

LITUANUS

LITHUANIAN QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Volume 42, No.2 - Summer 1996
Editor of this issue: Robert A. Vitas

ISSN 0024-5089
Copyright © 1996 LITUANUS Foundation, Inc.



SOUTH BALTIC¹

HARVEY E. MAYER

From a Common Baltic dialect cluster arisen from Indo-European via the following changes: initial *ks*-to initial *sk*-and the merger of palatal and ruki law reflexes to *Š, Ž* the following further subdivisions surfaced. East Baltic versus West Baltic with West characterized by *s, z* versus East characterized by *š, ž* from Common *Š, Ž* matched by West marked by *š, ž* versus East marked by *s', z'* from Common *sj, zj*. Both East and West Baltic agreed on *š, ž* from Common Baltic *Šj, Žj*. There also arose North Baltic versus South Baltic with South characterized by the merger of long *ō* with long *ā* versus North marked by the continuing separation of long *ō* from long *ā*, a conservatism, matched by the loss of final *n* from the postpositive *-en* 'in', a form having originated in East Baltic. All Baltic agreed on *Tjē, Tje* to *Tē, Te* (*T* = any consonant) and the merger of short *o* and *a*. Morphologically, East Baltic tended toward analysis versus West Baltic's favoring fusion.

Further differences involved South Baltic's conservatism against North Baltic's rising sonority innovations in long vowels and diphthongs in *i* and *n* with extremism growing in a northerly direction. Thus, North Baltic long *o* diphthongizes to *uo*. South Baltic matches this with its long *ē* tending toward *ie*, a change which we can see in Prussian accusatives, *mien, tiēn, siēn* 'me, thee, oneself from **mēn, *tēn, *sēn* (and, in Lithuanian, more northerly Žemaitian general *ie* from long *ē*), when Prussian long *ē* does not stay changed to *ei* (as in *seyr* 'heart'), a diphthong with falling sonority. Otherwise, North Baltic tends to continue the rising sonority trend which it started with the loss of final *n* in the postposition, *-en* (to *-e*), with the following continuing changes of diphthongs in *n* and *i*.

Lith. *ei* to *ie* matched by *ai* to **ia* to *ie*; *in, un. en, an* to *j, ū. ę. ā* to *ī, ū, ē, ā*, etc.

Latv. *ei* to *ie* matched by *ai* to **ia* to *ie*; *in, un. en, an* to *j, ū, ę, ā* to *ī, ū, ie, ua* to *uo*, etc.

These changes are found more frequently in Latvian than in Lithuanian. Forms not showing them are called "Curonianisms" sometimes in Lithuanian and almost always in Latvian.

I have called Lithuanian "East Baltic" and Prussian and Latvian "West Baltic". I now emphasize my agreement with Mažiulis (1988, 87) in his calling Curonian and Selonian "West Baltic" as well. Here, I also name Zemgalian "West Baltic". Also I now call not only Prussian, but also Curonian, Selonian, Zemgalian, Thracian, and Dacian "South Baltic" and estimate the northern boundary of South Baltic to have reached roughly midway between Riga and Saulkrasti running from west to east. Finally, I label Thracian and Dacian as *East Baltic*. My arguments for these decisions are the following with support drawn from Duridanov (1969).²

The South Baltic features evident in numerous examples from Prussian, Curonian, Thracian, and Dacian involving diphthongs with falling sonority, *ei, en, in, un, an, ai*, are the following with examples furnished for Thracian and Dacian with supporting data from the rest of Baltic if available. Dac. *Preides*, Prus. *Preyd-azare* / Latv. *priēde* 'pine'. Thracian **sunketa*, Dac. or Thrac. *sunkētēnē* / Latv. *sūkala* 'drop'. Thrac. *Brentopara*, OCur. *Brendicke*, Prus. *braydis* / Lith. *Bried-upis*, Latv. *briēdis* 'deer'.

Thrac. *Mentēs*, Prus. *Mente* (personal name).

Thrac. *Seietovien(us)*, Prus. *seyte* / Lith. *sietuvà*, Latv. *sietava*, 'river deep spot'.

