

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

Some points of discussion in Slavic historical linguistics

The publication of Matasović's comparative grammar of Croatian (2008) is a major event in Slavic historical linguistics because the author abandons a number of traditional views which can no longer be maintained and because he has an open mind for alternative possibilities. This provides an opportunity to draw attention to various issues on which consensus has not been reached and discussion may yield further progress. The following is not a review of Matasović's book but aims at elucidating certain points of disagreement where a solution seems possible. It definitely is not an exhaustive list of issues which require further discussion.

Matasović claims that the Proto-Indo-European labiovelars were delabialized at an early stage and did not leave any trace of the original labialization (2008: 84). He thus rejects the classic view that the phonetic reflex of the syllabic resonants is **uR* after original labiovelars and **iR* elsewhere (cf. Vaillant 1950: 167–177, Stang 1966: 82, Kortlandt 2007b). He also rejects the depalatalization of palatovelars before syllabic resonants (2008: 86), as in Russian *žěltyj* 'yellow' versus *zóloto* 'gold' and *zelěnyj* 'green' (cf. Kortlandt 2008c: 10f.). He also rejects the derivation of *x* < **kH* in Russian *soxá* 'wooden plough' (2008: 88), which is cognate with Lith. *šakà* 'branch', Arm. *c'ax*, Skt. *śákhā*, Persian *šāx*. The Slavic word may actually be an early borrowing from Iranian, where it may be a borrowing from Indic (cf. Mayrhofer 1976: 332).

Matasović dates the rise of prothetic **j-* and **w-* before the retraction of **ē* to **ā* after palatal consonants and states that this does not fit into my relative chronology (2008: 91). This is based on a misunderstanding. In my chronology (e.g. 2006b: 26–31 and 2008b), **ē* and **ā* merged after **j* into an archiphoneme **ā* (at stage 6.1) which became opposed to new **ē* < **ai* as a result of the monophthongization (at stage 6.5), after which /j/ lost its phonemic status after vowels (prothesis at stage 7.1) and after consonants (Van Wijk's law at stage 7.15). Then new /j/ arose, first in East Slavic, later in South Slavic, and finally in West Slavic (cf. Kortlandt 2006a). Thus, the eventual retraction of **ā* to **a* after palatals belongs to the separate dialect-

tal areas and may never have reached the dialects of the Kiev Leaflets and the Sinaitic Psalter (cf. Schaeken 1987: 101).

There are four Balto-Slavic accent paradigms:

(1) fixed stress on an acute syllable in Slavic (a) and Lithuanian and a stretched tone in Latvian;

(2) fixed stress on a rising syllable in Slavic (b) and Lithuanian and a falling tone in Latvian;

(3) mobile stress with a falling tone in Slavic (c) and an acute in Lithuanian and Latvian;

(4) mobile stress with a falling tone in Slavic (c) and Latvian and a rising tone in Lithuanian.

The acute is reflected as a short rising tone in Slavic, as a falling tone in Aukštaitian, and as a broken (glottalic) tone in Žemaitian and Latvian. It is clear that we must reconstruct the acute as a Balto-Slavic glottal stop which yielded a short rising tone in Slavic and a falling tone in Aukštaitian. The glottalization was preserved not only in present-day Žemaitian and Latvian but also in Slavic up to a recent stage because it remained distinct from both rising (b) and falling (c) tone movements, as is shown by Latvian borrowings from Old Russian and by data from Ukrainian, Polish, Upper Sorbian, Czech, Slovak, Slovene and Serbo-Croatian (e.g. Kortlandt 2006c: 361). Thus, we find e.g.

(a) SCr. *krāva* ‘cow’, Slk. *krava*, Pol. *krowa*, Cz. *kráva*, US. *kruwa* < *krówa*, Latv. *miēsts* ‘hamlet’ < *mēsto*;

(b) SCr. *brázda* ‘furrow’, Slk. *brázda*, Pol. *bruzda* < *bróзда*, Cz. *brázda*, US. *bróзда*, Latv. *grēks* ‘sin’ < *grēxs*;

(c) SCr. *bráda* ‘beard’, Slk. *brada*, Pol. *broda*, Cz. *brada*, US. *broda*, Latv. *svēts* ‘holy’ < *svēt̥s*.

