

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Vilnius University, Vytautas Magnus University

LITHUANIAN *miegóti* “SLEEP”

1. Root athematic presents made a large part of the Indo-European verbal system, but in the daughter languages there is a tendency to strongly reduce their number. In the western Indo-European languages they are directly represented only by a few verbs of common use (“to be”, “to go”, “to eat”, etc.).

In modern standard Lithuanian they have been practically eliminated as well, but in Old Lithuanian texts and in the dialects they are still represented in a surprisingly large number (almost a hundred). For many Lithuanian athematic presents a secondary origin can be ascertained on account of their late attestation (roughly from R u h i g 1947 on) and/or on phonetic grounds (e.g. *stovmi*, *girdmi* instead of ***staumi*, ***girmi*), so that it is uncertain whether we are dealing with an Indo-European archaism or with a specifically Baltic or Lithuanian expansion of the type. The most influential view on this matter has been that of Christian Stang (ScSl VIII, 1962, 161–170 [= *Opuscula Selecta*, Oslo, 1970, 196–205], *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo, 1966, 309–319).

Stang classifies the (Old) Lithuanian athematic presents in three groups:

A) Athematic presents that can be assured to be inherited on etymological grounds: *esmi* “I am”, *eimi* “I go”, *ėmi* “I eat (of animals, ich fresse)”, *duomi* “I give”, *demi* “I put”, *raumi* “I weep”, *pa-velmi* “I let” (: Ved. *ásti*, *éti*, *átti*, *dádāti*, *dádhāti*, *rodīṣi*, Lat. *uult*).

B) Athematic presents that are well attested in ancient texts and in the dialects, but lack cognates in other languages that would guaranty their antiquity. Accordingly, they must be innovations in most cases (about 30 verbs: *liekmi* “I leave, I am left”, *giemi* “I chant”, *bėgmi* “I run”, *miegmi* “I sleep”, etc.).

C) Athematic presents attested only recently, roughly from R u h i g (1747) on (*stovmi* “I stay”, *girdmi* “I hear”, etc.). About 30 verbs are included in this group as well, its secondary nature being, I believe, of general acceptance.

As for the historical explanation of the second group of verbs, Stang stresses the importance of some inherited perfects¹. They were reshaped as athematic presents

¹ Most of Stang’s examples of old perfects among Lithuanian athematic presents are highly doubtful to me, but a detailed criticism cannot be attempted here.

and later triggered an analogical expansion of the type to other verbs with which they shared some formal and functional features (stative or intransitive value, same preterit and infinitive stems).

My own, still tentative views on the Baltic athematic presents differ in some important points from those of Stang. In my view, many, perhaps most athematic presents of Stang's group B are not Baltic innovations, but the remnants of a class of Balto-Slavic athematic presents, usually paired with a second stem in *-ē- or *-ā-. From an Indo-European point of view, some old stative perfects probably showed this type of conjugation, but for the most part it simply inherited Indo-European athematic presents of one or another sort (interestingly, in many cases an old full grade athematic middle present seems to be involved). In this article I will try to argue such an origin for a particular verb (Lith. *miegóti*) as a sort of exemplification of the type of work needed in this area of research.

2. The athematic present 1 sg. *miegmi*, 3 sg. *miegti* (inf. *miegóti*, pret. *miegójo*) "sleep" is very well attested both in Old Lithuanian texts as well as in the dialects. In modern Lithuanian it has been thematized as *miẽga*, but other dialectal presents like *miegmù*, *miegtù* or *miegčiù* can only be explained as originated in several reanalysis of an inherited athematic present, which therefore must be considered ancient on internal grounds². Old Prussian *meicte* (GrG *moicte*, GrA GrF *meicte*), glossed as "schlaffen" and as "dormio", probably stays for an athematic 3rd person **meigti* "sleep(s)" (an infinitive is also possible, but would be more difficult to account for morphologically), thus suggesting that the athematic present is at least common Baltic.

The inchoative (*už-*)*mìgti*, *miñga*, *mìgo* "fall asleep"³ (Latv. *àiz-*, *ìe-migt*, *-mìegu*, *-migu*, OPruss. pret. 3 sg. *ismigē* (!), ptcpl. *enmigguns*) could be a secondary derivative built to the stative *miegóti* or else be also ancient.

The causatives *mìg(d)inti*, *mìg(d)yti* "put to sleep, let sleep" (Latv. *midzinât*) are almost certainly recent, at least formally.

If there is in principle every reason to take the athematic present *miegmi* seriously as potentially inherited, the important question arises of its origin. I can think of three

² See Specht, – KZ LXII, 1935, 83ff., Sabaliauskas, – Kai kurie lietuvių kalbos gramatikos klausimai, Vilnius, 1957, 99f, Zinkevičius, Lietuvių dialektologija, Vilnius, 1966, 349, for the data. Daukša attests a full athematic paradigm: 1 sg. *miegmi*, 2 sg. *miegsi*, 1 pl. *miegté*, 2 pl. *miegsté* (with ending *-ste* taken from *este*, *deste*, *duoste* ...), 3. *miegti* (according to Sen, – Studi Baltici, IV, 1934/35, 116–117).

³ Beside *miñga*, other presents are recorded (*miẽga*, *miẽgta*, *mẽgti*, etc.), all of them surely dependent on those of *miegóti*.

possibilities: 1) *miegmi* is a Baltic creation, either replacing an earlier present of a different type or derived from the inchoative (*už-*)*mìgti*, 2) *miegmi* is the direct continuant of an Indo-European athematic present, 3) *miegmi* is the indirect continuant of an Indo-European perfect. To test these possibilities, it is necessary to look at the comparative evidence outside of Baltic.

3. Slavic offers a state of affairs closely resembling that of Baltic. Here we find a stative verb **mьži-*, **mьžati* “have the eyes closed” < **mig-ī-*, **mig-ē-* (ORuss. *m(b)žiti* “doze”, OPol. *mżeć* “be weak, torpere”, OCz. *mžieti* “do not see well, siechen”, etc.)⁴, an inchoative **mьgnōti* “blink” (ORuss. *mgnuti*, OPol. *mgnąć*, OCz. *mehnuti*, etc., later replaced by *mig*^o, with the vocalism of the secondary imperfective *migati*), and a causative OCS *po-*, *sъ-měžiti (oči)* “close (the eyes)”.

The Slavic causative *-měžiti* < **moig^h-ēje/o-* is probably ancient and must be reconstructed for Balto-Slavic, Lith. *mìg(d)inti*, *mìg(d)yti* being a clear morphological innovation that could have replaced an earlier (and perhaps already lost) **maigyti*.

An inchoative verb present **mi-n-g-e/o-*, thematic aorist **mig-e/o-* seems also certain for Balto-Slavic. The formal (Pres. **minge/o-* → Slavic **migne-*, Aor. **mig-e/o-* → Baltic **migā-*) and semantic (**“blink”* → Baltic “fall asleep”, doubtless based on the earlier semantic shift of *miegóti* “sleep” < **“have the eyes closed”*) renewals we have to assume are easy to understand and fall into the observable tendencies of evolution of the Baltic and Slavic verb. If the inchoative is inherited from Indo-European, the ultimate origin I can think of is a (thematized) middle root aorist (**móig^h-el*^hig^h-ré*, under my reconstruction), but this is, strictly speaking, impossible to prove from the Baltic and Slavic evidence alone⁵.

4. Turning now to the stative presents Slavic *mьži-*, *mьžati* “have the eyes closed” and Baltic (Lithuanian) *miegmi*, *miegóti* “sleep”, we find ourselves on more insecure (and more interesting) grounds. Several possibilities are at hand. Here I will begin by assuming that these verbs are actually related to each other and must be derived from a common Balto-Slavic prototype. If we start from a regular **-ī-* present pared with a secondary stem in **-ē-*, as represented by Slavic *mьži-*, *mьžati*, it is not clear how we could explain the Baltic facts. If this option is chosen, one is lead to assume that

⁴ Cf. Vaillant, Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, III, Le verbe, Paris, 1966, 237; ESJS IX 521, for the data.

⁵ In my view, the Balto-Slavic (and Germanic) Class of inchoative verbs typically characterized by a nasal present has its ultimate origin in a series of thematic aorists coming from earlier, Indo-European middle root aorists. So, to give a couple of examples from Slavic, OCS *lešti*, *leggō*, *legъ* “lie down” (: Gk. ἔλεχτο), *въз-бънōti*, *-бънō*, *-бъдъ* “awake” (: Ved. *ábodhi* “awoke”, Gk. ἐπιθόμην “learned”) or *дръзнōti*, *дръзнō*, *дръзъ* “dare” (: Ved. *dhṛṣāná-* “daring”). A detailed argumentation of this theory, of course, cannot be attempted here.

