

DANIEL PETIT
École Normale Supérieure, Paris

OLD LITHUANIAN *AŅSKAT, ŠÌSKAT, TÀSKAT* AND COGNATES

Senosios lietuvių kalbos *aňskat, šìskat, tàskat*
ir su jais susiję žodžiai

0. INTRODUCTION

First introduced by the Greek grammarians (Chrysippos, Apollonios Dyskolos) and later elaborated by the German psychologist Karl Bühler (1934: 80), the notion of ‘deixis’ has been much debated throughout the 20th century¹. Although intuitively appealing, it is an artifact, which encompasses various types of gestural reference and covers a wide range of phenomena with different semantic features. Among the most striking expressions of deixis, the so-called ‘thetic judgments’ occupy a special position, in that they simply report the existence of a situation (e.g. Engl. *there is a cat sleeping in my room*), while ‘categorical judgments’ simultaneously assert the existence of an object and describe its action or state (e.g. Engl. *a cat is sleeping in my room* = *there is a cat* + *it is sleeping in my room*). This distinction is well known². However, a subclass of thetic judgments seems to have been generally overlooked in the standard textbooks of linguistics and in most specialized monographs and articles dealing with deixis³. Many languages present special deictic particles, which draw the attention of a speech partner to some event or state of affairs (e.g. Lat. *ecce*, Russ. *voť*, Fr. *voici, voilà* ‘here is/are’). By their most salient syntactic and semantic features, especially by

¹ See for example Charles Fillmore (1997) or Stephen Levinson (2006) for a recent overview.

² See for example Hans-Jürgen Sasse (1987).

³ An exception is Levinson (2006: 111), who uses the term ‘presentative particles’, otherwise very rare in English-language linguistics.

their reference to a speech partner, such particles differ from the other deictic particles (e.g. Lat. *ibi*, Russ. *zdes'*, Fr. *ici*, *là* 'here'). In scholarly literature, they are sometimes named 'presentative particles'; this technical term goes back to the description of the Biblical Hebrew particle *hinne^h* 'here is/are' and has been afterwards applied to the French particles *voici*, *voilà*. As I tried to show elsewhere⁴, the notion of 'presentative particles' is a powerful and attractive notion which could account for the use of some deictic particles of the Baltic languages, especially Lith. *štaĩ*, Latv. *re*, *raũ*, *lũk* and *še* 'ecce'. The aim of this paper is to discuss the origin of a subclass of presentative particles that is widely attested in Old Lithuanian and in some Lithuanian dialects, but remains unexplained from an etymological point of view.

1. DESCRIPTION

In Old Lithuanian literature and in some modern Lithuanian dialects, we find a set of presentative particles, which obviously share some common morphological features, but still lack a convincing etymology. Descriptively, these particles are a compound of a demonstrative stem (*anàs*, *šìs*, resp. *tàs*) and an ending *-(s)ka(t)* or *-(s)ga(t)*. In Table 1 all relevant forms are listed and briefly described.

Judging from the main uses of these different particles in Lithuanian, it is clear that they belong to the category that I have briefly presented above under the name of 'presentative particles': their basic meaning corresponds to that of the Latin particle *ecce*. To begin with, some of these particles may introduce a nominal form. Examples with *šìskat*:

- [1] *Wolfenbüttel Postilla* (WP 118 2–3 [1573]):
ſchifkat tar/naite weſzpaties.
 'Here is the maid servant of the Lord!'
- [2] Jonas Bretkūnas, *Postilla* (BP I 84 21 [1591]):
Jei tawe gandin Smertis bei prapūlims / tadda ſchifkat tawa gelbetoias Kriſtus.
 'If death and perdition frighten you, then behold your Saviour, Christ!'

With *šìsgatès*:

- [3] Simonas Daukantas (LKŽ XIV 914):
Šìsgatès piemuo!
 'Here is the shepherd!'

⁴ Daniel Petit (2010).

Senosios lietuvių kalbos *aňskat*,
šįskat, *tąskat* ir su jais susiję žodžiai

TABLE 1		stem <i>ans-</i>	stem <i>šis-</i>	stem <i>tas-</i>
with voiceless consonant -k-	-ka		<i>šįska</i> Daukantas	
	-kat	<i>anskat</i> Bretkūnas	<i>šįskat</i> Wolfenbüttel Postilla, Bretkūnas	<i>taskat</i> Wolfenbüttel Postilla, Bretkūnas, Klein, Sapūnas, Mielcke, Clavis Germanico-Lithvana, Lexicon Lithuanicum, Nesselmann, Kurschat
	-kate		<i>šįskate</i> Wolfenbüttel Postilla	
	-kategi			<i>taskateghi</i> Wolfenbüttel Postilla
with voiced consonant -g-	-g			<i>tąsg</i> dialects of Papilė, Tirkšliai
	-ga	<i>ansga</i> Juška	<i>šįga</i> Juška, dialects of Alsėdžiai, Skaudvilė <i>šįsga</i> Kossarzewski, dialect of Raudėnai	<i>tąsga</i> Pabrėža, Juška, dia- lects of Plungė, Raudėnai, Žemaičių Kalvarija
	-gat			<i>tąsgat</i> dialects of Kvėdar- na, Rietavas, Salantai
	-gatės	<i>aňgatės</i> dialects of Kuliai, Plate- liai, Salantai <i>aňsgatės</i> Alsėdžiai, Gargždai, Grūšlaukis, Stakliškės	<i>šįgatės</i> Sereiskis, dialects of Salantai, Skuodas <i>šįsgatės</i> Daukantas, Juška, Kossarzewski, dialects of Alsė- džiai, Gargždai, Plateliai, Salantai, Veiviržėnai, Žarėnai	<i>tąsgatės</i> Juška, Lazdynų Pėlėda, Baronas, dialects of Grūšlaukis, Ylakai, Kvėdarna, Luokė, Plungė, Rietavas, Salantai, Seda, Tirkšliai, Truskava, Tverai, Vieکشniai, Žarėnai
	-gati			<i>tąsgati</i> dialect of Žemaičių Kalvarija
	-gaties		<i>šįsgaties</i> dialect of Žarėnai	
	-gatis		<i>šįsgatis</i> Nieder- mann, Senn, Brender and Salys	<i>tąsgatis</i> Pabrėža, Valančius, Juška, dialects of Kretinga, Mosėdis, Plateliai, Raudėnai, Salantai, Žemaičių Kalvarija
	-gačiuos			<i>tąsgačiuos</i> dialect of Šatės

With *tàskat*:

- [4] Martynas Mažvydas, *Gesmes Chrikičzonifkas* (MŽ 447 4 [1570]):
Motriščk tafkat sunus tawa!
 ‘Mother! There is Your son!’
- [5] Jonas Bretkūnas, *Biblia* (BB Song 5, 2 [1590]):
Taskat balsas mana Prieteliaus tuskinancio.
 ‘There is the voice of my friend who is knocking.’

In this construction, the presentative particles are regularly followed by a nominative. This nominal construction is predominantly attested to in Old Lithuanian religious literature; an influence of the Biblical phraseology is possible. However, some instances may be found in later sources as well. Example with *tàsga*:

- [6] Antanas Juška, *Литовский словарь* ([1897–1922], cf. LKŽ XV 961):
Tàsga triba jo dirvos!
 ‘Here is the edge of his field!’

A construction with an indirect interrogative clause is also found, but seems to be very rare. To judge from the material collected from the LKŽ and Old Lithuanian literature, very few instances can be produced, and most of them are doubtful. For example:

- [7] Jurgis Pabrėža’s writings (LKŽ XV 961):
Tasga, koks vėl reikalas!
 ‘Look over there! What a story!’

Obviously, we are dealing here not with an indirect interrogative clause, but with an independent particle *tasga* followed by an exclamation *koks vėl reikalas!* ‘what a story!’. We are not yet able to determine whether this impossibility to use these particles with indirect interrogative clauses is due to the scantiness of our documentation or reflects a significant feature.

The same particles may be used as sentence-opening particles, introducing independent verbal predicates. This construction is abundantly attested not only in Old Lithuanian literature, where one might reckon with the influence of Biblical phraseology, but also in the modern dialects, where such an influence is precluded. Examples with *aňskat*:

- [8] Jonas Bretkūnas, *Biblia* (BB 22 Kings 4, 25 [1590]):
Ansƚkat ateia Sunamitiene.
 ‘Behold! The woman from Sunam is arrived.’

Senosios lietuvių kalbos *aĩskat*,
šĩskat, *tàskat* ir su jais susiję žodžiai

With *šĩskat*:

- [9] *Wolfenbüttel Postilla* (WP 158 30 [1573]):
Jr schifkat Ritą metą anksti ifch wiřsių řzalių muras pafsikiele.
'And behold! Early morning arose from all countries a wall.'
- [10] Jonas Bretkūnas, *Biblia* (BB Judg 15, 16 [1590]):
Schifkat anis gul pulkais.
'Behold! They are lying gathered together.'
- [11] Jonas Bretkūnas, *Biblia* (BB Lk 7, 27 [1590]):
Schifkat řiuncziu Angelą mana.
'Behold! I am sending my angel.'

