

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

TOKIE ŠALTI RYTAI

1. A cold winter morning drew my attention again to the classic problem of the nom.pl. endings of the Lithuanian *a*-stems (Indo-European *o*-stems). The data can be summarized as follows:

(1) The nominal ending is circumflex *-ai*, which is stressed in the mobile accent classes, e.g. *rytaĩ* 'mornings, east'.

(2) The pronominal ending is acute **-ie*, e.g. *tiẽ* 'those' (with metatony in a monosyllable), *šaltĩ* 'cold' (with shortening in the final syllable), definite form *šaltĩejai*. The original acute of *tiẽ* is clear from Latvian *tiẽ*, not ***tiẽ*.

(3) The metatonical circumflex of *tiẽ* is also found in *aniẽ* 'those', *tokiẽ* 'such', *kuriẽ* 'which', where it must be analogical.

(4) The circumflex ending *-ai* is also found with derived adjectives in *-is*, e.g. *auksĩniai* 'golden', *jaunũčiai* 'very young', which have no neuter, no comparative or superlative, no definite forms, and no mobile stress.

(5) There are dialectal forms with unstressed pronominal *-ai* such as *šitai* 'these', *mažĩejai* 'small' (e.g., Stang 1966: 67).

2. An explanation of this distribution may be sought along the following lines:

(1) Nominal *-ai* versus pronominal *-ie*: this rule, though largely in agreement with the evidence, can hardly be ancient in view of such forms as *šitai* and *mažĩejai*. Besides, it does not readily explain the difference between *šaltĩ* on the one hand and *auksĩniai* on the other. Moreover, it does not really offer an explanation at all because both endings represent the Proto-Indo-European pronominal ending **-oi*.

(2) Unstressed *-ai* versus stressed *-ie*: this rule is strongly supported by *šitai* and *mažĩejai*, but contradicted by endstressed nouns such as *rytaĩ*. Moreover, it does not explain the tonal difference between circumflex *-ai* and acute *-ie*.

(3) Neuter *-ai* versus masculine *-ie*: this rule was disproved by Nieminen in his dissertation (1922).

(4) Unstressed masculine *-ai* versus stressed neuter *-ie*: this is the rule which will be advanced here.

3. It is highly probable that stressed **ai* was monophthongized to **ē* in East Baltic and later diphthongized to *ie* in Lithuanian and eventually in Latvian (cf. Stang 1966: 52–68, Kortlandt 1977: 323–328). It follows that end-stressed nominal forms such as *rytaĩ* must be secondary. The analogical origin of these forms is actually supported by two additional pieces of evidence. Firstly, the stress was regularly retracted from final vowels and diphthongs in late Balto-Slavic times (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 5f., 1977: 322). We therefore expect retraction of the stress from the nom.pl. ending **-oi* in the mobile accent paradigm. Secondly, the Slavic evidence points to retracted stress in the nom.pl. form of the masculine *o*-stems with accentual mobility, e.g. SCr. *vûci* 'wolves'. This accentuation must be ancient¹. It follows that the ending *-ie* as a reflex of **-oi* cannot be original outside monosyllabic pronouns such as *tiě*.

If the accent of *rytaĩ* cannot be old, how did it originate? On the one hand, nouns with mobile stress may have adopted the accent pattern of the adjectives, e.g. *šaltì*, where the ending points to an original stressed diphthong. On the other hand, it is possible that stressed *-aĩ* has replaced a different stressed ending which was characteristic of a part of the nouns with mobile stress and which may have been eliminated at a recent prehistoric stage. Of course, I am thinking of the neuter ending **-aH*, where the final laryngeal blocked the late Balto-Slavic retraction of the stress.

4. What was the fate of the neuter *o*-stems in Balto-Slavic? It has been argued that original stem-stressed neuters became masculines at an early stage while end-stressed neuters preserved distinct endings (cf. Illič-Svityč 1963: 124, Kortlandt 1975: 45). The early date of this development is supported by the agreement of the Prussian material

¹ I withdraw the reasoning of Kortlandt 1975: 43f.

with the Slavic evidence (cf. Kortlandt 1983: 183). When the neuter plural ending **-aH* was replaced by the corresponding masculine endings in stem-stressed paradigms, we arrive at a complementary distribution of nom.pl. endings between unstressed **-oi* in masculine nouns and stressed **-aH* in neuters. Both endings coexisted in monosyllabic pronouns.

It can be demonstrated that the eventual loss of neuter nouns in East Baltic was a recent prehistoric development. The original neuter gender is still reflected in Finnish loan words, e.g. *kauha* 'scoop', *silta* 'bridge', Lith. *káušas*, *tìltas*. The accentuation of Latvian nouns shows that neuters still constituted a distinct category in this language after its separation from Lithuanian (cf. Kortlandt 1982: 5f.). It is therefore reasonable to suppose that they played a part in the morphological development of the East Baltic languages.

5. What is the expected reflex of the plural ending **-aH* in East Baltic? When the neuter pronoun **ta* from PIE. **tod* was disambiguated to nom. *tas* and acc. *tą*, it is a neat possibility that the plural form **taH* was disambiguated to nom. **taHi* and acc. **taHns*, which can be written **tái*, **tâns* after the rise of a broken tone from the laryngeal. The latter form may have contributed to the generalization of the acute tone in the acc. pl. ending of all flexion classes. After the monophthongization of stress **ai* to **ē*, the acute tone of the neuter nom. pl. form **tē* can similarly have spread to the masculine form **tē*, which did not have the regular masculine ending *-ai*. This explains the complementary distribution between pronominal acute *-ie* and nominal circumflex *-ai* in the nom. pl. endings.

The analogical spread of the ending *-ie* did not affect such derived adjectives as Lith. *auksinis* and *jaunùtis*, which have no neuter and no mobile accentuation. The dialectal forms *šítai* and *mažíejai* show that the extension of *-ie* to the unstressed masculine end of the pronoun is a recent development. It is possible that the stressed masculine ending of *rytai* replaced the inherited neuter ending **-íe* shortly before the beginnings of the written tradition.

REFERENCES

Illič-Svityč V.M.

- 1963 Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom: Sud'ba akcentuacionnyx paradigm (Moskva: Izd. AN SSSR).

Kortlandt F.

- 1975 Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology (Lisse: Peter de Ridder).
1977 Historical laws of Baltic accentuation. – *Baltistica*, XIII(2), 319–330.
1982 Innovations which betray archaisms. – *Baltistica*, XVIII(1), 4–9.
1983 On final syllables in Slavic. – *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, XI, 167–185.

Nieminen E.

- 1922 Der urindogermanische Ausgang *-ai* des Nominativ-Akkusativ Pluralis des Neutrums im Baltischen (Helsinki: Finnische Literaturgesellschaft).

Stang C.S.

- 1966 Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget).