of intransitive pret. *skīlo* ‘split’ (inf. *skīlti*, pres. *skīla*) : transitive pret. *skīlē* ‘lit the fire’ (inf. *skīlti*, pres. *skīlia*); IDE \**skelh*<sub>1</sub>-. The inherited character of the pres. *skīlia* ‘lights the fire’ is clear from Old Icelandic *skilja* ‘to divide, separate’. The meaning ‘to light fire’ developed in the prefixed form *išskīlti* ‘to strike a fire’, whence, due to de-prefixation, the meaning became generalized into the simplex form *skīlti*; for details see Ostrowski (2014). An analogy is provided by Russian *сечь* ‘to cut, split, chop’ vs. *высечь искру* ‘to strike a spark’.

The described repartition does not cover, however, all data that was already indicated by Christian Stang (1942, 189; 1966, 385):

- transitives with *-ā*-preterite: Lith. *skūsti*, *skūta*, *skūto* ‘to shave’ : Latv. *skust*, *skutu*, *skutu* ‘to shave’; Lith. *pīsti*, *pīsa*, *pīso* ‘futuere’ : Latv. *pīst*, *pīsu*, *pīsu* ‘futuere’; Lith. *rīsti*, *rīta*, *rīto* ‘to roll’ : Latv. *rist*, *ritu*, *ritu* ‘to roll’; Lith. *pirkti*, *peřka*, *piřko* ‘to buy’ : Latv. *pirkt*, *perku*, *pirku*.
- intransitives with *-ē*-preterite: Lith. *miřti*, *-řta*, *miřē* ‘to die’; Lith. *giřti*, *-řta*, *-ē* ‘to be born’; Lith. *viřti*, *verda*, *viřē* ‘to boil’; Lith. *guřti*, *gūla*, *gūlē* ‘to lie down’.

The listed examples are in clear contradiction to Endzelīns’s observations, and for all intents and purposes, this inconsistency has not yet been explained. The elucidation of these facts I am leaving for another time. Christian Stang

(1942, 63) was also the one who pointed out that thematic aorists in Old Church Slavonic are usually intransitive, e.g. *jadъ, idъ, sědъ, padъ*. This idea was developed by Hermann Kōlln (1969), who hypothesized that the use of thematic and sigmatic aorists in the Balto-Slavonic protolanguage overlaps roughly with the opposition of medium : activum; in Baltic languages, thematic aorist has been supplanted by *-ā*-preterite and sigmatic aorist by *-ē*-preterite. In this way, Kōlln explained the intransitive *-ā*-preterite of Baltic infixes, because, as is shown in Slavonic data, the infixes formed the thematic aorist, e.g. OCS *sědъ* ‘sat down’ (pres. *sędъ*) : Lith. *sėdo* ‘sat down’ (OPr. *sindats* ‘sitting’; see Stang *loc. cit.*); OCS aor. *prilbpe* ‘got stuck’ (pres. *prilbnetъ*) : Lith. *lipo* ‘stuck’ (pres. *liūpa*). I shall return later to Kōlln’s hypothesis.

As both *ischtirra* and *týre* are transitive, the difference between them must be more subtle than the opposition of intransitive pret. *skilo* ‘split’ : transitive pret. *skýle* ‘lit the fire’. Thanks to the paper by Hopper and Thompson (1980), we know that transitivity comprises a few parameters and only one of them points to the presence of an object. Therefore, Hopper and Thompson talk about high and low transitivity. These parameters are as follows:

	HIGH	LOW
A) PARTICIPANTS	2 or more participants, A and O.	1 participant
B) KINESIS	action	non-action
C) ASPECT	telic	atelic
D) PUNCTUALITY	punctual	non-punctual
E) VOLITIONALITY	volitional	non-volitional
F) AFFIRMATION	affirmative	negative
G) MODE	realis	realis
H) AGENCY	A high in potency	A low in potency
I) AFFECTEDNESS OF O	O totally affected	O not affected
J) INDIVIDUATION OF O	O highly individuated	O not-individuated

The parameters I) and J) concern the object. An object highly individuated has the following properties: proper, human/animate, concrete, singular, count, and referential/definite. On the other hand, an object non-individuated comprises the following properties: common, inanimate, abstract, plural, mass, non-referential. E.g., the possessive verb *turėti* ‘to have’ requires an object, so it is transitive in the usual sense, but it does not have at least three other properties: kinesis (action), aspect (telic), and punctuality (punctual).

Morphosyntactically, the low transitivity of *turėti* ‘to have’ manifests itself in its inability to make the passive voice, e.g. Lith. *Jis turi mašiną* → \**Mašina yra jo turėta* / *He has a car* → \**The car is had by him* (see Benveniste 1960 [1966]). Hopper and Thompson (1980, 253) illustrated variation in the degree of transitivity by means of the sentences *Jerry likes beer* and *Jerry knocked Sam down*. The verb in *Jerry knocked Sam down* represents high transitivity as it displays the following properties: kinesis (action), aspect (telic), punctuality (punctual), affectedness of object (total), and individuation of object: high, referential, animate, and proper. Lithuanian *týrė* ‘investigated’ has at least two properties that are missing in *ischtirra*: volitionality and individuation of object. In the case of the volitionality parameter, the agent acts purposefully – cf. the difference between *I wrote your name* (volitional) and *I forgot your name* (non-volitional); see Hopper, Thompson (1980, 252). Lith. *ischtirra* ‘found out’ is non-volitional, e.g. *He found out about it accidentally*. The difference between *ischtirra* and *týrė* is well visible if we compare ex. (1) with ex. (8) [Bretke’s Bible; Ecclesiastes 12, 9]:

(8) *O tas Kofnadieia ne tiktai buwa prafchmintingas, bet ir βmones mokie gierą pamokfla, ir daboios, tires ir futaiše daugia kalbefiū* (Ecclesiastes 12, 9)

‘Derselbe Prediger war nicht allein weise, sondern lehrte auch das Volk gute Lehre und merkte und forschte und stellte viel Sprüche.’ (Luther 1545)

‘And moreover, because the preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; yea, he gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs’. (King James Bible, [www.kingjamesbibleonline.org](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org))

In ex. (1), Pharaoh found out (*audivitque* in Vulgate) about Moses’s crime, but it is less possible that Pharaoh himself was involved in the investigation. A completely different situation is observed in (8), where the agent was engaged personally in seeking out proverbs. Also, the object in (1)–(7) is non-individuated: inanimate, common, and sometimes abstract (5). Hermann Kölln, when trying to describe the Old Greek opposition of thematic aorist : sigmatic aorist used the terms effective : ineffective verbs instead of transitive : intransitive. Ineffective verbs denote that there is no effect upon the object, e.g. *to see*, *to hear*. In other words, ineffective verbs correspond semantically to middle voice. The opposition of *týrė* ‘investigated’ : *ischtirra* ‘found out’ matches Kölln’s differentiation of effective : ineffective verbs, and the

verb *ischtirra* is a complex mental event. These kinds of events are related semantically to middle voice, too (Kemmer 1993, 137–142).

If we accept Kolln's hypothesis, we may assume that the difference of *ištirā* <ischtirra> 'found out' : *týré* 'investigated' is a continuation of the older opposition of thematic aorist : sigmatic aorist, and interestingly, both aorists are testified in Slavonic languages. Christoph Koch (1990, 435–439) noticed that Old Church Slavonic *otrъ* (recorded in Codex Assemanius) and Serbo-Croatian *třh, tř, tř* come from the older sigmatic aorist *\*trh<sub>1</sub>-s-* 'rub' > Proto-Slav. *\*tīr-s-s, \*tīr-s-t* > Serbo-Croatian *třh, tř, tř*. On the other hand, thematic aorist is testified in OCS *otbre* (Codex Marianus and Codex Suprasliensis), and therefore, we may establish a formal adequacy between Slavonic and Baltic data in the area of sigmatic aorist:

*\*trh<sub>1</sub>-s-* > Proto-Slav. *\*tīr-s-s, \*tīr-s-t* > S-Cr. *třh, tř, tř* / OCS *trъ*

*\*trh<sub>1</sub>-s-* > Proto-Balt. *\*tīr-s-t* => *\*tīr-ē-* (Lith. *týré*)

and thematic aorist:

*\*trh<sub>1</sub>-e-* > Proto-Slav. *\*tīr-* > OCS *otbre*

*\*trh<sub>1</sub>-e-* > Proto-Balt. *\*tīr-* / *\*tīr-* => OLith. *ištirā*

Now we may use Lith. *týré* 'examined' as an argument for Petit's (2004, 353–358) hypothesis, according to which, the lengthening in Baltic *-ē*-preterites is the result of phonetic development in a group of sigmatic aorists with the root structure *-VRH-s-*. Due to the substitution of sigmatic aorist by *-ē*-preterite (in short: sigm. aor. => *-ē*-pret.), the syllable boundary moved, preventing the shortening of the long vowel; e.g.:

Baltic aor. *\*gerH-s-t* 'drunk' > *\*gēr-s-Ø* (cf. OCS sigm. aor. *po-žřěxъ*) => *gēr-ē-Ø*.

According to Kuryłowicz's model (1968, 321–322), after the shortening of long diphthongs in the antecorsonantic position, i.e. *\*gērti* > *gērti* 'to drink', the only difference between laryngeal and non-laryngeal verbs was the intonation, i.e. *gērti* 'to drink' (IDE *\*g<sup>w</sup>erh<sub>3</sub>-*) vs. *beřti* 'to strew' (IDE *\*b<sup>h</sup>er-*). After the *gēre* type pattern, new preterites of the *bēre* type came into existence. The lengthening of verbs with root structure *CVC*, e.g. pres. *plēcīa* : pret. *plēte* (inf. *plēsti* 'to broaden') appeared only at the last stage. This stage is the latest, as the process has been conducted only partially in the Latvian preterite, where alongside the younger preterite *plētu*, the older *pletu*

has been maintained (cf. also the lack of lengthening in inf. *plest* alongside *plēst*); similarly Latvian pret. *lēcu* occurred alongside the older *lecu* ‘leaped’ (in Lithuanian only *lėkė* and *plėtė*). This explanation also has the advantage that it allows for elucidating the lack of lengthening in the preterite of *-īti*-verbs, e.g. Lith. *valýti* ‘to clean up’, pret. *vālė* (not *\*volė*), the derivative from Lith. *vėlti* ‘to press’ (IDE *\*welh<sub>3-</sub>*). The sigmatic aorist *\*waH-ī-š-* excluded the lengthening and prevented its analogical spread among non-laryngeal verbs, e.g. *manýti* ‘to think’ : pret. *mānė* (not *\*monė*), *sakýti* ‘to talk’ : pret. *sākė* (not *\*sokė*) etc.

A completely different hypothesis was put forward by Miguel Villanueva Svensson (2014, 241), who proposed the change *\*sver-ijā- > svērė* to explain the lengthening in the preterite. His assumption was based on Larsson’s (2004, 306) hypothesis, that if the accent in the sequence *\*-i(y)-* was retracted to the preceding syllable with a short vowel, this vowel was regularly lengthened and there appeared circumflex. Villanueva Svensson’s proposal demands an extensive comment, which would relate to the hypothetical development *\*-ijā > -ē*, the origin of the transitive preterite suffix *-ē-*, and the genesis of the opposition *-sta*-inchoatives : *-ja*-causatives (see Ostrowski 2001; 2006, 17–19 on the latter). On the origin of the transitive suffix *-ē-*, see Stang (1942, 151), Kuryłowicz (1966), and Ostrowski (2006, 47). All these problems go beyond the scope of the present paper, however, I would like to use this occasion to share a few of my doubts concerning the development *\*sver-ijā- > svērė*:

- 1) If I understand correctly, Miguel Villanueva Svensson seems to consider the change *\*-ijā > -ē* as a phonetically regular process. In this case, however, a question arises: how can we explain the lack of the change *\*-ijā > -ē* in *eldijā* ‘boat’ (Slav. *\*oldbji*), *vilki jā* ‘pack of wolves’, etc.?
- 2) Among nouns with the so-called “Zugehörigkeitssuffix” *\*-ija-*, we find two with “*métatonie douce*”, which is traditionally explained as a result of accent retraction, e.g. *kiáušas* (1, 3) ‘shell, skull’ : *kiaūšis* (2) ‘egg’, *taukai* (3) [acc.pl. *táukus*] ‘fat’ : *taūkis*, *-ė* (2) ‘Symphytum officinale’ (Stang 1966, 146; Derksen 1996, 46). Both of these nouns belong to AP2, and Stang (1966, 146) compared this type with Skt. (Vedic) *udaníya-* ‘watery’ and Greek γομφίος ‘molar’. Aside from these two instances, we find a whole series of nouns (old adjectives) with “Zugehörigkeitssuffix” *\*-ija-* that mostly fall into AP2 and do not show lengthening in the root

(Otrębski 1965, 64; Derksen 1996, 146), e.g.: *kāras* (4) ‘war’ : *kāris* (2) ‘army, cantonment’ / *karỹs* (4) ‘soldier’, *vakarāĩ* (3<sup>b</sup>) ‘the west’ / *vākaras* (3<sup>b</sup>) ‘evening’ : *vakāris* (2) ‘westerly wind’, *vāsara* (1) ‘summer’ : *vasāris* (2) ‘February, summery’, *vanduō* (3<sup>a</sup>) ‘water’ : *vandēnis* (2) ‘supernatural being’, *drāpana* (1) ‘clothing, dress’ → *drapānē* (2) ‘wardrobe’, *pākulos* (1, 3<sup>b</sup>) ‘tow, oakum’ → adj. *pakūlis*, *-ē* (2) ‘made of tow’, *pelenāĩ* (3<sup>b</sup>) ‘ash’ → *pelēnē* (2) ‘ash pan’, *sāmanos* (1) ‘moss’ → *samānē* (2) ‘wild bee’. Some of them are still used as adjectives, e.g. *samānē bitē* ‘wild bee’. In my opinion, Lith. *kēlis* (2) ‘knee’ also belongs here; its adjective function is still visible in the sentence *Kas tai keliai broliai (...)* ‘Who are real brothers (lit. brothers of knee) (...)’ (Katkus 1931, 125; Ostrowski [in prep.]). Does it mean that all these examples, except *kiaūšis* (2) and *taūkis*, *-ē* (2), were rootstressed? How can such an overwhelming advantage of rootstressed adjectives over suffixstressed ones be explained?

