

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20185> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Pronk-Tiethoff, Saskia Elisabeth

Title: The Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic : origin and accentuation

Issue Date: 2012-11-28

3 RESEARCH HISTORY ON THE ACCENTUATION OF GERMANIC LOANWORDS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

3.1 MEILLET (1909), LEHR-SPLAWIŃSKI (1929)

Meillet was to my knowledge the first to write about the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. He states that “les noms empruntés au germanique ont en général l’intonation rude” (1909: 69). The loanwords from Germanic kept their original initial stress and secondarily received acute intonation in Slavic.¹⁰

This idea has long been followed and, in consequence, scholars have tried to give different explanations for words that differed from this rule: when a word belonged to a different accent paradigm, the reason for this was sought in secondary developments or the word was explained as being borrowed from a different language. Meillet considers the words PSl. **osvlъ* ‘donkey’, **kotvlъ* ‘kettle’ and **kōbvlъ* ‘tub; quantity of grain’ borrowings from Latin *asellum*, *catellum* and **cupelleum* respectively because they supposedly reflect the Latin place of the stress, rather than the Germanic initial stress (1902: 186). Although Lehr-Splawinski rejects the Latin etymology of **kōbvlъ*, he agrees with Meillet about the Latin origin of **osvlъ*, **kotvlъ* (1929: 706, but cf. also §8.3.2).¹¹

Regarding the accentuation of the loanwords from Germanic, Lehr-Splawinski, just as Meillet, “constate aisément qu’ils ont conservé généralement l’accent sur leur syllabe radicale - laquelle était accentuée en germanique - et que cette syllabe accentuée apparaît toujours intonnée rude” (1929: 707).¹² He demonstrates this by enumerating a number of well-known examples of Germanic loanwords with acute intonation, e.g., PSl. **bljudo* ‘plate, dish’, **bordь* ‘(battle) axe, bearded

¹⁰ In the discussion of the theories advocated by Meillet, Lehr-Splawinski, Stender-Petersen, Kiparsky and Kurylowicz, I avoid using the Stang-terms AP (a), (b) and (c). As the mentioned scholars themselves mainly do, I will refer to the words that in modern terms belong to AP (a) as ‘acute’, to those belonging to AP (b) as ‘oxytone’ and to those belonging to AP (c) as ‘mobile’.

¹¹ PSl. **vino* ‘wine’ would also be a loanword from Latin, corresponding to the stem-stressed form Lat. *vīnum*. The end stress in **vino* is explained by Lehr-Splawinski as resulting from analogy to other end stressed words with the suffix *-no* (1929: 708). We can now easily explain the final stress in PSl. **vino* by Dybo’s law, regardless of the Latin or Germanic origin of the word.

¹² Although this article bears the title “Les emprunts latins en slave commun”, it deals quite extensively with Germanic loanwords and their accentuation in Proto-Slavic.

axe' (cf. §1.1, fn. 1), *vitędźb 'hero, knight', *volxb 'Romance-speaking person/people', *tynb 'fence', *xyzb/-a, 'small house, cottage', *bukb/*buky 'beech(nut); book', *šelmb 'helmet', *lixva 'interest, usury', *avorb 'maple, plane tree' (cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. *avorb), *xlębb 'loaf, bread', *skrin(j)a 'chest', *cbrky 'church' (cf. §5.3, s.v. PSl. *cbrky; reconstructed with AP (b) in this dissertation), *koldędźb 'well, spring' (1929: 708).¹³ Although in his overview of loanwords, Lehr-Splawinski mentions a small number of words that do not have acute intonation "dont l'origine germanique n'est pas douteuse", e.g., PSl. *gorazdb 'experienced, able', *cęsarb '(Roman) emperor', *myto 'toll, payment', the number of certain loanwords without acute intonation is in fact much larger (cf. §5.3 and §5.4). Lehr-Splawinski correctly places the words with a jer in the root apart and mentions that in these words the stress regularly shifts to the next syllable (1929: 708 fn.).

