

Rick DERKSEN

Leiden

THE ACCENTUATION OF LATVIAN CURONIANISMS

Abstract. Illič-Svityč's reconstruction of the Curonian prosodic system is based on a less than comprehensive study of Latvian Curonianisms. Pronk uncritically endorses Illič-Svityč's conclusions in an article on Curonian accentuation which is an accumulation of hypotheses involving language contact. Purely typological considerations do not suffice to attribute the West Latvian merger of the broken and falling tones to a Curonian substrate.

Keywords: Curonian; Latvian; Žemaitian; accentology; language contact.

1. Introduction

In studying the subject of metatony in the East Baltic languages (see, for example, Derksen 1996), one is inevitably confronted with so-called Curonianisms, words that are assumed to originate from the language of the Curonian tribe. The Curonianisms mentioned in the above publication are without exception Latvian forms that contain a sequence *Vn* before consonant, which does not occur in inherited Latvian forms, not counting the effects of syncope. I decided to treat these forms in the same way as suspected borrowings from Lithuanian,¹ which meant that they were immaterial to the problem of metatony. With respect to the accentuation of these forms, I gradually got the impression that the sustained tone was disproportionately represented.² My statement “the sustained tone is regular” (Derksen 1996, 264) is certainly a step too far, however. Clearly, this is a topic that warrants further research.

¹ Note that in ME a considerable number of forms are considered to be either a Curonianism or a Lithuanianism.

² Partly this a consequence of the fact that most Curonianisms are mentioned within the context of *métatonie rude*, as due to the merger of the the falling and the broken tone there are no West Latvian forms that unambiguously point to a circumflex.

It so happens that Tijmen Pronk has devoted an article to Curonian accentuation (Pronk 2017), in which he endorses several hypotheses that are hard to falsify, such as that the rise of the West Latvian system with two tones – a sustained tone and a broken tone – must be attributed to a Curonian substrate. The scant data that are adduced in support of this claim have been adopted from an article by Illič-Svityč (1964, 25), who had already suggested that Curonian had a system with a sustained and a broken tone, as Pronk acknowledges (2017, 662). On the other hand, the fact that Illič-Svityč (*l.c.*) had also linked the rise of the West Latvian system with two tones from a Proto-Latvian system with three tones to a Curonian substrate is not explicitly stated, possibly because it would be highly unlikely that Illič-Svityč had failed to make the connection. In any case, Pronk’s section on Latvian does not contain any fundamental additions to what Illič-Svityč had to say, where a critical evaluation of the evidence provided by the latter would have been appropriate, as I shall try to demonstrate.

Since it is difficult to establish whether a Latvian word is of Curonian origin, it makes sense to study the tonal characteristics of a category of forms that exhibit formal characteristics associated with a Curonian substrate, such as the retention of a sequence *Vn* before a consonant. To my mind, Pronk gives a somewhat misleading impression of the nature of Illič-Svityč’s study when he states that the latter “collected Latvian dialect words which preserved tautosyllabic *-an-* or *-en-*” (Pronk 2017, 661).³ The relevant data, which are far more numerous than those mentioned in Illič-Svityč’s article, were readily available in publications by Bielenstein (1863, 144–148), Būga (1924, lxxxix–cxxxiii = RR 3, 156–251), Endzelīns (1912; 1913–1914), Plāķis (1928), and Kiparsky (1939),⁴ not to mention the fact that one could simply leaf through the dictionary of Mühlenbach and Endzelīns (ME) and its supplement (EH). The term “selected” would therefore have been more apt. Furthermore, it seems to me that in order to be able to assess the evidence it is necessary to establish the geographical distribution of the lexical item and to rule out the possibility that the form was borrowed from a different source. In this respect, too, much work had already been done. Plāķis (1928), for

³ There is no reason to exclude *inC* and *unC*, but Illič-Svityč’s list only mentions *dziņtars*.

⁴ All these publications are referred to by Illič-Svityč (1964, 24fn.), with the exception of Plāķis 1928.

instance, is specifically directed against the view that all words containing the sequence vowel plus tautosyllabic *n* are Curonianisms, cf. Endzelīns (1913–1914, 101). In view of his usual thoroughness, I suspect that Illič-Svityč’s idea only occurred to him when he was finishing his article on North Baltic accentuation, of which hardly more than a single page is devoted to Curonian.

2. The evidence

2.1. Illič-Svityč’s examples

Pronk (2017, 662), omitting *laņka*, presents a simplified and not always accurate version of Illič-Svityč’s list. In the following I shall reproduce Illič-Svityč’s examples (in translation), while providing them with comments. The first eleven nouns are assumed to continue a Proto-Baltic circumflex root.

1. “Latv. dial. *beņdrs* (sic) ‘comrade’ < Blt. **beņdras* (Lith. *beņdras*, Latv. *biedrs*)”

According to ME (1, 279), *bęņdrs* ‘peer, companion, partner’ is “eine weit verbreitete [wohl kurische] Nebenform von *biedrs*”. EH (1, 222) mentions attestations in Kabillen and Sackenhausen, both in Kurzeme. Karulis (1992 1, 125), referring to Blese’s edition (Blese 1936, 31), notes that the forms also occur in the lexicon by Johannes Langius (1685), who was a pastor in Ober- and Nieder-Bartau in lower Kurzeme. Jakob Lange (1773, 53, 55) apparently regards *bendris* as an originally Lithuanian variant of *beedris* ‘Mitgenosse, Geselle’.

2. “Latv. dial. *meņte* ‘stirring stick’ < Blt. **meņtē* (Lith. *meņtė*, Latv. *mieturis*)”

The sustained tone of Latv. *meņte*, which incidentally belongs to the literary language, is attested in the area with three tones (e.g. in Ermes, Serbigal, Trikaten) as well as in West Latvian. Moreover, the East Latvian variant *mēnte*² is widely recorded (ME 2, 601; EH 1, 800). The meanings presented in ME, viz. ‘ein Rühr-, Maischholz, eine Rührschaufel zum umrühren dickflüssiger Dinge; eine flache Holzschaufel als Ruder; eine kleine Holzschaufel zum Kartoffelgraben; Maurerkelle’ all reappear in Lithuanian.⁵ The regular development **ment-* > *miet-* is found in *mieturis* [iē, iē̃, iē̂², iē²]

⁵ Here and elsewhere in this article the Lithuanian data stem from the LKŽ^o (the electronic version of the LKŽ) unless stated otherwise.

or *mieturs* ‘der Quirl, das Maischholz, das Butterholz’, which has a Lithuanian counterpart *mentūris*. As a designation for a churn staff, the latter noun is particularly frequent in the northern part of the East Aukštaitian territory (cf. LKA 1, map 71). For the Latvian variant *mēnturis*, ME (2, 602) and EH (1, 801) only mention attestations in Adsel in Zemgale and Waddaxt in East Vidzeme. Since Waddaxt belongs to the High Latvian dialect area, the sustained tone of the lemma probably does not apply to this particular attestation.

In Indo-European studies Lith. *meñtē* 2 (*mentē* 4) became a familiar form when Pedersen (1926, 64) compared this noun directly with Skt. *mānthā-* f. ‘churning stick’, giving rise to the reconstruction of a PIE *eh₁-* stem (cf. Schrijver 1991, 370; ALEW, 634). It is also possible to regard the forms as a recent deverbative of *męsti* ‘mix flour with water’ (Smoczyński 2018, 782). ME (2, 600) and Fraenkel (LEW 1, 437) consider Latv. *meñte* to be a borrowing from Lithuanian or Curonian. Smoczyński only mentions the inherited Latvian forms.

3. “Latv. dial. *krañts* ‘bank’ < Blt. **krañtas* (Lith. *krañtas*)”

The form *krañts* ‘shore, bank, steep slope’ is predominantly attested in former Curonian territory⁶ (ME 2, 259; EH 1, 642). The variant *krañte* is also found in Groß-Sessau (E. Zemgale) and *krànte*² in Bersohn (SE Vidzeme). There appears to be a rare form *kruota* ‘die Scheidelinie zwischen dem Uferabhang und der ebenen Fläche; der obere Rand eines Gebirges (aus der Ferne gesehen)’, which in ME (2, 295) is followed by the remark “P. Rozītis, der Autor dieser Belege, habe dies Wort aus dem Volksmunde nicht gehört”. The toponyms *Krote*, *Krotis*, and *Krotiņi* (all with *uô*²) seem to support the authenticity of *kruota* (Karulis 1992 1, 418).

The accentuation of Lith. *krantas* and its morphological variants, e.g. *krañtas* 2/4, *krantà* 2 vs. *krántas* 1, *kránta* 1, *krántē* 1, *krántis*, makes it difficult to determine the original tone of the root (Derksen 1996, 253, 271). The

⁶ My concept of the former Curonian territory is based on the isogloss marking the dialects with a Curonian substrate on map 1 of the LVDA. The isogloss does not coincide with the border between Kurzeme and Zemgale. On the one hand, a part of northwest Zemgale belongs to the dialect area with a Curonian substrate and, on the other hand, a part of southeast Kurzeme does not. Rudzīte (1964, 408–409) also excludes the Zemgallian dialects that are spoken in southwest Kurzeme. Endzelīns (1970, 7) assumes that the Curonians also settled in Vidzeme in significant numbers.

Latvian forms are considered to be borrowings from Lithuanian or Curonian (cf. ALEW, 518–519).

4. “Latv. dial. *gañdrs* ‘stork’ < Blt. **gañdras* (Lith. *gañdras*)”

As was already observed by Endzelīns (ME 1, 599), *gandrs* and *gandris* occur exclusively along the Lithuanian border and are therefore best regarded as borrowings from Lithuanian (thus also LEW 1, 133; ALEW, 292; Smoczyński 2018, 311). The distribution of the noun has been visualized in the Latvian dialect atlas (LVDA 1, 96, map 36), which includes the word for ‘stork’. With the exception of *gañdris*² (Groß-Essern), the accented forms are *gañdrs* or *gañdris*. Lith. *gañdras* is attested with AP 2 and 4.

5. “Latv. *dziñtars* ‘amber’ < Blt. **giñtaras* (Žem. *giñtaras*)”⁷

Though *dziñtars* is the Standard Latvian word for ‘amber’, there is a plethora of attestations suggesting that *dziñtars* was originally West Latvian (cf. ME 1, 552; EH 1, 359; Endzelīns 1913–1914, 98). Kiparsky (1939, 452), basing himself on ME only, states that it is exclusively found on former Curonian territory, but this is disproved by attestations in Lesten and Granteln in Zemgale as well as in Hohenbergen and Kortenhof in Vidzeme (Endzelīns 1913–1914, 98). One could add Groß-Essern and Alt-Schwarden, which are located in southeast Kurzeme but supposedly do not belong to the area with a Curonian substrate (see fn. 6). The evidence for a West Latvian origin of *dziñtars* (also *dzinteris*) is overwhelming, however. Moreover, it appears that forms with \bar{i} < **in* are rarely found on former Curonian territory. We do find *dzītars* in the Tamian dialect of Kandau and *zītars* in Hasenpot (lower Kurzeme), but *zītars* is abundantly attested in Vidzeme and the Central Latvian dialects of Zemgale, both in the area with three tones (here we also find *zīters*) and in areas where the sustained tone is part of a system with a conflated broken tone. Besides, we find *zītars*² (Meselau) and *zīteris*² (Bersohn, Gologowski, Kauliņš from Saussen, Marienburg) in High Latvian dialects.⁸ This means that with respect to the tone of the root there is in this case no discrepancy between forms with a retained tautosyllabic nasal and forms that show the regular Latvian development. Latvian offers no evidence for an East Baltic circumflex root.

⁷ Illič-Svityč (1964, 25) mentions Aukštaitian *gintāras* and Latv. dial. *dzītars* in a footnote.

⁸ On the elusive variation between *dz* and *z*, see Endzelīns 1905.

6. “Latv. dial. *laņktis* pl. ‘reel’ < Blt. **laņktis* (Lith. *laņktis*, -čio)”

Alongside the plural nouns *laņktis*, *lanktes*, and *lanktas* ‘die Garnwinde, Garnhaspel’, we find the singular forms *laņkte* and *lanktis* m. (ME 2, 421; EH 1, 719–720). The attestations are not limited to the former Curonian area. In Lithuanian, we find *laņktis* 2 and *lánktis* 1. Since the root is the same as in Lith. *leņkti*, Latv. *liekt* ‘bend, curve’, cf. Opr. *lanctis* ‘oven fork’, the variant with an acute root must be metatonical.⁹ There is a Latvian noun *luoki* pl. ‘die Haspel’ (ME 2, 525), but no regular Latvian counterpart with a *t*-suffix.

7. “Latv. *laņka* ‘marshy meadow’ < Blt. **laņkā* (Lith. *lankà* 2/4)”

This is another derivative of **leņk-* ‘bend’. Judging by the quite numerous data in ME and EH, the attestations of *laņka* seem confined to Kurzeme and Zemgale. Plāķis (1928, 76–77) mentions a few examples from Vidzeme, however. According to the LKŽ^e, Lith. *lankà* only occurs with AP 4, but Illič-Svityč (1963, 105) posits AP 2 on the basis of the East Aukštaitian illative forms *luņkon*, *luņkān* from the Kupiškis and Ciskodas¹⁰ regions. An originally barytone *ā*-stem with a non-acute root would correspond to **lōkā* (b) in Slavic. A semantically similar case is Latv. *daņga* (see below).

8. “Latv. dial. *leņta* ‘plank’ < Blt. **lentā*, **leņtan* (Lith. *lentà* 4)”

The form *leņta*¹¹ (Rutzau) has no “genuine” Latvian counterpart. Ulman n (1872, 142) regards the variant *lente* as Tamian. According to ME (1, 451), we are dealing with either a Curonianism or a borrowing from Lithuanian (thus also Smoczyński 2018, 688).

9. “Latv. dial. *baņda* ‘livestock’ < Blt. **bandā*, **baņdan* (Lith. *bandà* 4 ‘herd’)”

ME (1, 261–262) has *baņda* (also *baņds*), which usually occurs in the plural. This word means ‘das dem Knechte vom Wirte als Lohn zugeteilte Stück Feld oder die Aussaat darauf; das Nebengewerbe, Nebenverdienst; Gewinn, Geschäft, Profit’. The source of the meaning ‘livestock’ (Ru. *skot*), which Illič-Svityč attributes to *baņda*, is unclear to me. Lith. *bandà* 2/4

⁹ For my interpretation of the phenomenon of metatony, see Derksen 1996, 1. In my theoretical framework Balto-Slavic roots are either acute or non-acute, depending on their structure (cf. Kortlandt 1985; 1998). A brief discussion of alternative views can be found in Derksen 2020.

¹⁰ Ciskodas is Ciskādi in Latgale.

¹¹ Pronk has *leņta*, which error must have a technical background.

means ‘cattle, herd of cattle’, but the LKŽ^c also has an entry *bandà* 4 that is attested with meanings corresponding to those found for Latv. *bañda*, e.g. ‘payment in kind for a farmhand, additional income’. ME (*l.c.*) states that the Latvian form is a borrowing from Lithuanian or a Curonianism (thus Būga 1923, 116; ALEW, 93; cf. also Kiparsky 1939, 453), but Smoczyński (2018, 95), who mentions the Polish dialect form *bonda* ‘the sowing of grain on someone else’s land in return for a portion of the crops’, apparently only considers the former option (cf. Būga RR 3, 664). The distribution of the Latvian noun is not particularly suggestive of Curonian origin, e.g. *bañda(s)* (Baldohn, Drostenhof, and Ronneburg in Vidzeme), *bàndas*² (Kaltenbrunn in Latgale).

10. “Latv. *bañga* ‘wave’ < Blt. **bangá*, **bañgan* (Lith. *bangà* 4)”

Latv. *bañga* ‘wave, (pl.) breakers, downpour, mass, throng, cloud’ has a Lithuanian counterpart *bangà* 4, which occurs alongside *bañgas* 4. The inherited form *buoga* (also *buôgs*²) means ‘flock, group’, but is also attested with the specific meaning ‘ein mit Gestrüpp, Wald bewachsener Platz im Felde, eine (rundliche) Baumgruppe’ (ME 1, 362). Not much can be said about the original distribution of the form *bañga*, which belongs to the Standard Latvian lexicon. In any case its occurrence is not limited to the former Curonian territory, cf. *bañga* ‘die Schar’ (Schibbenhof in Zemgale), *bañga* (Ronneburg), *bañgas* (Drostenhof) ‘tall waves’ (Būga 1923, 115–119, cf. Derksen 1996, 234). This word is usually regarded as a Curonianism or a Lithuanianism (cf. LEW 1, 34; Young 2008, 211fn.).

11. “Latv. dial. *ceñkle* ‘hollow of the knee’ < Blt. **kenklẽ*, **keñklen* (Lith. *kenklẽ* 4)”

This may be an originally circumflex root, but the evidence is not unambiguous (Derksen 1996, 193), cf. Lith. *kinka* ‘thigh, haunch, hollow of the knee’, Latv. *ciñca* (Naukschen in Vidzeme), *ciñcis* (Rujen in Vidzeme) ‘die Wade an Menschen und Tieren’ (ME 1, 384). In ME (1, 372) the meaning of *ceñkle* and *ceñklis* is given as ‘der Schenkel, das Bein’, but we also find *ceñksle* ‘die Sehne unter der Kniebeugung, (pl.) die Füße, das Bein’, which has an accentual variant *ceñksle*² ‘Kniekehle’ in Katzdangen in Kurzeme (ME 1, 372). The roots *cenk-* and *cink-* are not limited to the former Curonian territory, cf. also *ciñkslis* (Drostenhof) ‘die starke Sehne in der Kniebeugung’ (Būga 1923, 138).

Then there are five nouns that according to Illič-Svityč contain a Proto-Baltic acute root.

12. “Latv. *skraņdas* pl. ‘rags’, *skraņda*, *skrānda*² < Blt. **skrāndā* (Lith. *skrānda* 1)”

I consider it likely that Illič-Svityč accidentally omitted the ² of *skraņdas*², a form which (alongside *aņ*) has been recorded in Dunika (ME 2, 886; EH 1, 507) and Rutzau (Plāķis 1928, 82). Pronk fails to mention the High Latvian form *skrānda*², which is abundantly attested. We are probably dealing with an acute root, cf. Lith. *skrānda* 1 [1/3], *skrāndas* 1/3 ‘hide, fur, (worn out) fur coat’. The circumflex of *skrēsti* (*skrēsta*, *skreņdo*) ‘become worn out’ may be metatonical in a verb of this type (cf. Derksen 2011a, 36–37). I do not understand why Smoczyński (2018, 1209) calls *nuoskrendis* ‘worn out’ (ME 2, 848; EH 2, 86, with *eņ* in Dunika) a native Latvian form but *skrandas* pl. a borrowing from Curonian.

13. “Latv. *spraņds*², *spraņds* ‘back of the head’ < Blt. **sprāndas* (Lith. *sprāndas* 3)”

Both the sustained tone and the conflated broken tone are well attested. This holds also true for the synonymous *spraņda*² and *spraņda* (ME 3, 210; EH 2, 556; ĒIV 3, 416). In addition, we find *sprānda*² (Saikava in E. Vidzeme). The sustained tone also occurs in the area with three tones, e.g. *spraņda* (Drostenhof, Ērģeme), and the forms with a conflated broken tone are not limited to Kurzeme, e.g. *spraņds*² (Bershof, Schwitten, Siuxt in Zemgale). The acute of the root seems solid, cf. Lith. *sprāndas* 3 ‘nape, back of the neck’ and probably Lith. *sprēsti*, Latv. *sprīest* ‘tighten, stretch’.

14. “Latv. *braņgs*², *braņgs* ‘portly, fat’ < Blt. **brāngus* (Lith. dial. *brāngus* 1, Lith. *brangùs* 3 ‘dear, expensive’)”

This adjective is interesting for various reasons. First, there are numerous accentual data, which enables us to establish a geographical distribution. Second, its meaning is “in Livl. im allg. prächtig, herrlich, vortrefflich, fett, korpulent, in Kurland aber ziemlich gut, angehend” (ME 1, 324). Third, the secondary variant *brēņgs* may throw light on the spread of this word across Latvia. Vanags 2004, which is a comprehensive attempt to trace the origin of Latv. *braņgs*, does not discuss the accentual evidence, presumably because it does not seem to add much. His article includes a detailed map, however,

which complements the data in ME (1, 323–324) and EH (1, 237). It appears that *braņgs*² is predominant in the former Curonian territory, while *braņgs* mainly occurs in Zemgale and the southern part of Vidzeme. The variant *brēņgs*, which arose from *a > e/ε* before or after *r*, is predominant in the other dialects of Vidzeme, insofar as they belong to the Central dialect, for instance in Ērgeme (ĒIV 1, 185). The well-documented High Latvian variant *brāņgs*² is actually either a normalization of a form corresponding to *brēņgs* (ME 1, 323; Vanags 2004, 235), which suggests lexical diffusion from west to east, or represents a recent borrowing from the literary language (Vanags 2004, *ibid.*). The oldest and in fact the only occurrence in one of the older Latvian dictionaries is *brangs* ‘prächtig, prangend’ (Stender 1789, 27). Most folksongs in which *brangs* occurs are from Vidzeme (Vanags 2004, 237–238). Interestingly, we find *bra’ηâ* ‘recht gut, recht fett; stramm’ (with broken tone) in Courland Livonian and *brāng* ‘gemästet’ in Salaca Livonian (Kettunen 1938, 28, 30; cf. Vanags 2004, 238).

The Lithuanian counterpart of the Latvian etymon under discussion is *brangùs* 3 (*brāngus* 1/3). Vanags considers a borrowing from Lithuanian less likely than Curonian origin because the Latvian forms seem to be more archaic semantically and because they do not reflect the characteristic developments of **anC* in East Lithuanian and Žemaitian. I find it hard to accept that in general Latvian words containing a sequence *anC* cannot have been borrowed from Lithuanian (cf. *gañdras* above), but I concede that *brangs* is a plausible example of a Curonianism. As an alternative, Vanags (2004, 238–239) suggests a relatively late borrowing from Middle Low German, cf. MLG *wrange* ‘bitter’, MoDu. *wrang* ‘astringent, sour’. His hypothesis presupposes that there once was a Low German form that was semantically similar to West Flemish *wrang* ‘strong and tough, tireless, persevering in strength and diligence’, whose meaning can be traced to De Bo 1877 (1355) and which is supported by *wranck* ‘perservering, fearless’ (Verwijs, Verdam 1925, 2851) in a chronicle by Nicolaas Despars (1533–1597).

15. “Latv. dial. *meņce* ‘cod’ < Blt. **menkē* (Lith. *mėnkė* 1)”

Nearly all attestations of *męñca*, *meņce*, *meñcis*, and *męñcs* in ME (2, 601) and EH (1, 800) stem from Kurzeme. This is in agreement with the material in Endzelīns 1913–1914 (99). The acute of Lith. *mėnkė* may very well be metatonical (cf. Derksen 1996, 199).

16. “Latv. dial. *spānda* ‘part of a plough’ < **spāndā* (Lith. dial. *spānda* 1, Lith. *spandà* 3 ‘support’)”

Lith. *spānda* 1, *spandà* 3/4 ‘support, pole’, which according to the DLKŽ is an East Lithuanian and Dzukish form, cannot be separated from *spāndyti* ‘set a trap, catch in a trap or net, support, squeeze’ and *spėsti* ‘set a trap, catch in a trap or net’. These verbs appear to be cognate with Latv. *spīest* ‘press, squeeze, compel, catch’ and *spuōsts* ‘trap, snare, cage’. Compared with the Lithuanian noun, Latv. *spānda* ‘das Band, das Pflugschar und Femern zusammenhält; das Eisen, das den Pflug zusammenhält’, *spāndas* pl. ‘eiserne Bänder, womit die Pfluggabel an die Femern angehängt ist’ (ME 3, 984) is more isolated. In addition to the preservation of the sequence *anC*, this may serve as an argument for the assumption that we are dealing with a borrowing. Endzelīns regards the word as a Lithuanianism or a Curonianism, provided that it is of Baltic origin. Note that *spanda* is not limited to West Latvia, cf. *spānda(s)*² in Groß-Buschhof, Saussen, and Kalupe (ME 3, 984; EH 2, 547; KIV 2, 423).

2.2. Additional examples

Before evaluating the evidence that we have just discussed (see 2.5. below), I would like to present a few more etyma that may be relevant to our topic. As I have said above, many Latvian words containing a sequence *VnC* have been labelled as possible Curonianisms, so I shall confine myself to a number of promising instances. A form such as *ceņtrs*² ‘barsch, streng, unfreundlich’, for instance, may very well be a Curonianism, but there is not much that we can say about its origin.

1. *daņa* ‘eine durchs Fahren entstandene Gruft, Grube [also with *ān*²]; die Ecke; ein Gang (Korridor) in einem Gebäude und auch im Walde; eine freie (waldlose) Fläche, eine solche Wiese, Stubenmitte’, *dāngas*² pl. (Mar.) ‘unebene Stelle’ (ME 1, 437; EH 1, 306–307). I have only found attestations without a tone for the meanings ‘die schräge Schleuderstelle auf dem Winterwege’, ‘ein Stück Land, das von drei Seiten von Morast oder Wasser umgeben ist’, and ‘die Bucht eines Sees’.

In my view, we are dealing here with a circumflex Balto-Slavic root **deng-* ‘bend’, cf. Lith. *dangà* 4 [1/4] ‘cover’, Ru. *dugá* ‘arc, arch’ < PSl. **dōgà* (b) (Derksen 2015, 114; cf. Petit 2021). Since *daņa* is not an inherited Latvian form, it is no use considering it a possible instance of *métatonie rude*, comparable to the Lithuanian variant *dānga*. Latv. *danga* ‘eine kotige Pfütze; weiches, morastiges Land; Meeresschlamm’ may be the same etymon

(Derksen 2015, 529–530). It is possible that *danga* ‘Ecke’ is limited to the former Curonian area, but there are many attestations of *danga* in other areas (cf. Plāķis 1928, 71), as is shown by the variant *dānga*². The sustained tone is also found in the area with three tones. A conflated broken tone is recorded in *daŋga*² ‘Radfelge’ (Kalleten), a form which occurs alongside *daŋgs*² (also in Ober- and Nieder-Bartau, Rutzau, *daŋgs* in Grobin and Rutzau) and *dañdzis* (Dondangen, Wandsen, (*an*) Sassmacken) ‘der Kranz, die aus einem Stück bestehende Radfelge’ (ME 1, 437).

2. *vaŋga* ‘eine niedrig gelegene, feuchte Wiese mit hohem Gras’ (Adiamünde), ‘ein Flussheuschlag (Heuschlag am Fluss)’ (Goldingen, Salis), ‘Heuschlag od. Sumpf an einem Fluss’ (Lemsal). The nasal also appears in Salaca Livonian *vaŋga* ‘Bachwiese’, South Estonian *vang* ‘meadow in the bend of a river’ (cf. Pajusalu et al. 2009, 293; Vaba 2014, 183–184). Cognate forms showing the regular Latvian development to *uo* may be *uôdzīte* ‘ein kleiner Bach’ (Përse, Selburg); eine sumpfige Stelle im Walde’, *Ûodze*² river-name (ME 4, 213).

It seems obvious that *vaŋga* is the same etymon as OLith. *vangà* ‘farmland, field’ and OPr. *wangus* (EV) ‘Dameraw’ (Prussian German *dameraw* ‘schlecht bestandener Eichenwald, halb ausgerodete Waldfläche mit jungen Eichen’, cf. Ziesemer 1935–1944 2, 12), particularly in view of the onomastic data (cf. Smoczyński 2018, 1603). In this case, too, it has been assumed that the original meaning of the root is ‘bend’, cf. ME 4, 413; Mažiulis PKEŽ 4, 219–220. The same root may be found in Lith. *vėngti* ‘avoid, evade’, *vėngis* ‘turn, bend, detour’, cf. Smoczyński 2018, 1633, 1669; ALEW, 1216f. LIV² (682) tentatively posits PIE **ueng-* ‘(sich) krümmen’ and compares OHG *winken* ‘wink’. Kroonen reconstructs a North European etymon **uōng^h-o-* > PGmc. **wanga-* m., e.g. Go. *waggs* m. ‘meadow, park, paradise’, Oic. *vangr* m. ‘field’, OHG *holz-wanga* Npl? ‘wooded area’ (Kroonen 2013, 573).

3. The word *balanda* ‘goosefoot, saltbush’ belongs to the literary language. According to Karulis (1992 1, 99), the form originates from the Curonian area. Judging by the data in ME (2, 253), EH (1, 200), and KIV (1, 164), dialect forms with regular *uo* are attested in East Latvian, usually with broken tone, e.g. *baluôdene* (Marienburg, Wessen), *baluôdine* (Kalupe). A variant *baluodene*² occurs in Sonnaxt. The forms with retained *an* have either sustained tone or conflated broken tone, e.g. *balañda* (Ronneburg, Alt-Pebalg, Ramkau, Siuxt), *balañda*² (Kandau, Iwanden), *balañde*² (Dunika), *balañde* (Grobin, Seyershof). Here the forms with *añ*² seem to be limited to

the originally Curonian territory. With the exception of Grobin, forms with *aĩ* are found in Vidzeme and Zemgale. Lithuanian has *balánda*. Of course, we must take into account that we are dealing with a suffix syllable here (cf. Endzelĩns 1922, 27–29), but the etymon is interesting all the same.

4. According to Kiparsky (1939, 453), *lāncīt* ‘das Netz aus dem Wasser heben’ only occurs outside the Old Curonian area. ME (2, 419) mentions *lāncīt* ‘das Netz aus dem Wasser hervorheben, etc. (Lasdohn), eine Strecke mit Mühe ablegen (Smiltene)’. Since *laĩcīt*² ‘besuchen’ (Rutzau, Nidden), *laĩcītĩs*² (Nigranden, Kalleten, Nieder-Bartau) ‘ausweichen’ (EH 1, 719) probably contains the same root **laĩk-*, cf. Lith. *lankýti* ‘visit, (dial.) bend’, Latv. *lūocīt* ‘bend, bow’, this seems incorrect. If we are dealing with a Curonianism, as suggested by Endzelĩns, this is a case where we do not find *aĩ* as the reflex of a circumflex semi-diphthong.

5. In the case of *vendzele* ‘burbot’, the *n* seems to be secondary, as the regular form is *vēdzele*, Lith. *vėgėlė* 3^a, *vėgėlė* 2. Owing to the fact that this word occurs in the LVDA (1, 94–96, map 35), we can state with confidence that *vendzele* is abundantly attested and restricted to the former Curonian territory. Endzelĩns (ME 4, 550) attempts to derive both *vėg-* and *veng-* from a root meaning ‘moist’, which is formally unproblematic for *vėg-* < PIE **ueg^{w-}* (Winter’s law), cf. OIc. *vogr*, MDu. *wak* ‘moist’, but in the case of *veng-* would require dissimilation from **velg-*, cf. Latv. *vēļgs* ‘moist’. Moreover, the meaning ‘moist’ rather than ‘slimy, slippery’ *vel* sim. is somewhat unspecific for a fish (cf. ALEW, 1205).

From the data in the LVDA it is clear that *vēdzele* is overwhelmingly attested with broken tone or conflated broken tone. Rarely do we find *vēdzele* or *vėdzele*². The only attestation of *vēdzele* within the former Curonian territory, in Nigranden, originates from ME (1, 550). In the case of *vendzele*, conflated broken tone outnumbers sustained tone (22 : 10). In dialect areas where both *vēdzele* and *vendzele* are recorded we only find conflated broken tone, except in Puze, which is located in the north of Kurzeme. Here we apparently find *veĩdzele*.

6. I agree with Endzelĩns (ME 1, 455) that *dėĩnķts* ‘stark, kräftig, stramm, stattlich, gravitatisch’ is probably cognate with Ru. *djágnut* ‘become stronger, grow stout’, *djáglyj* ‘healthy, strong’ (cf. Derksen 2015, 530), in which case the root is originally acute. The attestations in ME and EH are consistent with Curonian origin. All forms have sustained tone, except the adverb *dėĩnķt[fi]*² in the Tamian dialects of Schlehk and Suhrs.

7. In Balto-Slavic and Germanic, we find evidence for a root $*b^h(e/o)nd^h$, e.g. Lith. *blęsti* (pres. *bleñdzia*, pret. *bleñdė*) ‘sleep, stir flour into soup, talk nonsense, become cloudy’, *blandūs* 4 ‘dim, cloudy’, Latv. *bluožs* ‘thick, dense’, Go. *blinds* ‘blind’. Alongside Latv. *bluodītiēs*² ‘roam, be ashamed, behave shamelessly’, which corresponds to Lith. *blandýtis* ‘clear up, become cloudy, recover, roam’, OCS *blōditi* ‘err, indulge in debauchery’, we find *blāndītiēs* ‘roam’. Endzelīns (ME 1, 309) suggests that the latter form, which now belongs to the vocabulary of the literary language, was borrowed from Curonian or Lithuanian. Remarkably, the “genuine” Latvian root *bluod-* is attested in the Tamian dialects of Dondaga and Wandsen, both in Kurzeme, while *bland-* is found (with *añ*²) in the Tamian dialect of Strasden in Kurzeme, but also in Salis (with *añ*²), Alt-Pebalg (with *àn*), and Naukschen (with *añ*) in Vidzeme.

Unlike *bland-*, the root *blend-* in *blenst* or *blenzt*¹² ‘have poor eyesight, stare, gape’ does not have a variant where the nasal was regularly lost. We do find *bliēzt* ‘Unsinn reden (Bersohn), schiessend lärmern (Nabben)’, however, alongside *blēnst*² ‘talk nonsense’. Both verbs have a root in *-z* (also *blens-*). In view of the semantic field of Lith. *blęsti*, I assume that here, too, the original shape of the root was *blend-* (cf. ME 1, 313). As for *blenst* or *blenzt* ‘talk nonsense’, there are few attestations, but it is nevertheless clear that the verb occurs in both East and West Latvia. The variants *blēnst*² and *bleñst*² are in agreement with an original circumflex root, but *bleñzt* (Adsel) is unexpected. The same holds for *bliēzt*, where the acute may be analogical after *bliēzt* ‘beat, hew’ (cf. Derksen 2015, 93–94).¹³ In the case of the verb for ‘stare’, the situation is different. In dialects with a conflated broken tone we find *bleñst*² as well as *bleñst*. Though within the former Curonian territory *bleñst*² is attested in the Tamian dialects of Kurzeme and *bleñst* in dialects in the extreme southwest of Kurzeme, the distribution is unclear. The former variant also occurs in Zemgale and the latter variant in a Tamian dialect of Vidzeme as well as in Zemgale. According to Illič-Svityč’s hypothesis, the co-existence of variants with a conflated broken and a sustained tone is characteristic of an originally acute root, but the forms *blēnst* (Ronneburg)

¹² Alongside pres. *blenžu*, pret. *blendu* we find pres. *blenžu*, pret. *blenzu*, which is obviously secondary.

¹³ As far as I know, we would expect to find a conflated broken tone in Nabben, so the only attestation of an unambiguous broken tone probably originates from Bersohn, which has the East Latvian system.

and *blēntz* (Bächhof, Lösern) from the area with three tones as well as the etymology of the root disprove this.

8. The verb *trenkt* ‘drive, chase’ belongs to the literary language, but Karulis (1992 2, 425) assumes that the form with preserved *en*, which occurs alongside *triekt* ‘hit, crush, drive, chase’, originates from the Curonian dialect area. Both *trēnkt*² and *treñkt*² are abundantly attested (ME 4, 231; EH 2, 693). An unambiguous falling tone is apparently found in Ērgeme (ĒIV 3, 562). The Lithuanian counterpart is *treñkti* ‘crash, bang, fling’. Endzelīns suggests a Curonianism or a Lithuanianism.

9. *spēņguole* (Gramsden, Kalleten, Nigranden, Dunika) ‘cranberry’, *spēņgalājs* (Naukschen) ‘bearberry’, *spaņgūles* pl. (Rutzau, Gramsden) ‘cranberries, bearberries’, *spangales* pl. (Widdrisch) ‘bearberries’, *spangali* (Lange), *spangaļi* pl. (Ulmann) ‘cranberries’ (ME 3, 985, 989; EH 2, 546). The corresponding Lithuanian form is *spaņguolė* 1 (1/3^b) ‘cranberry’. With *e*-grade we find *speņgelis* (Lazūnai). Most attestations are from Kurzeme, but the etymon has also been recorded in Vidzeme. This is a plausible Curonianism, but note that Gramsden, Kalleten, Nigranden, Dunika, and Rutzau are all close to the Lithuanian border. Anyhow, this is another case where we find a Latvian sustained tone corresponding to a Lithuanian circumflex.

10. The verb *spreņgt* ‘fest zuschnüren, klemmen’ is one of those forms that, according to Kiparsky (1939, 452), are limited to the former Curonian territory. This seems to be in agreement with the attestations in ME (3, 1016) and EH (2, 558). Other formations are apparently more widespread, however, e.g. *saspraņgāt* or *sasprandzēt* (Selsau, Sesswegen, Bersohn, Smiltē, Drostenhof) and *spraņgas* (Drostenhof), *sprānga(s)*² (Saikava, Gologowski, Druwenen) ‘Klemme’ (ME 3, 742, 1010; Endzelīns 1913–1914, 100). There can be little doubt that we are dealing with a circumflex root **(s)preng^h-*, cf. Lith. *spreņgti* ‘squeeze (in, into), thrust (in, into), stretch, tighten’, OIc. *springa* ‘spring, spurt out, burst, break’ (cf. Young 2008, 207; LIV², 583). The fact that alongside the sustained tone of *spreņgt* we find attestations of *spreñgt*², for example in Wandsen and Iwanden (ME 3, 1016), does not conform to Illič-Svityč’s hypothesis. ALEW (962–963) does not rule out a borrowing from Lithuanian.

2.3. Curonianisms that do not contain a sequence *VnC*

It stands to reason that not all Curonianisms contain a mixed diphthong of the structure *Vn*. The problem, then, is how they could be identified. In the

absence of formal characteristics, the main criterion must be the geographical distribution of a word. In my view, an interesting candidate would be *pūri* / *pūri* pl., Lith. *pūrai* pl. 2/4 ‘winter wheat’, as this etymon is basically limited to West Latvia and the western part of Žemaitija (LVDA 1, 102–103, map 39; ABL, 164–167, 323). In Latvian, *pūri* and *pūri* are ubiquitous in Kurzeme and the adjacent parts of Zemgale. Attestations of *pūri* are also found in the southeast of Vidzeme and, surprisingly, in Skaista (southeast Latgale). Within the Žemaitian area, *pūrai* is particularly frequent in the North and West Žemaitian dialects. This means that the etymon is mainly found in one continuous area.

The accentuation of the Lithuanian and Latvian forms mentioned above was discussed in Derksen (1996, 70–71), along with the accentuation of Lith. *pūras*, Latv. *pūrs* ‘bushel, measure of grain’, which is treated as an inherited form identical with the word under discussion, but which is sometimes regarded as a borrowing from Slavic, e.g. Ru. *pur*, Pol. *pur* (thus Smoczyński 2018, 1040).¹⁴ The difficulty with the accentuation of the Latvian word for ‘winter wheat’ is its virtual absence in dialects with three tones combined with the fact that it is almost exclusively attested with conflated tones. Nearly all attestations have conflated broken tone, while the sporadic East Latvian forms have conflated falling tone. This is consistent with an original falling tone. An unambiguous falling tone has indeed been attested in Blieden, near the area where broken tone and falling tone have merged. Derksen (1996, *l.c.*) also mentions an unambiguous broken tone, recorded by Krumberg from Odensee. The LVDA (1, 103) gives *pūri*² for this dialect, referring to ME, which is puzzling. The significance of the data in the LVDA lies in the fact that the picture is much clearer than when I first studied the distribution. There are dozens of attestations of both *pūri*² and *pūri*² but not a single occurrence of *pūri* or *pūri*. All things considered, the Latvian accentological evidence points to a falling tone, which is in conflict with the etymology, considering that PIE **puHró-*, cf. Gk. πῦρός ‘wheat’, is expected to yield an acute (cf. Derksen 2015, 172–173; Smoczyński 2018, 1039; de Vaan 2008, 560–561; Kroonen et al. 2022, 21), as in Proto-Slavic **pŭrŭ* (a), cf. SCr. *pŭr* ‘millet’.¹⁵ On the other hand, the falling

¹⁴ Alternatively, the Slavic form may be a borrowing from Baltic (cf. Urbūtis 1969, 68; Anikin 2005, 257).

