

## APPENDIX E

### THE ORIGIN OF IE LENGTHENED GRADE

In 1894 Streitberg formulated the following rule: "Findet in einem Wort ein Morenverlust statt, so wird eine der Verluststelle unmittelbar vorausgehnde betonte kurze Silbe gedehnt, dagegen eine unmittelbar vorausgehnde betonte lange Silbe mit gestossem Akzent geschleift" (1894:313). Two years later Wackernagel (who incidentally omitted the word "betonte" in his quotation of Streitberg's rule) pointed out that "Für die ig. Dehnstufe passt diese Erklärung nicht, da es in den wenigsten Fällen möglich ist, für die Dehnform eine um eine More reichere Grundform wahrscheinlich zu machen" (1896:68). Nevertheless Streitberg's theory became almost generally accepted in the following decades. Hirt simply disregards Wackernagel's objections (1921:37f. and 1931:65). Yet I think that Streitberg's rule is both theoretically weak and materially inadequate.

From the theoretical point of view it is weak because it offers no explanation but merely shifts the problem to determining the conditions under which the "Morenverlust" and the subsequent analogical levelling took place. These problems are far from trivial. Van Wijk carries the principle through *ad absurdum* when he suggests that Gr. *kēr*, *méthu* go back to IE \**kérede*, \**médheye* (1907:340). This is mere speculation and does not further our understanding of the apophonic relationships in any respect.

Besides, Streitberg's theory is factually untenable, as Wackernagel demonstrated in his short discussion of the matter. Streitberg assumes that the lengthened grade in the active *s*-aorist goes back to the loss of a *schwa* in the next syllable. On the one hand, he does not explain why the alleged vowel was not lost elsewhere under the same conditions. On the other, he does not explain the absence of lengthened grade in the subjunctive and in the medial *s*-aorist, e.g. *ástoši*. The same objection can be made in the case of the other relevant categories.

At the same time, the essentially correct solution to the problem is put forward precisely by Wackernagel himself (1896:66ff.). He distinguishes three categories with seven subdivisions:

(a) Derivative nouns. Wackernagel accepts Streitberg's suggestion (1894:380) that lengthened grade in this category stems from the *vrddhi* in monosyllabic word forms. The existence of *vāk* 'speech' next to *vācaḥ* 'word' led to the creation of a collective *āśvām* 'herd of horses' next to *āśvaḥ* 'horse'.

(b) Roots in monosyllabic nouns, before primary suffixes, in the singular of athematic presents, and in the active *s*-aorist, e.g. *-hārd-*, *hārdi*, *mārṣti*, *ajaiṣam*. The long vowel of these words goes back to phonetic lengthening in monosyllabic word forms, e.g. *\*hārd*, *\*jaiṣ*.

(c) The final syllable of noun stems in the nom.sg. and loc.sg. forms, e.g. *sákhā*, *agná*. In the nominative Wackernagel assumes lengthening of the vowel before *r* in IE *\*paters* with subsequent spread to other resonant stems, and in the locative he posits an original ending *\*-e<sub>i</sub>-i*, *\*-eu-u*.

I agree with Wackernagel that the origin of the long vowel in the first and second category is the phonetic lengthening in monosyllabic word forms, but I do not think that the endings which he suggests for the third category are correct. I wonder if the matter was clear in his own mind, because in one and the same paragraph he mentions both "uralte Ersatzdehnung" and lengthening "gemäss der allgemeinen Neigung für Dehnung eines Vokals vor *r*-Konsonant" for this category. I think that the latter suggestion is correct and that we have to assume phonetic lengthening before word-final resonant. Even if we ignore the fact that there is no indication whatever for the assumption of a sigmatic nominative in the case of *pitá* and *sákhā*, the hypothesis of compensatory lengthening does not explain the short vowel in participles like *adán* < *\*edónts*.

Wackernagel's theory does not account for the alleged lengthened grade in such instances as Gr. *ōlénē*, SCr. *pāmēt*. These are the cases where I assume an alternation involving laryngeals.

While the first part of Streitberg's rule quoted in the first paragraph of this appendix refers to the origin of the lengthened grade, the second part is a statement of IE metatony. Since it is clear by now that evidence from all daughter languages (perhaps with the exception of Germanic) points to the preservation of the IE laryngeals up to a period posterior to the linguistic dissolution, the statement cannot be correct as it stands. Yet there is one kind of metatony in Balto-Slavic which may be very old indeed, viz. the one in Lith. *duōs*, SCr. *dā*, cf. especially Latv. *sāls*, *gūovs*. These instances show that the laryngeal was lost after a long vowel in monosyllables. The assumption

of late metatony in Lith. *duōs* would leave the other forms unexplained. Moreover, it is difficult to account for the difference between Lith. *lis* and *rašỹs* unless we assume that the latter form received its circumflex before the acute vowel in the former was shortened in accordance with Leskien's law. Thus, the metatony in *duōs*, which is required as a model for the one in *rašỹs*, cannot be identical with the one in *tĩē*, which is probably posterior to Leskien's law because it did not reach the Žemaitian dialects.

If this conjecture is correct, the loss of a laryngeal after a long vowel must be very old indeed. It follows from Lith. *dúosiu*, SCr. *dāh* that it preceded the generalization of the long vowel in the polysyllabic forms of the *s*-aorist. Since the latter development was shared by Sanskrit, I wonder if there are any traces of the former in this language.

The accentuation of Skt. *gávā*, *gáve*, *gávi* suggests that this noun belongs to the proterodynamic paradigm (cf. Kuiper 1942:32). The nominative *gáuh* is monosyllabic in the Veda, contrary to what one would expect on the basis of the reconstruction nom.sg. *\*g<sup>h</sup>óHus*. The simplest solution is to assume that the laryngeal was lost in the nominative after the introduction of lengthened grade, resulting in a form *\*g<sup>h</sup>óus* or *\*gáus*. If this is correct, Skt. *gáuh* is identical to Latv. *gùovs*. It cannot be decided whether Greek shared the loss of *\*H* after a long vowel.