


# The prehistory of *kláusti*, *klausyti*, and their related forms revisited

Dar kartą apie *kláusti*, *klausyti* ir jiems giminingų formų priešistorę

Yoko Yamazaki

Stockholm University, Suecia

yoko.yamazaki@balt.su.se

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0209-9599>

Lietuvių kalba núm. 17 49 60 2022

Vilniaus Universitetas  
Lituania

Recepción: 15 Septiembre 2022  
Aprobación: 27 Diciembre 2022

**Abstract:** The Baltic verbs, Lith. *kláusti* ‘to ask questions’, *klausyti* ‘to listen’, Latv. *klāust* ‘to ask questions’ and *klāusīt / klaūsīt* ‘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.

**Summary:** Baltų kalbų veiksmazodžiai, liet. *kláusti*, *klausyti*, latv. *klāust* ir *klāusīt / klaūsīt* 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 veiksmazodžio *kláusti* santykio su giminingais žodžiais ne tik baltų slavų, bet ir indoeuropiečių kalbose. Šiame straipsnyje bus dar kartą išnagrinėti visi autorei prieinami svarbūs duomenys ir hipotezės bei ieškoma labiau tikėtino istorinio aiškinimo.

**Keywords:** 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. *klāust*, *-šu*. *klāusīt*. *klāūsīt*, *-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) *śṛṇóti*,  $\sqrt{\text{śru}}$ -, pres.-inj. 3pl. *śróṣan* (I. *śróṣati*) ‘to listen, obey’; Gk. root-aor. impr. 2pl. *κλῦτε* ‘hear!’, OCS *slušati*, *-ajŕ* (variant *slъšati*), Ru. *slúšat*, SCr. *slŭšati* < PS *\*slŭšati* (AP a), *-ajŕ* ‘to listen’, among others. The rich attestation of the cognates (cf. EWAia II 672, LIV. 334–336, LEW 265–266, Kroonen 2013, 232), however, presents a complicated picture, as suggested by the reconstruction of two similar verbal roots by LIV., 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) *klāūsīt*, *-u* ‘to hear’) and the circumflex tone (Lith. *klausýti* *klāūso*, Latv. *klāusīt* *-u* ‘to hear’, *klāust*, *-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. √śru- ‘to hear’, pres. (V) śṛṇóti, root-aor. áśrot, 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. śrótā (cf. LIV<sup>2</sup> 334<sup>3</sup>).
- Activized medio-passives: OCS sluti, slovŕ ‘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. LIV<sup>2</sup> 335<sup>6</sup>).
- Stative formations in \*-ē-: Av. sruiē ‘is famous’, Lat. cluēō, -ēre ‘to be called, regarded as’.

## 2. Aniṭ \*kleus- ‘to listen’ [without laryngeal, with \*-s]

- Iterative: Lith. klausyti, klauso, klausė, Latv. klāusīt / klāusīt, -u ‘to listen’ < PIE \*klous-eye/o-<sup>1</sup>
- Inchoative: Lith. pa-klūsti, -klūsta / -klūsa, -klūso, Latv. klust, -stu ‘to obey’; OPru. poklusman ‘obedient’
- Stative: Lith. klusėti, klūsi, Latv. klusēt, -u ‘to be obedient’ as if from \*klus-eh<sub>1</sub>-, 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, -ajŕ (variant slъšati), Ru. slúšat’, SCr. slŭšati < PS \*slŭšati (AP a), -ajŕ ‘to listen’ < inf. \*klous-eh<sub>1</sub> -ti, pres. \*klous-eh<sub>1</sub>-ye/o-; it is possibly a denominative from the verbal noun sluxъ ‘Gehör, Ruf’ (< PS \*slŭxъ ‘hearing, rumour’, cf. LIV<sup>2</sup> 336<sup>1</sup>). 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 slъšati, the root vowel did not necessarily develop from a Proto-Slavic long vowel, and the acute -ŭ- in PS \*slŭšati, which looks as though

developed from a long vowel, might be analogically adopted from PS \*slyšati (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, -ajQ (variant slъšati), according to Schmid 1963, 13ff.
- OHG hlosēn, SwG. lose ‘to listen’ < PG \*hlusēn- < PIE \*klus-ch<sub>1</sub>-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.”<sup>2</sup> In this case, OCS slyšati ‘to hear’, pres. slyši- belongs to the same stative class, although the Slavic form points to a root-final laryngeal.
- OE hlosnian, hlysnan < PGmc. \*hlus-ni/a- ‘to listen’ < Northern IE \*klu-n-s-e/o- (Villanueva Svensson 2014, 245<sup>23</sup>, Gorbachov 2007, 88f.)
- Skt. √śruṣ-, pres.-inj. 3pl. śróṣan, impr. 3pl. śróṣantu (I. śróṣati), pres.-mid. ptpl. śróṣamāṇa- ‘to listen, obey’ < PIE \*kléus-e/o-; also TochB 3sg. klyauṣām, mid. klyauṣtär, TochA klyoṣtär (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 śúśrūṣate formed to the root √śru- ‘to hear’.
- OCS slyšati ‘to hear’, 1sg. slyšQ, 2sg. slyšiši < PS \*slyšati (AP a), \*slyši- < \*slyxēti < \*klū-ṣ- (Stang 1966, 92) < \*kleuHs-eh1-ti, \*kleuHs-?; Jasanoff (1987, 98ff.) and

Klingenschmitt (2008, 206) treat this verb as one of the stative verbs in *\*-ē-* (< *\*-eh<sub>1</sub>-*) with Narten ablaut *\*kléus-* / *\*kléus-*. This matter will be discussed below in § 3.

- Lith. *kláusti*, *kláusia*, *kláusė* ‘to ask, inquire’ (< *\*want to hear*)’ < as if *\*klóuHs-ye/o-*, but the circumflex tone of Latv. *klāust*, *-šu* points to an *aniṭ* root / stem.

It may be noteworthy that there are no reflexes of *seṭ* root without *\*-s* (*\*\*kleuH-*) 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<sub>1</sub>-*, which can be detected in Vedic desideratives and futures to roots endings in a resonant like *kariṣyánt-* ‘about to do’, *cikīṣati* ‘desires to do’, Gk. *τενέω* ‘I will stretch’ (< *\*-esō* < *\*-h<sub>1</sub>s-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 *seṭ* variants without *\*-s* (*\*\*kleuh<sub>1</sub>-*) arguably strengthens this view. It indicates that the laryngeal could not have occurred alone without *\*-s-* in this extended root (*\*kleu-h<sub>1</sub>s-*), being a part of the desiderative / future morpheme *\*-h<sub>1</sub>s-*, while *\*-...* could be lost in specific environments through laryngeal loss rules. For example, the iterative stem *\*klóu-[h<sub>1</sub>]s-eye/o-* and the nominal stem *\*klou[h<sub>1</sub>]s-* (> PS *\*slūx̥* ‘hearing, rumour’), which served as the basis of the denominative *\*klous-eh<sub>1</sub>-ti* (> PS *\*slūṣati* (AP a), *-ajṇ* ‘to listen’), satisfy the structural description of a laryngeal loss rule called “the Saussure Effect”.<sup>3</sup> In this way, it is easily understandable that the *aniṭ* variants with *\*-s* (i.e., *\*kleus-*) could be introduced in the proto language, while a *seṭ* variant without *\*-s* (*\*\*kleuh<sub>1</sub>-*) could have much fewer chances to occur.

### 3. Previous proposals on the prehistory of Lith. *kláusti* ‘to ask questions’ and *klausýti* ‘to hear’

Schulze (1904, 1434ff.) was one of the people in the early era of Indo-European studies, among others<sup>4</sup>, 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 *-s-*) in the future forms formed to monosyllabic roots ending in resonants, e.g., *manīṣyá-* ‘will think’ → 3sg. *maṇīsyáte* to *√man-*. *staviṣya-* ‘will praise’ (1sg. *staviṣyámi*) → *stoṣya-* (3sg. *stoṣyáti*) to *√stu-*. This indicates that these future forms, although

configured to what we now call “*aniṭ* roots”, behaved earlier as though formed to *seṭ* roots. Schulze saw a parallelism in the desiderative forms, which also behave as though they were formed to *seṭ* roots, even when they are actually formed to *aniṭ* roots. Compare the lengthening of the root vowel in desiderative *śúsṛ.ṣate* to *aniṭ*  $\sqrt{\text{śru-}}$  ‘to hear’ and desiderative *búb.ṣate* to *seṭ*  $\sqrt{\text{bhū}}$  ‘to be’.<sup>5</sup> 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. *maṇsyáte*, the future 1sg. *śroṣyāmi* to  $\sqrt{\text{śru-}}$  ‘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. *klāusiu* ‘I ask questions’ (*\*kleuəs-*). On the other hand, Schulze analysed the circumflexed Lith. *klaus-aũ* ‘I listen’ to be formed to the root *\*kleus-* (*aniṭ* and sigmatic), equating it with Skt.  $\sqrt{\text{śruṣ-}}$  *śróṣamāṇa-*, *śruṣtí-*) 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 *-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-(h.)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 *klāusti* originated from a desiderative formation with the suffix *-s-*. He believes that the circumflex tone of the root vowel *-aũ-* (cf. 3sg./pl. *klaũso* ‘to listen’) should be regular in Baltic *ia*-presents (< IE *\*ye/o*-presents), and therefore the acute tone of *klāusti*, *-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. *\*klaũsti*, pres. 1sg. *\*klausiù*, 3sg./pl. *\*klaũsia* ‘to ask questions’, is reconstructed for Proto-Baltic, which would have a preterit 3sg./pl. *\*klaũsē* ‘asked questions’ homonymic with the preterit of *klausyti* ‘to listen’. Thus, Schmid proposed that the acute tone was introduced to *\*klaũsti* *\*klaũsia*, *\*klaũsē* ‘to ask questions’ in order to differentiate it from *\*klaũsyti*, *\*klaũsia*, *\*klaũsē* ‘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. *\*klaũsiti*, pres. 3sg./pl. *\*klaũsi* ‘to listen’ with the circumflex tone, from which two new paradigms split out. One of them is inf. *\*klausiti*, pres. *\*klaũsā* ‘to listen’ with the



circumflex tone and new iterative present stem in *\*-i-*, and the other is inf. *\*klaūsti*, pres. *\*klaūsija* 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 (*klāust*, *klāušu* ‘to ask questions’). This implies that this paradigm split process was in East Baltic.

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 *\*leuǵ-*<sup>6</sup>) *láukti*, *láukia*, *láuķe* ‘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 *vřddhi* formation of *\*klaūsa-* ‘hearing’ → *\*klaūs-a-* ‘interrogating’, to which a verbal stem *\*kláusia-* ‘to ask questions’ was formed. Lith. *klauša* (acc. sg. *klaušą*) ‘ability to hear’ attests the non-acute nominal stem *\*klaūsa-* ‘hearing’ < IE *\*klou-s-*. Therefore, at least the basis for a *vřddhi* formation *\*klōu-s-* existed in Baltic. Likewise, for *láukti*, a nominal stem *\*láuķas* ‘what belongs to the field, a guard, watch’ (< *\*lōuk-o-*), a *vřddhi* formation of *\*louk-o-* (> Lith. *laũkas* ‘field’) is postulated. However, the semantics of the proposed *vřddhi* 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 *\*kleu-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 *\*klaūsija* (< *\*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*), *spáuisti*, *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 *spáuisti*,

*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., *klāuso* (← *\*klaūsija*), does not have the acute root.<sup>7</sup> This probably means that factors other than the apocope of *\*-i-* cause the acute tone of *klāusti*, *klāusia*.

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-* (< *\*-eh..*) with Narten ablaut *\*klēus-*. *\*klēus-*. Klingenschmitt (id.) further envisages a development of PIE *\*klēus-* / *\*klēus-* to PS pres. *\*slyši-* (< PBS 3pl. *\*slūš-inti*) through an earlier *\*sl’auš-*. *\*slūš-*. Since the Narten ablaut pattern of this verbal root is confirmed by Tocharian forms (A *klyoš-*, B *klyauš(ä)-* / *klyauše-* ‘to hear’ < PT *\*kl’aus’ä-* / *\*kl’ausa-* < *\*klēus-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-eh.-ti*, *\*kluHs-* (through PBS 3pl. pres. *\*slūš-inti*) to PS *\*slyšati* (AP a), *\*slyši-*.

As reviewed so far, various solutions and views have been put forward regarding the etymological background of Lith. *klāusti* ‘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 (*\*klēu-h.s-* ‘\*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 *klāusti* 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. *klāusti* and Latv. *klāust* ‘to ask questions’ (as if < *\*klouh.s-ye/o-*) can be directly equated with the Indic future (*\*kleuh.s-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 *\*klouh.s-ye/o-* existed, the laryngeal would have been lost by the Saussure effect and the acute accent of Lith. *klāusti* cannot be the regular outcome. The absence of the palatalisation of /l/ also indicates that the vocalism of *klāusti* is



not precisely that of *\*kleuh.s-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.-desideratives, while the roots that made reduplicated presents may have chosen reduplicated desideratives. Accordingly, at first glance, a desiderative stem *\*klouh.s-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 .-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 *\*klouh.s-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 *\*k-* is considered to be due to the dissimilation effect of the desiderative morpheme *\*-h.s-* (see Stang 1966, 91–92). This, together with the Slavic cognates, indicates the antiquity of the desiderative stem *\*kleuh.s-*, 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. *klāstīt* ‘to listen’ exhibits the regular outcome of the iterative *\*klou[h.s-eye/o-*, and therefore, the second question is how the acute tone of *kláusti*, 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*, -ajQ (variant *slъšati*), Ru. *slúшат’*, SCr. *slŭšati* < PS *\*slŭšati* (AP a), -ajQ ‘to listen’ < inf. *\*kl(o)u[h1]s-eh1-ti*, pres. *\*kl(o)u[h1]s-eh1-ye/o-*,
- possibly descendants of the ancient medio-passive: OCS *sluti*, slovQ ‘to be called’ < PS *\*slut*, *\*slōvQ* ‘be called, be famed’ < *\*kleu-tei*, *\*kleu-e/o-tor*,

- stative: OCS *slyšati* ‘to hear’, 1sg. *slyšŭ*, 2sg. *slyšiši* < PS *\*slyšati* (AP a; < *\*slyšeti*), *\*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 *\*kluh.s-*. However, the stative formation of this stem is not preserved in Baltic<sup>8</sup>, where one finds *\*girdētēi* (Lith. *girdėti*, Latv. *dzirdēt*, OPru. *kirdīt*, *kīrdimai* ‘to hear’), in place of *\*klūsētēi* (as if < *\*kluh.s-eh.-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 *\*kleuh.s-*, 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. *kláusti* has been introduced in Baltic might reside in the Baltic treatments of the family of *\*kleuh..*-based words.

As already envisaged (cf. Bammesberger 1991, Ostrowski 2001, 181), Lith. *kláusti* / Latv. *klàust* must certainly be a secondary formation based on an inherited verbal form. However, that does not mean that *kláusti* has to be directly derived from *klausyti*. *\*klou[h.]s-eye/o-*). In this paper, it is proposed that Lith. *kláusti* / Latv. *klàust* 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. *slyšŭ*, 2sg. *slyšiši* < PS *\*slyšati* (AP a), *\*slyši-* < *\*klūs-š-* (cf. Stang 1966, 92) < late PBS *\*s/klūsēti*, *\*s/klūsi-*<sup>9</sup> (< PIE *\*kluh.s-eh.-ti*, *\*kluh.s-* 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*, *\*s/klūsi-* still existed in Proto-Baltic, it would have given rise to PB *\*klūsētēi* (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 *-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 *-ēti* 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 iapresents intransitiveinchoatives and verbs in *ėti*

tran. <i>ia</i> -pres. & <i>é</i> -pret.	intr.-inch. pres.	Stative or intensive in <i>-ėti</i>
Lith. <i>baūsti, -džia, -é</i> ‘to punish’	Lith. <i>būsti, būnda, būdo</i> OCS <i>ъъz-bъ(d)nъti, -bъdъ</i> ‘to wake up’	Lith. <i>budėti, būdi, budėjo</i> OCS <i>бъдѣти, бъздѣ</i> ‘to be awake’
Lith. <i>dėlti, dėlia, dėlė</i> ‘to make blunt’	Lith. <i>đlti, đyla / dėla, đilė</i> ‘to become blunt(er)’	Lith. <i>delėti, dėli, delėjo</i> ‘to be sick’
Lith. <i>kėlti, kėlia, kėlė</i> Latv. <i>ceļt, ceļu, cēlu(ē)</i> ‘to lift up’	Lith. <i>kīlti, kyla / kīlsta, kīlo</i> Latv. <i>cilt cilstu cilu</i> ‘to rise up’	
Lith. <i>maūkti, maūkia, maūkė</i> ‘to set free’	Lith. <i>mūkti, muñka, mūko</i> ‘to come off’ OCS <i>(pro-)mъknъti sę, -mъkъ</i> ‘to spread’	OCS <i>мъчати, мъчѣ</i> (мъчи-) ‘to throw back and forth’
Lith. <i>láužti, láužia, láužė</i> Latv. <i>laūzt, -žu, -zu</i> ‘to break (tr.)’	Lith. <i>lūžti, -žta, -žo</i> ‘to break (intr.)’	Lith. <i>lūžėti, -ėja / -i, -ėjo</i> ‘to break a little’
Lith. <i>kláusti, kláusia, kláusė</i> Latv. <i>klàust, -šu</i> ‘to ask questions’	Lith. <i>paklūsti, -klūsta, -klūso</i> Latv. <i>klust, -stu, -u</i> ‘to obey’	PB <i>*klūsętēi</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 *\*klūsętēi*, pres. *\*klūs(i)-* or iterative *\*klausītēi*. However, in this particular case, the *ia*-present verb Lith. *kláusti* / Latv. *klàust* ‘to ask questions’ seems semantically more closely related to iterative *klausyti* ‘to listen’ and stative PB *\*klūsętēi* ‘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 *klausyti* ‘to listen’, which also has the non-acute root (cf. 3sg./pl. pres. *klāuso*). 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 *\*klūsętēi* ‘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., *klaūsīt* ‘to listen’ (beside *klāusīt*); and why Baltic transitive *ia*-present *\*klausti*, *\*klausia* ‘to ask questions’ has adopted different tones in Lithuanian (*klāusti*) and Latvian (*klāust*).

## 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 *aniṭ* *\*kleu-*, *aniṭ* *\*kleus-*, and *seṭ* *\*kleuHs-*, but no reflexes of *seṭ* *\*\*kleuH-*. For Slavic, unambiguous reflex with the acute root, continuing either Narten ablaut *\*kléus-* / *\*kléus-* or the *seṭ* variant *\*kleuHs-*, 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 *\*-h.s-*. The non-acute reflex of the iterative Lith. *klausyti* 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 *\*klouh.s-eye/o-* > *\*klous-eye/o-*.

Following this argument, it has been hypothesised that Proto-Baltic probably inherited the iterative PB *\*klausītēi* ‘to listen’ (< PIE *\*klous-eye/o-*) with the non-acute root and the stative PB *\*klūsētēi* ‘to hear’ (< PIE *\*kléus-* / *\*kléus-* or *\*kluh.s-ch.*) 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. *klāusti* / Latv. *klāust* ‘to ask questions’ and Latv. *klaūsīt* beside *klāusīt* ‘to listen’.

## References

- Bammesberger, Alfred. 1991. Zur Vorgeschichte von lit. *kláusti* und *mĩršta*. *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. \**neu(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. Präsensklasse” 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.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 1978. *Stative and middle in Indo-European*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Jasanoff, 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.
- Jasanoff, 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 Ambrazas (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.

- LIV. – Helmut Rix, et al. eds. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. 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. *Kláusti*. *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'ὠμῆλυσις 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 ὀρπετον 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.

## Notes

- 1 The perfective form of Latv. *klusēt* ‘to hear’, i.e. Latv. *izklusēt*, *izklusu*, *izklusīju*, means ‘to inquire’.
- 2 Jasanoff 1978: 56ff.
- 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).
- 5 This phenomenon is later accounted for by Jasanoff (2003, 134), as will be mentioned below.
- 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).
- 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.



**Disponible en:**

<https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=692574304004>

Cómo citar el artículo

Número completo

Más información del artículo

Página de la revista en redalyc.org

Sistema de Información Científica Redalyc  
Red de revistas científicas de Acceso Abierto diamante  
Infraestructura abierta no comercial propiedad de la  
academia

Yoko Yamazaki

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

Dar kartą apie kláusti, klausyti ir jiems giminingų formų priešistorę

*Lietuvių kalba*

núm. 17, p. 49 - 60, 2022

Vilniaus Universitetas, Lituania

[irena.smetoniene@flf.vu.lt](mailto:irena.smetoniene@flf.vu.lt)

/ ISSN-E: 1822-525X

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.15388/LK.2022.4>



**CC BY 4.0 LEGAL CODE**

**Licencia Creative Commons Atribución 4.0 Internacional.**