

Contributions to Morphology and Syntax. Proceedings of the 4th Greifswald University Conference on Baltic Languages. Edited by Artūras Judžentis & Stephan Kessler. Logos Verlag, Berlin 2015, pp. 201–215

Norbert Ostrowski (Poznań)

The Origin of the Lithuanian Particle »jùk«

Structure:

- 1 Lithuanian *jùk*, Latvian *juk* ‘after all’
- 2 The riddle of the final *-k*
- 3 Functions of *juo-* and the primary meaning of Lithuanian **juo-kai* (Latvian **juoka*)
- 4 Conclusion

1 Lithuanian *jùk*, Latvian *juk* ‘after all’. In the *Lithuanian Grammar* edited by Ambrazas the particle *juk* is described as an »intensifying-emphatic particle«; as for instance in: *Juk ir aš tavo duktė* ‘I am your daughter, too, am I not?’ (Ambrazas 1997: 402). It is for sure that Lith. *juk* introduces a polemic meaning, for example:

- (1) **Juk** aš tau sakiau.
‘I told you, **didn’t** I?’

Additionally, the particle occurs in a clause as justification of the one preceding it. For instance:

- (2) Pasikalbėk su juo, **juk** jis tavo brolis.
‘Talk to him (*or: you should talk to him*), **after all** he’s your brother.’
- (3) Eikime, **juk** nelyja.
‘Let’s go, **after all**, it’s not raining.’

This use of Lithuanian *juk* is still similar to the use of the particle in the 16th century; cf. both, Mikalojus Daukša’s Lithuanian *Pof-tilla Catholica* of 1599 (cf. Bibliografija 1969: N^o 216) and his source written by Jakób Wujek in Polish:

(4) *Wujek's text*: Ale co wiele mowić? **Wfák** y fam Arcyheretyk Marćin Luter w [...] fwym Káthechizmie nápomina fjkolne Miftrze / áby nakládáli dzieći fwe (Daukša 2000: 959, lines 4–6).

Daukša's translation: Beť ká dauğ kaľbét'? **Iuk'** ir patis / Arciheretikas / Martinas Lutheris [...] fawamé Catechismé rágina iřkáľos Miftrús / idáňt' pratintú / waikús fawús (op.cit.: 958, lines 4–6).

'But why speak more? **After all**, the grand heretic, Martin Luther, in his [...] catechism admonishes school masters, that they accustom their children [to make the sign of the cross].'

Nevertheless, the etymology of the Lithuanian particle *juk* and its Latvian counterpart is a crux interpretum (cf. Fraenkel 1962–5: I, 196; Smoczyński 2007: 236). This paper aims to fill this gap.

I will defend the thesis that Lith. *jùk* traces back to a conflation of the intensifying adverb *juō* 'especially, notably, all the more' with the connective *kāĩ* 'when'. The defended thesis requires a hypothesis about the monophthongization of **juo-'kai* > **juo-'kie* > **juo-'ki* > **ju-'ki* > *jùk*. The monophthongization finds a brilliant parallel in the development of the Lithuanian adversative conjunction **be-'tai* > *bèt* (section 2). The shortening **juo-'CV* > **ju-'CV* took place in proclitic position (section 2). The intensifying adverb *juo* 'especially' comes from correlative sentences of the type *juo ... juo(ba)* 'the (more) ... the (more)' (section 3).

2 The riddle of the final -k. If we posit the working hypothesis that in Lithuanian *juk*, the proclitic shortening *juo-* > *ju-* took place, we have to agree that the stress must have been placed on the next syllable and hence the current shape *jùk* is an innovation. This statement leads to the riddle of the final *-k*.

In Old Lithuanian texts *juk* was recorded in three variants:

- <iukáig> or <Iukáig>, cf. the notations in Daukša's postill (Daukša 2000: 266 line 4; 532 line 12; and 982 line 46);
- <juk'> or <juk>, also in Daukša's postill; for instance: *O iuk' parqříta* 'It has been written, hasn't it?', Wujek's *A wfák ná-pifano* (Daukša 2000: 500 line 46; resp. 501 line 44); and

- <jukig>, i. e. a hapax legomenon in Morkūnas' postill (cf. Bibliografija 1969: N^{os} 797–9) printed in 1600 (quoted here from LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 374).