### 3. Prefixed aorists in Baltic and Slavonic

As Rudolph Aitzetmüller (1962) pointed out, in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian, the verbs that were nondurative in Proto-Indo-European, and formed aorists preserved their nondurative meaning in prefixed forms. On the other hand, simplex forms appeared only if they had a durative meaning, e.g. durative *mrēti* ‘to die’ and nondurative *u-mrēti*; the starting point here was the IDE aorist; see Vedic *mṛta*. Moreover, in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian texts, sometimes only prefixed forms occur, whilst there is no evidence of simplex forms, e.g. *požrēti* ‘to swallow’ (not *\*žrēti*), *provrēti* ‘to stick through’, *zavrēti* ‘to close’ (not *\*vrēti*), *razdrēti* ‘to tear apart’ (not *\*drēti*), *prostrēti* ‘to spread’ (not *\*strēti*), *oprēti sę* ‘to lean on’ (not *prēti sę*), *načęti* ‘to start’ (not *\*čęti*), *pripęti*, ‘to enclose’ (not *\*pęti*). The whole set of prefixed verbs together with their attestations is provided by Aitzetmüller (1962) and Koch (1990, 441–453). It is also a common phenomenon in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian texts that some aorists are recorded exclusively with prefixes, e.g. OCS *umrětv* ‘died’ (not *\*mrětv*), *požrětv* ‘swallowed’ (not *\*žrětv*), *zavrětv* ‘closed’ (not *\*vrětv*), *načętv* ‘started’ (not *\*čętv*), *propętv* (not *\*pętv*), *oprětv sę* ‘leaned on’ (not *\*prětv sę*). Many of them go back to IDE aorists, e.g. Ved. (*ápa*) *āvar* ‘hat geöffnet’ (LIV 203; IDE *\*Hwer-*), Ved. conjunctive aorist *garan* ‘sollen verschlingen’ (LIV 189; IDE *\*g<sup>w</sup>erh<sub>3-</sub>*), Ved. *astariṣ* ‘hast hingebreitet’ (LIV 545; IDE *\*sterh<sub>3-</sub>*), Arm.



*hani* ‘webte, nähte zusammen’ (Klingenschmitt 1982, 235; IDE \**spenh*<sub>1</sub>-), Ved. *mā āpa spharīṣ* ‘stoße nicht weg’ (LIV 532; IDE \**sp<sup>h</sup>erH-*). A brilliant Slavic–Lithuanian parallel is delivered by OCS *otbre*, recorded only with a prefix, and Old Lithuanian *ištirā* (it lacks \**tirā*).

In Lithuanian, a large group of prefixed preterites are ingressive verbs with the prefixes *iš-* and *pra-*, e.g., *išvysti* ‘to see, to catch sight of, to glimpse’, *išgiřsti* ‘to hear’, and *pravyzdėti* ‘to get to see, to start seeing’, *praregėti* ‘to start seeing’, *pražibti* ‘to light up (intr.)’, *pražýsti* ‘to start to flower’. Their origin was elaborated by Ostrowski (2004) and especially by Ostrowski (2006, 55–64). Ingressive verbs of the presented type come from atelic stative verbs, i.e., *regėti* ‘to see’ → *praregėti* ‘to get to see’, *žydėti* ‘to blossom’ → *pražýsti* ‘to start to flower’, and they appeared because of a need to express a state as an event. As the perfective aspect in Baltic (and Slavonic) languages focuses on indicating the boundary of the action, a.k.a. the feature of perfective : imperfective aspect is [+/- limitation] (Seržants, Wiemer 2017, 245), then in the case of derivatives from atelic stative verbs, only the initial boundary of the state is possible. This in turn explains the ingressive meaning of verbs with prefixes *iš-* and *pra-*, derived from very stative verbs. Such an interpretation is supported by the Old Greek ingressive aorist, e.g. βασιλεύω ‘I rule’ : εβασίλευσα ‘I started ruling’, French passé simple, e.g. *savoir* ‘to know’ : (*il*) *sut* ‘he got to know’, *se taire* ‘to be silent’ : *se tut* ‘he fell silent’, and Spanish *conocer* ‘to know’ : *conoci* (simple past) *a Pedro hace muchos años* ‘I got to know Pedro many years ago’ (Comrie 1995, 19). A brilliant analogy in Lithuanian is delivered by the prefixed verb *patikti*, *patiñka*, *patiko* ‘to appeal, to like’, where the preterite points to the initial boundary of the state, e.g. *Jonui patiko Onutė* ‘John got to like Ann’, but the present expresses the result of the past action, i.e. *Jonui patinka Onutė* ‘John likes Ann’. Lithuanian verb *pažinti*, *pažįsta*, *pažino* ‘to get to know; to know sb’ (it lacks simplex \**žinti*) is another case in point; more on that in section 3.1. These parallels suggest that the preterite was the first stage in the development of the presented ingressives, so *žydėti* ‘to blossom’ → *pražýdo* ‘it started to flower’, *girdėti* ‘to hear’ → *išgiřdo* ‘got to hear’, and the present forms were only created later. This assumption is in turn supported by the ratio of preterite and present forms in Daukša’s *Postil* (1599), where we observe an evident prevalence of preterite forms (see Kudzinowski 1977):

