

Frederik KORTLANDT

Leiden University

BALTIC \bar{E} -STEMS REVISITED

Abstract. Balto-Slavic \bar{e} -stems represent Proto-Indo-European root nouns, in particular $*dheH_1$ -, and H_1 -stems, especially proterodynamic iH_1 -stems denoting deverbal abstracts, as well as Proto-Balto-Slavic \bar{e} -extensions of root nouns and hysterodynamic iH_2 -stems. In Latin we similarly find PIE root nouns and H_1 -stems, especially proterodynamic iH_1 -stems denoting deverbal abstracts, and hysterodynamic iH_2 -stems denoting denominal abstracts and collectives.

Keywords: Balto-Slavic; Indo-European; historical morphology; \bar{e} -stems.

Elsewhere I have argued for the following types of Baltic \bar{e} -stem (Kortlandt 1997, 162):

- (1) hysterodynamic eH_1 -stems and original root nouns, e.g. Lith. *gìrė* ‘woods’, *žvaigždė* ‘star’, Prussian *umnode* ‘bakehouse’,
- (2) hysterodynamic uH_1 -stems and original root nouns, e.g. Lith. *šlovė* ‘glory’, *vestuvės* ‘wedding’,¹
- (3) hysterodynamic iH_1 -stems, e.g. Lith. *neptė* ‘niece’,
- (4) proterodynamic iH_1 -stems, e.g. Lith. *pióvė* ‘cutting’, Prussian *giwei* ‘life’,
- (5) hysterodynamic iH_2 -stems, e.g. Lith. *vilkė* ‘she-wolf’, Prussian *mealde* ‘lightning’.

Peter Schrijver has identified the following types of \bar{e} -stem in Latin (1991, 390):

- (1) hysterodynamic eH_1 -stems and original root nouns, e.g. *vātēs* ‘prophet’, *spēs* ‘hope’,
- (2) hysterodynamic iH_1 -stem: *neptis* ‘granddaughter’,
- (3) proterodynamic iH_1 -stems, e.g. *aciēs* ‘sharp edge’.

¹ Lith. *gėrvė*, Prussian *gerwe* ‘crane’ is not a proterodynamic uH_1 -stem (thus *l.c.*) but a hysterodynamic uH_2 -stem (cf. Kortlandt 2018).

Schrijver also identified Old Irish *fáith* ‘prophet’ and *méit* ‘quantity’ as original eH_1 -stems (1991, 388) and Latin *socrus* ‘mother-in-law’ as an original uH_1 -stem (1991, 365). He established that iH_2 -stems denote feminines, denominal abstracts and collectives whereas proterodynamic iH_1 -stems denote deverbal abstracts (cf. Kortlandt 2015b, 73–75 on the Slavic correspondences).

Holger Pedersen has argued that Lith. *žvākė* ‘candle’, *meñtė* ‘paddle’, *gìrė* ‘woods’ are original \bar{e} -stems that can be identified with Latin *facēs* ‘torch’ and Vedic *mánthās* ‘churning stick’ and *girís* ‘mountain’ (1926, 60–67). In a recent article (2017), Piwowarczyk rejects this analysis without addressing Pedersen’s arguments, in particular the existence of the derivatives Lith. *girėnas* ‘forester’ and Latin *facētus* ‘clever’. The aspiration in Vedic *mánthās* and *pánthās* with $th < *tH_1$ is also found in the primary 2nd pl. ending *-tha* $< *tH_1e$ corresponding to *-te* in the other Indo-European languages, where a generalization of the secondary ending $*-te$ is improbable.²

Piwowarczyk subscribes to the widespread view that Lith. $-\tilde{e}$ developed from a contraction of $*-i(j)\bar{a}$, which cannot be correct for a number of reasons. First, there is no evidence for such a change. Second, the accent was retracted from a prevocalic $*i$, which was lost, e.g. in Lith. *vandēnis* ‘water-’ $< *i(j)os$, Vedic *udaníyas*. Third, it is unclear why the nom. sg. form in $-\tilde{e}$ should be the only one in the paradigm where the contraction took place. Fourth, Slavic *zemlja* (c) ‘earth’ belongs to accent paradigm (b) in Old Russian, Kajkavian and Old Slovene, which is incompatible with an original $j\bar{a}$ -stem (cf. Kortlandt 2011, 64). It must therefore be identified with Lith. *žėmė* (2) and Prussian *semmė* as an original \bar{e} -stem. Note that \bar{e} -stems became productive in Balto-Slavic by the creation of a nom. sg. form in $*-\bar{e}$ on the basis of the oblique cases of consonant stems, e.g. Lith. *žėmė*, *ùpė*, *sáulė*, *gìlė*, *mùsė*, *pelė*, *gėrvė*, *šlovė*, OPr. *semmė*, *ape*, *saule*, *gile*, *muso*, *peles*, *gerwe*. This also happened in the case of the hysterodynamic iH_2 -stems, e.g. Lith. *vilké*. The circumflex tone of the nom. sg. ending $-\tilde{e}$ resulted from the loss of a laryngeal after the lengthened grade vowel that originated in Proto-Indo-European monosyllables, e.g. $*d^h\bar{e}s < *d^h\bar{e}H_1s < *d^heH_1s$, Lith. *dėš* ‘will put’