The hapax legomenon <jukag> which is documented in the *Summa Aba Trumpas išguldimas Ewanieliv szwentu* of 1653 (cf. Bibliografija 1969: N^{os} 732–3) and which has been quoted by several authors (Fraenkel 1962–5: I, 196; Smoczyński 2007: 236; LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 374) is actually a typing error instead of the <iukáig> that we can find usually in the *Summa ... Ewanieliv szwentu*. Therefore, the hapax form cannot be borne in mind (see Hermann 1926: 244).

The shape <juk'> is relatively frequent in Daukša's postill. Daukša used an apostrophe to mark the palatalisation of the final consonants. The evidence can be given by comparing:

- the Dat. Sg. of the pronoun, <man'> 'me' (e.g. Daukša 2000: 386 line 11), with its full form *mani*, cf. <Mánig> (op. cit.: 622 line 26);
- the imperative form <eik'> 'go' (e.g. op. cit.: 758 line 3) with its Old Lith. counterpart *eiki*, cf. <eikiğ> (op. cit.: 488 line 32); or
- the preposition <ik'> 'to' (e.g. op. cit.: 332 line 30) with an alongside form <iki> (e.g. op. cit.: 402 line 34).

Equations of the type <ik'> vs. <iki> allow us to reduce the variant <juk'> to an older **juki* testified directly in Morkūnas' <jukig> (see above). The variant *jukai-* is preserved in Daukša's postill, as quoted above. The superposed acute in <iukáig> indicates stress, so conditions for the proclitic shortening *juo-* > *ju-* existed, as assumed at the beginning of this section.

However, the question arises of how to explain the difference of *jukaig* vs. **juki*. I would assume that two allomorphs have been distributed complementarily: *ki#* ~ *kaiC*. For have been evidence, we can compare within the period of Old Lithuanian:

- *ju'kaig* vs. **juki* > *jùk'* > *jùk* with
- *be'taig* vs. *beti* > *bèt'* > *bèt*.¹

The distribution of *-tai-* and *-t(i)-* is complementary: *-tai-* appears in stressed position before the focus particle *-g(i)*, whereas *-t(i)-* appears exclusively in word-final position (*-#*). So it is striking that the same allomorphy we assumed for *juk* recurs in the adversative conjunction *bet* 'but'. Bearing this point in mind, I assume the monophthongization of the diphthong /ai/:

- **be-'tai* 'and this' > **be'tie* > *beti* > *bèt'* (accent retraction + apocope of /i/) > *bèt*.

That way we gain a brilliant parallel for the change:

- **juo-'kai* > **juo-'kie* > **ju-kì* > *jùk'* (accent retraction + apocope of /i/)² > *jùk*.

The hapax legomenon <jukig> may be explained easily as a secondary form with added enclitic particle *-g(i)* before the shortening **juki* > *juk'*.

On the other hand, if monophthongization took place in the final, stressed syllable, i.e. **ju'kai#* > **juki#* (and resp. **be'tai#* > *beti#*), the question is, what is the reason for the lack of monophthongization in *ju'kai-g(i)*³ and *be'tai-g(i)*? This issue is explained in the next paragraph.

2.1 *-'kai-g(i)* vs. *-ki#* > *-k'#* > *-k#* and *-'tai-g(i)* vs. *-ti#* > *-t'#* > *-t#*. The differentiated development of *-tai* and *-kai* before *-g(i)* and *-#* is