*išgiṛsti* — preterite 25x : present 3x

*išvýsti* — preterite 27x : present 1x

*pražibti* — preterite 6x : present 1x

The analysis of data included in LKŽ yields similar results:

*išgiṛsti* — preterite 5x : present 0x (LKŽ 3, 348)

*išvýsti* — preterite 15x : present 1x (LKŽ 19, 742)

*pražibti* — preterite 10x : present 1x (LKŽ 20, 469).

Unprefixed verbs, e.g. *giṛsti*, if they appear, are seldom and recorded very late. In Old Lithuanian texts, only *išgiṛsti*, *išvýsti* and *pražibti* are testified. Disregarding these facts does not allow the derivational system of Old Lithuanian verbs to be precisely grasped.

Ingressive verbs with *iš-* point to the percipient; the source of the impetus perceived by the subject is outside of the subject, so the second actant is obligatory and the verb is transitive, e.g. *išvýsti kq* ‘to see sb / sth’. On the other hand, among the ingressives with *pra-*, the action comes from the subject itself and is directed from inside the subject, e.g. *pragýsti* ‘to start singing’ (: *giedóti* ‘to sing’), *prabilti* ‘to start talking’ (: *bylóti* ‘to talk’), *prakaľbti* ‘to start talking’ (: *kalbėti* ‘to talk, to speak’). The difference between the ingressives with *iš-* and *pra-* is best visible in the opposition between transitive *išvýsti kq* ‘to see sb / sth’ (subject is a percipient and already has the ability to see) and intransitive *pravyzdėti* ‘to start seeing (about a blind man)’ (the subject has only just acquired the ability to see). Striking is also the functional similarity of Lithuanian *pra-* and Latin *pro*. Benveniste (1949 [1966], 133) describes the latter as meaning rather ‘outside of’ than ‘in front of’, more precisely as a result of leaving a place assumed to be inside or hidden, e.g. *prōdeō* ‘to come forth, to appear’, *prōgeniēs* ‘progeny’<sup>3</sup>, cf. also Lat. *pro-for*, *pro-fārī* ‘to speak’ and Lith. *prabilti*, *prakaľbti* ‘to start talking’; Old Greek *προλέγω* ‘foretell; proclaim’.

---

<sup>3</sup> “1<sup>o</sup> *Pro* ne signifie pas tant «devant» que «au-dehors, à l’extérieur»; c’est un «en avant» réalisé par un mouvement de sortie ou d’expulsion hors d’un lieu supposé intérieur ou couvert (cf. *prodeo*, *progenies*); 2<sup>o</sup> Ce mouvement crée séparation entre la position initiale et la position *pro*; c’est pourquoi *pro*, indiquant ce qui vient se mettre «devant» le point de départ, peut marquer, selon le cas, couverture, protection, défense, ou équivalence, permutation, substitution; 3<sup>o</sup> le sens même de ce mouvement crée entre le point de départ et le point *pro* une relation objective, qui n’est pas exposée à s’inverser si la position de l’observateur change.” (Benveniste *loc. cit.*).

To sum up this part, in the past of the Lithuanian language, there was a group of preterites that always functioned with prefixes and functionally corresponded to the old aorists. On this ground, I maintain that the old aorists were reinforced in Baltic and Slavonic languages by adding prefixes. Reasons for this process are unclear, but we are here witnesses of the change from the older inflectional aspect to the innovative, derivational aspect. The coexistence of both aspect systems can be observed in Old Church Slavonic, Old Russian, and Bulgarian; the development of Old Russian has been thoroughly described by Seržants (2009). The description of the Old Lithuanian tense–aspect system presented here is preliminary, and future considerations need to include Old Lithuanian compound tenses of perfect (*būti* + part. praet. act.) and imperfect (*būti* + part. praes. act.) as well. At this moment, I want to highlight that traces of coexistence of the inherited aspect (“Grammatischer Aspekt” in Seržant’s terms), based on the distinction of perfective : imperfective tenses, and innovative aspect expressed by word formation (“Lexikalischer Aspekt” in Seržant’s terms) can also be found in Old Lithuanian. Section 3.1 is devoted to this topic.

### 3.1. Lithuanian *pažinti* and Baltic *-jā-imperfect*

There is one more reason to consider Old Lithuanian prefixed preterites presented in the previous section as archaic and to link them with the tense–aspect model similar to the one in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian. As is well known, perfective verbs in Baltic and Slavonic languages do not occur in sentences expressing extension in time, thus we cannot say in Polish *\*Przeczytałem książkę pięć godzin* or in Lithuanian *\*Perskaičiau knygą penkias valandas*. An exception is made for perdurative (e.g. Pol. *Przeżyłem tam trzy lata* ‘I lived there for three years’ and Lith. *Pragyvenau ten tris metus*) and delimitative verbs (e.g. Pol. *Posiedziałem godzinę* ‘I sat for one hour’ and Lith. *Pasėdėjau valandą*); see Holvoet (1995, 177–178). On the other hand, Old Greek was a language that did not know this kind of restriction, and the aorist could also occur in sentences that expressed extension in time, e.g. Ψαμμήτιχος δὲ ἐβασίλευσε Αἰγύπτου τεσσέρα καὶ πενήκοντα ἔτη (Herodot 2.157.1) ‘Psammetichus reigned in Egypt for 45 years’; see Holvoet (1995, 179). Old Russian aorist functioned in a similar way; cf. an instance from *Chronicles.*: *и созда столпъ то за 40 лѣтъ. и несвершенъ быс(тъ)* ‘and it took him forty years to build (sozda) that pillar, and it was not finished’ (Bermel 1997, 230). In Lithuanian, we can only find isolated traces of such a system; see instance (9) from Bretke’s *Bible*:

- (9) *ir regedama berneli santį graszu, **paslepe** aną per tris mėnesius.* (Exodus 2, 1)  
 ‘Und da sie sah, daß es ein fein Kind war, verbarg sie ihn drei Monden.’  
 (Luther’s *Bible*, 1545)  
 ‘and when she saw him that he was a goodly child, she hid him three months.’  
 (King James Bible, [www.kingjamesbibleonline.org](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org))

In modern Lithuanian, it is accepted in such a context only an unprefixated form, i.e. *slėpė jį tris mėnesius*. Similarly, in the next example with the verb *pašižino*:

- (10) *Sabalius **pašižino** su juo daugiau kaip penkeri metai* (LKŽ 20, 661)  
 ‘Sabalius has been an ally of his for more than 5 years’.

Such a use of a prefixed verb is also unusual today, and we should treat it as an archaism comparable to the abovementioned instances of Old Greek and Old Russian aorist.

The verb *pažinti*, *pažįsta*, *pažino* ‘to get to know; to know sb’ is a continuation of IDE *\*g’enh<sub>3-</sub> / g’nh<sub>3-</sub>*. The root was nondurative and from it was formed root-aorist *\*(e-)g’néh<sub>3-t</sub>*; cf. Old Greek ἔγνων, Lat. *(g)nōuī*, and OCS *znachъ*. The meaning of *pažino* points to the old aorist. Its emergence in Lithuanian relates to the thematization of old root-aorist, i.e.:

- (3 sg.) *\*(e)-žnéh<sub>3-t</sub>* : (3 pl.) *\*(e)-žinh<sub>3-énti</sub> → \*(e)-žinh<sub>3-é-nti</sub> → (3 sg.) \*žinh<sub>3-é-t</sub>*,

and after removing the apophony *e : a*, a new thematic aorist *\*žina* => pret. *pažinā* → pres. *pažin-sta-* appeared. A comparable process may be observed in Greek (Attic) aorist ἔτεμε ‘cut’, which continues an allomorph with a normal grade, and Doric ἔταμε based on the form of the 3 pl. *\*tṃh<sub>1-ént</sub> → \*tṃ(h<sub>1</sub>)-ont > \*tṃm-on > ἔταμον*; see Hardarson (1993, 157–158, 160–161). The resultative meaning of the pres. *pažįsta* ‘knows’ alongside ingressive pret. *pažino* ‘got to know’ finds a good analogy in the abovementioned opposition *patiko* ‘got to like’ : *patiñka* ‘likes’. From ingressive preterite *pažino* ‘got to know’, a durative derivative *pažinóti*, *pažinójo* ‘know sb’ was formed. The derivation *pažinti* ‘to get to know’ → *pažinóti* ‘to know sb’ points to the character of arguments. In *pažinti* and *pažinóti*, the second argument is always a person, never a thing, e.g. *pažinti: Visi šunys čia **mani** pažino* ‘All dogs got to know **me** here’ (LKŽ 20, 660) and *pažinóti: Jie **mani** nuo anksčiau pažinójo* ‘They knew **me** for a really long time’ (LKŽ 20, 660), *Tėvuko aš nepažinóju*,

