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ZERO-GRADED DENOMINATIVE NASAL AND \textit{sta}-PRESENTS IN BALTIC

Abstract. The article deals with relics of zero-grade fientive denominative nasal and \textit{sta}-presents in Baltic even when derived from full-grade nominals, a derivational pattern going back to “Northern Indo-European”.
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1. Lithuanian and Latvian have a wealthy class of fientive denominative nasal and \textit{sta}-presents, e.g. Lith. šląpias “wet” → šląpti, šlaämpa “become wet”, ilgas “long” → ilgti, -\textit{sta} “grow longer”, Latv. slapjš → slapt, slùopu, īľgs → īģt, -\textit{stu}. In this article I will argue that the derivational pattern inherited by (East) Baltic involved zero grade of the root even when derived from full-grade nominals, the ablaut invariance of historical Lithuanian and Latvian being a relatively recent innovation. In order to see the issue in its proper perspective it will be convenient to begin with a brief discussion of the position of denominatives in the anticausative-inchoative class of verbs of the northern Indo-European languages.

2. As is well known, Baltic, Slavic and Germanic share a productive class of anticausative-inchoative verbs most saliently characterized by a nasal present, e.g. Lith. įp-ti, pres. lį-\textit{m}-p-\textit{a}, pret. įp-o “stick to”, OCS pri-\textit{lb}(p)-\textit{nq}-ti, pres. -\textit{lb}(p)-ne-tb, aor. -\textit{lbp}-e “id.”, Go. af-\textit{lf}-na-n, pres. -\textit{lf}-ni-\textit{b}, pret. -\textit{lf}-no-\textit{da} “be left over”. The origins and development of this class cannot be discussed within the limits of this article (my views have been presented in Villanueva Svensson 2011). Here I will only highlight the essential facts insofar as they help define the very existence of a “northern” class of verbs and/or are relevant for the nasal present denominatives:

First, the functional value of the nasal presents in the northern languages contrasts markedly with that which we can reconstruct for Indo-European,
where nasal presents were typically transitive. As expected in a widely represented class, intransitive nasal presents do of course occur in other languages (e.g. Lat. fungor “enjoy” = Ved. bhuṅkté “id.”, but also act. bhunákti “offer enjoyment”), but a consistent class of intransitive nasal presents is found in the northern languages alone. This is the main argument for assuming that it rests on a common innovation.

Second, from a formal point of view the nasal presents display slightly different morphology in each of the three northern branches, but there is plenty of evidence pointing to a common Baltic-like prototype *li-m-p-é-ti, with zero grade of the root, nasal infix, and thematic inflection (note relics like Go. standan “stand”, OCS sěsti, sędǫ “sit down”, etc.). This has been conclusively shown by Gorbachov (2007), to whom I refer for the details. The formal features of the present type *li-m-p-é-ti are not particularly surprising in an Indo-European perspective, but the clarity with which such an (innovated) prototype can be reconstructed for northern Indo-European is noteworthy.

Third, although the present type *limpéti is the most salient morphological feature of the northern anticausative-inchoative class, it is not the only one. As far as the present stem is concerned, one should mention an archaic layer of ie/o-presents (e.g. OCS, ORu. pri-lьple ~ -lь(p)ne- “cling, cleave to”, ON liggja, OE licgan “lie”; see Villanueva Svensson 2011, 48ff., building on Tedesco 1948) and the sta-presents with which nasal presents stand in complementary distribution in Baltic and perhaps in Balto-Slavic (see Villanueva Svensson 2010; Gorbachov 2014 for two recent and mutually incompatible proposals). There are good reasons to believe that the anticausative-inchoative class involved a thematic aorist as its regular aorist formation (*lip-é-t, OCS pri-lьpe “stuck to”). The thematic aorist, however, is directly preserved only in Slavic (the preterit formations of Baltic and Germanic are clearly innovated) and, accordingly, this cannot be proved.

Fourth, an important argument in favor of a common origin of the type *limpéti in Baltic, Slavic and Germanic is its position in the verbal system. In Indo-European nasal presents were typically used to provide a present stem to active-transitive root aorists (e.g. Ved. pres. bhinátti : aor. ábhet “split”). Predictably, in the languages they usually surface as primary verbs (Lat. findō, -ere, fidi “split”). By contrast, northern deverbatives of the type *limpéti typically belong to one of the following two derivational patterns: i) anticaus-
atives to primary transitive-terminative verbs (e.g. Go. (ga-)brikam “break, crush” → us-bruknan “be broken off”; Lith. skleisti, skleidzja “spread (tr.)” → sklīsti, sklīnda “spread (intr.”); ii) inchoatives to stative or durative verbs (e.g. Go. wakan, -aih “be awake” → ga-waknan “wake up”; OCS bđëti, bżḍǫ “be awake” → ʋąz-bv(d)nöti “wake up”).

3. The third derivational pattern in which the type *limpēti is productive is that of fientive denominatives from adjectives and, less commonly, nouns. Their general meaning is “become X”, where “X” symbolizes what the adjective or noun denotes. Denominatives display exactly the same morphology as the deverbatives and are abundantly represented in all three branches:

Go. fulls “full” → (ga-)fullnan “become filled”;
Lith. šlūbas “lame” → šlūbti, šlūmba “become lame”;
CS lixv “abundant, excessive” → lixnöti “become abundant, excessive”.

An interesting feature of the denominatives is that they present zero grade of the root when derived from full-grade nominals in Old Norse (where the type is still productive) and oldest Slavic (where the type became unproductive and was replaced by denominatives in -ěti, -ějǫ, e.g. starv “old” → sv-starēti sę “become old”). Some examples:

ON blautr “weak” → blotna “grow weak”,
ON heitr “hot” → hitna “become hot”,
ON hvitr “white” → hvitna “turn white”,
ON starkr “rigid, sturdy” → storkna “coagulate”,
OCS gluxv “deaf” → o-glęxnöti “become deaf”,
OCS mrazv “frost, ice” → sv-/po-mręznöti “freeze over, become congealed”,
OCS slępv “blind” → o-slępnöti “go blind”,
OCS xromv “lame” → o-xręmnöti “grow lame”.

The agreement between North Germanic and Slavic can only be an archaism, the ablaut invariance of Gothic (hails “healthy” → ga-hailnan “be healed”, etc.) being an easily understood innovation. A relic of the original morphology is preserved anyway in Go. ga-staurknan “become rigid” (= ON storkna “coagulate”), no doubt because the base adjective *starks “strong” was lost in East Germanic (cf. Gorbachov 2007, 72). Ablaut invariance

---

1 The northern type *li-m-p-ě-ti certainly includes primary verbs, but most of them are suspect of being relatively recent.
is predictably also found in Old Norse, where it is rare (e.g. *sjúkna* for older *sokna* “fall ill” after *sjúkr* “sick”), and in Slavic (e.g. Ru. *slépnut’* for OCS *-slǫpnoitic* after Ru. *slepój* “blind”). The same innovation that took place in Gothic took place in (East) Baltic as well, where nasal and *sta*-present denominatives regularly present the same vocalism as the derivational base (see below).

