

SONDERDRUCK/OFFPRINT

vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai

Studien
zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft

Herausgegeben von
Harald Bichlmeier und Velizar Sadovski

Band 17

vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai

Proceedings of the international conference
of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII,
Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019,
celebrating one hundred years of Indo-European
comparative linguistics at the University of Ljubljana

Akten der Arbeitstagung
der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und des IWoBA XII
vom 4. bis 7. Juni 2019 in Ljubljana
aus Anlass der Hundertjahrfeier der dortigen Indogermanistik

edited by
Luka Repanšek, Harald Bichlmeier & Velizar Sadovski

baar
Hamburg 2020

Baar-Verlag

Hamburg

URL: <http://baar-verlag.com>

E-Mail: info@baar-verlag.com

Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© The authors, the editors and Baar-Verlag 2020

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Druck und Verarbeitung: SOWA, Piaseczno.

Umschlaggestaltung: Linda Sophie Gableske (5°sued), Dresden.

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Printed and bound in Poland.

ISBN 978-3-935536-26-4

ISSN 2192-0133

Contents

LUKA REPANŠEK – HARALD BICHLMEIER – VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Vorwort der Herausgeber	9
VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Opening address delivered at the plenary session of the <i>Ljubljana</i> conference	11
LUKA REPANŠEK	
Zur Geschichte des Lehrstuhls für vergleichende indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft an der Universität Ljubljana	15
I. Proceedings of the International conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies	23
ROBERTO BATISTI	
Some putative Greco-Armenian sound laws and the role of the accent	25
ANNA BAUER	
All, many, some and more: Non-Numerical quantification in Anatolian	49
HARALD BICHLMEIER	
Das Ghostword aksl. <i>seštъ/seštъ</i> ‘klug, weise’ – oder: der lange Schatten des Franz Xaver (Ritter von) Miklosich (Miklošič)	67
VÁCLAV BLAŽEK	
Latin <i>aqua</i> and its relatives	83
FILIP DE DECKER	
An overall analysis of the augment in epic Greek and applied to some longer passages	103
MICHAEL FROTSCHER / CORINNA SCHEUNGRABER	
From ditropic clitics to prefixation. On the historical development of Germanic preverbs * <i>ga-</i> , * <i>bi-</i> , Goth. <i>dis-</i> , OHG <i>zar-</i> and Goth. <i>du-</i> , OHG <i>za-</i>	127

METKA FURLAN

- The origin of the Anatolian alternation *keššar* : *kiššeran*
and the Balto-Slavic alternations of the type *akmuō/kamy* : *ākmenī/
kamenb* revisited 143

JOSÉ LUIS GARCÍA RAMÓN

- Anatolian and Greek infinitives: Continuity of Indo-European
morphosyntax vs. areal development 163

RICCARDO GINEVRA

- Gods who shine through the millennia: Old Norse *Baldr*,
Celtic *Belinos*, Old Irish *Balar*, and PIE **b^helH-* ‘be white, shine’ 189

FEDERICO GIUSFREDI / VALERIO PISANIELLO

- Grammatical categories in contact: Gender assignment criteria
in Hittite borrowings from the neighbouring languages 209

BJARNE SIMMELKJÆR SANDGAARD HANSEN

- Minimum standards for acceptable sound laws.
Some alleged root nouns in Proto-Norse 235

EUGEN HILL / SIMON FRIES

- On personal endings of thematic verbs in Proto-Indo-European 255

STEFAN HÖFLER

- Vedic *mahá-* ‘large’ and Lithuanian *māžas* ‘small’.
The emphatic reading of possessive derivatives 285

SAMPsa HOLOPAINEN

- Criticism of some Indo-Uralic sound-correspondences 293

MATE KAPOVIĆ

- The genitive plural ending in Proto-Indo-European and Slavic 321

NIKOLAI N. KAZANSKY

- Conglutinate suffixes in Indo-European languages
and PIE reconstruction problems 347

GÖTZ KEYDANA

- Accentual mobility in Vedic 355

WERNER KNOBL

- Minimal change: New comments (2) and (3) on RV 10.129 367

PETR KOCHAROV

- The etymology of Arm. *amp* ‘cloud’ 385

DANIEL KÖLLIGAN	
Seething anger: Latin <i>furor</i>	399
KONSTANTIN G. KRASUKHIN	
Accent-ablaut paradigms vs. the ablaut-accent paradigm	415
ROSEMARIE LÜHR	
Raumkognition auf dem ehemaligen Gebiet der „Alteuropäischen Hydronymie“	433
MAREK MAJER	
The Indo-European prehistory of the Albanian word for ‘sister’	455
LAURA MASSETTI	
‘The light of truth, the wage of rightness, the remedy of excellence.’ On three inherited collocations of Greek ἀρετή, Vedic <i>ṛtá-</i> , Avestan <i>aša-</i>	467
WOLFGANG MEID	
How not to interpret Old Irish texts. <i>Táin Bó Cúailnge</i> . The final verbal exchange between Medb and Fergus	481
STELLA MERLIN	
“Pre-Greek” between theories and linguistic data. Examples from the Anatolian area	487
ALJOŠA MILENKOVIĆ	
Between semantics and phonological theories. The origin of PSl. <i>*jǫstb</i> ‘that, the same’	507
BIRGIT ANETTE OLSEN	
Insiders and outsiders. The etymology of Slavic <i>*vъnukъ</i> ‘grandson’	527
GEORGES-JEAN PINAULT	
Going home in Proto-Indo-European	539
VELIZAR SADOVSKI	
Indo-Iranian <i>*HamHa-</i> and the fighter’s ‘ <i>Sturm und Drang</i> ’, in compound epithets, personal names, and poetical phraseology from the Veda, Avesta and Ancient Persia (Ritual Formulae and Ritual Pragmatics in the Veda and Avesta, IV)	557
ANDREA SANTAMARIA	
The Greek evidence for an alleged PIE <i>*√sekh₂-</i>	581

ANDREY SHATSKOV	
Mixture of <i>hi</i> - and <i>mi</i> -conjugation forms in Hittite	599
ZSOLT SIMON	
Die luwischen Wörter für ‚Dolmetscher‘. Stammbildung und Etymologie	607
MARKO SNOJ	
<i>Morem</i> , <i>moram</i> , <i>maram</i> – A flash of insight into the Slovenian national character	617
TOBIAS MOSBÆK SØBORG	
Sieving the sources of <i>s</i> -extended verbs in Hittite	621
MIGUEL VILLANUEVA SVENSSON	
Osthoff’s Law in Balto-Slavic	645
II. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology (IWoba) XII	663
JANOŠ JEŽOVNIK	
A further look at the progressive acute-accent shift in the <i>Tersko</i> dialect of Slovene	665
MATE KAPOVIĆ	
Accentual paradigm D on Susak: New data	679
VYTAUTAS RINKEVIČIUS	
Prosodic marks in the Old Prussian <i>Enchiridion</i> revisited	707
Contributor contact information	725

BETWEEN SEMANTICS AND PHONOLOGICAL THEORIES: THE ORIGIN OF PSL. **jistъ* ‘THAT, THE SAME’*

Aljoša Milenković, Belgrade

1 Introduction

The etymology of Slavic (*j*)*istъ* has been a matter of much debate in Balto-Slavic and Indo-European linguistics, with an impressive number of studies dealing with the topic *en passant*, if not entirely dedicated to it. Even though the recent breakthrough in Balto-Slavic accentology puts an etymologist in a more advantageous position in searching for the Proto-Indo-European preform of Slavic (*j*)*istъ* (if any), there have surprisingly been no new insights into its origin in the past few decades. Instead, the focus has been shifting towards the accentuation of this Balto-Slavic word: subscribing to Būga’s etymology, Derksen (2008: 153, 215) offers his view on the prehistory of the acute in PSL. **jǐstъ*. In spite of his explanation being far-fetched (cf. below 2.2), Derksen should be credited as the first scholar who has come up with an answer to this question – after more than 120 years of etymologizing.

Beneficial as it undeniably is, the attention the origin of PSL. **jistъ* has received also has a detrimental side, insofar as it has discouraged further discussion by creating the impression that little can be added to the previous scholarship. The conviction that certain issues are nonetheless yet to be resolved was the initial incentive for the present contribution. The article is structured as follows. First the data are presented, and the relevant criteria a satisfactory etymology of PSL. **jistъ* must satisfy are defined in section 2.1. Then the existing hypotheses are discussed at some length (2.2). The following section (3.1) features a detailed semantic analysis of the Balto-Slavic forms, before a new solution to the problem is finally proposed (3.2).

* I am indebted to Orsat Ligorio, Danilo Savić, Frederik Kortlandt, Tijmen Pronk, Nikolai Kazansky, Marek Majer and Miguel Villanueva Svensson, who discussed some aspects of the topic with me. It goes without saying that all eventual drawbacks in the article are exclusively mine.

2.1 Data and issues

The word is abundantly attested in the Slavic daughter languages, cf. Cz. *jistý* ‘sure, certain; stable, safe; determined, familiar’, dial. *istý*, Slk. *istý* ‘certain; true’, Pl. *isty*, Opl. (*j*)*isty* ‘self, very; the same’, ‘ipse; idem’, ‘said, known; certain; main’ (SSP III: 46ff.), Pl. *istny* ‘such, the same, true’, dial. *ten isty* ‘that, the same’, *istny* ‘the very (właśnie ten), the same’ (SGP II: 210), Kash. *jistnil/jisni* ‘the same, well-known’ (SGK III: 107), Slc. *jisnī/jišnī* ‘real; true; the same’ (SW I: 399) (West Slavic); ORus. *istyj* ‘that, the same; real, true’; Rus. *istyj* ‘real, true, genuine’ (East Slavic); OCS *istb* ‘real, true, genuine; that, the very; the same’; Mac. *ist* ‘the same’; Bg. (old and dialectal) *ist* ‘the same’; S., Cr. *īstī* ‘the same, self’, obs. ‘true’; Sln. *īsti* ‘the same’ (Pleteršnik I: 298) (South Slavic); (cf. ĖSSJa VIII: 246, ESJS 254, Derksen 2008: 215).

The East Baltic comparanda are not so numerous, with Latvian *ī(k)sts* ‘real, true’ (ME I: 838) as the only reliable counterpart of the above Slavic items. As for Lithuanian *iščias/yščias* ‘clear’ (LKŽ⁶), Derksen claims: “The quantity of the root vowel is uncertain [...] I [...] assume that we are dealing with a derivative in **jo-* of a form corresponding to Latv. *īsts* [...]” (2015: 206).¹

The listed Slavic words are underlain by PSll. **jīstb* (and some of them by **jīstbŋb*).² Its affiliation with AP [a], which perfectly matches the sustained tone of Latv. *ī(k)sts*, is evidenced by S, Cr. *īstī* and the neocircumflex in Sln. *īsti*, as well as on derivational grounds (see Dybo 1981: 144). Compared with Latv. *īsts*, PSll. **jīstb* points to PBSll. **iʔstos* (thus Derksen 2008: 215; 2015: 206).

Any etymology of PBSll. **iʔstos* that fails to meet the requirement that it find the source of the word’s laryngeal (> acute), while also providing a viable scenario for the semantic development and formation of the word must be judged inadequate.

2.2 Existing hypotheses

Assuming that our word is a derivative in **-to-* of the root **h₁es-* ‘be, exist’, Miklošič (1886: 105) sets up **jes-tb*, **jbs-tb* for OCS *istb* (likewise F. G. Möhl apud ĖSSJa VIII: 246, Gebauer SSČ s.v.; Skok ERHSJ I: 733), implying the semantic transfer ‘be, being’ > ‘true’, as in e.g. Skt. *satyá-* ‘true’, Av. *haiθiia-* ‘id.’ < PIE **h₁s-nt-ió-* (KEWAi III: 422). However, Brant (1889: 134) points out that one cannot explain the root vocalism of **jbstb* starting with **jestb*, as

¹ It follows from this Derksen’s observation that the length of the Lith. variant *yščias* should not be taken for granted, especially not as an argument for **ī-* > PSll. **ji-* (pace Vaillant 1931: 174). The PSll. form with **ji-* (not **jō-*) is warranted by the shape of the West Slavic descendants (Cz. *jistý*, Pl. *isty* etc.).

² For an exhaustive treatment of PSll. **ji-* and **jō-* word-initially, a traditional conundrum in Slavic historical linguistics, I refer to Derksen 2003. Derksen’s writing **jbstb* (2008, 2015) is just a matter of convention (2008: 16). In this article, the form is going to be reconstructed and written as **jīstb*, in accordance with Derksen 2003, unless otherwise marked in a quoted source.

the change **e* > **b* seems to have been restricted to unstressed syllables, the accent of Rus. *istyj* and S. Cr. *istī* rendering such a scenario improbable.³ Stang's objection to this etymology (1970: 83) concerns the formation of the word: Miklošič's **jes-tb*, a supposed past passive participle of **hies-*, happens not to be attested anywhere in Indo-European. Another version of this etymology – in which **jbstb* continues the zero-grade **his-* with the prothetic vowel **i-* and is cognate with Arm. *isk* 'really, in reality' (Meillet 1894: 259f.) – has fallen out of favour with its own creator: Meillet (1906: 336) ultimately argues that PSL. **jbstb* is irreconcilable with the West Slavic data (see 2.1). In addition, the connection with Arm. *isk*, occasionally invoked by proponents of some other etymologies (including ME I: 838 and Kortlandt 1975: 56), "is not flawless" (Olsen 1999: 518⁶⁴⁸). The acute intonation of Slav. *istb* and Latv. *īsts* definitely rules out this option (Vaillant 1974: 677f.).

Rejecting Miklošič's idea, particularly the putative development **jestb* > **jbstb*, Brandt proposes that OCS *istb* is related to *isto* 'kidney' (1889: 134). He additionally speculates that *iskati* 'seek' might belong here but admits that this would be rather inconvenient on semantic grounds. Brandt attempts to eliminate the glaring discrepancy between 'kidney' and 'true' by assuming 'interior, inner' as the intermediate stage, which is still highly unlikely. Since the etymology is clearly inadequate, it is not necessary to discuss the formal aspects.

Sobolevskij's tentative suggestion that *jist-* might be traceable to **jyst-* and related to Lat. *iūs*, *iustus* (1891: 100) has not met with any success among scholars, which has to do with the fact that the *ū* of Lat. *iūs* goes back to PIE **eu* (cf. Av. *yaoš*), not **ū* (**uH*).

The first etymologist who has ventured to take a radical turn from the previous scholarship is Berneker (SEW 435f., with some success in Buck 1949: 1169 and Černyx IĖSSRJa I: 361): in *istb* he saw an oxytonic compound containing a prefix (**bz-*; cf. OCS *izb* 'from, out of') and a zero-grade verbal root (**-st* < **sth₂-* 'stand'), the congeners of which are widespread across the IE languages.⁴ This hypothesis presupposes the shift from 'existing' to 'true', which, unlike 'kidney' > 'true' (Brandt loc. cit.) or 'feel' > 'true' (Machek 1930: 47ff.), gives every ap-

³ It has been established – almost a century after Brandt's note – that the development is in fact conditioned not only prosodically, but also by the segmental environment: **e* was narrowed in pretonic syllables only if either of the adjacent consonants was palatal(ized) (Kortlandt 1984/85: 367f.). Either way, an exclusive Proto-Slavic innovation, the raising of **e* to **i* can in no way be the mechanism giving rise to Latv. *ī* and Lith. *i/y*.

⁴ Compare: OCS *prostb* 'simple, free' < **pro+sth₂-ó-* (Derksen 2008: 421f.); Lat. *probis* 'good, excellent' < **pro+b^hHu-ó-* (de Vaan 2008: 490f.); also with a nominal stem instead of a prefix: Skt. *goṣṭhā-* 'cowshed' < **g^uh₃-eu+sth₂-ó-* (?); Gr. *νεογνός* 'newborn' < **neu-o+ǵnh₁-ó-* (cf. Brugmann 1906: 145). For the original shape of the root **b^hHu-* 'be', see e.g. Schrijver 1991: 226ff. and Kortlandt 2011: 9 (*pace* LIV² 98ff.).

pearance of being an actual semantic evolution. However, the desinential stress that needs to be assumed for a compound of this kind runs counter to AP [a] of the Slavic adjective and thus makes the assumption unlikely to be correct.

The identification of **jbstv* with Lith. *jùstas*, the past passive participle of *jùsti* (*juñta, jùto*) ‘feel, sense’ (Machek 1930: 47ff.), faces two major difficulties: it leaves the accent of PSI. **jìstv* and Latv. *īsts* unexplained and, moreover, there is simply too much of a gap between the semantics of **jìstv* and *jùsti*.

Machek has advanced another hypothesis regarding the origin of our word (1968: 228), this time proposing to treat **jbstv* as a pair of homonyms: **jbstv*¹ denotes ‘sure, certain’ and (somehow) derives from PIE **uidtós* ‘seen’, whilst **jbstv*² ‘true’ shares the common root with **jbsto* ‘kidney’. The particular unattractiveness of the latter connection has already been highlighted; as regards the former assumption, it impels its adherents to rely on *ad hoc* rules – Machek, for instance, argues that the initial syllable of **jbstv*¹ adopted its onset under the influence of **jbstv*².⁵ Perhaps more problematic is that Machek projects a meaning found nowhere outside West Slavic (‘certain’)⁶ – a clear indication of its recent date – all the way back into a remote Proto-Slavic past, and even goes on to pursue its Proto-Indo-European ancestry.

Reviving an old Sabler’s etymology, advocated back in the day by Baudouin de Courtenay (apud Toporov 1958: 80), Stang (1949; quoted from 1970: 86) is inclined to regard Slavic *istv* as the *to*-participle of the verbal root reflected in Skt. *īše*⁷/*īṣṭe* ‘owns, possesses, is master of’, OAv. *isē*, YAv. *ište* ‘is master of something’, PGm. **aigana* ‘own, possess’,⁸ TB *aik-* ‘know, recognize’, which is accepted by Seebold (1970: 71). Note that Mayrhofer (EWAia I: 207, KEWAi I:

⁵ US *wěsty* ‘gewiss, sicher’, mentioned *ibid.* by Machek, “[k]aum zu ursl. **istv* [...], sondern verwandt mit der in urs. **vĕděti* [...] enthaltenen W[ur]z[el] **vĕd-* [...]” (Schuster-Šewc HEW 1591). There can hardly be any doubt that the *v-* in Mac. *vistina* ‘truth’ is secondary (Koneski 1983: 25).

⁶ The presence of the meaning ‘certain’ in Old Russian and Old Serbian is highly doubtful. Sreznevskij (1157) defines the primary meaning of ORus. *isty* as ‘is, idem, certus’ but none of the quoted examples fits with ‘certus’. Daničić (I: 425) finds a single instance of this meaning in Old Serbian, but his interpretation of the passage need not necessarily be accurate. – Zubatý conducted a survey on the semantics of Cz. *jistý* (1918). He discriminates between ‘certain’ as ‘sure’ (~ Germ. *sicher*) and ‘known but unnamed’ (~ Germ. *gewiss*) and concludes (231f.) that the latter has been imported from Latin. As for the meaning ‘that, the same’, with a plethora of attestations in OCz., he states: “Toto *ten jistý* je jisté výraz starý a domáci: nalézáme podobné výrazy (s významem ‘ten’ i ‘tyž’) i v jiných jazycích slovanských” (231).

⁷ Despite being synchronically a medial root present (Kümmel 1996: 23), *īše* is a medial perfect form “mit iir. Reduplikationserneuerung **Hi-Hik-*” (LIV² 223⁴) in its origin. Therefore, its length cannot be taken as an argument for the root-structure **eiāḱ-* (*sic*) (pace Stang 1970: 87).

⁸ Go. *aigan* ‘have’, ON *eiga* ‘own, possess’, OE *āgan* ‘possess’, OHG *eigan* ‘have, own, keep, receive’. This Germanic preterite-present without ablaut (Go. 1SG *aih*, 1PL *aigum*; OE 1SG *āh*, PL *āgon*) continues the regular IE perfect paradigm with reduplication: SG **h₂e-h₂oiḱ-*, PL **h₂e-h₂iḱ-* (Haðarson 1993: 134¹⁶⁰, Kroonen 2013: 8).

96), Cheung (2007: 158), Kroonen (2013: 8) and Adams (2013: 107)⁹ reconstruct PIE **h₂eik-*, contrary to LIV² (223), with **Heik-* (**H* standing for **h₂* or **h₃*). The semantic change 'own' > 'real, actual' – the crucial requirement in order for this etymology to work – is corroborated by Cz. *vlastný* 'own' vs. *vlastně* 'actually, really' (Stang 1970: 87). Be that as it may, the supposed etymon **Hiktó-* as such contains nothing that could – to the best of our current knowledge – have resulted in an acute vowel in Balto-Slavic.¹⁰

Though completely ignored by the ĚSSJa in their extensive overview of the problem's history (VIII: 246f.), Būga's (1922) hypothesis has been quite influential, inasmuch as it has gained support of some prominent figures in the field, such as Vasmer (REW I: 491), Vaillant (1974: 677f.), Kortlandt (1975: 56) and Derksen (2008, 2015); thus also ME (I: 838).¹¹ The ESJS (254) erroneously presents Endzelīns's position on this matter: he does not plead for this etymology in his 1912 article on velar insertion in Baltic. Having convincingly shown that Latv. *īsts* could not be a Slavic loanword (1913: 252), Būga (1922: 122) correlates this Latvian adjective and its Slavic cognate *istb* with Lith. *yščias* 'clear' and further with Lith. *įškus*, *aiškus* 'id.'. The Indo-European pedigree of Lith. *aiškus* and PSL. **ėsnb* has never been called into question, but what remains disputable is the PIE root underlying them, since several conflicting accounts have been present.¹² In the primary formulation of this etymology, besides the controversy

⁹ More precisely, Adams' **h₂*, in the absence of a Hittite correspondence, stands here equally for his **h₂* and **h₄* (cf. Adams, Mallory 2006: 55; Adams 2013: xvi).

¹⁰ Recently it was brought to my attention that Wandl (2019: 274f.) rejects Pronk's glottalization of initial **Hi-* and **Hu-* in PBSL, and goes for an already Indo-European age of the metathesis, which in that case could not be separated from the one when **Hi/*Hu* were flanked by two consonants. This would eliminate the formal problems that Stang's proposition poses but the etymology at hand is still semantically inferior to Toporov's 1958 'pronominal hypothesis'.

¹¹ Geitler (1876: 46) drew a parallel between OCS *istb* and Lith. *aiškus* (*sic*) in his quest to identify the former *u*-stem nominals in Slavic – several decades before Būga did (as noticed by the ESJS 254). He believes that the *t* of Slav. *istb* and some Lith. variants (*aišktus*, *aikštus*, *aištus*) is merely euphonic ("pouze eufonické").

¹² Berneker's (SEW s.v.), Trautmann's (1970: 4) and Sobolevskij's (1914: 433) association with Skt. *yaśas-* 'beauty, splendour, glory, fame' (on which see Mayrhofer KEWAi III: 12; EWAia II: 405f.) is not very appealing. ME (I: 838) and Būga (1922: 122) remain silent, whereas Pokorny (IEW 16f.) introduces the root **aisk-* 'klar, hell, leuchtend' solely to shed light on the IE background of Lith. *aiškus*, OCS *jasno*, *iskra* (thus also Bezlaĭ ĚSSJ I: 213, s.v. *iskra*) and ON *eiskra* 'rage (with heated excitement); scream', but admits (17) that **aisk-* might in fact represent a *-sk-* extension of the root **aidh-*. Vasmer quotes several etymologies but is reluctant to endorse any of them (REW I: 488, 491). Matasović compares OCS *iskra* 'spark' and Lith. *aiškus* with OIr. *éscā* 'moon', all having supposedly descended from PIE **h₁eisk-* (2008: 90), i.e. **h₁eisk-* (2009: 118f.). Importantly, he tries to solve the problem of the unexplained acute in Balto-Slavic by assuming a secondary *vyddhi* or metatony (2009: 119). The ĚSSJa (VI: 51f.) derives PSL. **ėsnb* from the root **aidh-* (i.e. **h₂eidh-*), a view espoused by Derksen (2008, 2015). Vaillant maintains that the root of Lith. *ieškoti* 'seek' also underlies Lith. *aiškus*, *iškus* and OCS *jasnb* (1950: 181) and finds it likely that Slav. *istb* is related

over the root, two issues are left unaddressed, both of paramount importance: while one is given a clue about the word's Balto-Slavic lineage, its exact formation remains unspecified (cf. already Stang 1970: 83f.), so does the source of the acute. It was Derksen who finally broke silence on the latter problem ascribing this acute to *métatonie rude* in the *sta*-present¹³ of the root **h₂(e)id^h*- (2008: 153). The inconsistency of reckoning with *sta*-metatony in order to account for an unexpected acute in Slavic lies in that a strong case has been made for an inner-East Baltic age of the process – what is more, by Derksen himself (1996: 292). The root structure of **h₂id^h*- additionally shakes the validity of this solution (cf. Pronk 2011: 314). From those two flaws arose what turns out to be the most conceivable explanation of the said acute: it has spread to the full grade **aiʔsk-* from the zero-grade **iʔsk-*, where it has been introduced regularly by “the glottalization of initial stressed **Hi* (and **Hu*)” in Balto-Slavic¹⁴ (Pronk 2011: 315), as in:

- (1) PIE **Hoin-* ‘one’ (Go. *ains*, Lat. *ūnus*, Gr. *ōvñ*) >> Lith. *vienas* ‘one’, Latv. *viēns* ‘id.’, OPr. ACC.SG.M *ainan* : **Hin-* > PBSL. **iʔn-* > Lith. *ýnas* 3, PSL. **jīnʔ* ‘another’ (Pronk 2011: 315f.);
- (2) PIE **h₂eus-r-* >> Latv. dial. *aūstra* ‘dawn’, PS�. **ūt^{ro}* ‘morning’, with the acute originating from the zero-grade **h₂us-*, otherwise unattested in Balto-Slavic (Pronk 2011: 318f., 2018: 299).

While the “laryngeal metathesis” does remedy the weaknesses of the initial hypothesis and places the derivation from **h₂eid^h*- on a more sound footing, it shall nonetheless be argued in what follows that there is no reason whatsoever why one should maintain that **jistʔ* belongs to the family of the IE root for ‘kindle’ and is cognate with the (Balto-)Slavic words for ‘clear’ and ‘spark’, and that its acute is of wholly different origin.

It follows that Slav. *jistʔ* cannot be related to both Lith. *áiškus* (presumably from **h₂eid^h*-) and Skt. *īśe* (**h₂eik-*) (pace Kortlandt 1975: 56).

to them (1974: 677f.). As a matter of fact, the connection with *iskati* ‘look for, seek’ is a mirage: even when (*j*)*istʔ* is semantically close to *iskati*, this is nothing more than a folk etymology, as in Russian, where the meaning of *istyj* is occasionally reinterpreted as “*тотъ, кто иŝčѣтъ, възyskivaѣтъ, предъjavlѣтъ*” (Preobraženskij, ĖSRJa I: 275; emphasis mine).

¹³ The puzzling origin of this immensely productive class of inchoative verbs in East Baltic cannot be discussed here. For a view alternative to Derksen’s, see Villanueva Svensson 2010. Like Derksen, Gorbachov (2014) adheres to the “*ske*-theory”, but with a genuinely different explanation of Balt. *st* for PIE **s^k*, which challenges the mainstream treatment of PIE **s^k* (Meillet 1894 and lately Lubotsky 2001, Villanueva Svensson 2009).

¹⁴ The discovery of which goes back to Kortlandt’s 1974 observation that initial stressed **u* became acute in Slavic (1977: 38) and Baltic (1977: 39). The identical fate has subsequently been verified for inherited **i* in Slavic (Derksen 2003: 103), of which Kortlandt adduces only one reliable example in the referenced article (39) – S, Cr. *īn* ‘other’. The change in question is finally defined as “laryngeal metathesis” (Young 2006) or “the glottalization of initial **Hu-* and **Hi-*” (Pronk 2011: 319) and has meanwhile been invoked in Kortlandt’s (2013: 8) overview of the BSL personal pronouns and their accentuation and Pronk’s (2018: 299) revised etymological explanation of OCS (*j*)*utro* ‘daybreak, morning’ (but note Wandl 2019).

Labelled as “the most probable etymology of *jbstb*” by the ĖSSJa (VIII: 246), adopted by Karulis (1992: 346) and clearly favoured by the ESUM (II: 319f.) and the ĖSBM (III: 401),¹⁵ Toporov’s (1958: 80ff.) etymology gave the discussion something of a twist, due mostly to his interpretation of what the original semantics of *istb* were. After conducting a thorough analysis of both Church Slavonic and modern Slavic usages of (*j*)*ist-*, Toporov reaches the conclusion that the perplexing semantic variation in Slavic could easily be explained if one assumed that ‘the same’ was the original meaning of our word (1958: 83), contrary to the prevalent view that modern Russian and Latvian reflect the earlier state of affairs in this respect. He proceeds to hypothesize (84) that the pronominal compound **is+to-* was the parent form of not only Slav. *istb* but also a well-known Italic demonstrative (Lat. *iste* ‘that’ and Umbr. ACC.SG.M **estu** ‘this’). In spite of offering some lucid observations pertaining to the semantics of *istb*, which – no doubt – deserve to be taken notice of, Toporov’s account suffers from two hardly surmountable formal issues:¹⁶ it utterly fails to elucidate the background of the acute in **jīstb*, and it is not certain whether its alleged Italic cognates go back to Proto-Italic **esto-* or **isto-* (Untermann 2000: 236f.).¹⁷ This etymology is another example of how semantic attractiveness sometimes does not suffice to compensate formal mismatches.

Upon a more rigorous scrutiny of the existing hypotheses one cannot but notice that detecting the source of the **?* in PBSL. **i?stos* has been a serious impediment to reaching a definite solution. It should still not be sought at the expense of violating the previous findings – recall Derksen’s endeavour to do so (2008: 153). After all, a tenable explanation of both the complex semantic evolution and the formation of the word is required as well.

3.1 The semantics of Slavic (*j*)*istb* and Latvian *īsts*

Unlike the (fully neglected) accentuation of **jīstb* and *īsts*, the semantics have not escaped scholarly attention. The following lines will concentrate on the dis-

¹⁵ In a similar vein, Gluhak (1993: 279) argues that PSL. **jbstbjb* and Lat. *iste* are descendants of IE **is-to-*, with no reference to Toporov 1958.

¹⁶ The surmise that **jbstb* is composed of three pronouns, namely **jb*, **sb* (PIE **k̑i-*, cf. Lith. *šis* ‘this’) and **tb*, respectively (ERHJ 368), does not fare any better: suffice it to say that this revision of the ‘pronominal hypothesis’ does not bring us any closer to understanding how the acute of **jīstb* emerged.

¹⁷ If the former is the case, Latin has replaced **es-* with *is-* (de Vaan 2008: 310f.), presumably under the influence of *is* (Untermann loc. cit.); Proto-Italic **esto-* would originate from PIE **h₁es+to-*, with the oblique stem **h₁es-*, as in DAT.SG.M/N **h₁esmōi* (> Skt. *asmāi*, Av. *ahmāi*) (de Vaan, loc. cit.). Were the Plt. form to be reconstructed as **isto-*, the *e* in Umbr. **estu** would have been taken over from **eko-*, **ekso-*, **epso-*, **eno-* (Untermann loc. cit., LIPP II: 796).

tribution of the meanings, their mutual relations and the evolution of the lexemes within their respective lexical systems, the final goal being to find the original semantics of the preform of Slavic (*j*)*istъ* and Latvian *īsts*.

The meaning ‘clear’, which provides a reasonable ground to connect our word with *aiškus, jasnъ*, is unknown anywhere but in Lithuanian, where *iščias/yščias*, to put it mildly, does not take a prominent position in the lexicon. The same holds for ‘sure, certain’ (Cz., Slk., OPl.), ‘known, familiar’ (Cz., Kash.), and ‘safe, stable’ (Cz.), none of which exceeds the borders of the West Slavic area. In both cases it seems more feasible to assume a recent (inner-Lithuanian and inner-West Slavic) evolution than to go for a PIE antiquity; hence no etymology of PBSl. **i?stos* should be founded on these meanings (pace Būga 1922: 122, Machek 1968: 228). Of the remaining three candidates (‘real, genuine’, ‘true’ and ‘that, the same’), none seems to be subject to such a restriction, which makes it quite likely that one of them is the etymologically primary one. The chief problem is that ‘true’ > ‘the same’, ‘the same’ > ‘true’, ‘real’ > ‘the same’ (and so forth) all lack comparative evidence, so what we are dealing with here is somewhat unique. The course of events must then be figured out on the basis of internal Baltic and Slavic evidence.

Buck (1949: 1168) underlines the difference between ‘true’ as ‘real, genuine’ and ‘consistent with fact’ – notice that Slav. *jistъ* and Latv. *īsts* denote both of the two concepts. Focusing on the latter, he observes that “the s[u]b[stantive]s for ‘truth’ are most commonly derived from the adj[ective]s for ‘true’ [...]” This constitutes an argument on the side of ‘true’, since the nomen abstractum **jistina* ‘truth’ is derived from **jistъ*, but this is just a frequent occurrence; thus it cannot be taken as a prohibitive objection to the other options. Indeed, a more careful inspection of the data undermines this scenario: ‘that, the same’ is less abstract than ‘true; real, genuine’, so given the common tendency that abstract domains are perceived through more concrete ones (e.g. Blank 1999: 71f.), the chances are that ‘true’ would rather have arisen from ‘the same’ than vice versa. In West and East Slavic, ‘the same’ appears in the earliest monuments but is nowadays almost unknown (with the only exception of Kashubian), which renders the assumption of its recent date odd, if not downright impossible: ‘the same’ would have developed from the initial ‘true’ only to disappear shortly after being introduced. I see no less than two factors responsible for the disappearance of the initial, deictic meaning of **jistъ*: its desemanticization in certain contexts and the semantic expansion of **samъ* in East and West Slavic.

In the theory of semantic change, items have traditionally been examined out of their respective contexts (Traugott/Dasher 2002: 60), which does enable one to determine the starting point and the ultimate result of a process; yet it deprives them of the possibility to trace the course of the process itself (Traugott/Dasher

2002: 80f.). It was only recently that the context has been recognized as setting the stage for semantic shifts to take place.

Up to this point, several arguments have been presented to back up our assumption that 'the same' is the primary meaning of (*j*)*ist*. The Slavic languages distinguish between 'the same' as 'self(same), the very, the very same, not another' and 'exactly like another, exactly similar'; one does not have to go any further from modern English to find a parallel to this subtle difference. 'The very' is found in e.g. Old Church Slavonic, Old Polish and Old Serbian:

- (3) Old Church Slavonic (Sava's Book, SS 272)

<i>za</i>	<i>istaja</i>	<i>děla</i>	<i>věro</i>	<i>emlete</i>	<i>mi</i>
for	<u>the.very-ACC.PL.N</u>	deed-ACC.PL	faith-ACC.SG	take-PRS.2PL	I-DAT

"Believe me for the very works' sake" (John 14:11)

- (4) Old Polish (Life of Saint Blaise; SSP III: 47)

<i>Tey</i>	<i>istey</i>	<i>nocy</i>	<i>Cristus</i>
that-GEN.SG.F	<u>very-GEN.SG.F</u>	night-GEN.SG	Christ- NOM
<i>swõtemu</i>	<i>sy</i>	<i>Blaszeyu</i>	<i>pokazal</i>
Saint-DAT.SG.M	himslef	Blaise-DAT	show-PST.3SG.M

"That very night (in ipsa autem nocte) Christ showed himself to Saint Blaise"

- (5) Old Serbian (1423; Miklosich 1858: 329)

<i>kako je</i>	<i>toi</i>	<i>ista</i>	<i>moja</i>	<i>riječb</i>
for be-PRS.3SG	that- NOM.SG.N	<u>very-NOM.SG.F</u>	my-NOM.SG.F	word-NOM.SG

'For that is my very word'

The meaning 'ipse' exists in contemporary Slovene and Serbian but is obsolete in both of them:

- (6) Slovene (SSKJ² I: 486)

<i>V</i>	<i>istih</i>	<i>časih</i>	<i>so</i>	<i>potovali</i>
in	<u>that.very-LOC.PL.M</u>	hour-LOC.PL	be-PRS.3PL	travel- PTCP.PRF.PL.M
<i>z</i>	<i>Gorenjskega</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>Štajersko</i>	
from	Upper.Carniola-GEN	to	Styria-ACC	

"In those very hours they were travelling from Upper Carniola to Styria"

- (7) Serbian (RSA VIII: 438)

[...] <i>narodnosti</i>	[...] <i>koju</i>	[...] <i>uvažavaju</i>	<i>i</i>
nation-DAT.SG	which-ACC.SG.F	respect- PRS.3PL	even
<i>njeni</i>	<i>isti</i>	<i>dušmani</i>	
her-NOM.PL.M	<u>very-NOM.PL.M</u>	enemy-NOM.PL	

"[...] to the nation [...] respected even by its enemies themselves"

The meaning 'exactly like another' is ubiquitous in modern Serbian:

- (8) Serbian (RSA VIII: 438)

<i>Iste</i>	<i>njegove</i>	<i>oči</i>
<u>exactly.like- NOM.PL.F</u>	his- NOM.PL.F	eye- NOM.PL

"Eyes exactly like his"

Of utmost significance is the above example (3), in which OCS *istb* translates Gr. ὁ αὐτός, denoting ‘self, very’: διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστεύετε (Lat. *propter opera ipsa credite*). Unlike in *Sava’s Book*, Gr. τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ is translated as *ta děla* in *Codex Zographensis* and *Codex Marianus*. Interchangeable as they are, *istb* and *tb* are still not absolutely synonymous in this instance: while *tb* is a ‘plain’ demonstrative pronoun, the semantics of *istb* are more emphatic and exclusive – ‘exactly that (not another)’, ‘the very’. I would therefore rather think of (3) as being a more accurate translation of the Greek original than its counterparts from the aforementioned *Codices*. However, purely deictic meaning (‘is’, not ‘ipse’) used to be frequent in Old Czech (cf. ACC.PL *ty isté řeči* for Lat. *sermones istos*; Zubatý 1918: 231) and Old Russian (Sreznevskij 1157).

The loss of the original demonstrative semantics presupposes two consecutive stages. At first, the lexeme was used alone to denote ‘that (very)’, as in 3–7. Pronouns with such a meaning (‘is’/‘ipse’) tend to collocate with demonstratives, which usually results in a slight semantic modification (as witnessed by Gr. αὐτός vs. ὁ αὐτός) – a phenomenon conspicuous in OCS *tb istb*, *sb istb* (SS 272), Sln. univerbated *tisti* ‘derselbe, derjenige’ (Pleteršnik II: 670), Cz. *ten jistý*, Slk. *ten istý* (Toporov 1958: 82, Machek 1968: 228), OPl. *ten isty* (SSP III: 46ff.). The meaning that the sequence *tb istb* carried as a whole was ‘the same’, ‘idem’, as noticeable in (9), where OPl. *thego ystigo konya* is accurately interpreted as ‘eundem equum’ (SSP III: 47):

(9) Old Polish (Kodeks Świątosławów, SSP III: 47)

<i>Maczey</i>	<i>thego</i>	<i>*ystigo</i>	<i>konya</i>
Maciej-NOM	that-ACC.SG.M	<u>very-ACC.SG.M</u>	horse-ACC.SG
<i>gemv</i>	<i>wroczył</i>	<i>chrorego</i>	
he-DAT	give.back-PRF.3SG.M	lame-ACC.SG.M	

“Maciej gave him back the same horse lame”¹⁸

As seen, the meaning of the phrase had two aspects: demonstrative and emphatic-exclusive. Then came the turning point in the semantic history of *(j)istb*: since the pronoun *tb* became the sole bearer of demonstrative meaning in the collocation *tb (j)istb*, the lexeme *(j)istb* was left with merely referential function. Contextually desemanticized, *(j)istb* started to denote ‘said, aforementioned’ and ‘known, familiar’. But to distinguish ‘the same’ from ‘the aforementioned’ may not always be an easy task. The SSP shows preference for the latter solution—many cases where it seems that the interpretation of OPl. *(j)isty* could go either way fall under ‘de quo sermo est vel fuit; cuius mentio facta est’ in this dictionary (III: 46ff.).

¹⁸ The preceding asterisk marks a scribal error in this case (*ystigo* for *ystego*). The reader is referred to the original Old Polish monument for a broader context, which cannot be cited here for the sake of space.

Succinctly presented, (*j*)*istb* was initially used as a deictic-emphatic pronominal adjective ('ipse'; 3–7); it collocated with demonstrative pronouns and the phrase acquired the meaning 'idem' (6–9), where the lexeme's demonstrative meaning became superfluous and was consequently lost.

Another factor of relevance is the relation with the lexeme **sam̃b*. I draw the reader's attention to a clear-cut situation: (*j*)*ist* denotes 'the same' in those Slavic languages where the reflex of PSL. **sam̃b* means 'self' and not 'the same' (e.g. Western South Slavic); however, where **sam̃b* denotes 'the same' (as in Pl. *ten samy*, Cz. *ten samý*, Rus. *tot sámyj*), (*j*)*ist* predominantly signifies 'true', 'real, genuine' or some other abstract notion. This leads one to the inevitable conclusion that (*j*)*istb* 'that very, the same' was marginalized when *sam̃b* came to mean 'the same'. A side remark made by Sreznevskij (1157, s.v. *istyj*) might actually speak volumes: Gr. οὐ δὲ ὁ αὐτός εἶ (Hebrews 1:12) is translated as ORus. *ty že istb jesi* 'but you remain the same' in two early-fourteenth-century manuscripts; however, two centuries later, *istb* was systematically replaced with *sam̃b* in this passage. Pushed into the periphery of the system, the lexeme (*j*)*ist* survived by developing new, more abstract meanings, such as 'true', 'safe' or 'genuine'. The invariant semantic component *consistent with* might have been the pivot on which the transfer 'the same' (i.e. 'consistent with this/that') > 'true' ('consistent with fact') has been carried out. Such an analysis could also work for Latvian, which is indicated by the primary meaning of *īsts*, as defined in LLVV: "Tāds, kas pilnīgi atbilst attiecīgajam jēdzienam, paraugam (pēc savām būtiskajām pazīmēm)." What strikes one even more is that Karulis (1992: 346) follows Toporov in assuming that 'the same' was the primary meaning, although it left no obvious traces in Latvian.

3.2 The origin of PSL. **jīstb*: a new look

Thus far, two etymologies have stood out from the rest of the proposals, namely Būga's and Toporov's, but neither is devoid of shortcomings.

Besides its 'acuteness', the root **(a)iʔšk-* has nothing – either semantically or formally – to recommend it as cognate with **iʔst-*. The meaning 'clear' is undoubtedly an innovation in Lithuanian. The *k* in the Latvian dialectal variant *īskts* is given a central role in justifying the word's appurtenance to the family of **(a)iʔšk-* (ME I: 838), but one has every reason to believe that this *k* has been inserted secondarily, which is an opinion shared by Stang (1966: 110), Karulis (1992: 346) and Derksen (2015: 206, 537). When assessing Endzelīns's contribution to the topic, etymologists have confined themselves to ME, not taking into consideration his other works on the subject. Even when they have (like ESJS 254), the reference makes it only partway through the article. The eminent Latvian linguist likewise believes that the variant *īksts* is less archaic than *īsts*, but his

explanation (1912: 120, 1922: 173, 1951: 240) radically diverges from Stang's and Karulis's epenthesis: he starts with **īsktas*, a contamination of two different and unrelated roots – **īšk-* : **aišk-* (PSl. **jiskra* 'spark', Lith. *yškus* 'clear' : PSl. **ěsnъ* 'clear', Lith. *aiškus* 'id.') and **īst-* (> Latv. *īsts*, Lith. *yščias*, PSl. **jistъ*). The sequence **skt* underwent metathesis, finally giving rise to *īksts*. Endzelīns (1912: 120³) employs the same scenario for Lith. *aikštūs* 'visible, clear' (< **aišk-*). In my view, this contamination is precisely what misled Būga and his followers into thinking that *īsts* and *aiškus* are etymologically related.

Quite the opposite, it seems that Toporov's approach would not be any difficult to pursue if he had not insisted that *istъ* is related to Lat. *iste*, and if the account were in any way able to untangle the knotty problem of the accent. Unfortunately, this is not the case: agreeing with Toporov has so far amounted to merely repeating his original statement (ĖSSJa, ESUM, ĖSBM, Karulis loc. cit.). A desired improvement can be accomplished by setting up (post-)PIE **(h₁)id tod* (NOM/ACC.SG.N pronominal forms) instead of **(h₁)is+to-*. First of all, this proposition has a discernible advantage of not leaving the right part of *is-tъ* unexplained: Toporov rightly points out that it must be traced to the **so/*to-* demonstrative but struggles to choose between several members of this pronominal paradigm that could have produced PSl. **-tъ*, notably the PIE ACC.SG.M **tom* or the newly created PBSl. NOM.SG.M **tos* (Lith. *tąs*, OCS *тъ*) (1958: 83).

When univerted, **idtod* regularly yielded PBSl. **i?sto* by (a) **dt > *?st* (Winter's Law) and (b) the regular loss of dental stops in auslaut, which must have been anterior to Winter's Law (Kortlandt 2011: 160).¹⁹ Whether one will find this acceptable or not, to a very large extent depends on their viewpoint on the PIE consonantism. Since a proponent of traditional, non-glottalic approach will (in all possibility) a priori find it inconceivable, the development (a) is in need of further elucidation.

The controversy over the fate of PIE **dt* in Balto-Slavic is evocative of Lachmann's Law, a hotly debated vowel lengthening in Latin. Descriptively, the lengthening takes place when a voiced stop is succeeded by *t* (or *s*) at a morpheme boundary (Weiss 2009: 175); cf. Lat. *āctus* 'done' < **h₂eg-* vs. *uectus* 'carried' < **uegʰ-*. The mechanism by which the change had been executed is in itself troublesome, as "it is hard to see how the voiced and voiceless stops could have behaved differently in a neutralized context" (Weiss 2009 loc. cit.). To circumvent this problem, several proposals have been put forth, treating the development as either a complex sound change or a product of analogy. Kortlandt devises an elegant and strikingly simple way out of this paradox (1989, 1999, quoted from Kortlandt 2007):

¹⁹ The absence of Winter's Law in OCS *to* 'that' and OPr. *sta* (I, III), *stae* (II) 'id.' is in non-glottalic approach attributed to word-final devoicing (Matasović 2005: 151; Olander 2010: 88¹⁰, 2015: 50).

The chronological antinomy is now resolved by the hypothesis that the unaspirated voiced obstruents were actually glottalic. It follows that the glottalic feature was preserved in the *t*-participle, where it yielded lengthening of the preceding vowel, while it was lost in voiced environments. The lengthening of the preceding vowel is strongly reminiscent of Winter's law in Baltic and Slavic [...] (Kortlandt 1989, in 2007: 87).

An effort has later been made by Jasanoff (2004) to reconcile the phonological and the analogical explanation—two seemingly disparate approaches to Lachmann's Law, while he takes an outright dismissive stance on Kortlandt's glottalic interpretation of the Law (310f.¹⁰). Some points of Jasanoff's solution have been criticized by Sukač (2012: 30f.), Kroonen (2018: 144) and, finally, Kortlandt himself (2018: 71).

By parity of reasoning, the acute in such examples as Lith. INF *ėsti* 'eat', S, Cr. *jěsti* 'id.' < PIE **h₁edti-*, Lith. *skýstas* 3 'thin (of liquids)', S, Cr. *čĭst* 'clean, pure' < PIE **(s)kidtó-* could not be deemed the immediate result of Winter's Law if the Law is defined as "the BSl. lengthening of short vowels before voiced stops" (Jasanoff 2017: 75), which forces one to assume a large-scale analogical extension (e.g. PIE **(s)kidtos* > PBSl. **(s)kistos*, with the acute taken from the thematic present, Lith. 3SG *skiedžia*, Latv. 1SG *šķiēžu*).²⁰ On the contrary, the Glottalic Theory has no difficulty in explaining the acute in such examples as phonemically regular: it is not the 'voicedness' of a stop which triggers Winter's Law, but its glottalic feature ('preglottalization'; cf. Kortlandt 2011: 161).²¹ In both cases, the more economical scenario of the process is the glottalic one (cf. Kroonen 2018: 145), which lends support to the idea that the acute of Lith. *ėsti*, *sėsti*, *skýstas*, S, Cr. *jěsti*, *s(j)ěsti*, *čĭst* is *lautgesetzlich*, not analogical.

Curiously enough, the ERHJ (620f.) derives Cr. *mjěsto* 'place' (< PSl. **město*, AP [a]) from the PIE participle **medto-* by the same token, as T. Pronk kindly informs me; note that no analogy should be possible here. Such a solution is tacitly preferred over the alternative transposition to **meith₂-* 'dwelling', as the latter precludes one from accounting for the acute of this Slavic substantive (op. cit. 621). An additional piece of evidence in favour of the advanced solution – albeit not a decisive one—may be provided by the existence of compounds with these exact pronominal stems elsewhere in Indo-European, cf. **h₁ei+to-* > PIlr. **aitá-* 'dieser (bekannte hier)' > Skt. *etá-*, Av. *aēta-*, OP *aita-*, **h₁es+to-* or **(h₁)is+to* > Plt. **esto-/isto-* (cf. 2.2) (LIPP II: 796). The difference between **id tod* and the quoted two parallels is that I assume that the former was a univerbation.²²

²⁰ As made clear to me by M. Villanueva Svensson, for which I owe him a great debt of gratitude.

²¹ But Kümmel 2012: 299, going for "stronger voicing of the plain voiced stops as against the former aspirates".

²² It may now be possible to return to Toporov's **isto-*, and still account for the word's acute. Since the full grade **h₁ei-* (Skt. NOM.SG.M *aídm* 'this' < **h₁ei-óm*) necessitates a word-initial **h₁* in order not to violate the PIE root structure constraint, the laryngeal would be expected in the zero-grade as

4 Conclusions

(1) PSŁ. **jīstb* is cognate with Latv. *īsts* and Lith. *iščias/yščias* (< **īst-jo-*), all going back PBSŁ. **iʔstos*, for which there turned out to be no convincing word-equations outside Balto-Slavic.

(2) Building on Toporov's 1958 semantic analysis and the one I conducted on my own (3.1), I assume that PBSŁ. **iʔst-* (> PSŁ. **jīstb*, Latv. *īsts*, Lith. *iščias/yščias*) should be separated from PBSŁ. **iʔšk-* (> PSŁ. **jīskra*, Lith. *yškus*), ablauting with **aiʔšk-* (> PSŁ. **ėsnb*, Lith. *aiškus*) (thus Endzelīns 1912: 120, 1922: 173, 1951: 240; implicitly Kuryłowicz 1952: 229; *pace* Būga 1922: 122; ME I: 838, Vasmer REW I: 491, Vaillant 1974: 677f., Kortlandt 1975: 56; Derksen 2008: 215, 2015: 206, 537; Pronk 2011: 315).

(3a) PBSŁ. **(a)iʔšk-*, by all odds, derives from PIE **h₂eidʰ-* 'kindle' (thus ĖSSJa VI: 51f., Derksen 2008: 153, 2015: 45; Pronk 2011: 315; *pace* Berneker SEW, Trautmann 1970: 4; Vaillant 1950: 181, Matasović 2008: 90, 2009: 118f.).

(3b) The root **h₂eidʰ-* did form a *-sk-*present in Balto-Slavic. Nevertheless, the acute in the daughter languages is not quite likely to stem from metatony (Derksen 2008, 2015, Matasović 2009: 119) or a secondary vřddhi-formation (Matasović loc. cit.), but rather from the "laryngeal metathesis" in the zero-grade (**ʔišk-* > **iʔšk-*), whose result has subsequently been extended to the full grade **aiʔšk-* (Pronk 2011: 315).

(4) The IE background of **iʔst-* (which notably exhibits no ablaut) has not received a satisfactory answer.

(4a) The original semantics of Slav. *(j)istb* (attested quite early in OCS, OPL, OCz, ORus. and OS) are identical to those of Lat. *ipse*, *is* or *idem*. The more abstract meanings, such as 'true', 'real, genuine', have come into being in West and East Slavic due mostly to the factors presented in 3.1. Latvian 'true' (that is, 'consistent with the concept', LLVV) is likewise derivable from 'the same' (as 'consistent with X').

(4b) I find it hard to see how a word that initially denoted 'is, ipse, idem' can derive from anything but a pronoun. It is suggested in this article that PBSŁ. **iʔsto* traces back to the post-PIE pronominal univerbation **idtod* (i.e. **iʔdtoʔd*)²³ 'the very'. The proposition takes care of the word's deictic-emphatic semantics and its acute.

well. Pre-PBSŁ. **h₁isto-* could be reflected as PBSŁ. **iʔsto-* by Pronk's glottalization provided that the initial stress were to be reconstructed. If my understanding of Wandl's account is not mistaken, he would expect PBSŁ. **iʔsto-* even from **Histó-* as Hirt's Law would be fed by the laryngeal metathesis. It is beyond my comprehension, however, whether the **h₁-* of **h₁ei-* was an integral part of the root or automatically inserted in a form beginning in a vowel, as O. Ligorio suggests to me (personal communication). It should be noted that some scholars have been hesitant to reconstruct **h₁* in the zero-grade (cf. de Vaan 2008: 310, with PIE **(h₁)i-*).

²³ To ward off any potential misunderstanding, I am henceforth going to use the symbol **ʔd* for the preglottalized dental stop.

(5) The root **īst-* has coalesced with **īšk-* in East Baltic, as noticeable in Latv. *īkst-*, a metathesized form of **īskt-*, which is a contamination of *īsk-* and *īst-* (Endzelīns 1912: 120, 1922: 173, 1951: 240). I assume that the synonymy relation between Lith. *iščias/yščias* and *aiškus* emerged as a part of the same process. Latv. *īsts* was unaffected by the merger and thus remains the sole 'pure' reflex of PBSl. **i?st-* in Baltic.

In sum, one arrives at the following chain of events: (1) **i?d to?d* (collocation) > (2) **i?dto?d* (univerbation) > (3) **i?dsto?d* (**s*-insertion in a cluster involving two dental stops) > (4) **i?dsto* (loss of the word-final dental stop) > (5) **i?tsto* (Winter's Law: the PIE preglottalized stop **?d* dissolves into **?* [the laryngeal component] and **t* [the buccal component]) > (6) **i?sto* (**tst* > **st*) > (7) the morpheme boundary had thus been blurred in PBSl. **i?sto*, which came to be recognized as a neuter adjective form, leading to the creation of a new paradigm (NOM.SG.M **i?stos*, GEN.SG.M/N **i?stō*, NOM.SG.F **i?sta?*, GEN.SG.F **i?stās* and so forth). The univerbation (2) must be ordered before the loss of final dental stops (4), otherwise we would have PBSl. **ito*.²⁴

Two main bones of contention among the scholars who have investigated the origin of PSl. **jīstb* have long been the word's semantics and its formation. It was not until Derksen 2008 that the accent of PSl. **jīstb* came to the forefront. Both of the previous explanations of the acute in **jīstb* and Latv. *īsts* (Derksen 2008, 2015, Pronk 2011) rest on Būga's connection with Lith. *aiškus*, which cares very little about the word's actual semantics and its original formation. I believe that the solution outlined in 3.2 (**īdtod*, i.e. **i?dto?d* > PBSl. **i?sto*) enables us to neatly tie up those loose ends, aware at the same time of its dependence on a particular framework – the Glottalic Theory, which has, admittedly, never come to be the prevailing view in the field, notwithstanding the increasing comparative evidence supporting the Theory (cf. Kortlandt 2018: 71f.).

Postscript

Just a week before my talk in Ljubljana, I came across the entry *istny* in Boryś (2008: 200), in which the author is open to the possibility that Slavic **jbstb* might derive from (what he reconstructs as) **id-to-* (**īd* [sic] is also mentioned by Snoj [2016, s.v. *īsti*]). The idea sketched in this article has been developed independently of Boryś's guess – partially as a response to traditional negligence of the accentual side of the problem and partially to provide an alternative view to Būga's connection with Lith. *aiškus*, which I believe to be assailable on multiple levels. Above all, Boryś does not seem to be aware that the **d* of **id-to-* resolves the problem of the acute, nor does he adduce any evidence to substantiate his assumption any further.

²⁴ I am grateful to F. Kortlandt for drawing my attention to this detail.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B, Revised and Greatly Enlarged. Volume 1.* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10.1). Amsterdam – New York.
- Adams, Douglas Q. / Mallory, James P. 2006: *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World.* Oxford.
- Blank, Andreas. 1999: Why do New Meanings Occur? A Cognitive Typology of the Motivations for Lexical Semantic Change. In: Blank, Andreas / Koch, Peter (eds.): *Historical Semantics and Cognition.* (Cognitive linguistics research 13). Berlin – New York: 61–89.
- Boryś, Wiesław. 2008²: *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego.* Kraków.
- Brandt, Roman. 1889: Dopolniteľnyja zaměčanja k razboru etimologičeskago slovarja Miklošiča. *Russkij filologičeskij vėstnik* 22: 112–144.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1906: *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Kurzgefasste Darstellung der Geschichte des Altindischen, Altiranischen (Avestischen und Altpersischen), Altarmenischen, Altgriechischen, Albanesischen, Lateinischen, Oskisch-Umbrischen, Altirischen, Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, Litauischen und Altkirchenslavischen: Vergleichende Laut-, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre der indogermanischen Sprachen. Erster Teil: Allgemeines. Zusammensetzung (Komposita). Nominalstämme.* Strassburg.
- Buck, Carl D. 1949: *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages.* Chicago – London.
- Buga, Kazimir. 1913: Slavjano-baltijskija etimologii. *Russkij filologičeskij vėstnik* 70: 248–256.
- Būga, Kazimieras. 1922: *Kalba ir senovė.* Kaunas.
- Cheung, Johnny. 2007: *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb.* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 2). Leiden – Boston.
- Daničić, Đuro. 1863–64: *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih.* Beograd.
- Derksen, Rick H. 1996: *Metatony in Baltic.* (Leiden studies in Indo-European 6). Amsterdam – Atlanta.
- Derksen, Rick H. 2003: Slavic *jъ-. In: Schaeken, Jos / Houtzagers, Peter / Kalsbeek, Janneke (eds.): *Dutch Contributions to the Thirteenth International Conference of Slavists, Ljubjana, August 15–21.* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 30). Amsterdam – New York: 97–105.
- Derksen, Rick H. 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon.* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 4). Leiden – Boston.
- Derksen, Rick H. 2015: *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon.* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 13). Leiden – Boston.
- Dybo, Vladimir A. 1981: *Slavjanskaja akcentologija. Opyt rekonstrukcii sistemy akcentnykh paradigm v praslavjanskom.* (Studia philologica). Moscow.
- Ėndzelin, Ian. 1912: О «vstavочныхъ» k i g въ baltijskixъ языкахъ. *Izvēstija Otdělenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk* 17(4): 110–126.
- Endzelins, Jānis. 1922: *Lettische Grammatik.* Rīga.
- Endzelins, Jānis. 1951: *Latviešu valodas gramatika.* Rīga.
- ERHJ = Matasović, Ranko (ed.). 2016: *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika.* 1. svezak: A–Nj. Autori: Ranko Matasović, Tijmen Pronk, Dubravka Ivšić, Dunja Brozović Rončević. Zagreb.
- ERHSJ = Skok, Petar. 1971–74: *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika.* Zagreb.
- ĖSBM = Martynou, V.U. (ed.). 1978–: *Ėtymalahičny sloŭnik belaruskaj movy.* Minsk.
- ESJS = Havlová, Eva et al.: *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského.* Fasz. 1–14, Praha 1989–2008, Fasz. 15–19, Brno 2010–2018.
- ĖSRJa = Preobraženskij, Aleksandr G. 1910–49: *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka.* Moscow.
- ESSJ = Bezlaj, France / Snoj, Marko / Furlan, Metka / Klemenčič, Simona. 1976–2007: *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika* I (1976): A–J (France Bezlaj), II (1982): K–O (France Bezlaj / Marko Snoj), III: P–S (France Bezlaj / Marko Snoj / Metka Furlan), IV (2005): Š–Ž (France Bezlaj / Marko Snoj / Metka Furlan), V (2007): *Kazala* (Marko Snoj, Simona Klemenčič). Ljubljana.

- ĖSSJa = Trubačev, Oleg N. (ed.). 1974–: *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*. Moscow.
- ESUM = Meľničuk, Oleksandr S. (ed.). 1982–: *Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukraïnskoï movy*. Kyïv.
- EWaia = Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986–2001: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. I: A–D, Heidelberg [1986–]1992. II: N–H, Heidelberg [1992–]1996. III: *Die jüngere Sprache*. [1996–] 2001. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Zweite Reihe: Wörterbücher). Heidelberg.
- Geitler, Leopold. 1876: O slovanských kmenech na U. *Listy Filologické a Paedagogické* 3(1): 1–86.
- Gluhak, Alemko. 1993: *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. (Biblioteka Vocabula). Zagreb.
- Gorbachov, Yaroslav V. 2014: The Origin of the Baltic Inchoative in *-sta-*. An Overlooked Proto-Baltic Sound Law. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119: 21–53.
- Haðarson, Jón A. 1993: *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelaorist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 74). Innsbruck.
- HEW = Schuster-Šewc, Heinz. 1978–89: *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*. Bautzen.
- ĖSSSRJa = Černyx, Pavel Ja. 1999³: *Istoriko-ėtimologičeskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*. Moscow.
- IEW = Pokorny, Julius. 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I–II. Bern – München.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2004: Plus ça change... Lachmann's law in Latin. In: Penney, John H. W. (ed.): *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford: 405–416.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2017: *The Prehistory of the Balto-Slavic Accent*. (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 17). Leiden – Boston.
- Karulis, Konstantīns. 1992: *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. Rīga.
- KEWai = Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956–80: *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Zweite Reihe: Wörterbücher). Heidelberg.
- Koneski, Blaže. 1983: *A Historical Phonology of the Macedonian Language*. (Historical phonology of the Slavic languages 12). Heidelberg.
- Kortlandt, Frederik H.H. 1975: *Slavic Accentuation: A Study in Relative Chronology*. (PdR Press publications in Slavic accentuation 1). Lisse.
- Kortlandt, Frederik H.H. 1977: Initial *u in Baltic and Slavic. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 91(1): 37–40.
- Kortlandt, Frederik H.H. 1984–85: On Reduced Vowels in Slavic. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* XXVII–XXVIII: 367–368. (Reprinted in Kortlandt 2011: 177–178.)
- Kortlandt, Frederik H.H. 1989: Lachmann's Law. In: Vennemann, Theo (ed.): *The New Sound of Indo-European: Essays in Phonological Reconstruction*. 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics held September 9 - 13, 1985, at the University of Pavia. (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs 41). Berlin – New York: 103–105. (Reprinted in Kortlandt 2007: 87–89.)
- Kortlandt, Frederik H. H. 1999: Lachmann's Law Again. In: Polomé, Edgar C. / Justus, Carol F. (eds.): *Language Change and Typological Variation: In Honor of Winfred P. Lehmann on the Occasion of His 83rd Birthday*, vol. I: *Language Change and Phonology*. (Journal of Indo-European Studies. Monograph 30). Washington: 246–248. (Reprinted in Kortlandt 2007: 121–123.)
- Kortlandt, Frederik H. H. 2007: *Italo-Celtic Origins and Prehistoric Development of the Irish Language*. (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 14). Amsterdam – New York.
- Kortlandt, Frederik H. H. 2011: *Selected Writings on Slavic and General Linguistics*. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 39). Amsterdam – New York.
- Kortlandt, Frederik H. H. 2013: Balto-Slavic Personal Pronouns and Their Accentuation. *Baltistica* 48/1: 5–11.
- Kortlandt, Frederik H. H. 2018: Balto-Slavic Acute. *Baltistica* 53(1): 69–77.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2013: *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 11). Leiden – Boston.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2018: Lachmann's Law, Thurneysen's Law, and a New Explanation of the PIE *no-* Participles. In: van Beek, Lucien / Kloekhorst, Alwin / Kroonen, Guus / Peyrot, Michaël / Pronk, Tijmen / de Vaan, Michiel (eds.): *FARNAH. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*. Ann Arbor – New York: 143–152.

- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1952: *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes*. (Prace Komisji językowej 37). Kraków.
- Kümmel, Martin J. 1996: *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen*. (Historische Sprachforschung. Ergänzungsheft 39). Göttingen.
- Kümmel, Martin J. 2012: Typology and Reconstruction: The Consonants and Vowels of Proto-Indo-European. Nielsen Whitehead, Benedicte / Olander, Thomas / Olsen, Birgit Anette / Rasmussen, Jens E. (eds.): *The Sound of Indo-European: Phonetics, Phonemics, and Morphophonemics*. (Copenhagen studies in Indo-European 4). Copenhagen: 291–329.
- LIPP = Dunkel, George E. 2014: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. I–II. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Zweite Reihe: Wörterbücher). Heidelberg.
- LIV² = Rix, Helmut. 2001: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Unter der Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden.
- LKZ^e = Naktinienė, Getrūda (red.). 2005: *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, 1–20 (1941–2002): elektroninis variantas. Vilnius. <<http://www.lkz.lt/>>
- LLVV = 1972–96: *Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca*. Rīga.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 2001: Reflexes of Proto-Indo-European *sk in Indo-Iranian. *Incontri linguistici* 24: 25–57.
- Machek, Václav. 1930: *Studie o tvoření výrazů expresivních*. (Práce z Vědeckých Ústavů 27). Praha.
- Machek, Václav. 1968²: *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2005: Toward a Relative Chronology of the Earliest Balto-Slavic Sound Changes. *Baltistica* 40(2): 147–157.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2008: *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. (Matica hrvatska. Biblioteka THEORIA / ΘΕΩΡΙΑ. Novi niz). Zagreb.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2009: *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 9). Leiden – Boston.
- ME = Mīlenbachs, Kārlis / Endzelīns, Jānis. 1923–32: *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca*. Rīga.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1894: De quelques difficultés de la théorie des gutturales indo-européennes. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 8: 277–304.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1906: Les alternances vocaliques en vieux slave. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 14: 332–390.
- Miklosich, Franz. 1858: *Monumenta serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*. (Editiones monumentorum Slavicorum veteris dialecti). Viennae.
- Miklosich, Franz. 1886: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*. Wien.
- Olander, Thomas. 2010: Proto-Indo-European Final Nasals in Slavic. *Scando-Slavica* 56/1: 84–98.
- Olander, Thomas. 2015: *Proto-Slavic Inflectional Morphology. A Comparative Handbook*. (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 14). Leiden – Boston.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette. 1999: *The Noun in Biblical Armenian. Origin and Word Formation – with special emphasis on the Indo-European heritage*. (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs 119). Berlin – New York.
- Maks, Pleteršnik / Furlan, Metka (ed.). 2006: *Slovensko-nemški slovar. Transliterirana izdaja*. (Zbirka Slovarji). Ljubljana. Online-Ausgabe (2014): <http://www.fran.si/136/maks-pletersnik-slovensko-nemski-slovar>.
- Pronk, Tijmen C. 2011: On the Development of Initial *Hu, *Hi and the Rise of Initial Acute Diphthongs in Baltic and Slavic. In: Pronk, Tijmen / Derksen, Rick (eds.): *Accent Matters: Papers on Balto-Slavic Accentology*. (Studies in Slavic and general linguistics 37). Amsterdam: 309–321.
- Pronk, Tijmen C. 2018: Old Church Slavonic (*jutro*, Vedic *uśár-* 'daybreak, morning'. In: van Beek, Lucien / Kloekhorst, Alwin / Kroonen, Guus / Peyrot, Michaël / Pronk, Tijmen / de Vaan, Michiel (eds.): *FARNAH. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*. Ann Arbor – New York: 298–306.

- REW = Vasmer, Max. 1953–58: *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Zweite Reihe: Wörterbücher). Heidelberg.
- RSA = 1959–: *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika*. Beograd.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1991: *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. (Leiden studies in Indo-European 2). Amsterdam – Atlanta.
- Seebold, Elmar. 1970: *Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen starken Verben*. (Janua Linguarum. Series Practica 85). The Hague – Paris.
- SEW = Berneker, Erich. 1908–13: *Slawisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Erster Band: A–L. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Abteilung 1: Sammlung indogermanischer Lehr- und Handbücher. Zweite Reihe: Wörterbücher 2. Sammlung slavischer Lehr- und Handbücher. Zweite Reihe: Wörterbücher 1). Heidelberg.
- SGK = Sychta, Bernard. 1967–76: *Słownik gwar kaszubskich na tle kultury ludowej*. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków.
- SGP = Karłowicz, Jan. 1900–11: *Słownik gwar polskich*. Kraków.
- Snoj, Marko. 2016³: *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Tretja izdaja. (Zbirka Slovarji). Ljubljana. Online edition (2015): <https://fran.si/193/marko-snoj-slovenski-etimoloski-slovar>.
- Sobolevskij, Aleksej I. 1891: *Drevnij cerkovno-slavjanskij jazyk. Fonetika*. Moscow.
- Sobolevskij, Aleksej I. 1914: Nėscofko zamětoko po slavjanskim vokalizmu i leksikě. *Russkij filologičeskij vėstnik* 71: 431–449.
- Sreznevskij, Izmail I. 1893–1903: *Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkago jazyka po pis'mennym pamjatnikam*. Sanktpeterburg.
- SS = Cejtin, Rajla M. et al. (eds.). 1994: *Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X–XI vekov)*. Moscow.
- SSČ = Gebauer, Jan. 1970²: *Slovník staročeský*. Praha. <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx>
- SSK² = 2014: *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Druga, dopolnjena in deloma prenovljena izdaja. I–II. Ljubljana.
- SSP = Urbańczyk, Stanisław (red.). 1953–2002: *Słownik staropolski*. Warszawa – Kraków.
- Stang, Christian S. 1949: L'adjectif slave *istъ*. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* XV: 343–351.
- Stang, Chr. S. 1966: *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. (Scandinavian University Books). Oslo – Bergen – Tromsø.
- Stang, Christian S. 1970: *Opuscula linguistica. Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*. Oslo.
- Sukač, Roman. 2012: Lachmann's Law (Part 1). *Linguistica Brunensia* 60(1–2): 13–36.
- SW = Lorentz, Friedrich. 1908–12: *Slovintzisches Wörterbuch*. I–II. St. Petersburg.
- Toporov, Vladimir N. 1958: Ètimologičeskie zametki (slavjano-italijskie paralleli). *Kratkie soobščeniia Instituta slavjanovedeniia* 25: 74–88.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. / Dasher, Richard B. 2002: *Regularity in Semantic Change*. (Cambridge studies in linguistics 97). Cambridge.
- Trautmann, Reinhold. 1970²: *Baltisch-Slavisches Wörterbuch*. 2., unveränderte Auflage. Göttingen.
- Untermann, Jürgen. 2000: *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher. Handbuch der italischen Dialekte 3). Heidelberg.
- de Vaan, Michiel C. 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and Other Italic Languages*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 7). Leiden – Boston.
- Vaillant, André. 1931: Les deux -i de l'alphabet vieux-slave et du slave commun. *Revue des études slaves* 11(3–4): 171–186.
- Vaillant, André. 1950: *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome I: Phonétique*. (Collection les langues du monde. Série grammaire, philologie, littérature 6). Lyon.
- Vaillant, André. 1974: *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome IV: La formation des noms*. (Collection les langues du monde. Série grammaire, philologie, littérature). Paris.
- Villanueva Svensson, Miguel K. 2009: Indo-European **sk* in Balto-Slavic. *Baltistica* 44(1): 5–24.
- Villanueva Svensson, Miguel K. 2010: Baltic *sta*-Presents and the Indo-European Desiderative. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115: 204–233.

- Wandl, Florian. 2019: On the Slavic Word for 'Morning': **(j)u(s)tro*. *Scando-Slavica* 65(2): 263–281.
- Weiss, Michael L. 2009: *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor – New York.
- Young, Steven R. 2006: Laryngeal metathesis in initial position in Balto-Slavic. In: Aronson, Howard I. et al. (eds.): *The Bill Question: Contributions to the Study of Linguistics and Languages in Honor of Bill J. Darden on the Occasion of his sixty-sixth Birthday*. Bloomington, Ind.: 229–235.
- Zubaty, Josef. 1918: Jistý. *Naše řeč* 2(8): 230–232.