Dac. *Stendai*, Prus. *San-stangen* (different grade and suffix) (lake name).

Thrac. *Spindeēnē* / Latv. *spīdēt* 'shine'.

Thrac. *Kuntis*, Purs. *Kunte* (personal name).

Thrac. *Strambai*, Prus. *strambo* / Latv. *strūobs* (from **stran-b-*) 'reed'.

Dac. *Karpudaimon*, Prus. *Deyme* (different grade) (river name).

Thrac. *Gaidre(a)s* / Lith. *giēdras* 'clear', Latv. *dziedrs* 'azure blue'.

Dac. *Spand-* in Rum. *spīnz* / Latv. *spuōds* 'shiny'.

Thrac. *Kintis*, Prus. *Jo-kintis* / Lith. *kęsti*, Latv. *ciest* (different grade) 'suffer'.

Dac. *Grandeton*, Prus. *grandico* / Latv. *gruōdi* 'beams'.

Thrac. *Brinkazis* / latv. *Brīkūsis* (place name).

Thracian and Dacian do not drift from this pattern of falling sonority diphthongs which marks them as South Baltic.³

The same features marking Lithuanian as East Baltic are not as unambiguously portrayed, indisputable, or obvious in available Thracian and Dacian materials. Yet these following two items justify designating them as *East Baltic*. The Rumanian word *juvete* 'small fish' which Duridanov (1969, 95) implies as derived from Dacian comparing it with Lith. *žuvis*, *-iēs*, (nom. pl. *žūves*) and Latv. dial. *zuva* 'fish' with initial *ž-* (written *j-*) rather than initial *z-* can come only from East Baltic either as an unlikely borrowing into Dacian or as an original Dacian word. This is unambiguous phonetic evidence marking Dacian as East Baltic. The item which, most likely, does the same for Thracian is morphological involving zero grade rather than full grade. It appears in the word for "pine"; written *pusigon* and listed by Duridanov as *pusis*. The West Baltic words for "pine" are either *preide* (appearing as *preyde* in Prussian or *priedē* in Latvian) or *e-* grade *peusē* (appearing only in Prussian). The zero grade correspondence of the second word occurs, otherwise, only in East Baltic Lithuanian where it seems to have had special significance. Lithuanians have kept place names with the South Baltic Prussian form of *preidē* fundamentally unchanged with falling sonority diphthong *ei* in the place names where they had found them (and *preidē* was not native to Lithuanian as shown by *priedē* borrowed from Latvian *priēde* into Lithuanian) like *Priedžiu káimas* and *Pleidžiai*, a procedure common in names of that sort which had been given by West Baits before the arrival in Lithuania of East Balt Lithuanians. But if they had found any West Baltic *e-*grade forms matching Prussian *peuse* 'pine' as in Prussian *Peusebalten*, and, surely, these must have existed, Lithuanians East Balticized them into zero grade ones with *š*, the East Baltic reflex of the Indo-European palatal *k'*, giving the forms *Pušynės káimas*, *Pušiné*, *Pušyno káimas*, *Pušinėlis*, and even Žem. *Pušynė*, *Pušynytė* based on Lith. *pušynas* 'pine forest'. For me this is evidence enough for regarding Thracian, too, as East Baltic. With these facts in mind, Duridanov's lists of Dacian and Thracian forms should be revised to show their East Baltic character, thus, for Dacian "fish" we should find not the West Baltic shape *zuv-*, but the East Baltic one, *žuv-*. Note the following list of Dacian and Thracian forms accompanied by Lithuanian counterparts to the right and normalized to show their true East Baltic character. Thracian: *bružas*: *brūžas*, *dīžas*, *paiša*: *pašas*, *prauš-*, *pušis*: *pušis*, *tarš-*: *taršyti*, *ž(i)burul-*: *žiburýs*, *žilma*: *žilmà*, *keršas*: *kéršas*, *traušas*, *šėkas*: *šėkas*, *švit-*: *švitėti*, *žilas*: *žilas*, *žvaka*: *žvākė*, *ž(v)ēris*: *žvėris*; Dacian: *žudaš*, *berža*: *béržas*, *šuka*: *šukė*, *želmas*: *želmuō*, *-eñs*; *žuv-*: *žuvis*; Dacian or Thracian place name: *Kratiškara*: *Kratiškiai*.

