



**Potsdam Linguistic Investigations**

**Potsdamer Linguistische Untersuchungen**

**Recherches Linguistiques à Potsdam**

Edited by  
Herausgegeben von  
Edité par

Peter Kosta  
Gerda Haßler  
Lilia Schürcks  
Nadine Thielemann

Roman Sukač (ed.)

# FROM PRESENT TO PAST AND BACK

Papers on Baltic and Slavic Accentology



**PETER LANG**

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

The Fifth International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology took place in 2009 at the Silesian University in Opava (Czech Republic). This volume contains papers presented at the workshop. The papers treat thematically various aspects of Baltic and Slavic prosodic development as well as provide synchronic descriptions of individual Baltic and Slavic languages and their dialects.

Roman Sukač, PhD, born in 1970, is an assistant professor at the Silesian University in Opava (Czech Republic).

From Present to Past and Back

**Potsdam Linguistic Investigations**  
**Potsdamer Linguistische Untersuchungen**  
**Recherches Linguistiques à Potsdam**

Edited by/Herausgegeben von/Édité par  
Peter Kosta, Gerda Haßler, Lilia Schürcks  
and/und/et Nadine Thielemann

Vol./Bd. 7



**PETER LANG**

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Wien

Roman Sukač (ed.)

# FROM PRESENT TO PAST AND BACK

Papers on Baltic and Slavic Accentology



PETER LANG

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

**Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche  
Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the  
Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is  
available in the internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Cover Design:  
Olaf Gloeckler, Atelier Platen, Friedberg

ISSN 1862-524X (Print Ausgabe)  
ISBN 978-3-631-61914-8 E-ISBN 978-3-653-01072-5

© Peter Lang GmbH  
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften  
Frankfurt am Main 2011  
All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any  
utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without  
the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to  
prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions,  
translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in  
electronic retrieval systems.

[www.peterlang.de](http://www.peterlang.de)

## Editorial

The series *Potsdam Linguistic Investigations – Potsdamer linguistische Untersuchungen – Recherches linguistiques à Potsdam* presents cutting-edge fundamental linguistics research carried out at the University of Potsdam. Its major goal is to publish collection of articles, conference proceedings and monographs on contemporary issues in the fields of Slavic languages and literature, Romance studies, English and American studies, German studies and general linguistics. A special focus of study is the formal, functional and cognitive description of language. The following areas of linguistics will seek to develop their own profile: phonology, morphology, syntax (with special attention to generative syntax), semantics, pragmatics (discourse analysis, speech act theory), sociolinguistics and language contact.

We do not set any theoretical, methodological or geographical boundaries. The series will serve greatly as a forum for young scholars as well as other researchers working in various linguistic fields and frameworks in Potsdam or elsewhere. The indication of Potsdam stands for the crucial importance and outstanding quality of linguistics research at the University of Potsdam. On the other hand, researchers from other Universities with proven excellence of their work are most welcome to publish their doctoral dissertations, habilitation monographs or conference proceedings in this series. The languages of publication are German, English and French.

## Editorial

Die Reihe *Potsdam Linguistic Investigations – Potsdamer linguistische Untersuchungen – Recherches linguistiques à Potsdam* ist eine Plattform für linguistische Forschungen an der Universität Potsdam. Sie publiziert Sammelbände und Monographien zu aktuellen Fragen der zeitgenössischen internationalen Linguistik aus den Disziplinen Slavistik, Romanistik, Anglistik/Amerikanistik, Germanistik und Allgemeine Linguistik. Ein besonderer Schwerpunkt liegt in der formalen, funktionalen und kognitiven Sprachbeschreibung. Darin bilden vor allem die Bereiche Phonologie, Morphologie, Syntax (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der generativen Syntax), Semantik, Pragmatik (Diskursanalyse, Sprechhandlungstheorie, Geschlechterforschung), Soziolinguistik und Sprachkontakt ihre eigenen Profile.

Wir wollen keine theoretischen, methodischen oder lokalen Grenzen setzen. Deshalb richtet sich die Reihe sowohl an Nachwuchswissenschaftler als auch an Kollegen in Potsdam und außerhalb Potsdams, die in verschiedenen Richtungen, Modellen und theoretischen Ansätzen der modernen Linguistik arbeiten. Der Hinweis auf den Standort Potsdam soll zum einen die herausragende Bedeutung der linguistischen Forschung an dieser Universität signalisieren. Andererseits bedeutet die Nennung nicht, dass ausschließlich Forschungsergebnisse (einschließlich Dissertationen, Habilitationen und Konferenzsammelbände) veröffentlicht werden, die von Linguistinnen und Linguisten an der Universität Potsdam stammen. Die drei Publikationssprachen sind Deutsch, Englisch und Französisch.

## Editorial

La série « *Potsdam Linguistic Investigations – Potsdamer linguistische Untersuchungen – Recherches linguistiques à Potsdam* » représente une plate-forme d'études linguistiques à l'université de Potsdam. Elle publie des recueils et des monographies sur les questions actuelles de la linguistique contemporaine internationale dans les domaines des études des langues slaves et romanes, anglaise et américaine, des langues germaniques et de la linguistique générale. Un point principal de recherche est posé sur la description formelle, fonctionnelle et cognitive de ces langues. Dans ces domaines, on met l'accent sur les profils de la phonologie, morphologie, syntaxe (en tenant compte de la syntaxe générative), sémantique, pragmatique (l'analyse du discours, la théorie des actes de la parole, la recherche sur le genre), la sociolinguistique ou la linguistique de contact.

Nous ne voulons pas poser des limites dans la théorie, la méthode et le lieu de recherche. C'est pourquoi la série invite les jeunes chercheurs ainsi que les collègues de Potsdam et des autres universités qui travaillent dans les secteurs de la linguistique moderne. Le titre de la série veut démontrer d'un côté l'excellente qualité de la recherche linguistique à Potsdam sans toutefois exclure les autres. Cela veut dire que nous acceptons et nous invitons les linguistes de Potsdam et de l'extérieur (inclus les thèses de doctorat et d'habilitation et les actes de colloques). Les trois langues de publication sont : l'allemand, l'anglais et le français.

## Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	IX
<b>Katsiaryna Ackermann</b> On the Prosody of Slavic Continuants of Indo-European Verbal Adjectives in -to-, -no-, -lo- .....	1
<b>Václav Blažek</b> On the Accentuation of the Baltic Verb .....	13
<b>Rick Derksen</b> The Relative Chronology of East Baltic Accentual Developments .....	17
<b>Vladimir A. Dybo</b> Balto-slawische Akzentologie und die germanische Konsonantengemination (Zur Verteidigung von F. Kluges Theorie) .....	23
<b>Zbyněk Holub</b> Quantity Patterns of a-stems and o-stems in South-Western Czech Dialects (Especially in the Doudleby Region) .....	40
<b>Jay H. Jasanoff</b> Balto-Slavic Mobility as an Indo-European Problem .....	52
<b>Yuri Kleiner</b> Accentuation and Quantity .....	75
<b>Frederik Kortlandt</b> West Slavic Accentuation .....	86
<b>Orsat Ligorio</b> Concerning New Štokavian Retraction .....	108
<b>Michail Oslon</b> Über den Silbenakzent in Juraj Križanićs Dialekt .....	111
<b>Vytautas Rinkevičius</b> Akzentuierung der altpreußischen suffigierten Verba .....	125

<b>Joseph Schallert</b>	
The Role of Sonority and Quantity in the Morphophonemic Development of Stress in Common Slavic Masculine Barytona (AP <i>a</i> ) in Balkan Slavic Dialects .....	146
<b>Tobias Scheer</b>	
Home-Made Western Slavic Vowel Length .....	165
<b>Bonifacas Stundžia</b>	
Some Remarks on Accentual (Neo)mobility in Lithuanian .....	188
<b>Roman Sukač</b>	
Moravian Quantitative Paradigms .....	194
<b>Alexandra Ter-Avanesova</b>	
The Accentuation of <i>*a-/*ja</i> -stems in East Russian Dialects .....	201
<b>Zuzana Topolińska</b>	
Main Conclusions of My Prosodic Research .....	216
<b>Tomasz Wiśniewski</b>	
Late Accent Shifts and Fixing of Stress in West Slavic .....	218
<b>Steven Young</b>	
Winter's Law and Baltic Ablaut .....	237

## **Preface**

This book contains papers presented at the Fifth International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology (IWoBA V), held at the Silesian University in Opava on 7-10 June 2009.

The IWoBA tradition, having traveled to many superb European cities, has now reached the Czech Republic. The Opava meeting produced many compelling and thought-provoking presentations and it is hoped that the present conference volume will contribute to the continuing advancement of our understanding the complexities of Baltic and Slavic accentual phenomena. Thanks go to all the IWoBA participants for their papers. We hope that not only Balto-Slavic accentologists, but also scholars working in the other fields of linguistics, will be take an interest in the papers collected here.

A note of gratitude goes to Prof. Dr. Peter Kosta for accepting this volume for publication in the Potsdam Linguistic Investigations series. Special thanks to Ute Winkelkötter from Peter Lang International Academic Publishers for her advice and help.

Roman Sukač  
Department of Czech Language and Library Sciences  
Silesian University in Opava



## On the Prosody of Slavic Continuants of Indo-European Verbal Adjectives in -to-, -no-, -lo-

My recent research in the system of the Proto-Slavic finite verb<sup>1</sup> has brought a new perspective on the correlation of prosody and morphology in the rise of paradigmatic classes and minor paradigmatic oppositions as for example in the Rule of N. van Wijk (which will be treated below). Because the non-finites received just peripheral attention, it seemed appropriate to bring up for discussion relevant data concerning the role of prosody in the formation of *-t-*, *-n-*, and *-l-* participles in Slavic according to the current state of knowledge in Indo-European and Balto-Slavic studies.

When reconstructing the system of the Proto-Slavic aorist one is confronted with the necessity to account for such cases of metatony in the 2.-3.sg. as

e.g. S.-Cr. *pî*, *îs-pî*; OCSl *pitъ* < Proto-Sl. *\*pītŭ* ← pre-Proto-Sl. *\*\*pītŭ*  
< IE root aorist *\*péh<sub>3</sub>/pih<sub>3</sub>-* ‘to take a sip/mouthful’ to the IE root *\*peh<sub>3</sub>(i)-* and past participle passive (ppp) e.g. S.-Cr. *pît*; Slov. *pît*, *popît*<sup>2</sup>; Russ. - *'pit(o)*, *pîta*, OCSl *-pitъ/ -pita/ -pito* ‘drunk’ < Proto-Sl. *\*pītŭ* ← pre-Proto-Sl. *\*\*pītŭ* < IE *\*p(e)ih<sub>3</sub>(i)-tó-* (Bezlaj 2: 44; Jaksche 1965: 121; Sadnik 1959: 141-142, 147; Svane 1958: 81; Kiparsky 1962: 348-349).

The phenomenon of the prosodic-morphological opposition of the Slavic past participles with the dental suffix and circumflex, on the one hand, and those with nasal suffix and acute, on the other, is part of the well-known rule formulated by Nicolaas van Wijk (van Wijk 1926). Accordingly:

Circumflex in the root vowel → *-t*-ppp and Ausgang *°tŭ* in the 2.-3.sg. aorist as: e.g. ppp *\*pĩ-to-*, 2.-3.sg. aorist *\*pĩ-tŭ* from *piti* ‘drink’

Acute in the root vowel → *-n*-ppp and Nullausgang in the 2.-3.p.sg. aorist e.g. ppp *\*bĕjeno-*<sup>3</sup>, 2.-3.sg. aorist *\*bí* from *biti* ‘beat’

Van Wijk however could not provide his rule with a plausible explanation.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 A sketch of my investigation of the IE background of Slavic aorist classes and present aorist constellations appears in the Proceedings of the 13th International Indo-European Conference in Salzburg in October 2008, a more comprehensive presentation will soon appear in the International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction.

2 Cf. adj. *pîten*, *pîtna* ‘drinkable’.

3 The place of the accent is a matter of controversy.

4 He did wrongly assume the corresponding verb stems to possess the same intonation ad initio. (Van Wijk 1926: 286; van Wijk 1923: 42-47; van Wijk 1931: 231-233).

L-participles seemed to comply with the distribution in so far as a clear distinction in the place of the accent in corresponding fem. forms between the 2 groups could be observed, cf:

*l*-ppa m.,f.: OCSl *pilъ, pila*; S.-Cr. *pǐo, pǝ-pio, pila, pǝ-pila*;  
 Čak. *pǝpǐl, popǐlǎ*; Slov. *pil, popil*,<sup>5</sup> *pila, popila*;<sup>6</sup> Russ. *pil, pi<sup>1</sup>la*

as against

*l*-ppa m.,f.: OCSl *bilъ, bila*; S.-Cr. *bǐo, bǐla, pǝ-bio, pǝ-bila*;  
 Čak. *ubil, ubila*; Slov. *bil, bila*; Russ. *(po)<sup>1</sup>bil, (po)<sup>1</sup>bila*.

Past participles with an acute root vowel - according to van Wijk's Rule, those with an *-n*-suffix - do not pose a great problem regarding their intonation. Those with a circumflex, however, are rather heterogeneous as to the original root structure and subsequently their prosody. Some of them cannot be explained phonologically, as, for example, *pitъ* 'drunk' illustrated above. It is common knowledge today that a verbal adjective with the laryngeal-final root structure in IE and suffix *\*-to-* as e.g. in *\*p(e)ih<sub>3</sub>(i)-tó-* definitely demands an acute.

In 1958 V. A. Dybo described this prosodic discrepancy in his article '*O drevnejšej metatonii v slavjanskom glagole*', and subsequently in 1961 in '*Udarenie slavjanskogo glagola i formy staroslavjanskogo aorista*'. He focused on the corresponding forms of the 2.-3.sg. aorist, not on those of the participles. Dybo associated such metatony in the aorist forms with Meillet's Law. That is metatony of the type:

e.g. Lith. *sūnūs* - OPr. *soūns* vs. OCSl *\*<sup>1</sup>sŷnъ*, (S.-Cr. *sŷn*) 'son', OI *sūnūh*  
 'son' = 'the born one' from the root *\*seuH* - 'to bear'

or Lith. *gývas*, Latv. *dzīvs*, Proto-Sl. *\*<sup>1</sup>živъ* (S.-Cr. *živ*), OI *jīvá*, Lat. *uīuus*  
 '(a)live' < *\*g<sup>h</sup>ih<sub>3</sub>uó-* 'the one having vitality, viability' to the root  
*\*g<sup>h</sup>ieh<sub>3</sub>-* 'to live'

and some more, which enabled the class reduction in the system of the noun by eliminating the unproductive declension type. (For Meillet's own formulation and the following discussion, consult Meillet 1902: 195; Meillet 1914: 65-84 as well as van Wijk 1958<sup>2</sup>: 82-94; Bulachovskij 1960: 21-26.)

Two factors played the decisive role in Meillet's analysis: the comparison of the Slavic material with the Lithuanian and the oxytonensis of the corresponding forms in Old Indic (as illustrated above). However the conditions which

5 Likewise n. Slov. *popilo*, Russ. *po<sup>1</sup>pilo* and pl. Slov. *popili*, Russ. *po<sup>1</sup>pili*.

6 The first leftward accent shift in Slov. is responsible for the form *pila* < Proto-Slav. *\*pilá*. According to Jaksche (1965: 115) the transition should have been phonetic, because of the circumflex root vowel, whereby the femininum should have been oxytone already in Proto-Slavic. (Cf. Sadnik 1959: 148).

according to Meillet trigger the metatony of the original acute vowel into a circumflex one in such nominals are not applicable to the forms of the 2.-3. sg. aorist and the relevant participle formations. Firstly these categories cannot be one to one compared with those in Lith. For, on the one hand, Baltic does not have any sigmatic aorists (the *-s*-formant has been developed to build a future tense instead); secondly *-tá*-participles have spread largely at the expense of *-n*-participles. Moreover the prosodic structure of the input forms of later Slavic participles is not always unequivocal. Dybo manages to evade this problem by operating with present forms. (As e.g. in 1961: 34).

I discussed the pros and contras of his explanation in my paper for the 36<sup>th</sup> ÖLT (In References under Ackermann 2008). The most important conclusion to be mentioned here is that postulating a common accent paradigm in the proto-language for nominals, showing traces of the metatony of that kind in Slavic as opposed to their Baltic cognates, is rather problematic, since the cases listed by Meillet, go back to various kinetic as well as static accent paradigms in PIE. It is also difficult to account for the Proto-Slavic leftward accent shift, which should have taken place in the framework of this theory. (Against Dybo 1958: 55-62; 1961: 33-38; 1962: 220-225).

Van Wijk in contrast cannot explain ‘durch welche Bedingungen diese Zurückziehung hervorgerufen wurde’. He suspects, however, the existence of 2 stress patterns in IE in such words. (1958<sup>2</sup>: 82, 85-86, 92-93, cf. also Meillet 1924: 333; Bulachovskij 1927: 73, 76-77).

Kortlandt (1975: 10-12, 54-55) tried to explain Meillet’s circumflex, like many other prosodic developments in B-Sl. in the framework of the glottal theory, by means of the late loss of laryngeals, which I cannot support.

Rasmussen (1989: 180, 196) on the contrary, sees Meillet’s law conforming with the general trend in Slavic towards *Polarisierung der Mobilität*. This rather perfunctory formulation has a serious methodological problem, as it focuses on the output context disregarding the input one.

Assuming the existence of one homogeneous mobile paradigm for the B-Sl. words in question (Moscow accentological school) has the drawback of a great number of exceptions and particularities to be accounted for.

Over the last decades the following suggestion has worked its way into a well established theory: many IE attributive adjectives, when used without the corresponding substantive (i.e. absolutely) tended to shift (leftward or rightward) their accent so that a concomitant accentual opposition arose between the adjective used attributively vs. its form in the absolute use. Such adjectives developed, in general, additional semantic independence. (A comprehensive discussion is given in Schaffner 2001: 328-345; Klingenschmitt 1992b: 119;

Panagl 1989: 188-189. See also Bezzenberger 1896: 310-314; Endzelin J. 1913-1914: 107-108; Sadnik 1959: 71).<sup>7</sup>

This accent shift as the concomitant means of word-formation accompanied the process of substantivisation of adjectives, like:

e.g. OI *kṛṣṇá-h* (RV+) adj. 'black' vs. *kṛṣṇa-* (RV+) m. 'black antelope' from the root *\*ker(s)-* 'to be dark' (by means of barytonensis); OI *ásita-h* (RV+) adj. 'black' vs. *asitá-* (AV+) m. 'black serpent' from the root *\*h<sub>2</sub>mes-/ h<sub>2</sub>ṃs-i-* something like 'to be dirty' (by means of oxytonesis):

or the process of morphological differentiation of verbal adjectives:

e.g. OI (RV) *jústa* - adj. 'welcome' vs. (AV) *justá* -adj. 'welcome' from the root *\*ǵeus-* 'taste, enjoy'; whereby in OI concretization to 'like' took place;

A closer analysis of the forms cited within this theory enabled an observation that mostly IE suffixal formations ending with °ó-, such as *\*-tó-*, *\*-nó-*, *\*-ló-*, *\*úó-* and when substantivised or semantically individualized were generally subject to such an accent shift (mostly barytonensis, rarely oxytonensis), as, for example, in:

OI *pūrṇá-h*, Lat. *plēnus*, OIr. *lán* oxytone vs. Lith. *pilnas* - (3 perhaps <1)<sup>8</sup> adj. Latv. *pīlns*, Proto-Sl. *\*'pьlnъ* > OCSl *plьnъ*, S.-Cr. *pŭn*, Čak. *pŭn*, *punã*, (Novi) *pŭn*, *pŭna*, (Hvar) *pŭn*, *pŭna*, Slov. *pótn*, Russ. *'polnyj*, m. *'polon*, n. *'polno*, f. *'polna* adj. 'full' < BSl. *\*pólnos* < *\*pŕh<sub>1</sub>-no-* barytone to *\*pleh<sub>1</sub>-* 'to fill oneself, to become full'. (Skardžius 1935: 57, 150, 164, 175, 171; Buch 1961: 71, 78. Further see Trautmann 1923: 218; van Wijk 1958<sup>2</sup>: 120; Mühlenbach - Endzelin, 3: 216; van Wijk 1958<sup>2</sup>: 91; Illič-Svityč 1963: 74 Rasmussen 1985: 18; Schaffner 2001: 336; cf. Derksen 2008: 426)<sup>9</sup>

In Indo-Iranian one can still easily find both the input and output forms of such an accent shift. In the later attested IE languages, however, only one accent pattern frequently remains: barytone or oxytone. Compare the following:

---

7 Stang 1966: 152ff treats the corresponding cases in Baltic differently.

8 The attested data in Latv. and OLith. speak for the Proto-Balt. barytone stress with subsequent transition into the modern mobile class. See the bibliographical data in the main text.

9 Cf. the phonological explanation by Vaillant (1950: 245), followed by Sadnik 1959: 101-102.

I. Traces of the former substantivisation in:

e.g. Proto-Sl. \*<sup>l</sup>zbrno, Proto-Balt. \*žirno < BSl. \*žárno- ‘corn’ < \*ǵǵh<sub>2</sub>-no- substantivised verbal adj. ‘smth. ground’,<sup>10</sup> to the root \*ǵǵerh<sub>2</sub>- ‘grind, grate, make old’.<sup>11</sup> Sl.: S.-Cr. zřno; Čak. zřno, zřna (Vrg.); zârno, zârna (Hvar);<sup>12</sup> Slov. zřno; Čech., Slk. zrno; Bulg. zbrno, or zbrno; ORuss., R.-CSl. zérno<sup>13</sup> also second. zernó, zërna n. ‘corn’ (Kiparsky 1962: 247; Sadnik 1959: 71). Balt.: Lith. žirnis (1), Lat. ziřnis m. ‘pea’, OPr. syrne ‘corn’ (Skardžius 1935: 15; Vasmer I: 454-455 however with the wrong intonation; Trautmann 1923:372; Mühlenbach - Endzelin, 4: 728ff) as against \*ǵǵh<sub>2</sub>-nó- in OI jřnâ-h adj. ‘decomposed, old’, or jřrnâ- adj. denoting the same.

e.g. Proto-Sl. \*<sup>l</sup>dblǵb, Proto-Balt. \*ilgas ‘long’ < BSl. \*dálgos < \*dǵh<sub>1</sub>ǵ<sup>h</sup>-o- ‘long’ Sl.: S.-Cr. dǵg, čak. dǵg, slov. dǵlg, dǵtga, russ. <sup>l</sup>dolgij, m. <sup>l</sup>dolog, n. <sup>l</sup>dolgo, f. <sup>l</sup>doľga, čech. dlouhý, slk. dlhý ‘long’ (Kiparsky 1962: 270-271; Sadnik 1959: 101-102). Balt.: Lith. ilgas (3<1)<sup>14</sup> adj., lat. ilǵs<sup>15</sup> ‘long’ (Skardžius 1941: 148; Trautmann 1910: 346; 1923: 55; Endzelin 1913-1914: 108; 1971: 169; Bezenberger 1896: 313, 314; Mühlenbach - Endzelin, 1: 705; van Wijk 1958<sup>2</sup>: 91, 120; Illič-Svityč 1963: 75; Rasmussen 1985: 181; Derksen 2008: 133) as against \*dǵh<sub>1</sub>ǵ<sup>h</sup>-ó- in: Ved. dīrghâ-h, Gr. δολιχός ‘long’ : δόλιχος ‘the long horse race track’.

II. Traces of the adjectivisation of a verbal adjective in:

e.g. Proto-Sl. \*<sup>l</sup>starb ‘old’ < BSl. \*stâros < \*stéh<sub>2</sub>-ro- ‘one having a firm stand’ to the root \*steh<sub>2</sub>- ‘take one’s stand’.( LIV<sup>2</sup>: 590. See also Meillet 1902c-1905: 404). Sl.: S.-Cr. stâr,<sup>16</sup> ‘old’; Čak. (Vrg.) stârî, stâr, starâ, stâro; (Hvar) stôr, stârâ, stâra; (Orb.) stâr, stâra, stâro; Slov. stâr, stâra; Čech. starý, Slk. stary; Russ. <sup>l</sup>staryj, m. star, n. <sup>l</sup>sta’ro, f. sta’ra ‘old’ (Belić 1925: 10; summarised in Sadnik 1959: 102-103; cf. also Derksen 2008: 465; Kiparsky 1962: 271) as against \*steh<sub>2</sub>-ró- in Lith. stóras (3)<sup>17</sup> ‘strong, stocky’,<sup>18</sup> or OI. sthirás ‘firm, hard, unmovable’.

---

10 Cf. also OIr. grán, Goth. kairn, OHG kerno, ON kjarni, Lat. grānum.

11 or from \*ǵǵerH- ‘grind, wipe out’. The semantic split of the root doesn’t seem to have taken place in Ilr. (Cf. Kümmel in LIV2: 165).

12 Cited from Derksen 2008: 553.

13 Cf. dial. coll. zérn’ f. or else zerenje meaning the same.

14 Cf. OLith. adverb ilgai (Schleicher 1856-1857, II: 142); Mod. Lith. ilgaĩ, or ilgai and OLith. toponym ilginykai.

15 With the old stem stress.

16 Cf. S.-Cr.dial. stâ-man, stâ-mna with the same meaning (Trautmann 1923: 282).

17 Belonged to the 3rd class already in OLith.

(Skardžius 1935: 175, Buch 1961: 71, 116; Fortunatov 1900: 45; Vasmer III: 5 with further bibliography; Holthausen 1948: 284);

A similar, but much younger process of substantivization took place in Proto-Balt. *o-*, *īo-*, *ā-*, *īā*, and *ē-*stems, cf:

Latv. *liēls* adj. ‘big’ (Lith. *liēlas* ‘big’) and *liēls* ‘shin-bone’ from the IE root *\*lejh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘fade, cease, become thin’ (Schaffner 2001: 329-330; Bezzenberger 1896: 310-314; Endzelin J. 1913-1914: 107-108; Buga 1923: 109).

One should distinguish between the outcome of this late productive morphological metatony in Baltic and the reflexes of earlier oppositional accent shifts, which took place in the protolanguage. The minimal pairs of the latter are recognizable mostly in comparison of several IE daughter languages, cf:

Lith. *ilgas* (3) ‘long’ vs. *ilgis* (2) ‘length’ (with Balt. *métatonie douce*) and OLith. *ilgai* adv. (1), Latv. *ilgs*, Čak., S.-Cr. *dŭg* < BSl. *\*dǎlgos* < *\*dʰhg<sup>h</sup>-o-* vs. Ved. *dīrghá-h*, Gr. *δολιχός* ‘long’

As can be seen from some of the examples illustrated above, a large number of cases traditionally explained purely phonologically by means of Hirt’s Law (Hirt 1895: 94, 165-166; Collinge 1985: 81-85)<sup>19</sup> have now received a morphological treatment. This mechanism was demonstrated by Klingenschmitt (1992a) more than a decade ago to account for such cases as:

e.g. Lith. *dūmai*, Latv. *dūmi*, Proto-Sl. *\*dŭmь* (S.-Cr. *dŭm*), OI *dhūmá-* m. ‘smoke’ = ‘the one smoking’ to the root *\*d<sup>h</sup>ueh<sub>2</sub>-*;

e.g. Lith. *gývas*, Latv. *dzīvs*, Proto-Sl. *\*žīvь* (S.-Cr. *živ*), OI *jīvá*, Lat. *uīuus* ‘alive’ = ‘the one possessing the power of life’ to the root *\*g<sup>v</sup>ejh<sub>3</sub>-*;

e.g. Lith. *sūnùs* - OPr. *soūns*, Proto-Sl. *\*sŭnь*, (S.-Cr. *sŭn*), OI *sūnúh* ‘son’ = ‘the one which was born’ to the root *\*seuH-*.

This account offers better grounds for many single cases with a visible accent shift and those without it in nominals built with *\*-tó-*, *\*-nó-*, *\*-ló-*, *\*-úó-*: namely that the accent mobility occurred as the means of morphological derivation.

Unlike the case with nouns, it is not possible to find in all Proto-Sl. *-t-*, *-n-*, and *-l-* participles traces of unambiguous transition into another semantic category, but it is obvious that accent shifts of that kind should have been an important means of word-formation at some earlier stage of Proto-Slavic. At the same time, the extent of semantic differentiation could not have played the

---

18 Cf. stress deviation in Latv. *stūrs* ‘persistent’, which should obviously represent an old stem accent. However the influence of Germ. is also possible.

19 Cf. also the treatment by Garde 1976: 333-334.

decisive role. Undoubtedly the adjectivisation and paradigmatic arrangement of some Proto-Slavic verbal adjectives in the noun system occurred parallel to the grammaticalization of other Proto-Slavic verbal adjectives as participles in the system of the verb. Such (de)verbal adjectives had functioned morphologically and syntactically at the earlier stage of Proto-Slavic as pure nominals. Continuants of the IE \*-lo-, \*-to-, \*(e)no-deverbatives have been then step-by-step integrated in the system of the verb: first they functioned syntactically as nominal predicates in combinations with copula, later gaining morphological independence, which at its extreme yielded the *l*-preterite in the majority of the modern Slavic languages. This phenomenon has been a matter of thorough analysis for R. Večerka (1993: 108; 1996: 199-214).

Such development of IE \*-lo- verbal adjectives, working out closer affinities to the verbal system in Slavic, has parallels in Armenian, as seen in the formation of the preterit participle: Arm. <sup>o</sup>*éal* < Proto-Arm. \*<sup>o</sup>*ea-lo* as e.g. in *bereal* ‘born’ built from the aorist stem *ber-e/a-* ‘bear, bring’ < IE root \**b<sup>h</sup>er-* ‘bear, bring’ and infinitive: Arm. <sup>o</sup>*l* as e.g. in *go-l* ‘be, exist’ to IE root \**h<sub>2</sub>ues-* ‘stay’ (Klingenschmitt 1982: 55-59, part. § 5.4. and 5.7.; Meillet 1913: §128); as well as in Tocharian in the formation of gerundives I and II: by means of the Formant *-lle* for sg. nom. m. and *-lye* for obl. sg. m. in Toch. B: e.g. *allek / allyek* ‘other’ and accordingly *-l-* in Toch. A. (See also Klingenschmitt 1994: 335).

The principle of combination of morphological and prosodic means to mark new syntactical roles of earlier verbal adjectives, as demonstrated above, has provided the longed answer for the question ‘durch welche Bedingungen diese Zurückziehung hervorgerufen wurde’ (cf. van Wijk 1958<sup>2</sup>: 85). Peculiar about it is the intonation change, which should have taken place either simultaneously or subsequently. Thus this prosodic development, resembling in its surface structure Meillet’s Law, revealed its logics, namely to maintain the paradigmatic rearrangement of former IE deverbal adjectives, resulting in their receiving a new value, namely that of active or passive participles, and acquiring the valence of the root verb. Its operation in the verbal system can be directly observed, as expected, in the non finite verbal categories:

Proto-Sl. supine < IE \**tū-stems* (Bulaxovskij 1927);

Proto-Sl. participles < IE \*<sup>o</sup>*lo-*, \*<sup>o</sup>*to-*, \*<sup>o</sup>*(e)no-* verbal adjectives.

e.g. IE verbal adj. \**pih<sub>3</sub>-tó-* > Pre-Proto-Sl. \**pī-tū-* (with an acute on the root vowel) > proto-sl. ppp \* *pīb-* (according to Meillet) ‘drunk’ e.g. IE deverbal state adj. \**pih<sub>3</sub>-ló-* > Pre-Proto-Sl. \**pī-lū-* (with an acute on the root vowel) > Proto-Sl. past participle active \**pīl<sup>1</sup>b-* (according to Meillet) ‘having drunk’

The process of morphological rearrangement in the *-t-* and *-n-* participles and their syntactical roles, which started in Proto-Slavic, has been in progress till the very recent times. Some cases illustrating the reanalysis of the deep syntax in participial constructions are cited by Večerka (1993:109), cf.: OČech. *je súzen* (beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> cen.) as the translational equivalent of lat. ‘iudicatus’ whereby mod. Čech. *jest souzen* would mean ‘iudicatur’.

## Conclusion

This investigation aimed to offer a plausible scenario for the development of IE *-lo-*, *-no-* and *-to-* deverbatives in Slavic. This, as illustrated, occurred to be the result of several developments at different language levels. It involved not only prosody and morphology as traditionally assumed, but also syntax and semantics. This new perspective provided a better context for understanding the operation of Meillet’s Law and subsequently that of van Wijk’s Rule. An important issue was the reconsidering of Meillet’s Law as applied to the process of grammaticalization of Proto-Slavic verbal adjectives. Meillet’s Law which operated in the system of the noun and Meillet’s Law which operated in the system of the verb have common phonological and prosodic environment, but different morphological context and different functions. Thus, it is left open, whether to associate the latter prosodic development with the name of Meillet, which is in fact a matter of convention.

## References

- ACKERMANN, K. Kontinuität und Innovation in der Genese des slavischen Verbums: Das System des urslavischen Aorists. In: *Proceedings of the 13th International Indo-European Conference in Salzburg 21.-27.09.2008*. Wiesbaden. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- ACKERMANN, K. *Diachrone Bemerkungen zu VAN WIJKS Regel über das participium praeteriti passivi auf -тъ/-ta/-to und den Ausgang °тъ der 2.-3. P.Sg. Aorist im Altslavischen. Paper on the 36<sup>th</sup> Linguistics Meeting (ÖLT) in Vienna*. Online available. [cit. 6.- 8.12. 2008].
- BELIĆ, A. Zur slavischen Akzentlehre. Aus Anlaß von D. Bubrich’s Aufsatz über ‘Die Akzentlehre’ von A. BELIĆ. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie II*, 1925, 1-28.
- BEZLAJ, F. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. 2. vyd. Dop. in ured. M. SNOJ in M. Furlan. Ljubljana, 1972.

- BEZZENBERGER, A. Anzeige zu 'Der indogermanische Akzent. Ein Handbuch. von H. HIRT. Strassburg 1895. *Bezzenberger Beiträge*, 1896, 21, 289-316.
- BUCH, T. *Die Akzentuierung des Christian Donelaitis*. Wrocław - Warszawa - Kraków, 1961.
- BUGA, K. Die Metatonie im Litauischen und Lettischen. *KZ*, 1923, 51, 109 - 142.
- BULAXOVSKIJ, L.A. Besprechung von N. van Wijks Die baltischen und slavischen Akzent- und Intonationssysteme. - *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeling Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel XXIII, N.2* (1923). *ZfSlPh I*, 1925, 216-232.
- BULACHOVSKIJ, L. A. Die Intonation des slavischen Supinums. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie IV*, 1927, 69-83.
- BULAXOVSKIJ, L.A. Drevnejšaja slavjanskaja metatonija akutovyh dolgot (Zakon A. Meje). In: *Ezikovedsko-etnografski izsledvanija v pamet na akademik STOJAN ROMANSKI*. 1960, 21-26.
- COLLINGE, N. *The Laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam /Philadelphia. 1985.
- DERKSEN, R. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden -Boston, 2008.
- DYBO, V. A. O drevnejšej metatonii v slavjanskom glagole. *VJa*, 1958, VII, 6, 55-62.
- DYBO, V.A. Udarenie slavjanskogo glagola i formy staroslavjanskogo aorista. *Kratkie soobščeniya Instituta slavjanovedenija*, 1961, 30, 33 - 38.
- DYBO, V.A. [Rez.] Stang 1957. In: *Strukturno-tipologičeskie issledovanija*. Moskva, AN SSSR, 1962, 220-225.
- DYBO, V.A. *Zur historischen Akzentologie des Slavischen*. Presentation in Vienna on 22.10.1991.
- DYBO, V.A., ZAMJATINA, G.I., NIKOLAJEV, S.L. *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii*. Moskva, 1993.
- DYBO, V.A. Iz balto-slavjanskoj akcentologii. Problema zakona Fortunatova i popravka k zakonu F. de Sossura. *Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija*, 2000, 14 (1998/1999), 27-82.
- ENDZELINS, J. Weiteres zu den lettischen Intonationen. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 1913-1914, 33, 104-118.
- FORTUNATOV, F. Über die schwache Stufe der uridg. 'ǎ'-Vokale. *KZ*, 1900, 36, 38-54.
- GARDE, P. *L'histoire de l'accentuation slave*. 2 vol. (Collection de manuels de l'Institut d'études slaves, 7). Paris, 1976.
- HIRT, H. *Der indogermanische Akzent: Ein Handbuch*. Strassburg, 1895.

