

Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics

Series Editors:

Peter Houtzagers · Janneke Kalsbeek · Jos Schaecken

Editorial Advisory Board:

R. Alexander (Berkeley) · A.A. Barentsen (Amsterdam)
B. Comrie (Leipzig) · B.M. Groen (Amsterdam)
F.H.H. Kortlandt (Leiden) · W. Lehfeldt (Göttingen)
G. Spieß (Cottbus) · R. Sprenger (Amsterdam) · W.R. Vermeer (Leiden)



Amsterdam - New York, NY 2009

Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, vol. 35

Stressing the past Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology

edited by
Thomas Olander
Jenny Helena Larsson

Cover Image:
 Mikalojus Daukša: Postilla catholica. Tái est: Ižguldimas Ewangeliu...
 Vilnius, Academy Printers, 1599
 Image reproduced from the 1926 facsimile edition (Kaunas, Lithuania)

The paper on which this book is printed meets the requirements
 of "ISO 9706: 1994, Information and documentation - Paper for
 documents - Requirements for permanence".

ISBN: 978-90-420-2555-4
 ©Editions Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam - New York, NY 2009
 Printed in The Netherlands

CONTENTS

Preface	VII
RAINER ECKERT Zum 40. Todestag des russischen Sprachforschers Dr. V. M. Illič-Svityč	1
MIGUEL CARRASQUER VIDAL Slavic verbal accentuation – notes on origin and development	7
RICK DERKSEN Slavic evidence for Balto-Slavic oxytona	15
В. А. ДЫБО Система порождения акцентных типов производных в балто-славянском праязыке	21
ADAM HYLLESTED & BERND GLIWA Metatony in Lithuanian internal derivation	47
MATE KAPOVIĆ The accent of Slavic * <i>ja(zb)</i> 'Ÿ'	53
FREDERIK KORTLANDT Accent retraction and tonogenesis	75
THOMAS OLANDER The accentuation of Old Prussian <i>deiws</i> 'god'	83
ИРИНА С. ПЕКУНОВА О некоторых акцентуационных особенностях существительных а.п. с в старосербских памятниках	93
TIJMEN PRONK The accentuation of the Slavic <i>n</i> -stems	101
JENS ELMEGÅRD RASMUSSEN A note on Slaaby-Larsen's law	115
TOSHIHIRO SHINTANI On Winter's law in Balto-Slavic	119

ROMAN SUKAČ	
Hirt's law and Optimality Theory	137
MATEJ ŠEKLI	
On Romance-Alpo-Slavic substitutional accentology: the case of pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names in Slovene	145
ALEXANDRA TER-AVANESOVA	
The accentuation of <i>i</i> -verbs in some Russian dialects: an innovation that preserves an archaism	161
STEVEN YOUNG	
Tone in Latvian borrowings from Old Russian	177

Preface

This volume contains sixteen articles on Baltic and Slavic accentology. Some of the articles represent elaborated versions of papers presented at the Second International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology (IWoba II), held at the University of Copenhagen on 1–3 September 2006.

After the first workshop on Baltic and Slavic accentology, organized by Mate Kapović and Ranko Matasović in Zagreb on 1–3 July 2005, it became clear that there was great interest for a second meeting and we, Adam Hyllested and the editors of this volume, decided to organize a follow-up in Copenhagen. Since then, a third meeting was organized by Tijmen Pronk at Leiden University on 27–29 July 2007, and a fourth was held in Scheibbs, Austria, on 2–4 July 2008. We are delighted to see such interest in upholding this new tradition, and by the progress in the area of Baltic and Slavic accentology it brings along. *Stressing the past* helps us to reach a more complete understanding of the diachronic and synchronic aspects of accentual phenomena in Baltic and Slavic.

The Copenhagen workshop took place almost exactly on the 40th anniversary of the untimely death of one of the most highly esteemed scholars in Baltic and Slavic accentology, Vladislav Markovič Illič-Svityč. We decided to dedicate the workshop and this volume to his memory. The volume opens with a tribute to this outstanding researcher, written by his fellow student and personal friend Prof. Dr. Rainer Eckert.

We are grateful to Prof. Toshihiro Shintani for allowing us to republish his article "On Winter's law in Balto-Slavic" in this volume. The article was originally published in 1985 in the series *Arbejds-papirer udsendt af Institut for Lingvistik, Københavns Universitet (APILKU)*, but since these working papers are not easily accessible, we felt the need to make this important paper more familiar to scholars working in the field of Baltic and Slavic accentology.

Finally, we owe great thanks to the editors of the *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, especially Prof. Dr. Jos Schaecken, for accepting this volume for publication in their series.

THE EDITORS

**Zum 40. Todestag des russischen Sprachforschers
Dr. V. M. Illič-Svityč**

RAINER ECKERT

*Светлой памяти
Владислава Марковича Илича-Свитыча*

Auf Vorschlag von Rick Derksen gedachten die Teilnehmer des 11. Internationalen Arbeitstreffens über baltisch-slawische Akzentologie (International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology 11), das vom 1. bis 3. September 2006 in Kopenhagen stattfand, des vor 40 Jahren tragisch ums Leben gekommenen russischen Sprachwissenschaftlers Dr. Vladislav Markovič Illič-Svityč.¹

Als Nichtfachmann habe ich natürlich nicht an der erwähnten Veranstaltung – die nun erfreulicherweise eine feste Tradition zu werden scheint (der Erste Workshop fand unter Leitung von Mate Kapović und Ranko Matasović vom 1. bis 3. Juli 2005 an der Universität Zagreb statt; der Zweite Workshop unter Leitung von Thomas Olander, Adam Hyllested und Jenny Helena Larsson in Kopenhagen und ein Drittes Arbeitstreffen wird unter Leitung von Tijmen Pronk vom 27. bis 29. Juli 2007 an der Universität Leiden durchgeführt) – zur balto-slawischen Akzentologie teilgenommen. Man hat mich aber gebeten, da ich Vladislav Markovič persönlich gut gekannt habe, die folgenden Zeilen zu verfassen.

Meine Bekanntschaft und Freundschaft mit dem vorzeitig von uns Gegangenen liegt in der Zeit meines Studiums (1952–1957) und meiner Doktorandur (1957–1961) an der Moskauer Universität. Im zweiten Studienjahr (1953–1954) wohnte ich mit Slava – so nannten wir ihn liebevoll – zusammen in einem 6-Mann-Zimmer des Studentenwohnheimes der MGU, einem Gebäude aus der Zeit Peters des 1. am Flusse Jauza. Wir waren beide Schüler des renommierten russischen Slawisten Prof. Dr. Samuil Borisovič Bernštejn (1911–1997) und verteidigten im Sommer 1957 an einunddemselben Tag unsere Diplomarbeiten: Vladislav Markovič über die Nominalstämme auf langes *-ū* und ich über die Nominalstämme auf kurzes *-u*

¹ Siehe R. Eckert, „V.M. Illič-Svityč in memoriam“, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 12/4, Berlin 1967, 624–626. – Meine erste baltistische Publikation in Buchform (R. Eckert. *Baltistische Studien. Mit einem Geleitwort von Rudolf Fischer und einer Bibliographie von Rainer Eckert und Frido Metsk*, Akademie-Verlag Berlin 1971, 102 S.) habe ich meinem Freund und Studienkollegen Vladislav Markovič Illič-Svityč gewidmet.

im Urslawischen. Im Jahre 1958 verfasste er ein Gutachten über eine schriftliche Arbeit („Sledy geteroklitičeskogo sklonenija v praslavjanskomazyke“), die ich im Rahmen der Doktorandur anzufertigen hatte (russ. *specvopros*).² Schon als Student der Slawischen Abteilung an der Philologischen Fakultät der Moskauer Universität rief er bei seinen Lehrern und Mitstudenten Erstaunen und Bewunderung ob seines vielseitigen Talents hervor: Er besaß hervorragende Kenntnisse in mehreren Fremdsprachen, ein immenses Wissen auf den Gebieten der Slawistik und Indogermanistik; schrieb Poeme für die studentische Wandzeitung, hielt fesselnde Vorträge in der Wissenschaftlichen Studentengesellschaft NSO.

Auf dem v. Internationalen Slawistenkongress 1963 in Sofia traf ich Vladislav Markovič zum letzten Male.

Wenige Jahre nach seinem tragischen Tode am 22. August 1966 erfuhr ich in Moskau einige Einzelheiten der Katastrophe: Vladislav Markovič sollte eigentlich im August 1966 schon etwa Mitte des Monats mit einer Expedition des Instituts für Slawistik der Akademie der Wissenschaften der UdSSR ins Polesie fahren. Es handelte sich um die Dialektexpeditionen, die seit Anfang der 60er Jahre auf Initiative von S. B. Bernštejn und N. I. Tolstoj in das Gebiet der Nordukraine und des südlichen Weißrussland führten. Er verlegte jedoch seine Abreise um einige Tage und geriet dadurch in den tödlichen Unfall. Ein fatales Schicksal! An einem düsteren, frühen Morgen hatte er Petroleum zu beschaffen und wurde auf dem Heimwege von einem großen und überschnellen PKW überfahren und so schwer verletzt, dass er nach kürzerer Zeit verstarb. Es fand weder eine Untersuchung noch eine Gerichtsverhandlung statt. Der Verursacher des Unfalls, ein Angehöriger der Sowjetadministration, kam ungeschoren davon. Letztlich war auch Illič-Svityč ein Opfer des totalitären Regimes, das ihm weder eine seinen glänzenden Fähigkeiten angemessene Arbeitsstelle nach dem erfolgreichen Studium bot (er arbeitete eine Zeit lang in einem Moskauer Verlag, in dem er mit D. Tolovskij das erste „Makedonisch-russische Wörterbuch“ herausbrachte; erst ab Mai 1958 konnte ihn Prof. S. B. Bernštejn ins Akademie-Institut holen) noch ihm gestattete, sich in Moskau niederzulassen. Er war gezwungen, weit außerhalb Moskaus in Mytišči zu wohnen. Diese widrigen Lebensumstände waren nicht unbeteiligt am verhängnisvollen Geschehen.

In seiner frühesten Schaffensperiode trat er mit einer Reihe origineller Artikel und Rezensionen zur slawischen Namenkunde, Dialektologie und Etymologie auf, unter denen als glänzendes Beispiel sein Aufsatz über das anlautende *ch-* im Urslawischen (erschieden in der Zeitschrift *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, Nr. 4, Moskau 1961) hervorrangt.

2 Rainer Eckert, „Eine frühe Arbeit von V. M. Illič-Svityč“, in: *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte (LAB)* 15, Leipzig 1976, 96–99. – Diesen Aufsatz veröffentlichte ich anlässlich des 10. Todestages des allzu früh Verstorbenen.

Mit großem Erfolg wandte er sich der balto-slavischen Problematik zu. In einem halben Jahrzehnt leistete er Erstaunliches auf diesem Gebiet: Bereits 1958 auf dem iv. Internationalen Slawistenkongress in Moskau trat er in der Diskussion zum Verhältnis des Baltischen und Slawischen mit der fruchtbaren Idee auf, dass die lexikalischen Übereinstimmungen zwischen den beiden Sprachzweigen auch nur einen Teil des Slawischen bzw. des Baltischen erfassen können. Er wies auf besondere Beziehungen zwischen dem Ostzweig des Südslawischen (Bulgarisch, Makedonisch) und dem Baltischen hin unter Verweis auf bulg. *bărna* ‚Lippe‘: lit. *burnà* ‚Mund‘; bulg. *jūda* ‚mythologischer Drache‘: lit. *judėti* ‚sich bewegen‘ und ksl. (serb.-ksl. und russ.-ksl.) *azvno* ‚Leder‘: lit. *ožys* ‚Ziegenbock‘; *ožinis* ‚Ziegenbock-‘.³ Ich habe diese Thematik in meinem Vortrag auf der internationalen Konferenz „Das Urslawische und sein Zerfall“ am 5. bis 7. Dezember 1996 an der Universität Krakau behandelt und anlässlich des 30. Todestages die Arbeit meines unvergesslichen Freundes und Studienkollegen V. M. Illič-Svityč zum Ausgangspunkt meiner Darlegungen genommen.⁴

Im Jahre 1959 veröffentlichte Illič-Svityč einen Bericht über die balto-slavische Problematik auf dem Moskauer internationalen Slawistenkongress.⁵

In der Folgezeit befasste sich Vladislav Markovič mit dem baltischen Verb⁶ und vor allem mit der Akzentologie des Baltischen und Slawischen. Als Ergebnisse seiner tiefgründigen Einarbeitung in dieses Gebiet erschienen zwei Rezensionen⁷ und mehrere Aufsätze.⁸ Die Krönung seiner fruchtbaren Studien auf diesem Feld aber stellt die Monographie über die nominale Akzentuierung im Baltischen und

3 S. B. Bernštejn (*Očer skravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskich jazykov*, Moskau 1961, 73–75) gliederte hinsichtlich der speziellen Beziehungen zwischen dem Ostzweig des Südslawischen und dem Baltischen phonetische Varianten, Wortbildungs-Varianten und lexikalische Varianten heraus und bezog sich ausdrücklich auf Stefan Mladenov und V. M. Illič-Svityč.

4 Rainer Eckert, „Partiell urslawisch-baltische Entsprechungen und ihre Interpretation“, in: *Prasłowiańszczyzna i jej rozpad*, pod redakcją Jerzego Ruska i Wiesława Borysia, Warszawa 1998, 41–45.

5 V. M. Illič-Svityč, „Balto-slavjanskaja problematika na iv. Meždunarodnom sezde slavistov“, *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, Nr. 1, Moskau 1959, 139–141.

6 Siehe V. M. Illič-Svityč, „Vydelenie tipov kornej s ischodom na sonant v baltijskoj glagol'noj sisteme, ich funkcionirovanie i proischozdenie“, *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija*, vypusk 5, Moskau 1961, 108–137.

7 V. M. Illič-Svityč, Rez. zu E. Nonnenmacher-Pribić, „Die baltoslavischen Akzent- und Intonationsverhältnisse und ihr quantitativer Reflex im Slovakischen“, Wiesbaden 1961, *Kratkie soobščeniya Instituta slavjanovedenija (KSIS)*, vyp. 34, Moskau 1962, 63–77, und Rez. zu T. Buch, *Die Akzentuierung des Christian Donelaitis*, Wrocław / Warszawa / Kraków 1961, *KSIS*, vyp. 41, Moskau 1964, 88–90.

8 V. M. Illič-Svityč, „K istolkovaniju akcentuacionnych sootvetstvij v kel'to-italijskom i balto-slavjanskom (O vtorom pravile Dybo)“, *KSIS*, vypusk 35, Moskau 1962, 63–72, und ders., „Sledy iščeznuvšich baltijskich akcentuacionnych sistem“, *KSIS*, vyp. 41, Moskau 1964, 18–26.

Slawischen⁹ dar, die 1963 erschien und mit der er sich im Januar 1964 erfolgreich promovierte.

Mit diesem Buch verbinden sich zwei persönliche Erlebnisse von mir, über die ich das erste Mal berichten möchte:

Als auf einem der Höhepunkte des v. Internationalen Slawistenkongresses 1963 in Sofia der berühmte Sprachwissenschaftler Prof. Dr. Roman Osipovič Jakobson seinen Vortrag über die slawische Akzentuierung („Opyt fonologičeskogo podchoda k istoričeskim voprosam slavjanskoj akcentologii: pozdnij period slavjanskoj jazykovoju praistorii“, erschienen in: *American contributions to the 5th International Congress of Slavists*, Den Haag 1963, 153–178) hielt, sprach er einleitend davon, dass er in der Nacht davor das Buch des jungen Moskauer Linguisten Illič-Svityč gelesen habe, das in faszinierender Gründlichkeit die Vorgeschichte dessen, was er darzulegen gedenke, darstellt und ihn ungemein gefesselt habe. Der Autor des Werkes war anwesend und es war sicher für ihn in seinem kurzen Leben einer der wenigen glücklichen Momente der internationalen wissenschaftlichen Anerkennung und Würdigung seiner Leistungen.

Im zweiten Halbjahr 1963 hatte Slava mir seine Monographie nach Leipzig geschickt, wo ich damals an der Universität arbeitete. Nachdem ich die Verpackung geöffnet hatte und das Buch in der Hand hielt, fiel mir der schwarze Einband desselben auf. Ich war schockiert und ein Gefühl der Bangigkeit und Trauer überkam mich. Es sollte kein gutes Omen sein!

Die Abhandlung über die nominale Akzentuierung des Baltischen und Slawischen fand sofort nach Erscheinen in der Fachwelt höchste Anerkennung. Im Jahre 1979 erschien eine Übersetzung des Buches ins Englische unter einer erstklassigen Adresse.¹⁰ Algirdas Sabaliauskas charakterisierte das Werk in seiner „Geschichte der Forschungen zur litauischen Sprache“ als „eine der wertvollsten Untersuchungen zur balto-slawischen Akzentologie im [damals – R. E.] vergangenen Jahrzehnt.“¹¹ Er ist es auch, der uns darüber berichtet, wie Vladislav Markovič über einen längeren Zeitraum hinweg in Vilnius gearbeitet hat, die Zettelsammlungen des „Litauischen Akademie-Wörterbuches“ (*Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*) und des Litauischen Dialektatlases ausgewertet sowie einschlägige Handschriften und seltene Drucke des Litauischen studiert hat.

Mit seinem Buch leistete Illič-Svityč einen bedeutenden Beitrag zur Entwicklung der balto-slawischen und indogermanischen Akzentologie, indem er überzeugend die indogermanische Herkunft des balto-slawischen nominalen Akzentsystems begründete, die beträchtlichen Veränderungen in der Geschichte des letzteren herausarbeitete und gleichzeitig die Evolution dieses Systems in den

9 V.M. Illič-Svityč, *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Sud'ba akcentuacionnyh paradigm* (Institut slavjanovedenija AN SSSR), Moskva 1963, 176 S.

10 V.M. Illič-Svityč, *Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. Translated by Richard L. Leed and Ronald F. Feldstein, The MIT Press, Cambridge (MA) / London 1979.

11 A. Sabaliauskas, *Lietuvių kalbos tyrinėjimo istorija* (1940–1980), Vilnius 1982, 122.

anderen indogermanischen Sprachen beachtete. Eine weitere wichtige Entdeckung in diesem Buch betrifft den sekundären Charakter der slawischen Oxytona, die im Verhältnis der komplementären Distribution zu den indogermanischen Barytona stehen.

Vladislav Markovič Illič-Svityč arbeitete eng mit seinem Freund Vladimir Antonovič Dybo, dem unangefochtenen Haupt der Moskauer akzentologischen Schule zusammen und war in dieser frühen Periode der Entwicklung dieser Richtung neben Dybo zweifellos ihr markantester Vertreter.

Ende der 50er Jahre bis Mitte der 60er Jahre befasste sich V.M. Illič-Svityč tiefgründig mit einer erstaunlichen Anzahl außerindogermanischer Sprachen und Sprachfamilien, die in einem groß angelegten Werk über ihre genetische Verwandtschaft mündete. Durch den Vergleich des Semito-Hamitischen, der uralischen und altaischen Sprachen, des Drawidischen, der kartwelischen (südkaukasischen) Sprachen und des Indogermanischen gelangte er zur Rekonstruktion der sogenannten nostratischen Makrosprachfamilie. Es gelang ihm, grundlegende phonetische Entsprechungen zwischen ihnen zu ermitteln und Vorformen der ihnen gemeinsamen lexikalischen und morphologischen Elemente zu rekonstruieren und somit exakt fassbare genetische Beziehungen zwischen den genannten Sprachfamilien der Alten Welt aufzudecken. Es entstand ein grandioses Werk, das alles bisher von seinen Vorgängern in dieser Richtung Unternommene um ein Mehrfaches übertraf. Bereits auf Grund weniger, anfänglicher Informationen in Form von Thesen kam der bekannte schwedische Komparativist B. Collinder zu folgender Meinung: „Die Untersuchung des Herrn Kollegen Illič-Svityč bedeutet, wenn sie sich bewähren sollte, einen entscheidenden Fortschritt im Bereich der indo-uralaltaischen Sprachvergleiche...“¹²

Dass dieses große Unternehmen sich bewährte und ein riesiges, weit über den indogermanischen Sprachvergleich hinausgehendes Material erstmalig verallgemeinert wurde, zeigt der Nachlass des Nostratischen etymologischen Wörterbuches, das nach dem jähen Ableben von Illič-Svityč unvollendet bleiben musste. Dieses umfangreiche Œuvre ist in den 70er Jahren von seinem Freund und Mitstreiter V.A. Dybo veröffentlicht worden.¹³

Ich glaube, dass der Satz, den ich ans Ende meiner Besprechung des 2. Bandes dieses unvergleichlichen Wörterbuches gestellt habe, auch heute nach einem Vierteljahrhundert noch volle Gültigkeit besitzt: „Wer immer beim Vergleich über

12 B. Collinder, *Hat das Uralische Verwandte? Eine sprachvergleichende Untersuchung*, Uppsala 1965, 172.

13 V.M. Illič-Svityč, *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov (semitochamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij)*. *Vvedenie. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b – K)*, Moskva 1971, 370 S., und ders., *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov ... Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (l – z)*. (Ukazateli, Moskva 1976, 156 S. – Zu letzterem vgl. meine Rezension in *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung (ZfPhSK)* 34/4, Berlin 1981, 487–489.

die Schwelle EINER Sprachfamilie hinaustritt, kann an diesem imposanten Werk ... nicht vorübergehen.¹⁴

Leicht vergrößernd lässt sich der allzu kurze Schaffensweg von Vladislav Markovič Illič-Svityč in drei Etappen gliedern: (1) die slawistische Etappe (Ende der 50er und Anfang der 60er Jahre), (2) teilweise synchron dazu die Etappe der Forschungen zur Balto-Slawistik und hier vor allem zur balto-slawischen Akzentologie (1958–1963) und (3) die Etappe des nostratischen Sprachvergleiches (in der ersten Hälfte der 60er Jahre bis zu seinem vorzeitigen Tode 1966).

Wer Vladislav Markovič gekannt und getroffen hat, war sicher gleich von Anfang an ganz eingenommen von seinem freundlichen, stillen, äußerst bescheidenen Wesen; von seinem immensen Wissen, das er stets bereitwillig anderen mitteilte; von seinem glühenden Enthusiasmus für die Wissenschaft und seiner Furchtlosigkeit, sich in die tiefsten Tiefen der Sprachforschung zu begeben, wie es in dem von ihm rekonstruierten poetischen nostratischen Textstück heißt, von dem ich hier nur seine Übertragung ins Russische anführe:

Язык – это брод через реку времени,
он ведет нас к жилищу ушедших;
но туда не сможет прийти тот,
кто боится глубокой воды.¹⁵

Berlin

¹⁴ Vgl. *ZfPhSK* 34/4, 489.

¹⁵ Epigraph zum ersten Band seines posthum erschienenen Vergleichenden Wörterbuches der nostratischen Sprachen (*Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskich jazykov*, 1, Moskau 1971). – Ich danke Herrn Dr. Rick Derksen für die Anregung zu diesem Artikel und Herrn Dr. Thomas Olander und Frau Dr. Jenny Helena Larsson für die freundliche Aufnahme desselben in die Publikation über das 11. Internationale Arbeitstreffen über baltisch-slawische Akzentologie in Kopenhagen.

Slavic verbal accentuation – notes on origin and development

MIGUEL CARRASQUER VIDAL

As I argued last year at IWoBA 1 in Zagreb, I believe that Proto-Balto-Slavic had three distinct accent paradigms: barytone (I), theme-stressed (II) and mobile (III). The novelty here is the postulation of a theme-stressed paradigm, reflecting: (1) PIE oxytone *o*-stem neuters, (2) compounds with dominant (i.e. stressed) suffixes such as PIE *-ikós, and (3) verbs with PIE stress on the thematic vowel. This latter category is especially abundant, in contrast with what is the case in nominal formations, where the theme-stressed a.p. was always marginal in comparison with the other two. A thorough study of the PIE background and further development of Balto-Slavic verbal accentuation, dare I say a “Gлагол’naja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom”, would be required to put the 3-paradigm hypothesis on firmer ground and sort out all the details. I don’t have that for you now. What I have are a few suggestions about the origin and development of Slavic verbal accentuation, which I will outline below. Most of the Slavic material is drawn from the lists in Zaliznjak’s “Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj”, and is compared with PIE material largely from *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben* (edited by Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden 1998; abbr. *LIV*).

Origin of the Slavic conjugations

The first conjugation (*e*-verbs) consists of:

- 1 PIE *bhárati* verbs, which after the working of Pedersen’s law passed into the mobile (III) accent paradigm.
- 2 PIE *tudáti*-verbs, which remained in the theme-stressed (II) accent paradigm.
- 3 PIE *-ské* (*-sté*) verbs, a conspicuous category in Baltic, but marginal in Slavic. We assume they remained theme-stressed (a.p. II) in Balto-Slavic.
- 4 *dhé*-verbs, a uniquely Slavic category: athematic verbs which were thematized by generalization of the 2sg. imperative form in *-*dhí*. They were of course theme-stressed.

Many originally athematic verbs were subsequently thematized, presumably at different times, by simple substitution of thematic endings for the athematic endings, and passed into the first (or third) conjugation, resulting in the eventual reduction of the athematic category to just a handful of verbs in Common Slavic.

The second conjugation (*ne*-verbs) continues the PIE *n*-infix verbs (sg. $*b^hu-né-d^h-$, pl. $*b^hu-n-d^h-$). While Baltic generalized the plural form with *n*-infix, Slavic generalized the singular form, with theme-stressed *-né-* as a suffix ($*b^hud^h-né-$: innovation or archaism?).

The third conjugation (*je*-verbs) consisted in PIE of verbs with theme-stressed *-jé-* and zero-grade root, which naturally passed into a.p. II, and verbs with full-grade root and unstressed suffix *-je-*. This latter category seems to have passed into a.p. I instead of the mobile accent paradigm (unlike the *bhárati* verbs).

The fourth conjugation (*i*-verbs) has its origin in two separate PIE verbal categories: the causative-iteratives in *-î-*, infinitive in *-îti* (Lith. *-ô-*, inf. *-ýti*), and the essive-fientives in *-î-*, infinitive in *-ěti* (Lith. *-i-*, inf. *-ėti*). In Sanskrit, the causative-iterative suffix *-aya-* alternates with *-paya-*, the latter after verbal stems ending in a synchronic vowel. If *-aya-* and *-paya-* are variants of the same entity, and if the *p-* is not a feature of the preceding verbal stem, then *p-* must be a prefix. The only PIE morpheme I know which fits is the preverb *pē-/po-*, therefore the entity $*-ei-e/o-$ must be a verb. The Hittite thematic verb *iyami/iezzi* can be derived from a root $*(h_1)ei(h_1)-$ (variant $*(h_1)yeh_1-$), and the semantics ("do, make") are impeccable, as far as the causative is concerned. I therefore conclude that the causative-iterative suffix is in origin an incorporated verb, added to a specific (*o*-infix) form of the verb. The Slavic infinitive in *-îti* can in principle be derived from $*eiH$, $*iH$, or it can have an analogical acute after the verbs in *-âti*, *-ěti*, etc. The Lithuanian infinitive, however, can only come from $*iH$, the zero grade of the causative-iterative suffix $*-eih_1-$. The Slavic present tense with circumflex *-î-* is an irregular reduction of $*-ei(h_1)-e > *-ije- > -î-$, while the Lithuanian form is an irregular reduction of the same suffix after *-a-* had been generalized as the thematic vowel ($*-ei(h_1)-e/o- > *-eja- > *-ea- > *-â- > -ô-$).

The essive-fientive suffix is the "long diphthong" $*-eh_1(i)-$, which, according to the soundlaws laid down by Rasmussen, should have evolved to *-éh₁-* before *CC/C#*, *-éih₁-* before *C*, *-éh₁i-* before *V*, and *-h₁i-* (*-ə₁-* before */t/*) when unstressed. This points to a paradigm:

-éih₁-mi *-h₁i-mós*
-éih₁-si *-h₁i-té(s)* [*<ə₁té(s)*]
-éih₁-ti *-h₁i-énti*,

later thematized, with aorist *-éh₁-m*, *-éh₁-s*, *-éh₁-t*, transferred to the infinitive as well (Slavic *-ěti*, Lith. *-ėti*). As was the case with the *ne*-verbs, Lithuanian in the present generalized the plural form in *-i-*, while Slavic continues the singular in

-éih₁-e/o- > -î-, although maintaining the mobile accentuation of the PIE prototype.

Finally, the fifth conjugation represents the PIE thematic verbs, mostly mobile (> a.p. III), a few with fixed stress on the root (a.p. I).

Diagrammatically:

	conjugation	accent paradigm
presents:		
<i>bhárati</i>	I	III
<i>tudáti</i>	I	II
<i>-ské-/sté-</i>	I	II
<i>-d^hi</i>	I	II
<i>-né-/n-</i>	II	II
<i>-jé-</i>	III	II
<i>'-je-</i>	III	I
caus./iter.	IV	II(*)
ess./fient.	IV	III
ath. mob.	V	III
ath. stat.	V	I
infinitives		II*
<i>l</i> -participle		III
aorist 1st person		II
aorist 2/3 persons		III

NOTE * Causatives usually take the a.p. of their base word (I, II or III). Lengthened grade iteratives are a.p. I (see below).

The development of Slavic verbal accentuation: the soundlaws

Pedersen's law causes barytone thematic verbs (*bhárati*-verbs) to become mobile.

Hirt's law draws the ictus one syllable back if the immediately pretonic syllable contains a consonantal laryngeal after the syllabic peak. This affects a.p. II verbs and some a.p. III verbs containing sequences *VH* (e.g. $*léh_1\hat{g}-mi$, $*leh_1\hat{g}-mós > lěz-$), *oRH* (e.g. $*poiH-láh_2 > pěla$) and $\mathcal{R}h_1$, provided the ictus fell on the immediately following syllable (this excludes thematic mobile forms). Hirt's law fails if the laryngeal follows an *e*-diphthong ($eRH = eRə$) or if the laryngeal is h_2 or h_3 and follows a syllabic resonant ($ih_{2/3} = iə$, $uh_{2/3} = uə$, perhaps also $\mathcal{r}h_{2/3} = irə$, $lh_{2/3} = ilə$, $\mathcal{N}h_{2/3} = iNə$), as in $b^huh_2-láh_2 > bylá$, $pih_3-láh_2 > pilá$, $g^wih_3-láh_2 > žilá$.

Winter's law causes length and acute intonation on a vowel or diphthong preceding a PIE $*b$, $*d$, $*g$, $*\hat{g}$ or $*g^w$. It had no immediate effect on the place of the ictus.

Meillet's law causes, among other things, acute intonation to be lost from the barytone forms of mobile paradigms.

Meillet's law fails in closed syllables (**Slaaby-Larsen's law**). This explains the accentuation of the *l*-ptc. of *C*-verbs (*něslv*, *neslá*, *neslŏ*; *bérglv*, *berglá*, *berglŏ*, both by Dybo's law; and *kládlv*, *kládlá*, *kládlŏ* by the *jáblvko* law). It also explains the accentuation of the athematic verb "to be" (*ěsmv*, *esí*, *ěstv*, *ěsmv*, *esté*, *sŏtv*), by Dybo's law from original **és-mi*, **é(s)-seī*, **és-ti*, **es-mú*, **es-té*, **s-entí*, which failed to become enclitic due to Slaaby-Larsen's law. An unclear issue remains the accentuation of the acute athematic verbs (*věmv*, *dambv*, *ěmv*).

The **měso-law** causes a word with a pretonic circumflex in an open syllable to join the mobile accent paradigm. Obviously, this happened after Meillet's law had made circumflex intonation on the first syllable a feature of the barytone forms of mobile paradigms. The working of the law is seen in theme-stressed *né*- and *jé*-verbs having a long circumflex vowel or diphthong and ending in an open syllable, such as *vínŏ*, *mánŏ*, *mínŏ*, *měňŏ*, and *dájŏ*, *žjújŏ*, *kljújŏ*, *lějŏ*, *smějŏ*, *snújŏ*, *ŏrjŏ*, in part also *jěmjŏ* and *gŏlgŏljŏ*. A *sté*-verb like *ŏrstŏ* also seems to fit this pattern, if the syllabification was **ar.stŏ*. I cannot explain why the *dhé*-verb *kládŏ* had acquired circumflex accentuation, while *krádŏ*, *ědŏ* retained the acute.

An interesting case is constituted by *tudáti*- and *jé*-verbs ending in a syllabic resonant. In theory we would expect the following distribution:

	<i>tudáti</i>	<i>jé</i>		<i>tudáti</i>	<i>jé</i>
R	-i.Rŏ	-iR.jŏ	leading to	-iRŏ (b)	-iRjŏ (c)
RH	-iR.Hŏ	-iRH.jŏ		-iRHŏ > iRŏ (c)	-iRHjŏ > -iRjŏ (b)

That is to say, *tudáti*-verbs become a.p. *c* when they have a *set*-root, and remain a.p. *b* otherwise, while *jé*-verbs remain a.p. *b* when *set*, but become mobile when *aniŭ*. This implies that at the time of the *měso-law*, laryngeals were still phonological in Proto-Slavic.

In practice, we find:

aniŭ		set	
a.p. b	a.p. c	a.p. b	a.p. c
(<i>tudáti</i>)	(<i>jé</i> -verbs)	(<i>jé</i> -verbs)	(<i>tudáti</i>)
<i>jŏmŏ jęti</i> * <i>h₁em-</i>	<i>mŏr(j)ŏ mertí</i> * <i>mer-</i>	<i>dŏm(j)ŏ² dŏti</i> * <i>d^hmeH-</i>	<i>žŏrŏ žertí</i> * <i>g^werh₃-</i>
<i>čŏnŏ čęti</i> * <i>ken-</i>	<i>stŏr(j)ŏ stertí</i> * <i>ster⁻¹</i>	<i>žŏn(j)ŏ žęti</i> * <i>g^wjeh₃-</i>	<i>nŏrŏ nertí</i> * <i>nerH-</i>
<i>žŏmŏ žęti</i> * <i>gem-</i>		<i>žŏr(j)ŏ žŏrti</i> * <i>g^werH-</i>	<i>pŏrŏ pertí</i> * <i>sp^herH-</i>
		<i>tŏr(j)ŏ tŏrti</i> * <i>terh₁-</i>	<i>klŏnŏ kletí</i> * <i>klenH-</i>
			<i>pŏnŏ pęti</i> *(s) <i>penh₁-</i>
			<i>tŏnŏ tęti</i> * <i>temh₁-</i>

NOTES 1. LIV (sub **sterh₃*): "Möglicherweise wird von dem slav. Verbum auch **ster*- 'niederstrecken' fortgesetzt". 2. cf. Lith. *dumiù*.

An apparent exception is *mŏnŏ męti* (Lith. *minù*), probably originally an athematic verb (thus LIV).

By the **jáblvko law** the accent is retracted from theme-stressed paradigms (including infinitives) to the first acute syllable. This retraction law must be kept distinct from Hirt's law, and works in circumstances where Hirt's law had previously failed, or did not apply, such as in the case of sequences **erH*, **Rh_{2/3}* and acutes caused by Winter's law. Examples include presents such as *čjújŏ*, *bljújŏ*, *pljújŏ* (with **euH*), infinitives such as *býti*, *žiti* and *piti* (with **uh₂* or **ih₃*) and presents such as *věrgŏ*, *ědŏ*, *běgajŏ*, etc. (with acute by Winter's law).

The phenomena traditionally attributed to **Stang's law** are in my opinion best separated into at least two sets of soundlaws, one occurring before Dybo's law, the other after it. The former is Common Slavic in extent, and generally results in neo-acute intonation, without lengthening of short vowels. Among the phenomena that belong here are (1) the fixing of the accent (old acute or neo-acute) to the first or last syllable of the word in compounds (*moldŏ-jŏ*, *bělŏ-jŏ*, *dŏnŏ-sŏ*, *po-tŏpŏ*, *bez-bŏrdŏ*), (2) the retraction of non-acute stress from medial syllables in a.p. II verbs, with subsequent contrastive advancement of the stress in the 2/3 sg. of a.p. III verbs:

<i>lug-jŏ</i>	= <i>lŏžjŏ</i>	<i>běrŏ</i>	= <i>běrŏ</i>
<i>lug-jési</i>	> <i>lŏžješŏ</i>	<i>běresi</i>	> <i>berešŏ</i>
<i>lug-jęti</i>	> <i>lŏžjetŏ</i>	<i>bęreti</i>	> <i>beretŏ</i>
<i>lug-jému</i>	> <i>lŏžjemŏ</i>	<i>beremú</i>	= <i>beremŏ</i>
<i>lug-jęte</i>	> <i>lŏžjete</i>	<i>bereté</i>	= <i>beretŏ</i>
<i>lug-jánti</i>	> <i>lŏžjŏtŏ</i>	<i>berantí</i>	= <i>berŏtŏ</i>

The second set comprises post-Common Slavic phenomena, also resulting in neo-acute intonation, but usually with lengthening of short vowels, such as (1) stress retraction in *voljā*-nouns (Cz. *vůle*), (2) stress retraction in *aje*-verbs (*pytāje* > *pytā-* > *pýta-*), etc.

The loss of stress on weak jers (**Ivšič's law**) must probably be placed somewhere in between "Stang I" and "Stang II".

Barytone (a.p. I) verbs with non-acute intonation were subject to **Dybo's law**. Old a.p. II verbs with retraction due to Stang's law were not, because they had rising [neo-acute] intonation. In an old a.p. I verb such as *mogti*, Dybo's law should have resulted in a paradigm like:

<i>mágŏ</i>	> <i>mogŏ</i>
<i>mágesi</i>	> <i>možěšŏ</i>
<i>mágeti</i>	> <i>možętŏ</i>
<i>mágemu</i>	> <i>možémŏ</i>

mágete > *možéte*
máganti > *mogótv*

As a result of the **Stang II** retraction, this was secondarily adapted to the standard a.p. *b* model, giving e.g. Czech *mohu*, *můžeš*, *může*. The retraction must post-date the dialectal lengthening of the thematic vowel, because in dialects where the stressed thematic vowel remains short (Štokavian), we have *můžeš*, like *pléteš*, while in dialects where the stressed thematic vowel is lengthened (Old Czech) we have *možéme* like *vedéme*.

As noticed by Dybo, the distribution of *je*-verbs with lengthened root vowel is the following: *ii* > *ī*, *uu* > *ū* are in a.p. *a* (*sýpati*, *mýkati*, *smýkati*, *týkati*, *sýsati*, *prýskati*, *brýzgatī*, *stígati*), while *ee* > *ē*, *aa* > *ā* are in a.p. *b* (*skakāti*, *xapāti*, *xramāti*, *makāti*, *kazāti*, *drēmāti*). The lengthening of the root vowel in these verbs must therefore be relatively ancient, as it follows the PIE distribution, where the only long /ī/ and /ū/ were acute (from /iH/ and /uH/), while *ā*, *ē* and *ō* could be either acute or circumflex. In particular, the formation of these verbs must predate the development **ei* > *i* and Meillet's law (which created new *i*'s and *ū*'s (*y*'s)).

There is a category of verbs with lengthened root vowel which could be even older than the *sýpati/stígati/skakāti/drēmāti*-group, at least it is claimed to be of already PIE origin by the makers of *LIV*. These are causative/iteratives (Slavic *i/i*-verbs) with a lengthened root vowel, *LIV* category 4b (*R(ō̄)-je-*). If the claim were false, and these formations were of later, early (Balto-)Slavic age, one would expect these verbs (all with root vowel /a/) to fall into a.p. *b*, like the *skakāti*-verbs. This is not the case. Instead, we find the verbs in question scattered over all three accent paradigms:

gāziti and *vāditi* are a.p. *a*
davīti, *palīti* and *travīti* are a.p. *b*
sadīti and *gasīti* are a.p. *c*

I am not sure about the a.p. of *kaniti*, *račiti* and *mariti*, but they appear to be a.p. *b* or *c* (SCR. *kāniti kānim*, *māriti mārīm*, Russ. *račítel'nyj*). Since these verbs are not uniformly a.p. *b*, they cannot be lengthened /a/'s of the *skakāti*-type (/aa/ > /ā/). But a lengthened vowel of PIE origin (*Dehnstufe*) should be reflected in Balto-Slavic as an acute long vowel (/ā/ > /ā̄/), and the verbs are not uniformly a.p. *a* either. The pattern is in fact similar to the one we found above in the theme-stressed *tudāti* and *je*-verbs with syllabic resonant, except that the starting point here was the root-stressed a.p.: roots of the structure /ōC/, /ōR/ remain a.p. *a*, while roots of the structure /ōRH/ become a.p. *b*. We have:

*g^(w)ō̄ĝ^h-eje- > gōz-ī-; *wō̄d^hh₁-eje- > wōd-ī-

as opposed to:

*dhō̄uH-eje- > dōw-ī-; *trō̄uH-eje- > trōw-ī-; *kō̄nh₁-eje- > kōn-ī-

In the first set, the syllabification is *g^(w)ō̄-ĝ^he-je-, *wō̄-d^h(h₁)e-je- with a long rising vowel in the first syllable, which remains in a.p. *1* (*a*). In the second set, it is *d^hō̄u-He-je-, *trō̄u-He-je-, *kō̄n-h₁e-je-, with a long falling diphthong in the first syllable, and therefore a circumflex (cf. the circumflex in *(H)ō̄u-jóm > ōje > vājel/jāje, or *mēmsóm* > *męso*). When the laryngeal fell away, the semivowel/resonant was pulled to the next syllable, but the circumflex accentuation stayed. The stress was subsequently advanced by Dybo's law.

PIE barytone *je*-verbs did not join the mobile a.p. as did barytone *e*-verbs, but instead remained in the barytone a.p. Short-vowelled verbs underwent stress advancement by Dybo's law and then retraction + lengthening by Stang II. This can be seen in cases such as *kólje-* > *koljé-* > *kōljē-* (Cz. *kůle*), and presumably the other verbs in this same category (*koljō* (Lith. *kalù*, Latv. *kaļu*), *borjō* (Lith. *barù*, Latv. *baru*), *meljō* (Lith. *malù*, Latv. *maļu*), *poljō* ~ *peljō*, *porjō*). It can also be seen in an *o*-grade *je*-verb like *stonāti*, *stonjō*, Cz. *stoňu*, *stůněš*.

The Old Russian verb *svrāti*, *serjō* follows a.p. *b*, which is surprising for an *e*-verb. We are in fact dealing with an old *je*-verb (cf. Slov. *sérjem*), with loss of palatalization of /r'/, as in a number of other cases. If the verb had been end-stressed **ker(H)-jé-*, the reconstruction (which *LIV* leaves at **ker(H)-* "Set-Wurzel nicht ausgeschlossen"), must necessarily be **kerH-*, as a form **sēr-jé-* would have passed into a.p. *c* by the *męso*-law. On the other hand, if the verb was barytone in PIE, a form **kér(H)-je-* (either *set* or *aniť*) would have developed into *serjō*, *serjěšb* by Dybo's law (the laryngeal is lost in this environment), and then with retraction: *ser(j)ō*, *sěr(j)ěšb*, as is indeed suggested by Czech *seru*, *séřeš*, *séře*.

Summary

Original a.p.	Resulting a.p.
I → Dybo + Stang II	<i>a</i> <i>b</i> e.g. <i>mogó</i>
II Hirt / <i>jāblōko</i> → <i>męso</i>	<i>a</i> e.g. <i>bājō</i> , <i>věrgō</i> <i>b</i> <i>c</i> e.g. <i>měbrō</i>
III Hirt / Slaaby-Larsen Slaaby-Larsen + Dybo →	<i>a</i> e.g. <i>lězō</i> , <i>pādla</i> <i>b</i> e.g. <i>nesló</i> <i>c</i>

Hilversum

Slavic evidence for Balto-Slavic oxytona

RICK DERKSEN

1 According to Kortlandt (1975: 4–7), the shape of the Slavic mobile paradigm was partly determined by a retraction of the stress from final open syllables to an immediately preceding syllable unless the latter was closed by an obstruent, e.g. Ru. *pilá* f. : *pílo* n. 'drank' vs. *neslá* f. : *nesló* n. 'carried'. The final stress in the latter example is not due to Dybo's law, as we are dealing with a mobile verb. I have argued on several occasions (e.g. 1996: 66–128), that the aforementioned formulation of the retraction implies that in Late Balto-Slavic neuter *o*-stems there existed an oxytone paradigm alongside the regular immobile and mobile paradigms. In Slavic, the oxytone neuter *o*-stems ultimately joined AP (b). Here I shall examine a number of instances where a final jer preceded by a consonant cluster of the above-mentioned type may be assumed to have retained the stress up to the stage where final jers lost their stressability. I shall then proceed to more general observations, while referring to Illič-Svityč's monograph on nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic (1963).

2. The retraction of the stress from a final jer – a development which must have preceded Dybo's law – yielded long rising syllables, e.g. Sln. *góř* Gpl. 'mountains', Ru. *golóv*, Ukr. *holív* Gpl. 'heads', Sln. *možéh* Lpl., Cz. *mužích* Lpl. 'men', Slk. *nesieš* 2sg. (< **-šě*) 'carry', *nesie* 3sg. (< **-tě*) 'carries'. This circumstance can be used to identify pre-Dybo final stress. Thus, the length reflected in Pl. *niósł* m., Slk. *niesol* m. 'carried' originates from a retraction of the stress in **neslě*, where the sequence **-sl-* had blocked Ebeling's law. A similar case is OCz. *šel* m., Slk. *šiel* m. 'went' < **švdlě* (cf. Bulaxovskij 1953: 26). Here the original final stress is confirmed by the raising of pretonic *e* to *ě* in a palatal environment, which seems to have occurred prior to Dybo's law (Kortlandt 1984–1985). Another example of pretonic raising is OCS *žvzlě*, *žezlě*, Ru. *žezl* 'stick, staff, sceptre', where in spite of the fact that in Old Russian both AP (b) and (c) are attested I assume that the end-stressed paradigm is original, cf. the variant **žezlě* attested in Czech, Serbo-Croatian and Slovene.

The Nsg. of the word for 'rain' is attested with a long root vowel, e.g. Cz. *děšť* (alongside *dešť*), Slk. *dážď*, Pl. (dial.) *děšč* (cf. Topolińska 1968: 77fn.), Čak. *dáš* (Orbanići, see Kalsbeek 1998: 432). In a forthcoming publication I suggest that

the long root vowel in these forms can be attributed to the retraction of the stress from jers in final syllables, assuming that in **dǒždžǐb* final stress had been preserved after a closed syllable. The length in the Nsg. was often analogically eliminated. To my knowledge, there is no independent evidence for original oxytone accentuation.

PSl. **ogǐnb*, which in most Slavic languages is now a *jo*-stem belonging to (b), was originally a masculine *i*-stem (cf. Illič-Svityč 1963: § 57). One may wonder if the fact that **ogǐnb* was not affected by the generalization of accentual mobility in the *i*-stems can be connected with the preservation of end-stress after the cluster **-gn-*. There seem to be no indications that this is the case, however. Furthermore, the Lithuanian variant *ùgnis* (AP 2) is reliably attested.

Two more *i*-stems belonging to (b) that are discussed by Illič-Svityč (l.c.) are the cardinals **sedmb* and **osmb*. He assumes that the accentual difference between these numerals on the one hand and **pǐtb* and **šestb* (c) on the other reflects an IE barytone vs. oxytone distinction. For the originally barytone type he refers to the above-mentioned **ogǐnb* and to Sln. *ôst* 'spike, thorn' (with *ô* reflecting neo-acute tone). For the oxytone type he adduces Skt. *pañkti-* 'set of five', *šaṣṭi-* 'sixty'. The direct comparison with Sanskrit may not be justified, however, cf. Lith. *penki*, *šeši* with adjectival inflexion. I am inclined to assume original final stress for 'seven' and 'eight', cf. Skt. *saptá*, *aṣṭá-*, Gk. *ἑπτὰ*, *ὀκτώ*, Go. *sibun*. For Balto-Slavic I posit **septin* and **ostóH*, which were reshaped in Baltic and Slavic separately. Due to the structure of the first syllable, these numerals retained final stress and later joined AP (b). The numerals 'five' and 'six' may have been **pǐnk(e)* and **šes* at the time of the operation of Ebeling's law, cf. Gk. *πέντε*, *ἕξ*. In Slavic they acquired the suffix **-tb* and like most *i*-stems joined the mobile type. The ordinal **pǐtǐ(jb)*, which belongs to AP (b), may continue BSl. **pǐnktoš* (for older **p(e)nk^w(t)ós*). The ordinals **šeštǐ(jb)* (c), **sedmǐ(jb)* (b) and **osmǐ(jb)* (b) belong to the same accent paradigm as the corresponding cardinals.

3. For the marginal class of oxytone *o*-stem neuters I have assumed that in Slavic they joined the barytone neuters between the loss of the laryngeals in pretonic syllables and the shortening of pretonic long vowels. In my view, it is not entirely sure what the fate of the oxytone masculine *o*-stems may have been. An important question is whether this class would have become mobile as a consequence of Illič-Svityč's law, i.e. the generalization of accentual mobility in masculine *o*-stems with a non-acute root vowel. If not, it is no longer a necessity that masculine *o*-stems belonging to (b) are original neuters, provided that the structure is such that the etymon would not have been affected by Ebeling's law.

The tree name **berstǐ* 'elm' is generally derived from an adjective 'bright, shining', cf. Go. *bairhts*. Illič-Svityč (1963: § 52) reconstructs AP (b) – with transfer to

(c) in a number of languages – and accordingly assumes an original neuter.¹ As in the case of **gvozdb* 'thicket, forest' and **xvostǐ* 'id.', which Illič-Svityč derives from **guostom* and **sguostom*, respectively, the reconstruction of an original neuter may not be necessary. In the case of the words for 'thicket', OPr. *twaxtan* 'bath besom', emended to *gwaxtan* by Illič-Svityč, can hardly be regarded as firm support for original neuter gender. I have no opinion on Ru. *šest*, dial. *šost* 'pole' < **šbstǐ* or **šestǐ* (b), which Illič-Svityč rather unconvincingly regards as a neuter substantivization of Gk. *σχιστός* 'split'.

PSl. **dǒždžǐb* (b) < **dus-diu(s)* may have remained unaffected by Illič-Svityč's law because it was neuter, which is uncertain, but one may also argue that at that stage it was not a *jo*-stem. For **drozdb* 'thrush', where original neuter gender is unlikely, Illič-Svityč (1963: § 45) reconstructs a (barytone) *u*-stem, cf. OIc. *þrǫstr* 'id.', to account for the reflexes of AP (b), which occur beside reflexes of (c). I would consider an oxytone masculine *o*-stem, cf. Lith. *strāzdas* 4, where we find no attestations of fixed root stress, which is what we would expect in the case of an old neuter (see Derksen 1996: 126–128). The reconstruction of a BSl. *u*-stem is more convincing in the case of **bebrus* 'beaver', PSl. **bebrǐ*, **bobrǐ*, **bǐbrǐ*. I am hesitant about accounting for the variant **bǐbrǐ* (ORu. *bǐbrǐ*, SCR. *dābar*) by assuming pretonic raising because it is not a palatal environment.

4. According to Illič-Svityč (1963: § 55), adjectives with a jer in the root are excluded from the comparison with IE oxytona because they shifted from the mobile paradigm to the oxytone paradigm as a result of the loss of weak jers. He specifically mentions **tǐščǐb* 'emaciated, empty', **pǐstrǐ* 'motley' and **čǐrnǐ* 'black', cf. Skt. *tucchyá-* 'empty', Gk. *πικρός*, 'sharp, bitter', Skt. *kṛṣṇá-* 'black'. It seems to me that this explanation is untenable, cf. **tvǐrdǐ* 'hard', **pǐrxǐ* 'dust', or **sǐto* 'hundred', which are all mobile. Note that for the South-Slavic reflexes of nouns such as **lbnǐ* 'flax' and **mǐxǐ* 'moss' Illič-Svityč (1963: § 57) assumes the converse development, starting with introduction of the accentuation and vocalism of the NAsg. into other case forms. In my opinion, it is more likely that **tǐščǐb* and **pǐstrǐ* retained the inherited oxytone accentuation. In the case of **pǐstrǐ*, the comparative evidence for this assumption is unfortunately not very strong, considering that *πικρός* belongs to a productive type. As to *tucchyá-*, it should be noted that Lubotsky (1988: 90) is reluctant to include this form in the evidence as it derives from a present stem. I see no objection to comparing the accentuation of the isolated form *tucchyá-* with **tǐščǐb* and Lith. *tūščias*, which in Daukša's writings shows no evidence for AP 2. In the case of **čǐrnǐ*, barytone accentuation may be original (Lubotsky 1988: 87).

1 Note that if the root is **b^hrh₁ǵ-* 'shine' (cf. Skt. *bhrājate*), which has also been assumed for PSl. **bǐrza* (a), Lith. *bėrzas* 1/3 'birch', the laryngeal appears to have been lost in pretonic position.

At this moment I am unable to present a comprehensive overview of the accentuation of masculine *o*-stem substantives or *o*-/*ā*-adjectives containing a sequence -CC- where the first consonant is an obstruent. A preliminary survey indicates that for words of this type the distribution between AP's (b) and (c) is such that AP (b) is predominant. Notable exceptions are **līstǔ* 'leaf', **mōstǔ* 'bridge' and **mōzǔgǔ* 'brain'. Of course, we must keep in mind that the majority of the etyma belonging to (b) are probably original barytona. I would like to single out the following etyma:

- **glīstǔ* (b), e.g. Ru. *glīst*, Cz. *hlíst* 'intestinal worm'. If this etymon contains the root **gleh₁i-* that we find in SCr. *gljīva* 'tree-fungus', Lith. *glėivės* 'slime', it becomes very difficult to explain why the word is not (a) or (c). We may assume **glh₁istós* with loss of **H* in pretonic position and compensatory lengthening.
- **bōdrǔ* (b) 'lively': **buditi* 'awaken' (c), cf. Lith. *budrūs* 'vigilant'.
- The etymology of **nāglǔ* (b) 'sudden' is unclear. Trubačėv (1976) suggests that **nāglǔ* is etymologically identical with **nāgǔ* (c) 'naked' and continues **nagnǔ*. If this is correct or, more in general, if **nāglǔ* dates back to Balto-Slavic, one might assume that Ebeling's law did not apply and that the glottal stop (originating from Winter's law) was lost in pretonic position.

5. Finally, I would like to return to **žezlǔ/žbzlǔ*. As this word belongs to (b), we must assume that it continues a barytone neuter unless we adopt my suggestion that masculine *o*-stems belonging to (b) may also continue oxytone masculine *o*-stems. In this case that does not seem to be a viable solution, however, cf. the variant **žezlǔ*. On the other hand, the variation regarding the vocalism of the root points to original final stress.

As pointed out by Illič-Svityč (1963: § 49), there is a large-scale fluctuation between masculine and neuter *o*-stems belonging to AP (b). It seems plausible that the originally barytone *o*-stems, which had a NAsg. in *-*ǔ* but a NApl. in *-*aH* and may have shown neuter agreement, tended to acquire the NAsg. in *-*o* (l.c.). This tendency may have been reinforced by the co-existence of barytone neuters in *-*ǔ* with inherited fixed stress on an acute root and barytone neuters in *-*o* that had acquired fixed stress on an acute root as a result of Hirt's law. In this situation it seems conceivable that occasionally *-*o* was replaced with *-*ǔ*. For cases like **žezlǔ/žbzlǔ* vs. **žezlǔ*, where final stress seems to be old, we have little choice but to assume that the variant in *-*o* is original. In view of the pretonic raising, the variant in *-*ǔ* must have originated before the retraction of the stress from final jers and therefore before Dybo's law. Substitution of *-*ǔ* for *-*o* may also be posited for **pǔrstǔ* (b) 'finger', where on the basis of OPr. *pirsten* and perhaps Skr. *pṛṣṭhā-* n. 'back, mountain ridge' I would in principle have expected a neuter in -*o*. With AP (a) we find Cz. *týl* vs. Slk. *tylo* 'back of the neck' from **týlǔ* < **túHlom*

but Ru. dial. *jat* 'shoal of fish' vs. SCr. *jǎto* 'herd, flock' from **jǎto* < **ieh₂tód* << **ieh₂tóm*.

Leiden University

References

- Bulaxovskij, L. A.
1953 *Akcentologičeskij kommentarij k češskomu jazyku. Vypusk 1: Obščie javlenija*. Kiev: Kievskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. T. G. Ševčenko.
- Derksen, R.
1996 *Metatony in Baltic*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
forthc. "Quantity patterns in the Upper Sorbian noun". – To appear in: *Evidence and counter-evidence: Linguistic essays in honour of Frederik Kortlandt's sixtieth birthday. Volume 1* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 32): *Balto-Slavic and Indo-European linguistics*.
- Kalsbeek, J.
1998 *The Čakavian dialect of Orbančić near Žminj* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 25). Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Kortlandt, F.
1975 *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.
1984–1985 "On reduced vowels in Slavic". *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27–28 (Festschrift Ivič), 367–368.
- Illič-Svityč, V. M.
1963 *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*. Moskva: Institut Slavjanovedenija.
- Lubotsky, A. M.
1988 *Nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden: Brill.
- Topolińska, Z.
1968 "Zakres i chronologia tzw. wzdłużenia zastępczego w językach zachodniosłowiańskich". In: H. Faßke and R. Löttsch (eds.), *Přimoški k serbskemu řečespytej* (Beiträge zur sorbischen Sprachwissenschaft), 75–83. Budyšin: Domowina.
- Trubačėv, O. N.
1976 "Principy i metody semantičeskix issledovanij". In: *Ėtimologičeskie issledovanija i leksičeskaja semantika*, 173–177.

Система порождения акцентных типов производных в балто-славянском языке

В. А. ДЫБО

Исследования по реконструкции систем порождения акцентных типов производных в праславянском и пралитовском языках привели к восстановлению двух языковых систем, тождественных по своим основополагающим принципам, правилам и единицам. В одних случаях они совпадают как в словообразовательном, так и в акцентологическом отношении, в других – они представляют разные части (“обломки”) фактически одной системы, которые могут быть объединены в ходе дальнейшей реконструкции.

Введение понятия морфонологической акцентуационной валентности и рассмотрение явления, отраженного этим понятием, как некоего просодического явления праславянского и балто-славянского языков привело к ряду нетривиальных результатов.

1 Производные с первичными (прикорневыми) суффиксами

Изучение славянского и балтийского отглагольного словообразования с прикорневыми суффиксами приводит к выводу, что они делятся на два класса, аналогичные двум классам вторичных суффиксов: I класс – класс балто-славянских прикорневых “рецессивных” суффиксов, т. е. (-)-суффиксов, и II класс – балто-славянские прикорневые суффиксы, которые можно рассматривать как “доминантные”, т. е. (+)-суффиксы. Как и следовало ожидать, при “рецессивных” суффиксах производные сохраняли акцентную парадигму (а.п.) производящих, тогда как при “доминантных” суффиксах производные получали неподвижный акцентный тип независимо от а.п. производящего.

Наряду с этим предсказываемым теорией результатом был получен также результат [Николаев 1986], который непосредственно теорией не предсказывался: оказалось, что в производных с “доминантными” суффиксами от акутированных корней “рецессивного”, т. е. (-)-класса, происходит метатония “акут → циркумфлекс”, тогда как в этих же производных от акутированных корней “доминантного”, т. е. (+)-класса, метатония отсутствует:

1.1 Балто-славянская метатония в производных с суффиксами “доминантного” класса (-to-, -sto-, -tlo-, -dlo- и под.): акутированные корни с (-)-маркировкой меняют интонацию на циркумфлекс

Производные от балто-славянских глаголов подвижного акцентного типа:

1.1.1 Литовский

a суфф. -ta-s

- 1 лит. *stōtas* (2) ‘телосложение’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *stóti* ‘стать, становиться’, лтш. *stāt* ‘остановиться, останавливаться’; слав. **-stājō*, **-stajetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 302–303].
- 2 лит. *klōtas*, pl. *klōtai* (2) ‘мостки’ ~ лит. *klóti* ‘стелить; накрывать’, лтш. *klāt* ‘покрывать, стлать’; слав. **klādō*, **kladetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 354–355].
- 3 лит. *graiūztas* (2) ‘огрызок’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *gráužti* ‘грызть, глотать’, лтш. *graužt* ‘грызть, глотать’; слав. **grȳzō*, **gryzetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 354].
- 4 лит. *dōtas* (2) ‘подарок’ ~ лит. *duoti* ‘дать, давать’, лтш. *duôt* ‘дать, давать’; слав. **dājō*, **dajetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 299–300].
- 5 лит. **nuo-dētas* (> жемайт. *nū-dētas*) (2) ‘Sünde’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *dēti* ‘класть, ставить, помещать’, лтш. *dēt* ‘класть яйца’; *dėtiēš* ‘деваться, деться’; слав. **dějō*, **djetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 296–298, 512].
- 6 лит. **mōtas* (2) в adv. (instr. pl.) *mōtais* ‘in Betracht’ ~ лит. *móti* ‘махать; кивать’, лтш. *māt* ‘махать; кивать’; слав. **mājō*, **majetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 301].
- 7 лит. *sōstas* (2; *SkŽD* 321) ‘трон, престол’ [Николаев 1989: 78] при вторичном *sóstas* (1), *pa-sēstas* (2) ‘сидение’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *sēsti* ‘сесть, садиться’, лтш. *sēstiēš* ‘сесть, садиться’; слав. (caus.) **sādjō*, **saditb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 458].
- 8 лит. *džiaūtas* (2; *SkŽD* 320) ‘pintinaitė sūriams džiovinti’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *džiūti* ‘вешать для просушки’, лтш. *žaiūt* ‘развешивать для просушки’.
- 9 лит. *plaiūtas* (2) ‘полók’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *pláuti* ‘полоскать, стирать, мыть’; лтш. *plaušt* ‘ausgiessen; nass machen (durch Waschen pamentlich)’; слав. **plǫvō*, **plovetb* и **plȳnō*, **plynetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 286, 329].
- 10 лит. *ap-maūtas* (2) ‘чехол’, *pa-maūtas* (2) ‘недоуздок’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *máuti* ‘надевать, напяливать’, лтш. *maūt* ‘anziehen, aufziehen; zäumen’.
- 11 лит. *plaiūstas* (2; *Šl.* 352) ‘paróm’ [Николаев 1989: 78] при вторичном *pláustas* (1) ~ лит. *pláusti* ‘полоскать, мыть, стирать’, лтш. *plaušt* ‘ausgiessen; nass machen’.

- 12 лит. *kliūtas* (2; *Jušk.* II, 167) ‘карша, замоина’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *kliáutiš* ‘полагаться на кого-л., доверять кому-л.; лнуть; держаться за кого-л., что-л.’, лтш. *kļaiūt* ‘прижимать (к себе)’.
- 13 лит. *naītas* (2) ‘норов’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *nėrti* ‘вязать, плести, набрасывать (петлю); нырять’; лтш. *niūt* ‘нырять’; слав. **nǫrō*, **nǫretb* (а.п. с; словен. praes. 1.sg. *pondrēm*).
- 14 лит. *spraiūstas* (2) ‘шпунт’ [Николаев 1989: 78] ~ лит. *spráusti* ‘втискивать, впихивать’, лтш. *spraiūst* ‘втыкать, вкалывать’.

b суфф. -sta-s

- 1 лит. *klōstas*, pl. *klōstai* (2) ‘жерди, которыми надавливается мочимый лен; мостки’ [Николаев 1989: 79] ~ лит. *klóti* ‘стелить; накрывать’, лтш. *klāt* ‘покрывать, стлать’; слав. **klādō*, **kladetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 354–355].
- 2 лит. *mōstas* (2) ‘жест’ [Николаев 1989: 79] ~ лит. *móti* ‘махать; кивать’, лтш. *māt* ‘махать; кивать’; слав. **mājō*, **majetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 301].
- 3 лит. *aūkštas* (2) ‘этаж, ярус, чердак’ [Николаев 1989: 79] ~ лит. *augti* ‘расти’, лтш. *augt* ‘расти’.
- 4 лит. *šluōstas* (2) ‘тряпка для вытирания’ [Николаев 1989: 79] ~ лит. *šluoti* ‘мести, подметать’, лтш. *sluôt* ‘ohne Zweck umhergehen, schlendern, bummeln’.
- 5 лит. *pa-grēbstai* (pl.; 2) ‘сгребки, сгребенные остатки’ [Николаев 1989: 79] ~ лит. *grėbti* ‘грести (граблями), сгребать’; ср. слав. **grěbō*, **grebetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 363].
- 6 лит. *naīstas* (2; *SkŽD* 324) ‘verknötete Stelle der Peitsche, damit sie kürzer wird’ ~ лит. *nėrti* ‘вязать, плести, набрасывать (петлю); нырять’; лтш. *niūt* (С.), *nirt²* ‘нырять’; слав. **nǫrō*, **nǫretb* (а.п. с; словен. praes. 1.sg. *pondrēm*).

c суфф. -kla-s

- 1 лит. *dėklas* (2) ‘кобура, футляр’ [Николаев 1989: 79] ~ лит. *dėti* ‘класть, ставить, помещать’, лтш. *dēt* ‘класть яйца’; *dėtiēš* ‘деваться, деться’; слав. **dějō*, **djetb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 296–298, 512].
- 2 лит. *pa-būklas* (2) ‘орудие’ [Николаев 1989: 79] ~ лит. *būti* ‘быть’, лтш. *būt* ‘быть’; слав. (l-part.) **bŭlŭ*, **bylā*, **bŭlo* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 513, 500].
- 3 лит. *tiñklas* (2) ‘сеть, невод’ [Николаев 1989: 79] ~ лит. *tinti* ‘пухнуть’, лтш. *tīt* ‘мотать, наматывать; навивать; накручивать; крутить, свертывать; окутывать, пеленать’.
- 4 лит. *pa-neřklas* (2) ‘wiązadlo, którym przywiązuje się bat do biczyska’, *prineřklas* (2) ‘virvelė botagai prie koto priřišti (prinerti); spragilo jungas’ ~

лит. *nėrti* 'вязать, плести, набрасывать (петлю); нырять'; лтш. *niřt* (С.), *niřt²* 'нырять'; слав. **něřq*, **něretb* (а.п. с: словен. праes. 1.sg. *pondrēm*).

- 5 лит. *spīřklas* (2) 'пинок, удар (ногой)' ~ лит. *spīřti* 'брыкнуть, брыкать, пнуть, пинать, лягать, ударять (ногой); упираться, подпирать', лтш. *speřt* 'ударить, пнуть; лягать, брыкать'; слав. **pěřq*, **peretb* (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 274, 254–257].

1.1.2 Славянский (→ а.п. b)

a суфф. -dlo

- 1 слав. **dědlo* > **dědlō* [Николаев 1989: 85] ~ слав. **dějř*, **dějretb*; inf. **děti*; лит. *dėti* 'класть, ставить, помещать', лтш. *dēt* 'класть яйца'; *dėtiėš* 'деваться, деться' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 296–298, 512].
- 2 слав. **pědlo* > **pědlō* [Николаев 1989: 85] ~ слав. **pěņq*, **pěnetb*; inf. **pěti*; лит. *piņti* 'плести, вить; спутывать', лтш. *pīt* 'плести, заплетать' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 258–259, 267].
- 3 слав. **žerđlo*, **žvřdlo* > **žerdlō*, **žvřdlō* [Николаев 1989: 86] ~ слав. **žerř*, **žeretb*; **žvřq*, **žvřetb*; inf. **žvřati*, **žerti*; лит. *gėrti* 'пить', лтш. *dzeřt* 'пить' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 266, 273, 490, 493, 501, 506].
- 4 слав. **stādlo* > **stādłō* [Николаев 1989: 86] ~ слав. **stājř*, **stajetb*; inf. **stajāti*; лит. *stōti* 'стать, становиться', лтш. *stāt* 'остановиться, останавливаться' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 302–303].
- 5 слав. **židlo* > **židłō* [Николаев 1989: 88] ~ слав. **živř*, **živetb*; inf. **žiti*; лит. *gyti* 'заживать' (в Библии Хилинского 'жить'), лтш. *dzīt* 'заживать' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 287–288].
- 6 слав. **būdlo* > **bydlō* [Николаев 1989: 88] ~ слав. (l-part.) **bylb*, **bylā*, **býlo*; лит. *būti* 'быть', лтш. *būt* 'быть' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 513, 500].
- 7 слав. **žędlo* > **žędlō* 'жало' [Николаев 1989: 86] ~ лит. *gėlti* 'жалить, кусать; болеть, ныть, ломить', лтш. *dzeřt* 'жалить, кусать (о змее); жечь, обжигать (о крапиве).
- 8 слав. **veřdlo* > **verdlō* 'источник' [Николаев 1989: 86] ~ лит. *virti* 'кипеть; вариться', лтш. *viřt* 'кипеть, вариться'.
- 9 слав. **tvěřdlo* > **tvěrdłō* 'загон для скота' [Николаев 1989: 86] ~ лит. *tvėrti* 'огораживать, ставить забор; делать перевязку, перевязывать; прикреплять, вставлять', лтш. *tvėřt* 'хватать, ловить'.
- 10 слав. **peřdlo* > **perdlō* 'проход' [Николаев 1989: 86] ~ слав. **pěřq*, **peretb*; inf. **pěřati* (а.п. с); ? лит. *spīřti* 'брыкнуть, брыкать, пнуть, пинать, лягать, ударять (ногой); упираться, подпирать', лтш. *speřt* 'ударить, пнуть; лягать, брыкать' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 274, 266].

1.2 Отсутствие балто-славянской метатонии в производных с суффиксами "доминантного" класса (-to-, -sto-, -flo-, -dlo- и под.): акутированные корни с (+)-маркировкой не меняют интонации

Производные от балто-славянских глаголов неподвижного акцентного типа:

1.2.1 Литовский

a суфф. -ta-s

- 1 лит. *kāltas* (1) 'долото' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *kālti* 'ковать, вбивать, долбить', лтш. *kaļt* 'ковать; долбить (о дятле)'; слав. **koljř*, **koljetb*; inf. **kōlti* (а.п. b/a) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 265].
- 2 лит. *būrtas* (1) 'жребий, ворожба, чары' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *būrti* 'гадать, ворожить, колдовать', лтш. *buřt* 'колдовать'.
- 3 лит. *gniāužtas* (1) 'кулак', pl. 'тиски' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *gniāužti* 'сжимать, стискивать', лтш. *gnaūzt²* 'drücken, quetschen'.
- 4 лит. *miltai* (pl.; 1) 'мука' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *mālti* 'молоть, размалывать', лтш. *maļt* 'молоть'; слав. **meljř*, **mēljretb*; inf. **mēlti* (а.п. b/a) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 265].
- 5 лит. *sietas* (1) 'сито' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ слав. **sějř*, **sějretb*; inf. **sējati* 'сеять, просеивать' (а.п. a) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 289–290].
- 6 лит. *viltas* (1) 'предательство, измена, обман' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *vilti* 'обманывать в надеждах, разочаровывать', лтш. *viļt* 'обманывать, вводить в заблуждение'.
- 7 лит. *rėžtas* (1) 'заведенный порядок; старая дорога' (*sàvo rėžtu* 'своим чередом; по-своему'); *riuožtas* (1) 'полоса, участок, область' (*sàvo riuožtu* 'своим чередом; по-своему') [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *rėžti* 'резать'; слав. **rězjř*, **rězjetb*; inf. **rězati* (а.п. a); в лтш. в глагольных корнях на шумные обобщение прерывистой интонации.

b суфф. -sta-s

- 1 лит. *žióstas* (1; *SkŽD* 324) 'tai, kiek vienu kartu galima apžioti' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *žióti* 'разевать, раскрывать'; слав. **žějř*, **žějretb* (а.п. a) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 289].
- 2 лит. *váistas* (1) 'средство, лекарство' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ слав. **věděti* 'знать, ведать' (а.п. a).

c суфф. -kla-s

- 1 лит. *dūřklas* (1) 'штык' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *dūřti* 'колоть, тыкать', лтш. *duřt* 'колоть'.

- 2 лит. *irklas* (1 > 3) 'весло' ~ лит. *irti* 'двигать судно шестом или веслами; грести (веслами)', лтш. *īrt* (*uz krastu*) 'гнать лодку, грести (к берегу)', *īrtiēs* 'грести (веслами)'.
 3 лит. *piūklas* (1) 'пила' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *piūti* 'резать, отрезать; пилить; жать (хлеб на поле); косить (сено, траву)', лтш. *plāūt* 'косить; жать (хлеб)'.
 4 лит. *žėnklas* (1) 'знак, признак, знамение' [Николаев 1989: 80] ~ лит. *pa-žinti* 'знать кого-л., быть знакомым; узнать', лтш. *pa-zīt* 'знать кого-л., что-л.; быть знакомым; узнать, узнавать'.
 5 лит. *pa-vėikslas* (1) 'картина, изображение, образ, пример, образец' ~ слав. **vīdjo*, **vīditi*; inf. **vīdēti* (а.п. а).
 6 лит. *sėkla* (1; f.) 'семя' ~ лит. *sėti* 'сеять, рассевать', лтш. *sēt* 'сеять'; слав. **sějjo*, **sějjetj* (а.п. а) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 280–281, 289–290, 486, 487, 498, 512].

1.2.2 Славянский (а.п. а)

а суфф. -dlo

- 1 слав. **bīdlo* [Николаев 1989: 84] ~ слав. **bījjo*, **bījjetj*; inf. **bīti* (а.п. а) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 276].
 2 слав. **dūdlo* [Николаев 1989: 84] ~ слав. **dūjjo*, **dūjjetj*; inf. **dūti* (а.п. а) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 279].
 3 слав. **mūdlo* [Николаев 1989: 84] ~ слав. **mūjjo*, **mūjjetj*; inf. **mūti* (а.п. а) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 277–278].
 4 слав. **rūdlo* [Николаев 1989: 84] ~ слав. **rūjjo*, **rūjjetj*; inf. **rūti* (а.п. а) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 278].
 5 слав. **čūdlo* [Николаев 1989: 84] ~ слав. **čūjjo*, **čūjjetj*; inf. **čūti* (а.п. а) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 279].
 6 слав. **šīdlo* [Николаев 1989: 84] ~ слав. **šījjo*, **šījjetj*; inf. **šīti* (а.п. а); лит. *siūti* 'шить'; лтш. *šūt* 'шить' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 276].
 7 слав. **mędlo* [Николаев 1989: 84] ~ слав. **mьnjo*, **mьnetj*; inf. **męti* (а.п. а/б); лит. *minti* 'топтать, растаптывать; мять', лтш. *mīt* 'топтать, мять' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 254, 263].
 8 слав. **tьrdlo* [Николаев 1989: 84] ~ слав. **търjo*, **тбретj*; inf. **трти* (а.п. а/б); лит. *tirti* 'исследовать, расследовать; изучать', *trinti* 'тереть, натирать, стирать'; лтш. *trīt* 'точить; править; направлять; тереть' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 254–256, 263].

Исключения из данного соотношения единичны и легко объясняются либо наличием древних акцентуационных вариантов у некоторых глаголов, либо сменой акцентных характеристик у них в более поздний период.

2 Производные с вторичными суффиксами

Согласно "второму принципу парадигматического акцента" выбор акцентных типов в этом реконструированном фрагменте акцентной системы определяется двумя параметрами: акцентной парадигмой (а.п.) производящего и морфонологическим классом суффикса. Двум а.п. неизменяемых: 1 а.п. (лит. 1 и 2 а.п.) и 2 а.п. (лит. 3 и 4 а.п.)¹ – соответствовали три акцентных типа производных: тип А – неподвижное ударение на корне; тип В – неподвижное ударение на суффиксе; тип С – подвижное ударение (= 2 балтийской а.п.). Суффиксы делились на два морфонологических класса – I класс (рецессивные суффиксы): *-išk-a-* (adj.), *-in-a-* (adj.), *-at-i-*, *-ast-i-*, *-ing-a-* (adj.), *-yst-ā* (f.), *-yb-ā* (f.); II класс (доминантные суффиксы): *-el-is*, *-išk-is* (adj.), *-in-is* (adj.), *-esn-is* (adj., ср.ст.), *-um-a-*, *-at-ā*, *-ist-ē*, *-inik-a-*, *-ib-ē*, *-uot-a-* (adj.), *-(j) aus(j)-a-* (adj., прев.ст.). Выбор акцентного типа производился следующим образом: от основ 1 а.п. независимо от класса суффикса выбирался акцентный тип А, от основ 2 а.п. при суффиксах I класса – тип С, при суффиксах II класса – тип В:

А.п. производящих	1	2
I	А	С
II	А	В

2.1 Суффиксы I класса

А С краткими гласными

а Суффикс -osti-s

А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость
Балт. subst. -ast-i-				
Sg. nom.	<i>pīlnastis</i>	<i>biaūrastis</i>	<i>gyvastis</i>	<i>nerimastis</i>
gen.	<i>pīlnasties</i>	<i>biaūrasties</i>	<i>gyvastiēs</i>	<i>nerimastiēs</i>
acc.	<i>pīlnastį</i>	<i>biaūrastį</i>	<i>gyvastį</i>	<i>nērimastį</i>

1 Реконструированное состояние относится к периоду до действия закона де Соссюра.

Слав. subst. -ost-ъ-				
	<i>a^a</i> (= A)	<i>a^b</i> (= E)	<i>c^c</i> (= C)	
Sg. nom.	<i>rādstь</i>	<i>mōdrōstь</i>	<i>lēnostь</i>	<i>čęstostь</i>
dat.	<i>rādosti</i>	<i>mōdrōsti</i>	<i>lēnosti</i>	<i>čęstosti</i>
instr.	<i>rādstьjъ</i>	<i>mōdrōstьjъ</i>	<i>lēnostьjъ</i>	<i>čęstostьjъ</i>
loc.	<i>rādosti</i>	<i>mōdrōsti</i>	<i>lēnosti</i>	<i>čęstosti</i>
Pl. gen.	<i>rādstьjъ</i>	<i>mōdrōstьjъ</i>	<i>lēnostьjъ</i>	<i>čęstostьjъ</i>

Примечание. Материалы по славянской реконструкции см. [Дыбо 1981: 107–122], балтийская реконструкция и материалы [Дыбо 2006: 135–136].

b Суффикс -in-o-

А.п. производящих форм производных	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость
Балт. adj. -in-a-				
Sg. m.	<i>áuksinas</i>	<i>vārinās</i>	<i>pláukinas</i>	<i>krūvinās</i>
f.	<i>áuksinā</i>	<i>vārinā</i>	<i>plaukinā</i>	<i>kruvinā</i>
Pl. m.	<i>áuksiniē</i>	<i>vāriņiē</i>	<i>plaukiniē</i>	<i>kruviņiē</i>
f.	<i>áuksinās</i>	<i>vārinās</i>	<i>pláukinās</i>	<i>krūvinās</i>

Слав. adj. -ъn-o-				
	<i>a^a</i> (= A)	<i>a^b</i> (= D)	<i>c^c</i> (= C)	
Sg. m.	<i>věrnъ</i>	<i>grěšъnъ</i>	<i>mīrnъ</i>	<i>dělzъnъ</i>
f.	<i>věrna</i>	<i>grěšъna</i>	<i>mīrnā</i>	<i>dělzъnā</i>
n.	<i>věrnо</i>	<i>grěšъno</i>	<i>mīrnо</i>	<i>dělzъno</i>

Примечание. Материалы по славянской реконструкции см. [Дыбо 1981: 72–94], балтийская реконструкция и материалы [Дыбо 2006: 131–134].

c Суффикс -išk-o-

А.п. производящих форм производных	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость
Балт. adj. -išk-a-				
Sg. m.	<i>výriškas</i>	<i>dvāsiškas</i>	<i>sūniškas</i>	<i>diēviškas</i>
f.	<i>výriškā</i>	<i>dvāsiškā</i>	<i>sūniškā</i>	<i>dieviškā</i>
Pl. m.	<i>výriškiē</i>	<i>dvāsiškiē</i>	<i>sūniškiē</i>	<i>dieviškiē</i>
f.	<i>výriškās</i>	<i>dvāsiškās</i>	<i>sūniškās</i>	<i>diēviškās</i>

Слав. adj. -ъsk-o-				
	<i>a^a</i> (= A)	<i>a^b</i> (= E)	<i>c^c</i> (= C)	
Sg. m.	<i>brātъskъ</i>	<i>ženъskъ</i>	<i>žuērъskъ</i>	<i>mōžъskъ</i>
f.	<i>brātъska</i>	<i>ženъska</i>	<i>žuērъskā</i>	<i>mōžъskā</i>
n.	<i>brātъsko</i>	<i>ženъsko</i>	<i>žuērъsko</i>	<i>mōžъsko</i>

Примечание. Материалы по славянской реконструкции см. [Дыбо 1981: 62–72], балтийская реконструкция и материалы [Дыбо 2006: 119–131].

в С долгими акутированными гласными

d Балт. -iŋg-a-

Вид производящей основы	А.п. производящих		Неподвижная		Подвижная	
	одно- / дву- сложные	м. / f.	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость
До закона де Соссюра	одно- сложные	m.	<i>kūnīngas</i>	<i>gālingas</i>	<i>nāudīngas</i>	<i>žālīngas</i>
		f.	<i>kūnīngā</i>	<i>gālingā</i>	<i>nāudīngā</i>	<i>žālīngā</i>
	дву- сложные	m.	–	<i>ākmenīngas</i>	–	<i>išmintīngas</i>
		f.	–	<i>ākmenīngā</i>	–	<i>išmintīngā</i>

Латышский суффикс -iŋg- соответствует по своим просодическим характеристикам литовскому суффиксу, а производные с ним в деталях согласуются с реконструированными литовскими.

- От имен с плавной интонацией: лтш. *piēnīgi luōpi* 'milchreiche Kühe' (Gr. 271–272); *pūcīgs* 'böse wie eine Eule' (Gr. 272); *vainīgs* 'schuldig' (Gr. 272); *tīrīgs* 'reinlich' (Gr. 273); *piļnīgs* 'füllig (von körperlicher Fülle); vollständig, vollkommen' (Mühl.-Endz. III: 215) и др.
- От имен с прерывистой интонацией: лтш. *zālīga plava* 'grasige (grasreiche) Wiese' (Gr. 271); *naīdīgs* 'feindselig' (Gr. 272); *sīrdīgs* 'zornig, heftig, eifrig' (Gr. 272); *priēcīgs* 'freudig' (Gr. 272); *darbīgs* 'arbeitsam' (Gr. 272); *pēdīgs* 'der letzte' (Gr. 273); *saldīgs* 'süßlich' (Mühl.-Endz. III: 669) и др.

Очевидно, что латышское отражение совершенно точно соответствует реконструированному состоянию². И конечно оно не требует объяснений посредством отяжки иктуса; это хорошо видно как только мы расставим соответствующие маркировки (+ ставится под доминантной морфемой, т.е. с плавной интонацией, – поставлен под рецессивной морфемой, т.е. с прерывистой интонацией): *piļnīgs*, но *salđīgs*.

2 О моем отношении к предлагаемому Эндзелином объяснению возникновения различия между прерывистой и плавной латышскими интонациями см. [Дыбо 2005: 207–210].

В славянских языках обращает на себя внимание суффикс *-ĕn-* (видимо, *-ĕn-*), который занимает близкие позиции в системе словообразования и просодически тождествен балтийскому *-ing-a-*. Сложность его сегментного состава достаточно убедительно соотносится со сложностью его просодической характеристики.

Слав. adj. *-ĕn-o-*

Формы производных	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		Акут	Циркумфл., краткость	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость
После действия закона Иллич-Свитыча	Sg. m.	<i>mědęnъ</i>	<i>stbklęnъ</i>	<i>pърstęnъ</i>	<i>lědęnъ</i>
	Sg. f.	<i>mědęna</i>	<i>stbklęna</i>	<i>pърstęnà</i>	<i>lědęnà</i>
	Sg. n.	<i>mědęno</i>	<i>stbklęno</i>	<i>pърstęno</i>	<i>lědęno</i>

Примечание. Материалы по славянской реконструкции системы выбора акц. типов у прилагательных с суфф. *-ĕn-* см. [Дыбо 1981: 127–140], балтийская реконструкция и материалы акцентной системы прилагательных с суфф. *-ing-* – в [Дыбо 2006: 137–142].

2.2 Суффиксы II класса

А С краткими гласными

а Суффикс *-ot-ā*

Формы производных	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная
		Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость	
Балт. subst. <i>-at-ā</i>				
До действия закона де Соссюра	Sg. nom.	<i>svėikatā</i>		<i>gyvātā</i>
	gen.	<i>svėikatās</i>		<i>gyvātās</i>
	acc.	<i>svėikatā</i>		<i>gyvātā</i>
	instr.	<i>svėikatā</i>		<i>gyvātā</i>
Слав. subst. <i>-ot-ā</i>				
После действия закона Иллич-Свитыча	Формы	<i>a^a (= A)</i>	<i>a^b (= E)</i>	<i>b^c (= B)</i>
	Sg. nom.	<i>nīščeta</i>	<i>dobrōta</i>	<i>lěpotā</i>
	acc.	<i>nīščetō</i>	<i>dobrōtō</i>	<i>lěpotō</i>
	instr.	<i>nīščetojō</i>	<i>dobrōtojō</i>	<i>lěpotōjō</i>

Примечание. Материалы по славянской реконструкции см. [Дыбо 1981: 122–125], балтийская реконструкция и материалы [Дыбо 2006: 204–208].

б Суффикс *-tuŋ-o-/tuŋ-ā*

Балт. *-tuvas* и *-tuvē*

От глаголов балто-славянского неподвижного акцентного типа

- dūmtuvė* 'мех' (лит. *dūmti* 'дуть') ~ слав. **dъmъ*, **dъmetъ*; l-part. *dōlъ*, f. *dōla*, n. *dōlo* (а.п. *b/a*) 'дуть' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 263, 503, 510].
- kāltuvė* 'ковальня' (Šakýna, Žagarės raj.) (лит. *kālti* 'ковать') ~ лтш. *kaļt* 'schmieden, schlagen'; слав. **koljъ*, **koljetъ*; inf. **kōlti*, sup. **kōltъ*; aor. 1.sg. **kōlхъ* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3.sg. **kōl*; l-part. **kōllъ*, f. **kōlla*, n. **kōllo* 'колоть' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 265, 488, 491, 503].
- kārtuvė* 'виселица' (лит. *kārti* 'вешать') ~ лтш. *kārt* 'hängen, behängen'.
- kūltuvas* 'цеп' (лит. *kūlti* 'молотить') ~ лтш. *kuļt* 'schlagen, prügeln, dreschen'.
- kūrtuvė* 'новоселье' (лит. *kūrti* 'разжигать огонь') ~ лтш. *kuīt* 'Feuer anmachen, heizen'.
- māltuvė* 'молотьня' (Šakýna, Žagarės raj.) (лит. *mālti* 'молоть') ~ лтш. *maļt* 'mahlen, drehen, schwatzen'; слав. **meljъ*, **meljetъ*; inf. **mēlti*, sup. **mēltъ*; aor. 1.sg. **mēlхъ* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3.sg. **mēl*; l-part. **mēllъ*, f. **mēlla*, n. **mēllo* 'молоть' || см. [Дыбо 2000: 265, 488, 491, 503].
- mīntuvai* 'мяло, льномялка, трепало' (лит. *mīnti* 'мять') ~ лтш. *mīt* 'treten'; слав. **mъnъ*, **mъnetъ*; l-part. **mēlъ*, f. **mēla*, n. **mēlo* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 263, 503].
- pjāutuvas* 'серп' (уже в древнелитовском зафиксирован переход в подвижный акцентный тип: др.-лит. *piėutuwi* instr.sg. DP 605⁴⁶, *piautuwi* gen.pl. DP 38⁴⁴) (лит. *pjāuti* 'жать, косить') ~ лтш. *pļaut* 'rezāt, jāt', 'mähen, ernten'.
- riėtuvė* SkŽD 'штабель, поленица' (лит. *riėti* 'складывать в штабели') ~ лит. *riėklas* (1) 'zwei hängende Stangen bzw. Gerüst unter der Stubendecke (beim Ofen) zum Trocknen des Brennholzes oder der Kleider', также *riėklas* и pl. *riėklai* 'Dachboden' (отсутствие метатонии свидетельствует о первичности неподвижного акцентного типа производящего глагола).
- sėtuvė* 'лукошко (с зерном), посевной ящик' (лит. *sėti* 'сеять') ~ лтш. *sēt* 'säen, besäen'; слав. **sějъ*, **sějjetъ*; part. praes. act. **sěję*, **sějotj-*; aor. 1.sg. **sějjasъ* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3.sg. **sėja*; l-part. **sėjalъ*, f. **sėjala*, n. **sėjalo* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 289–290, 486–487, 498, 512].
- skiltuvas* 'огниво; ударник' (лит. *skilti* 'высекать') ~ лтш. *šķilt* 'Feuer anschlagen'.
- šāutuvas* 'винтовка, ружье; ткацкий челнок' (лит. *šauti* 'стрелять') ~ лтш. *šaut* 'eine heftige Bewegung nach einer Richtung hin machen; schnell schieben oder stoßen'; слав. **sūjъ*, **sūjetъ*; inf. **sovāti*, sup. **sovātъ*; l-part.

- **sovāl̥*, f. **sovāla*, n. **sovālo*; part. praet. act. f. **sovāv̥ši* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 289, 489, 512, 517].
- 13 *trintuvai* в выражении *mintuvai-trintuvai* 'moterų darbas' *Būga RR* III 67 (лит. *trinti* 'тереть') ~ лтш. *trit* 'reiben, schleifen, schärfen'; ср. слав. **t̥r(j)ǫ*, **t̥r(j)et̥*; inf. **t̥rti*, sup. **t̥rt̥*; аог. 1. sg. **t̥r̥x̥* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3. sg. **t̥r*; l-part. **t̥rl̥*, f. **t̥rl̥a*, n. **t̥rlo*; part. praet. act. nom. sg. m. **t̥r̥*, f. **t̥r̥ši* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 263, 488, 491, 503, 514].

От глаголов балто-славянского подвижного акцентного типа

- 1 *artūvas* 'darbininkas arklys' *SkZD* 383 (лит. *arti* 'пахать') ~ лтш. *art* 'pflügen'; слав. **ǫr(j)ǫ*, **ǫr(j)et̥*; inf. **orāti*, sup. **ǫrat̥*; аог. 1. sg. **orāx̥* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3. sg. **ǫra*; l-part. **ǫral̥*, f. **ǫralā*, n. **ǫralo* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 274–275, 488, 494, 507].
- 2 *bliautivė* 'kas vis bliauja, rėkia', 'сквернослов, похабник' (лит. *bliauti* 'блеять, реветь') ~ лтш. *blaiūt* 'blöken, schreien'; слав. **bljāj̥*, **bljajet̥* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 293].
- 3 *dētūvai* 'укладчик; кладовая; хранилище' (лит. *dėti* 'класть, ставить; помещать') ~ лтш. *dēt* '(Eier) legen'; слав. **dēj̥*, **děj̥et̥*; l-part. **dēj̥al̥*, f. **dēj̥alā*, n. **dēj̥alo* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 296–298, 512].
- 4 *nuduotivės* 'обет, брак' (др.-лит. *nudūtūwiu* 'slub' gen. pl. *DP* 281₃₁) (лит. *dūoti* 'давать') ~ лтш. *duôt* 'geben'; слав. **dāj̥*, **dajet̥*; l-part. **daj̥al̥*, f. **daj̥alā*, n. **daj̥alo* и **dāl̥*, f. **dalā*, n. **dālo*; part. praet. act. nom. sg. m. **dāv̥*, nom. pl. **dav̥šē*, nom. sg. f. **dav̥ši* и **dajav̥ši* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 299–300, 512, 513, 516, 517].
- 5 *pragertivės* *J*⁹, *užgertivės* *Šl.* 'zapicie, wypicie (pozałatwieniu jakiejś sprawy; za czyjeś zdrowie)' (лит. *gėrti* 'пить') ~ лтш. *dzeīt* 'trinken, saufen, zechen'; слав. **žbr̥*, **žbr̥et̥* и **žbr̥*, **žbr̥et̥*; аог. 1. sg. **žbr̥x̥*, **prožbr̥x̥* (pl. 1. **žbr̥x̥om̥*, **prožbr̥x̥om̥*, 2. **žbr̥stē*, **prožbr̥stē*, 3. **žbr̥šē*, **prožbr̥šē*), 2-3. sg. **žbr̥t̥*, **prožbr̥t̥* и 1. sg. **žbr̥āx̥* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3. sg. **žbra*; l-part. **žbr̥l̥*, f. **žbr̥lā*, n. **žbr̥lo* и **žbr̥al̥*, f. **žbr̥alā*, n. **žbr̥alo* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 266, 273, 490, 493, 501, 506].
- 6 *keltivės* 'обряд поднимания молодых с постели в первое утро после свадьбы' (лит. *kėlti* 'поднимать')³ ~ лтш. *celt* 'heben'.
- 7 *klotūvas* (2) tech. 'укладчик' (*Lyb.*), *paklotivė* *SkZD* 385 'простыня', 'paklodė' ~ лтш. *klāt* 'hinbreiten, decken'.

3 Но также *keltuvių rýts* Šakýna, Žagarės raj., *keltivės* и *keltivės* Tvėrai, Rietavo raj.; *keltūvas* (1) *DLKŽ*, *LRKŽ*, *keltūvas* (3) *Šl.*, *keltūvas* *SkZD*, *keltūva* (1) *J*⁵, *DLKŽ*, *LRKŽ*, *keltūva* (3) *SkZD*, *keltuvė* (3) *KLD*, *Otr.Tver.* 148. Столь широкая фиксация накоренного неподвижного акц. типа и его рефлексов свидетельствует по мнению С. Л. Николаева о переходе этого корня в лит. языке в доминантный тип, об этом же свидетельствует и отсутствие метатонии в словах *kėltas*, *kėlta*.

- 8 *lietūvai* 'форма, в которой отливают свечи, фигуры' (лит. *lieti* 'лить') ~ лтш. *liēt* 'gießen, vergießen'; слав. **lij̥*, **lij̥et̥* и **lēj̥*, **lēj̥et̥*; inf. **liti*, sup. **lit̥* и inf. **lj̥āti*, sup. **lj̥at̥*; аог. 1. sg. **līx̥* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3. sg. **lit̥* и аог. 1. sg. **lj̥āx̥* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3. sg. **lj̥ja*; l-part. **lil̥*, f. **lilā*, n. **lilo* и **lj̥jal̥*, f. **lj̥jalā*, n. **lj̥jalo*; part. praet. act. nom. sg. f. **liv̥ši* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 282, 294, 489, 495, 498, 508, 512, 517].
- 9 *pintūvės* *Šl.* (2): *pintuvių vākaras* 'wieczór przed ślubem, na którym dla młodej wiją wianek' (лит. *pinti* 'плести, вить; сплетать') ~ лтш. *pīt* 'flechten'; слав. **p̥ñ̥*, **p̥ñ̥et̥*; аог. 1. sg. **p̥x̥* (pl. 1. **p̥x̥om̥*, 2. **p̥stē*, 3. **p̥šē*), 2-3. sg. **p̥t̥*; l-part. **p̥l̥*, f. **p̥lā*, n. **p̥lo*; part. praet. pass. **p̥t̥*, f. **p̥tā* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 267, 491, 502, 525].
- 10 *vytūvai* 'мотовило, моталка' (лит. *vūti* 'вить, свивать') ~ лтш. *vīt* 'winden, flechten'; слав. **vij̥*, **vij̥et̥*; inf. **vīti*, sup. **vīt̥*; аог. 1. sg. **vīx̥* (то же ударение в pl.), 2-3. sg. **vīt̥*; l-part. **vil̥*, f. **vilā*, n. **vilo*; part. praet. act. nom. m. **viv̥*, f. **viv̥ši* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 283, 489, 495, 508, 515].
- 11 *virtūvas* *Šl.* (2) 'rondel; samowar' (лит. *virti* 'кипеть, вариться; кипятить, варить') ~ лтш. *viīt* intr. 'kochen, sieden, tr. 'kochen'.
- 12 *tintūvas* (2) 'прибор для отбивки кос'⁴ (лит. *tinti* 'отбивать, направлять, точить (косу)') ~ слав. inf. **tēt̥i*, praes. 1. sg. **t̥ñ̥*, 3. sg. **t̥ñ̥et̥* (а.п. с; см. [Дыбо 2000: 267] и [Дыбо 1981: 235]).

Слав. subst. -*ьц-ā*

От глаголов неподвижного акцентного типа

- 1 слав. **bīt̥uā*, acc. sg. **bīt̥uǫ* [схрв. *bītva*, словен. *bītva*, чешск. *bitva*] ~ слав. **bīti*, praes. 1. sg. **bīj̥*, 3. sg. **bīj̥et̥* || см. Дыбо 2000: 276].
- 2 слав. **brīt̥uā*, acc. sg. **brīt̥uǫ* [схрв. *brītva*, словен. *brītva*, чешск. *brītva*] ~ слав. **brīti*; praes. 1. sg. **brīj̥*, 3. sg. **brīj̥et̥* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 276–277].
- 3 слав. **žbr̥t̥uā*, acc. sg. **žbr̥t̥uǫ* [схрв. *žr̥tva*, словен. *žr̥tva*] ~ лтш. *dziīt* (*iēs*) (praes. *dziiru*, praet. *dziūru*) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 330].
- 4 слав. **žēt̥uā*, acc. sg. **žēt̥uǫ* [схрв. *žētva*, словен. *žētva*, чешск. *žatva*] ~ слав. **žēti*; praes. 1. sg. **žñ̥*, 3. sg. **žñ̥et̥* || см. [Дыбо 2000: 263].
- 5 слав. **sēt̥uā*, acc. sg. **sēt̥uǫ* [схрв. *sjētva*, словен. *sētva*] ~ лтш. *sēt* 'säen, besäen'; слав. **sēj̥*, **sēj̥et̥*; part. praes. act. **sēj̥*, **sēj̥ot̥j-*; аог. 1. sg. **sēj̥as̥*

4 Зафиксировано также *tintūvas* и *tintūvai* pl. 'прибор для отбивки кос', что указывает на первично неподвижный акцентный тип литовского глагола; но в латышском соответствии отсутствует, в славянском глаголе реконструируется а.п. с на основании словенской и ст.-хорватской акцентовки презенса, поддержанной ст.-словацкими и ст.-хорватскими данными по акцентовке инфинитивной основы, см. [Дыбо 2000: 267] и [Дыбо 1981: 235]; однако словен. *zatēt* (*SSKJ V*: 791 = *zatēt*), супин от *zatēti* 'hineinhauen; überraschen, ereilen', может оказаться реликтом первичного неподвижного акцентного типа.

(то же ударение в pl.), 2-3.sg. *sěja; l-part. *sějalъ, f. *sějala, n. *sějalo || см. [Дыбо 2000: 280–281, 289–290, 486, 487, 498; 512].

6 слав. *lěztъŭā, acc.sg. *lěztъŭŭ [схрв. *ljestva*; словен. *ljestva*] ~ слав. *lězti; praes. 1.sg. *lězъ, 3.sg. *lězеть || см. [Дыбо 2000: 349–350].

От глаголов подвижного акцентного типа

1 слав. *klětъŭā, acc.sg. *klětъŭŭ [схрв. *klětva*, польск. *klątwa*] ~ слав. praes. 1.sg. *klěnъ, 3.sg. *klěnětъ || см. [Дыбо 2000: 268].

2 слав. *pastъŭā, acc.sg. *pastъŭŭ [польск. диал. *pástwa (по *Kucala* 253: *ńe pác'iubyj_śe*)] ~ слав. *pāsti; praes. 1.sg. *pāsъ, 3.sg. *pāsětъ || см. [Дыбо 2000: 355].

3 слав. *plytъŭā, acc.sg. *plytъŭŭ [ст.-чешск. *plýtva* и совр. чешск. *ploutev*] ~ слав. *plōvъ, *plōvětъ и *plŭnъ, *plŭnětъ (а.п. с) || см. [Дыбо 2000: 286, 318–319, 329].

4 слав. *pręstъŭā, acc.sg. *pręstъŭŭ [чешск. *prástva*] ~ слав. *pręsti, praes. 1.sg. *prędъ, 3.sg. *prędětъ || см. [Дыбо 2000: 354].

5 слав. *žbratъŭā, acc.sg. *žbratъŭŭ [русск. *жртва*] ~ слав. praes. 1.sg. *žērъ, 3.sg. *žerětъ || см. [Дыбо 2000: 273].

6 слав. *ubrstъŭā, acc.sg. *ubrstъŭŭ [польск. диал. *vąstfa F., vąstef, vąstfe S. (Kucala 112)*] ~ слав. *ubrťeti, praes. 1.sg. *ubrťiъ, 3.sg. *ubrťitъ.

В С долгими акутированными гласными

с Балто-слав. -ōt-о-

Формы производных	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		Акут	Циркумфл., краткость	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость
До действия закона де Соссюра	Sg. m.	<i>miltūotas</i>	<i>duṁblūotas</i>	<i>taukūotas</i>	<i>kraujūotas</i>
	f.	<i>miltūotā</i>	<i>duṁblūotā</i>	<i>taukūotā</i>	<i>kraujūotā</i>
	Pl. m.	<i>miltūotie</i>	<i>duṁblūotie</i>	<i>taukūotie</i>	<i>kraujūotie</i>
	f.	<i>miltūotās</i>	<i>duṁblūotās</i>	<i>taukūotās</i>	<i>kraujūotās</i>

Слав. adj. -āt-о-

Формы производных	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		<i>a^a</i> (=A)	<i>a^b</i> (=F ₁)	<i>a^c</i> (=F ₂)	
После действия закона Иллич-Свитыча	Sg. m.	<i>vǫlnatъ</i>	<i>ženātъ</i>	<i>golūātъ</i>	<i>možātъ</i>
	Sg. f.	<i>vǫlnata</i>	<i>ženāta</i>	<i>golūāta</i>	<i>možāta</i>
	Sg. n.	<i>vǫlnato</i>	<i>ženāto</i>	<i>golūāto</i>	<i>možāto</i>

Примечание. Материалы по славянской реконструкции см. [Дыбо 1981: 174], балтийская реконструкция и материалы [Дыбо 2006: 227–228]. Основные параметры балтийской акцентной системы производных с этим суффиксом были установлены уже Ф. де Соссюром (см. [Соссюр: 625]).

Можно привести также пример с двусложным доминантным суффиксом

d Балто-слав. -inik-о-

Формы производных	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		Акут	Циркумфл., краткость	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость
До действия закона де Соссюра	Sg. nom.	<i>áuksinikas</i>	<i>viētīnikas</i>	<i>darbinīkas</i>	<i>daržīnikas</i>
	gen.	<i>áuksinikā</i>	<i>viētīnikā</i>	<i>darbinīkā</i>	<i>daržīnikā</i>
	acc.	<i>áuksinikā</i>	<i>viētīnikā</i>	<i>darbinīkā</i>	<i>daržīnikā</i>
	instr.	<i>áuksinikūo</i>	<i>viētīnikūo</i>	<i>darbinīkūo</i>	<i>daržīnikūo</i>

Примечание. Балтийская реконструкция и материалы в [Дыбо 2006: 214–218].

Я не привожу здесь славянскую систему парадигматического выбора, она, как известно, тождественна балтийской (см. [Дыбо 1981: 187; Дыбо 2000: 147–149]). Должен только здесь напомнить, что в том случае, когда с этим суффиксом появляется вариант женского рода, -ī- получает акутовую интонацию. Так как в обоих случаях мы имеем дело, по-видимому, с долгим монофтонгом, приходится принять, что акут здесь первичен, а циркумфлекс – результат метатонии, что вызывает предположение, что акут в этом суффиксе первично рецессивный.

3 Вторичная доминантность и метатония в суффиксах

3.1 Структура вторичных суффиксов. Рассматривая структуру вторичных суффиксов, мы видим, что их можно представить как последовательность, минимум, из двух частей: -oko- = -o-+ko-; -āko- = -ā-+ko-; -iko- = -i-+ko-; -uko- = -u-+ko-; -īko- = -ī-+ko-; -ikā- = -ī-+kā-; -ovo- = -o-+vo-; -āvo- = -ā-+vo-; -īvo- = -ī-+vo-; -ito- = -i-+to-; -īto- = -ī-+to-; -oto- = -o-+to-; -ōto- = -ō-+to-; -āto- = -ā-+to-; -ijo- = -i-+jo-; -ijā- = -i-+jā-; -ājo- = -ā-+jo- и под.

3.2 Морфонологические характеристики составляющих и просодическое поведение вторичных суффиксов. Первая часть – либо тематический гласный -o-, извлеченный из тематических основ, либо иной основообразующий формант, сросшийся с первичным суффиксом (-i-, -u-, -ā-, -ī-, -ū-), а вторая – первичный суффикс. Тематический гласный (в норме) и другие основообразующие форманты при самостоятельном функционировании являются рецессивными морфемами, т. е. (-)-морфемами, что непреложно вытекает из наличия у всех этих видов основ подвижного акцентного типа. Естественно предположить, что доминантность такого рода суффиксов обусловлена доминантностью их второй части. Иначе говоря, доминантная вторая часть суффикса изменяет морфонологический статус первой его части, делая ее (вторично) доминантной так же, как первичный доминант-

ный суффикс изменяет морфонологический статус первично рецессивного корня, делая его (вторично) доминантным.

Если первая часть вторичного суффикса представляет собой изначальный долгий монофтонг и должна быть согласно правилу де Соссюра акутированной, в ней происходит метатония и акут заменяется на циркумфлекс.

3.3 Примеры метатонии в суффиксах. Проще всего, по-видимому, начать с примеров словообразовательного типа с вторичным суффиксом *-ykla-s*, вторая часть которого нам уже встречалась в примерах с метатонией: *gýdyklas* 'лекарство' (от *gýdyti* 'лечить'), *výstyklas* (3 < *1) 'пеленка' (от *výstyti* 'пеленать, свивать'), но *kabýklas* (2) 'вешалка' (от **kabýti* > *kabinti* 'вешать'), *kibýklas* (2) 'крюк, зацеп' (от *kibýti* 'вешать, зацеплять'), *kratýklas* (2) 'labai slidus šypelis pakuloms kratyti' (от *kratýti* 'трясти'). Суффикс *-ykla-s*, очевидно, состоит из доминантного первичного суффикса *-kla-s* и основообразующего форманта каузативных глаголов *-y-* (< *-ī-*), морфонологическим статусом которого, как показывают славянские данные, была рецессивность (см. наличие в каузативах а.п. *s* и тип ее акцентной кривой: inf. **gubīti* ~ sup. **gūbītē*; l-part. **gūbīlē*, **gubīlā*, **gūbīlo*; pl. **gūbīli* и т. д.). По двум первым примерам производных видно, что суффикс *-ykla-s* не наводит метатонию на корень, однако сама первая часть его (*-y-*), что обнаруживается при рассмотрении последних трех примеров, подвергается метатонии и получает морфонологический статус доминантности. Подвижность акцента у второго производного, очевидно, вторична (а.п. первого слова неизвестна), ср. подобное же вторичное развитие подвижности у производных с суффиксом *-tuva-s* и под. Возникает вопрос, почему не подвергся метатонии акут в *salýklas* (1) 'солод' (по-видимому, от не сохранившегося **salýti*, итератива от *sálti* 'делаться сладким, солодеть'). Но если *-y-* в данном производном извлечено из основы итеративного глагола, а не каузатива, мы имеем дело с закономерным отсутствием метатонии, так как в итеративах, по свидетельству славянского, основообразующий формант *-ī-* сам обладал статусом доминантности, а доминантные акутированные морфемы, как мы видели, метатонии не подвергались.

3.4 Морфонологическое представление просодического поведения вторичных суффиксов. Такое различие в морфонологическом поведении вторичных и первичных суффиксов, а равно и составляющих вторичных суффиксов, по-видимому, свидетельствует о сложном характере статуса доминантности.

Можно отразить установленные нами различия в типе доминантности соответствующей маркировкой. Для обозначения первичной доминантности корней, первичных суффиксов и соответствующих частей вторичных суффиксов оставим знак (+), для обозначения вторичной доминантности корней и соответствующих частей вторичных суффиксов введем знак (±).

В этом случае суффикс *-ykla-s* должен получить следующую маркировку: *-y_±-kla_±-s*. Различие между соответствующими адъективными и субстантивными суффиксами выразятся так: 1. adj. *-ā_±-kō_±-s* ~ subst. *-ā_±-kō_±-s*; 2. adj. *-ukō_±-s* ~ subst. *-u_±-kō_±-s*; 3. adj. *-ā_±-vō_±-s* ~ subst. *-ā_±-vō_±-s*; 4. adj. *-ī_±-kō_±-s* ~ subst. *-ī_±-kō_±-s* (ср. здесь же, по-видимому, первичное противопоставление subst. f. и m.: subst. f. *-ī_±-kā_±-* ~ subst. m. *-ī_±-kō_±-s*; первоначальная рецессивность суффикса subst. f. отражается лишь в отсутствии метатонии, в остальном суффикс был преобразован, вероятно, в результате действия закона Хирта). Приведем еще некоторые характерные морфонологические представления вторичных суффиксов: 1. adj. *-in_±-ō_±-s* ~ adj. *-in_±-jō_±-s*; 2. adj. *-išk_±-ō_±-s* ~ adj. *-išk_±-jō_±-s*; 3. subst. *-īb_±-ā_±-* ~ subst. *-īb_±-jā_±-*; 3. subst. *-in_±-ī_±-kō_±-s*, *-ov_±-ī_±-kō_±-s* и под. Уже из этого перечня видны некоторые особенности внутренней структуры вторичных суффиксов: во-первых, вторично доминантные составляющие не наводят вторичную доминантность и, следовательно, метатонию на предшествующие им части суффиксов, т. е. ведут себя так же как вторично доминантный суффикс в целом по отношению к корневой морфеме; во-вторых, бросается в глаза некоторая произвольность членения, связанная с наличием "чередующихся" пар и их структурой: если у нас представлены пары с рецессивными адъективными суффиксами, в которых первичный *-k-* осложнен сросшимися с ним явно рецессивными основообразующими формантами, и с соответствующими доминантными субстантивными суффиксами, мы предпочитаем вычленять первично рецессивный основообразующий формант, а различие статусов парных суффиксов сводить к различию статусов первичных суффиксов adj. *-kō-* и subst. *-kō-*, следуя за аналогичным рассмотрением первичных суффиксов adj. *-tō-* и subst. *-tō-*, в тех же случаях, когда в наших парах наведение вторичной доминантности осуществляется заменой тематического гласного или другого основообразующего форманта каким-либо иным формантом, мы выделяем в качестве носителя акцентуационной валентности этот тематический гласный. В действительности, по-видимому, в большинстве случаев носителем акцентуационной валентности был тематический гласный, форманты *-k-*, соответственно *-t-*, субстантивов и адъективов генетически тождественны, и следует, по-видимому, предполагать для индоевропейского существование двух тематических гласных, различавшихся какими-то просодическими качествами, которые отобразились в балто-славянском в виде двух различных морфонологических статусов (акцентуационных валентностей).

3.5 Дистрибуционные характеристики процесса (-) → (±):

- он происходит на любом слоговом отрезке, маркированном знаком (-), количество или качество этого слога, по-видимому, какой-либо существенной роли не играет;

- 2 он происходит в непосредственной близости (смежности) к следующему за ним звуковому отрезку, в надежно установленных случаях слоговому, маркированному знаком (+), каких-либо ограничений процесса количеством или качеством данного слогового отрезка не обнаружено;
- 3 на краткостных и циркумфлектированных слогах фонетически данный процесс никак не проявляется, в первоначально акутированных слогах он переводит акутовую интонацию в циркумфлекс (' → ~).

3.6 Интерпретация. Такие дистрибуционные особенности этого процесса указывают на ассимиляционный его характер, т. е. мы имеем скорее всего дело с результатом тоновой ассимиляции. Можно попытаться более точно определить фонетический характер как самого этого процесса, так и элементов, участвующих в нем.

- 1 Очевидно, что мы имеем дело лишь с частичной ассимиляцией, т. е. (±) не равняется (+), так как в слоге с маркировкой (±) ' → ~, тогда как в слогах с маркировкой (+) акут не изменяется.
- 2 Можно думать, что характер самого процесса ' → ~ как-то связан с фонетическим характером элементов, принимавших в нем участие, т. е. (-) и (+); при частичных просодических ассимиляциях обычно просодическая характеристика первой части слога (первой моры) сохраняет близость к первоначальной просодической характеристике данного слога, тогда как просодическая характеристика второй части слога (второй моры) уподобляется просодической характеристике слога, который стимулирует ассимиляцию, т. е. слога, смежного с тем, в котором произошла (в данном случае) метатония.
- 3 Циркумфлекс в литовском представляет собой восходящую интонацию, и нет серьезных оснований считать, что он был качественно иным в балто-славянском.

Примечание. Предположение о качественном изменении балто-славянского циркумфлекса в литовском, основывалось на убежденности в генетическом тождестве славянского и литовского циркумфлексов. Поскольку это тождество отклонено, и доказано, что литовскому циркумфлексу в славянском соответствует восходящая интонация типа нового акута, это предположение отпадает.

Всё это дает основание полагать, что просодические характеристики, принимавшие участие в рассматриваемом процессе, были, скорее всего, регистровыми тонами: маркировке (-) соответствовал низкий тон, маркировке (+) – высокий тон. В этом случае при регрессивной частичной ассимиляции в порядке (- +) на первом слоге должен был возникнуть восходящий тон: |__| → |_|| → |_/||. Этот ассимиляционный восходящий тон как бы взломал возникающий по правилам де Соссюра и Беценбергера акут и создал на этом (первом) слоге интонацию, достаточно близкую фонетически к балто-славянскому циркумфлексу, в дальнейшем совпавшую с ним.

Интерпретация акцентуационных валентностей (-) и (+) как отображений языковых низкого и высокого регистровых тонов хорошо поддерживается типологическими сопоставлениями (ср. контурные правила, тождественные балто-славянским, в сахарских языках (группа теда-канури)).

4 Чередование акцентных валентностей и метатония в суффиксах

А Краткосложные рецессивные суффиксы → краткосложные доминантные суффиксы

4.1 Суффикс *-in-o-* → суффикс *-in-jø-*:

Балт. <i>-in-jo-</i>				
А.п. производных	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость
Sg. m.	<i>dūminis</i>	<i>vištinis</i>	<i>beržinis</i>	<i>daržinis</i>
f.	<i>dūminė</i>	<i>vištinė</i>	<i>beržinė</i>	<i>daržinė</i>
Pl. m.	<i>dūminiai</i>	<i>vištiniai</i>	<i>beržiniai</i>	<i>daržiniai</i>
f.	<i>dūminės</i>	<i>vištinės</i>	<i>beržinės</i>	<i>daržinės</i>

Примечание. Балтийская реконструкция и материалы в [Дыбо 2006: 176–179].

Эта иммобилизация образований с суффиксом *-in-* при его йотации характерна и для славянского, где в подобных образованиях не только не отмечается конечнударных членных форм, но и отмечены у Ю. Крижанича краткие формы типа D и типа B:

Тип D: бліжньи (Гр. 59) ~ слав. **blizъ* > **blizò* (а.п. b).

Тип B: срьдньи (Гр. 55) ~ слав. **serdā*, acc.sg. **sêrdø* (а.п. c).

По-видимому, полезно продемонстрировать подобное преобразование в балтийском и суффикса прилагательных балт.-слав. *-isk-o-*. При присоединении “темы” *-jo-* он приобретает доминантность и таким образом переходит во второй класс (этот вариант суффикса, возможно, существовал в праславянском, но естественно был потерян после радикальных фонетических процессов).

4.2 Суффикс *-išk-o-* → суффикс *-išk-jo-s-*:

Балт. <i>-išk-ja-</i>				
А.п. производящих форм производных	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость
Sg. m.	<i>výriškis</i>	<i>dvàsiškis</i>	<i>berniškis</i>	<i>gališkis</i>
f.	<i>výriškė</i>	<i>dvàsiškė</i>	<i>berniškė</i>	<i>gališkė</i>
Pl. m.	<i>výriškiai</i>	<i>dvàsiškiai</i>	<i>berniškiai</i>	<i>gališkiai</i>
f.	<i>výriškės</i>	<i>dvàsiškės</i>	<i>berniškės</i>	<i>gališkės</i>

Примечание. Балтийская реконструкция и материалы в [Дыбо 2006: 175–176].

В Долгосложные рецессивные суффиксы → долгосложные доминантные суффиксы и метатония акут → циркумфлекс

4.3 Суффикс *-īb-ā-/-īb-ā-* → суффикс *-īb-jā-*:

Балт. <i>-īb-ā-</i>					
Вид производящей основы	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость	Акут	Циркумфлекс, краткость
До действия закона де Соссюра	nom.	<i>līgībā</i>	<i>lābībā</i>	<i>saldībā</i>	<i>gerībā</i>
	acc.	<i>līgībā</i>	<i>lābībā</i>	<i>saldībā</i>	<i>gerībā</i>

Примечание. Балтийская реконструкция и материалы в [Дыбо 2006: 150–156].

Приведенной реконструкции, по-видимому, противоречит латышская плавная интонация на этом суффиксе: лтш. *līdzība* 'die Ähnlichkeit; das Gleichnis; die Gleichheit'; лтш. *dzīvība* 'das animalische Leben, das Leben im Gegensatz zum Tode'; лтш. *verdzība* 'die Sklaverei, Knechtschaft, Leibeigenschaft' и под. И. Сержант считает её согласующейся с литовской 1-й а.п. соответствующих имен [Seržants 2003: 97–98], однако, как показано выше, нужно исходить из рецессивности этого суффикса в пралитовском и, следовательно, из первичности прерывистой интонации в этом суффиксе, ср. суфф. adj. *-īg-* и *-āk-*. Как всё же объяснить это отклонение в латышском? Можно думать, что в данном случае мы имеем дело с нисходящей интонацией слившейся, по свидетельству Эндзеллина, с плавной в непервых слогах, а нисходящая интонация появилась (в результате метатонии) в основах на *-ībe*, так же как и в литовском контаминировавших с основами на *-ībā*.

В славянском этому балтийскому суффиксу соответствует суфф. *-ьb-ā*; вероятно, количественное различие гласного (*i ~ ĭ*) возникло в результате генерализации в балтийском *ī*, форманта *i*-глаголов, а в славянском фор-

манта именных *i*-основ: в обоих языках производные с этим суффиксом образовывались от имен и глаголов. Скудный материал с суфф. *-ьb-ā* позволяет установить в этих производных первичное наличие парадигматического выбора: тип А – **suātība*, тип D – **slūžība*, – но установить надежно какой тип выбирался от имен и глаголов а.п. с (С или В) пока не удается, вероятно, выбор был тем же, что и в балтийском, т.е. суфф. *-ьb-ā* был рецессивным.

Балт. <i>-īb-jā-</i>					
Формы производных	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		Акут	Циркумфл., краткость	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость
До действия закона де Соссюра	Sg. nom.	<i>tāmsībē</i>	<i>biaūribē</i>	<i>augštībē</i>	<i>gerībē</i>
	gen.	<i>tāmsībēs</i>	<i>biaūribēs</i>	<i>augštībēs</i>	<i>gerībēs</i>
	acc.	<i>tāmsībē</i>	<i>biaūribē</i>	<i>augštībē</i>	<i>gerībē</i>
	instr.	<i>tāmsībē</i>	<i>biaūribē</i>	<i>augštībē</i>	<i>gerībē</i>

Примечание. Балтийская реконструкция и материалы в [Дыбо 2006: 218–226].

4.4 Суффикс *-īst-ā-* → суффикс *-īst-jā-*:

Балт. <i>-īst-ā-</i>					
Вид производящей основы	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		Акут	Циркумфл., краткость	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость
До действия закона де Соссюра	Sg. nom.	<i>brālistā</i>	<i>keŗdžistā</i>	<i>žmōgistā</i>	<i>dievistā</i>
	gen.	<i>brālistās</i>	<i>keŗdžistās</i>	<i>žmōgistās</i>	<i>dievistās</i>
	acc.	<i>brālistā</i>	<i>keŗdžistā</i>	<i>žmōgistā</i>	<i>dievistā</i>
	instr.	<i>brālistā</i>	<i>keŗdžistā</i>	<i>žmōgistā</i>	<i>dievistā</i>

Примечание. Балтийская реконструкция и материалы в [Дыбо 2006: 142–149].

Балт. <i>-īst-jā-</i>					
Формы производных	А.п. производящих	Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		Акут	Циркумфл., краткость	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость
До действия закона де Соссюра	Sg. nom.	<i>brālistē</i>	<i>beŗdrīstē</i>	<i>vienīstē</i>	<i>draugīstē</i>
	gen.	<i>brālistēs</i>	<i>beŗdrīstēs</i>	<i>vienīstēs</i>	<i>draugīstēs</i>
	acc.	<i>brālistē</i>	<i>beŗdrīstē</i>	<i>vienīstē</i>	<i>draugīstē</i>
	instr.	<i>brālistē</i>	<i>beŗdrīstē</i>	<i>vienīstē</i>	<i>draugīstē</i>

Примечание. Балтийская реконструкция и материалы в [Дыбо 2006: 209–214].

4.5 Суффикс *-āko-s* → суффикс *-āko-s*:

А.п. произво- дящих производных		Балт. <i>-āk-a-</i>			
		Неподвижная		Подвижная	
		Акут	Циркумфл., краткость	Акут	Циркумфл., краткость
До действия закона де Соссюра	Sg. m.	<i>īlgākas</i>	<i>māzākas</i>	<i>sāltākas</i>	<i>rētākas</i>
	f.	<i>īlgākā</i>	<i>māzākā</i>	<i>sāltākā</i>	<i>rētākā</i>
	Pl. m.	<i>īlgākīe</i>	<i>māzākīe</i>	<i>sāltākīe</i>	<i>rētākīe</i>
	f.	<i>īlgākās</i>	<i>māzākās</i>	<i>sāltākās</i>	<i>rētākās</i>

Примечание. Балтийская реконструкция и материалы см. также в [Дыбо 2006: 239–245].

В славянском этот суффикс в адъективном употреблении сохранился лишь у местоименных прилагательных и показывает в них отчетливо рецессивный характер, ср.: 1. **jākъ*, **jaká*, **jāko* (от **jǫ*, **já*, **jě* – а.п. с); 2. **tākъ*, **taká*, **tāko* (от **tǫ*, **tá*, **tǫ* – а.п. с); 3. **kākъ*, **kaká*, **kāko* (ср. **kǫto*, **čǫto* – а.п. с); но от местоимений неподвижного акцентного типа: 1. **īnъ*, **īnaka*, **īnako* (от **īnъ*, **īna*, **īno* – а.п. а); 2. **všěkъ*, **všěka*, **všěko* (от **všъ*, **všě*, **všě*; – а.п. b).

В литовском нормативном прилагательные с суффиксом *-oka-s* (< *-āko-s*) относятся к неподвижному акцентному типу с постоянным акутовым ударением на суффиксе: *ilgokas* (ср. лтш. *īlgs*), *plonokas* (ср. лтш. *plāns*), *sunkokas* (ср. ст.-лит. *suñkus*, 2 а.п. у Даукши), *platokas* (ср. *platūs*, 4 а.п. у Даукши и в совр.). Это явно перестроенная акцентовка с генерализацией акцентного типа, возникшего в результате действия закона де Соссюра в производных от циркумфлектированных и краткостных имен неподвижного акцентного типа и в результате наложения деформаций акцентной кривой, вызванных действием законов де Соссюра и Хирта в производных от циркумфлектированных и краткостных имен подвижного акцентного типа, с устранением неподвижного акцентного типа с акутовым ударением на корне и деформированного действием закона Хирта акутированного подвижного типа. Однако в диалекте Zietela еще сохранялись следы подвижного акцентного типа:

От прилагательных подвижного акцентного типа

- лит. диал. (Zt.) *kartokas*, f. *kartokā* (3) 'горьковатый' (Ziet. 273), при варианте *kartokas*, f. *-a* (1) ~ др.-лит. *kartūs*, *-i* (3) 'gorzki';
- лит. диал. (Zt.) *šaltokas*, f. *šaltokā* (3) 'холодноватый' (Ziet. 653), при варианте *šaltokas*, f. *-a* (1) ~ лит. *šaltas* (3) 'холодный'; лтш. *saļts* 'kalt, bloß, nackt';
- лит. диал. (Zt.) *retokas*, f. *retokā* (3) 'редковатый', pl. *ratokī l'inaī*; adv. *retokāī* 'редковато': *retokāī pas'ėjau* (Ziet. 545) ~ др.-лит. *rėtas* (4) 'rzadki';

- лит. диал. (Zt.) *trumpokas*, f. *trumpokā* (3) 'коротковатый' и *trumpokas*, f. *trumpoka* (1): *kāl'inēs trumpokos, reika dadūrt* (Ziet. 713) ~ др.-лит. *truīpas, -ā* (4) 'krotki; doczešny; mały'.

От прилагательных неподвижного акцентного типа

- лит. диал. (Zt.) *ilgokas*, f. *ilgoka* (1) 'длинноватый; довольно долгий, долговатый', adv. *ilgokai* 'довольно долго' (Ziet. 232) ~ др.-лит. *ilgas* (1);
- лит. диал. (Zt.) *gerokai* adv. 'nemaža' (Ziet. 202) ~ др.-лит. *gėras, -ā* (2 а.п. по памятникам Прусской Литвы, см. [Иллич-Свитыч 1963: 56];
- лит. диал. (Zt.) *mažokas*, f. *mažoka* (1) 'маловатый' (Ziet. 287) ~ др.-лит. *māžas* (2).

В латышском языке при помощи суффикса *-āk-* образуется сравнительная степень; прерывистая интонация гласного суффикса регулярно отражает балто-славянский рецессивный акут.

- От прилагательных с плавной интонацией: лтш. *mīlāks* 'lieber' (Gr. 352); *īlgāki* 'länger' (Gr. 353); *vairāk* 'mehr' (Gr. 353); *lielāks* 'größer' (Gr. 353); *sūrāks* (Ērg.3: 460).
- От прилагательных с прерывистой интонацией: лтш. *aūgstāku* 'höher' (Gr. 353); *jaūnākus* (Ērg.2: 14); *jaūnākās ziņas* (Ērg.2: 15); *ciētākus* (Ērg.1: 216); *ciētāku* (Ērg.1: 216); *ciētāka* (Ērg.1: 217); *ciētāks* (Ērg.1: 217); *mīkstāka zeme* (Ērg.2: 316); *mīkstāki* (Ērg.2: 316); *mīkstāka* (Ērg.2: 317); *mīkstāks* (Ērg.2: 317); *plānāki zūobi* (Ērg.3: 98); *plānākā ķemmē* (Ērg.3: 98).

Очевидно, что латышское отражение так же, как и в предыдущем случае, совершенно точно соответствует реконструированному состоянию. И оно также не требует объяснений посредством оттяжки иктуса.

Для балто-славянского следует таким образом восстанавливать рецессивный статус этого адъективного суффикса.

Этот же суффикс в субстантивном употреблении показывает циркумфлектированный характер гласного *-ā-* и акцентный тип с постоянным насуффиксальным ударением: лит. *naujokas* (2) 'новичок, новобранец', *bėrōkas* (2) 'гнедая лошадь, гнедко', *kaulōkas* (2) диал. 'ребро с мясом' и под., этому соответствует и метатония в аналогичных случаях в латышском: *bārņāks*, *sunāks*, *vaprāks*⁵ [Seržants 2003: 113] (= *sunāks* [Mühl.-Endz. III: 1121], с отмеченным Эндзелином слиянием нисходящей и плавной интонации в непервых слогах); ср. генетически тождественную а.п. *b* в подобных образованиях в славянском: **durākъ*, **prostākъ*, **rybākъ*, **mōdrākъ* и под. Очевидно, что и в этом словообразовательном типе мы встречаемся с генерализацией акцентного типа с насуффиксальным ударением и устранением акцентного типа с пер-

5 В Zvirgzdine по [Mühl.-Endz. IV: 538] записано *vėprēks*².

вично накоренным ударением. Например, два последних славянских примера первоначально должны были иметь следующую акцентовку: *rŭbākъ и *mōdrākъ.

Москва

Российский государственный гуманитарный университет

Литература и сокращения

- Гр.
1859 Граматично исказанје оу руском језику попа Јѳрка Крижанѳца, презвѳннем Сербљанина међу Кѳпојѳ и Вѳнојѳ риками, во ѳјездеѳ Бѳиѳца града, окол Дѳковца, Озла и Рѳвника Острѳгов / Писано въ Сѳвѳири Лѳгта ꙗꙗꙗꙗ / Издано Бодянским. М., 1859. [Арабские цифры передают славянскую пагинацию книги.]
- Дыбо, В. А.
1981 Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском. Москва.
2000 Морфонологизованные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис, 1. Москва.
2005 "Балтийская сравнительно-историческая и литовская историческая акцентологии". *Аспекты компаративистики*, 1, 177–213. Москва: РГГУ.
2006 "Порождение акцентных типов производных имен в балтийском". *Балто-славянские исследования* 17. Москва.
- Иллич-Свитыч, В. М.
1963 Именная акцентуация в балтийском и славянском. Москва.
- Николаев, С. Л.
1986 Балто-славянская акцентуационная система и ее индоевропейские истоки. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Москва. (Частично опубликовано в *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*. Москва 1989, 46–109.)
1989 "Балто-славянская акцентуационная система и ее индоевропейские истоки". *Историческая акцентология и сравнительно-исторический метод*, 46–109. Москва.
- Соссюр, Фердинанд де
1977 *Труды по языкознанию*. Москва.
- Būga RR
1958–1961 K. Būga, *Rinktiniai raštai*, 1–III. Vilnius. [Указатели: K. Būga, *Rinktiniai raštai, rodyklės*. Vilnius, 1962.]
- DLKŽ
1954 *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* / Red. J. Balčionis. Vilnius.
- DP
1926 материал из "Постилы Н. Даукши" цитируется по изданию: *Daukšos Postilė. Fotografuotinis leidimas*. Kaunas.

- Ērg.
1977–1983 E. Kagaine & S. Raģe, *Ērgemes izloksnes vārdnīca*, 1–III. Rīga.
- Gr.
1922 J. Endzelin, *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga.
- J^s
1880 *Svotbinė rėda Velūnyčiu Lietuvių surašyta par Aņtaną Juškevičę 1870 metųė*. Kazanuis.
- Jušk.
1904–1922 А. Юшкевич, *Литовский словарь*, вып. 1–III. СПб.
- KLD
1883 *Littauisch-deutsches Wörterbuch von Friedrich Kurschat*. Halle.
- Kucała
1957 M. Kucała, *Porównawczy słownik trzech wsi małopolskich*. Wrocław.
- LKŽ
1968–1986 *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas (Antras leidimas)*, 1–XIV. Vilnius.
- LRKŽ
1962 A. Lyberis, *Lietuvių-rusų kalbų žodynas*. Vilnius.
- Lyb.
1988 A. Lyberis, *Lietuvių-rusų kalbų žodynas*. Vilnius.
- Mühl.-Endz.
1923–1932 K. Mühlensbachs, *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. Redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von J. Endzelin*, 1–IV. Riga.
- Otr.Tver.
1934 J. Otrębski, *Wschodniolitewskie narzecze twereckie*, 1. Kraków.
- Seržants, Iļja
2003 "Die Intonationen der suffixalen und Endsilben im Lettischen. Synchronie und Diachronie". *Baltu filologija* 12/1. Rīga, 83–123.
- SkŽD
1943 Pr. Skardžius, *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*. Vilnius.
- SSKJ
1970–1991 *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, 1–v. Ljubljana.
- Šl.
1940 J. Šlapelis, *Kirčiuotas lenkiškas lietuvių kalbos žodynas. Antroji laida*. Vilnius.
- Ziet.
1998 Aloyzas Vidugiris, *Zietelos šnektos žodynas*. Vilnius.
- Zt.
примеры из диалекта Zietelos (сокращение LKŽ).

Metatony in Lithuanian internal derivation

ADAM HYLLESTED

BERND GLIWA

1. It is well known that Lithuanian *i*-stem derivatives of masculine *a*-stems usually undergo “*métatonie douce*”, i.e. that they change an originally acute accent into a circumflex (see, e.g., Derksen 1996: 42ff.; Kortlandt 1988: 302; Larsson 2004: 308–311). Among the examples are:

dvýnas ‘twin’ > *dvýnis* ‘id.’
gývas ‘living’ > *gývis* ‘vividness’ (but also *gývis* ‘living being; herd’)
plýnas ‘bald’ > *plýnis* ‘bald place’ (beside *plýné*, *plýnia* ‘id.’)
šývas ‘grey’ > *šývis* ‘grey horse’

2. In addition, Rasmussen (1999 [1992]) has shown that “*Métatonie douce* [...] occurs whenever a long vowel has received the accent in a relatively late period, i.e. in productive categories and late loanwords (esp. from Slavic).” Specifically, when an *a*-stem masculine noun is formed from the masculine form of an *a*-stem adjective noun by internal derivation, i.e. substantivisation without the addition of any new suffix, the change of word-class is manifested by an accent shift from acute to circumflex. E.g.:

áukštas ‘high’ ~ *aūkštas* ‘growth; room in the attic; floor’ (beside *áukštas* ‘id.’)
klótas ‘covered’ ~ *klótas* ‘layer, foundation’ (Bugá 1959, II: 387)
kliūtas ‘hit’ ~ *kliūtas* ‘hindrance’
rýžtas ‘resolute, tough’ ~ *rýžtas* ‘resolution, toughness, strength’
skirtas ‘separated’ ~ *skirtas* ‘difference’

Rasmussen (loc. cit.) states that these nouns are “simply formed on the inherited pattern seen in Gk. sbst. *τόμος* ‘a cut’ vs. adj. *τομός* ‘cutting’ [...] Old participles [...] similarly formed initially stressed nouns [...], thereby copying the duality seen also in, e.g., Gk. *θνητός* ‘dead’ ~ *θάνατος* ‘death.’”

3. We have pointed out elsewhere (Gliwa & Hyllested 2006) that alleged Slavic loanwords with *métatonie douce* can in fact be internally derived in Baltic (in

cases where there are no other indications of a Slavic origin than the accent), in accordance with the possibility that the adjective from which the substantive in question is derived has been lost. Thus, Lith. *slyvā*¹ and especially *slyvas*, both 'sloe (*Prunus spinosa*), need not be borrowed from the Slavic word for 'plum' but can theoretically be derived from an adjective **slyvas* 'blue' < Balt. **slī-va-* < IE **slīH₃-uō-* (cf., e.g., Lith. *gyvas* 'living' < Balt. **gī-va-* < IE **g^wiH₃-uō-*). We know that the IE formation **slīH₃-uō-* indeed was adjectival since it denotes different objects and phenomena having nothing in common but the blue colour (Hyllested 2004).

4. This derivational process continues in modern Lithuanian, also applying to further categories and subtypes:

(a) *ū*-stems:

pavojūs 'dangerous' ~ *pavojus* 'danger'

rajūs 'greedy' ~ *rājus* 'stomach of carnivorous fish; bait' (Gliwa & Hyllested 2006: 88)

šlajūs 'leaning against something, snuggling to something; greasy' ~ *šlājus* 'farm house, small cottage' (< 'small crooked building')

(b) proper nouns < substantives:

E.g., the name of the mythological figure *Rāsa* is probably derived from *rasà* 'dew' (Young 1994: 308).² In the light of the *ū*-stem examples in (a), Vanagas's (LPŽ 1: 161) argumentation that the proper name *Bājus* cannot be derived, because of its accent, from the appellative *bajūs* must be dismissed. The same derivational pattern is probably the source of *Vyčius* beside *Vyčiūs* 'a river near Garliava' (Vanagas 1981: 376) and *Šlājus* 'a surname' (cf. *šlajūs* in a) above).

5. It is also worth pointing out that we are not dealing with a sound-law proper, but with a derivational pattern that can be followed or not. In other words, the shift of accent constitutes a trend rather than a rule. Just as irregular vocalism can occur due to analogy, paradigmatic levelling, dialectal confusion, or other kinds

1 Whatever the derivational pattern, examples like *bėdà* ~ *bėdas* 'trouble, need', *vyžà* ~ *výžas* 'bast shoe', etc., stand in the same metatonic relationship (Buga 1959, II: 394f.) as *slyvā* ~ *slyvas*.

2 Substantives in *-nà*, *-tā*, *-vā*, etc., are only rarely formed from feminine adjectives like, e.g., *kilnà* (masc. *kilnas*) 'noble, pompous' > *kilnà* 'wealth, abundance, pomp' (Skardžius 1996: 219), *geltà* (masc. *geltas*) 'yellow, pale, withered' > *geltà* 'sawwort (*Serratula tinctoria*)', *mintà* (masc. *mintas*) 'fed, full' > *mintà* 'keep, alimentation' (Skardžius 1996: 323). *Žalvā* 'green, verdure' is an independent abstract formation, rather than a derivative of *žalvas*, *-a* 'green, greenish'; from this adjective formation, however, is derived the name *žalvė*, designating different grass species – 'alkali grass (*Puccinellia* spp.)' and 'meadow grass or bluegrass (*Poa* spp.)'.

of linguistic variation, this may also be the case with word accents. Thus, a range of word-forms exhibit varying intonation:

aūkštas ~ *aukštas* 'growth; room in the attic; floor' (see above)

dvylas ~ *dvylas*, (also *dvylis*) '(of an ox) dark brown, with dark skin' > *dvylys* 'dark-brown ox'

dvynas ~ *dvynas*, *dvynis*, *dvynys* 'twin' (Buga 1959, II: 421).

grynas ~ *grynas* 'pure, clean, unmixed' (Smoczyński 2003: 26)

šlynas ~ (rare) *šlynas* 'a kind of clay, gley, kaolinite'

Can we argue that in internal derivation there is a general metatonic trend to let acute accent become circumflex? In fact, there are also examples of the reverse development.³ According to Vanagas (1981: 334), the Lithuanian hydronym *Šlyna* 'a river' belongs with *šlynas* 'a kind of clay, gley, kaolinite' ~ *šlyna*, *šlynà*, (rare) *šlynas* 'id.', and the rare adjective *šlynas* (fem. *šlynà*) 'containing gley, clay (of earth)'. Etymological literature connects these with *šlyti* 'to lean; to be close' and *šliėti* 'to lean against something, snuggle to something' (LEW 1004, 1006; Smoczyński 2006: *šlyti*). Further Baltic derivatives are *šlaitas* 'slope', *šlajūs* 'leaning against something, snuggling to something; greasy' > 'slippery' > (*šlajės*, *šlajos* 'sledge'); similarly > 'clay used in pottery' > *šlājus* ('small crooked building' >) 'farm house, small cottage' and 'stripe of forest' (cf. Dan. *skovbryn* 'edge of a wood', lit. 'wood-brow'). Another set of derivatives always display circumflex accent: *šlyvas* 'bent, sloping', *šlivas* 'id.', *šlivis*, *šlivys*, *šlyvis* 'bow-legged person', *šlyvėti*, *šlyvi*, *-ėjo* 'to lean, stand leant', *šlyvinti*, *šlyvoti*, etc.