Northern denominatives of the type *limpéti* have received relatively little attention in the literature, but they are interesting for at least two reasons:

First, they have a remarkable probative force for the very existence of a northern Indo-European class of (secondary!) anticausative-inchoative verbs. The nasal infix was not used to make denominatives in Indo-European, a fact that implies that we must be dealing with an innovation. Even more important is the fact that Indo-European denominatives did not have zero grade of the root when derived from full-grade nominals. The innovation we are dealing with must thus be highly specific.²

The origin of the northern denominative type is reasonably clear on theoretical grounds: some deverbal anticausatives and/or inchoatives were secondarily associated to an adjective or noun of the same root and reinterpreted as fientive denominatives. A new denominative type was thus born and quickly became productive. Unfortunately, the original core that gave rise to this process is impossible to determine because of the very nature of the available evidence (exactly the same problem, it must be noted, is found with the northern deverbatives themselves). The essential point to stress in our present connection is that there must have been a robust class of anticausatives and/or inchoatives for a new denominative type to develop and that the existence of a denominative type characterized by nasal infix, thematic inflection, and consistent zero-grade of the root is so peculiar that it is unlikely to rest on parallel, but independent developments of the three branches. It must have arisen in “Northern Indo-European” itself.

Second, taking the denominatives seriously may give us an additional device to uncover the prehistory of individual verbs and/or word-families in Baltic, Slavic and Germanic. The derivational base of an original denomina-

² A third possible argument would be the associated thematic aorist of denominatives in Slavic, if sufficiently old. As already observed, however, although there are good reasons to project the Slavic thematic aorist of Leskien’s Class II back into northern Indo-European, this cannot be proved.
tive may be lost. The denominative may be reinterpreted as a primary verb and give rise to new derivatives of its own, eventually including a back-formed transitive that would be synchronically indistinguishable from other primary verbs of the language. There is hardly any necessity to observe that such a framework may have an impact on research on “root-enlargements” and other processes leading to the creation of neo-roots in these dialects of Indo-European (see below for some examples).³

4. We can turn now to Baltic, where the nasal presents must needless to say be studied together with the sta-presents with which they stand in complementary distribution.⁴

Fientive denominatives are very well represented in Lithuanian (215 examples, according to Pakalniškienė 2000, 72), somewhat less in Latvian (48 examples, according to Hauzenberga-Šturma 1970, 184).⁵ The root vocalism of the denominative regularly copies that of the nominal base (in spite of the fact that zero-grade is perfectly well established among deverbatives), e.g. žąlias “green” → žálti, žąla/-sta “grow green”, sēnas “old” → sėnti, -sta “grow old”, sveikas “healthy” → sveĩkti, -sta “get better, recover”, etc.

In other words, Lithuanian and Latvian present exactly the same picture as Gothic and must rest on an equally trivial innovation. From the preceding section, however, it is clear that the pattern inherited by Baltic regularly involved zero-grade of the root even when derived from full-grade nominals. It is perfectly possible, in principle, that some zero-grade denominatives survived into historical times – presumably not as transparent synchronic

³ In a more speculative vein, one could consider the possibility that the fientive deverbatives, once firmly established in the language, could have a certain impact on the development of the system of anticausative and inchoative deverbatives. Elsewhere I have argued that the inchoatives were originally characterized by a je/o-present, inchoative nasal presents being a secondary import from the anticausatives (Villanueva Svensson 2011, 46ff.). Fientive denominatives must have been frequently paired with a stative denominative in *-eh₁je/o-. It is at least conceivable that this fact had a certain influence on the constitution of the characteristic Balto-Slavic deverbative pattern stative Lith. buděti, budi, OCS bȳděti, budi- “be awake”: inchoative Lith. pa-būsti, -buñda, OCS vėz-/bỳ(d)nòti, -bỳ(d)nò “wake up”.

⁴ The rules ordering the distribution of nasal and sta-presents in Lithuanian are well-known and have been described many times (e.g. Stang 1966, 340ff.). See Villanueva Svensson (2010, 206ff.; 2011, 34f.) for their distribution in Proto-Baltic.

⁵ The absence of certain examples in Old Prussian is surely due to chance.
denominatives, but as “disguised” ones whose denominative origin can only be recovered from a historical perspective.

In what follows I will discuss potential examples of inherited zero-grade denominatives in Baltic. The survey is mostly centered on Lithuanian and does not try to be exhaustive. It is rather intended to exemplify the type of evidence and problems we are dealing with. If the framework developed in this article is accepted, I am certain that more examples will show up in the future.

5. The first surprise one finds when approaching the evidence in this perspective is that synchronically recognizable zero-grade denominatives are actually attested in Lithuanian:

(1) aršùs AP 4 “furious, violent” (Latv. aršāk(i) “more”, ārsala “angry woman”) → dial. išti, -šta “rage, go angry” (Latv. sa-irstiē “id.”).
(2) bjaũrus/bjaурùs, bjaурās AP 2/4 “ugly” (Latv. bļaũrs “bad, awful”) → bjùrti, bjûra/bjûrsta “become ugly” (also rare dial. bjaurti, -sta “id.”).
(3) bràngus/brangûs AP 1/3 “expensive” (Latv. braņgs “id.”) → dial. brìngti, -sta “become expensive” (normal brângti, -sta “id.”).
(4) draũgas AP 4 “friend” → OLith. su-drugti, -sta “become friends with” Bretkūnas (also draugti, -ia “be friends with” Daukša; normal draugauti, -āuja “id.”).
(5) kartûs AP 3/4 “bitter” → dial. kišti, -sta “turn bitter” (normal kašti, -sta “id.”, also kartéti, -éja “id.”).
(6) kiáuras AP 3 “holey” (Latv. caũrs “id.”) → kiùrti, kiùra/kiùrsta “grow holey, get holes”.
(7) lîesas AP 1/3 “lean, thin” (Latv. liẽss “id.”) → lýsti, -sta “grow thin” (also lîesēti, -éja “id.”, dial. lîést, -sta “id.”; Latv. liẽst, -stu “id.”).
(8) lùošas AP 3 “lame” → dial. ap-lûšti, -lûsta “become lame” (very rare; also luõsti, -šta “id.”).
(9) niaurûs, niaûras AP 4 “sullen, gloomy, rusty” → niûrti, niûra/niûrsta “grow gloomy” (also adj. niûrûs, but the initial palatalization requires a full-grade base).
(10) siaûras AP 4 “narrow” (Latv. šàurs) → dial. siûrti, siûra “grow narrow” (very rare; normal siaurûti, -éja “id.”).

