



**Baltų kalbos iš indoeuropeistikos perspektyvos**

**Baltu valodas indoeuropeistikas perspektīvā**

**Baltic from an Indo-European perspective**

KATSIARYNA ACKERMANN

University of Vienna  
katsiaryna.ackermann@univie.ac.at

## Linguistic commentaries on the “Verzeichnis veralteter oder wenig bekannter litauischer Wörter” collected by G. Ostermeyer in Lithuania Minor (Kleinlitauen)

The “Verzeichnis” is an alphabetical list of approx. 158 lemmas collected and supplied with translations and occasional comments by Gottfried Ostermeyer (1716-1800), a Protestant pastor in Trempen (lith. Trempai) in *Lithuania Minor* – as it was part of Prussia, the author of “Neue Littauische Grammatik”<sup>1</sup>. The list was obviously compelled while Ostermeyer worked at collecting and publishing 1793 Lithuanian folklore material under the title “Erste Littauische Liedergeschichte”<sup>2</sup>. However his collection didn’t manage to attract proper attention, largely because of methodological disputes among the intellectual community in Prussia of late 18<sup>th</sup> cent. upon his publication 1781 of “*Giesmes sventos baznyčioje ir namej’ giedojamos su nobaznoms maldoms – vienas knygas suglaustos nu G. Ostermejerio Karaliaučiuje*”. It comes out from the brief comparison with the Lithuanian dictionaries of that time, primarily with that by Ruhig / Mielcke,<sup>3</sup> which appeared in Königsberg 1800 – that is shortly after Ostermeyer issued his “Liedergeschichte”. Though Mielcke and Ostermeyer were in contact, the former was not likely to be familiar with the word list: his dictionary lacks certain lexemes of it and diverges in the translational equivalents of some other. Nor later dictionaries seem to incorporate Ostermeyer’s material. Mielcke (lith. Kristijonas Gotlibas Milkus) criticized heavily Ostermeyer’s pragmatic attempts to adapt Old Lithuanian folklore to contemporary perception and succeeded in abolishing his songbooks. That the two didn’t consider each other close friends is fairly obvious.

Later etymological dictionaries of Lithuanian on the one hand relied fully on Mielcke, on the other focused on “literary” lexicon of early Catechisms, leaving vernacular outboard.

The wordlist itself is of high interest from the linguistic viewpoint both as to the etymology, and to dialectal affiliation of different lexemes. It contains many lexemes, the dialectal status of which is to be verified. Ostermeyer was perfectly aware of the fact,<sup>4</sup> that folklore wordstock was largely influenced by German spoken in East Prussia and sorted out carefully what he considered the authentic material.

The intended talk will take a closer look on some words survived due to Ostermeyer’s list and discuss them from the angle of language history.

<sup>1</sup> *Neue Littauische Grammatik ans Licht gestellt von Gottfried Ostermeyer*. Königsberg, 1791.

<sup>2</sup> *Erste Littauische Lidergeschichte ans Licht gestellt von Gottfried Ostermeyer...* Königsberg, 1793.

<sup>3</sup> *Littauisch-deutsches und deutsch-littauisches Wörter-Buch / worinn das wom Pfarrer Ruhig zu Walterkehmen ehemals heraus gegebene zwar zum Grunde gelegt, aber mit sehr vielen Wörtern, Redens-Arten und Sprüchwörtern zur Hälfte vermehret und verbessert worden von Christian Gottlieb Mielcke, Cantor in Pillckallen.*

<sup>4</sup> V. Gerulaitiene (2001), *Abraham Jakob Penzel und sein Interesse an der litauischen Literatur in Ostpreußen*. In: Annaberger Annalen. Jahrbuch über Litauen und deutsch-litauische Beziehungen 8(1): 73.

SANDRA HERRMANN

Philipps-Universität Marburg  
sandra.herrmann@ymail.com

## The representation of middle event types in Old Lithuanian

The middle voice as we know it from classical Indo-European languages, such as Sanskrit or Ancient Greek, vanished in the majority of the daughter languages whose written attestation begins considerably later. Nevertheless, the event types expressed by means of the middle voice do not cease to exist with the loss of a morphosyntactic category: new ways of coding those situation types developed. Thus the question arises as to whether these new systems cover the same semantic range formerly represented by the middle voice. In this paper we will take a closer look at the development of middle semantics from Proto-Indo-European to the Baltic language family with a focus on Old Lithuanian.

The framework for this undertaking is laid out in Suzanne Kemmer's study *The Middle Voice* in which she defines a number of middle event types and their reflexive counterparts based on a typological background. Using this model, the functions of the middle voice in Hittite, Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit were compared in order to reconstruct the semantic spectrum of the middle diathesis in Proto-Indo-European. During this process Kemmer's categorizations were adjusted in order to apply them to the needs of historic corpora since some middle and reflexive situation types are difficult to distinguish from each other, as Kemmer mentions herself. In addition, some criteria for the distinction can hardly be held up due to the limited material available.

This paper, however, is focused on the Old Lithuanian reflexive verbs and their ability to represent middle event types. For this purpose, the evidence collected for my MA thesis will be supplemented by more data from the Old Lithuanian corpus. When evaluating the examples, it will be important to keep in mind that the majority of the Old Lithuanian literature consists of translations from German, Polish and Latin, with only a few exceptions. Another problem that we might face would be the genre of the texts in the corpus: although the number of catechisms and bible translations is abundant, the reflexive contexts they deliver might be limited. Comparing the functions of the Old Lithuanian reflexive to those previously reconstructed for the middle voice of the proto-language will show how middle semantics are represented in a non-middle voice system, as well as if and to what extent the range of functions became broader or narrower.

## EUGEN HILL

University of Erfurt  
eugen.hill@uni-erfurt.de

## Explaining Baltic and Balto-Slavonic nominal inflection: 'Lex Szemerényi' and the animate accusative plural of vocalic stems

The talk deals with inflectional morphology of the Baltic branch of Indo-European. Focussing on the inflection of nominal parts of speech both in East Baltic and Old Prussian, I will address a problem which, despite efforts of numerous scholars, is still lacking a satisfactory solution. I feel that substantial progress in this particular area of research is only possible if recent methodological advances in the broader fields of both Indo-European studies and, more generally, contemporary historical linguistics are taken into consideration.

The particular pieces of inflectional morphology I am going to investigate are first the animate nominative singular of resonant stems and second the animate accusative plural of vocalic stems. The standard theory of IE nominal inflection assumes that the long vowel in the former case (cf. its reflexes in Lith *duktė*, *ruduo*) originates from a compensatory lengthening caused by a secondary assimilation of the case ending PIE \*-s into the stem-final resonant. However, a similar development is usually not assumed for the accusative plural of the vocalic stems where the segmental environment is virtually the same. 'Lex Szemerényi' becomes, therefore, a kind of grammatically conditioned sound change, which is theoretically unsatisfactory (cf. Nathan Hill 2014 for a logical analysis of the concept).

I will begin my investigation by analysing the evidence for a secondary lengthening also in the animate accusative plural of vocalic stems. As repeatedly pointed out in recent times, this evidence abounds in several branches of IE, including Baltic and Slavonic (cf. Griffith 2006, Kim 2012). However, the situation in these particular branch(es) of IE is particularly unclear. It is no accident that both most recent investigations of PIE long vowels in Baltic and Slavonic – Villanueva Svensson 2011 and Pronk 2012 - refuse to address this evidence in detail. I will demonstrate that Baltic and Slavonic length in the animate accusative plural of vocalic stems is most probably caused by developments postdating the disintegration of Proto-Balto-Slavonic. As this demonstration will leave us with the 'Lex Szemerényi'-controversy in its purest form, i.e. with a lengthening before resonant plus PIE \*s in the animate nominative singular but not in the animate accusative plural, I will try to establish the conditioning of this PIE sound change in a more satisfactory way.

### References

- Griffith, Aaron. 2006. \*-n(C)s in Celtic. *Sprache* 45, pp. 44-67.
- Hill, Nathan W. 2014. Grammatically conditioned sound change. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 8, pp. 211-229.
- Kim, Ronald. 2012. The PIE thematic animate accusative plural revisited. In: Roman Sukač, Ondřej Šefčík (eds.), *The Sound of Indo-European 2: Papers on Indo-European phonetics, phonemics and morphophonemics*, Munich: Lincom, pp. 144-158.
- Pronk, Tijmen. 2012. Proto-Indo-European long vowels and Balto-Slavic accentuation. *Baltistica* 47, pp. 205-247.
- Villanueva Svensson, Miguel. 2011. Indo-European long vowels in Balto-Slavic. *Baltistica* 46, pp. 5-38.

ADAM HYLLESTED

University of Copenhagen  
ah@hum.ku.dk

## The etymology of the month-name *Szarwas* ‘December’ in Jacob Brodowski’s *Lexicon Lithvanicum* (around 1740)

The modern Lithuanian name of the month December is *Gruodis*. However, an older name *fzarwas* occurs in Jacob Brodowski’s *Lexicon Germanico-Lithvanicum et Lithvanico-Germanicum* compiled between approximately 1710 and 1740. In this paper I will argue that the name originally referred to the (summer or winter) solstice and is historically identical to Mod. Lith. *šárvas*, which has various meanings whose common denominator can be reconstructed as ‘physical sign or equipment in a rite of passage’ (thus Bernd Gliwa in *Acta Linguistica Lituanica* 53: 9-21, 2005). The word is of Indo-European origin and related to Classical Greek *koũros* ‘(noble) youth’, which forms part of the name of the Dioskouri as well as the name of the sixth month *Dios-koũros* in the Old Cretan calendar. Numerous parallels of terms referring to rites of passage as well as turning-points in the calendar (solstice, equinox, moon phases etc.) can be found throughout the Indo-European languages.

## SANTERI JUNTILA

Universität Helsinki  
santeri.junttila@helsinki.fi

## Die baltisch-slawische Frage im Lichte der alten baltischen Lehnwörter des Ostseefinnischen

Gäters (1977: 4) bestreitet die Rekonstruktion einer baltisch-slawischen Ursprache mit einem Argument von Ancītis und Jansons (1963: 32): „Da sich in den finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen des Baltikums viele Baltismen finden, müßten unter ihnen zumindest einige vorkommen, die lautlich baltisch sind, deren entsprechendes Wort jedoch nur noch in den slavischen Sprachen bekannt ist. Solche Wörter jedoch gibt es in den finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen nicht.“

Diese Ansicht war von Anfang an veraltet. Schon Lidén (1897: 60–63, 1911: 198–202) hatte zwei Lehnwörter der genannten Art entdeckt: fi. *aisa* ‚Deichsel‘ ← ba. pl. \**ajesā*, vgl. slowen. *oje*, -*sa* id. (~ ar.) und *aitta* ‚Speicher, Vorratshaus‘ ← ba. \**aitā*, vgl. slowen. *pojata* ‚Wirtschaftsgebäude‘. Noch eine Entlehnung ist von Paasonen (1917) erkannt worden: fi. *vuona* ‚Lamm‘ ← ba. \**āgnas*, vgl. asl. *азна* id. (~ lat., gr.)

Nieminen (1944) hat diese drei Etymologien verkennen wollen, weil das Slawische und das Baltische seiner Meinung nach zwei freistehende Verzweigungen des Urindogermanischen seien. Später hat aber Viitso (1983: 273) ein viertes baltoslawisches Lehnwort und Koivulehto (1987) sogar drei Stück mehr festgestellt: fi. *Väinä* ‚Düna‘, *väinä* ‚breiter Fluss, Mündung‘ ← ba. \**Dveinā*, vgl. russ. *Двина* ‚Düna‘; fi. *kuori* ‚Rinde, Schale‘ < frühurfi. \**kari* ← ba. \**karā*, vgl. asl. *кора* ‚Rinde‘ (~ lat.); fi. *puoli* ‚Hälfte; halb; Seite‘ < frühurfi. \**pali* ← ba. \**palu-*, vgl. asl. *ноль* id. (~ germ.; laut Aikio 2012: 238 jedoch ein uralisches Erbwort); fi. *vilja* ‚Getreide‘ ← ba. \**wilja-*, vgl. asl. *обиль* ‚reichlich‘.

Koivulehto (1999: 9–10) hat sich geäußert, dass „mehrere der ältesten sog. baltischen Lehnwörter können offenbar besser als schon gemein balto-slavisch eingestuft werden, wie auch Kallio [1998: 212] in letzter Zeit geltend gemacht hat; dasselbe kann von einigen frühen Lehnwörtern behauptet werden, deren Originale nur noch im Slavischen erhalten sind“. Damit teilen Kallio und Koivulehto die Ansicht von Mažiulis (1964), Matasović (2005) und Kortlandt (2008), nach der eine baltoslawische Ursprache existiert und sich in einen ostbaltischen, einen westbaltischen und einen slawischen Zweig gespalten hat.

Weil der Beweiskraft des Slawischen beim Suchen baltischer Lehnwörter so kürzlich anerkannt ist, gibt es wahrscheinlich noch zahlreiche unentdeckte Fälle. Eine bisher unveröffentlichte Etymologie ist fi. *leuka* ‚Kinn, (Unter)kiefer‘ < ba. \**kleukā*, vgl. russ. *клюка* ‚Krücke, Krummstab, Ofenkrücke‘, kroat. *kljuka* ‚Haken‘.

