Frederik KORTLANDT
Leiden University

BALTO-SLAVIC RECONSTRUCTION: A CLARIFICATION

Miguel Villanueva Svensson's competent review (2010) of my work (2009) has made clear that I have not always been sufficiently explicit about the argumentation for my reconstructions. Here I shall briefly comment on two points where he evidently found my reasoning unconvincing.

The first point concerns my reconstruction of the PIE 3rd pl. ending *-o* in the thematic present beside *-ont* in the thematic aorist, *-nt* in the athematic aorist, and *-(e)nti* in the athematic present. According to what Villanueva calls the "traditional view", in its most extreme form represented by Cowgill (1985), the endings of the thematic present were identical with the endings of the athematic present, preceded by the thematic vowel *-e/o-*. The alternative view that the thematic present endings were entirely differ-ent from those of the athematic present was defended by Meillet, Pedersen, Watkins (1969) and others and can hardly be called less traditional (cf. Kort-landt 2007 *passim*). Villanueva states that "apart from Baltic, the only piece of evidence [Kortlandt] adduces [for thematic 3rd pl. *-o*] is TB 3 sg. *āśäṃ*, 3 pl. *ākeṃ*, allegedly from 3 sg. *$h_2e\hat{g}$-e*, 3 pl. *$h_2e\hat{g}$-o* + enclitic *-ṃ* in spite of TA 3 pl. *ākeñc < *$h_2e\hat{g}onti$*". This is a gross simplification. In fact, I have argued that Latin *-unt*, Old Irish *-at* and Old Church Slavic *-ǫtъ* cannot sim-ply be derived from *-onti* (2009, 162). The Toch. B clitic *-ṃ* in 3rd sg. *āśäṃ* 'agit', 3rd pl. *ākeṃ* 'agunt' and its Toch. A counterpart *-ṣ* were established by Holger Pedersen (1941, 142). The Toch. A 3rd pl. ending *-eñc* represents *-o* plus added *-nti* from the athematic present, as is clear from the coexis-tence of such forms as *tāke* beside *tākeñc* 'will be', predominantly in an ar-chaic text. In Indo-Iranian, the thematic present endings are reflected in the subjunctive, where the 3rd pl. ending *-an* represents *-o* plus added *-nt* and cannot possibly be derived from *-onti* (cf. Beekes 1981). The only branch of Indo-European which unambiguously points to 3rd sg. *-eti* and 3rd pl. *-onti* is Germanic.

Villanueva cites Endzelin's suggestion that the original 3rd pl. verbal end-ing was preserved in the nom.pl. form of the active participle in Lithuanian,

e.g. *degą̃* 'burning'. This view cannot be correct because there is an apophonic difference between the participial forms *ẽsą* 'being', *ẽją* 'going' (cf. K o r t - l a n d t 2009, 298f., with *o*-vocalism from the thematic flexion) and the original 3rd pl. forms **senti*, **ienti*, which would yield **señt*, **jeñt* and perhaps merge with the gerund (Daukša) *sañt*, *eñt*. The nom. pl. form of the participle continues the original neuter sg. form, as in *jái nuo dárbo rankàs suką̃* '(she said) her arms ache from work' (A m b r a z a s 1997, 371), which ultimately reflects the PIE ergative construction (cf. K o r t l a n d t 2010 *passim*).

The second point to be discussed here concerns the PIE gen. pl. ending **-om*. I have argued that original **-om* was raised to **-um* in early Balto-Slavic times and that the stem vowel of the *o*-stems was restored in Lith. acc. sg. *-ą* and in the Prussian nominal paradigm, where it was generalized and extended to the *ā*- and *u*-stems. Villanueva finds "the analogy relatively unproblematic for Lithuanian, but not so for Prussian (especially not for the genitive plural)". This is remarkable because T r a u t m a n n already observed that the Prussian gen. pl. ending "*-on* wurde aber zu *-an* nach den überwiegenden Kasus mit *a* umgestaltet: *grecon* und *grecun* I; sonst *griquan* II, *grīkan*, *grijkan*, *grikan* III" (1910, 220). Villanueva acknowledges the difference in the genitive plural between nominal *-an* and pronominal *-on* in Old Prussian but does not mention other instances of **-om*, which is regularly reflected as *-on* except for the acc. sg. ending of inflected *o*-stem nouns, where it is replaced by *-an* (with the single exception of *deickton* 3× 'stead, something'). Thus, we find *-on* in *niainonton* 'nobody', *muisieson* 'larger', *pauson* 'because', *enterpon* 'useful', *dessīmton* 'ten, tenth', and in the passive participles *ainangeminton*, *niwinūton*, *ismaitinton*, *perklantīton*, *polaipinton*, *pogauton*, *potaukinton*, *billīton*, *(po)dāton*, *(po)peisāton*, *pogalbton*, *poquoitīton*, *prolieiton*. It follows that *-on* is the phonetic reflex of PIE **-om* in Old Prussian and that *-an* contains an analogical vowel which was taken from other case forms.