Although self-explanatory at first sight, not all examples are equally certain. Zero-grade seems to be the rule among roots ending in °r° (bjûrti, kiûrti, niûrti, all of them belonging to the standard language, dial. siûrti), whereas other root structures are more erratically represented and only lýsti is normal in standard Lithuanian. The case of dial. išti, bringti, kišti (← aršûs, brangûs,
*kartūs* is particularly uncertain because deverbative *u*-stem adjectives with *o*-grade of the root (ultimately continuing the PIE type τομός) are productive in Lithuanian (*miūtī* “die” → *marūs* “mortal”, etc.). The possibility that we are dealing with an old primary verb is high in the case of *arūs ~ iūštī* (cf. dial. *arūtīs* “get excited, rage”, *erūstas* “anger”), but I find it unlikely in the case of *kartūs ~ kūštī* and *brangūs ~ bringtī* (note, in addition to the semantics, that the original immobility of *brangūs*/*brangūs* is untypical for deverbative adjectives the type *marūs*). An occasional reversion of the derivational channel *miūtī* → *marūs* into *kartūs* → *kūštī* can perhaps not be excluded, but would be distinctly rare.

Apart from Lith. *draūgas*, Latv. *drāugs* (: OCS *drugъ*) none of the items mentioned above has a completely certain extra-Baltic etymology. Accordingly, in many of them we must be dealing with purely (East) Baltic material. *bjaurūs*, *kiāuras*, *niaūras*, *siaūras* → *bjūrtī*, *kiūrtī*, *niūrtī*, *siūrtī* must have been created after the sound change *-euC- > *-jauC-*. The chronology of this sound change is disputed, but there is some evidence suggesting that it was a relatively late development that took place independently in Slavic and Baltic (cf. Villanueva Svensson 2015a, with references; see further below § 8.2). Finally, *lūošas* → *ap-lūštī* implies an exclusively East Baltic neo-ablaut (*-ō- >) *-uo- → -ū-* (cf. Villanueva Svensson 2015b, 322ff.).

The provisional conclusion seems to be that the derivational process involving zero-grade denominatives did not just leave some relics in Baltic, but was kept alive, at least marginally, in Proto-East Baltic.

Cases like *bjaurūs* → *bjūrtī* etc. have only occasionally been noted in the literature (e.g. Pakalniškienė 2000, 73) and never been highlighted as potentially interesting. In point of fact, most treatments simply do not mention them. The only exception known to me is Gorbachov (2007, 162),

---

6 The idea that *arūs*, *iūštī* etc. are Byelorussian loan words (e.g. Fraenkel LEW 16ff., 187) is almost certainly false, cf. Urbūtis 1989, 44ff.

7 It may be illustrative to see how they are treated in the etymological dictionaries (as, put it this way, their authors could not escape this material for the sake of clarity of exposition). The only comment I have found in Fraenkel is that *lūštī* “lautet ab mit līesas” (376). Other examples are regularly mentioned, but not commented upon. Smoczyński (2007) offers alternative accounts for *kiūrtī* (282) and *niūrtī* (426), declares *-drūgtī* unclear (120), and makes no comment on the other forms. ALEW (2015) offers an alternative account of *-drūgtī* (988), considers *bringtī* a primary verb (130), and qualifies
who correctly observes that süsti, sîsta “grow scabby; wither” and tükti, tuñka “grow fat” are relics of the original northern Indo-European morphology of nasal present denominatives. Unfortunately, both items are problematic:

(11) taukaĩ AP 3 “fat” (Latv. tāuki “id.”, adj. tāuks “fat, greasy”, OPr. taukis “lard” Elb.) → tükti, tuñka (-sta) “grow fat” (Latv. tukā, tūki, also tükt, -stu “id.”) → caus. tükinti “make fat”, adj. tuklūs “fat, greasy”, etc. (Latv. tucināt, tukls).

The Baltic word for “fat” has clear cognates in the northern languages: Sl. *tȗkъ AP c “fat” (OCS tukъ, Ru. tuk, Scr. tûk, etc.; with derivatives like *tučъ “fat, rich” [OCS tučъ, Ru. тучnyj, etc.], *tuciti “make fat; (refl.) grow fat” [Ukr. tûčyty, Pol. tuczyć]), Gmc. *þeuha- n. “thigh” (ON þjó, OE þēoh, OHG dioh). Although less certain, here probably belong MIr. tón “hindquarters, bottom” (< *tuknā?; see Zair 2012, 155 on MW tin “arse, buttocks, bottom”), Lat. tucca, tuccētum “a kind of sausage” Pers.+ (Gaulish loan word), Um. gen. sg. toco TI Vb 13 “Hinterschinken” (vel sim.; cf. Untermann 2000, 774).

It is generally agreed upon that these forms are related to the root *teuh2- “grow fat, strong” (Ved. tavīti “becomes strong”, Sl. *tūti, *-jǭ AP a “grow fat”, etc.; LIV 639f.), but the ultimate analysis is problematic. A “root-enlargement” *teuhk- is probably the standard approach (e.g. IEW 1081), whereas the LIV posits a “Parallelwurzel” *teuk- (641). The main argument for the latter approach is the interpretation of the Indo-Iranian root *tuaks- (Ved. tvaks- “be active, be strong”, Ir. *θuaks- “be busy, work on”) as a fossilized desiderative *tuék-s- with secondary State II of the root (as in *h2eug- → *h2ēek-s-, etc.). This is attractive, but not conclusive. Leaving Baltic aside, the evidence is multiply ambiguous and does not allow deciding between *teuhk- and *teuk- (Sl. *tûkə is ambiguous as a result of Meillet’s law; MIr. tón, if it really goes back to *tuknā, could point to *teuk-, but the short vowel could be explained via Dybo’s law [Matasović 2009, 393] or via “Wetter’s rule” [Balles 2011, 281]).

In my view, a problem with both approaches is that the concepts of “root-enlargement” and “parallel roots” are virtually impossible to control and

bjûrti, lýsti, niùrti as “regelmäßig tiefstufiges intransitives Inchoativum” (119, s.v. *bjûrti). It is unclear to me what “regelmäßig” means in this context. Derksen (2015) is the only author who correctly observes that kiùrti is “a denominative verb belonging to kiáuras” (249; other verbs are not mentioned), but does not add any other observation.
should be avoided unless the facts compel us to do otherwise. A more rational approach would be to start from a real derivative *teuh₂-ko-, *touh₂-ko- or *tuh₂-ko- as the source of the Western forms. This would force us to leave In.-Ir. *tyakš- aside and it remains a task for the future to work out the evidence in detail.

There is no need to take a strong position here. The relationship between tükš, tuňka and taukaĩ is so obvious even in modern Lithuanian that a denominative is the most likely solution under any root analysis. Even if we are dealing with a “real” root *teuHk- or *teuk-, the fact remains that tükš, tuňka would stand alone as the only witness of a PIE primary verb (if LIV’s analysis of In.-Ir. *tyakš- is correct, it would be an extremely old formation and thus hardly relevant for tükš).

The original intonation of this Baltic word family is surprisingly indeterminate. Acute intonation predominates in Lithuanian, circumflex in Latvian, without it being easy to derive one from the other. If we start from (pre-)Bl. *taũka- (Latv. tāuki), Lith. tükš, tuņka, Latv. tukt, tûku are unproblematic, but not Latv. tûkt, -stu. If we start from (pre-)Bl. *tāuka- or *tṓuko- (Lith. taukaĩ AP 3), I see two possible solutions for the short vowel of tükš. The denominative could have been formed at a time when “normal” zero-grade derivatives could be made from “long vowel” bases as *tṓuko-. This is perhaps conceivable, but hardly attractive. Alternatively, one could recall the fact that pairs of normal zero-grade nasal present and lengthened zero-grade sta-presents from original acute roots are well attested in East Baltic (e.g. Lith. skísti, -sta “liquify” ~ skísti, skiūda “become flimsy”, trūkti, -sta “be lacking, burst” ~ trûkti, trūňka “last, continue”, etc.). The origin of this phenomenon is unclear, but its reality cannot be doubted. This framework would actually explain why we have not only Lith. tükš, tuņka, Latv. tukt, tûku, but also Latv. tûkt, -stu (which is otherwise hard to generate within Latvian).

? (12) saũsas AP 4 “dry” (Latv. sàuss “id.”) → sústi, sůsta “grow scabby; wither” (Latv. sust, -u “become dry”; also saũsti, -sta “become dry”, sauséti, -éja “id.”, Latv. sàust², -stu, sàusêt, -ėju, susêt, -u).

At first sight saũsas → sústi looks like an almost ideal example, for two reasons: i) susti, sůsta has secondary semantics vis-à-vis the later denominative saũsti, -sta, which is exactly what we would expect in an archaism; ii) OCS sux̱ “dry” → -sůxnòti, -sůxnɔ “wither, become dry” offers an
apparently perfect *comparandum, thus pointing to a Balto-Slavic denomina-
tive *su-n-s-e-ti “becomes dry”.

On closer inspection, however, it is by no means certain that we are ac-
tually dealing with a denominative. Beside OCS -sъxne- there is a well-es-
stablished je-present OCS -sъše- (cf. Tedesco 1948, 358) with reasonable
cognates in Ved. śuṣyati “dries up”, Gk. αὕω “dry (tr.)”, all of them pointing
to a PIE je/o-present *h₂sus-je/ó- (e.g. LIV 285).

The existence of an archaic je/o-present in oldest Slavic does not automa-
tically prove that Lith. sùsti, sūsta is not an old nasal present denomina-
tive, but of course it would be preferable to keep the equation OCS -sъxngti,
-sъxne-/sъše- = Lith. sùsti, sūsta. Slavic actually has a couple of denomina-
tive je-present variants beside “normal” ne-presents (krěpъ “strong” → ORu.
o-krěple- “become strong”, slěpъ “blind” → ORu. o-slъple- “go blind”, cf.
Sīgalov 1961, 93) and there is no reason why the northern fientive denom-
inatives could not have encompassed je/o-presents in addition to nasal pre-
sents. If this is the case, *h₂souš-ó- “dry” ~ *h₂sus-je/ó- “become dry” must
have been one of the core pairs that gave rise to the whole process (the other
option would be to assume that ORu. o-krěple-, o-slъple- represent a very
moderate expansion of “Class II” je-presents in some varieties of Slavic).

Turning back to Lith. sùsti, sūsta, from what has been said it is clear that it
is not a probative example of an old nasal denominative. On the other hand,
its preservation into historical times (note that its relationship to saũsas is
self-evident and that Latv. sust, -u, unlike Lith. sùsti, does not have special-
ized semantics) makes better sense if it was supported by a class of zero-grade
denominatives.

6. The examples discussed in § 5 are exceptional. Qua archaisms one
would not expect old zero-grade denominatives to be still recognizable as
such. In a branch characterized by such a rich derivational system as Baltic
we would rather expect them to be synchronically embodied in large word
families, their denominative origin being only recoverable from a historical
perspective (as to some degree is the case with taukaĩ → tūkti → tuklis). In
this section I will examine some synchronically opaque denominatives:

   (13) *graũbas “rough, uneven” → grũbti, gruũba “become numb, coarsen” →
grub(l)is AP 4 “rough, uneven”.

This word family includes many derivatives (gruoblē “unevenness (of ter-
rain)”, graublē “id.”, grüb(l)as “id.”, Latv. grubulis “unevenness, clod”, etc.),
all of them clearly dependent on adj. grub(l)ūs. Note further Latv. grumbt, -ju “wrinkle”, which looks like a cognate of Lith. grūbtī, grūmba with -m- resegmented as part of the root and transfer to the ia-presents.

Other things being equal one would take grūbtī as an unremarkable denominative of grubūs. In Slavic, however, we have adj. *grubnъ “coarse, rude” beside *grūbmъ “id.” (OCS grūmbъ, Ru. grūbyj, Pol. gręby, SCR. grūb, Slvn. grōb, Bulg. grub), which can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as a full-grade adjective *groub-o- and a secondary adjective *grumb-o- that adopted its -um- from an original nasal present cognate with Lith. grūbtī, grūmba. Its more natural interpretation is a zero-grade denominative of Bl.-Sl. *groub-o-. The derivation of a secondary adjective grub(l)ūs from grūbtī in Baltic is unproblematic, as is the fact that grub(l)ūs eventually replaced *graũbas. The end result was an (East) Baltic word family in which grūbtī was naturally reinterpreted as a denominative of its original derivative grubūs.

(14) kraupūs AP 4 “frightful” (Latv. kraũps “rough, coarse”; kraũpa “detached tree bark; knot, wart”, kŗaũpa “scab (of horses)”) → krūptī (kriũptī), kruũpa “grow scabby, become rough; grow numb, stiff”, Latv. krupt (krupt), kruņu “become scabby, rough” (also kraũpt “id.”, rare) → kr(i)ūpē, kr(i)ūpis AP 2, Latv. krupis (kruapis), krūpis “toad”, Latv. krups “tiny”, etc.

The meaning of Lith. kraupūs “frightful” (with derivatives like kraũptī, -ia “frighten; scold”, krūptī, -sta “become afraid”, krupūs AP 4 “fearful”, etc.) is almost certainly secondary. The Latvian evidence and Lith. krūptī, kr(i)ūpē point to an original meaning “rough, coarse, scabby” (vel sim.). There are several reasons for assuming that krūptī, Latv. krupt is an original denominative of kraupūs, Latv. kraũps:

First, the Germanic and Slavic evidence point to a “northern” full grade adjective *kreupo- “rough, scabby” as the core of this word family: Gmc. *hreuba- “scabby, rough” (ON hrjúfr, OE hréof, etc.), Sl. *krupynъ “coarse” (Ru. krúpnyj, SCR. krúpan, etc.), *krupɑ AP b “grain, groats; hail, crumb” (CS krupa, Ru. krupá, SCR. krúpa, etc.). Zero-grade is very rare in Slavic (only Ru. dial. krópyj, kropkój “fragile, rough” < *krępky) and probably secondary in Germanic (ON hrufa “fragile, rough” (h)rufr “scab, leprosy”). There is no evidence for a primary verb in either Germanic or Slavic.

Second, the Baltic palatalized variants Lith. kri̇, Latv. kŗ̄ require a full-grade base *kr’ap̄- < *kreup- as their starting point (cf. Gmc. *hreuba-)
and, at the same time, a motivation for the depalatalization to *kr(a)up-. A
denominative *kru-m-p-e/o-, if sufficiently old, would provide a reasonable
source. The existence of a Balto-Slavic denominative *kru-m-p-e/o- is prob-
ably supported by Latv. krūmpa “fold, wrinkle”, krūmpēt “crinkle, wrinkle”,
CS kropèti “contract”, Sl. *kropъ “small, short; thick” (CS kropъ, Pol. krępy,
Bulg. krăp).

(15) *maulas (maulióti(s) “get dirty”) → mūlti, -sta “get dirty” (rare) → mūlinas
“dirty”; ? muĪvas “clay-coloured”, muĪvé “mud, marsh”.

These forms are dialectal and not abundantly attested (see LKŽ s.v.). Since
*meul- is not an acceptable root structure, the –l- must contain suffixal mate-
rial. An original adjective or noun *maulas as the source of mūlti is supported
by maulióti(s) and Sl. *mulъ/*mul “mud; murky water, rainwater” (Ru. mul,
SCR. mūlj, Cz. mula, Pol. mul, etc.; see ĖSSJa 20, 185f., with references).

(16) mauraĩ AP 3(1/2/4) “duckweed; silt, mud” (Latv. maũrs “grass, lawn”) →
mūrėti, -sta/mūrā “become wet; sink” (Latv. iz-muiris “wet”) → mūras “wet
(earth)”, mūris “id.”, mūrdyti “plunge”, mūrdēti “welter”, Latv. mūrdēt (mūrdēt,
mūrdēt) “well (from)”: 

Lith. mauraĩ (with transparent derivatives like adj. máurinas/maũrinas,
maurúotas, coll. maurýnas, denom. máurēti/maurēti, māurinti, etc.) has clear
cognates in Slavic: *murъ, *mura “mud, mould” (Ru. dial. mur “mould”,
SCR. mër “drift sand”, múra “mud, clay”, Cz. mour “soot”), *murava “meadow
grass, lawn” (Ru. muravá, Bulg. muráva, Slvn. mūrāva, etc.), perhaps
*murъ “dark-grey” (Ru. dial. múryj, Slvn. můr). See ĖSSJa XX 191ff. for
more material. As per Smoczyński (2007, 378), we must be dealing with
a Balto-Slavic derivative *mouH-ro- from the root *meuH- of Latv. maũt,
maũju “swim, submerge”, Lith. máudyti “bath”, Sl. *mýti, *mýjǫ AP a “wash”
(PCS myti, myjǫ, SCR. mûti, mûjēm, Ru. mytъ, móju, etc.).

Zero grade is rare in Baltic (it is unattested in Slavic) and clearly dependent
on mūrėti, -sta (note that forms like Lith. murà “mire”, mūras “wet (earth)”,
mūrinti “make wet, make dirty”, mūrioti/mūrióti “id.”, Latv. mūrēt, mūrēt
“id.”, etc. cannot of course continue something like *muH-ro-). Accordingly,
an old zero-grade denominative seems unavoidable.

(17) slăbnas, slōbnas (Latv. slābs [Slavicism?], slābans) “weak” → silpti/siĺpti, -sta
“grow weak” → silpnas/siĺpnas “weak” AP 1/3/4.
If this etymology of *siļpti, *siļpnas is accepted (e.g. Smoczyński 2007, 550) an old zero-grade denominative is the best way to motivate the assimilation -b- > -p- (*silb-ti, *silb-sta, *silb-o > *silp-ti, *silp-sta, *silb-o). Once established in the language *silpti/*silpti gave rise to a new family of its own that eventually displaced *slōbna out of use. Interestingly, the process leading to *silpti/*silpti repeated itself in newly formed denominatives: *slōpti, -sta ~ slōpti/slōpti, -sta (also slābti, slaṁba), Latv. slābt/slābt, -stu ~ slāpt, -stu “grow weak”. The original adjective Bl.-Sl. *slābas is preserved in Sl. *slābъ AP a “weak” (OCS slabъ, Ru. slābyj, Scr. slāb, etc.) and, perhaps, Latv. slābs (which has often been suspected of being a Slavic borrowing). The tone of the Baltic forms is surprisingly unstable, but most of the evidence agrees with the Slavic acute.

(18) šiáurė AP 1/3 “North; north wind”, šiaurys AP 3/4 “north wind”, šiáuras/šiáuras AP 3/4, šiaurūs AP 4 “sharp, biting, cold” (dial. šūras AP 4, šūrūs AP 4 “id.”) → šiurti, šiūra/-sta “bristle (hear); fray (clothes); get rough, rugged” → šiūrinti “rustle”, šiarkštūs AP 4 “rough, coarse”.

To my knowledge, this etymology of šiurti, šiurkštūs is proposed here for the first time. The more or less traditional connection with šértis, -iasi “shed hair or feathers, molt”, šerỹs “bristle”, Sl. *sъrstъ “hair (of animals)” (e.g. Fraenkel LEW 995, Derksen 2015, 451) is unlikely on formal grounds.

The base word šiáurė has well-known cognates in Sl. *sъverъ AP a “North; north wind” (CS sęverъ, Scr. sjēvăr, Ru. séver, etc.) < *kēh₁uero-, Lat. caurūs “north wind” (< *kēh₁uero-). The mismatch between Lith. šiáurė and Sl. *sęverъ is usually explained as reflecting Balto-Slavic ablaut, but this would imply a fairly unique type of paradigm. I thus prefer assuming that Bl.-Sl. *sęero- was syncopated to *sęyro- in Baltic, whence Lith. šiáurė by regular sound change. If this is correct, derivatives like adj. šiáuras/šiaurūs must be exclusively Baltic. The meaning of the denominative šiurti (be it from šiáurė or from adj. šiáuras) must rest on a development “get bitten by cold wind” → “bristle (hear), get rough (hand) out of cold” (vel sim.). Dialectal forms like šiūras/šiūrūs “sharp, biting, cold” may have been formed from šiurti at an early date and reflect its original meaning.

7. As observed above (§ 6), old zero-grade denominatives are likely to end up as part of large word families. In this section I will study three cases that on a priori grounds must represent the most common constellations in which
old zero-grade denominatives can be found. In all three cases we are dealing with unremarkable derivatives from a synchronic point of view.

7.1. The original zero-grade denominative looks like a normal denominative from a zero-grade nominal that was derived from it:

(19) *kaṃpas AP 2/4 “corner” → *kuṇpīti, -sta “become crooked, bent; bend (intr.)” → *kuṃpas AP 4 “bent, crooked”.

Lith. *kaṃpas, kuṇpti, kuṃpas are Proto-Baltic in date: Latv. kaņpis “curved piece of wood”, kuṇpt, -stu “become crooked, bent; shrivel”, kuṃps2 “shriveled, crooked” (if not Curonianisms, as suggested by the preserved -m- and the intonation), OPr. kūmpint, kūmpinna “push away, hinder” (implying *kumptvei = Lith. kuṇpti), etkūmps “again, anew” (implying *et-kumpas = Lith. kuṃpas). Lith. kaņpas belongs with PIE *kamp- “bend (vel sim.)”: Gk. κάμπτω “bend, curve”, κάμπη “caterpillar, silkworm” (?), Lat. campus “field”, Gmc. *hamfa- “mutilated, lame” (Go. hamfs, etc.), Sl. *koṭ⁴ AP b “corner” (OCS kọt, etc.) < *kamp-to- or *kump-to-.

From a synchronic point of view kuṇpti is an unremarkable derivative of kuṃpas. If this analysis is historically correct, it requires previous kaṃpas → kuṇpas. The derivational morphology implied here, however, is unparalleled in Baltic. Similar difficulties arise if one projects kuṃpas back into Indo-European or Balto-Slavic: there is no comparative evidence for an adjective *kṃp-ó- and zero-grade derivatives are rare for PIE roots with root vowel *a. It is therefore preferable to assume that kuṃpas was derived from kuṇpti. As for kuṇpti, -sta itself, there are two ways to generate the zero grade within Baltic. It could be an old anticausative to a lost transitive primary verb *kaṃpti, -ia “bend” cognate with Gk. κάμπτω (as perhaps implicitly suggested in LIV 342). This, however, has the disadvantage of operating with unattested evidence. The second option is to assume an old zero-grade denominative of kaṃpas “corner”, which has the advantage of operating with attested material at a relatively late date. Although this cannot be verified, Sl. *koṭ⁴ could be a derivative from the Balto-Slavic denominative.

7.2. The original zero-grade denominative looks like an inchoative from a stative-durative verb that was derived from it:

(20) miēlas AP 1/3 “dear”, Latv. dial. mīls2 “id.” (< *miels2, Latv. miēlasts “Gastmahl”, miēluot, mielāt “host, feast, feed; be dear”) (also Žem. mīlas, Latv. mīls, miļš, OPr. miūls, mīls “dear”) → (pa-)mīlti, -sta “fall in love; become dear” → mylēti, mīli, Latv. mīlēt, -u, OPr. milijt, mīle “love”.
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Synchronically (pa-)mīlti is an unremarkable inchoative of mylēti of the type žydēti “bloom” → (pra-)žýsti “begin to bloom”. Since *mei[H]l- is not an acceptable root structure it is clear that mylēti cannot be a primary verb and that it must be somehow derived from the primary adjective mīelas/my- 
as “dear” (not “beloved”), with a perfect cognate in Sl. *mīlō AP a “dear” (OCS mīlo, Ru. milyj, Scr. mīo, etc.) < *méiH-lo- or *miH-lô-. Further material from the root *meiH- (Lat. mītis “soft”, etc.) is well known and needs not be repeated here.

Other things being equal one would simply assume that Bl. *mīlēti “*be dear > love” is a denominative of the primary adjective (and hence was inflected as *mīlēti, -ēja) that became a primary verb and was transferred to the type budēti, būdi, the unmarked type for stative deverbatives. The problem in this case lies in the primary adjective, for which both *mēila- and *mīla- are well established in Baltic (Sl. *mīlo is ambiguous). Most authors simply recognize ablaut variants *mēila- ~ *mīla-. Although this cannot be excluded, it is a priory unattractive to operate with synonymous variants in prehistory. In such cases it is always advisable to at least explore the possibility that only one of them is original.

The above scenario starts from the assumption that full grade was original in the primary adjective *mēilas, *-mīlti “become dear” being an old zero-grade denominative. The denominative *-mīlti then generated a stative verb *mīlti “be dear”. The semantic shift to “to love” could have taken place either with *-mīlti or with *mīlēti. When this happened the neo-stative *mīlēti became the center of this word-family, with the result that adj. *mēilas “dear” was remade to *mīlas in most Baltic dialects (note that most traces of *mēil° in Latvian have displaced semantics and must thus be relatively old). The position of *-mīlti in the system was naturally reordered.

Note that it is not possible to reach an explanation of the variation *mēila- ~ *mīla- along these lines starting from the stative *mīlēti, as stative denominatives in *-eh₁je/o- do not seem to have triggered zero-grade of the root in Balto-Slavic or Indo-European.

7.3. The original zero-grade denominative looks like an anticausative from a transitive verb that was back-formed from it:

(21) Sl. *mōrkъ AP c “darkness” (OCS mrakъ, Scr. mrâk, Ru. dial. mórok, etc.) → *mīrkti, -sta “grow dark” → mërkti, -ia “close one’s eyes” (whence mirksēti, mirksi, Latv. mīrkšēt “blink”).
In principle, one would take Lith. mérkti, -ia and Sl. *mŏrkọti AP a “grow dark” (OCS -mŏrkọti, Scr. mĕknuti, Ru. mërknut’, etc.) as membra disjecta of a Balto-Slavic transitive primary verb (Lith. mérkti) and a derived anticausative (Sl. *mŏrkọti). But there are two problems with such an analysis. First, within Slavic *mŏrkọti is most straightforwardly interpreted as a denominative of *mŏrk. Second, a root “*merHk-” is suspicious because the coda °RHT- is extremely rare among bona fide Indo-European verbal roots.  

This suggests that the -k- contains suffixal material and that we must start from a northern Indo-European nominal *merH-ko- (or *morH-ko-, *mřH-ko-), cf. Go. maurgins “morning”. If Sl. *mŏrkọti is indeed an old (Balto-Slavic) denominative, its Baltic counterpart would be (unattested) *mîrkti, -sta. Since Lith. mérkti cannot be a primary verb and lacks a plausible nominal derivational basis, it is reasonable to interpret it as an inner-Baltic back-formed transitive to *mîrkti, -sta.

8. The examples we have seen so far have an interest for etymology and for uncovering the precise prehistory of individual word families. On occasion, however, inherited zero-grade fientive denominatives may have a certain impact on broader issues of Baltic, Balto-Slavic, even Indo-European historical linguistics. In this section I will study two such cases.

8.1. Lith. gýti, gýja and the alleged primary verb of the PIE root “to live”.

(22) Sl. *gŏj AP c (ORu. goi “peace, friendship”, Scr. gŏj “peace”, Slvn. gŏj “care, cultivation”, Cz. hoj “abundance, wealth”), Lith. gajùs AP 4 “vital, tenacious, thriving” (if old) → gýti, gýja/-na/-sta “recover; heal” (Latv. dzît, -stu “id”) → caus. gýdyti “treat, heal”.

