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This paper aims to show the sources of the Lithuanian conjunction *nei(gi)* ‘than’ and its later development. The most archaic function of *nei* that can be found in Old Lithuanian texts is *nei* ‘and not’ as a type of sentence negation in a clause following another clause that does not contain a negation, with both clauses combined asyndetically. Examples can be divided into two subtypes, defined as unordered addition and temporal succession clauses in Dixon’s terms (Dixon 2009). The counterparts of *nei* are Latin *ne-que* and German *und nicht*. The next stage in the development of coordinate sentences with *nei* was correlative sentences of the type *ne- ... nei(gi)* ‘not ... nor’, which were very common in the 16th century. The correlative construction *ne- ... nei(gi)* ‘not ... nor’ traces back to juxtaposed clauses with narrow-scope negation, viz. ¬p & ¬q (‘We didn’t meet Marvin, and we didn’t meet Joan either’)—Haspelmath (2007, 16). Negative coordination of the type *ne- ... nei(gi)* underlies reduplicated connectives *nei ... nei* ‘neither ... nor’, which are widespread in modern Lithuanian. *ne- ... nei(gi)* also gave rise to the conjunction of comparative clauses *nei(gi)* ‘than’. (*Pirm*) *nei(g)* ‘before’, as a conjunction of temporal clauses, belongs to the latest chronological layer.
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### 0. The goal and structure of the article

One of the most neglected fields in diachronic descriptions of Lithuanian, and Baltic languages in general, is the development of coordinate clauses and hence the etymology of coordinating connectives (= coordinators). This state of affairs is due, among other things, to insufficiently analysed data from Old Lithuanian texts. We can say that although the historical description of subordinate clauses in Lithuanian (and Latvian) has been the subject of some studies (e.g. Holvoet 2000, 2010, Pajędienė 2012),

---

1 On participial and infinitival constructions in Baltic see Ambrazas (1990, 1995, 2006).
coordination has never aroused much interest among researchers. For instance, in the historical syntax of Lithuanian by Ambrazas (2006), which presents a synthesis of hypotheses put forward so far, the few remarks about coordination are dispersed in various chapters. A rare exception to the rule is the paper by Judžentis & Pajėdienė (2001). This is why works from the beginning of the 20th century, such as studies by Leskien (1903), Hermann (1912) and Fraenkel (1926) are still considered valuable.

The inadequacies in the synchronic description of language in the oldest texts adversely affect etymology. An example of this is the account of the Lithuanian/Latvian negation *nei* in Fraenkel’s (1962) and Smoczyński’s (2007) etymological dictionaries, whose authors do not go beyond the trivial equation of Lith. *nei* ... *nei* = Slav. *ni* ... *ni* ‘neither ... nor’. Actually, Lith. *nei* ... *nei* ‘neither ... nor’ is a late innovation, not a remnant of the period of Balto-Slavic unity, cf. section 1.2. This paper aims to show how a philological analysis of the oldest Lithuanian texts can help us to follow the functional changes of *nei*. In this way we are able to separate different chronological layers and point to innovations following in succession. As the author of this paper is primarily interested in the history of Baltic languages, the typological data are exploited here to a lesser extent. I am aware that the changes presented in the article may seem trivial to a typologist; however, the less exotic the change, the more probable it is that the diachronic description offered is correct. Secondly, tracing the historical changes might be a no less fascinating adventure than a typological depiction would be.

The most archaic function of *nei*, which can be found in Old Lithuanian texts, is *nei* as a sentence negation in a clause following another clause that does not contain a negation, with both clauses combined asymmetrically. Examples can be divided into two subtypes that can be defined as unordered addition and temporal succession clauses in Dixon’s terms (Dixon 2009). Counterparts of *nei* are Latin *ne-que* and German *und nicht*. The next stage in the development of *nei* was correlative sentences of the type *ne*- ... *nei(gi)* ‘not ... nor’, very common in the 16th century. This type of sentence traces back to juxtaposed clauses with narrow-scope negation (section 1.1). It was only the type *ne*- ... *nei(gi)* ‘not ... nor’ (contrastive negative coordination in Haspelmath’s (2007) terms) that then gave rise to *nei* ... *nei* ‘neither ... nor’, which is common in modern Lithuanian (section 1.2). Negative coordination of the type *ne*- ... *nei(gi)* also gave rise to the connective of comparative clauses *nei(gi)* ‘than’, the particle
COMPARATIVE in Stassen’s (1985) terms (section 2). The latest chronological layer is nei ‘before’ used as a connective of adverbial time clauses. This change illustrates the shift from a qualitative comparison of two actions to a comparison of two actions in time, i.e. ‘than’ > ‘before’. Such a shift is the reverse of a change described by Stassen (1985, 61) for Dutch dan ‘than’, which comes from dan used adverbially in temporal succession clauses, i.e. ‘then’ > ‘than’, cf. Heine (1997, 117), section 2.

1. Lith. nei(gi) ‘nor’ as a coordinator of contrastive negative coordination

1.1. Lithuanian ne- ... nei(gi) ‘not ... nor’

In this type, a coordinated clause introduced by the coordinator nei ‘nor’ follows a clause with sentence negation ne-, cf. (1)–(4). In Old Lithuanian texts of the 16th century this kind of negative coordination prevails over the second subtype nei(gi) ... nei ... nei(gi) ‘neither ... nor’, cf. 1.2.

(1) Schitai, anis man ne tike-s, nei mano
behold they 1SG.DAT NEG believe-FUT.3 nor my
bals-a klausi-s, bet sakj-s... (BB)
voice-GEN.SG hearken-FUT.3 but say-FUT.3
‘But, behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my
voice: for they will say ...’ (Exod. 4.1)

(2) aš iiémus né liepíeu / nei-g ium-p
I.NOM they.DAT.PL NEG order.PST.1SG NEG-FOC YOU[PL]-ALL
kalbėiau: (DP 246.36–37)
say.PST.1SG
‘I did not order them, nor said to them...’

(3) Ir klause ghi / ir biloia yamui /
and ask.PST.3 he.ACC.SG and say.PST.3 him.DAT.SG
kamgi tu Chrikschtighi / kada tu ne essi
why you baptize.PRS.2SG if you NEG be.PRS.2SG
Christus nei Helioschius / nei Prarakas? (VEE 7.15–17)
Christ NEG Elias NEG prophet
‘And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou

2 The English renderings come from the King James Bible (Authorized Version), Pure Cambridge Edition.
then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?’
(John 1.25)

(4)  
then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?’

(John 1.25)

(4)  
Therefore brother…nei-gi pirket (mž 371.12–15)

‘Therefore, my brothers, do not err […] neither sell, nor buy.’

Sentences (1)–(4) have two striking features in common. Firstly, the negative coordinator nei(gi) always introduces the second and following clauses, cf. (3). That is, it is possible to have ne- … nei, but not *nei … nei.

The same state of affairs is evidenced:

(a) in Latvian, cf. es tuo nedarišu, nei man klātus tuo darīt. ‘I will not do this, and it is unseemly for me to do this’ (mē 2, 715),

(b) in the Latgalian dialect of Latvian (Evangelia toto anno 1753), cf. Kopec tad krysti, kad na essi tu Chrystus, ni Eliass, ni Profests? (evta 4.2-4) ‘Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?’ (John 1.25),

(c) in Slavic, e.g. ne truždajutь se, ni predutь ‘they toil not, neither do they spin’ (Miklosich 1868–1874, 183), ni < *nei.4

Secondly, the focus particle -gi is always added to nei (2), or, if nei is repeated, to the last one (4), therefore we have ne- … neigi but never *negi … nei. This rule applies also to Old Latvian ne- … nedz ‘neither … nor’, where -dz < -gi (5), and Old Prussian, cf. ni perweckammai ne-ggi ernertimmairyichta ‘nicht verachten noch erzürnen’ (‘we should neither hold in contempt nor enrage’)—(Enchiridion 31.4–5).

(5)  
Na-war kūk-s ļob-s, slykt-us OLatgalian  
NEG-can.prs.3  tree-nom.sg  good-nom.sg  bad-acc.pl  
augl-us dūt-t: ne-dz kūk-s slykt-s,  
fruit-acc.pl  give-inf  neg-loc  tree-nom.sg  bad-nom.sg  
ľob-us augl-us dūt-t. (evta 56.4–5)  
good-acc.pl  fruit-acc.pl  give-inf

3 The Latgalian ni is probably a result of the change *nei > *nie > ni (Mažiulis 1996, 181).

4 Cf. OCS Ne dadite / s[vę]taro psomь. ni pomětaite biserь vašichь prědь sviniěmi […] (Codex Zographensis) ‘Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine’ (Matt. 7.6).
‘A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.’ (Matt. 7.18)

The enclitic particle -gi was a marker of contrastive focus⁵ and this usage is obvious in (6), where the focus is also graphically marked, by using the capital letter in <Penktangi> ‘fifth’. The clause, being in the scope of the focalized coordinator nei-gi, expressed contrast, i.e. the whole sentence could be paraphrased along the lines of ‘not X, and not Y either’. The focalizer -gi was added optionally, cf. (1) and (3).

(6) \textit{Potam isch-gulda iemus Penkt-an-gi} \par	hen \textit{PRV-lecture-pst.3 them.dat.pl fifth-acc.sg-loc} \par
\textit{prisakim-a sawa dang-aus Tiew-a.} \par
commandment-acc.sg his heaven-gen.sg father-gen.sg

(\textit{BP II} 284.18–19)

‘Then he lectured them on the fifth commandment of his heavenly Father’

Martin Haspelmath (2007, 14–17), when describing \textsc{contrastive negative coordination} (e.g. neither... nor), a negated variant of \textsc{contrastive coordination}, e.g. both A and B, either X or Y,⁶ noticed, among other things, that neither ... nor may be interpreted either as a conjunction with narrow-scope negation, viz. ¬p & ¬q ('We didn't meet Marvin, and we didn’t meet Joan either'), or a disjunction with wide-scope negation, viz. ¬(p ∨ q) ('We didn’t meet either Marvin or Joan')—Haspelmath (2007, 16). Haspelmath’s explanation sheds light on the source of the negative coordination \textit{nei-} ... \textit{nei(gi)} and \textit{nei} ... \textit{nei(gi)} ‘neither ... nor’ (1.2.). Out of the two options (viz. conjunction vs. disjunction), \textit{nei} ... \textit{nei(gi)} ‘not ... nor’ as a conjunction with narrow-scope negation is supported by the existence of \textit{nei} ‘and not’ in (7)–(9), a kind of sentence containing asyndetic clause-combining where the first clause does not contain a negation. This type has been recorded only in Old Lithuanian texts coming from

---


⁶ “it is emphasized that each coordinand belongs to the coordination, and each of them is considered separately. Thus, the following sentence is felicitous only if there was some doubt over one of the conjuncts […]” (Haspelmath 2007, 14):

\textit{Both Guatemala and Belize are in Central America}.
East Prussia (Wilent, Bretke, Vaišnora). Counterparts of nei in (7)–(9) are German *und nicht* / *auch nicht* (Luther, 1545) and Latin *nec* / *neque* / *et non* (Vulgate), cf.:

(7) *Tu pa-min-i mana Szmon-es [...]*, **nei** an-u
You * PRV-oppress-PRS.2SG my people-ACC.PL NEG them-GEN.PL nor-i * pa-leis-ti: (BB)
want-PRS.2SG PRV-let-INF
Luther: *Du trittest mein Volck noch vnter dich / vnd wilts nicht lassen*
Vulgate: *Adhuc retines populum meum et non vis dimittere eum?*
‘As yet exaltest thou thyself against my people, that thou wilt not let them go?’ (Exod. 9.17)

(8) *Ghis dręba ir siaucz ir kasa*
he * TREMBLE.PRS.3 and rage.PRS.3 and dig.PRS.3*
Szem-es, **nei** klausa bals-o Trumitt-os. (BB)
ground-ACC.PL NEG obey.PRS.3 sound-GEN.SG trumpet-GEN.SG
Luther: *Es zittert vnd tobet vnd scharret in die erde / vnd achtet nicht der drometen halle.*
Vulgate: *Fervens et fremens sorbet terram nec consistet, cum tubae sonaverit clangor.*
‘He swalloweth the ground with fierceness and rage: neither believeth he that it is the sound of the trumpet.’ (Job 39.24)

(9) *Aesch vsch masz-aus-i daikt-a laikau /*
I * SMALL-SPR.L-ACC.SG thing-ACC.SG think.PRS.1SG*
idant nūg yussu bu-cziq sudi-t-as /
that by you[PL].GEN be-cond.1SG judge-PPP-NOM.SG.M
alba nūg szmonischk-q5s dien-OS / nei
or by human-GEN.SG.F gathering-GEN.SG NEG
pats sawe taipa-ieg
self.NOM.SG.M RFL.ACC in_this_way-FOC
sudiyu. (vee 5, 17–19; 1 Cor 4.3)
judge.1SG
Luther: *Mir aber ists ein geringes / das ich von euch gerichtet werde / oder von einem menschlichen Tage / Auch richte ich mich selbs nicht.*

__7__ For other instances of this kind, cf. Ostrowski (2008).
Vulgate: *Mihi autem pro minimo est, ut a vobis iudicer aut ab humano die. Sed neque meipsum iudico.*

‘But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man’s judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self.’

(1 Cor. 4.3)

A parallel for the elucidation of the Lith. *ne- ... nei(gi)* presented here is provided by Gothic *ni-h* (lit.) ‘not and’ and Latin *ne-que* in (10):

(10) *ni maurnaiþ saiwalai izwarai* Gothic

*neg take_thought.OPT.PRS.2PL soul.DAT.SG you[PL].DAT.SG.F hwa matjaiþ jah hwa drigkaîþ nih* what eat.OPT.PRS.2PL and what drink.OPT.PRS.2PL NEG

*leika izwaramma hwe wasjaiþ.*

body.DAT.SG your[PL]-DAT.SG how dress.OPT.PRS.2 PL

Vulgate: *Ne solliciti sitis animae vestrae quid manducetis, neque corpori vestro quid induamini.*

OLith.: *nerupinkites apie bjûwata yusu / kû turietumbite walgiti ir // gerti. Ney taïpaieg apie kunq yûsu kû turietumbite wilketi.* (Vee 111.5–7)

‘Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on.’ (Matt. 6.25)

Sentences (7)–(9) are instances of so-called unordered addition (Dixon 2009, 26). The second, less common subtype is temporal succession clauses: ‘X, and following after X, Y’ (Dixon 2009, 9), cf. (11). Both kinds of *and*-coordination, i.e. unordered addition and temporal succession, can be conveyed asyndetically (Dixon 2009, 37–8) and Lithuanian examples (7)–(9) and (11) meet this condition.

