

Metatony in monosyllables

In earlier publications (e.g. 1985, 1997, 2002) I have argued that there are two chronological layers of metatonical circumflex in monosyllables, viz. an early Balto-Slavic layer which is reflected e.g. in Lith. *dēs* ‘will put’, *jōs* ‘will ride’, *duōs* ‘will give’, *liēs* ‘will pour’, also *dēvi* ‘wears’ (cf. Kortlandt 1989: 111), analogical *kalbēs* ‘will speak’, *žinōs* ‘will know’, and Latvian *sāls* ‘salt’, *gūovs* ‘cow’, and a recent Aukštaitian layer which is found e.g. in nom.pl. *tiē*, acc.pl. *tuōs*, inst.sg. *tuō*, also adv. *geriaū* ‘better’, *sukaū* ‘I turned’, *sukaī* ‘you turned’, cf. *geriāusiai* ‘best’, Latvian *tiē*, *tuōs* with an acute. The crucial piece of evidence for the distinction is provided by the southern and eastern Aukštaitian dialects, where we find e.g. *darīs* ‘will do’, *rašīs* ‘will write’, *sakis* ‘will say’ with regular shortening in accordance with Leskien’s law (cf. Zinkevičius 1966: 361). The absence of shortening in *stovēs* ‘will stand’, *žinōs* ‘will know’, *dainuōs* ‘will sing’ in the large majority of Aukštaitian dialects shows that the circumflex in these verb forms is older than Leskien’s law. It follows that the same holds for *dēs*, *jōs*, *duōs*, which provided the model for the metatony in the 3rd person future forms of polysyllabic verbs. Metatony then spread to the verbs in *-yti* in the western Aukštaitian dialects, e.g. *darīs*, *rašīs*, *sakīs*, while shortening was generalized in a part of the eastern dialects, e.g. *dēs*, *stovēs*, *žinās* (cf. Zinkevičius 1966: 362). The secondary character of this shortening is clear from two peculiarities. Firstly, it affected not only acute but also original circumflex vowels, e.g. Ukmergė *pūs* ‘will blow’ (*pūsti*), Jukiškiai *siūs* ‘will send’ (*siūsti*, also *siūti* ‘sew’ and *siūsti* ‘rage’), Linkmenys *vāgs* ‘will steal’ (*vōgti*). Secondly, it gave rise to new short vowels, e.g. Linkmenys *dās* ‘will give’, imperative *dāt* ‘give!’, Tverėčius *važī* (= *važiōj*) ‘travel!’. The absence of shortening in Tverėčius *duōs* ‘will give’ and *važiuōs* ‘will travel’ as opposed to *jās* ‘will ride’ and *dēs* ‘will put’ shows that the analogical shortening in the latter was more recent than the Aukštaitian diphthongization of **ō* to *uo* in the former (cf. Zinkevičius 1966: 503 and McKenzie 1918). These examples show that Leskien’s law never operated in *dēs*, *jōs*, *duōs*, *stovēs*, *žinōs*, *važiuōs*, unlike *darīs*, *rašīs*, *sakis*, and that the metatony in these forms must be older than Leskien’s law, unlike the circumflex of *darīs*, *rašīs*, *sakīs*. The idea that the shortened forms *dēs* and *jās* of the easternmost dialects are original and that *dēs* and *jōs* are analogical (e.g. Pedersen 1933: 14, Petit 2002: 270, Pronk 2012: 236) cannot be correct.

The Aukštaitian metatony which is found e.g. in *tiē*, *tuōs*, *tuō*, *sukaū*, *sukaī* was more recent than Leskien’s law, according to which acute long vowels in final syllables were shortened, e.g. in nom.pl. *geri*, acc.pl. *gerūs*, inst.sg. *gerū* ‘good’, *sukū* ‘I turn’, *sukī* ‘you turn’, cf. *gerieji*, *geruosius*, *geruoju*, *sukuosi*, *sukiesi*. In monosyllables, Leskien’s law affected the high vowels *-y-* and *-ū-* only, e.g. *gis* ‘will heal’, *būs* ‘will be’, *ji* ‘she’, acc. *jūs* ‘you’, except in northwestern Žemaitian, where we also find inst.sg. *tø*, acc.pl. *tūs*. The metatony did not reach the westernmost Aukštaitian (and Žemaitian) dialects, where we find *tie*, *túos*, *túo* with an acute. In the 3d person future forms of the verb, the shortened high vowels are gradually replaced by circumflex long vowels on the analogy of the non-high vowels in the western Aukštaitian dialects, including the literary language, e.g. *vīs* ‘will chase’ (*výti*) or ‘will fade’ (*výsti*), *siūs* ‘will sew’ (cf. Petit 2002: 247-255 and Kortlandt 2002). There are three indications that Leskien’s law preceded the Aukštaitian metatony. First, the metatony is a much more local