[mirè] *mes mažučiai dar buvom* ‘I did not know **daddy**, [he died] when we were still small’ (LKŽ 20, 660). On the other hand, in *žinóti* ‘to know’, the second argument is non-personal, e.g. *Aš tai jau ir užmiršus, o ana viską žino* ‘I have forgotten all this, she knows **this** better’ (LKŽ 20, 642), *Noriu, kad vaikai ir vaikų vaikai žinotų, koks jų protėvių gyvenimas buvo* ‘I want the kids and the kids of the kids to know the life of their ancestors’ (LKŽ 20, 643). This fact provides a few conclusions:

- 1) As the prefix *pa-* does not change the character of the arguments, then *pažinóti* cannot be a derivative from *žinóti* ‘to know sth’, but from *pažinti* ‘to get to know; to know sb’.
- 2) Lith. *pažinóti* is a defective verb; among finite forms it does not have any present form, but only preterite *pažinójo*. Since pret. *pažino* ‘got to know’ corresponds functionally to the aorist, therefore, it could also be used in sentences expressing an extension in time, and this is really supported by instance (10). However, along with the development of the derivational aspect, the prefixed forms were limited to the contexts in which they could only indicate the boundary of the process. In the case of pret. *pažino* ‘got to know’, this was the initial boundary. On the other hand, there was the need to express the durative action in the past, therefore alongside the preterite (aorist) *pažino* ‘got to know’ arose the new imperfective *pažinójo* ‘knew’. Therefore, we have to assume the following derivation:

perfective pret. *pažino* ‘got to know’ → imperfective pret. *pažinó-jo-*

The same kind of derivation can be observed in Old Lithuanian iterative *tyréti*, *-éja*, *-éjo* ‘to investigate’, which is etymologically connected to pret. *týrė* ‘investigated’ (Ostrowski 2006, 20). In this regard, the following subsequent conclusions can be drawn:

- a) Since imperfective preterite *pažinó-jo* has been formed from perfective *pažino* ‘got to know’, then we have to assume that the preterite suffix *-jā-* served as an imperfectivizing suffix added to the perfective (aoristic) forms; see Seržants, Wiemer (2017, 277–278) on the origin of the suffix *-jā-*. This in turn brings to mind the derivational model known from the Slavonic languages:

aor. *бѣра-хѣ* ‘took’ → imperf. *бѣра-ах-ѣ*

- b) The derivation of perfective *pažino-Ø* → imperfective *pažinó-jo-Ø* finds its exact counterpart in the derivation of Lith. pret. *mìnė* ‘remembered’ → *miné-jo-Ø* ‘mentioned’. This process explains the almost total disappearance of IDE ingressive aorist with the suffix \*-eh<sub>1</sub>- in Baltic, which has been preserved only in a few Lithuanian preterites: *mìrė* ‘died’, *mìnė* ‘remembered’, *vìrė* ‘cooked’, and *gùlė* ‘lay down’.
- c) Imperfective preterites *pažinó-jo-Ø* and *miné-jo-Ø* suggest that *pažino* and *mìnė* had to be accented on the suffix, which is in line with the IDE model.

## S. LIE. *ischtirra* ‘SUŽINOJO’ IR KELETAS PASTABŲ APIE PRETERITO RAIDĄ BALTŲ KALBOSE

### *Santrauka*

Bretkūno raštuose randama preterito forma <ischtirra> /ištira:/ ‘sužinojo’ iki šiol buvo nežinoma tyrėjams. Etimologijos požiūriu, <ischtirra> yra susijusi su tranzityviniu preteritu *týrė*, o formos požiūriu – abu atitinka ssl. *otbre* (tematinis aoristas) ir *trb* (sigmatinis aoristas). Šie faktai pagrindžia Danielio P e t i t (2004) hipotezę apie pailgintojo laipsnio genezę baltų kalbų preterite. Antrojoje šio straipsnio dalyje aptariami kaitybinio (aoristas : imperfektas) ir darybinio (perfektyvas : imperfektyvas) veiklo koegzistencijos pėdsakai lietuvių kalboje.

### SOURCE TEXTS

BB – *BIBLIA tatau estis Wissas Schwentas Raschtas, Lietuwischkai pergulditas per Janą Bretkuną [...] 1590*, in Jonas Palionis, Julija Žukauskaitė (eds.), *Jonas Bretkūnas. Rinktiniai raštai*, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1983.

BP – Ona Aleknavičienė (ed.), *Jono Bretkūno „Postilė“: Studija, faksimilė ir kompaktinė plokštelė*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 2005.

Kudzinowski, Czesław 1977, *Indeks-słownik do ‘Daukšos Postilė’* 1–2 (= *Seria Filologia Bałtycka* 2), Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.

