Abstract. The purpose of this article is to present the history of the comparison made by scholars between the Latin fifth declension and the Baltic -ē-stems and to decide whether both of those formations could go back to a common Indo-European source. It is claimed that the *-eh₁- nominal stems did not exist as such in the proto-language and that both the Baltic -ē-stems and the Latin fifth declension are secondary developments of other Indo-European formations.
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1. The comparison of the Latin fifth declension (diēs “day”, rēs “thing”, māteriēs “matter”) with the Baltic -ē-stems (Lithuanian žẽmė “earth”, vīlkē “she-wolf”, Old Prussian semmē “earth”) has a long history. Both Latin and the Baltic languages possess what may be synchronically termed -ē-stems. However, their origin remains disputable and was discussed by many scholars in the past. I will briefly summarize here the more recent theories concerning their comparison and try to evaluate them in the light of modern comparative grammar.

2. The opinions of scholars concerning the origin of the Latin fifth declension and the Baltic -ē-stems can be divided into two groups. The
first group assumes the existence of *-ē-stems (*-eh₁-stems in laryngealistic terms) in Proto-Indo-European and therefore considers the Latin fifth declension (along with the subtype of the third declension – vatēs “seer”, caedēs “killing”) and the Baltic -ē-stems as a continuation of those stems (Brugmann 1888; 1906; Lindsay 1894; Pedersen 1926; Monteil 1970; Beekes 1985; Schrijver 1991; Kortlandt 1997; Beekes 2011, 199). The second group does not accept the existence of the proto-language *-ē-stems and therefore assumes that the Latin fifth declension and the Baltic -ē-inflection are secondary formations, resulting from different sound changes and subsequent analogical reshapings (Sommer 1914a, 394–402; Steinbauer apud Mayrhofer 1986, 133–134; Klingenschmitt 1992, 127–135; Nussbaum 1999; Piwowarczyk 2016). What is more, most scholars seem to agree that the two basic words which belong to the Latin fifth declension – diēs, -ēī “day” and rēs, -ēī “thing” – are not original *-ē-stems and, furthermore, there are not many direct cognates in forms of this inflection between Latin and Lithuanian (the allegedly common origin of the forms lāpē “fox”, Žvākė “candle” and Latin volpēs “fox” and facēs “torch” seems to be doubtful). In the following pages I will first present and try to evaluate the opinions of the first group, i.e. of the scholars who assume the existence of the *eh₁-stems in the proto-language.

3. Brugmann in the first edition of his Grundriss (1888, 313–314) reconstructed a suffix which could appear in several ablaut grades: *-ī/-iē/-iē-. The basis for such a reconstruction was, among others, the ablaut in the optative: s-iē-s : s-ī-mus. He then assumed that the Latin -iē-s inflection and the Lithuanian -(i)ē inflection originated in the generalization of the suffix form -iē- (-iē-). In comparing the Latin and Lithuanian forms, he assumed that the Lithuanian žem-ē “earth” originated from the proto-form *žem-īē. Furthermore, Brugmann reconstructed the ending of the accusative singular as *-i-m which was then remade to *-iē-m from which Latin -iem, Old Indic -iyam and Greek -ian evolved (with the analogical -m and -n in Old Indic and Greek to the other accusative singular forms).

4. In the second edition of the Grundriss Brugmann admits that the whole question of *-ī/-iē-stems in the proto-language is unclear but reconstructs *-ē-stems alongside the *-iē-stems for Proto-Indo-European (Brugmann

3 Though Beekes (1985, 80–81) is of the opinion that Latin rēs was originally an *-eh₁-stem. His view was discussed in Piwowarczyk 2017.
1906, 220–223). His reconstruction is based on the Latin fifth declension, the third declension forms of the caedēs “killing”, sēdēs “seat” type and the Baltic ē-stems. Brugmann also cites verbal forms like Greek kʰrē in order to legitimize his claim on the existence of the *-ē-stems in the proto-language. Greek kʰrē has been recently explained as an old instrumental in *-eh₁ (cf. Balles 2006, 258–260).