Slavic *mъžati* and Lith. *miegóti* are genetically independent from each other⁶. The opposite is not the case. Since Slavic has at least some *-ī̃-presents that appear to correspond to athematic presents elsewhere in the family⁷, it is in principle a reasonable hypothesis that the Slavic *-ī̃-present *mъži-* is the morphological renewal of an inherited athematic present still attested in ancient and dialectal Lithuanian *miegmi*.

If we take the reasonable step that a Balto-Slavic athematic present is continued as an *-ī̃-present in Slavic *mъži-*, it is then equally reasonable that the second stem **mig-ē-* (> *mъža-*) has also replaced an earlier second stem **m(e)ig-ā-*, as still represented by Lith. inf. *miegóti*, pret. *miegójo*. Slavic still preserves two verbs with an *-ī̃-present paired with a second stem in *-ā-, not *-ē- (*спи-, спати* “sleep”, *счи-, сцати* “piss”), but it is clear that such a paradigm was strongly in retreat in Slavic, so that the replacement of a putative Pre-Slavic **mig-ā-* by **mig-ē-*, triggered by the already established present **mig-ī̃-*, would have been almost unavoidable.

5. The credibility of this scenario depends entirely on our capacity to explain these two facts:

- a) the renewal of an athematic present by an *-ī̃-present in Slavic,
- b) the discrepancy in root vocalism between the full grade of Baltic and the zero grade of Slavic.

5.1. As for the first question, this is not the only case (see above, footnote 7). This process could be attributed *in toto* to functional reasons: a stative athematic present of whatever origin would be, from this point of view, almost predetermined to become an *-ī̃-present in Slavic.

A second possibility, however, has broader implications for the Balto-Slavic verbal system as a whole. Endzelin⁸ explained the *-i-* of OPruss. 1 pl. *waidīmai*, 2 pl. *waidītai* (beside athematic 2 sg. *waisei*, OCS 1 sg. *vědě, věмь*) and dialectal

⁶ So, for instance, Z e h n d e r, – LIV 383 (Lith. *miegóti* from a perfect, Slavic *mъžati* from an “Essiv” in **-hī̃é-*). This must be the common view, inasmuch as the question has been posited at all (I am not aware of any earlier to establish a direct equation between *miegóti* and *mъžati*). Given their close semantic and paradigmatic affinities, a proposal embracing Lith. *miegmi*, OPruss. *meicte* and Slavic *mъži-* under a single coherent framework should, I believe, be given priority.

⁷ Consider, for instance, OCS *běži-, běžati* “run” (: OLith. *bėgmī*, ORuss. *bėgu, bėči*), *veli-, velėti* “order” (: OLith. *velti*, Lat. *uult*, subj. *uelim*, Goth. *wiljau* < **uelh₁-ih₁-*), *vidi-, vidėti* “see” (OLith. *veizdmi*, OCS imper. 2/3 sg. *viždb*). I think a similar origin is to be posited for other verbs of Leskien’s Class IV B like *slyši-, slyšati* “hear”, *спи-, спати* “sleep”, *счи-, сцати* “piss” or Russ. *perdet’* “pedere”, which would then have a slightly different prehistory from old perfects like *gori-, gorėti* “burn” and from the type *bъdi-, бъдėti* “be awake” (both also originally athematic, in any case). A detailed argumentation of this proposal is not possible here.

⁸ See E n d z e l i n, Darbu izlase, III.1, 461; id. IV.1, 495; id. IV.2, 132, 558. The theory is taken over and further developed by J a s a n o f f, Stative and Middle in Indo-European, Innsbruck, 1978, 105ff.

Latvian 1 pl. *dziēdīm*, 2 pl. *dziēdīt* (: OLith. *giemi*, *giedóti* “chant”), *raūdīm*, *raūdīt* “weep” (: OLith. *raumi*, *raudóti* “weep”) as stemming from a 3 pl. **-inti* < **nti*, with **-i-* extended as a union vowel to the other plural (and perhaps also dual) endings⁹. Under this very attractive theory, the replacement of some old athematic presents and perfects by **-ǐ-*presents and not, say, by simple thematic presents is easier to understand. A Balto-Slavic “mixed” paradigm like Sg. **meig-* / Pl. (Du.) **m(e)ig-i-* would have been almost unavoidably subject to leveling: either the athematic inflection was extended to the plural and dual (as in Baltic), or the **-ǐ-* inflection to the singular (as in Slavic).