- HIRT, H. *Indogermanische Grammatik V - Der Akzent*. Heidelberg, 1929.
- HOLTHAUSEN, F. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altwestnordischen*. Heidelberg, 1948.
- ILLIČ-SVITYČ, V.M. *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*. Moskva, 1963.
- JAKSCHE, H. *Slavische Akzentuation II - Slovenisch*. Wiesbaden, 1965.
- JASANOFF, J.H. Acute vs. Circumflex: Some Notes on PIE and Post-PIE Prosodic Phonology. In: *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Ibidus Martiis anno MMIV*. A. Hyllested a kol. (Eds.) Innsbruck, 2004, 247-255. IBS 112.
- KIPARSKY, V. *Der Wortakzent der russischen Schriftsprache*. Heidelberg, 1962.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, G. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden, 1982.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, G. Die indogermanischen Grundlagen des slavischen Akzents, unpubl. Presentation in Vienna on the 10.12. = (1993) in Berlin = (1994) Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen. In: *Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in honorem H. PEDERSEN 26.03-28.03 1993 in Kopenhagen*. J. E. Rasmussen (Ed.) Wiesbaden, 1992a, 235-251.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, G. Die Lateinische Nominalflexion. In: *Latein und Indogermanisch. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanische Gesellschaft in Salzburg, 09. 1986*. Innsbruck, 1992b, 89-135.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, G. Das Tocharische in indogermanischer Sicht. In: *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin September 1990*. B. Schlerath (ed.). (=TIES Suppl. Ser. Vol.4). Rejkjavík, 1994), 310-415.
- KORTLANDT, F. *Slavic Accentuation. A Study in Relative Chronology*. Lisse, 1975.
- LEHFELDT, W. *Einführung in die morphologische Konzeption der slavischen Akzentologie*. 2nd ed., in the Series: Vorträge und Abhandlungen zur Slavistik, (Ed. P.Thiergen) with Appendix by W. Vermeer. München, 2001.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> = RIX, H. et al. (2001) *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.
- MEILLET, A. *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*. Paris, 1902-1905.
- MEILLET, A. *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg, 1913.
- MEILLET, A. Sur l'accentuation des noms en indo-européen. *MSL*, 1914, 19, 65-84.
- MEILLET, A. *Le slave commun*. Paris, <sup>1</sup>1924.

- MÜHLENBACH- ENDZELIN - *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. I-IV. Riga, 1923-1932.
- NIKOLAEV, S.L. Balto-slavjanskaja akcentuacionnaja sistema i ee indoeuropejskie istoki. Balto-slavjanskije sootvetstvija klassam greko-arijskih suffiksov. In: *Istoričeskaja akcentologija i sravnitelno-istoričeskij metod*. Moskva, 1989, 46-109.
- PANAGL, O. Bahuvrīhi, Ellipse, Synekdoche. In: *Indogermanica Europaea, Festschrift für W. MEID zum 60. Geburtstag am 12.11. 1989*. 4th ed. K. Heller, O. Panagl, J. Tischler (ed.). Grazer Linguistische Monographien, 1989, 185-192.
- RASMUSSEN, J.E. On Hirt's Law and Laryngeal Vocalisation. *APILKU*, 1985, 5, 179-215.
- RASMUSSEN, J.E. *Studien zur Morphophonemik der Indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck, 1989.
- RASMUSSEN, J.E. Processes of Grammaticalization in Indo-European Verbal Derivation. In: *Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in Honor of R. S. P. Beekes on the Occasion of his 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. Lubotsky A. (ed.). Leiden Studies in Indo-European, 9. Amsterdam, 1997, 249-262.
- SADNIK, L. *Slavische Akzentuation I - Vorhistorische Zeit*. Wiesbaden, 1959.
- SCHAFFNER, S. *Das Vernerscher Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. (Univ. Diss. Regensburg 1999). Innsbruck, 2001. IBS 103.
- SCHLEICHER, A. *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*. Sv. I-II. Prag, 1856-1857.
- SKARDŽIUS, P. *Daukšos akcentologija*. Kaunas, 1935.
- STANG, CH. *Slavonic Accentuation*. Oslo, <sup>1</sup>1957.
- STANG, CH. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo, 1966.
- STANG, CH. Zur Flexion der u-Stämme im Baltischen. *Scando-Slavica*, 1976, 22, 175-177.
- SVANE, G. O. *Grammatik der slowenischen Schriftsprache*. Kopenhagen, 1958.
- TRAUTMANN, R. *Baltisch-Slavisches Wörterbuch*. Göttingen, 1923.
- VAILLANT, A. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves* I. Paris, 1950.
- VAN WIJK, N. L'accentuation de l'aoriste slave. *RES*, 1923, III, 27 - 47.
- VAN WIJK, N. Die slavische Partizipia auf -to- und die Aoristformen auf -тъ. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 1926, 43, 281-289.
- VAN WIJK, N. *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache. B.I. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Berlin-Leipzig, 1931.
- VAN WIJK, N. *Die baltischen und slavischen Akzent- und Intonationssysteme*. Leiden, <sup>2</sup>1958.

- VASMER, M. III. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3rd ed. Heidelberg, 1958.
- VEČERKA, R., KELLER, F., WEIHER, E. *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax: B.II. Die innere Satzstruktur*. Freiburg, 1993.
- VEČERKA, R., KELLER, F., WEIHER, E. *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax: B. III. Die Satztypen*. Freiburg, 1996.

## On the Accentuation of the Baltic Verb<sup>1</sup>

1. It is generally accepted that verbs with acute intonation in Lithuanian and their counterparts with circumflex in Latvian indicate the Indo-European ‘disyllabic base’ (Trautmann 1923, 40; Beekes 1995, 145), e.g.:

(1) Lithuanian *barù* : *bárti* vs. Latvian *bāru* : *bařt* ‘schelten’ < \**b<sup>h</sup>orH-*, cf. Old Indic *br̥nāti* ‘droht, schimpft’ < \**b<sup>h</sup>r-né-H-* (LIV 80);

(2) Lithuanian *delù* : *dilti* ‘sich abnutzen, schwinden’, Latvian *dēlu* : *dīřt* ‘abnehmen, sich verschleissen’ < \**delH<sub>1</sub>-* : \**d̥lH<sub>1</sub>-*, cf. Latin *doleō*, *-ēre* ‘schmerzen’ < \**dolH<sub>1</sub>-éje-* (LIV 114);

(3) Lithuanian *giriù* : *girti* ‘loben, rühmen’, Latvian *dzīruōs* : *dziřtiēs* ‘sich rühmen’ < \**g<sup>u</sup>rH-je/o-*, cf. Vedic *gr̥nāti* ‘begrüsst, rühmt’ < \**g<sup>u</sup>r-né-H-* (LIV 210-11);

(4) Lithuanian *kalù* : *kálti* ‘schlagen, stechen’ vs. Latvian *kaļu* : *kaļř* ‘schmieden, (Pferde) beschlagen’ < \**kolH<sub>2</sub>-*, cf. Greek *κλάω* ‘breche’ < \**k̥lH<sub>2</sub>-je/o-* (LIV 350);

(5) Lithuanian *malù* : *málti* vs. Latvian *maļu* : *maļř* ‘mahlen’ < \**molH<sub>2</sub>-*, cf. Luwian *mālhūta* ‘brach’ (LIV 432-33);

(6) Lithuanian *minù* : *minti* vs. Latvian *minu* & *miņu* : *mīř* ‘treten, gerben’ < \**mnH-*, cf. Middle Breton *monet* ‘gehen’ < \**monH-eje/o-* (LIV 438);

(7) Lithuanian *pilù*, dial. *piliù* : *pilti* ‘giessen, (aus)füllen, schütten’ < \**plH<sub>1</sub>-*, cf. Vedic *pūryate* ‘wird voll’ < \**plH<sub>1</sub>-je-toj-*, Greek *πλήτο* ‘wurde voll’ < \**pleH<sub>1</sub>-to* (LIV 482);

(8) Lithuanian *vemiù* : *vėmti* vs. Latvian *vēmu* : *veřt* ‘erbrechen’ < \**uemH<sub>1</sub>-je/o-*, cf. Old Indic *vāmīti* ‘speit aus’, Greek *ἐμέω* ‘erbreche’ (LIV 680).

2. There is a set of the verbs of this accentological pattern in the zero-grade of the root, extended in \*-*je/o-*, but with external cognates excluding the *seř*-root (cf. Kuryłowicz 1952, 410):

(9) Lithuanian *burìu* : *burti* ‘allerhand Wahrsagerei oder Zeichendeuterei treiben’, Latvian *buřu* & *buřu* : *buřt* ‘zaubern’ (Trautmann 1923, 40). The external comparison confirms the *aniř* reconstruction: Greek *φάρμακον*

---

1 Acknowledgements: This study originated in cooperation with the Centre for the Interdisciplinary Research of Ancient Languages and Older Stages of Modern Languages (MSM 0021622435) at Masaryk University, Brno, and thanks to the grant No. IAA901640805. I would like to express my thanks to Jay Jasanoff for his critical remarks and fruitful discussion.

‘magical drink, medicine, healing herb, drug’ <  $*b^h\dot{r}m^o$  (cf. Frisk I, 992-93 after Osthoff; cf. Trautmann, l.c.: ‘Ist die Gleichung richtig, so beruht das balt. Verbum aus zweisilbiger schwerer Basis neben der leichten in φάρμακον’).

(10) Lithuanian *duriù* : *dùrti* ‘to pierce’, Latvian *duŗu* : *duŗt* id. (Trautmann 1923, 52; Pokorny 1959, 207-08; LIV 119-21:  $*dr\text{-}\dot{i}e/o\text{-}$ ).

(11) Lithuanian *kuriù* : *kùrti* ‘to create, found, originate; to make up the fire / kindle, light’, Latvian *kuŗu* & *kùru* : *kuŗt* ‘to kindle, ignite, heat’ <  $*k^u\dot{r}\text{-}\dot{i}e/o\text{-}$ , etc. (Trautmann 1923, 31, 52; Pokorny 1959, 131-32, 641-42; LIV 76-77, 121, 391).

(12) Lithuanian *skiriù* : *skìrti* ‘trennen, teilen, unterscheiden’, Latvian *šķiru* : *šķiŗt* ‘scheiden, trennen, teilen’ <  $*skr\text{-}\dot{i}e/o\text{-}$  (Pokorny 1959, 938-40; Fraenkel 1962-65, 808; Rasmussen 1989, 209, 309:  $*sker\text{-}$ ). Kümmel in LIV differentiates the *seř* root  $*(s)kerH\text{-}$  (p. 558) vs. *aniř* root  $*(s)ker\text{-}$  (p. 556).

Besides the Baltic accentuation the main argument for presence of the laryngeal in the root is based on the Goidelic present verbal stem  $*skara\text{-}$ , attested in Old Irish *scaraid* ‘trennt (sich)’, later remodelled in  $*skar\text{-}\grave{a}\text{-}$  (so Schuhmacher 2004, 46, 576, following Joseph). But it is easier to imagine this scenario in the opposite direction (see Thurneysen 1946, 336, §523 on the correspondence of the Irish weak *a*-verbs to the Latin verbs in  $\text{-}\grave{a}re$ , the Gothic in  $\text{-}on$  or the Greek in  $\text{-}\hat{\omega}v$ ).

The both *seř* and *aniř* verbs in Lithuanian have the same present paradigmas, classified as the thematic conjugation of the  $\text{-}\dot{i}e/o\text{-}$ -class:

**Table 1**

inf.	1 sg.	2 sg.	3 sg. + pl.	1 pl.	2 pl.
<i>gìrti</i>	<i>giriù</i>	<i>giri</i>	<i>gìria</i>	<i>gìriame</i>	<i>gìriate</i>
<i>kùrti</i>	<i>kuriù</i>	<i>kuri</i>	<i>kùria</i>	<i>kùriame</i>	<i>kùriate</i>

3. An agreement with the rule described in §1, i.e. Lithuanian *Ci/ùr...*, Latvian *Ci/uŗ..* <  $*C\dot{r}HC$ , could be attained, if two scenarios with different morphological segmentation are proposed: (i)  $*C\dot{r}H\text{-}\dot{i}e/o\text{-}$  vs. (ii)  $*C\dot{r}\text{-}H\dot{i}e/o\text{-}$ , where the extensions may be identified with the present in  $\text{-}\dot{i}e/o\text{-}$  and the essive in  $\text{-}H\dot{i}e/o\text{-}$  respectively, accepting the classification used in LIV<sub>2</sub> 19, 25; consequently  $*C\dot{r}HC = *C\dot{r}\text{-}H\dot{i}(e/o\text{-})$ , see Blažek 2001-02, 88-89.