Norbert OSTROWSKI
Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków

LITHUANIAN *dabar̃* 'NOW' AND THE BALTIC *-ā́*-ILLATIVE
Lietuvių *dabar̃* ir baltų *-ā́*-iliatyvas

Abstract. Lithuanian *dabar̃* 'now' comes from the illative of the continuative adverb *dābar* 'still, yet'; schematically: *dābar* 'still, yet' → illative **dabar-ā́ > *dabarà > dabar̃* 'now'. Change in accentuation visible in *dābar* 'still, yet' vs. *dabar̃* 'now' brings to mind a similar process in illative forms, e.g. acc.sg. **mìškan* → ill.sg. **miškan-ā́ >* dial. *miškanà >* ill.sg. *miškañ*. The primary illative **dabar-ā́* is preserved in the dialectal *dabarõs* 'now', which is traced back to a contraction of **dabar-à-es*. The postposition **-es* is a mark of the enclitic verb *esti* 'is'. The shift of accent like between *dãbar* 'still, yet' and dial. *dabarõs* 'now' can also be observed in a few other adverbs, e.g. **pa gãli* (cf. OLith. *ik' gâli* 'to the end') → *pagaliõs* 'in the end'.
Keywords: Baltic; postpositions; illative; etymology; enclitics.

Anotacija. Lietuvių *dabar̃* kilęs iš prieveiksmio *dābar* 'dar' iliatyvo, t. y.: *dābar* 'dar' → ill. **dabar-ā́ > *dabarà > dabar̃*. Kirčio vietos kaita *dābar : dabar̃* primena panašų procesą iliatyvo formose, pvz., acc. sg. **mìškan* → ill. sg. **miškan-ā́ >* dial. *miškanà >* ill. sg. *miškañ*. Pirminis iliatyvas *dabar-ā́* išlikęs tarminėje formoje *dabarõs* 'dabar', kildinamoje iš kontrakcijos **dabar-à-es*. Postpozicija **-es* yra enklitinio veiksmažodžio *esti* 'yra' požymis. Kirčio vietos kaita, panaši į *dãbar* 'dar' : dial. *dabarõs* 'dabar', matoma ir kai kuriuose kituose prieveiksmiuose, pvz., **pa gãli* (plg. s. lie. *ik' gâli* 'iki galo') → *pagaliõs* 'pagaliau'.
Raktažodžiai: baltų kalbos; postpozicijos; iliatyvas; etimologija; enklitikai.

Lithuanian *dabar̃* 'now' is connected etymologically with the Old Lith. continuative adverb *dãbar* 'still, yet' (> Lith. *dár* 'still') but both are differentiated by the accentuation, i.e. *dãbar* 'still, yet' vs. *dabar̃* 'now'. A similar change in accentuation may be observed in the illative, e.g. acc.sg. **mìškan* 'forest' vs. ill.sg. *miškañ* 'to the forest'. In this paper I shall defend the thesis that Lith. *dabar̃* 'now' stems from the illative of the continuative adverb *dãbar* 'still, yet'. The primary illative **dabar-ā́ > *dabarà* is preserved in dial. *dabarõs* 'now', which goes back to **dabar-à-es*. Also, analysis of other forms with the postposition *-õs* (OLith. *atgaliõs* and *pagaliõs*) confirms that the primary illative was formed with the postposition **-ā́*. The structure of

the paper runs as follows: in the first section I shall discuss the origin of *dabar̃* 'now' starting with a new etymology of the Baltic illative, see O s t r o w s k i (2021). In the second section I shall present some instances of the postposition **-es* – that is, a shortened form of the enclitic verb *esti* 'is'.