5.2. As for the discrepancy in root vocalism, I can see the following solutions:

a) the Slavic zero grade is an innovation, presumable taken from the inchoative *mьgnoti* on the model of other pairs of inchoative *-ne-*present and stative *-i-*present, both with inherited zero grade (e.g. OCS *bъždǫ*, *bъděti* “be awake” beside *vъz-bъnǫti*, *-bъnǫ*, *-bъdъ* “wake up”, *pri-lъplǫ*, *-lъpěti* “be stuck (to)” beside *pri-lъnǫti*, *-lъnǫ*, *-lъpъ* “stick”),

b) both full and zero grade are projected back into a single Balto-Slavic paradigm. In that case, either the present was still ablauting in Balto-Slavic times (sg. **meig-* : pl. and du. **mig-(i-)*),

c) or the present was not ablauting but the second stem in **-ā-* (and **-ē-*) induced zero grade of the root (pres. **meig-* : inf. and aor. **mig-ā-*). The actual paradigms are easy to derive from both possibilities by leveling¹⁰.

The first solution is unproblematic on Balto-Slavic terms: we would just have to reckon with a verb **meig^{mi}*, **meig-ā-*, of a type still attested in the dialects (OLith. *miegmi*, *miegóti*; *raumi*, *raudóti*, etc.). The other two are more intriguing, as they imply a type of paradigm not directly attested in any of the branches, but perfectly conceivable in Indo-European terms.

The assumption that a second stem in **-ā-* triggered zero grade of the root at least finds a parallel in the type OCS *berǫ*, *bъrati*, but it is not clear to which degree this is revealing, since we are clearly dealing with different verbal classes that presumably had a different prehistory. Inner paradigmatic ablaut would only be acceptable if we could derive the putative **meig-/mig-* from some Indo-European familiar source.

⁹ The dialectal Latvian 1 pl. *zinim*, 2 pl. *zinit* (: Latv. *zinu*, *zināt*, Lith. *žinaũ*, *žinóti* “know”) must reflect the same development, from an old perfect (not from a nasal infixal present!) **gēgnóh₃-e* (or *gēgnoh₃y*, cf. Ved. *jajñāu*)/**gēgn₃-ǝ* (: Goth. *kann*, *kunnum*, etc.). Lith. *bijaũ*, *bijóti* “fear” (: OCS *boji-*, *bojati se*, Ved. *bibhāya*) offers a clear parallel.

¹⁰ A fourth possibility, that the full grade of Lith. *miegóti* is an innovation vis-à-vis Slavic **mig-*, would be difficult to account for.

A perfect **memoig^h-/*memig^h-*, as defended by Stang, Vergl. Gramm., 311¹¹, would do full service¹², but is badly compromised with the vocalism of OPruss. *meicte* and the evidence presented below (§6) supporting an inherited athematic present as the origin of Lith. *miegmi*.

A regular active athematic present **méig^h-ti/*mig^h-énti* would in principle seem possible for Baltic, but Slavic *mьži-* would be more difficult to account for (I am not aware of any other clear example of a “normal” Indo-European active athematic present among Balto-Slavic **-ǐ-* presents). A full grade middle **méig^h-or/*méig^h-ro(r)* (→ **méig^h-(t)or/*méig^h-ntor*) would be unproblematic in all other respects, but the putative Balto-Slavic ablauting paradigm **meig-/*mig-* would have to be explained as analogical, perhaps after regular active athematic presents and perfects. This seems difficult to believe because the evidence rather points to a tendency to eliminate inner paradigmatic ablaut in Balto-Slavic. In principle it would be desirable to start from an ablauting paradigm inherited from the parent language. The only choice left (and a reasonable one indeed) is an ablauting Narten present **méig^h-/*méig^h-*. Starting from such a paradigm, it is possible to explain Baltic **meig^{-mi}* (Lith. *miegmi*, OPruss. *meicte*) by generalization of the weak grade, while Slavic *mьži-* should be explained through a renewed paradigm **mēig^h-/*mig^h-*¹³.