(11) *Diew-as nu-schlosti-s wiss-as aschar-as nûg* God-NOM.SG PRV-wipe-FUT.3 all-ACC.PL.F tear-ACC.PL from

---

8 Unordered addition “involves two distinct events which are semantically or pragmatically related but for which no temporal sequence is assumed. For example:

*Mary peeled the potatoes and John shelled the peas.*

Both actions relate to the preparation of food. There is no time specification here—the potatoes may have been dealt with first, or last, or the activities may have been simultaneous or overlapping. Temporal information is not considered relevant and is not stated. (*If then were added after and, it would create a statement of sequentiality.*)” (Dixon 2009, 26)
iу aki-u / nei bus potam
them.GEN.PL eye-GEN.PL NEG be.FUT.3 after
Smert-ies/ [...]/ nei schauks-o / nei sopeghim-o
Death.GEN.SG NEG SCREAM-GEN.SG NEG pain.GEN.SG
(БР 13.12–14)
‘And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there
shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall
there be any more pain.’ (Rev. 21.4)

1.2. Lithuanian nei ... nei(gi) / nei(gi) ... nei ‘neither ... nor’

In modern Lithuanian CONTRASTIVE NEGATIVE COORDINATION is expressed
by the reduplicated connectives nei ... nei ‘neither ... nor’ and both of them
occur in the scope of the sentence negations ne- (12). Also possible is the
variant with the negation ne- omitted, as in (13)–(14), cf. Ambrazas, ed.
(1997, 671).

(12) Žmon-ės nei ne-matė, nei
people-NOM.PL neither NEG-see.PST.3 nor
nei-girdėjo artėjanči-os audr-os.
NEG-hear.PST.3 approaching-GEN.SG storm-GEN.SG
‘People neither saw (lit. ‘not-saw’) nor heard (lit. ‘not-heard’) the
approaching storm.’ (Ambrazas, ed., 1997, 671)

(13) Žmon-ės nei matė, nei girdėjo
people-NOM.PL neither see.PST.3 nor hear.PST.3
artėjanči-os audr-os.
approaching-GEN.SG storm-GEN.SG
‘People neither saw nor heard the approaching storm.’ (Ambra-
zas, ed., 1997, 671)

(14) Weisde-ki-te ant pauksči-u Dang-aus / iog ghie
look-IMP-2PL at bird-GEN.PL SKY-GEN.SG that they
ney seja / ney piauja / ney su-renka
neither SOW.PRS.3 nor reap.PRS.3 nor PRV-gather.PRS.3
klůn-úsna (VEE 111.5–7)
barn-ILL.PL
Gothic: insaihuþ du fuglam himinis, þei ni saiand, nih sneþpand nih
lisand in banstins.
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Vulgate: *Respicate volatilia caeli, quoniam non serunt neque metunt neque congregant in horrea.*

‘Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns’ (Matt. 6.26)

Sentences like (12) are extremely rare in Old Lithuanian texts. They are not found in Mosvid’s (1547–1570) and Wilent’s (1579) works (West-Aukštaitian dialect) at all, but are instanced in the first part of *Punktay sakimu* (1629) by the Lithuanian Jesuit priest Konstanty Szyrwid (East-Aukštaitian dialect). More common were examples like (13)–(14), although this type (i.e. *nei ... nei*) was also definitely less frequent than *ne- ... nei*(gi) ‘not ... nor’. In Wilent’s *Euangelias bei Epistolas* (1579) the ratio of *ne- ... nei*(gi) to *nei ... nei* was 20 : 2. Taking into account the subsequent increase in usage of *nei ... nei* ‘neither ... nor’, one can suppose *nei ... nei* to have been a later Lithuanian innovation, despite the presence of an identical structure *ni ... ni* ‘neither ... nor’ in Slavic. Interestingly, *nei ... nei* is missing in Old Prussian. The spread of *nei* to the first clause has a parallel in Latin *nec ... nec* ‘neither ... nor’ and Gothic *nih ... nih* ‘neither ... nor’, cf. *gakunnaiþ blomans haþjos, huaiwa wahsjand; nih arbaidjand nih spinnand* (Matt. 6.28) ‘Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin’.

What caused the dislocation of *nei* to the beginning of the first clause? The origin of this change was possibly determined by the desire to focalize the first clause. In the sequence *ne- ... nei* ‘not ... nor’, described in 1.1, the contrastive particle -gi could be attached only to *nei*, never *ne-*, therefore *ne- ... neigi*, but not *negi- ... nei*. In other words, only the second clause, introduced by *nei*, optionally reinforced by -gi, could be highlighted, not the first one. However, such a restriction does not operate in the case of *nei ... nei* ‘neither ... nor’, where both *nei-gi ... nei* (15) and *nei ... nei-gi* (16) were possible.

(15) *Nei-gi wel delei nekoki-u papiktinim-u /
   NEG-FOC again due_to some-GEN.PL depravity-GEN.PL
   kur-ie ne-koro-t-i at-lik-t /
   which-NOM.PL.M NEG-punish-PPP-NOM.PL.M PRV-remain-PRS.3
   tur bu-ti Baþnicz-a ap-leif-t-a /
   must.PRS.3 be-INF church-NOM.SG PRV-abandon-PPP-NOM.SG.F
   nei waid-as jra dari-tin-as
   NEG dispute-NOM.SG be.PRS.3 do-PNEC-NOM.SG.M
moxl-e / kad næ iak-ia blud-a
doctrine-LOC.SG that NEG any-GEN.SG.M error-GEN.SG
moxl-e næra / kaip apię tatai Powil-as
doctrine-LOC.SG NEG.be.PRS.3 as about this Paul-NOM
aľchrai ap-raʃcha 1. Cor. 1. (MT 103v.10–14)
gravely PRV-write.PRS.3
‘Nec propter aliqua scandala, quae impunita manent, Ecclesia deserenda, et schisma faciendum est, si nullus sit error in doctrina, ut gravissime Paulus praecepit.’
‘Neither due to any moral corruption which remains unpunished may the church be abandoned, nor should any dispute arise over the doctrine, as there is no error in the doctrine, as Paul gravely teaches in 1 Cor. 1.’

(16) Iſchtogi nei iem intiktinai gal tarnau-ti, therefore neither him faithfully might,PRS.3 serve-INF nei-gi ifchgani-t-u pafto-ti (MT XXIII.14–15)
nor-FOC redeem-PPP-INS.SG become-INF
‘Therefore [he] can neither faithfully serve Him [God], nor be redeemed.’

2. Lithuanian comparative constructions with nei(gi)
‘than’

Beginning from the first Lithuanian texts nei(gi) appears as a conjunction of comparative clauses, cf.:

(17) Er ne did-esn-is daikt-as szįwat-s /
PTCL NEG big-CMPR-NOM.SG.M thing-NOM.SG life-NOM.SG
neigi walgim-s? Ir kun-s neigi
than meat-NOM.SG and body-NOM.SG than
raiment-NOM.PL
‘Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?’
(Matt. 6.25)
(18) Bet esch daugi-aus dirbau / neig kurs-ai
but I much-CMPR labour.PST.1SG than anyone-PTCL
isch yū (VEE 102.16–17)
among them.GEN.PL
'But I laboured more abundantly than they all' (1 Cor. 15.10)

In modern Lithuanian the variant *neig(i)* ‘than’ is no longer used, but in the 16th century the majority of authors showed predilection for *neig(i)* rather than *nei*. In Wilent’s works the ratio of *nei* to *neig* was 1 : 6. Only Bretke diverged from the others and the ratio of *nei : neig* in his *Postilla* (1591) was 55 : 6; Bretke’s tradition eventually got the upper hand in Lithuanian.

In Stassen’s typology (1985, 2001), examples (17)–(18) are instances of the particle comparative, a type very common mainly in Europe. Of 18 particle comparatives collected by Stassen, 13 are evidenced just in Europe (Haspelmath 2001, 1499). The remaining part of the examples come from West-Indonesian languages. A distinctive feature of this type is the presence of a connective linking the standard of comparison and the comparee; moreover, the comparee often has a morphological marker of comparative, e.g. *-esn-* and *-'aus* in (17)–(18). Unlike conjoined comparatives, the particle comparative does not have the form of a coordination of clauses,9 but displays some features in common with coordination. Firstly, the connective is sometimes etymologically connected to a coordinating conjunction, e.g. *baino* ‘than / but’ in Basque, *na* ‘than / nor’ in Scottish Gaelic, *nor* ‘than / nor’ in Scottish English, Polish *ni-ż* / (Old Polish) *ni-że* ‘than’.10 Secondly, the particle comparative allows gapping, which is commonly argued to be a feature of coordination (Stassen 1985, 46-7, 190–1; 2001, 995–6), cf. Lithuanian instances (19a) and (19b)—Holvoet & Judžentis (2003, 144):

(19a) *Jon-as bèga greiči-au negu Petr-as.*

John-NOM run.prs.3 fast-cmpr than Peter-NOM

‘John runs faster than Peter.’

(19b) *Jon-as bèga greiči-au, negu Petr-as bèga.*

John-NOM run.prs.3 fast-cmpr than Peter-NOM run.prs.3

9 In conjoined comparatives the comparison is not expressed directly, but inferred from the fact that the compared clauses contain antonymous predicates or predicates conveying a positive-negative polarity (Stassen 1985, 38, 44; Cristofaro 2003, 46), cf.:

*Kaw-ohra naha Waraka, kaw naha Kaywerye* (Hixkaryana).

tall-not he_is Waraka tall he_is Kaywerye

‘Kaywerye is taller than Waraka’

10 Cf. Polish *ni* as a coordinator: *Ni pies, ni wydra* ‘Neither dog, nor otter’ (nobody knows what something is); *-ż* comes from the focus particle *-że < -że*, cf. *ten-że* ‘exactly this one’ : *ten* ‘this’.
'John runs faster than Peter runs.'

Old Lithuanian connectives neg, nei(g), neng, nent, net and nekaip ‘than’ contain the negation ne, and some of them are recorded also in the function of sentence negation. For instance OLith. neg(i) ‘than’, resulting from conflation of ne ‘not’\(^{11}\) and the aforementioned focus particle -gi, appears in (20)–(21) in a juxtaposed clause expressing contrast\(^{12}\) to the preceding one:

(20) Ko teip skubin-tei-s — ne-gi dega.
what-GEN.SG so RUSH-REFL NEG-FOC burn.PRS.3
(Lkž 8: 619—Tauragėnai)
‘Why are we to hurry up so much, there’s no rush (lit. ‘it does not burn’).’

(21) Teip’ gáli-mę fu wěrkę-ncz-iu Petr-ú bú-i
so can-PRS.1PL with weep-PPA-INS.SG.M Peter-INS.SG be-INF
ižganê-t-i ne-g fu nufimín-usi-ǜiu
redeem-PPP-NOM.PL.M NEG-FOC with grieve-PPA-INS.SG.M.DEF
Judas-INS.SG be-INF condemn-PPP-INS.PL.M
Pol. ‘Tak możemy z płaczącym Piotrem być zbawieni / ktorzy-smy z rospaczaiącym Judaszem mogli być potępiani.’
‘Therefore we can be redeemed with crying Peter, and not be condemned with grieving Judas.’

Interesting is an instance of Lith. negu ‘than’, cf. (19a)–(19b). As a connective of comparative clauses negu seems to have appeared very late. It was still lacking in the folk-tales published by Schleicher (1857). In Old Lithuanian texts ne-gu appeared exclusively in rhetorical questions; the enclitic -gu was a question particle (cf. Nau & Ostrowski 2010, 27) and ne- served as a sentence negation, cf. (22)—ps\(^{1}\) 281.25–26:

(22) Ir priei-i tarn-ai Wiešpat-ies [...]
and come-PPA.NOM.PL.M servant-NOM.PL householder-GEN.SG

\(^{11}\) Also the negation ne ‘not’ alone may serve in Baltic languages as a comparative connective ‘than’ (cf. Milenbachs 1891/2009; Petit 2009).

\(^{12}\) “The connection of contrast means that in the speaker’s opinion two propositions A and B are valid simultaneously and proposition B marks a contrast to the information given in proposition A.” (Rudolph 1996, 20)
tare iam: Wießpat-ie, Ne-gu gier-u
say.pst.3 him.dat.sg lord-voc neg-ptcl good.acc.sg
seklt-u pa-seiey vnt dirw-os tawo?
seed.acc.sg prv-sow.pst.2sg on field.gen.sg thy
‘So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field?’ (Matt. 13.27)

But as a sentence negation negu emerges in (23), cf.:
(23) Negu prieš ji rank-q kel-si. (Lkž 8: 622)
eg neg against him.acc.sg hand.acc.sg raise-fut.2sg
‘But you will not raise a hand against him.’

Slightly different is the origin of OLith. net ‘than’13 (e.g. BB Esther 6.6). In Bretke’s works net comes up first of all in adversative sentences marking—like German sonder—‘substitutive adversative coordination’ (Haspelmath 2007, 28), cf. (24):
(24) betaig ne mana walia / net tawa te-nusidus-t
but-foc neg my will but yours opt-happen-prs.3
(BP 194.1–2)
‘Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done’ (Luke 22.42)

Here also both clauses are coordinated and contrasted. The case of net is reminiscent of a subtype of conjoined comparative called ‘antonymy’ by Heine (1997, 117) (‘X has property p while Z has the opposite property q’).14

The examination of the examples with neg(i), negu and net betrays the functional closeness of these items. By assuming the sentence negation itself to have given rise to connectives of comparative clauses, we gain the possibility of establishing the origin of Lith. neig ‘than’. Its source was juxtaposed sentences, in which the second clause conveyed contrast relative to the first one, and the focus particle -gi was a marker of contrast. This state of affairs is clearly visible in (25):

---

13 net (Old Lithuanian neta / nete) ‘but; unless; until; because; than; in order to’ developed from the combination of the negative particle ne and enclitic forms of the demonstrative pronoun -ta / -te (Hermann 1912, 82-3).
14 Cf. Mastingcala king waste, tka singhela king sice (Dakota)
rabbit the good but rattle-snake the bad
‘The rabbit is better than the rattle-snake’
Norbert Ostrowski

(25) *Sakau yumus tas-ai nueja
tell.PRS.1SG you[PL].DAT this-PTCL go_down.PST.3
ap-teisin-t-as nam-ûsna sawa nei-g anas.
PRV-justified-PPP-NOM.SG.M house-ILL.PL his NEG-FOC other
(VEE 103.12)
‘Jch sage euch / Dieser gieng hinab gerechtfertigt in sein haus / fur jenem’15 (Luther 1545)
‘I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other’ (Luke 18.14)

In (25) we see ellipsis of the predicate, which resembles the particle comparative described above (19a)–(19b). The first clause (i.e. *Sakau yums...) and the second one (viz. *neig anas) are juxtaposed and contrasted. The similarity between (20)–(21) and (25) is obvious. However, it gives rise to a question: in what kind of sentences did *neig (25) come into being? Examples (7)–(9), i.e. with *nei ‘and not’, seem to be less probable. Firstly, they do not express contrast. Secondly, the negation *nei in (7)–(9) never takes -gi, which results from the first observation. Thirdly, the aforementioned parallel of Scottish Gaelic na ‘than / nor’ and Irish ná ‘than / nor’ speaks for ne- ... *nei(gi) in (1)–(4) as a source of neigi (25). The Irish counterpart of English neither ... nor is a single word ná following the clause with the sentence negation níl (26)— (Haspelmath 2007, 17). Such a construction is an exact equivalent of the Lith. ne- ... *nei(gi).

(26) *Níl mac ná iníon aige.
NEG.is son nor daughter at_him
‘He doesn’t have a son nor a daughter.’

In this way we come to the conclusion that comparative clauses with *nei(gi) ‘than’ represent a change from a sentence containing asyndetic clause-combining to the subordination of a comparative clause, but this subordination still conveys some characteristics of coordination. Apart from gapping, the second feature is the impossibility of clause extrapolation in (27):

(27) *Ne-gu Petr-as, Jon-as bèga greiči-au.
than Peter-NOM John-NOM run.PRS.3 fast-CMPR
*‘Than Peter, John runs faster’

15 MHG für / vîr / viüre ‘statt, statt dessen’ (Lexer 1992).
This restriction does not hold, however, in (28), where neg ‘before’ functions as a connective of a temporal clause:

(28) neg Abrôm-as bû / iau aß efmi. (dp 130.29) before Abraham-nom be.pst.3 already I be.prs.1sg
‘Before Abraham was, I had already been.’

It is interesting that the connectives neg(i), nei(gi), neng ‘than’ were also used in temporal clauses in the Old Lithuanian period. As shown in the table below, there existed a strict connection between neg(i), nei(gi), neng ‘than’ and ‘before’, i.e. the authors who did not use e.g. neng ‘than’ (Dauksza, Szyrwid), did not use neng ‘before’ either, cf.:

Table 1. The use of neng, neg(i) and nei(gi) in Old Lithuanian texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>neng</th>
<th>neg(i)</th>
<th>nei(gi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘than’</td>
<td>‘before’</td>
<td>‘than’</td>
<td>‘before’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilent (VEE)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauksza (DP)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretke (BP)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szyrwid (ps¹)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The philological analysis of Old Lithuanian texts brings to our attention the change ‘than’ > ‘before’. That is, we see a shift from qualitative comparison of two actions to comparison of two actions in time; cf. Pajėdienė (2012, 51–63), who described thoroughly the usage of neg(i), nei(gi), neng ‘before, by the time’ in Old Lithuanian texts. She showed, among other things, that neg(i), nei(gi), neng ‘before’ used to appear following a clause with adverb pirm(a) ‘first’, cf. (29), or even made up a cluster pirm neg ‘before’ (lit. ‘first than’) (30), comparable to Old Polish pierwej (wprzód) niż ‘before’ (lit. ‘first than’):

(29) sweria pirm żodźi-us negi ku
weigh.prs.3 first word-acc.pl than what.acc.sg
The shift from a qualitative comparison of two actions to a comparison of two actions in time in Old Lithuanian and Old Polish (‘than’ > ‘before’) is in some ways the reverse of a change described by Stassen (1985, 61) for Dutch dan ‘than’, which traces back to dan used in temporal succession clauses, i.e. ‘then’ > ‘than’, cf. (31a)–(31b):

(31a) Eerst ga ik, dan gaat Jan
first go I then goes Jan
‘First I will go, then Jan will go.’ (Stassen 1985, 61, Heine 1997, 117)

(31b) Jan is groter dan Piet.
Jan is taller than Piet
‘Jan is taller than Piet.’