² Dr Alexander Lubotsky reminds me that Vedic *pánthās* ‘path’ has no \bar{a} -stem cognates in any Indo-European language, which renders a reconstruction with $*H_2$ instead of $*H_1$ highly unlikely. The same holds for *sphāya-* ‘fatten’, cf. Latin *spēs*, Lith. *spėti*, OCS *spěti*.

(cf. Wackernagel 1896, 66–68; Kortlandt 1985; 2015a; 2015c; 2017a).

Deverbal \bar{e} -stems are frequent in Latin, e.g. *caedēs*, *sēdēs*, *clādēs*, *vātēs*, *compāgēs*, *ambāgēs*, *prōlēs*, *subōlēs*, *struēs*, *luēs*.³ Both sigmatic and asigmatic nominatives are found in Vedic compounds of root nouns, e.g. *śraddhā* ‘trust’ < $*-d^h\bar{e}$, *śraddhās* ‘trustful’, Avestan *mazdā* < $*-dās$, cf. Old English *wōð* ‘song’ and *wōd* ‘mad’ corresponding to Welsh *gwawd* ‘song’ and Irish *fáith* ‘prophet’ (= Latin *vātēs*), reflecting a proterodynamic and a hysterodynamic flexion of the same word. Baltic compounds with $*-d^h\bar{e}$ are frequent, e.g. Lith. *arklìdė*, *avìdė*, *alùdė*, *pelùdė*, also *žvaigždė* ‘star’, OCS *zvězda*, OPr. *umnode* ‘bakehouse’, with the circumflex tone of a monosyllable.

In his brilliant studies of the Elbing Vocabulary, Jules Levin (1973; 1974) has shown that the nom. sg. ending of the proterodynamic and hysterodynamic iH -stems is $-y/i / \bar{i}/$ and $-e / \bar{e}/$, respectively, e.g. *sansy* ‘goose’ versus *mealde* ‘lightning’, Lith. *patì* < $*-i\bar{?}$ vs. *vìlkė* < $*-i\bar{?}\bar{e}$, OCS *bogynji* vs. *mlbnii*. At the end of the East Baltic period, the accent was retracted in the hysterodynamic paradigm, yielding metatony in the preceding syllable and loss of the prevocalic $*i$. The reflexes $*-\bar{e}$ < $*-i\bar{e}$ in East Baltic and $-ii$ < $*-i\bar{e}$ in Slavic presuppose a Balto-Slavic nom. sg. form in $*-i\bar{?}\bar{e}$, with full grade $*-\bar{e}$ from the simple \bar{e} -stems (cf. Pedersen 1926, 58; Schrijver 1991, 387) and raising of the final $*-\bar{e}$ to $*-\bar{i}$ in Early Slavic, as in OCS *mati*, Lith. *mótė*. When the hysterodynamic paradigm adopted the circumflex nom. sg. ending of the earlier \bar{e} -stems, it still had gen. sg. $*-i\bar{?}es$ and acc. sg. $*-ei\bar{?}m$, preserved in OPr. *warein* (2×) ‘power’, with the same vocalism as in OCS acc. sg. *svėkrovь* ‘mother-in-law’ < $*-euHm$ (cf. Rozwadowski 1914, 14–18; Kortlandt 1997, 160–162). This is the origin of the hysterodynamic feminine adjectives in $-\bar{e}$, e.g. Lith. *dìdelė*, *gerèsnė*, *vidurìnė*, *auksìnė*, *mažùtė*, as opposed to the proterodynamic feminine paradigm of the u -stems, e.g. *lýgi*, *brangì*, *platì*. Proterodynamic feminines were originally derived from athematic stems, e.g. OPr. *sansy*, Lith. *patì*, and hysterodynamic feminines from thematic stems, e.g. *vìlkė* from *vìlkas* (cf. Fellner 2014, 70f.; Kortlandt 2017b). In Latin, the acc. sg. ending $*-eiHm$ of the hysterodynamic iH_2 -stems yielded $*-\bar{e}m$ < $*-eim$ (cf. *trēs* < $*treies$) because the final nasal became syllabic after the double consonant, as in the 1st sg. thematic optative ending Vedic $-eyam$,

³ The derivation of Latin *caedēs* ‘killing’, *sēdēs* ‘seat’ etc. from pluralia tantum (Piwowarczyk 2017, 253) is highly unlikely.

