

## 5 Conclusion

### a Proto-Balto-Slavic prosodic distinctions:

accentual distinction: **1** = accented; **2** = unaccented;

quantitative distinction: **a** = acute (long); **b** = non-acute (short).

### b Typical Baltic and Slavic correspondences in initial syllables:

	P.-B.-SL.	LITH.	LATV.	O.PR.	PROTO-SL.	COMM.SL.
<b>1a</b>	* l̥e̯pān	l̥ep̥a AP 1	li̯epu	kaūlins	* l̥e̯pān AP a	*l̥ip̥a AP a
<b>1b</b>	* u̯ai̯tān	vi̯et̥a AP 2	vi̯etu	rānkan	* u̯al̥kān AP b	*vol̥k̥a AP b
<b>2a</b>	* gāl̥u̯ān	gāl̥v̥a AP 3	gāl̥vu	geīwans	* gāl̥u̯ān AP c	*gōlv̥a AP c
<b>2b</b>	* ze̯imān	ži̯em̥a AP 4	zi̯emu	deiwan	* ze̯imān AP c	*zīm̥a AP c

### c The Proto-Balto-Slavic prosodic distinctions are preserved in the following ways:

- Lithuanian tones preserve quantitative but not accentual distinction: **a** vs. **b**;
- Latvian tones preserve quantitative and (in long syllables) accentual distinctions: **1a** vs. **2a** vs. **b**;
- Old Prussian macron preserves quantitative and (in short syllables) accentual distinctions: **a** vs. **1b** vs. **2b**;
- Slavic accentuation preserves accentual and (in accented words) quantitative distinctions: **1a** vs. **1b** vs. **2**.

Thomas Olander  
Department of Cross-Cultural and Regional Studies  
University of Copenhagen

Copenhagen  
1–3 September 2006  
Second International Workshop on  
Balto-Slavic Accentology (IWoba II)

## The accentuation of Old Prussian *deiws* ‘god’

### 1 Introduction

<b>a</b>	OLD PRUSSIAN	CORRESP. LITH. FORMS
	nom. sg. <i>mūti</i>	<i>mótē</i> AP 1
	acc. sg. <i>rānkan</i>	<i>rañk̥a</i> AP 2
	inf. <i>turīt</i>	<i>turėti</i>
	nom. sg. <i>dessīmts</i>	<i>deši̯mtas</i> AP 4
<b>b</b>	OLD PRUSSIAN	CORRESP. LITH. FORMS
	acc. pl. <i>kaūlins</i>	<i>káulas</i> AP 1(3)
	inf. <i>pogaūt</i>	<i>pagáuti</i>
	nom. sg. <i>rānkan</i>	<i>rañk̥a</i> AP 2
	prs. 3. ps. <i>ēit</i>	<i>eīti</i>
<b>c</b>	OLD PRUSSIAN	CORRESP. LITH. FORMS
	nom. sg. <i>deiws</i> ‘god’ 34×, <i>deiwas</i> 1×	<i>diēvas</i> AP 4
	acc. sg. <i>deiwan</i> 40×	<i>diēv̥a</i>
	gen. sg. <i>deiwas</i> 49×	<i>diēvo</i>

## 2 Examples

### a With macron:

OLD PRUSSIAN	CORRESP. EAST BALTIC FORMS
acc. pl. <i>kaūlins</i> 1×	Lith. <i>káulas</i> AP 1(3), Latv. <i>kaūlus</i>
inf. <i>pogaūt</i> 1×	Lith. <i>pagáuti</i>
prs. 3. ps. <i>ēit</i> 2×	Lith. <i>eīti</i> (but Latv. <i>iēt, iēt</i> )
nom. sg. <i>rānkan</i> 3×, acc. pl. <i>rānkans</i> 4×	Lith. <i>rañkq</i> etc. AP 2, Latv. <i>rùoku</i> etc.
acc. sg. <i>kērdan</i> 3×	cf. Lith. <i>keřdžiy</i> AP 2
prs. 3. ps. <i>gēide</i> 1×	Lith. <i>geīdžia</i>
masc. acc. pl. <i>geīwans</i> 1×	Lith. <i>gývas</i> AP 3, Latv. <i>dzīvus</i>
nom. sg. <i>soūns</i> 3×, acc. sg. <i>soūnon</i> 2×, <i>soūnan</i> 4× etc.	Lith. <i>sūnùs</i> etc. AP 3
gen. sg. <i>ālgas</i> 2×	Lith. <i>algōs</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>ālgas</i>
nom. sg. <i>piēnctis</i> 1×	Lith. <i>peñktas</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>piekts</i>
acc. sg. <i>mārtin</i> 1×	Lith. <i>mařčiq</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>māřšu</i>
acc. pl. <i>āusins</i> 1×	Lith. <i>ausis</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>àusis</i>
acc. sg. <i>mērgan</i> 1×, dat. pl. <i>mergūmans</i> 1×	Lith. <i>meřgq</i> AP 4

### b Without macron:

OLD PRUSSIAN	CORRESP. EAST BALTIC FORMS
nom. sg. <i>deiws</i> etc. >100×	Lith. <i>diēvas</i> etc. AP 4, Latv. <i>dievs</i> etc.
acc. sg. <i>deinan</i> 8×	Lith. <i>diēnq</i> AP 4, Latv. <i>dienu</i>
nom. sg. <i>waix</i> 3×, acc. sg. <i>waikan</i> 1×	Lith. <i>vaikas</i> etc. AP 4
nom. sg. <i>laucks</i> 1×, acc. sg. <i>laukan</i> 3×	Lith. <i>laūkas</i> etc. AP 4 (but Latv. <i>laūks</i> etc.)
acc. sg. <i>dangon</i> 13×	Lith. <i>daņgy</i> AP 4
acc. sg. <i>mensan</i> 4×, gen. sg. <i>mensas</i> 2×	Lith. <i>mēsq</i> etc. AP 4, Latv. <i>miesu</i> etc.
acc. sg. <i>wargan</i> 8×	Lith. <i>vařgq</i> AP 4(2), Latv. <i>vārgu</i> <sup>2</sup>

## 3 Previous research

a Absence of macron because of original final accentuation – Fortunatov, Hirt, Trautmann, van Wijk (“die altpreussische ‘dritte Intonation’”, apart from rising and falling tones), Stang (“man denkt daher an die Möglichkeit einer dritten phonologischen Intonation, eines ‘Mitteltons’”).

b No explanation – Endzelins:

Unklar bleibt nur das beständige Fehlen des Längenstrichs in *deinan* 8×, *deiws* 34× [...]. Was darüber Fortunatov [...], Hirt [...], Trautmann [...], van Wijk [...] und Rysiewicz [...] sagen, überzeugt nicht. (*Altpreußische Grammatik*, 1994, pp. 30–31)

– and Kortlandt:

I shall abstain from the use of negative evidence, that is to say, I shall not draw any conclusions from the absence of a symbol in the text. Thus, I consider the accentuation of *deiws*, *deiwas*, *deiwān*, *deiwāns* unknown. (“Old Prussian Accentuation”, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88, 1974, p. 299)

## 4 Unaccented word-forms in Slavic and Latvian

a Slavic unaccented word-forms:

Russian *pródal*, *zá ruku*, *pó vodu*, dial. *zimús*’ etc.; Štokavian *pròdāli*, *nā rūke*, *nā vodu*, *zimūs* etc.

b Latvian broken tone on unaccented syllables:

nom. sg. *galva*, cf. LI *galvā* AP 3 with final accent; but acc. sg. *galvu*, cf. LI *gálvq* with initial accent; singularia tantum: *ārs* ‘outside’, *zuōds* ‘cheek’ – almost all corresponding Lithuanian forms (*óras* AP 3, *žándas* AP 3) have initial accent.

c Remnants in Lithuanian:

secondary case forms, e.g. illative sg. *galvoñ* from acc. sg. *gálvq* (cf. Old Russian gen. sg. *nošči bó* vs. *nóšči*); perhaps also accentuation of preverbs, e.g. *nèveda* (cf. Old Russian *pótrjasu*).