- 1 All variants come from Daukša's postill, and most of them have already been quoted above. The two examples left: <Bėti> is a hapax legomena (Daukša 2000: 720 line 21); and the notation <betáig> (e.g. op. cit.: 1086 line 52) points to Old Lith. *be'tai-g(i)*. On the origin of the Lith. resp. Latv. *bet* 'but' see Hermann (1926: 335–6), Fraenkel (1962–5: I, 41), Nau & Ostrowski (2010: 21), and internet resource »NO«.
- 2 Also in *bèt* we have to take into account the proclitic shortening **bē-'tai*; cf. Samogitian *biēt* 'but' (testified in Kuršėnai district). **bē-* relates to Lithuanian *be* 'and' (Old Prussian *bhe* 'and'); see Rosinas (1988: 226). Furthermore, it probably relates to the Baltic past form *bē* 'was' < **bjā* < **bijā*; cf. Old Latvian subjunctive *būtubem*, Lith. dial. *sùktumbēmēs* 'I wish we could whirl' and Old Lith. *jeibeg* 'if' (Kazlauskas 2000: 397; Nau & Ostrowski 2010: 21; Ostrowski 2010: 147). For a thorough investigation of the origin of the Baltic conditional see Stang (1966: 430) and Holvoet (2002; 2010).
- 3 **jukaiḡi* is visible in <jukaigēi> preserved by Simonas Vaišnoras' *Apie popie-*

connected to the etymology of the Lithuanian neuter pronoun *tai* 'this' and the Baltic connective *kai*; cf. Lith. *kai* 'when, than, if, how' < *kaĩ-p(o)* < *kai-põ* 'as, how', Old Prussian *kai* (*kāi*) 'how, that, in order to', Latv. dial. (Latgalian) *kaĩ* 'how'. Ošrowski (2014) in his paper on the origin of the Old Lithuanian indefinite pronoun *kajakas* 'whoever, anything' paid attention to the structural similarity between *kajakas* and Russian *кое-кто* 'somebody' and *что-то* 'something'. This in turn leads to a morphological analysis of Old Lithuanian *kajakas*, where *kaja-* is a neuter pronoun that relates to Old Church Slavonic **коѣ** 'what, which'. As far as the origin of Lith. **kaja* is concerned, it developed from the conflation of two neuter relative pronouns: *ka* < Indo-European **kʷod* (cf. Latin *quod*) and *ja* < Indo-European **(H)yod* (cf. Old Indic *yád*). Successors of Lith. Masc. *kajakas* and Neutr. **kajaka* are Lith. *kiekas* 'how many' rešp. 'much, some, anything' and *kiek(a)* 'how many' rešp. 'much, a little, every, any, anything', respectively, as well as Latv. **kiek* > *ciek* > *cik* 'how many' rešp. 'much, every'. To explain the relationship between Masc. *kajakas* rešp. Neutr. **kajaka* and Masc. *kiekas* rešp. Neutr. **kiek(a)*, a syncope of the unstressed vowel /a/ needs to be posited, i.e.:

- Neutr. **kaja*-*'ka* > **kaj-ka* > Old Lith. *kieka* > *kiek* (Latv. *cik*).

The shape **kajka* is documented in Finnish *kaikki* 'all, altogether, everything', a loanword from Baltic (cf. Toivonen 1955: 141; and Rosinas 1988: 195). The accentuation *kiekó*, *kiekám'* documented in Daukša's *Poštilla Catholicka* (cf. Skardžius 1999: 227) points indirectly to the oxytonesis of Masc. *kajakas* rešp. Neutr. **kajaka*.

Another argument in favour of the hypothesis presented is the fact that the analogous process, the apocope of the unstressed /a/, displays the oxytonically stressed pronoun *kataràs* > *katràs* 'which of the two?'. The **kaja* (neutr.), reconstructed on the basis of the relative pronoun *kajakas*, makes it possible to eluci-

szischkaie missche of 1600 (cf. Bibliografija 1969: No. 1206; our quotation from Vaišnoras 1997: 686 left column, line 16). We explain *jukaigei* < **ju-kai-gi-ai*.

date the common Baltic connective *kai* 'how' as the result of the apocope of /a/. Three reasons speak in favour of this hypothesis:

- firstly, there is the parallel of Polish *jak* and Russian *как* 'how', which both derive from the neuter relative pronouns *jako* and *kako*;
- secondly, such an explanation of *kaĩ* is supported by the etymology of the neuter pronoun *taĩ* 'this, that', which comes from *taja*; see Rosinas (1988: 187). Also cf. the Neutr. *tajag* 'exactly the same' in the following example:

(5) *Wujek's text*: tedy fie nam **tož** oftánie / co fie temu fludze okrutnemu oftálo. (Daukša 2000: 771 lines 29–30).