1. The Baltic **-ā́*-illative and the origin
of the Lith. *dabar̃* 'now'

O s t r o w s k i (2021) presented a new etymology for the Baltic illative. Lithuanian–Latvian illative was formed from the IE *accusativus directivus* with the local postposition **-ā́*. The primary illative plural ended in *-s-ā́*, testified among others in OLith. <debesisa> 'into heaven' (Bretke's *Postill*), see P a l i o n i s (1967, 169). The inessive meaning of the old **-s-ā́*-illative results from neutralisation of the privative inessive vs. illative opposition preserved until today in South and East Aukštaitian dialects. As to the neutralisation of the privative inessive vs. illative opposition, see O s t r o w s k i (2021). The primary state of affairs has remained until the present day in the East Aukštaitian dialect in the north from the line Raguva–Ukmergė–Molėtai–Salakas line, where inessive sg. and illative sg. are distinguished, but inessive pl. and illative pl. are not, e.g. *píevos* 'on meadows' (= iness. pl. *píevose*) alongside *píevos* 'onto meadows' (= ill. pl. *píevosna*), see Z i n k e v i č i u s (1966, 201). As **-s-ā́*-illative also appears in an inessive function in West Aukštaitian; so the neutralisation originally must have comprised an area much larger than today's and included the West Aukštaitian dialect too. The postposition *-na* visible in the plural forms *miškúos-na* 'into forests', *píevos-na* 'onto meadows', etc. resulted from a reanalysis of **miškan-ā́* => **miška-nā́*, which enabled the stem of the illative to fit the stem of other cases. Schematically:

	older state		younger state
nom.sg.	**miška-s*		**miška-s*
acc.sg.	**miška-n*		**miška-n*
ill.sg.	**miškan-ā́*	=>	**miška-nā́* (after reanalysis)

A similar hypothesis was recently considered by K a l n i ņ š (2020, 119).[1]

The postposition **-ā́* has been preserved in *yrà* 'is, are; OLith. there is, there are' < **ī-r-ā́*, and Lith. *čià* 'here' < **tj-ā́* (see O s t r o w s k i 2015,

---

[1] Kalniņš has proposed the following method of inquiry: 'It is also possible that the post-position is simply **a* or **ā̄(?)* and that the morpheme boundary in e.g. *a*-ill.sg. **-an-a* has been reinterpreted as **-a-na*'.

2017). Its presence in *yrà* and *čià* 'here' proves that the postposition *-ā́* was indifferent to the rest vs. movement opposition, and the lative meaning of illative is connected to the *accusativus directivus*, from which the *-ā́*-illative was derived. The next instance of the postposition *-ā́* is Lith. dial. *dabarõs* 'now' that comes from the contraction */dabar-à-æs/ < *dabar-ā́*, the old *-ā́*-illative derived from the OLith. continuative adverb *dãbar* 'still, yet'. Firstly, the derivation of the illative from adverbs is well-testified in Lithuanian. U l v y d a s (2000, 292) cites among others dial. *numiẽn* 'at home, home' from *numiẽ* 'at home, home'. Secondly, the accentual difference between *dãbar* 'still' and *dabar̃* 'now' recalls the accent shift between the acc.sg. and the illative, e.g. acc.sg. **mìškan* → ill.sg. **miškan-ā́* > dial. *miškanà* 'into the forest' > *miškañ* is like OLith. *dãbar* 'still, yet' → ill. sg. **dabar-ā́* > **dabarà* > *dabar̃* 'now'. The change in accentuation (*dãbar* 'still' vs. *dabar̃* 'now', acc. sg. **mìškan* vs. *miškañ* 'into the forest') is a morphonological process accompanying the derivation of the illative. The accentuation of the ill. sg. is probably modelled on the inessive sg., see S e r ž a n t (2004). Thirdly, one of the functions of the OLith. illative was to indicate the expected time of an event, e.g. *toian dienon' po Welîkų* (DP, 204:15) 'w tydzień po Wielkieynocy' Wj 212:29 'the week after Easter' (F r a e n k e l 1929, 9; A m b r a z a s 2006, 262). We know that in the present time, the reference time is identical to the moment of speech, so the illative **dabar-ā́* > **dabarà* > *dabar̃* 'now' is semasiologically identical with the reference time in sentences with the continuative adverb *dãbar* 'still, yet'. Last but not least, the expected illative **dabar-ā́* is preserved in Lith. dial. *dabarõs* 'now' (Pasvalys and Radviliškis area; LKŽ 2, 201). The length of the vowel in *dabarõs* 'now' results from contraction of illative **dabar-ā́* with postposition *-es*; on the origin of *-es* see section 2. It seems that the contraction took place after shortening **dabar-ā́* > **dabar-à* (Leskien's law). The change */a-æs/ > /a:s/ is supported by the Baltic gen. sg. of *-o*-thematic nouns: **deiw-a-et > dievā > dievo* vs. Latin abl. sg. *-ōd*. On this basis I assume this development: **dabar-à-es* /dabar-à-æs/ > *dabarõs* 'now'.