5. Lindsay (1894, 344–347) considers it possible that the Latin -ē-stems are connected with the Baltic -ē-stems. He thus assumes that Lithuanian žēm-ē comes from *žem-īē. He also finds it likely that the explanation of Latin -iē- might be phonetic – i.e. a development of -iā- to -iē- as found in Vulgar Latin: Iānuarius > Iēnuarius (cf. Weiss 2009, 143; a similar hypothesis was put forward by Thurneyssen 1921, 200–202) or Latin heriem (Gellius XIII, 23, 2) which corresponds to Oscan heriam. However, this has been cogently explained by Nussbaum (1976, 250–252) to be a loanword from Oscan, secondarily transferred into the -ēs inflection (cf. also Untermann 2000, 321). Apart from this, it would be the only example of such a change in early Latin. Additionally, Lindsay points out that the Latin caedēs, sēdēs “third declension” type can originate from the plural as many of those nouns ending in -ēs were originally used in the plural (e.g. aedēs).

6. Pedersen (1926, 14–18), following Brugmann (1906, 220–223) claims that the PIE *-(i)e-stems (modern reconstruction *-(i)eh₁-) lie at the basis of the whole Latin fifth declension. He finds it impossible to assume that the -iēs abstracts, the most numerous forms of the Latin fifth declension, would be modelled on the few inherited words like diēs, rēs, spēs, fidēs and finds no basis for the reconstruction of the acc. sg. as *-īi-ām in the Indo-European morphology. Thus he considers the possibility of the origin of this inflection from the acc. sg. -iem highly unlikely (this hypothesis was put forward by Osthoff 1884, 338 and followed by Sommer 1914a, 394–395). Instead he assumes a separate stem for the proto-language based on the Latin material (the entire Latin fifth declension, third declension forms

---

4 And indeed within Proto-Indo-European we would not generally expect such a form or remodelling. But in the particular branches it can be expected that the consonant-stem ending would be added to some other stems (cf. the remodeling of the urkīh-formation accusative in *-īm to -iyam in Vedic and the reinterpretation of the Latin accusative singular as a weak case with the insertion of the productive consonant-stem ending in -em (< *-m)).
of the caedēs “killing” and vatēs “seer” type) and the Baltic e-stems which he considers to be partly inherited formations from the proto-language\(^5\). Furthermore, Pedersen assumes that the inherited -iēs formations in Latin mix with the -ia ones because of the identical meaning and closeness of both suffixes (cf. Pedersen 1926, 81).

7. Since most of the Latin and the Baltic e-stems can be explained without invoking any *-h\(_1\)-stems, there seems to be no other comparative evidence for the *-eh\(_1\)- nominal suffix. The cases like Lithuanian žėmē “earth” have been explained as going back to *žemijā, that is original feminine adjective “earthly” to the word “earth” (cf. Kuryłowicz 1966; Petit 2004, 65–66; Smoczyński 2007, 777–778). As far as Pedersen’s critique of the analogical reshaping is concerned – I do not think his criticism is well-founded since both words diēs, reś are extremely frequent in Latin and can easily be used as a model of analogy. Pedersen’s hypothesis is also criticized by Gerschner (2002, 151) who points out that the fifth declension nouns in general have a defective paradigm with the exception of diēs and reś. Despite all those facts, the hypothesis of Pedersen was taken up by Beekes (1985, 37–38; 2011, 199), Schrijver (1991, 379–387) and Kortlandt (1997)\(^6\).

8. Monteil (1970, 205–208) reconstructs the *-iēh\(_1\)-stems for the proto-language, the function of which should be that of forming of the abstract nouns (parallel to the *-ieh\(_2\)-stems: as in Latin superbia, avaritia). He also mentions that the same -iēs suffix was used in the -t-stems to form abstractions – thus from minutus → minut-iēs, durus → duri-tiēs, canus → canit-iēs. From those formations on, the -itiēs suffix was abstracted. As for the origin of the -iēs/-ia inflection, Monteil assumes that the suffix *-iēh\(_1\) appeared (in