Daukša's translation: tad' múmus **taiağ** tikfis / kas' tam' târnui fmâr-kiam'tikoś (op. cit.: 770 lines 30–1).

'So it will happen **the same** to us what happened to this cruel servant.'

- last but not least, the change **'kaja* > *kai* explains the acute intonation in Lith. *káikas* 'somebody, something' (LKŽ 1941–2002: V, 48); cf. the secondary acute intonation in *kélnès* < *kēlinès* 'trousers' and in Dat. Sg. *tàvi* > *táu* 'you'.

Assuming both, Lith. *kaĩ* and *taĩ*, derived from **'ka-ja* resp. **'ta-ja*, we gain the advantage of being able to elucidate a twofold development of **juo'kai* resp. **be'tai* in word-final position and before *-g(i)*.

The underlying reason is the relative chronology of the two processes:

- the disappearance of the unstressed /a/ before *-#* and *-g(i)*; and
- the monophthongization of /ai/ > **/e:/* (> /ie/).

The apocope of the unstressed /a/ before *-#* has to have taken place earlier than the syncope of /a/ before *-gi*. The change **juo'kaja-gi* > **juo'kai-gi* took place only after the monophthongization /ai/ > /ie/ had expired. Old Lith. *ju'kaig* most likely had acute intonation; cf. Lith. dial. *káikas* 'somebody, something'. Furthermore, the acute intonation in the final syllable explains, on the strength of Leskien's Law, both shortenings, **ju'kie* > **ju'ki* and **be'tie* > *beti*. The one-syllable forms **kái* and **tái* (stemming

from **kaja* and **taja*) have been changed, also according to Leskien's Law, into *kaĩ* and *taĩ*. As for the demanded secondary acute intonation in **kái* and **tái* see above.

On the other hand, the Lithuanian neuter pronoun *tataĩ* 'this, that' seems to be a counter-example to the proposed hypothesis. *tataĩ* is an instance of reinforcement: it arose by adding the deictic pronoun *taĩ* 'this, that' to the neuter pronoun *ta* (< Indo-European **tod*) 'this', as documented in the Old Lithuanian compounds *tapirmiaius* 'firstly, at the beginning' (cf. Old Russian *мо нѣрво* > Russ. *менѣрь* 'now') and *tapagaliaus* 'finally' (Ostrowski 2014); *tapirmiaius* and *tapagaliaus* are recorded two times, in Martynas Mažvydas' *Catechismosa Prafty Szadei* of 1547 (cf. Bibliografija 1969: № 678) and in Baltramiejus Vilentas's *Enchiridion* published in 1579 (cf. op. cit.: № 1281). However, there are reasons to think that the shape *tataĩ* is a late innovation.

The starting point is, of course, the philological analysis of Old Lithuanian texts, which is regularly neglected by researchers. For the notation <tať> 'this', which is very common in Daukša's postill (e.g. Daukša 2000: 242 line 9—see below example 6), we can reconstruct the older shape **tati*:⁴

(6) *Wujek's text*: mamy wiedzieć / żeć słowo Boże iest nie tylko to co w Biblię itoi napisano (Daukša 2000: 243 lines 8–9).

Daukša's translation: turime žinoti iog žodis Dievo yra' ne tiekai tať kas Biblioę yra parašita (op. cit.: 242 lines 8–9).

'We have to know that the word of the Lord is not only **that** what has been written in the Bible.'

On the strength of the aforementioned explanation of *bet' ~ bet* we are forced to assume the following development for *tať*:

- **ta-'tai* > **ta-'tie* > **ta-'ti* > *tať* > *tat*

Leskien's Law explains the change **ta-'tie* > **ta-'ti*. Of course, in such a case the final diphthong /ie/ had to have acute intonation

4 Compare <Bet'> (Daukša 2000: 500 line 48) with <Beťi> 'but' (op. cit.: 720 line 21), <bút'> (op. cit.: 1292 line 5) with <buti> 'to be' (op. cit.: 140 line 24), and the aforementioned pairs like <ik'> ~ <iki>.

stemming from the shortening **taja* > **tái*; cf. the aforementioned Dat. Sg. *tàvi* ‘you’ > *táu*.

The trace of the change *-tai* > *-ti* > *-t’* > *-t* is also instanced by *it*, recorded in Lithuanian as a focus particle (example 7), deictic pronoun (example 8) and intensifying adverb (example 9):

(7) *It* tokį pat radau Žemaičiuose (augalą). (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 263)
‘**Exactly** the same plant I found in Samogitia.’

(8) ir iš d’ienōs *it* v’isa padarid reik’a b’it. (Vidugiris 1998: 242)
‘and during the day all **these things** had to be done’.

(9) Man jau *it* nieks nesekas. (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 263)
‘I am doing **completely** badly.’

it in example 8 has its exact counterpart in the neuter pronoun *itai* ‘this’ (sometimes *itaĩ*):

(10) o iš *itai* p’irks’i sáu ad’æža. (Vidugiris 1998: 242)
‘and for **this** you will buy clothes.’

The parallel for the change of “neuter deictic pronoun” > “focus particle” is delivered by Polish (neutr.) *to* ‘this’; cf. *to* as a deictic pronoun (example 11) and focus particle (example 12):

(11) Czy mógłbyś mi **to** podać?
‘Could you give me **this**, please?’

(12) **To** Janek kocha Anię.
‘It is John who loves Ann.’

In view of these data, we can explain *it* as the result of the process **i-’tai* > **i-’tie* > **i-’ti* > *it*.⁵ The unshortened shape **i-ti* has been preserved in the intensifying adverb *itin*:

(13) Kad jau *itin* vasara – kelias sausas. (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 268)
‘It’s **totally** summer – the way is dry.’

(14) Tas arklys *itin* geras. (loc. cit.)
‘This horse is **extraordinarily** good.’

The final /-n/ traces back to the Indo-European anaphoric pro-

5 Traditionally it is believed that Lith. *it* corresponds to the Latin adv. *ita* and ved. *iti* ‘in this way’. As can be seen, this is not quite right, although in this case we have an amalgam of two demonstrative elements anyway.

noun *-n*,⁶ which is documented in Lithuanian in a few lexemes with anaphoric-deictic functions; to compare Lith. *teñ* 'there' with *tè* 'there' (Latv. *te* 'here') as well as Old Lith. *tasjan* 'exactly this'⁷ with both Old Lith. *tasja* and *tasjag*;⁸ and may also be both in Old Lith. *neng* 'than'⁹ and in *nent* 'than',¹⁰ to compare with *ne* 'not, than'.

Presumably, the contemporary form *tataĩ* 'this, that' replaced the older **tati* on the analogy of *tataig(i/u)* (a form extremely common in Daukša's postill). A parallel for such a scenario is provided by *betai* 'but', documented in Samuelis Minvydas' Lithuanian *Summa, Aba Trumpas ifzguldimas Ewanieliv szwentu* of 1653 (cf. Bibliografija 1969: N^o 732), alongside the more common *bet'* resp. *bet*. In Minvydas' *Summa* the ratio *betai* to *betaig/bataig* is 3 : 78 (cf. internet resource »SR«). In texts by other authors (Mažvydas, Daukša, Vilentas, Sirvydas) there is an exclusive distribution of *bet/bet'* vs. *betaig(ila)*.

2.2 Latvian »juk«. If we assume that Lith. *jùk* goes back to **juo-'kai*, then Latvian *juk* 'after all' gives rise to difficulties. Firstly, *kai* does not exist outside the Latgalian dialect. Secondly, **juo-'kai* > **juo-'kie* should trigger Latvian **juc*; cf. 2nd sg. pres. *pērc* 'you buy' vs. Lith. *perkì* (refl. *perkiesi*). Therefore, a better solution for Latvian *juk* seems to be the pre-form **juo-'ka*; cf. Latv. *ka* 'that', a connective of complement clauses which, according to standard etymology, comes from the interrogative (indefinite) neuter pronoun **k^wod* (Latin *quod*).¹¹ As the aforementioned Baltic *kai* < **kaja*

6 We most likely find the enclitic *-n* in Polish *ten* < **t^on^o* 'this'; cf. Rysiewicz (1956a; 1956b), who compared Polish *ten* and a few other Slavonic forms to the Old Armenian suffixed pronoun of the 3rd person (see Jensen 1959: 164; Pisowicz 2001: 80–1).

