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BALTO-SLAVIC LONG VOWELS

In Baltistica 46(1), Miguel Villanueva Svensson presents a defence of the so-called “traditional” view on the development of long vowels in Balto-Slavic, in opposition to the views of the “Leiden school” (see Frederik Kortlandt’s “Long vowels in Balto-Slavic”, Baltistica 21(2)). In Baltistica 47(2), Tijmen Pronk replies to Villanueva Svensson’s points.

I presented my own views on the matter, albeit in a general setting, in the paper “Syllables, intonations and Auslautgesetze” (see Carrasquer Vidal 2011), and elsewhere. In the following I would like take some of the items discussed by Villanueva Svensson and Pronk and hold them against my own interpretation of the facts, which differs both from the Leiden and the “traditional” views.

A short summary of my basic position, where V stands for a (short) vowel, V̄ for a long vowel, H for a laryngeal, D for a PIE media, and R for a resonant (one of i/j, u/w, m, n, l or r):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long acute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long circumflex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long circumflex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long acute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This agrees with the “traditional” position in that I expect an acute reflex of a PIE long vowel in Balto-Slavic. But, in contrast with the traditional view, I see a long vowel of any origin (V̄ or VH) followed by a tautosyllabic resonant as giving a Balto-Slavic circumflex syllable (unless followed by a tautosyllabic laryngeal).

**Nom. sg. of nouns ending in a resonant**

Lith. nom. sg. akmuo “stone”, duktě “daughter”, etc. owe their circumflex accentuation to the lost final resonant:
At least in the proterodynamic forms (‘-ōn), this had already happened in dialectal PIE (Germanic and Balto-Slavic), see Jasanoff 2013, “A note on the Slavic genitive plural”.

In Slavic, the original circumflex vowel was raised in the Auslaut, giving -y (kamy) and -i (dōkti). The rarer stems in -l and -w are represented by Latv. ābuōls “apple” and Slav. žērāv “crane”(*h₂ábōl and *ģērHōu).

A t-stem like Lith. mēnuō “month, moon” (< *meh₁nōts) was reshaped after the more frequent resonant stems in -uō. But perhaps we do find the expected acute in Slav. nogā < *h₃nōghʷōts “leg, foot”, if that is the nominative belonging with acc. *h₃nōghʷutm > nōgτᵺ “nail”\(^1\).

I cannot agree with Villanueva Svensson’s “tacit” rejection of well-established forms such as o-stem dat. sg. *-o-ei > *-ōi, although of course everybody agrees on the circumflex character of the ending\(^2\). The Lith. ā-stem acc. sg. -q < *-ām < *-ah₂m, inexplicably unaffected by Saussure’s law in the traditional view, is naturally circumflex in my scheme of things.

The acc. pl., which is acute in Lithuanian and has long vocalism in Slavic, and the o-stem ins. pl. are special cases. Apparently, the resonant in the endings -ns and -js did not make a diphthong with the preceding vowel, and the cluster as a whole caused (acute) lengthening of the preceding vowel, independently in (at least) Baltic, Slavic and Indic.

**o-stems**

| acc. pl. *-oj-ms(?) > *-ōns > Lith. *-ōs > -ūs |
|---------|--------|
|         | Slav. *-ūnh > *-ūN > -y |
| ins. pl. *-oj-s > |
|         | Lith. *-āis > -aīs |
|         | Slav. *-uľh > *-uľh > *-ū(h) > -y |

\(^1\) Slav. vodā “water” remains a problematic form in more than one respect, cf. Lith. vánduo, vanduō.

\(^2\) Note especially the abl. (> gen.) *-oot, which must have still been uncontracted in PBS (*-ōt would have given Lith. †-uo, Slav †-y, *-ōt Lith. †-u, Slav. -a). This form, in my opinion, explains all the Balto-Slavic forms beautifully (nominal `-oot > Lith. -o, Slav. -a; pronominal -ēot, -ōot > Slav. -ego, -ogo; Lith. -io, -o).
ā-stems
acc. pl. *-ah₂-ms > *-āns > Lith. *-ās > -ās
Slav. *- ānh > *-ūN > -y

i-stems
acc. pl. *-i-ms > *-ins > Lith. *-īns > *-īs > -īs
Slav. *- īnh > *-īN > -i

u-stems
acc. pl. *-u-ms > *-uns > Lith. *-ūns > *-ūs > -ūs
Slav. *-ūnh > *-ūN > -y