development than Leskien's law. Second, the spread of the circumflex in 3rd person future forms of monosyllabic verbs with a high vowel is taking place before our eyes (cf. Senn 1966: 231 and Petit 2002: 248). Third, the highly frequent form *būs* 'will be' seems to resist the spread of the circumflex even in the northwestern Aukštaitian dialects, where the development is pervasive. It follows that we cannot identify the early metatony in *dēs, jōs, duōs, stovēs, žinōs* with the recent metatony in *tiē, tuōs, tuō, sukaū, sukaī* because Leskien's law was younger than the former but older than the latter. Contrary to Petit's account of my view (2002: 262f.), this analysis is not based on a comparison with Slavic or Indo-European but on the internal evidence of the East Baltic languages.

The Baltic future represents two Indo-European paradigms, viz. an *s*-present of the type 3rd sg. **tresti*, 3rd pl. **trsentī*, with accentual mobility between the suffix and the ending, and an *s*-aorist of the type 3rd sg. **tērst*, 3rd pl. **tersnt*, with fixed stress on the root and monosyllabic lengthening in the 2nd and 3rd sg. forms (cf. Pedersen 1921: 22-27, 1933: 3-21, Kuiper 1937: 36-40, Kortlandt 1982: 6-8, 1985: 115-117, 2005: 151-153). Both of these formations have exact correspondences in the Old Irish subjunctive, e.g. *-bé* < **b^hH₂uest* 'be', *fo-ló* < **leugst* 'support', cf. also Greek *φανῶ* 'I will show' < **b^hH₂nes-*, *ἔφηνα* 'I showed' < **b^heH₂nsm* (adduced by Pedersen 1921: 25 already). The Indo-European origins of the Baltic future have recently been the subject of a careful and detailed study by Eugen Hill (2004). Unfortunately, this author basically follows McCone's theories in his evaluation of the Celtic material (2004: 148-152), disregarding their shortcomings and ignoring the alternatives (cf. Kortlandt 2007 *passim*). Hill rejects the reconstruction of an ablauting *s*-present (2004: 153f.) because he takes Umbrian *ferest* 'will bring' and Oscan *pertemest* 'will prevent' to represent **fere-s-* and **eme-s-*, with the tense suffix following the thematic vowel, instead of **fer-es-* and **em-es-*, with the tense suffix following the root. He states that in the Latin future perfect *ēg-er-ō* 'I will have driven' "das morphologisch dunkle vorlat. **-is-* erscheint" (2004: 129) instead of a newly created form **ēgesmi* on the basis of a Proto-Italic future **agesmi* (cf. Pedersen 1921: 16, Kortlandt 2007: 152), also *fuerō* 'I will have been', Oscan *fust* 'will be, will have been', Old Irish subj. *-bé*. There can be no doubt that there was an ablauting *s*-present with a zero grade root vowel beside an *s*-aorist with fixed stress on the root and no suffixal ablaut. In Lithuanian, the future of verbs with a high vowel continues the original *s*-present whereas the future of verbs with a non-high vowel represents the *s*-aorist injunctive. Both formations must have existed side by side in Proto-Baltic in view of Prussian *teīks* 'make!' beside *postāsei* 'you will become'. Hill does not take the Tocharian evidence into account (cf. Kortlandt 1994: 63f.). The Indo-Iranian *ya*-future is a *ya*-derivative of the sigmatic aorist (thus already Meillet 1900: 309, 317). This new formation evidently replaced the athematic *s*-present. The Slavic remnant of the future participle *byšęšteje* 'future' supports the athematic character of the sigmatic future (cf. already Pedersen 1933: 18). The Russian Church Slavic variant *byšqšt-* beside more frequent *byšęšt-* can easily have taken its vowel from *sqšt-* 'being' and *boqđqšt-* 'future'. Similarly, Lithuanian *būsiant-*, *dúosiant-* etc. adopted the vowel of the present participle *ėsant-*, *dúodant-*.

The circumflex of Latvian *sāls* 'salt' and *gūovs* 'cow' shows metatonical length in **sāl-* and **gōv-* from earlier **seH₂l-* and **g^weH₃u-* as a result of an early lengthening in original monosyllables, as in Lith. *duōs* < **dōs* < **deH₃-* (cf. Kortlandt 1985: 118f.). This is in agreement with Vedic monosyllabic *gáus* < **g^wōus*, acc.sg. *gām* < **g^wōm*

‘bull, cow’ (cf. Lubotsky 1995: 226), like *dyáus* < **diēus*, acc.sg. *dyām* < **diēm* ‘sky’, but not with Greek *βοῦς*, *ναῦς*, where the circumflex points to disyllabic **g^woHus*, **naHus*, unlike *Zeús* < **dieus*, similarly Vedic disyllabic *náus* < **neH₂us* (cf. Lubotsky 1995: 229) and *mās* < **meH₁ns* ‘month’, unlike *mās* < **mēms* ‘flesh’. The laryngeal was lost with compensatory lengthening in the acc.sg. ending *-*aHm* in Lithuanian -*a* (with a circumflex), Vedic -*ām*, Greek -*áv*, Old High German -*a*, also in the acc.pl. ending *-*aHns* in OHG -*ā* and without compensatory lengthening¹ in Greek (Cretan) -*avς*, but not in Lith. -*às* (where the acute was preserved up to Leskien’s law) and Vedic -*ās* (where the nasal was vocalized). It follows that the form **g^wōus* cannot have developed phonetically from **g^woHus* and that the lengthened grade must be of analogical origin. I used to assume that the long vowel spread from **diēus* to **nēH₂us* and **g^wēH₃us* and that the laryngeal was lost after the long vowel in Indo-Iranian and Balto-Slavic, but not in Greek, where the circumflex points to its preservation (Kortlandt 1985: 118, followed by Schrijver 1991: 129 and Nassivera 2000: 58). There are two problems with this view. First, the motivation for the spread of the long vowel is unclear. Second, nom.sg. **diēus* appears to replace an earlier form **deius* on the basis of acc.sg. **dieum* (thus already Kortlandt 1985: 118), cf. Vedic *devás* < **deiuos* ‘god’. It is then probable that the lengthened grade is the result of monosyllabic lengthening in both **diēus* and **diēm*, and similarly in acc.sg. **nH₂ēm*, Greek (Doric) *vāv*,² where it never reached the nom.sg. form **neH₂us*. If this is correct, the length in **diēm* and **nH₂ēm* has nothing to do with the loss of the **u* in *-*eum*, which may have preceded the lengthening. We may then surmise that **g^weH₃um* became **g^weH₃m*, yielding **g^wēH₃m* and eventually Vedic *gām*, analogically nom.sg. *gáus*, and Greek *βῶν*. The circumflex of *vāv* and *βῶν* may have been taken from nom.sg. *ναῦς*, *βοῦς* as well as from acc.pl. *ναῦς* < **neH₂uns*, *βοῦς* < **g^weH₃uns* (cf. analogical acc.sg. *βοῦν* after *βοῦς* and acc.pl. Doric *βῶς* after *βῶν*). In Vedic, the laryngeal was maintained in disyllabic *náus* on the analogy of the oblique stem *nāv-* < **neH₂u-* (cf. Lubotsky 1995: 229) whereas in *gáus* it was lost and the lengthened grade was introduced for disambiguation from gen.sg. *gós* < **g^wH₃eus*. The acc.pl. form *gās* was created on the analogy of acc.sg. *gām*. Latvian *gūovs* reflects the acc.sg. form **g^wēH₃m*, like *sāls* < **sēH₂l*, which is an original neuter *l*-stem (contra Kortlandt 1985: 119) in view of Old Latin *sale* ‘salt’, Prussian *sal*, Old Irish *salann* (Middle Irish *sál* ‘sea’), Tocharian B *salyiye*. Villanueva Svensson objects (2011: 15) to my loss of a laryngeal after a long vowel in Latvian *sāls* and *gūovs* that we find an acute in *nāss* ‘nostril’, Lith. *nósis* (1) ‘nose’ < **neH₂s-* (cf. Kortlandt 1985: 19). Note that in the theory presented here all of these words have the vocalism of the acc.sg. form, and the same holds for Latvian *zūoss* ‘goose’ and *zvērs* ‘beast’, Lith. *žqsis* and *žvėris*, both of which had mobile stress (cf. Pronk 2012: 216, Kortlandt 2012: 251, 2013: 14). There is no evidence for a PIE phoneme **a* in the words for ‘salt’, ‘goose’ and ‘nose’, nor for the vowel **e* in the PIE paradigm of ‘cow’, nor for a PIE paradigm with fixed

¹ Thus already Bernabé 1990; for the implications of this view see Nassivera 2000: 63-68. If *-*hr-* lost its aspiration before a following consonant in Proto-Greek, e.g. in dat.pl. *χερσί* ‘hands’, *χέρνιψ* ‘spinner’, *χερνήτις* ‘water for ablution’ < **g^hesr-*, also in *πτέρνη* ‘heel’ < *-*hrn-* < *-*rhn-* < *-*rsn-*, Gothic *fairzna*, it appears that we are left without any evidence for Osthoff’s law.

² Dr Lucien van Beek points out to me that the form *vāv* is unattested while the reliability of the analogical nom.sg. form *vās* (Herodian, “παρὰ δωριεῦσι”) is questionable. Both forms may be the creation of grammarians.

stress in the case of ‘cow’, ‘nose’ and ‘beast’, nor for a generalization of the original nom.sg. instead of acc.sg. accentuation in the words for ‘salt’ and ‘nose’ (contra Villanueva Svensson 2011: 15, 20). All of these ideas depend on supplementary hypotheses which are superfluous if the logical consequences of the laryngeal theory are taken into account.