With *šĩskate*:

- [12] *Wolfenbüttel Postilla* (WP 195 12–13 [1573]):
A meřs řchifkate, ka/iamis miname.
'And we – behold! – are trampling down with our feet.'

With *tàskat*:

- [13] *Wolfenbüttel Postilla* (WP 16v 28–29 [1573]):
A tafkat artinafi iumis karaliř/te Dangaus!
'And behold! The word of the realm of heaven is coming to you!'
- [14] Jonas Bretkūnas, *Biblia* (BB Gen 29, 6 [1590]):
Ir řchitai tafkat jo dukte Rahel ateit su avimis.
'And behold! His daughter Rahel is arriving with her sheep.'
- [15] Jonas Bretkūnas, *Postilla* (BP I 303 7 [1591]):
Todelei mielas Krikřchczonie tu tafkat effi krikřchtitas.
'Therefore, o dear Christ! Behold! You were baptized.'

With *tàskategi*:

- [16] *Wolfenbüttel Postilla* (WP 117r 10 [1573]):
Tafkategi panas Die=||was tawe paaukřřtinaija.
'Behold! The Lord God has raised you.'

With *tàsgatės*:

- [17] Dialect of Tryškiai (LKŽ XV 961):
Tàsgatės kare buvo, ne juokai!
'Behold! It was in war, is not a joke.'

2. MORPHOLOGY

From a morphological point of view, it is obvious that we are dealing here with two different formations. As far as I can see, forms with a voiceless consonant (*-ka-*) are exclusively Old Lithuanian: they occur in the Wolfenbüttel Postilla (1573) and in the works of Jonas Bretkūnas (ca 1590), Daniel Klein (1653, 1654) or Kristupas Sapūnas (1673). They are still mentioned in some 19th century dictionaries, where they were probably taken from older sources: we have for example *taskat*, *Adv. siehe da* in the dictionaries of Georg Nesselmann (1851: 95) and Friedrich Kurschat (1883: 450). On the other hand, forms with a voiced consonant (*-ga-*) occurred only more recently. To my knowledge, their oldest attestations go back to the writings of Jurgis Pabrėža (1771–1849) and Motiejus Valančius (1801–1875). There is thus a chronological difference between both types of endings: forms with *-ka-* are older than forms with *-ga-*.

This first impression is corroborated by the dialectological distribution. In Old Lithuanian, forms with *-ka-* are best attested in the Wolfenbüttel Postilla (WP 1573), but occurrences are found in various texts based on other dialects as well, e.g. Martynas Mažvydas, Bretkūnas or Mikalojus Daukša. It is thus likely that the ending *-ka-* represents a common Lithuanian inheritance. The picture is radically different with the younger forms with *-ga-*, since they are restricted to a little number of Low Lithuanian (Žemaitian) dialects: they are predominantly attested in the north of a line drawn between Klaipėda and Kuršėnai (e.g. in Kretinga, Skuodas, Telšiai, Rietavas, Luokė, Papilė). From older literature one may mention the writings of Pabrėža and Valančius, both born precisely in this area (Skuodas, resp. Kretinga). It is clear that the voiced ending (*-ga-*) is a local innovation of the Northern Low Lithuanian dialects. However, it can hardly be considered a regular evolution of an older *-ka-*.

3. ETYMOLOGY

Since the 19th century, the etymology of these particles has been much discussed. In a brief note, the Latvian master Jānis Endzelīns (DI II 499 [1913]) explained the ending *-skat* in *aīskat*, *šīskat*, *tāskat* as cognate with the stem of the Latvian verb *skatīt* ‘to see, to look’. This explanation was also adopted by Eduard Hermann (1926: 387). Another view was proposed by Adalbert Bezzenberger (1877: 175–176), who saw in *aīskat*, *šīskat* and *tāskat* compound forms of the demonstrative pronouns *aīš* (*anàs*), *šīs*, resp. *tàs* in combination with different

