

The prehistory of *kláusti*, *klausýti*, and their related forms revisited

Yoko Yamazaki

Department for Slavic and Baltic Studies, Finnish, Dutch and German, Stockholm University
Email: yoko.yamazaki@balt.su.se
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0209-9599>

Abstract. The Baltic verbs, Lith. *kláusti* ‘to ask questions’, *klausýti* ‘to listen’, Latv. *kláust* ‘to ask questions’ and *kláusīt / kláusīt* ‘to listen’ exhibit intriguing morphological and accentological distributions. For a long time, this has interested linguists as shown by numerous previous studies starting with Schulze (1904). Despite several proposals put forward so far, researchers have not yet agreed on a historical interpretation of the acute tone of Lith. *kláusti*, or on the historical relationship of *kláusti* to its cognates not only in Balto-Slavic but also in Indo-European languages. In this paper, all the relevant data and hypotheses available to the current author will be examined again, and a more probable historical interpretation will be sought.

Keywords: Balto-Slavic historical morphology, Indo-European desideratives, iteratives, Baltic transitive *ia*-presents, Baltic intransitive inchoatives.

Dar kartą apie *kláusti*, *klausýti* ir jiems gimininių formų priešistorę

Santrauka. Baltų kalbų veiksmažodžiai, liet. *kláusti*, *klausýti*, latv. *kláust* ir *kláusīt / kláusīt* pasižymi įdomiais morfologiniais ir akcentologiniais požymiais. Ilgą laiką tai domino kalbininkus, kaip rodo daugybė ankstesnių tyrimų, pradedant Schulze (1904). Nepaisant keleto iki šiol pateiktų pasiūlymų, tyrėjai dar nesutarė dėl istorinės *kláusti* akūtinio kirčiavimo interpretacijos ar dėl veiksmažodžio *kláusti* santykio su gimininiais žodžiais ne tik baltų slavų, bet ir indoeuropiečių kalbose. Šiame straipsnyje bus dar kartą išnagrinėti visi auterei prieinami svarbūs duomenys ir hipotezės bei ieškoma labiau tikėtino istorinio aiškinimo.

Raktažodžiai: Baltų ir slavų kalbų istorinė morfologija, indoeuropiečių desideratyvai, iteratyvai, baltų tranzityvinės *ia*-kamieno esamojo laiko formos, baltų intranzityviniai inchoatyvai.

1. The problems surrounding Lith. *kláusti* ‘to ask questions’, *klausýti* ‘to hear’ and their cognates

Lith. *kláusti* ‘to ask questions’, *klausýti* ‘to hear’ and their corresponding words in Baltic (Latv. *kláust*, *-šus*; *kláusīt / kláusīt*, *-u*, OPru. *klausiton* ‘to listen’) are well-known cognates of the Indo-European verbs for ‘to hear, listen’. They are exemplified by Skt. $\sqrt{\text{śru-}}$ ‘to hear’, pres. (V) *śrṇóti*, $\sqrt{\text{śruṣ-}}$, pres.-inj. 3pl. *śróṣan* (I. *śróṣati*) ‘to listen, obey’; Gk. root-

Received: 15/09/2022. Accepted: 27/12/2022

Copyright © 2022 Yoko Yamazaki. Published by Vilnius University Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence (CC BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

aor. impr. 2pl. κλῦτε ‘hear!’, OCS *slušati*, *-ajō* (variant *slъšati*), Ru. *slúšat’*, SCr. *slūšati* < PS **slūšati* (AP a), *-ajō* ‘to listen’, among others. The rich attestation of the cognates (cf. EWAía II 672, LIV² 334–336, LEW 265–266, Kroonen 2013, 232), however, presents a complicated picture, as suggested by the reconstruction of two similar verbal roots by LIV², i.e., **kleu-* ‘to hear’ and **kleus-* ‘to hear / listen (to)’. It appears that the complexity can be sorted out according to the following two parameters:

- i) with or without the (root-) final laryngeal;
- ii) with or without the stem-final **-s*.

Surely, the tonal contrast between the acute tone (Lith. *kláusti* ‘to ask questions’, Latv. (variant) *klaūsīt*, *-u* ‘to hear’) and the circumflex tone (Lith. *klausýti klauso*, Latv. *klàusīt -u* ‘to hear’, *klàust*, *-šu* ‘to ask questions’) constitutes a part of the complexity surrounding the verbal root **kleu-* ‘to hear’ or **kleus-* ‘to hear / listen (to)’. This tonal contrast of the Baltic forms has interested historical linguists for a long time, and several solutions have been proposed. In what follows, those proposals will be examined in a broader context of the variations that the Indo-European cognates exhibit. First, we will look into the variations observed among the cognates according to the aforementioned two parameters.

2. The variations of the cognates

As anticipated in § 1 above, the cognates exhibit variations. There may be various possible ways to sort those variations, but as a starting point of our discussion in this paper, we will attempt to sort them depending on the two parameters mentioned above, i.e., i) whether they have the root-final laryngeal; and ii) whether they have the stem-final **-s*. The resulting classification is the following three groups:

- 1) Aniṭ **kleu-* ‘to hear’ [without laryngeal, without **-s*]
 - Skt. $\sqrt{śru}$ - ‘to hear’, pres. (V) *śṛṇóti*, root-aor. *ásrot*, fut. *śroṣyāmi*, *śroṣyāti* (B+), causative *śraváyati*, *śrāváyati* (< **klo.u-e.ye/o-*, note Brugmann’s Law).
 - Gk. pres. act. κλέω ‘to celebrate’ / mid. κλέομαι < **kleu-e-(tor)* (Vine 1998, 76), root-aor. impr. 2pl. κλῦτε ‘hear!’ with the replacement of older **-eu-* with **-ū-*, cf. the older **kléutē* with the root vocalism of **-eu-* as attested in Ved. *śrótiā* (cf. LIV² 334³).
 - Activized medio-passives: OCS *sluti*, *slovō* ‘to be considered as, to be called’ < **kleu-e/o-(tor)* (cf. Vine 1998, 76); Latv. *sluvēt*, *sluv* ‘to be known’ (possibly the original medio-passive inflexion shifted to the stative class in **-ē-* common in Balto-Slavic, cf. LIV² 335⁶).
 - Stative formations in **-ē-*: Av. *sruiiē* ‘is famous’, Lat. *clueō*, *-ēre* ‘to be called, regarded as’.
- 2) Aniṭ **kleus-* ‘to listen’ [without laryngeal, with **-s*]
 - Iterative: Lith. *klausýti*, *klaūso*, *klaūsė*, Latv. *klàusīt* / *klaūsīt*, *-u* ‘to listen’ < PIE **klous-eye/o-*¹

¹ The perfective form of Latv. *klausīt* ‘to hear’, i.e. Latv. *izklausīt*, *izklausu*, *izklausīju*, means ‘to inquire’.

- Inchoative: Lith. *pa-klūsti*, *-klūsta* / *-klūša*, *-klūso*, Latv. *klust*, *-stu* ‘to obey’; OPru. *poklusman* ‘obedient’
 - Stative: Lith. *klusėti*, *klūsi*, Latv. *klusēt*, *-u* ‘to be obedient’ as if from **klus-eh₁-*, pres. **klus-i-* (the semantics may speak for its derivation from the inchoative Lith. *pa-klūsti* ‘to obey’, Latv. *klust* ‘to become silent’)
 - OCS *slušati*, *-ajō* (variant *sl̥šati*), Ru. *slúšat*’, SCr. *slūšati* < PS **slūšati* (AP a), *-ajō* ‘to listen’ < inf. **klous-eh₁-ti*, pres. **klous-eh₁-ye/o-*; it is possibly a denominative from the verbal noun *sluxъ* ‘Gehör, Ruf’ (< PS **slūxъ* ‘hearing, rumour’, cf. LIV² 336¹). Verbal nouns are also attested in Ved. *śruṣtī-* ‘listening, obedience (verbal noun)’, Ave. *s(ə)raoša-* ‘obedience’, ON *hlust* n. ‘Gehör’, OE *hlyst* (m./f.) ‘hearing’. As shown in the variant *sl̥šati*, the root vowel did not necessarily develop from a Proto-Slavic long vowel, and the acute *-ǔ-* in PS **slūšati*, which looks as though developed from a long vowel, might be analogically adopted from PS **sl̥šati* (AP a) ‘to hear’.
 - OPru. *klausiton*, pres. 1pl. *klausēmai*, VN *poklausijsnan*, impr. 2pl. *klausieiti* ‘to listen’ < inf. **klausēt*, pres. **klausē-*, corresponding to the Slavic inflexion exemplified by OCS *slušati*, *-ajō* (variant *sl̥šati*), according to Schmid 1963, 13ff.
 - OHG *hlosēn*, SwG. *lose* ‘to listen’ < PG **hlosēn-* < PIE **klus-eh₁-ye/o-* (Kroonen 2013: 232); Jasanoff (1987, 98) argues that the fact that OHG *hlosēn* ‘to listen’ belongs to the III-rd weak class may indicate that it “may have developed from an athematic present or perfect middle along the lines set forth in my *Stative and Middle in Indo-European*, ch. 3.”² In this case, OCS *sl̥šati* ‘to hear’, pres. *sl̥ši-* belongs to the same stative class, although the Slavic form points to a root-final laryngeal.
 - OE *hlosnian*, *hlysnan* < PGmc. **hlos-ni/a-* ‘to listen’ < Northern IE **klu-n-s-e/o-* (Villanueva Svensson 2014, 245²³, Gorbachov 2007, 88f.)
 - Skt. *√sruṣ-*, pres.-inj. 3pl. *śróṣan*, impr. 3pl. *śróṣantu* (I. *śróṣati*), pres.-mid. ptpl. *śróṣamāna-* ‘to listen, obey’ < PIE **kléus-e/o-*; also TochB 3sg. *klyauṣām*, mid. *klyauṣtār*, TochA *klyoṣtār* (thematic present) support a PIE present stem **kléus-e/o-*. However, they may not be descendants of the desiderative / future stem in **-s-*. Jasanoff (1987, 99) suggests that these forms are possibly derived from the IE subjunctives of the *s*-aorist, adducing a Vedic hapax *si*-imperative 2sg. *śróṣi* ‘hear!’, which was probably formed from the *s*-aorist subjunctive stem (also Narten 1964, 45–49). Therefore, it should be noted that some sigmatic variants are not related to the desiderative / future stem.
- 3) Set **kleuHs-* ‘to hear’ [with laryngeal, with **-s*]
- Skt. desiderative *śúsruṣate* formed to the root *√sru-* ‘to hear’.
 - OCS *sl̥šati* ‘to hear’, 1sg. *sl̥šō*, 2sg. *sl̥šiši* < PS **sl̥šati* (AP a), **sl̥ši-* < **slyxēti* < **klū-ṣ-* (Stang 1966, 92) < **kluHs-eh₁-ti*, **kluHs-?*; Jasanoff (1987,

² Jasanoff 1978: 56ff.

98ff.) and Klingenschmitt (2008, 206) treat this verb as one of the stative verbs in $*\bar{e}$ - (< $*eh_1$ -) with Narten ablaut $*kl̥eus$ - / $*kl̥eus$ -. This matter will be discussed below in § 3.

- Lith. *klàusti, klàusia, klàusė* ‘to ask, inquire (< $*want$ to hear)’ < as if $*kl̥ouHsye/o$ -, but the circumflex tone of Latv. *klàust, -šu* points to an anit̥ root / stem.

It may be noteworthy that there are no reflexes of set̥ root without $*-s$ ($**kl̥euH-$) attested. It has been suggested by previous studies (Schulze 1904, 1434–1442, Gotō 1987, 317, Jasanoff 2003, 132ff. among others) that the variants with $*-s$ have been introduced by the desiderative / future suffix $*(H)s-$. Furthermore, Jasanoff (2003, 134) argues that the laryngeal in the suffix must have been an $*-h_1$ -, which can be detected in Vedic desideratives and futures to roots endings in a resonant like *kariṣyánt-* ‘about to do’, *cikīrṣati* ‘desires to do’, Gk. *τενέω* ‘I will stretch’ (< $*-esō$ < $*-h_1s-e/o-$). In this view, the absence of laryngeal reflexes in the forms like Skt. *vakṣyánt-* ‘about to say’, Skt. *vivṛṣati* ‘desires to turn’ and Gk. *γράφω* ‘I will write’ is attributed to a laryngeal loss between obstruents already in PIE.

The absence of the set̥ variants without $*-s$ ($**kl̥euh_1-$) arguably strengthens this view. It indicates that the laryngeal could not have occurred alone without $*-s$ - in this extended root ($*kl̥eu-h_1s-$), being a part of the desiderative / future morpheme $*-h_1s-$, while $*-h_1$ - could be lost in specific environments through laryngeal loss rules. For example, the iterative stem $*kl̥ou-[h_1]s-eye/o-$ and the nominal stem $*kl̥ou[h_1]s-$ (> PS **slūx̥b* ‘hearing, rumour’), which served as the basis of the denominative $*kl̥ous-eh_1-ti$ (> PS **slūṣati* (AP a), *-aj̥ō* ‘to listen’), satisfy the structural description of a laryngeal loss rule called “the Saussure Effect”.³ In this way, it is easily understandable that the anit̥ variants with $*-s$ (i.e., $*kl̥eus-$) could be introduced in the proto language, while a set̥ variant without $*-s$ ($**kl̥euh_1-$) could have much fewer chances to occur.

3. Previous proposals on the prehistory of Lith. *klàusti* ‘to ask questions’ and *klausyti* ‘to hear’

Schulze (1904, 1434ff.) was one of the people in the early era of Indo-European studies, among others⁴, who were aware of the historical relationship between the Indic future in *-sya-* and the desiderative. Schulze noted the Sanskrit data attesting the shortening (or the loss of *-i-*) in the future forms formed to monosyllabic roots ending in resonants, e.g., *manīsyá-* ‘will think’ → 3sg. *maṃsyáte* to $\sqrt{man-}$; *staviṣya-* ‘will praise’ (1sg. *staviṣyámi*) → *stoṣya-* (3sg. *stoṣyáti*) to $\sqrt{stu-}$. This indicates that these future forms, although configured to what we now call “anit̥ roots”, behaved earlier as though formed to set̥ roots. Schulze saw a parallelism in the desiderative forms, which also behave as though they were formed to set̥ roots, even when they are actually formed to anit̥ roots. Compare

³ The laryngeal loss rule was originally described in Saussure (1905, 511ff.). It has been examined in numerous studies including Rasmussen (1989) for Balto-Slavic, Nussbaum (1997) for Latin and Italic, Yamazaki (2009) for Lithuanian and Baltic, Pronk (2011) for IE branches other than Greek, and van Beek (2011) for Greek.

⁴ An earlier mention to their relationship is found, for example, in Delbrück (1874, 184).

the lengthening of the root vowel in desiderative *śúśrūṣate* to *aniṭ* $\sqrt{śru}$ - ‘to hear’ and desiderative *búbūṣate* to *seṭ* $\sqrt{bhū}$ ‘to be’.⁵ This confirmed for him the close relationship between the future and the desiderative. He further suggested that in the same fashion that *maniṣyá-* ‘will think’ was shortened to 3sg. *mamṣyáte*, the future 1sg. *śroṣyāmi* to $\sqrt{śru}$ - ‘to hear’ must also have been a result of the loss of *-i-* in an earlier **śraviṣyāmi*. Schulze equated this reconstructed future **śraviṣyāmi* with Lith. *kláusiu* ‘I ask questions’ (**kleuəs-*). On the other hand, Schulze analysed the circumflexed Lith. *klaus-ai* ‘I listen’ to be formed to the root **kleus-* (*aniṭ* and sigmatic), equating it with Skt. $\sqrt{śruṣ}$ - (*śróṣamāna-*, *śruṣṭi-*) and Gmc. **hlus-* (OS *hlust*, OE *hlyst*, OHG *hlosēn*, OE *hlosnian*). Schulze left the historical origin of the *aniṭ* sigmatic variant unexplained. However, as discussed above (§ 2), it could be introduced through the operation of a laryngeal loss rule in a relevant stem or some reflexes of it (i.e., Skt. *śroṣi* ‘hear!’, TochB 3sg. *klyauṣām*, mid. *klyauṣtār*, TochA *klyoṣtār*) had a totally different origin, i.e., the *s*-aorist subjunctive (see above for the discussions of Narten 1964 and Jasanoff 1987). Nonetheless, of course, except for these Indo-Iranian and Tocharian forms whose origin has been suggested to be another, the desiderative reading of the extended root **kleu-(h₁)s-* seems to have been generally accepted, as can be seen in LEW 265, EWAia II 672, García-Ramón (1994, 58–59), Derksen (1996, 312) among others.

Schmid (1962) agrees with Schulze that *kláusti* originated from a desiderative formation with the suffix *-s-*. He believes that the circumflex tone of the root vowel *-ai-* (cf. 3sg./pl. *klaūso* ‘to listen’) should be regular in Baltic *ia*-presents (< IE **ye/o*-presents), and therefore the acute tone of *kláusti*, *-ia* ‘to ask questions’ cannot be a regular phonological outcome. His investigation starts from the Baltic root **klaus-*, whose meaning ‘to hear’ is attested in all the Baltic languages. An original *ia*-present paradigm, i.e., inf. **klaūsti*, pres. 1sg. **klausiu*, 3sg./pl. **klaūsia* ‘to ask questions’, is reconstructed for Proto-Baltic, which would have a preterit 3sg./pl. **klaūsē* ‘asked questions’ homonymic with the preterit of *klausýti* ‘to listen’. Thus, Schmid proposed that the acute tone was introduced to **klaūsti* **klaūsia*, **klaūsē* ‘to ask questions’ in order to differentiate it from **klaūsyti*, **klaūsia*, **klaūsē* ‘to listen’.

A similar line of approach is presented by Otrębski (1963). His proposal is a paradigm split. Otrębski assumes that Proto-Baltic inherited one single paradigm, i.e., inf. **klaūsīti*, pres. 3sg./pl. **klaūsi* ‘to listen’ with the circumflex tone, from which two new paradigms split out. One of them is inf. **klausīti*, pres. **klaūsā* ‘to listen’ with the circumflex tone and new iterative present stem in **-ā-*, and the other is inf. **klaūsti*, pres. **klaūšja* with the new infinitive stem and the new meaning ‘to ask questions’. The new infinitive stem received the secondary acute tone, which spread to the whole paradigm of the verb for ‘to ask questions’ in Lithuanian (inf. *kláusti*, pres. *kláusia*), while the circumflex tone has been maintained in Latvian (*klàust*, *klàušu* ‘to ask questions’). This implies that this paradigm split process was in East Baltic.

⁵ This phenomenon is later accounted for by Jasanoff (2003, 134), as will be mentioned below.

However, not everyone was convinced by those proposals above. Bammesberger (1991) casts a spotlight on a class of *ya*-present verbs with the acute *-áu-* root vocalism: e.g., *láužti, láužia, láužė* ‘to break’ (IE **leug-*⁶) *láukti, láukia, láuké* ‘to wait’ (IE **leuk-* ‘to shine’), where circumflex *-aũ-* might be expected. In order to account for the acute tone certainly unexpected for at least some of them, a denominative derivation is proposed: a *vṛddhi* formation of **klaũsa-* ‘hearing’ → **kláus-a-* ‘interrogating’, to which a verbal stem **kláusia-* ‘to ask questions’ was formed. Lith. *klausà* (acc. sg. *klaũsq*) ‘ability to hear’ attests the non-acute nominal stem **klaũsa-* ‘hearing’ < IE **klou-s-*. Therefore, at least the basis for a *vṛddhi* formation **klóu-s-o-* existed in Baltic. Likewise, for *láukti*, a nominal stem **láuikas* ‘*what belongs to the field, a guard, watch’ (< **lóuk-o-*), a *vṛddhi* formation of **louk-o-* (> Lith. *laũkas* ‘field’) is postulated. However, the semantics of the proposed *vṛddhi* does not seem to be supported by the acute variant Latv. *laũks* ‘field’. Semantically, it would be more attractive to derive it from a causative-iterative **láukyti* (> OPru. *laukīt* ‘look for’), with a metatonical acute root since *métatonie rude* often takes place in causative-iteratives (Derksen 1996, 310ff.). Nonetheless, even Bammesberger’s (1991) proposal has not convinced everyone. Smoczyński (2001, 159–160) finds Bammesberger’s (1991) proposal unconvincing because of the absence of attested parallel developments. Ostrowski (2001, 181) presents his scepticism to the proposal, stating that the type of nominal derivation advanced by Bammesberger (1991) for the adduced verbs, including for **kléu-s-*, does not seem to be well established and, therefore, this solution does not seem fully convincing.

As an alternative to Bammesberger’s approach, Smoczyński (2001, 159–160) proposed that the secondary acute tone of *kláusti, kláusia* could have resulted from a syncope of **-i-* in its preform **klaũsija* (< **klous-eye/o-*). The syncope could cause the compensatory lengthening of the diphthong **-aũ-* in the root, and the resulting long diphthong received the acute tone as in *kláusia*. He adduces the acute tone of *ia*-present verbs occurring side by side with iteratives, e.g., *láužti, láužiu* ‘to break’ (~ iter. *láužyti*), *spáusti, spáudžiu* ‘to press’ (~ iter. *spáudyti*), as the parallel cases. Nevertheless, there seems to be a difference between the case of *kláusti, kláusia* and the case of *spáusti, spáudžiu*. While the present of both *spáusti* and *spáudyti* has the acute tone (*spáudžia* and *spáudo*, respectively), which allegedly is the result of the syncope in older **spaudija*, the present of *klausyti*, i.e., *klaũso* (← **klaũsija*), does not have the acute root.⁷ This probably means that factors other than the apocope of **-i-* cause the acute tone of *kláusti, kláusia*.

Jasanoff (1987, 98ff.) and Klingenschmitt (2008, 206), as noted earlier, take a completely different approach. Jasanoff (1987) holds the view that OCS *slyšati* ‘to hear’, pres. *slyši-* (< PS **slyšati* (AP a), **slyši-* < **slyxēti* < **klū-š-*, cf. Stang 1966, 92) is one of the stative verbs in **-ē-* (< **-eh₁-*) with Narten ablaut **klēus-* / **kléus-*. Klingenschmitt (id.) further envisages a development of PIE **klēus-* / **kléus-* to PS pres. **slyši-* (< PBS 3pl. **šlūš-inti*) through an earlier **šl’auš-* / **šlūš-*. Since the Narten ablaut pattern of this ver-

⁶ The acute tone can also be due to Winter’s Law.

⁷ The acute tone of *spáusti* and *spáudyti* might be due to Winter’s Law (PIE **speud-* ‘to hurry’, cf. LIV² 581).

bal root is confirmed by Tocharian forms (A *klyoṣ-*, B *klyauṣ(ä)- / klyauṣe-* ‘to hear’ < PT **kl’aus’ä-* / **kl’ausa-* < **kléus-e/o-*), this is accepted as a possible scenario, for example, in Villanueva Svensson (2014, 244ff.). However, it would also be possible to assume a more straightforward (or direct) development from **kluHs-eh₁-ti*, **kluHs-* (through PBS 3pl. pres. *slūš-inti*) to PS **slýšati* (AP a), **slýši-*.

As reviewed so far, various solutions and views have been put forward regarding the etymological background of Lith. *kláusti* ‘to ask questions’ and *klausyti* ‘to hear’; however, researchers have not yet agreed on a convincing conclusion concerning the prehistory of these verbs and their related Baltic forms. At least two points seem to be generally accepted. The first point is Schulze’s (1904) insight that the sigmatic variants (Baltic **klaus-*, **kleus-*) originated from an IE desiderative / future formation (**kleu-h₁s-* ‘*want to hear’ > ‘listen [to]’). The second is that Lith. *klausyti* is an iterative formation, be it an inherited IE formation or a Baltic derivation. Nevertheless, researchers have not agreed on the prehistory of *kláusti* and *klausyti*.

4. Remaining questions

Through the quick review of the previous studies and the data (§§ 2, 3) emerge some questions remain from the previous studies. The most concerning question for the current author is whether PB **klaus-tēi*, pres. **klaus-ya-* underlying Lith. *kláusti* and Latv. *kláust* ‘to ask questions’ (as if < **klouh₁s-ye/o-*) can be directly equated with the Indic future (**kleuh₁s-ye/o-*). Alternatively, in other words, whether this formation is so old that it is a direct descendant of a Proto-Indo-European formation. Schulze (1904) is without a doubt correct in relating these sigmatic variants to the IE desiderative / future formations. However, if a PIE form **klouh₁s-ye/o-* existed, the laryngeal would have been lost by the Saussure effect and the acute accent of Lith. *kláusti* cannot be the regular outcome. The absence of the palatalisation of /l’/ also indicates that the vocalism of *kláusti* is not precisely that of **kleuh₁s-ye/o-* reconstructed for the Indic future (cf. Ostrowski 2001, 181). This may be relevant to the second question below.

Second, it is still not totally clear what sort of root vocalism and stem formation would be chosen in the individual desiderative / future formations in PIE. Jasanoff (2003, 135) suggests the possibility that the desiderative formations may correlate to their present formations; for instance, roots that made Narten-presents may have favoured Narten *s*-desideratives, while the roots that made reduplicated presents may have chosen reduplicated desideratives. Accordingly, at first glance, a desiderative stem **klouh₁s-ye/o-* appears to point to the existence of a present stem in **klou-ye/o-*. However, it is difficult to find any comparative support for the root **kleu-* forming such a present stem. It would rather be more reasonable to assume that the *o*-grade-like root vocalism of *kláusti* has a more recent (in other words, not as old as Proto-Indo-European) prehistory. One might think of the iterative **klouh₁s-eye/o-* as its source. In my view, Schmid (1962), Otrębski (1963) and Bammesberger (1991) correctly assumed that the acute tone of *kláusti* was secondarily introduced in one way or another.

The failure of sibilantisation of the initial **k̑-* is considered to be due to the dissimilation effect of the desiderative morpheme **-h₁s-* (see Stang 1966, 91–92). This, together with the Slavic cognates, indicates the antiquity of the desiderative stem **k̑leuh₁s-*, which was probably reinterpreted as a root for “to listen to” in Balto-Slavic or possibly even earlier. On the one hand, Lith. *klausyti* / Latv. *klāustīt* ‘to listen’ exhibits the regular outcome of the iterative **k̑lou[h₁]s-eye/o-*, and therefore, the second question is how the acute tone of *klāusti*, on the other hand, has been introduced in the prehistory of the Baltic branch.

5. Proposal

Turning our eyes to Slavic, we find the following verbal attestations:

- denominative: OCS *slušati*, *-ajō* (variant *slъšati*), Ru. *slúšat*’, SCr. *slūšati* < PS **slūšati* (AP a), *-ajō* ‘to listen’ < inf. **k̑l(o)u[h₁]s-eh₁-ti*, pres. **k̑l(o)u[h₁]s-eh₁-ye/o-*,
- possibly descendants of the ancient medio-passive: OCS *sluti*, *slovō* ‘to be called’ < PS **sluti*, **slōvō* ‘be called, be famed’ < **k̑leu-tei*, **k̑leu-e/o-tor*,
- stative: OCS *slyšati* ‘to hear’, 1sg. *slyšō*, 2sg. *slyšiši* < PS **slyšati* (AP a; < **slyxēti*), **slyši-* < PBS **s/klūsēti*, **s/klūsi-* < PIE **kléus-* / **kléus-* or **kluh₁s-*.

Out of these three, the stative paradigm provides the unambiguous reflex of the acute root, continuing either Narten type **kléus-* / **kléus-* or the laryngeal in **kluh₁s-*. However, the stative formation of this stem is not preserved in Baltic⁸, where one finds **girdētēi* (Lith. *girdėti*, Latv. *dzirdēt*, OPru. *kirdīt*, *kīrdimai* ‘to hear’), in place of **klūsētēi* (as if < **kluh₁s-eh₁-ti*). The reason remains unclear why this lexical replacement took place in Baltic. Nonetheless, it would be worthy to clarify how those words formed to the root **k̑leuh₁s-*, including how the stative PBS **s/klūsēti*, **s/klūsi-*, were treated in Baltic. The answer to the question as to how the acute tone of Lith. *klāusti* has been introduced in Baltic might reside in the Baltic treatments of the family of **k̑leuh₁s-*-based words.

As already envisaged (cf. Bammesberger 1991, Ostrowski 2001, 181), Lith. *klāusti* / Latv. *klāust* must certainly be a secondary formation based on an inherited verbal form. However, that does not mean that *klāusti* has to be directly derived from *klausyti* (**k̑lou[h₁]s-eye/o-*). In this paper, it is proposed that Lith. *klāusti* / Latv. *klāust* could be a transitive-terminative formation based on, or at least influenced by the lost Baltic descendant of the stative formation equivalent to OCS *slyšati* ‘to listen’, 1sg. *slyšō*, 2sg. *slyšiši* < PS **slyšati* (AP a), **slyši-* < **klū-s-* (cf. Stang 1966, 92) < late PBS **s/klūsēti*, **s/klūsi-*⁹ (< PIE **kluh₁s-eh₁-ti*, **kluh₁s-* or Narten ablaut **kléus-* / **kléus-*). The descendant of the late PBS **s/klūsēti*, **s/klūsi-* is unfortunately not attested in Baltic, probably because it was replaced by **girdētēi* (Lith. *girdėti*, Latv. *dzirdēt*, OPru. *kirdīt*, *kīrdimai* ‘to hear’) for a reason yet unknown. However, before the replacement took place, if late PBS **s/klūsēti*,

⁸ As will be mentioned briefly later, the attested stative formation Lith. *klusėti* / Latv. *klusēt* ‘to be obedient’ seems to be rather derived from the intransitive inchoative Lith. *paklusti* ‘to obey’/ Latv. *klust* ‘to become silent’.

⁹ The subscript tilde (̃) denotes an acute nucleus in Proto-Balto-Slavic, following the notation in Olander 2015.

**s/klūsi-* still existed in Proto-Baltic, it would have given rise to PB **klūsēti* (pres. **klūsi-*) ‘to hear, be hearing’. A transitive-terminative form to the same root could have adopted the acute tone from PB **klūs(i)-* to give rise to **klausia-* (with acute root) when it was formed according to a common Baltic pattern of verbal formations.

The table below shows the common Baltic pairs of transitive verbs in *ia*-presents and *ē*-preterits and intransitive-inchoative verbs in either nasal presents or *sta*-presents (cf. Stang 1942, 124–125; Endzelīns 1951, 764–765). In addition, stative or intensive formations in *-ėti* based on the respective verbal roots in the table are quoted when available. The pattern is partially paralleled by Slavic verbs as supplemented with OCS forms.

Table 1. **Baltic transitive *ia*-presents, intransitive-inchoatives and verbs in *-ėti***

tran. <i>ia</i> -pres. & <i>ē</i> -pret.	intr.-inch. pres.	Stative or intensive in <i>-ėti</i>
Lith. <i>baūsti</i> , <i>-džia</i> , <i>-ė</i> ‘to punish’	Lith. <i>būsti</i> , <i>buñda</i> , <i>būdo</i> OCS <i>вѣз-бѣ(d)нѣти</i> , <i>-бѣдѣ</i> ‘to wake up’	Lith. <i>budėti</i> , <i>būdi</i> , <i>budėjo</i> OCS <i>бѣдѣти</i> , <i>бѣздѣ</i> ‘to be awake’
Lith. <i>dėlti</i> , <i>dėlia</i> , <i>dėlė</i> ‘to make blunt’	Lith. <i>dilti</i> , <i>dyla</i> / <i>dėla</i> , <i>dilė</i> ‘to become blunt(er)’	Lith. <i>delėti</i> , <i>dėli</i> , <i>delėjo</i> ‘to be sick’
Lith. <i>kėlti</i> , <i>kėlia</i> , <i>kėlė</i> Latv. <i>celt</i> , <i>ceļu</i> , <i>cēlu(ē)</i> ‘to lift up’	Lith. <i>kilti</i> , <i>kyla</i> / <i>kilsta</i> , <i>kilo</i> Latv. <i>cilt cilstu cilu</i> ‘to rise up’	
Lith. <i>maūkti</i> , <i>maūkia</i> , <i>maūkė</i> ‘to set free’	Lith. <i>mūkti</i> , <i>muñka</i> , <i>mūko</i> OCS <i>(pro-)мѣкнѣти се</i> , <i>-мѣкѣ</i> ‘to spread’	OCS <i>мѣцати</i> , <i>мѣѣр</i> (<i>мѣѣи</i>) ‘to throw back and forth’
Lith. <i>laužti</i> , <i>laužia</i> , <i>laužė</i> Latv. <i>lauzt</i> , <i>-žu</i> , <i>-zu</i> ‘to break (tr.)’	Lith. <i>lūžti</i> , <i>-žta</i> , <i>-žo</i> ‘to break (intr.)’	Lith. <i>lūžėti</i> , <i>-ėja</i> / <i>-i</i> , <i>-ėjo</i> ‘to break a little’
Lith. <i>kláusti</i> , <i>kláusia</i> , <i>kláuse</i> Latv. <i>klàust</i> , <i>-šu</i> ‘to ask questions’	Lith. <i>paklūsti</i> , <i>-klūsta</i> , <i>-klūso</i> Latv. <i>klust</i> , <i>-stu</i> , <i>-u</i> ‘to obey’	PB <i>*klūsēti</i> , pres. <i>*klūs(i)-</i> ‘to hear’

As can be seen from some empty slots under “stative or intensive in *-ėti*”, the stative (or intensive) formation in *-ėti* is not a regular part of this pattern. However, the pairs of transitive *ia*-presents and intransitive-inchoatives are prevalent in East Baltic. Therefore, it is not conceivable that transitive *ia*-present Lith. *kláusti* / Latv. *klàust* is directly derived from the stative **klūsēti*, pres. **klūs(i)-* or iterative **klausīti*. However, in this particular case, the *ia*-present verb Lith. *kláusti* / Latv. *klàust* ‘to ask questions’ seems semantically more closely related to iterative *klausýti* ‘to listen’ and stative PB **klūsēti* ‘to hear’ rather than to its intransitive-inchoative counterpart, *paklūsti* ‘to obey’. The meaning of

kláusti, ‘to ask questions’, does not directly correspond to the meaning of Lith. *paklūsti* ‘to obey’ / Latv. *klust* ‘to become silent’. Probably Lith. *paklūsti* / Latv. *klust* has gone through a semantic change ‘*to start to listen > to become silent > to obey’, probably starting from the iterative **klausītēi* ‘to listen’. The non-acute root would also indicate that they were formed based on *klausýti* ‘to listen’, which also has the non-acute root (cf. 3sg./pl. pres. *kláūso*). For that matter, the attested stative formation Lith. *klusėti* / Latv. *klusēt* ‘to be obedient’ is a perfect match both semantically and accentologically with the non-acute Lith. *paklūsti* ‘to obey’ / Latv. *klust* ‘to become silent’. On the other hand, Lith. *kláusti* / Latv. *klàust* ‘to ask questions’ seems to have developed a new meaning on its own, starting from ‘to hear, listen’, i.e., ‘*want to hear [something particular] > ask questions’. The acute tone of Lith. *kláusti* indicates some influence from the lost base stative formation **klūsētēi* ‘to hear’.

Through the discussion above on the semantics and the tone of the root, it has been attempted to show that Proto-Baltic inherited the iterative **klausītēi* and stative **klūsētēi*, and the intransitive-inchoative (**klustēi*, pres. **klu-n-sa*), transitive *ia*-present (**klausti*, **klausia*), and the new stative (**klusētēi*) are Baltic creations. While it is relatively straightforward that the intransitive-inchoative (**klustēi*, pres. **klu-n-sa*) was formed based on the iterative **klausītēi* and the new stative (**klusētēi*) was further formed to the intransitive-inchoative (**klustēi*, pres. **klu-n-sa*), the transitive *ia*-present (**klausti*, **klausia*) could have been formed either to the iterative **klausītēi* or to the stative **klūsētēi*. Since the iterative **klausītēi* inherited the non-acute root, while the stative **klūsētēi* had the acute root, it is conceivable that the Baltic derivatives confused these different tones in their derivational processes or post-derivational analogical processes. This may explain why the Latvian iterative form itself has a tone variation with the acute root, i.e., *klāūsīt* ‘to listen’ (beside *klāusīt*); and why Baltic transitive *ia*-present **klausti*, **klausia* ‘to ask questions’ has adopted different tones in Lithuanian (*kláusti*) and Latvian (*klàust*).

6. Conclusions

This paper has attempted to answer the ongoing, long-standing question, namely, why the Baltic verbs for ‘to listen, hear, ask questions’ exhibit seemingly random tone variations. First, it was attempted to sort out the attestations across the Indo-European and Balto-Slavic languages. Through the sorting processes, it has been revealed that there are reflexes of anī **k̑leu-*, anī **k̑leus-*, and seṭ **k̑leuHs-*, but no reflexes of seṭ **k̑leuH-*. For Slavic, unambiguous reflex with the acute root, continuing either Narten ablaut **k̑léus-* / **k̑léus-* or the seṭ variant **k̑leuHs-*, is the stative formation with the acute root PBS **s/klūs-ē-ti*, **s/klūs(-i)-*, descended by OCS *slyšati* ‘to listen’, pres. *slyši-* ‘to hear’.

Accepting the previous studies, it is assumed in this paper that the variants with **-s* and the root-final laryngeal were introduced in Proto-Indo-European by the desiderative suffix **-h₁s-*. The non-acute reflex of the iterative Lith. *klausýti* and Latv. *klāusīt* is proposed to have been introduced through an old laryngeal loss in Proto-Indo-European, i.e., the Saussure effect in PIE **k̑louh₁s-eye/o-* > **k̑lous-eye/o-*.

Following this argument, it has been hypothesised that Proto-Baltic probably inherited the iterative PB **klausūtēi* ‘to listen’ (< PIE **klous-eye/o-*) with the non-acute root and the stative PB **klūsētēi* ‘to hear’ (< PIE **kléus-* / **kléus-* or **kluh₁s-eh₁-*) with the acute root. It was concluded that these tone variations in the root inherited in Proto-Baltic must have caused the random-looking tone variations in Lith. *kláusti* / Latv. *klàust* ‘to ask questions’ and Latv. *klaūsīt* beside *klàusīt* ‘to listen’.

References

- Bammesberger, Alfred. 1991. Zur Vorgeschichte von lit. *kláusti* und *mīršta*. *Historische Sprachforschung / Historical Linguistics* 104 (2), 269–278.
- van Beek, Lucien. 2011. The “Saussure Effect” in Greek: a reinterpretation of the evidence. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 39 (1/2), 130–175.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1874. *Das altindische Verbum*. Halle: Waisenhaus.
- Derksen, Rick. 1996. *Metatony in Baltic*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- García Ramón, José Luis. 1994. Zur historischen Betrachtung der indogermanischen Aktionsarten und Aspektprobleme: idg. **neū(H)-* ‘eine momentane Bewegung machen, (sich) einen Augenblick wenden, drehen’. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 54, 33–63.
- Gorbachov, Yaroslav. 2007. *Indo-European Origins of the Nasal Inchoative Class in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic*. PhD thesis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 1987. *Die “I. Präsentklasse” im Vedischen. Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- EWAia – Manfred Mayrhofer, ed. 1996. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, vol. 2. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Jananoff, Jay. 1978. *Stative and middle in Indo-European*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Jananoff, Jay. 1987. Some irregular imperatives in Tocharian. In *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*, Calvert Watkins, ed. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 92–112.
- Jananoff, Jay. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 2008. Erbe und Neuerung bei Akzent und Ablaut in der litauischen Morphologie. Danguolė Mikulėnienė, Laima Grumadienė, Saulius Ambrasas (eds.) *Kalbos istorijos ir dialektologijos problemos 2*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 180–215.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- LEW – Ernst Fraenkel (1962-1965). *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- LIV² – Helmut Rix, et al. eds. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärs-tambildungen*. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix bearbeitet von Martin J. Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schimmer. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Narten, Johanna. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Nussbaum, Alan. 1997. The “Saussure Effect” in Latin and Italic. Lubotsky, A. (ed.), *Sound Law and Analogy: Papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 181–203.
- Olander, Thomas. 2015. *Proto-Slavic inflectional morphology*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Ostrowski, Norbert. 2001. Angeblich primäre Jotpräsentien im Litauischen. *Historische Sprachforschung* 114, 177–190.
- Otrębski, Jan. 1963. Noch einmal über lit. *Klāusti*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 68, 42–46.
- Pronk, Tijmen. 2011. The Saussure effect in Indo-European Languages Other Than Greek. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 39 (1/2), 176–193.
- Rasmussen, Jens. 1989. *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

- de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1905. Δ'ὀμήλυστις à Τριπτόλεμος, remarques étymologiques. In *Mélanges Nicole*. Genève: W. Kündig & Fils. 503–514.
- Schmid, Wolfgang P. 1962. “Lit. *kláusti* „fragen“ und das altind. Futurum” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 67(1), 1–15.
- Schmid, Wolfgang P. 1963. *Studien zum baltischen und indogermanischen Verbum*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Smoczyński W. 2001. Zu den litauischen mit der Binnensilbensynkope zusammenhängenden akutierten Wortformen. *Linguistica Baltica* IX, 155–162.
- Stang, Christian S. 1942. *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*. Oslo: Dybwad.
- Stang, Christian S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Schulze, Wilhelm. 1904. Lit. *kláusiu* und das indogermanische Futurum. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1434–1442.
- Villanueva Svensson, Miguel. 2014. Tone variation in the Baltic *ia*-presents. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119(1), 227–249.
- Vine, Brent. 1998. *Aeolic ὄππετον and Deverbative *-etó- in Greek and Indo-European*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Yamazaki, Yoko. 2009. The Saussure Effect in Lithuanian. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 37, 430–461.