

APPENDIX C

SHORTENING OF PRETONIC LONG VOWELS IN ITALIC AND CELTIC

The reconstruction of the oldest Balto-Slavic accentual system requires an evaluation of the comparative IE evidence. The only detailed comparison available so far is presented in Illič-Svityč's monograph on nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic (1963). In this study the Baltic and Slavic material is confronted with identical formations in Sanskrit, Greek, and Germanic. These are not the only languages which supply useful information about IE accentuation, however. As Dybo demonstrated in 1961, the shortening of pretonic long vowels in Italic and Celtic provides another valuable clue for the reconstruction of accentual differences in prehistoric times. Here I quote the main part of the introduction to this important article (Dybo 1961a:9f.).

“Comparative linguistics often has to deal with variants of a root where side by side with a long vowel or long resonant (respectively heavy base or root with a laryngeal) a short vowel or resonant (respectively light base or root without a laryngeal) appears. Both variants are usually supposed to go back to IE times.

But a careful examination of the material shows this view to be unwarranted :

1. If one leaves aside the instances when the root with a long vowel appears before a vowel or where the root (stem) is split by a nasal infix, and also some cases of shortening of vowels before certain consonant clusters, then the overwhelming majority of the words with a short root variant belongs to the Western part of the IE area, viz. to the Italic, Celtic and, partly, the Germanic languages.

2. Moreover, where there are corresponding words or words with a similar structure, the Italic short root variant coincides with the Celtic one, and in the case of a root ending in an intervocalic resonant, also with the Germanic one :

1) Lat. *cūtis*, W. *cwd*, but OHG. *hūt* ;

2) Lat. *defrūtum*, OIr. *bruth*, but OHG. *prūt* ;

- 3) Lat. *fūturus*, OIr. *ro-both*, but Skt. *bhūtāḥ*, Lith. *būtas* ;
- 4) Lat. *sūcula*, W. *hwcc*, but Skt. *sūkarāḥ* ;
- 5) Lat. *pūter*, Ir. *othar*, *othrach* (root *pū-*) ;
- 6) Lat. *ulna* (< **ōlenā*), Ir. *uile*, Goth. *aleina*, but Gr. *ōlénē*, *ōlēn*, Arm. *uln* (*u* < IE *ō*) ;
- 7) Lat. *vīr*, Ir. *fer*, Goth. *wair* ; but Skt. *vīrāḥ*, Lith. *výras* ;
- 8) Lat. *sērēscō*, Ir. *serb*, OHG. *serawēn*, but Skt. *kṣārāḥ*, Gr. *ksērós* ;
- 9) Osc. *bivus* (acc.pl.), W. *byw*, Goth. **qīus*, but Skt. *jīvāḥ*, Lith. *gývas* ;
- 10) Lat. **tūmus* (in *tūmēre*), W. *twf*, Ge.(dial.) *dūm*, but Avestan *tūma-*, OChSl. *tyti* ;
- 11) OIr. *del*, Sw.(dial.) *del* (masc.), but Latv. *dēls* (gen. *dēla*) ;
- 12) Ir. *lon*, Goth. *lun* (the brevity of the *u* is established on the basis of OE. *ālynnan*), but Skt. *lūnāḥ* ;
- 13) Ir. **len* (in *lenomnaib* 'liūris'), Ge.(dial.) *len*, Sw. *len*, but Skt. *lināḥ* ;
- 14) Celt. **nōvis* (in Ir. *nóine*, *nūna*, W. *newyn*, Bret. *naoun*), Goth. *nawis*, but Latv. *nāvs*, Lith. *nōvis*, OPr. *nowis*, Ru. *nav*'.

These two peculiarities of the distribution of the material with a short root variant compel one to look for the causes of the emergence of this short variant in the phonetic processes of the Celto-Italic dialectal area, and also in the similar and, probably, connected phonetic processes in the dialects underlying the Proto-Germanic language.

The analysis of the Celtic and Italic material from the point of view of IE accentology shows that long vowels and resonants were preserved in these languages under the stress only and were shortened in unstressed position, probably already in the period of Celto-Italic unity, at a time of close contact with the dialects underlying the Proto-Germanic language.