I have dated the raising of **-om* to **-um* before the loss of final **-t/d*, among other things because the difference between the Slavic thematic aorist endings 1st sg. *-ъ* < **-om* and 3rd pl. *-ǫ* < **-ont* was preserved when final **-t* was lost. Villanueva proposes to "assume for a moment that **-oN* > **-uN* was posterior to the loss of final **t/d* (a chronology compatible with the traditional view that this is an exclusively Slavic sound change)" so that the two endings would merge into **-ъ* and supposes that "a proportional analogy **-ętъ* : **-ę* = **-ǫtъ* : X, X = **-ǫ* (with **-ǫ* replacing *lautgesetzlich* **-ъ*) would have been quite trivial at any stage". This is not so because there is no reason

why a redundant morphological distinction in the present tense should be copied in the aorist. If the 1st sg. and 3rd pl. endings had merged into *-ъ, the obvious solution would be to eliminate the homonymy by adopting the 3rd pl. ending *-ę of the productive sigmatic aorist in the thematic paradigm instead of creating a new ending for which there was no motivation.

It must be regretted that Villanueva does not mention the principal reason to date the raising of *-om to *-um before the loss of final *-t/d, viz. the fact that PIE barytone neuter o-stems became masculine in Slavic whereas PIE oxytone neuter o-stems remained neuter. This development was established by Illič-Svityč (1963). New barytone neuter o-stems arose as a result of Hirt's law, which was a Balto-Slavic development. It follows that the raising of *-om to *-um and the rise of a distinct ending in the oxytone neuter o-stems preceded Hirt's law and therefore belonged to the early Balto–Slavic period. The correctness of this analysis is confirmed by evidence from the three Baltic languages. All neuter o-stems which have been preserved in Old Prussian represent original oxytona (cf. Kortlandt 1983, 183). In Latvian, the new barytone neuter o-stems which arose from Hirt's law adopted mobile stress at a more recent stage (after its separation from Lithuanian but before the fixation of the stress on the initial syllable), evidently because the other neuter o-stems had mobile stress (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 14f.). In Lithuanian, the nom. pl. endings of the Indo-European o-stems point to an earlier complementary distribution between unstressed masculine -ai < *-oi and stressed neuter -ie < *-aH-i (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 147–149). While the former ending was common to masculine nouns with fixed and mobile stress, as is clear from Serbo-Croatian nom. pl. *vûci* 'wolves', the latter was limited to neuters with mobile stress, which points to the absence of neuters with fixed stress at an early stage.

As an alternative to my reconstructions of Lith. *akmuõ* 'stone' (Slavic *kamy*) < *-ōn, *dù vilkù* 'two wolves' < *-oH, and gen. sg. *vil̃ko* < *-ō, Villanueva mentions the possibility of deriving these endings from *-ȭ, *-ő, and *-ã̃, respectively, assuming "an earlier intonational contrast" and a vowel *ā in the gen. sg. ending of the o-stems. These are arbitrary assumptions for which there is simply no evidence. Since I have discussed these issues in detail elsewhere (1983, 167–170), there is no reason to return to the matter here.

BALTŲ-SLAVŲ REKONSTRUKCIJA: PAAIŠKINIMAS

Santrauka

Ide. 3 pl. tematinio prezenso galūnė buvo *-o ir virto lie. -a, pr. -a. Ide. o kamieno gen. pl. galūnė buvo *-om ir virto lie. -ų, pr. -on.

REFERENCES

Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.) 1997, *Lithuanian grammar*, Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1981, The subjunctive endings of Indo-Iranian, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 23(1), 21–27.

Cowgill, Warren 1985, The personal endings of thematic verbs in Indo-European, in Bernfried Schlerath (Hrg.), *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 99–108.

Illič-Svityč, Vladislav Markovič 1963, *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom: Suďba akcentuacionnyx paradigm*, Moskva: AN SSSR.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1983, On final syllables in Slavic, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 11, 167–185.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2007, *Italo-Celtic origins and prehistoric development of the Irish language*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2009, *Baltica & Balto-Slavica*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2010, *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European and Indo-Uralic*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Pedersen, Holger 1941, *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*, København: Munksgaard.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1910, *Die altpreußischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2010 (rev.), Frederik Kortlandt, Baltica & Balto-Slavica 2009, *Baltistica* 45(2), 359–364.

Watkins, Calvert 1969, *Indogermanische Grammatik. Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Frederik KORTLANDT
Cobetstraat 24
NL-2313 KC Leiden
Holland
[*f.kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl*]
[*www.kortlandt.nl*]