\(^6\) The existence of the long *-ē-stems (or *-eh\(_1\)-stems) in the proto-language is also assumed, despite Sommer’s study, by Otřebški (1965, 44), E ndzelīns (1971, 146–149) and Stang (1966, 201–205).
parallel fashion to *-iH₂) in zero grade in the nominative as *-iH₁, and that this should give -ia in Latin (as, in his opinion, *-iH₂ does). However, the sequence *-iH₂ gives -i in Latin, as in most Indo-European languages, (e.g. qui, quīcum, cf. Weiss 2009, 251; Schrijver 1991, 230–232) and therefore there is no need to assume such a development for *-iH₁ either⁷. Moreover, reconstructing *-iH₁-stems on the basis of only the Latin material is against the rules of the comparative method.

9. Beekes (1985, 37–38) considers the Latin fifth declension as remnant of the inherited *-eh₁-stems, along the Baltic -ē-stems, following the ideas of Pedersen (1926). He further assumes that the *h₁-stems were part of the elaborate system of accent-ablaut paradigms the details of which he sketches in his monograph. First, he assumes, following a personal comment of Kortlandt, that the Tocharian nominative singular of the ā-stems goes back to *-h₂ (Beekes 1985, 20). Combining that with the view that the Latin nominative singular of the ā-stems in short -a, in Beekes’ view, lacks a convincing explanation, he assumes that the inflection of the Proto-Indo-European *ā-stems was hysterodynamic and the long *ā was introduced in languages other than Tocharian and Latin from the accusative (Beekes 1985, 34–35). Following the view of Pedersen (1926, 14–18), he then assumes that there was a *h₁-inflection in the proto-language with the nominative

---

⁷ The only Indo-European languages where one can find traces that the *-iH (at least in the case of *-iH₁ and *-iH₂) sequence developed into *-iV, instead of the expected *-i, are Tocharian, Greek and probably Armenian. In Greek this process is regular and takes place probably in the case of all three laryngeals (though there are no sound cases attested with *-iH₃) with the result depending on the quality of the laryngeal, e.g. (after Weiss 2009, 52):

nom./acc. du. *h₂ok³-iH₁ “eyes” > *okje > Homeric Greek ósse but OCS oći
nom. sg. fem. pres. part. *bh₂er-ont-iH₂ “carrying” > *pherontja > *pheronsa > Greek phérousα but Vedic bháranti
nominative singular *potn-iH₂ “lady” > *potntja > Greek pótnia but Vedic pátnti
(for details on the development in Greek see also Peters 1980, 127–220 and Beekes 1969, 155–161)

In Tocharian, on the other hand, the process seems to be less clear (cf. Kim 2014). There are clear cases where the treatment is similar to the one in Greek: PIE *bh₂er-ont-iH₂ > Proto-Tocharian *pərënt’a > Tocharian B prentsa “pregnant” (cf. Kim 2014, 20) but, as far as the case of *-iH₁ is concerned, the solution seems more problematic. The *-iH₁ sequence seems to show *-je in word-final position in Tocharian but *-i- in the optative suffix (cf. Kim 2014, ibidem).
singular in \(-h_1\) parallel to the \(-h_2\) nominative singular of the \(eh_2\)-stems. The nominative singular would have been then \(-ih_1\) and the oblique \(-jeh_1\). The nominative in \(-i\) would then be remodeled to \(-ia\) “after the example of \(i < *ih_2\), which was replaced by \(-ia\) on the basis of the oblique cases (...)”. The nominative in \(-es\), then, was probably formed on the basis of the accusative \(-em\) (from \(-eh_1m\)” (Beekes 1985, 38). As mentioned before in the discussion of Pedersen’s hypothesis, the very existence of the \(h_1\)-stems in the proto-language is dubious and does not have to be invoked in order to explain the Latin fifth declension or the Baltic \(-e\)-stems.

