

DOI: 10.2478/v10122-011-0014-5

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE LITHUANIAN *tačiaũ* ‘BUT, HOWEVER, YET’

NORBERT OSTROWSKI

ABSTRACT: Norbert Ostrowski. *On the Origin of the Lithuanian tačiaũ ‘but, however, yet’*. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, vol. LII (2)/2011. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-173-0, pp. 75–81.

The present study is intended as a further contribution to our knowledge of the origin of the Lithuanian connective *tačiaũ* ‘but, however, yet’. Of two existing so far etymologies we speak in explanation of Pranas Skardžius. In his opinion *tačiaũ* traces back to the combination of deictic pronoun *tat* ‘this, that’ and postpositioned particle *jau*, strictly speaking *jau* functioning as an ‘emphatic assertion of identity’. Typological data presented below support such a possibility.

Norbert Ostrowski, Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University, al. Niepodległości 4, PL – 61-874, Poznań, e-mail: norbertas@poczta.onet.pl

INTRODUCTION

The polyfunctionality of the Lithuanian particle *jaũ* has not yet received a thorough description. The brief overview of functions which I present in section 1 is not claimed to be complete. My aim is only to give a survey of some distinctive properties of *jaũ* that will form a background to the second part of the paper, i.e. the etymology of the Lithuanian connective *tačiaũ* ‘but, however, yet’.

1. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE LITHUANIAN PARTICLE *jaũ*

Most often *jaũ* appears in Lithuanian as a ‘specifying and limiting’ particle (AMBRAZAS 1997: 397f.), and this function is emphasized in grammars and dictionaries of Lithuanian, e.g.:

- (1) *Sául-ė* *jaũ* *nu-si-léid-o*. (AMBRAZAS 1997: 398)
 sun:NOM.SG already PRV-RFL-set:PST
 ‘The sun has **already** set.’

In this meaning *jaũ* corresponds to its etymological counterparts in other languages as Latv. *jau* ‘already’, OChSl. *ju-že* ‘already’, Pol. *ju-ż* (OPol. *ju-że*) etc. However, the sphere

of usage in Lithuanian is much broader and not restricted only to *jaũ* as a ‘specifying and limiting’ particle.

1.1. *jaũ* AS A SCALAR ADDITIVE PARTICLE

Lith. *jaũ* may serve also as a scalar additive particle, as is shown in the Lithuanian translation of this German example from KÖNIG (1991: 140):

- (2) *Schon die kleinste Aufregung kann gefährlich sein.*
 Engl. ‘(Even) the smallest excitement can be dangerous.’
 Lith. ‘**Jau** mažiausias susijaudinimas gali būti pavojingas.’¹

Cf. also the Polish translation: ‘**Już** najmniejsze wzruszenie może być niebezpieczne.’

1.2. *jaũ* AS AN ‘EMPHATIC ASSERTION OF IDENTITY’

The term ‘emphatic assertion of identity’ was coined by Ekkehard KÖNIG (1991: 125ff.) and pertains to such particles as Germ. *eben*, *genau*, *ausgerechnet*, Eng. *exactly*, *precisely*, thus to such words that “are [...] used emphatically to assert the identity of one argument in a proposition with an argument in a different, contextually given proposition” (KÖNIG 1991: 127), e.g.:

- (3) *Eben / genau deshalb möchte ich nicht dorthin gehen.*
 ‘This is exactly why I don’t want to go there.’ (KÖNIG 1991: 126)²

Lithuanian *jaũ* as an ‘emphatic assertion of identity’ is combined with the deictic and anaphoric words *tas* ‘this, that’, *toks* ‘of this kind’, *taip* ‘so, this way’. In this way *jaũ* resembles Germ. *eben*³, but unlike *eben* Lith. *jaũ* always occurs as a postposition, cf. example (4) from Bretkūnas’ *Postilla* (1591) – BP I 253.17–18:

- (4) *Antr-oie dal-ije isch-rascha tus-iau Euangelista*
 second:LOC.SG.F part:LOC.SG PRV-write:PRS this:NOM.SG.M-FOC Evangelist
did-i ir stebukling-a darb-a Pon-a Krist-aus.
 great:ACC.SG.M and wonderful:ACC.SG.M work:ACC.SG lord:ACC.SG Christ:GEN.SG
 ‘In the second part **precisely this** Evangelist describes Christ’s great and wonderful work.’

Old Lithuanian possessed a set of enclitics fulfilling a similar function, cf. *taipo-jau* ‘in just the same way’ alongside *taipo-ja(g)* (written most often <taipoieg>) and *taipo-gi*, but only *-gi* was an universal focus marker and could be combined with various parts of speech, cf. *-gi* with numeral in (5):

¹ On this kind of particles and their role in focus marking, see KÖNIG (1991) and GROCHOWSKI (1983: 1986).

² Polish expressions such as *ten sam* ‘the same’ and *podobny* ‘similar’ are sometimes described as expressions with incorporated anaphoric information (“z wbudowaną informacją anaforyzacyjną”), see GRZEGORCZYKOWA 1996.

³ Cf. KÖNIG (1991: 128): “in its use as focus particle, *eben* is almost entirely restricted to demonstrative pronouns and anaphoric expressions as potential foci. [...] Demonstrative and anaphoric elements express referential identity of two expressions and *eben* emphasizes this identity.”

- (5) *Potam isch-guld-a iemus Penkt-an-gi prisakim-a*
 then PRV-lecture:PST them fifth:ACC.SG.M-FOC commandment:ACC.SG
sawa dang-aus Tiew-a. (BP II 284.18-19)⁴
 of his heaven:GEN.SG father:GEN.SG
 'Then he lectured them on the fifth commandment of his heavenly Father'⁵

Aside from *-jau* and *-ja* the 'emphatic assertion of identity' is expressed also by the postposition *-ai*. The functional similarity of *-jau*, *-ja* and *-ai* is testified in this sentence from Daukšas' *Postilla* (1599):

- (6) *Bat' tof-iáu ne-gédž-ios*
 but that:NOM.PL.F-FOC NEG-shy:NOM.PL.F
âk-is / [...] / tafs-iía liežiúw-is (DP 7.54)
 eye:NOM.PL that:NOM.SG.M-FOC tongue:NOM.SG
wil-qf-is / tafs-ái piŭw-as
 betray:PTC.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M-RFL that:NOM.SG.M-FOC belly:NOM.SG
ne pa-fsótin-t-as / [...] / ir tie-ia-g
 NEG PRV-satiate-PTC.PRS.PASS-NOM.SG.M and that:NOM.PL.M-FOC-FOC
pât-is jánar-iei kur-ié tarnáw-o [...]
 same:NOM.PL.M limb:NOM.PL.M which:NOM.PL.M serve:PST
kreiwúmo-p / tie pát-is o ne kit-í
 immoral deed:ALL.SG the same and NEG other:NOM.PL.M
pa-kêl-s káncž-iq ir koróim-q /
 PRV-experience:FUT torture:ACC.SG and punishment:ACC.SG.M
kur-i nu-péln-e. (DP 8.1-3)
 which:ACC.SG.M PRV-deserve:PST

Pol. 'Ale **te iste** wszeteczne oczy / [...] / **ten** język zdradliwy/ **ten** brzuch nienasycony/ (...) / y **też iste** członki które służyły ku nieprawości / te same a nie insze podeymą mękę y karanie/ ktore zasłużyły.'

'But **exactly those** shameless eyes, [...], **the very** tongue which betrays, **precisely that** insatiable belly, [...], and **exactly those** limbs that served immoral deeds, the same, not other ones will experience the torture and punishment they deserved.'

In Old Lithuanian texts one may sometimes observe the reinforcement of *-ai* by means of *-jau* and *-gi*, cf. this instance from the errata in Daukšas' *Postilla* (1599)⁶:

- (7) *Tokf-aiieu-ġ búw-o Pówil-as S.* [*<*toks-ai-jau-g*]
 such-FOC-FOC be:PST Paul St.
 'Exactly of this kind of man was St. Paul.'

Similarly in *Žemczuga Theologischka* (1600):

- (8) *jra tass-aiiau moxl-as* (MT 16. 8) [*<*tas-ai-jau*]
 be:PRS that-FOC science:NOM.SG
 'it is **exactly that** science'

⁴ In this example the focus is also marked graphically, by the use of the capital letter in <Penktangi> 'fifth'.