Eduard H e r m a n n (1926, 377) collected a few instances with the postposition *-os* – among others, OLith. *atgaliõs* 'back' (e.g. SD[3], 423; DP), *pagaliõs* 'in the end' = *pagaliaũ(s)*, OLith. *tuojõs* 'soon' (SD[1], 167), *tenõs* 'there', *nuolatõs* 'constantly'. All manifest the change in accentuation – *tuõj* : OLith. *tuojõs* 'soon', *teñ* : *tenõs* 'there', *nuõlat* : *nuolatõs* 'constantly'. The origin of the adverbs *atgaliõs* 'back' and *pagaliõs* 'in the end' is interesting. The starting point was the prepositional phrases **at gãli* and **pa gãli*. Prepositional phrases of this kind are well-testified in Old Lithuanian texts,

e.g. *ik' gâli* 'until the end' (DP, 30, 39), *ik' vakari* 'till tonight', *prieg stali* 'at a table', *po wissam swieti* 'all over the world' etc. (K a z l a u s k a s 1968/2000, 140). From the prepositional phrase **at gāli* 'from the end, in the back' the Old Lithuanian adverb *atgali-õs* was derived. The development ran as follows:

> **at gāli* 'from the end' (cf. OLith. *ik' gâli*) (> adverb **atgāli* > *atgaĨ* 'back; again') → illative *atgali-õs* 'back'; **pa gāli* (> preposition *pagar*) → illative *pagali-õs* 'in the end'.

The shift in accent accompanying the derivation **at gāli → atgaliõs* recalls *dābar* 'still' → *dabarõs* 'now'. The semasiological interpretation of *atgaliõs* as the primary illative is supported by the innovative illative *atgaliõ-n*, created from dial. *atgaliõ* 'back'. OLith. *atgaliõs* relates to dial. *atgaliõ* like OLith. *geriaus* 'better' to Lith. *geriau*. The accentuation *atgaliõ* 'back' excludes the gen.sg. of adjective *ãtgalias* as the basis of the derivation. At first glance, the explanation of OLith. *atgaliõs* 'back' as a gen. sg. from the feminine adjective *atgalià* 'returning; walking backwards' seems possible. However, for at least two reasons this explanation is less attractive. Firstly, adj. *ãtgalias, -ià* is not testified in Old Lithuanian in contrast to Old Lith. *atgaliõs* (SD, 423; DP). Secondly, adj. *ãtgalias, -ià* is easily explained as a derivative from the prepositional phrase **at gāli* (> adverb *atgaĨ* 'back; again'). The parallel is delivered by the adjective *išañkst-inis* 'prepared in advance', which comes from the Old Lithuanian prepositional phrase *iš añksto* 'in advance'. To sum up, the adverbs *dabarõs* 'now', *atgaliõs* 'back' and *pagaliõs* 'in the end' trace back to old illatives with the postposition *-õs*, which came into being through the contraction **/–à–æs/. The origin of the enclitic **-es* will be explored in the second part of this paper.

2. The postposition **-es* and the Proto-Baltic enclitic verb *esti*

I do not know any work about the enclitic verb 'to be' in Lithuanian, although such a verb is well known in other IE languages. In ex (1), quoted from W a c k e r n a g e l (2020, 329), Latin *fuit* 'was' appears in tmesis between *per* and *familiaris*:

(1) Phaedo   Elidensis   ex   cohorte
    Phaedo.NOM.SG.M   of.Elis.NOM.SG.M   from   entourage.ABL.SG.F
    illa   *Socratica*   *fuit*   *Socratique*
    that.ABL.SG.F   Socratic.ABL.SG.F   be.PRF.3SG Socrates-and.GEN.SG.M
    et Platoni   *per **fuit***   *familiaris.*
    and Plato.GEN.SG.M   very be.PRF.3SG   familiar

'Phaedo of Elis was part of that Socratic entourage and he was very familiar with Socrates and Plato' (Gellius 2.18.1)

The shortened form of the Old Lith. *esti* 'is, are' appears in the causal conjunction *nes* 'because'. E n d z e l ī n s (1979, 582) explained the Lithuanian *nes* as a compound of the negation *ne* and the shortened verb *esti*, i.e. **ne-es-*. Proto-Lithuanian **ne-es-* continues – depending on the dialect – as *nės* or *nes*. The ending *-a* in *nėsa / nesa* 'because' is already recorded in Sirvydas' dictionary (East-Aukštaitian dialect): *nes nesung, nessa* 'because' SD[3] 1. It is interesting that *nes* ('because' in Old Lithuanian) is often found in the second position of the clause, so in accordance with Wackernagel's law, e.g.:

(2)   *Tassai **nes** buwa praneschens ape Wieta Uschgimimo* (BP 1, 59, 3) 'Because he was the one who foretold the place where [Jesus] would be born' (H e r m a n n 1926, 369 ff.)