deictic particles. He derived the first particle *-ka-* from the PIE coordination **k^{ue}* ‘and’ (cf. Gr. τ&, OInd. *ca*) and compared the second particle *-t* (from *-te*) with the ending of Lith. *n&t* ‘even’. In a slightly different way, Ernst Fraenkel (1921: 3, 33, cf. LEW I 11 [1962]) derived *aĩskat*, *šĩskat* and *tàskat* from the demonstrative pronouns *aĩs* (*anàs*), *šĩs*, resp. *tàs* in combination with a deictic particle *-ka-*. However, he did not trace back the ending *-t* to another deictic particle, but to a shortened form of the 2nd singular personal pronoun in the dative case (*-ti* ‘to you’ > *-t*). The same view was taken by Peter Arumaa (1933: 35) and more recently by Wojciech Smoczyński (2007: 17, 640, 661). None of these scholars seems to have supported any of these explanations by precise historical or typological evidence. It would perhaps not be unfair to apply to all of them the skeptical judgement pronounced by Alvilis Augstkalns (1934–1935: 67) on Fraenkel’s proposal: *Diese Vermutung läßt sich aber, soweit ich sehe, auch durch nichts erklären*. A thorough examination of all the implications involved by these etymologies is still to be conducted.

Let us begin with Endzelĩns’ proposal. In support of his claim that the ending of *aĩskat*, *šĩskat* and *tàskat* goes back to a verbal form cognate to Latv. *skatĩt* ‘to see, to look’ one could mention the Modern French presentative particles *voici*, *voilà*. These particles were created in Middle French from the imperative of the verb *voir* ‘to see’ in combination with the local particles *ci* ‘here’, resp. *là* ‘there’. In contrast to Fr. *voici*, *voilà* from *vois ci*, *vois là* (imperative + local particle), Lith. *aĩskat*, *šĩskat*, *tàskat* would display the opposite word order (local particles **anà*, **šĩ*, **tà* + imperative of **skatĩti* = Latv. *skatĩt*). From this point of view, the regular use of these particles with the nominative (as in *šchĩfkat tarnait& w&f&paties* ‘here is the maid of the Lord’ WP 118 2–3 [1573]) would be secondary. A similar case would be the Greek presentative particle *ĩdoú* ‘ecce’, which goes back to the imperative form of the aorist *ĩdeĩv* ‘to see’: it was originally followed by noun phrases in the accusative, but in Hellenistic Greek it came to be used with noun phrases in the nominative (e.g. *ĩdoú ó áv&θ&ω&πος* ‘ecce homo’ Jn 19, 5). However attractive it may appear at first glance, Endzelĩns’ etymology faces a serious difficulty: the segmentation proposed by Endzelĩns (**anà*, **šĩ*, **tà* + **skat-*) does not account for the forms with a voiced consonant (cf. *tàsgat*, etc.), nor for the forms without final dental (cf. *šĩska*, *tàsga*, etc.). It is likely that the ending *-t* is not inherent to the structure, but is rather an adventitious element added to an already constituted stem, which suggests that, the connection with the verbal root of Latv. *skatĩt* must be seen as mistaken.

I now turn to Bezenberger’s and Fraenkel’s etymologies. Whichever solution one prefers, both have in common the idea that *-ka-*, resp. *-ga-* are originally

deictic particles added to the demonstrative stems of *aĩs* (*anàs*), *šĩs*, resp. *tàs*. Although rare, a deictic particle *-ka-* occurs in some Lithuanian dialects, instead of Standard Lithuanian *-ki-*. A particle *-ga-* has left some traces in Old Lithuanian (e.g. *nesanga* ‘because, for’, *betaiga* ‘but’, cf. OPruss. *anga* ‘if, whether’) alongside the more frequent particle *-gi-*. The sibilant before these deictic particles must belong to the demonstrative stems. It should probably be interpreted as the masculine nominative singular ending (*aĩs* = *anàs*, *šĩs*, *tàs*), and indeed in many cases the context implies agreement with a masculine singular noun, see for instance the following examples:

- [18] Martynas Mažvydas, *Gesmes Chriķfczonifkas* (MŽ 447 4 [1570]):

Motriķchk taķkat sunus tawa!

‘Mother! There is Your son!’

(agreement of *taskat* ‘this one there’ with *sunus* ‘son’).

- [19] Simonas Daukantas (LKŽ XIV 914):

Šisgatės piemuo!

‘Here is the shepherd!’

(agreement of *šisgatės* ‘this one here’ with *piemuo* ‘shepherd’).

However, counter-examples are relatively frequent, either with feminine gender nouns, as in the following examples:

- [20] *Wolfenbüttel Postilla* (WP 118 2–3 [1573]):

ķchķkat tar/naite wēķpaties!

‘Here is the maidservant of the Lord!’

(disagreement of *ķskat* ‘this one here’ with *tarnaitė* ‘maid servant’).