The Thracian and Dacian diminutive suffix *-už-* is ambiguous since the correspondences are with Latvian which the following normalized examples show. Dacian: *Katuža*: Latv. place names *Katuža-visimins*, *Katužs*, *Naruža* (Rum. *Nāruja*): Latv. river name *Naruža*, Thracian: *Kartuža*: Latv. place name *Kartuži*. In this suffix (Lith *-užė* as in *mergūžė*) the Indo-European source is **-ugj-* which changed first to Common Baltic **-užj-* and then to Early Common East Baltic **-užj-* / Early Common West Baltic **-uzj-* and finally to Lith. and Latv. *-už-*. Other similar cases of ambiguity are Dacian *žūras*: Lith. *Žiūrà*, *žiūrėti*, Latv. *žūrēt* and Thracian *laža*, *-as*: *laža*, Lith. *pā-lažas*.

East Baltic Thracian and Dacian (as well as Lithuanian) show Latvian influence. This attests to Latvian's having been the most easterly of West Baltic languages. In Thracian we find the lone example of *ge* to *ze* like Latvian *ge* to *dze* in *zerva* 'crane' in the place name *Zervae*: Latv. *dzērve*. This is hardly native since Thracian keeps *ge* (3x), *gi* (2x), *ke* (5x), *ki* (4x) matching Dacian *ge* (5x), *gi* (5x), *ke* (5x), *ki* (1x) against *ki* to *ci* also in one lone example: *Mamutzis*: OLatv. *Mamwtze*. In the Dacian example, the suffix *-uc-* seems directly borrowed from Latvian. Thracian *zerva* with *z*, not *dz* (according to the spelling) may show an indirect borrowing via Dacian, which, remaining more northerly, surely had more sustained contact with North Baltic.

In demonstration of this, Dacian, rather than Thracian, shows initial *sk-* from initial *ks-*, the clear, unique sign of Baltism in two roots, *skaudus* 'painful', *skuja* 'pine' attested as *Scaugdae* (from **skaud-gdae*) and *Skuanes* (versus initial *ks-* to *x-* in Russ. *xudoj* 'bad', *xvoja* 'pine needles') and the change *tl* to *kl* typical of North Baltic in the suffix *-ukl-* in *Brucla*: Latv. *brūkle* and *Genukla*: ELatv. *dzanuklis*, Lith. *ganyklà*, *stebūklas*, *žénklas* / Prus. *ebsentliuns* with *tl* intact paralleled by *dl* in *addle* 'pine' / Lith. *ėglė* with *dl* to *gl* (but note Prus. *kl* from *tl* in *gurcle* 'throat'). Yet Thracian, through having been far away to the south, shows one more West Balticism, initial *sr-* to initial *str-* in *strūna* 'stream' (and also in *Strymon*, *strambas*) matched by

Lith. river name *Strūna* with the same West Baltic feature found also in Lith. Dial. *straumuõ*, a feature resisted in Lith. *sraunà*, *srūti*, *sravėti*. This West Balticizing of initial *sr-* to initial *str-* is also found in Dacian **strunga* 'milking room' corresponding with Lith. 's borrowing from Latv. *strúoga* matched by an East Balticized doublet *srúoga*!

Otherwise, we find evidence for East Baltic influence on West Baltic and North Baltic influence on South Baltic and a possible new piece of evidence of a surviving East Baltic declensional desinence in *š*!

I believe that East Baltic had been strongly influenced both phonologically and morphologically in very early times by languages to the east of it including Iranian and Indic and, possibly, some form of Uralic. This resulted in the following. 1. The making of joint ruki law and palatal reflexes compact: *ś, ź* to *š, ž*. 2. From *sj, zj* not *š, ž*, but *s', z'*. 3. The keeping of initial *sr-* as in Indic and Iranian. (West Baltic changed it to *str-*.) 4. The adaptation of the Iranian (and Indic) form of the *o*-stem ablative singular, *-ād* (rather than *-ōd*) with final *d* dropped yielding, originally, long *-ā*. 5. The postpositioning of the *e*-grade morpheme for "in", originally, **-en*, with inessive, locative meaning. These changes made East Baits more syllable-conscious than West Balts which resulted in one major difference in morphological technique between East Baltic and West Baltic. East Baltic has been comparatively analytical. West Baltic has been comparatively fusional.

East Baltic influence on West Baltic Latvian, but *not* Prussian which was too far away, that is, *before* the intrusion of East Baltic Lithuanian into originally West Baltic territory (modern Lithuania), involved the following changes in its morphology. 1. Long *-ā* as the *o*-stem ablative singular used, ultimately, for the genitive instead of the original ending, *-as*, maintained in Prussian. 2. Postposition *e*-grade *-en* to mean "locative".

North Baltic influence on South Baltic involved the loss of final *n* in the postposition *-en* yielding the lone example of it in Thracian given by Duridanov (1969:86, 98), *midne* "in the place", in the expression *midne Potelense*. This *midne*, I believe, originated as **mītinēn* or **mītenēn*. The loss of *-n* in the postpositive was due to North Baltic influence. Duridanov believes that the form exactly matches Latvian *mītne* from an earlier **mītinē, -enē*. But West Baltic is morphologically fusional. This we see in Latvian where we find *o*-stem long *ā* from *a* plus *e*, *i*-stem long *ī* from *i* plus *e*, etc. in the locative. East Baltic Thracian, like Lithuanian, was surely analytical with locative *-e* kept consistently discrete. So, though the Latvian form can be only *e*-stem, the Thracian form, like any conceivable Lithuanian counterpart, could *not* have been *e*-stem. It could have been, originally, a consonant stem or an *o*-stem, something like nom. **mītinās, -enas*: loc. **mītin-e, -en-e* with nom. desinence vowel *-a-* dropped, suppleted by loc. *-e* from *-en*. (If it had been *e*-stem, we would have **midneie* from earlier **mīdnēie* with the suffix resembling Lithuanian *-ėje* as in *žemėje* 'on earth'.)⁴

The East Baltic ablative-genitive suffix, long *-ā*, is found South Balticized to long *-ō* in the Dacian *Decebalus per Scorilo* 'Decebal, son of **Skorilus*' (the true nominative form here, I believe, despite the use of *Skorilo* for that function by foreigners) as we find it in Lithuanian, e.g., *draūgo* 'of the friend'. But the word order matching that of Albanian shows a sort of early Balkanism like the conservatism of anti-Lidén law initial *vr-'s* reflex, *br-*, in Thracian *briza* from earlier **vriza*. This keeping of initial *v-* followed by *r* is not to be found in Baltic north of the Carpathians any more than it is in Slavic, a Carpathian language, originally, (like Albanian) (see Mayer, 1996), which I have called "Northern Albanoidic" elsewhere (Mayer, 1992). But Albanian, presently a Balkan language, has also, contrary to Lidén's law, maintained initial *vr-* (e.g., *vrasje* 'murder'), the reflex of Indo-European *wr-*.⁵

If the transcription of the somewhat shaky Thracian form in a Mysian inscription, instr. (dat.) pl., cited in Duridanov (1969) as *-aiš* is to be understood to stand for *-aiš* (with *ś = š* and not just any *s*), (see Duridanov 1969, 97), then we have an expected East Baltic ruki law *š* in a *declensional desinence*, something which, I believe, was West Balticized out of Lithuanian (see Mayer, 1994b). The Thracian form labeled Mysian by Duridanov allows us to posit ruki law *š* as an original item in all Lithuanian desinences like **sūnūš, *sūnaūš, *sūnumiš*, etc.⁶

We may conclude here by emphasizing the following. 1. All South Baltic languages, Thracian, Dacian, Prussian, Curonian, Selonian, and Zemgalian, are extinct. 2. Two South Baltic languages, Thracian and Dacian, were East Baltic, a fact emphasized by their very names which have reflections either only in Lithuanian like Dakai 'Dacians' tied with Lith. *dàknoti* 'to make disorderly', *dakānyti* 'to drive away' (and are *never* in Prussian), or are less numerous in Latvian, i.e., more numerous in Lithuanian, as *Thrakoi* Thracians' with Lith. *trākas* 'mad, furious' or 'open place for burning' accompanied by allomorphs in two other grades, *trēkti* 'to ruin', *trikti* 'to become furious' with Latvian correspondences covering fewer grades, *traks* 'mad', *trēkns* 'powerful'. The meanings of the names *Dakoi*, *Thrakoi* 'Dacians, Thracians' seem to have the common element of interpretation of "frantic, unsettled" which is reminiscent of *goidelic* from Welsh *gwyddel* 'wild man' as a term meaning "Irish". 3. South Baltic territory included *all* of Lithuania and much of Latvia. So place names there should be seen in that context. With East Baits having left traces near Moscow, West Baits near Germany, North Baits near Scandinavia, and South Baits in the Balkans and Asia Minor, we can say that Lithuanians and fellow Baits really got around!

1 See my sister article, "North Baltic" (Mayer, 1994a) where I classify Lithuanian-Latvian agreements as "North Baltic".

2 See Mayer (1993).

3 Dacian *ie* from *e* (according to Duridanov), a possible early Balkanism found also in Albanian, might really or originally have been from long *ē* (as it, most likely, was in Thracian) (Note Dac. *Dierna*: Jatvingian *Dērna*, Dac. *Degis*: *Diegis* transcribed as *Diēgis* with Greek symbols.) If so, then the rising sonority diphthong here shows a development similar to Prussian *mien*, *tien*, *sien* from **mēn*, **tēn*, **sēn* with long *ē*. This seems definitely confirmed by Dacian *certie* matched with Lithuanian *kertė* where Dac. final *ie* is matched by Lith. final long *ė*. Note *-ien-* for *ēn-* in Thrac. *Seietovien(us)* versus *Spindeēnē*.

4 Duridanov (1969) mentions the possible tie to OCS *město* 'place' of Thrac. *midne*, Latv. *mītne*, *miets* 'beanpole', Lith. *miėtas* 'fence pole'. A possible explanation of *midne* with an *ē*-stem loc. *-ē* would be a misspelled *-ēj* like Lith. *ėj* in *žėmėj*.

5 See also Klimas (1967) who insisted that Baltic and Slavic be understood as separate families of Indo-European. Otherwise, unlike Duridanov, I interpret the Dacian abl. -gen. -o in *Scorilo* as derived not directly from long *-ō*, but from long *-ā* patterned originally by East Balts after Iranian and Indie long *-ā* here, their expected reflex of original Indo-European long *ō*. Dacian, in characteristic South Baltic fashion, blended long *ō* and long *ā* into one phoneme which here appears, I believe, as long *ō*. This Dacian form happens to resemble its Lithuanian counterpart, also long *ō* now, a form that exactly matches its Latvian counterpart, *ā* from an original long *ā*. Thus, even though, under South Baltic influence, Lith. original long *ā* here as elsewhere has, like Dac. long *ā*, been changed to long *ō*, unlike Dac.'s, Lith.'s original long *ō*, like Latv.'s, remains distinct via change to *uo*. Therefore, any depiction in Duridanov (1976, 108) of Thracian, like Dacian also South Baltic, as showing separate developments for reflexes of Indo-European long *o* and *a* must be viewed with suspicion. Was it just long *ō* that developed to long *ū*? Or did the joint reflex of both long *ō* and long *ā*, as in Prussian, another South Baltic language, mutate to long *ū* after labials and velars and was this long *ū* spread elsewhere by analogy? Finally, Duridanov (1969, 98) is mistaken in calling Dacian and Thracian more or less generalized linking vowel *u* in compounds like *Desu-daba* and *Tranu-para* gen. pl. formations "exactly" corresponding to those in Latvian and Lithuanian as in *Desu-grava* and *Žasū-gala*. Aside from the North Balticism final *-e* for final *-en* in one example in Thracian *midne*, Thracian and Dacian stay true to the South Baltic falling sonority pattern of keeping the *n* after the vowel in diphthongs. Latvian *u* in these compounds can not with certainty be identified as a genitive plural. Nor can the corresponding Lithuanian long *ū* whose length can be attributed to something else, say, compensatory lengthening for loss of something other than nasalization. The following set of examples from Prussian correspondences to these compounds furnished by Duridanov (1969, 36) shows what was happening. Dac. *Kapi-dava*, *Kapi-sturia* (here with a different linking vowel, *i!*), *Kopu-storas* (with *o* in *Kopu-* not from 6th century Slavic as Duridanov says, but really, as he alternatively says, from Late Dacian, and I say, not necessarily Late, where, as in Prussian, also a South Baltic language, no reflex of *o* or *a* either length differed from one another in the same context) Prus. *Auctacops*, *Auctu-kape*, *Awctum-kape*. Note the different vowels, *a* and *u*, in Prussian as well. This we find matched by Latvian examples on the same page: *Kapumājās*, *Kapa-kalns*. The Prussian alternation, *Auct-kape* / *Awctum-kape* gives some clue to what must have been happening. Lithuanians copying this kind of name-giving seem to have lengthened the *u* to compensate for the loss of *m* in something like West-Balticized *aukstum-* (from *aukstūmas*). So, from, say, **Kapum-ėžeras* to **Kapū-ėžeras* the *u* was lengthened to compensate for the lost *m*. Later, to give sense to the compound, the long *ū* was reinterpreted as *u*, a "genitive plural". Note — in Mayer (1996) I identify Thracian and Dacian as Baltic.

6 A possibly ambiguous further piece of evidence proving that Thracian was East Baltic is an item said to be from Thracian in a Middle Bulgarian text, *Knišava* 'a dug out place', the Lithuanian counterpart verb, *knisti* (*-sū* / *-s(i)aū*) 'to dig', has been West Balticized out of its expected ruki law reflex, *š*. The Bulgarian text form has preserved this East Baltic reflex if it does not represent the Slavic reflex of this law, *x*, altered to *š* via the first palatalization of the velars (**knix-* = *-ēva* to *knišava*) or a stem formed from *sj* (*knis-* + *-java* to *knišava*) or even a stem formed from *š* (from I.E. palatal *k'*) + *j* (with **knišjava* to *knišava*). Duridanov (1969) mentions this form as typical for river names and cites *Nišava* formed from the "ancient" name *Naissos* (now *Niš*), spelled *Naissus* in Russu (1967, 239-241) who designates that name as "Thraco-Dacian", no doubt, in this instance, correctly enough since its location in Upper Moesia, equidistant from Thrace and Dacia, shows that it could have been named by either Thracians or Dacians.

Bibliography

Duridanov, I. (196). *Die thrakisch- und dakisch-baltischen Sprachbeziehungen*, in *Linguistique balkanique*, XIII, 2, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sophia.

——— (1976). *Ezik "t na trakite*. Nauka i izkustvo, Sophia.

Klimas, A. (1967). "Balto-Slavic, or Baltic and Slavic? (The Relationship of Baltic and Slavic Languages)", *Lituanus*, 13:2.5-37.

Meyer, H. (1992). "Dacian and Thracian as Southern Baltoicid", *Lituanus*, 38:2.24-30.

——— (1993). "West Baltic Latvian/East Baltic Lithuanian", *Lituanus*, 39:3.57-62.

——— (1994a). "North Baltic", *Lituanus*, 40:1.5-13.

——— (1994b). "Baltic Diglossia in Lithuanian", *Lituanus*, 40:3.51-56.

——— (1996). "Balts and Carpathians", submitted to *Lituanus*.

Mažiulis, V. (1998). *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, I, A-H, Mokslas. Vilnius.

Russu, I.I. (1967). *Limba traco-dacilor*, Editura Stiintifică, Bucharest.