Ein schon von Posti (1977: 268–69) erkanntes baltisches Lehnwort kommt semantisch näher zu den slawischen als den baltischen Entsprechungen seiner Originale: fi. *ohdake* ‚Distel‘ ← ba. \**aš(a)ta-* > russ. *ocom* id. aber lit. *ašutas* ‚Pferdehaar aus Mähne und Schweif‘, lett. *asta* ‚Schwanz‘.

Ein Lehnwort zeigt eine im Slawischen erhaltene Form des Verbstamms und eine im Litauischen erhaltene Suffix: fi. *kekäle* ‚brennendes oder glühendes Holzstück‘ ← ba. \**gegalas*, vgl. lit. *degalas* ‚Docht; Lunte; Brennmaterial‘ von *degti* ‚brennen‘, das unregelmäßig mit asl. *жеуму* (< ba \**geg-*) id. verbunden ist. Ein umgekehrter Fall ist fi. *hauki* ‚Hecht‘ ← ba. \**šeukā*, wo der Stamm in lett. *šaut*, lit. dial. *šiau-* < idg. \**ḱewH-* ‚schießen‘ vertritt, die Suffix aber in slowen. *ščuka* ‚Hecht‘ < idg. \**sḱewH-* (SES, IEW 954–55, LIV 330) mit *s mobile*. Diese Vorschläge sind neue Modifikationen der bisher abgelehnten baltischen Etymologien von Kalima (1936: 113–14) und Liukkonen (1999: 40–42).

Noch eine von mehreren Forschern (Koivulehto 2001: 56–57, Nikkilä 2001: 399, Nilsson 2001: 189) bestrittene Etymologie von Liukkonen (1999: 120) kann mit gutem Grund verteidigt werden: fi. *sulhanen* ‚Bräutigam‘, est. *sulane* ‚Diener, Knecht‘ ← ba. \**sulas* > asl. *сълъ* ‚Bote, Gesandter‘.

Diese Etymologien stützen stark den baltischen Ursprung der Urslawischen. Zum Vergleich gibt es im Ostseefinnischen nur ein baltisches Lehnwort, dessen Original ausschließlich im Westbaltischen erhalten ist, nämlich fi. *panu* ‚Feuer‘. Die üblichen in diesem Zusammenhang oft erwähnten Wörter, fi. *kela* ‚Haspel‘, *hirvi* ‚Elch‘ und *virsi* ‚Lied‘ haben auch leicht abweichende Entsprechungen im Ostbaltischen.

### Literatur

- Aikio, Ante 2012 = Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte: On Finnic long vowels, Samoyed vowel sequences, and Proto-Uralic \*x. – *Per Urales ad Orientem. Iter polyphonicum multilingue. Festschrift tillägnad Juha Janhunen på hans sextioårsdag den 12 februari 2012*. MSFOu 264: 227–50.
- Ancītis, Krišjānis & Jansons, Aleksandrs 1963: Vidzemes etniskās vēstures jautājumi – *Arheoloģija un etnogrāfija* 5. Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība, Rīga.
- Gäters, Alfrēds 1977: *Die lettische Sprache und ihre Dialekte*. Trends in Linguistics. State-of-the-Art Reports 9. Mouton Publishers, The Hague – Paris – New York.
- IEW = Pokorny, Julius 1959–65. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* I–II. Bern und München.
- Kalima, Jalo 1936: *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten balttilaiset lainasanat*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia XV. Helsinki.
- Kallio, Petri 1998: Vanhojen balttilaisten lainasanojen ajoittamisesta – *Oekeeta asijoo. Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Seppo Suhonen sexagenarii*. MSFOu 228: 209–17.
- Koivulehto Jorma 1987: Zu den frühen Kontakten zwischen Indogermanisch und Finnisch-Ugrisch. – *Parallelismus und Etymologie. Studien zu Ehren von Wolfgang Steinitz anlässlich seines 80. Geburtstags am 28. Februar 1985*. Linguistische Studien. Reihe A. Arbeitsberichte 161/II: 195–218. Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR. Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin.
- 1999c: *Verba mutuata. Quae vestigia antiquissimi cum Germanis aliisque Indo-Europaeis contactus in linguis Fennicis relinquerint*. MSFOu 237.
- 2001b: Etymologie und Lehnwortforschung: ein Überblick um 2000. – *FUF* 56: 42–78.
- Kortlandt, Frederik 2008: Balto-Slavic phonological developments – *Baltistica* 43: 5–15.
- Lidén, Evald 1897: *Studien zur altindischen und vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte*. Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala; 6, 1. Almqvist & Wiksell, Uppsala.
- 1911: Baltisch-slavische wörterklärungen. – *Le Monde Oriental* V: 197–204.
- Liukkonen, Kari 1999: *Baltisches im Finnischen*. MSFOu 235.
- LIV 2001 = Helmut Rix, Martin Kümmel (red.): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Matasović, Ranko 2005: Toward a relative chronology of the earliest Baltic and Slavic sound changes. – *Baltistica* 40: 147–57.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas 1964: Linguistic Notes on Baltic Ethnogenesis. – *VII International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Moscow, August 1964*. Volume V: 653–57. Nauka, Moscow.
- Nieminen, Eino 1944a: *Jäärä ja vuona* sanojen oletetuista balttilaisista vastineista. – *Virittäjä* 48: 24–31.
- Nikkilä, Osmo 2001: Fragwürdige Lehnwortforschung. – *FUF* 56: 394–403. Nilsson, Torbjörn 2001: A new treatise on Baltic loanwords in Finnish. – *Linguistica Baltica* 9: 177–94. Universitas, Cracow.
- Paasonen, Heikki 1917: Eräs liettualaisperäinen sana länsisuomalaisissa kielissä. – *Virittäjä* 21: 11–13.
- Posti, Lauri 1977: Some new contributions to the stock of Baltic loanwords in Finnic languages. – *Baltistica* 13: 263–70.
- SES = Snoj, Marko 2003: *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Modrijan, Ljubljana.
- Vitso, Tiit-Rein 1983: Läänemeresoome maahõive ja varaseimad kontaktid. – *Symposium Saeculare Societatis Fenno-Ugricae*. MSFOu 185: 265–81.

## TEREZA KABELÁČOVÁ

Masaryko universitetas, Brno  
146513@mail.muni.cz

### **Baltų ir slavų deminutyvai**

Pranešime bus kalbama apie mažybinius daiktavardžius lietuvių, latvių, prūsų, rusų, lenkų, baltarusių (galbūt ir vokiečių bei estų) kalbose. Konkrečios slavų kalbos yra parinktos pagal arealo kriterijų: jos šiandien vartojamos baltų kalbų vartojimo arealui gretimose teritorijose.

Pradžioje bus paminėta tiriamosios medžiagos apibrėžimo problema, t. y. kokius klausimus reikia spręsti norint kalbėti apie deminutyvus įvairiose kalbose. Pavyzdžiui, vienoje kalbose mažybinių daiktavardžių ir augmentatyvų (arba amplifikatyvų) daryboje vartojamos skirtingos priesagos, kitose abi šias reikšmes išreikšti galima viena ir ta pačia priesaga. Taip pat bus nagrinėjamos bei lyginamos analizuojamų kalbų darybinės mažybinių daiktavardžių priesagos, kitos šių priesagų vartojimo galimybės (ne tik mažybinių daiktavardžių darybai) ir konkretūs pavyzdžiai.

Pabaigoje bus apibendrinta viskas, kas pasakyta. Taip pat bus pateiktos išvados, ką išanalizuota konkrečių kalbų medžiaga leidžia spręsti apie bendrą baltų-slavų prokalbę: ar galima rasti šių kalbų žodžių darybos bendrybių (arba skirtumų) remiantis deminutyvų medžiaga.



## IGORS KOŠKINS

Latvijas Universitāte  
igors.koskins@lu.lv

### Latviešu valodas strīdīgu slāvismu etimoloģija pirmindoeiropiešu rekonstrukcijas skatījumā

Daudzi indoeiropiešu (ie.) valodu etimoloģisko vārdnīcu autori par vārda etimoloģiskās rekonstrukcijas gala mērķi uzskata vienīgi tā saucamās vārda pirmformas rekonstrukciju; šādās vārdnīcās rekonstruētas tikai pirmvalodas, kas ir kādas valodu grupas pamatā, saknes vai leksēmas. Pastāv vesela virkne strīdīgu un neatrisinātu jautājumu par ie. sakņu rekonstrukciju: fonēmu raksturs un to esamība, ie. saknes morfēmiskā struktūra (dalāmība). Strīdus zinātnieku vidū turpina izraisīt jautājums par ie. sakņu homonīmiju. Dziļā rekonstrukcija līdz indoeiropiešu saknei ir nepieciešama, lai rekonstruētu latviešu un baltu vārda pirmatnējo semantiku, etimoloģisko nozīmi, kas savukārt norāda uz pirmatnējas nominācijas jeb nosaukšanas motīviem (cēloņiem). Šādas problēmas pastāv arī latviešu valodas slāviskās cilmes aizguvumu etimoloģizēšanā (sk., piemēram, Konstantīna Karuļa “Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīcu”). Piemēram, dažādi viedokļi pastāv par tādiem vārdiem kā latv. *solīt*, *dūša*, *gads*, *miers*, *poga* u. c. Referātā tiek iztirzāti dažu strīdīgu latviešu valodas senākā posma slāvismu etimoloģijas problēmjaucējumi, ņemot vērā ie. saknes rekonstrukciju.

### The etymology of controversial Slavisms in Latvian in the aspect of Proto-Indo-European Reconstruction

The authors of many etymologic dictionaries of Indo-European (IE) language regard only the so called reconstruction of the primary form of the word as the final purpose of the word's etymologic reconstruction. The primary languages, which are the basis of definite languages, roots or lexemes, undergo the reconstruction in such dictionaries. Still there is a whole range of controversial and unresolved questions about the reconstruction of IE roots: the character of phonemes and their essence, the morphological structure of the roots and its divisibility. The question of the homonymy of IE roots is still causing some disputes among scientists. The profound reconstruction till Indo-European root is necessary to reconstruct the primary semantics and etymologic meaning of Latvian or Baltic word, which in turn indicates the primary nomination or the motives of naming (its causes). These problems exist for etymologization of Slavic loanwords in Latvian (see e. g. “Latvian Etymologic Dictionary” of Konstantins Karulis) as well. For example, there are different opinions about the following words: *solīt*, *dūša*, *gads*, *miers*, *poga* etc. The most problematic questions of etymology of the most ancient controversial Slavisms are discussed, taking into consideration the reconstruction of IE roots.

## ARTHUR LAISIS

École normale supérieure, Paris  
École pratique des hautes études, Paris  
arturas.laisis@inbox.lt

**Dėl baltų kalbų *upė* → *užupis* darybos tipo kilmės**

Baltų kalbų priešdėliniai ir sudėtiniai vardažodžiai rodo daugelį įdomių morfologijos bruožų, nors iki šiol nesulaukė pakankamai dėmesio. Net ir neretai šioje kategorijoje pasitaikantys techninei ir mokslinei kalbai būdingi naujadarai išsaugojo sunkiai sinchroniniu atžvilgiu suprantamus darybinius bruožus. Į šio tyrimo akiratį patenka darybos tipas *miškas* (vyr.g.) → *pamiškė* (mot.g.), *upė* (mot.g.) → *užupis* (vyr.g.), *dienà* (mot.g.) → *pirmādienis* (vyr.g.) ir pan., kuriam būdinga ne tik galūninė daryba (\*-io/-iā priesagos pridūrimas), bet dažnai ir giminės kaita. Tokių pavyzdžių daugiausiai suteikia lietuvių kalba, nors jų aptinkama visose baltų kalbose. Kartais esama abiejų giminių variantų (*pakraštys* / *pakraštė*) ar leksinės distribucijos (*greitkelis* / *krūžkelė*); vietovardžiai šių ypatybių atžvilgiu taip pat skiriasi nuo bendrinio žodyno. Pirminis šio pranešimo tikslas – nustatyti tikslesnę šių abiejų reiškinių distribuciją ir motyvaciją pačių baltų kalbų lygmeniu. Tačiau glaudžios slavų kalbų pateikiamos paralelės su pastovia niekatrąja gimine (r. *zapéube*, l. *zarzecze* = lie. *užupis*), taip pat pavienės kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų šakų paralelės (pvz., lot. *forma* → *informis* ir panašūs armėnų kalbos pavyzdžiai) verčia nagrinėti ir istorinę šio darybos tipo raidą.

DUCCIO LELLI

University of Florence  
ducciolelli@hotmail.it

## The Lithuanian nouns in *-muõ*

Among the productive categories of Lithuanian nouns, the group of nouns formed with the suffix *-muõ* (Indo-European *\*-men*) is of great importance from a linguistic point of view, for an ancient pattern of derivation is still used in recent times.

In this lecture, I will discuss the general features of these nouns and present several significant examples.

As already said, the productivity of this formation is generally very recent and can be seen in many neologisms, but in large part — in contrast to what happens, for example, in Greek and Latin — it follows an ancient pattern (verbal root + suffix) and does not show other means of derivation (e.g. it is not realized from derivative verbs or with the occurrence of a dental extension).

In order to judge the productivity of the category and the status of each noun, I have divided the Lithuanian nouns in *-muõ* into three groups: nouns that have cognates in other Indo-European languages, nouns that have cognates only within Baltic languages and nouns attested only in Lithuanian.

Among the 14 Lithuanian nouns in *-muõ* that have cognates in other Indo-European languages, only few can be judged as old inherited forms (e.g. *akmuõ*, *piemuõ*, *sõmuõ*, *õelmuõ*); others are of doubtful antiquity (e.g. *s(t)raumuõ*, *õarmuõ*), while others are definitely recent (e.g. *augmuõ*, *dõmuõ*, *duomuõ*, *juosmuõ*, *raumuõ*, *stomuõ*). This analysis shows that an ancient structure and the presence of cognates do not assure the antiquity of these formations.

As regards the second group, there are no nouns that have cognates in Old Prussian.

The 10 nouns that have cognates in Latvian are in most cases independent and parallel formations in the two languages, since they belong to families well attested both in verbal and nominal forms.

The third group, formed by nouns attested only in Lithuanian, is the biggest (about 75 nouns). It includes very recent words, among which there are many neologisms of the scientific and technical terminology (e.g. *dalmuõ*, *kryõmuõ*, *õilmuõ*).

As an appendix to the discussion of the formations in *-muõ*, I will consider another Lithuanian formation, the nouns in *-mõ*, that are often attested, with a related meaning, besides the nouns in *-muõ*. These parallel formations constitute a productive pair; although the relative chronology of the elements of this pair is hard to establish, I will present a couple of interesting cases in order to elucidate the problems one has to deal with.

## ADAM PAULUKAITIS

University of Georgia  
pztpaco34@yahoo.com**\*-ājie- iteratives in East Baltic**

East Baltic possesses the iterative suffix *\*-ājie-* < PIE *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>ie-*, e.g. Latv. *mētāt, -āju* ‘throw around’ < *mest, metu* ‘throw’, Lith. *klūpoti, -o(ja)* ‘kneel, be in a kneeling position’ < *klūpti, kluṃpa* ‘fall to one’s knees’. This suffix eventually became productive as a denominative verbal formant of the type Lith. *núoma* ‘rent (N sg.)’, *núomoti, -oja* ‘rent (v.)’. However, Latvian and Lithuanian show an old, unproductive layer of *-oti, -oja* (deverbal) iteratives with root-stress and ablaut distribution dependent upon root structure. TeRT- roots took o-grade, e.g. Latv. *luōdāt, -āju* (< *\*land-*) ‘continuously crawl around’ < *list, liedu* ‘sneak, crawl’, Lith. *vālkoti, -oja* ‘wear’ < *vilkti, veīka* ‘pull, drag’, while TeT- roots took ē-grade, e.g. Latv. *nēsāt, -āju* ‘carry around’ < *nest, -u* ‘carry’, Lith. *rékoti, -oja* ‘whoop’ < *rèkti, reīka* ‘shout, give a shout’.

Latvian and Lithuanian also have a class of lengthened zero-grade resultatives with the *\*-ājie-* suffix, built as “iteratives” to zero-grade anticausatives-inchoatives, e.g. Latv. *gūbātīēs* ‘writhe; be sluggish’ < *gubt, gubstu* ‘sink; sink down; be reduced’, Lith. *kýboti, -o(ja)* ‘be hanging’ < *kibti, kiṃba* ‘stick to, cling’. This class is especially prolific in Lithuanian, where a large number of these lengthened zero-grade resultatives show *-oti, -o* instead of the expected *-oti, -oja*.

This paper will discuss the Indo-European origins of the o-grade ~ ē-grade ablaut distribution, as well as the origin of the unexpected *-oti, -o* ending found in Lithuanian lengthened zero-grade resultatives.

OLIVER PLÖTZ

University of Vienna  
oliver.ploetz@univie.ac.at

## Strategies of expressing imperatives: A journey from PIE to the modern Baltic languages

Starting from PIE times with the a overview of the imperative system (including the commonly reconstructed syntagma *\*meh<sub>1</sub>* + injunctive for negative imperatives), this paper tries to present the mayor outlines of the transformations of a grammatical category from PIE via Balto-Slavic to the modern Baltic languages.

The emergence of special markers (as in Old Prussian *ni turri* 'you don't have to' or Latvian *lai*) or emphasizing particles (as *-ki* in Lithuanian, maybe a negative polarity marker) together with their dialectal distribution and function will be shortly discussed. Also the role of the pre-Balto-Slavic negated optative as a contributing factor in the substitution of the PIE imperative by the optative will be addressed and typologically compared with the usage of injunctive forms as imperatives in PIE and later languages (cf. Vedic *dhāh* 'put!' and *dāh* 'give!'; Gr. *σῴε* 'keep!').

This paper is an extract of my ongoing Ph.D. thesis: Die syntaktische Kategorie des Prohibitivs.

### Literature (selection)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Dunkel George: Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme, 2 Bd., Heidelberg 2014.                                     | Schmalstieg William: The Lithuanian imperative in <i>-k</i> , in: Obst U. & Ressel G.: Balten - Slaven - Deutsche, Münster 1999, 261-268. |
| Holvoet Axel: Mood in Latvian and Lithuanian, in: Rothstein B. & Thieroff R.: Mood in the languages of Europe, Amsterdam 2010, 425-446. | Stang Christian: Das slavische und baltische Verbum, Oslo 1942.   |
| Gaters Alfred: Lettische Syntax. Die Dainas, Frankfurt am Main 1993.  | ---: Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen, Oslo 1966.  |

## TIJMEN PRONK

Leiden University  
t.c.pronk@leidenuniv.nl

## Stang's law in Baltic

It has long been recognized that in accusative singular form of the Indo-European words for 'cow' and 'sky', Vedic *gām*, *dyām*, Greek βῶν, Ζῆν, the phoneme *\*u* was lost between a vowel and the following *\*-m*, cf. Vedic nom. sg. *gáus*, *dyáus*. Christian Stang linked this loss, which has long been recognized as an inner-Proto-Indo-European development, with the length of the preceding vowel. The loss of *\*u* would have caused compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. The same process was later argued to have taken place in the acc.sg. of the *ā*-stems as well: *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>m* > PIE *\*-ām* on the strength of Skt. monosyllabic *-ām*, Greek *-ην* and Lith. non-acute *-ą* (Rix 1992: 75). Stang's law is widely, but not universally accepted, cf. Collinge's (1995: 37f.) conclusion that "[o]ne would like to join the happy throng of believers in Stang II, but the way remains very cloudy". During the talk, Stang's law will be discussed, with a focus on the relevant Baltic data, to wit Latv. *guovs* and the acc.sg. ending of the *ā*-stems.

## References

- Collinge, Neville E. 1995 Further Laws of Indo-European. In: Werner Winter (ed.) *On languages and language*, Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 27–52.
- Rix, Helmut 1992<sup>2</sup> *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Stang, Christian S. 1965 Indo-européen *\*g<sup>w</sup>ōm*, *\*d(i)jēm*. In: Jan Safarewicz & Franciszek Sławski (eds.) *Symbolae linguae in honorem Georgii Kuryłowicz*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy Im. Ossolińskich, 292–296.

ĒRIKA SAUSVERDE

Vilnius University  
erika.sausverde@flf.vu.lt

## **Linguistics, archeology and genetics – premises of pre-Indo-European substratum in languages around the Baltic Sea**

Question of possible pre-Indo-European substratum in north-western Europe has been mostly discussed within the framework of Germanic languages (e.g. maritime vocabulary, with starting point in the works of Sigmund Feist). Though nowadays the amount of unclear Germanic etymologies does not exceed the amount of unclear etymologies in any other language, the question is still relevant. The possible substratum in neighbouring languages has also been considered. The analyses of possible borrowings from pre-Indo-European language(s) in Baltic Finno-Ugric languages (idea first suggested by Paul Ariste) shows, that there is still a lexical layer which could be considered as borrowings from non-Uralic languages (Koivulehto, Itkonen, Kallio). Separate Baltic words have also been discussed, cf. e.g. fish-names in the area, which traditionally are interpreted as borrowings from one language to another (i.e. Germanic, Baltic, Baltic Finno-Ugric), some of them really being borrowings dating back to different epochs (Laumane, Blažek). However, an overview of etymological material in these languages often ends in a closed circle or with an admission of an impasse (cf. *āl* 'eel' in Bjorvand, Lindeman 2007).

The question of possible non-Indo-European substratum in the area is dealing with the question of the linguistic continuum in north-western Europe, language contacts, the origin of Germanic, Baltic and Baltic Finno-Ugric peoples. Archaeological data testifies that people had lived in this area for a long time before the arrival of Indo-Europeans. The last decades have brought new data into research, namely the vigorous development of genetics caused a fundamental change in our views on characteristics of the populations. Due to the fact that analysis of genetic variations in modern humans is providing us with an insight into prehistoric events, it seems worthwhile revising our knowledge of old languages and their possible contacts in prehistoric times. The present paper aims to review the perspectives of such an approach by dealing with the question of the oldest contacts around the Baltic Sea.

ILJA A. SERŽANT

University of Mainz  
ilja.serzants@uni-mainz.de

## Verbalization and non-canonical case marking of some irregular verbs in \*-ē- in Baltic and Russian

The present paper aims to provide a historical account of the irregular present-stem morphology and the non-canonical alignment of some verbs in \*-ē- in Baltic and East Slavic, exemplified by such verbs as Russian *bolet'* / Old Russian *bolēti* 'to ache', Lithuanian *skaudėti* 'to ache' / dial. *sopėti* 'to ache', *gailėti* 'to pity', *reikėti* 'to need', 'have to, must' and Latvian *sāpēt* 'to ache'. Differently from other approaches, an attempt is made to account for both syntactic and morphological irregularities at the same time.

These verbs have been subjected to scrutiny in several works, cf., inter alia, Bjarnadóttir (2015), Holvoet (2009; 2013), Seržant (2013; to appear), Seržant & Bjarnadóttir (2014). Their nominal and late origin has been asserted for many years in the literature (Skardžius 1943; Jakaitienė 1968; contrastingly Kaukienė 1994). While the nominal origin of these verbs seems to be unquestionably clear, none of the aforementioned works provides a historical scenario that would account for the morphosyntactic make-up and the morphological irregularities of the present stem formation of these verbs. The nominal origin in itself does not entail the case assignment patterns and morphological irregularities in the present stem formations and, hence, requires an explanation.

In this paper, an attempt will be made to provide a historical account that would explain both the syntactic alignment and the morphology of these verbs. The typological background is provided by Bricyn et al. (2009).

### References

- Bjarnadóttir, V., 2015: Non-canonical subjects in Baltic, PhD Dissertation. Stockholm.
- Bricyn, V. M., E. V. Rakhilina, T. I. Reznikova, G. M. Yavorskaya (eds.) 2009: В.М. Брицын, Е.В. Рахилина, Т.И. Резникова, Г.М. Яворская (ред.), Концепт БОЛЬ В типологическом освещении, Київ: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго.
- Holvoet, A. 2009: Difuziniai subjektai ir objektai. A. Holvoet, R. Mikulskas (eds.), Gramatinių funkcijų prigimtis ir raiška, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Asociacija Academia Salensis, 37–67. (Acta Salensia 1.)
- Holvoet, A. 2013: Obliqueness, quasi-subjects and transitivity in Baltic and Slavonic. I. A. Seržant, L. Kulikov (eds.), The Diachronic Typology of Non-Canonical Subjects, SLCS Series, John Benjamins.
- Jakaitienė, E. 1968: Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmoždziai su priesaga *-ėti*. Kalbotyra 19, 31–44.
- Kaukienė, A. 1994: Lietuvių kalbos veiksmoždzio istorija 1, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universitetas.
- Seržant, I. A., to appear-b: Dative experiencers as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. To be published in In: P. Arkadiev, A. Holvoet, B. Wiemer (eds.), Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics. De Gruyter.
- Seržant I. A. 2013: The Diachronic Typology of Non-Canonical Subjects and Subject-like Obliques. In: Seržant, Ilja A. and Leonid Kulikov (eds.), The Diachronic Typology of Non-Canonical Subjects. SLCS. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Seržant, I.A. & V. Bjarnadóttir 2014: Verbalization and non-canonical case marking of some irregular verbs in \*-ē- in Baltic and Russian. In: Judžentis, Artūras, Tatyana Civjan and Maria Zavyalova (eds.), Baltai ir slavai: dvasinių kultūrų sankritos / Балты и славяне: пересечения духовных культур. Vilnius: Versmės. [Proceedings of the international conference, dedicated to the academian Vladimir Toporov, The Balts and Slavs: Intersections of Spiritual Cultures.] 218-242.
- Skardžius, P. 1943: Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.



FLORIAN SOMMER, PAUL WIDMER

Universität Zürich

florian.sommer2@uzh.ch, paul.widmer@uzh.ch

## **Bringing together events and participants: Two ways of nominalizing linked predications**

While there has been done much research on finite subordinate clauses in several branches of Indo-European, there has been no comprehensive study of nominal strategies in clause combining and predication linking, which range from participles and absolutes to action nouns.