References

- Bernabé, Alberto. 1990. Towards a new interpretation of the Osthoff's law. *Historische Sprachforschung* 103, 220-235.
- Hill, Eugen. 2004. Die sigmatischen Modus-Bildungen der indogermanischen Sprachen. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 1, 69-171.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1982. Innovations which betray archaisms. *Baltistica* 18/1, 4-9.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1985. Long vowels in Balto-Slavic. *Baltistica* 21/2, 112-124.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1989. Lithuanian *statyti* and related formations. *Baltistica* 25/2, 104-112.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1994. The fate of the sigmatic aorist in Tocharian. *Tocharisch [Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin 1990, Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, suppl. 4]*, 61-65.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1997. PIE. lengthened grade in Balto-Slavic. *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp 2 [Journal of Indo-European Studies, monograph 25]*, 26-31.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2002. Shortening and metatony in the Lithuanian future. *Baltistica* 37/1, 15-16.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2005. Holger Pedersen's *Études lituaniennes* revisited. *Baltistica* 6 priedas, 151-157.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2007. *Italo-Celtic origins and prehistoric development of the Irish language* (Amsterdam: Rodopi).
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2012. The early chronology of long vowels in Balto-Slavic. *Baltistica* 47/2, 249-254.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2013. Palatovelars before syllabic resonants: another look. *Baltistica* 48/1, 13-17.
- Kuiper, Franciscus B.J. 1937. *Die indogermanischen Nasalpräsentia* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij).
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 1990. La loi de Brugmann et *H₃e-. *La reconstruction des laryngales* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres), 129-136.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 1995. Reflexes of intervocalic laryngeals in Sanskrit. *Kuryłowicz memorial volume 1* (Cracow: Universitas), 213-233.
- McKenzie, Roderick. 1918. Notes sur l'histoire des diphtongues *ie* et *uo* dans les langues baltiques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 21/2, 156-174.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1900. Sur les suffixes verbaux secondaires en indo-européen. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 11, 297-323.
- Nassivera, Michele. 2000. The development of the PIE words for ‘sky’, ‘cow’ and ‘ship’ and the relative chronology of Osthoff's law. *Historische Sprachforschung* 113, 57-70.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1921. *Les forms sigmatiques du verbe latin et le problème du futur indo-européen* (København: Høst & Søn).
- Pedersen, Holger. 1933. *Études lituaniennes* (København: Levin & Munksgaard).

- Petit, Daniel. 2002. Abrègement et métatonie dans le futur lituanien: pour une reformulation de la loi de Leskien. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 97/1, 245-282.
- Pronk, Tijmen. 2012. Proto-Indo-European long vowels and Balto-Slavic accentuation. *Baltistica* 47/2, 205-247.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1991. *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Latin* (Amsterdam: Rodopi).
- Senn, Alfred. 1966. *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache* 1 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter).
- Villanueva Svensson, Miguel. 2011. Indo-European long vowels in Balto-Slavic. *Baltistica* 46/1, 5-38.
- Zinkevičius, Zigmās. 1966. *Lietuvių dialektologija* (Vilnius: Mintis).

Summary

There are two chronological layers of metatonical circumflex in monosyllables, viz. an early Balto-Slavic layer which is reflected e.g. in Lith. *dē̃s*, *jō̃s*, *duō̃s* and a recent Aukštaitian layer which is found e.g. in nom.pl. *tiē̃*, acc.pl. *tuō̃s*, inst.sg. *tuō̃*. Leskien's law was younger than the former but older than the latter. This analysis is not based on a comparison with Slavic or Indo-European but on the internal evidence of the East Baltic languages.

The Baltic future represents two Indo-European paradigms, viz. an *s*-present with accentual mobility between the suffix and the ending and an *s*-aorist with fixed stress on the root and monosyllabic lengthening in the 2nd and 3rd sg. forms. Both of these formations have exact correspondences in the Old Irish subjunctive. They must have existed side by side in Proto-Baltic in view of Prussian *teīks* 'make!' beside *postāsei* 'you will become'.

The circumflex of Latvian *sā̃ls* and *gū̃ovs* shows metatonical length as a result of monosyllabic lengthening. There is no evidence for a PIE phoneme **a* in *sā̃ls*, *zū̃oss* and *nā̃ss*, nor for the vowel **e* in the PIE paradigm of *gū̃ovs*, nor for a PIE paradigm with fixed stress in the case of *gū̃ovs*, *nā̃ss* and *zvē̃rs*, nor for a generalization of the original nom.sg. instead of acc.sg. accentuation in *sā̃ls* and *nā̃ss*.