¹¹ First stated by Mahlow, *Die langen Vokale ā ē ō in den europäischen Sprachen*, Berlin, 1879, 144. To some degree this is the standard view (it is also adopted by Watkins, *Idg. Gr.*, III.1, 223; Smoczyński, *Język litewski w perspektywie porównawczej*, Kraków, 2001, 49, 140; or Zehnder, – LIV 383). In taking this position, they are forced to leave OPruss. *meicte* out of consideration. Stang’s suggestion that OLith. *miegmi*, *miegóti* and OPruss. *meicte* may continue different formations is uneconomical to say the less. Ivanov, *Slavjanskij, baltijskij i rannebalkanskij glagol. Indoeuropejskie istoki*, Moskva, 1981, 122 and Mažiulis, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, II, Vilnius, 1993, 44–45 assume a Baltic athematic present **meig-mi*, while both **meig^h-mi* and **(me)moig^ha(i)* seem in principle possible to Van Wijk, – *Studi Baltici*, III, 1933, 136. Finally, Fraenkel’s view that an inherited athematic nasal present gave rise to both the inchoative *mingù* and the stative *miegmi* (*Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 447), remains unclear to me. As already observed, none of these authors mentions Slavic *mьži-*, *mьžati* as a possible *comparandum* of OLith. *miegmi* and OPruss. *meicte*.

¹² OCS *boji-*, *bojati se* beside Lith. *bijo*, *bijóti* “fear” < perfect **bhe/ibhoiH-/*bhe/ibhiH-* (: Ved. *bibhāya*) would provide a clear parallel, both for the second stem and for the root apophony.

¹³ I leave out of consideration the important question of the verbal voice of the hypothetical Narten present **méig^h-/*méig^h-*, as it cannot be answered from the Baltic and Slavic evidence alone. Under current theory, it must have been inflected in the active voice. There is, however, some tenuous evidence suggesting that **meig^h-* built a middle paradigm in the parent language: 1) intransitive, characteristically middle semantics, 2) the inchoative Balto-Slavic verb pres. **minge/o-*, aor. **mig-e/o-*, if originated in a middle root aorist, 3) Ved. *ni-méghamāna-* (see below §6). Although hardly ever addressed seriously in the literature, I think there is some evidence suggesting that at least a number of Narten presents had ablaut in the middle voice in Indo-European (consider, for instance, Hitt. *ēsa*, YAv. 3 pl. *āṇhāire*, Ved. *āste*, Gk. *ἤσται* “sit” < **h₂és-or*; Gk. *μήδομαι* “meditate” beside *μέδομαι* “meditate, think”, Lat.

Be it as it may, it is important to emphasize that this is just a theoretical possibility among other to explain the discrepancy in root vocalism between Slavic *mъži-*, *mъžati* and Lith. *miegmi*, *miegóti*.

6. Up to here I have tried to press out the internal evidence concerning the verbal formations of the root **meig^h-*¹⁴ in Baltic and Slavic. I have established a set of three verbal formations for Balto-Slavic: 1) an inchoative verb pres. **minge/o-*, aor. **mige/o-*, that I have tentatively derived from an Indo-European middle root aorist, 2) a causative **maig-eje/o-*, whose Indo-European origin is uncontroversial, 3) and a stative verb characterized by an athematic present (perhaps embodied in a mixed paradigm with a plural and dual stem in **-i-*) and a second stem in **-ā-*. The presence of inner paradigmatic ablaut in this paradigm is possible, but far from assured. Some of the features I have attributed to this stative verb are not found directly in the Baltic or Slavic material as we know it, but I believe it provides a convenient starting point from which the actually attested paradigms can be derived.

As for the historical explanation of the stative athematic present still attested in OLith. *miegmi*, it is difficult to imagine how it could have been created in Balto-Slavic times, so there is a good chance that it is inherited. When dealing with problems of Balto-Slavic verbal morphology there is often a point where we have to stop, because of lack of clear comparative evidence, but I think in this particular case we are lucky to find corroborative evidence outside of these branches of Indo-European, namely in Vedic.

Gotō, Die “I. Präsensklasse” im Vedischen, Wien, 1987, 245, followed by Zehnder, LIV 383, derives the Vedic participle *ni-méghamāna-* “herabschimmernd, niederblinzelnd” (RV 2.34.13, 8.4.10) from this same root **meig^h-*¹⁵. Gotō and Zehnder assume a simple thematic present **méig^h-e/o-* as the source of *ni-méghamāna-*, but this is severely compromised by the unpalatalized velar *-gh-*, since thematic presents in Indo-Iranian otherwise generalize the palatalized variant of the final velar (e.g.

medeor, *-ērī* “cure, remedy”, OIr. *midithir* “judge” < **mēd-/med-*; Toch. A *śamatār* beside Toch. B *tsmetār* “grow” < **dēm₂-/*dṛh₂-*; Toch. B *ñewetār* “roar” beside Ved. *návate* < **nēu-/neu-*; Gk. ἡδουμαι “enjoy” beside Ved. *svádate* “be sweet” < **sūd-/sūd-*). A detailed exposition of this idea is not possible here. From this point of view, in any case, it is possibly that Balto-Slavic inherited an ablauting middle Narten present.

¹⁴ Pokorny, IEW 712–713. I remain skeptic about identifying the family of Gk. ὀμίχλη, Lith. *miglà* “fog”, Ved. *meghá-* “cloud”, etc. with that of *miegóti*, etc. If it is accepted, the root must be reconstructed as **h₃meig^h-*. In any case, this matter is irrelevant for our present study.

¹⁵ To be fair, one has to observe that *ni-méghamāna-* has also been explained as a *Künstbildung* (from *méhati* “urinate”, either after *meghá-* “cloud” or due to a confusion of the roots **h₃meig^h-* and **(H)meig^h-*) see Gotō, loc. cit., Mayrhofer, EWAia II 381, with references.

rócate “shines” < **léuk-e-toi*, *sácate* “follows” < **sék^w-e-toi*). Gotō avoids this problem by starting from a fossilized participle **méig^h-o-mh₁no-*¹⁶, but this would entail a very earlier loss of all other forms of the paradigm¹⁷. Another possibility is readily at hand.

From the other simple thematic presents with preserved final velar in Vedic known to me (*válgati* “springs, waves”, *śánkate* “hesitates, fears”, *ślághate* “extols”), only the prehistory of *śánkate* is reasonably clear. Hitt. *kānk-/kank-^{hhi}* and OHG *hāhan* “hang (tr.)” point to an Indo-European active “**h₂e*-conjugation” present **kónk-/kénk-(*k₁nk-)*¹⁸. In the middle, the iterative Lat. *cūnctor*, *-ārī* “delay, hesitate” shows a meaning very close to that of Vedic *śánkate*, while Goth. *hahan*, 3 sg. *hahaip* “hang (intr.)” attests a Class III weak verb, thus pointing to a middle present **kónk-or* (with irregular **-o*-vocalism) as the immediate source of Ved. *śánkate* (a Germanic weak verb of Class III could hardly come from a regular thematic present), the preservation of the final velar being thus explained through secondary, relatively late thematization of an original athematic middle¹⁹.

The same explanation is eminently plausible for *ni-méghamāna-*. As it was the case with Vedic *śánkate*, the hypothesized Indo-European athematic middle present **méig^h-or* is not just a theoretical reconstruction, but finds direct comparative support in the Lithuanian athematic present *miegmi*. In its turn, Ved. *ni-méghamāna-*, if correctly interpreted, guarantees the inherited nature I have postulated for *miegmi* on the basis of an internal, Balto-Slavic analysis. Apart from that, of course, it doesn’t give an answer to the important questions our analysis of Lith. *miegmi* has posed for the reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic and even Indo-European verb.

7. To sum up, I hope to have shown that OLith. *miegmi*, *miegóti* “sleep” (a verb that, to my knowledge, has never figured prominently in discussions on the Baltic athematic presents) continues an Indo-European root athematic present. This present probably was a Narten present inflected in the middle voice and was paired with a middle athematic aorist. Much of this reconstruction as well as the scenario explaining the Baltic and Slavic facts remains insecure. Greater security will only be gained if it could be shown that other Baltic and Slavic verbs share a similar prehistory. This, however, stands beyond the purposes of this article.

¹⁶ So already W a c k e r n a g e l, Ai.Gr. I, 1896, 148.

¹⁷ See M a y r h o f e r, EWAia II 380 (with literature), for the evidence of **méig^h-* (beside **meis-* and **meik-*) in Indo-Iranian.

¹⁸ See J a s a n o f f, Hittite and the Indo-European Verb, Oxford, 2003, chapter 3, for this type of present.

¹⁹ So J a s a n o f f, Stative and Middle, 83. Otherwise G o t ö, op. cit., 304, M a y r h o f e r, EWAia II 604 (influence of the noun *śānkā-* “Sorge, Angst”).

LIETUVIŲ *miegóti*

Santrauka

S. lie. atematinis prezensas *miegmi* yra susijęs su slavų *mъži-*, *mъžati* – abu kilę iš baltų ir slavų atematinio prezenso (galbūt turėjusio šaknies apofoniją) su antriniu kamienu **-ā*. Slavų prokalbėje šis atematinis prezensas pavirto į **-ī* prezensą, galbūt veikiant dgs. 3 a. **-inti* < **-ntʰ*. Vedų *ni-méghamāna-* yra tiesiogiai susijęs su šia baltų ir slavų formacija.