Baltic ê- and î/jâ-stems

Kortlandt, F.H.H.

Frederik KORTLANDT

BALTIC *ē*- AND *ī/jā*-STEMS

Eighty years ago, Nicolaas van Wijk tried to identify Baltic *ē*- and *ī/jā*-stems in the Old Prussian catechisms (1918, 29–32) This resulted in the following classification of the evidence (acc sg forms unmarked)

(1) *ē*-stems

I *semmin*, II *semmien*, E *semmien* (8x), *semien* (2x), *semman*, dat I *semmey*, II *semmiey*, nom E *semmē*, EV *same*, Lith *žeme*, Latv *zeme*

I *muttin*, II *mutien*, E *mūtien*, *mutien*, *mūtin*, nom *mūti*, EV *mothe*, Lith *mote*, Latv *māte*

I *geiwin*, II *geywien*, E *giywin*, gen *giywis*, nom *giwei*, Latv *dzīve*

E *perōnien* (3x), *perōnin* (2x), nom *perōni*

E *warrien*, *warrin* (2x), *warein* (2x), nom Latv *vara*, *vare*

E *peisālin*, nom *peisālei*

E *teisin* (5x), *teischin*, gen *teisis*, nom *teisi*, Lith *teise*, *tiesa*

(2) possible *ē*-stems

E *sālin*, nom EV *soalis*, Lith *žole*, Latv *zāle*

II *druwin*, E *drūwien* (3x), *druwien* (7x), *nidruwien*, nom *druwi*, *druwis*, I *droffs*

E *dūsin*, *dusin*, *doūsin*, *daūsin* (2x), nom EV *dusi* < Polish *dusza*

E *tickrōmien* (2x)

(3) *i*-stems

I *nactin*, II *naktin*, E *naktin*, *nacktin*, *nacktien* (2x), nom Lith *naktis*

E *nautin* (2x), *nautien*, dat *nautei*

(4) *ī/jā*-stems

E *mārtin*, *mārtan*, nom Lith *martì*

E *waispattin* (2x), nom Lith *viešpatì*

E *maldūnin* (2x)

(5) *ja*-stems

I *rekian*, II *reykyen*, E *rikijan* (31x), *rickijan*, gen *rikijas* (6x), nom I *rekis*, *rickis*, II *rykyes*, *reykeis*, E *rikijs* (24x), *rickijs*, *rikeis*

I *tawischen*, II *tauwyschen*, E *tawischan* (4x), *tawischen*, *tawisen*, gen I *tawischis* (2x), II *tauwyschis*, *tauwyschies*, E *tawischas* (3x)

(6) possible *ja*-stems

I *naseilen* (2x), II *naseylien* (2x), E *noseilien* (7x), *noseilin* (5x), *nuseilin*, gen I *naseilis*, II *naseylis*, E *noseilis* (2x), *noseilīs*, nom *nosēilis*, *noseilis* (2x)

I *pekollin*, II *pykullien*, E *pickullien* (2x), gen *pikullis*, nom EV *pyculs*

I *geittin* (2x), II *geytien*, E *geitien* (2x), *geitin* (3x), *geitan*, nom *geits*, EV *geytye* (for *-ys*)

I *etwerpsannan*, *attwerpsannan*, II *etwerpsennian* (2x), E *etwerpsennian* (2x), *etwerpsennien* (7x), *etwerpsennin*, *etwerpsennınn*, nom *etwerpsnā* (2x), *etwerpsna* (2x)

I *tirtin*, II *tirtien*, E *tīrtian*, *tīrtin*, *tīrtan*, dat *tīrtsmu* (3x), nom I *tirts*, II *tirtis*, E *tīrts* (2x)

E *busennien* (2x), *bousennien*, *bausennien* (5x), nom *bousennis*

E *aucktimmien*

E *nertien* (3x), gen *nierties*

E *pogirrien*, nom Lith *pagyris*

Most acc sg forms in *-in*, *-ien* cannot be identified as belonging to the *i-*, *ja-* or *ē*-stems (van Wijk, 1918, 37–39) If we eliminate the less reliable instances, the evidence for the acc sg endings can be summarized as follows