The Balto-Slavic acute (glottal stop) continues the Indo-European laryngeals and the glottalic feature of the “un aspirated voiced” stops (Winter’s law), e.g. in SCr. *slādak* ‘sweet’, Pol. *słodki*, US. *slódki*, Latv. *sal̥ds* (cf. Derksen 1996: 164), whereas original long vowels (representing lengthened grade and early contractions) are never acute. The original distribution was blurred by the loss of laryngeals after lengthened grade vowels (cf. Kortlandt 1985 and 1997a) and by the loss of glottalization in consonant clusters (cf. Dybo 2002 and Kortlandt 2008a). Matasović posits a number of alleged lengthened grade vowels with an acute reflex (2008: 132–136) for which there is simply no evidence, as if the assumption of a lengthened grade vowel requires no justification, e.g. deriving Slavic *věko* ‘eyelid’ from **wēh₂ko-* and Lith. *vókas*, Latv. *vāks* from **wōh₂ko-*. In fact, these words continue **weh₁ko* and **woh₁ko*, with Lith. *ó*, Latv. *â* from **o?* after **w-* (cf. Derksen 2008: 519). He assumes “apophonic length” (prijevojna duljina) in SCr. *mìcati* ‘to move’, *brìzgati* ‘to gush’, *sìpati* ‘to pour’, to which we may add *brìsati* ‘to wipe’, *gìnuti* ‘to perish’, Russian *gìbnut’*, *mýkat’*, *sýpat’*, *týkat’* (cf. Schuyt 1990: 350). These verbs represent original infix nasal presents with *u*-vocalism (cf. already Kortlandt 1975: 64),

with the same development as in SCr. *līko*, Russ. *lyko* ‘bast’, Lith. *lūnkas*, Latv. *lūks* (which must be separated from Skt. *lūñcati* ‘tears’, cf. Mayrhofer 1976: 105). The nasal infix was acute in Slavic (but not in Baltic), as is clear from Russ. *ljágu* ‘I (shall) lie down’, evidently on the analogy of *stano*, *seđo*, *bođo*, *obreštō*. For the Baltic type of derived verbs with an acute long root vowel I refer to Derksen (1996: 295–353). In the case of Lith. *jūnkti*, Latv. *jūkt*, Slavic *vyknōti* ‘to get used to’, Skt. *úcyati*, Arm. *usanim*, the Balto-Slavic acute originated from metathesis of the initial laryngeal under the stress (cf. Kortlandt 1977 and Pronk 2008).

Proto-Indo-European lengthened grade was limited to monosyllabic word forms and their secondary nominal derivatives and to final syllables of nominal stems in a resonant (cf. Wackernagel 1896: 66–68 and Kortlandt 2004), e.g. SCr. *rīječ* ‘word’, *žâr* ‘heat’, *čâr* ‘magic’, *sâm* ‘alone’, *mêso* ‘meat’, *žërāv* ‘crane’, sigmatic aorist *ùmrijev* ‘I died’, *dònihev* ‘I brought’, Dubrovnik *rījev* ‘I said’, Posavian *zaklě* ‘I swore’, Czech *žár*, *čár*, *sám*, *žeráv*, Lith. *mēsà* ‘meat’, *akmuō* ‘stone’, *duktě* ‘daughter’, *rěkě* ‘shouted’, *běřé* ‘strewed’, Skt. *vāk* ‘speech’, *māmsám* ‘meat’, *duhitā* ‘daughter’, *ābhār* ‘carried’. Laryngeals were lost after lengthened grade vowels, e.g. Latv. *sāls* ‘salt’, *gūovs* ‘cow’, Skt. *gāus*, Lith. *-dē* ‘store’, *duōs* ‘will give’, *liēs* ‘will pour’, SCr. *dā* ‘gave’, *lī* ‘poured’, as opposed to 1st sg. *dāh*, *līh*, Skt. injunctive *sto-sam* ‘I praise’, *ješam* ‘I conquer’ with full grade vocalism. Secondary lengthened grade also yielded non-acute long vowels in Slavic, e.g. SCr. *bírati* ‘to choose’, *rīd* (b) ‘reddish’, *tráva* (b) ‘grass’, Czech *zář*, *záře* ‘glow’. It follows that SCr. *rāna* ‘wound’ cannot simply be identified with Skt. *vrañás*, which may be cognate with Latin *volnus*. The comparative has a neo-acute in Slavic, e.g. Old Czech *hūře* ‘worse’, *méné* ‘less’, Russ. dial. *bōle* ‘more’, which developed from a combination of Van Wijk’s, Dybo’s and Stang’s laws (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 40). The short vowel of SCr. *mlādī* ‘younger’, *drāžī* ‘dearer’, *těžī* ‘heavier’, *ljěpšī* ‘nicer’, *měkšī* ‘softer’ is the expected reflex of the falling tone (c) in polysyllabic word forms, as in *mlādōst* ‘youth’, and does not represent the old acute (a). For the acute of SCr. *slāva* ‘fame’, *vrāna* ‘crow’, Lith. *šlōvė*, *várna*, *úolektis* ‘elbow’ < **h₃eh₁l-*, *úosis* ‘ash-tree’ < **h₃eh₂s-*, *šókti* ‘to jump’ and *gróbtī* ‘to seize’ I refer to my earlier treatment (1985, 1988). The acute acc.pl. ending of Lith. *turgūs* ‘markets’ resulted from reanalysis and generalization of **-ʔns* from stems in a laryngeal.

In my view, Meillet’s law, according to which the acute was lost in barytone forms of mobile paradigms (3) in Slavic, e.g. SCr. acc.sg. *glāvu* ‘head’, *sīn* ‘son’, Lith. *gálvą*, *sūnu* (stage 5.4 of Kortlandt 2006b: 26), was an analogical development after the loss of the laryngeals in pretonic syllables (stage 5.3). The analogical character of this development is supported by the existence of a paradigm with an acute root vowel (a) and mobile stress (c), viz. SCr. *māti*, Sln. *máti* ‘mother’, Lith. *mótė* (1), Skt. *mātā*, OHG. *muoter*. In this paradigm, the accent was retracted to the root syllable as a result of Hirt’s law in Balto-Slavic (stage 4.1) except in the polysyllabic oblique plural case forms, where accentual mobility has been preserved in Čakavian (Novi) dat.pl. *materán*, inst.pl. *materāmi*, loc.pl. *materāh* (cf. Belić 1909: 231) and

Russian *materjám*, *materjámi*, *materjájáx*. The singular of this word was evidently too frequent to lose its acute on the analogy of the oblique plural forms.

Here I shall not go into the numerous points of disagreement with Matasović's treatment of the quantitative and accentual developments after the rise of the new timbre distinctions (2008: 166–169, cf. Kortlandt 2005a and 2006b). Suffice it to point out that Slavic rising tones originated at different points of time (my stages 6.10, 8.2, 9.2, 9.3, 10.3, 10.10, 10.11, 10.12) and yielded different reflexes in the separate dialectal areas. In the genitive plural, the retraction of the stress from final jers yielded new long vowels in paradigms with mobile stress (c), e.g. Slovene *góř* 'mountains', Polish *raqk* 'hands'. The new length subsequently spread to the paradigms with fixed stress (a) and (b), where the original short stem vowel has partly been preserved in the West Slavic languages.

The original Proto-Indo-European gen.pl. ending was **-om* in all flexion classes, including the *o*-stems (cf. Kortlandt 1978 and 2007a), and developed into Slavic *-v*, which was regularly lost in all languages. The Serbo-Croatian gen.pl. ending *-ā* developed on the analogy of the oblique plural endings *-am*, *-ami*, *-ah* (cf. Oblak 1890: 440) after the loss of final jers, as is clear from the long medial jer in *seštārā* 'sisters' (which is epenthetic) and *otācā* 'fathers'. The original accentuation is preserved in Vrgada *seštār* beside *seštār̃*, Hvar *seštōr* beside *seštōr̃*, Susak *siēstar*. Oblak's solution is supported by the fact that we find e.g. gen.pl. *voděj* beside dat.pl. *vodēm* 'waters' in a Venetian dialect of Slovene (cf. also Ramovš 1923: 211). The model for the analogical development of *-ā* was a paradigm with gen.pl. *-ī* and loc.pl. *-ih* (cf. Karlgren 1911: 15), which was of analogical origin itself (cf. Johnson 1972: 349). Rešetar has pointed out (1898: 137) that in the dialects of eastern Montenegro which keep the reflex of the jers distinct from **a* the former is found in the gen.pl. ending, which is identical with the loc.pl. ending (cf. also Miletić 1940: 401–407). This supports Stevanović's view (1933: 67) that the vowel timbre of the gen.pl. ending must here be derived from the original loc.pl. endings of the *i*- and *u*-stems, which contained a jer.

This is not the place to go deeply into the differences of opinion about the origins of Slavic flexional categories, on which I shall limit myself to a few remarks. I find no evidence for accentual mobility in pronouns, for which I reconstruct accent patterns (a) and (b), never (c). For the present endings of the verb I refer to my earlier study (1979) and for the quantity of the thematic vowel to Vermeer (1982 and 1984). The sequence *-ěa-* in the Slavic imperfect, e.g. *veděaše* 'led', shows that it is a compound formation of a nominal *ē*-stem which can be identified with Lith. *vėdė* (cf. Meillet 1906: 370 and Kortlandt 2005b: 169) and the perfect of the verb 'to be' **ōse*, Skt. *āsa* (cf. Stang 1942: 82). Other *ē*-stems mostly joined the *ā*-stems in Slavic (cf. Kortlandt 1997b: 162). Finally I must confess that I am sorry about the references to Kortlandt 1994, which is so full of printer's errors that it should not be consulted. The Serbo-Croatian translation of this article (1989) is faultless and the original English version (written in 1983) can be found on my website [www.kortlandt.nl].

References

- Belić 1909: Aleksandar Belić, Zamětki po čakavskim govoram, Izvęstija Otdělenija ruskago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk 14/2, 181–266
- Derksen 1996: Rick Derksen, Metatony in Baltic, Amsterdam
- Derksen 2008: Rick Derksen, Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon, Leiden
- Dybo 2002: Vladimir A. Dybo, Balto-Slavic accentology and Winter's law, *Studia Linguarum* 3/2, 295–515
- Johnson 1972: D. J. L. Johnson, The genesis of the Serbo-Croatian genitive plural in *-ā*, *The Slavonic and East European Review* 50/120, 333–358
- Karlgren 1911: Anton Karlgren, Sur la formation du gén. plur. en serbe, Uppsala
- Kortlandt 1975: Frederik Kortlandt, Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology, Lisse
- Kortlandt 1977: Frederik Kortlandt, Initial **u* in Baltic and Slavic, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 91/1, 37–40
- Kortlandt 1978: Frederik Kortlandt, On the history of the genitive plural in Slavic, Baltic, Germanic, and Indo-European, *Lingua* 45, 281–300
- Kortlandt 1979: Frederik Kortlandt, Toward a reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic verbal system, *Lingua* 49, 51–70
- Kortlandt 1985: Frederik Kortlandt, Long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 21/2, 112–124
- Kortlandt 1988: Frederik Kortlandt, Remarks on Winter's law, Dutch contributions to the 10th international congress of Slavists: Linguistics (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 11), 387–396
- Kortlandt 1989: Frederik Kortlandt, Od praindoevropskog jezika do slovenskog (fonološki razvoj), *Zbornik za Filologiju i Lingvistiku* 32/2, 41–58
- Kortlandt 1994: Frederik Kortlandt, From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 22, 91–112
- Kortlandt 1997a: Frederik Kortlandt, PIE. lengthened grade in Balto-Slavic, *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp II*, 45–48
- Kortlandt 1997b: Frederik Kortlandt, Baltic *ē-* and *ī/jā-* stems, *Baltistica* 32/2, 157–163
- Kortlandt 2004: Frederik Kortlandt, Accent and ablaut in the Vedic verb, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47/1, 7–15
- Kortlandt 2005a: Frederik Kortlandt, From Serbo-Croatian to Indo-European, *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 113–130
- Kortlandt 2005b: Frederik Kortlandt, Lithuanian *tekėti* and related formations, *Baltistica* 40/2, 167–170
- Kortlandt 2006a: Frederik Kortlandt, Indo-European *e-*, *a-*, *o-* in Slavic, *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 44–45 [Gedenkschrift Birnbaum], 279–282
- Kortlandt 2006b: Frederik Kortlandt, On the relative chronology of Slavic accentual developments, *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 52, 25–41
- Kortlandt 2006c: Frederik Kortlandt, Balto-Slavic accentual mobility, *Baltistica* 41/3, 359–369
- Kortlandt 2007a: Frederik Kortlandt, Gothic gen.pl. *-e*, *Historische Sprachforschung* 120, 237–240
- Kortlandt 2007b: Frederik Kortlandt, The development of the Indo-European syllabic resonants in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 42/1, 7–12
- Kortlandt 2008a: Frederik Kortlandt, Winter's law again, *Proceedings of the 3rd international workshop on Balto-Slavic accentology* (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 36), Amsterdam
- Kortlandt 2008b: Frederik Kortlandt, Slavic historical morphology: Nominal paradigms, Dutch contributions to the 14th international congress of Slavists: Linguistics (= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 34), Amsterdam, 397–429

- Kortlandt 2008c: Frederik Kortlandt, Balto-Slavic phonological developments, *Baltistica* 43/1, 5–15
- Matasović 2008: Ranko Matasović, *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*, Zagreb
- Mayrhofer 1976: Manfred Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen III*, Heidelberg
- Meillet 1906: Antoine Meillet, *Observations sur le verbe latin*, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 13, 350–375
- Miletić 1940: Branko Miletić, *Crnjički govor*, *Srpski Dijalektološki Zbornik* 9, 209–663
- Oblak 1890: Vatroslav Oblak, *Zur Geschichte der nominalen Declination im Slovenischen*, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 12, 1–47 and 358–450
- Pronk 2008: Tijmen Pronk, *On the accentuation of Lithuanian áiškus, vienas, ieškoti, iesmė, ieva, áuksas, Latvian austra and their Slavic cognates*, *Proceedings of the 3rd international workshop on Balto-Slavic accentology* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 36), Amsterdam
- Ramovš 1923: Fran Ramovš, *K poznavanju praslovanske metatonije*, *Slavia* 2, 205–231
- Rešetar 1898: Milan Rešetar, *Primorski lekcionari XV. vijeka*, *Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti* 136, 97–199
- Schaeken 1987: Jos Schaeken, *Die Kiever Blätter* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 9), Amsterdam
- Schuyt 1990: Roel Schuyt, *The morphology of Slavic verbal aspect: A descriptive and historical study* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 14), Amsterdam
- Stang 1942: Christian S. Stang, *Das slavische und baltische Verbum*, Oslo
- Stang 1966: Christian S. Stang, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo
- Stevanović 1933: Mihailo S. Stevanović, *Istočnocrnogorski dijalekat*, *Južnoslovenski Filolog* 13, 1–128
- Vaillant 1950: André Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves I: Phonétique*, Lyon
- Vermeer 1982: Willem R. Vermeer, *On the principal sources for the study of čakavian dialects with neocircumflex in adjectives and e-presents*, *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 2: *South Slavic and Balkan Linguistics*, Amsterdam, 279–341
- Vermeer 1984: Willem R. Vermeer, *On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: the quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues*, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5/2, 331–395
- Wackernagel 1896: Jakob Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik I: Lautlehre*, Göttingen

Abstract: *Some points of discussion in Slavic historical linguistics.* The publication of Matasović's comparative grammar of Croatian (2008) is a major event in Slavic historical linguistics, because the author abandons a number of traditional views which can no longer be maintained and because he has an open mind for alternative possibilities. This provides an opportunity to draw attention to various issues on which consensus has not been reached, and discussion may yield further progress.

Keywords: comparative, Croatian, grammar

Frederik Kortlandt
Cobetstraat 24
2313 KC Leiden, Niederlande
www.kortlandt.nl