In his very short article regarding the accentuation of the Proto-Slavic feminine *ū*-stems that were borrowed from Germanic, Illič-Svityč proposes that these words joined the *ū*-stem declension in Proto-Slavic because here, AP (a) was predominant, whereas the feminine *ā*-stems included many mobile words as well (1961: 29-31).

3.2 STENDER-PETERSEN (1927), KIPARSKY (1934)

Although both Stender-Petersen and Kiparsky devote a chapter to the accent and intonation of the loanwords in Slavic in their respective monographs, they essentially disregard and reject accentological evidence. Stender-Petersen takes the view that:

"eine solche Untersuchung nicht zu irgendwie feststehenden oder sonst entscheidenden Resultaten wird führen können. Gerade innerhalb dieses Gebietes können die mannigfachsten An- und Ausgleichungen gewirkt haben, deren Tragweite jetzt nicht mehr voll zu ermessen ist" (1927: 533).

While Stender-Petersen notes that the loanwords often have initial accent and that this initial accent supposedly continues the initial accent of Germanic, he concludes that the Germanic initial accent had no influence at all on the accentuation type in Slavic. He, furthermore, supposes that the words with oxytone stress might have been borrowed from Proto-Germanic before the

¹³ For the sake of uniformity, I render the words in their Proto-Slavic reconstruction; Lehr-Splawinski cites the S/Cr. form.

Germanic fixation of the stress on the initial syllable (1927: 533-537), but this can hardly be correct.

Kiparsky acknowledges that the view that Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic as a rule became acute (as was, for example, held by Meillet) cannot be maintained because of the considerable number of words that do not have acute intonation. On the basis of this observation, however, Kiparsky concludes that the accent is no criterion at all in determining whether the word is a loanword (1934: 298-299).

3.3 KURYŁOWICZ (1951, 1952)

Kuryłowicz treated the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic in his book *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes* (1952) and in a separate article that was published one year earlier.¹⁴ Kuryłowicz holds the view that the differences in accentological treatment of the loanwords from Germanic are caused by the fact that the words were borrowed in different periods. His explanation of the distribution of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic over the accentual paradigms has warmly been embraced and was followed, for example, by Kiparsky (1958), Martynov (1963: 27ff.), more recently also by Gołąb (1991) and, to a certain extent, Matasović (2000).

3.3.1 “PÉRIODE 1”

In Kuryłowicz's “période 1”, when the earliest Germanic words were borrowed into Proto-Slavic, the accent in Germanic was already fixed on the initial syllable. According to him (but also to, e.g., Meillet, see above), the Germanic initial accent could only be retained in Proto-Slavic in the accentual type with acute intonation. The loanwords from Germanic received acute intonation secondarily because this feature came together with the fixed initial stress: “Le slave de l'époque antérieure à l'affaiblissement des yers n'a pu conserver cette barytonèse constante du thème qu'en lui conférant l'intonation rude. Les thèmes à tranche radicale intonable reçoivent par conséquent l'intonation rude” (1952: 275, 1958: 234-235). This happened in loanwords where the Germanic stem vowel was long or contained a diphthong, e.g., PSl. **bljudo* ‘plate, dish’, **bukъ*

¹⁴ This article, with the title “Związki językowe słowiańsko-germańskie”, was published in 1951 and reprinted in *Studia językoznawcze* (1987).

‘beech(nut)’, **xlěbъ* ‘loaf, bread’, **lixva* ‘interest, usury’, **lukъ* ‘onion’, **stōpa* ‘pestle, mortar’, **šelmъ* ‘helmet’, **volxъ* ‘Romance-speaking person/people’.

Kuryłowicz saw that the acute accentuation type did not allow words with fixed initial stress on traditional short vowels. The loanwords that were borrowed in the first period and contained a short stem vowel therefore became oxytones: “L’immobilité des thèmes à tranche brève ne peut être effectuée que par l’imposition de l’oxytonèse puisqu’il n’y avait pas, en slave, de barytons immobiles à vocalisme bref” (1952: 276, 1958: 234-235). This happened in, for example, in PSl. **kotъlъ* ‘kettle’, **osъlъ* ‘donkey’, **popъ* ‘clergyman, priest’, **postъ* ‘fast, Lent’, **skotъ* ‘cattle’.

3.3.2 “PÉRIODE 2”

Kuryłowicz dates the second period in which words were borrowed from Germanic into Proto-Slavic after the weakening of the jers and the establishment of the neo-acute intonation. Words that were borrowed during this period would regularly have become oxytones (AP (b) in post-Stang terminology), viz., PSl. **korlъbъ* ‘king’, **lěkъ* ‘medicine’, **lugъ* ‘lye, caustic soda’, **pila* ‘saw, file’, **skutъ* ‘hem; clothing covering the legs’, **trъba* ‘trumpet’, **vino* ‘wine’. As the reason for this, Kuryłowicz assumes the shortening of the long acute, after which words with fixed stress on a long initial vowel did not exist in Proto-Slavic anymore: “Les substantifs germaniques à vocalisme long empruntés après l’affaiblissement des yers et après la constitution de l’intonation néorude, sont devenus oxytons en slave parce qu’entretemps, à cause de l’abrègement des longues rudes, les barytons immobiles à vocalisme long ont disparu de la langue.” (Kuryłowicz 1952: 276, 1958: 234-235).

3.3.3 “PÉRIODE 3”

The youngest layer of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic supposedly retained the Germanic place of the stress on the initial syllable of the word, even on a short stem vowel, e.g., PSl. **petъlja* ‘noose, snare’, **smoky* ‘fig (tree)’: “La couche d’emprunts la plus récente semble constituée par les thèmes accentués sur une voyelle radicale brève [...]. Ces emprunts ont été traités comme les formes slaves à accentuation néorude (accentuation de la more prédésinentielle)” (1952: 276, 1958: 234-235).

3.3.4 DISCUSSION OF KURYŁOWICZ'S THEORY

Kuryłowicz's analysis of the distribution of the Germanic loanwords over the accentuation patterns of Proto-Slavic has been superseded in several respects by huge progress that has been made in the field of Slavic historical accentology in the second half of the 20th century. As a result, a large part of his interpretation of the material has now become invalid. Especially the character and development of AP (b) and Dybo's law are important in this respect. In the following section, I will discuss the major points of Kuryłowicz's classification of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. It will be shown that Kuryłowicz's division cannot be upheld from a modern accentological point of view.

1. "Le slave n'a pu conserver cette barytonèse constante du thème qu'en lui conférant l'intonation rude."

It has now been established that AP (a) and AP (b) had the same stress pattern up until the operation of Dybo's law (cf. §2.3.1). The only difference between the two paradigms was the intonation of the vowel: the vowel in AP (a) was acute (which probably means glottalized), whereas the vowel in AP (b) was (non-glottalized and) rising (Kortlandt 2008a: 6). Since Dybo's law has been dated rather late in Proto-Slavic, it is reasonable to assume that the majority of loanwords were borrowed before this time, i.e., at the time when two accent paradigms with fixed initial stress existed. The loanwords from Germanic could, therefore, retain their original initial accent (up to almost the end of the Proto-Slavic period) in AP (b) as well.

2. "Il n'y avait pas, en slave, de barytons immobiles à vocalisme bref."

This point has also been superseded by the discovery of Dybo's law. Certainly, only words with stressed long vowels and diphthongs could follow the barytone accentuation type that has now been labelled as AP (a). However, in AP (b), both long and short stressed vowels as well as diphthongs could occur. This is indeed well attested in the many Germanic loanwords with a short stem vowel that follow AP (b) and these words are mentioned by Kuryłowicz as well (see above under "Période 1"). We must now reject Kuryłowicz's suggestion that the stress in these words had shifted to the final syllable at the moment the words were borrowed into Proto-Slavic in order to adapt the words to the existing stress patterns. The words were rather borrowed into Proto-Slavic with their Germanic fixed initial stress, which they retained until the words underwent Dybo's law at a later stage.

3. "Les substantifs germaniques [...] empruntés après l'affaiblissement des yers et après la constitution de l'intonation néorude."

Kuryłowicz assigns a large number of Germanic loanwords in Slavic to the period after the weakening of the jers and the development of the neo-acute

intonation. However, these developments are now considered to have occurred very late in late Proto-Slavic: the neo-acute arose as a result of Stang's law, which can be regarded as the last accentual development in Proto-Slavic and has been dated to the ninth century (Kortlandt 1976: 2, cf. §2.3.2). After Stang's law, there were hardly any innovations in Proto-Slavic that were shared by all three branches of Slavic (Kortlandt 2002a: 16-17). Since the words Kuryłowicz attributes to his "période 2" clearly date from Proto-Slavic (they regularly underwent Proto-Slavic sound changes, e.g., the monophthongization of diphthongs, the development of nasal vowels), these words must have been borrowed when Proto-Slavic was still a linguistic unity and thus earlier than the weakening of the jers and Stang's law, from which the neo-acute intonation in these examples originated.

4. "l'abrègement des longues rudes"

This statement is based upon the traditional idea that the acute vowels were originally long. In accordance with this theory, Kuryłowicz supposes that the younger loanwords became oxytones (i.e., joined AP (b)) because acute vowels were shortened in an earlier period, as a result of which a fixed initial accent on words with a long stem vowel had become impossible. However, acute vowels are now considered to be indifferent with respect to length (Kortlandt 1976: 5).

5. "La couche d'emprunts la plus récente semble constituée par les thèmes accentués sur une voyelle radicale brève".

PSl. **petblja* and PSl. **smoky*, Gsg. **smokъve* regularly joined AP (b) (cf. §8.3.2). The words were originally stressed on the initial syllable and the stress moved to the next syllable with Dybo's law. The stress was then retracted to the initial syllable again when the jers lost their stressability, which resulted in fixed initial stress throughout the paradigm. In the NAsg. of PSl. **smoky*, the stress moved back in analogy to the oblique case forms. Kuryłowicz also mentions the reflexes of PSl. **sъbota*, **sobota* 'Saturday' in this category, but these forms are rather borrowed from Latin (Snoj 2003: 678).

3.4 RECEPTION OF KURYŁOWICZ (1951, 1952)

3.4.1 KIPARSKY (1958)

Kiparsky's article "Zur Datierung der gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen" (1958) is a reaction on Kuryłowicz's theory on the accentuation of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Kiparsky accepts Kuryłowicz's theory and abandons his earlier accentological nihilism. He furnishes Kuryłowicz's

material with information about the accentuation of some of the words in Russian on the basis of material in old(er) Russian texts (chiefly based upon his book *O kolebanijax udarenija v russkom literaturnom jazyke* (1950)).

By giving an absolute dating for the three periods defined by Kuryłowicz, Kiparsky concludes that Kuryłowicz's first period, containing the oldest loanwords, ranges from the beginning of the first millennium until around 700, when the oldest Christian terms came into Slavic from Old High German. The second period of borrowings would contain (Balkan) Gothic as well as West Germanic (German) words and is dated to the eighth and ninth centuries and Kuryłowicz's third period dates from after the ninth century (Kiparsky 1958: 24). This dating can be considered problematic because the first period is very long (lasting more than six centuries!) and apparently comprises words from a number of donor languages, namely Proto-(East-)Germanic, Gothic and Old High German. Kiparsky maintains that loanwords from the eighth and ninth centuries can be of (Balkan) Gothic as well as West Germanic origin, even though the Goths had ceased to play a role of importance in the Balkans several centuries earlier. The dating of the third period after the ninth century is too late to have been Proto-Slavic. This chronology is thus not very convincing (and has for that reason been criticised in later works, e.g., Martynov 1963: 28, Gołąb 1991: 359), but doubtlessly results from a major problem that initially concerns Kuryłowicz's classification: as we have seen, Kuryłowicz considers the words that have (in post-Stangian terms) AP (b) on a light syllabic nucleus or AP (a) to belong to an early period of borrowings, whereas the words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus belong to a later period. I assume that Kiparsky dated the second period to the eighth and ninth centuries because of the date of borrowing of PSl. **korljb* 'king' (from *Karl*, probably referring to Charlemagne). The hypothesis that the words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus were borrowed any later than the words with AP (a) or AP (b) on a light syllabic nucleus is, nonetheless, not supported by any other evidence. All of these accentual categories contain words of Gothic origin and words of West Germanic origin. On formal grounds it is impossible to say that words in one of these categories were borrowed earlier than the words in the other categories. This is, apart from the accentological considerations elaborated upon above, the main reason to reject Kuryłowicz's theory.

3.4.2 MARTYNOV (1963)

Martynov considers the earliest loanwords in Proto-Slavic to stem from the period when the Indo-European place of the accent was still retained in Germanic. He investigates whether the division made by Kuryłowicz still applies when one keeps this circumstance in mind. According to him, it does, but with

the following adaptation: an oxytone word with a long vowel or diphthong does not necessarily point to later borrowing because the end stress may also reflect Proto-Germanic oxytonesis (1963: 29-30).

Up until a certain stage of Proto-Germanic, the free Indo-European place of the stress was retained. Germanic must still have had the free place of the stress when Verner's law operated. According to Kluge, the stress became fixed (mainly) on the initial syllable around the beginning of the first millennium (1913: 34-35, 86).¹⁵ In Martynov's own theoretical framework, in which the contacts between Proto-Slavic and (Proto-)Germanic are dated between the fifth century BC and the first century AD, it is possible that loanwords were borrowed before the stress in Germanic became fixed on the initial syllable of the word. However, it will be shown in chapter 4 that the earliest contacts between the Slavic and Germanic people could hardly start before the mid-third century, at which point the Proto-Germanic free stress had got lost.

3.4.3 GOŁĄB (1991)

Gołąb adopted Kuryłowicz's theory about the accentuation of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic as well and does not add new insights to Kuryłowicz's classification. He criticises the chronology provided by Kiparsky (1958, see above) and refers to a "more detailed" chronology of the loanwords that was published by Kuryłowicz in an article titled "'Germanic-Slavic linguistic relations," (1964: 99-100)" (1991: 360):

"[Kuryłowicz] gave a more detailed chronology of these loanwords in Slavic, without however quoting the linguistic (?) [question mark in the original] criteria upon which his chronology is based. Undoubtedly, the starting point was accentology, as previously proposed, but it became supplemented by additional information. In any case, he distinguished the following periods of borrowing or chronological layers of Germanic:

I. - Borrowings from Eastern Proto-Germanic taken before the second century AD.

II. - Borrowings from Gothic taken between the second and fourth centuries AD

¹⁵ Kortlandt dates the fixation of the stress before Grimm's law in Gothic and after Grimm's law in the Northwest Germanic languages (1988: 9).

III. - Borrowings from Balkan-Gothic taken in the fifth and sixth centuries AD

Of course, there are loanwords whose chronological classification is controversial because of the lack of sufficient linguistic criteria. But the above chronology, which I will follow in the list of Germanic loanwords below, has greater value for a historian than the purely linguistic and rather too general chronology proposed by V. Kiparsky” (Gołąb 1991: 360-361)

Surprisingly, no article by Kuryłowicz from 1964 and with this title figures in Gołąb’s bibliography, nor have I been able to find it elsewhere. I suppose that Gołąb has Kuryłowicz’s 1951 article “Związki językowe słowiańsko-germańskie” in mind. In this article, a chronological layering is provided that is very similar to the one reproduced in the citation above (1951 = 1987: 401). This chronology is however not devised by Kuryłowicz himself; it is a summary of the chronologies postulated by Stender-Petersen (1927) and Kiparsky (1934), as Kuryłowicz himself faithfully notes (1951 = 1987: 401).¹⁶ Gołąb is, thus, mistaken in supposing that the chronology cited above is Kuryłowicz’s answer to Kiparsky’s chronology in his article from 1958. Gołąb, furthermore, seems to imply that the three categories labelled as I, II and III are intended by Kuryłowicz to be identified with his “périodes” 1, 2, 3, but this can, obviously, not be the case because the chronologies postulated by Stender-Petersen and Kiparsky date from before the accentological classification devised by Kuryłowicz.

3.4.4 MATASOVIĆ (2000)

Ranko Matasović has examined the material that Kuryłowicz brought together in “période 2”, i.e., the words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus. Matasović observed that this material is “vrlo [...] raznorodna i dopušta i drukčije tumačenje [very diverse, and also allows a different interpretation]” (2000: 132). In his article, he therefore seeks different explanations for a number of these words, either as inherited words or as loanwords from another language. Kuryłowicz gives seven loanwords as examples for his theory (viz., **korljъ* ‘king’, **lěkъ* ‘medicine’, **lugъ* ‘lye, caustic soda’, **pila* ‘saw, file’, **skutъ* ‘hem; clothing

¹⁶ Gołąb does not reproduce the fourth category: West Germanic loanwords dating from 600-800 AD.

covering the legs, **trǫba* ‘trumpet’, **vino* ‘wine’).¹⁷ Matasović provides a different explanation for four of these words:

- PSl. **pila* might be an inherited word related to Lith. *peilis* ‘knife’.
- PSl. **vino* could be explained as a borrowing from vulgar Latin, rather than from Germanic, based on the fact that Germanic masculine words on the whole retain their gender in Slavic.¹⁸
- R *trubá*, Cr. *trúba*, Bg. *trǎbá* might have been borrowed twice, from vulgar Latin *trumba* ‘trumpet’ as well as from OHG *trumba* ‘trumpet’.
- For the word **lěkъ* ‘medicine’, Matasović allows the possibility that the word is not a loanword from Germanic at all, but instead a native word built on the PIE root **leikʷ-* ‘to leave’ (2000: 132).

Matasović concludes that the regular accentological reflex of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic was AP (a): “germanske posuđenice s dugim prvim slogom zadržavaju mjesto naglaska na tom slogu, koji u praslavenskom dobiva akutsku intonaciju [Germanic loanwords with a long initial syllable keep the place of the accent on this syllable, which received acute intonation in Proto-Slavic]” and that this is “[...] u skladu s našim spoznajama o praslavenskim intonacijama [consistent with our understanding of Proto-Slavic intonation.]” (2000: 132). This implies that all loanwords with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic

¹⁷ In his 1951 article, Kuryłowicz also mentions PSl. **stǫlpъ* (**stǫlbъ*) ‘post, pillar’ (1951 = 1987: 409), but this word is not to be regarded as a Germanic loanword. The word is probably related to Germanic forms as ON *stolpi* ‘pillar’, MDu. *stolpe* ‘beam’ and Baltic forms as Lith. *stulbas* ‘pillar, column’ (REW 3: 18, De Vries 1977: 551); Kuryłowicz did not include the word in the list of examples of borrowings in “période 2” in the overview in *L’accentuation des langues indo-européennes* (1958: 234-235).

¹⁸ Cf. however §7.3.3, where it is shown that the word was likely to be originally neuter in Germanic as well.

nucleus must be explained otherwise. However, not all words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus can be explained away. In his article, Matasović leaves Kuryłowicz's other three examples PSl. **korljъ*, **lugъ*, **skutъ* aside. PSl. **korljъ*, above all, is evidently a loanword from Germanic, but the same probably goes for PSl. **lugъ* and **skutъ*. In §5.3, more words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus are listed.