7 cf. Samuel Chyliński's Old Testament printed in 1660 (cf. Bibliografija 1969: N^o 196), here Genesis 24,7 et passim (quoted by LKŽ 1941–2002: XV, 972).

8 cf. Daukša 2000: 263 line 31, et passim. On the postponed neuter pronoun *-ja* see Ostrowski (2014).

9 cf. Vilentas 1965: 9 line 25, et passim.

10 cf. Mažvydas 1993: 56 line 26, et passim.

11 cf. also Lith. *kà* 'that': *Aš tau sakiau, ka lauکه lyja* (LKŽ 1941–2002: V, 3) 'I

was also a neuter pronoun, the functional similarity between *ka* and *kai* is obvious. On this basis it justifies the reconstruction **juo*-*'ka* (for Latvian) and **juo*-*'kai* (for Lithuanian).

The carried-out analysis of the word-final *-ki* > *-k'* > *-k* sheds some light on the origin of the Lithuanian connective (preposition) *iki* rešp. *ik* 'as long as, to'; cf. Old Prussian *ickai* rešp. *ikai* 'if, although, when'. Presumably, we face the development *-kai* > *-kie* > *-ki* here, but this issue requires a separate study.

3 Functions of *juo*- and the primary meaning of Lith. **juokai* ~

Latv. **juoka*. Lithuanian-Latvian *juo* is a polyfunctional connective, e.g. Lith. *Višą skolą atleidžiau tau, juog prašei mane* (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 414) 'I cancelled your entire debt, because you asked me to'; Latv. *es nelauztu ievās zarus, juo es pati kā ieviņa* (MEH 1923–46: II, 124) 'I would never have broken the bird-cherry's twig, because I am like a bird-cherry myself'. In Old Lithuanian texts *juo* comes up as a connective of complement clauses. However, the most common is *juo* used in correlative clauses; cf. both in Lith. *Juo daugiau turi, juo daugiau nori* (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 389) 'The more he has, the more he wants' and in Latv. *juo ... juo*. In the context of the etymology presented, special attention is drawn to the intensifying adverb *juo* with both meanings, 'especially, entirely' (example 15) and 'even more, all the more' (examples 16–8) Here, Lith. *juo* corresponds to *juoba* as well as to Latv. *juo* 'especially, very' (example 19):

(15) Kai jau **juog** per kaklā varva, nerauname linu. (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 414)

'Especially when it is already raining on the neck, we do not pick flax.'

(16) O jie **juo** daugiau šaukė. (Bretkūnas 2005: 381; LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 389)

'And they shouted **even more**.'

(17) Jā **iū** neszina (...) kā kalbeja alba dare. (Mažvydas 1993: 127, line 12)

'And they knew **even less** (...), about what they had said or done.'

have told you that it is raining outside'. The function of the interrogative pronoun *ka* 'what, was?' is well documented in Old Prussian, e.g.: *Ka aft fta billiton?* 'What does it mean?' (Rosinas 1988: 190–3; Mažiulis 1993: 134–8).

(18) Kad paties tėvo nebuvo namie, tai **juo** reikėjo žiūrėti namų. (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 389)

‘When father himself was not at home, then I needed **even more** to look after the homestead.’

(19) Viņi dzīvuo **juo** laimīgi. (MEH 1923–46: II, 124)

‘They have a **very** happy life.’

The primary meaning of **juokai* could be ‘particularly, notably when’. A parallel is delivered by contemporary Lithuanian *juoba*, *kad*:

(20) Ar nemanai mesti to pavojingo amato – **juoba, kad** taip senas? (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 389)

‘Do you not think about quitting this dangerous craft, **particularly as** you are so old?’

Both instances, 17 and 18, are interesting for the origin of the intensifying *juo*. In modern standard Lithuanian the adverb *juobà* rather than *juo* would be used here:

(21) Tam dalykui **juoba** išskelti aikštėn duodame dar pluoštą pavyzdžių. (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 389)

‘In order to explain this thing **even more**, we give a couple of examples.’

The source of *juoba* seems to have been correlative sentences of a type shown in the next example:

(22) **Juo** toliaus eitam į metus, **juoba** didžiaus dauginas nepaščyvastis mūsų (LKŽ 1941–2002: IV, 389)

‘**The older** we grow (*literally: the further we go into years*), **the bigger** our villainy is.’

The sentence with *juo ... juoba* is a variant of the Lithuanian resp. Latvian correlative sentence *juo ... juo* ‘the more ... the more’ (cf. example 23) and this very type most likely underlies the intensifying adverb *juo*.

(23) Szmones **juo** ilgiaus, **juo** daugiau ji teipajeg pradeda myleti. (Bretkūnas 2005: 169)

‘**The longer** people know him, **the more** they start loving him.’

The intensifying adverb *juo* has also served the purpose of expressing the comparative of inequality in Latvian and Lithuanian dialects; e.g. Latv. *juo labs* ‘better’ vs. *labs* ‘good’. Typologi-

cally *juo labs* may be compared to the Indo-European comparative *-yos-*, originally an intensifying suffix, too. However, this is a very different story.

4 Conclusion. The Lithuanian particle *juk* results from a conflation of the intensifying adverb *juo* 'especially, notably, even more, all the more' with the connective *kaĩ* 'when', i. e. **juo-'kai*. For Latvian, **juo-'ka* has to be assumed; cf. the complementizer *ka* 'that'.

A parallel for the monophthongization **juo-'kai* > **juo-'kie* > **juo-'ki* is delivered by the adversative conjunction *bet* < **be-'tai*. Stress on the last syllable made way for the proclitic shortening **juo-'CV* > **ju-'CV*.

In favour of the development **be-'tai* > **be-'tie* > **beti* > *bèt'* > *bèt* is the etymology of **i-'tai* 'this, that' and **ta-'tai*. Their phonetically regular successors are *it* (cf. *itin*) and *tat* 'this' (Old Lith. *tat'* < **ta-ti*), respectively. The current (dialect) forms *itaĩ* and *tataĩ* are later innovations.

Internet Resources

- NO Norbert Ostrowski: Iš lietuvių kalbos istorinės morfologijos problemų: apie 'nebe(-)' ir 'bent' kilmę. In: *Lietuvių kalba* 5 (2011); on: www.lietuviukalba.lt
- SR: Senieje raštai. [Corpus of Old Lithuanian texts] On: www.lki.lt/seniejirastai/db.php

References

- AMBRAZAS, Vytautas (1997) (ed.): *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius.
- BIBLIOGRAFIJA (1969): *Lietuvos TSR bibliografija. Serija A: Knygos lietuvių kalba. Tomas 1 [Vol. 1]: 1547–1861*. Edited by Lietuvos TSR Ministrų Tarybos Valstybinis Spaudos Komitetas, Lietuvos TSR Knygų Rūmai; Vilnius.
- [BRETĶŪNAS, Jonas] (2005): *Jono Bretkūno Postilė. Studija, faksimilė ir kompaktinė plokštelė*. Edited by Ona Aleknavičienė; Vilnius. [Edition by faksimile.]
- [DAUKŠA, Mikalojus] (2000): *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų Postilė ir jos šaltiniai*. Edited by Jonas Palionis; Vilnius. [Edition by faksimiles.]
- FRAENKEL, Ernst (1962–5): *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 2; Heidelberg.
- HERMANN, Eduard (1926): *Litauische Studien. Eine historische Untersuchung schwachbetonter Wörter im Litauischen*. Berlin.
- HOLVOET, Axel (2002): Notes on the development of the Lithuanian and Latvian conditional. In: *Linguistica Baltica* 10, pp. 39–50.
- , — (2010): Notes on complementisers in Baltic. In: Nicole Nau, Norbert Ostrowski (eds.), *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*. Vilnius, pp. 73–101. (*Acta Salensia*, 2)
- JENSEN, Hans (1959): *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
- KAZLAUSKAS, Jonas (2000): *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*

- [1968]. In: J. K., *Rinktiniai raštai*. Vol. 1, edited by Albertas Rosinas; Vilnius.
- ЛКŽ (1941–2002). *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. XX vol.; Vilnius. (Resp. available on: www.lkz.lt)
- MAŽIULIS, Vytautas (1993): *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas. Tomas 2 [Vol. 2]: I–K*. Vilnius.
- MAŽVYDAS, Martynas (1993): *Katekizmas ir kiti raštai*. = *Catechismus und andere Schriften*. Edited by Giedrius Subačius; Vilnius. [Edition by faksimiles.]
- VAIŠNORAS, Simonas (1997) (ed.): *Simono Vaišnoras 1600 metų Žemczuga Theologischka ir jos šaltiniai*. Edited by Guido Michellini; Vilnius. [Edition by faksimiles.]
- МЕН (1923–46). Karl Mühlenbach: *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von J. Endzelin. 4 vol., Riga 1923–32. — Completed both by: J. Endzelin, E. Hausenberg, *Ergänzungen und Berichtungen zu K. Mühlenbachs Lettisch-Deutschem Wörterbuch. Bd. 1* [i.e. vol. 5]. Riga 1934–38; and by: J. E., E. H., *Papildinājumi un labojumi K. Mülenbacha Latviešu valodas vārdnīcai. III sējums* [i.e. vol. 6]. Rīga 1946.
- NAU, Nicole & OSTROWSKI, Norbert (2010): Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages. In: N. N., N. O. (eds.), *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*. Vilnius, pp. 1–37. (*Acta Salensia*, 2)
- OSTROWSKI, Norbert (2010): Latvian *jeb* ‘or’ – from conditional to disjunctive conjunction. In: Nicole Nau, Norbert Ostrowski (eds.), *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*. Vilnius, pp. 135–50. (*Acta Salensia*, 2)
- , — (2014): On the postponed neuter pronoun *-ja* in Baltic. In: Tatjana Civjan, Marija Zavjalova, Artūras Judžentis (eds.), *Baltai ir slavai: dvasinių kultūrų sankirtos = Балты и славяне: пересечения духовных культур*. Vilnius, pp. 242–53.
- PISOWICZ, Andrzej (2001): *Gramatyka ormiańska*. (*Grabar-Aszcharabar*). Kraków.
- ROSINAS, Albertas (1988): *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai*. Vilnius.
- RYSIEWICZ, Zygmunt (1956 a): Zachodnio-słowiańskie *тннъ, сннъ*,

- јѸѸ [1934]. In: Z. R., *Studia językoznawcze*. Edited by Jerzy Kuryłowicz, Wrocław, pp. 65–70.
- , — (1956b): Kaszubskie *nen* i formacje pochodne [1936]. In: Z. R., *Studia językoznawcze*. Edited by Jerzy Kuryłowicz, Wrocław, pp. 61–4.
- SKARDŽIUS, Pranas (1999): Daukšos akcentologija [1935]. In: P. S., *Rinktiniai raštai*. Vol. 5, edited by Albertas Rosinas; Vilnius.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, Wojciech (2007): *Lietuvių kalbos etimologinis žodynas*. Vilnius.
- STANG, Christian S. (1966): *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø.
- TOIVONEN, Yrjö Henrik (1955): *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja*. Vol. 1; Helsinki.
- [VILENTAS, Baltramiejus] (²1965): *The Lithuanian Catechism of Baltramiejus Vilentas (1579)*. Edited by Gordon B. Ford; Louisville/KY, rev. ed. [Textedition and faksimile.]
- VIDUGIRIS, Aloyzas (1998): *Zietelos šnektos žodynas*. Vilnius.