LKŽ – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20, Vilnius, 1968–2002.

## REFERENCES

- Aitzetmüller, Rudolph 1962, Über Präfixe bei nicht-durativen Verben vom Typus *mrěti*, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 30(2), 310–336.
- Barton, Charles R. 1980, Notes on the Baltic Preterite, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 85, 246–278.
- Benveniste, Émile 1949 [1966], Le système sublogique des prépositions en latin, in Louis Hjelmslev, Paul Diderichsen et al. (eds.), *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague 5: Recherches structurales*, Copenhagen: Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag, 177–184 (= Idem, *Problèmes de linguistique générale* 1, Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 132–139).
- Benveniste Émile, 1960 [1966], 'Etre' et 'avoir' dans leurs fonctions linguistiques, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 55, 113–134 (= Idem, *Problèmes de linguistique générale* 1, Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 187–207).
- Bermel, Neil 1997, *Context and the lexicon in the development of Russian aspect*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Comrie, Bernard 1995, *Aspect*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Derksen, Rick 1996, *Metatony in Baltic*, Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Endzelin, Jan 1910, Zum lettischen Präteritum, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 43, 1–41.
- Harðarson, Jón Axel 1993, *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelarist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen* (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 74), Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Holvoet, Axel 1995, Glagol'nyj vid i vremennyj deiksis, in Stanisław Karolak (ed.), *Semantika i struktura slavjanskogo vida* 1, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP, 175–181.
- Hopper, Paul J., Sandra A. Thompson 1980, Transitivity in grammar and discourse, *Language* 56, 251–299.
- Katkus, Mikalojus 1931, Balanos gadyne. Vaizdai iš netolimos praeities, in Vincas Krėvė Mickevičius (ed.), *Mūsų tautosaka* 4, Kaunas: Humanitarinių mokslų fakulteto Tautosakos komisija, 13–186.
- Kemmer, Susanne 1993, *The middle voice*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Koch, Christoph 1990, *Das morphologische System des altkirchenslavischen Verbums 1: Text, 2: Anmerkungen*, München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Kolln, Herman 1969, *Oppositions of voice in Greek, Slavic, and Baltic* (= *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser* 43(4)), Copenhagen: Munksgaard, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy 1966 [1975], Bałtycka deklinacja na *-ē-*, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 3, 83–88 (= Les thèmes en *-ē-* du Baltique, in Idem, *Esquisses linguistiques* 2, München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1975, 418–425).
- Larsson, Jenny Helena 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: Universität Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen, 305–322.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2001, Angeblich primäre Jotpräsentien im Litauischen, *Historische Sprachforschung* 114(1), 177–190.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2004, Dėl išgirsti, prabilti tipo ingresyvų Daukšos „Postilėje“, *Baltistica* 39(1), 55–59.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2006, *Studia z historii czasownika litewskiego. Iteratiwa. Denominatiwa* (= *Seria Językoznawstwo* 25), Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2014, Deprefiksacja czasownikowa w języku litewskim, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 38, 172–181.

Ostrowski, Norbert (in preparation), Dlaczego Bałtowie i Słowianie liczyli pokrewieństwo w kolanach, czyli o etymologii słów. *kolēno* ‘kolano; ród’ i lit. *kėlis* ‘kolano; ród’, *LingVaria* 29.

Otrębski, Jan 1965, *Gramatyka języka litewskiego 2: Nauka o budowie wyrazów*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Petit, Daniel 2004, *Apophonie et catégories grammaticales dans les langues baltiques* (= *Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 86), Leuven, Paris: Peeters.

Seržants, Ilja A. 2009, Tempus und Aspekt im ältesten Russisch-Kirchenslavischen, untersucht an den Texten des Gottesdienstmenäums für Dezember, in Dagmar Christians, Dieter Stern, Vittorio S. Tomelleri (Hgg.), *Bibel, Liturgie und Frömmigkeit in der Slavia Byzantina. Festgabe für Hans Rothe zum 80. Geburtstag* (= *Studies on language and culture in Central and Easter Europe* 3), München, Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner, 309–328.

Seržants, Ilja A., Björn Wiemer 2017, Diachrony and typology of Slavic aspect: What does morphology tell us?, in Walter Bisang, Andrej Malchukov (eds.), *Unity and diversity in grammaticalization scenarios* (= *Studies in diversity linguistics* 16), Berlin: Language Science Press, 239–307.

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

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

Villanueva, Svensson Miguel 2014, Tone variation in the Baltic *ia*-presents, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119, 227–249.

Norbert OSTROWSKI

Katedra Językoznawstwa Ogólnego i Indoeuropejskiego

Instytut Językoznawstwa

Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie

al. Mickiewicza 3

PL-31-120 Kraków

Poland

[norbert.ostrowski@uj.edu.pl]