As is well known, in Indo-European “alive” and “to live, to be alive” were expressed with adj. *gώiH3uó-, vb. *gώiH3uе/o- “to live”, respectively (preserved in most languages, e.g. Lat. uīuus, uīuere, etc.). The adjective *gώiH3uó- is directly continued in Lith. gývas AP 3, Latv. dzîus, Sl. *žîvь AP c. The verb “to live”, on the other hand, presents a much more complicated picture. OPr. inf. giwīt, pres. 2 sg. giw ASSI, giwas, 3 sg. giwa, 1 pl. giwamme points to a paradigm *giṽ-e-tēi, *giṽ-e/o- of the type tekēti, tēka. It may well preserve the Balto-Slavic paradigm untouched. Lith. gvyėnti, gvyėna probably depends on a Prussian-like paradigm, whatever the details might be. Latv. dzûvōt, -uōju,

---

8 The LIV includes only seven such cases (*bʰrejHk-, *bʰreHuɡ-, *dʰeHɡw-, *spɛrHɡ-, *sreHɡ, *stelH3k-, *yelH1b²-), most of them questionable for one or another reason.
on the other hand, is clearly a denominative replacing the old primary verb (in Latvian we also have dzīvāt, dzīvēt and OLatv. dzīvu; the denominatives gyvoti, gyvūoti are in use in Lithuanian as well). For Slavic we can reconstruct a paradigm Sl. *žiti, pres. *živọ, *živet- AP c, aor. *živę̄, *žitb/*žīve (OCS žiti, živọ). As per Kočh (1990, 642ff.), the stem *ži- of inf. *žiti, aor. *živę̄ goes back to *ži- (*živě̄t, *živuxę̄) and does not continue unextended *g”ih₃-. The modern Slavic languages present more variation. East Slavic agrees with OCS žiti, živọ (Ru. žít’, žívú, živět, etc.). In West Slavic we have an (easily understood) je-present (Cz. žíti, žiį, etc.). In South Slavic we have –či, –če- in Bulg. živeja, Maced. živee “live” and –či, –če- in SCr. životji, živım, Slvn. živětì, živım “live”, which also have a je-present with a slightly different meaning in SCr. užiti, užijem, Slvn. užiti, užijem “recover, get better”. It is unclear whether South Slavic requires an old second stem in –či to be equated with OPr. inf. giwıt and whether the meaning “recover, get better” of SCr. ižiti etc. can be equated with Lith. gýti (discussion in Kočh, loc. cit., Kølln 1977, 107ff.).

Turning back to Lith. gýti, gýja/-na/-sta “recover; heal”, it has traditionally been regarded as a primary derivative of the unextended root *g”iēh₃- (*g”eiḥ₃-). The details have needless to say never been clear and, generally speaking, Lith. gýti does not look so archaic. As an alternative I propose considering gýti an old zero-grade fientive denominative of the PIE noun *g”oh₃-o- of Sl. *gōjš, Ved. gaya-, Av. gaia- m. “life, vitality, household” (with quasi regular Schwebeablaut of *g”iēh₃- “live”). Whether the adjective Lith. gajus was derived from the noun Bl. *gajas or from gýti is something that cannot be determined with certainty. In any case, Sl. *gōjš → *gojiti “treat, heal” offers a clear parallel.

From a typological point of view the Balto-Slavic facts have two important implications: i) unlike the primary adjective, the primary verb is by no means stable; ii) the primary verb may easily be replaced with a denominative. Nominal reflexes of the unextended root *g”iēh₃- (*g”eiḥ₃-) are reasonably well-attested in the Indo-European languages. A primary verb is usually also reconstructed on the apparently impressive evidence of five branches (e.g. LIV 215f.). On closer inspection, however, the evidence is quite deceptive. Baltic (Lith. gýti) and Slavic (OCS žiti) have already been discussed. Arm. keam “live”, I submit, goes back to *g”ih₃-eḥ₂-o-, a denominative of *g”ih₃-o-, coll. *g”ih₃-eḥ₂- (Gk. βίος, Cypr. acc. sg. ζαν “life”, βία “bodily strength”, Ved. jiyā- “power”, Um., Paelign. bia “fountain”; cf. Weiss 1994,
154f.), not to an old athematic present.\(^9\) YAv. 2 sg. mid. jiγaēša Y. 62,10 = V. 18,27 has been much discussed (cf. Kümmel 2000, 628f., with references). In my view its isolation in Indo-Iranian and the fact that it occurs in a figura etymologica (†aŋ′ha †uruuaखš.ŋ′ha gaiia jiγaēša tā xšapanō yā juuāhi “Mit einem Dasein, das ein frohes Dasein ist, mit Lebenskraft mögest du leben die Nächte, die du leben wirst” [trans. Kümmel]) strongly favors explaining jiγaēša as an Augenblicksbildung created within the poetic tradition (a possibility fully exploited in Vedic or Homeric studies, but generally avoided in Avestan studies). This leaves us with Gk. (Hom.) fut. βέομαι, aor. ἐβίων as the only possible witness of a PIE primary verb of the root \(g^\text{w}_3e\text{h}_2\text{e}/o\)- (\(g^\text{w}_3\text{eih}_3\text{e}/o\)-).

I have nothing to offer on the Greek evidence, but I strongly believe it is not enough for reconstructing a PIE primary verb beside the unusually well-established \(g^\text{w}_3\text{iheh}_3\text{e}/o\)-.

8.2. Lith. čiutnas and the development of \(\ast\varepsilon\nu\) in Baltic and Balto-Slavic.

(23) tautā AP 4 “people, nation” (\(<\ast\varepsilon\’autā) → \(\ast\varepsilon\u0111ug, \ast\varepsilon\u0111unta “get people-like, get human-like” > “get orderly, proper” (\(\text{vel sim.}\)) → dial. čiutnas AP 4 “tidy, neat”, čiutnis “id.”, čiutluis “id.”, čiūntyi, -ija “put in order, tidy up”, čiūntiti “take care of, pamper”, čiūnymt, čiūstymi “clean out”, ?čiūtēti, čiūta “doze”, čiūtēti, čiūti “lie/sit motionlessly, hide”.

Here perhaps also belong Lith. dial. tutēnti “take care of”, tautēti “keep, take care of”, tutinti “spoil, pamper”, Latv. tutināt “swathe, pamper”, which are formally closer to tautā (see below), as well as dial. (nu-)taŭstū, -sta/-čia “long for, be homesick; be sad; become weak, miserable” (with rare nomen postverbale tautā “nostalgia”), which looks like an independent later denominative.

This etymology of čiutnas etc. goes back to Karaliūnas (1976), who presented an impressive amount of dialectal material allegedly related to tautā. Karaliūnas’s material was subject to a detailed criticism by Petit (2000), who dismisses all of it (for the most part correctly, in my opinion). The notion of an archaic layer of zero-grade fientive denominatives, however, permits looking more favorably at part of Karaliūnas’s material (which otherwise is left without a good etymology). The case of nu-taŭstū “be homesick” →

\(^9\) It is interesting to observe that Klingenschmitt (1982, 85) and Barton (1990-91, 45\(^8\)) also considered deriving Arm. keam from \(g^\text{w}_3\text{eh}_2\text{e}/o\)-, but dismissed this possibility because of the questionable status of \(g^\text{w}_3\text{eih}_3\text{e}/o\)- as a deverbal formation. It is a pleasure to acknowledge that Oliver Plötz (p.c.) had also arrived at this interpretation of Arm. keam on different grounds.
“be sad” is particularly clear. The semantic development one has to assume for čiùtnas etc. is admittedly peculiar, but not absurd (note modern Lithuanian expressions like būk žmogûs! “Behave in a proper way!”, literally “Be a man!”). Since čiùtnas etc. cannot be directly derived from tautâ, it is reasonable to postulate an intermediate denominative *čiùsti, *čiùñta (← *t’autâ). Forms like tuténti may reflect secondary influence of tautâ.