Now, the underlying PIE root is **klei-* 'to lean against something' (LIV: 332), an anit-root. Why, then, do we find acute in *šlyti*, *šlynas*, etc.? It seems that for suffixless derivatives we have to consider both developments of the type adj. *šlynas* 'slippery, slick' > subst. *šlynas* 'slippery material' (*metatonie rude*) and the type like **slyvas* 'blue' > *slyvas*, *slyvā* 'blue fruit' (*metatonie douce*). The verb *šlyti* could be explained as a secondary derivative having arisen from or having been influenced by *šlynas* or by verbs of the type *ryti* 'to gorge, to swallow', *gyti* 'to become alive, healthy'. Smoczyński (2003b: 21, 36) considers the *y* in *šlyti* a lengthened grade (reshaped at the Baltic stage *šliėti* ~ **šleiH-*), analogous to set-roots like *siėti* ~ *susyti*. Another possibility would be to consider a set-variant beside the anit-root (see Gliwa forthc.).

6. Circumflex forms do not necessarily serve as examples of metatony, but may be explained in other ways. Smoczyński (2003b: 119) argues that *šlyja* in fact results from < **slī-n-ja* with *n*-infix present after having derived a *-ja* present in analogy to *gyja* < **gi-n-ja* where the *j* is the laryngeal hiatus reflex. Lith. *šlinù* 'I lean' is also

3 A circumflex may also be retained; cf., e.g., *bālas* 'white' ~ *bālas* 'snowdrop (*Galanthus nivalis*)'.

derived from this reshaped root, not from the IE one **k̑l-n/ne-i-* (as *LIV*: 332 tentatively suggests), since this would more likely result in the non-existing †*šilnu*.

Yet another way to explain the acute accent in *šl̑ynas* and *šl̑yti* would be to posit an adjective **šlijinas*, derived in the same way as *šlitinas* (adj., participle) 'lurching' (cf. Gliwa 2003: 27) from the stem of the past tense *šlijo* and the suffix *-inas*. The expected outcome would indeed be an adjective. Syncope is a common process, often leading to a substantive (from a synchronic point of view), e.g. Old Lith. *vėlinas* ('having the behaviour of a soul' < Lith. *velė* 'soul') ~ *vėlnias* 'devil', *šėrinas* (*šeriai* 'bristle') ~ *šėrnas* 'boar' (Smoczyński 2003a: 10, 92). Thus, an adjective **šlijinas* could theoretically also yield a new substantive *šl̑ynas* via a syncopated form **šlijnas*, which was then subject to the contraction of *ij > y*; here, however, circumflex accent would be expected, which makes the scenario involving secondary *métatonie rude* more likely.

7. For each pair of examples to fit into this derivational pattern, there need not be any other parallels than a circumflex accent in the nominative singular of the derived word versus an acute accent in the same form of the base word. It is not a question of paradigm type shifts – i.e. whether they belong to AP 2 or 4.

Since substantives can be derived from (a) adjectives or (b) other substantives by internal derivation, the accentuation of adjectives should weigh more than in substantives, in comparative-historical discussions:

- (a) adjective > substantive
original accent > secondary accent
- (b) substantive > substantive
original accent > secondary accent

Exceptions are, of course, such cases where evidence from the other Indo-European branches indicates that the substantive is inherited from PIE.

Proper nouns constitute even less secure evidence since these may (theoretically) have been subject to twofold internal derivation (c):

- (c) adjective (> substantive) > proper noun
original accent (> secondary accent) > (new) secondary accent

8. We may conclude that, in Lithuanian, a range of substantivisations and de-appellative proper nouns with circumflex accent occur as the result of a post-Baltic pattern of internal derivation that has even survived into the modern language, operating independently of the historical accent – let alone original accent-triggering factors such as a laryngeal that has long since disappeared. By overlooking these late developments, Lithuanian material may be subject to over-interpretation, i.e. taken as (the only) secure evidence for certain conditions and developments in Balto-Slavic and Proto-Indo-European. Whether a metatonic example

has old roots or reflects later derivational patterns must be subject to careful consideration and investigation in each individual case.

University of Copenhagen
Sargeliai, Lithuania

References

- Buga, Kazimieras
1959 *Rinktiniai Raštai*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Derksen, Rick
1996 *Metatony in Baltic*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Gliwa, Bernd
2003 "Nešina, vedinas, tekinas". *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 48, 19–34.
forthc. "Again on the etymology of Lithuanian *ráistas* 'bog', *rōjus* 'paradise' and the prediction of bog bodies". In Gojko Barjamović, Irene Elmerot, Adam Hyllested, Benedicte Nielsen & Bjørn Okholm Skaarup (eds.), *Language and prehistory of the Indo-European peoples: a cross-disciplinary perspective*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Gliwa, Bernd & Adam Hyllested
2006 "Baltisches zu idg. **sleiH-* 'blau (sein)'"'. *Baltistica* 41/1, 87–93.
- Hyllested, Adam
2004 "Greek *λωτός* 'lotus' and the Indo-European Words for 'blue'. In James Clackson & Birgit Anette Olsen (eds.), *Indo-European word formation*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 59–64.
- Kortlandt, Frederik
1988 "The laryngeal theory and Slavic accentuation". In Alfred Bammesberger (ed.), *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 299–312.
- Larsson, Jenny Helena
2004 *Metatony and length in Baltic*. In Adam Hyllested, Anders Richardt Jørgensen, Jenny Helena Larsson & Thomas Olander (eds.): *Per aspera ad asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 305–322.
- LIV*
2001 Helmut Rix (ed.), *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. 2nd edition. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- LEW*
1962–1965 Ernst Fraenkel, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2. Heidelberg / Göttingen: C. Winter / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- LPŽ*
1985–1989 Aleksandras Vanagas (ed.), *Lietuvių pavardžių žodynas* 1–2. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård
1999 "Contributions to the understanding of Lithuanian metatony." In *Selected Papers in Indo-European Linguistics*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 541–550. [*Copenhagen Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 1992: 79–89.]
- Skardžius, Pranas
1996 *Rinktiniai raštai* 1. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

- Smoczyński, Wojciech
 2003a *Studia balto-słowiańskie* 2. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
 2003b *Hiat laryngalny w językach balto-słowiańskich*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
 2006 *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* (manuscript). Kraków.
- Vanagas, Aleksandras
 1981 *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Young, Steven
 1994 "The scope of Saussure's law in colloquial Lithuanian." In H. I. Aronson (ed.), *Non-Slavic languages of the USSR. Papers from the fourth conference*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 304–309.

The accent of Slavic *ja(zv) 'I'

MATE KAPOVIĆ

Introduction¹

The aim of this article is to deal with the accentuation of the Slavic first person nominative singular personal pronoun *ja(zv). Before examining the accentuation itself, we will analyze the material and try to resolve the question of the two forms in Slavic, which is related to the problem of the accentuation.

Material

First we shall adduce the forms for 'I' in the Slavic literary languages: OCS *azъ*, Bulgarian *aз*, Macedonian *jaс*, Croatian *jā*, Slovene *jāz*, Czech *já*, Slovak *ja*, Lusatian *ja*, Polabian *jo*, *joz*, Polish *ja*, Kashubian *ǰω*, Slovencian *jāu*, Russian/Ukrainian/Byelorussian *я*.

Old Church Slavic

OCS shows a form without the initial *j-* (*azъ*), unlike all the other Slavic languages except Bulgarian. This is usually the only form mentioned in OCS grammars;² however, *jazъ* is a hapax in *Codex Marianus*,³ which could be due to the influence of the dialect area in which the text was written.⁴

1 This article was originally a part of my PhD dissertation (Kapović 2006).

2 Cf. Vondrák 1912: 459, Leskien 1922: 109, Rosenkranz 1955: 96, Bielefeldt 1961: 146–147, Горшков 1963: 135, Trubetzkoy 1968: 150, Kurz 1969: 76–77, Hamm 1970: 133–134, Lunt 1974: 65, Damjanović 2005: 95 etc.

3 *SP*, Diels 1932–4: 77, Sloński 1950: 84, Nandriš 1959: 104. According to Đorđić (1975: 105), *jazъ* occurs a number of times after the conjunction *i* – *i ězъ* (in Glagolitic script), *i jazъ* (in Cyrillic script). In fact, even the occurrence of *jazъ* (i.e. *ězъ*) in *Codex Marianus* is in this position: *въпросъ i ězъ* (Mar. 162, 6–7). Weingart (1937–8: 200) considers this to be a sandhi variant of *azъ* in a hiatus.

4 The origin of *Codex Marianus* is disputed. According to Jagić (1883), judging by the sporadic changes $\rho > u$, $y > i$, $vъ > u$, $\varphi > e$, the manuscript could have been written in Croatian or Serbian speaking area (i.e. Štokavian, judging by $vъ > u$). Hamm thinks that the vocalization of the *jers*

In Croatian and Russian Church Slavonic, there is the same form as in OCS (CCS *azъ/azь*, RCS *azъ*).⁵ In *Psalterium Sinaiticum* (Ps. 38, 13), the OCS form *a* is found. Diels (1932–4: 214) and Nandriš (1959: 105) take this form to be a mistake, but it probably represents the OCS *j*-less pendant of the form *ja* in other Slavic languages.⁶

Bulgarian

The Bulgarian form is also *j*-less, in accord with OCS. Dialectally, besides *az*, one also finds the forms *азека*, *азекана*, *азкана*, *я*, *язе*, *язка*, *язекана* (ESSJ), *ac*, *ѡa*,⁷ *яз* (Vasmer 1950–8), *язека*, *яска*, *ази*, *азе*⁸ etc. The Bulgarian *j*-less form *az* must be of the same dialectal origin as OCS *azъ*. For the attestation of *яз*, *я* and *аз* in Bulgarian dialects, cf. БДА 1: 160. The form *аз* is attested in southeastern Bulgaria, the form *я* is attested not only in the west of Bulgaria, but also in the southeast.⁹ The form *я* could be attributed to the Serbian influence in some cases.¹⁰

Macedonian

The Macedonian literary form *jac* shows an initial *j*-, thus differing from OCS and literary Bulgarian. In dialects, one also finds *ja* (SP) – for instance in North-West Macedonia, *јаска* (Matecki 1934), *ac*, *аска*, *јазека* (ESSJ) etc.

Croatian

The Croatian literary form is *jā* (*nì jā*, *ì jā* with a Neo-Štokavian retraction of accent). Most dialects have a *z*-less form, except for some of the North-West Čakavian and a few Kajkavian dialects (in Štokavian, there are no forms with the final *-z* anywhere). Two types of accentuation exist – the most common variant with the neo-acute (˘), or with ˘ < ˘ in the dialects that do not preserve ˘, and the rarer variant with the short falling accent (˘). Again, the latter is non-existent in Štokavian dialects; it occurs marginally in Kajkavian and regularly in North-

(˘ > o, ˘ > e) and the loss of epenthetic *l* could point to Macedonian origin (Damjanović 2005: 18). Judging by *jazъ* it could be both (Croat. *jā*, Maced. *jac*).

5 According to Mihaljević (in press), in Croatian Glagolitic fragments from 12th and 13th century only the forms *azъ/azь/az* appear. There is no attestation of native *ja* or even *jaz* in these texts.

6 This would not be the sole occurrence of an unusual feature in *Psalterium Sinaiticum*. This text is for instance the only OCS source which preserves the *s of Proto-Slavic *u(s)tro ‘morning’ in the adverb *zaustra*, which had disappeared elsewhere.

7 Стойков 1993: 90, 250.

8 Мирчев 1963: 163.

9 SP, Харалампиев 2001: 108.

10 Бернштейн 1948: 325–326.

West Čakavian. In Štokavian for instance: Posavina *jā*,¹¹ Neo-Štokavian *jā* (everywhere).

In Čakavian, as already said – there is a neo-acute in South and Central Čakavian: cf. Vrgada *j°ā*, Hvar *jō* (Jurišić 1973), Blato (Korčula) *jā* (personal data), Pag *j°ā* (no neo-acute, Kustić 2002), Rivanj *jā* (no neo-acute, Radulić 2002), Murter *jā* (personal data), Senj *jā* (Moguš 1966: 78) etc. In the North, there is a short falling accent here: Novi *jā* (Белић 1909: 199), Istra *jā* (but also *jās*, *jā*) (Jurišić 1973), Cres (town) *jā* (Tentor 1909: 172, 1950: 75), Bejska Tramuntana (Cres) *jā* (Velčić 2003), Orlec (Cres) *jā* (Houtzagers 1985), Tometići (near Kastav) *jās* (but only when by itself, Skok 1971–4), Kastav *jāz*, Silba *jāz* (*Bezljaj*), but Orbanići *jā(s)* (Kalsbeek 1998) etc. In Istra, the form *jaz* was attested already in 1454 (*Bezljaj*).

In Kajkavian, the form with the neo-acute (or long falling if ˘ < ˘ in the final syllable or in general) and with no *-z* is the most frequent by far: Samobor *jā*, *jā sem* (no neo-acute in the final syllable, Šojat 1973c: 53), Ozalj *jā* (no neo-acute there, Težak 1981), Turopolje *jā* (no neo-acute in the final syllable, Šojat 1982), Repušnica, Varaždin *jā* (no neo-acute in the final syllable, Brlobaš 1999, Lipljin 2002), Cerje *jā* (no neo-acute in the final syllable, Šojat 1973b), Brdovec (today Kajkavian, but genetically Čakavian) *jā/jā* (Šojat 1973a: 42). However, in Bednja (Jedvaj 1956), we find *jōz* (older and more frequent), *jō* (younger), Štuparje *jās* (older people), *jā* (younger people) (personal data). A similar thing is found in Gregurovec Veternički: *jās* and *jā* (Jembrih & Lončarić 1982–3: 41).¹²

Until the beginning of the 17th century, *jaz* was common in Kajkavian texts – for instance in Pergošić’s language. In his *Decretum* from 1574, *jaz* occurs only four times (pages 5, 6, 147, 187), due to the legal nature of the text. Out of these four times, *jaz* was written 1× as <iaz>, 2× as <iaaz> and 1× as <iāz> which strongly suggests that it was indeed *jāz* (or *jāz*). According to Šojat (1970: 89), the form *ja* became the main one from the beginning of the 17th century under the influence of the spoken dialects. However, already in Vramec’s *Postilla* from 1586, apparently only *ja* appears (for instance, on pages 8, 9, 12 – 3×, 13 – 3×, 14 – 3×, 180 etc.). It is interesting that Vramec always writes <ia> for *ja*, which might point to *jā* rather than *jā/jā*, considering that Vramec often indicates the length by doubling the vowel.¹³ However, since the doubling of the vowel is inconsistent, one cannot be certain. According to Šojat (1970: 89) and Junković (1972: 125), in the 16th century

11 Ivšić 1913, II: 34 or 1971: [373].

12 The authors dub the form *jās* older and the variant *jā* younger. The form *jā* is more frequent, especially if before a word beginning with a consonant, while *jās* is used before words beginning with a vowel (e.g. *jās ōnda veļim*, *jās idem*). It is interesting to note the long falling accent in *jā*, in spite of the fact that this dialect preserves the neo-acute in all positions, cf. *bik*, *pōt*, *stōp*, *střic* etc. (Jembrih & Lončarić 1982–3: 32). That could perhaps indicate there we are dealing with a loanword from another Kajkavian dialect here.

13 For instance: *znaam* ‘I know’, *kluucz* ‘key’, *kraal* ‘king’, *daal* ‘gave’, *deen* ‘day’, *deel* ‘part’, *zaam* ‘alone’ etc. However, this is not consistent, cf. *glaz* ‘voice’.

works of Antun Vramec one finds both *ja* and *jaz*. I was not able to verify that on the material of *Postilla*, as already said. The form *jaz* is also found, for instance, in *Pavlinški zbornik* from the year 1644 (Šojat 1992: 26).

In Štokavian, the form *ja* is attested from the earliest times, for instance in *Povelja Kulina bana* from the year 1189 (ARj IV: 378) and elsewhere. Petar Budmani in ARj claims that the form *jaz* (*jazv*), as well as *az/azv*, is not native but taken from OCS. He provides two Štokavian examples of *jazv* from 1186 and 1198–9. However, it is not clear if these examples are undoubtedly OCS loanwords (as *azv* certainly is).¹⁴ Budmani also considers the Kajkavian example *jas* (or *jaz*?) from the year 1587 a Slovene loanword, but that seems an unnecessary assumption.

Slovene

The Slovene literary form is *jáz*. Snój also adduces the younger variant *jâz*.¹⁵ Cf. *iaz* already in the Freising Monuments and the forms *Jas*, *ya*, *ye* in the 16th century texts of the protestant writer Krelj (*Bezljaj*). In Središče, both *jaz* and *ja* exist.¹⁶ Pleteršnik adduces *jâ* for Eastern Styria and Bela krajina,¹⁷ cf. also *jâ* for Bela Krajina (and elsewhere) in *Bezljaj*. In the dialects one also finds *jêst* (< **jâst*) in Cerčno (FO 1981: 70), *jêst* in Hrušica (FO 1981: 114) etc. Forms with a final *-st* appear already from the 15th century (*Bezljaj*).

According to de Courtenay (1929: 228), the Slovene dialect of Rezija distinguished the forms *jaz*, used by males, and *ja*, used by females. However, Steenwijk (1992: 119) claims that the forms are just free variants and not gender-related, the form *jas* being more “authoritative”.¹⁸

Czech

The literary form in Czech is *já*. In Old Czech, there was also *jáz*. The form *já* occurs from the beginning of the 14th century.¹⁹ Since there are no earlier attestations of this pronoun at all, this means that both forms were used from the very

¹⁴ For *ja/jaz* in Croatian and Serbian old texts, cf. also Даничић 1874: 215.

¹⁵ This accent is found in Snój only. The change *jáz* > *jâz* is due to the very recent sporadic lengthening of the final short vowels in Slovene. This change is part of a tendency to eliminate the quantitative oppositions in Slovene. Cf. also *bât* > *bâ*, *mâk* > *mâ*, *krâs* > *krâ* etc. (Šekli 2003: 33).

¹⁶ Rigler 2001: 361.

¹⁷ The attestation of *jâ* in Bela krajina is not so important since that dialect is in fact genetically Croatian, not Slovene.

¹⁸ In *Bezljaj*, the forms *jâs*, *jâ* and *jâ* are adduced for Rezija.

¹⁹ It occurs, for instance, already in *Alexandreis*, which could in fact stem not from the beginning of the 14th, but from the end of the 13th century (each form, *jáz* and *já*, occurs seven times in the text).

beginning of the Old Czech literary tradition. The form *jáz* was used in Czech up until the end of the 15th century.²⁰

As for some other attestations of Old Czech *jáz* and *já*, cf. for instance *Dalimila*, which dates from sometime between 1308/1310 and 1314, where *jáz* is found only eight times (each time at the beginning of the sentence) and *já* 27 times; in the Old Czech text *Katonova dvojverší* (found in 6 manuscripts – one from the second half of 14th century and 5 from 15th century), we find both *jáz* (“*jáz pomyslí*”) and *já* (“*naučím já tě*”) (58b); in *Závišova píseň* (*Jižt mne vše radost ostává*) from the end of the 14th century one finds only *já* five times; *já* is found also in the 14th century Czech translation of the Bible (SBDO, e.g. page 293) and in the 14th century epic *Vévoda Arnošt* etc.

Slovak

The Slovak literary form is *ja*. Since the real beginnings of the Slovak literary language are not older than the end of the 18th century, it is hardly surprising that there is no attestation of final *-z* in Slovak.²¹ The fact that the modern Slovak dialects do not show the final *-z* anywhere is in accord with the same fact in modern Czech. If Slovak were attested earlier (not just in traces in Czech texts), we would probably also find the final *-z* there, as in Old Czech (cf. however Old Polish with only one doubtful attestation of the *z*-form). The Slovak literary form *ja* differs from the Czech form *já* in length only on the surface. The length was originally there in Slovak as well (as it still is in dialects), but one cannot see it in Central Slovak because there *já* > *ja* regularly (cf. Czech *voják*, Croatian *vòjāk* but Slovak *vojak*). Thus, Slovak *ja* stems from an earlier form *jâ* still attested in dialects. An even older form, also attested in dialects, is *jã*.²² The form *jã* is attested in Central and Eastern Gemer (North-West Slovakia) and Lower Orava (South-East Slovakia), in Central Slovak dialects which had no diphthongization *ã* > *ia*, and in Western Liptova. The form *jã* is attested in the South-West of Slovakia and in Central Orava (where *ã* > *á*), cf. also SSN, Orlovský 1982 (Gemer), HSSJ. In Central Slovak, in North West Slovak and in East Slovak, the form *ja* occurs.²³ In Central Slovak, this form is explained via the diphthongization of *ã* > *ia* according to which the old *jã* yields *jia*, which then results in a form *ja*, due to the change of *jï* > *j*. In East Slovak, the form *ja* is due to shortening (*jã* > *já* > *ja*). In East Novohrad, *ã* > *eĭ* (thus the forms *jeĭ* and *eĭ*).²⁴

²⁰ Gebauer 1896: 524, Gebauer 1903–1916, Trávníček 1935: 335 etc.

²¹ Stanislav 1958: 290, Pauliny 1990: 150.

²² In Slovak, **ã* after soft consonant yields *ã* which then yields *ia* > *ia*.

²³ Pauliny 1990, *ibid.*, Stanislav 1958, *ibid.* For *já*, cf. for instance Ripka 1975: 146.

²⁴ Pauliny 1990, *ibid.*

Lusatian

In Lusatian, only the form *ja* is attested, including older texts and dialects.

Polabian

In Polabian, one finds *jo* and *joz* when accented, and *ja* and *jaz* when unaccented.²⁵ According to Schleicher (1871: 259), the forms *joz*, *jo* are more frequent. The form *jo* occurs in front of verbs, for instance in *jo jis* < **ja jesmь*.

Polish

The modern Polish literary form is *ja*. However, in Polish dialects which preserve *â* < **ā*, one finds the form *jā* with the attested length, as in Czech. Cf. also Kashubian *jā* (*ω* < **ā*) and Slovincian *jāu* (*SP*). In Old Polish, the form *jaz* is attested only as a hapax in the 15th century in *Psalterz floriański* 108, 3.²⁶ However, according to some authors,²⁷ this is in fact a Czech loanword. The shorter form *ja* is attested in Polish already in the 13th century.

East Slavic

Modern East Slavic languages all have the form *я*. This form appears already in Old Russian, as early as the year 1130 in *Мьстиславова грамота*, together with the longer form *язь* and the OCS form *азь*, without any noticeable difference between these three forms – “се азь Мьстиславъ”, “а язь даль”, “а се я Всеволод”.²⁸ Kiparsky (1967: 130–131) says that this only supports the conclusion that the forms *я* and *яз* were used in Russian for a long period without any significant stylistic difference. This is confirmed by Гадолина (1963) who gives clear examples of how both *я* and *яз* in Russian occurred in the emphasized and in the non-emphasized position. According to Черных (1962: 218), *яз* was still a very usual form in the first half of the 16th century in Moscow (although it was not the only existing form). According to Черных, both forms co-existed in Russian until the 17th century. However, Cocron (1962: 133) and Гадолина (1963: 26) claim that the form *я* was the only possible form already in the 17th century. Interestingly, the forms *яз* and *яз-то* were found in *былина* songs up to the 19th century (Черных, *ibid.*).

In Ukrainian, the form *я* is attested from 1322 and *язь* from 1341 (*CCM*).

25 Cf. Lehr-Splawiński 1929: 185, Селищев 1941: 440, *PED*.

26 Łoś 1927/III: 159, *SS*, *SP*.

27 Klemensiewicz, Lehr-Splawiński & Urbańczyk 1955: 321.

28 For attestations of these forms in Old Russian, cf. Срезневский 1893–1903, *СДЯ* and *СДЯ 2*.

Overview

1 Standard languages

Only z-forms: Bulgarian, Macedonian, Slovene

Only z-less forms: Croatian, Serbian, Slovak, Czech, Polish, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian

2 Modern dialects

Only z-forms: –

Only z-less forms: Štokavian, Czech, Slovak, Polish, Kashubian, Slovincian, Upper Lusatian, Lower Lusatian, Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian

Both z-forms and z-less forms: Bulgarian, Macedonian, Čakavian, Kajkavian, Slovene

3 Historical attestations²⁹

Only z-forms: –

Only z-less forms: Štokavian (?), Slovak, Lusatian

Z-less and z-forms in the past: Bulgarian, Čakavian, Kajkavian, Slovene, Czech, Polish (?), Polabian, Russian

The final *-zъ in Slavic

Traditionally,³⁰ it has been taken as obvious by most linguists that the form *(*j*)*azъ* with final -z(ъ) is the original one. The form **ja* was always considered somehow secondary, as a result of some sort of secondary dropping of the final -z(ъ). This supposed dropping of the final -z(ъ) in Slavic has been explained in many ways. Here, we shall mention a few of those and discuss them briefly.

One of the explanations is that the -z(ъ) was dropped because of sandhi positions like *jaz sam* or *jaz znam*³¹ (Solmsen as quoted in *ARj* for instance). As already noted very sharply by Budmani in *ARj*, the case of *jaz sam* can hardly prove anything, since the only two modern Slavic languages that have only the shortened *s*-initial forms of the 1st person singular present tense of the verb 'to be' are exactly the only two modern Slavic languages which have preserved the final -z (Slovene and Bulgarian). The collocation *jaz znam* is more convincing, but it is hard to imagine that this would be so frequent that it would cause the -z to be dropped completely.

29 For some of the languages, like Kashubian and Slovincian, there is almost no historical data. In the case of the East Slavic languages, the histories of Russian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian are not easily discernable. The same is true of Bulgarian and Macedonian, and Czech and Slovak.

30 Although it is difficult to speak of tradition when so many different theories exist.

31 We shall take the Croatian form as an example here.

An explanation similar to this is one which states that the supposed shortening of *jaz(ъ)* to *ja* is simply an *allegro* process.³² This is possible but still *ad hoc*.

Another explanation is that *jaz(ъ)* is shortened by analogy to *ty* (and *my* and *vy*)³³ because in this way all the nominatives of the personal pronouns are monosyllabic and end in a vowel. This explanation seems perfectly possible.

Yet another explanation, similar to the previous one, is that *ja* was created as an unaccented monosyllabic variant of disyllabic *jazъ* so that *ja* – *jazъ* would function in the same way as *mi* – *mъně*, *mę* – *mene* etc. (Jakobson, cited from Трубачев 1974 – accepted by Gluhak 1993 for instance).

Vaillant (1958: 443),³⁴ for instance, believed that both **ja* and **jazъ* originate from an older **jaz* in the same way that the original **ot* produced the form *otъ* (with an unetymological final *jer*) besides the expected *ot-* and *o-*. Thus, according to this explanation, *ja* would be a regular, expected form and *jazъ* would have an unetymological *jer* which has risen to stop the dropping of the final *-z*, while being in accord with the law of open syllables. However, since Slavic **-ъ* can be derived directly from the attested IE **-om*,³⁵ there is no need to assume that it is a secondary development. Also, the case of *otъ* (and *izъ*) is not quite same as the case of *jazъ*. In the first case, we have a preposition (used also as a verbal prefix) and in the second one we have a pronoun form. In the case of *ot* > *otъ* and *iz* > *izъ* (cf. Lithuanian *at-*, dial. and older *iž*), the reason for the introduction of the unetymological *-ъ* was to prevent the making of the variants *ot-* and *o-*, which would lead to semantic confusion (cf. the preposition/prefix *ob-/o-*). Thus, *-ъ* was introduced to prevent verbs like **ot-nesti* ‘take away’ from becoming **o-nesti*, while having **ot-iti* ‘go away’ in the same time. There is also a possibility that the final *-ъ* here was introduced by analogy to the prepositions *kъ*, *vъ*, *sъ* (Gluhak 1993). In the case of **jaz*, there is no reason whatsoever to introduce an unetymological *-ъ*. The proto-form **jaz* would simply yield **ja* and the final **-z* would be gone forever, just like the final **-s* that disappeared in the *o*-stem nominative singular ending **-us* > *-ъ*. Moreover, if **ja* were the only original form, one would expect the acute here as the result of Winter’s Law – **jā* < PIE **éǵ*. However, in that case it would be impossible to explain the neo-acute accentuation that also

32 Cf. for instance Meillet 1934: 452, SP, Boryś 2005.

33 Cf. for instance Гадюлина 1963: 14, Иванов 1983: 295.

34 Accepted for instance in Aitzetmüller 1991: 107–108, Bańkowski 2000 etc.

35 The evidence for the reconstruction of PIE **éǵHóm* with final **-óm* is not as firm as is usually presumed. The attestation of **-om* in Indo-Iranian is not very relevant since this **-om* is practically omnipresent in personal pronouns. However, the agreement of the accent of Vedic *ahám* and Slavic **jāzъ* (see § 13) points to the PIE **-óm* and is highly indicative. It is possible that the proliferation of **-óm* in Indo-Iranian started from this form. Greek *éǵón* almost certainly reflects this **-óm* indirectly and at least some of the Germanic forms can probably be derived from **éǵHóm*. The strongest case for the reconstruction of PIE **-óm* comes from Slavic *-ъ*, since this cannot be explained as secondary as Vaillant wants to. Thus, in spite of the difficulties, it seems that the reconstruction of PIE **éǵHóm* is founded.

appears in this form (see § 13). Thus, Vaillant’s idea has to be rejected, since the cases of *otъ* and *jazъ* are not comparable and since the accentual data cannot be explained by his hypothesis.

As we have seen, some of these explanations are indeed possible. However, there is another possibility – to presume that both of these forms, both **ja* and **jazъ*, are original and thus derived directly from Indo-European forms **éǵ* and **éǵHóm*. This idea is not new,³⁶ in spite of the fact that it was never very popular. This may strike us as a little bit odd, since it was clear for quite some time that there were at least two forms of this pronoun in IE, which would yield exactly the forms attested in Slavic – *ja* and *jazъ*. Thus, it is strange that so many linguists have gone at such trouble to explain the mysterious supposed disappearance of the final *-z(ъ)*, when there was no need to assume any disappearance in the first place. One can imagine that one of the, probably unconscious, reasons for this is the fact that in OCS only the form with the final *-zъ* is attested.³⁷ Thus, because of the false unconscious prejudice that OCS is for all practical purposes identical to Proto-Slavic, many linguists were probably prone to reject any possibility of *ja* to be old, since it did not appear in OCS.

There is more than one explanation as to why there is only one example³⁸ of the short form in OCS. The simplest explanation would perhaps be that this alternative form was lost in the dialect that was the basis of OCS. That can hardly be considered impossible since there are quite a number of such cases – it is not always true that OCS forms are the oldest, in spite of the fact that OCS is the first attested Slavic language. Thus, for instance, OCS has the ending *-tъ* in the 3rd person singular of the present tense, which is, according to the comparative IE evidence, apparently secondary to the ending *-tb*, attested in Old Russian and Old Polish. To name another example, in OCS, the ending of the *n*-stem dative plural is the obviously secondary *-anъmъ*, with the final *-ъmъ* taken from the *i*-stems, while in Old Croatian (in *Povelja Kulina bana* from 1189) one finds the ending *-am* which represents the original ending. The same goes for the OCS ending of the instrumental singular of *i*-stems where we find the ending *-bjъ* (taken from *ā*-stems and there from the pronouns), while in modern Croatian we find a variant *-i* which is the reflex of the original IE ending **-ih₁*. One can think of other reasons why there was no short form in OCS texts – for instance, the longer form **jazъ* (i.e. *azъ* in OCS) could have been regarded as a solemn form in opposition to *ja*, which could have been regarded as a colloquial or intimate variant. This is of course speculation, but it is nonetheless possible.

36 Cf. for instance Kluge 2002, Якубинский 1953: 200, Schmidt 1978: 27. Others have also accepted the two forms already in Proto-Slavic, even if they did not attribute them directly to IE heritage, cf. for instance Lehr-Splawiński & Bartula 1954: 51 and Arumaa 1985: 159.

37 Although this is also not completely true, since, as we have seen, the form *a* is also attested in OCS, if only as a *hapax* in *Psalterium Sinaiticum*.

38 Or none, if one does not accept the form *a* of *Psalterium Sinaiticum* as relevant.

The question to be asked is – why should we presume the existence of two forms, **ja* and **jazv*, at all? What are the reasons to consider this theory at all? There are a couple of good answers to this question, some of which have already been mentioned:

Firstly, the simple fact is that both **ja* and **jazv* can be derived very easily from Indo-European and Balto-Slavic. In fact, no one really doubts that the form with the final *-*zv* is old,³⁹ and this form is very well attested outside Balto-Slavic (Vedic *ahám*), while the form *ja* (from **jaz* in pre-law-of-open-syllables Slavic) has a direct correspondence in Baltic.⁴⁰ If there is a short form attested in Baltic, why should we assume that this short form had disappeared in Slavic just to be resurrected again via some irregular *allegro* process or analogy? Thus, if one can explain both forms easily by deriving them regularly from IE, there is no point in struggling to explain *ja* in a different fashion.

The second reason for the assumption of the two original forms is the fact that, as was already seen (cf. the section Material), in many Slavic languages, the *z*-less forms occur rather early. For instance:

- in Štokavian only *ja* occurs already from the 12th century
- in Kajkavian texts, *ja* and *jaz* seem to occur at the same time
- in Old Czech, the *z*-less form occurs together with the longer one from the very beginnings of the literary tradition
- in Polish, the *z*-less form is practically the only one since the first texts
- in Russian both forms occur together from the earliest times

Thus one has to take into consideration the option that Proto-Slavic had both the form **ja* and **jazv*, and that only later one of these forms was generalized in various Slavic languages – the form **ja* was usually more successful.

The third reason is that, like the two variants of the same pronoun that exist in Slavic, two types of accent can also be found. This has up until now, to my knowledge, never been taken as an archaism. These two types of accentuation must be related to these two different forms – it can hardly be a coincidence that there is evidence not only for two different forms, but for two different accents of the same pronoun. The existence of the two types of accentuation provides an independent indication that there were two different forms for 'I' in Slavic. If there had been only one form, there would be no reason for it to have two different accents.

The accent of **ja(zv)* 'I'

As we have already seen in the chapter Material, two types of accentuation are attested in the 1st person nominative singular pronoun in Slavic. Most languages

³⁹ Except Vaillant, see above.

⁴⁰ Except for the fact that the final consonant is devoiced there, which also solves the disagreement in the vocalism.

point to the neo-acute (**jāzv*): Old Štokavian *jā*, Neo-Štokavian *jā* (*i jā*), South and Central Čakavian *jā*, Kajkavian (most dialects) *jā*, Czech *já* (Old Czech *já(z)*),⁴¹ Slovak dial. *já*, Polish dial. *jā*, Kashubian *iw* and Slovincian *jāu*. On the other hand, Slovene *jāz* (dial. also *jā*), North Čakavian *jā(z)* and Kajkavian *jā(z)* (in some dialects) point to the old acute (**jāzv*). In Old Russian, *язв* is an «ЭНКЛИНОМЕН»⁴² (which points to the old circumflex), but this must be due to the analogical influence of the other personal pronouns *мѣ*, *мѣ*, *ѡ* in which this is expected⁴³. Here is an overview of the reflexes in Slavic:

Neo-acute	Štokavian, South/Central Čakavian, Kajkavian (most dial.), Czech/Slovak, (Old and dial.) Polish, Kashubian, Slovincian
Acute	Slovene, North Čakavian, Kajkavian (marginally)
Circumflex	Old Russian ⁴⁴

The problem of two kinds of accents is obviously very interesting. It is a stunning fact that it was, to my knowledge, never treated in the literature in more than a couple of sentences.

Three solutions are possible here – the first one is to assume that the acute is the original accent; the second one is that the neo-acute is original; and the third one is that both accents are original, i.e. that neither is secondary.

The first possibility is taken up by Kortlandt⁴⁵ who claims, very shortly, that the acute, preserved in Slovene *jāz* (as well as in the neighboring Čakavian dialects), is the original (Balto-)Slavic accent. Kortlandt believes that Old Štokavian *jā* and South Čakavian *jā* are the result of the later secondary lengthening.⁴⁶ A similar claim is made by Vaillant (1958: 443) who says that the Štokavian *jā* is the result of a compensatory lengthening and that (North) Čakavian *jā(z)* represents the original Proto-Slavic form. Kortlandt and Vaillant aside, there are several reasons why the theory of the original acute cannot be correct. First of all, the proposed lengthening is completely *ad hoc* and there is no real explanation for it (except,

⁴¹ Czech *já(z)* could theoretically be derived from **jāzv* as well but in the light of Slovak dial. *já*, this seems highly unlikely, and the Czech form should also be derived from **jāzv*.

⁴² Зализняк 1985: 143.

⁴³ Cf. a typological parallel in Štokavian, where *tī*, *mī* and *vī* have the neo-acute by analogy to the form *jā* where this is expected.

⁴⁴ The innovative Slovene form *jāz* (cf. § 5f) has no connection to this form.

⁴⁵ Cf. for instance Kortlandt 1997: 29 and 2007.

⁴⁶ It must be noted, however, that Kortlandt bases his theory on the subject on his own doctrine of Slavic accentuation, many postulates of which I do not accept. Thus, his views on the subject are hardly explainable in the non-Kortlandt doctrine – for instance, in Kortlandt 2007, he says that Czech and Slovak have preserved the original short reflex of the acute in *ty*, *my*, *vy*. However, according to my view, and to the view of the most Slavic accentologists, the original reflex of the acute is long in Czech and short in Slovak. This is one of the reasons why Kortlandt's theory cannot really be accepted by accentologists who are not working within the framework of the Leiden doctrine.

of course, the ever present *allegro* change, which is not impossible, but still not very convincing). Secondly, if we were to suppose that the acute is the original accent here, we would have to assume a secondary *ad hoc* lengthening not only in Štokavian and South/Central Čakavian, but also in Kajkavian, Czech, Slovak, Polish and Slovencian. Somehow, this possibility does not strike me as very economical.

The second possibility is to assume that the neo-acute is the original accent here, and that the short reflexes in Slovene, North Čakavian, and marginally in Kajkavian are secondary and due to an *allegro* shortening.⁴⁷ However, this view, in spite of the fact that it is more economical than the former, because it supposes *allegro* shortening only in three neighboring dialects (and not in seven or so widely spread ones), is again troubled by the fact that yet again one must subside to the help of the mysterious *allegro* changes and *ad hoc* developments. It is unclear why *jā(z)* would be shortened to *jǎ(z)*, while there was no shortening of *tī, mī, vī* anywhere.

Thus, as already said, the deficiency of both of these approaches, in spite of the fact that these kinds of irregular secondary lengthening and shortening in short forms like these ones are theoretically possible, is that they presume *ad hoc* lengthening and shortening, not attested elsewhere in these languages. For instance, there is no parallel for the change of *jǎ > jā* elsewhere in Štokavian. Kortlandt's theory is even more unbelievable since it includes, among other things, lengthening in Slovene *tī*, but the absence of it in *jǎz*.⁴⁸

The third approach, however, seems more reasonable. If we have established that there were probably two forms of the pronoun in question already in Common Slavic, **ja* and **jazv*, and since we already know for sure that there were at least two different forms of this pronoun in PIE,⁴⁹ why not assume that there were two types of accent in Slavic, if this is what the material points to? Why not assume that somehow both the old acute and the neo-acute are original in Slavic? Since we already have two forms – **ja* and **jazv*, why should we not relate these two forms to the two different kinds of accentuation that the material seems to point at? The logical thing to do would be to assume that the old acute is the original accent of the shorter form **jǎ*, and that the neo-acute is the original accent of the longer form **jāzv*. In this way, Common Slavic **jǎ* could be derived from PIE **éǵ* with the acute as the result of Winter's law. The absence of the acute in Lithuanian *àš* is easily explained if we derive Lithuanian *àš* and Old Lithuanian *eš* from a PIE

47 This is the view of Bulcsú László (personal communication).

48 Kortlandt (1997: 29) believes that the falling tone in Slovene *tī, mī, vī*, but the rising one in Posavina southern Čakavian points to the secondary lengthening of an originally short vowel (i.e. the reflex of the old acute). However, he provides no reason for this supposed "secondary lengthening".

49 **éǵ* as attested in Old Lithuanian *eš*, and **éǵh₂óm* as attested in Slavic *jazv* or in Vedic *ahám*.

**ék*,⁵⁰ a sandhi variant with the devoiced ending, which was generalized in Baltic and in front of which, logically, there was no Winter's law and hence no acute. Common Slavic **jāzv* is to be derived from older **jāzǔ*,⁵¹ with the neo-acute as the result of Ivšić's Rule.⁵² It is only natural to relate a neo-acute to a form that has two syllables, because the neo-acute demands an extra syllable (i.e. a weak *jer*) in order to be explained convincingly. Slavic **jāzǔ* can also be directly derived from the PIE form **éǵHóm* (Vedic *ahám*) with the final accent.⁵³ The lengthening in Slavic can be explained here also via Winter's law.⁵⁴ Here, Winter's Law has produced the acute pretonic length. In Slavic, the acute has been lost in unaccented positions,⁵⁵ and when the stress was finally retracted via Ivšić's Rule, the syllable received the usual neo-acute intonation.

PIE **éǵ* > Slavic **jǎ*

PIE **éǵHóm* (Vedic *ahám*) > Slavic **jāzǔ* > **jāzv*

Thus, as we have concluded, there were originally two forms in Slavic – **jǎ* and **jāzv* < **jāzǔ*. What has happened after the Common Slavic period? These two forms must have mixed, probably from an early age. Thus, the forms **jǎ* and **jāzv* (cf. Slovene dial. *jǎ* and standard *jǎz*) have emerged, as well as **jāzv* and **jǎ* (cf. Old Czech *jáz* and *jǎ*). Various languages/dialects have generalized one of the two accents in both forms, and that is what we see now in modern Slavic forms. First, there were two forms and two accents, then two forms and one accent, and finally one form and one accent. The generalization of the accent had finished before the disappearance of the two different forms. In the small area consisting of Slovene, part of Kajkavian and North Čakavian, the acute was generalized in both forms (cf. North Čakavian *jǎ* and *jǎz*). In the rest of the Slavic languages (excluding the unclear East Slavic), the neo-acute was generalized in both forms (Old Czech *já*

50 For this reconstruction, cf. also Bańkowski 2000, who takes it as a dialectal IE form.

51 In the Slavic nominal system, **-v* in the nominative-accusative (< IE **-os, *-om*) could not be accented before Diščo's Law. Slavic had an initial accent in the nominative-accusative of the a. p. c, having thus lost the **-ós* of the IE *o*-stem oxytones (which were the source of Slavic a. p. c). In **jāzǔ*, however, the original place of the accent was preserved. This is not surprising, since the pronominal system often behaves differently from the nominal one – cf. Lithuanian forms like *anàs* (the nominative *-as* cannot be accented in the nominal declension).

52 The retraction of the accent from a weak *jer*.

53 Ivšić (1911: 194) first proposed this explanation.

54 Cf. the closed syllable, which is necessary according to Matasović's interpretation of Winter's Law (see for instance Matasović 1995). For the development **ĕ- > *ja-*, cf. Kapović 2006.

55 This is the only logical assumption. That is clear from the fact that the old mobile acute paradigm has remained mobile, which points to the conclusion that the accent was not retracted to the acute pretonic vowel, as could be presumed, or the old mobile acute nouns would all get a fixed old acute on the root (thus, Lithuanian a. p. 3 would be related not to Slavic a. p. c, but to Slavic a. p. a). The old acute pretonic long vowels behave just like the old non-acute pretonic long vowels, which must mean that the acute has just disappeared if it was not accented.

and *jáz*). Thus, the generalizing of the accent, as already said, occurred earlier than the generalization of one of the two forms and is therefore independent of it.

Slavic **jǎ* and Meillet's Law

The paradigms of Slavic personal pronouns, including the 1st person singular personal pronoun, are clearly mobile (cf. Зализняк 1985: 143 who puts all the personal pronouns into Old Russian a. p. c). We find the familiar traits of a. p. c here: absolute initial accent – **měne*, **mĕ* (like **gōrdъ* 'town', **gōlvъ* 'head') and final accent – **mb/vnĕ*, **mĕnoj*⁵⁶ (like **golvĕ*, **golvojĕ*, **gordomĕ*). Of course, the mobile paradigm of the personal pronouns has its own special peculiarities, just like the verbs have theirs, adjectives theirs, just like the *i*-stems are different from the *o*- and *u*-stems etc.

In the nominative-accusative of the personal pronouns, we find the forms with the circumflex in Slavic⁵⁷, i.e. unaccented words or the words with the absolute initial accent: **mĕ*, **tŷ*, **tĕ*, **mŷ*, **nŷ*, **vŷ*, **vĕ*, **nā*, **vā*. Forms like Old Prussian *toū*, *ioūs* or Latvian *jūs* point to the Balto-Slavic acute in these forms. The discrepancy of Baltic and Slavic is easily explained – since the paradigm is mobile in Slavic, Meillet's Law⁵⁸ operates and the forms with an initial acute get a circumflex instead of it.⁵⁹

A question appears – if the new circumflex forms came into existence via Meillet's Law in the nominative and accusative forms of the personal pronouns, how are we then to explain the preserved acute in one of the nominative 1st person singular forms – **jǎ*? Here the explanation as in **nāsъ* etc. certainly cannot be correct. But there is also a simple answer to this question. Meillet's Law is not really a mechanical, strictly phonetic sound change. It is rather a complex morphophonological process – in the mobile paradigms, the tendency appears to stretch the accent either to the absolute last syllable, or the absolute initial syllable of the word. How can we then explain the absence of the Law in **jǎ*, when it has clearly worked in **tŷ*, **mŷ* and **vŷ*? The answer is rather banal. In order for Meillet's Law to work, one has to have a paradigm – a mobile paradigm. Now, the 1st person singular is a clear case of mobility, cf. **měne*, **mĕnĕ*. Yes, the mobility is indeed there, but where is the paradigm? That the forms **nāgъ* 'naked', G. **nāga* or **golvá*, A. **gōlvъ* belong to the same paradigm is quite clear. That the forms

tŷ*, **tĕbe*, **te/obĕ*, **tĕ*, **tobojĕ* belong to the same paradigm is not quite so clear because this paradigm is irregular, but still, all these forms are similar enough to be considered a paradigm, although a far less prototypical one than the first two mentioned. Thus, the operation of Meillet's Law in **tŷ* and **tĕ* is not surprising, since these two forms belong to a mobile paradigm. It is the same with **vŷ*, **vāsъ*, **vāmъ*, **vāmi*, which also make an "irregular" paradigm, but a paradigm still. The case of **mŷ*, **nŷ*, **nāsъ*, **nāmъ*, **nāmi* is not such an obvious paradigm. Here, the nominative form stands out because of its initial **m*-. However, one could hardly expect Meillet's Law not to work in the form **mŷ*, when it operated in the accusative **nŷ*, which is similar enough to the rest of the forms to be making a paradigm with them, and when it also operated in **tŷ* and **vŷ* which rhyme with **mŷ*. The same reason is behind the operation of Meillet's Law in the 1st person dual – **vĕ*. This form clearly stands out from the other forms: **nā*, **nāju*, **nāma*, but since Meillet's Law operated in the accusative **nā*, in the 2nd person dual nominative and accusative (where both **vŷ* and **vā* are similar to **vĕ* in the fact that all the forms have an initial **v*-) and in the nominative forms of the plural **mŷ*, **vŷ*, the influence was simply far too great for it not to work in **vĕ*. But in the case of the 1st person singular, it was not so. In this case, we had a form which was completely isolated in a number of ways. Firstly, its nominative forms (jǎ* and **jāzъ* < **jāzĕ*) were completely different than the rest of its "paradigm". Secondly, the 1st-person nominative singular forms are also special because there are two of them – which is not the case anywhere else. Thirdly, the form **jǎ* was not similar to any of the other nominative or accusative forms in any visible way (neither in the initial consonant, nor in the final vowel, unlike for instance **vĕ*). Thus this form was simply not a part of the same paradigm as the forms **měne*, **mĕnĕ*, **mĕ*, **mĕnojĕ*. The form **jǎ* was an isolated form (**jāzĕ* as well), not a part of a mobile paradigm,⁶⁰ and thus, logically, Meillet's Law did not operate in it and the form managed to preserve its acute.⁶¹

56 The instrumental accentual variants **mĕnojĕ* and **tobojĕ* can be regarded as a special trait of the pronominal mobile paradigm, cf. Kapović 2006.

57 Kortlandt's doctrine that all the personal pronouns in Slavic had an unchanged original acute (cf. for instance Kortlandt 1997: 29) is unsubstantiated in the material. All the forms point to an original circumflex in **ty*, **my*, **vy* – Kortlandt's hypothesis is thus completely *ad hoc*.

58 For Meillet's Law, cf. for instance Kapović *forthc*.

59 Cf. also Дыбо 1981: 37 for the explanation of **tŷ*, **mŷ*, **vŷ* via Meillet's Law.

60 A suppletivity of completely unrelated (or very different) forms is thus not regarded as the same paradigm, but as two (or more) different forms. One can set a provisional hierarchy of the prototypical paradigms – the most prototypical ones would be those that make a clear paradigm, the so-called regular words like Croatian *kōnj*, *kōnji* or English *horse*, *horses*. The less prototypical paradigm would be that of the irregular words, like Croatian *tī*, *tĕbe* or English *man*, *men*. The least prototypical, i.e. not really a paradigm, is a case of synchronic suppletivity like Croatian *čōvjek* – *ljūdi*, *dōbar* – *bōlji* or English *good* – *better*. Traditional grammars may teach us that the form *better* is a comparative of *good*, but one should know better – especially when talking about what really is in a native speaker's mind and not in grammar-books.

61 In the form **jāzĕ*, the acute was, as already said, eliminated in the pretonic (unaccented) syllable.

Conclusion

In this article, I have tried to show that the two forms of the Slavic first person nominative singular personal pronoun, *ja and *jazv, are related to the two different accents attested in Slavic – the neo-acute (for instance in Štokavian dial. jã, Czech já) and the old acute (for instance in Slovene jãz, North Čakavian jã(z)). Originally there were two forms in Slavic – *jã and *jãzv < *jãzv̌. One of the accentual variants was generalized in specific Slavic dialects, thus leading to the present situation. The form *jã is to be derived directly from PIE *éǵ (Lithuanian àš, Avestan azə) with the acute as the result of Winter's Law. The form *jãzv is to be derived from PIE *éǵHóm (Vedic ahám) with the final accent, and the length is to be explained as the result of Winter's Law with the subsequent elimination of the pretonic acute in Slavic. The form *jã did not undergo the operation of Meillet's Law, in spite of the mobile paradigm (*mène, *mь/vnè, *mè), because the stems in question were obviously suppletive (*ja- : *m-).

University of Zagreb

References

- Aitzetmüller, Rudolf
1991 *Altbulgarische Grammatik als Einführung in die slavische Sprachwissenschaft*. 2nd edition. Freiburg.
- ARj
1881–1976 *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, sv. 1–97 [dijelovi I–XXIII], JAZU, Zagreb.
- Arumaa, Peter
1985 *Urslavische Grammatik: Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der slavischen Sprachen*, III. *Formenlehre*. Heidelberg.
- Bańkowski, Andrzej
2000 *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego*, I–II, Warszawa.
- Bezljaj
1977–82 France Bezljaj, *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, I–III. Ljubljana.
- Bielefeldt, Hans Holm
1961 *Altslawische Grammatik: Einführung in die slawischen Sprachen*. Halle (Saale).
- Boryś, Wiesław
2005 *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków.
- Brlobaš, Željka
1999 “Kajkavski govor Repušnice”. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 25, 77–87.
- Cocron, Friedrich
1962 *La langue russe dans la seconde moitié du xvii^e siècle (morphologie)*. Paris.
- Damjanović, Stjepan
2005 *Staroslavenski jezik*. 5th edition. Zagreb.

- de Courtenay, Jan Baudouin
1929 “Einfluss der Sprache auf Weltanschauung und Stimmung”. *Prace filologiczne* 14, 185–256.
- Diels, P.
1932–4 *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik 1–11*. Heidelberg.
- Dordić, Petar
1975 *Staroslovenski jezik*. Novi Sad.
- ESSJ
1980 *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků, Slova gramatická a zájmena 2*. Praha.
- FO
1981 *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*, ANUBiH. Sarajevo, 1981.
- Gebauer, Jan
1896 *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého, 111/1. Skloňování*. Praha / Vídeň.
1903–16 *Slovník staročeský, 1–11*. Praha.
- Gluhak, Alemko
1993 *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb.
- Hamm, Josip
1970 *Staroslavenska gramatika*. 3rd edition. Zagreb.
- Houtzagers, H. P.
1985 *The Čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 5). Amsterdam.
- HSSJ
1991 *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka, I*. Bratislava.
- Ivšić, Stjepan
1911 “Prilog za slavenski akcentat”. *Rad JAZU* 187, 133–208.
1913 “Današnji posavski govor”. *Rad JAZU* 196 (I), 124–254; 197 (II), 9–138.
1971 *Izabrana djela iz slavenske akcentuacije* (*Gesammelte Schriften zum slavischen Akzent*), mit einer Einleitung sowie Berichtigungen und Ergänzungen des Verfassers herausgegeben von Christian Alphonsus van der Berk (*Slavische Propyläen, Texte in Neu- und Nachdrucken* 96). München.
- Jagić, Vatroslav
1883 (see *Codex Marianus*)
- Jedvaj, Josip
1956 “Bednjanski govor”. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 279–330.
- Jembrih, Alojz & Mijo Lončarić
1982–3 “Govor Gregurovca Veterničkoga”. *Rasprave Zavoda za jezik Instituta za filologiju i folkloristiku* 8–9, 5–62.
- Junković, Zvonimir
1972 “Jezik Antuna Vramca i podrijetlo kajkavskoga dijalekta”. *Rad JAZU* 363, 1–229.
- Jurišić, Blaž
1973 *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade, uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima, II*. Rječnik. Zagreb.
- Kalsbeek, Janneke
1998 *The Čakavian dialect of Orbanici near Žminj in Istria*. Amsterdam.
- Kapović, Mate
2006 *Reconstruction of Balto-Slavic personal pronouns with emphasis on accentuation*, unpublished PhD dissertation.
forthc. “Reexamining Meillet's Law”.

- Kiparsky, Valentin
1967 *Russische historische Grammatik, II. Die Entwicklung des Formensystems*. Heidelberg.
- Klemensiewicz, Z., Tadeusz Lehr-Splawiński, & S. Urbańczyk
1955 *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warszawa.
- Kluge, Friedrich
2002 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. 24th edition. Berlin / New York.
- Kortlandt, Frederik
1997 "PIE. lengthened grade in Balto-Slavic". *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp*, 11, 26–31.
2007 "Miscellaneous remarks on Balto-Slavic accentuation". In Mate Kapović & Ranko Matasović (eds.), *Tones and theories: proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology, Zagreb, 1–3 July 2005*, 229–235. Zagreb.
- Kurz, Josef
1969 *Učebnice jazyka staroslověnského*. Praha.
- Kustić, Nikola
2002 *Cakavski govor grada Paga s rječnikom*. Zagreb.
- Lehr-Splawiński, Tadeusz
1929 *Gramatyka połabska*. Lwów.
- Lehr-Splawiński, Tadeusz & Czesław Bartuła
1954 *Zarys gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego na tle porównawczym*. 4th edition. Wrocław / Kraków.
- Leskien, August
1922 *Handbuch der altpulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*. 6th edition. Heidelberg.
- Lipljin, Tomislav
2002 *Rječnik varaždinskoga kajkavskog govora*. Garestin d.o.o., Varaždin.
- Łoś, J.
1922–7 *Gramatyka polska, 1–III*. Kraków.
- Lunt, Horace G.
1974 *Old Church Slavonic grammar*. 5th edition. The Hague.
- Małecki, Mieczysław
1934 *Dwie gwary macedońskie (Suche i Wysoka w Soluńskim)*, 1. Teksty, 11. Słownik. Kraków.
- Matasović, Ranko
1995 (1996) "A reexamination of Winter's Law in Baltic and Slavic". *Lingua Posnaniensis* 37, 57–70.
- Meillet, Antoine
1934 *Le slave commun*. 2nd edition. Paris.
- Mihaljević, Milan
in press "Zamjenice u hrvatskoglagoljskim fragmentima 12. i 13. st."
- Moguš, Milan
1966 "Današnji senjski govor". *Senjski zbornik* 2, 5–152.
- Nandriš, Grigore
1959 *Old Church Slavonic grammar*. London.
- Orlovský, Jozef
1982 *Gemerský nářečový slovník*. Rimavská Sobota.
- Pauliny, Eugen
1990 *Vývin slovenskej deklinácie*. Bratislava.

- PED
1967 K. Polański & G. A. Sehnert, *Polabian-English dictionary*. The Hague / Paris.
- Radulić, Ladislav
2002 *Rječnik rivanjskoga govora*. Zadar.
- Rigler, Jakob
2001 *Zbrani spisi, 1. Jezikozgodovinske in dialektološke razprave*. Ljubljana.
- Ripka, Ivor
1975 *Dolnotrenčianske nárečia*. Bratislava.
- Rosenkranz, Bernhard
1955 *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Altbulgarischen (Altkirchenslavischen)*. 3-Gravenhage / Heidelberg.
- Schleicher, August
1871 *Laut- und Formenlehre der polabischen Sprache*. St.-Petersburg.
- Schmidt, Gernot
1978 *Stamm- und Flexion der indogermanischen Personalpronomina*. Wiesbaden.
- Šekli, Matej
2003 "Održi praslavanskih oblikotvornih naglasnih tipov samostalnikov moške o-jevske sklanjatve v (knjižni) slovenščini". *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 9/2, 29–50.
- Skok, Petar
1971–4 *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika, Knjiga prva: A–J. Knjiga druga: K–poni¹. Knjiga treća: poni²–Ž. Knjiga četvrta: Kazala*. Uredili akademici Mirko Deanović i Ljudevit Jonke. Suradivao u predradnjama i priredio za tisak Valentin Putanec. Zagreb.
- Słoński, Stanisław
1950 *Gramatyka języka starosłowiańskiego (starobułgarskiego)*. Warszawa.
- Šojat, Antun
1970 "Kratik navuk jezičnice horvatske (Jezik stare kajkavske književnosti)". *Kaj* 3/2, 81–96.
1973a "Kajkavski ikavci kraj Sutle". *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 2, 37–44.
1973b "O govoru Cerja kod Sesveta". *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 2, 45–49.
1973c "Govor u Samoboru i njegovoj okolini". *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 2, 51–72.
1982 "Turopoljski govori". *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 6, 317–493.
1992 "Kulturološko-jezične značajke Pavlinskog zbornika (1644)". *Kaj* 15/4, 21–28.
- SP
1961–2001 *Slovník praslavianski*. F. Slawski (ed.), 1–8. Wrocław.
- SS
1953/5–1988/93 *Slovník staropolski, 1–x*. Warszawa.
- SSN
1994 *Slovník slovenských nářečí, 1*. Bratislava.
- Stanislav, Ján
1958 *Dejiny slovenského jazyka, 11. Tvaroslovie*. Bratislava.
- Steenwijk, Han
1992 *The Slovene dialect of Resia San Giorgio*. Amsterdam.
- Tentor, Mate
1909 "Der čakavische Dialekt der Stadt Cres". *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 30, 146–204.
1950 *Leksička slaganja creskoga narječja i slovenskoga jezika protiv Vukova jezika, Razprave/Dissertationes, 1*. Ljubljana.
- Težak, Stjepko
1981 "Ozaljski govor". *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 5, 203–432.

- Trávníček, František
1935 *Historická mluvnice československá*. Praha.
- Trubetzkoy, Nikolaus S.
1968 *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik. Schrift-, Laut- und Formensystem*, Herausgegeben von Rudolf Jagoditsch, Hermann Böhlau Nachlf. 2nd edition. Graz / Wien / Köln.
- Vaillant, André
1958 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, Tome II. Morphologie. Deuxième Partie. Flexion pronominale*. Lyon.
- Vasmer, Max
1950–8 *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I–III*. Heidelberg.
- Velčić, Nikola
2003 *Besedar Bejske Tramuntane*. Mali Lošinj / Beli / Rijeka.
- Vondrák, Wenzel
1912 *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*. 2nd edition. Berlin.
- Weingart, Miloš
1937–8 *Rukověť jazyka staroslověnského, I–II*. Praha.
- БДА**
1964 *Български диалектен атлас*. Съставен под ръководство на Ст. Стойков и С. Б. Бернщейн (I), Ст. Стойков (II). София, 1964.
- Белић, Александар
1909 "Замѣтки по чакавскимъ говорамъ". *Извѣстия отдѣлення русскаго языка и словесности Академии Наукъ* 14: 181–266.
- Бернщейн, С. Б.
1948 *Разискования в области болгарской исторической диалектологии, I. Язык валашских грамот XIV–XV веков*. Москва / Ленинград.
- Гадолина, М. А.
1963 *История форм личных и возвратного местоимений в славянских языках*. Москва.
- Горшков, А. И.
1963 *Старославянский язык*. Москва.
- Даничић, Ђура
1874 *Историја облика српскога или хрватскога језика до свршетка XVII вијека*. Биоград.
- Дыбо, Владимир А.
1981 *Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском*. Москва.
- Зализняк, А. А.
1985 *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*. Москва.
- Иванов, В. В.
1983 *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. 2nd edition. Москва.
- Мирчев, Кирил
1963 *Историческа граматика на българския език*. 2nd edition. София.
- СДЯ**
1975–2002 *Словарь русского языка (XI–XVII вв.)*, I–XXVI. Москва.
- СДЯ 2**
1988–2004 *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)*, I–VII. А. Аванесов (ed.). Москва.

- Селищев, А. М.
1941 *Славянское языковедение, I. Западнославянские языки*. Москва.
- Срезневский, И. И.
1893–1903 *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам, I–III*. Санктпетербург.
- ССМ**
1977–8 *Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст., I–II*. Київ.
- Стойков, Стойко
1993 *Българска диалектология*. 3rd edition. София.
- Трубачев, О. Н. (ed.)
1974– *Этимологический словарь славянских языков*. Москва.
- Харалампиев, Иван
2001 *Историческа граматика на българския език*. В. Търново.
- Черных, П. Я.
1962 *Историческая грамматика русского языка, краткий очерк*. 2nd edition. Москва.
- Якубинский, Л. П.
1953 *История древнерусского языка*. Москва.

Sources

- Alexandreida*: Vaclav Važný, *Staročeská Alexandreida*. Praha, 1963 (2nd edition).
- Codex Marianus*: Vatroslav Jagić (ed.), *Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae codex Marianus glagoliticus*. Characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum V. Jagić (mit Anhang über Schreibweise und Sprache und einem erschöpfenden Index). Berlin / Sankt Peterburg, 1883.
- Dalimila*: Marie Bláhová & alii (eds.), *Kronika tak řečeného Dalmila*. Praha, 1977.
- Decretum*: Ivanuš Pergošić, *Decretum 1574, Hrvatski kajkavski editio princeps, za tisak priredio i priloge napisao Zvonimir Bartolić*. Čakovec, 2003.
- Katonova dvojverší*: Eduard Petrů (ed.), *Ezopovy bajky, Katonova dvojverší, Rada otce synovi*. Praha, 1999.
- Postilla*: Antun Vramec, *Postilla*. Zagreb / Varaždin, 1990.
- Psalterium Sinaiticum*: *Psalterium Sinaiticum* [reprint]. Graz, 1954.
- SBDO*: Vladimír Kyas (ed.), *Staročeská Bible Drážďanská a Olomoucká. Kritické vydání nejstaršího českého překladu bible ze 14. století, I. Evangelia*. Praha, 1981.
- Vévoda Arnošt*: Eduard Petrů (ed.), *Rytířské srdce majíce. Česká rytířská epika 14. století*. Praha, 1984.
- Závišova píseň (Jižť mne vše radost ostává)*: Jan Lehár (ed.), *Česká středověká lyrika*. Praha, 1990.

Accent retraction and tonogenesis

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

Abstract: Distinctive rising and falling tone movements in Slavic and East Baltic originated from retractions of the stress in these languages. These developments were independent from the gradual loss of glottalization which gave rise to new tonal distinctions at more recent stages. Several contributions to the present volume are reconsidered against this background. Original glottalization was preserved in the Russian dialect of Common Slavic at the time of the earliest borrowings into Latvian.

Like its predecessor in Zagreb, the conference on Balto-Slavic accentology in Copenhagen was a great success. The enthusiasm of the organizers Adam Hyllested, Jenny Larsson and Thomas Olander proved highly effective in stimulating discussion among the participants. While in Zagreb most papers dealt with Slavic data, in Copenhagen the emphasis was on Balto-Slavic problems.

Over thirty years ago I formulated my Late Balto-Slavic retraction of the stress from final open syllables of disyllabic word forms unless the preceding syllable was closed by an obstruent (1975: 5f., 1989a: 45, 2005: 154f.), e.g. Lith. gen.sg. *vilko* 'wolf', dat.sg. *vilkuī*, *gálvai* 'head', *nėša* 'carries', Serbo-Croatian *vũka*, *vũku*, *glãvi*, *nėse* 'carried', neuter *pũlo* 'drank', but Lith. gen.sg. *aviė̃s*, gen.pl. *vilkũ* < *-òm, nom. sg. *galvà* < *-àH, Russian *pĩlá* 'she drank' < *-àH, neuter *nesló*, infinitive *nestĩ*, where syllable-final consonants (including word-final laryngeals) prevented the retraction of the stress. Note that the final stress in *nesló* and *nestĩ* cannot be the result of Dybo's law in view of the quantitative difference between Slovak *mohol* 'could' < **mògl̥o* (b) and *niesol* 'carried' < **nesl̥o* (c). Rick Derksen has rightly concluded that this law generated a class of oxytone nouns in stem-final -CCo-, e.g. Lith. -*stas*, -*klas*, Slavic -*dlo* (1995: 166, 1996: 96–128, 229–232). He has returned to the subject at the meeting of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft in Cracow (2004) and at the present conference in Copenhagen. Several papers at this conference have made clear that his findings have not yet become common knowledge.

Both Hirt's law and my retraction of the stress from a final open syllable to a preceding syllable which was not closed by an obstruent disturbed the Early Balto-Slavic accent system where nouns had either fixed stress on the root or alternating stress between the initial and the final syllable of a word form. The origin of this system has been the subject of controversy since the early studies by Saussure

and Pedersen up to Olander's dissertation (2006) and Dybo's contribution to the present conference. While I have accepted Pedersen's view that the accent retraction in Lith. acc.sg. *dūkterj* 'daughter', Greek *thugatéra*, was a "recul d'un accent qui contrastait avec un autre accent (final) dans le même paradigme, et qui à cause de ce contraste était exagéré et anticipé" (1933: 25), Olander concurs with Saussure's view that it is "difficile de dire le caractère exact qu'aurait cette loi, car il y a des obstacles à la transformer en loi phonétique pure et simple" (1896: 163 = 1922: 533). Having criticized Olander's original views in detail (2006) without offering a solution to his problem, I would now like to suggest a possibility which may be acceptable to our neogrammarian colleagues.

There were two mobile accent patterns in Proto-Indo-European, viz. proterodynamic and hysterodynamic (cf. Pedersen 1926: 24f., 1933: 21f., Beekes 1985: 150, 1995: 175ff.). On the basis of the apophonic alternations in the most archaic attested paradigms, we may reconstruct the following accent patterns for Late Indo-European. I shall write Rsd for radical stress, rSd for suffixal stress, and rsD for desinential stress and adduce case forms of Vedic *sūnús* 'son', Old Irish *ainm* 'name', Greek *thugatēr* 'daughter', Lith. *piemuō* 'shepherd' and Old Norse *oxe* 'ox' as examples.

nom.sg.	<i>sūnús</i>	Rsd *-s	<i>ainm</i>	Rs *-ø
acc.sg.	<i>sūnúm</i>	Rsd *-m	<i>ainm</i>	Rs *-ø
gen.sg.	<i>sūnós</i>	rSd *-s	<i>anmae</i>	rSd *-s
loc.sg.	<i>sūnáu</i>	rS *-ø	<i>ainm</i>	rS *-ø
dat.sg.	<i>sūnáve</i>	rSd *-i		rSd *-i
inst.sg.	<i>sūnúnā</i>	Rsd *-H ₁		Rsd *-H ₁
nom.pl.	<i>sūnávas</i>	rSd *-es	<i>anman</i>	rSd *-H ₂
acc.pl.	<i>sūnún</i>	Rsd *-ns	<i>anman</i>	rSd *-H ₂
gen.pl.	<i>sūnúnām</i>	rsD *-om	<i>anman</i>	rsD *-om
loc.pl.	<i>sūnúšu</i>	rsD *-su		rsD *-su
dat.pl.	<i>sūnúbhyas</i>	rsD *-mus		rsD *-mus
inst.pl.	<i>sūnúbhis</i>	rsD *-bhi	<i>anmanaib</i>	rsD *-bhi
nom.sg.	<i>thugatēr</i>	<i>piemuō</i>	<i>oxe</i>	Rs *-ø
acc.sg.	<i>thugatéra</i>	<i>piemenj</i>	<i>oxa</i>	rSd *-m
gen.sg.	<i>thugatrós</i>	<i>piemeñs</i>	<i>oxa</i>	rsD *-os
loc.sg.	<i>thugatri</i>	<i>piemenyjè</i>	<i>oxa</i>	rSd *-i
dat.sg.		<i>piemeniui</i>		rsD *-ei
inst.sg.		<i>piemeniu</i>		rsD *-eH ₁

nom.pl.	<i>thugatéres</i>	<i>piemenys</i>	<i>yxn</i>	rSd *-es
acc.pl.	<i>thugatéras</i>	<i>piemenis</i>	<i>yxn</i>	rSd *-ns
gen.pl.	<i>thugatrōn</i>	<i>piemenū</i>	<i>yxna</i>	rsD *-om
loc.pl.	<i>thugatrāsi</i>	<i>piemenysè</i>		rsD *-su
dat.pl.		<i>piemenims</i>	<i>yxnom</i>	rsD *-mus
inst.pl.		<i>piemenimis</i>		rsD *-bhi

Since the radical stress in the nom.sg. form of the hysterodynamic paradigm was isolated, its transfer to the final syllable is a logical development, e.g. Lith. *duktē*, Vedic *duhitā*. The same development could then take place in the sigmatic nom.sg. form of the proterodynamic paradigm so as to yield a clear distinction between end-stressed masculines and feminines on the one hand and root-stressed neuters on the other. For the oblique plural cases, which have both radical and suffixal zero grade in the archaic paradigms, I assume final stress in all forms. Medial stress was now limited to the dat.sg. and nom.pl. forms of the proterodynamic paradigm and the acc.loc.sg. and nom.acc.pl. forms of the hysterodynamic paradigm. At this stage, a retraction of the stress in these forms yielded the accent patterns reconstructed for Early Balto-Slavic. This account differs from my earlier treatment (1989a: 43, 2006: 359) in the following respects:

- 1 There is no need to assume that Indo-European accentual mobility was lost at an early stage. The rise of final stress in Lith. *duktē*, *piemuō*, *sūnús* is independently motivated by the elimination of radical stress in the hysterodynamic paradigm and generalization of final stress in the non-neuter nom.sg. form.
- 2 The retraction of the stress from medial syllables (Pedersen's law) may have been a phonetic development, see below.
- 3 The barytonesis did not affect acc.sg. *āvī* 'sheep', *sūnuj* 'son', which had preserved Indo-European radical stress, nor *žiemq* 'winter', which was built on the original nom.sg. form **gheim* (cf. Beekes 1985: 44), but did yield the retraction in *diēvaq* 'god', cf. Vedic *devám*, because the *o*-stems had fixed stress from the outset.
- 4 The oxytonesis did not affect inst.sg. *sūnumi*, inst.pl. *žiemomis* because the original form in *-*bhi* had final stress already in Indo-European times. There may have been no Balto-Slavic process of oxytonesis at all.

Holger Pedersen stated about the retraction in *dūkterj*: "Il ne s'agit pas d'une loi qui exige le recul de l'accent de toute pénultième; il serait tout à fait impossible de prouver qu'une telle loi se soit jamais manifestée" (1933: 25). I would suggest that Vladimir Dybo's contribution to the present conference points the way to precisely such a solution. Dybo shows that the class of Balto-Slavic oxytone neuters in -CCo- identified by Derksen belong to a.p. (2) in Lithuanian and to a.p. (b) in Slavic with loss of an original acute in the root, e.g. Lith. *aūkštas* 'floor', *tiñklas* 'net', Polish *žadło* 'sting', while a subclass with preserved acute belong to a.p. (1)

and (a), e.g. Lith. *irklas* 'oar', Polish *mydło* 'soap'. The latter evidently originated from Hirt's law whereas the former escaped the Late Balto-Slavic retraction of the stress as a result of the intervening consonant cluster. The metatonical type became productive, e.g. Lith. *klōstai* 'planked footway', *mōstas* 'gesture', *dēklas* 'holster', Polish *stadło* 'pair', then also Lith. *klōtai* 'planked footway', *stōtas* 'build', with *-tas* for *-stas* on the analogy of such instances as *graužtas* 'core' where the *-s-* was lost. The metatony resulted from the East Baltic retraction of the stress from final **-à* established by Derksen (1996: 103, 126, 230f.). The independent loss of the pretonic acute in Early Slavic belongs to my stage 5.3 (1989a: 46). Here the end-stressed neuters escaped the shortening of pretonic long vowels at my stage 7.13 (1989a: 51), evidently because the accent had been retracted analogically at that time. For a recent parallel of such an analogical retraction to a preceding long vowel cf. Štokavian *trēsēmo* 'we shake' beside *pečēmo* 'we bake', where the original stress is preserved in Čakavian *tresemò*, *pečemò*.

Derksen's end-stressed neuters can also be found among polysyllabic formations, e.g. Lith. *kabỹklas* or *kabyklà* (2) 'peg', *kratỹklas* or *kratỹklė* 'shaker', where the metatony evidently originated from the East Baltic retraction of the stress from final **-à*. This is the explanation of Dybo's "dominant" suffixes with concomitant metatony on the preceding syllable. More generally, such nouns as *aviniņkas* 'sheepfold', *dalykas* 'object', *degūtas* 'tar', *malūnas* 'mill', *sidābras* 'silver', *vainikas* 'garland', *žmogystà* (2) 'person', *gyvatà* (2) 'life', *lydekà* (2) 'pike' and diminutives in *-ūkas* (cf. Stang 1957: 12) represent original end-stressed thematic neuters. Substantives with metatony derived from otherwise identical adjectives also belong here, e.g. *naujōkas* 'novice', *pagirėika* 'boaster', cf. *naujōkas* 'pretty new', *prieštariėkas* 'disputatious person'. In Slavic the end-stressed neuters are represented by abstracts in *-stvo* and diminutives in *-bc-* (cf. Dybo 1968: 174–192, 1981: 146–172).

Beside the end-stressed neuters there is a second class of formations which yielded "dominant" suffixes with concomitant metatony in East Baltic, e.g. Lith. *-ỹbė*, *-ỹstė* (cf. Derksen 1996: 181, 188). Here the accent was retracted from a prevocalic **i* (cf. already Stang 1966: 167, Kortlandt 1977: 324). Other examples of this retraction are *vandėnis* 'water-', *auksinis* 'gold-', *vyriškis* 'man', *jaunikis* 'bridegroom', *maniškis* 'my', *drabužis* 'clothing', *melāgis* 'liar'. This type cannot represent **-iās*, which is found in *gaidỹs* 'rooster', gen.sg. *gaidžio*, cf. Estonian *takijas* from Lith. *degỹs* 'thistle', Latv. *dadzis*, but must be compared with Lith. *vilkė* 'she-wolf' < **wilkiH-aH*, Russ. *volčica* < **wilkiH-kaH*, Vedic *vrkīs* < **wlkīHs*, gen.sg. *vrkīas* < **wlkīHós*. The accent was not retracted from Lith. *-tūvas*, *-tūvė* < **-tuH-*, Russ. *žratvá* 'grub', which represents the same type (cf. Kortlandt 1997: 162 on these formations). In Slavic the type is attested in abstracts and collectives in *-vje* and *-vja* and in possessive adjectives in *-vj-* (cf. Dybo 1968: 181–191, 1981: 152–170). Interestingly, the possessive adjective replaces the genitive in the oldest Slavic texts (cf. Vaillant 1977: 52, Kortlandt 1978: 294f.), e.g. *synō božii* 'son of God', which allows

the identification of *-vj-* < **-iH-* with the Italo-Celtic gen.sg. ending *-ī*. I conclude that all "dominant" suffixes of the second class can be derived from formations in **-iH*, **-uH*.

There is a third class of "dominant" suffixes which originated from Hirt's law, e.g. Lith. *taukiōtas* 'greasy', *kraujūotas* 'bloody', Russ. *ženátyj* 'married', *bludnica* 'fornicatress', *travína* 'blade' (cf. Dybo 1968: 193–195, 1981: 172–174). It thus appears that all "dominant" suffixes can be derived from Early Balto-Slavic end-stressed forms. It follows that the accent retraction in Lith. *dūkterj* may have been a phonetic development which eliminated the stress from any medial syllable and gave rise to the characteristic accent system where all nouns had either fixed stress on the root or alternating stress between the initial and the final syllable of a word form.

The rise of metatony as a result of accent retraction in Lith. *vilkė* 'she-wolf' < **wilkiH-aH* may be compared with the rise of the independent svarita in Vedic gen.sg. *vrkyàs* < *vrkīas*. When the *-i-* lost its syllabicity, it also lost its high tone and the stress shifted to the neighboring syllables, which were less prominent than the earlier stressed syllable but still had a higher tone than other unstressed syllables. This typically gave rise to a new distinctive tone, which resembled the high tone of stressed syllables in being prominent but the low tone of unstressed syllables in not being high. Glottalization was evidently weaker in Lithuanian, where it has largely been lost, than in Latvian, where it is better preserved. As a result, the tonal effect of the accent retraction on the newly stressed syllable was different in the two languages. If glottalization is weak, the tonal rise caused by the increased pressure before the glottal closure lasts longer than the tonal fall caused by the glottal constriction. If glottalization is stronger, the fall is more pronounced than the preceding rise. When the accent was retracted to a preceding glottalized syllable we therefore expect a rising tone in Lithuanian and a falling tone in Latvian, and this is what we find. When the newly stressed syllable was not glottalized, the retraction yielded a rising tone in Latvian because there was no pronounced fall in the syllable but a falling tone in Lithuanian, where the initial part of the syllable was more prominent. In a similar way, Latvian subsequently developed a stretched tone from the rise before the glottal closure in the remaining stressed glottalized syllables but a falling tone when the initial part of the syllable was more prominent. The Aukštaitian dialects of Lithuanian developed a falling tone from the remains of glottalization in stressed syllables and a rising tone where that fall was absent.

The Early Balto-Slavic system of lateral accentual mobility was renewed twice, once in Slavic and once in Lithuanian, e.g. Russ. *ná vodu* 'onto the water', *né byl* 'was not', Lith. *nėveda* 'does not lead', *prisimena* 'remembers' (cf. Kortlandt 1989a: 49, 1977: 326). Both developments can be viewed as a generalization of unstressed word forms. The problem with this view is that it requires either the presence of an immediately preceding stressed word form, as in Lith. *prisimena*, Bulg. *Čérno*

more 'Black Sea', or the presence of distinctive tone on the initial syllable, as in SCr. *nã vodu*. In Lithuanian, the generalization of unstressed word forms evidently required the introduction of a high tone on the last prefix at a stage which was more recent than the lengthening of stressed *e*, *a*, cf. *vėda* 'leads'. In Slavic we have to assume the rise of a tonal distinction after the generalization of accentual mobility in the non-acute masculine *o*-stems, which must be dated after Meillet's law (cf. Kortlandt 1989a: 46, 49). Since the distinctive tone appears on the first prefix or preposition in Slavic, we have to accept a retraction of the stress to the initial syllable of the extended word form or phrase. While pre-accentuation is a property of the word in Lithuanian, it is a property of the phrase in Slavic. While the Early Balto-Slavic retraction of the stress in *dūkterj* may have been a phonetic development, the retraction in *nėveda* and Russ. *nã vodu* originated from generalization of an alternating morphological variant. The rise of a tonal distinction in East Baltic and Slavic has a perfect analogue in the rise of the independent svarita and of extended low tone phrases, respectively, in Vedic Sanskrit.

Here I would like to add a remark on the suffix which is attested as Lith. *-ingas*, Latv. *-igs*, North Slavic *-ęn-* and South Slavic *-ěn-*. Following Thurneysen (1883), I assume a development of intervocalic *-ng-* < **-ngn-* < **-Kn-*, where **K* stands for **k*, **g*, **gh* (e.g. 1988: 388, 1989b: 104). The original obstruent could be restored on the basis of cognate forms where it was not followed by the nasal (cf. *ibidem*). The intermediate stage seems to be preserved in Greek (cf. Allen 1974: 35), Latin (cf. Allen 1970: 23), and Slavic, where the coexistence of *-ęn-* and *-ěn-* points to original **-ingn-* with loss of **-g-* around stage 7.5 in South Slavic and around stage 7.15 in North Slavic (cf. Kortlandt 1989a: 50f.).

I have little to add on the other contributions to the conference. Mate Kapović reconstructs both Slavic *ja* (a) < Indo-European **éǵ* and Slavic *jazъ* (b) < **éǵHóm*, cf. Vedic *ahám* 'I, but lateral mobility (c) in the oblique cases. The geographical distribution of (*j*)*az*, which is found in southeastern and northwestern South Slavic and in southwestern and northwestern West Slavic, suggests to me that Slovene *jaz* (a) is the oldest form and that **já* (b) is a Proto-Slavic innovation which did not reach the peripheral dialects. I find it improbable that the two forms coexisted during 4000 years of linguistic development without a clear semantic distinction. Moreover, I reconstruct original fixed stress on the initial syllable of the oblique case forms (b), as in Vedic Sanskrit.

Tijmen Pronk reconstructs a mobile accent paradigm (c) with final stress in the nom.acc.sg. form for Slovene *vréme* 'weather', where I assume fixed stress on the suffix as a result of Dybo's law (b) and substitution of **e* for **ě* in the root on the analogy of *pléme* 'tribe'. Since the full grade suffix of the nom.acc.sg. form was taken from the oblique cases (cf. Kortlandt 1983: 176), the assumption of an accentual difference is highly improbable. I find no evidence for original accentual mobility in the neuter *n*-stems except for the word **imę* 'name', where the

full grade root vowel of Latin *nōmen* had been eliminated in Balto-Slavic times already.

Matej Šekli reconstructs a.p. (a) for *Beljàk*, *Čedàd*, *Kobaríd*, *Prosníd*, *Solkàn*, *Subíd*, *Sužíd* and a.p. (b) for *Bregínj*, *Gumín*, *Krmín*, *Tolmín*, *Bóvec*, *Ratènj*, *Týst*, *Áhten*, *Vídem*. As Tijmen Pronk remarked at the conference, the accent pattern is evidently based on the timbre of the vowel which was stressed before Dybo's law, viz. acute **a* or **i* in a.p. (a) but non-acute **y*, **e*, **b* in a.p. (b).

Steven Young observes that Latvian borrowings from Old Russian have a stretched tone if the original vowel was acute but a falling tone if it was circumflex or pretonic, e.g. *miēsts* 'hamlet', *muōka* 'torment', *grāmata* 'book' (a), *grēks* 'sin', *bēda* 'care', *strādāt* 'work' (b), *svēts* 'holy', *grēda* 'pile', *vēsts* 'news' (c). Since the stretched tone reflects stressed glottalization (see above), this distribution suggests that glottalization had been preserved in Russian at the time of borrowing. This view is supported by the word *kaĺps* 'servant', Russ. *xolóp*, where the absence of *polnoglasie* shows that it was borrowed before the loss of glottalization (cf. stages 9.1 and 9.2 of Kortlandt 1989a: 54).

I conclude that we must be grateful to Hyllested, Larsson and Olander for taking over the initiative and establishing a tradition. There can be no doubt that the new series of conferences on Balto-Slavic accentology has already produced important results and will continue to do so in the years to come.

Leiden University

References

- Allen, W. Sidney
 1970 *Vox Latina*. Cambridge: UP.
 1974 *Vox Graeca*. Cambridge: UP.
- Beekes, Robert S. P.
 1985 *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection*. Innsbruck: IBS.
 1995 *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Derksen, Rick
 1995 "On the origin of the Latvian tones". *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 163–168.
 1996 *Metatony in Baltic*. Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
 2004 "The fate of the neuter *o*-stems in Balto-Slavic". Paper read at the meeting of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft in Cracow, October 2004.
- Dybo, Vladimir A.
 1968 Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom, *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie: vi mezhdunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov, Praga, 1968*, 148–224. Moskva: Nauka.
 1981 *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Kortlandt, Frederik
 1975 *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder (also www.kortlandt.nl).

- 1977 "Historical laws of Baltic accentuation". *Baltistica* 13/2, 319–330.
- 1978 "On the history of the genitive plural in Slavic, Baltic, Germanic, and Indo-European". *Lingua* 45, 281–300.
- 1983 "On final syllables in Slavic". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 11, 167–185.
- 1988 "Remarks on Winter's law". *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 11, 387–396.
- 1989a "Od praindoevropskog jezika do slovenskog (fonološki razvoj)". *Zbornik za Filologiju i Lingvistiku* 32/2, 41–58 (English edition: "From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic", www.kortlandt.nl).
- 1989b "Lachmann's law". In *The new sound of Indo-European: Essays in phonological reconstruction*, 103–105. Berlin: Mouton.
- 1997 "Baltic *ē*- and *ī/jā*-stems". *Baltistica* 32/2, 157–163.
- 2005 "Holger Pedersen's *Études lituaniennes* revisited". *Baltistica*, VI priedas, 151–157.
- 2006 "Balto-Slavic accentual mobility". *Baltistica* 41/3, 359–369.
- Olander, Thomas
2006 *Accentual mobility: The prehistory of the Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms* (Diss. Copenhagen).
- Pedersen, Holger
1926 *La cinquième déclinaison latine*. København: Høst.
- 1933 *Études lituaniennes*. København: Levin & Munksgaard.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de
1896 "Accentuation lituanienne". *Indogermanische Forschungen: Anzeiger* 6, 157–166.
- 1922 *Recueil des publications scientifiques*. Genève: Sonor.
- Stang, Christian S.
1957 *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- 1966 *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf
1883 "Urspr. *dn, tn, cn* im lateinischen". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 26, 301–314.
- Vaillant, André
1977 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, v. La syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck.

The accentuation of Old Prussian *deiws* 'god'

THOMAS OLANDER

1 Introduction

Despite the paucity of documentation, the phonological and prosodic system of the extinct Baltic language Old Prussian is relatively well known. Occasionally certain aspects of the Old Prussian writing system are reinterpreted and new ideas are proposed. In a paper published thirty-five years ago, for instance, Frederik Kortlandt made the proposal that the double writing of consonants in Old Prussian texts indicates that the following vowel was accented,¹ a proposal which was made independently by Dybo approximately at the same time.² The idea has received some support but continues to be debated.³

The most important Old Prussian document for prosodic purposes is the *Third Catechism*, or *Enchiridion*, which was translated into Old Prussian by Abel Will in the sixteenth century. A special feature of the *Enchiridion* is the macron-like diacritical sign found above certain vowels. In this paper I will concentrate on the significance of this macron – or rather, on the significance of its unexpected absence in certain words.

At the end of the nineteenth century, Filipp Fortunatov and Erich Berneker reached the conclusion that Abel Will used the macron to indicate a long accented vowel or, in the case of diphthongs, the prominent part of an accented diphthong, thus distinguishing between rising and falling pitch in diphthongs.⁴ The macron at the same time marks length and accent and, in diphthongs, tone. This use of the macron enables us to establish that the Old Prussian prosodic system comprised long and short vowels, a free accent and, in long syllables, two distinctive tones. The prosodic system of Old Prussian is in this respect quite similar to the Lithuanian prosodic system.

A comparison of corresponding Old Prussian and Lithuanian word-forms shows a high degree of agreement in the position of the accent and in the tone of the accented syllable, apart from the fact that the Old Prussian rising tone cor-

1 Kortlandt 1974: 300.

2 Dybo 1982: 246–247 with fn. 25; 1998: 6 with fn. 4.

3 See Olander 2006: 109 with fn. 4 and 5 for discussion and references.

4 Fortunatov 1895 [1897]: 153; Berneker 1896 [2004]: 103.

responds to a Lithuanian falling tone and vice versa, a circumstance which is of minor importance to the discussion in this paper. The following words exemplify the correspondences between the position of the accent in Old Prussian and Lithuanian.

A POSITION OF THE ACCENT

OLD PRUSSIAN	LITHUANIAN
nom. sg. <i>mūti</i>	<i>mótė</i> AP 1
acc. sg. <i>rānkan</i>	<i>rañkq</i> AP 2
inf. <i>turīt</i>	<i>turėti</i>
nom. sg. <i>dessīmts</i>	<i>dešīmtas</i> AP 4

The following words illustrate how the Old Prussian rising tone corresponds to a Lithuanian falling tone, whereas the Old Prussian falling tone has Lithuanian correspondences with rising tone:

B TONES

	OLD PRUSSIAN		LITHUANIAN
rising	acc. pl. <i>kaūlins</i> inf. <i>pogaūt</i>	falling	<i>káulas</i> AP 1(3) <i>pagáuti</i>
falling	nom. sg. <i>rānkan</i> prs. 3. ps. <i>ēit</i>	rising	<i>rañkq</i> AP 2 <i>ėiti</i>

Unlike other graphic peculiarities of the Old Prussian texts, the use of the macron as an indication of a long accented syllable or of the prominent part of a diphthong has not been seriously challenged.

An interesting peculiarity of Abel Will's use of the macron is its consistent absence in certain words where a comparison with Lithuanian makes us expect it to be there. For instance, in the word *deiws* 'god', of which there are more than 100 occurrences in the text, we never find a macron on the *e* as we expect on the basis of Lithuanian *diėvas* AP 4:

C OCCURRENCES OF *deiws* IN OLD PRUSSIAN

OLD PRUSSIAN	LITHUANIAN
nom. sg. <i>deiws</i> 34×, <i>deiwas</i> 1×	<i>diėvas</i> AP 4
acc. sg. <i>deiwan</i> 40×	<i>diėva</i>
gen. sg. <i>deiwas</i> 49×	<i>diėvo</i>
acc. pl. <i>deiwans</i> 1×	<i>dievūs</i>

In my recently finished PhD dissertation I briefly discussed the significance of the absence of the macron, suggesting a new interpretation of the facts.⁵ In this paper I would like to elaborate on the issue.

2 Material

If we compare the Old Prussian accentuation and tones directly with Lithuanian, we notice that the correspondences are quite consistent. As we saw in table B above, Lithuanian acute syllables correspond to Old Prussian syllables with a macron on the second part of the diphthong, whereas Lithuanian circumflex syllables correspond to Old Prussian syllables with a macron on the first part of the diphthong. However, in some of the latter cases, we find no macron on the corresponding Old Prussian syllable. Since Abel Will sometimes omits the macron in forms which are written correctly with the macron in other places in the text, the absence of a macron in a particular word-form is relevant only in cases where the form is attested more than just a few times.

To give an impression of the problem to be discussed in this paper, in table D below I have listed some examples of words that are written according to our expectations, with a macron; and in E, the most important words that are written against our expectations, without a macron.

D OLD PRUSSIAN FORMS WITH A MACRON

OLD PRUSSIAN	EAST BALTIC
acc. pl. <i>kaūlins</i> 1×	Lith. <i>káulas</i> AP 1(3), Latv. <i>kaūlus</i>
inf. <i>pogaūt</i> 1×	Lith. <i>pagáuti</i>
prs. 3. ps. <i>ēit</i> 2×	Lith. <i>ėiti</i> (but Latv. <i>iēt, iēt</i>)
nom. sg. <i>rānkan</i> 3×, acc. pl. <i>rānkans</i> 4×	Lith. <i>rañkq</i> etc. AP 2, Latv. <i>rūoku</i> etc.
acc. sg. <i>kērdan</i> 3×	cf. Lith. <i>keřdžiū</i> AP 2
prs. 3. ps. <i>gēide</i> 1×	Lith. <i>geidžia</i>
masc. acc. pl. <i>geiwans</i> 1×	Lith. <i>gyvas</i> AP 3, Latv. <i>dzivus</i>
nom. sg. <i>soūns</i> 3×, acc. sg. <i>soūnon</i> 2×, <i>soūnan</i> 4× etc.	Lith. <i>sūnūs</i> etc. AP 3
gen. sg. <i>ālgas</i> 2×	Lith. <i>algōs</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>ālgas</i>
nom. sg. <i>piēnctis</i> 1×	Lith. <i>peñktas</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>piekts</i>
acc. pl. <i>mārtin</i> 1×	Lith. <i>mařciq</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>māřšu</i>
acc. pl. <i>āusins</i> 1×	Lith. <i>ausis</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>āusis</i>
acc. sg. <i>mērgan</i> 1×, dat. pl. <i>mergūmans</i> 1×	Lith. <i>meřga</i> AP 4

⁵ Olander 2006: 109–110.

E OLD PRUSSIAN FORMS WITHOUT A MACRON

OLD PRUSSIAN	EAST BALTIC
nom. sg. <i>deiws</i> etc. >100 ×	Lith. <i>diēvas</i> etc. AP 4, Latv. <i>dievs</i> etc.
acc. sg. <i>deinan</i> 8 ×	Lith. <i>diēnā</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>dienu</i>
nom. sg. <i>waix</i> 3 ×, acc. sg. <i>waikan</i> 1 ×	Lith. <i>vaikas</i> etc. AP 4
nom. sg. <i>laucks</i> 1 ×, acc. sg. <i>laukan</i> 3 ×	Lith. <i>laukas</i> etc. AP 4 (but Latv. <i>lauks</i> etc.)
acc. sg. <i>dangon</i> 13 ×	Lith. <i>daņgy</i> AP 4
acc. sg. <i>mensan</i> 4 ×, gen. sg. <i>mensas</i> 2 ×	Lith. <i>mēsā</i> etc. AP 4, Latv. <i>miesu</i> etc.
acc. sg. <i>wargan</i> 8 ×	Lith. <i>vārgā</i> AP 4(2), Latv. <i>vārgu</i> ²

If we take a look at the simple word correspondences between Old Prussian and Lithuanian, there seems to be no system in the presence vs. absence of a macron. But if we take the accent paradigms of the Lithuanian words into consideration, a system emerges. It can be inferred from the examples that Old Prussian words with a macron correspond to Lithuanian words with AP 1, 2, 3 and 4; the Old Prussian words without a macron, on the other hand, correspond to Lithuanian words with AP 4, i.e. mobile words with a circumflex root. This correspondence has been known for more than a century.⁶

3 Previous interpretations

To most accentologists of the pre-Dybo–Illič–Svityč era, including Filipp Fortunatov, Hermann Hirt, Reinhold Trautmann, Nicolaas van Wijk and Christian Stang, the absence of a macron in words like acc. sg. *deiwan* was in harmony with the prevailing theory, according to which words with AP 4 in Lithuanian reflect words that had had desinential accentuation in Proto-Balto-Slavic.⁷ Thus, the absence of the macron in *deiwan* as opposed to its presence in *rānkan* was seen as a preservation of two distinct accent paradigms, one with immobile desinential accentuation and another with mobile accentuation.

In a monosyllabic word like nom. sg. *deiws*, however, these scholars could not postulate the preservation of desinential accentuation. Instead they had to assume a new prosodic entity, a “dritte Intonation”⁸ or “Mittelton”⁹ resulting from the loss

6 Fortunatov 1895 [1897]: 167–168.

7 Fortunatov 1895 [1897]: 167–168; Hirt 1899: 36–37; Trautmann 1910: 189–190; van Wijk 1923 [1958]: 43; Stang 1966: 144.

8 Van Wijk 1923 [1958]: 43.

9 Stang 1966: 144, cf. p. 173.

of the final accented syllable. These scholars thus operated with three distinctive tones in certain positions in Old Prussian.

According to the interpretation of the Balto-Slavic accentuation system sketched by Ferdinand de Saussure for Lithuanian and accepted in the works of V.M. Illič-Svityč and V.A. Dybo and, subsequently, by most contemporary scholars of Balto-Slavic accentology (including the author of the present paper), there never was an opposition in Balto-Slavic between desinentially accented paradigms and paradigms with mobile accentuation. The traditional explanation of the Old Prussian problem thus cannot be applied within this framework.

Some investigators, like Frederik Kortlandt, have deliberately chosen not to draw any conclusions from this peculiarity of the *Enchiridion*:

I shall abstain from the use of negative evidence, that is to say, I shall not draw any conclusions from the absence of a symbol in the text. Thus, I consider the accentuation of *deiws*, *deiwas*, *deiwan*, *deiwan*s unknown.¹⁰

As long as we do not have any obvious explanation of the absence of a macron in the type of words under consideration, it may be the safest approach to the problem not to draw any conclusions from negative evidence. But it should evidently not abstain us from proposing and testing hypotheses that offer explanations even of the negative evidence.

It should be mentioned that Kortlandt, as a reaction to my criticism of his views, adduces the frequency of the macronless forms as an argument against their value as evidence.¹¹ According to Kortlandt, the spelling of frequently occurring wordforms often deviates from what we expect. This way of reasoning is quite unfruitful. If rarely occurring wordforms cannot be used as evidence because they may be spelling mistakes, and frequently occurring wordforms cannot be used because they may be the result of (unexplainable) idiosyncracies, we are left with very little material. In my opinion, the spelling of any wordform should be taken seriously unless there are strong reasons not to do so. Besides, even if we accept this explanation for *deiws*, it does not solve the problem of the less frequent examples without a macron, like *deinan*, *waix*, *laucks*, *dangon* etc.

10 Kortlandt 1974: 299; cf. Endzelins 1943 [1974]: 30–31: “Unklar bleibt nur das beständige Fehlen des Längenstrichs in *deinan* 8 ×, *deiws* 34 × [...]. Was darüber Fortunatov [...], Hirt [...], Trautmann [...], van Wijk [...] und Rysiewicz [...] sagen, überzeugt nicht.”

11 Kortlandt 2006: 363; independently of Kortlandt, Henning Andersen mentions the same possibility (pers. comm.).

4 Unaccented word-forms in Slavic and Baltic

Before moving on to my own attempt at an interpretation of the Old Prussian *deiws* type, I should like to mention a prosodic peculiarity of Slavic and its significance for a related problem in the development of Latvian prosody.

In his 1963 paper "Опыт фонологического подхода к историческим вопросам славянской акцентологии", Roman Jakobson maintained that the prosodic system of the Slavic proto-language was characterised by the presence of phonologically unaccented word-forms, i.e. word-forms that did not have a phonologically relevant accent. This prosodic category is most evidently preserved in Old Russian, but it has left traces in several Slavic languages and dialects; cf. Russian *pródal, zá ruku, pó vodu*, dial. *zimús'* etc.; Štokavian *prōdāli, nā rūke, nā vodu, zimūs* etc. From a morphological point of view, the unaccented word-forms belong to the Common Slavic AP C, which corresponds to accent paradigms 3 and 4 in Lithuanian, i.e. the mobile words.

Since Endzelins's pioneering works on Latvian prosody from the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, it has generally been assumed that the broken tone of Latvian words like nom. sg. *galva* 'head' is somehow connected with the fact that the acute first syllable had been unaccented at an earlier stage; cf. Lithuanian *galvà* AP 3 with accent on the final syllable. Latvian words with broken tone generally correspond to Lithuanian words with AP 3, i.e. mobile words with an acute root. The few scholars who thought about this problem also asked themselves about the origin of the broken tone in Latvian forms like acc. sg. *galvu*, where the corresponding Lithuanian form has initial accent, i.e. *galvą*. They usually assume that the Latvian broken tone in word-forms corresponding to forms with initial accent in Lithuanian has been introduced by analogy with the tone of the forms with desinential accent.

As already pointed out by Endzelins¹² and repeated by Steven Young,¹³ a problematical case in this connection is constituted by *o*-stem *singularia tantum* like *ārs* 'outside', *zuōds* 'cheek', etc. Here almost all corresponding Lithuanian forms have initial accent (nom. sg. *oras* AP 3, acc. *orą*, gen. *oro*, dat. *orui*, instr. *oru*, loc. *orè/oré*; similarly, *žāndas* AP 3, etc.). It is difficult to find a place in the paradigm where the Latvian broken tone could have arisen.¹⁴

As far as I am aware, Paul Garde was the first to make a connection between the existence of unaccented word-forms in Common Slavic and the develop-

ment of the broken tone in Latvian.¹⁵ Tracing the unaccented word-forms back to Proto-Balto-Slavic and assuming that the Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms were constituted by forms with desinential accent alternating with unaccented forms,¹⁶ Garde was able to explain all Latvian forms, including acc. sg. *galvu*, as phonologically regular. This is also the only hypothesis which offers a reasonable explanation of how the broken tone could arise in *o*-stem *singularia tantum* like the ones mentioned above.

Thus together with the Slavic data, the Latvian broken tone constitutes a strong argument in favour of tracing the category of unaccented word-forms back to the Balto-Slavic proto-language. Apart from Garde, scholars like Dybo and Young also support the view that such forms existed in Proto-Balto-Slavic.¹⁷

In Lithuanian we find only few traces of the former existence of unaccented word-forms. As noted by Garde, perhaps the most striking feature is the accentuation of the Lithuanian secondary case forms. These forms consist of primary case forms plus an added enclitic. The relationship between the accentuation of the Lithuanian primary and secondary case forms, e.g. illative sg. *galvoñ* from acc. sg. *galvą*, is quite parallel to the behavior of Old Russian expressions like *nošči bó* with an enclitic vs. gen. sg. *nošči* without clitics. This relationship may be interpreted as a remnant of an older system comprising unaccented word-forms. The accentuation of preverbs in Lithuanian words like *nèveda* may have a similar origin (cf. Old Russian *pótrjasu*), but the evidence is less compelling. Again, it is the mobile words that group together in displaying these prosodic peculiarities. Admittedly, the independent Lithuanian evidence for unaccented word-forms is not very strong by itself, but it still does lend some support to the hypothesis put forward by Garde on the basis mainly of Slavic and Latvian.

To sum up, the combined evidence of Slavic and Latvian, to which we may add the support of Lithuanian, points to the existence of a category of unaccented word-forms in the Balto-Slavic proto-language. Now let us see if this insight in the Proto-Balto-Slavic prosodic system may help us in solving the riddle of the Old Prussian macron-less word-forms.

5 Conclusion

In table E above we saw that words of the *deiws* type generally have AP 4 in Lithuanian and falling tone in Latvian. That is, these words are of the type that had mobile accentuation and a non-acute root in Proto-Balto-Slavic. As we established in § 4 above, the Proto-Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms were characterised by an alternation between forms with desinential accentuation and unaccented forms.

12 Endzelins 1916 [1974]: 597–598.

13 Young 1994: 106 fn. 9.

14 Derksen (pers. comm.) and Kortlandt (pers. comm. and 2006: 363) express doubts as to whether these words are in fact *singularia tantum*. But even if they are sometimes used in the plural and thus occasionally did occur with desinential accentuation in Pre-Latvian, these words must have occurred much more often with non-desinential accentuation. The question thus remains why they would receive a broken tone in Latvian if the non-desinentially accented forms were in fact accented on the initial syllable at an earlier stage.

15 Garde 1976, 1: 195–196; .

16 Garde 1976, 1: 7–13, 2: 429 n. 15.

17 Dybo 1981: 54; see also Young 1994: 106.

If we consider that the absence of marking of the initial syllable of the Old Prussian *deiws* type is identical to the general absence of marking of unaccented syllables in the *Enchiridion*, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that word-forms like nom. sg. *deiws*, acc. sg. *deiwan* etc. were simply still unaccented in the Old Prussian language as attested in Abel Will's translation of the Catechism. The phonetic realisation of the unaccented word-forms in Old Prussian remains, of course, uncertain.

We should notice that since Old Prussian words corresponding to words with AP 3 in Lithuanian – i.e. the mobile paradigm with acute root in Proto-Balto-Slavic – seem to be written consistently with a macron on the first syllable, we must assume that this type of words had acquired root-accentuation in Old Prussian, just as it eventually happened to all unaccented word-forms in Lithuanian and Russian. The non-desinentially accented word-forms of the Proto-Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms retained their status as phonologically unaccented in Old Prussian only if they had a non-acute root-syllable.

A problem to the hypothesis advanced here is constituted by words like acc. pl. *āusins* corresponding to Lithuanian *ausis* AP 4. Here the macron on the first syllable of the Old Prussian form is unexpected. If cases like this are not simply spelling mistakes, they may be explained by assuming that certain words were redistributed among the mobile and immobile accent paradigms in Lithuanian and Old Prussian.

In table F below I present my attempt at establishing the typical reflexes in Lithuanian, Latvian, Old Prussian, Proto-Slavic and Common Slavic of Proto-Balto-Slavic word-forms with non-desinential accentuation. The different prosodic reflexes in the Baltic and Slavic languages are the result of a combination of two binary distinctions in Proto-Balto-Slavic, viz. an accentual one (accented vs. unaccented) and a quantitative one (acute or long, vs. non-acute or short).

F TYPICAL BALTIC-SLAVIC CORRESPONDENCES IN INITIAL SYLLABLES

P.-B.-SL.	LITH.	LATV.	O.PR.	PROTO-SL.	COMM.SL.	
1a	* ^l l̥eipān	l̥epa AP 1	liēpu	kaūlins	* ^l l̥eipān AP a	* ^l l̥p̥o AP a
1b	* ^l uaitān	viētq AP 2	vietu	rānkan	* ^u al ^l kān AP b	* ^v olk̥o AP b
2a	* ^g ālūān	gālvq AP 3	gālvu	geiwans	* ^g ālūān AP c	* ^g ōlv̥o AP c
2b	* ^z eiṃmān	ziēmq AP 4	ziemu	deiwan	* ^z eiṃmān AP c	* ^z im̥o AP c

1 = accented **2** = unaccented (accentual distinction)

a = acute (long) **b** = non-acute (short) (quantitative distinction)

As can be inferred from table F, the Proto-Balto-Slavic prosodic distinctions are preserved in various ways in the Baltic and Slavic languages. I have tried to put these reflexes together in table G:

G REFLEXES OF PROTO-BALTO-SLAVIC PROSODIC DISTINCTIONS IN INITIAL SYLLABLES

P.-B.-SL. DISTINCT.	ACCENTED (1) VS. UNACCENTED (2)	LONG (a) VS. SHORT (b)	1a vs. 1b vs. 2a vs. 2b
LITH.	not preserved	preserved by tones	a vs. b
LATV.	preserved by tones (long syllables only)	preserved by tones	1a vs. 2a vs. b
OLD PR.	preserved by macron	preserved by macron (short syllables only)	a vs. 1b vs. 2b
PROTO-SL.	preserved by accentuation	preserved by accentuation (accented words only)	1a vs. 1b vs. 2

While I admit that the hypothesis proposed in this paper to explain the absence of a macron in words like Old Prussian *deiws* may still require refinement, I believe its immediate simplicity – (graphic) lack of accent mark equals (phonological) unaccentedness – should make us consider it seriously. Therefore I suggest that until another hypothesis has been demonstrated as being more plausible, we should take the type Old Prussian *deiws* at its face value – as an unaccented form.

University of Copenhagen

Literature

- Berneker, Erich
1896 *Die preussische Sprache*. Strassburg. [Quoted from: Replica edition 2004.]
- Dybo, V. A.
1981 *Славянская акцентология*. Москва.
1982 “Праславянское распределение акцентных типов в презенсе тематических глаголов с корнями на нешумные (материалы к реконструкции), 1”. In *Балто-славянские исследования 1981*, 205–261. Москва.
1998 “О системе акцентных парадигм в прусском языке (материалы к акцентологии прусского языка. 1)”. *Славяноведение* 1998/3, 5–18.
- Endzelins, Jānis
1916 “К литовской акцентуации и имени т. пад. множ. ч. основ на -o”. *Извѣстия Отдѣленія русскаго языка и словесности Императорской Академіи Наукъ* 21/2, 295–312. [Quoted from: Endzelins 1974: 591–606.]
1943 *Senprūšu valoda*. Rīga.
1944 *Altpreußische Grammatik*. Rīga. [German translation of Endzelins 1943. Quoted from: Reprint edition, Hildesheim / New York 1974.]
1974 *Darbu izlase. Izbrannye trudy. Ausgewählte Werke, II*. Rīga.

- Fortunatov, F. F.
 1895 "Объ удареніи и долготѣ в балтійскихъ языкахъ. I. Удареніе въ прусскомъ языкѣ". *Русскій филологическій вѣстникъ* 33 (1895), 252–297 [non vidi].
 1897 "Über accent und länge in den baltischen sprachen". *Beiträge zur kunde der indogermanischen sprachen* 22, 153–188. [German version of Fortunatov 1895.]
- Garde, Paul
 1976 *Histoire de l'accentuation slave, I–II*. Paris.
- Hirt, Herman
 1899 "Akzentstudien [11–14]". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 10, 20–59.
- Jakobson, Roman
 1963 "Опыт фонологического подхода к историческим вопросам славянской акцентологии". In *American Contributions to the 5th International Congress of Slavists, Sofia 1963, I*, 153–178. The Hague.
- Kortlandt, Frederik
 1974 "Old Prussian Accentuation". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88 (1974), 299–306.
 2006 "Balto-Slavic accentual mobility". *Baltistica* 41/3, 359–369.
- Olander, Thomas
 2006 *Accentual mobility: the prehistory of the Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms* [Ph.D. dissertation]. Copenhagen.
- Stang, Christian S.
 1966 *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø.
- Trautmann, Reinhold
 1910 *Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Göttingen.
- van Wijk, Nicolaas
 1923 *Die baltischen und slavischen Akzent- und Intonationssysteme* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 23, 2). Amsterdam. [Quoted from: 2. edition, 's-Gravenhage 1958 (= C. H. van Schooneveld (ed.), *Janua Linguarum. Studia memoriae Nicolai van Wijk dedicata. Series minor* 5).]
- Young, Steven R.
 1994 "Endzelin's law and acute tone in Latvian". *Linguistica Baltica* 3, 101–108.

О некоторых акцентуационных особенностях существительных а.п. с в старосербских памятниках

ИРИНА С. ПЕКУНОВА

В статье рассматриваются данные двух крупнейших известных в настоящее время староштокавских акцентуированных памятников – *Апостола* (полный текст с месяцесловом, София НБКМ № 889 первая половина XV в.), далее *Ап*, и *Евангелия* (полный апракос с месяцесловом, Москва РГБ № 7364 первая треть XV в.), далее *Ев*. Материал из *Ап* публикуется впервые, материал из *Ев* ранее привлекался к рассмотрению в работах Р. В. Булатовой [Булатова 1981] и В. А. Дыбо [Дыбо 1983], [Дыбо 2000].

Для анализа выбраны правила акцентовки словоформ непроизводных существительных акцентной парадигмы с с исторически ударными односложными окончаниями, то есть словоформ вида □♦ или □□♦, где □ означает компонент основы, несущий минусовую маркировку и, соответственно, исторически безударный, а ♦ – флексию, несущую плюсовую маркировку и, соответственно, исторически ударную.¹ Словоформы вида □♦ (основа равна корню) представлены в парадигмах существительных всех типов склонения, а именно, этимологических а-, о-, i-, и- и согласного (ср. *nog.а* NSg, *gols.у* IPl, *čьst.i* LSg, *dom.и* LSg, *krъv.е* GSg); словоформы вида □□♦ (основа, помимо корня, содержит т.н. "словоизменяемый суффикс") рассматриваются только у существительных согласного склонения (ср. *slav.es.е* GSg)².

Замечание 1. Заметим, что характеристика "лексема акцентной парадигмы с" в данном случае понимается как характеристика синхронная, а именно: лексема, имеющая в акцентной системе данного памятника среди своих словоформ словоформы-энклиномены – такие словоформы выявляются, как правило, по возможности "переноса" их начального ударения на проклитику, ср. ASg *вѣдоу, нѣ водоу*. Все прочие словоформы лексем, принадлежащих акцентной парадигме с, называются оротоническими. Фактически, все существительные,

1 Подробнее о маркировках и правиле постановки ударения в праславянском см. [Дыбо 2000, 11–14] и [Зализняк 1985, 121–125].

2 Не рассматриваются, таким образом, непроизводные (или опростившиеся) существительные с многосложной основой. Данное ограничение принято ввиду скудости соответствующего материала. Тем не менее, в ходе изложения эта группа существительных может иногда привлекаться в качестве дополнительного иллюстративного материала.

представляющие в наших памятниках синхронную а.п. с, представляют и историческую (праславянскую) а.п. с; для праславянского состояния во всех ортотонических словоформах а.п. с реконструируется нафлекссионное ударение. Подробнее об акцентных парадигмах, ортотонических формах и формах-энклиномена см. [Дыбо 2000, 15–17] и [Зализняк 1985, 118–128].

Далее используется введенная выше условная запись акцентного контура словоформ с обозначением □, ■ для слогов основы и ○, ● для слогов окончания; ударному слогу отвечают ■ и ●, безударному – □ и ○. Проклитика, в частности, предлог, обозначается значком ▲ без ударения и ▲ под ударением.

При сохранении праславянской (далее – CSL) акцентовки в рассматриваемой группе словоформ ожидалось бы сплошное нафлекссионное, то есть конечное ударение в любых контекстах. Наблюдаются, однако, три основных класса отступлений от указанной ожидаемой картины. В системах первого класса флекссионное ударение сменяется накоренным только в фонетически двусложных словоформах, то есть в двусложных словоформах, не сопровождаемых проклитикой. В системах второго класса флекссионное ударение сменяется накоренным во всех случаях. В системах третьего класса конечное флекссионное ударение сохраняется в трехсложных словоформах вида □□●, но заменяется ударением на начальном слоге фонетического слова, если такое фонетическое слово содержит одиночную двусложную словоформу (в этом случае получаем накоренное ударение: ■○) или двусложную словоформу с проклитикой (в этом случае получаем ударение на проклитике: ▲□○). Иными словами, в системах третьего класса двусложные словоформы преобретают статус энклиноменов, а трехсложные – сохраняют конечную ударность.

Вот общая схема описанных систем акцентовки:

CSL	класс 1	класс 2	класс 3
□●	■○	■○	■○
▲□●	▲□●	▲■○	▲□○
□□●	□□●	□■○	□□●

Таблица 1

Замечание 2. Легко видеть, что с точки зрения набора акцентных контуров словоформ, характеризующего акцентную парадигму с (см. Замечание 1), системы первого и второго класса принципиально отличаются от системы CSL, в то время как системы третьего класса с этой точки зрения тождественны исходной системе. В самом деле, и в системе CSL, и в системах класса 3 всякая словоформа, входящая в парадигму лексемы а.п. с, представляет собой либо словоформу-энклиномен, либо словоформу с флекссионным ударением. При этом за счет выписанного преобразования в системах класса 3 словоформ-энклиноменов оказывается больше, чем в исходной системе (так называемые “новые энклиномены”). В системах класса 1, помимо словоформ с акцентными контурами, унаследованными из CSL, представлены еще ортотонические словоформы с накоренным ударением в абсолютном

употреблении и нафлекссионным – в употреблении с проклитикой (как бы “антиэнклиномены”), а в системах класса 2 – ортотонические словоформы с устойчивым вне зависимости от контекста накоренным ударением.

В штокавском материале (в широком смысле слова – см. таблицу ниже) представлены как примеры развития по всем трем указанным классам, так и развитие по стандартной модели, то есть с сохранением CSL-акцентного контура:

	стандарт (= CSL)	класс 1	класс 2	класс 3
литературный серб. (1)	+	–	+ (2)	–
некоторые штокавские диалекты, в том числе говор Дубровника (1)	+	+ (3)	–	–
<i>Ев</i>	+	+ (4)	–	–
<i>Ап</i>	+	– (5)	+	+

Таблица 2

Комментарии к табл. 2:

- 1 До новоштокавской оттяжки ударения.
- 2 Только GPI (< GDu) лексемы **noga*: **nōgū*, **pod nōgū* (ср. совр. *ногу*, *испод ногу* [Даничић 1925, 7]).
- 3 Варианты развития по классу 1 для слов с односложной основой отмечены С. Л. Николаевым в LSg m (окончание старого *и*-скл.), ср. *nā tvōmū nōsu* (< **nōsu*), но *po nōsu* (< **po nosū*); а также в LSg f *i*-скл., ср. *na òvōj kōsti* (< **kōsti*), но *na kōsti* (< **kosti*); см. [OCA 1993, 30], [Rešetar 1900, 43, 104].
- 4 Здесь имеется в виду, прежде всего, распределение, наблюдаемое в GSg односложных основ *a*-скл.: беспредложные употребления показывают сплошное накоренное ударение, ср. *гла́вы* 3х, *стра́ны* 2х, *во́ды* 1х, *но́гы* 1х, при единственной конечноударной форме *гла́вы*, отражающей стандартное развитие, в то время как припредложные формы показывают господствующее нафлекссионное ударение, ср. *ꙋ гла́вы*, *ꙋ гла́вы*, *ꙋ гла́вы*, *ꙋ роу́кы*, *ꙋ роу́кы*, *ꙋ во́ды* 2х, *ꙋ во́ды*, при трех формах с накоренным ударением *ꙋ во́ды* 3х, демонстрирующих развитие по классу 2. По остальным входящим в круг нашего рассмотрения формам по материалу *Ев* надежных данных нет.
- 5 В материале *Ап* представлена, однако, форма *гла́ва* 3х при варианте с энклитикой *глава́ же* (вариантов с проклитикой не засвидетельствовано, см. ниже табл. 3). Здесь, по-видимому, имеет место спорадическая оттяжка ударения с конечного слога, представленная в *Ап* в ряде случаев также и у словоформ а.п. *b* (ср. *се́стра*, а также в среде многосложных а.п. с вариант *сатана́* при стандартных *сатана́*, *сво́вода́*). Можно ли квалифицировать эти случаи как развитие по классу 1, 2 или 3, или необходимо предполагать какой-то иной вариант, определить из-за недостатка материала, в частности, форм с проклитиками, невозможно.

Как видно из таблицы, развитие по классам 2 и 3, если не считать единичного литературного примера и, возможно, некоторых примеров в *Ев* (см. комм. 2 к таблице), представлено исключительно материалом *Ап*. Отметим,

что системы класса 3 известны также по восточноболгарским памятникам (старотырновская система, см. [OCA 1990, 170 и далее]). Вопрос о возможности диалектного распределения между какими-либо из указанных систем требует дополнительного исследования.

Ниже, в табл. 3 полностью представлен материал *Ап*³; одновременно в табл. 3 приводится полная сводка позиций, релевантных для развития по классам 1, 2 или 3. Каждая позиция определяется односложной ударной в а.п. *с* (то есть *с* +-маркировкой) CSL-флексией, имеющей стандартный рефлекс в морфологической системе изучаемого памятника. Таковы: NSg *a*-скл. -а, GLDu *o, a*-скл. -оу, GLSg *i*-скл. -и, GLSg *u*-скл. -оу, GSg *C*-скл. -е, NAP1 *o*-neutra -а, GSg *a*-скл.т. -ы, GSg *a*-скл.м. -е, IPl *o*-скл. -ы/-и, GPl *o, a*-скл. -ъ/-ь (см. [Дыбо 2000, 43], [OCA 1993, 24–25], ср. также [Зализняк 1985, 140–141]). Из всех релевантных позиций две – NSg *a*-скл. -а, и GSg *a*-скл.м. -е – показывают только стандартное развитие во всех обследованных памятниках (а также и в восточноболгарской старотырновской системе)⁴, к ним примыкает GLDu *o, a*-скл. -оу, где нестандартное развитие в рамках штокавского ограничено единственным литературным примером. Для всех остальных позиций примеры нестандартного развития имеются в *Ап*, а для ряда позиций – также в *Ев* или диалектах (см. выше комментарии к табл. 2).

		стандарт □● △□● □□●	класс 2 ■○ △■○ □■○	класс 3 ■○ ▲□○ □□●
\ddot{a} NSg <i>a</i> -скл.	□○	вода 1х, земля 8х, земля же 1х, роука 5х, глава же 1х	глава 3х (1)	
	△□○	й земля 4х, не роука ли 1х	нет	нет
	(△)□□○			
\ddot{u} GLDu <i>o, a</i> -скл.	□○	ногоу 2х, роукоу 4х	нет	
	△□○	при ногоу 2х, на ногоу 3х, сь роукоу 1х	нет	нет
	(△)□□○			

\ddot{i} LSg <i>i</i> -скл.	□○	нет	кръвы 1х, пльти 2х, скръви 3х, чести 1х	
	△□○	въ пльти 9х	въ пльти 3х, въ пльти бо 1х, й чести 1х	въ брани 1х, въ вещи 2х, на власти 2х, въ ноци 4х, въ скръви 2х, ѡ скръви 1х, въ страсти 1х, въ чести 1х, въ чести 4х
	(△)□□○	нет	(й, ѡ, въ) словеси 14х, не въ словеси во 1х, (ѡ, въ) т'влеси 5х	нет (2)
\ddot{i} GSg <i>i</i> -скл.	□○	нет	власти 3х, ноци 1х, пльти 15х, чести 2х, чести 2х	
	△□○	нет	да пльти 1х, ѡ пльти 3х	ѡ скръви 1х, ѡ чести 7х, ѡ чести же 1х, до дни 1х
	(△)□□○			
\ddot{u} LSg <i>u</i> -скл.	□○	нет	домоу 3х	
	△□○	нет	въ домоу 3х	въ домоу 7х, на домоу 1х
	(△)□□○			
\ddot{u} GSg <i>u</i> -скл.	□○	нет	домоу 3х, полоу 1х	
	△□○	нет	ѡ домоу 1х	нет
	(△)□□○			
\ddot{e} GSg <i>C</i> -скл.	□○	нет (3)	кръве 3х, къве 2х	
	△□○	нет (3)	й къве 3х, вес къве 1х	до къве 1х, безъ къве 1х, до дне 2х
	(△)□□○	нет	словесе 3х, т'влесе 1х	нет
\ddot{a} NAP1 <i>o</i> -neutra	□○	нет	нет (4)	
	△□○	нет	нет	въ срьдца 3х, на срьдца 1х (5)
	(△)□□○	т'влеса 3х, й т'влеса 2х	очеса 1х, словеса 10х, т'влеса 3х, др'влеса 1х	= стандарт

3 Из соображений наглядности в таблице унифицированы варианты акцентных знаков, встречающиеся в рукописи для конечного ударения (гравис и камора), также унифицированы варианты букв (оу и ѡ и некоторые другие), титла раскрыты; наличие энклитик при словоформе отмечается.

4 См., впрочем, выше комментарий 5 к табл. 2.

\tilde{y} GSg a-скл.т.	□□	главы 2х	вѣды 2х, скверни 1х	
	Δ□□	ѣз роуқы 1х	ѡ вѣды 3х, ѡ роуқы 1х	ѡ цѣны 2х (6)
	(Δ)□□□			
\tilde{z} GSg a-скл.м.	□□	земли 3х	нет	
	Δ□□	ѡ земли 9х	нет	нет
	(Δ)□□□			
\tilde{y} / \tilde{i} PI o-скл.	□□	слоухы 2х	зоувы 1х, сръдци 1х	
	Δ□□	нет	нет	
	(Δ)□□□	нет (3)	словеси 5х, словеси 1х, ѣ оушеси 1х	нет
\tilde{z} / \tilde{z} GPI o, a-скл.	□□	нет (7)		
	Δ□□	нет (7)	ѣз роукъ 1х, ни ѡ роукъ 1х	ѣ гласть 1х, ѡ кнѣзь 1х (3)
	(Δ)□□□	нет (7)		

Таблица 3

Комментарии к табл. 3:

- См. комм. 5 к табл. 2.
- Здесь представлена форма **чѣлесн** LSg с начальным ударением, вообще говоря, не укладывающаяся в рамки принятых трех типов развития. Эту форму естественно трактовать как распространение эффекта “новых энклиноменов”, характерного для класса 3, на многосложные основы; ср. также GSg a-скл., комм. 6.
- В формах с двумя акцентными знаками, таких как **крьвѣ, вѣз' крьвѣ, словеси, ѡ' кнѣзь** знак грависа, по всей видимости, должен трактоваться как неиктусный; в целом по материалу *Ап* такой неиктусный гравис (каллиграфически неотличимый от иктусного) используется для факультативного обозначения долготы, ср. в окончаниях прилагательных: DPI **чистымь, добрымь**, GSgm **дрогтго**, APIn **добраа** и др., в корне долго-сложной основы а.п. *b*: ISg **выною же, винюю**. Следует ли предполагать появление долготы конечного гласного в разбираемых здесь формах, неясно: для окончания **-ѣ** GSg C-скл. этому противоречит этимологическая краткость гласного, возможно, однако, речь в этом случае должна идти о фиксации какого-то особого характера просодического выделения ударного (первого) слога, ср. аналогичную ситуацию в форме **Вос жѣно** от лексемы а.п. *b*, соответствующей совр. серб. *жѣно* при *жѣна, жѣну*. В окончании PI *o*-скл. долгота вероятнее, поскольку гласный этимологически долгий, кроме того, зафиксирована форма PI **ѣ чюдеси** от лексемы а.п. *a* с накоренным ударением и таким же неиктусным грависом на окончании, ср. также аналогичные свидетельства в пользу долготы окончания GSg a-скл.м. в формах а.п. *a*: **волѣ, пищѣ, ѣ ѡ чашѣ**, подтверждаемые долготой этого окончания в совр. серб. (окончание PI *o*-скл. **y/i* в современном языке утрачено). О способах обозначения долготы ср. также ниже комм. 7.
- Заметим, что в формах а.п. *b* здесь представлено накоренное ударение (ср. ситуацию в NSg a-скл. – комм. 5 к табл. 2): **не на лица, вѣ рѣбра, сѣла, оуѣжа, оуѣста 1х, ѣ оуѣста, вѣ оуѣста**.
- Ввиду недостатка материала по непроизводным существительным среднего рода, здесь учтено слово **srdьce*, содержащее суффикс **-ьс-**.

- Отметим еще начальнударные формы GSg многосложных лексем а.п. *c*: **сѣгани, свѣбоди**, получившие, видимо, также статус энклиноменов; ср. выше LSg *i*-скл., комм. 2.
- Вот все представленные формы GPI *o, a*-скл. а.п. *c*, за исключением внесенных в таблицу: **влась, вѣкъ, ѡ вѣкъ, градъ, ни кнѣзь, моужь, рѣдъ; ѡ ногъ, роукъ, скверни; срѣць; словесь 2х**. Во всех этих формах обозначена долгота либо предконечного, либо конечного (**ни кнѣзь, срѣць, моужь**) слога, таким образом, здесь следует предполагать ситуацию, аналогичную совр. серб. (продление слога, предшествующего долгому окончанию **-a < *ъ** GPI). Современное состояние показывает только предконечное ударение в словах а.п. *c*, сдвинутое с конечного слабого редуцированного, несмотря на “прояснение” (сохранение слогового характера) этого редуцированного; произошло ли это передвижение уже в XV в., неясно; ср. также обозначение долгот в таких формах а.п. *a* (с заведомо корневым ударением) из *Ап*: **ѡ ѣдоложрѣт'вѣ, книгъ, моукъ, ѣ птиць, ѡ ран', ризъ, ѣ рывъ, оуѣзъ, оуѣзь, до оуѣзъ, от оуѣзъ, лѣтъ 2х, лѣтъ 4х, до лѣтъ, чѣдъ, чѣдъ 3х, ѣ чѣдъ 2х, от чѣдъ, вез дѣль, вез' дѣль, не ѡ дѣль, ѣ чюдѣсь** и др.

Анализ выявленных данных может идти в двух основных направлениях. С одной стороны, можно говорить о поиске распределения обнаруженных эволюций (классов 1, 2, 3 или стандартного типа) относительно тех или иных характеристик словоформ-носителей этих эволюций. Это могут быть этимологические, грамматические, синтаксические или иные характеристики соответствующих основ, флексий или словоформ в целом. С другой стороны, мы можем предпринять попытку упорядочить те или иные из установленных типов развития так, чтобы рассматривать их как разные этапы единой эволюции или как диалектные варианты такой эволюции.

Что касается возможностей распределения найденных эволюций по тем или иным параметрам, какие-либо определенные выводы представляются преждевременными. Простого распределения по этимологическим характеристикам окончаний нет – среди релевантных окончаний представлены и этимологически краткие (GSg C-скл.), и этимологически долгие (все прочие), и этимологически акутированные, и этимологически циркумфлексированные (см., например, [Дыбо 2000, 43]). Отметим, что привлекательной была бы возможность представить как ядро рассматриваемых эволюций группу словоформ с флексиями, на другом материале показывающими долготу или краткость в соответствующей диалектной группе (см. [Дыбо 2000, 37–43], [ОСА 1993, 22–27]), или связать наблюдаемые эволюции конечноударных словоформ а.п. *c* с аналогичными процессами оттяжки конечного ударения в а.п. *b*. Что касается лексического распределения, следует отметить реликтовые стандартные конечноударные формы в позиции LSg *i*-скл., представленные только в устойчивом предложном сочетании **вѣ платьи**; ср. в этой связи сохранение конечного ударения в таких наречных сочетаниях, как *po noći* в штокавских диалектах [Rešetar 1900, 104].

Что касается возможностей динамической (в частности, хронологической) интерпретации данных, обращают на себя внимание следующие факты. Наиболее архаичный вид имеет класс 1, здесь отличие от стандарта

сводится к оттяжке ударения с конечного слога в двусложных тактовых группах. Класс 2 может быть получен непосредственно из класса 1 путем распространения той же оттяжки на тактовые группы любого вида. В классе 3 можно усматривать последовательно проведенный переход двусложных форм с оттянутым ударением (как в классе 1) в ранг форм-энклиноменов, то есть унификацию их акцентных контуров в рамках ассортимента акцентных контуров а.п. с (см. выше замечание 2). Показательны в этом отношении также формы *Ап тѣлеси* LSg, *сѣтани* GSg, *свѣбоди* GSg, в которых представлена, по-видимому, та же унификация ассортимента акцентных контуров словоформ а.п. с в рамках развития по классу 2, ср. аналогичные примеры в восточноболгарской старотырновской системе [OCA 1990, 145 и далее]: *ѣзера* NP1, *слѣвѣсть* GP1, *слѣвѣсы* IP1, *ѣ словеси* LSg, *ѣс корене* и т.п.

В заключение отмечу, что приведенный разбор нельзя, конечно, ни в коей мере считать исчерпывающим. Моей основной целью было здесь продемонстрировать наблюдаемые факты, что потребовало какой-то их систематизации. Оценка этого анализа должна быть получена в ходе дальнейших исследований.

Москва

Российский государственный гуманитарный университет

Сокращения

- Булатова, Р. В.
1981 "Акцентуация непроизводных имен существительных а-основ в древнесербских рукописях XIV–XVI вв." In: *Славянское и балканское языкознание. Проблемы морфологии*. Москва: Наука.
- Дыбо, В. А.
1983 "Праславянское распределение акцентных типов в презенсе тематических глаголов с корнями на нешумные (Материалы к реконструкции). Часть II". In: *Балто-славянские исследования 1982*. Москва: Наука.
2000 *Морфонологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис, 1*. Москва: Языки русской культуры.
- Даничић, Ђ.
1925 *Српски акценти*. Београд.
- Зализняк, А. А.
1985 *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*. Москва: Наука.
- OCA
1990 В. А. Дыбо, Г. И. Замятина & С. Л. Николаев, *Основы славянской акцентологии*. Москва: Наука.
1993 В. А. Дыбо, Г. И. Замятина & С. Л. Николаев, *Основы славянской акцентологии. Словарь*. Москва: Наука.
- Rešetar, M.
1900 *Die serbokroatische Betonung südwestlicher Mundarten. Südslavische Dialektstudien, 1*. Wien.

The accentuation of the Slavic *n*-stems

TIJMEN PRONK

The Indo-European *n*-stems are represented in Slavic by three limited groups of nouns, viz. masculine and neuter *men*-stems and masculine *n*-stems. Their accentuation and its origin have been discussed on several occasions.¹ However, a complete overview that takes into account material from all languages that provide any information about the Proto-Slavic situation, that pays due attention to productive types in the respective daughter languages, and that takes into account the huge progress that has been made in Slavic accentology since Stang's *Slavonic accentuation*, is wanting. The following is an attempt to give such an overview. It should be pointed out that this article is based on forms from the scholarly literature only. In some cases, no doubt, only research into manuscripts and dialectological fieldwork will provide a more definitive answer to the questions that arise.²

1 Neuter *men*-stems

The neuter *men*-stems with a NASg. in *-ę* represent the Indo-European neuter *men*-stems. These have retained a separate flexion in most Slavic languages, although their number is limited. Not seldomly have the neuter *men*-stems joined other flexion classes. The common Slavic neuter *n*-stems are the following (Vailant 1958: 211ff.):³

ormę 'shoulder', *sęmę* 'seed', *selmę* 'beam', *tęmę* 'forehead', *vymę* 'udder', *znamę* 'sign', *plemę* 'tribe', *bermę* 'burden', *stermę* 'stirrup', *vermę* 'time', *jymę* 'name', *pismę* 'letter', *čismę* (only CS) 'number', **persmę* (in RCS *bes přěsmene* 'ceaseless').

1 E.g. by Meillet (1903), Sadnik (1959), and Snoj (1993).

2 For the relative chronology of the accentual developments discussed in this paper and their exact conditions, I refer to Kortlandt 1989b. For convenience's sake I will refer to the paragraphs in Kortlandt's paper as K1.1–K12.6.

3 For an exhaustive and well-documented collection of the material on the accentuation of the neuter *men*-stems see Snoj 1993. I am very grateful to prof. Snoj for sending me a copy of his article.

The treatment of the accentuation of the neuter *men*-stems by Stang (1957: 91f.) has shown that the Proto-Slavic situation is best reflected in older Russian and especially in Slovene. On the basis of Slovene, Stang distinguishes three types, which reflect the following Proto-Slavic paradigms:

type (a), columnal stress on the root:

NAsg. *sěme*, Gsg. *sěmena*, NApl. *sěmena*

type (b), columnal stress on the suffix:

NAsg. *plemè*, Gsg. *plemèna*, NApl. *plemèna*

type (c), mobile stress:

NAsg. *jǫmę*, Gsg. *jǫmena*, NApl. *jǫmenǎ*

It is clear that analogy played a very important role in the way these types are reflected in the various Slavic languages. In order to establish the accent type of any single *men*-stem, one has to take into account the productive types in the various languages. In East Slavic, Bulgarian, and Serbo-Croatian, initial stress in the singular, as opposed to stress on the desinence in the plural, became a productive pattern, no doubt at least partly under the influence of the neuter *o*-stems.⁴ In Slovenian, the singular is stressed on the first root syllable, whereas the plural (and Lsg.) is stressed on the final root syllable (Lorentz 1903: 200). This pattern reflects initial stress in the singular, as opposed to stress on the desinence in the plural as well, through retraction of the stress from the final syllable of word forms of more than two syllables (i.e. stage 2 in the chronology of accentual developments presented in Kortlandt 1978: 77f.). In Czech, the long root vowel of the NAsg. of type (a) spread to all other *men*-stems (cf. K10.5). In Slovene, type (b) became productive.⁵ It goes without saying that any noun belonging to a productive type cannot be used as direct evidence for the original accentuation of that noun.

The evidence for type (a) for *těmę*, *ramę*, *vymę*, *sěmę*, and *selmę* can be found in Slovene, where these words have a barytone Gsg., often next to an alternative Gsg. with the productive stress on the suffix. In the other languages the picture is often distorted by the strong influence of productive paradigms. *bermę* is often said to reflect a.p. (a) because of Russian *берѣмя*, Byelorussian *берѣмо*. Snoj rightfully points out that Čakavian (Vrgada) *brīme* (like *sīme*) points to a.p. (a) as well, as opposed to *vrīme* which reflects a.p. (c), and similarly Kajkavian *brěma* (like *sěma*), as opposed to *vrīema* (1993: §4). Middle Bulgarian also reflects a.p. (a), e.g. Apl. *брѣмена* (Hock 1992: 102). Slovene has *bréme*, *breměna* here, reflecting suffix stress, a.p. (b), but in view of the omnipresent evidence for a.p. (a), we must

⁴ Also in Serbo-Croatian dialects, e.g. in Posavian and in Čakavian.

⁵ E.g. Pleteršnik (1894) *sěme*, Gsg. *sěmena*, next to *seměna*, *slěme*, Gsg. *slěmena*, next to *sleměna*, *pláme*, Gsg. *plaměna*, *těme*, next to *těme*, Gsg. *těmena*, next to *teměna*, *ráme*, Gsg. *ráměna*, next to *raměna*. The root stress is also preserved in derived adjectives, e.g. *sémenski*, *rámenski*, *témenski*.

assume that this is secondary.⁶ Štokavian *brěme*, Gsg. *brěmena*, NApl. *breměna* joined the productive mobile flexion.

The direct evidence for type (b) is very meager indeed. Stang establishes type (b) for **plemę*. Snoj rather reconstructs an original mobile paradigm Nsg. **plemę*, Gsg. **plēmene*. The South Slavic languages are inconclusive here, as all attested forms are indistinguishable from the mobile type. In Slovene, type (b) was productive, so the paradigm *plēme*, Gsg. *plēměna* does not provide definite proof for original suffix stress. Middle Bulgarian *плѣма* shows no traces of mobility, but no conclusive evidence for suffix stress either (see Dybo, Zamjatina, Nikolaev 1990: 211).⁷ The Old Russian examples from the *Čudovskij Novyj zavet* are inconclusive (Kolesov 1972: 199), Zaliznjak gives ORu. Nsg. *племѣ*, Gsg. *племѣне* (1985: 134). The derivation **plemenъnik* 'person belonging to the same tribe' has initial stress in South Slavic (SCr. *plēmenik*, Bulg. *плѣменник*), but suffix stress in Russian (*племѣнник* << **племѣнник*). Where the South Slavic barytone forms can be explained analogically (cf. SCr. *plēme*, Bulg. *плѣме*), the Russian form appears to be derived from suffix stressed **plemēn-* (cf. Dybo 1981: 187f.). The fact that the suffix stressed type is abundant in Slovene implies that there were neuter *men*-stems that originally belonged to this type. The appurtenance of other nouns than **plemę* to this type is uncertain. ORu. *гусьмѣ* might belong here (with suffix stress in the *Čudovskij Novyj zavet*), but the evidence is inconclusive (see Kolesov, ibidem). Slovene *bréme* might reflect suffix stress, but cf. the discussion above about the East Slavic evidence for type (a).

The number of nouns belonging to type (c) is also limited. The traditionally adduced example is **jǫmę*. Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev, however, argue that this word belonged to accent paradigm (a) originally (1990: 31). Their argument is based on the fact that this word has fixed initial stress in an east Bulgarian 14th century manuscript from the Zografski Monastery (cf. idem: 210). To explain the accentuation of Slovene *imę*, *iměna*, they assume that the weak initial jer lost its stressability at an early stage, which resulted in a long falling accent on the following syllable.⁸ The fact that we find examples with a forward shift of the accent

⁶ Snoj also argues that a.p. (a) is retained in Slovene dialects (ibidem). He adduces Beltinci *bréme* and Inner-Carniolan *brějme*, NApl. *brějmena/breměna*. These forms could very well be archaisms, but it cannot be ruled out that they are secondary. In Beltinci we find *plēme*, *plēmēna* < **plemę*, *tēmē*, *tēmēna* < **tēmę*, *vrějme*, *vrějmena* < **vrēmę* (see footnote 10 about this form) (Novak 1985). If *bréme* is from **brēmę*, it can easily have adopted a short root vowel, as it did in the standard language and most other dialects. The vocalism of the Inner-Carniolan forms does not prove anything, since the opposition between acute **ě* (**brēmę* > *brějme*) and pretonic long **ē* (**brēmę* > *brějme*) has been eliminated in that area (cf. Rigler 1963: 44f.). The plural forms with root stress can be due to influence from original acute *men*-stems (*brějme*, *breměna* >> *brějme*, *brějmena* like *sějme*, *sějmena*).

⁷ The NAsg. *плѣма* can reflect both **plemę* and *plēmę*, cf. Kortlandt 1982.

⁸ Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev attribute their rule to Bulaxovski, who only established it to explain the length of Slk. *dcéra*, *včēla*, Cz. dial. *céra* etc (1958: 38). Bulaxovski adduces Sln. *bčēla*

from prepositions in Slovene dialects (e.g. Ziljska dolina Asg. *nə ime*), is hard to explain if we follow Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev's theory.⁹ To my mind, Sln. *imĕ* is simply the result of the general Slovene forward shift of the falling accent. We are not dealing with the earlier shift from a weak jer, as in *stō*, because Štokavian and Čakavian took part in that shift as well (*stō*). There we find *ime*, without the forward shift. The fact that jers after initial *j-* were not weak in South Slavic is demonstrated by the fact that they are not syncopated. This subject has been discussed thoroughly in Derksen 2003. The fixed initial stress of MBulg. *има* etc., however, is easily explained if one takes into account that the whole of the singular originally had initial stress. Apparently, the plural adopted the initial stress. Reflexes of the original short stressed NApl. ending **-ā* are still found in western dialects, see Kortlandt 1989a.

Apart from **jvme*, **ver(t)mĕ* is often attributed to the mobile type. Dybo originally regarded this word to be of class (b) because of the South-Slavic evidence, regarding the Old Russian forms he discussed, which point to mobile stress, as secondary (1981: 81; see also Kiparsky 1962: 253). Notice, however, that the mobile type became productive in Russian only from the 17th century onwards (idem: 255). Ukrainian *вѣрем'я* and Byelorussian *вѣреме* confirm mobile stress for East-Slavic, as does the Russian Church Slavonic Lpl. *о временехъ*. Stang points to the fact that this form belongs "to a series of sporadic cases of stress on the first syllable, esp. in the loc.pl.," which he regards as secondary (1957: 93). This type of secondary initial stress in the Lpl. is, however, mainly found with mobile nouns (idem: 76f.). In Middle Bulgarian, too, **ver(t)mĕ* had mobile stress, e.g. *вѣ врѣма*, *врѣма жѣ*, Dpl. *врѣменѣмъ*, etc. (Dybo, Zamjatina, Nikolaev 1990: 212; Hock 1992: 102). Notice that in Middle-Bulgarian, *врѣма* was the only mobile *men*-stem, since *ума* joined type (a) (idem: 210ff.). Additional proof for the original mobility of **ver(t)mĕ* is provided by Kortlandt, who shows that western Bulgarian dialects show reflexes of a short stressed NApl. **vremĕnā* which, like **imenā*, reflects original mobility, as opposed to the long ending of **prasĕtā* and **žrĕbĕtā*, which marks the shift from class (c) to class (b) of the latter two (1989a: 36). Stang refers to Štok. *nĕvrĕme* (NApl. *nevremĕna*, but Slovene *nevreme*, *nevremĕna* reflecting a.p. (b)) as a possible indication of original mobility. The flexion of Sln. *vrĕme*, *vremĕna*, pl. *vremĕna* points to type (b).¹⁰ An additional argument to

as a parallel for the original initial stress of Slk. *vĕĕla*. He does not imply that the rule worked for Slovene as well.

9 Also, the abundant prefix stressed forms in Old Russian (e.g. *на имя*, *во имя*, *по имени* etc.; see e.g. Kolesov 1972: 198) would have to be secondary.

10 The problematic nature of the open vowel in Sln. *vrĕme*, already observed by Ramovš (1918: 141ff.), has been neatly explained by Snoj (1993, §2.1) as a result of restoration of the columnal stress after the retraction of the type *zvĕzda* < **zvĕzdā*. The barytonesis arose again as a result of the retraction of the type *žĕna* < **ženā*. The older situation is retained in Eastern Slovene dial., e.g. in Središče *vřĕmā* and Beltinci *vřĕjme* <

ascribe **ver(t)mĕ* to type (b) is the final stress of Štok. *vrijĕme* and Bulg. *времѣ*. In Štokavian and Bulgarian, like in Russian, the *men*-stems adopted the accentual opposition between root stress in the singular and end stress in the plural. In both languages, *vrijĕme*, resp. *времѣ* form the only exception, reflecting end stress in the NAsg. (Stang 1957: 16; Kodov 1929: 65f.).¹¹ The rest of the paradigm of these words follows the productive mobile type. The final stress in the NAsg. must have existed already before the spread of mobility started and cannot therefore be the result of recent analogy. In Čakavian we do indeed find the productive NAsg. *vrĕme*. Summing up, three original paradigms could theoretically be reconstructed for **ver(t)mĕ*:

- 1 suffix stress (a.p. b): NAsg. **ver(t)mĕ*, Gsg. **ver(t)mĕna*, NApl. **ver(t)mĕna*.
- 2 mobile stress I (a.p. c): NAsg. **vĕr(t)mĕ*, Gsg. **vĕr(t)mĕna*, NApl. **ver(t)menā*
- 3 mobile stress II (a.p. c): NAsg. **ver(t)mĕ*, Gsg. **vĕr(t)mĕna*, NApl. **ver(t)-menā*

**vrĕmĕ*. Alternatively, one could think that the vowel of other *men*-stems of type (b) spread to *vrĕme*, e.g. *plĕme*, *brĕme*, *strĕme*, but Snoj's explanation seems more attractive. Snoj maintains that original mobility is retained in several Slovene dialects (1993, §2.1). Amongst others, he refers to the alleged reflex of the paradigm NAsg. **ver(t)mĕ*, Gsg. **vĕr(t)mĕna* in Carinthian (Podjunki). The adduced forms are Globasnica *vrijāme*, Gsg. *vremānā*, and Pliberk *vrĕĕme*, Gsg. *vrĕmānu*. The accentuation of the Gsg. cannot be old for two reasons.

Firstly, the regular reflex of an **e* that received the stress as the result of the forward shift of the falling accent is *i* in Podjunki, not *a* (e.g. *grebīni*), which is rather the reflex of unstressed **e*. We would find the *-a-* from unstressed **-e-* in the NApl. **vrĕmani*, with regular retraction of the neocircumflex, cf. NApl. *žrĕbati* (Pronk 2007: 176f.). The neocircumflex has not spread to the mobile paradigm, where we find old long rising stress (e.g. *učīsa*), generalized from the Gpl. (e.g. *učīsa*). We would thus expect Globasnica Gsg. ***vremīna*, if it were mobile. Secondly, the NAsg. *vrijāme* corresponds to the standard *vrĕme* (cf. e.g. *zīāmūa* < **zemlā*). This reflects earlier restored **vremĕ* for **vrĕme*, as explained by Snoj (see above). If the original mobility was retained, there would not have been any model to restore **vremĕ*, and we would expect NAsg. ***vrĕme*. I find it more likely that the falling accent of Gsg. **imĕna* spread to **vremĕna*. Another possible model for introducing the falling accent in the Gsg. **vremĕna* is provided by the mobile *s*-stems. In the Podjunki dialect, the NAsg. of the *s*-stems is barytone as a result of the so called "tertiary retraction". We find the paradigm *dreūsa*, Gsg. *dreūīsa*. This paradigm could easily have influenced that of **vrĕmĕ*. Snoj also adduces Gorenski (Gorje) *vrĕme*, *vrĕmĕna* (ibidem). Here too, it seems, we have problems explaining the root vocalism of the NAsg. if the accentuation of the Gsg. is old. Further, Snoj refers to the Savinjski dialect forms NAsg. *urīĕme*, Gsg. *uramĕ:na/urĕmĕ:na* as continuing the initial falling accent of the oblique cases of a mobile paradigm (1993: §2.1). According to the data in Logar 1954, however, we cannot be sure that they do. This paradigm could also reflect **vremĕ*, **vremĕna*. The neighbouring Zgornjesavinski *uramĕ:na*, however, can only reflect suffix stressed **vremĕna* (ibidem).

I did not have access to the material in the archives in Ljubljana, which could provide more certainty about the accentual developments under discussion. The forms I quote for the Podjunki dialect are from Zdovc 1972.

11 In MBulg. we find both root stress and end stress: *врѣма* next to *врѣмā*.

Slovene reflects suffix stress, Old Russian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian, Čakavian, and possibly Middle-Bulgarian, reflect “mobile stress I”, Štokavian and modern Bulgarian, and possibly Middle-Bulgarian, reflect “mobile stress II”. The Slovene forms with suffix stress can be analogous, cf. also *pláme(n)*, Gsg. *plaměna* from an original mobile paradigm (cf. dial. Sln. *plamēn*, MBulg. *на пламень*). Although the attested forms are most easily explained from a mobile paradigm with an oxytone NAsg. (already Meillet 1903: 427), “mobile stress II” can hardly be old, since **jъmę* seems to reflect “mobile stress I”, and a coexistence of the two types for a longer period seems unlikely.¹² The NAsg. **vēr(t)mę* was probably replaced by **ver(t)mę* in the whole of South Slavic. Čakavian *vřime* might reflect the original barytone form, but it may also have generalized the root stress of the oblique forms. The motivation to introduce final stress in the NAsg. is unclear. It also disrupts the transparent model singular ~ root stress, plural ~ end stress. The alternative solution, which is advocated by Kortlandt 2009: 80, is to regard the mobile forms as analogical and the Slovene suffix stressed paradigm as original. This option is hardly more satisfactory, since it fails to account for the abundance of forms that reflect mobility and it disregards the apparent productivity of suffix stress in Slovene (cf. especially *bréme*, *breměna*). The conclusion must be that, at least to me, the original accentuation of **ver(t)mę* remains obscure.

Traces of a mobile paradigm with an oxytone NAsg. (i.e. “mobile stress II”) are also found in Ukrainian forms of **jъmę*. Stang quotes: *ім'я*, *імені*, *іменем*, *імені*, pl. *іменá*, *іменám* etc. He refuses to give this paradigm “historical priority” over the abundant initially stressed forms and rather attributes it to influence of the type **-ę*, **-ène*, **-èna* (1957: 92). Byelorussian similarly has NAsg. *імá*, Isg. *ім(ен)ем*, NApl. *імэны/імі*.¹³ It should be noted that these oxytone NAsg.

12 Pace Snoj 1993, §2.1, who postulates an original paradigm of the type “mobile stress II” for all *men*-stems that do not belong to a.p. (a), except **jъmę*. In my presentation at the second IWoBA in Copenhagen, I defended “mobile stress II” for **ver(t)mę*, following Snoj. I postulated an original NAsg. **vertmę*, **inřmę* in the mobile paradigm, with final stress resulting from the introduction of the full grade suffix from the oblique cases. As a result of Hirt's law, the stress would be retracted in **inřmę*, but not in **vertmę*. Although this scenario would produce the attested forms, I do not think it likely anymore that the difference in accentuation between **ver(t)mę* and **jъmę* would have survived from the application of Hirt's law in Balto-Slavic till present day Štokavian.

13 Meillet (1903: 427) quotes Hanusz, who indicates initial stress in the NAsg. of all neuter *men*-stems in Ukrainian, but optionally also final stress for “manche von diesen Wörtern” (1884: 338). Hanusz gives *імá*, *вумá*, and *стремá*. Probably, this reflects the situation in the Western Ukrainian dialects of Galicia, where Hanusz learned Ukrainian (idem: 223), as opposed to the Ukrainian standard which has its base in the South-Eastern dialects. In view of *вумá*, which goes back to a barytone paradigm, end stress spread in Western Ukrainian. This is also reflected in the suffix stressed paradigm of *імá* in ‘Ruthenian’ which Stang quotes (1957: 92; cf. also the Byelorussian plural). In my view, this is a result of influence from the type **plemę* or from the type **telę*. The influence did, however, not necessarily cause the final stress of the NAsg. It is likely that the shift to the suffix stressed type was motivated by the fact that the

forms are exceptional in Ukrainian and Byelorussian, cf. Ukr. *плém'я*, *рám'я*, BRu. *плéмя*, *стрэ́мя*. In both languages, the originally suffix stressed **plemę* assumed initial stress throughout the singular. If Stang is correct in assuming that the final stress of *ім'я* is secondary, it must have arisen relatively early. Initially stressed **jъmę* is reflected in modern Russian *імя*, Serbo-Croatian *їте*, and Slovene *імę*. Middle Bulgarian *іма* (Bulg. *іме*) can reflect end stress as well as root stress (see Kortlandt 1982).

2 Masculine *men*- and *n*-stems

The masculine *men*- and *n*-stems are reflected as a separate flexion class in Slovenian and in Church Slavonic, where they are clearly merging with the *i*-stems. The *men*-stems differ from the *n*-stems only in the Nsg., which in OCS ends in *-my* in the *-men* stems (e.g. OCS *камy*, *платy*, *кремy*, RCS *ječьmy*)¹⁴, and in *-enъ* in the *n*-stems. In the other Slavic languages, both masculine *men*- and *n*-stems have been absorbed by the other flexion classes, except for *дънь* which has retained a unique flexion in e.g. Slovene and Serbo-Croatian, and there are traces of the original flexion in Czech and Polish as well. The following words can be classified as common Slavic *men*-stems (Vaillant 1958: 206ff.):

kamen- ‘stone’, *polmen*- ‘flame’¹⁵, *ječьmen*- ‘barley’, *strumen*- ‘flow’, *kremen*- ‘flint’, *remen*- ‘oar’, *pormen*- ‘tuft’.

And the following words can be classified as common Slavic *n*-stems (Vaillant 1958: 193ff.):

дън- ‘day’, *koren*- ‘root’, *jelen*- ‘deer’, *stepen*- ‘degree’, *greben*- ‘comb’, *jasen*- ‘ash’, *pъrsten* ‘ring’, *šъršen*- ‘hornet’, *stъržen*- ‘heart-wood’.

The accentuation of the masc. *men*- and *n*-stems cannot be established on the basis of the Štokavian and Čakavian material, because we find initial stress in

NAsg. *імá* was already stressed on the suffix. Since **plemę* gained initial stress throughout the singular in East Slavic, it could hardly have caused the end stress of **jъmę*. If the analogy had been very early, it would be unclear why **jъmę* would have remained oxytone in standard Ukrainian. The columnal stress on the suffix in the Byelorussian plural can be explained along the same lines as the ‘Ruthenian’ material, if it is not the result of leveling of the Gpl. (cf. SCR. dial. (Bednja) NApl. *vremāno*, Gpl. *vremān* etc.). The Ukrainian alternative end stressed Isg. *ім'я* is, like e.g. Isg. *тел'я*, clearly secondary.

14 In Slovincian, the ending Nsg. **-my* is retained as *-mäl-m* in all *men*-stems, next to *-mjeň* from the original Nsg. (for an overview see Lorentz 1903: 244ff.). In Polabian we still find Nsg. *komāi* (Npl. *komīnē*), and in the SCR. dial. of Babinpotok we find Nsg. *kāmi*, both corresponding to OCS *камy*. In Bulgarian, the suffix *-къ* has been added to the ending *-my*: *ечимікъ*, *платмък*, *камък*, pl. *камъни*. Vaillant quotes Old Serbo-Croatian *prami* (1958: 207).

15 This word joined the neuter *men*-stems later in East Slavic (Ukr. *пóлом'я*, Ru. dial. *пóломя*, BRu. *пóлымя*), in Slovene dial. (Dolensko) (*pláme*, cf. also *sléme* next to *slémen*, *pléme* next to *plémen*), and in Sorbian (USorb. *plômjo*, LSorb. *plômje*).

all cases, e.g., Štok. *kāmēn*, *plāmēn*, *jāsēn*, *krēmēn* etc., reflecting original mobile stress. In Kajkavian we find evidence for non-initial stress in Bednja *jāčtān* (as opposed to *kerān* < **kōrenv*). In East Slavic, we mostly find fixed initial stress, with the exception of Ukr. *ячмінь*, Rus. *ячмѣнь*, and Rus. *крѣмѣнь* (next to *крѣмѣнь*). In Slovincian, only mobility remains (Lorentz 1903: 181). The type with fixed suffix stress joined the mobile type regularly (cf. stage 3 in Kortlandt 1978: 77), fixed root stress was replaced analogically. Middle Bulgarian and Slovene provide evidence for something other than mobile stress. The Middle Bulgarian evidence is in concordance with what we find in Slovene, and they show reflexes of all three Proto-Slavic accent types in the masc. *men*-stems:

type (a), columnal stress on the root:	Nsg. <i>kāmy</i> , Gsg. (j)bz <i>kāmene</i>
type (b), columnal stress on the suffix:	Nsg. <i>jěčbŭmy</i> , Gsg. (j)bz <i>jěčbŭmēne</i>
type (c), mobile stress:	Nsg. <i>pōlmy</i> , Gsg. (j)bz <i>pōlmene</i>

The existence of all three types is beyond doubt. The only representative of type (a) we find in Slavic is **kāmy* (SCr. dial. (Babinpolje) *kāmi*, Sln. *kāmen*, Gsg. *-ena*, *kāmik*, MBulg. *камень*).¹⁶ The *n*-stems **jasen-* and **pvrsten-* probably also belong to type (a).¹⁷

Columnal stress on the suffix of the *men*-stems can be reconstructed for **jěčbŭmy*: Sln. Gsg. *ječtēna*, MBulg. Gsg. *лчмѣне*, Ukr. *ячмінь*, Rus. *ячмѣнь*, Kajk. *jāčtān*. **kremen-* also belongs here in view of the agreement between Rus. *крѣмѣнь* and Sln. *krēmen*. Other words are less certain. Slovene has several words that seem to reflect this type: *prāmen*, Gsg. *pratēna*, *plāme(n)*, Gsg. *platēna* (eastern dial. *plāmena*), *jērmen*, Gsg. *jermēna* (for rarer *rēmen*, Gsg. *remēna*), and *strūmen*, Gsg. *strumēna*. Since at least *plāmen* seems to be mobile originally (e.g. MBulg. *на пламень*, BRus. *пoлѣмя*, Sln. dial. *plamēn*), the suffix stressed type must have enjoyed some productivity, just as in the neuter *men*-stems. Of the *n*-stems, **jelen-* and possibly **stepen-* originally have fixed suffix stress.

The mobile *men-* and *n-*stems have initial stress throughout the paradigm in the languages that provide evidence for the place of the stress in common Slavic (e.g., Ru. *кoрeнь*, SCr. *kōrēn*, Sln. *korēn*). Original mobility can be established for **pōlmen-*, **greben-*, **koren-*, and **dvŭn-*.

16 The neocircumflex in Sln. *kāmik* must be secondary. Nevertheless, the metatony with *kāmen* implies an earlier acute.

17 **pvrsten-* seems to be acute (cf. Sln. dial. *pīsten*), like the simplex **pvrstvŭ* (e.g. Middle Bulgarian Isg. *прѣстомъ*, Dybo, Zamyatina, Nikolaev 1990: 182). The Lithuanian cognate *pīštas* belongs to accent type 2, which has the expected accentuation, if it is correct to derive this word from PIE **pr-sth₂-*. Prof. Kortlandt suggested to me that the acute in **prH-* 'first' (Lith. *pirmas*) may have influenced the Slavic forms.

3 From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic

The masculine *men*-stems belonging to type (b) reflect Indo-European barytone-sis (of the type Gr. *τέκτων*, Skt. *tákṣan-*). Late Proto-Slavic **jěčbŭmy* reflects earlier **jěčbŭmy*, before Dybo's law (κ8.7). **jěčbŭmy* is probably a derivation of (dialectal) PIE **Hnki-* 'sharp' + **-men-*, related to OHG *ango* 'prickle', which, like **jěčbŭ-*, reflects stress on the ending.¹⁸ It is conceivable that the initial stress of **kāmy* continues the PIE initial stress we find in Skt. *ásmā*, Gr. *ἄκμων* (Sadnik 1959: 234). The BSL initial stress is confirmed by Lith. dialectal *ākmuo* (e.g. in Daukša). The mobility of standard Lith. *akmuō*, *akmeiš* is secondary.

The Slavic mobile type continues Indo-European suffix stressed nouns (of the type Gr. *ποιμήν*, Skt. *ātmán-*). The mobile *men-* and *n-*stems have initial (falling) stress throughout the paradigm in the languages that provide evidence for the place of the stress in common Slavic. The fact that we find falling stress in the *n*-stems at all, points to the presence of oxytone forms in the paradigm in Proto-Slavic when the mobile paradigms developed falling stress in barytone forms (κ6.9). Otherwise one would expect them to have joined accent type (b). The Nsg. (and possibly the Gsg.) seems the obvious place to expect original oxytony, in view of the Baltic material. The common Slavic Nsg. ending of the *n*-stems we find in most Slavic languages is *-ēnv*. This is originally the A sg. ending. The ending *-ę* in RCS, SCS Nsg. *korę*, RCS *svrša*, and RCS *stroža* (see Vaillañt 1958: 195) can hardly be regarded as a recent innovation. To my mind, it replaced the original Nsg. reflecting PIE **-ōn* (cf. Lith. *šuō*), before the rise of the nasal vowels (κ5.5). In turn, *-ę* was replaced by *-ēnv* during the disintegration of Proto-Slavic. Thus, I reconstruct a Proto-Slavic Nsg. **korŷN*.¹⁹ The original paradigm of **dvŭn-*

18 I cannot agree with Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev, that we have to reconstruct initial stress in the Nsg. **jěly* for at least part of Proto-Slavic on the basis of Ukr. *о́лнь*, *рѣмѣнь*, *крѣмѣнь*, Rus. dial. *о́лень*, and MBulg. *ѣлень* (1990: 209). Russian and Ukrainian show initial stress throughout the paradigm in the *n*-stems. Clearly, the type with fixed root stress and the mobile type, which also had fixed root stress during the last stage of Proto-Slavic, ousted the suffix stressed type. In Middle-Bulgarian I assume the same happened in the Nsg., i.e. *ѣлень* (type (b)) after *ка́мень* (type (a)) and *пла́мень* (type (c)). Rus. *о́лень* and *крѣмѣнь* (next to *крѣмѣнь*), and Ukr. *ячмінь* are archaisms. Notice that original initial stress in the Nsg. would be hard to explain historically. In spite of Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev's reconstruction **jěly* (ibidem), the final **-y* of the Nsg. of the *n*-stems cannot have been long. The ending **-y* that arose from **-ōn* in early Proto-Slavic (κ5.1) was shortened at an early stage (e.g. SCr. dial. *kāmi*). This is also demonstrated by the short **-i* in **māti* < **maŭtēr*, which is reflected in Cz. *mati*, Sln. *māti*, and SCr. *māti*. Therefore, **jěly* would give **jely* after Dybo's law, not **jěly*, and it would not provide input for Stang's law (κ9.3).

19 The final stress of **korŷN* corresponds to that of Lithuanian *vanduō* etc. Notice that the retraction of the stress from open final syllables in disyllabic word forms (κ4.4) did not affect these forms, as the final syllable was still closed by a nasal at the time. There is no need to regard the CS ending *-ę* as an archaism from Pre-Slavic times. The Nsg. ending *-myN* of the *men*-stems resisted analogy longer than the Nsg. ending **-yN* of the *n*-stems. The fact that the masc. *men-*

is hard to establish. In any case we should reconstruct ablaut in the root in view of Lith. *dienà*. The zero grade was generalized in Slavic. Since the Nsg. was probably originally monosyllabic (perhaps **dei-n*, or **di-ōn*? Vaillant (1958: 193) proposes Nsg. **diēn*, which is reminiscent of Lat. *diēs*), the mobility of this word in Balto-Slavic is expected (cf. Pedersen 1933: 24). The *n*-stems further followed the same accentual developments as the *men*-stems did.

The neuter *men*-stems are barytone in Sanskrit and Greek. If this were the starting point of the Balto-Slavic situation, we would not be able to explain accentual mobility. We must assume that at least the mobility of **jbm̥* is of Indo-European origin. The original proterodynamic flexion of PIE **h₃nh₃-mn-* is reflected in the difference in ablaut grade between e.g. Sanskrit *nāman-* and Latin *nōmen* with full grade on the one hand, and Slavic **jbm̥*, and Greek *δνομα* with zero grade on the other. Where Greek generalized zero grade in the root and root stress from the (lost) full grade forms of the root, Balto-Slavic generalized full grade of the suffix, but retained mobile accentuation. The NAsg. inherited the original initial stress. The rest of the singular became barytone as a result of Pedersen's law in those cases where the ending was syllabic (κ3.2, now formulated as a phonetic development in Kortlandt 2009), or later as a result of Hirt's law. The final stress of the plural arose in the NApl. **-ménh₂* (or, less likely, **-mōn*?), which was replaced by *-menâH* after the NApl. of the neuter *o*-stems **-aH* < **-eh₂*. The Gpl. became end stressed analogically, since the ending **-om* was stressed in all other mobile paradigms. The oxytony subsequently spread to the other oblique cases of the plural.²⁰

Directly opposed to the mobile **jbm̥* is **vym̥*, which has fixed acute root stress. **vym̥* has cognates in several other Indo-European languages, viz. Sanskrit *ūdhar*, Gsg. *ūdhnas*, Greek *οὔθαρ*, Gsg. *οὔθατος*, Old Icelandic *júgr*, Latin *über*, all 'udder', Lithuanian *ūdróti* 'to be with young', *pa-ūdrė* 'lower part of the body'. These all reflect a Proto-Indo-European heteroclitic **h₁euHd^h-r/n-*. The **-r* of the NAsg. **h₁euHd^h-r* (or **h₁ouHd^h-r*?) was replaced by the **-n-* from the oblique cases. The final vocalic **-ŋ* in the NAsg. was probably unique outside the *men*-stems, which led to a transfer into that class.

stems were treated as a separate class from the *n*-stem in Proto-Slavic was probably enforced by the existence of the neuter *men*-stems. One could argue that the original Nsg. ending of the *n*-stems was **-ēn*, as opposed to **-mōn* in the *men*-stems. This would help to explain why the *n*- and *men*-stems did not merge in Slavic. Evidence for this distribution outside Slavic is however meager. Only Greek preserves a distinction between Nsg. *-ŋv* and Nsg. *-ων* (in both *n*- and *men*-stems), in stressed and unstressed position respectively. This distribution could very well reflect the original state of affairs, cf. also the Gm. *n*-stems which reflect a hysterodynamic paradigm with a Nsg. in **-ōn* combined with initial stress (e.g., Old English *clīde* < Proto-Germanic **klīpōn*, Guus Kroonen, p.c.).

20 Kortlandt now assumes that the oblique endings of the plural were stressed in PIE already (2009: 76).

It has been assumed that the Indo-European heteroclitic **h₁euHd^h-r/n-* had an acrostatic flexion in view of the ablaut of the root (*e*-grade in OIc. *júgr*, *o*-grade in Gr. *οὔθαρ*, zero-grade in Skt. *ūdhar*. Schindler 1975: 7f.). The *e*-grade of OIc. *júgr* might, however, be secondary, in view of the very productive ablaut patterns in the root in Germanic, especially in the *n*-stems, but probably also elsewhere. Additional evidence for a protostatic paradigm would have been provided by a zero grade suffix in languages that preserve a full grade of the suffix in the Gsg. of proterodynamic heteroclitics (i.e. Old Irish, Avestan, and Hittite, see Beekes 1995: 187), but the word for 'udder' is not attested in any of them (Latin has a new Gsg. *ūberis*). The evidence for an original static paradigm for 'udder' in Indo-European, rather than a proterodynamic paradigm, is thus meager.²¹ It appears to me that the accentuation of Slavic **vym̥* supports the reconstruction of an original static paradigm. The tonal opposition between **vym̥* and **jbm̥* in Slavic strongly suggests an earlier difference in flexion-type, especially in view of their similar structure (i.e. **HnH-men* and **HuHd^h-men*).²² The proterodynamic flexion of **jbm̥* led to an opposition between initial stress in the singular and final stress in the plural, as described above, whereas the initial stress of the static paradigm of **vym̥* has been retained.

The origin of the accentuation of the other neuter *men*-stems is less clear. All neuter *men*-stems were probably proterodynamic in origin. We would expect mobile stress in Balto-Slavic, as in **jbm̥*. Unfortunately, none of the other neuter *men*-stems that have a sound etymology appears isolated from, e.g., verbal forms that may have influenced the stress pattern. I will discuss them briefly.

**sēm̥*. The initial stress and full grade of the root of **sēm̥* correspond to Lithuanian *sėmenys* 'flaxseed', secondarily mobile *sėmuō*. Other cognates are Old Prussian *semen*, Latin *sēmen*. The full grade of the root was generalized from the NAsg., because in the zero grade forms the root would have become unrecognizable. With it, initial stress was apparently generalized.

**zname̥*. The connection between **zname̥* and Gr. *γνώμα* 'mark' need not be old and its stress and full grade of the root may have been influenced by the verbal root.

**berm̥*. **berm̥* seems to be an old *men*-stem, corresponding to Sanskrit *bhāriṃan-* 'carrying, support'. Greek *φέρμα* 'fruit' may also be related, but it can easily be a younger formation. The acute root of the Slavic word is unexpected. The verbal root **b^her-* does not contain a laryngeal. The *-ī-* in Skt. *bhāriṃan-* appears to reflect a laryngeal, but other *men*-stems show variants with and without *-i-* (e.g., *vārṣmán-* 'height' next to *varṣimán-* < **uers-men-*), so the Skt. form

21 Kloekhorst (forthc.) has recently shown that the PIE word for 'water', **uodr*, the other alleged PIE static heteroclitic, had a protero-dynamic flexion rather than a static flexion.

22 One could argue that 'udder' had no plural but a collective **HuHd^h-ōr* 'bunch of udders' (cf. Hitt. NApl. *ūtār* 'water' < **udōr*), which existed long enough to block the rise of final stress in the plural, but such a collective is nowhere attested and seems semantically odd.

should be treated with caution. Notably, the root of **berdja* 'pregnant', which also reflects **b^{her}-*, is (also) acute (Rus. dial. *berézaja*, *berěžaja*, Čak. *brěja*, Sln. *bréja*). This word is probably related to Latin *forda* 'pregnant'. Both forms could reflect **b^{her}Hd^h-ieh₂*. In the case of **bermę*, influence from the verbal root and the uncertainty about the original accentuation in Slavic make it impossible to draw conclusions about its accentual history.

**ormę*. **ormę* is not an original *men*-stem. *o*-stem forms are found in Slavic **ormo*, Old Prussian *irmo*, Latvian pl. *īrmi* 'legs', Sanskrit *irmá-* 'arm'. Gothic *arms* 'arm' is an *i*-stem. The different stem formations and the ablaut of the root might reflect an original *m*-stem.

**vermę*. Finally, **vermę* is related to Sanskrit *vártman-* 'course, track', both from **uert-men-*. The full grade of the root appears to be old, since the Slavic verbs **vortiti* and **vortěti* cannot have caused it. If **vermę* was mobile in Slavic, it probably reflects a proterodynamic paradigm **uert-mn*, Gsg. **urt-men-s*. If it had suffix stress in Slavic, it could reflect a (late-PIE) static paradigm.

4 Conclusions

It follows from the above that the Slavic *n*- and *men*-stems show reflexes from all three accentual classes. No single Slavic language continues the original state of affairs as a result of the productivity of one of the types, as well as inner paradigmatic leveling. The suffix stressed type cannot be eliminated for the neuter *men*-stems (*pace* Snoj 1993), **jǫmę* is not acute (*pace* Dybo, Zamjatina, Nikolaev 1990: 31), Nsg. **jely* was not barytone in late Proto-Slavic (*pace* Dybo, Zamjatina, Nikolaev 1990: 209). Neither the traces of the barytone, nor those of oxytone forms in the NAsg. of mobile neuter *men*-stems can easily be explained as the result of recent analogy. The opposition between mobile and non-mobile Slavic *n*-stems is a continuation of Indo-European oppositions. The mobility of PSl. **jǫmę* reflects its original proterodynamic flexion, whereas the fixed root stress of **výmę* reflects an original acrostatic paradigm.

Leiden University

References

- Beekes, R.
1995 *Comparative Indo-European linguistics*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
- Bulaxovski, L.
1953 *Akcentologičeskij komentarij k češskomu jazyku, vypusk 1*. Kiev.
- Derksen, R.
2003 "Slavic **jb-*", *Dutch contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana: Linguistics (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 30)*, 97–105.

- Dybo, V.
1981 *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Moskva.
- Dybo, V., G. Zamjatina & S. Nikolaev
1990 *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii*. Moskva.
- Hanusz, J.
1884 *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 7, 222–255, 325–385.
- Hock, W.
1992 *Der Flexionsakzent im mittelbulgarischen Evangelie 1139 (NBKM), 1. Akzentgrammatik*. München.
- Kiparsky, V.
1962 *Der Wortakzent der russischen Schriftsprache*. Heidelberg.
- Kloekhorst, A.
forthc. "Hittite 'water'". To appear in *The heart of the matter, Festschrift for J. J. S. Weitenberg*. Leuven.
- Kodov, H.
1929 *Podvižnoto bŭlgarsko udarenie i negovoto otnošenje kŭmŭ praslavjanskoto udarenie, 1. Spštestvitelni imena*. Sofia.
- Kolesov, V.
1972 *Istorija russkogo udarenija*. Leningrad.
- Kortlandt, F.
1978 "A history of Slavic accentuation". *Lingua* 44, 67–91.
1982 "Srvnitel'no-istoričeskie kommentarii k bolgarskomu udareniju". *Zbornik za Filologiju i Lingvistiku* 25/1, 91–96.
1989a "The accentuation of neuter nouns in Slovene and West Bulgarian". *Slavistična Revija* 37, 32–37.
1989b "Od praindoevropskog do slovenskog (fonološki razvoj)". *Zbornik za Filologiju i Lingvistiku* 32/2, 41–58.
2009 "Accent retraction and tonogenesis". This volume; also available at www.kortlandt.nl/publications.
- Logar, T.
1954 "Dialektološke študije III, Karakteristika in klasifikacija gornjesavinskih govorov". *Slavistična revija* 5–7, 155–162, 167–168.
- Lorentz, F.
1903 *Slovinzische Grammatik*. Sankt Peterburg.
- Meillet, A.
1903 "De quelques déplacements d'accent dans les dialectes slaves". *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 25, 425–429.
- Novak, F.
1985 *Slovar beltinskega prekmurskega govora*. Murska Sobota.
- Pedersen, H.
1933 *Études lituaniennes*. København.
- Pleteršnik, M.
1894 *Slovensko-nemški slovar*. Ljubljana.
- Pronk, T.
2007 "The retraction of the neocircumflex in the Carinthian dialects of Slovene". In: Mate Kapović & Ranko Matasović (eds.), *Tones and theories: proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology, Zagreb, 1–3 July 2005*, 171–183. Zagreb.
- Ramovš, F.
1918 "Slovenische Studien". *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 37, 123–174.

- Rigler, J.
1963 "Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu". *Slavistična revija* 14, 25–78.
- Sadnik, L.
1959 "Akzentstudien". *Slavistična revija* 10, 230–236.
- Schindler, J.
1975 "Lapophonie des thèmes indo-européens en *-r/n*". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 70, 1–10.
- Snoj, M.
1993 "Zur Akzentuierung der urslawischen neutralen *-men*-Stämme". *Linguistica* 33, 227–241.
- Stang, C.
1957 *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo.
- Vaillant, A.
1958 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, II. Morphologie*. Paris.
- Zaliznjak, A.
1985 *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj*. Moskva.
- Zdovc, P.
1972 *Die Mundart des südöstlichen Jauntales in Kärnten: Lautlehre und Akzent der Mundart der "Poljanci"*. Wien.

A note on Slaaby-Larsen's law

JENS ELMEGÅRD RASMUSSEN

At the IWoBA conference in Copenhagen, I distributed a page from Yahoo's Cybalist written by Thomas Olander, who had given me permission to do so with the proviso that I made it clear that the real author is Martin Slaaby-Larsen who originally provided the examples and formulated the rule they illustrate. Martin has kindly permitted me to use his law as the basis of a comment I would like to make.

Before I come to the point about Slaaby-Larsen's law, I shall look at Olander's law, the law of mobility (cf. Olander 2006: 133–136, = chapter IV, 1). According to this law, originally barytone paradigms were retained that way in Balto-Slavic, while oxytone paradigms, i.e. words stressed on the vowel of the stem-forming suffix, lost the accent in some of the forms. Now, the rule by which this loss is governed is quite simple in Olander's theory: it occurs whenever the vowel is originally short, including cases of hiatic sequences which later appear as circumflex long vowels.

This is not the place to discuss where the border lies: leaving the hiatic sequences out of the account I think one can say in full honesty that the end-stress is lost on word-final short vowels and on sequences of short vowel + consonant, and that there is no such deaccentuation on plain long vowels, including old sequences of short vowel + tautosyllabic laryngeal.¹

A group of exceptions to the accent loss – and to all theories based on Illich-Svitych's view that Balto-Slavic mobility corresponds to Proto-Indo-European oxytonesis – is constituted by words containing a consonant cluster. Cf. the examples reported by Olander:

1 Olander encounters difficulties with the genitive and dative of *ā*-stems. Indeed, a reconstruction **-āh₂-s*, **-āh₂-ai* would yield end-stress in the genitive and enclisis in the dative, but the Lith. gen. *algōs* has circumflex just as Greek *θεᾶς*. Strangely, this can be better explained under the traditional theory that the Balto-Slavic mobility is inherited from Indo-European: in *i*- and *u*-stems (and originally also in *n*-stems and possibly more), the two cases ended in **-éi-s* / **-éi-ei*, **-éw-s* / **-éw-ei*, (**-én-s* / **-én-ei*), where the genitive was stressed on the final, and the dative on the penult, which would cause the accent to be deleted (or retracted) in the dative, but not in the genitive. This may mean that the history of Balto-Slavic mobility is not a simple one, but may represent a conspiracy of more than one source.

“This explains:

Pre-Sl. mobile **dubna* > CS **dъnъ*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **gnaizda* > CS **gnězdъ*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **sejĭdla* > CS **sidlъ*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **kirsnu* **kirsnā* **kirsna* > CS **čьrnъ* **čьrnā* **čьrnъ*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **agni* > CS **ъgnъ*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **mizdā* > CS **mъzdъ*;

(? Pre-Sl. mobile **p(t)etra* > CS **perъ*);

etc.

Pre-Sl. mobile **neslu* **neslā* **nesla* > CS **něslъ* **něslā* **něslъ*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **pekle* **peklā* **pekla* > CS **pěklъ* **pěklā* **pěklъ*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **klādlu* **klādā* **klādla* > CS **klādлъ* **klādla* **klādlo*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **pādlu* **pādā* **pādla* > CS **pādlъ* **pādla* **pādlo*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **sēdlu* **sēdlā* **sēdla* > CS **sědlъ* **sědla* **sědlo*;

Pre-Sl. mobile **ēdlu* **ēdlā* **ēdla* > CS **ědlъ* **ědla* **ědlo*;

etc.

(Cf. Pre-Sl. mobile **derlu* **derlā* **derla* > CS **děrlъ* **děrlā* **děrlъ* with C₁ not = obstr.)

Pre-Sl. mobile **tapnān* **tapnexi* etc. > CS **tonъ* **tъnešъ* etc.;

etc. (this applies to most *ne*-presents).

Pre-Sl. end-stressed **klādtēj* > CS **klāsti*;

Pre-Sl. end-stressed **pādtēj* > CS **pāsti*;

etc.

(Cf. Pre-Sl. end-stressed **gērtēj* > CS **žerti* with C₁ not = obstr.)”

Thus if we take an *l*-participle like **nečlās*, **nečlā*, **nečlá*, Olander’s rule of accent deletion would lead to a following stage **nečlas*, **nečlā*, **nečla*, with the masc. and ntr. unaccented and the fem. unchanged, i.e. end-stressed. Now, the actual result *něslъ*, *něslā*, *něslъ* reflects **něslъ*, **něslā*, **něslъ* accented as if nothing has happened. However, if we follow Olander’s rules we should get deaccented **nečlas*, **nečla*, i.e. enclitomena forms liable to produce mobility. In their further development, the forms have obviously found *something* to accent, and it seems clear that that was the root:

Masc. **nečlas* > **néčlas* > **něslъ* > **něslъ* > *něslъ*

Neutr. **nečla* > **néčla* > **něslo* > *něsló*,

reflecting the operation of Dybo’s and Stang’s laws.

The question is now what occasioned a new accent to appear in the word, and on the root at that. I believe the answer is being cried out by the forms themselves: it was caused by the syllable weight produced by the following cluster, in this case *-čl-. On another posting within the same Cybalist thread, Anders Richardt Jør-

gensen rehearses the types of clusters that cause accent retraction; it is basically found to be caused by all clusters except *s* + stop, only it *is* caused by *-st-* from *-t/d-* + *-t-* which must therefore have been something more voluminous than [st] at the time the change took place, most probably [tst]; the retraction is also caused by /s/ + voiced stop, i.e. phonetically [zd], [zg] and the like. (For details and examples I refer the reader to messages no. 35395 by Thomas Olander and 35412 by Anders Richardt Jørgensen, both of Dec. 9, 2004.)

It will only be natural if there is a limit to the amount of phonetic material that can lean on a preceding word as an enclitic. It seems that cliticized sequences of vowel + stop + sonant could not remain unaccented in the long run, but developed an accent of their own. This accent addition took place before Dybo’s law, and so the sequence of events was deaccentuation – reaccentuation – Dybo – Stang. In the feminine *něslā* nothing happened at all, for long vowels in final syllables simply retain their accent.

Back to Slaaby-Larsen’s law. It is plain that the law is about syllable weight, seeing that short vowels which would otherwise lose their accent to the following syllable (by Dybo’s law) keep it if their syllable contains additional material in the shape of certain consonant clusters.

I think this explanation has an advantage over any conceivable alternative of accounting for a problem of syllable prominence by linking it to other facts of syllable prominence, a combination that can hardly be called far-fetched. It may be recalled that syllable weight is also the governing principle in many of the other rules of accent shift we have to deal with: Thus, Saussure’s law basically says that a long vowel takes the accent from a preceding short vowel; Hirt’s law captures the retraction of the accent onto a syllable containing a non-syllabified variant of one of the three laryngeals, apparently the heaviest class of articulatory elements the language had; Lithuanian adverbs in *-iai* made from adjectives in *-us* have end-stress if the root has a short vocalism, and root accent with roots having a long vocalism (including diphthongs and sonant diphthongs), cf. *platus* : *plačiai* ‘broad’, *gilus* : *giliai* ‘deep’, vs. *gailus* : *gailiai* ‘compassionate’, *sunkus* : *sunčiai* ‘heavy’ (further examples in Laignonaitė 1959: 91), which, whatever the origin, is synchronically also a matter of syllable weight.

My conclusion from this is that Slaaby-Larsen’s law is not at all out of character in the realm of innovative Balto-Slavic phonetic rules where a regulation by a parameter of syllable weight is in fact quite common.

University of Copenhagen

References

- Laigonaitė, A.
1959 *Literatūrinės lietuvių kalbos kirčiavimas*. Vilnius.
- Olander, Thomas
2006 *Accentual mobility. The prehistory of the Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms*. Ph.d.-afhandling. Det humanistiske Fakultet, Københavns Universitet.

On Winter's law in Balto-Slavic*

TOSHIHIRO SHINTANI

Editors' note: This article first appeared in *Arbejdsrapporter udsendt af Institut for Lingvistik, Københavns Universitet (APILKU)* 5, 1985, 273–296. We are thankful to the author for allowing us to reprint the article. Numbers in the margin refer to the original pagination.

o W. Winter recently suggested that a short vowel before a Proto-Indo-European plain media was lengthened in Balto-Slavic (1978).¹ This sound law has been accepted by some scholars, however apparently without any critical examination (e.g. Kortlandt 1977, 1978a, 1978b and Hamp 1983, 1984), but rejected by Gercenberg (1981: 129–138).²

* I am heartily grateful to my teachers, Mr. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen and Miss Birgit Anette Olsen, for their support and valuable suggestions.

- 1 In addition the lengthened vowel got an acute intonation as is implicitly pointed out by Winter (1978: 443) and explicitly by Kortlandt (1978a: 447, 1978b: 279).
- 2 Gercenberg (1981: 129–138) rejects Winter's law, arguing that the length in the Baltic and Slavic examples shown by Winter (op.cit.) cannot be a Balto-Slavic innovation, because the roots contained in these examples show not only lengthened grades in other languages outside the Balto-Slavic area but also normal grades (viz. short vowels) in Baltic and Slavic. The existence of the normal grades of these roots in Balto-Slavic is discussed in the present paper. As regards the length outside Balto-Slavic it should be mentioned that a comparison should be made between morphologically similar word formations but not for instance between a noun and a verb, because every Proto-Indo-European root may in principle show a lengthened grade.

Gercenberg's arguments are thus to be examined.

1. As regards Lith. *ėsti* etc. G. is right in pointing out that we are dealing with a root which shows acrostatic presents in Proto-Indo-European, e.g. Arm. *utem* < **H₁ōd-eje/o-* (iterative). Thus Lith. *ėsti* etc. may go back either to **H₁ēd-* or to **H₁ed-*. Consequently they are not available for verifying Winter's law.

As an additional remark it should be mentioned that Gercenberg's analysis, in which Eckert's finding Rus. dial. *jederu* (in *kupit' na jederu*) shows a short vocalism of this root (**ēder-*) also in Slavic, must be a simple misunderstanding. For Eckert (1974: 493, 1980: 73) himself assumes that *jederu* is from **ēder-* (viz. **ēder-*).

2. Gercenberg considers Lith. *sėdėti* etc. a formation with a lengthened grade, citing Toch. A *še-*, B *šai-*, *šey-* "byt'" < **sēd-ḷ-*, Arm. *nstim* < **ni-sēd-ḷ-*. But these analyses are unacceptable. As regards the Tocharian imperfect A *šem*, B *šaim*, *šeym* a comparison with the ipf. A *yem*, B *yaim*, *yey* < **H₁i-* (from IE **H₁ei-* "to go") clearly shows that we are dealing with **H₁s-* (from IE

Although Gercenberg's rejection is not cogent in its entirety he draws our

**H₁es-* "to be"). Arm. *nstim* may be from IE **ni-sd-eH₁-mi*. Lat. *sēdēs* "place" and Av. *Frañhād-* "sidjaščaja vperedī", which are not verbal formations, are irrelevant here. Consequently his suggestion concerning the original lengthened grade in Lith. *sēdėti* etc. is not cogent.

3. Gercenberg considers that the length in Lith. *sēsti* etc. is due to a nasal infix like in OCS *seđo* and *leđo*, which is quite unacceptable, because in that case we would expect Lith. ***sendu*, Latv. ***siežu* instead of Lith. *sėdu*, Latv. *sēžu*.

4. The original length in Lith. *bėgti* etc. may be pointed to by the length in the Indo-Iranian items such as Hindi *bhājnā*, *bhāgnā* "to flee", Bengali *bhāgā*, Kumaunī *bhājno*, Lakhimpurī dialect of Awadhī *bhājab* as Gercenberg suggests. Gk. *φέβομαι* also possibly points to an original IE acrostatic athematic present with a long vocalism in the singular. This example is thus not available for our purpose.

5. Gercenberg considers Lith. *úosti* etc. an original athematic verb of the type **tēksti*, **tēksnti* [these should be **tēkpti*, **tēkphnti* as is generally accepted] > OInd. *tāṣṭi*, *tākṣati*. But the Baltic forms (Lith. *úodžiu*, Latv. *uōžu*) correspond to Gk. *ὄζω*, Arm. *hotim* and go back to the Proto-Indo-European *i*-present **H₃od-je/o-*. On the other hand the original vocalism of OCz. *jadati* cannot be known with certainty, because it may contain a secondary long vocalism in its root as natural feature of the Slavic *a*-verbs.

6. OCS *padati* may be a causative-iterative formation of the type Arm. *utem* < IE **H₁ōd-eje/o-*. (Gercenberg points to a denominative and causative formation). Thus this item may not be available for our discussion of Winter's law. But OCS *pasti*, *padq* may be a de-reduced intensive formation, as J.E. Rasmussen (personal communication) suggests. In that case OCS *padq* may go back to **pod-mi*.

7. As regards Lith. *pėdà* etc. Gercenberg presents Illič-Svityč's (op.cit. § 29) analysis, according to which Lith. *pėdà* etc. go back to IE **pēd-ō-m* (cf. OPr. *Pedan* "Plow-share", Gk. *πηδὼν* "oar blade"), which may be a vřddhi formation. This analysis must be correct.

8. Gercenberg's analysis, according to which Lith. *púodas* etc. go back to IE **pōd-*, seems possible but not necessary: We have short *o* in Gmc. **fata* N "vat" (OE *fæt*) and long *ē* in the vb. Goth. *fetjan* "adorn" derived from **fēt(a)-* (OE *fēt*) "ornament". Possibly the original paradigm was a ntr. **pōd*, gen. **pēd-s* "casing", vřddhi adjective **pēd-ō-* "thing held by a casing, jewel" [B. A. Olsen, personal communication]. The example is thus inconclusive.

9. Gercenberg's argument that Lith. *vėdaras* etc. are related to Lat. *vē(n)sica*, Gk. *ἦνυστρον*, Toch. B *wemts*, makes no sense, because these must be from **uen(d)-*.

10. On Lith. *vėdys* etc. see Winter op.cit. § 10.2.

11. Gercenberg quotes Machek's hypothesis according to which the length in Lith. *nuogas* etc. is due to the expressive character of this root (cf. Gk. *γυμνός* < **vyγμός*, Av. *mayna-*, Osset. *bāynā* etc.). But this is not cogent.

12. The etymology of OCS *naglō* is uncertain, as Gercenberg points out.

13. For OCS *agnē*, Gk. *ἀγνός*, Lat. *agnus*, OE *ēanian* > Gmc. **a³na-*, OIr. *úan* < Celt. **agnos* Gercenberg reconstructs a heteroclitic paradigm **ogh^u* : **agnés*, which cannot be correct. We must simply assume that Proto-Indo-European had two different roots *(*H₂*)*ag^u*- and *(*H₂*)*ag^u*-. OCS *agnē* may be from either of these. Thus this cannot be considered an example that supports the validity of Winter's law. On the contrary this is one of the cases where a final etymology is to be determined by Winter's law as follows: OCS *agnē* – IE *(*H₂*)*ag^unós*.

14. As regards Lith. *úoga* etc. Gercenberg suggests the following reconstructions: Lat. *ūva* < **ōug^uā*, Lith. *úoga*, Latv. *uōga* < **ōug^uā*, OCS *vinjaga* ← **ōg-* (the *ō*-vocalism is related to the first stage of the change **ōu* > **ō* > *uo*). This cannot be acceptable. Lith. *úoga* etc. must be compared to Goth. *akran* N "Frucht, teils von Bäumen, teils vom Getreide" and Toch. AB *oko*

attention to the fact that some of the examples given by Winter (op.cit. §§ 3.1–3.4) are not relevant to our purpose:

- (1) Lith. *ėsti*, *ėmi*, *ėdu*, Latv. *ēst*, *ēmu*, *ēdu* : OCS *jasti*, *jamь* :: OInd. *ādmi*, Lat. *edō*
- (2) Lith. *bėgti*, *bėgu*, Latv. *bēgt*, *bēgu* : OCS *běžati*, *běžo* :: Gk. *φέβομαι*
- (3) Lith. *pėdà*, *pėdas*, Latv. *pēda*, *pēds* :: Lat. *pēs*, *pedis*
- (4) Lith. *púodas*, Latv. *puōds* :: OHG *faz*
- (5) OCS *naglō* :: Goth. *anaks*. Uncertain etymology.
- (6) OCS *agnē* :: Gk. *ἀγνός*, Lat. *agnus*
- (7) Lith. *ožkà*, *ožys*, Latv. *āzis* : OCS *jazьno* :: OInd. *ajás*

The fact is that we are dealing with one item with uncertain etymology and a number of items the root forms of which may have either normal grade or lengthened grade.³ However, it should be mentioned that these items are no counterexamples to Winter's law.

| The positive examples of Winter's law are thus reduced as follows:

- (8) Lith. *obelis* (3a), Latv. *ābele*, Lith. *óbuolas* (3a), Latv. *ābuols* : Rus. *jabloko* :: OHG *aphul*
- (9) Lith. *vėdaras* (3a), Latv. *vēdarš* :: OInd. *udáram*
- (10) Lith. *nuogas* (3), Latv. *nuōgs* : OCS *nagь* :: Goth. *naqaps*
- (11) Lith. *úoga* (1), Latv. *uōga* : OCS *vinjaga* :: Goth. *akran* N "Frucht, teils von Bäumen, teils vom Getreide", Toch. AB *oko* "Frucht, Wirkung"
- (12) OCS *jazь* (beside Lith. *àš*, *eš*, Latv. *es*) :: OInd. *ahám*
- (13) Lith. *sėsti*, *sėdu*, Latv. *sēst*, *sēžu*, Lith. *sėdėti*, *sėmi*, *sėdžiu*, Latv. *sėdēt*, *sėdu* / *sēžu* : OCS *sěsti*, *sědėti*, *sěždq* :: Gk. *έζομαι*, Lat. *sedēre*
- (14) Lith. *úosti*, *úodžiu*, Latv. *uōst*, *uōžu* : OCz. *jadati*, *jadaju*, *jadás* :: Gk. *όζειν*
- (15) OCS *pasti*, *padq* :: OInd. *pádyate*

Nevertheless Winter's presentation of this sound law is in itself a fairly convincing one. However, there still remains some weakness in his theory because of a number of counterexamples to the rule such as OCS *voda* and Lith. *sėgti*.

The present paper is an attempt to make Winter's law more plausible by eliminating this weakness.

1 A rapid glance at our list of positive examples of Winter's law shows a remarkable fact: all Latvian items have a Brechtion on the lengthened vowel before the IE plain media, e.g. *ābuols*, *vēdars*, *nuōgs*, *sēst* etc. This indicates that these items originally belonged to the non-barytone type (viz. mobile AP⁴) in Balto-Slavic.

"Frucht, Wirkung". Lat. *ūva* quoted by Winter cannot belong here (the *ū-* may be from **ū-*, **oi-* or **eu-* / **ou-*).

3 For more detailed discussion see above Note 2.

4 AP: accentual paradigm.

This is further supported by some Lithuanian and Slavic items, e.g. Lith. *niogas*, *nuogà*, OCS *nagǫ*, Slov. *nâg*, *nagô*, *nâga*, Rus. *nag*, *nâgo*, *nagà*, ORus. *pó nagu* (cf. Illič-Svityč 1963: § 62). The fact that no item with barytone AP is found among the positive examples of Winter's law leads to a HYPOTHESIS:

A SHORT VOWEL BEFORE AN IE PLAIN MEDIA WAS LENGTHENED WHEN IN UNSTRESSED POSITION.

275 | It should, however, be kept in mind that Winter only gives examples involving the non-high vowels *e*, *a*, *o*, as indicated by our list, though still supposing the rule to work with other vowels (and diphthongs) as well.

2 Although HYPOTHESIS seems phonetically difficult to explain, it is worthwhile to examine its validity.

The validity of HYPOTHESIS is first of all indicated by facts such as:

- I As regards the nouns (8–12) it is sufficient to point out that Latvian always shows a Brechton. Further supports are OInd. *udáram* and *ahám*.
- II As regards the verbs (13–15) Latvian Brechton again shows an original oxytone AP, at least in Baltic. This is further supported by the Slavic items: (13) OCS *sěděti*, *sěždǫ*, Rus. *sidět'*, *sizǫ* belong to the end-stressed *i*-presents (Stang 1957: 113). (14) OCz. *jadati*, *jadaju*, *jadáš* is unclear as regards the place of its original ictus. However, as it is a secondary verb (denominative or *ā*-iterative-durative), original non-barytonesis (viz. the ictus on the suffix) is probably to be expected. (15) OCS *pasti*, *padǫ* is probably from an original athematic de-reduplicated intensive.⁵ Thus some inflexional forms with non-root-stress are expected.

In the known stages of the Balto-Slavic languages a root does not normally show any apophonic alternation in a paradigm (except OCS *esmb*, *sǫtǫ*), which is either an inherited situation or the result of a generalization. On the basis of this situation we may, according to HYPOTHESIS, assume that a short vowel before an IE plain media was lengthened in inflexional forms with an unstressed root segment, and that the root form with lengthening was in some cases subsequently generalized in the paradigm.

In two cases, however, no lengthening is to be expected:

- I a short vowel was not lengthened if it was originally stressed throughout a paradigm (viz. in the immobile barytone AP).
 - II a short vowel was not lengthened in a root-stressed inflexional form in a mobile AP, and this root form without | lengthening could later be generalized throughout the paradigm of individual stems.
- 276

5 This was suggested by J. E. Rasmussen (personal communication).

Thus we find:

- (16) Lith. *àš*, *eš*, Latv. *es* < IE **éǵ(H₂)* beside (12) OCS *jazǫ* :: OInd. *ahám* < IE **éǵ(H₂)óm⁶*

3 The examples without lengthening before an IE plain media found in Winter's paper (op.cit. § 9) are now to be examined.

- (17) Lith. *pādas* (2), Latv. *pads* : ORus. *podǫ*, SCr. dial. *pōd*, *podā* (Novi, Susak, Posavina), *pěd*, *pyedā* (Bednja), *pōd*, *pōda* (Piva, Žumberak) < Balto-Slav. **podoN* < IE **pód-o-m*, cf. Gk. *πέδον* < **péd-o-m* beside an oxytone variant OInd. *padám* < **ped-ò-m*. For more detailed discussion see Illič-Svityč op.cit. §§ 15, 49.

According to HYPOTHESIS the short *o* in IE **pód-o-m* was not lengthened in the stressed position.

Thus Winter's analysis, according to which Lith. *pādas* is derived from IE **-d^h(H₁)os*, is not cogent.

- (18) Lith. *sėgti*, *segù*, *sėga*, Latv. *segt* [: OCS *prisěšti*, *prisěǫ*] :: OInd. *sájati*

Because of OInd. *sájati* we may reconstruct a barytone thematic present in Proto-Indo-European: **ség-e/o-*. Thus no vowel lengthening is expected. Contrary to Winter, we may assume that Lith. *sėgti* is not a counterexample to Winter's law.

- (19) OCS *sedblo*, Rus. *sedló*, SCr. *sedlo*, Sloven. *sedlo*, OCS *osedǫlati* cause some difficulty because of their oxytonesis. Winter (op.cit. §§ 9.3, 9.4) suggests that Slav. **sedb/ǫlo* may be a loan word from Pre-Germanic, saying "... it can easily be imagined that the confrontation with a different type of saddle from the one previously used triggered the adoption of a foreign term for the object ...". This suggestion seems fairly plausible, but it should be mentioned that it may still be possible that Slav. **sedb/ǫlo* contains an originally stressed root form **séd-*.

- (20) OCS *voda*, Rus. *vodá*, acc. *vódu*, Čak. *vodā*, acc. *vòdu* :: Goth. *watō*

| Slav. **vodā* (cf. Rus. *ná vodu*) belongs to a mobile AP of an *ā*-stem, which is a Slavic innovation, because the word for "water" was a neuter *r/n*-stem in Proto-Indo-European: Hitt. *wa-a-tar*, *ú-e-te-na-aš*, Gk. *ὕδωρ*, *ὑδάτος*, Ved. gen. *udnāh*, pl. *udā* < **udōr* etc.

The following reconstruction applies to "water" (cf. Schindler 1975):

6 A reconstruction such as OCS *azǫ* < PIE **éǵHom* was given by Kortlandt (1977: 322, 1978b: 280).

Sg. N/A	* <i>uòd-ŕ</i>	Coll. N/A	* <i>uèd-òr</i> / * <i>uèd-ò^{6a}</i>
G	* <i>uèd-ŕ-s</i>	G	* <i>ud-n-òs</i>
L	?	L	* <i>ud-èn(-i)</i>

Sg. nom.-acc. **uòd-ŕ* and coll. nom.-acc. **uèd-ò* may have been contaminated into **uòd-ò* > Balto-Slav. **uòd-ò*, which was later transformed into Slav. **vodã* (-ã from *ã*-stem). Thus we can understand why Slav. **vodã* shows no vowel lengthening.

In Baltic two different cases are found:

- I The nom.-acc. **uòd-ò* (cf. Lith. *vādaksnis* "Flußeinbuchtung") developed into **uándò* (-*n*- from a verb like OInd. *unátti*, *undánti*, acute intonation reflecting old length in the root and oxytonesis from oblique cases), the root form of which was further generalized in the paradigm: Lith. *vanduõ* (beside dial. *vánduo*), *vandė̃s*, *vandenj*.
- II The coll. loc. root form **ud-èn-* developed into **ūd-èn-* according to Winter's law (and HYPOTHESIS) (on lengthening of a short *u*, see Addendum 2), and further into **ünd-èn-*, the root form of which was thus generalized throughout the paradigm: Lith. *Žem. unduõ* / *únduo*, Latv. *ūdēns* < **ündēnis*.

(21) OCS *bogŭ*, SCr. *bōg*, gen. *bōga* :: OInd. *bhāgah* "Teil, Anteil, Glück; Zuteiler, Herr", Av. *baya*- N "Anteil, Los", M "Herr, Gott", Gk. *σιρο-φάγος* "Getreide essend".

Winter (op.cit. § 9.5) considers Slav. **bogŭ* a loan word from Iranian, which is quite understandable. It is, however, still possible to regard this word as inherited according to HYPOTHESIS: Slav. **bogŭ* < IE **b^hāgos*.

Semantically, on the other hand, it is hardly possible to consider Slav. **bogŭ* "Anteil" (in OCS *ubogŭ*, *nebogŭ*, SCr. *ùbog*, *nèbog*, OCz. *zbožie* N "Besitz, Reichtum" < Slav. **sŕbožbje* ← | **sŕ-bogŭ*, OCS *bogatŭ*, SCr. *bōgat*) a loan word from Iranian, contrary to the Iranian *baya-*, which is a special cultural term. We may therefore assume that Slav. **bogŭ* "Anteil" is an inherited IE word: Slav. **bogŭ* < IE **b^hāgos* according to HYPOTHESIS.

(22) OCS *xodŭ*, SCr. *xōd*, *xōda* :: Gk. *ὀδός* F

For Proto-Slavic, **xodŭ*, **xōda* should be reconstructed (see Illič-Svityč op.cit. § 43). Gk. *ὀδός* must be considered a transformation of the original nomen actionis **ōdos* < **sōd-o-s* (Schwyzer 1939 vol. 1, p. 459) derived from IE **sed-* (cf. Lith. *sėdėti* etc.). Thus the absence of lengthening in Slav. **xodŭ* is expected according to HYPOTHESIS.⁷

6a ~ of *uèd-ò* just means trimoric length.

7 Contrary to the reconstruction **xodŭ* < IE **sodōs* suggested by Illič-Svityč (op.cit. § 43). The mobility of for instance Rus. dial. *iz xodu* may be explained by the possible existence of an oxytone variant (nomen agentis) **sod-ò-s*.

As regards Slav. **šbd-* in OCS *šbdŭ*, *šblŭ*, Pol. *szedł*, the zero grade **b* cannot be inherited from Proto-Indo-European, but must be a Slavic innovation.⁸ Therefore Slav. **šbd-* is irrelevant to our discussion of Winter's law.

4 Now we have 8 certain examples (8–15) that show Winter's lengthening of unstressed short vowels and 6 certain examples without lengthening (16–18, 20–22), all according to HYPOTHESIS.

In summing up our discussion we may assume that Winter's law should be modified as follows:

*Winter's law is limited to Pre-Balto-Slavic unstressed short vowels before IE plain mediae.*⁹

It should, however, be mentioned that there still remain some difficulties: (I) The chronology of Winter's law is difficult to make out.¹⁰ (II) A natural phonetic

8 For more detailed discussion see Shevelov 1964: 112.

9 Or should it rather be limited to Pre-Balto-Slavic *pretonic* short vowels before IE plain mediae as is the case with our examples?

10 According to Kortlandt Winter's law was posterior to Hirt's law (1977: 319–323, 1978a: 447, 1978b: 280) and "I (= Kortlandt) think that it (= Winter's law) must be dated to the very end of the Balto-Slavic period" (1977: 320). This statement is based on (a) Kortlandt's theory on the origin of the Balto-Slavic acute intonation (1975, especially chapter 3) as developed from a laryngeal feature: e.g. Lith. *dūona* "bread" < IE **d^hoHnaH₂*. And "the Indo-European lengthened grade is never reflected by an old acute in Balto-Slavic" (1977: 319). (b) Gamkrelidze-Ivanov's glottal theory (1973) according to which the so-called IE plain voiced occlusives were actually glottalized occlusives. (c) Kortlandt's reinterpretation of Winter's law: "The proto-language possessed a series of glottalic consonants which were preserved well into the Balto-Slavic period. At a certain stage the feature was transferred from a glottalic consonant to a preceding vowel and the two sets of voiced consonants coalesced" (1978a: 447). (d) Illič-Svityč's reformulation of Hirt's law (1963: 80f.) according to which the ictus was retracted if the vowel of the preceding syllable was immediately followed by a laryngeal. On the basis of these theories Kortlandt concludes that "The merger of the feature (= the glottalic feature) with the reflex of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals was certainly posterior to Hirt's law because the stress was not retracted in the forms which were to develop into Latv. *pēds*, *nuōgs*" (1977: 320). Although this is the most logical conclusion made on the basis of the four theories it indicates nothing about the chronological order between Hirt's law and Winter's law: No matter whether Winter's law operated before or after Hirt's law, an item such as IE **nog^hōs* would turn into pre-Balto-Slavic **naġas* and could not at any stage be affected by Hirt's law, simply because no laryngeal is supposed to have been included in it.

The above mentioned four theories are, however, either unacceptable or must be modified:

(a) As for the origin of the Balto-Slavic acute intonation it is questionable whether all of the three so-called laryngeals (*H₁*, *H₂*, *H₃*) were actually laryngeal. The Indo-European lengthened grade is reflected by an acute intonation in words such as OCS *myšb* "mouse", SCr. *mīš*, Čak. *mīš* ← IE **mūs* (cf. Gk. *μῦς* < IE **mūs*, gen. *μῦός* < IE **mus-ōs*) and Lith. *nōsis* "nose", Latv. *nāss* "nostril" ← IE **nās* (cf. OInd. nom. du. **nāsā* "nostrils, nose" ← IE **nās-e*, instr. sg. *nasā* < IE **nas-ēH₁*).

explanation is missing. (III) Our modification is only to be considered final for the non-high vowels *e*, *a*, *o* (on *i/u* see Addendum 2).

279 | Addendum 1

An inspection of the material found in Pokorny's IEW adds the following examples:

- (23) Latv. *agrs* adj. "früh" :: OInd. *ágra-* N "Spitze", *agre* (loc.) "an der Spitze" also temporal "im Anfang, zuerst", Av. *ayra-* "der erste, oberste nach Zeit, Raum usw.", N "Anfang; das oberste, Spitze" < IE *(H)*ógro-*. (IEW 8)
- (24) Lith. (Žem.) *smagùs* (4) "schwer zu tragen oder zu ziehen", Latv. *smags* "schwer von Gewicht, lastend", *smagrs* "schwer" :: Gk. *μόγος* "Mühe, Anstrengung", *μόγις* adv. "kaum". (IEW 971)

In Lithuanian the *u*-adjectives have been very productive and many *o*-adjectives have been replaced by *u*-adjectives: Lith. *bukùs* :: dial. Tverečius *bùkas* (Otrębski 1965: 56), Lith. *gudrùs* :: dial. Kupiškis *gùdras*, Lith. *gailùs* :: Mažvydas *gailas*, Lith. *miklùs* :: dial. Dusetos *miklas*, Lith. *sukrùs* :: dial. Svėdasai *sùkras* etc. (LKG vol. 1, p. 491). In addition there is a tendency that *u*-adjectives avoid the barytone accentual patterns: Lith. *dosnùs* (4), *gausùs* (4), *meilùs* (4), *baisùs* (4) :: Daukša *dósnus*, *gáusus*, *méilus*, *baĩsus* etc., Lith. *brangùs* (3), *vėsùs* (4) :: dial. Tverečius *brúngus*, *vėsus* etc. (Stang 1966: 150).

On the basis of these facts and the Greek evidence we may assume that Lith. *smagùs* and Latv. *smags* go back to Balt. **smāgas* < IE *smōgos*.

- (25) OLith. *duomi*, Lith. *dúodu*, Latv. *duõmu*, OCS *damъ*, SCr. *dām*, Čak. (Novi) *dán*, Sloven. *dám* :: OInd. *dádāmi*, Gk. *δίδωμι*

(b) The glottal theory was convincingly rejected by Rasmussen in his contribution to the Eighth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics in Copenhagen 1984 (unpublished, cf. Rasmussen forthcoming a and b). He pointed out that Proto-Indo-European did have a series of plain mediae, as was traditionally accepted, but that the glottal theory may be ascribed to the prehistory of Proto-Indo-European.

(c) Kortlandt's reinterpretation of Winter's law is consequently unacceptable.

(d) Illič-Svityč's reformulation of Hirt's law is reinterpreted by Rasmussen (1985): He suggests that the ictus was retracted only by a consonantal laryngeal (viz. VHC / RHC / VRHC – the last-mentioned structure being restricted to *i*-diphthongs and originally reduplicated wordforms) and not by a vocalic laryngeal (viz. VR̥C).

Thus we have no evidence for the relative chronology of Winter's law in relation to Hirt's law. Kortlandt claims also that Winter's law was posterior to the loss of final **t/d* because of the Slavic neuter pronoun *to* (1977: 322). But this claim is no longer necessary because of HYPOTHESIS: IE **tōd* was accented and gave Slav. **tōd* with a short vowel. Therefore we may tentatively assume that Winter's law may have taken place at any stage in the Balto-Slavic prehistory, even just after the separation of Balto-Slavic from Proto-Indo-European.

Like the development IE **d^he-d^heH₁-mi¹¹* : **d^he-d^hH₁-mēs* > **d^hed^h(H₁)mi* : **d^hed^h(H₁)mēs* > Balto-Slav. **dedmi* : **dedmē(s)*¹² we would expect a development such as IE **de-dōh₃-mi* : **de-dH₃-mēs* > **ded(H₃)mi¹³* : **ded(H₃)mēs*. As a proportionate analogy on **d^heH₁-* : **d^hed^h(H₁)-* the *o*-timbre of the root **doH₃-* was introduced into **ded(H₃)-* so that **ded(H₃)mi* : **ded(H₃)mēs* turned into **dod(H₃)mi* : **dod(H₃)mēs*, which subsequently developed into Balto-Slav. **dōdmi* : **dōdmē(s)* according to HYPOTHESIS. This is supported by the fact that the Baltic and Slavic forms do | not continue **doH₃mi* etc. and consequently do not show any trace of an accent retraction according to Hirt's law: cf. the Latvian Brechton in *duõmu* and the oxytonesis in SCr. *dām*, Čak. (Novi) *dán*, Sloven. *dám*.¹⁴

Addendum 2

o The discussion of Winter's law given by Winter himself (op.cit.) and that given above are limited to the IE non-high vowels *e*, *a*, *o*. Thus we would ask ourselves what happened to IE short *i* and *u*. Winter supposes that the IE short *i* and *u* may also have been lengthened before an IE plain media, however, without giving any examples.

As IE short *i* and *u* are generally the zero grade of *eī* or *ie* and *eu* or *ue* respectively and are thus unstressed, it is natural to expect a lengthening before IE plain mediae according to Winter's law (with the modification by HYPOTHESIS). If this is so, we would expect that IE unstressed short *i* and *u* spontaneously developed into Balto-Slavic *ī* and *ū* respectively with an acute intonation, which was later replaced by a circumflex intonation by metatony in some cases. Thus in Slavic the reflex of Balto-Slavic *ī* coincides with that of *ěī*. The Slavic material is therefore to be treated very carefully and should mainly be used as additional support for the Baltic evidence. Consequently a reasonable approach would be to concentrate on the Baltic material as regards the lengthening of *i* and *u*.

11 As for the *e*-vocalism in the reduplication syllable I quote Hamp's argument: "We may first note that in the ensuing argument we will not successfully arrive at the observed forms in any simple way by assuming a reduplication in *-i-. We are therefore assured of a pre-form in *-e-reduplication. Here the Baltic forms give us valuable indirect evidence on this archaic formation in -e-" (1972: 85).

As for the place of the ictus in the present singular it is not possible to decide whether the Proto-Indo-European forms were **d^he-d^heH₁-mi* and **dē-doH₃-mi* or **d^he-d^heH₁-mi* and **de-dōH₃-mi* because Gk. *πιδημι* and *δίδωμι* tell us nothing about the original accentuation, and OInd. *dādāmi* and *dádāmi* could be secondary.

12 This development was convincingly explained by Hamp (1972).

13 The oxytonesis in the singular paradigm is to be reconstructed because of the final accentuation in Slavic and the Latvian Brechton. It may be explained as the result of an analogy on the plural paradigm.

14 Cf. also Kortlandt 1977: 323.

1 An inspection of the material found in Pokorny's IEW yields the following lists:

1.1 Forms with lengthening of *i* or *u* before an IE plain media in Balto-Slavic.

- (26) Lith. *údra* (1), dial. Dusetos *údras* (3), Latv. *údris* "Fischotter" : OCS *vydra* "Fischotter" :: OInd. *udráh* "ein Wassertier", Av. *udra-* M "Otter, Fischotter", Gk. *ύδροσ, ύδρα* "Wasserschlange" < IE **udró-*. (IEW 79, Fraenkel 1157f.)
- 281 | (27) Lith. *úgis* (2), dial. *úgýs* (4) "Wuchs, Wachstum" :: OInd. *ugrá-* "gewaltig" < IE **H₂ug-* [: Lith. *áugti, áugu*, Latv. *aúgt*¹⁵ "wachsen" : Lat. *augēre* "vermehren", Goth. *aukan* "sich mehren", Gk. *ά(φ)έξω* < IE **H₂aug-* / **H₂ueg-*.] (IEW 84f., Fraenkel 1158)
- (28) Lith. *būgti, būgstu, būgau* intr. "erschrecken", HLatv. *būgnis* "schrecklich, ängstlich" :: Lat. *fugere, fugiō* "fliehen, enteilen, verschmähen", Gk. aor. *έφυγον* < IE **b^hug-* [: Lith. *baugūs* "ängstlich, furchtsam, bange", caus. *bauginti* "jmd. erschrecken" : Gk. *φεύγω* "fliehe" < IE **b^houg-* / **b^hueg-*.] (IEW 152, Fraenkel 37)
- (29) Latv. *dzīdrs*¹⁶ "klar, hell", *dzīdrums* "Klarheit" < IE **g^{uh}id-* [: Latv. *dziedrs* "azurblau", Lith. *giēdras, gaidrūs* "heiter, klar" : Gk. *φαιδρός* "klar, hellglänzend" < IE **g^{uh}aīd-*.] (IEW 488f., Frankel 128)
- (30) OCS *igo* "Joch", Rus. *igo*, Sloven. *igō, igēsa, iżēsa*, OCz. *jho* < Slav. **jigo* < **iygo* < Balto-Slav. **iūgōN* :: OInd. *yugám*, Gk. *ζυγόν*, Lat. *iugum*, Goth. *juk* N < IE **iugóm* [: Pol. *jugo* (beside *igo*) "Querbalken im Schlitten" : Gk. *ζεῦχος, ζεύγεα* s-st. "Gespann, Zugvieh" < IE **iēug-os*.] (IEW 508f., Vasmer vol. 1, p. 469f.)
- (31) Lith. *liūdnas* (4) "traurig", *liūsti, liūstū, liūdaū* "traurig werden" :: OS *luttīl* "klein, elend", OHG *luzil, luzzil, liuzil* "klein, wenig, gering" < IE **lud-* [: R.-CS *ludō* "töricht" : Goth. *liuts* "heuchlerisch", OE *lot* N "Betrug" < IE **leud-*.] (IEW 684)
- (32) Lith. *lūžti, lūžtu*, Latv. *lūst, lūstu* intr. "brechen", Lith. *lūžis* (2) M "Bruch" :: OInd. *rujāti* "zerbricht, peinigt", *rugná-* "zerbrochen" < IE **luḡ-* [: Lith. *láužti*, Latv. *laūzt* tr. "brechen" : OInd. *rōga-* M "Gebrechen, Krankheit", *lóga-* "Erdkloß, Scholle", Arm. *lucanem* "löse los, breche auf", Lat. *lūgēre* "trauern" < IE **leuḡ-* / **louḡ-*.] (IEW 686)
- 282 | (33) Lith. *rūstas* (3), *rūstūs* (3) beside Daukša and dial. *rūstus* (1) "mürrisch, grimmig", *apsi-rūstu*, pret. *su-rūdau* "böse, traurig werden", Rus. *rydat'*

15 Here and elsewhere we have evidence that strongly supports the correctness of Winter's (op. cit. p. 432) statement that his law also affected diphthongal combinations. Whether or not the lengthening in such structures is subject to comparable restrictions as the plain vowels must be relegated to a future study.

16 The dialectal form *dzīdrs* (Livlandic-Livonian, Tahmian, Central Latvian) may be a sandhi variant (in a proclitic position?), see Endzelin 1923: 99.

- "weinen" :: OInd. *rudāti* "heult, weint, jammert", Lat. *rudere* "schreien, brüllen" < IE **rudH-* [: Lith. *raudōti* "wehklagen", Latv. *raūdāt* "weinen, beweinen" : OInd. *rōditi* "heult, weint, jammert", OE *rēotan* "klagen, weinen", OIce. *rauta* "brüllen" < IE **reudH-* / **rouḡH-*.] (IEW 867)
- (34) Lith. *rūgėti, rūgiu* "rülpsen, saures Aufstoßen haben", Latv. *rūgts / rūkts* "bitter, herb", Rus. *rygát* "rülpsen" :: Arm. *orcām* "erbreche mich, rülpse", Gk. *έρυγή* "Aufstoßen" < IE *(*H₁*)*rug-* [: Lith. *rjaugmi, raugiū* "rülpse, habe saures Aufstoßen", Latv. *atraugties* "aufstoßen" : Gk. *έρεῦγομαι* "speie aus, erbreche mich" < IE *(*H₁*)*reug-* / *(*H₁*)*rouḡ-*.] (IEW 871, Vasmer vol. 2, p. 554)
- (35) Lith. *svýsti, svýstu, svýdau* "zu glänzen beginnen", *svydėti, svydzūi*, 3. pers. *svýdi* "hell glänzen", Latv. *svíst, svistu, svidu* "anbrechen, vom Tage", (beside Lith. *svisti, svindū, svidaū* "zu glänzen beginnen", *svidėti, svidū* "glänzen", *svidūs* (4) "blank, glänzend") [: OE *sweotol, swutol, switol, swytol, sutol* "klar" < IE **suīd-* :: Latv. *svidīt* "salben (eig. glänzen machen)" : Av. *x^aaēna-* "glühend, lohend", Lat. *sīdus, -eris* "Gestirn" < IE **sueīd-* / **suōīd-*.] (IEW 1042, Frankel 952)
- (36) Latv. *svíst, svistu* "schwitzen" :: OInd. *svīdyati* "schwitzt", OHG *swizzen* "schwitzen" < IE **suīd-* [: Latv. *sviēdri* pl. "Schweiß" : OInd. *svēda-* M "Schweiß", Arm. *kīrt-n* "Schweiß", OHG *sweiz* M "Schweiß" < IE **sueīd-* / **suōīd-*.] (IEW 1043)
- (37) Lith. *isvýsti, -výstu, -výdau* "gewahr werden", *pavydėti, pavydi* "beneiden", *pavydas* (2) "Neid", Latv. *pavidēt* "mißgönnen, beneiden", (beside Lith. *pavidalas* (1) "Aussehen, Gestalt") < IE **uīd-* [: **ueīd-* "sehen".] (IEW 1127, Fraenkel 556, 557)

1.2 Forms without lengthening of *i* or *u* before an IE plain media in Balto-Slavic. 283

- (38) OCS *igrb, igra* "Spiel", *igrati* "springen, tanzen", OCz. *jhra, jhrāti, Cz. hra, hrāti* < Slav. **jbg-* < Balto-Slav. **ig-* < IE **H₂ig-* [: OInd. *éjati* "rührt sich, bewegt sich, erhebt", Gk. *aiyίς* "Sturmwind, Sturmwolke", der Schild des Zeus (wohl ursprünglich verstanden als die von Zeus geschüttelte Sturmwolke, Gewitterschild) < IE **H₂aig-*.] (IEW 13f., Vasmer vol. 1, p. 470)
- (39) Lith. *duktė, -ėis* (3) "Tochter", OCS *dōšti, -ere* :: OInd. *duhitār-*, Gk. *θυγάτηρ, θυγατέρα* < IE **d^hug₂tēr-*. (IEW 277)
- (40) Lith. *dubūs* (4) "tief, hohl", *dūgnas* (4) "Boden" = Latv. *dibens* < **dubnas*, OCS *dōbrv* "Schlucht", *dōno* "Grund, Boden" :: Gk. *βυθός* M "Tiefe (des Meeres)" < IE **d^hub-* [: Lith. *daubà, dauburýs* "Schlucht" : Goth. *diups* "tief" < IE **d^heub-* / **d^houḡb-*.] (IEW 267f., Fraenkel 108f.)

- (41) Lith. *ligà* (4) "Krankheit", Latv. *liga* "schwerere Krankheit, Seuche" :: Gk. *ὀλίγος* "klein" < IE **lig-* [:: Lith. *pāliegis* M "Siechtum": Gk. *λοιγός* "Verderben, Unheil, Untergang, Tod" < IE **leig-* / **loig-*.] (IEW 667)
- (42) Lith. *lūgnas* (4) "geschmeidig, biegsam" :: Gk. *λυγίζω* "biege, winde, drehe", *λύγος* F "biegsamer Zweig", *λύγινος* "geflochten", Lat. *lucta* F "Ringeln, Ringkampf" < IE **lug-* [:: OHG *louh*, OE *lēac*, OIce. *laukr* "Lauch" < IE **loug-*.] (IEW 685)
- (43) Lith. *mudà* (2) "Möglichkeit", *mudrùs* (4), Latv. *mudrs* "munter", Lith. *mùdrinti*, Latv. *mudīt* "antreiben" :: OInd. *mudrá-* "lustig", *múd-*, *mudā-* "Lust, Freude", Gk. *μύδος* M "Nässe, Fäulnis", *μυδάω* "bin feucht, faul" < IE **mud-* [:: OInd. *módate* "ist lustig", *móda-*, *modana-* N "Lust, Fröhlichkeit", MÍr. *muad* "rein, stolz" < IE **meud-* / **mouud-*.] (IEW 741, Fraenkel 467)
- 284 | (44) Lith. *svidùs* (4), *svidėti*, *svidù*: see above under (35) Lith. *svýsti* etc.
- (45) Lith. *pavidalas* (1): see above under (37) Lith. *isvýsti* etc.

2 A glance at our lists with or without lengthening of *i* or *u* gives a relatively confused picture. The material is now to be examined.

2.1 Forms with expected length of *i* or *u* according to HYPOTHESIS.

- (26) Dusetos *údras* (3) < IE **udrós* > OInd. *udráh*. The Brechton in Latv. *údris* is also expected. Lith. *údra* (1) and Gk. *ύδρα* point to an original barytonesis. The initial accent of Gk. *ύδρος* may be analogical on *ύδρα*. The length of Lith. *údra*, OCS *vydra* may be analogical on *údras* or a result of a new vřddhi formation in Balto-Slavic.
- (27) Lith. dial. *ūgỹs* (4) is secondary, because the noun formation by *-ỹs* is productive. Lith. *ūgis* (2) points to Balt. **ūgias*.¹⁷
- (28) Lith. *būgti*, *būgstu*, *būgau* may be derived from IE thematic aorist injunctive **b^hug-è/ò-* (cf. Gk. *έφυγον*) or IE *sk-*present **b^hug-sk-è/ò-*. HLatv. *būgnis* points to an original deverbative (viz. verbal adjective) **b^hug-nò-s*.
- (29) Latv. *dzīdrs* may point to IE **g^hid-rò-s*. The Dehnton might be secondary, *dziedrs* etc. indicating the one-time existence of root-stressed forms.
- (30) If Winter's law did not affect this item, we would expect a development such as IE **jugóm* > Balto-Slav. **jugón* > Slav. **jǫgò* > **jǫgò* > (**igò* >) Rus. ***igó*, Sloven. ***igo* (cf. Rus. *peró* "feather", Sloven. *pérp*, SCr. Čak. *però* < Slav. **però* < IE **pteróm* or **peróm* "feather; wing") according to Illič-Svityč's statement (op.cit. §§ 47–53) that the Proto-Indo-European neuter (singular) with a short root segment with oxytone | AP corresponds to the

285

17 The circumflex intonation in Lith. *ūgis* etc. is a result of "métatonie douce" (cf. Stang 1966: 144ff., Kortlandt 1977: 324f.).

Slavic neuter with oxytone AP. But this is not the case, as is shown by Rus. *igo*¹⁸ and Sloven. *igò*.¹⁹

On the other hand, if Winter's law did affect this item, we would expect such a development as follows: IE **jugóm* > Balto-Slav. **jūgón* (with Winter's lengthening with an acute intonation on *-ū-*) > Slav. **jǫgo* (with a circumflex intonation on *-y-* and an accentual mobility according to Meillet's law) > **jigo* > (**igo* >) Rus. *igo*, Sloven. *igò* (cf. SCr. *měso* "meat", Rus. *mjásó*, Sloven. *mesò* < Slav. **měso* < IE **mēm̥sóm*, see Illič-Svityč op.cit. § 62). This is what we have in the existing Slavic languages. Therefore we may assume that Winter's law did affect this item, which is expected by HYPOTHESIS.

- (31) Lith. *liūdnas* (4) < **ludn-ò-s* (with secondary *li-* from **liaud-* < **leud-*) (see Otrębski 1965: 166). As for *liūsti* etc. an original unstressed root form in zero grade is expected like in (28) *būgti*.
- (32) Lith. *lūžis* (2) points to Balt. **lūžias*. Lith. *lūžti* etc. goes back to an original thematic aorist injunctive **luǵ-è/ò-*, which is supported by OInd. *rujāti*.
- (33) Lith. *rūstas* (3) points to an original verbal adjective **rudā-tò-s*. Lith. *rūstus* (3), *rūstus* (1) may be secondary. Lith. *-rūstu*, *-rūdau* point to a root form with an original unstressed zero grade, cf. OInd. *rudāti*. Rus. *rydát'* can have a secondary lengthening of the root vowel as is the nature of *ā*-verbs.
- (34) Lith. *rūgiu* is possibly from an iterative **rug-èj-ò*. Lith. *rūgėti* points to a stative **rug-èH₁-tēj*, but this is rather a secondary formation to the present, because *ėti*-infinitives to intransitive verbs are productive. Latv. *rūgts* / *rūkts* goes back to **rug-tò-s*.
- (35) Lith. *svýstu*, Latv. *svīstu* point to an original end-stress, possibly *sk-*present **suīd-sk-ò*. This is supported by the Latvian Brechton.
- (36) The accentuation of OInd. *svīdyati* is irrelevant because it represents a different morphological class from Latv. *svīstu* which may go back to **suīd-sk-ò*.
- 286 | (37) Lith. *-výstu* points to an original *sk-*present: *-výstu* < IE **uīd-sk-ò*. Lith. *pavydėti*, Latv. *pavidēt* might be from a stative IE **-uīd-èH₁-tēj*. Lith. *pavydas* may point to an original nomen actionis **-uīd-ò-s* (some Lithuanian nomina actionis have other vowels than IE *o* in the root segments, see Otrębski op.cit. p. 32). Thus the lengthening of *i* is not expected. Nevertheless the circumflex intonation may point to a secondary formation: a dialectal form with *-ỹ-* for expected *-iē-* (IE **uējd-ò-s*)?

18 Preobraženskij (1910–1914) considers Rus. *igo* an (Old) Church Slavonic loan word. No such idea is mentioned by Trubačev (1981) or by Vasmer (1953). Kiparsky (1975) considers this item an inherited word from Proto-Indo-European.

19 The trace of *s*-stem flexion may be the result of influence from the competitive word **jūgo* < **iēug-os*.

2.2 Forms with expected short *i* or *u* according to HYPOTHESIS.

- (38) Rus. *igrá, igrú*, pl. *igrý*, but ORus. *igrá, igrú*, pl. *igrý* oxytone columnar AP, cf. SCr. Štok. *igra, igru*, dat. *igȓi*, pl. *igre*, but Čak. *igȓü, igȓè* (Kolesov 1972: § 15, p. 34f.). For Proto-Slavic an oxytone columnar AP is to be claimed for this item.

Whether *i-* in *igra* is short or long in its origin is a complicated question. Cz. *hra* cannot be a safe piece of evidence for original short *i-*, because the absence of *ji-* is sporadic: cf. Cz. *jikra* "spawn" < **ik^hraH₂* :: **iēk^uȓ*, Cz. *jiskra* "spark" < **iskraH₂* :: Lith. *aiškūs* (Daukša *ėiškus*) "clear". On the other hand, Arumaa's statement (1964: 102) must be correct: "Dieses so entstandene *i* (viz. from **jb-*: the present author) war kurz und muß deshalb vom sonstigen slavischen *i* (aus idg. *i, ēi*, teilweise aus *ai, oi*) getrennt werden, vor allem nach dem Ausweis des Südslavischen, wo es z. B. in der štokavischen Mundart des Serbokroatischen nur die Intonation einer Kürze (" oder ") haben kann."

If *i-* in *igra* is an original long vowel, only an original acute intonation is possible, because a circumflex intonation on a long vowel is always of secondary origin. As a noun with a long root form with an original barytone AP remained barytone, and as a noun with a long acuted root form with a mobile oxytone AP acquired a mobile AP with a circumflex intonation in Slavic according to Meillet's law, *igra* cannot have a long root form. The oxytonesis in *igra* (*ā-st.*!) points to an original barytone columnar AP such as **igrā, *igroN* etc. according to Dybo's law (cf. Illič-Svityč op.cit. §§ 38–40). Thus no lengthening of *i-* is expected.²⁰

- 287 | (41) As for Lith. *ligà* the accentual mobility may be secondary because of Gk. *ὀλίγος*.
 (42) Gk. *λύγος* f, *λύγιος* point possibly to original barytonesis of Lith. *lūgnas*.
 (43) Lith. *mudà* (2) goes back to IE **mūdaH₂*. The accentual mobility of Lith. *mudrūs* is probably secondary.
 (45) Lith. *pavidalas* (1) has an ictus on its root.

2.3 Forms which HYPOTHESIS does not affect.

- (39) Lith. *duktė*, OCS *dōšti*: For Proto-Slavic **dōkti*, acc. **dōkterb* a mobile AP is reconstructed (Illič-Svityč op.cit. § 59). In Proto-Indo-European a columnar oxytone AP is found in this item: **d^hugə₂tēr*, **d^hugə₂tēr-ŋ*. The disputed *u* in this item was thus never stressed and consequently a length-

²⁰ The Štokavian accentuation in *igra, igru* etc. may theoretically also point to a circumflex intonation on the root vowel. But a reconstruction such as Slav. **igrā* < **ēigrā* is out of the question because of the initial *H₂* of the root.

ening is to be expected according to HYPOTHESIS. The short *u* may thus be explained as follows: A vocalic laryngeal between two obstruents may have disappeared at an early stage in the Balto-Slavic prehistory, which caused the loss of voicedness of *g*: **-gə₂t-* > **-gt-* > **-kt-*. As for (33) Lith. *rūstas* < **rudatōs* the voiced *d* may have been reintroduced by analogy on other formations of this root. But the same thing could never apply to **d^hugə₂tēr-*. If this is not so, this item may well be considered a counterexample to HYPOTHESIS.

- (40) Lith. *dubūs* (4), *dūgnas* (4), SCr. *dn̄o*, Rus. *dno, do dná*, Gk. *βυθός* point to end-stress. This is a counterexample to HYPOTHESIS [cf. below].
 (44) For Lith. *svidūs* (4), *svidėti, svisti* etc. no explanation can be given [cf. below].

3 We have now 17 examples with or without lengthening of high vowels *i* and *u* which support HYPOTHESIS and 3 counterexamples. The latter – especially *duktė* and *dubūs, dno* – indicate that HYPOTHESIS must be modified somehow. A solution should be sought in a future study.

| Additional remarks

As regards items 40 and 44, J. E. Rasmussen suggests the following solutions (personal communication, the solutions being formulated by the present author):

- (40) IE **d^hub-* "tief, hohl" and IE **b^hud^h-(men-)* "Boden" (cf. OInd. *budhnāh* "Grund, Boden", Gk. *πυθμήν* M "Boden, Fuß eines Gefäßes", OE *botm* M, Eng. *bottom*) might have influenced each other because of their semantic and structural similarity, so **d^hub-* might have turned into **d^hub^h-* in some cases. The latter might thus be reflected in Slav. **dno* and Balt. **dubnas* (OCS *dno* and Lith. *dūgnas*, Latv. *dibens* mean "Boden"!). If this is so, this item was not affected by Winter's law because of its root final media aspirata *b^h*.
 (44) Some of the Balto-Slavic *ē*-verbs might be from Proto-Indo-European perfects via athematic presents (cf. Stang 1966: 321). Thus (35) *svydėti* and (44) *svidėti* might be from IE sg. **s(u)e-suōid-*, pl. **s(u)e-suid-*. As an intermediate stage of this transition we would expect Balt. **suīd-* (the root-stress from the old singular) and Balt. **suīd-* (the end-stress from the old plural). The former is reflected in Lith. *svidėti*, the latter in *svydėti*.

If the possible solution given above concerning Lith. *duktė*, OCS *dōšti* and these solutions, which are theoretically possible, are all correct, there is no counterexample to HYPOTHESIS.

References

- Arumaa, P.
1964 *Urslavische Grammatik*, 1. Heidelberg.
- Eckert, R.
1974 "Studien zur Geschichte der nominalen Stammbildung im Slawischen". *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 19/4, 489–499.
1980 "По поводу некоторых производных от корня *ed- 'есть' в балтийских и славянских языках". In: *Балто-славянские этноязыковые контакты*, 72–76. Москва.
- Endzelin, J.
1923 *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga.
- Fraenkel, E.
1962–1965 *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 1–2. Heidelberg / Göttingen.
- Gamkrelidze, T. & V. Ivanov
1973 "Sprachtypologie und die Rekonstruktion der gemeinindogermanischen Verchlüsse". *Phonetica* 27, 150–156.
- Gercenberg, L. G.
1981 *Вопросы реконструкции индоевропейской просодики*. Ленинград.
- Hamp, Eric P.
1972 "dúodu, dedū". *Lingua Posnaniensis* 16, 83–85.
1983 "Pronoun + clitic". *Baltistica* 19/2, 176–178.
1984 "Lith. *ėžeras*". *Baltistica* 20/1, 64.
- Illič-Svityč, V. M.
1963 *Именная акцентуация в балтийском и славянском*. Москва.
- Kiparsky, Valentin
1963 *Russische historische Grammatik*, 3. Heidelberg.
- Kolesov, V. V.
1972 *История русского ударения*. Ленинград.
- Kortlandt, F. H. H.
1975 *Slavic accentuation*. Lisse.
1977 "Historical laws of Baltic accentuation". *Baltistica* 13/2, 319–330.
1978a "Comment on W. Winter's paper". In: Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Recent developments in historical phonology* (Trends in linguistics. Studies and Monograph 4). The Hague / Paris / New York, 447.
1978b "On the history of Slavic accentuation". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 92, 269–281.
- LKG
1965 *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. 1: *Fonetika ir morfologija*. Vilnius.
- Otrębski, Jan
1965 *Gramatyka języka litewskiego*. 2: *Nauka o budowie wyrazów*. Warszawa.
- Pokorny, Julius
1959–1969 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (IEW)*. 1–2. Bern.
- Preobraženskij, A.
1914–1919 *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, 1. Москва. Reprint New York 1951.
- Rasmussen, J. E.
1985 "On Hirt's law and laryngeal vocalization". *Arbejdsrapporter udsendt af Institut for Lingvistik, Københavns Universitet (APILKU)* 5, 179–213. [Reprinted in J. E. Rasmus-

- sen, *Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics*, 1: 170–198. Copenhagen 1999; editors' note]
- forth. a "On the status of the aspirated tenues and the Indo-European phonation series". *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 20, 81–109. [Reprinted in J. E. Rasmussen, *Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics*, 1, 216–243. Copenhagen 1999; editors' note]
- forth. b "Die Tenues Aspiratae: Dreiteilung oder Vierteilung des indogermanischen Plosivsystems und die Konsequenzen dieser Frage für die Chronologie einer Glottalreihe". In Theo Vennemann (ed.), *The new sound of Indo-European. Essays in phonological reconstruction*, 153–176. Berlin / New York.
- Schindler, J.
1975 "The ablaut of the Indo-European r/n-stems". In *Indo-European Studies*, 11, 210–225. Cambridge, Mass.
- Schwyzler, E.
1939 *Griechische Grammatik, auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik*, 1. München.
- Shevelov, G. Y.
1964 *A prehistory of Slavic. The historical phonology of Common Slavic*. Heidelberg.
- Stang, C. S.
1957 *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo.
1966 *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø.
- Trubačev, O. N.
1981 *Этимологический словарь славянских языков*. Москва.
- Vasmer, M.
1953–1958 *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1–111. Heidelberg.
- Winter, W.
1978 "The distribution of short and long vowels in stems of the type Lith. *ėsti* : *vėsti* : *mėsti* and OCS *jasti* : *vesti* : *mesti* in Baltic and Slavic languages". In J. Fisiak (ed.), *Recent developments in historical phonology* (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs 4), 431–446. The Hague / Paris / New York.

Hirt's law and Optimality Theory

ROMAN SUKAČ

Recent debates about the complex field of Balto-Slavic accentology seem to have reached a turning point. Works of a new generation of IE, BS and Slavic scholars show a tendency to reinterpret facts discovered and explained by previous authors. New trends also come from other fields of linguistics, especially various approaches of non-linear phonology and Optimality Theory. We can observe more and more papers and works that hand in hand use results of historical and comparative linguistics with the very recent phonological theories. The paper presented here should be viewed as a contribution to the hotly debated issues of IE and BS accentology.

Problem

Hirt's law is, by *communis opinio*, considered as one of the first and most important accentual laws in Balto-Slavic. As Illich-Svitych established in his classical work (1963/1979), Baltic and Slavic nominals with long roots correspond to PIE *mobilia-oxytone*. Due to the presence of non-apophonic root length caused by the presence of a laryngeal, stress retracted to the root syllable. The ranking of Hirt's law within the chronology of changes from PIE to Baltic and Slavic was established by Kortlandt (Kortlandt 1974, 1975, 1977, 1994). Hirt's law should take place in Late Balto-Slavic after the loss of PIE accentual mobility, Pedersen's law, and barytonesis and oxytonesis of thematic stems. In his criticism of Illich-Svitych's and Kortlandt's *modus operandi*, Rasmussen specified the function of Hirt's law (Rasmussen 1985, 1992): the retraction of stress is restricted to words containing a consonantal laryngeal; a laryngeal must be non-syllabic in antecorsonantal position. Rasmussen also revised the corpus of words traditionally assumed to undergo Hirt's law and corrected their etymologies – both nominals and verbs.

I limit my paper to discussion of nominals only.

Several problems still remain unexplained. The PIE accentual distribution has been regarded as follows: athematic nouns should have been acrostatic, proterokinetic, hysterokinetic and amphikinetic, as successfully established by workers of Erlangen school and their followers. Their continuing research in internal

derivation and transition between paradigms also promises new looks on early BS accentuation. Thematic nouns are considered to be accentually distributed between barytona and oxytona. A coherent explanation of how these paradigms developed into Baltic and Slavic accentual distribution was made by Kortlandt (Kortlandt 1974, 1975, 1977, 1994). After the loss of IE mobility, mobile patterns should merge into a single laterally mobile class. Pedersen's law should cause the retraction of stress from inner syllables in mobile paradigm; this should be limited to the flexion of polysyllabic consonant stems (the commonly used example is the PIE word for "daughter"; see also Rasmussen 1985, 1992 for a similar view). Then, barytonesis (analogical spreading of the stress retraction to vocalic stems in cases where Pedersen's law applied) and oxytonesis (stress shift from an internal syllable to the ending in end-stressed forms) applied. Subsequently, Hirt's law is supposed to apply.

This succession, which is important for the starting point of the application of Hirt's law, has recently and independently been challenged by Klingenschmitt and his followers (e.g. Klingenschmitt 1994, 2001), Kim 2002 and Olander 2004, 2005, 2006. I agree with Olander's claim that analogical "laws" like Pedersen's, which are supposed to operate at Early BS and at the beginning of Late BS, are complicated and unnatural. It is more acceptable to consider the continuation of phonologically unstressed (root stressed) and thematic stressed paradigms in vowel stems (as silently supposed by Olander), and the continuation of accentual distribution of thematic stems from PIE. Olander explains the further mobility of those stems by establishing the mobility law (rejected by Kortlandt 2006). A very radical view of the whole system and evolution of IE and BS accentology was taken by Kim (with the largest part about Hirt's law written so far). Using the modus operandi of the metrical and bracket theory applied by Halle on the IE accentuation together with methods of historical linguistics, Kim argues that the thematic vowel, especially in *o*-stems, was underlyingly unaccented. Barytone stems were, therefore, also unaccented with default initial stress. Oxytone stems were underlyingly postaccenting.

The BS system of underlyingly accented and unaccented morphemes therefore continues that of PIE. Kim's research results are in direct opposition to those made by Illich-Svitych: PIE *o*-stems were unaccented (barytona) and postaccenting (oxytona); *-eh₂*-stems were accented (barytona) and unaccented (oxytona); BS barytone *o*-stems are continued by unaccented stems of APc in Slavic, oxytone stems underwent a split – they are continued by postaccenting stems of APb if the nucleus of the syllable preceding the thematic vowel does not end in a laryngeal; if it ends in a laryngeal, stress is retracted by Hirt's law. It means that Dybo's law is considered unnecessary. Kim also argues that the features of the PIE nominal system of columnal stress on one hand and strong and weak cases on the other hand continues in BS. I refrain from discussing the details in this article.

Several other problems still remain. When checking the small IE corpus of nominals supposed to undergo Hirt's law, the accentual reconstruction does not appear to be quite firm. The reconstruction of thematic oxytones seems to be clear:

- Latv. *jūts*, Skt. *yūtīh*: Balt. **jūtis*, PIE **iūtis* (Illich-Svitych 1975:59), **iuh-ti-* (Rasmussen 1985);
 SCr. *jāto*, Sln. *játo*, Skt. *yātām*: PIE **iah₂-tó-m* (Rasmussen 1985);
 Lith. *dúona* 1, Latv. *duōna*, Balt. **dōnā*, PIE **dhōnā* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 57), **d^hoh-ná-h₂* (Rasmussen 1985), **d^hoH-néh₂* (EWAi I: 187);
 Ru. *dólog*, SCr. *dūg*, Sln. *dolg*, Cz. *dlouhý*, Latv. *ilgs*, Lith. *ilgas* 1 > 3, Skt. *dirghāh*: Balt. **ilgas*, PIE **dīghós* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 58, 136), **dīgh^h-ó-s* (Rasmussen 1985), **dīh₁g^hó-* (EWAi I: 728);
 Ru. *gríva*, SCr. *grīva*, Cz. *hříva*, Latv. *grīva*, Skt. *grīvā*: PIE **griHuáH* (Kortlandt 1975: 22), **g^wrih₃-uáh₂* (Rasmussen 1985);
 Latv. *snāte*, OE. *snōd*: PIE **snah-táh₂* (Rasmussen 1985);
 Lith. *sūnus* (1 >) 3, Skt. *sūnús*: Balt. **sūnus* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 59), PIE **suh-nús*;
 Lith. *tiltas* 1, Latv. *tilts*, Skt. *tīrthām*: Balt. **tīlta*, PIE **iītHóm* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 58), **tīh₂-t^hó-m* (Rasmussen 1985), **tīh₂-th₂-ó-* (EWAi I: 650);
 Lith. *úosis* 1, Gr. *akherōís*: Balt. **ōsis*, PIE **ōsis* (Illich-Svitych 1979), *(H)*ōsi^o*- (Blažek 2001: 50), extended form > ? **h₃osh₁énos*;
 SCr. *pír*, Sln. *pír*, Cz. *pýr*, Ru. *pyréj*, Gr. *pūrós*, Lith. *pūras*, OE. *fyr*s, Skt. *pūrā-*: PIE **puh₁-ró-* (Rasmussen 1985);
 Ru. *dym*, SCr. *ďim*, Sln. *dim*, Cz. *dým*, Latv. *dūmi*, Lith. *dūmai* 1, Skt. *dhūmā-*, Gr. *thūmós*, Lat. *fūmus*: Balt. **dūmai*, PIE **dhūmós* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 58): **d^huh-mó-s* (Rasmussen 1985), **d^huh₂-mó-*, to **d^hueh₂-* (Casaretto 2004: 380).

Other forms of thematic stems as well as athematic stems are not straightforward:

- Latv. *znuōts*, Skt. *jñātis*, Gr. *gnōtós*, SCr. *zēt*, Ru. *zjat'*, Cz. *zeť*, Psl. *zētv*: Balt. **žnōtis*, PIE **gnōtis* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 160), **gnoh₃-ti-* (Rasmussen 1985);
 Latv. *vējš*, Lith. *vėjas* 1, Skt. *vājús*: Balt. **vėjus*, PIE **uējús* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 59), **h₂ueh₁-iús* (Rasmussen 1985);
 Ru. *pólon*, SCr. *pūn*, Sln. *poln*, Cz. *plný*, Psl. **pl̥n̥v̥*, Latv. *pīlns*, Lith. *pilnas* 1 > 3, Skt. *pūrñá-*, OIr. *lán*, Lat. *plēnus*, E. *full*: Balt. **pīlnas*, PIE **pīnós* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 58), **pīh-nós* (Rasmussen 1985).

Here the problematics of reconstruction is as follows: as Lubotsky (1992: 265ff) remarks, one can observe that *i-* and *u-* stems in Skt. that are derived from roots with a final laryngeal are predominantly oxytones,¹ but the conditions of the shift are "incomprehensible" because root laryngeals generally attract stress.

1 Similarly Dybo 1981: 18

Some authors also think about different reconstructions: Schaffner (obviously under the influence of Klingenschmitt) reconstructs the opposition **p̥h₁-nó-* (oxytone verbal adjective) > **p̥l̥nó-* / **p̥l̥nó-* / **p̥l̥nó-* > **p̥l̥nó-* > **p̥l̥na-* > Lith. *pilnas*, Skt. *pūrṇá*, contra **p̥h₁-no-* > **PSL. p̥l̥n̥* > *ScR. p̥l̥n̥*, R. *pól̥nyj* (Schaffner 2001: 336, cf. also Forssman 2001: 27); see also Viredaz 2002 for detailed discussion about the word **ǵnoh₃-tf-*.

Other differences in reconstruction can also be seen in the following data:

Lith. *piemuo* 1 (> *piemuo* 3) (Dybo 1981: 17), Gr. *poimēn*: Balt. **pōimōn* / **pēimōn*, PIE **pōimēn* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 60), **poih₂-mēn* (Rasmussen 1985), reconstructed by Schaffner as hysterokinetic: Nsg **poih₂-mē(n)*, Gsg **poih₂-mn-és*, with *Laryngalmetathese* **poih₂-* < **poh₂-i-* (Schaffner 2001: 89–90);

Lith. *mėnuo* 1, OHG *mānōd*, Got. *mēnōþs*: Germ. **mēnōt*, PIE **mēnōt* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 60), reconstructed as amphikinetic Nsg **mēh₁-n-s*, Gsg **meh₁-ns-ós* (Beekes 1985: 62); similarly Schaffner **mēh₁-nō-s* : **m̥āns-és* (Schaffner 2001: 83–84) and Rieken **mēh₁-nō-t(s)* : **m(e)h₁-ns-és* (Rieken 1999: 62);

Latv. *vīrs*, Lith. *výras* 1, Skt. *vīrá-*: Balt. **vīras*, PIE **uīrós* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 58), **uīh-rós* (Rasmussen 1985); Schaffner assumes an opposition of **uīhₓ-ró-* (adjective) > Skt. *vīrá-*, contra **uīhₓ-ro-* (substantive) > Lith. *výras* (Schaffner 2001: 331), but see Casaretto for **uīh₁-ró-* > *výras* (Casaretto 2004: 419 + Anm. 1359);

Ru. *déver*, ScR. *djěvēr*, Sln. *devēr*, Lith. *dieveris* 1 (and *dieveris* 3), Latv. *diēveris*, Skt. *devā*, Gr. *dāēr*: Balt. **dāivēr*, PIE **dāiuēr* (Illich-Svitych 1979: 90), **daih₂-uēr* (Rasmussen 1985); Nsg **deh₂i-uēr*, Dsg **deh₂i-ur-éj*, Asg **deh₂i-uēr-ŋ* (Rieken 1999: 266), hysterokinetic, but see Jeong-Soo's argument for amphikinetic reconstruction (Jeong-Soo 2005: 19)

Ru. *mat*, ScR. *māti*, Sln. *māti*, Cz. *māti*, Slk. *mať*, OCS *mati*, Latv. *māte*, Lith. *mótė* 1, Skt. *mātā*, Lat. *māter*, OHG *muoter*: PIE **mah-tēr* (Rasmussen 1985); Nsg **meh₂tér-s*, Gsg **meh₂tr-és*, hysterokinetic (Jeong-Soo 2005: 14); Beekes argues for static inflection (Beekes 1985: 185), also Snoj 2004 with acrostic paradigm.

It is obvious that a mixture of nominals of different origin and accentuation underwent Hirt's law. The different mobility of athematics is also difficult to frame into a sort of lateral mobility – the starting point from which Hirt's law should apply. There is also an interesting remark made by Dybo (Dybo 1981: 17) who, having observed that *u*-stems and consonantal stems that underwent Hirt's law returned back to mobility in Lithuanian, suggested, that those forms created a sort of mixed accentual paradigm with retracted forms and forms keeping original ending accentuation.

We can accept the working hypothesis that original IE accentual frames continued at least up to the time of operation of Hirt's law. This hypothesis has not very

firm grounds, because the corpus of words under examination is small. But Optimality Theory analysis seems to explain more successfully Hirt's law under the premise of the continuance of original accentual distribution. However, another condition must be broken – we must accept the fact that the stress was retracted also from syllables not immediately following a syllable with a consonantal laryngeal – which is against the common understanding of how Hirt's law operates.

Frazier has recently dealt with the accentual paradigms of PIE athematic nouns from the point of view of Optimality Theory (Frazier 2006). She uses a concept of dominant and recessive morphemes in a concept of morphology-phonology interface. Dominant affixes are those that cause deletion of accent from the base. Any affix that does not bear such specification is recessive by default. Apart from using input-output correspondence also output-output correspondence is used, because from one base different outputs in paradigms can be created. Accented roots are always stressed in the output, unaccented roots yield paradigms with alternating stress, postaccenting roots yield paradigms with stress on the inflectional suffix. Frazier also uses antifaithfulness constraints (Alderete 2001), operating only on the output-output correspondence, which are satisfied by an output which violates a correspondent faithfulness constraint. Comparisons between members of inflectional paradigms are solved by a theory of Optimal paradigms, which was, however, not developed with the intention of explaining differences among members of paradigms due to inflectional affixes (McCarthy 2005). Creating a non-optimal paradigm (–OP) model to generate multiple candidates simultaneously, Frazier is successfully able to demonstrate the interaction and ranking of constraints of the types: DEP(A) – do not insert accent, MAX(A) – do not delete accent, NOFLOP(A) – do not shift accent, ALIGN-LEFT – for every stressed syllable, align its left edge with the left edge of the prosodic word, OP-DEP(A) – do not insert an accent into any member of an inflection paradigm, –OP-DEP(A) – insert an accent into the stem of a member of an inflectional paradigm created with a dominant affix; similarly OP-MAX(A), –OP-MAX(A), OP-NOFLOP(A), –OP-NOFLOP(A), DEP(A)_{ROOT}, DEP(A)_{DERIV}, and show how they control the placement of the stress in all four types of athematic accentual paradigms.

I use Frazier's concept as a starting point and I try to show that to explain a leftward stress shift we must include a dominant constraint which specifies the position of a laryngeal in a root. As for Hirt's law, it is obvious that a target root syllable contains a laryngeal as a part of a coda, which means that this laryngeal is consonantal. I argue that late Indo-European and Early Balto-Slavic generally prefer a consonantal (and tautosyllabic) laryngeal rather than a vocalic one. As for the case of Hirt's law, the root laryngeal is consonantal and therefore attracts stress. Therefore, I posit a constraint **ₐ_{root}* (root laryngeal must be consonantal).

If we accept the working hypothesis that athematic nouns, at least those that underwent Hirt's law, kept their original accentual distribution, we can easily create tables for showing the undominance of constraints **ₐ_{root}* and ALIGN-LEFT.

Amphikinetic nouns have a root stress in strong cases and an ending-stress in weak cases. The stress is, therefore, shifted leftward only in weak cases²:

RŚÉ	* ∂_{root}	ALIGNĹ	OP-NOFLOP(A)
▶ \dot{R}_H SE			*
R _H ŚÉ		*	
R _S ŚÉ	*	*	

Weak cases of **meH-nōt-s*

As for hysterokinetics, the stress alternates between suffix and ending. The root is never accented. I accept Frazier's presupposition that hysterokinetics had post-accenting root – otherwise it would be impossible to explain their anomalous accentuation. The leftward stress shift again shows the undominance of constraints * ∂_{root} and ALIGN-LEFT:

R _{PA} ŚÉ				
R _{PA} ŚÉ	* ∂_{root}	ALIGNĹ	OP-NOFLOP(A)	POST ACC
R _{PA} ŚÉ	**	**		
R _{PA} ŚÉ			**	
▶ \dot{R}_H SE				**
\dot{R}_H SE				**

Strong and weak cases of the type **maH-tēr*, **daiH-ūēr*, **poiH-mēn*

Thematic oxytona also have postaccenting root (accepting Halle's proposal):

RŚÉ	* ∂_{root}	ALIGNĹ	POST ACC
R _{PA} ŚÉ	*	*	
▶ \dot{R}_H SE			*

Also, taking the above mentioned results into consideration, we can easily explain the anomalous resistance of Sanskrit *i-* and *u-* stems derived from roots with a final laryngeal, as observed by Lubotsky. The fact that the roots having a final consonantal laryngeal do not attract stress can be explained by the following preliminary hypothesis: while in Balto-Slavic the consonantal root laryngeal causes the attraction of stress (Hirt's law) and it is undominated from the OT point of view, in Sanskrit the constraints * ∂_{root} and ALIGN-LEFT are dominated by some other constraints. Therefore, the leftward stress-shift is blocked. However, further research is to be done to confirm it.

Silesian University in Opava

2 R_S-root with non-consonantal laryngeal, S-suffix, E-ending, R_H-root with tautosyllabic laryngeal; OP-NOFLOP(A) – do not shift stress in any member of the inflectional paradigms.

References

- Alderete, J.
2001 *Morphologically governed accent in Optimality Theory*. New York / London.
- Beekes, R. S. P.
1985 *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection*. Innsbruck.
- Blažek, V.
2001 "Old Prussian arboreal terminology". *Linguistica Baltica* 9, 29–61.
- Carrasquer, M.
2005 "The three accent paradigms of Proto-Balto-Slavic and the evolution of the three Slavic accent paradigms". Handout presented at IWoBA I, Zagreb.
- Casaretto, A.
2004 *Nominale Wortbildung der gotischen Sprache. Die Derivation der Substantive*. Heidelberg.
- Dybo, V. A.
1981 *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Moskva.
- Forssman, B.
2001 *Lettische Grammatik*. Dettelbach.
- Frazier, M.
2006 *Accent in Proto-Indo-European athematic nouns: antifaithfulness in inflectional paradigms*. MA thesis (ms.), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, <http://www.rutgers.roa.edu>.
- Halle, M.
1997 "On stress and accent in Indo-European". *Language* 73/2, 275–313.
- Halle, M. & W. Idsardi
1995 "General properties of stress and metrical structure". In: J. A. Goldsmith (ed.), *The handbook of phonological theory*, 403–443. Cambridge (Mass.) / Oxford.
- Illich-Svitych, V. M.
1979 *Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. MIT Press. (Translated from *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*, AN SSSR, Moskva 1963.)
- Jeong-Soo, K.
2005 *Der indogermanische Flexionakzent*. Ms. Universität Würzburg.
- Lubotsky, A. M.
1992 "The Indo-Iranian laryngeal accent shift and its relative chronology". In: R. Beekes, A. Lubotsky & J. Weitenberg (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 31. August – 4. September 1987*. Innsbruck.
- Kim, R. I.
2002 *Topics in the reconstruction and development of Indo-European accent*. PhD dissertation (ms.). University of Pennsylvania.
- Klingenschmitt, G.
1994 "Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen". In: J. E. Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*. Wiesbaden.
- Klingenschmitt, G.
2001 "Die slavische Nominalflexion". *Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in Freiburg, 19.–22. September 2001*. Unpubl. manuscript.

- Kortlandt, F.
 1974 "On the history of Baltic accentuation". In: *Historical linguistics 11: Theory and description in phonology. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Edinburgh, September 1973*, 295–309. Amsterdam.
 1975 *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse.
 1977 *Historical laws of Baltic accentuation*. *Baltistica* 13/3, 319–330.
 1994 "From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 22, 91–112.
 2006 "Miscellaneous remarks on Balto-Slavic accentuation". – <http://www.kortlandt.nl>.
- Keydana, G.
 2006 "Indogermanische Akzenttypen und die Grenzen der Rekonstruktion". Ms, to be published in *Historische Sprachforschung*; www.keydana.de.
- Mayrhofer, M.
 1986–1997 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, 1–2. Heidelberg.
- McCarthy, J.
 2005 "Optimal paradigm". In: L. Downing, T. A. Hall & R. Raffelsiefen (eds.), *Paradigms in phonological theory*, 170–210; www.rutgers.roa.edu. (ROA-485-1201).
- Olander, T.
 2004 "The ending-stressed word-forms of the Baltic and Slavic mobile paradigms". In: A. Hyllested, A. R. Jørgensen, J. H. Larsson & T. Olander (eds.), *Per aspera ad asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, 407–417. Innsbruck.
 2005 "The Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms". Ms. presented at IWoBA I, Zagreb.
 2006 *Accentual mobility: the prehistory of the Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms*. PhD dissertation, University of Copenhagen.
- Rasmussen, J. E.
 1985 "On Hirt's law and laryngeal vocalization". *Arbejdsrapporter udsendt af Institut for Lingvistik, Københavns Universitet (APILKU)* 5, 179–213.
 1992 "Die Vorgeschichte der baltoslavischen Akzentuierung – Beiträge zu einer vereinfachten Lösung". In: B. Barschel, M. Kozianka & K. Weber (eds.), *Indogermanisch, Slawisch und Baltisch. Materialien des vom 21.–22. September in Jena in Zusammenarbeit mit der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft durchgeführten Kolloquiums* (Slavistische Beiträge 285), 173–200. München.
- Rieken, E.
 1999 *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Schaffner, S.
 2001 *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbruck.
- Snoj, M.
 2004 "Zur Akzentuierung der urslawischen *ter*-Stämme". In: A. Hyllested, A. R. Jørgensen, J. H. Larsson & T. Olander (eds.), *Per aspera ad asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, 537–543. Innsbruck.
- Viredaz, R.
 2002 "Le nom du 'genre' en indo-européen et en balto-slave". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 107, 152–180.

On Romance-Alpo-Slavic substitutional accentology: the case of pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names in Slovene¹

MATEJ ŠEKLI

Abstract: This paper discusses Romance-Alpo-Slavic substitutional accentology, i.e. the integration of Romance accentual elements into the Alpo-Slavic accent system, using the example of pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names in Slovene. Analysing the material of the Slovene dialects of Upper Soča, Nadiža/Natisone, Ter/Torre and Rezija/Resia, the original Alpo-Slavic accent of the following place names is reconstructed: *Ahten, Beljak, Bovec, Breginj, Čedad, Gumin, Kobarid, Krmin, Prosnid, Ratenj, Solkan, Subid, Sužid, Tolmin, Trst, Videm*.

Izveček: V prispevku je na primeru predslovanskih substratnih krajevnih imen moškega spola v slovenščini obravnavano romansko-alpskoslovansko nadomestno naglasoslovje, tj. vključevanje romanskih naglasnih prvin v alpskoslovanski naglasni sestav. Na podlagi analize gradiva v obsoškem, nadiškem, terskem in rezijanskem narečju slovenščine je rekonstruiran prvotni alpskoslovanski naglas naslednjih krajevnih imen: *Ahten, Beljak, Bovec, Breginj, Čedad, Gumin, Kobarid, Krmin, Prosnid, Ratenj, Solkan, Subid, Sužid, Tolmin, Trst, Videm*.

1 Introduction

1.1 Pre-Slavic linguistic substrate in the Slovene linguistic territory

The pre-Slavic linguistic substrate in the Slovene linguistic territory can be defined as Romance, i.e. romanised pre-Romance, especially Celtic and Illyrian, and Romance itself. At the same time it is not always possible to distinguish the substrate from the adstrate (Friulian, Istrian, Dalmatian). For the study of Romance elements in Slovene, the isogloss on the Koper–Solkan–Beljak line which divides North-Western *Romania* from South-Eastern *Romania* in the north-south direc-

¹ This text was prepared using the ZRCola insert system elaborated at the Research Centre of the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts in Ljubljana (www.zrc.sazu.si) by Peter Weiss.

I am very grateful to Prof Alenka Šivic-Dular for her valuable comments, Prof Vera Smole for having checked my phonetic transcriptions of dialect material with special attention to the pitch accent, Prof Ranko Matasović for having sent me his unpublished article on the accentuation of early Latin and Romance loanword in Slavic, and Mate Kapović for a constructive debate about the operation of Dybo's/Illič-Svityč's law. Any errors or incongruities in the text are, of course, entirely my responsibility.

tion is extremely important.² The lenition (sonorisation, spirantisation, loss) of Latin voiceless occlusives in voiced environments (i.e. between vowels or between a vowel and a sonorant) and the preservation of the Latin final *-s* are characteristics of North-Western Romance languages; the preservation of Latin voiceless occlusives in voiced environments and the loss of the Latin final *-s* are characteristics of South-Eastern Romance languages (Wartburg 1950: 32; Skubic 1989: 97, 100).³ I am going to use the term Alpo-Romance (Friulan) to denote the substrate and adstrate Romance linguistic territory to the west of the Koper–Solkan–Beljak line and the term Balkano-Romance (Cello-Romance, Illyro-Romance; Istrian, Dalmatian) to refer to the territory to the east of that line.

The Koper–Solkan–Beljak isogloss was established on the basis of the examination of the phonetic properties of pre-Slavic substrate geographical names in Slovene (Šturm 1928: 22–24; Grad 1958).⁴ The geographical names situated to the west of the isogloss show the sonorisation of Latin voiceless occlusives in voiced environments (Čedad ← Rom. **Kiuitāte*, Kobarid ← Rom. **Kap(o)rētū*, Modreja ← Rom. **Matreia*, Oglej ← Ancient *Aquileia*, Sužid ← Rom. **Silikētū*, Viden ← Substr. **Ūtinu*). However, the geographical names located to the east of the isogloss do not show this sonorisation (Batuje ← Ancient *Batavia*, Beljak ← Substr. **Biljāku*, Kolpa ← Ancient *Colapis*, Koper ← Lat. *Caprīs* abl. pl., Logatec ← Rom. **Longātici* gen. sg., Solkan ← Substr. **Silikānu*, Trojane ← Rom. *Atrante*).

The Koper–Solkan–Beljak isogloss divides the reflexes of Lat. sequences *k^{i/e}*, *g^{i/e}* at the same time. The reflexes č, ž (Čedad ← Rom. **Kiuitāte*, Sužid ← Rom. **Silikētū*) occur to the west of the line, whereas the reflexes *c*, *z* (Cr. *Cavtat* ← Rom. **Kiuitāte*, Slov. *Celje* ← Ancient *Celeia*, Cr. *Buzet* < **Bulzētō* ← Ancient *Pinguente*) or the reflexes *k*, *g* (in Dalmatia, cf. dial. Cr. (Dubrovnik) *kimak* ← Rom. **cimice*, *plakir* ← Rom. **placēre*) are to be found to the east of the line. This fact has been interpreted in three different ways. Skok argued for the PSl. first and second palatalisation or preservation of the Balkano-Romance velars before front vowels in Slavic (Skok 1926: 386).⁵ Ramovš explained the state of affairs, using current Rom-

anic terminology, as follows: (1) In Alpo-Romance (Friulan), the palatalisation of Latin velars before front vowels had already occurred by the 6th and 7th centuries. The Slavs substituted Alpo-Romance palatals with their own palatals of the same kind: Lat. *k^{i/e}*, *g^{i/e}* > ARom. č, ž → Sl. č, *ž > ž; (2) In Balkano-Romance, Latin velars before front vowels were still preserved in the 6th and 7th centuries, but were phonetically palatalised. The Slavs substituted them in two different ways depending on the time of substitution: (a) in the oldest period (including the 9th century), when no velars before front vowels were admitted in Slavic, the Balkano-Romance palatalised velars were substituted by the closest palatal consonants in Slavic, according to the following substitutional-phonetic rules: Lat. *k^{i/e}*, *g^{i/e}* > BRom. **kⁱ*, **gⁱ* → Sl. *c*, **z* > *z*; Lat. *k_i*, *g_i* > BRom. **k_i*, **g_i* → Sl. **t*, **z*; (b) in the later period (after the 9th century), when velars before front vowels were already admitted in Slavic, the Balkano-Romance palatalised velars (especially from Dalmatian) were replaced by Slavic velars: Dalm. *k^{i/e}*, *g^{i/e}* → sl. *k*, *g* (Ramovš 1926/27: 154–155, 160–165). Šturm was of the opinion that the palatalisation of Latin velars before front vowels occurred in the 6th century in Alpo-Romance (Lat. *k^{i/e}*, *g^{i/e}* > ARom. č, ž) and Celto-Romance territory (Lat. *k^{i/e}*, *g^{i/e}* > CRom. *c*, *z*), while there was no palatalisation in Illyro-Romance (Lat. *k^{i/e}*, *g^{i/e}* > IRom. *k*, *g*) (Šturm 1927: 45–47).

The linguistic contact between Romance and Alpo-Slavic has already been studied from the phonetic/phonological point of view.⁶ The following rules of substitutional phonetics were established, for instance in the vowel system: Substr. **i*/**ē*, > ASL. **i*, Substr. **ū*/**ō* > ASL. **y*, Substr. **a* > ASL. **o*, Substr. **ā* > ASL. **a*, Substr. **a*/**o* + **m*/**n* > ASL. **ɸ*, Substr. **aRC* > ASL. **oRC*, Substr. **oRC* > ASL. **ɸRC*, Substr. **eRC* > ASL. **ɸRC* (Ramovš 1936: 23–46; Šega 1998: 72–76; Furlan 2002: 30–32). Nevertheless, Romance-Alpo-Slavic substitutional accentology has not yet been systematically studied.⁷ The purpose of this paper is to examine the integration of Romance accentual elements into the Alpo-Slavic accent system using the example of pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names in Slovene.

1.2 Pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names in Slovene

In the paragraph below the following pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names (PSl. masculine *o*-stems) will be subjected to accentological analysis: *Ahten*, *Bel-*

2 The isogloss on the La Spezia–Rimini line divides North-Western *Romania* from South-Eastern *Romania* in the west-east direction (Wartburg 1950: 32).

3 Cf. the reflexes of Latin voiceless occlusives in a voiced environment and the Latin final *-s* in the Romance languages: Lat. *rota* ‘wheel’ > Friul. *ruede*, Sardinian *roda*, Catalan *roda*, Spanish *rueda*, Portuguese *roda*, Old French *roue* ~ Standard Ital. *ruota*, Romanian *roată*; Lat. *cantās* ‘you sing’ > Friul. *cjantis*, Sardinian *cantas*, Occitan *cantas*, French *chantes*, Catalan *cantes*, Spanish *cantas*, Portuguese *cantas* ~ Standard Ital. *canti*, Romanian *cînti*.

4 Cf. also Grad 1969; Skubic 1989: 101; Furlan 2002: 32–33.

5 The opinion that toponyms of the type Celt. Rom. *Celeia* → Slov. *Celje* were subject to PSl. second palatalisation has been defended by a number of other linguists in recent years (Greenberg 2002: 81; Furlan 2002: 32; Matasović 2007: 106). Some authors see in the case of Rom. *Longaticum* → Slov. *Logatec* traces of PSl. third palatalisation (Greenberg 2002: 81; Matasović 2007: 106). The existing explanations of the toponym *Logatec* usually start from the Latin genitive singular with local meaning, in accordance with the Italian toponyms in *-i* such as Ital.

Ascoli, *Brindisi*, *Rimini*, *Girgenti* (former name for Agrigento in Sicily) (Skubic 1989: 173): Lat. **Longātici* → ASL. **Logatvcs*.

6 Alpo-Slavic (6th–10th century) is the Slavic present in the Slovene linguistic territory, the intermediate phase between Proto-Slavic and Slovene (Ramovš 1936: 22–67). Original Common Slovene represents the Proto-Slovene state after all Common Slovene innovations, it is the common starting point of all Slovene dialects and their local dialects.

7 By contrast, German-Slovene language contact has been examined in detail from the point of view of both substitutional phonetics (Striedter-Temps 1963: 1–73) and substitutional accentology (Grafenauer 1923).

jak, Bovec, Breginj, Čedad, Gumin, Kobarid, Krmin, Prosnid, Ratenj, Solkan, Subid, Sužid, Tolmin, Trst, Videm. The feminine place names (PSl. *a*-stems) will not be discussed since in the western and southern Slov. dialects, where most pre-Slavic substrate toponyms are indigenous, it is impossible to distinguish between the reflexes of PSl. nouns of accent paradigm *a* and PSl. nouns of accent paradigm *b* with a PSl. long vowel in the final stem syllable.

The distinction between the reflexes of PSl. nouns of accent paradigm *a*, i.e. CSlov. nouns with a short-acuted stem vowel as a result of the CSlov. shortening of PSl. old-acuted stem vowels (PSl. **līpa *līpō* (*a*) > CSlov. **līpa *līpō*), and PSl. nouns of accent paradigm *b* with a PSl. long vowel in the final stem syllable, i.e. CSlov. nouns with a long-acuted stem vowel as a result of the common Slov. accent retraction from an open final short (i.e. PSl. short or shortened PSl. long) vowel to the pre-tonic length (PSl. **mōkà *mōkō* (*b*) > CSlov. **mōka *mōkō*), was neutralised, in the western and southern Slov. dialects, by the early lengthening of the CSlov. short-acuted vowels in a non-final syllable (CSlov. **līpa *līpō* > western and southern Slov. **līpa *līpō = *mōka *mōkō*). Constant stress on an acuted stem is the reflex of two originally different accent paradigms in these dialects: *Nadiško* (Jevšček) *lí:pa lí:po = mó:ka mó:ko*. Toponyms such as *Nadiško* (Jevšček) *Burjá:na, Tipá:na* can reflect either the PSl. accent paradigm *a* or the PSl. accent paradigm *b*.

It is possible to distinguish between the reflexes of the PSl. accent paradigm *a* and the reflexes of the PSl. accent paradigm *b* in the *a*-stems only in the *Tersko* dialect: *Tersko* (Subid) *lí:pa lí:po ~ mó:ka mó:kō*. Accentuation of the type *lí:pa lí:po* represents the preservation of the original stress place (PSl. **līpa *līpō* > CSlov. **līpa *līpō* > western and southern Slov. **līpa *līpō* > *Tersko* (Subid) *lí:pa lí:po*). Accentuation of the type *mó:ka mó:kō* is secondary, i.e. it presents the *Tersko* accent shift from a CSlov. long-acuted vowel to the post-tonic short vowel with a tonal peak – the tonal peak on the post-tonic syllable is the remnant of the former stress place on this syllable before accent retraction – (PSl. **mōkà *mōkō* (> CSlov. **mōka *mōkō*) > *Tersko* **mó:kà *mó:kō* > *mó:ka mó:kō*) under the influence of the accent shift of the type PSl. **iūžina* (> CSlov. **iūžina *iūžino* > western and southern Slov. **iūžina *iūžino*) > *Tersko* **jú:žina* > *južəna* (Šekli 2006a: 173, footnote 18). The accent of the forms such as *Tersko* (Subid) *Ní:əme, Borjá:na, Tipá:na* and not **Níe!me, *Borja:na, *Típa:na* point to the reflex of PSl. accent paradigm *a*. Unfortunately however, in the *Tersko* dialect only a few pre-Slavic feminine substrate toponyms are preserved.

1.3 Dialectal material analysed

Language material (common nouns and proper names) of single local dialects of the “language” in the genetic-linguistic sense, i.e. concrete organic idioms, is only relevant for the purposes of historical linguistic study. Language material of

the “umbrella” standard language, i.e. a concrete inorganic idiom, is relevant only in cases where its codified standard norm arose on the basis of the abstraction of properties of single local dialects by means of theoretical linguistics.⁸ As the standardised forms of pre-Slavic substrate toponyms in Standard Slovene (*Slovenski pravopis*, Slovene Orthographic Dictionary, Ljubljana 2001) is the result of an applied linguistic approach of codification, i.e. by means of questionnaires to “standard speakers”, it is irrelevant to historical linguistics.

The material that forms the basis of this study will therefore be the phonetic and accentual form of the toponyms in the local dialects in which these toponyms are indigenous, i.e. they have continuity from the Alpo-Slavic period to the present day, and that show relevant accentual properties. Dialectal material was collected in the following locations: Idrsko (Upper Soča dialect, Slov. *obsoško narečje*), Jevšček pri Livku, Ošnje/Osgnetto pri Sv. Lenartu/San Leonardo, Breginj (Nadiža/Natisone dialect, Slov. *nadiško narečje*),⁹ Subid/Subit (Ter/Torre dialect, Slov. *tersko narečje*), Solbica/Stolvizza (Rezija/Resia dialect, Slov. *rezijansko narečje*).¹⁰

2 Reconstruction of the Alpo-Slavic accent of pre-Slavic masculine substrate toponyms in Slovene

The pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names analysed are distributed in alphabetical order. In first place, the standardised form of the toponym is given as presented in the codificational manuals of Standard Slovene.¹¹ The dialectal forms

- 8 The theory of the genetic-linguistic classification of idioms on the basis of criteria such as organicity/inorganicity, concreteness/unconcreteness (systemicity, diasystemicity, non-systemicity), higher/lower hierarchical grade is taken in its entirety from Brozović 1970: 10–14.
- 9 The genetic-linguistic classification of the local dialects of Breginj and its surroundings is not unambiguous in literature on the Slovene language. These local dialects are classified as part of the *Obsoško* dialect, specifically the *Borjana* dialect (Ramovš 1935: 77), the *Nadiško* dialect (Logar 1951) and the *Tersko* dialect (Logar–Rigler 1983). On the basis of the facts concerning historical phonology and accentology, the local dialects of Breginj and its surroundings are part of the *Nadiško* dialect: CSlov. **ǝ/*ǝ-*, **ǝ/*ǝ-* > Breginj *e, o*: (Nadiško: Jevšček *e, o*; Tersko: Subid *ɛ, ɔ*: ~ Obsoško: Kobarid *iɛ, uɔ*); CSlov. **CVCV̇* > Breginj *CVCV̇* (Nadiško: Jevšček *CVCV̇*, Obsoško: Kobarid *CVCV̇* ~ Tersko: Subid *CVCV̇*).
- 10 In the linguistic atlases in which Slovene is considered (SLA = *Slovenski lingvistični atlas*, OLA = *Общеславянский лингвистический атлас*, ALE = *Atlas linguarum Europae*), the analysed dialects are represented as follows: Idrsko: nearest point Kobarid, point SLA 70; Jevšček: nearest point Livek, point SLA 76; Ošnje: point SLA 81, OLA 2; Breginj: point SLA 64; Subid: nearest point Tipana/Taipana, point SLA 63; Solbica: point SLA 59, OLA 1, ALE 14.6/601. Informants during the field-work were: Idrsko: Stanislav Šavli (born 1937); Jevšček: Leopold Šekli (born 1939); Ošnje: Lucia Carlig (born 1927); Breginj: Vida Lenkič (born 1930), Andrej Mazora (born 1953); Subid: Bruna Balloch (born 1935); Solbica: Luigia Negro (born 1965). I would like to thank all the informants for their valuable help.
- 11 The sources of the standardised Slovene forms are the following: SKL = *Slovenska krajevna imena*, SKII = *Slovenska krajevna imena v Italiji*, DK = *Dvojezična Koroška*, which give a

are then adduced (nom. and. gen. sg., prepositional phrases with local meaning answering the question where?, where to?, where from?),¹² transcribed using the new Slovene national phonetic transcription.¹³ These dialectal forms are the basis of the abstracted diasystemic form, which is, in addition to information on the origin of the name (the oldest attested forms are extremely important; when these are not available, the foreign denominations can serve as comparative material), the starting point for the reconstruction of the original Alpo-Slavic proto-form, i.e. of both its phonetic and accentual form.

Ahten. Standardised material: *Áhten Áhtna* (SKII). Dialectal material: Breginj: *Ūá:xtən Ūá:xtna*, *ŷ Ūá:xtne*, *ŷ Ūá:xtən*, *z Ūá:xtna*; Subid: *A:x'tan A:x'na*, *ŷ A:x'ne*, *ŷ A:x'tan*, *od A:x'na*; i.e. *Áhtən Áhtna* < CSlov. **Áxtən *Áxtna*;¹⁴ Friul. *Atimis*, Ital. *Attimis*. The name is of pre-Romance origin. The first historical attestations are late (1106 *ad locum, qui dicitur Attens*), therefore the original ASL form cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

Beljak. Standardised material: *Belják Beljága* (SP), *Beljàk Beljága* (DK). Dialectal material: Solbica: *Bi'jek Bi'jaka*, *ŷ Bi'jacę*, *ŷ Bi'jek*, *z Bi'jaka*; i.e. *Belják Beljága* < ASL. **Bělákə *Běláka* (a) from Substr. **Biljāku* for Celt. **Biliacōn*, Ancient *st(ationis) Bilachiene(n)s(is)*; Germ. *Villach*, Friul. *Vilac*, Ital. *Villacco*. The name is derived from a personal name with the Celt. suffix *-acum*.

Bovec. Standardised material: *Bôvec Bôvca*, *Bóvec Bóvca* (SKI), *Bóvec Bóvca* (SP). Dialectal material: Idsko: *ʼBouc Bó:uca*, *ŷ Bó:uc*, *ŷ ʼBouc*, *z Bó:uca*; Jevšček: *ʼBuc Bú:ca*, *ŷ Bú:ce*, *ŷ ʼBuc*, *z Bú:ca*; Ošnje: *ʼBuc Bú:ca*, *ŷ Bú:cu*, *ŷ ʼBuc*, *z Bú:ca*; Breginj: *ʼBuc Bu'ca*, *ŷ Bu'ce*, *ŷ ʼBuc*, *z Bu'ca*; Subid: *ʼBuc Bu:ca*, *ŷ Bu:cu*, *ŷ ʼBuc*, *od Bu:ca*; Solbica *ʼBolc ʼBolca*, *ŷ ʼBolcę*, *ŷ ʼBolc*, *z ʼBolca*;¹⁵ i.e. *Bölc Bolcä/Bölc Bólca* < ASL.

dynamic word accent, and SP = *Slovenski pravopis* 2001, which gives both dynamic and melodic word accents (in this analysis the latter will be considered).

12 In the analysed local dialects, prepositions of place are never used alone – they are always emphasised by adverbs of place such as *gori/gor* 'up, upward', *doli/dol* 'down, downward', *tam/tja*, 'there', *tu/sem* 'here', which change in accordance with the actual position of the speaker. This is one of the characteristics of languages and dialects of the Alpine area (Isačenko 1939: 127–128) – e.g. Jevšček: *ʼdu Kobarí:de* 'down there to Kobarid', *ʼdu Ko'bart* 'downward in Kobarid', *ʼdo s Kobarí:da* 'downward from Kobarid', *ʼyu Bú:ce* 'up there in Bovec', *ʼyu ʼBuc* 'upward to Bovec', *ʼyo z Bú:ca* 'upward from Bovec', *ʼta ŷ Li:ŷke* 'there in Livek', *ti:e ŷ Li:ŷk* 'therewards to Livek', *ʼta z Li:ŷka* 'therewards from Livek'. When adducing the dialectal material, the adverbs of place will be omitted.

13 Cf. Kenda-Jež in Logar 1996: VIII–XV.

14 The *Tersko* form points to the CSlov. acute on a long vowel.

15 The dialectal material shows that the pre-tonic ASL. diphthongal sequences **ClbC*, **CbrC* in ASL. **Blbcá*, **Tbrzbstə* **Tbrzbstá* were interpreted either as short or long, upon which the absence/presence of accent retraction in local dialects (without accent retraction from Slov. open short final syllable to the pre-tonic short vowel) depends. The form **Tbrzbstə* was phonetically modified by oblique-case forms **Tbrzbstá* > **Tbrstá* (Furlan 2002: 31). Somewhere

**Blbcə* **Blbcá* (b)¹⁶ maybe from Substr. **Plitjo* for Ancient *Phligadia*, *Phlygades* (the rise of ASL. **c* is unclear);¹⁷ Friul. *Pleç*, Ital. *Plezzo*, Germ. *Flitsch*.

Breginj. Standardised material: *Bregínj Bregínja* (SKI), *Bregīnj Bregīnja* (SP). Dialectal material: Idsko: *Bəryí:n Bəryí:na*, *ŷ Bəryí:n*, *ŷ Bəryí:n*, *z Bəryí:na*; Jevšček: *Bəryí:n Bəryí:na*, *ŷ Bəryí:ne*, *ŷ Bəryí:n*, *z Bəryí:na*; Ošnje: *Baryí:n Baryí:na*, *ŷ Baryí:ne*, *ŷ Baryí:n*, *z Baryí:na*; Breginj: *Bəryí:n Bəryí:na*, *ŷ Bəryí:ne*, *ŷ Bəryí:n*, *z Bəryí:na*; Subid: *Bri:n Bri:na*, *ŷ Bri:ne*, *ŷ Bri:n*, *od Bri:na*; i.e. *Bərgín Bərgína* < ASL. **Bərgynə* **Bərgyná* (b) from Substr. **Bərgōna*; Friul. *Bergogne*, Ital. *Bergogna*.

Čedad. Standardised material: *Čedād Čedáda* (SKII), *Čedād Čedāda* (SP). Dialectal material: Idsko: *Če'ded Čedá:da*, *ŷ Čedá:d*, *ŷ Če'ded*, *š Čedá:da*; Jevšček: *Če'dat Čedá:da*, *ŷ Čedá:de*, *ŷ Če'dat*, *š Čedá:da*; Ošnje: *Če'dat Čedá:da*, *ŷ Čedá:de*, *ŷ Če'dat*, *š Čedá:da*; Breginj: *Če'dat Čedá:da*, *ŷ Čedá:de*, *ŷ Če'dat*, *š Čedá:da*; Subid: *Če'dat Čedá:da*, *ŷ Čedá:de*, *ŷ Če'dat*, *ot Čedá:da*; Solbica: *Čau'det Čau'dada*, *ŷ Čau'dade*, *ŷ Čau'det*, *š Čau'dada*; i.e. *Čəvdād Čəvdāda* < ASL. **Čəvədādə* **Čəvədāda* (a) from OFriul. **Čivīdāde* < Rom. **Kivītāte* < Lat. *civītās civītātis* 'town', 760–795 *Civītās Iulia* 'the town of the Julians'; Friul. *Cividāt*, local *Sividāt*, Ital. *Cividale*.

Gumín. Standardised material: *Gumín Gumína* (SKII), *Gumīn Gumīna* (SP). Dialectal material: Solbica: *U'mīn U'mīna*, *ŷ U'mīne*, *ŷ U'mīn*, *z U'mīna*; i.e. **Golmín *Golmína* < ASL. **Glbmynə* **Glbmyná* (b) from Substr. **Glemōna*, around AD 610 in *Glemona*; Friul. *Glemone*, Ital. *Gemona*, Germ. *Glemaun*.

Kobarid. Standardised material: *Kobaríd Kobarída* (SKI), *Kobarid Kobarída* (SP). Dialectal material: Idsko: *Ko'ber Kobarí:da*, *ŷ Kobarí:d*, *ŷ Ko'ber*, *s Kobarí:da*; Jevšček: *Ko'bart Kobarí:da*, *ŷ Kobarí:de*, *ŷ Ko'bart*, *s Kobarí:da*; Ošnje: *Koba'rit Kobarí:da*, *ŷ Kobarí:de*, *ŷ Koba'rit*, *s Kobarí:da*; Breginj: *Ko'bart Kobarí:da*, *ŷ Kobarí:de*, *ŷ Ko'bart*, *s Kobarí:da*; Subid *Kobo'rət Kobo'ri:da*, *ŷ Kobo'ri:de*, *ŷ Kobo'rət*, *ot Kobo'ri:da*; Solbica *Koba'rət Koba'rída*, *ŷ Kaba'ríde*, *ŷ Kaba'rət*, *s Kaba'rída*; i.e. *Koborīd Koborída* < ASL. **Koborīdə* **Koborīda* (a) from OFriul. **Kaborēdu* < Rom. **Kaprētu* 'where the goats are', which is derived from Lat. *caper* 'he-goat', *capra* 'she-goat' by the suffix Lat. *-ētum* with local meaning; Friul. *Cjaurēt*, Ital. *Caporetto*, Germ. *Karfreit*.

the accent of oblique cases (in which the shortening of the pre-tonic length of the type Jevšček *slat'ka* < PSI. **saldoká* had occurred) was generalised.

16 In standardisation, the folk-etymologic interpretation of the final *-c* as suffix Slov. *-ac* < PSI. **-cb* occurred (Šivic-Dular 1990: 161).

17 For the relation Substr. **pl* ~ Sl. **bl* cf. also Cr. *Buzet* < **Bulzētə* form Ancient *Pinquentum* after distance dissimilation *n-n* > *l-n* and probably with Rom. passage *gy* > *z* (Skok 1971: 246).

Krmin. Standardised material: *Krmín Krmína* (SKII), *Krmîn Krmîn* (SP). Dialectal material: Idrsko: *Kərmí:n Kərmí:na*, *u Kərmí:n*, *u Kərmí:n*, *s Kərmí:na*; Jevšček: *Kərmí:n Kərmí:na*, *u Kərmí:ne*, *u Kərmí:n*, *s Kərmí:na*; Ošnje: *Karmí:n Karmí:na*, *u Karmí:ne*, *u Karmí:n*, *s Karmí:na*; Breginj: *Kərmí:n Kərmí:na*, *u Kərmí:ne*, *u Kərmí:n*, *s Kərmí:na*; i.e. **Kərmín Kərmína** < ASL. **Kərmynō* **Kərmynā* (b) from Substr. **Kormōnes*, around AD 610 in *Cormones*; Friul. *Cormons*, Ital. *Cormòns*.

Prosnid. Standardised material: *Prosníd Prosnída* (SKII). Dialectal material: Breginj: *Pros'nət Prosní:da*, *u Prosní:de*, *u Pros'nət*, *s Prosní:da*; Subid: *Pros'nət Prosní:da*, *u Prosní:de*, *u Pros'nət*, *ot Prosní:da*; i.e. **Prosníd Prosnída**; Friul. *Prosenic*, Ital. *Prosenicco*. The oldest known historical attestations are late (1170 *de villa Prosernich*). The origin is not clear;¹⁸ it is therefore not possible to reconstruct the original ASL. form.

Ratenj. Dialectal material: Solbica: *Ra'teń Rata'ńa*, *u Rata'ńe*, *u Ra'teń*, *z Rata'ńa*, i.e. **Ratěnj Ratenjā** < ASL. **Ortěnb* **Orteńā* (b) from Substr. **Artenja*, around AD 610 in *Artenia*; Friul. *Dartigne*, Ital. *Artegna*, Germ. *Ardingen*.

Solkán. Standardised material: *Sólkan/Solkàn Solkána* (SKI), *Sólkan/Solkân Solkâna*, *Solkàn Solkána* (SP). Dialectal material: Idrsko: *Sou'ken Soukâ:na*, *u Soukâ:n*, *u Sou'ken*, *s Soukâ:na*; Jevšček: *Su'kan Sukâ:na*, *u Sukâ:ne*, *u Su'kan*, *s Sukâ:na*; Ošnje: *Su'kan Sukâ:na*, *u Sukâ:ne*, *u Su'kan*, *s Sukâ:na*; Breginj: *Su'kan Sukâ:na*, *u Sukâ:ne*, *u Su'kan*, *s Sukâ:na*; i.e. **Solkân Solkána** < ASL. **Səlbkânō* **Səlbkâna* (a) from Rom. **Silikānu*, 1001 *Siligānum*; Friul. *Salcan*, Ital. *Salcano*.

Subid. Standardised material: *Subíd Subída* (SZII). Dialectal material: Breginj: *Z'bat Zbí:da*, *na Zbí:de*, *na Z'bat*, *z Zbí:da*; Subid: *Sə'bat Səbí:da*, *u Səbí:de*, *u Sə'bat*, *ot Səbí:da*; i.e. **Subíd Subída**; Friul. *Subít*, Ital. *Subit*. The first historical attestations are late (1170 *de villa Subid*). The origin of the name is not clear;¹⁹ it is therefore not possible to reconstruct the original ASL. form.

Sužid. Standardised material: *Sužíd Sužída* (SKI). Dialectal material: Idrsko: *Šə'žed Šəží:da*, *u Šəží:đ*, *u Šə'žed*, *š Šəží:da*; Jevšček: *Se'žit Seží:da*, *u Seží:de*, *u Se'žit*, *s Seží:da*; Breginj: *Šə'žət Šəží:da*, *u Šəží:de*, *u Šə'žət*, *š Šəží:da*; i.e. **Solžíd Solžída** < ASL. **Səlbžídō* **Səlbžída* (a) from OFriul. **Siližēđu* < **Siligēđu* < Rom. **Silikētu* *'where the flintstone is', which is derived from Lat. *silex silicis* 'flintstone' by the suffix Lat. *-ētum* with local meaning.

Tolmin. Standardised material: *Tolmín Tolmína* (SKI), *Tolmîn Tolmîna* (SP). Dialectal material: Idrsko: *Tmí:n Tmí:na*, *u Tmí:n*, *u Tmí:n*, *s Tmí:na*; Jevšček: *Tmí:n Tmí:na*, *u Tmí:ne*, *u Tmí:n*, *s Tmí:na*; Ošnje: *Tomí:n Tomí:na*, *u Tomí:ne*,

18 Frau's explanation that it is a case of the derivative with Slov. suffix *-nik* from Slov. *proso* (Frau 1978: 98) is not confirmed by the Slov. dialectal material.

19 Frau, though with reservations, derives the name from Lat. *subire* 'climb, mount, ascend', the original meaning of the name would be in this case 'ascent, slope' (Frau 1978: 114).

u Tomí:n, *s Tomí:na*; Breginj: *Tmí:n Tmí:na*, *u Tmí:ne*, *u Tmí:n*, *s Tmí:na*; Subid: *Tulmí:n Tulmí:na*, *u Tulmí:ne*, *u Tulmí:n*, *ot Tulmí:na*; Solbica: *Tu'mîñ Tu'mîña*, *u Tu'mîñe*, *u Tu'mîñ*, *s Tu'mîña*; i.e. **Tolmín Tolmína** < CSlov. **Tl'mín* **Tl'minā* (b); Friul. *Tulmin*, Ital. *Tolmino*, Germ. *Tolmein*. The first historical attestations are late (1063–1068 in *Tuimine*, after 1086 *super Tulminum*, 1139 *apud Tulmin*, 1146 *Tulminum*). The origin of the name is not clear; it is therefore not possible to reconstruct the original ASL. form with certainty. Ramovš (1936: 26) derives it from Celt. **tilmon-* > ASL. **Təlmynō*, Bezljaj (1954: 132) from the common Alpine toponymical base **talamon* > ASL. **Təlmynō*, **Tolmynō*.

Trst. Standardised material: *Třst Třsta* (SKII), *Třst Třsta* (SP). Dialectal material: Idrsko: *Tərst Tərsta*, *u Tərst*, *u Tərst*, *s Tərsta*; Jevšček: *Tərst Tərsta*, *u Tərste*, *u Tərst*, *s Tərsta*; Ošnje: *ṽTərst Tərs'ta*, *u Tərs'te*, *u ṽTərst*, *s Tərs'ta*; Solbica: *ṽTərst Tərsta*, *u ṽTərst*, *u ṽTərst*, *s ṽTərst*; i.e. **Tərst Tərstā/Tərst Tərsta** < ASL. **Tərsbōstō* **Tərsbōstā* (b) from Ancient *Tergeste*;²⁰ Friul. *Triest*, Ital. *Trieste*, Germ. *Triest*.

Videm. Standardised material: *Víden Vídna* (SKII), *Vídem Vídma* (SP). Dialectal material: Idrsko: *Í:dəm Í:dma*, *u Í:dmi*, *u Í:dəm*, *z Í:dma*; Jevšček: *Í:dem Í:dma*, *u Í:dme*, *u Í:dem*, *z Í:dma*; Ošnje: *Ví:dan Ví:dna*, *u Ví:dne*, *u Ví:dan*, *z Ví:dna*; Breginj: *Ůi:den Ůi:dna*, *u Ůi:dne*, *u Ůi:den*, *z Ůi:dna*; Subid: *Ví:dan Ví:dna*, *u Ůi:dne*, *u Ůi:dan*, *od Ví:dna*; Solbica: *ṽViden ṽVidna*, *u ṽUudne*, *u ṽUuden*, *z ṽVidna*; i.e. **Vídan Vídna** < CSlov. **Ůidən* **Ůidna* < ASL. **Ůydbnō* **Ůydbna*²¹ from OFriul. **Ůdinu* < Substr. **Ůtinu*, 983 *Udene*, around AD 1000 *Utinum*, which is of pre-Romance origin; Friul. *Udin*, Ital. *Udine*, Germ. *Weiden*.

3 Integration of Romance accentual elements into the Alpo-Slavic accent system

An analysis of pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names in Slovene confirms Matasović's conclusion (on the basis of an analysis of early Romance loanwords and toponyms in Croatian) that the loans are integrated into PSl. accent paradigm a or PSl. accent paradigm b in the early post-Proto-Slavic period and that they are never integrated into PSl. accent type c (Matasović 2007: 112). However, the

20 Cf. footnote 15.

21 The initial **u* in front of **y* in ASL. **Ůydbnō* is surely of prothetic origin. Dialectal forms such as *Í:dəm* (Idrsko) and *Í:dem* (Jevšček) are secondary and arose in sequences with preposition *u*, in which the initial *u* was interpreted as a preposition: **u Ůi:den* → *u Í:den* (Alenka Šivic-Dular, p. c.). The hypothesis has been confirmed by subsequent collected material in Ošnje: *Ví:dan Ví:dna*, *z Ví:dna* ~ *u Í:dne*, *u Í:dan*.

The alternation of the phonemes /m/ and /n/ in the Nadiško dialect and some other western Slovene dialects (*Vídən*, *Vídəm*) is originally characteristic of the sandhi position and is historically documented in the dictionary of Alasia from 1607 (*adam* 'vno', *vum* 'fuora', *dam* 'giorno', *sim* 'figliuolo') and in the linguistic material of Baudouin de Courtenay from the 2nd half of the 19th century (*Škrátec am máslar*), for instance (Furlan 1991: 26).

Slovene material does not confirm Matasović's hypothesis that integration into a determinate accent paradigm depends on the gender of the noun. In Matasović's opinion, the masculine *o*-stem would be always integrated into PSl. accent paradigm b because it is the sole productive accent paradigm with a stressed final stem syllable in nom./acc. sg., while the feminine nouns would be integrated into PSl. accent paradigm a (Matasović 2007: 112–113, 116). The frequency of the reflexes of PSl. accent paradigm a (*Bəljāk Bəljāka, Čəvdād Čəvdāda, Koborīd Koborīda, Prosnīd Prosnīda, Solkān Solkāna, Subīd Subīda, *Solžīd *Solžīda*) and the reflexes of PSl. accent paradigm b (*Bərgīn Bərgīna, *Golmīn *Golmīna, Kərmīn Kərmīna, Tolmīn Tolmīna; Bōlc Bolcā/Bōlc Bōlca, Ratēnj Ratenjā, Tərst Tərstā/Tərst Tərsta*) in the PSl. masculine *o*-stems is fairly equal in Slovene, despite the slight prevalence of the reflexes of PSl. accent paradigm b. The reflexes of PSl. accent paradigm a cannot therefore be regarded as exceptions.

Pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names with a constant stress on a long vowel in the penultimate syllable are integrated into PSl. accent paradigm a. This means that the substrate constant stem stress was preserved on the same syllable in ASl. and that the substrate long vowel was substituted by an homonymous ASl. long vowel which acquired the PSl. old acute: Substr. *ā → ASl. *ǎ (Substr. *Biljāku, *Čijīdāde, *Silikānu → ASl. *Bǎlākō, *Čijīdādā, *Sǎlvkǎnō), Substr. *ē → ASl. *ī (Substr. *Kaborēdu, *Siližēdu → ASl. *Koborīdō, *Sǎlvžīdō), cf. Substr. *Kijūtātē → LSl. *Cьyūtātō > Cr. *Cāvtat Cāvtata, Cāptat Cāptata* as well. Analysis of the material confirms Ramovš's statement that PSl. old-acuted lengths were still preserved in ASl. and that the South-Slavic shortening of PSl. old-acuted lengths was later (7th–8th centuries) (Ramovš 1936: 54; 1950: 499). At the same time the material does not confirm Matasović's statement that PSl. accent paradigm b was the sole productive accent paradigm with a stressed final stem syllable in nom./acc. sg. in the masculine *o*-stems.

The following pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names are integrated into PSl. accent paradigm b: (1) with a constant stress on a long vowel in the penultimate syllable (this holds always true for nouns with Illyrian suffix *-ōna and with similar phonetic sequences): Substr. *-ōn- → ASl. *-yn- (Substr. *Bergōna, *Glemōna, *Kormōnes, *Tilmōn-/*Talamōn- → ASl. *Bərgynō, *Gləmynō, *Kərmynō, *Təlmynō/*Tō/oləmynō), cf. Substr. *Salōna* → LSl. *Solynō > Cr. *Sōlīn Solīna*, as well;²² (2) with a constant stress on a short vowel in the penultimate syllable (Substr. *Artenja, *Plitjo → ASl. *Ortēnb, *Blōcb).

22 Some more examples: *Flanōna* → Plōmīn Plomīna, *Albōna* → Lābīn Labīna, *Aenōna/Nōna* → Nīn Nīna, *Scardōna* → Skradīn Skradīna, *Stelpōna* → Stūpīn Stupīna, *Salōna* → Sōlīn Solīna, *Narōna* → Nōrīn Norīna (Šimunović 1984–1985: 150; Matasović 2007: 111–112). The substitution of the kind Substr. *-ōna → Sl. *-yna points to the fact that the *y from *-ōna was integrated with the PSl. old acute in the *a*-stems: *Cētina* < *Cētyna ← *Centōna, Prōmina* < *Promyna ← *Promōna* (Matasović 2007: 110, 111).

In the pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names with a constant stress on an antepenultimate long syllable (**Ūdinu*) it is possible to reconstruct with certainty only the Original Common Slovene accent (**Ūidən *Ūidna, *Āxtən *Āxtna*), but not the Alpo-Slavic one.

When explaining the integration of nouns with a constant stress on a long vowel in the penultimate syllable into PSl. accent paradigm b, Matasović does not exclude the operation of Dybo's/Illič-Svityč's law (Matasović 2007: 115);²³ nevertheless, he is more inclined to the opinion that the substrate long-stressed vowel in the final stem syllable was interpreted as "neo-acuted" in Slavic and was preserved as such in nom./acc. sg., whereas in the oblique cases, the accent was analogically shifted to the desinence on the model of the nouns of PSl. accent paradigm b (Matasović 2007: 116).²⁴ By means of Matasović's hypothesis of substrate stressed vowel being interpreted as PSl. neo-acuted it is possible to explain the ASl. accent paradigm b of pre-Slavic substrate place names with a constant stress on (a long or short vowel in) the penultimate syllable (Substr. *Berlgōna *Berlgōnae → ASl. *Bərgynō *Bərgyna → *Bərgynō *Bərgynā following the type PSl. *klūcb *klučā; Substr. *Artenja *Artenjae → ASl. *Ortēnb *Ortēna → *Ortēnb *Ortēnā following the type PSl. *kōnb *koñā) as well as the ASl. accent of pre-Slavic substrate place names with a constant stress on the antepenultimate syllable (Substr. *Ūdinu *Ūdinī → ASl. *Ūydbnō *Ūydbna, *Āxtb/ənb *Āxtb/əna), where no analogical stress shift took place.²⁵ This way of accent integration into the reflex of PSl. accent paradigm b is also characteristic of later Old and Middle High German loanwords with a short vowel in the sole stem syllable, for instance (OHG *flēc* → Slov. *blěk *blēka ≥ *blěk *blekā > dial. Slov. *blěk blekā*; OHG *flēc, zwęc, spēch* or MGH *vlēc, zwęc, dręc, spēc* → dial. Slov. *blěk blekā, cvěk cvekā, drěk drekā, špěh špehā*). The accent of pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names in ASl. can be explained by means of Dybo's/Illič-Svityč's law as well (Substr. *Berlgōna *Berlgōnae → ASl. *Bərgynō *Bərgyna > *Bərgynō *Bərgynā > *Bərgynō *Bərgynā; Substr. *Artenja *Artenjae → ASl. *Ortēnb *Ortēna > *Ortēnb *Ortēnā > *Ortēnb *Ortēnā; Substr. *Ūdinu *Ūdinī → ASl. *Ūydbnō *Ūydbna > *Ūydbnō *Ūydbna > *Ūydbnō *Ūydbna > CSlov. *Ūidən *Ūidna), operation of which is anyway less probable. It

23 The operation of Dybo's/Illič-Svityč's law is argued by Holzer, for instance (Holzer 2005: 44–46, 59–60).

24 Kortlandt is of the opinion that during the operation of Dybo's law, the accent was not shifted to the PSl. final jers; the accent shift in accordance with Matasović's explanation is therefore irrelevant (Kortlandt 2006: 3).

25 If pre-Slavic substrate place names with a constant stress on the antepenultimate syllable had been integrated into PSl. accent paradigm b (Substr. *Ūdinu *Ūdinī → ASl. *Ūydbnō *Ūydbna, *Āxtb/ənb *Āxtb/ənā), shortening of a long vowel in the antepenultimate in oblique cases would have occurred (ASl. *Ūydbnō *Ūydbna, *Āxtb/ənb *Āxtb/ənā > *Ūydbnō *Ūydbna, *Āxtb/ənb *Āxtb/ənā > CSlov. *Ūidən *Ūidna, *Āxtən *Āxtna). Consequently, the stress would not be retracted in dial. Slov. (dial. Slov. *Vidən *Vidnā, Āhtən *Āhtnā*), cf. dial. Slov. *mehkā, krepkā, sladkā* < PSl. *mekōkā, *krēpōkā, *soldōkā.

is possible to conclude from this only that the substrate long-stressed vowel in the group of nouns, which do not show the reflex of PSl. accent paradigm a, was not interpreted as PSl. old-acuted.

4 Conclusion

Pre-Slavic masculine substrate place names are integrated into Proto-Slavic accent paradigm a or PSl. accent paradigm b; however, they are never integrated into PSl. accent paradigm c in Alpo-Slavic (Slovene), similarly to Littoral-Slavic (Croatian).

Substrate place names with a constant stress on a long vowel in the penultimate syllable are integrated into PSl. accent paradigm a (Slov. *Bəljäk Bəljáka*, *Čəvdād Čəvdáda*, *Koborīd Koborída*, *Prosnīd Prosnída*, *Solkān Solkána*, *Subīd Subída*, **Solžīd *Solžída*). This means that the substrate long-stressed vowel was interpreted as the PSl. "old-acuted" in ASl. (Substr. **Biljāku*, **Čijidāde*, **Silikānu*, **Kaborēdu*, **Siližēdu* → ASl. **Bvlākō*, **Čbvdādō*, **Svlkānō*, **Koborīdō*, **Svlžīdō*), cf. Substr. **Kijitāte* → LSl. **Cvūtātō* > Cr. *Cāvtat Cāvtata*, *Cāptat Cāptata*, as well.

Substrate place names with a constant stress on a long or short vowel in the penultimate syllable are integrated into PSl. accent paradigm b (Slov. *Bərgín Bərgína*, **Golmín *Golmína*, *Kərmín Kərmína*, *Tolmín Tolmína*; Bòlc *Bolcā/Bòlc Bólca*, *Ratēnj Ratenjā*, *Tərst Tərstā/Tərst Tərsta*), whilst substrate place names with a constant stress on an antepenultimate syllable got a constant PSl. neo-acute type stress on an antepenultimate syllable (*Áhtən Áhtna*, *Vídən Vídna*). This means that the substrate (long- and short-) stressed vowel was not interpreted as the PSl. "old-acuted" in ASl. (Substr. **Bergōna*, **Glemōna*, **Kormōnes*, **Tilmōn-/ *Talamōn-*; **Artenja*, **Plitjo*; **Ūdinu* → ASl. **Bərgýnō*, **Glmýnō*, **Kərmýnō*, **Təlmýnō/*Tə/oləmýnō*; **Ortēńb*, **Blòcb*; **Ūýdbnō*, **Áxtb/ənbō*), cf. Substr. *Salōna* → LSl. **Solýnō* > Cr. *Sòlīn Solína*, as well.

The question, why the substrate long-stressed vowel in the penultimate syllable was sometimes interpreted as PSl. "old-acuted" and sometimes as PSl. "non-old-acuted" (Substr. **Kaborēdu* → ASl. **Koborīdō* ~ Substr. **Bergōna*, **Ūdinu* → ASl. **Bərgýnō*, **Ūýdbnō*), remains unanswered so far. This fact has already been observed by Holzer.²⁶ In the future study of Romance-Slavic substitutional accentology, special attention should be paid to this problem.

University of Ljubljana

26 "Es ist unklar, wovon es abhing, ob eine Entlehnung mit Akut versehen wurde oder nicht; eine positions- oder zeitbestimmte Ratio zeichnet sich nicht ab" (Holzer 2005: 60).

Abbreviations

ARom. = Alpo-Romance, ASl. = Alpo-Slavic, BRom. = Balkano-Romance, Celt. = Celtic, Cr. = Croatian, CRom. = Celto-Romance, CSlov. = Common Slovene, dial. = dialect, Friul. = Friulian, Germ. = German, Illyr. = Illyrian, IRom. = Illyro-Romance, Ital. = Italian, L = Latin, LSl. = Littoral-Slavic, MHG = Middle High German, OFriul. = Old Friulian, OHG = Old High German, PSl. = Proto-Slavic, Rom. = Romance, Sl. = Slavic, Slov. = Slovene, Substr. = substrate.

Sources

- Finco, Franco, Barbara Cinausero & Ermanno Dentesano
2004 *Nons furlans di lûc / Nomi friulani di luogo. Repertorio toponomastico italiano-friulano*. Udin/Udine.
- Kattinig, Franc, Mihael Kulnik & Janko Zerzer
2004² *Dvojezična Koroška: seznam dvojezičnih krajevnih imen južne Koroške / Zweisprachiges Kärnten: zweisprachiges Ortsnamenverzeichnis von Südkärnten*. Celovec.
- Kos, Franc
1902, 1906, 1911, 1915 *Gradivo za zgodovino Slovencev v srednjem veku*, I. 501–800, II. 801–1000, III. 1001–1100, IV. 1101–1200. Ljubljana.
- Kos, Milko
1928 *Gradivo za zgodovino Slovencev v srednjem veku*, v. 1201–1246. Ljubljana.
- Merkù, Pavle
1999 *Slovenska krajevna imena v Italiji. Priročnik / Toponimi sloveni in Italia. Manuale*. Trst.
- Slovenska krajevna imena*
1985 Franc Jakopin, Tomo Korošec, Tine Logar, Jakob Rigler, Roman Savnik & Stane Suhadolnik, *Slovenska krajevna imena*. Ljubljana.
- Slovenski pravopis*
2001 *Slovenski pravopis*. Ljubljana.

References

- Bajec, Anton
1928 "Romanizacija in jezik rimskih provinc Norika ter obeh Panonij". In *Razprave Znanstvenega društva za humanistične vede v Ljubljani* 4, 43–56.
- Bezljaj, France
1955 "J. Hubschmid, Alpenwörter romanischen und vorromanischen Ursprungs, Bern 1951; Pyrenäenwörter vorromanischen Ursprungs und das vorromanische Substrat der Alpen, Acta Salmaticensia, Filosofía y Letras, T. VII, núm. 2; Universidad de Salamanca 1954". *Slavistična revija* 8/1–2, 132–138.
- 1958 "Predslovanski ostanki v slovenščini". *Naša sodobnost* 6/2, 673–693.
- 1969 "Das vorslavische Substrat im Slowenischen". *Alpes orientales* 5, 19–35.
- Brozović, Dalibor
1970 *Standardni jezik. Teorija, usporedbe, geneza, povijest, suvremena zbilja*. Zagreb.
- Dapit, Roberto
1995, 1998 *Aspetti di cultura resiana nei nomi di luogo: 1. Area di Solbica/Stolvizza e Korito/Coritis. 2. Area di Osoanè/Oseacco e Učja/Uccea*. Padova.

- Desinan, Cornelio Cesare
1976–1977 *Problemi di toponomastica friulana*. Udine.
- Frau, Giovanni
1978 *Dizionario toponomastico del Friuli-Venezia Giulia: primo repertorio organico di nomi*. Udine.
- Furlan, Metka
1991 "Slovensko *slima* 'Jaliua, plouagne' (Alasia) in srbohrvaško *slim* (Žumberek) – novo gradivo za slovansko-germansko izogloso **slímъ* : **slīma-*". *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 1, 25–30.
- Furlan, Metka
2002 "Predslovanska substratna imena v slovenščini". *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 8/2, 29–35.
- Furlan, Metka, Alenka Gložančev & Alenka Šivic-Dular
2001 *Pravopisno ustrezen zapis zemljepisnih imen in stvarnih lastnih imen v Registru zemljepisnih imen in Registru prostorskih enot*. Ljubljana.
- Grad, Anton
1958 "Contribution au problème de la sonorisation des consonnes intervocaliques latines". *Linguistica* 3/2, 33–40.
- Grad, Anton
1969 "Importance de quelques toponymes slovénes pour la géographie linguistique romane". *Actes du Xe Congrès de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes (Strasbourg, 1962)*, III, 1176–1184. Paris.
- Grauenauer, Ivan
1923 "Naglas v nemških izposojenkah v slovenščini (Donesk k zgodovini slovenskega naglasa)". *Razprave Znanstvenega društva za humanistične vede v Ljubljani* 1, 358–391.
- Holzer, Georg
2005 "Zur relativen Datierung prosodischer Prozesse im Gemeinslavischen und frühen Kroatischen". *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 31–71.
- Isačenko, A. V.
1939 *Narečje vasi Sele v Rožu*. Ljubljana.
- Kortlandt, Frederik
2006 "Miscellaneous remarks on Balto-Slavic accentuation". <http://www.kortlandt.nl/publications/art226e.pdf>
- Logar, Tine
1951 "Obsoško-nadiška dialektična meja". *Slavistična revija* 4, 223–237.
- 1996 *Dialektološke in jezikovnozgodovinske razprave*. Karmen Kenda-Jež (ed.). Ljubljana.
- Logar, Tine & Jakob Rigler
1983 *Karta slovenskih narečij*. Ljubljana.
- Matasović, Ranko
2000 "Germanske posuđenice u praslavenskome: pitanja relativne kronologije". *Filologija* 34, 129–137.
- 2007 "On the accentuation of the earliest Latin and Romance loanwords in Slavic." In Mate Kapović & Ranko Matasović (eds.), *Tones and theories: proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology, Zagreb, 1–3 July 2005*, 105–119. Zagreb.
- Ramovš, Fran
1921–22 "Slov. *Kobarid* – furl. *Čavorèd* – ital. *Caporetto* – nem. *Karfreit*". *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* 3, 60–62.

- 1926/27 "O prvotnih južsl. substitucijah za balk.-lat. k, g pred e, i". *Južnoslovenski filolog* 6, 153–165.
- 1935 *Historična gramatika slovenskega jezika, VII. Dialekti*. Ljubljana.
- 1936 *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana.
- 1950 "Relativna kronologija slovenskih akcentskih pojavov". *Slavistična revija* 3, 16–23.
- Šega, Agata
1998 "Contributo alla conoscenza dei latinismi e romanismi antichi in sloveno." *Linguistica* 38/2, 63–85.
- Šekli, Matej
2006a "Tersko narečje v kraju Subid / Il dialetto sloveno del Torre nel paese di Subit". In Milena Kožuh (ed.), *Terska dolina / Alta Val Torre / Val de Tor*, 161–187. Celje, Gorica.
- 2006b "Naglas nekaterih predslovanskih substratnih krajevnih imen moškega spola v slovenščini". In Irena Novak Popov (ed.), *42. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture: Mesto in meščani*, 220–227. Ljubljana.
- Šimunović, Petar
1984–1985 "Prvotna simbioza Romana i Hrvata u svjetlu toponimije." *Rasprave Zavoda za jezik* 10–11, 147–200.
- Šivic-Dular, Alenka
1988 "K normiranju slovenskih zemljepisnih imen". In B. Pogorelec (ed.), *24. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. Zbornik predavanj*, 55–66. Ljubljana.
- 1990 "O ljudski etimologiji." In T. Pretnar (ed.), *26. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. Zbornik predavanj*, 155–171. Ljubljana.
- Skok, Petar
1926 "Zur Chronologie der Palatalisierung von c, g, qu, gu vor e, i, y, j im Balkanlatein". *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 46, 385–410.
- 1928 "O simbiozi i nestanku starih Romana u Dalmaciji i na Primorju u svijetlu onomastike". *Razprave Znanstvenega društva za humanistične vede v Ljubljani* 4, 1–42.
- 1971 *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika, I*. Zagreb.
- Skubic, Mitja
1988 *Romanski jeziki*. Ljubljana.
- 1989 *Uvod v romansko jezikoslovje*. Ljubljana.
- Stang, Christian S.
1957 *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo.
- Steenwijk, Han
1999 *Grammatica pratica resiana: Il sostantivo*. Padova.
- 2005 *Piccolo dizionario ortografico resiano / Mali bisidnik za tō jošt rozajanskē pisanjē*. Padova.
- Striedter-Temps, Hildegard
1963 *Deutsche Lehnwörter im Slowenischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Šturm, Fran
1927 "Refleksi romanskih palataliziranih konzonantov v slovenskih izposojenkah." *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* 6, 45–85.
- 1928 "Romanska lenizacije medvokaličnih konzonantov in njen pomen za presojo romanskega elementa v slovenščini." *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino* 7, 21–46.
- von Wartburg, Walther
1950 *Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume*. Bern.

O romansko-alpskoslovanskem nadomestnem naglasoslovju
(na primeru predslavanskih substratnih krajevnih imen moškega spola v slovenščini)
(Povzetek)

V prispevku je na primeru predslavanskih substratnih krajevnih imen moškega spola v slovenščini obravnavano romansko-alpskoslovansko nadomestno naglasoslovje, tj. vključevanje romanskih naglasnih prvin v alpskoslovanski naglasni sestav. Na podlagi analize gradiva v obsoškem, nadiškem, terskem in rezijanskem narečju slovenščine je rekonstruiran prvotni alpskoslovanski naglas krajevnih imen *Ahten*, *Beljak*, *Bovec*, *Breginj*, *Čedad*, *Gumin*, *Kobarid*, *Krmin*, *Prosnid*, *Ratenj*, *Solkan*, *Subid*, *Sužid*, *Tolmin*, *Trst*, *Videm*. Romansko-alpskoslovansko naglasno nadomeščanje je primerjano z romansko-primorskoslovanskim (Matasović, On the accentuation of the earliest Latin and Romance loanwords in Slavic, IWoBA 2005).

Predslavanska substratna krajevna imena moškega spola se v alpski slovenščini (slovenščini) podobno kot v primorski slovenščini (hrvaščini) vključujejo v psl. naglasni tip a ali v psl. naglasni tip b, ne pa tudi v psl. naglasni tip c.

Psl. naglasni tip a (sln. *Bəljāk Bəljáka*, *Čəvdād Čəvdáda*, *Koborīd Koborída*, *Prosnīd Prosnída*, *Solkān Solkána*, *Subīd Subída*, **Solžīd* **Solžída*) izkazujejo substr. imena s stalnim naglasom na dolgem samoglasniku v predzadnjem besednem zlogu, kar pomeni, da je bil substr. dolgi naglašeni samoglasnik v alp. sl. prepoznan kot psl. staroakutiran (substr. **Biljāku*, **Čijidāde*, **Silikānu*, **Kaborēdu*, **Silizēdu* → alp. sl. **Bvlāk*, **Čvvdādāv*, **Svbkān*, **Koborīd*, **Svbžīd*), prim. tudi substr. **Kijitāte* → prim. sl. **Čvvtāt* > hr. *Cāvtat Cāvtata*, *Cāptat Cāptata*.

Psl. naglasni tip b (sln. *Bərgīn Bərgína*, **Golmīn* **Golmína*, *Kərmīn Kərmína*, *Tolmīn Tolmína*; *Bōlc Bolcā*/*Bōlc Bōlca*, *Ratēnj Ratenjā*, *Tərst Tərstā*/*Tərst Tərsta*) izkazujejo imena s stalnim naglasom na dolgem in kratkem samoglasniku v predzadnjem besednem zlogu, medtem ko imena s stalnim naglasom na predpredzadnjem besednem zlogu izkazujejo stalni psl. novoakutski naglas na predpredzadnjem zlogu (*Āhtən Āhtna*, *Vīdən Vīdna*). To pomeni, da substr. naglašeni samoglasnik v alp. sl. ni bil prepoznan kot psl. staroakutiran (substr. **Bergōna*, **Glemōna*, **Kormōnes*, **Tilmōn*/**Talamōn*); **Artenja*, **Plitjo*; **Ūdinu* → alp. sl. **Bvrgyn*, **Glymyn*, **Kormyn*, **Tvlmyn*/**Tv/olvmyn*; **Ortēn*, **Blècv*; **Ūydvnt*, **Āxtv/vnt*), prim. tudi substr. *Salōna* → prim. sl. **Solyn* > hr. *Sōlin Solína*.

Zazdaj ostaja neodgovorjeno vprašanje, zakaj je bil substr. dolgi naglašeni samoglasnik v predzadnjem besednem zlogu včasih prepoznan kot psl. staroakutiran in včasih kot psl. nestaroakutiran (substr. **Kaborēdu* → alp. sl. **Koborīd* ~ substr. **Bergōna*, **Ūdinu* → alp. sl. **Bvrgyn*, **Ūydvnt*). V nadaljnjih proučevanjih romansko-slovanskega nadomestnega naglasoslovja bo temu vprašanju potrebno posvetiti posebno pozornost.

The accentuation of *i*-verbs in some Russian dialects:
an innovation that preserves an archaism¹

ALEXANDRA TER-AVANESOVA

This article deals with the accentual systems of *i*-verbs in some Russian dialects in which an innovation in verbal accentuation has taken place: the generalization of stress on the root in the present forms of the verbs of CSL. a. p. b. This innovation occurred in different parts of the Russian territory independently, in the dialects that belong to different accentuation types pointed out in Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев (1990, 1993). In some of these dialects the results of later changes in the accentuation of *i*-verbs, such as the development of accent mobility in the present of *i*-verbs, can be distinguished from the original accent mobility that has been transformed into columnar stress on the root in the present forms.

o Introduction

Some Russian dialects have developed a new accentuation type (a. t.) B* of *i*-verbs: stress on the root (stem) in present forms and in the past passive participle: *хожу*, *ходишь*, etc., *ходжено*, and stress on the suffix *-i-* in past forms and in the infinitive: *ходил*, *ходить*. A. t. B* arises of the verbal accentuation curve of a. p. b, as a result of generalization of "barytonal" accentuation in present forms. In most dialect systems this innovation occurred not only in *i*-verbs, but in all verbal classes. It can be found in *i*-verbs of CSL. a. p. b₁ and, in some dialects, in some *i*-verbs of CSL. a. p. b₂, but never or very rarely in verbs of a. p. c, see Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев (1990) for the reconstruction.

As for the geographical aspect of this innovation, it is attested, to my knowledge, in the north Russian dialects of the Pskov and Novgorod districts; in the dialects of *Педасельга* and *Деревянное* on the south-west coast of Lake Onego (Republic of Karelia); in the Archangelsk District, in *Тамица* and *Кянда* on the southern coast of the White Sea and in *Азаполье* on the Mezen' river. This group of dialects of Novgorodian origin is not particularly closely connected with a rather big dialect area in the south-east of Russia, in the Riazan' and Lipeck districts, where the accentual innovation is attested in dialects that belong to differ-

¹ The author wants to thank Dr Jenny Larsson and Dr Thomas Olander for their useful advices and their help in preparing this text to publication.

ent dialect groups. To the "Riazan' area" belongs the dialect of *Пустошà*, now in the east of the Moscow district.

In most dialects with the transformation a. p. *b* > a. t. B*, four accentuation types are distinguished in *i*-verbs:

A: *морòжу, морòзишь, морòзил, морòжено*

B*: *хòжу, хòдишь, хòдил, хòжено*

B: *кошù, кòсишь, кòсил, кошòдно* and *кòшено*

C: *дою, дойшь, дойл, доёно.*

A. t. B appears in such systems secondarily, due to a number of reasons. In contemporary dialects it is a result of influence of the standard language, as in the dialect of Tamica. In the dialect of Pustosha a. t. B developed as a result of the all-Russian tendency of change of flectional accent (a. t. C) into accent mobility (a. p. B) in the present of *i*-verbs. Anyhow, a. t. B develops later than the transformation a. p. *b* > a. t. B* in all dialectal systems, and it is thus possible to distinguish the earlier class of verbs with mobile accent in the present from the verbs that acquired accent mobility later.

0.1 The developments of the four CSL dialectal accentual types as proposed in Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев (1990, 1993) are found in Russian, most clearly in the archaic forms of the dialects reflected in Old Russian manuscripts. The original systems of accentuation of *i*-verbs have been transformed in standard Russian and its contemporary varieties under different kinds of conditions, so that the CSL accentual dialectal type which a Russian dialectal system of accentuation of *i*-verbs belongs to can be defined with the help of a statistic approach to the distribution of verbs between the accentual types on the background of evidence of the Slavic languages (vs. CSL accentual reconstruction).

A. A. Zaliznjak (1985: 27–29) pointed out the tendencies of stylistic, semantic, morphonological (number of syllables in the root) and grammatical (transitivity) character that determine the accentuation of *i*-verbs in standard Russian. The common tendencies should be actual in the dialects, but stylistic, derivative and semantic factors are difficult to observe in them. In standard Russian, denominatives with specific types of semantic relation to the words they are derived from tend to acquire stress on the ending in present forms (a. t. C: *золотит, застеклит, чернит, молодит*, etc.), and also in the dialects the stress of denominative *i*-verbs often falls on the flexion irrespective of the accentuation of the words they are derived from. In some dialects deadjectival *i*-verbs meaning 'to become somewhat', 'to make something become somewhat' belong to a. t. A (inf. *белить, чёрнить, покрывиться*). The opposite all-Russian tendency is that *i*-verbs with the stress on the ending in present forms (CSL a. t. *c* and partly *b*₂, except certain semantic types of verbs) acquire accent mobility: *солю, солит; тащù, тащит*, etc. In west Russian dialects this tendency is very strong, while eastern dialects,

especially north-eastern, preserve more present forms with the stress on the ending like *солит, тащит*. The isoglosses of the final stress in present forms of *i*-verbs of a. p. *b*₂ and *c* *дарит, тащит, варит, валит, катит, солиù* are shown in *Образование* (1970: 118–125, maps 34, 35); the final stress in the present of these verbs prevails to the east of the line Ладожское озеро – Новгород – Старая Русса – Осташков – Старица – Москва – Тула.

The dialects with the transformation a. p. *b* > a. t. B* possess different systems of reflection of CSL a. t. *b*₁, *b*₂ and *c* in the class of *i*-verbs. In some of them the reflexes of a. t. *b*₁ differ from those of a. t. *b*₂ and *c* (*Pustosha*). In the other dialects a. p. *b*₂ is reflected in two ways, coinciding partly with a. p. *b*₁ and partly with *c*, the different reflexes being dependent on the quality of the root vowel.

In this work the distribution of *i*-verbs of CSL a. p. *b*₁, *b*₂ and *c* between synchronic accentual types in Russian dialects with the transformation a. p. *b* > a. t. B* is studied, together with its dependence on the quality of the root vowel and (partly) of derivative factors.

1 Пустоша

The village of Pustoshà is located in the Moscow district, 180 km eastwards of Moscow. The dialect of the village is included in a group of Middle Russian dialects; it has a north-east dialectal base and a number of features of south Russian origin. From the point of view of (1) the transformation a. p. *b* > a. t. B* in verbal accentuation and (2) the opposition of two *o*-phonemes, the reflexes of CSL. **o* being different in orthotonic and enclimena forms, the dialect of Pustosha may be grouped with the Riazan' (south-east) group of Russian dialects.

In Pustosha there are two slightly different variants of the dialect bound to two big parts of the village: one is reminiscent of the Vladimir type of pronunciation, the other reminds of the Riazan' type. The latter probably originates from the language of the migrants from the Riazan' district who traditionally came to Pustosha and its surroundings to find work. The difference between the two variants may once have been deeper than it is now; anyhow, it becomes apparent in the accentuation of *i*-verbs.

The material given below was gathered during the expeditions in 1992, 2002–2004. Some very important but, unfortunately, also very few examples are taken from D. V. Bubrix's description of the phonetic system of the dialect of Pustosha (1914).

1.1 The accentual types of *i*-verbs in the Pustosha dialect are shown in table 1.

	a. t. A	a. t. B*	a. t. B	a. t. C
pres. 1 sg.	пудмню	хѡжу	кошѹ	дойѹ
2 sg.	пудмниши	худѡиши	куѡсиши	дойиши
3 sg.	пудмнит	худѡит	куѡсит	дойит
1 pl.	пудмним	худѡим	куѡсим	дойим
2 pl.	пудмнитѡи	худѡитѡи	куѡситѡи	дойитѡи
3 pl.	пудмняют	худѡют	куѡсят	дойят
imper. 2 sg.	пудмни	ходѡи	косѡи	дойѡи ~ дои
pret. perf. ptc.	пудмнено	худѡжено	куѡшено~кошѡно	дойѡно
pret. m.	пудмнил	ходѡил	косѡил	дойил
pret. f.	пудмнила	ходѡила	косѡила	дойила
inf.	пудмнить	ходѡить	косѡить	дойить

Table 1

The following deviations from the "standard" accentual curves given in table 1 are found:

- All the verbs that belong to a. t. B* can also be accented as a. t. B.
- 16 verbs can be accented as a. t. B or a. t. C (they are underlined in the lists of verbs given in table 2).
- Four verbs possess mobile accent in the past forms: *простѡить* 'forgive', *пустѡить* 'let', *родѡить* 'give birth', *тащѡить* 'pull'. The past forms of all these verbs can vary between mobile accent and "standard" columnar accent on the suffix. The present forms of *пустѡить* are accented as a. t. B, whereas the present forms of *простѡить*, *родѡить*, *тащѡить* are accented as a. t. C:

пустѡить (pres. a. t. B): pret. m. пѹстил, ѡтпѹстил, пѹстѡилсѡи ~ пѹстѡилси, припѹстѡилси, pl. пѹстили, ѡтпѹстили, не ѡтпѹстили ~ ѡтпѹстѡили, пѹстѡилѡисѡи, припѹстѡилѡисѡи, f. ѡтпѹстѡила, не пѹстѡила, пѹстѡилѡасѡи;
простѡить (pres. a. t. C): pret. m. прѡстѡил ~ прѡстѡил, прѡстѡилсѡи, pl. прѡстѡили ~ прѡстѡили, f. прѡстѡила, прѡстѡилѡасѡи ~ прѡстѡилѡасѡи;
родѡить (pres. a. t. C): pret. m. рѡдил, пѡрѡдил, рѡдилсѡи, pl. рѡдили, пѡрѡдили, рѡдилѡисѡи, f. рѡдила, рѡдилѡасѡи;
тащѡить (pres. a. t. C): pret. m. тѡш'ш'ил, f. тѡш'ш'ила.

It should be noticed that *родѡить* is the only *i*-verb that preserves accent mobility in the past in standard Russian and in most of its varieties. The mobile accent in the past of *пустѡить*, *простѡить*, *тащѡить* is preserved in the dialects to the south and east of Moscow. There are also cases of secondary accent

mobility in past forms of *i*-verbs, as in *i*-verbs with the meaning 'to give birth to' in the dialects near Lake Onego, certainly under the influence of the accentual curve of the verb *родѡить*: f. *родѡила* (about women), *телѡилѡсѡи* (about cows), *щѡнилѡсѡи* (about dogs and wolves), *котѡилѡсѡи* (about cats, goats, sheep), *жерѡбилѡсѡи* (about horses), *порѡсилѡсѡи* (about pigs), *ягнѡилѡсѡи* (about sheep).

4 The accentuation of *ложѡить* 'put' varies (a. t. A~C).

1.2 Data and commentary. Table 2 shows the distribution of *i*-verbs of CSL. a. p. *b*₁, *b*₂, *c* between a. t. B*, B, C in the dialect of Pustosha. In table 2 the verbs are divided into groups with respect of the quality of the root vowel (*o* < **o*, **ѡ*; *u* < **u*, **ѹ*; *oro, olo, ere* < **TORT* groups; *e* < **e*, **ѡ*; *a* < **a*, **ѡ*; **ѡ*; **ѡ*). Verbs without CSL. accentual reconstruction are put in brackets; verbs with variable accentuation are underlined (B ~ C types) or given in bold letters (B* ~ B types).

<i>b</i> ₁ > B*	<i>b</i> ₁ > B	<i>b</i> ₂ > B	<i>c</i> > B	<i>b</i> ₂ > C	<i>c</i> > C
водѡить	*гонѡить	(точитѡить)	покосѡитѡсѡи	<u>коѡтитѡсѡи</u>	(божитѡсѡи)
возѡить	(со)скоѡчитѡить	глѡтитѡить	(ловѡить)	плѡдитѡить	(у)годѡить
носѡить	тоѡмитѡить	(клоѡнитѡить)	морѡить	пѡститѡсѡи	гѡститѡить
ходѡить		коѡтитѡить	станѡвитѡсѡи	<u>соѡчитѡсѡи</u>	говѡритѡить
просѡить		кѡрѡмитѡить	тоѡпитѡить (в водѡе)		грѡзитѡить
ломѡить		коѡтитѡить (гравѹ)			(грѡмитѡить)
(мѡчитѡить)		крѡшитѡить			<u>дойѡить</u>
		(моѡлитѡ(сѡи))			коѡтитѡить (глазѡми)
		(у)ронѡить			(крѡитѡить)
		скоѡблитѡить			крѡпитѡить
		прѡслѡнитѡсѡи			ѡбновѡить
		пѡсобѡить			морѡить
		(стрѡчитѡить)			(поѡитѡить)
		тоѡпитѡить (воск)			прѡститѡить
		творѡить			(рѡститѡить)
		-ворѡить			(соѡлитѡить)
		звѡнитѡить			родѡить
	любѡить	блѹдитѡить	будѡить	курѡить	
	мутѡить	(в)кѡлѡчитѡить	губѡить		
	рубѡить	круѡжитѡить	глуѡшитѡить		
	служѡить	круѡтитѡить	душѡить		
	(по)лѹчитѡить	купѡить	пустѡить		
	(на)стѹпитѡить	куѡситѡить	стѹдитѡить		
		судѡить	суѡить		
		суѡитѡить			
		хѹлитѡить			
волѡчитѡить		(у)корѡтитѡить			(жерѡбитѡсѡи)
колѡтитѡить		(нѡрѡвитѡсѡи)			(порѡситѡсѡи)
мѡлоѡтитѡить		(сторѡнитѡсѡи)			(прѡчерѡзитѡсѡи)
		хѡронѡить			
		ворѡшитѡить			

женить(ся)	селить(ся)		крестить(ся)	(шевельться)
	телиться		стеклить	(щениться)
(о)травить	давить	гасить	катить(ся)	валить
хвалить	дразнить	дарить	палить	варить
	рядить(ся)	(манить)	(тащить)	(садить(ся))
	(хватить)	платить		святить
				сластить
	белишь	(ценить)	следить	(кипятить)
	(беситься)	делить		навестить
	гнездиться	(лечить)		(лениться)
	заменить	лепить		(клеить)
	зацепить			
		чинить	лишить	дивить(ся)
			пилить	

Table 2

It can be seen from table 2 that the majority of the *i*-verbs belong to **a. t. B**. **A. t. B** involves *i*-verbs of CSL. a. p. *b*₁, *b*₂, *c*. There are verbs with variable accentuation: **B*** ~ **B**, **C** ~ **B**, but never **B*** ~ **C**; thus it may be assumed that a. t. **B** has spread in the dialect and now, at least in some cases, it stands for earlier a. t. **B*** or **C**. The change a. t. **C** → **B** presumably took place as a result of the all-Russian tendency towards accent mobility in the present. One of the reasons of the change a. t. **B*** → **B** can be the influence of the standard language: since the beginning of the 20th century the number of verbs of a. t. **B*** has reduced and some of them entered a. t. **B**, as can be seen from the comparison of the data recorded by D. V. Bubrix in 1913 and a century later.

In the Pustosha dialect to **a. t. B*** belong:

- some *i*-verbs of CSL. a. p. *b*₁; in my material they are seven (*водить*, *возить*, *волочить*, *ломить*, *носить*, *просить*, *ходить*), three more are taken from Bubrix's description (*мочить*, *молотить*, *колотить*);
- verbs of CSL. a. p. *b* of other classes: *хотеть*, *тонуть*, *метать*, *махать*, *пахать*, *сказать*, *скакать* (Bubrix 1914);
- Bubrix also gives forms of *i*-verbs *гасить* (*c*), *крошить* (*b*₂), *ловить* (*c*), *платить* (*c*), *строчить* (*c*), *хватить* (*b*₂) that point to a. t. **B***. In the present-day dialect, a. t. **B*** in groups (b), (c) is not attested; all these verbs belong to a. t. **B**. Thus a. t. **B*** now involves only frequently used iterative *i*-verbs that belong to CSL. a. p. *b*₁.

Verbs of CSL. a. p. *b* (together with iterative *i*-verbs of a. p. *b*₁) are supposed to be the nucleus of a. t. **B*** in the dialect of Pustosha. The examples of a. t. **B*** of *i*-verbs like *гасить* (group *c*) find different explanations, and it seems most likely to regard them as results of the influence of the south-east dialects of the Riazan' district. As can be seen from the short list of data given below, in the Novoselki

dialect these verbs belong to a. t. **B***. The examples in question could even be heard by Bubrix from the migrants from the Riazan' district.

A. t. B stands for CSL. a. p. *b*₂ and *c*, independently of the quality of the root vowel. As for a. p. *b*₂, it usually changes into a. t. **B** if the root vowel is *o*, *u*, *oro*, *e*; the verbs of a. p. *c* show the highest percentage of change to a. t. **B** in the same positions. In the case of *a*, *i* and reflexes of **ě* in the root, a. t. **B** and **C** are attested in an equal amount of verbs of both CSL. a. p. *b*₂ and *c*.

A. t. C is attested in a group of denominative verbs independently of the reconstructed CSL. a. p. and in a group of verbs of CSL. a. p. *b*₂ and *c*.

i-verbs with accent mobility in the past provide more evidence of the originally common accentuation of *i*-verbs of a. p. *b*₂ and *c*. Both verbs of CSL. a. t. *b*₂ and *c* preserve accent mobility in the past and reflexes of enclitomena forms indicated by wide /o/ < *o: *отпустил*, *простили*, *родили*, *породил*. It may be thus supposed that the accentuation of *i*-verbs of a. t. *b*₂ and a. t. *c* originally was the same, and that it was the mobile type (**C**).

Thus in the Pustosha dialect a system of accentuation of *i*-verbs of the "eastern" (4th) type (Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев 1990: 109–121, 136–137) may be supposed: a. p. *b*₁ > a. t. **B** > a. t. **B***, a. p. *b*₂, *c* > a. t. **C** > a. t. **B**, **C**; see table 3.

CSL. stage	stage 1	stage 2	contemporary stage
a. p. <i>b</i> ₁	a. t. B	a. t. B*	a. t. B*
a. p. <i>b</i> ₂ , <i>c</i>	a. t. C	a. t. C	a. t. C , B

Table 3

1.3 Accentuation of *i*-verbs in the dialect of Pustosha and distribution of *o*-phonemes.

In Pustosha, as well as in the Novoselki dialect, there is an opposition of two *o*-phonemes, narrow (diphthongal) /uo/ and wide (monophthongal) /o/, distributed in accordance with the rule that was formulated by Васильев (1929) and Шахматов (1914) and reformulated by Зализняк (1985: 172–176): /uo/ stands for accented **o* in the orthotonic forms, /o/ stands for accented **o* in the enclitomena forms, **o*, **o*, **e*. In Russian dialects there are deviations from this principle which may be explained by analogy, and a number of forms and classes of forms in which this rule does not work because of recent changes in accentuation. In the latter, as well as in loan-words, both /o/ and /uo/ are pronounced.

Standard reflexes of accented **o* in the roots of *i*-verbs are shown in table 1.

- In the root of *i*-verbs of **a. t. A** we find /uo/ < **o* in accordance with the rule of Vasiljev–Shakhmatov: 1 sg. (*не*) *пудню*; pret. m. *куднчыл*, f. *закуднчыла*; 3 pl. *готудвоуца*, pret. pl. *приготудвилисе*; pret. pl. *спудрили*; inf. *забудтиць*; *рзострудили*. Wide /o/ in pret. pl. *уничтджыли* must be a result of anal-

ogy with *што* < *čšto. Cf. the reflexes of *ʔ: 1 sg. брѡшу, 2 sg. брѡсиш; 3 sg. нѡртициць; part. p. п. нирепѡлнин.

- b In the root of *i*-verbs of a. t. B* we find narrow /uo/ < *o in the 2–3 sg. and 1–3 pl. forms in accordance with the rule of Vasiljev–Shakhmatov, but in the 1 sg. we usually find wide /o/ (the standard reflex of *o in enclitomena forms); the single exception is underlined in my material given below:

1 sg. вѡжу ~ вожу́, 3 sg. вудѡдит; 1 sg. вѡжу ~ вожу́, 3 sg. вудѡзит, 3 pl. вудѡзют, pret. pl. привозили; 1 sg. спрѡшу, 3 pl. спрудѡсит, 1 sg. прошу́, 3 sg. прудѡсит; 1 sg. нѡшу ~ ношу́, 3 sg. нудѡсит, отнудѡсициць, part. p. p. f. нудѡшѣнѣ одѣжа; 1 sg. хѡжу ~ хожу́, не хѡжу, выхѡжу, 3 sg. худѡдит, 3 pl. прохудѡют, нахудѡют, inf. ходѡить, pret. m. ходѡил, f. сходилѡ, part. pres. act. n. нипроходѡимо; 1 sg. вѡлочу́ ~ волѡчу, 3 sg. волудѡчит; 1 sg. отлудѡмлю ~ ѡтлудѡлю, 3 sg. отлудѡмит, отлудѡмит.

Bubrix usually adduces the 1 sg. forms with narrow /uo/ < *o: 1 sg. vidži, niđši, xiđži, nastrѡci piđmiđ, zatiđci, toliđci, pakoliđci, xiđci, tiđni. Narrow /uo/ is found in 1 sg. in south-east Riazan' dialects (see data from Novoselki below) and it fits the explanation of the root stress in the 1 sg. as analogical.

The difference in vocalization in the 1 sg. (*нудѡшу* ~ *нѡшу*) seems to correspond with two variants of the dialect spoken in the village of Pustosha. The pronunciation *нудѡшу* belongs to the variant that probably originates from the language of the migrants from Riazan'; this variant was widely spoken at the time of Bubrix's expedition but now it is almost forgotten. Today the pronunciation *нѡшу* prevails; it belongs to the primordial dialect of Pustosha.

Wide /o/ in 1 sg. (*вѡжу*, *нѡшу*) cannot be a reflex of circumflex intonation; it should be explained as "unmarked" *o* pronounced under the new stress.

- c The quality of the *o*-phoneme in the root of *i*-verbs of a. p. *b*₂ and *c* indicates the late emergence of their root stress in present forms (a. t. B).

In verbs of a. t. B we find narrow /uo/ < *o in most cases in forms with root stress; it can be explained by analogy with verbs of a. t. B*: 1 sg. прѣгоню́, 3 sg. прогудѡнит; 1 sg. нѣклоню́ся, 3 sg. поклудѡнициць, наклудѡнит, наклудѡнициць; 1 sg. кѣлочу́, 3 pl. околудѡтют; 1 sg. коплю́, 3 sg. кудѡнит, накудѡнит, 1 pl. кудѡним; 1 sg. укѣрочу́, 3 sg. укорудѡтит, pret. f. укѣротѡила; 1 sg. кошу́, 2 sg. кудѡсиш, 3 sg. кудѡсит, 3 pl. кудѡсют, pret. m. косѡил; покудѡсициць, pret. m. нѣкосѡилси; 1 sg. (зѣ)мочу́, 3 sg. (за)мудѡчит, pret. f. зѣмочѡылѣ; 1 sg. молю́ся, 3 sg. мудѡлициць; 1 sg. мѣлочу́, 3 sg. молудѡтит, 1 pl. молудѡтим, pret. f. мѣлотѡйлѣ; 2 sg. замудѡрисиш, pret. f. зѣморѡилѣся; 1 sg. нѣровлю́сь, 3 sg. нѡрудѡвициць, inf. нѣровѡициць 'be slow; be lazy'; 1 sg. ѡброню́, 3 sg. обрудѡнит, урудѡнит, pret. f. уронѡила; 1 sg. скоблю́, 3 sg. скудѡблит, 3 pl. онскудѡблит; 1 sg. сѣскочу́, 3 sg. соскудѡчит; 3 sg. прислудѡнициць; 3 sg. смудѡлит; 3 pl. посудѡбют; 3 sg. останудѡвициць; 3 sg. нѣсторудѡнициць; 3 sg. ниретудѡмициць, потудѡмит 'stew', утудѡмициць 'get tired'; 1 sg. топлю́,

3 sg. тудѡнит, 1 pl. тудѡним, 3 pl. тудѡнят 'fire', 'melt', 'sink'; 1 sg. точу́, 3 pl. тудѡчут, inf. точѡить; 1 sg. нѣтворю́, 3 sg. натвудѡрит биѣт; 1 sg. ѣтворю́, 3 sg. отвудѡрит; 1 sg. хѣроню́, хѣроню́сь, 1 pl. хорудѡнимси, 3 pl. хорудѡнют, схорудѡнют, нѣхорудѡнют, part. p. pass., f. нѣхорудѡнена; 1 sg. нѣвѣрошу́, 3 sg. нѣворудѡшит; 1 sg. нѣзвоню́, 3 sg. позвудѡнит.

Narrow /uo/ < *o is also found in the case of accentual variation (a. t. B* ~ C): 1 sg. нѣбожѡсь, 3 sg. побудѡжѡициць ~ божѡициць; 3 sg. угудѡит ~ угудѡдит, пригудѡициць; 1 sg. грѡжу́, 3 sg. погрудѡзит ~ (нѣ)грѡзит; 3 sg. кронѡит ~ крудѡнит; 1 sg. поѡю́, 3 sg. пудѡит ~ поѡит, imp. напоѡ ~ напоѡй; 3 sg. сочѡициць ~ судѡчициць; 3 sg. солѡит ~ судѡлит.

The late emergence of root stress in present forms of *i*-verbs of a. p. *b*₂ and *c*, and the analogical character of /uo/ < *o in the root are proved by the following facts:

- a /uo/ is found not only in the place of *o, but also *a (3 sg. заплудѡтит, 3 pl. посудѡют, past perf. part. посудѡженный) and *ʔ in *TRBT groups (3 sg. крудѡшит, прогудѡтит);
- b in some roots of verbs of a. t. B and B ~ C, wide /o/ is pronounced (*лѡвит*, *дѡит*, *кѡтицица* 'give birth' (about sheep)); it may be explained by analogy with enclitomena forms or as pronunciation of *o* under the new stress;
- c in the case of *ложѡить* both root accentuation and wide /o/ can be explained as developed by analogy with enclitomena forms: 1 sg. розлѡжу, полѡжу ~ нѣложу́, 2 sg. ни полѡжѡиш, 3 sg. полѡжѡит, pret. m. полѡжѡил, f. полѡжѡила, полѡжѡылѣ ~ нѣложѡылѣ, part. p.p. полѡжѡнѣ, как полѡжѡнѣ, imp. нѣложѡ ~ полѡи, inf. полѡжѡить.