3. Conclusions

1. The most archaic function of nei that can be found in Old Lithuanian texts is represented by sentences of the type Ghis dręba ir siaucz ir kasa Szemes, nei klausa balso Trumittos. (BB) ‘He swalloweth the ground with fierceness and rage: neither believeth he that it is the sound of the trumpet.’ (Job 39.24). In this kind of sentence nei ‘and not’ functions as a type
of sentence negation in a clause following another clause that does not contain negation, with both clauses combined asyndetically. The counterparts of nei are Latin ne-que / nec and German und nicht, cf. Vulgate: *Fervens et fremens sorbet terram nec consistet, cum tubae sonaverit clangor* and Luther (1545) *Es zittert vnd tobet vnd scharret in die erde / vnd achtet nicht der drometen halle.* (Job 39:24).

2. Examples with the sentence negation nei ‘and not’ can be divided into two subtypes, defined as unordered addition and temporal sucession clauses in Dixon’s terms (Dixon 2009).

3. The next stage in the development of coordinative sentences with nei were correlative sentences of the type ne- ... nei(gi) ‘not ... nor’, which were very common in the 16th century, e.g. *Schitai, anis man ne tikes, nei mano balsa klausis, bet sakjs.* (bb) ‘But, behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice: for they will say.’ (Exod. 4.1). These developed from juxtaposed clauses with narrow-scope negation, viz. ¬p & ¬q (‘We didn’t meet Marvin, and we didn’t meet Joan either’)—Haseplmath (2007, 16).

4. Negative coordination of the type ne- ... nei(gi) underlies reduplicated connectives nei ... nei ‘neither ... nor’, which are widespread in modern Lithuanian. The dislocation of nei to the beginning of the first clause was determined by the desire to focalize the first clause. In the sequence ne- ... nei(gi) ‘not ... nor’, the contrastive particle -gi could be attached only to nei, never ne-, as such a restriction did not operate in the case of nei ... nei ‘neither ... nor’, where both nei-gi ... nei and nei ... nei-gi were possible.

5. The usage of nei ... nei ‘neither ... nor’, common in modern Lithuanian, in the scope of the sentence negation ne- is a late innovation, very rarely found in the 16th cent. In order to establish the time and the reasons why nei ne- ... nei ne- ‘neither ... nor’ has become so productive, analysis of later texts is an absolute must.

6. The conjunction of comparative clauses nei(gi) ‘than’ came into being in juxtaposed sentences, in which the second clause conveyed contrast relative to the first clause and the focus particle -gi was a marker of contrast. The source was the aforementioned correlative sentences of the type ne- ... nei(gi) ‘not ... nor’. The problem of the origin of Lith. nei(gi) in simulative constructions, cf. *Piktas néi velnias.* (Ìkž 8: 624) ‘Angry like a devil’, is still unsettled.

7. nei(g) ‘before’, a conjunction of temporal clauses, belongs to the latest chronological layer. The context in which the shift ‘than’ > ‘before’
took place was sentences with the adverb *pirm(a)* ‘first’. Worthy of note is the existence of identical structures in Old Polish, cf. *(pierwej)* niż ‘before’ (lit. ‘first than’).
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**ABBREVIATIONS**

ACC — accusative, ACT — active, ALL — allative, CMPR — comparative,  
COND — conditional, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, F — feminine, FOC —  
focus, FUT — future, GEN — genitive, ILL — illative, IMP — imperative,  
INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, LOC — locative, M — masculine,  
NEG — negation, NOM — nominative, OPT — optative, PL — plural,  
PNEC — participium necessitatis, PPA — past active participle, PPP —  
past passive participle, PRS — present, PRT — particle, PRV — preverb,  
PST — past, PTCL — particle, PRL — reflexive, SG — singular, SPRL — su-  
perlative, VOC — vocative

**SOURCE TEXTS**


From sentence negation to connective. Old Lithuanian nei(gi) ’and not; nor; than; before’

\( M_T = \) Margarita Theologica ... Zemčzuga Theologischka ... Litauischkai jra perguldita per Simona Waischnora warnischki ... Karaliaucziuie ... 1600. Cited from: Guido Michelini, ed., Žemčzuga Theologischka ir jos šaltiniai. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1997.
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