- [21] Antanas Juška, *Литовскій словарь* ([1897–1922], cf. LKŽ XV 961):

Tàsga triba jo dirvos!

‘Here is the edge of his field!’

(disagreement of *tasga* ‘this one there’ with *triba* ‘edge’).

or with plural nouns:

- [22] Jonas Bretkūnas, *Biblia* (BB Judg 15, 16 [1590]):

Schķkat anis gul pulkais.

‘Behold, they are lying gathered together.’

or even without any substantive at all:

- [23] Dialect of Tryškiai (LKŽ XV 961):

Tàsgatės kare buvo, ne juokai!

‘Behold, it was in war, it was not a joke.’

This might be the result of a secondary extension, once *aĩskat*, *šĩskat*, *tàskat* have been reanalyzed as uninflected particles. As a parallel, one could mention the Hittite presentative particles *kāša*, *kāšma* ‘look here, behold’ and *āšma* ‘lo, behold’, which, according to a standard etymology, go back to the common gender nominative singular of demonstrative pronouns *kāš* ‘this one here’ (< PIE **kós*, cf. Lith. *šĩs* < **kĩ-*), resp. **āš* ‘this one’ (< PIE **h₁ós*), in combination with a deictic particle *-(*m*)*a* (cf. Hitt. *imma* ‘truly, really, indeed’, *namma* ‘then, once again, furthermore’), but may be used more widely as petrified adverbial formations.

One may likewise assume that the first part of *aĩskat*, *šĩskat* and *tàskat* is a frozen masculine singular nominative ending. The forms were reanalyzed as uninflected adverbs or particles. It should be noted that forms without sibilant are attested in some Lithuanian dialects: *šiga*, *šĩgatės* (beside *šĩsgatės*), *aĩgatės* (beside *aĩsgatės*); they must be seen as renewed adverbial formations.

The ending *-t* remains as the main problem. This is precisely the point where Bezenberger’s and Fraenkel’s explanations diverge. I shall first discuss Fraenkel’s etymology, since nowadays it turns out to predominate in the standard handbooks. His claim is that the ending *-t* reflects a second singular personal pronoun in the dative case *-t* (from *-ti* ‘to you, for you’). Although not mentioned by Fraenkel nor by any scholar having endorsed his opinion, this etymology could apparently be strengthened by a vast amount of typological evidence, showing a phraseological predilection of presentative particles for being linked with second singular or plural personal pronouns in the dative. In Latin, for example, the presentative particles *ecce* and *em* ‘here is / here are’ are frequently followed by the dative singular *tibi* ‘to you, for you’. Examples with Lat. *ecce tibi* ‘here is / here are’:

[24] Cicero, Pro Sestio 89:

Ecce tibi consul, praetor, tribunus plebis noua noui generis edicta proponunt!

‘See now the consul, the pretor, the tribune of the people proposes new edicts of a new sort!’

[25] Cicero, Ad Atticum 7, 19:

Ecce tibi ante diem tertium Nonas Februarias mane accepi tuas litteras!

‘But here, this 3rd of February, I have received in the morning a letter from you!’

With Lat. *em tibi* ‘here is / here are’:

[26] Plautus, Asinaria 880:

Em tibi hominem!

‘There is your man!’

[27] Plautus, Amphitryon 778:

Em tibi pateram, eccam!

‘There! Your bowl, see!’

- [28] Plautus, Pseudolus 754:
Em tibi omnem fabulam!
 ‘There’s the whole plot for you!’

A similar feature is also documented in the Romance languages, for example in Italian, where the presentative *ecco* has a variant *eccoti* (< *ecco* ‘here is’ + *ti* ‘for you’, sg.):

- [29] I Fioretti di San Francesco XXXVI [first edition 1476]:
Ed eccoti venire una grande moltitudine!
 ‘And behold! A big crowd is coming!’
- [30] Pietro Aretino (1492–1556), Ragionamenti 11 [first edition 1533]:
E venuto il tempo di levarsi. Eccoti mia madre che mi rimenò a casa.
 ‘The time to get up is come. Here is my mother who brings me back home.’
- [31] Carlo Goldoni (1707–1793), La sposa persiana III 8 [first edition 1753]:
Eccoti il mio consiglio.
 ‘Here is my advice.’

and in Old French *es vos* (< *es* ‘here is’ + *vos* ‘for you’, pl.):

- [32] Chanson de Roland 1989 [end of the 11th century]:
As vos Rollant sur son cheval pasmet.
 ‘You’d seen Rollant aswoon there in his seat.’
- [33] Beroul, Roman de Tristan 3702 [12th century]:
Atant es vos le roi Artus.
 ‘And look, here is King Arthur.’
- [34] Wace, *Vie de Sainte Marguerite* 562 [ca 1130–1140]:
Es vos un tonnoire mult grant.
 ‘Here is a very big thunder.’

A similar collocation of the dative of a second person pronoun with a presentative particle is also known in Biblical Armenian. At least, two instances may be found in the New Testament (*aha* ‘here is’ + *c’jéz* ‘to you’, pl.):

- [35] Jn 19, 5:
 eu asœ Ānosa: aha ayrd ĀjeÔ.
 Ew asē c’nosa : aha ayrd c’jéz.
 ‘And he saith unto them: Behold the man!’
- [36] Jn 19, 14:
 eu asœ Āhreaysn : aha »agawor jer ĀjeÔ.
 Ew asē c’hreaysn: aha t’agawor jer c’jez.
 ‘And he saith unto the Jews: Behold your king!’

Finally, every speaker of any Slavic or Baltic language knows that presentative particles may be enlarged by the dative of the second singular personal pronoun. Evidence may be found for example in Russian *vot tebe* (< *vot* ‘here is’ + *tebe* ‘to you, for you’, sg.):

[37] Russian proverb:

Vot tebe, babushka i yur’ yev den’.

‘That’s, Grandma, the Yuri’s day (± What an unpleasant surprise!).’

in Polish *oto ci*, OPol. *otósci* (< *oto* ‘here is’ + *ci* ‘to you, for you’, sg.):

[38] Polish (instance found on the web <siymia.blog.interia.pl>):

Widzieliście więc sępa łaciatego? Oto ci on.

‘Did you (pl.) see the speckled vulture? Here he is.’

in Lithuanian e.g. *tè táu*, *và táu* (< *tè*, *và* ‘here is’ + *táu* ‘to you, for you’, sg.):

[39] Dialect of Daukšiai (cf. LKŽ XV 1046):

Te tau mano bėrą žirgą.

‘Here is my bay horse.’

[40] Dialect of Mzš (cf. LKŽ XVII 763):

Và táu gražioji diena – koks debesys kyla!

‘What a lovely day, indeed – what a cloud is raising!’

and in Latvian e.g. *še tev* (< *še* ‘here is’ + *tev* ‘to you, for you’, sg.):

[41] Lerchis-Puškaitis, 1891. *Latviesu tautas (teikas un) pasakas*, V 318 (cf. ME IV 13):

Še tev brīnumi!

‘What a surprise! (± Look at this miracle!).’

In some cases, this feature may be explained by a special pragmatic value of the presentative particle which does not only draw attention to something, but also invites the speech partner to take possession of it, which implies that the dative case refers to the recipient or beneficiary of the action. The general meaning then is ‘here is for you, at your disposal, you may take it’. In other contexts, there is no such implication of giving something, but the dative case seems merely to point out the presence of a speech partner who is invited to feel concerned about the action, that is, the function of the dative is that of a so-called ‘ethical dative’. Even if the ethical dative is not particularly frequent in Baltic, its existence should not be controversial at least for the oldest stages of the Baltic languages. It is interesting that the same typological feature is expressed in different Indo-European languages with various linguistic means ; this shows that encoding of a speech partner is frequently seen as constitutive of presentative particles. Nevertheless, all

this typological evidence would convincingly support Fraenkel's etymology of the ending *-t* of Lith. *aĩskat*, *šĩskat* and *tàskat*. Nevertheless, typology itself is not an argument in etymological issues; it has only a confirmatory value. One must first examine whether the reconstruction proposed is simply possible from a technical point of view.

Having this point in mind, let us now have a look at Bezenberger's etymology. According to Bezenberger, a structure like *tàskat* should be seen as the result of the agglutination of two deictic particles (*-ka-* + *-t*). It is true that presentative particles are often expanded by the addition of other deictic or local adverbs or particles: in Lithuanian, for example, beside *štaiĩ* 'ecce', instances of *štaiĩ čia* are also found. Long forms such as *šĩskate*, *tàskategi*, and especially *šĩsgatės* and *tàsgatės* seem to speak in favor of the form **-tē* > **-te* which could reasonably be equated with the local particle *tē* 'there' (if from **-tē* < **teh₁*); there is also evidence for a clitic form, cf. OLith. *arte* (SD³ 413) and *artės* (SD¹ 127, SD³ 4) 'maybe' beside *ar*. Taken at face value, these forms seem to weaken Fraenkel's explanation of the ending *-t* by a personal pronoun *-ti* in the dative case. At least, one would be compelled to accept the idea that the ending *-ti* was replaced by *-te* on the analogy of a pattern **-t* / **-te* attested in some adverbial formations, see for example Lith. *net* 'even' and OLith. *nete* PK 98 (cf. also *netegi* = *netgi* in SD³ 32, *netes* in the manuscript dictionary of Silvestras Gimžauskas 1879–1881) or Lith. *anót* 'according to' and *anóte* or *anotė* 'according to'. But it is true that such an analogy rests on a shaky foundation and appears to be too far-removed from a semantic point of view to be likely to have played a role whatsoever in the formation of *šĩskate*, *tàskategi*, *šĩsgatės* and *tàsgatės*. On the other hand, some of the presentative particles in question display long forms with a final vowel *-i*, e.g. *tàsgati* (in the dialect of Žemaičių Kalvarija), *šĩsgatis* (in the dictionary of Max Niedermann, Alfred Senn, Franz Brender and Antanas Salys), *tàsgatis* (in the works of Pabrėža, Valančius and Juška, and in the dialects of Kretinga, Mosėdis, Plateliai, Raudėnai, Salantai, Žemaičių Kalvarija), which could speak in favor of Fraenkel's etymology. In any case, one has to assume some secondary analogy. It is thus difficult to determine which form is old and which is new.

Another argument in favor of the reconstruction of a deictic particle **-tē* > **-te* in *aĩskat*, *šĩskat* and *tàskat*, and against the dative of a personal pronoun is the fact that the same particle **-tē* > **-te* > **-t* may occur, although sporadically, with other local particles, even when they are not presentative particles. In some Lithuanian dialects, we find for example *čionaitės* 'here' (LKŽ II 115, dialect of Bartninkai) or *tenaitės* 'there' (LKŽ XVI 34, dialects of Vilkaviškis, Daukšiai, Bartninkai). If the ending *-t*, **-te* or **-tē-s*, was the refection of an older personal pronoun **-ti*, one would expect to find it only in presentative particles, because, as I have already

Senosios lietuvių kalbos *aĩskat*,
šĩskat, *tàskat* ir su jais susiję žodžiai

pointed out, encoding of a speech partner is particularly important in such particles, not in normal local particles in which the presence of an ethical dative would hardly be justified. Nevertheless, this argument is rather weak, because we could assume that the ending of *aĩskat*, *šĩskat* and *tàskat* is different from that of *čionáitės*, *tenáitės* and that the ending of *šĩsgatės*, *tàsgatės* is simply due to analogy.

4. CONCLUSION

In view of these data, there is no way to decide between both solutions: Fraenkel's etymology appears very attractive on a typological level, but leaves certain questions open; Bezenberger's explanation is more trivial and probably less exciting, but still remains as a possibility. It would be nice, of course, if we could fit the Lithuanian data into a more general typological framework. However, it all depends on the data and data alone.

LITERATURE

Arumaa Peter 1933: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der litauischen Personalpronomina*. Tartu: Universitas Tartuensis.

Augstkalns Alvils 1934–1935: Baltische Miscellen. – *Studi Baltici* 4, 63–71.

BB – Bretkūnas Jonas 1590: *Biblia tatau estis wissas Schwentas Raschtas Lietuwischkai pergulditas per Jana Bretkuna*. Königsberg.

Bezenberger Adalbert 1877: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der litauischen Sprache. Auf Grund litauischer Texte des XVI. und des XVII. Jahrhunderts*. Göttingen: Peppmüller.

BP – Bretkūnas Jonas 1591: Postilla Tatau estis Trumpas ir Prastas Ischguldimas Euan-geliu / sakamuiu Basznyczoie Krikschczionischkoie / nuog Aduento ik Waeliku. Per Iana Bretkuna [...]. – *Jono Bretkūno Postilė*, ed. by Ona Aleknavičienė. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 2005.

Bühler Karl 1934: *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: Verlag von Gustav Fischer.

DI I–IV – Endzelīns Jānis 1971–1982: *Darbu izlase* 1–4. Rīga: Zinātne.

Fillmore Charles 1997: *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Fraenkel Ernst 1921: *Baltoslavica, Beiträge zur balto-slavischen Grammatik und Syntax*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Grevisse Maurice ¹1936, ¹²1986: *Le bon usage, Grammaire française*. Bruxelles: Duculot.

Hermann Eduard 1926: *Litauische Studien, Eine historische Untersuchung schwachbetonter Wörter im Litauischen*. Göttingen: Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen.

Kurschat Friedrich 1883: *Littauisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Halle.

Levinson Stephen C. 2006: "Deixis". – *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, ed. by Laurence R. Horn, Gregory L. Ward. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 97–120.

LEW I–II – Fraenkel Ernst 1962–1965: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

LKŽ ²II, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 2, 2-asis leid. Ats. red. Jonas Kruopas, Vilnius: Mintis, 1969; 14–15. Vyr. red. Kazys Ulvydas, Vilnius: Mokslo, 1986–1991; 16. Vyr. red. Kazys Ulvydas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1995; 17. Vyr. red. Vytautas Vitkauskas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996.

ME I–IV – Mühlenbach Karl, Endzelīns Jānis 1923–1932. *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca, Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* 1–4. Rīga: Izglītības ministrija.

MŽ – Mažvydas Martynas 1547–1570: *Gesmes Chrikščizonifkas. – Katekizmas ir kiti raštai*, ed. by Giedrius Subačius. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1995.

MŽ – Mažvydas Martynas 1547–1570: *Gesmes Chrikščizonifkas. – Martyno Mažvydo raštai ir jų šaltiniai*, ed. by Guido Micheli. Vilnius: Mokslo, 2000.

Nesselmann Georg H. F. 1851: *Wörterbuch der Littauischen Sprache*. Königsberg: Verlag der Gebrüder Bornträger.

Niedermann Max, Senn Alfred, Salys Antanas, Brender Franz 1932–1968: *Wörterbuch der litauischen Schriftsprache* 1–4. Heidelberg: Winter.

Petit Daniel 2010: On presentative particles in the Baltic languages. – *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*, ed. by Nicole Nau, Norbert Ostrowski. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 151–170.

PK – Petkevičius Merkelis 1598: *Katechismas. – 1598 metų Merkelio Petkevičiaus Katekizmas*, ed. by Juozas Balčikonis. Kaunas: Švietimo ministerijos knygų leidimo komisija, 1939.

Sasse Hans-Jürgen 1987: The Thetic/Categorical Distinction Revisited. – *Linguistics* 25, 511–580.

SD – Sirvydas Konstantinas ³1642: *Dictionarium trium linguarum. – Pirmasis lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, ed. by Antanas Lyberis. Vilnius: Mokslo, 1979.

Senosios lietuvių kalbos *aňskat*,
šískat, *tàskat* ir su jais susiję žodžiai

SD – Sirvydas Konstantinas K. ¹ca 1620: Dictionarium trium linguarum. – *Senasis Konstantyno Sirvydo žodynas*, ed. by Kazys Pakalka. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1997.

Smoczyński Wojciech 2007: *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

WP – Wolfenbüttler Postilla 1573: *Die litauische Wolfenbütteler Postille von 1573*, ed. by Jolanta Gelumbeckaitė. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag in Kommission, 2008.

Senosios lietuvių kalbos *aňskat*, *šískat*, *tàskat*
ir su jais susiję žodžiai

SANTRAUKA

Šio straipsnio tikslas – aptarti parodomųjų dalelyčių poklasiui – pristatomosioms dalelytėms – priklausančių *aňskat*, *šískat*, *tàskat*, gausiai paliudytų senuosiuose lietuviškuose raštuose ir kai kuriose dabartinėse lietuvių tarmėse, etimologijas. Išsamiau analizuojamos dvi šių dalelyčių kilmės versijos, kurias išskėlė Adalbertas Bezenbergeris (1) ir Ernstas Fraenkelis (2):

1) *aňskat*, *šískat*, *tàskat* traktuojami kaip dūriniai, sudaryti iš parodomųjų įvardžių *aňs* (*anàs*), *šís*, *tàs* ir įvairių parodomųjų dalelyčių;

2) *aňskat*, *šískat*, *tàskat* laikomi dariniais iš parodomųjų įvardžių *aňs* (*anàs*), *šís*, *tàs*, parodomosios dalelytės *-ka-* ir sutrumpėjusio asmeninio įvardžio antrojo asmens vienaskaitos naudininko linksnio (*-ti*, *tau'* > *-t*).

Detaliai aptarus šias hipotezes ir nurodžius argumentus *pro* ir *contra*, prieita prie išvados, kad verifikuoti kurią nors iš šių hipotezių galėtų tik išsami lietuvių kalbos duomenų analizė.

Įteikta 2011 m. vasario 12 d.

DANIEL PETIT
École normale supérieure
45, rue d'Ulm, 75005 PARIS, France
E-mail – daniel.petit@ens.fr