2 Новоселки

The data from Novoselki (Riazan' district) are given for comparison with those from Pustosha. It is left almost without commentaries because there is too little material. It is taken from texts pronounced by people in the eighties and nineties; perhaps owing to that, a. t. B is not attested at all and three a. t. are present. Some examples were taken from the report by F. M. Ton'shin (1912).

2.1 Accentual types in the dialect of Novoselki are shown in table 4.

	A	B*	C
pres. 1 sg.	пудѡмнѡу	худѡ'у	цѡдѡ'у
2 sg.	пудѡмнѡиш	худѡ'иш	цѡдѡ'иш
3 sg.	пудѡмнѡит'	худѡ'ит'	цѡдѡ'ит'
1 pl.	пудѡмнѡим	худѡ'им	цѡдѡ'им
2 pl.	пудѡмнѡит'а	худѡ'ит'а	цѡдѡ'ит'а

3 pl.	<i>пудмн'ут'</i>	<i>хуод'ут'</i>	<i>цуд'ат'</i>
imper. 2 sg.	<i>пудмн'и</i>	<i>хад'и</i>	<i>цуд'и</i>
pret. m.	<i>пудмн'ил</i>	<i>хад'ил</i>	<i>цуд'ил</i>
pret. f.	<i>пудмн'ила</i>	<i>хад'ила</i>	<i>цуд'ила</i>
inf.	<i>пудмн'ит'</i>	<i>хад'ит'</i>	<i>цуд'ит'</i>

Table 4

2.2 Data. Table 5 shows the distribution of *i*-verbs of CSL. a. p. *b*₁, *b*₂, *c* between a. t. B* and C in the dialect of Novoselki. The verbs are divided into groups with respect to the quality of the root vowel (*o* < **o*, **o*; **o*; *u* < **u*, **o*; *oro*, *olo*, *ere* < **TORT* groups; *e* < **e*, **b*; *a* < **a*, **e*; **ě*; **i*).

<i>b</i> ₁ > B*	<i>b</i> ₂ > B*	<i>b</i> ₂ > C	<i>c</i> > B*	<i>c</i> > C
<i>бродить</i>	(<i>божиться</i>)		<i>становить</i>	<i>поить</i>
<i>водить</i>	<i>отворить</i>			<i>доить</i>
<i>возить</i>	<i>молиться</i>			<i>родить</i>
* <i>гонить</i>	<i>крошить</i>			(<i>вопить</i>)
<i>ходить</i>	<i>кормить</i>			
<i>носить</i>				
<i>просить</i>				
<i>волочить</i>	<i>хоронить</i>			(<i>колоситься</i>)
<i>молотить</i>	(<i>пороситься</i>)			
<i>колотить</i>				
<i>служить</i>	<i>курить</i>		<i>будить</i>	
			<i>учиться</i>	
	<i>нарядить</i>	(<i>тащить</i>)	<i>платить</i>	<i>валить</i>
	<i>хватить</i>	<i>катить</i>		<i>варить</i>
				<i>дарить</i>
				(<i>шалить</i>)
	<i>зацепить</i>	<i>белить</i>	<i>лепить</i>	<i>цедить</i>
				<i>цемить</i>
		<i>пилить</i>		(<i>дымить</i>)

Table 5

It may be noticed that a. t. B* in Novoselki dialect corresponds to a. t. B* and B in the dialect of Pustosha. In Novoselki all the attested verbs of a. p. *b*₁ belong to a. t. B*, as do the majority of the verbs of a. t. *b*₂ and a number of verbs of a. p. *c*, irrespective of the quality of a root vowel. To a. t. C belong verbs of a. p. *c* with all kinds of vowels in the root and verbs of a. t. *b*₂ with a CSL. long root vowel (**a*,

**ě*, **i* in the material). All attested verbs with [u] in the root (both a. p. *b*₂ and *c*) belong to a. t. B*. Original and "new" accent mobility are not distinguished in the dialect of Novoselki.

The view of the development of a. t. B* as analogical is supported by the absence of consonant alternations in the present of *i*-verbs:

- a. t. B – 1 sg. *бруд'у*, 3 sg. *бруд'ит'*; 1 sg. *н'ь разб'уд'у*, 3 sg. *разб'уд'ит'*; 1 sg. *зац'уеп'у*, 3 sg. *зац'уеп'ит'*; 1 sg. *к'ор'м'у*, 3 sg. *к'ор'м'ит'*; 1 sg. *кр'ут'у*, 1 pl. *кр'ут'им*; 1 sg. *н'е худ'у*, 2 sg. *схуд'иши*;
a. t. C – 1 sg. *пр'яц'ид'у*, 3 sg. *ц'ид'ит'*; 1 sg. *н'ь дым'у*, 3 sg. *дым'ит'*.

3 Тамица

The village of Tàmica is situated on the southern coast of the White Sea in the Onega Region, Archangelsk District. The dialect belongs to the *поморская группа* of North Russian: it originates from one of the medieval dialects of Velikij Novgorod, later influenced by east Russian dialects. The transformation a. p. *b* > a. t. B* in verbal accentuation is known in the dialect of Tamica and three neighboring villages. A. t. B* is attested in all verbal classes.

The data were recorded from a 72 year old woman who had lived in the town of Onega since she was 16 and returned to her native village at an age of 60. Now she speaks "town language" with the members of her family, but with the people of her age in Tamica she speaks her mother dialect. She liked the idea of accenting the wordforms "as old people in Tamica would do", did it accurately, but still gave many variations surely caused by the influence of "town language".

3.1 Accentual types of *i*-verbs in the Tamica dialect are given in table 6:

	A	B*	B	C
pres. 1 sg.	<i>мор'ожу</i>	<i>х'ожу</i>	<i>хвал'у</i>	<i>вар'у</i>
2 sg.	<i>мор'оз'иши</i>	<i>х'од'иши</i>	<i>хвал'иши</i>	<i>вар'иши</i>
3 sg.	<i>мор'оз'ит</i>	<i>х'од'ит</i>	<i>хвал'ит</i>	<i>вар'ит</i>
1 pl.	<i>мор'оз'им</i>	<i>х'од'им</i>	<i>хвал'им</i>	<i>вар'им</i>
2 pl.	<i>мор'оз'ит'е</i>	<i>х'од'ит'е</i>	<i>хвал'ит'е</i>	<i>вар'ит'е</i>
3 pl.	<i>мор'оз'ат</i>	<i>х'од'ат</i>	<i>хвал'ат</i>	<i>вар'ат</i>
pret. perf. ptc.	<i>мор'ожено</i>	<i>х'ожено</i>	<i>хвал'ено</i>	<i>вар'ено</i>
			~ <i>загор'ож'дно</i>	
pret. m.	<i>мор'оз'ил</i>	<i>х'од'ил</i>	<i>хвал'ил</i>	<i>вар'ил</i>
inf.	<i>мор'оз'ит'</i>	<i>х'од'ит'</i>	<i>хвал'ит'</i>	<i>вар'ит'</i>

Table 6

3.2 Data and commentary. Table 7 shows the distribution of *i*-verbs of CSL. a. p. b_1, b_2, c between a. t. B^*, B, C in the dialect of Tamica. In table 7 the verbs are divided into groups with respect to the quality of the root vowel ($u < *u; u < *q; o < *o; o < *b; oro, olo, ere < *TORT$ groups; $e < *e; e < *b; e < *ě; a < *a, *ę; *i; *y$). Verbs without CSL. accentual reconstruction are put in brackets. Verbs with variable accentuation in the present are given in **bold** letters ($B^* \sim C$); the variations in past p. participles are not taken into account. Denominatives or verbs correlated semantically with nouns are underlined. The variation of a. t. $B^* \sim B$ found in some of the verbs in the two left columns is not reflected in the table: the informant explained it as a distinction of “old” and “new, modern” kinds of speech.

The verbs *телиться*, *жеребиться*, *котиться* are not used in the 1 sg. and are included into a. t. B arbitrarily.

$b_1 > B^*$	$b_2, c > B^*$	$b_2 > C$	$c > C$	B
лунить	ключить		глушить	
любить	купить		(крушить)	
служить	курить		студить	
	<u>трудиться</u>		сушить	
	тушить		(очутиться)	
	пустить <i>c</i>			
(по)лучить	(грузить)	дубить		кружить b_2
рубить	крутить	тужить		(мутить $b_1?$)
ступить	(откусить)			
	<u>судить</u>			
бродить	клонить	звонить	доить	копить b_2
водить	обронить	косить (косой)	говорить	котиться b_2
возить	скоблить	плодить	годить	родить <i>c</i>
гонить	топить (печь)	<u>поститься</u>	гостить	
ломить	(точить)	творить (тесто)	грозить	
носить	становить <i>c</i>	-творить (дверь)	ловить	
просить		(томить b_1)	морить	
скокить			(розорить)	
ходить			поить	
			простить	
			(солить)	
			топить (в воде)	
			(вопить)	(одолжить)
проглотить	<u>дождить</u>		(долбить)	
кормить	<u>крошить</u>		<u>скорбить</u>	

волочить	торопить	ворожить	(пороситься)	(городить)
колотить	хоронить	<u>голосить</u>	(полошить)	(золотить)
молотить		нереститься		<u>жеребиться</u> b_2
		оперeditь		
		сторожить		
		терebить		
		воротить		
	селить(ся)		веселить	женить b_1
			(щениться)	<u>телиться</u> b_2
				(сердиться)
		крестить		
		<u>мертвить</u>		
		гнездиться	лепить	
		(грезить)	(лечить)	
		крепить	<u>слепить</u>	
		(лениться)	<u>светить</u>	
		решить	(местить <i>a</i>)	
		<u>следить</u>		
		смешить		
		(спешиить)		
	дразнить	(тащить)	варить	(манить)
	катить	палить	гасить	хвалить b_1
			калить	(хватить)
			платить	явить <i>c</i>
			(садить)	
			таить	
			(отравить)	
			(хранить)	
		рядить	<u>святить</u>	
		лишить	<u>винить</u>	
		пилить	<u>мирить</u>	
		стыдить		

Table 7

Table 7 shows that almost all verbs of a. t. b_1 belong to a. t. B^* . Exceptions: *томить* C , *женить* B , *хвалить* B , *мутить* B .

A. p. *c* is well preserved independently of the quality of the root vowel and is in most cases reflected as a. t. C . Exceptions: *пустить* B^* , *становиться* B^* , *явить* B , *родить* B .

A. t. B may be regarded as a variation of a. t. B^* , a result of influence of “town language”, because (a) the distribution of verbs relative to the quality of the root vowel is more or less the same in a. t. B^* and B ; (b) some verbs of a. p. b_1 belong to a. t. B (*женить*, *хвалить*, *мутить?*).

A. p. b_2 is generally reflected as a. t. B^* (and B) in the case of root vowel [u] < $*u, *q$. A few examples with [e] < $*e$ may be added to this group (*селиться* B^* , *телиться* B). There are no examples of a development a. p. $b_2 > a. t. B^*$ if the root vowels are [e] < $*ě$, [a] < $*ę$, [i], [y]; in these positions we find the development of

a. p. $b_2 > a$. t. C; the difficulty is that 10 of 13 verbs are denominatives that usually tend to acquire a. t. C. Verbs of CSL. a. p. b_2 with roots of *TORT structure tend towards a. t. C. The amount of verbs of a. p. $b_2 > a$. t. B* (B) and a. p. $b_2 > a$. t. C is almost equal if the root vowels are [a] and [o], but among the verbs with [o] in the root that belong to a. t. C there are denominatives.

The same distribution is presented by the accentuation of past p. participles of *i*-verbs as shown in table 8. Most of the participles are taken from the resultative constructions in which they are used as predicates. The accentuation of participles is columnal in all accent types:

A: морóжен, морóжена, морóжено, морóжены;

B*: хóжен, хóжена, хóжено, хóжены;

C: сушóн, сушóна, сушóно, сушóны.

In table 8 the accentuation of *en*-participles is shown in correlation with the accentuation of present forms and CSL. a. p. of the verbs. *i*-verbs with accentual variation in the present are underlined; deviations of the accentuation of participles from that of present forms are given in bold letters.

$b_1 > B^*$	$b_2, c > B^*$	$b_2 > C$	$c > C$	B
ун'егó ар'м'ийа	кúпл'ено		наглушóно	
отслу́жена	запу́шчены, -а		роскрушóно	
	нау́ц'еной		роскрушóно	
	уц'óной		<u>отсту́жен</u>	
	фкл'уч'óна		насушано	
	кúпл'ено		насушóно	
	<u>накур'ено</u>		пр'исушóна	
	п'ер'атружены			
полúц'ена	нагружена	надубл'óно		
нарúбл'ены	укушано			
срубл'ена	откушан			
	осу́жен			
	осу́жд'он			
	настúпл'ено			
вóжено	наклон'óна	позвóн'ено	дойóна	наклóпл'ено
отлóмл'он	урóн'ен	<u>н'е кошóно</u>	наговор'óно	рóжен
нанóшено	<u>соскóбл'ено</u>	<u>наплóжно</u>	налóвл'оно	
спрóшено	<u>натóпл'ено</u>	роствор'óно	умор'óной	
соскóц'ено	<u>натóц'ены</u>	ц'óд натвор'óно	обновл'óно	
хóжено	останóвл'ен	утомл'óна	розор'óно	
		заостр'óно	н'е пойóна	
			гр'ех'и прошчóны	
			гр'ибы осол'óны	
			<u>утол'óны</u>	
	<u>проглóц'ана</u>	накрошóно		
	накóрмл'ен			

приволóц'ено	похорóн'ена	пр'иворóжна	загорóжно
пр'иколóц'ена		от'ер'ебл'óно	озолóц'ена была
помолóц'ено		отворóц'ена	
		ты окр'еишчóна	жен'он был
		пр'икр'епл'óно	рос'с'ёржен
		закр'епл'ено	<u>пол'еч'он</u>
		реишóн	пр'ил'епл'óно
		насл'еждóно	пом'ешишóны
		стайшчóно	навар'óно
		опал'óно	погашóно
			нахва́л'ен
			схва́ц'ены
			заплóц'ено
			досáжны
			<u>посажóны, -о</u>
			утайóно
			отравл'он
		л'ишóн	
		нап'ил'óно	

Table 8

Thus in the dialect of Tamica with 5-phoneme vocalism and no phonetic (synchronic) difference between the reflexes of **e*, **ь* and **ě*, **o* and **ъ*, the accentuation of *i*-verbs is correlated with the quality of the root vowel, so that [e] < **ě* and [e] < **e* in the root have different effects on the accentuation. Further, the reflexes of **ě* have the same accentuation effect as reflexes of some other CSL. long vowels do (**i*, **y*, **or*). This accentuation effect (stress on the suffix -*i* in present forms of CSL. a. p. b_2) can be connected with CSL. long root vowel, in spite of the fact that in the present-day dialect the reflexes of CSL. long labial vowels and **a*, **ę* do not behave as long. The reflexes of **u* and **ǫ* show the accentuation effect of short vowels, perhaps due to their "proper" phonetic shortness, even more consequently than the reflexes of **o* and **ъ*. The accentuation of *i*-verbs in Tamica may be regarded as a development of the system of the 2nd type (Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев 1990); this conclusion conforms to the Novgorodian origin of the dialect.

Russian Academy of Sciences
Institute for Russian language

References

- Бубрих, Д. В.
1914 "Фонетические особенности говора д. Пустоша". *Известия ОРЯС* 1913, т. 18, кн. 4, 305–346. Санкт-Петербург.
- Васильев, Л. Л.
1929 *О значении каморы в некоторых древнерусских памятниках XVI–XVII вв. К вопросу о произношении звука о в великорусском наречии*. Ленинград.
- Дыбо, В. А., Г. И. Замятина & С. Л. Николаев
1990 *Основы славянской акцентологии*. Москва.
1993 *Основы славянской акцентологии. Словарь. Непроизводные основы мужского рода*. Москва.
- Зализняк, А. А.
1985 *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*. Москва.
- Образование
1970 *Образование севернорусского наречия и среднерусских говоров*. Москва.
- Тоньшин, Ф. М.
1912 "Материалы по Рязанской губ. и у. Новосельской в. с. Новоселки". *Русский филологический вестник*, т. 68, №3.
- Шахматов, А. А.
1914 "Описание Лекинского говора Егорьевского уезда Рязанской губернии" *Известия ОРЯС* 1913, т. 18, кн. 4, 171–220. Санкт-Петербург.

Tone in Latvian borrowings from Old Russian

STEVEN YOUNG

On the basis of examples such as Latv. *muōka* 'torment' < Ru. *мýка* (SCr. *mŭka*), Latv. *bēda* 'care, worry; grief, sorrow' < Ru. *бѣда* (SCr. *bijēda*), Latv. *grēda* 'pile, heap; flower bed' < Ru. *грядá* (SCr. *grēda*, acc. sg. *grēdu*), representing accent paradigms (a), (b), and (c) respectively, Endzelin 1913 has argued that in the numerous Latvian borrowings from Old Russian, Slavic rising tone is reflected as Latvian sustained tone and Slavic falling tone as Latvian falling tone (p. 118).

In addressing Endzelin's conclusions, Lehr-Spławiński 1918: 261f. objects to ascribing Common Slavic rising and falling tones to the Old Russian source of the Latvian borrowings,¹ arguing that the Latvian tonal distinctions reflect instead the place of stress within the Russian originals: borrowings with sustained tone correspond to Russian words with initial stress (*grāmata* 'book': *грáмомa*), while in borrowings with falling tone the stress has been shifted, in comparison with Russian, to the initial syllable: *grēda*: *грядá*, *bēda*: *бѣда*. This stress shift took place within Latvian after the time of the borrowings (p. 262). Forms such as *grēks* 'sin' < *грѣхъ* are not seen as counterexamples, since the Russian stem is oxytonic: gen. sg. *грѣхá*. At least two examples of mobile bases do, however, present a problem for Lehr-Spławiński's approach, as he himself acknowledges (p. 262): *svēts* 'holy' < Ru. *святъ* (he assumes the influence of the polysyllabic *svētīt* < Ru. *святúть* here) and *vēsts* 'news' < Ru. *вѣсть*. These show Latvian falling tone corresponding to what Lehr-Spławiński assumes to be stressed syllables in the Russian source forms (we would now recognize these, following Jakobson 1963: 161, as enclinenomen forms).

In his reply to Lehr-Spławiński (1922b), which seems to have been the last word on the subject (except for summaries such as Kiparsky 1948: 44), Endzelin reiterates his earlier views, noting that a Latvian falling tone reflecting pretonic position in Russian is phonetically implausible; if anything, one would expect rising tone. And since the old quantitative distinctions were obviously preserved, there is no reason for rejecting tonal distinctions for this period.

¹ "Niema więc żadnej podstawy do wniosków co do zachowania dawnych stosunków intonacyjnych na gruncie ruskim w chwili zapożyczenia odnośnych wyrazów" (p. 263).

Below I review the relevant data to see what conclusions can in fact be drawn regarding the prosodic system of Russian at the time of the borrowings. But first a few words about the time frame and cultural context of these borrowings. The words were borrowed into a (presumably eastern) dialect of Latvian which still distinguished sustained and falling (together with broken) tones; this dialect area now merges sustained and falling tones (in opposition to broken tone). Although the Latvian words in question are generally said to come from “Old Russian,” we can be more specific as to their time, place, and source. The Slavs with whom the early Latvians would have come into contact in the several centuries before the rise of German political and cultural dominance in the 13th century were the Kriviči of the Pskov-Polotsk region, a fact which Endzelin emphasized as early as 1899 (p. 81).² The Kriviči first appeared in this area, which was formerly Baltic, in the 7th and 8th centuries (Xaburgaev 1979: 110). Latvian-Russian (Krivič) contacts later intensified as trade routes became established along the Gauja river, from Scandinavia through Latvian territory to Pskov and Novgorod (Semēnova 1966: 10), and on the Western Dvina (Daugava) along the “*путь из варягъ в греки*.” Some of the Russian (Krivič) lexical items which passed into Latvian result from this trade: *bagāts* (богатый), *mērs* (мера), *puods* (пуд), *tuīta* (мыто), *birkavs* (берковец). With the 10th-century baptism of Russia, religious terminology also made its way into Latvian; among such terms presented below are *baznīca* (божница), *grēks* (грѣх), *svēts* (святой), *pedēļa* (недѣля), *karogs* (хоругвь), *svētki* (святки) (Semēnova *loc. cit.*). With the 13th-century conquest of Livonia by the Germans, contact between the Russians and Latvians wanes (and loanwords decrease) until the 19th century (Endzelin 1899: 82), so the 13th century serves as a *terminus ad quem* for our early borrowings.

The phonetic features of the local Russian reflected in these pre-13th-century Latvian borrowings reflect a rather archaic state (Nikolaev-Xelimskiĭ 1990): original vowel length is preserved in the Russian source (i. e., there are no polysyllabic shortenings, a point emphasized by Endzelin 1913: 118 and Stang 1957: 52f.): Latv. *grāmata* < *грамота* (itself a fairly late borrowing from Gr. γράμματα: Jakobson 1963: 158); jers are preserved as high vowels in both strong and weak position: Latv. *kurts* ‘greyhound’ < *хвртъ*; Russian *u* (represented in later Latvian borrowings as *ū* and still later as *u*) appears as Latvian *uo*, reflecting a stage when this vowel was still a long closed **ō* in both languages: Latv. *tuoka* ‘torment’ < **tōka* < **tōka* (Ru. *мука*; a parallel case with *-ie-* from **ē*, modern Russian *i*, may perhaps be found in Latv. *kriev-* ‘Russian’: Ru. *кривич-*: Endzelin 1952: 444); the situation preceding East Slavic pleophony is still found: Latv. *kalps* ‘servant; farm hand’ < **холпъ*, mod. Ru. *холоп*. Among specifically Krivič features in the Latvian borrowings are the presence of *цоканье* (seen in Latv. *silvēks* ‘person’:

2 The Latvian ethnonym *krievs* ‘Russian’ (Ru. *krivič* is a patronymic formed on this base) was presumably first used in reference to this population and later extended to all Russians.

Ru. *человѣкъ*) and an open pronunciation of *-ē-* (*ъ*), reflected in the borrowings as *-ē-*: Latv. *bēda* ‘care, worry; grief, sorrow’: Ru. *бѣда* (later Latvian borrowings have *-ie-*).³ ORu. *-ā-* (*я*) from Slavic **ę* is borrowed with the same open vowel: Latv. *svēts* ‘holy’: Ru. *святъ*. Prosodic features of this dialect will emerge from the presentation below.

The following material is arranged according to the stress placement and accentual paradigm of the Russian source. I limit myself to the more reliable borrowings suspected of being pre-13th century; forms of uncertain origin (native or borrowed?) like Latv. *ālava*, *ālavica* ‘dry cow’ (ME I 237–38): Ru. *яловица*; Latv. *dārgs* ‘dear’ (ME I 448): Ru. *дорог* are omitted. The entries are cited for the most part as they appear in Mühlenbach-Endzelin (ME), still the most authoritative source, with additional references to Karulis 2001 (the translations from the Latvian are mine) and Endzelin 1913; comparanda from other languages are cited as they appear in the original reference. The accentual paradigms of the Old Russian source forms are cited according to Zaliznjak 1985, with occasional references to Kiparsky 1962 and (for Proto-Slavic) to Dybo 1981 and 1990. I assume throughout that, since Latvian does not show prosodic alternations throughout a paradigm, the borrowed forms reflect the prosodic characteristics of a single word-form, the nominative singular (as the psychologically most basic form) in instances where the Old Russian source word has a complex accentual curve.

I. Russian stressed long syllables (vowels and diphthongs) are represented in Latvian borrowings by sustained tone.

Ia. Initial stress in Russian:

biškavs, *biškava* ‘a shippound (=20 lisponds)’: ME I 298: “wohl aus einem aruss. **бърковъ* woher das jetzige *бѣрковецъ*.” The adjectival *бърковъ* is from **Бърка* [the Viking-age Swedish trading center Birka = Björkö]: Būga 1925: 27. See also Vasmer I 156–57, s. v. *берковец*.

blūōda ‘dish, bowl, basin’: Karulis 138; ME I 321: “aus russ. *блюдо*.” Zaliznjak 132: (a).

duōma ‘thought, idea; opinion’: Karulis 223; ME I 532–33: “aus slav. *duma*, und zwar muss le. *duoma* zu der Zeit entlehnt sein, als in slav. *duma* statt *u* noch ein geschlossenes *ō* gesprochen wurde.” Zaliznjak 132: (a), with some tendency toward (b). Also borrowed is *duōmât* ‘think, intend’ from ORu. *думати*.

grāmata ‘book’: Karulis 306–7; ME I 644: “Nebst li. *grōmata* ‘Brief’ und estn. *raamat* ‘Buch, Brief’ aus aruss. *грамота* ‘Schrift.’” Cf. Ru. *грамота* ‘official document, deed’.

3 Note Zaliznjak 2004: 52: “В диалектах кривичского ареала праслав. **ĕ* реализовалось в виде широкого монофтонга или дифтонга с широким вторым компонентом (отсюда изредка встречающиеся в сев.-зап. говорах примеры типа *яла* = *ѣла*, *кяп* = *цеп*, *ряпа* = *рѣпа*.)”

kalps 'servant; farm hand'. Karulis 372; ME II 144: "Aus einem uruss. *холпъ > r. холонъ 'Leibeigener, Knecht.'" Dybo 1981: 69: *xólpъ, gen. sg. *xólpа (a).

kuōkalis 'corn cockle'. Endzelin 1913: 116; ME II 342: "Wohl eher ... entlehnt aus r. куколь dass., als damit ... verwandt." (Karulis 190 treats it as native.) Cf. Ru. кúколь, -я '(bot.) cockle'. Kiparsky 1962: 164: fixed root stress (though note SCr. кúколь, Ru. dial. куко́ль).

kuīts 'greyhound'. Karulis 449; ME II 326: "aus aruss. *хортъ." Endzelin 1913, 116 cites Serb. hřt, Bulg. hōrtot. Cf. Ru. хópm, -а 'greyhound'.

luōki 'spring onions' (sg. *luōks*). ME II 525 s.v. *luōkavi* 'der Lauch': "luōks entweder aus mnd. *lōk* (woher auch estn. *lōk* dass.), oder aber aus der urslavischen Form von r. лук; *luokavs* beruht wohl auf dem für Letten deminutivisch aussehenden r. луковина 'Zwiebel.'" Karulis 542: from MLG, EFris. *lōk* or MDu. *look* or ORu. лóукъ. Zaliznjak 131: (a).

mērs 'measure'. ME II 620: "da li. *miera* sicher aus slav. *měra* entlehnt ist, so ist wahrscheinlich auch le. *mērs* ein Lehnwort." The Latvian form shows a shift in gender from the Russian original. || *mērīt* ME II 619 "eher wohl entlehnt aus r. мѣрить 'messen.'" Karulis 582–83 treats it as native. Zaliznjak 132: *мѣра* (a).

mētra 'mint'. Karulis 585–86; ME II 622: "auf r. мята 'Minze' beruhend." Zaliznjak 132: (a).

miēsts 'hamlet, small village'. ME II 655: "aus slav. *město*." Karulis 592: from ORu., BRu. мѣсто 'place, square, town'. Apparently an example of a borrowing from a non-Krivič dialect (due to the treatment of *ъ* as *ie*), or a later borrowing. Zaliznjak 132: (a).

miūta 'customs; duty'. Karulis 604; ME II 662: "aus slav. *myto*." Būga III 247, commenting on the gender of the borrowing, notes that by the 11th–13th centuries Latvian final *a* had already shortened, and so Russian *мыто* was borrowed as *miūta*. Zaliznjak 135: (b). Kiparsky (1962: 238), who likewise establishes an original oxytone for Old Russian (citing Serb. *mīto*), notes the root-stressed *mýto* in the dictionaries of 1794, 1847, and Ušakov, and suggests that the shift to type 1 [root stressed] was conditioned by the Serbian-influenced initial stress of Church Slavic, since the word had long since disappeared from the spoken language. But the tone of the Latvian form clearly suggests an old root-stressed form in the source dialect of Old Russian, perhaps alongside of (b).

miūka 'torment, torture; agony'. ME II 682–83: "aus aruss. мука dass." || *miūcīt* 'to torment, torture; harass, worry'. ME II 681: "aus aruss. мучить dass." Dybo 1990: 216: PSl. *mōka is (a); Zaliznjak 135: (a). Karulis 601 considers it native, with the modern meaning influenced by the corresponding Russian forms; however, the base is also found in the early Balto-Finnic (Karelian) borrowing from Old Russian *muokka* 'pain' (Kiparsky 1948: 36).

Pāvils 'Paul'. Endzelin 1913: 116: from ORu. *Pāvъls (cf. Lith. Póvilas).

puōds 'unit of weight, about 8 kg'. Karulis 707 (ME III 454): borrowed about the 10th century from ORu. нудъ < *pōdъ*, ultimately from Latin *pondus* 'weight',

through a Scandinavian intermediary; reborrowed in late 18th–early 19th centuries, with same meaning, as *puds* (Karulis 717). Kiparsky 1962: 19: type III (fixed stress in singular, end-stress in plural).

sērs 'sulphur'. ME III 830: "wohl ... aus slav. *sěra* dass. entlehnt." Karulis 807 treats it as native. Zaliznjak 132: (a), with some tendency toward (b).

stārstas, stāраста 'village elder'. ME III 1051: "aus r. староста [староста] 'Ältester.'" Dybo 1981 110: *stārъ, *stāra, *stāro (a).

suits. Karulis 954, s.v. *suīti*; ME III 1116: "'überflüssig, mehr, zuffiel'; dürfte am ehesten nebst li. *suitis* 'reichlich' ... und apr. *zuit* "genug" auf slav. *syťъ* 'satt' ... beruhen." Zaliznjak 133 (a); Dybo 1981: 110 *sýťъ, *sýťa, *sýťo (a).

tulks 'interpreter'. Karulis 1072; ME IV 259: "wahrscheinlich nebst li. *tūlkas* und estn. *tulk* dass. aus aruss. тълкъ 'Dolmetscher' entlehnt." (Note the borrowing into Finnish as *tulkki* 'interpreter', Kiparsky 1948: 44.) Kiparsky 1962: 262–63: fixed root stress.

vāpēt 'to glaze'. Endzelin 1913: 116; ME IV 499, s.v. *vāpīt*: "aus Ru. *ванить* 'färben.'"

žēl 'sorry, pity (adv.)'. ME IV 805: "aus der Vorstufe von r. жалъ 'leid.'" Karulis 1212: borrowed by 13th century from ORu. *жель (Ru. жалъ); found in 16th century translations. (The native Latvian cognate base is found in *dzēlīgs* 'stinging, biting; caustic', to verb *dzelīt* 'sting'.) The prosodic evidence of the Slavic languages is difficult to interpret, but the correspondence set SCr. *жао*, Slovene *žal*, gen. *žāli*, Cz. *žal* shows the same relations as SCr. *нѣм*, Slovene *nit*, gen. *nīti*, Cz. *nif*, which is (a). The stress of Ru. denominal жаловатъ (cf. *вѣроватъ* < *вѣра*, (a)) and жалоба (as opposed to *стыдоба* [Dal' IV 603]: *стыд* (b)) also indicates (a).

žēlabas 'sorrow, grief; lament, lamentation'. ME IV 805: "aus der Vorstufe von r. жалоба 'Klage.'" See *žēl*.

žīds 'Jew'. ME IV 813: "aus r. жиѡв." Zaliznjak 131: (a); (c) is more recent.

An apparent exception is:

prāvs 'considerable; pretty large'. ME III 384: because of the falling tone, Endzelin considers this a possible borrowing from Slavic *pravъ*; see also Būga III 147. Karulis 713 treats it as native. In the latter case, however, we would expect a Latvian ***prāvs*, since the Slavic base shows fixed root stress (under acute): Zaliznjak 133: (a); Kiparsky 1962: 269: nsf. *prāva* 1623, dictionary of 1794 (cf. SCr. *prāva*). Note also (p. 276) the comparative *prāvēja* (1623). The related *prāva(s)* 'legal proceedings', which both Endzelin (ME III 383) and Karulis (712) consider a borrowing, shows both falling and sustained tone in dialects where these tones are distinctive (see ME III 383). Zaliznjak 132: (a). Kiparsky 1962: 244 also establishes original root stress, but notes Serb. *prāvo* 'law' alongside adverbial *prāvo* 'right'.⁴ Perhaps

4 Mate Kapović (personal communication) notes that the tone of the noun *prāvo* (like that of *prāvi*) is secondary; the adverb *prāvo* preserves the original tone.

the tone of Latv. *prāvs* was influenced by a Russian long-form *pravъjъ* showing a metatony comparable to that of Slovene *prāvi*, Čak. *prāvi*, lit. Štok. *prāvi* beside *prāvī* (forms from Stang 1957: 101).

Also ambiguous are:

pāsmā, pāsmis 'lea (textiles)' < Ru. *нѣсмо*. Cited by Endzelin 1913: 116 with sustained tone, but shown in *ME* III 190 with falling tone only (see also Karulis 708 s. v. *posms*.) The attestations are all from two-tone eastern regions in which falling tone merges with sustained tone, so this is not unambiguously sustained tone.

uōma 'mood'. *ME* IV 419: "Wohl ... aus dem Altrussischen (vgl. r. *умѣ* 'Verstand')"; Karulis 635 (*uōma*, dial. *uō, uò*) also treats the word as a borrowing from Old Russian. All three tones are represented across the dialects, an unusual situation: judging from the data of *ME*, sustained tone is found in northern and western Vidzeme, in western Zemgale, and in Kurzeme; distinctive falling tone is found in areas which distinguish all three tones, and distinctive broken tone is found in eastern Vidzeme. A similar alternation between an acute-based and circumflex-based roots also exists in the inherited base which has been preserved in Lithuanian *aumiō* (*aūmenī*), *omē* (*ōmē*), *omiō* (*ómenī*), *omenis* (*ómenī*) 'reason, understanding, intellect' (cited after Fraenkel I 26). This fact, together with the broken tone of the Latvian examples, suggests that the Latvian word is, at least in part, inherited rather than borrowed. Old Russian *умѣ* is (b): Zaliznjak 134.

žerbiņš 'lot' (with both *-eř-* and *-ēr²-*): *ME* IV 804: "Auf r. *жѣребеѣ* beruhend." *ME* shows sustained tone in the central Vidzeme three-tone area and falling tone in the eastern Vidzeme two-tone area, where falling and sustained tone merge as falling, so we are probably dealing with sustained tone here, which does not match the (c) pattern of Russian (Zaliznjak 137: *жѣребеѣ*: (c)).

Ib. Stress on an internal long syllable in Russian is reflected by Latvian sustained tone on the same syllable:

bagāts 'rich' (Karulis 96 cites the expected *bagāts*, with sustained tone, as the headword). *ME* I 249: "dem slav. *bogatъ* dürfte eher ein echt lettisches **baguots* entsprechen. Demnach ist dies li.-le. Wort ... wohl entlehnt aus dem Slavischen." The broken tone of the suffix in the form adduced by Endzelin is undoubtedly under the influence of the *-t* participle of verbs in *-āt* (e.g., *mazgāts* 'washed'), since broken tone otherwise rarely (if ever) occurs in borrowings.

bajārs (tone from Karulis 97) 'boyar'. *ME* I 252: "aus dem Slavischen." Karulis 97: borrowed by 13th century from ORu. *бояринъ* (< **bojarъ*). Mod. Ru. *боярин*, *-а*; *бојре*.

bulvāns. *ME* I 349: "'ausgestopfter Vogel, um Wild herbeizuziehen; ein Lockvogel'; aus aruss. *бѣлванѣ* 'Klotz, Pfahl, Götzenbild.'" Reborrowed later [after Russian *ѣ > о*] as *balvāns* (*ME* I 260), 'ausgestopfter Vogel'. Cf. mod. Ru. *болван*, gen. sg. *болвана*.

cilvēks 'man, person' (Karulis 175: *cilvēks*). *ME* I 382–83: "wohl aus einer altr. Nebenform **чѣловѣкъ* (woher auch aksl. *чѣловѣкъ*). Цоканье and open *-ē-* indicate a Krivič borrowing.

kāpuōsts 'cabbage'. Karulis 379; *ME* II 194: (Also *kāpuōsts*.) "Nebst li. *kopūstas* und estn. *kābustas* zunächst aus r. *капустѣ*." Cf. mod. Ru. *капустѣ*.

karuōgs 'banner'. *ME* II 165: "aus ar. *хоругвь* 'Kriegsfahne.'" Karulis 383: borrowed before the 13th century from ORu. *хоругвы*. Zaliznjak 133: *хоругвы* (a).

kažuōks 'fur coat'. *ME* II 184; according to Karulis 396, who takes *kažuōks* as basic (it is not clear why: the dial. *kažuōks²* mentioned in *ME* is from Sausnēja, in the eastern two-tone region, hence the tone must represent original sustained tone), borrowed before the 13th century from ORu. *кожухѣ*. Būga III 641: borrowed at the beginning of 9th century from Ru. **kážōxъ*. Kiparsky 1962: 180: Serb. *kōžuh* indicates old suffixal stress, but does not guarantee type IV (desinential stress). The dictionary of 1794 has *kožúchъ, -chѣ*; type IV (of modern Russian *кожýх, -á*) is first attested in the dictionary of 1847.

nedēļa 'week'. Karulis 621; *ME* II 710: "aus r. *недѣля* dass." Dybo 1981: 75: **nedēlja*, acc. sg. **nedēljѣ* (a).

nekītrs 'obscene, filthy, lewd' [= *nekītrs* Karulis 623, dial. also *nekītrs*; cf. *ME* II 389 *kītrs* 'schlecht, faul'.] *ME* II 719: "auf r. *хитрый* 'schlau' beruhend? Zur Negation vgl. *nešpētns*." Karulis 623: the base is ORu. (BRu.) *хытрѣ*, whence also dial. *kītrs* 'dexterous, clever'. Zaliznjak 133: *хытрѣ* (a); newer (b); cf. SCr. dial. *хѣтра, хѣтра, хѣтра* (Dybo 1981: 117).

pagāns 'heathen'. *ME* III 28–29: "Nebst li. *pagānas* od. *pagonis*, apr. acc. pl. *pogānans*, estn. *pagan* zunächst wohl aus slav. *poganъ*." Karulis 641: possibly from ORu. *поганъ*, but it could also have been spread by Catholic preachers using the Latin term. Zaliznjak 147: *поганин* is a derivative of an (a) base,

Forms requiring comment:

baznīca 'church'. Karulis 115; *ME* I 269: "aus r. *божніца* [auch *бозьница* in alten Texten geschrieben]." Blese 18454: The fall of the jers in East Slavic took place in late 12th–early 13th centuries, so Latv. *baznīca* was borrowed from ORu. *божьница*, Kriv. *бозьница* only at this time; the term was used for pagan temples. || Although the suffix *-nīca* typically shows sustained tone (*ābelnīca* 'apple tree'), it may also appear with broken tone, at least in Alūksne and Lizums (where broken tone is distinctive): *sāimenīca* 'mistress of the house'. It is possible that *baznīca* acquired its broken tone by association with the East Latvian version of this native suffix; cf. *timenīca* below. The suffix itself is acute: Dybo 1990: 57.

svētki 'holiday, festivity'. Karulis 970; *ME* III 1155–56: "aus r. *святки* 'Christwoche.'" Mod. Ru. *святки* shows root stress, so the Latvian tone must be from related *svēts* 'holy', q. v.

timenīca 'a dark place'. *ME* IV 191 (s. v. *timinieks*): "aus slav. **tymnīca* 'Gefängnis.'" For the tone, see *baznīca*.

The single example of a post-tonic long syllable, *pavārs* 'cook' (Karulis 663; *ME* III 134: "aus r. *поваръ* [*nóvar*]"), would seem to indicate that these syllables also show sustained tone; the German borrowing *kipluōks* 'garlic' supports this (*ME* II 383: "Aus mnd. *klüflōk* [Karulis 474: *klüflōk*] dass.>").

II. Various Russian pretonic long syllables (vowels and diphthongs) are represented in Latvian borrowings by falling tone.

IIa. First pretonic position in Russian:

bēda 'care, worry; grief, sorrow'. *ME* I 287–88: "Wohl zu slav. *bědá* 'Not.'" Karulis 117 argues that it is native on the basis of the falling tone of the root, which he says is not characteristic of borrowings ("kas nav raksturīga aizguvumiem"). But as these examples show, this is not the case. Zaliznjak 135: (b); Dybo 1981 78: **bědá*, acc. sg. **bědō* (b).

cilvēks 'man, person'. *ME* I 382–83; see above.

kāpuōsts 'cabbage'. *ME* II 194; see above.

krāsa (also *krāsa* Drusti, Vidzeme; note the corresponding adjective *krāsains* 'colored') 'color, complexion; paint'. *ME* II 267: "Wohl ... aus slav. *krasa* ('rote) Farbe, Schönheit.'" Karulis 418: borrowed by the 13th century from ORu. *краса* [Ru. *краса́*] 'beauty, splendor', together with the adjective *krāsns* (see *krāšns*), but used only in eastern regions; introduced more broadly only in the 18th century. The word acquires its modern meaning "color" under the influence of Ru. *краска* in the early 19th century. Zaliznjak 135: (b). Dybo 1981: 78 **krasá*, acc. sg. **krasō* (b). Čirulis' *krāsa* (the form cited by Endzelin 1913: 117) matches Slavic (b). But there also seem to be traces of (a) in Russian: Kiparsky 1962: 195 notes that the family name *Красин* is an unusual exception to the rule that derivatives in *-in* from end-stressed *-a* bases have suffixal stress; note also the verb *krāsīt* (since the dictionary of 1794 mainly *krāšu*, *krāsīšv* = [Ukr. *красити*]: Kiparsky 1962: 315). See *krāšns*.

kuodaļa 'tow'. *ME* II 340; *kuodeļa* *ME* II 341; *kuodeļš* (*ME* II 341; no tone): "aus r. *кудель* od. *куделя* 'zum Spinnen vorbereiteter Flachs.'" Attested early in Finnish, where the original nasal is preserved: *kuontalo* (Kiparsky 1948: 36). Karulis 412: borrowed before the 13th century from ORu. *куделя*, mod. Ru. *кудель*, *-u*.

ļūoti adv. 'very'. *ME* II 546: "Aus dem Slavischen; vgl. aksl. *лютъ* 'δεινῶς, valde', r. *лютой* 'grimmig' und (hinsichtlich der Bed.) le. *briēsmīgi* ['dreadful, terrible, awful']." Karulis 554 considers it native. Dybo 1981: 108, 110: **ljūtō*, **ljutá*, **ljutō* (b). Zaliznjak 136: (b); more recent is (c).

sābris 'neighbor'. Karulis 775; *ME* 823, s.v. *sēbrs*: *sābris* Jaun-Piebalga, within the three-tone area of central Vidzeme; other examples of *sābris*² are from the High Latvian area, in which falling and sustained tone merge as falling; "*sēbrs* geht zunächst ... auf r. *сябрь* ... zurück; hochle. *sābris* ist eine Neuerung für älteres *sābrs* < *sēbrs* ... ; *sābr(i)s* in Peb. u. a., wo sonst *ē* nicht zu *ā* geworden ist,

ist wahrscheinlich aus dem Hochle. entlehnt." So less reliable, since the tone may also have been borrowed: High Latvian collapses falling and sustained tone. Cf. mod. Ru. *сябрь*, gen. sg. *сябрьá*, (b).

strādāt 'work'. Karulis 937; *ME* III 1083–84: "Wohl aus r. *страд́ать* 'leiden, sich abmühen, arbeiten' entlehnt." Zaliznjak 137: (b).

IIb. Included here are words which are monosyllabic in Latvian, from a source form that was undoubtedly still disyllabic with an end-stressed jer (a neo-acute arising from retracted stress would presumably have been represented in Latvian by sustained tone):

grēks 'sin'. Karulis 312; *ME* I 652: "aus slav. *grěxъ* dass." Zaliznjak 134: (b), Dybo 1981: 78: **grěxъ*, gen. sg. **grěxá* (b). Note OPr. *grikas* (gen. sg.), as a borrowing from Lechitic, preserving pretonic length (Stang 1957: 55).

krāšns 'splendid, magnificent'. *ME* II 269: "Wohl nebst *krāsns* aus ar. *красньнъ* 'schön' ...; das *šn* für *sn* ist wohl zuerst im Adverb *krāšni* aufgekommen." Karulis 419: borrowed by the 13th century in the form *krāsns* from ORu. *красньнъ* 'beautiful'; *krāšns* is from the second half of the 18th century. Zaliznjak 152: "Ранняя акцентная перестройка произошла также в слове *красньнъ*: первоначальная акцентовка *красньнъ*, *крáсьна*, *-o* сменилась здесь (по аналогии с непроизводными типа *чьрнь*, *чьрнá*, *чьрнó*) на *красньнъ*, *красньнá*, *красньнó*. В более позднюю эпоху такая перестройка охватила значительное число слов; однако в слове *красньнъ* она происходила раньше, чем в остальных." Dybo 1981: 78: **krasá*, acc. sg. **krasō* (b). The adjective form is end-stressed, and thus (b). Dybo 1981: 57: "with neo-acute on root" **krásънъ*, **krásъна*, **krásъно*.

*prūods*². *ME* III 400: "ein kleiner natürlicher Teich; aus (a)russ. *прудь* dass." The word is also mentioned as a borrowing from Old Russian by Būga I 351. Although from a dialect area that does not distinguish falling and broken tone, it must be original falling, since broken tone is generally not found in Latvian borrowings. Zaliznjak 134: (b). Dybo 1981 79: **prōdъ*, gen. **prōdá*, (b).

pūlks 'regiment; crowd'. *ME* III 407: (Also *pūlks* Alūksne.) "Dürfte ... zunächst aus slav. *рѣлкъ* dass. entlehnt sein." Karulis 721: borrowed by 13th century from ORu. *рѣлкъ* (Fraenkel II 665 s.v. *pūlkas* agrees). Zaliznjak 134: (b), occasionally (a). Kiparsky 1962: 20: type IV (desinential stress).

skūops 'stingy, miserly'. Karulis 836; *ME* III 910: "wohl aus aruss. *скунъ* 'geizig.'" Zaliznjak 136: (b), with some tendency toward (c).

sūods 'punishment, penalty'. Karulis 883–84; *ME* III 1136: "aus aruss. *судъ* 'gerichtliche Strafe, Verdammung.'" Dybo 1981: 79: **sōdъ*, gen. **sōdá* (b); Zaliznjak 134: (b). || *sūodīt* 'punish, inflict penalty on, fine'. *ME* III 1135: "aus aruss. *судити* (als statt *u* noch ein enges *ō* gesprochen wurde) 'verurteilen, eine Strafe verordnen.'" Zaliznjak 137: (b).

sūogis 'judge'. *ME* III 1136: "Aus aruss. *судья* dass." Kiparsky 1962: 227 and 1948: 44: end-stressed.

Пс. The orthotonic word forms of Russian mobilia also show falling tone in Latvian borrowings:

grēda 'pile, heap; flower bed'. Karulis 311; *ME* I 652: (Also *grēda* Rūjiena.) "Entlehnt aus r. *грѣда* 'Reihe, Beet.'" Zaliznjak: 138: (c).

vērste 'verst, unit of measure'. *ME* IV 542: "Aus r. *верста* [*< върста*]." Karulis 1145: the standard form *vērsts* becomes established in the 1930s. Zaliznjak 138: (c). Borrowed after the vocalization of the jers.

sūlīt 'promise'. *ME* III 1137–38: "aus aruss. *сулити* 'versprechen.'" Karulis 885: traditionally considered a borrowing from ORu. *сулити* (mod. Ru. *сулить* : *сулю*, *сулишь*). Zaliznjak 318: the root is (c).

Пд. Lastly, borrowings in which a Latvian initial syllable with falling tone represents a second-pretonic syllable of the Russian source form:

pātaga 'whip, knout'. *ME* III 190: "aus slav. *batogъ* dass., wobei das *p-* statt *b-* vielleicht in der Aussprache lettisierter Liven od. Esten entstanden ist." Karulis 658: from ORu. dial. *namóгъ* 'stick, cudgel' (lit. *батогъ*). Zaliznjak 134: *батогъ* (b). Mod. Ru. *батогъ*, -á. Kiparsky 1962 157: old type IV (desinential stress).

pīrāgs 'pie, pasty'. Karulis 687; *ME* III 233: "aus slav. *pirogъ*." Zaliznjak 134: (b). Kiparsky 1962 157: old type IV [desinential stress]. The second syllable of *pīrāgs* shows an irregular lengthening on syllables with secondary stress (Endzelin 1922a: 100); some dialects preserve an original short *-a-*: *pīrags* Blīdiene, Dundaga, *pīrags*² Jaun-Auce (*ME* III 233).

rūobeža 'border, boundary; limit'. *ME* III 575: "aus r. *рубѣжъ* dass." Karulis 760: borrowed by 13th century from ORu. *рубѣжъ* 'notched marker > 'boundary'. Kiparsky 1962: 127: type IV (gen. sg. *rubežá*) indicated since earliest times for Russian.

tvāragš. *ME* IV 289: "Käsemilch, Käseteig"; aus r. *тварогъ* 'Quark.'" Kiparsky 1962: 157: old type IV (end-stress).

zābaks 'boot'. *ME* IV 694: "aus dem Russischen (vgl. aruss. *запогъ* und *сабогъ* dass.)" Karulis 1179: borrowed by the 13th century from ORu. *забогъ* (Ru. *сапógъ*, dial. *забógъ*); mentioned in 17th-century dictionaries. Dybo 1981 79: **sapogъ*, gen. **sapogá* (b). Zaliznjak 134: (b). Kiparsky 1962: 157: old type IV (end-stress).

*žīvats*². *ME* IV 814: "ein Tier; Haustier; *sīkliops* (ein Schaf, Schwein). Aus r. *животы* [*животы́*] 'Haustiere.'" POS x: 226: *живот*³ 'сельскохозяйственное животное'.

Па-d. Apparent counterexamples (and ambiguous forms):

buļvāns 'decoy'. *ME* I 349: "ausgestopfter Vogel, um Wild herbeizuziehen; ein Lockvogel"; aus aruss. *булванъ* 'Klotz, Pfahl, Götzenbild.'" Reborrowed after Russian *б > o* as *balvāns* (*ME* I 260), 'ausgestopfter Vogel'. (Mod. Ru. *болван*, gen. sg. *болváна*.) The sustained tone is unexpected.

kīselis 'fruit-juice jelly'. *ME* II 389: "aus r. *кисель* 'säuerlicher Mehlbrei.'" Karulis 477: from Ru. *кисель* in the earlier meaning "sour meal porridge". Zaliznjak 134: *кисель* (b), although the base itself is acute: Serb. *kīsnuti*, Ru. *kīsnut*'. The Latvian may be a more recent borrowing.

ļēsa 'lentil'. Karulis 512; *ME* II 455: "auch *lēcis*; aus aruss. *ляча* > dial. **ляца* 'Linse.'" The sustained tone of Latvian *ļēsa* matches the stem-stress of Ru. dial. *ляца* (*Dal* II 746) = Bulg. *лѣца* (Vasmer II 553, s. v. *ляча*), though is at odds with SCr. *léha* and Slovene *léča*.

Пп. The "enclinenomen" forms of the mobile paradigm show falling tone (these are the forms that presented difficulties for Lehr-Spławiński); note that the stem formants *-i-*, *-u-* of the nominative singular were recessive in Balto-Slavic (Dybo 1990: 104):

blēdis 'cheat, swindler'. *ME* I 314: "Entlehnt aus altruss. *блѣдь* ... 'Betrüger.'" Karulis 134 considers it native. Kiparsky 1962: 23: *Учение и хитрость* [1647] shows gen. pl. *bljadėj* and instr. pl. *bljadьmí*, hence type II, i.e. (c).

svēts 'holy, sacred'. Karulis 970; *ME* III 1156: "Aus r. *святъ* 'heilig'. Dybo 1981: 109: **svētъ*, **svētá*, **svēto* (c); Zaliznjak 138: (c). Note OPr. *swītas* (gen. sg.), as a borrowing from Lechitic, preserving length (Stang 1957: 55).

tēls 'image; statue'. *ME* IV 171: "Da altes (ide.) ē eher akutiert wäre, wahrscheinlich entlehnt aus aruss. *тѣло* 'истукан, идол, изображение чловѣческаго тѣла, образ' ... ; dafür spricht auch die grosse Übereinstimmung in der Bedeutung." Karulis 1020f. is skeptical. Dybo 1990: 35 and 214: *tēlo*, *tēlese* (c); Zaliznjak 138: (c).

tīrgus 'market'. Fraenkel 1143 assumes an Old Russian borrowing (*тѣргъ*) for both Lith. *tuīrgus* and Latv. *tīrgus*, *tuīrgus*² (*ME* IV 271), while *ME* IV 194–95 and Karulis 1044–46 treat *tīrgus* as native. On the Latvian *-i-* for expected *-u-*, note also (dial.) *siruobs* (*ME* III 848 'a notch in the end of a beam' for **suruobs* < ORu. *сѣрубъ*, and occasional *-i-* : *-u-* alternations within Latvian: *krusts* 'cross' : dial. *kristis*, *sudrabs* 'silver' : dial. *sidrabs*, *kumoss* 'morsel' : dial. *ķimūss*, *tūmsa* : dial. *tūmsa* 'darkness', and the corresponding verb *tūmst* 'grow dark' : dial. *tūmst*. Since *тѣргъ* is also found as a borrowing in Lithuanian and in Baltic Finnic (Finn. *turku*, Est. *turg*), and the same vocabulary items are often borrowed regionally, it seems reasonable to consider the Latvian form a borrowing as well. Zaliznjak 134: (b); Illič-Svityč 1979: 126: *тѣргъ* continues an old mobile *u-*stem.

vēsts 'news'. *ME* IV 571: "aus r. *вѣсть* dass." Karulis 1150: older *vēste*, *vēsta*, borrowed from ORu. *вѣстѣ*. Note also the verb *vēstīt* (*ME* IV 571) 'herald, presage' from ORu. *вѣстѣти*. Zaliznjak 138: (c).

In the following, the infinitive has taken on the "mobile" features of the present tense:

prēst (also *sprēst*² ME III 1018) 'spin'. ME III 390: "Aus r. *пръсть*." Karulis 908: borrowed from Ru. *пръсть* as Latv. dial. *prēst*, to which *s-* has been added dialectally. Dybo 1981: 255 and 1990: 64: The present stem *prēdō* is a Proto-Slavic mobile, which goes back to an acute base **pręsti*. IE cognates are lacking; for Balto-Slavic acute, compare Lith. *spręsti*, Latv. *sprīest*. Zaliznjak 139: the present tense *пряду* is (c); the infinitive system is (a). Apparently we are dealing here with an infinitive treated as an enclinenomenon form, under the influence of the present tense. For a stressed infinitive, we would have expected a Latvian ***prēst*.

Apparent counterexamples:

dīvains 'strange, odd, queer, peculiar'. Here also *dīvētiēs* 'sich wundern'. ME I 479 says of the base *dīva*, *dīvs* [no tone] 'das Meerwunder, Ungeheuer': "wohl entlehnt ... aus slav. *divo* resp. *divъ* 'Wunder'." Karulis 220 treats it as native. Dybo 1981 82: *dīvo*, *dīvese* [i.e., (c)]. Zaliznjak 138: (c).

puōsts 'empty; wretched (Karulis 709 s.v. *postīt*: found in folklore and older writings); as a noun, 'distress, misery, calamity, disaster'. Karulis 709; ME III 459–60: "Entlehnt ... zunächst als Adjektiv aus aruss. *пучъ* 'wüst, öde.'" || *puōstīt* 'to devastate, destroy', ME III: 459. The adjective, verb, and derived noun *puōstaša* all point to an apparently unattested Old Russian (a) paradigm, but Old Russian only shows mobile stress: Zaliznjak 138: *пучъ* (c), verb *пучумъ* 140: (c). Note, however, Kiparsky 1962: 274 "Wb. 1847 scheint nur S [stem stress] zu kennen."

puōstaša (standard *puōstaža*) 'waste, devastated plot of land'. ME III 459: "aus r. *пучомъ* 'Wildnis.'" See *puōsts*.

IV. Finally, it should be mentioned that a number of Latvian loanwords with a root vowel *ū*, borrowed from a Russian source with accent paradigm (b) or (c), show a sustained tone where one would expect falling tone on the basis of the previous exposition. Among these are:

dūda 'bagpipe'. ME I 523–24: "aus dem Slavischen." Kiparsky 1962: 195: end-stressed [= (b)].

kūds 'skinny'. ME II 332: "Nebst *kuods* [ME II 341] dass. und li. *kūdas* aus r. *худъ*." Dybo 1981: 114: **xūdъ* (c). Zaliznjak 138: (c).

kūma 'godparent', also *kūms*. ME II 336: "Nebst *kuoma* [ME II 343], *kuoms* [ME II 344] und li. *kūmas* od. *kūmā* dass. aus r. *кумъ*." Karulis 443: borrowed before the 13th century from ORu. *кумъ*, introduced from South Slavic (**kumъ* < **kuma* from Balkan Ltn. *commetru* < *commāter*). There is a dialectal (Lazduona) form with falling tone: *kūoms*², which in this region (eastern Vidzeme) is ambiguous (it merges with sustained tone). Ru. *kum*, *kumā* and Serb. *kūm*, gen. sg. *kūma* show (b).

pūka 'down, fluff'. Karulis 718; ME III 445: "Nebst li. *pūkas* 'Flaumfeder' aus r. *пыхъ* 'Flaum.'" Ru. *пых*, gen. *пыха* 'down', Slovene *pūh* 'steam, puff', Cz. *puch*

'stench', point to (c); Serb. *пыха* 'bubble, blister', which is a different stem, is apparently (a) (all forms cited after Vasmer III 414, s. v. *пых*).

pūsts (dial.) 'empty, waste/desert field, marshy woods'. ME III 451. See *puōsts*.

(with *-uō-*): *suōma* 'bag'. Karulis 887; ME III 1138: "wohl aus aruss. *сума* 'Beutel, Tasche, Bettelsack.'" Kiparsky 1962: 196: *suma* is type II (end-stress throughout). Zaliznjak 135 includes *сума* among (b) words of later origin.

strūga 'barge'. ME IV 1097: "aus r. *стругъ*." Vasmer III 782: *стругъ* 'вид речного судна, легкая лодка с острыми концами', сиб. (Даль), *стругá*. Connected with *стругъ* 'plane', which is mobile: cf. Serb. *стругъ*, Cz. *struh*.

trūba 'tube, pipe'. ME IV 249: "aus r. *труба*." Zaliznjak 135: (b).

*ūda*², *ūda* 'type of fishing rod; fish hook'. ME IV 404: (Broken tone [central Vidzeme three-tone dialect] and falling tone [three-tone and eastern two-tone dialects] are also noted, so the form must be considered ambiguous as to tone.) "aus r. *удá* 'Angel.'" Karulis 1083 considers it a native word, influenced by the Russian; given the tonal variation, it may well be. Zaliznjak 132: (a). Also borrowed into Estonian as *und* 'fishing rod' (Kiparsky 1979: 83).

ūs(s) 'moustache'. ME IV 409: (there are dialectal forms with *ū*² in eastern Vidzeme, which may match sustained tone [note also *ūsas*² from this region], an instance of broken tone from a three-tone area [Rauna, central Vidzeme], and *ū*² from Kurzeme and western Zemgale, which presumably match the broken tone of the Rauna example, making an assessment about the original tone difficult.) "Nebst li. *ūsai* "Schnurrbart", estn. *ūz* und le. *usas* dass. aus r. *усъ*." Karulis 1092: a borrowing from ORu. *усъ* (Ru. *усъ*) 'moustache, beard' widely introduced in the mid 19th century, as moustaches became fashionable. Zaliznjak 134: (b).

Discussion

The above material paints a rather more complex picture than that found in either Endzelin's or Lehr-Splawiński's work and suggests a prosodic situation which is in keeping with the generally archaic appearance of the phonology of Krivič Old Russian:

A Russian stressed syllable, whether initial or internal (Lehr-Splawiński fails to mention this category), is represented in Latvian borrowings by sustained tone (see also Jakobson 1963: 163),⁵ which has a level or slightly rising contour.⁶ This need not reflect tonal features of this syllable (such as traditional rising tone) in the original Russian, since Latvian represents the stressed syllable in borrowings from languages without distinctive tone in the same way: *ruōze* 'rose', from MLG, MDu. *rōse* (Karulis 766), *skuōla* 'school' from MLG, MDu. *schōle* (Karulis 835), *puīka* 'boy', from Liv. **pūoiga* (> *pūoga*) (Karulis 718). Nevertheless, borrowings

5 Jakobson's examples of Latvian *kūms* (кум) and *pūka* (пых) are not relevant here – see the discussion of section IV below.

6 The classic phonetic investigation of the Latvian tones is Ekblom 1933.

such as *kal̥ps* 'servant; farm hand' < ORu. **холпъ*, cf. Ru. *холон*, which represent a pre-pleophonic stage of the Russian source, suggest the presence of distinctive tone (unfortunately, there seem to be no sure examples of such borrowings from accent paradigms (b) or (c)). The fact that the enclinenomen forms of source words with a mobile paradigm are borrowed differently (with falling tone) also suggests a prosodic opposition on the corresponding Russian syllables at the time of these borrowings.

Except for post-tonic length, which is also represented by sustained tone: *pavārs* 'cook' : Ru. *повар*, *ķipluōks* 'garlic' : MLG *klūflōk*, Russian atonic syllables show falling tone in Latvian. This is a complex set which includes pretonic syllables reflecting accent paradigm (b) of Russian monosyllabic stems (*bēda* 'care, worry; grief, sorrow' : Ru. *бѣда*) or disyllabic stems (*rūbeža* 'border, boundary; limit' : Ru. *рубѣж*, gen. sg. *рубѣжѧ*), including forms ending in a jer, which must still have borne the stress in Krivič Old Russian,⁷ otherwise we would expect a reflection of neo-acute (i. e., identification with Latvian sustained tone): *grēks* 'sin' : *грѣхъ*, gen. sg. *грѣхѧ*; *krāšņs* 'splendid, magnificent' : **красънъ*, **красъна*, **красъно*; *ļūoti* 'very', which presupposes an adjectival **ļūots* : *лютъ*, *люта*, *люто*. Note that the falling tone of the Latvian borrowings (whether it reflects traditional falling tone, Jakobson's low pitch, or lack of stress in the original) is also an argument against a pretonic rising or high tone (at least for Krivič Old Russian) claimed by Van Wijk (1958: 94) and Jakobson (1963: 160). The orthotonic forms of the Russian mobile paradigm also belong here (*grēda* 'pile, heap; flower bed' < *грѣда*).

It is significant that the enclinenomen forms of the mobile paradigm show the same falling tone in Latvian as do Russian pretonic syllables (*vēsts* 'news' < *вѣсть*, like *grēks* 'sin' < *грѣхъ*). This suggests that such forms were either stressless in Russian and, like other stressless syllables, were identified for some reason with falling tone in Latvian, or that they preserved a prosodic feature, presumably low tone (as opposed to the "high tone" of a stressed syllable, following Jakobson 1963), equated in Latvian with falling as the only other available tone (sustained tone was used for high-pitched/stressed syllables and broken tone is not typically found in borrowed words). If, on the other hand, we assume a falling tone ("Slavic circumflex") for the first syllable of these enclinenomen forms, we must presumably also posit falling tone for Russian pretonic syllables (since both are borrowed into Latvian in the same way), an alternative which Endzelin (1922b: 207) regarded as "sehr sonderbar und kaum zu erklären."

A major set of exceptions to the above generalizations is found in section IV: Latvian borrowings with unexpected sustained tone. Since they all share a long root *ū* rather than *uo*, they must represent a more recent stage of Old Russian

7 Note Jakobson 1963: 163: "латышская нисходящая интонация здесь соответствует первоначальной славянской предупредной долготе, в частности долготе, впоследствии перенянувшей ударение с конечного ъ."

(Krivič or successor dialects), though one in which length was still distinguished. For the words in this group whose Russian antecedents belong to accent paradigm (b), e.g. *dūda*, *trūba*, we might consider that "definalization" of stress – prefinal stress resulting from retraction from a final stressed open syllable, e.g. *страна* < *странѧ*: see Zaliznjak 182ff. – had already appeared in their west Russian sources.⁸ The Russian enclinenomen mobile forms (e.g., *kūds* < *худъ*) among these later borrowings must already have developed orthotonic stress (on which process see Zaliznjak 178), hence the sustained tone of the Latvian loanword is expected.

University of Maryland Baltimore County

References

- Blese, E.
1833/34 "Krievu valodas ietekme". *Latviešu konversācijas vārdnīca* x, 18450–18456.
- Būga, K.
1925 "Die litauisch-weißrussischen Beziehungen und ihr Alter". *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 1, 26–55.
1958–61 *Rinktiniai raštai*. 3 vols. Vilnius.
- Dal'
1903–09 В. И. Даль & И. А. Бодуэн-де-Куртенэ, *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка*. 3-ье издание. С.-Петербург.
- Dybo, V. A.
1981 *Славянская акцентология*. Москва.
1990 В. А. Дыбо, Г. И. Замятина & С. Л. Николаев, *Основы славянской акцентологии*. Москва.
- Eklblom, R.
1933 *Die lettischen Akzentarten (nach der Aussprache Professor J. Endzelins)*. Uppsala.
- Endzelin, J.
1899 "Латышские заимствования из славянских языков". *Живая старина* 111, 285–312. (J. Endzelins, *Darbu izlase* 1, 80–112, Riga 1971.)
1913 "Weiteres zu den lettischen Intonationen". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 33, 104–118.
1922a *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga.
1922b "Zur Intonation der lettischen Lehnwörter aus dem Russischen". *Slavia* 1/2, 206–7. (J. Endzelins, *Darbu izlase* 111/1, 173–75, Riga 1979.)
1952 "Древнейшие славяно-балтийские языковые связи". *Vēstis* 3, 33–46. (J. Endzelins, *Darbu izlase* 111/2, 429–45, Riga 1979.)
- Fraenkel, E.
1962–65 *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Heidelberg / Göttingen.

8 Apparently to account for the sustained tone and *ū* of *dūda*, *trūba* Endzelin (1913: 116–17) suggests that they may be borrowings from Lithuanian, though he later (*ME* 1 523–24, IV 249) considers them Slavic/Russian in origin.

- Illič-Svityč, V. M.
1979 *Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. R. L. Leed & R. F. Feldstein (trans.). Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Jakobson, R.
1963 "Опыт фонологического подхода к историческим вопросам славянской акцентологии. Поздний период славянской языковой праистории". In: *American contributions to the Fifth International Congress of Slavists, Sofia, September 1963*, 1, 153–78. The Hague.
- Karulis, K.
2001 *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* (2nd printing). Rīga.
- Kiparsky, V.
1948 "Chronologie des relations slavobaltiques et slavofinnoises". *Revue des études slaves* 24, 29–47.
1962 *Der Wortakzent der russischen Schriftsprache*. Heidelberg.
- Lehr-Splawiński, T.
1918 "Ślady dawnych różnic intonacyjnych w językach ruskich. (Z powodu prac Szachmatowa, Rozwadowskiego, i Endzelina)". *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 8, 250–63 (reprinted in T. Lehr-Splawiński, 1957, *Studia i szkice wybrane z językoznawstwa słowiańskiego*, Warszawa, 303–13.)
- ME
1923–32 K. Mühlentach & J. Endzelin, *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, 4 vols. Riga, <http://www.aialab.lv/MEV>.
- Nikolaev, S. L. & E. A. Xelimskij
1990 "Славянские (новгородско-псковские) заимствования в прибалтийско-финских языках". In: *Uralo-Indogermanica: Балто-славянские языки и проблема урало-индоевропейских связей*, 1, 41–43. Москва.
- POS
1967– Б. А. Ларин, *Псковский областной словарь с историческими данными*. Ленинград.
- Semënova, M. F.
1966 *Сопоставительная грамматика русского и латышского языков*. Рига.
- Stang, Chr. S.
1957 *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo.
- Van Wijk, N.
1958 *Die baltischen und slavischen Akzent- und Intonationssysteme*. 2nd ed. The Hague.
- Vasmer, M.
1986–87 *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Перевод с немецкого и дополнения члена-корреспондента АН СССР О. Н. Трубачева, 1–1v, Москва.
- Veisbergs, A. (ed.)
1997 *Latviešu-angļu vārdnīca*. Rīga.
- Xaburgaev, G. A.
1979 *Этнонимия "Повести временных лет" в связи с задачами реконструкции восточнославянского глоттогенеза*. Москва.
- Zaliznjak, A. A.
1985 *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*. Москва.
2004 *Древненовгородский диалект* (2nd ed.). Москва.