The ending *-ą* in *nesą* was introduced under the influence of the synonymous conjunction *kadangi* 'because'. Endzelīns' argumentation was accepted by F r a e n k e l (1933, 237; 1962, 496).

2. 1. The postposition *-tės* < **-te-es*

Nearly 100 years ago the 'parasitic' /-s/ in forms such as *tuojaũs* 'soon' : *tuojaũ* or OLith. *tačiaus* 'however' : *tačiaũ* attracted the attention of Eduard H e r m a n n (1926, 376–378). Among the instances quoted by Hermann we find the additive-scalar particle *nèt-s* 'even', variant of *nèt* 'even'. Since the Lithuanian *nèt* 'even' comes from the Old Lithuanian *ne-te / ne-ta*, where *-ta / -te* are enclitic demonstrative pronouns (see H e r m a n n 1912, 82–83; 1926, 386 and N a u, O s t r o w s k i 2010, 16–17, 25), so *-s* in *nèt-s* must be an element added secondarily to *nèt*. The analysis conducted by Būga (see B ū g a RR 1, 355) showed that *nete* appears in Daukša's *Postil*, Petkiewicz's *Catechism* (1598) and Sirvydas' *Dictionary*, e.g. *netegi / net* 'unless' SD[3] 32. On the other hand, writers from East Prussia (Vilentas, Vaišnora) used *neta*, so the *neta* vs. *nete* variation was determined dialectally. From the East-Aukštaitian dialect (Linkmenys) comes the particle *netės* 'even' (LKŽ 8, 740). Since the final vowel /-e/ in *nete* was short, a question arises regarding how to explain the long /e:/ <ė> in *netės*. The simplest solution is to assume that in *netės* a contraction /e-e/, viz. *nete + es > netės*, took place. The same postposition *-tės* (< **-te-es*) is found in *dabař-tės* 'now', *dař-tės* 'now', *yrõ-tės* 'is, are', and the OLith. *ar-tės* 'question particle; perhaps'. On the origin of the final *-s* in comparatives with suffix *-jaus,* see O s t r o w s k i (2015; 2018).

2.2. Lithuanian *bė̃s / bès* 'question ptc.; perhaps'

There are two forms in Lithuanian: *bė̃s* and *bès*. The form with a long vowel is only recorded in older texts. The question particle *bė̃s* (written <bæs>) (192, 14)[2] appears in Old Lithuanian *Euangelias bei Epistolas* (1579) by Vilentas. Vilentas used the sign <æ> in a root syllable to indicate a long, low vowel /æ:/, e.g.: *bæda* (208, 12) [= *bėdà* 'misfortune'], *sæd* (115, 18; 168, 20, 21; 179, 16) [= *sėdi* 'seats'], *dæl* (164, 6; 129, 21; 130, 23; 180, 16) [= *dėl* 'for'], *dælto* (162, 15; 166, 14) [= *dėl to* 'because'], *sædeia* (161, 16) [= *sėdėjo* 'sat'], *sædęs* (145, 1). Lithuanian *bės* 'perhaps' is also recorded in the *New Testament* by Bythner (1701):

(2) *O štai bės atneš vaisių, o jei ne, potam jį iškirsi* (Luke 13, 9) 'ob er wolte Frucht bringen / Wo nicht / So hawe jn darnach abe.' / 'And if it bear fruit, *well*: and if not, *then* after that thou shalt cut it down.'[3]

The epistemic *bės* 'perhaps' finds its exact counterpart in Old Latvian *bēst* 'vielleicht' < **be-est*. Instances:

(3) *Behst.* Vielleicht. *Kas sinna, behst nahks*, wer weiß, vielleicht wird er kommen.[4] 'Who knows, perhaps he will come.'