This is rather surprising since such strategies play a major role in the syntactical make-up of most of the Ancient Indo-European languages. Our talk is to be understood as a contribution to filling this gap.

We will elaborate on the different kinds of formal and functional orientation of nominalized construction and provide an overview of structures as well as an account of their distribution from an areal and historical perspective. We will draw on material from the major branches of Indo-European, which allows for situating the nominalizing constructions of the Baltic languages in their wider genealogical and typological context.

## RAFAŁ SZEPTYŃSKI

Institute of the Polish Language of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków  
 rafal.szeptynski@gmail.com

# Laryngeal correction in Balto-Slavic and the other northwest Indo-European languages

The aim of this paper is to reestablish the direct relationship between pretonic “shortening” in *\*eH*, *\*oH*, *\*iH*, *\*uH* sequences followed by resonants (*\*r*, *\*l*, *\*n*, *\*ŷ*; *\*m* and *\*j* are less certain) in the Germanic, Celtic and Italic languages and the acute mobility reconstructed for respective Balto-Slavic cognates.

The former phenomenon, posited by V.A. Dybo (thus called “Dybo’s law”; it was applied to Celtic and Italic in an extended formulation in Dybo 1961) and P. Schrijver (1991: 357), may be interpreted as deletion of a laryngeal in the syllable onset: cf. *\*ǵʰu<sub>1</sub>e.h<sub>1</sub>r<sub>1</sub>ǵ-* (weak cases), *\*ǵʰro.h<sub>x</sub>néh<sub>2</sub>-*, *\*ǵʰi.h<sub>3</sub>uó-*, *\*su.h<sub>x</sub>nú-*, etc., whereas the latter is based on later resyllabification which usually yielded a.p. 3 in Lithuanian, the broken tone in Latvian and a.p. *c* in Slavic (with the secondary circumflex due to morphophonological Meillet’s law):

	N sg. 1. <i>*su.h<sub>x</sub>nús</i>	>	2. <i>*su.Hnús</i>	>	3. <i>*suǰ.nús</i>	>	4. <i>*sú:nùs</i>
but	A sg. 1. <i>*súh<sub>x</sub>num?</i>						
or		>	2. <i>*súH.num</i>	>	3. <i>*súǰ.num</i>	>	4. <i>*sú:nų:</i>
	A sg. 1. <i>*su.h<sub>x</sub>núm?</i>						

The strong cases were barytone either originally or due to some kind of retraction, possibly similar to that posited by F.H.H. Kortlandt (1975: 5-6); this development is not identical with Hirt’s law, which serves as a means of comparison between “secondary” Balto-Slavic acute barytona and their “primary” oxytone Old Indic and Greek cognates, for the stress in *\*sú:nų:* was possibly *retracted* onto an *open* syllable from a syllable of a *particular* structure, whereas within Hirt’s law it would be *attracted* (before the stage 3.) by a *closed* syllable, possibly *irrespective* of the structure of the following syllable.

The conclusion is that in the northwest Indo-European languages laryngeals in *\*-VHRV-* sequences of disyllabic words belonged to stressed syllables (*\*-ǵH.RV- : \*-VHRǵ-*). “Hirt’s law” in Balto-Slavic and the “retention” of “pretonic” length in Germanic, Celtic and Italic may be either due to secondary barytone accentuation: *\*-ǵH.CV-* (derivational or generalised within mobile paradigms) or different syllabification: *\*-VH.Cǵ-*, *\*-CRǵH.Cǵ-* (> Balto-Slavic *\*-CǵRCV-*, Italo-Celtic *\*-CRāCV-*, none reflecting the old accentuation; however, Germanic seems to have had *\*-R.HRǵ-/ \*-R<sub>ǵ</sub>.HRǵ-* at least in the cases where Cowgill’s law operated). Both for Balto-Slavic (e.g. Lith. *výras*, Latv. *vīrs*; Lith. *dúona*, Latv. *duõna*; Latv. *grīva*, Cr. *grīva*; but also Cr. *dâr*, *stân*) and the other northwest languages (cf. Zair 2012: 145) some exceptions must be considered. But if the foregoing interpretations were rejected in general so should be Hirt’s law for Balto-Slavic, as it was actually done at first by Dybo (1961:19); one cannot explain the exceptions by assuming *ad hoc* “non-acute” lengthened grade (Kortlandt 1975: 54) or *\*-CHL.C-* structure (Kortlandt 1975: 2-3, 81), since the former is often indemonstrable and the latter could hardly have yielded length in Balto-Slavic.

### Bibliography

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Dybo V.A., 1961, Sokraščenie dolgot v kel’to-italijskix jazykax i ego značenie dlja balto-slavjanskoj i indo-evropejskoj akcentologii, <i>Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija</i> 5, 9-34. | Schrijver P, 1991, <i>The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Latin</i> , Amsterdam - Atlanta. |
| Kortlandt F.H.H., 1975, <i>Slavic accentuation. A study in relative chronology</i> , Lisse.   | Zair N., 2012, <i>The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Celtic</i> , Leiden-Boston.          |

MIGUEL VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Vilnius University  
miguel.villanueva@flf.vu.lt

## **Zero-grade denominative nasal and *sta*-presents in Baltic**

The Northern Indo-European languages (Germanic, Baltic and Slavic) share a productive class of anticausative-inchoative verbs whose most salient morphological feature is a nasal present (which in Baltic stands in complementary distribution with *sta*-presents). One of the main functions of this class is to form fientive denominatives from nouns and adjectives. In Old Norse and, to a lesser degree, in Slavic the denominative verb presents zero grade of the root even when derived from full-grade nominals. This is an obvious (and fairly interesting) archaism, whereas the apophonic invariance of Gothic or Baltic is an easily understood innovation. Nevertheless, one can reasonably expect the Baltic languages to preserve at least a handful of more or less hidden archaic zero-grade denominatives. This paper will be devoted to present and discuss evidence pointing in this direction.

## KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ WITCZAK

University of Łódź  
krzysztof.tomasz.witczak@gmail.com

## “The Pagan dialects from Narew” in the light of Yatvingian onomastic remnants

30 years ago Prof. Zigmantas Zinkevičius published a manuscript entitled “The Pagan Dialects from Narew” (henceforth PDN) in Russian and Lithuanian (Zinkevičius 1984; 1985). It was a manual copy by Vyacheslav Zinov, a young man from the city of Brest in White Russia. Later the Lithuanian scholar presented an English augmented version of his paper with the same title: *A Polish-Yatvingian Vocabulary?* (Zinkevičius 1992), as he suggested that Zinov’s copy may contain not only Polish words, but also their equivalents in the lost Yatvingian language. Balticists treat this discovery in different ways. Some of them accept Zinkevičius’ hypothesis, some reject the Yatvingian origin of the Baltic part, others believe that the manuscript, called Zinov’s dictionary after the surname of the young copist, is a modern forgery.

In my presentation I would like to demonstrate that the Baltic vocabulary, attested in Zinov’s dictionary, agrees very well with Yatvingian onomastic remnants. Observed differences are, in fact, doubtful or illusory. Thus the Yatvingian hypothesis, suggested by Zinkevičius (1984; 1985; 1992) and accepted by a number of scholars (e.g. Helimsky, Karulis, Orel, Sabaliauskas, Schmalstieg, Schmidt, Witczak and so on), seems the best possible conclusion.

The author wants to demonstrate additionally that a forgery is impossible for a number of reasons. Firstly, a linguistic calque attested in the post-Yatvingian toponymical area (*Windobała – Wiatrołuża*), confirmed by Zinov’s dictionary, was unknown in the eighties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Witczak 2004). Secondly, some toponyms from the post-Yatvingian area cannot be correctly explained without Zinov’s dictionary, e.g. the *Kojle* lake near Suwałki, originally ‘a silent [lake]’, refers only to *kajli* ‘silently’ [PDN 125] and not to OPrus. *kails* ‘healthy’, Latv. *kails* ‘naked, bare’, Slavic \**cělъ* ‘whole, intact’ (< BSl. \**kailu-*). An alleged forger would have to be an excellent Balto-Slavic linguist and dialectologist, exceeding all the modern specialists of the Baltic onomastics. Thirdly, Yatvingian is the only Baltic language showing the depalatalization of palatalized syllabic resonants after Baltic \**v* at an early period. It is attested in three different sources: (1) Maleckis’ relation from 16<sup>th</sup> c. on the Sudovians (i.e. Yatvingians) in Sambia mentions “an aged priest offering a goat” called *wurszajtis*, cf. Lith. *viršaitis* ‘village-mayor, village-chief, elder in a village’, Latv. *virsaitis* ‘village-mayor’ (Witczak 1989); (2) the Masovian river name *Wągra*, *Węgra* represents (Yatvingian) \**Wungrā* and Baltic \**Wingrā* f. ‘winding, tortuous, crooked [river]’ (Witczak 2015); (3) “the Pagan Dialects from Narew” demonstrates two examples of the observed phenomenon, cf. *wułk* ‘wolf’ [PDN 25] < Balt. \**wilkas*, cf. Lithuanian *vilkas*, Latvian *vilks*, OPrus. *wilkis* ‘id.’; *wułd* ‘to want’ [PDN 3] < Balt. \**wiltēi*, cf. Lith. *viltis* ‘to hope’, Latv. *vilt* ‘to cheat, swindle, delude’. This phonological process (i.e. Yatv. *vul-*, *vun-*, *vur-* < Baltic \**vil-*, \**vin-*, \**vir-*) was unknown and completely unrecognized before the publication of Zinkevičius’ articles (1984, 1985). Generally, it is impossible to suggest that an unknown forger had better knowledge than all the Balticists, who existed and worked in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In other words, Zinov’s dictionary entitled “The Pagan Dialects from Narew” should be treated as a copy of a lost authentic document. My final conclusion is that Prof. Zinkevičius correctly named it the “Polish-Yatvingian dictionary”.

## References

- Witczak K. T., 1989, Wurszajtis – jaćwieski kapłan-ofiarnik. Przyczynek do identyfikacji “Gwar pogańskich z Narewu”, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* XX, pp. 339–342.
- Witczak K. T., 2004, Linguistic Calques in the Old Prussian and Yatvingian Toponymy, *Baltistica* XXXIX(2), pp. 309–313.
- Witczak K. T., 2015, Węgra – dawny hydronim jaćwieski [Węgra – a former Yatvingian hydronim], *Onomastica* LIX (in press).
- Zinkevičius Z., 1984, Pol'sko-jatvjažskij slovarik?, *Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija* 1983, Moskva, pp. 3–29.
- Zinkevičius Z., 1985, Lenkų-Jotvingių žodynėlis?, *Baltistica* XXI(1), 1985, pp. 61-82, oraz XXI(2), pp. 184–194.
- Zinkevičius Z., 1992, A Polish-Yatvingian Vocabulary?, *Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznań* I, pp. 99–133.

YOKO YAMAZAKI

Stockholm University  
yoko.yamazaki@balt.su.se

## Balto-Slavic pronominal forms and monosyllabic circumflexion

In Lithuanian or in Balto-Slavic, a phenomenon called Monosyllabic Circumflexion (MC) is known. This phenomenon denotes that many of the monosyllabic words exhibit a circumflex tone instead of the expected acute tone: e.g., *geríeji* ‘the good ~ *tiē* ‘they. For the relative chronology of the phenomenon, two different opinions have been suggested. Rasmussen (1999: 481ff.) considers that the circumflex tone of some Baltic and Slavic pronominal forms (Lith. *tiē, jūs* ‘you (pl.);’ Sln. *tī* ‘you (sg.);’ *mī* ‘we,’ *vī* ‘you (pl.);’ *tā* ‘that (f.sg.nom.)’) points to an MC at a Proto-Balto-Slavic stage. On the other hand, Kortlandt (2014) assumes that the Lithuanian dialectal variants of the pronominal forms attested with the acute tone (e.g., *tíe* (nom.pl.), *túos* (acc.pl.), *túo* (instr.sg.)) in the westernmost Aukštaitian and Žemaitian dialects mean that MC of those words only took place in the Aukštaitian dialects where those pronominal forms have the circumflex tone. In addition, he considers that an old MC took place at a Proto-Balto-Slavic stage based on the data of the 3rd person future forms in Lithuanian and Latv. *sāls* ‘salt’ and *gūovs* ‘cow,’ which are traced back to PIE root nouns.

In this paper, I will examine those previous studies on the relative chronology of MC observed in the pronominal forms, also referring to what other categories of MC (East Baltic reflexes of PIE root nouns and particles/prepositions) tell us on the issue.

### Bibliography

Kortlandt, F. 2014. “Metatony in monosyllables”, *Baltistica* 49(2), 217–224.  
Rasmussen, J. E. 1999. “Die Vorgeschichte der baltoslavischen Akzentuierung – Beiträge zu einer vereinfachten Lösung” In *Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics*, Part 2, pp. 469–489. Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen. First published in: B. Barschel, M. Koziánka

& K. Weber (Hrsg.): *Indogermanisch, Slawisch und Baltisch*. Materialien des vom 21.–22. September in Jena in Zusammenarbeit mit der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft durchgeführten Kolloquiums (= *Slavistische Beiträge*, Bd. 285), München: Otto Sagner 1992, pp. 173–200.