⁵ For more information on the particle *-gi* in Old Lithuanian, the reader is referred to HERMANN (1926: 106-171) and AMBRAZAS (2006: 80-82).

⁶ Emendation to page 384, 22.

Postposed *jaũ* as an ‘emphatic assertion of identity’ is used also in equative constructions, cf.:

- (9) *Vis-ai toks jau kaip ir tu.* (LKŽ vol. 16: 479)
 entirely:ADV such FOC as and you
 ‘Entirely **the same** as you.’

1.3. *jaũ* FOLLOWING THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS

Focusing *jaũ* can also accompany interrogative pronouns, cf.:

- (10) *Kas jaũ, kas mano mažyt-į skriaudž?* (LKŽ vol.4: 294)
 who FOC who my baby:ACC.SG harm:PRS
 ‘**Who is this**, who my baby harms?’
- (11) *Kàs jaũ táu at-si-tik-o?* (OTREBSKI 1956: 362)
 what FOC you:DAT.SG PRV-RFL-happen:PST
 ‘**What** happened to you?’

Similarly in the case of the Lithuanian focus particle *-gi*:

- (12) *Er ne-deschimt-is pa-gilb-a / kame-gi dewini?* (BP II 391.18–21)
 INTR NEG-ten:NOM.SG PRV-recover:PST where:FOC nine
 ‘Were there not ten cleansed? but **where** are the nine?’ (Luke 17:17)
- (13) *Ka-ge ghis pikt-a dar-e?* (BP I 381.2)⁷
 WH:ACC.SG-FOC he evil:ACC.SG do:PST
 ‘what evil hath he done?’ (Luke 23:22)

2. LITH. *tačiaũ* ‘BUT, HOWEVER, YET’

Lithuanian *tačiaũ* is a connective in adversative and concessive clauses, cf.:

- (14) *Šauk-ė ji ilg-ai, tačiau niek-as ne-at-si-liep-ė.* (AMBRAZAS 1997: 764–765)
 shout:PST she long:ADV but nobody NEG-PRV-RFL-answer:PST
 ‘She shouted for a long time, **but** nobody ever answered.’
- (15) *Kaczei Welin-as lab-ai macn-us ira [...].*
 although devil:NOM.SG very:ADV strong:NOM.SG.M be:PRS
Tacziau Pon-as Krist-us macn-esn-is... (BP I 297.12–15)
 yet lord:NOM.SG Christ:NOM.SG strong:COMP-NOM.SG.M
 ‘Although the devil is very strong [...], **yet** Christ is much stronger...’

As for the origin of *tačiaũ* there are two hypotheses:

⁷ <-e> in *Kage* appeared under the influence of German orthography, in which the final reduced vowels are denoted with <e>, cf. *Tu esse wienas* (BP I 372.17) ‘You are the one’ with <esse> instead of <essi> (Lith. *esi* ‘you are’). Thus OLith. *-ge* is probably not connected with Slavonic *-že*.

- i) *tačiaũ* < **tad-tjau* (FRAENKEL 1962–1965: 1048); *tad* < *tada* 'then', where *-tjau* relates to Latv. *šu* 'auch, selbst, sogar' and Lith. *čia* 'here, it' coming from **ijo*. Etymologically *tačiaũ* is identical with Latv. *taču* 'however' < **tad-šu* (KARULIS 1992: 369).
- ii) *tačiaũ* stems from **tat-jau*, cf. *tat* 'that, this' / *tatiau(g)* 'exactly that one' (SKARDŽIUS 1932/1998: 339), cf. Daukšas' *Postila* (537.33):

- (16) *Todrîna-g̃ anî tos iu iž kalb-ós / tat-iéu at-fakî-fsí-me...*
 therefore-FOC to that they:GEN.PL PRV-argument:GEN.SG that-FOC PRV-respond:FUT.IPL
 Pol. 'Przetoż na tę ich wymówkę / **toż** im odpowiemy [...]'
 'Therefore to that argument of theirs **that's** what we will respond [...]'⁸