(4) *Billdini par to leetu tawu Tuwaku /* **behȘt** *wings to nhe gir darriyis / jeb gir wings to darriyis / ka wings wayrs to nhe darra.* (Sirach 19:13)[5] 'SPrich deinen Nehesten drumb an / **vileicht** hat ers nicht gethan / Oder hat ers gethan / das ers nicht mehr thu.' / 'Admonish a friend, it may be he hath not done it, and if he haue *done it* that he doe it no more.'

The shortening of the vowel *bės > bes* appeared in proclitic position in forms such as *beskam / beskuõ / beskõ* 'that is why', e.g:

(5) **bëskŭ** *žmónės prë visú nelabýsczu ir bėdú vis vélnię kaltin* (S c h l e i c h e r 1857, 163) 'And that is why people accuse the devil for all misfortunes.'

---

[2] The numbering of instances is in line with VEE.

[3] www.lki.lt/seniejirastai (the electronic corpus of Old Lithuanian texts). The English renderings here and below are from the King James Bible (www.kingjamesbibleonline.org). The German renderings are from Luther's *Bibel* (1545) (liederschatz.net/biblia/biblia2/index.htm).

[4] Fürecker's *Lettisches und Teutsches Wörterbuch* (1650), 40, (after: www.ailab.lv/senie).

[5] Mancelius, *Das Haus=, Zucht= vnd Lehrbuch Jesu Syrachs* (1631), (after: www.ailab.lv/senie).

(6) *Tai ir pats tenai buvai –* **beskuõ** *taip gerai žinai* 'You have been there – that is why you know this so well' (LKŽ 1, 780).

Combinations of this kind are testified in Old Lithuanian too, e.g. (7):

(7) **bes ką** *karalius rodas noretų garbinti* **net** *mane?* (BB Ester 6:6) '**Wem** sollte der König anders gern wollen Ehre tun **denn** mir?' / 'To whom would the king delight to doe honour, more then to my selfe?'

The particle *bės / bes* did not have to stay in the proclitic position before the pronouns *ko, kam, kuo*. In *Wolfenbüttel Postil* we find an epistemic *bės / bes* three times in the combination <bes pen> 'perhaps at least', e.g.:

(8) *Eikima iump a ſu garbe, melſime ių,* **bes Pen** *ka kalbes mumis.* (WP 159v:2) 'Let's go to them with reverence, we will ask them, **perhaps at least** they will tell us a little'.[6]

3. Conclusions

a) Lith. *dabar̃* 'now' is an old illative derived from the continuative adverb *dãbar* 'still, yet'.

b) The Baltic illative was derived from the accusativus directivus with the postposition *-*ā́, which was indifferent to the rest vs. movement opposition. Its traces are also preserved in the Baltic *yrà*, Lith. *čià*.

c) The postposition *-õs* (e.g. dial. *dabar-õs* 'now') comes from the contraction *$/$a:-æs$/$*, where *-es* is a continuation of the enclitic verb *esti*.

---

[6] The particle *pen* 'at least' is especially frequent in Daukša's *Postill* (1599). Its appearance alongside the older *ben* 'at least' (later *bent*) is explained by O s t r o w s k i (2011) as follows: the syntagma <bes pen> created a phonological word, which was syllabified [be-spen] like [be-sko], [be-skuo]. However, a point of departure was *{bes ben}, see OLith. *ben* 'at least'. The syntagma *{bes ben} had to be realized phonetically as *[be-zben]. The group [zb] appears just in borrowings, e.g. [zb] in **zb**rainas 'armed' < Pol. *zbrojny*, OLith. *vaizba* 'transportation' < Pol. *wojźba* < *woźba* 'wożenie (towarów) wozem, przewóz)' (S m o c z y ń - s k i 2007, 714). Since indigenous Lithuanian lexemes have always the group [sp], e.g. **sp**irti, **sp**alva alongside ka**sp**inas, be**sp**alvis, be**sp**ragis, so the expected *[bezben] was renovated by introduction of {pen}. This caused the restitution of the inner group [sp], i.e. {bespen}, from which was abstracted a new form *pen* 'at least'.

SOURCES

BB – BIBLIA tatai esti Wissas Schwentas Raschtas, Lietuwischkai pergulditas per Janą Bretkuną [...] 1590, [Here cited after: Triškaitė, Birutė et al., Jonas Bretkūnas, Biblija, Esteros knyga, www.lki.lt/seniejirastai, 2020].