10. Schrijver (1991, 379–387) explains the origin of the \(-i\)\(es\) formations by assuming the existence of two independent paradigms in the proto-language: the \(jeh_1\)-stems and \(jeh_2\)-stems. As was already mentioned above, the existence of the nominal suffix in \(-e\) (< \(-eh_1\)) in the proto-language does not seem to have any comparative evidence. Additionally, Schrijver assumes a highly unlikely phonological change from \(-ih_2m\) to \(-iem\) violating Stang’s law\(^8\).

11. Furthermore, Schrijver (1991, 371), following Pedersen (1926, 58) and recently also Beekes (2011, 199) compared the paradigm of vatēs to Vedic pānthās and reconstructed the hysterodynamic \(h_1\)-stem for both of those words, assuming that the \(h_1\) also caused aspiration in Indo-Iranian in the position \(Th_1V\), alongside the universally accepted \(Th_2V\). His argument in favor of assuming the aspiration caused also by \(h_1\) is the ending of the second plural in Vedic \(-thah\), which, according to him, goes back to \(-th_1es\). However, this assumption is not commonly accepted. Most examples point to the fact that \(h_2\) in the position after a voiceless stop and before a vowel causes aspiration of the preceding stop (cf. Mayrhofer 1986, 136–137; 2005, 110–119). The aspiration in Vedic can easily be explained as analogical to the second person dual without invoking \(h_1\) (the ending of the second person dual is usually reconstructed as \(-th_2es\), thus giving the aspirate in Vedic \(-thah\) regularly according to the accepted sound law, Weiss 2009, 386).\(^9\)

\(^8\) Recently Pronk (2016) tried to disprove Stang’s law and claimed that the length in the acc. sg. \(djēm\) was due to monosyllabic lengthening. However, the assumption of monosyllabic lengthening in Proto-Indo-European is far from universally accepted.

\(^9\) For a close typological parallel one may note than in the Bavarian dialects of German the pronouns of the plural were replaced by those characteristic of the dual (cf. Howe 1996, 279–280).
12. Additionally, neither Pedersen (1926) nor Schrijver (1991, 379–387) and neither Beekes (1985, 37–38) nor Kortlandt (1997) explain the function of the *h₁ suffix. I presume that they think that it basically copies the function of the *h₂- suffix. If that is so, one cannot escape thinking that this means basically multiplying entities and projecting transponats into the proto-language.

13. Schrijver maintains that Lithuanian lāpė “fox” is cognate with Latin volpēs “fox”. However, Bammesberger (1970) has shown that these forms cannot be compared with each other, cf. also Stang 1966, 201–205; Bammesberger 1973, 31–39; Klingenschmitt 1992, 114ff.; Petit 2004, 188–190.

14. As for the explanation of the Latin caedēs type, it seems that some ṽ̄s-abstracts are plurals that have become singulars (cf. already Lindsay 1894, 346; Weiss 2009, 244) and others have been secondarily characterized with the -ēs nominative singular ending, like uerrēs or canēs, original *n-stems (cf. Klingenschiut 1992, 114–115). To the former category belong also compounds of the type conflūgēs “meeting place of rivers” (plural only, cf. OLD, 402) or ambāgēs (plural early “circumlocutions”, some singular forms later “detour, circuit”, cf. OLD, 113). If those forms were plurals, this implies that e.g. prōpāgēs “stock” (found only in singular, cf. OLD, 1489) may have had the same history, but the plural forms died out early. For these there is no reason to assume original i-stems. This might point to the fact that also simplex forms like sēdēs “seat” (cf. OLD, 1725) might be old plurals that have partly become singulars too. Pointing in this direction might be the fact that sēdēs even in its plural meaning is very reminiscent of pluralia tantum with singular meanings like insidiae (from the same root) “an ambush”, exsequiae “a funeral rite” or suppetiae “help, aid”. An item that is an i-stem simplex and has the same development of a plural becoming singular is also aedēs “house” (in the plural), “room” (in the singular). The root *sed- made a root noun in the proto-language and that means that if a root noun abstract *sed- “a sitting” was originally used as a pluralia tantum abstract (cf. insidiae, ambāgēs, aedēs) with a singular meaning, it would have had a consonant-stem inflection in Latin (i.e. sēdēs, -um)¹⁰. This could be the origin of the consonant