The first hypothesis encounters phonetic and methodological difficulties. On the basis of **tad-tjau* we expect **tasčiau* rather than *tačiaũ*. Secondly, Latv. *šu*, a so-called scalar additive particle, remains without etymology, and the explanation referring to the hypothetical **-tjau* is a case of explanation *ignotum per ignotum*. On the other hand, Skardžius' proposal is entirely satisfactory in both formal and semantic terms. As was noted by KÖNIG (1991: 131):

Especially *gerade*, *eben* and *ausgerechnet* express something over and above mere identity of two values. These three particles often carry an implication of dissonance or incompatibility concerning the two propositions over which they operate [...]. These particles are typically used in contexts where the relevant propositions 'p' and 'q' do not usually go together. In other words, these contexts and these particles often suggest that there is an adversative or concessive relationship between the relevant propositions.

Cf. one of the examples given by König (p. 132):

- (17) *Wenn man Kinder bittet, etwas nicht zu tun, dann tun sie es gerade.*
 'If you ask children not to do something, that's exactly what they will do.'

Unfortunately, due to the late testimony of Lithuanian texts (16th c.) it is impossible nowadays to show the contexts that could give rise to lexicalization of the connective **tat-jau*, but the quoted German parallel makes highly probable the assumption that *tačiau* comes from the combination of the deictic pronoun *tat* and *jaũ* as an 'emphatic assertion of identity'.

As far as the origin of *tat* is concerned, STANG (1966: 114–115, 232, 242) saw in it the continuation of the IE nom.-acc. neutr. pronoun **to-d* 'this'. However, such an explanation is not felicitous, as the regular continuation of IE **tod* is Lithuanian *-ta*, attested in OLith. *ne-ta* (polyfunctional coordinative connective, then scalar additive particle 'even').⁹ In fact, Lith. *tat* 'that, this' stems from *tataĩ* 'that, this' via reanalysis *ta-taĩ* > *tat-aĩ*, and rejecting *-aĩ* on the pattern of *tas-aĩ* 'exactly this one' alongside *tas* 'this, he' (NIEMINEN 1922: 47; NAU & OSTROWSKI 2010: 22; Ostrowski 2011a); in the same way *šitai* 'behold' (etymologically *ši-tai*) was reanalyzed as *šit-ai*, whence the new particle *šit* 'behold, lo'. Similarly there appeared Lith. *ten* 'there' from OLith. *tenai* 'exactly there'. *te-nai* was originally *te* 'there' (Latv. *te* 'here') as Lith. *ji-nai* was to *ji* 'she'. In the next step *te-nai* was reanalyzed as a pro-

⁸ Of course, *tatiau(g)* is a late innovation, cf. the lack of [č], i.e. **tačiaug*.

⁹ As for the etymology of *neta* / *nete* > *net* cf. HERMANN (1912: 82–83): "Die Bedeutung von *net(a)* ist zumeist 'sondern', diese muß man sich etwa so entstanden denken: *schitta kosanis netiktai wienims piemenims kalbama ira, net wissam swietui* [...] 'diese Predigt ist nicht nur zu den Hirten allein gesprochen, nein: zu der ganzen Welt.'" See also NAU & OSTROWSKI (2010: 16f.).

noun with a focus particle *-ai*, i.e. *ten-ai*, whence the shortened form *ten* ‘there’ (OSTROWSKI 2011b).¹⁰ By means of reanalysis one may easily explain also Lith. *bet* ‘but’ as coming from **bet-ai* (cf. OLith. *betai-g*) < **be-tai* ‘and this’ (see HERMANN 1926: 335f.; FRAENKEL 1962/1965: 41; NAU & OSTROWSKI 2010: 21; Ostrowski 2011). Thus etymologically *tataĩ* is an example of reinforcement: the deictic pronoun *ta* (IE **to-d*) was reinforced by adding a second deictic pronoun *taĩ* ‘that, this’; a case reminiscent of Latin *is-te*.¹¹

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC – accusative, ACT – active, ADV – adverb, F – feminine, FOC – focus, GEN – genitive, LOC – locative, NOM – nominative, NEG – negation, PASS – passive, PL – plural, PRS – present, PRV – preverb, PST – past, PTC – participle, RFL – reflexive, SG – singular

REFERENCES

- AMBRAZAS Vytautas (ed.). 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- AMBRAZAS Vytautas. 2006. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- BP = *Jono Bretkūno POSTILĖ: Studija, faksimilė ir kompaktinė plokštelė*. Ona ALEKNAVIČIENĖ (ed.), 2005. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla.
- DP = *Postilla Catholica. Tāi est: Ižguldimas Ewangeliu kiekvienos Nedelos ir švętes per wissūs metų. Per Kūnigą Mikaloiv Davkszą Kanoniką Médnikų... 1599*. Jonas PALIONIS (ed.), 2000, *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų Postilė ir jos šaltiniai*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- FRAENKEL Ernst. 1962–1965. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bd. 1–2. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- GROCHOWSKI Maciej. 1983. “Wpływ partykuły *nawet* na strukturę tematyczno-rematyczną zdania.” In: *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych*, seria 6. Warszawa: PWN, 121–130.
- GROCHOWSKI Maciej. 1986. *Polskie partykuły. Składnia, semantyka, leksykografia*. Wrocław etc.: Ossolineum (Prace Instytutu Języka Polskiego, 62).
- GROCHOWSKI Maciej (ed.). 1996. *Anafora w strukturze tekstu*. Warszawa: Energeia.
- GRZEGORCZYKOWA Renata. 1996. “Polskie leksemy z wbudowaną informacją anaforyzacyjną.” In: GROCHOWSKI 1996: 71–77.
- HERMANN Eduard. 1912. *Über die Entwicklung der litauischen Konjunktionalsätze*. Jena: Frommannsche Buchdruckerei (Hermann Pohle).
- HERMANN Eduard. 1926. *Litauische Studien. Eine historische Untersuchung schwachbetonter Wörter im Litauischen*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- KARULIS Konstantīns. 1992. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. Vol. 2: *P-Ž*. Rīga: Avots.
- KÖNIG Ekkehard. 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London–New York: Routledge.
- LEHMANN Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München–Newcastle: LINCOM (LINCOM studies in theoretical linguistics, 01).
- LKŽ = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. Volumes 1–20 (1968–2002), Vilnius.
- MT = *Margarita Theologica ... Zemczuga Theologischka ... Lituwischkai jra perguldita per Simona Waischno-ra warnischki ... Karaliaucziue ... 1600*. In: Guido MICHELINI (ed.), 1997, *Zemczuga Theologischka ir jos šaltiniai*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- NAU Nicole, OSTROWSKI Norbert. 2010. “Background and Perspectives for the Study of Particles and Connectives in Baltic Languages.” In: Nicole NAU & Norbert OSTROWSKI (eds.), *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas / Asociacija “Academia Salensis”: 1–37 (Acta Salensia, 2).
- NIEMINEN Eino. 1922. *Der urindogermanische Ausgang -ãi des Nominativ-Akkusativ Pluralis des Neutrums im Baltischen*. Helsinki: Drukerei der Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft.

¹⁰ On the origin of *-nai* see ZINKEVIČIUS 1981: 199.

¹¹ LEHMANN 1995: 22f.; NAU & OSTROWSKI 2010: 21.

- OSTROWSKI Norbert. 2011a. "Iš lietuvių kalbos istorinės morfologijos problemų (apie *nebe(-)* ir *bent* kilmę)." *Lietuvių kalba* 5, <http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php?id=186>.
- OSTROWSKI Norbert 2011b. "Pochodzenie litewskiego afiksu duratywnego *teb(e)-*." *Folia Scandinavica Posnaniensia* 12, 205–210.
- OTREBSKI Jan. 1956. *Gramatyka języka litewskiego*. Vol. III: *Nauka o formach*. Warszawa: PWN.
- SKARDŽIUS Pranas. 1932/1998. "Lietuvių latvių kalbos žodyno dalykai." *Archivum Philologicum* 1932, 3, 47–54. [Reprinted in: Albertas ROSINAS (ed.). 1998. *Pranas Skardžius. Rinktiniai raštai*. Vol. 4. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas: 334–342).
- STANG Christian. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- ZINKEVIČIUS Zigmąs. 1981. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. Vol. 2. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Allatum di 25 mensis Octobris anno 2011