Note that the acc. pl. cannot have been *-ons in PIE, as that would have given Lith. †-ās.
Note that the ins. pl. cannot have been *-ōjs in PIE, as that would have given Lith. †-uis.
The diphthong -ai- gives unstressed -ai-, stressed -īe/-iē- in Lithuanian. Stressed -ai- must then come from *-āi-, as in the nominal nom. pl. -ai (< *-ah₂ + -oj, apparently also proposed independently by Klingenschmitt 2008).

Lithuanian nom. sg. fem. -ē
I subscribe to the communis opinio that the Lith. nom. sg. feminine ending -ē < *-ijā.

Nouns with long root vowel: root nouns?
Latv. sāls “salt”, zūoss “goose”, giūvs “cow” and nāss “nose”.

I agree with Villanueva Svensson that Latv. zūoss, Lith. žāsis, Slav. gōsъ “goose” is irrelevant, although for different reasons (in my view, *g̊āns- or *g̊hans- would not have made any difference intonationally).

Very relevant, however, is Latv. nāss, Lith. nōsis “nose”. As Villanueva Svensson puts it:

If we start from *g̊wōu-, *sāl-, *nās-, Kortlandt’s general theory on the long vowels would account for Latv. giūvs, sāls, but not for nōsis. The traditional view accounts for Lith. nōsis, but not for Latv. giūvs, sāls. Similar problems arise if one starts from *g̊weh₃u-, *seh₂l-, *neh₂s- without applying the rule *-ĒH- > *-E-.

In my theory, all three are explained naturally. The final resonant in *sāl(s) and *g̊wōus yields circumflex intonation (preserved when the words were transferred to the i-stems), and in *nās(s) we have acute intonation before the occlusive. There is no problem and everything is explained. The opposition between sāls and nāss was indeed, as I recall, what led me to my theory in the first place. The Slavic forms, solb and nosb, with a short vowel, continue the PIE accusatives *salm and *nasm.
The accentuation of Lith. žvėris (nom. pl. žvėrys), Latv. zvērs, Slav. zvěrь (ap c) “wild animal” cannot come from the nominative of a root noun *gʰwēr, as that would have given circumflex intonation. We must start from the accusative (*gʰwērm) and the oblique (gen. *gʰwērés). The cognates Lat. fērus, fera, and Gmc. *beran— “bear” also show oxytone accentuation (with Dybo’s shortening law). Pronk’s attempt to reconstruct a laryngeal in this word, while simultaneously keeping it out of the claws of Hirt’s law (trisyllabic ins. sg. *gʰweḥtəmí and the dat., loc. and ins. plural) is ingenious, but lacks the crucial support of some other singular form (e.g. the dative) which is what lends credibility to the partial retention of mobility in the Balto-Slavic reflexes of the u-stem *suHnūs “son”.

For Slav. žalь “sorrow”, I would expect *gʷēlHīs with circumflex intonation, as in Lith. gėlà (*gʷēlHā). However, if Kapović 2009 is right and the word was originally in ap a, it may have been a root noun *gʷēlH(s), *gʷēlHə, with generalization of the acute of the nominative.

Slav. rěčь “word” looks very much like root noun. The original acute intonation was eliminated by Meillet’s law.

The acute in Slav. mýšь “mouse” is probably of laryngeal origin, given de Vaan’s derivation of TochB maścitse from *mās- < *mwas- < *muh₂/₃s-³. The short vowel in Lat. musculus “muscle” could then come from Dybo-shortening of pretonic *muHs-kó-. It would be unexpected, however, to find Dybo-shortening in Ved. muškā- “testicle”.

**Nouns with long root vowel: vowel stems**

Slav. mēso (Latv. miesa) “meat” is circumflex (*mēmsōm) and has become mobile in Slavic. The same goes for other forms with a (long) circumflex in an open root syllable, such as vȃje/jāje (*ōurjóm) “egg” and dēti (*dʰeh₁i-tí- = *dējítí-) “children”⁴.

---

⁴ Although if we accept the same soundlaw for Greek, μῦς becomes problematical (one would expect *m(w)ās or *m(w)ōs).

⁴ One anonymous reviewer objects: “but then what about *deh₂i-wer- ‘husband’s brother’, which has acute reflexes in Lithuanian and Latvian?”. I subscribe to Rasmussen’s 1989 theory that the “long diphthongs” developed as follows:

1. when stressed: ēH₁-V, ūH-C, ēH(CC/C#);
2. when unstressed: Hī before voiced, H before unvoiced.

The acute in *daih₂-wēr- is then regular (except that perhaps zero-grade might have been expected). In the word *dēi-tí-, the original zero grade must have been replaced by the (antevocalic) root-shape of the verb *deh₁i-e- (Latv. dēju ‘to suck’).
**Slav. trāvà “grass” and slāva “glory”**

In nouns with a long diphthong followed by a vowel-initial suffix or desinence, the intonation of the root depends on whether we are dealing with a seṭ or anịt root. In Slav. trāvà, the laryngeal causes the syllabification to be *trōuHā*, and the intonation is circumflex. In Slav. slāva, there is no laryngeal, and we have acute *klōwā*. This rule applies, for instance, to Slav. bělъ (ap b) “white”, Latv. bâls ~ bâls “pale”, from *bʰēlHo*- c.q. *bʰālHo*, and to a number of other nouns showing circumflex accentuation (Lith. vōlas, vōras, žolē, Slav. mēlъ, žārъ, etc.).

What I said above about slāva is contradicted by Pronk’s remark:

all instances of the root *kleu-* and (probably analogically) most instances of its extended variant *kleu-s- (with the exception of Lith. klausītī and paklūstī, Latv. klāusīt) contain an acute vowel or diphthong in Balto-Slavic. Except if one wishes to posit a lengthened grade for all forms deriving from the root (i.e. for Slavic *slava, slaviti, sluti, sluxati, slušati, slyšati, slyti*), one has to reconstruct a Balto-Slavic root-final laryngeal.

For slava, slaviti, slyšati and slyti, a lengthened grade is indeed in order, and a laryngeal is excluded (slava) or unnecessary (slyšati). As to the forms with slu-, perhaps Pronk’s next remarks apply(?):

Verbal roots ending in a glide often behave as if they end in a glide plus laryngeal, irrespective of whether they contained a laryngeal in Indo-European.

Thus, it appears that, apart from *kleu-* ‘to hear; be known’, *smei-* ‘to laugh’ (Latv. smiēt vs. Skt. -smita–, Villanueva Svensson 2011a, 22), *kwei-* ‘to observe’ (if not from *kʰeH1-, Beekes 2010, 1490) and ‘to punish, repent’ (Cr. čajati ‘to wait’, kājati se ‘to repent’ if the Slavic acute is not analogical to acute *bajati ‘to tell’, lajati ‘to bark’, majati ‘to wave’, tajati ‘to melt’, gajati, grajati, rajati all ‘to caw, croak’), *pleu-* ‘to float’ (Lith. plūti, Cr. plūti ‘to swim, sail’ vs. Ru. plot, Pl. plet ‘raft’ < *płbst, if not contaminated with the synonymous *pleh3–, cf. Derksen 1996, 116–117; 2008, 403, 405–407; LIV, 485, 487), and perhaps *kou-* ‘to strike’ (Lith. kauti ‘to beat, hew, slay’ vs. Slav. koznъ ‘skill’) and *krou- ‘to pile up, cover’ (Lith. krūtī ‘to cover’, Cr. krišti ‘to cover’ vs. Gr. χύπτω ‘to cover’, ToB krauptår ‘to gather’ with an unexplained labial, cf. Adams 1999, 219f.) obtained a laryngeal in Balto-Slavic. Exceptions are the roots *ei-* ‘to go’ and *au-* ‘to put on footwear’, which are generally circumflex […]

Lith. núoma and Latv. nuōma “rent” are convincingly connected by Pronk to Slav. naj ča “rent”, from *nō + h₁m- “take from”. The acute length may therefore be of laryngeal origin.

Slav. véra “faith”, Lat. vérus, OIr. fir, OHG wār “true”, etc. all point to PIE *wēr- or *weh₁r-. Villanueva Svensson adduces Anatolian forms like
Hitt. *warri-* “helpful” to derive the Western IE words from PIE *wērH-o/eh₂- (from a root meaning “to favour, give preference”), instead of *weh₁-ro-, from an otherwise unknown root *weh₁-. Pronk objects that the connection with the Anatolian forms is semantically doubtful. For me, the problem is that *wērHeh₂-, of the *travā-*type, would have given Slav. †*věrā.

**Nouns with an acute diphthong**

Slav. *bérmę* “burden” must come from the *aniṭ* root *bʰer*- , so the acute is a problem here. Deriving from lengthened grade *bʰér-men-* provides no solution, as VR, in my view, is just as circumflex as VR. I would follow Derksen 2008 in reconstructing *bʰerH-men-* , with an unclear and admittedly *ad hoc* laryngeal.


Derivation of the “crow” word from *vṛddhi*-ed *wōrnā* is pointless, and is ruled out by Petit’s (2010) observation that lengthened grade *wōrnā* would have given Lith. †*vuornā > †(v)urna*. The only way to derive an acute diphthong -ár-/ũr- (-ér/-ũr-) is if the diphthong was followed by a laryngeal (or a PIE *media*). Greek οὐρώνη “crow” suggests that the laryngeal was *h₃, alternating with *w* (Lat. *corvus* “crow”). The Balto-Slavic forms would then continue *wórwos ~ *worh₃nah₂, with secondary transfer of the suffix -no- to the masculine form.

Latv. *siēva* “wife”, from the root *k̑êi-wo* “socially close” (Ved. *śéva- “dear”, *śivá- “friendly”, Lat. *cīvis “citizen”, Gmc. *heiwa “household”), is derived by Villanueva Svensson from a *vṛddhi*-derivative *k̑êi-wah₂*. Again, I fail to see the point, but I can offer no better solution than a laryngeal *k̑êiH-wo-, following Lubotsky 1988, or an inner-Baltic *mētatonie rude* of the type *vilkē, zūikē*, whatever its origin.

**Pronominals**

Villanueva Svensson presents Slav. *nýne*, *nékto*, *něčto* as further examples of a PIE lengthened grade yielding an acute in Balto-Slavic. The Baltic parallels are not helpful, but the Slavic words are indeed suggestive.

Dybo (1990, 34–35) reconstructs the oblique forms of the 1/2 pl. personal pronoun in Slavic as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nāsъ, vāsъ</td>
<td>nāmъ, vāmъ</td>
<td>nāmí, vāmí,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all with (old) acute.

If this is correct, that is another set of forms with an acute reflecting the PIE lengthened grade (cf. also Lith. acute gen. pl. *mūsų* and *jūsų* and related
forms). These forms must have been originally oxytone (*nōsōm, *nōssú, *nōsmós, *nōsmís), and the retraction of the accent, which prevented the loss of a pretonic acute (see the next section), appears to be analogical after the ā-stems, which have āmīb, āxīb, -āmi by Hirt’s law.

This would put Meillet’s law and the jāblŏko/vědrò-distribution after the Slavic merger of ā and ō.

**The Slavic (sigmatic) aorist**

For the sigmatic aorist, with PIE ē-grade (likely by Szemerényi’s law in the 2/3 sg.), we would expect a Balto-Slavic acute. Like Olander (2009), I explain the loss of the acute as due to it being in pretonic position, where the acute was eventually lost in Slavic. However, I assume no forward shift of the accent, merely retention of original suffix-stress in the PIE thematic s-aorist (1sg. *-šóm, 1pl. *-šómos), and presumably analogical suffix-stress (after the 1st persons and e.g. the athematic plural) in 2pl. *-sté(s) and *-šént. The 2/3 sg. forms were replaced by asigmatic root imperfects (with mobile, i.e. barytone, accentuation).

The motivation of the metatony is clear: there was apparently (cf. Meillet’s law) a period in the prosodic history of Slavic where a pretonic acute syllable had to either take the stress (the case of e.g. jāblŏko or býti), or lose its acuteness (the case of e.g. vědrò or of the barytone mobile forms affected by Meillet’s law). The sigmatic aorist falls in the latter category.

As to the 2/3sg. aorist of verbs ending in a laryngeal, we can see that the intonation follows that of the past participle in -l-. If that is mobile (bylā, dalā, lilā, pilā), so is the aorist (bŷ, dâ, lî, pî). If it is barytone and acute (a), as in bîla ~ bî, šîla ~ šî, čûla ~ čû, krîla ~ krî, the two likewise agree.

**The Baltic ē-preterit**

The origin of the Baltic preterit(s) is disputed. Despite the ē-grade of the ē-preterit, I find a derivation from the sigmatic aorist highly unlikely, in part because of the circumflex intonation, but mainly because of the lack of –s-. I agree wholeheartedly with Pronk when he says that “the long circumflex vowel of bērē will have to be explained”, but unfortunately I have no suggestions to offer at the present time.

---

5 To explain the mobility, I have suggested that Hirt’s law did not work for the sequences *ih₂/₃ and *uh₂/₃ (cf. the development of these sequences in Tocharian and Greek). For dalā, I accept Kortlandt’s (1975) explanation (zero grade *dh₃-lō remade after *doh₃-).

6 Except to note that the parallel with the long vowel in the preterit plural of the Germanic verbs of the same shape eR- / eC- (strong classes IV and V) looks too exact to be a mere coincidence.
The Baltic future

Pronk (after Petit 2002) convincingly argues for an inner Lithuanian (Aukštaitian) origin for the metatony in forms like duðs “shall give” and kalbēs “shall speak”. At the Balto-Slavic stage (if applicable here at all) we only have to deal with (laryngeal) acutes, on which we all agree.

Narten presents

Slav. sēk̑t̑i, sēk̑o (ap c) “cut” < *sēkH̑- undoubtedly points to a non-laryngeal acute.

The case of Slav. -rēst̑i, *-rēt(j)̑p̑, aor. -rēt̑v̑ (ap a) “find” is less clear-cut, but Villanueva Svensson’s derivation from a Narten present *rēt̑- sounds reasonable enough.

Slav. smējt̑i, *smēj̑o sę (ap c), Latv. smiẽti(smēs), smeju(ōs), pret. smēju(ōs) “laugh”. The expected acute of *smē-jo- is seen in Latvian, and is obscured in Slavic by Meillet’s law. Reflexes of *sme-jo-, with short vowel, are also seen in both languages, although not in the same places.

ieškōti

Lith. ieškōti, ieškau (OLith. iesku) “look for, search”, Latv. iēskāt “look for lice”, Slav. įskāti ~ iskāti (ap b) “look for, search”, connected with Ved. icchāti, YAv. isaiti, Umbr. e-iscurent (< *h₂is-skē/ó-), Arm. haycem, OHG eiscon “ask” (< *h₂ais-ske/o-). On the unexpected acute full grade in Lith. ieškau, Villanueva Svensson, with Jasanoff 2003, concludes that “it is thus reasonable to assume that Lith. ieškau, Gmc. *aiskōn etc. reflect a contamination of inherited *h₂is-skē/ó- and [the Narten desiderative] *h₂ēis-s/*h₂ēis-s-”. Pronk’s alternative hypothesis that *Hi- (and *Hu-) became glottalized in initial position when stressed is unconvincing: the initial of *h₂is-skē/ó was obviously not stressed, and the stressed variant *h₂e(:)is(k̑)- obviously had no *Hi-. I find the connection with Lat. gnōscō, pāscō ~ Hitt. ganēss-, pahlys-highly attractive, and I think such a contamination does indeed underlie the Balto-Slavic forms of the “search” verb. Unfortunately, what it does not explain is the acute in the East Baltic initial syllable (*h₂ēis-s- is circumflex). For that, we should probably turn to Derksen 1996, where an excellent case is made for métatonie rude in Baltic sta-verbs.

Intensives / iteratives

The intensives / iteratives under discussion in Villanueva Svensson and Pronk’s articles were also analyzed in my Copenhagen paper “Slavic verbal accentuation”:

---

7 See now my 2013 paper “Verb incorporation in PIE, and other verbal suffixes” for a possible explanation of the acute, in which the verb ieškōti plays a central role.
As noticed by Dybo, the distribution of je-verbs with lengthened root vowel is the following:

\[ ii > ĭ, uu > ŭ \] in a.p. a (sýpati, mýkati, sýňkati, týkati, sýśati, pryškati, břýzgati, stúgati), while \[ ee > ě, aa > ā \] are in a.p. b (skakáti, xapáti, xramáti, makáti, kazáti, drémáti). The lengthening of the root vowel in these verbs must therefore be relatively ancient, as it follows the PIE distribution, where the only long ĭ and ŭ were acute (from \(*iH\) and \(*uH\) ), while ā, ě and ŝ could be either acute or circumflex. In particular, the formation of these verbs must predate the development \(*ei > ĭ\) and Meillet’s law (which created new ĭ’s and ŭ’s (ŷ’s)).

There is a category of verbs with lengthened root vowel which could be even older than the sýpati/stúgati/skakáti/drémáti-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(ō)-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 skakáti-verbs. This is not the case. Instead, we find the verbs in question scattered over all three accent paradigms:

- gážiti, páríti and váditi are a.p. a
- davíti, palíti and travíti are a.p. b
- sadíti and gasíti are a.p. c

I’m not sure about the a.p. of kaníti, račíti and maríti, but they appear to be a.p. b or c (Scr. káňiti káńím, máříti, mářím, Russ. раchíтeльны́). Since these verbs are not uniformly a.p. b, they cannot be lengthened a’s of the skakáti-type (aa > ā). But a lengthened vowel of PIE origin (Dehnstufe) should be reflected in Balto-Slavic as an acute long vowel (ā > ā), and the verbs are not uniformly a.p. a either. The pattern is in fact similar to the one we found above in the tudáti and jé-verbs with syllabic resonant, except that the starting point here was the root-stressed a.p.: roots of the structure āC, āR remain a.p. a, while roots of the structure āRH become a.p. b. We have:

\[ *g(\²)ōgʰ-ejej- > *gól-ij-; *(s)pór-ejej- > *pór-ir-; *wódʰh₁-ejej- > *wódr-ir- \]
as opposed to:

\[ *dʰōuH-ejej- > dōw-ir-; *tróuH-ejej- > trōw-ir-; *kónh₁-ejej- > kón-ir- \]

In the first set, the syllabification is \( g(\²)ōgʰeje- \), *(s)pór-eje-, *wódʰh₁eje- with a long rising vowel in the first syllable, which remains in a.p. I (a). In the second set, it is \(*dʰōu.Hejej-\), *(s)tróu.Hejej-\), *kón.h₁.ejej-\), with a long falling diphthong in the first syllable, and therefore a circumflex (cf. the circumflex in \*(H)ōu-jóm > ţje > váje/ jāje, or \*měmsóm > měso). 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.

One group of verbs I did not mention at the time are the ones Pronk discusses at some length in his reply to Villanueva Svensson: iteratives/inten-
sives with present tense *-ah2-je- (e.g. birāti, birāj̄o, etc.). The type, like the type skakāti, skačj̄p, appears to be a Balto-Slavic innovation, and the original intonation of the lengthened vowel may have been identical (ĩ, ū vs. ē, ā). My analysis of these forms is the following: the accentuation in the present tense must have been -āje-, as if by Hirt’s law from *-ah2-jē-. Subsequently, the pretonic acute (if any) was lost, as we saw in the case of the s-aorist (*bīrār̄jē- > *bīrār̄je-).

**je-presents**

Villanueva Svensson lists a number of Baltic verbs which derive from a non-acute root and have a long root vowel or diphthong which is attested with acute and with circumflex accentuation (Lith. répti, -répia beside -rēpti, -rēpia “take, embrace”, grēbti / grēbti “snatch, rake”, trēkšti / trēkšti “crush”, plēšti / plēšti “tear” (Latv. plēst), žēbti / žēbti “chew”, kvēpti / kvēpti “inhale” (Latv. kvēpt), čiáupti / čiáupti “close (mouth, lips)”, sīekti / sīkti “try to reach”, pliekšti / pliekšti “beat”).

Pronk establishes that all examples have a root ending in an occlusive and have a je-present and an ē-preterit. He then suggests that the long vowel of these verbs originates in the preterit stem, and that the introduction of the acute can be linked (after Petit 2010, 128) to je-presents built from roots ending in a resonant plus laryngeal. These show metatony (e.g. árti, āria ‘to plough’, skēlti, skelšia ‘to split’ etc.), due to the loss of the final laryngeal before the suffix *-je/o- (Pinault’s law). The pattern acute ē-preterit ~ circumflex je-present would have become productive in (East) Baltic, affecting the group in question, with root in occlusive.

I find this account plausible, given the fact that most of these verbs don’t have clear Narten-nature elsewhere.

Pinault’s law (Pinault 1982) is however supposed to be of Indo-European date, which forces me to rethink the analysis I made of zero-grade verbal roots in “Slavic verbal accentuation”:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tudáti</th>
<th>jé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ř</td>
<td>-i.Ró</td>
<td>-iR.jó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŘH</td>
<td>-iR.Hó</td>
<td>-iRH.jó</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leading to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tudáti</th>
<th>jé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ř</td>
<td>-iRó (b)</td>
<td>-iŘjó (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŘH</td>
<td>-iŘHó &gt; ĭRó (c)</td>
<td>-iŘHjó &gt; -iRjó (b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 aništ. [...].

In practice, we find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tudáti</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jo jěti (*h1em−)</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jo merti (*mer−)</td>
<td>dьm̩̊jо̊ dỳti (*dhmeH−)</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*g2erh3−)</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*gem−)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jьm̩̊jo čěti (*ken−)</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jo stëti (*ster−)</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*g2jeh3−)</td>
<td>nьr̩̊q nerti (*nerH−)</td>
<td>nьr̩̊q nerti (*g2erH−)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jьm̩̊jo žěti (*gem−)</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jo lьrti (*terH−)</td>
<td>žьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*g2erH−)</td>
<td>kьn̩̊q kьtëti (*klenH−)</td>
<td>žьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*gem−)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jьm̩̊jo pьrti (*spherH−)</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jo tьrti (*terH−)</td>
<td>žьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*g2erH−)</td>
<td>kьn̩̊q pьtëti (*spenH1−)</td>
<td>žьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*gem−)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jьm̩̊jo tьrti (*temH1−)</td>
<td>jьm̩̊jo tьrti (*temH1−)</td>
<td>žьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*g2erH−)</td>
<td>lьn̩̊q tьtëti (*temH1−)</td>
<td>žьm̩̊jо̊ jěti (*gem−)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we focus on the set je-presents, it is clear that if we accept Pinault’s law for PIE, there should be no difference between set and aništ reflexes (which I believe there is, based on the admittedly small sample of verbs). If we don’t accept Pinault’s law, however, the set je-presents should all have been in ap a, because of Hirt’s law, as I now realize. The mechanism by which Pinault’s law worked in these Slavic forms must have been something other than simply dropping the laryngeal. Perhaps we can think of something similar to the Germanic Verschärfung? Forms like, say, *dummjó, *ginnjó, *girrjó, *tirrjó would obviously not have been subject to Hirt’s law, but would also not have exhibited circumflex intonation (specifically, the resonant might not have made a diphthong with the preceding vowel, similarly to what we saw above in connection with the acc. pl.).

**BALTŲ IR SLAVŲ KALBŲ ILGIEJI BALSIAI**

*Santrauka*

Miguelis Villanueva Svenssonas (*Baltistica* 46(1)) gina vadinamąį „tradicinį’ požiūrį į baltų ir slavų kalbų ilgųjų balsių raidą, priešinamą „Leideno mokyklos” požiūrį (žr. Frederiko Kortlandto straipsnį „Long vowels in Balto-Slavic“, *Baltistica* 21(2)). Tijmenas Pronkas (*Baltistica* 47(2)) atsako į Villanuevos Svenssono argumentus. Šiame straipsnyje autorius aptaria kai kurius Villanuevos Svenssono ir Pronko minimus faktus, vadovaudamasis savaja interpretacijai, besiskiriančia tiek nuo Leideno, tiek nuo „tradicinio“ požiūrio. Straipsnyje aptariama:
- sonantu besibaigiantis daiktavardžių nom. sg.;
- lie. -ė;
- daiktavardžiai su ilguoju šaknies balsiu; šakniniai daiktavardžiai?;
- daiktavardžiai su ilguoju šaknies balsiu: balsiniai kamienai;
- įvardžiai;
- slauų (sigmatinis) aoristas;
- baltų ė preteritas;
- baltų futūras;
- Narten prezensai;
- ieškoti;
- intensyvai / iteratyvai;
- je prezensai.
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