¹⁵ I prefer the reconstruction of the PIE root as **p(e)uH-* ‘clean’ to **p(e)h₂u-* ‘beat’, as I am of the opinion that the latter would be more problematic from an accentological

tone matches the Lithuanian evidence, at least partly. According to the LKŽ, Lith. *pūrai* occurs with AP 2 and AP 4, for which reason I considered the etymon an unexplained case of *métatonie douce*. It now appears that the ABL (166–167) also mentions attestations of *pūrai*. These seem to be Northeast Žemaitian.

With respect to the Latvian form, we may note that if the unexpected accentuation is a consequence of the fact that the etymon was borrowed from Curonian, there is absolutely no link with the correspondences proposed by Illič-Svityč.

2.4. Livonian Curonianisms

In Livonian, we find many borrowings from Baltic that preserve mixed diphthongs containing a tautosyllabic *n*. According to Vaba (2014, 182), they are about fifty in number. Apart from forms corresponding to Latv. *brangs* and *vanga* (see above), Kettunen (1938) mentions, for instance, *bla'ndā* ‘sich umhertreiben’, *da'ņž* ‘Radfelge’, *krānīta* ‘senkrechtes, vom Wasser ausgegrabenes Ufer’, *lāņķka* ‘niedrige Flusswiese’, *lūņķka* ‘Bucht, Busen, (niedrige) Wiese am Flusse’, *mānđrāķš* ‘Quirl’, *sasprānga* ‘Kummetriemen’, *sklānda* ‘Zaunstange’, *skrānda* ‘Fetzen’, all from Courland Livonian. An example from Salaca Livonian is *mānts* ‘Dorsch’. These words may have been borrowed from Curonian, but in view of such forms as *bīđdārz*, *bī'edārz* ‘Vereinsmitglied, Geselle, Kamerad’, which apparently occurs alongside *bāndrōz* (Vaba 2014, 180), it cannot be excluded that they entered the language through Latvian, in which case we could be dealing with Latvian Curonianisms but also with Lithuanianisms. Thus, the mere presence in Livonian of a Baltic borrowing with tautosyllabic *n* is not solid proof of Curonian origin (cf. Vaba 2014, 182). Nevertheless, the Livonian material brings an interesting perspective. In Salaca Livonian we find *balad* or *balāž* ‘Taube’ from Latv. *baluōdis*, but Courland Livonian has *palāndāks*, cf. Lith. *balañdis*, a form which does not correspond to a recorded Curonianism (cf. Endzelīns 1913–1914, 102). Other forms worth mentioning are *vāgāl* ‘Quappe’ (see *vendzele* and *vēdzele* above) and *tange* ‘Himmel’ (Winkler 1994, 40, 72), which corresponds to Lith. *dangūs* and OPr. *dangus* but lacks a Latvian counterpart.

point of view. In the case of **puH-ró-* the stress would be retracted in accordance with Hirt’s law, but not in the case of **ph₂u-ró-*. For the history of this particular version of Hirt’s law, I refer to Derksen 2015, 17–18.

2.5. Evaluation of the evidence

The material that Illič-Svityč adduces in favour of his view on the relationship between the Latvian and Curonian accentual systems can hardly be called straightforward. From the list of examples with an originally circumflex root, *gañdrs* may be disregarded, as it is probably a Lithuanianism. The status as a Curonianism of *meñte*, *lañktis*, *bañda*, *bañga*, and *ceñkle* is, in my opinion, not beyond doubt. Apart from the fact that these words have preserved a sequence *VnC*, there is nothing to suggest that they are borrowings from Curonian. More convincing candidates on account of their geographical distribution are *bęñdrs*, *krañts*, *dziñtars*, *lañka*, and *leñta*. It is uncertain if *krañts* derives from an originally circumflex root, however. In the case of *dziñtars*, the sustained tone is also found in forms showing the regular development *inC* > *iC*. In this respect *dziñtars* differs from *bęñdrs*, for instance, which occurs alongside *biedrs*. The forms that I added to Illič-Svityč's list do not radically alter the picture. Plausible examples of Curonianisms with a sustained tone on an originally circumflex root are *dañga* and *spęñguole*, but the verbs *lāncît*, *blenst* (*blenzt*), *trenkt*, and *sprengt*, if they are Curonianisms at all, do not support Illič-Svityč's hypothesis.

For Curonianisms with an originally acute root, Illič-Svityč assumes that they have either sustained tone or conflated broken tone. This means that they do not differ from inherited Latvian forms with an acute root, which have sustained tone or broken tone in the Central Latvian system with three tones. Good examples are *skrañdas*² [*añ*], *sprañds*² [*añ*] or *sprañda*² [*añ*], and *brañgs*² [*añ*, *àñ*²]. Variants with a conflated falling tone may be attributed to diffusion of an originally West Latvian form. In the case of *meñce*, the original acute tone of the root seems less secure. Finally, it is not at all certain that *spañda* is a Curonianism. From the examples that I have added, *vañga*, *balañda*² [*añ*], and *dęñkts* seem convincing. The accentuation of the word *pūri* / *pūri* 'winter wheat', which on account of its distribution would make a plausible Curonianism, does not conform to Illič-Svityč's hypothesis.

It may be clear that the accentuation of forms which can be regarded as Curonianisms does not constitute solid proof for a Curonian prosodic system with a sustained tone and a broken tone, though it seems reasonable to assume that the distinction between originally acute and circumflex syllables was at least to some extent maintained.

3. Language contact and Curonian

The conclusion that a study of the accentuation of Curonianisms does not allow us to establish the Curonian prosodic system does not disprove the hypothesis that the West Latvian system with a sustained tone and a conflated broken tone must be attributed to a Curonian substrate. In fact, the connection between the structural argument and the comparative data was not obvious to begin with. Pronk (2017, 661) offers a phonetic explanation for the West Latvian merger of the broken tone and the falling tone (cf. Grinaveckis 1964, 15–17), suggesting that the Curonian substrate speakers associated the falling tone with the phase of the broken tone that follows the glottal constriction. The most conspicuous claim of Illič-Svityč's study, however, is that Curonianisms show a sustained tone corresponding to a Central Latvian falling tone. Thus, it seems that the Curonians generally adopted the Latvian distribution of the tones, merging the falling tone and the broken tone in the process, but retained a sustained tone reflecting a circumflex in a limited number of words that were probably still perceived as Curonian. This is not impossible, but I cannot agree with Pronk's assertion (Pronk 2017, 661) that Illič-Svityč's study, which I have shown to be inconclusive, confirms the Curonian prosodic system that was posited on structural grounds.

My main objection to typological arguments like the one presented by Pronk is that they express above all an unshakable conviction that this particular development must be a result of language contact. The phonetic explanation for the merger of the falling tone and the broken tone hardly carries any weight. We know that the West Latvian system with two tones arose from a threefold tonal opposition. Since the Curonian system has not been recorded, it is always possible to come up with a scenario that fits the facts. Does the Selonian rising tone, which is found instead of broken tone, reflect the prosodic system of the Selonians? The areal configuration alone would suggest an innovation (cf. Zeps 1970, 14). What about the East Latvian merger of the sustained tone and the falling tone? Is this the result of language contact or are we dealing with an internal development?

Since within Finnic the occurrence of broken tone is limited to Livonian and Leivu South Estonian (Pajusalu 2014, 153), it seems safe to assume that the rise of the broken tone in these languages is due to language contact. Pronk (2017, 662–663) suggests Curonian influence for Livonian and Latvian influence for the relevant Estonian dialects. He is not wrong in stating that for Salaca Livonian the existence of a broken tone cannot

be demonstrated, but leaves it to the reader to interpret his remark that the present-day Latvian dialects of this region have eliminated the broken tone. According to Kallio (2016, 49–51, 57), both primary and secondary broken tone are Proto-Livonian. If there is a connection between the loss of the broken tone in Salaca Livonian, assuming that this was the case, and the fact that in the Latvian dialects on the eastern coast of the Gulf of Riga the conflated broken tone is actually realized as a falling tone, one is still at a loss to explain why this happened.

The fixed initial stress of Latvian has often been attributed to Finnic influence (e.g. Balode, Holvoet 2001, 9). A tendency to retract the stress is also found in the northern dialects of Lithuanian (cf. Zinkevičius 1966, 447). Unlike Endzelīns (1922, 18–19), Pronk assumes that Curonian also acquired fixed stress. I am not prepared to accept the Curonian fixed stress as a fact, but for Pronk, who argues that the Latvian initial stress and the Žemaitian stress retractions can only be linked by assuming similar developments in a common substrate language, there is no other option. If Illič-Svityč is correct in assuming that in Curonianisms the regular reflex of an old acute is either a sustained tone or a broken tone, this could actually be presented as an argument in favour of Curonian free stress, as the words could have entered Latvian before the loss of the broken tone under the stress. I do not wish to enter the debate whether the Žemaitian stress retractions originate from a Curonian substrate (cf. Grinaveckis 1973, 67) or must be viewed as an internal development, but Pronk's assertion (2017, 664) that the former stance is superior seems purely ideological.

Unsurprisingly, Pronk subscribes to Kortlandt's view that the Žemaitian and Latvian broken tones are an archaism (e.g. Kortlandt 1999), but whereas in Kortlandt's theory a contrast between glottalized and non-glottalized syllables serves as a starting point for the tonogenesis in the East Baltic languages, Pronk assumes that both in stressed and unstressed syllables Proto-East Baltic had an opposition between a broken tone and a plain or slightly rising tone. This system, he claims, was best preserved in Žemaitian and Curonian. It is clear that Pronk, preoccupied as he is with the mutual influence of attested and unattested prosodic systems in the area, fails to present a coherent view on the rise of the East Baltic accentual system, which cannot be properly understood without addressing the problem of metatony. Only at the end of his article is there a faint echo of the relative chronologies established by Kortlandt and Derksen (cf. Kortlandt 1977; Derksen 2011b).

In view of our limited knowledge of the Curonian language, it comes as no surprise that its classification has been open to debate. After a period in which Finnic origin was considered an option, Curonian has been classified as West Baltic, East Baltic, an originally West Baltic language that due to language contact became a link between Lithuanian and Latvian, or simply as a Latvian dialect. Pronk rejects West Baltic affiliation because there are no indisputable common innovations. This may be so, but the same holds true for the relationship with East Baltic. In fact, it can be argued that Curonian did not share the monophthongization of *i*-diphthongs, which was definitely Proto-East Baltic and preceded the retractions of the stress that generated metatony (cf. Kortlandt 1977, 323–329, Derksen 2011b, 17–20). Of course, this does not imply that the Curonian prosodic system could not have influenced West Latvian, but we should not pretend that we can undo the convergence of the Baltic languages that were once spoken in the area and reconstruct them in detail. Pronk's article illustrates the dangers inherent to the reconstruction of a genetically close substrate language, which invites circular reasoning (cf. Girdenis, Rosinas 1974, 191).

LATVIŪ KALBOS KURONIZMŪ KIRČIAVIMAS

Santrauka

Remdamasis keletu latvių kalbos kuronizmų su *Vn* tipo dvigarsiais, Illič-Svityčius (1964) padarė išvadą, kad kuršių kalboje būta tęstinės ir kylančiosios priegaidės, ir susiejo jas su vakarų latvių tarmių priegaidžių sistemos atsiradimu. Vis dėlto jo pateikti riboti argumentai negali būti laikomi neiginčijamais – daugiausia dėl to, kad dalies formų kuršiška kilmė iš tiesų yra abejotina. Nesiremdamas papildoma literatūra, su Illič-Svityčiaus išvadomis sutinka ir Pronkas (2017), netgi teigiantis, kad kuršių kalbos prozodija, kuriai, jo manymu, buvo būdingas ir fiksuotas žodžio pradžio kirtis, padarė įtaką žemaičių ir lyvių kalboms. Nesant tvirto faktų pagrindo, šie teiginiai iš esmės tėra įsitikinimo reikalas.

EXONYMS

Adiamünde = Skulte	Marienburg = Alūksne
Adsel = Gaujiena	Meselau = Mēdzūla
Alt-Pebalg = Vecpiebalga	Nabben = Nabe
Alt-Schwarden = Zvārde	Nidden = Nida (Lith.)
Bächhof = Upes muiža, now Upenieki	Nieder-Bartau = Nīca
Baldohn = Baldone	Nigranden = Nīgranda
Bershof = Bērsmuiža	Ober-Bartau = Bārta
Bersohn = Bērzaune	Odensee = Odziena
Blieden = Blīdene	Ramkau = Ranka
Dondangen = Dundaga	Ronneburg = Rauna
Drostenhof = Drusti	Rujen = Rūjiena
Druwenen = Druviena	Rutzau = Rucava
Ermes = Ērgeme	Sackenhausen = Saka
Goldingen = Kuldīga	Salis = Salaca
Golgowski = Galgauska	Sassmacken = Sasmaka
Gramsden = Gramzda	Sausen = Sausnēja
Granteln = Grantele	Schibbenhof = Šķibe
Grobin = Grobiņa	Schlehk = Zlēkas
Groß-Buschhof = Birži	Schwitten = Svitene
Groß-Essern = Liel-Ezere	Selsau = Dzelzava
Groß-Sessau = Lielsesava	Serbīgal = Cirgaļi
Hasenpot = Aizpute	Sesswegen = Cesvaine
Hohenbergen = Veļķi	Seyershof = Jeri
Iwanden = Īvande	Siuxt = Džūkste
Kabillen = Kabile	Sonnaxt = Sunākste
Kaltenbrunn = Kaldabruņa	Stradsen = Strazde
Kandau = Kandava	Suhrs = Zūras
Katzdangen = Kazdanga	Trikaten = Trikāta
Kortenhof = Beļava	Waddaxt = Vadakste
Lasdohn = Lazdona	Wandsen = Vandzene
Lemsal = Limbaži	Wessen = Zasa
Lesten = Lestene	Widdrisch = Vidriži
Lösern = Liezēris = Liezēre	

REFERENCES

ABL – Danguolė Mikulėnienė, Anna Stafecka (eds.), *Atlas of the Baltic languages. Lexis 1: Flora*, 2nd revised edition, Vilnius:Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Latvijas Universitātes Latviešu valodas institūts, 2013.

ALEW – *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Unter der Leitung von Wolfgang Hock und der Mitarbeit von Elvira-Julia Bukevičiūtė und Christiane Schiller bearbeitet von Rainer Fecht, Anna Helene Feulner, Eugen Hill und Dagmar S. Wodtko, Hamburg: baar, 2015.

Anikin, Aleksandr 2005, *Opyt slovarja leksičeskix baltizmov v russkom jazyke*, Novosibirsk: Nauka.

Balode, Laimute, Axel Holvoet, 2001, The Latvian language and its dialects, in Östen Dahl, Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages. Typology and Contact 1: Past and Present*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 9–40.

Blese, Ernsts 1936, *Nīcas un Bārtas mācītāja Jāņa Langija 1685. gada latviski-vāciskā vārdnīca ar īsu latviešu gramatiku*, Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.

BW – Krišjānis Barons, Heinrich Wissendorffs, *Latvju dainas* 1–6, Jelgavā: Drawin-Drawneeka general-komisijā; Peterburgā: Keisaristas Zinību Akadēmijas speestavā, 1894–1915.

Bielenstein, August 1863, *Die lettische Sprache nach ihren Lauten und Formen vergleichend dargestellt. Erster Theil. die Laute. die Wortbildung*, Berlin: Dümmler.

Blese, Ernsts 1936, *Nīcas un Bārtas mācītāja Jāņa Langija 1685. gada latviski-vāciskā vārdnīca ar īsu latviešu gramatiku*, Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.

Būga, Kazimieras 1923–1924, Die Metatonie im Litauischen und Lettischen, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 51, 109–142; 52, 91–98, 250–302.

Būga, Kazimieras 1924, *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas. I sąsiuvinis*, Kaunas: Švietimo ministerija.

Būga RR – Kazimieras Būga, *Rinktiniai raštai* 1–3, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1958–1962.

De Bo, Leonard Lodewijk 1873, *Westvlaamsch idioticon*, Brugge: Gailliard & Comp.

Derksen, Rick 1996, *Metatony in Baltic*, Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

Derksen, Rick 2011a, The accentuation of the East Baltic *sta*-present, in Elena Stadnik-Holzer (ed.), *Baltische und slavische Prosodie. International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology IV, Scheibbs, 2.–4. Juli 2008*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 31–37.

Derksen, Rick 2011b, The relative chronology of East Baltic accentual developments, in Roman Sukač (ed.), *Papers on Baltic and Slavic Accentology*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 17–22.

Derksen, Rick 2015, *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Derksen, Rick 2020, Balto-Slavic, in Marc Greenberg (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online*. https://doi.org/10.1163/2589-6229_ESLO_COM_032140.

DLKŽ – *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, 4-asis leidimas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2000.

EH – Jānis Endzelīns, Edīte Hauzenberga, *Papildinājumi un labojumi K. Mūlenbacha Latviešu valodas vārdnīcai* 1–2, Rīga: Lettisches Kulturfonds, Grāmatu apgads, 1934–1946.

ĒIV – Elga Kagaine, Silvija Raže, *Ērgemes izloksnes vārdnīca* 1–3, Rīga: Zinātne, 1977–1983.

Endzelīns, Jānis [Jan Endzelin] 1905, Zur erweichung der gutturale im Lettischen, *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 29, 178–195.

Endzelīns, Jānis 1912, Par kursu (jeb kuršu) tautību ir valodu, *Druva* 5, 623–633 (= *Darbu izlase* 2, 454–465).

Endzelīns, Jānis [Jan Endzelin] 1912, Über die nationalität und sprache der kuren, *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 12, 59–72.

Endzelīns, Jānis [Jan Endzelin] 1913–1914, Zu den kurischen Bestandteilen des Lettischen, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 33, 96–104.

Endzelīns, Jānis 1970, Par latviešu un lībiešu valodas savstarpējo ietekmi, *Baltistica* 6(1), 7–10.

Fraenkel LEW – Ernst Fraenkel, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Heidelberg, Göttingen: Winter, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955–1965.

Girdenis, Aleksas, Albertas Rosinas 1974 (rev.), Vladas Grinaveckis, *Žemaičių tarmių istorija*, 1973, *Baltistica* 10(2), 187–207.

Grinaveckis, Vladas 1964, Istorischesoe razvitie udarenija i intonacij žemajtskix govorov litovskogo jazyka (v sravnenii s latyšskom), in Vladimir D. Koroljuk et al. (eds.), *Slavjanskaja i baltijskaja akcentologija*, Moskva: Nauka, 3–17.

Grinaveckis, Vladas 1973, *Žemaičių tarmių istorija*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Illič-Svityč, Vladislav Markovič 1963, *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Sud'ba akcentuacionnyx paradigm*, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Illič-Svityč, Vladislav Markovič 1964, Sledy isčeznuvsix baltijskix akcentuacionnyx sistem, in Vladimir D. Koroljuk et al. (eds.), *Slavjanskaja i baltijskaja akcentologija*, Moskva: Nauka, 18–26.

Kallio, Petri 2016, Historical phonology from Proto-Finnic to Proto-Livonian, *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri–Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugrian Linguistics* 2016 (7/1), 39–65.

Karulis, Konstantins 1992, *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* 1–2, Rīga: Avots.

Kettunen, Lauri 1938, *Livisches Wörterbuch*, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Kiparsky, Valentin 1939, *Die Kurenfrage*, Helsinki: Druckerei der Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft.

KIV – Antoņina Reķēna, *Kalupes izloksnes vārdnīca* 1–2, Rīga: Latviešu valodas institūts, 1998.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1977, Historical laws of Baltic accentuation, *Baltistica* 13(2), 319–330.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1985, Long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 21(2), 112–124.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1998, The rise and fall of glottalization, *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 147–150.

Kroonen, Guus 2013, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Kroonen, Guus, Anthony Jakob, Axel I. Palmér, Paulus van Sluis, Andrew Wigman 2022, Indo-European cereal terminology suggests a Northwest Pontic homeland for the core Indo-European languages, *PLoS ONE* 17(10), e0275744, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275744>.

Lange, Jacob 1773, *Lettisch Deutscher Theil des vollständigen Lettischen Lexici*, Schloß Ober-Pahlen: s.n.

Langius, Johannes 1685, *Lettisch-Deutsches Lexicon* (ms).

LIV – Helmut Rix et al., *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben*, zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.

LKA – *Lietuvių kalbos atlasas* 1–3, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1977–1991.

LKŽ – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20, Vilnius: Mokslas, Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1941–2002.

LKŽ^e – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, elektroninis variantas, atnaujinta 2018–01–01, <http://www.lkz.lt>.

LVDA – *Latviešu valodas dialektu atlants 1: Leksika*, Rīga: Zinātne, 1999.

Mažiulis PKEŽ – Vytautas Mažiulis, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas* 1–4, Vilnius: Moklas, 1988–1997.

ME – Karl Mühlentach, Jānis Endzelīns, *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* 1–4, Riga: Kulturfonds, 1923–1932.

Pajusalu, Karl, Arvo Krikmann, Eberhard Winkler 2009, Lexical relations between Salaca Livonian and Estonian dialects, *Linguistica Uralica* 45(4), 283–298.

Pajusalu, Karl 2014, The relationship between Salaca Livonian and Courland Livonian dialects, *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri / Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugrian Linguistics* 2014 (5–1), 149–171.

Pedersen, Holger 1926, *La cinquième déclinaison latine*, København: Høst.

Petit, Daniel 2021, On the etymology of Lithuanian *dangus*, *Baltistica* 56(2), 197–219.

Plāķis, Juris 1928, Vai tautosillabiskais voc.+n(+cons.) savienojums ir kuršu valodas iezīme?, *Latoijas Universitātes Raksti* 17, 63–100.

Pronk, Tijmen 2017, Curonian accentuation, in Bjarne Simmelkjær Sandgaard Hansen et al. (eds.), *Usque ad radices: Indo-European Studies in Honour of Birgit Anette Olsen*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 659–889.

Rudzīte, Marta 1964, *Latviešu dialektoloģija*, Rīga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība.

Schrijver, Peter 1991, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*, Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2018, *Lithuanian Etymological Dictionary*, Berlin: Lang.

Stender, Gotthard Friedrich 1789, *Lettisches Lexikon* 1–2, Mitau: Steffenhagen.

Ulmann, Karl Christian 1872, *Lettisches Wörterbuch. Erster Theil. Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, Riga: H. Brutzel & Co.

Urbutis, Vincas 1969, Dabartinės baltarusių kalbos lituanizmai, *Baltistica* 5(1), 43–68.

Vaba, Lembit 2014, Curonian linguistic elements in Livonian, *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri / Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugrian Linguistics* 2014(5–1), 173–191.

Vanags, Pēteris 2004, Latvian *braņgs*: from Lithuanian, Couronian, or German?, in Philip Baldi, Pietro U. Dini (eds.), *Studies in Baltic and Indo-European Linguistics*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 231–241.

Verwijs, Eelco, Jakob Verdam, 1925, *Middelnederlandsch woordenboek*, negende deel, 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff.

Winkler, Eberhard 1994, *Salisch-Livische Sprachmaterialien*, München: Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars der Universität München.

Young, Steven 2008, Winter's law and etymologies, with special reference to Lithuanian, *Baltistica* 43(2), 201–218.

Zeps, Valdis 1970, Latvian accent and the notion of markedness, *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 13, 10–14.

Ziesemer, Walther 1935–1944, *Preußisches Wörterbuch, Sprache und Volkstum Nordostdeutschlands*, Königsberg: Gräfe und Unzer.

Rick DERKSEN

[r.h.derksen@gmail.com]