¹⁰ Note also Klingenschiut’s derivation of sēdēs as an verbal abstract of the caedēs-type from the secondary root *sēd (Klingenschiut 1992, 117).
stems sêdës, -um and therefore caedës, -um. Once the original i-stem uâtës (cf. Old Irish fâith\textsuperscript{11}) was associated in a single morphological class with the new singular paradigm of the old pluralia tantum consonant-stem sêdës (and caedës) type, the consonant-stem inflection was spread to uâtës, producing genitive plural uâtum\textsuperscript{12}. This would explain this type of inflection without invoking the *h\textsubscript{1}-suffix and thus multiplying entities for the proto-language.

15. Schrijver also invokes the Celtic evidence in support of the *h\textsubscript{1}-stems and claims that Old Irish fâith “seer” is not to be taken as directly cognate with Latin vâtës and thus is not evidence for an original i-stem. He thinks that the Old Irish nouns of the meit-type (meit “quantity”), usually considered to be a mix of the *i-stems and *ih\textsubscript{2}-stems, are in fact reflexes of an *eh\textsubscript{1}-paradigm copying exactly that one of *eh\textsubscript{2}-stems. He then assumes that the Old Irish word fâith “seer”, which was the only masculine noun among the *h\textsubscript{1}-stems, entered this type of inflection later. Schrijver also mentions the view of Thurneysen (1946, 186 infra) and writes that “as far as the old *ih\textsubscript{2}-stems were confused in late OIr., there was confusion with ā- or iā-stems, not with i-stems” (Schrijver 1991, 388). However, as pointed out by Irslinger (2002, 421\textsuperscript{15}), Thurneysen writes that the confusion between the classes spreads in all directions. She also points out that Schrijver’s theory does not explain the function of the *h\textsubscript{1}-suffix. If it behaves exactly like *h\textsubscript{2}, has the same paradigm and thus same functions, then we should remind ourselves of Ockham’s razor.

16. Kortlandt (1997), following the work of Pedersen (1926), Beekes (1985) and Schrijver (1991), assumes the existence of *-eh\textsubscript{1}-stems in the proto-language and traces the origins of the Lithuanian forms žvâkë “candle”, mentë and girë “forest” to those stems adding the comparative evidence in the form of Latin facës and Vedic mánthås and girîs. The first forms žvâkë and facës were already deemed dubious. The comparison of mentë and mánthås requires the assumption that *Th\textsubscript{1}V caused aspiration of the preceding stop which is not universally accepted. Finally, girë, compared with Vedic girîs is a variant of girià (cf. Smoczyński 2007, 182). The existence of -iâ variants to forms in -ë could point to their origin in *-ià (cf. Nagy 1970, 56–58

\textsuperscript{11} On the etymology of this form see most recently Weiss 2013, 341\textsuperscript{10}. Cf. also Irslinger 2002, 99–100 for comments on the earlier literature.

\textsuperscript{12} I am grateful to Alan Nussbaum (Cornell University, Ithaca NY) for turning my attention to this fact.
and especially Otrebski 1965, 72 for the list of the doublets). Kortlandt furthermore assumes that the Baltic -ē- and -ē/iä-stems are continuations of the Proto-Indo-European: hysterodynamic *eh₁-stems, hysterodynamic *-uh₁-stems and *-uh₂-stems, proterodynamic *-uh₁ and *-uh₂-stems, hysterodynamic *-ih₁ and *-ih₂-stems, proterodynamic *-ih₁ and *-ih₂-stems. I think this is unnecessary since the *h₁-stems mostly duplicate the functions of the *h₂-stems.

17. I will now turn to presenting and evaluating the opinions of the second group of scholars, i.e. those assuming that the Latin fifth declension and the Baltic ē-stems originate in secondary developments of different proto-language formations and thus should not be reconstructed as *-eh₁-stems in Proto-Indo-European. The newest hypotheses on the origin of the Latin -iēs/-ia inflection were presented and evaluated elsewhere (cf. Piwowarczyk 2016). Here I will briefly sketch their assumptions as far as the comparison with the Baltic -ē-stems is concerned.

18. Sommer (1914a, 394–402) considers the whole Latin fifth declension to be composed of heterogenous elements. Thus, he mentions the -iēs-stems, the “Hauptkontingent” of the fifth declension as he calls it, which he compares with the Lithuanian -ē-stems (Lithuanian žemė “earth”) and reconstructs as *-ē-stems, following Brugmann (1906, 220–223). As Lommel did before (Lommel 1912, 67–70), Sommer also compares such formations to the Old Indic devi-stems but he points out that the long *-ē-stem does not appear in Greek which usually preserves the Proto-Indo-European vocalism intact. Following this assumption, Sommer investigated in detail the origin of the Baltic nominal ē-stems in a large monograph (Sommer 1914b). There he noted that the Baltic ē-stems do not have even one plausible correspondence in the Latin -iēs formations (Sommer 1914b, 13): cases of Lithuanian žvâkė “candle” and Latin facēs (attested only in Paulus’ summary of Festus)¹³ are problematic since for facēs the meaning itself is uncertain¹⁴ (cf. also recently de Vaan 2008, 207–208). Additionally, the function of the suffix -ē and -iēs would be the same only in several forms where they derive abstracts.

¹³ Earlier the comparison was made between facēs “face” and žvâkė “candle”. This is untenable due to the meaning of the two words (cf. the criticism of Osthoff 1905, 64–65¹).

¹⁴ Paulus (ex Fest.) gives the passage as: “faces antiqui dicebant, ut fides” (77.19.), cf. Lindsay 1913.
(e.g. Lithuanian *mėilė “love”, Latin *rabiēs “frenzy”). Normally, Lithuanian -ė functions as a motion suffix (Lithuanian *vilkas “wolf” : *vilkė “she-wolf”, cf. Otrębski 1956, 32) whereas Latin -iēs is a suffix used for deriving abstracts from verbal or nominal formations. Since there is hardly any evidence from other Indo-European languages for an *-ē motion suffix, it seems that the only option would be to derive those ė-stems from the *-iēs feminine formations (Sommer 1914b, 10–11). Thus Sommer tried to demonstrate that the Baltic -ē-stems go back not to Proto-Indo-European *-iēs- but to *-iēs- which subsequently contracted and gave Lithuanian -ē.

19. If the Baltic -ē-stems can be explained without invoking the reconstruction of the *-ē-stems in the proto-language, it is thinkable that the Latin -iēs formations also have an inner-Latin beginning. Sommer thus considers it credible, following Osthoff (1884, 338), that the origin of the Latin -iēs abstracts might lie in the accusative singular of the devē-inflection which, according to him, would become *-iam and then *-iem by vowel weakening (cf. *cornican > cornicen) and thus could have been the beginning of this type of inflection on analogy to the inherited and productive stem of rēs (Sommer 1914a, 394–395). However, he assumes a development of *-iam to *-iem as regular and this is very unlikely since the regular outcome of the *-iam sequence (or *-iHM as we would reconstruct it today) in Italic, according to Stang’s Law (Stang 1965), would be *-īm. It would be thinkable that the *-iHM sequence did not undergo Stang’s Law and developed, according to the syllabification rule (cf. Schindler 1977, 56–57), into *-iHM > *-iHM > *-iem (or perhaps *-ih2m > *-ih2em > *-iam > *-iem in the case of the second laryngeal), but this would require an explanation why Stang’s Law did not operate as it does regularly in case of *-ih1m in the optative formations (e.g. *-C-ih1-m > *-ī-m > Latin edim, cf. Weiss 2009, 417) or *-eh2m in the accusative singular of the ā-stems (e.g. *-eh2m > *-ām > Latin -am, cf. Weiss 2009, 233). However, Sommer also mentions the possibility that the devē-stem accusative would be remade into *-iēs- that is the productive consonant-stem accusative ending would be introduced into the devē-inflection (cf. a similar suggestion already by Brugmann, ibidem) which in turn would give Latin -iem and thus form the base for the new inflection. Sommer stresses his viewpoint that the Latin fifth

---

15 It was already mentioned by Hirt (1912, 3) and Lommel (1912, 70–72) that the Baltic -ē-stems deivē and vilkē have counterparts in Vedic devi and vrkīh.
delension should not be compared with the Baltic -ē-stems (going back to *-iā) in the comments to his handbook of Latin phonology and morphology (cf. Sommer 1914c, 112–113).

20. Kuryłowicz (1966, 13–20) claims that the Baltic -ē-stems originate from feminine gender substantivized adjectives with the suffix *-iā. Thus Latin facēs cannot be directly compared with Lithuanian žvâkė because it was extended with *-ēs- whereas žvâkė was extended with *-iā, being the feminine form of the original adjective in *-iōjo. It was then morphologically extended to the other cases. While discussing the Baltic -ē-stems, Kuryłowicz also mentions a solution to the origin of the Latin -iēs/-ia inflection (Kuryłowicz 1966, 19–20). In his opinion, the origin of those formations lies in the morphological recharacterization of the motivated forms. He assumes the existence of root nouns in Latin (characterized with the -t- suffix as in sacerdōtis) but he points out that the two most important forms belonging to the Latin “fifth declension”, i.e. diēs and rēs, are not root nouns. Diēs and rēs develop the accusative singular *diēm and *rēm and an analogical new nominative singular in diēs and rēs respectively. Then Kuryłowicz assumes that the relation between the accusative singular in -em (shortened before /m/ inAuslaut) and nominative plural in -ēs offers a possibility for a renewal of original root nouns with accusative singular in -em and feminine formations with nominative singular in -ī (victrīx) and accusative singular in -iem (< *iīm). However, as Kuryłowicz notices, root nouns of the type dux, ducem did not get a renewed nominative in †ducēs. Only forms like sēdēs, caedēs, compāgēs, labēs got the new nominative in -ēs. Kuryłowicz thus considers those formations to be root nouns and assumes that the new nominative singular in -ēs was introduced into them because they were motivated by the existence of the corresponding verbs (sedeō, caedō). Thus forms like caedēs were originally root nouns in *kaid-s, *kaid-em and because of the similarity in their accusative singular (-em) to the forms of the “fifth declension” they were recharacterized with the new nominative in -ēs, characteristic of the “fifth declension” (but this happened only in the forms where the derivational motivation was visible). As far as the isolated, non-motivated cases are concerned, Kuryłowicz thought that perhaps there the -ēs enlargement was mechanical: as in facēs “torch” (to fax), famēs “hunger” and pubēs “youth”. The differentiation between the old root nouns and the “fifth declension” nouns is in the fact that in the old root nouns (of the sēdēs-type,
according to Kuryłowicz) the long -ē appears only in the nominative and ablative singular whereas in the “fifth declension” it is present in all cases.

21. Additionally, Kuryłowicz thinks that the nouns of the type of uatēs “seer” which do not have the motivating verb could enter this type through a differentiation between the abstract noun *uōdi- (German Wut) and the personal noun (uatēs “seer”). The word is obviously an original -ī-stem as Kuryłowicz notices (cf. Old Irish fáith). Subsequently the nominative in -ēs would be introduced to the old feminine *-ī-stems (that the *-ī was once their nominative is witnessed by, for example, victrīx) which had a connection to the core of the “fifth declension” nouns through their accusative in -iem (< *iīm). Thus the new nominative was introduced in the forms like scabiēs, faciēs where the existence of the -ēs was also motivated (by the corresponding verbs). It also entered the -itiēs inflection. The original oblique cases of the *-ī feminines were in *-jā (as in Vedic devī́, devyāh) and could have been remodeled to the forms with -ē (as was in faciēs). The competition between -ē- and -ā- was visible until Romance where the forms in -ā- were generalized (facia, glacia, rabia). Thus, in Kuryłowicz’s words “le motif décisif de l’introduction de -ē- au nom. a été le caractère motivé des formations respectives” (Kuryłowicz 1966, 20). However, forms like caedēs, sēdēs are likely to be plurals used in the singular (thus already Lindsay 1894, 344–347) and most of the words in -ēs seem to be ī-stems originally. Besides, not all of the forms belonging to the -iēs/-ia inflection seem to be motivated (cf. glaciēs). Nevertheless, it is worth noting that also Kuryłowicz points towards the paradigm of diēs and rēs as the starting point for the creation of this type of inflection (already mentioned by Osthoff 1884, 338).