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

DP – Jonas Palionis (ed.), *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų Postilė ir jos šaltiniai. Postilla Catholicka. Tái est: Izguldimas Ewangeliu kiekwienos Nedelos ir szwętes per wissús metús. Per Kúnigą Mikaloiv Davkszą Kanonîką Médnikų... 1599*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2000.

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

SD[1] – Kazys Pakalka, *Senasis Konstantino Sirvydo žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1997.

SD3 – Kazys Pakalka et al. (ed.), Dictionarium trium lingvarum, In usum Studiosae Iuventutis, Avctore (...) Constantino Szyrwid... (1642). Pirmasis lietuvių kalbos žodynas, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1979.

VEE – Adalbert Bezzenberger (ed.), *Litauische und Lettische Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts. Heft III*. Baltramiejus Willentas. 1579. *Enchiridion* (VE) & *Euangelias bei Epistolas* (VEE), Göttingen: Robert Peppmüller, 1882.

WP – *Wolfenbüttelio Postilė*, 1573. Tekstą rengė Jolanta Gelumbeckaitė (www.lki.lt/seniejirastai).

www.lki.lt/seniejirastai (electronic corpus of Old Lithuanian texts)

www.ailab.lv/senie (electronic corpus of Old Latvian texts)

REFERENCES

Ambrazas, Vytautas 2006, Lietuvių kalbos istorinė sintaksė, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Būga, Kazimieras 1958, *Rinktiniai raštai* 1, ed. by Zigmas Zinkevičius, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Endzelīns, Jānis 1979, *Darbu izlase* 3(1), Rīga: Zinātne.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1929, *Syntax der litauischen Postpositionen und Präpositionen*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1962, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1, Heidelberg: Winter, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Hermann, Eduard 1912, *Über die Entwicklung der litauischen Konjunktionalsätze*, Jena: Fromannsche Buchdruckerei (Hermann Pohle).

Hermann, Eduard 1926, *Litauische Studien. Eine historische Untersuchung schwachbetonter Wörter im Litauischen*, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Kalniņš, Aigars 2020, *Studies in Latvian Comparative Dialectology – with special focus on word-final *-āj(s)/*-ēj(s) and *-āji(s)/*-ēji(s)*, Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Kazlauskas, Jonas 1968/2000, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis. [Here cited after: Albertas Rosinas (ed.), *Jonas Kazlauskas: Rinktiniai raštai* 1, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas].

Nau, Nicole, Norbert Ostrowski 2010, Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages, in Nicole Nau & Ostrowski (eds.), *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*, Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas, Asociacija "Academia Salensis", 1–37.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2011, Iš lietuvių kalbos istorinės morfologijos problemų (apie *nebe(-)* ir *bent* kilmę), *Lietuvių kalba* 5.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2015, From focus marker to comparative suffix – the original character of the Lithuanian comparative *-iaūs*, *Historische Sprachforschung* 126, 296–308.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2017. Non-verbal predication in Baltic. Lithuanian *yrà*, in Michał Németh, Barbara Podolak, Mateusz Urban (eds.), *Essays in the History of Languages and Linguistics. Dedicated to Marek Stachowski on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 463–471.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2018, Grammaticalization of the Lithuanian comparative *-jau(s)*, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 123, 273–292.

Ostrowski, Norbert 2021, The Baltic *-*ā́*-illative, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 126, 65–84.

Palionis, Jonas 1967, *Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a.*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Schleicher, August 1857, *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache 2, Lesebuch und Glossar*, Prag: J. G Calve'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Seržant, Ilja 2004, Einige Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des Illativs, *Baltu filoloģija* 13, 113–120.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Lietuvių kalbos etimologinis žodynas*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Ulvydas, Kazys 2000, *Lietuvių kalbos prieveiksmiai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Wackernagel, Jacob 2020, *On a Law of Indo-European Word Order*: *Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung* (= *Classics in Linguistics* 7), Berlin: Language Science Press.

Norbert OSTROWSKI
Katedra Językoznawstwa Ogólnego i Indoeuropejskiego
Instytut Językoznawstwa, Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie
al. Mickiewicza 3
PL-31-120, Kraków
Poland
[norbertas@poczta.onet.pl]