

Frederik KORTLANDT

*Leiden University***BALTO-SLAVIC *o*-GRADE PRESENTS**

The very well-read young scholar Miguel Villanueva Svensson has presented a paper on the accentuation of the infinitive of *o*-grade presents at the Vilnius workshop on Balto-Slavic accentology (2010). The following observations are based on his handout and cannot therefore do full justice to his actual views.

It is far from obvious that reconstructing the accentuation of the Balto-Slavic infinitive is a legitimate enterprise. In Vedic Sanskrit we find a large variety of infinitive formations, e.g. (Macdonell 1916, 463) *drśáye* and *drśé* ‘to see’, *pītáye* ‘to drink’, *caráse* ‘to move’ but *cákṣase* and *abhipracákṣe* ‘to see’, *dāváne* ‘to give’ and *turváne* ‘to overcome’ versus *dhúrvaṇe* ‘to injure’, *iyádhvai* ‘to go’ but *gámadhvai*, *dámáne* ‘to give’ but *vidmáne* ‘to know’, *bhártave* ‘to bear’, *gántave* and *étave* ‘to go’ beside *gántavái*, *étavái*, *ápabhartavái*, also *ityái* and *áyase* ‘to go’, and many other formations. It appears that there is no reason to assume a single formation with a uniform accentuation for Balto-Slavic before Hirt’s law, as Villanueva (following Rasmussen) presupposes. Moreover, the infinitive often adopted the vocalism of the preterit, e.g. Lith. *lėkti* ‘to fly’, *srėbti* ‘to sip’, which have the lengthened grade of the sigmatic aorist (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 53), or that of the present tense, e.g. Prussian *laikūt* ‘to hold’, SCr. *nósati* ‘to carry back and forth’ (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 177). As a result, only infinitives in **-ei* with a zero grade in the root may be taken into consideration in a discussion of the Balto-Slavic state of affairs, e.g. Slavic *piti*, Vedic *pītáye* < **pHitéi(ei)*. Besides, the loss of final **-i* e.g. in Russian *peč’* ‘to bake’, where stressed *-i* is preserved in the dialects (cf. Stang 1957, 151f.), and similar loss of *-i* in the other Slavic languages does not inspire confidence in the possibility of reconstructing the original form and accentuation of the infinitive. Rasmussen’s idiosyncratic conception of Hirt’s law with its peculiar differentiation between consonantal and syllabic (but not actually vocalized!) laryngeals (1999, 191) and its arbitrary vocalizations (e.g. 1999,

173f., 186f.) adds to the hopelessness of the enterprise. Villanueva rightly dismisses Rasmussen's account of the problem.

Most scholars have accepted Stang's derivation of *o*-grade presents such as Lith. *kálti* 'to forge', *málti* 'to grind', OCS *bosti* 'to stab', Latin *fodiō* 'I dig' from the reduplicated intensive exemplified in Vedic *jañghanti* 'strikes' (1942, 41f.; cf. Kortlandt 2010, 216). Jasanoff's alternative proposal to posit an alternating paradigm with **o* in the singular and **e* in the plural (e.g. 1979; 2003) cannot be maintained because no such paradigm can be reconstructed (cf. Kloekhorst 2008, 142f.; Peyrot 2010, 406). In his lucid treatment of the problem, Kümmel points out that the intensive may not be an ancient formation (2004, 144f.). He also argues that the *hi*-flexion of the *o*-grade presents in Hittite may be secondary because of their active meaning and the absence of confusion with the perfect outside Anatolian (2004, 148). Moreover, he observes that the Indo-Iranian cognates of proposed *o*-grade presents are thematic, e.g. Vedic *sphuráti* 'jerks', *tudáti* 'thrusts', *vijáte* 'trembles' (2004, 150).

Elsewhere I have argued that the Hittite *hi*-verbs represent a merger of the original perfect and the original thematic flexion with zero grade in the root, e.g. Vedic *tudáti* (2010, 373–382, where *q*- has unfortunately been printed as *-q* throughout the chapter). If the root vowel of CeC-roots was introduced in this formation between stages C and E of my chronology (2010, 385, 396), it automatically became **o*, as happened in the singular forms of the perfect. Thus, we arrive at *o*-grade in Slavic *bosti* 'to stab', *kopati* 'to dig', *kosnōti sę* 'to touch', *kovati* 'to forge' and the Germanic 6th class verbs versus zero grade in the Vedic 6th class presents adduced above. The athematic reduplicated intensive is evidently a derivative of this formation, e.g. Vedic *jañghanti* 'strikes', *dedišam* 'point out', Greek *πορφύρω* 'boil' (Vedic *bhuráti* 'quivers', *járbhurīti* 'sprawls'), Latin *susurrō* 'whisper', Gothic *inreiraida* 'quaked' (cf. Kortlandt 2010, 131, 133, 216f., 236f.), OLith. *barti* 'scolds' (with loss of reduplication). In Anatolian, the complementary distribution between *o*- and zero grade was brought into line with the paradigmatic alternation of the perfect. In Indo-Iranian, the reduplicated intensive similarly adopted the alternation of the root vowel from the 3rd class reduplicated presents but preserved the zero grade root vowel of the 6th class presents in the subjunctive (cf. Schaefer 1994, 35–43).

BALTŲ-SLAVŲ o LAIPSNIO PREZENSAI*Santrauka*

Kitur esu teigęs, kad hetitų kalbos *hi* veiksmažodžiai atspindi pirminio perfekto ir tematinės fleksijos su nuliniu balsių kaitos laipsniu šaknyje sutapimą, pvz., vedų *tudāti*. Jei CeC tipo šaknies balsis buvo įvestas į šį darinį laikotarpiu tarp mano chronologijos C ir E etapų (2010, 385, 396), jis automatiškai virto *o, kaip atsitiko ir perfekto vienaskaitos formose. Taip galima paaiškinti santykį tarp o laipsnio sl. **bosti* ‘smeigti, durti’ ar germanų 6 klasės veiksmažodžiuose ir nulinio laipsnio vedų 6 klasės veiksmažodžiuose, pvz., vedų *jañghanti* ‘smogia’. Anatolų kalbose papildomoji distribucija tarp o ir nulinio laipsnio buvo priderinta prie perfekto paradigminės kaitos. Indų-iranėnų kalbose reduplikacinis intensyvas panašiai perėmė šaknies balsių kaitą iš 3 klasės reduplikacinio esamojo laiko, tačiau išsaugojo 6 klasės veiksmažodžių esamojo laiko nulinį laipsnį konjunktyve.

REFERENCES

- Jasanoff, Jay H. 1979, The position of the *hi*-conjugation, in Erich Neu, Wolfgang Meid (eds.), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 79–90.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2003, *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin 2008, *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*, Leiden: Brill.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2009, *Baltica & Balto-Slavica*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2010, *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European and Indo-Uralic*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Kümmel, Martin J. 2004, Zur o-Stufe im idg. Verbalsystem, in James Clackson, Birgit Anette Olsen (eds.), *Indo-European word formation*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 139–158.
- Macdonell, Arthur A. 1916, *A Vedic grammar for students*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peyrot, Michaël 2010, *The Tocharian subjunctive*, Dissertation, Leiden.
- Rasmussen, Jens E. 1999, *Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Schaefer, Christiane 1994, *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Stang, Christian S. 1942, *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*, Oslo: I kommisjon hos Jacob Dybwad.

Stang, Christian S. 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo: I kommisjon hos H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2010, *On the accentuation of the infinitive type Latv. kāl̃t, Sl. *kōl̃ti* (Paper read at the 6th International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology in Vilnius, July 2010; cf. this volume, pp. 301–326).

Frederik KORTLANDT

Cobetstraat 24

NL-2313 KC Leiden

Holland

[f.kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl]

[www.kortlandt.nl]