ē-stems I *-in* (3x), II *-ien* (3x), E *-ien* (12x), *-in* (2x)

i-stems I *-in*, II *-in*, E *-in* (4x), *-ien* (3x)

ī/jā-stems E *-in* (5x)

ja-stems I *-ian*, *-en*, II *-yen*, *-en*, E *-ijan* (32x), *-an* (4x), *-en* (2x)

On the basis of the evidence I reconstruct for the *ē*-stems */-ien/, for the *i*- and *ī/jā*-stems */-in/, and for the *ja*-stems */-jæn/ (cf Kortlandt, 1998a, 1998b) The ending */-ien/ was written *-in* in the First catechism, was corrected to *-ien* in the Second, and became mixed up with the ending */-in/ in the Enchiridion before the generalization of the ending */-an/ of the *a*-stems Accordingly, the expected acc sg ending is for the *ē*-stems *-ien* (written *-in* in the First catechism), for the *i*- and *ī/jā*-stems *-in* (all sources), and for the *ja*-stems *-(i)an*, *-(i)en* (which may be written *-in* in I and E) This leads me to disagree with van Wijk's identification of the stem formation in the following instances

E nom *teisi*, acc *-in* (6x) is probably an *ī/jā*-stem

EV nom *soalis*, E acc *sālin* is probably a *ja*-stem

I nom *droffs*, II acc *druwin*, E nom *druwis* suggests an *i*-stem, whereas E nom *druwi*, acc *-ien* (11x) points to an *ē*-stem This word will be discussed below

EV nom *dusi*, E acc *-in* (5x) is probably an *ī/jā*-stem

I *naseilen* (2x), II *naseylien* (2x) is definitely a *ja*-stem

I *etwerpsannan*, *attwerpsannan* may belong either with II *etwerpsennian* (2x), which is a *ja*-stem like E nom *bousennis*, acc *-ien* (8x), or with E nom *etwerpsnā* (2x), *etwerpsna* (2x), which is an *ā*-stem

We now turn to the Elbing Vocabulary In an important but neglected article (1973), Jules Levin has identified 137 *ē*-stems (47 of which have an equivalent in Lithuanian)

and 25 *ī/jā*-stems He makes clear that the difference cannot be attributed to phonological variation or dialect mixture but represents a genuine morphological distinction While 35% of the *ē*-stems have East Baltic equivalents, the *ī/jā*-stems have East Baltic cognates which are *jā*-, *ja*- or *i*-stems While almost a third of the *ē*-stems represent suffixal or prefixal derivations or compounds, derived *ī/jā*-stems are few and semantically detached Levin points out that over 60% of the *ī/jā*-stems belong to three out of eleven semantic groups (landscape and natural phenomena, body parts and diseases, agriculture and related terms), whereas none is found in the group denoting wildlife, which contains 34 *ē*-stems He argues that among the loanwords from Slavic, the *ē*-stems *medinice*, *nadele*, *calene* represent an older stratum than the *ī/jā*-stems *dusi*, *garkity*, *knapios*, evidently as a result of the rise of new */j/ in Proto-Lekhitic (cf Kortlandt, 1979b, 271) The Prussian *ī/jā*-stems have recently been discussed by Kaukiene (1996), who unfortunately disregards most of the scholarly literature

The morphological distinction between *ē*- and *ī/jā*-stems is found not only in Prussian, but also in Lithuanian, where the latter type is preserved in *martì*, gen *marčios*, and *patì*, gen *pačios* We may therefore look for correspondences in Slavic and other Indo-European languages The classic study on the subject is by Holger Pedersen (1926) In his discussion of the Lithuanian *ē*-stems, Pedersen distinguishes between the following types

(1) *žvake*, *mente*, *gire*, Latin *facēs*, Vedic *mánthās*, *girís*, Slavic *gora* These are eH_1-stems

(2) *arklide*, *avide*, *alude*, *pelude*, also *žvaigžde*, Prussian EV *umnode*, Slavic *zvězda*, Vedic *-dhā́*, Latin *-dēs* These are compounds of the root *$dheH_1$- 'put'