22. Steinbauer (apud Mayrhofer 1986, 133–134) reconstructs a hysterokinetin *-jeh₂-stem in the proto-language which also does not show any comparative evidence.

23. Klingenschmitt (1992, 127–135) looks for the origin of this formation in the proto-language devī́ (the aciēs type with the -iē suffix throughout) and ṥrkīh formations (the māteriēs type with the -iē/-ia variation). He assumes that the nominative in -iēs is originally an analogical formation to the accusative in -iem on the model of uolpēs : uolpem “fox”. Such a model of analogical reshaping seems highly unlikely as it should also generate the nominative in *-ēs to the formations of the type: rēx, rēgem or pēs, pedem.

24. Nussbaum (1999), while discussing the reflexes of the word *djeus in Latin, assumes that the Latin formations in -iēs originate in the partial
identification of the Proto-Italic devi, uṛkīh and *-iā paradigms. The basis for the new nominative in -iēs is the accusative in -iem created by introducing the productive ending of the consonant stems in -em to the uṛkīh paradigm (similarly to what happened in Old Indic). The analogical model for the creation of the new nominative in -iēs is the commonly used noun for “day”: diēs (contrary to the noun uolpēs “fox”, assumed by Klingenschmitt as being the model for the reshaping).

25. The solution on the origin of this type of inflection in Latin was recently presented by Piwowarczyk (2016). I will only summarize the main outlines of that solution here. The origin of this type of inflection is traced back to the Proto-Italic stage where the continuants of the Proto-Indo-European devi, uṛkīh and *-iā- paradigms intermixed with each other. Afterwards, the devi and uṛkīh paradigms merged into a single one with a new instrumental-ablative in *-iēd created on the model of the consonant-stems, followed by an analogical creation of the nominative in *-iēs on the model of *diēd : *diēs.

26. Additionally, Villanueva Svensson (2011) argued recently that the sound change *-iā > *-ē (professed already by Sommer 1914b) is correct because it explains both the -ē-stems and the -ē-preterite in Baltic. This phonetic process seems to be supported by prosody (cf. also Villanueva Svensson 2014). It seems thus that the Baltic -ē-stems are reflexes of either such a sound change and its subsequent generalization or substantivization of earlier adjectives to masculine forms. Their origin does not seem to be the same as the Latin -iēs/-ia formations and thus both of these formations cannot be used as evidence for the reconstruction of *-(i)eh1-stems in the Indo-European proto-language.

27. To conclude, although there is only indirect evidence for the secondary nature of both the Latin and the Baltic -ē-stems, it seems that the assumption of original nominal *-eh1-stems in the proto-language is less economical as those stems would simply copy the function of the *-eh2-stems and thus the secondary origin of both formations seems more likely.

---

16 Don Ringe (University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia) informs me that Warren Cowgill already around 1980 claimed that the East Baltic *ē arose regularly from *iēā. I am grateful to Ronald Kim (Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań / Charles University Prague) for turning my attention to this fact.

17 I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for turning my attention to this fact.
LOTYNŲ KALBOS PENKTOJI LINKSNIUOTĖ
IR BALTŲ KALBŲ -ē- KAMIENAI

Santrauka

Straipsnio tikslas – pristatyti lotynų 5 linksniuotės ir baltų kalbų -ē- kamienų lyginimo istorijos apžvalgą bei nuspręsti, ar abu šie dariniai gali būti kilę iš bendro indoeuropietiško šaltinio. Teigima, kad *-eh₁- vardažodžių kamienai prokalbėje neegzistavę, o tiek baltų -ē- kamienas, tiek lotynų penktoji linksniuotė laikytini kitų ide. darinių antrinės raidos rezultatu.
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