The different reflexes of long *ī* and *ī̄* can also be explained by the place of the stress (Celto-Ital. *ar*, *al* in unstressed position, Celto-Ital. *rā*, *lā* under the Indo-European stress)."

Dybo then presents the material, consisting of 42 items where long IE vowels and resonants have been shortened in unstressed syllables, and 44 items where long IE vowels and resonants have been preserved under the stress. I refrain from repeating the material here and refer to the source for full information.

In addition to the material which is in accordance with the hypothesis, Dybo adduces 17 items with a long stem vowel in Italic and Celtic corresponding to a stressed stem vowel in Baltic and Slavic but to a pretonic long stem vowel in Greek and Sanskrit, e.g. Lat. *fūmus*, *grānum*, Ir. *grán*, *lán*, SCr. *đim*, *zřno*, *pùn*, Skt. *dhūmah*, *jirñah*, *pūrñah*. The difference between the Balto-Slavic and the Greek and Sanskrit accentuation is generally explained by Hirt's law. On the basis of the Italic and Celtic material Dybo rejects this law and assumes that the stress placement in Baltic and Slavic goes back to the proto-language and that the final accentuation in the oldest IE evidence is due to an innovation.

The explanation of the difference between a short vowel in Italic and Celtic and a long vowel elsewhere as resulting from the shortening of pretonic long vowels in the former languages is supported by the existence of an alternation between a long and a short vowel in derivatives from the same root in Italic and Celtic, e.g. Welsh *biw* 'cattle', *byw* 'living', Lat. *sūs*, *sūcūla*, *pūrus*, *pūtus*, *cārus*, OIr. *caraim*. According to Dybo, the quantitative opposition in these words reflects an earlier accentual difference.

The same explanation is put forward for the quantity of the stem vowel in deverbative nominals in *-to-* (participle) and *-tu-* (supine). The *to*-participle has final accentuation in Greek and Sanskrit, whereas the latter language has generalized both full grade and barytonesis in the infinitive in *-tum*. If the preservation or loss of quantity in the root reflects an earlier accentual opposition in Italic and Celtic, one has to assume two classes of *t*-formations which merged in Greek and Sanskrit, e.g. Lat. *litus*, *litum*, *pūtāre*, *fūtāre*, *fūtūrus*, OIr. *ro-both*, *bith*, W. *ffrwst*, *ffraeth*, but Lat. *sūtus*, *sūtum*, *rūta*, *strātus*, *strātum*, OIr. *ro-bíth*, *bráth*, W. *prid*, *blawt*. These classes must be old because the same distribution is found in Baltic and Slavic, cf. Latv. *liēt/lít*, *plāūt*, *hūt*, *dzít*, *sprūst*, *sprāgt*, *šūt*, *bīrt*, *mālt*, Ru. *lilá*, *bylá*, *žilá*, *šila*, *rýla*, *prostěrla*, *bila*, *krýla*, *molóla*. On the basis of the agreement between the Western and the Northern languages Dybo assumes that the accentuation of the Greek and Sanskrit forms is secondary in these categories.

Dybo's article provoked a reaction by Illič-Svityč (1962), who accepted the thesis that pretonic long vowels were shortened in Italic and Celtic, but rejected the suggestion that these languages together with Baltic and Slavic preserved the old stress placement on the stem in a number of cases where Greek and Sanskrit show final accen-

tuation. Illič-Svityč's main objection is that the motivation for the oxytonesis in the latter languages remains unclear, especially because the stem is stressed in such words as Skt. *úrṇā*, *bhrātā*, as opposed to *pūrṇāḥ*, *mātā*. Moreover, the Germanic evidence generally supports the antiquity of the Greek and Sanskrit accentuation rather than the stress placement conjectured on the basis of Italic and Celtic quantity, e.g. OHG. *muoter* < **māter*, OE. *sēod* < **sjūtós*, cf. Lat. *māter*, *sūtus*, Skt. *mātā*, *syūtāḥ*. Illič-Svityč concludes that the Sanskrit, Greek, and Germanic accentuation goes back to the proto-language and that the stress was retracted in Italic and Celtic under the same conditions as it was in Baltic and Slavic.

According to Illič-Svityč, the origin of the retraction must be sought in the intonation of the root vowel. He posits the existence of four types in the proto-language:

(1) IE barytona with a rising intonation on the root syllable: fixed stress on the stem and preservation of length in Balto-Slavic and Celto-Italic, e.g. SCr. *brāt*, Lat. *frāter*, OIr. *bráthir*, Skt. *bhrātā*, Gr. *phrātēr*, OHG. *bruodar*.

(2) IE oxytona with a rising intonation on the root syllable: retraction of the stress and preservation of length in Balto-Slavic and Celto-Italic, e.g. Lith. *pilnas*, Latv. *pīlns*, SCr. *pūn*, Ir. *lán*, Skt. *pūrṇāḥ*.

(3) IE oxytona with a 'broken' intonation on the root syllable: mobile stress in Balto-Slavic and shortening of pretonic length in Celto-Italic, e.g. SCr. *trâg*, Ir. *trog*.

(4) IE barytona with a 'broken' intonation on the root syllable: mobile stress in Balto-Slavic and preservation of length under the stress in Celto-Italic, e.g. Lith. *plónas*, Latv. *plāns*, Lat. *plānus*.

Thus, the opposition between preservation and loss of quantity in Italic and Celtic reflects an earlier intonational difference, which is independent of the IE stress placement. The *to*-participle was stressed on the ending but could have different intonations in the root.

Leaving the Germanic evidence aside, I think that Illič-Svityč is right for two reasons when he sticks to the view that Sanskrit and Greek have preserved the IE stress placement better than Italo-Celtic and Balto-Slavic. First, the original accentuation cannot be established without taking the apophonic evidence into account. When apophony and accentuation in Greek and Sanskrit coincide, there can hardly be any doubt. The combination of final stress and zero grade of the root vowel in the *to*-participle suggests that this is the

original situation. In the *tu*-formation we may expect proterodynamic mobility (cf. Kuiper 1942:35). Second, the preservation of the neuter gender in SCr. *zřno* and similar words cannot be explained if we start from original barytonesis. The merger of barytone neuters and masculines in the singular must have preceded the retraction of the stress in these words (cf. section 5.3 above). There is no way to avoid Hirt's law in Baltic and Slavic.

On the other hand, I do not agree with Illič-Svityč that a similar retraction must have operated in Italic and Celtic. The preservation of pretonic long vowels in these languages can be explained more easily if we base ourselves on the principle of relative chronology, i.e. if we assume that the pretonic long vowels which have been preserved had not yet arisen at the time when the shortening operated. It is remarkable that all of the items with preservation of pretonic length adduced by Dybo have a 'long sonant' in the root with the single exception of the word Lat. *māter*, OIr. *máthir*, Skt. *mātá*. In this very word Greek has preserved a stem-stressed nominative *mētēr*, Dor. *mátēr*, which must be the remnant of an old type of mobility. It is probable that the long vowel in Italic and Celtic, which was regularly preserved under the stress in the nominative, was analogically introduced in the other case forms. Alternatively, one could suggest that these languages, in contradistinction to Sanskrit and Slavic, generalized the barytonesis of the nom.sg. form throughout the paradigm.

If this view is correct, the loss of the laryngeals after a vocalic resonant is posterior to the shortening of pretonic long vowels in Italic and Celtic. The specific development of the vocalic liquids, which is posterior to the common shortening of pretonic long vowels, which is in turn posterior to the development of *ē*, *ā*, *ō* from short vowel plus laryngeal, supports the hypothesis of Italo-Celtic linguistic unity.

Illič-Svityč's conjecture about the presence of different intonations in the root must be reconsidered in this connection. It should be clear that his solution is no explanation: it merely shifts the problem. Even if the observed differences reflect an earlier pitch opposition, the latter must still be explained in terms of the root structure. Moreover, the quadripartition into stem-stressed and end-stressed nouns with rising and 'broken' intonation is not so straightforward as Illič-Svityč suggests. Not all of his comparisons are equally acceptable. In particular, his third type is a heterogeneous class and his

fourth type is a fallacy. The broken intonation of Latv. *plāns* is the regular reflex of an old acute in neuter nouns, cf. Lat. *plānum*, and the mobility in Lith. *plónas* is secondary, while Latv. *plāns* points to original barytonesis. The other items belonging to the same class are also objectionable. This reduces the problem to establishing the difference between the second and third type, i.e. to determining the conditions of Hirt's law and its Italo-Celtic analogue.

In his monograph on Baltic and Slavic accentuation (1963), Illič-Svityč abandons Kuryłowicz's idea that the place of the ictus in Baltic and Slavic is independent of the place of the ictus in Indo-European and proves that Balto-Slavic mobility is the reflex of IE oxytonesis, and that fixed stress in Baltic and Slavic continues IE root stress, with the exception of a few definable classes. One of these classes owes its existence to Hirt's law, which I adopted in this book in Illič-Svityč's formulation: the ictus was retracted if the vowel of the preceding syllable was immediately followed by a laryngeal. As a result of this retraction, we find fixed stress on the stem in Baltic and Slavic corresponding to final accentuation in Sanskrit and Greek. (Another exceptional class, where we find Slavic mobility corresponding to IE barytonesis, originated from what I have called Illič-Svityč's law, cf. section 3.4 above.)

If this formulation of Hirt's law is correct (as I think it is), we can identify the above 'rising intonation' as the presence of a vowel or syllabic resonant which is immediately followed by a laryngeal, and the 'broken intonation' as the absence of this situation. In the latter case there are at least four possibilities. Either there was no laryngeal and the long vowel goes back to lengthened grade, which is a possible solution for SCr. *trâg*, Ir. *trog*. Or the root contained vowel plus laryngeal but the accentual mobility was preserved, as in Lith. *sūnūs*, SCr. *sîn* (cf. Ebeling 1967:582). Or the laryngeal followed the second component of a diphthong, as in Latv. *tiēvs*, Gr. *tanaós*. Or the laryngeal preceded a vocalic resonant. The latter solution was put forward in section 1.3 above as an explanation of the final accentuation in Ru. *pilá*, *lilá*, *žilá*, *bylá*. I think that this suggestion is now corroborated by the Italo-Celtic evidence. It can also be advanced for SCr. *žir*, Skt. *jiráh*, cf. Lat. *vīrēre*.

Thus, I assume that the shortening of a pretonic 'long sonant' in Italic and Celtic points to the presence of a laryngeal preceding the syllabic resonant. This conjecture is supported by other IE evidence in a number of cases, cf. Latv. *lēju*, Hitt. *paḫhur*, perhaps Gr. *phūtón*,

bios. The case of Lat. *vīr* is slightly different. The retraction in Lith. *výras*, Latv. *vīrs*, as compared with Skt. *vīráḥ*, points to **viHrós*, which would yield a long vowel in Italo-Celtic. The expected quantity is indeed attested in Umbr. *veir-*. The short vowel in Latin must be explained by a merger with the cognate of Skt. *jīráḥ*, where the Balto-Slavic evidence points to a root **g^hHi-*, cf. Lat. *vīrēre*. The original length was preserved in *vīs*.

As Dybo pointed out, the shortening of pretonic long vowels yielded a quantitative alternation in such cases as Welsh *biw* (< **g^hHivos*, Gr. *bíos*), *byw* (< **g^hHivós*, Skt. *jīvāḥ*), Lat. *pūrus*, *pūtus*, *cārus*, OIr. *caraim*. The alternation was analogically extended by shortening of the root vowel in certain morphological categories to stems which originally had a vocalic resonant followed by a laryngeal, e.g. in Lat. *sūcūla*, W. *hwch*, cf. Lat. *sūs* < **suH-*. It is not necessary to assume the complicated mechanism which Illič-Svityč suggests in this connection (1962:71f.). The agreement of Italic and Celtic at this stage is another argument in favour of the Italo-Celtic hypothesis. A final solution to the problem requires a detailed chronological analysis of the material, which remains a task for the future.