(3) *šlove*, Slavic *slava*, Latin *cluēre*, which may also be an eH_1-stem

(4) *gerve*, Latin *grūs*, which may be an uH_1-stem

(5) *žeme*, Slavic *zemlja*, which is an extension of a root noun, like *upe*, *saule*, *muse*, *pele*

Besides, there are two types which represent Proto-Indo-European *iH*-stems

(6) *vilke*, *nepte*, Vedic *vrkís*, *napt̄s* This type is usually represented by Slavic *-ica* (cf Lohmann, 1932, 21, 24)

(7) *deive*, Vedic *devī́* This type can easily have replaced the flexion of *martì* and *patì* on the analogy of the preceding type

It thus appears that the *ē*-stems represent original hysterodynamic eH_1- and *iH*-stems (with accentual mobility between the stem and the ending), whereas the *ī/jā*-stems directly continue proterodynamic iH_2-stems (with accentual mobility between the root and the suffix), cf Vedic *vrkís*, gen *vrkiàs* < *-*iHos*, versus *devī́*, gen *devyás* < *-*ieH₂s* The two types of *iH*-flexion are attested in Slavic, e g in *sǫdi*, *sǫdu*, gen *sǫdiję* 'judge' and *mlъni*, *mlъnu*, gen *mlъnię* 'lightning' versus *bogynji*, gen *bogynję* 'goddess' (cf especially Lohmann, 1932, 60–62) It has long been recognized that as a rule the former type is found in derivations from *o*-stems and the latter type in derivations from consonant stems (e g Lohmann,1932, 22, 67) This explains the ending of Prussian EV *sansy* as op-

posed to the 34 *ē*-stems denoting wildlife, including 19 species of wild birds, which correspond to the regular type of Lith. *vilkė*, cf. *žąsis*, gen. pl. *žasų*, versus *vilkas*.

The distinction between hysterodynamic and proterodynamic *iH*-stems has a perfect analogue in the distinction between hysterodynamic and proterodynamic *uH*-stems. P e d e r s e n reconstructs a proterodynamic paradigm **plēdhū*, gen. **plēdhuēs* < **-ueH₁s* for Latin *plēbēs* and Greek *plēthūs*, and similarly for Lith. *gervė* and Latin *grūs* (1926, 63, 71). There is no reason to reconstruct an original hysterodynamic paradigm on the basis of Greek gen. *plēthúos* (thus B e e k e s, 1985, 39 and S c h r i j v e r, 1991, 380f.) because the latter can easily be analogical. Note that Latin *-b-* represents intervocalic **-dhw-*, not intervocalic **-dh-* (as in *vidua* 'widow'), and cannot therefore be derived from **-dhuH-*. Similarly, I reconstruct a proterodynamic paradigm for Avestan *hizū-*, *hizvā-*, Vedic *juhū-*, *jihvā-*, Prussian EV *insuwis*, in spite of Gāthic gen. *hizvō* < **-uHos*, which can easily have arisen on the basis of the original accusative **-uHm*, cf. Gāthic acc. *tanvə̄m*, which is trisyllabic like gen. *tanvō* < **-uHos*. The motivation for the restoration of the laryngeal in the oblique cases of the Avestan word for 'tongue' was probably the phonetic development of **-zv-* to **-zb-* in Iranian, which gave rise to a paradigm **hizū*, **hizu'am*, **hizbā-*, with an oblique stem which is preserved in later Iranian languages. In the Rgveda we find acc. *juhuàm* beside *jihvā́m*, inst. *juhuā́* beside *jihvā́* and *jihváyā*, gen. and abl. *jihvā́yās*, nom. pl. *juhuàs* beside *jihvā́s*, inst. pl. *juhū́bhis* beside *jihvā́bhis*, and the compound *juhu-ā̀syas* beside nom. sg. *jihvā́*. This points to a paradigm **juhū*, **juhu'am*, obl. *jihvā-*, in accordance with the Iranian forms. Note that Vedic acc. *devī́m* must be analogical in view of the root aorist 1st sg. *ábhuvam* < **-uHm*, with vocalization of the final nasal, as opposed to monosyllabic *-ām* < **-eHm*, with compensatory lengthening of the vowel.

The flexion of the hysterodynamic *uH*-stems is best preserved in Slavic *svekry*, gen. *svekrъve* 'mother-in-law'. Jan R o z w a d o w s k i has shown that the original accusative is *svekrovь* < **-euHm*, not *-ъvь* (1914, 14–18). This must be a highly archaic form because there is no model for an analogical origin. The elimination of the isolated full grade suffix in other Indo-European languages is a trivial development. The antiquity of the Slavic paradigm is corroborated by the regular loc. sg. and nom. acc. pl. endings *-i*, which are identical with the *i*-stem endings and differ from the endings of both the *ā*-stems and the consonant stems. This is especially remarkable because we find the *ā*-stem endings in the dat., inst. and loc. pl. forms. I conclude that we have to reconstruct loc. sg. **-euHi*, nom. pl. **-euHes*, acc. pl. **-euHns*, which yielded the attested loc. sg. and acc. pl. endings. The nom. pl. form adopted the acc. pl. ending, as happened with all feminine nouns in Slavic. The early introduction of the *ā*-stem endings in the oblique plural cases suggests the previous existence of **-H₂es* in the nom. pl. ending. Thus, everything seems to point to an original hysterodynamic paradigm **suekruH₂s*, **-euH₂m*, **-uH₂os*, as opposed to proterodynamic **pleH₁dhuH₁*, **-ueH₁s*, and comparable with e. g. the *nt*-participle **H₁eints*, **H₁ientm*, **H₁intos* (cf. Beekes 1985, 70).

The Latin material has been discussed in detail by Peter Schrijver (1991, 363–390). He argues that hysterodynamic *ē*-stems like *vātēs* joined the third declension whereas root nouns such as *spēs* became the core of the fifth declension. Furthermore, he tentatively distinguishes between four types of *iH*-stems:

(1) proterodynamic iH_2-stems, which are reflected in the formations of *genetrīx*, *rēgīna*, *avia*, and denominal abstracts like *mīlitia*.

(2) proterodynamic iH_1-stems, which are reflected in deverbal abstracts of the fifth declension such as *aciēs*.

(3) hysterodynamic iH_2-stems, which are reflected in denominal abstracts and collectives like *māteriēs*, gen. *māteriae*.

(4) hysterodynamic iH_1-stems, in particular *neptis*, which may be compared with *socrus*.

In order to explain the *iē/iā*-flexion of *māteriēs*, Schrijver assumes that original **-iH_2m* yielded Latin *-iem* which then served as a basis for the creation of a nominative in *-iēs*. This is highly improbable in view of the subjunctive ending 1st sg. *-im* < **-īm* < **-iH_1m*. It follows that the flexion of the types represented by *mīlitia* and *aciēs* is based entirely on the proterodynamic oblique cases. The *iē/iā*-flexion of *māteriēs*, gen. dat. *-iae* now offers independent evidence for the reconstruction of an accusative in **-eiH_2m*, the phonetic reflex of which was **-ēm*, cf. *trēs* < **treies*, in agreement with the Slavic evidence for hysterodynamic **-euHm*. Note that Slavic antevocalic **-ei-* yielded **-ij-*, e. g. in *trije* < **treies*, so that the full grade suffix was lost phonetically in the hysterodynamic *iH*-flexion.

Schrijver's evidence for reconstructing **-H_1-* instead of **-H_2-* in *neptis* and *socrus* is delicate, as he points out himself (1991, 365). Moreover, it seems to be contradicted by the *ā*-stem endings in the Slavic oblique plural cases of *svekry*. If the suffix was **-uH_1-*, we would expect *i*-stem endings here. However, it must be recalled that Baltic *ē*-stems are usually reflected as *ā*-stems in Slavic, e. g. *zvězda* 'star'. I therefore see no cogent objection to the view that the Slavic evidence for the color of the laryngeal can be disregarded. Note that we have **-H_2-* in Old Polish *kry* 'blood', cf. Greek *kréas*. Besides, I find it very difficult to see how Latin *neptis* and *socrus* could avoid becoming *ā*-stems if they had an *a*-coloring laryngeal. I therefore subscribe to Schrijver's view that these two nouns represent hysterodynamic iH_1- and uH_1-stems.

The reconstruction of a hysterodynamic accusative in **-euHm* provides an elegant solution for the coexistence of **vidhū-* and **vidhevā-* in the word for 'widow', Prussian *widdewū* (cf. Beekes, 1992, 184). This word evidently represents the hysterodynamic uH_2-stems and thereby supports the reconstruction of **-H_1-* in the word for 'mother-in-law'. The preservation of the front vowel in the medial syllable of Prussian *widdewū*, as opposed to the regular development of heterosyllabic **-eu-* in Slavic *vъdova* (cf. Kortlandt, 1979a, 57), suggests that **-eu-* spread to the nominative at an early stage and that we have to reconstruct a Balto-Slavic nom. sg. form **videuH*.

Now we return to the Prussian material The reconstruction of acc sg *-*eiHm* for the hysterodynamic *iH*-flexion offers a straightforward explanation for the peculiar accusative *warein* (2x) and the nominatives *giwei* and *pisālei* It appears that there was a paradigm with nom -*ei* and acc -*ein* beside the dominant paradigm with nom -*ē* and acc -*ien* and the proterodynamic *ī/jā*-flexion with nom -*i* and acc -*in* The type in -*ei*, -*ein* evidently represents the original iH_1-stems reflected in the Latin deverbal abstracts like *aciēs* Interestingly, Slavic *neti*, *netii*, Old Polish *niec*, Czech *net'*, gen *neteře*, Slovak *neter* (but cf Vaillant, 1958, 258) shows that the flexion of this hysterodynamic iH_1-stem remained distinct from the flexion of the proterodynamic iH_1-stems even if the latter adopted the acc sg ending *-*eiHm* in Prussian It follows that all of the reconstructed types must have existed side by side in Balto-Slavic The proterodynamic iH_1-stems can now be identified with the Slavic type *volja* 'will' (cf S t a n g, 1957, 57) The corresponding type of proterodynamic uH_1-stems is reflected in *klętva* 'oath' It appears that the proterodynamic iH_1-stems joined the proterodynamic iH_2-stems in Lithuanian, e g *valia*, gen *valios*, cf also Latvian *vara* beside *vare* In Slavic, the hysterodynamic type *sǫdi(i)* may include original iH_1- as well as iH_2-stems while denominal nouns like *koža* 'skin', which belong to the same type as *volja*, may represent earlier proterodynamic iH_2-stems Note that from a semantic point of view Vedic *rathī́s* 'charioteer', like the Slavic word for 'judge', fits Latin *vātēs* better than *māterēs* and may therefore contain *-iH_1- whereas *-iH_2- is probable for feminines such as Slavic *mlъni(i)*, Prussian EV *mealde* This leads us to the following tentative classification of the Balto-Slavic material (Prussian unmarked)

(1) hysterodynamic eH_1-stems and original root nouns *umnode*, Lith *gire*, *žvaigžde*, Russ *gora*, *zvezda*

(2) hysterodynamic uH_1-stems and original root nouns Lith *šlove*, Russ *slava*, *svekrov'*

(3) hysterodynamic uH_2-stems and original root nouns *widdewū*, Russ *vdova*, *krov'*

(4) proterodynamic uH_1-stems *gerwe*, Lith *gerve*, Czech *žeráv*, Russ *kljatva*

(5) proterodynamic uH_2-stems *insuwis*, Lith *liežuvis*, Russ *jazyk*

(6) hysterodynamic iH_1-stems Lith *nepte*, Russ *sud'ja*

(7) hysterodynamic iH_2-stems *mealde*, Lith *vilke*, Russ *molnija*, *volčica*

(8) proterodynamic iH_1-stems *giwei*, Lith *valia*, Russ *volja*

(9) proterodynamic iH_2-stems *sansy*, Lith *pati*, Russ *bogиnja*, *koža*

Most important is that in Prussian, unlike East Baltic and Slavic, the proterodynamic iH_1-stems adopted the flexion of the hysterodynamic iH_1-stems and thereby remained distinct from the proterodynamic iH_2-stems This points to an early split Also noteworthy is that in Slavic the H_1-stems were evidently redistributed according to animacy and gender Russian *gora*, *zvezda*, *slava*, *kljatva*, *volja* versus *sud'ja* versus *svekrov'*, Czech *net'*, *žeráv*, similarly in the Slavic proterodynamic iH_2-stems *koža* versus *bogynji* The *ā*-stem flexion of the type *sǫdi(i)* is therefore remarkable and must probably be attributed to a compara-

tively recent phonetic development This supports the reconstruction of *-*iH*$_1$ in *sǫdi(i)* versus *-*iH*$_2$ in *mlɔni(i)*

Apart from the *iH*$_1$-stems, which remained a distinct category in Prussian but joined the corresponding *iH*$_2$-stems elsewhere, it appears that the West and East Baltic reflexes are usually in agreement We often find a neuter in *-jan* beside a collective in *-ē* or *-jā*, e g EV *garian*, E *garrin* 'tree' beside Lith *gire*, *giria* 'forest', further I *kraugen*, E *krawian* beside *krawia*, EV *crauyo* 'blood', also EV *soalis*, E *sālin* 'herb' beside Lith *žole* 'grass' This model can hardly account for I *stas droffs*, corrected in II *stan druwin*, E *(stas) druwis* beside *sta druwi*, acc *-ien* (11x), which points to an original neuter *i*-stem beside the feminine *ē*-stem Similarly, we find a neuter nom *giywan*, *giwan*, gen *gīwas* (2x), *geiywas*, acc *-an* (9x), beside the feminine *giwei*, gen *giywis*, acc *giywin*, I *geiwin*, II *geywien* As these deverbal abstracts fit the *iH*$_1$-stems semantically, it seems probable to me that the neuter *i*-stem, which could either become masculine or adopt *a*-stem endings, was created on the basis of the oblique cases with zero grade suffix *-*i*- of the feminine nouns in *-ei*, acc *-ein* This again confirms the paradigms of Latin *māteriēs* and Slavic *svekry* discussed above

REFERENCES

Beekes R S P, 1985, The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection, Innsbruck

Beekes R S P, 1992, 'Widow', – Historische Sprachforschung, CV, 171–188

Kaukiene A, 1996 Prūsų kalbos *ī(jā)* kamieno sąsajos su kitais kamienais, – LKK XXXVI 87–100

Kortlandt F, 1979a, Three problems of Balto Slavic phonology, – Zbornik za Filologiju i Lingvistiku XXII (2), 57–63

Kortlandt F, 1979b, On the history of the Slavic nasal vowels, – Indogermanische Forschungen, LXXXIV, 259–272

Kortlandt F, 1998a, The development of the Prussian language in the 16th century, – Baltistik Aufgaben und Methoden, Heidelberg (forthcoming)

Kortlandt F, 1998b, The language of the Old Prussian catechisms, – Res Balticae, IV (forthcoming)

Levin J F, 1973 *-jā* stems and *-ē* stems in the Elbing Vocabulary, – Baltic literature and linguistics, Columbus, Ohio, 189–196

Lohmann J, 1932 Genus und Sexus, Gottingen

Pedersen H, 1926, La cinquieme declinaison latine, København

Rozwadowski J, 1914, Przyczynki do historycznej fonetyki języków słowiańskich, – Rocznik Slawistyczny, VII, 9–21

Schrijver P, 1991, The reflexes of the Proto-Indo European laryngeals in Latin, Amsterdam-Atlanta

Stang C S, 1957, Slavonic accentuation, Oslo

Vaillant A, 1958, Grammaire comparee des langues slaves II (1) Morphologie Flexion nominale, Lyon-Paris

van Wijk N, 1918, Altpreussische Studien, Haag