If this is correct, it has an important implication for the double treatment of PIE *ēu in Baltic (Balto-Slavic), which seems to have yielded both *jau (e.g. Lith. liáudis, OCS ljudbe “people” < *h₁leudʰ-i-, cf. OHG liut) and *au (e.g. Lith. tautâ, Latv. tûta, OPr. tauto “nation” < *teuteh₂-, cf. Go. þiudo). One can distinguish two main accounts: i) the double treatment depended on the quality of the following vowel: *eu > *jau before front vowels, *au before back vowels; ii) the double treatment depended on word-position: *eu > *au in heterosyllabic position, *jau in tautosyllabic position. This is not the place to argue at length for my acceptance of the second view (see Villanueva Svensson 2015a, with references).

Most of the examples allegedly favoring the first view can be explained in some other way (e.g. Lith. naũjas “new” after *no̞u̞o- < *ne̞uo-, OCS novъ, etc.). The major exception (and thus its main argument) has always been precisely Bl. *taũtâ. None of the solutions proposed so far to account for Bl. *tautâ for expected †čiautâ is attractive (dossier in Petit 2000, 142f.). Pedersen (1934–35, 151) proposed that it continues *t’autâ with assimilation of *t’...t to *t...t. The ad hoc flavor of Pedersen’s account is self-evident, but assimilation and dissimulation are processes that actually take place in natural languages. Lith. čiùtnas etc., if correctly interpreted, now provides evidence indicating that Pedersen’s assimilation (pre-Bl. *teũtâ) > *t’aũtâ → *taũtâ (> Lith. tautâ) is actually right.¹⁰

¹⁰ It may be interesting to draw attention to another potential piece of evidence concerning the development of *ēu in Balto-Slavic that has appeared very recently. There has been considerable discussion about the interpretation of the Old Prussian digraph <eu> (e.g. OPr. keuto “skin” (Elb.) ~ Lith. kïáutas “shell”), the main positions being i) real /eu/ (< Bl.-Sl. *eu), ii) a rendering of /’au/. If the account of tautâ (OPr. tauto!), čiùtnas presented above is correct, it is evident that the idea that Old Prussian <eu> simply continues unaffected Bl.-Sl. *eu cannot be right. As for the second option, in my view a more natural development would be something like *eu > Bl.(-Sl) *jau > Bl. *’au > pre-OPr. *’eu > OPr. eu. Positive evidence for the intermediate stage *’eu may actually have just been found. According to Lemeškin (2014) the recently found Old
The case of tautà AP 4 “people, nation” \(\rightarrow\) (nu-)taŭsti, -sta/-čia “long for; be sad; become weak” (which is clearer and independent from that of čiūtnas) allows us to add a final example of a zero-grade denominative giving rise to a new word family with strongly displaced semantics:

\[(24) \text{liáudis} \text{ AP 1 “people, nation” (Latv. ļàudis)} \rightarrow (\text{nu-})\text{liũsti, -sta “become sad”} \rightarrow \text{liūděti, liūdi “be sad”, liūdnas AP 4 “sad”}.\]

This etymology is also due to Karaliūnas (1976, 89). It is not the standard one, which rather connects liūdnas to Sl. *lūdъ AP c “crazy”, Go. liuts “hypocritical” (e.g. Fraenkel LEW 378f., Smoczyński 2007, 360f., Derksen 2015, 289). Although in principle perfectly possible, note that it operates with (unfortunately fairly typical) semantic freedom. The case of (nu-)liũsti \(\rightarrow\) liūděti (synchronically (nu-)liũsti is an unremarkable inchoative of liūděti) is the same as that of (pa-)mìlti \(\rightarrow\) mylěti, see above § 7.2.

9. The conclusions of this article are easily summarized. The evidence discussed in § 5-8, I believe, shows that Baltic did indeed inherit zero-grade fientive denominatives from northern Indo-European. Some examples seem to reach Balto-Slavic antiquity (e.g. Lith. grùbti, gruũba \(\sim\) Sl. *grobъ, etc.), but, interestingly, others suggest that the principle was kept alive, at least marginally, into Proto-East Baltic (e.g. bjùrti, bjůra/bjürsta, lýsti, -sta, etc.). I would like to stress that my survey is not exhaustive and that the corpus will no doubt be enlarged in the future.

Baltic thus joins North Germanic and Slavic in using a present type *li-m-p-é-ti for fientive denominatives, with regular zero grade of the root even when derived from full-grade nominals. This is an important and often overlooked argument in favor of the very existence of a common northern Indo-European class of anticausative-inchoative verbs.

As for Baltic itself, I hope to have shown that the framework developed in this article has a considerable interest for research on the historical composition of its lexicon. It may lead to new etymologies (e.g. šiùrti, šiūra/-sta, šiurkštus), and to a better grounding of already proposed ones (e.g. Sl. *slábv ā ~ silpti/sīlpti, -sta, silpna/sīlpna). It may help in clarifying the precise relationship between Baltic and Slavic word families (e.g. Sl. *mörkъ, *mörkn̩tǐ ā

Prussian Trace of Crete (1422) contains the word (acc. sg.) pievʃʃen = Elb. peuse “pine” (Lith. pušîs, Gk. πεύκη, OHG fiuhta). It is tempting to see in pievʃʃen the missing link between Bl. *p′aus- and OPr. peuse.
mérkti, -ia), and the precise prehistory of complex Baltic word families (e.g. mīelas/mýlas ~ mylēti, mýli ~ -mīlti, -sta). Finally, it may even have an impact on broader issues of Baltic and Balto-Slavic historical grammar (e.g. tautā ~ čiūtinas).

NULINIO LAIPSNIO DENOMINATYVINIAI INTARPINIAI IR -sta PREZENSAI BALTŲ KALBOSE

Santrauka

Šiaurės indoeuropiečių kalbose (germanų, baltų, slavų) buvo gausi antikauzatyvinių-inchoatyvinių veiksmažodžių klasė. Vienas pagrindinių šios klasės darybos tipų buvo denominatyviniai fientyvai, padaryti iš būdvardžių ir, rečiau, iš daiktavardžių bei turintys reikšmę „tapti X“. Senojoje islandų ir senojoje slavų kalbose tokie denominatyvai turi nulinį šaknies vokalizmo laipsnį net tada, kai jie yra padaryti iš pamatinio laipsnio vardažodžių, pvz., s. isl. blautr “silpnas” → blotna “susilpti”, s. sl. gluxь “kurčias” → o-glъxnоти “apkursti”. Tai yra akivaizdus archaizmas, o gotų ir baltų kalbose vartojama apofoninė invariacija, lengvai suprantama kaip naujadaras. Straipsnyje pristatoma daugiau nei 20 pavyzdžių ir rodoma, kad baltų kalbos paveldėjo darybos principą, pagal kurį intarpiniai ir -sta prezensai įgydavo nulinį laipsnį net tada, kai jie buvo daromi iš pamatinio laipsnio vardažodžių (pvz., lie. bjaũrus → su‑bjūrti). Taip pat aptariama, kaip toks archaiškas darybos principas galėtų praversti nagrinėjant baltų kalbų žodžių etimologiją bei baltų kalbų žodžių šeimų prieistorė ir struktūrą.
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