Greek $-οια$, Gothic $-au < *-oiHm$. This gave rise to the Latin $i\bar{e}/i\bar{a}$ -flexion of $m\bar{a}teri\bar{e}s$, gen. dat. $m\bar{a}teria\bar{e}$.

I conclude that Balto-Slavic \bar{e} -stems represent Proto-Indo-European root nouns, in particular $*d^heH_1-$, and H_1 -stems, especially proterodynamic iH_1 -stems denoting deverbals, as well as Proto-Balto-Slavic \bar{e} -extensions of root nouns and hysterodynamic iH_2 -stems. In Slavic, \bar{e} -stems are mostly continued as \bar{a} -stems, e.g. OCS *zvězda* ‘star’, *gora* ‘mountain’. In Latin we similarly find PIE root nouns and H_1 -stems, especially proterodynamic iH_1 -stems denoting deverbals, and hysterodynamic iH_2 -stems denoting denominal abstracts and collectives. Piwowarczyk’s idea that H_1 -stems and H_2 -stems would be functionally equivalent (2017, 253, 259) is simply mistaken. For early Proto-Indo-European we can reconstruct $*-H_2$ for collectives, $*-iH_2$ for possessives (cf. Kortlandt 2017b), and $*-H_1$ for verbal nouns that were incorporated in the flexional system as \bar{e} -preterits, e.g. Lith. *vėdė* ‘led’ (cf. Kortlandt 2007, 84).

DAR KARTĄ APIE BALŲ \bar{e} KAMIENUS

Santrauka

Baltų-slavų \bar{e} kamienai reprezentuoja ide. šakninius daiktavardžius, visų pirma $*d^heH_1-$, ir H_1 kamienus, ypač proterodinaminis iH_1 kamienus, žyminčius veiksmožodinius abstraktus, taip pat baltų-slavų \bar{e} plėtinis iš šakninių daiktavardžių ir histerodinaminių iH_2 kamienų. Lotynų kalboje panašiai randami ide. šakniniai daiktavardžiai ir H_1 kamienai, ypač proterodinaminiai iH_1 kamienai, žymintys veiksmožodinius abstraktus, taip pat histerodinaminiai iH_2 kamienai, žymintys vardažodinius abstraktus ir kolektyvus.

REFERENCES

- Fellner, Hannes A. 2014, Das Femininum der thematischen Adjektiva im Tocharischen, in Norbert Oettinger, Thomas Steer (eds.), *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 65–77.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 1985, Long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 21(2), 112–124.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 1997, Baltic \bar{e} - and $\bar{i}/\bar{j}\bar{a}$ -stems, *Baltistica* 32(2), 157–163.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2007, *Italo-Celtic Origins and Prehistoric Development of the Irish Language* (= *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 14), Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2011, *Selected Writings on Slavic and General Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 39), Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2015a, Sigmatic and asigmatic long vowel preterit forms, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 43, 236–242.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2015b, Proto-Slavic *j, Van Wijk's law, and ē-stems, *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 41(1), 65–76.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2015c, Tocharian ē-grade verb forms, *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 16, 51–59.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2017a, What is Stang's law?, *Baltistica* 52(1), 73–80.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2017b, On the origin of grammatical gender, *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 18, 95–104.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2018, The Balto-Slavic word for 'crane' and its cognates, *Baltistica* 53(1), 113–115.

Levin, Jules Fred 1973, -jā-stems and -ē-stems in the Elbing Vocabulary, in Arvids Ziedonis, Jaan Puhvel, Rimvydas Šilbajoris, Mardi Valgemae (eds.), *Baltic Literature and Linguistics*, Columbus: Ohio State University, 189–196.

Levin, Jules Fred 1974, *The Slavic Element in the Old Prussian Elbing Vocabulary*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pedersen, Holger 1926, *La cinquième déclinaison latine*, København: Host & Son.

Piowarczyk, Dariusz R. 2017, The Latin fifth declension and the Baltic ē-stems, *Baltistica* 52(2), 247–263.

Rozwadowski, Jan 1914, Przyczyunki do historycznej fonetyki języków słowiańskich, *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 7, 9–21.

Schrijver, Peter 1991, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin* (= *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 2), Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Wackernagel, Jakob 1896, *Altindische Grammatik* 1: *Lautlehre*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Frederik KORTLANDT

Leiden University

Cobetstraat 24

NL-2313 KC Leiden

The Netherlands

[f.kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl]