

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

## 8 ACCENTOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIAL

### 8.1 SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

In chapter 3, the two prevailing theories regarding the accentuation of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic have been expounded. According to the first theory, put forward by Meillet, the regular reflex of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic was AP (a). Lehr-Splawiński correctly set the words with a *jer* in the first syllable apart from this and assumed that these words regularly shifted the stress to the following syllable (1929: 708 fn.). However, we have seen that there are enough loanwords from Germanic with AP (b) to conclude that the regular accentological reflex cannot have been AP (a).

The second theory was formulated by Kuryłowicz. This theory makes a temporal division between older and younger loanwords: the older loanwords regularly joined AP (a) and the younger loanwords joined AP (b). The theory of Kuryłowicz was highly praised in later literature. There are, nevertheless, a number of problems connected to this theory, which make it - both in the light of the etymology of the Germanic loanwords and in the light of the progress in the field of Slavic accentology since the 1950's of the twentieth century - untenable. In the first place, the temporal division that Kuryłowicz applies does not agree with the supposed origin of the loanwords: if we agree that there was an older layer of loanwords (with a heavy syllabic nucleus) joining AP (a) and a younger layer joining AP (b), then we would very much like to see that corroborated in some formal way (for example, if the words that joined AP (a) show different vocalic reflexes from the words that joined AP (b)) or if the words that joined AP (a) were clearly borrowed from Gothic and the words with AP (b) from West Germanic. Unfortunately, no such division can be observed, which is also implied by Kiparsky's unsatisfying and much criticised dating of the categories distinguished by Kuryłowicz (cf. §3.4.1). It is apparent from the corpus that AP (a) contains words that are clearly of West Germanic origin, as well as words that are clearly of Gothic origin, and the same holds for AP (b).

From a modern accentological viewpoint, Kuryłowicz's theory does not hold either: the theory is based on the idea that there was an acute, stem stressed accentuation type and a non-acute, oxytone accentuation type. The acute was thought to be originally long, so the older loanwords with a long vowel or diphthong in the root could only retain their barytonesis by joining the acute, stem-stressed accentuation type, AP (a). The later loanwords were borrowed after the shortening of the acute and could thus only assume the oxytone-stressed accentuation type, AP (b).

It has now been shown that the oxytone accentuation type also goes back to stem stress originally and that the stress remained on the stem almost until the end of Proto-Slavic. This means that at the time when the loanwords were borrowed, Proto-Slavic had two accent paradigms with fixed initial stress which the loanwords could join, namely AP (a) and AP (b). The acute is likely not to have been long, but rather indifferent with respect to length (Kortlandt 1976: 5).

All earlier theories depend on the assumption that the stress pattern in AP (b) was originally oxytone. The natural point of departure was to assume that loanwords would in principle regularly join AP (a) because they would be able to retain their Germanic initial stress in AP (a) only. Dybo's law, however, shows that AP (b) goes back to fixed initial stress as well: the oxytone stress pattern of AP (b) was caused by an earlier forward shift of the stress from a syllable with rising intonation. As Ranko Matasović also noted, the Germanic loanwords were by and large all borrowed before the operation of Dybo's law (e.g., 2000: 131-132). When the words entered Proto-Slavic, they regularly retained their Germanic initial stress and they could do this as either AP (a) or AP (b). Then, at a later stage, some of the words underwent the accent shift known as Dybo's law that was characteristic of AP (b), whereas other words retained their initial stress in AP (a).

As it was shown in §2.2 and §2.3, the difference between AP (a) and AP (b) lay in the intonation of the stressed vowel: the stressed vowel in AP (a) was acute or glottalized while the stressed vowel in AP (b) was rising. When they entered Proto-Slavic, some of the words adopted the acute or glottalic intonation of AP (a) and others adopted the rising intonation of AP (b). It will be investigated in the present chapter why some Germanic loanwords joined the Proto-Slavic accent paradigm (a), while others joined AP (b).

## **8.2 PRESENTATION OF THE MATERIAL ACCORDING TO THEIR GERMANIC ORIGIN**

In most works dealing with Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, a number of different layers of loanwords are distinguished, depending on the Germanic origin, viz., Proto-Germanic, Gothic, Balkan Gothic, High German and occasionally also Low German (cf. §1.3). The basis for some of these layers is not evident. A layer of Proto-Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic must be excluded on historical rather than on linguistic grounds: many loanwords may formally derive very well from reconstructed Proto-Germanic, but this cannot be the case because the collapse of Proto-Germanic has been dated around the beginning of the first millennium, whereas the first contacts with the Proto-Slavs are not likely to have started before the third century (cf. §4.1). The existence of Balkan

Gothic loanwords in Proto-Slavic (supposedly borrowed from Gothic in the fifth or sixth centuries) is also improbable from a historical viewpoint because it is unlikely that the Proto-Slavs borrowed many words from Gothic when the Goths occupied no more than a marginal position in the Balkans.

Judging from the material, a clear distinction can be made between Gothic and non-Gothic loanwords. Some of the non-Gothic loanwords are evidently borrowed from Old High German, while a small number of others seem to come from Low German. The origin of a number of loanwords, however, remains unclear and may on formal and semantic grounds be either Gothic, High German or Low German. I therefore distinguish between the words that derive from Gothic, those that stem from West Germanic and those of which the origin cannot be determined. I refer to the corresponding entries for detailed discussion about the etymologies of the words.

The words that are probably or undoubtedly of Gothic origin, are:

AP (a): *\*bljudo*, *\*lixva*, *\*xlěvō*;

AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *\*kupiti*, *\*kusiti*, *\*lěkō*, *\*vino*, *\*vinogordō*;

AB (b) with a light syllabic nucleus: *\*kotvō*, *\*lvō*, *\*osvō*, *\*stvō*, *\*velvblōdō*;

AP (c): *\*dōlgō*, *\*lvstvō*;

Unknown AP: *\*gobina/\*gobino*, *\*gobvdzvō*, *\*userędzvō*.

The words that are probably or undoubtedly of West Germanic origin are:

AP (a): *\*bukō*, *\*buky*, *\*lukō*, *\*nuta*, *\*pěnědžvō*, *\*plugō*, *\*šelmō*, *\*skrin(j)a*, *\*stopa*, *\*tynō*, *\*vitędžvō*, *\*xyzvō/-a*, *\*xysvō/-a*, *\*xyžvō/-a*, *\*xyšvō/-a*;

AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *\*cbrky*, *\*grędelbō*, *\*korlvō*, *\*lagy*, *\*lugō*, *\*řborō(kō)*, *\*trōba*, *\*xlěvō*;

AB (b) with a light syllabic nucleus: *\*gonoziti*, *\*goneznōti*, *\*kōbvlō*, *\*kōnědžvō*, *\*nebožězvō/\*nabozězvō*, *\*ovotjvō/\*ovotje*, *\*petvlja*, *\*redvky/\*rvdvky*, *\*xrvstvō*;

AP (c): *\*jvstvōba*;

Unknown AP: *\*bvōbnja/\*bvōbnjvō*, *\*pila*, *\*retędžvō*, *\*vaga*, *\*vōrtogordō*, *\*xřdogō*, *\*xula/\*xuliti*.

Of these words, PS. *\*xlěvō*, *\*ovotjvō/\*ovotje*, *\*petvlja*, *\*redvky/\*rvdvky* and *\*pila* are likely to stem from Low German dialects.

The origin of the following words cannot be established with any certainty:

AP (a): *\*duma*, *\*koldędžvō*, *\*orky*, *\*volxō*;

AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *\*česarvō/\*cesarvō/\*cvsarvō*, *\*myto*, *\*pōlkō*, *\*skutō*, *\*xřsa*, *\*xōlmō*;

AB (b) with a light syllabic nucleus: *\*brōnja*, *\*krvstvō*, *\*pōpō*, *\*pōstvō*, *\*pōstiti sę*, *\*skotō*;

Unknown AP: *\*gorazdō*, *\*likō*, *\*pergynja*, *\*skvlędžvō/\*stvvlędžvō/\*štvlędžvō*.

### 8.3 DISCUSSION OF THE MATERIAL

#### 8.3.1 AP (c)

It is well known that loanwords from Germanic (or from Romance, for that matter) did not regularly join AP (c) (cf. chapter 3). This can be explained by the fact that the stress in Germanic was in principle fixed on the initial syllable of the word. Because AP (c) is characterized by mobile stress, it is unexpected for Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic to join this accentuation type. There are, nevertheless, some words that follow or seem to follow AP (c). These words are: PSl. *\*dǫlgǫ*, *\*jbstǫba* and *\*lǫstv*.

Another word that has often been thought to have AP (c) is PSl. *\*kǫnĕdźv* (e.g., Zaliznjak 1985: 137, Dybo 1981: 171). Kortlandt (p.c.) suggested that this word might rather have belonged to AP (b) originally: PSl. *\*kǫnĕdźv*, Gsg. *\*kǫnĕdźa* regularly underwent Dybo's law and yielded PSl. *\*kǫnĕdźv*, Gsg. *\*kǫnĕdźa*. Stang's law did not operate from the newly stressed long falling vowel in the nominative because the stress could not retract to a weak jer. In the oblique cases, it would not have operated anyway because Stang's law only operated in final syllables excluding final jers (cf. Kortlandt 2002a: 17). In the oblique case forms, Gsg. *\*kǫnĕdźa*, etc., the long falling vowel was shortened because it stood in a medial syllable, yielding Gsg. *\*kǫnĕdźa*, etc. After the deletion of the initial jer, this paradigm might easily have joined AP (c) due to the long falling accent in the nominative form. A similar case might be PSl. *\*mǫlinǫ* 'mill' (cf. §6.1).

The reason for PSl. *\*dǫlgǫ* to have AP (c) could perhaps be found in the Proto-Slavic *u*-stems. In the attested Slavic languages, the *u*-stems cannot be regarded as a separate stem class. In Old Church Slavic already, the old *u*-stem flexion and the *o*-stem flexion had become mixed and there is no clear distinction between the *o*-stems and the *u*-stems. Although the *u*-stems merged with *o*-stems into one paradigm, the *u*-stems left numerous productive formations in Slavic.<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup> For example, the genitive ending *\*-u* that is frequent in West Slavic and Slovene and functions as a partitive genitive for some nouns in Russian, the locative in *\*-u* that functions as "second locative" in Russian, and occurs, e.g., in Polish after roots ending in a velar and has been generalised in Slovene and Serbian/Croatian, and the GPL in *\*-ovǫ* has had some productivity in Old Church Slavic and frequently occurs in East and West Slavic forms in order to prevent the Gpl. and Nsg. forms to become identical, and has been generalised for all genders in Sorbian. This is just a selection; all *u*-stem endings have survived in some form in one or more Slavic languages (cf. Bräuer 1969: 140-150).

This indicates that the *u*-stems were at a certain point of time a numerous, influential stem class (Orr 1996: 317-318).

It is impossible to establish with certainty which words originally were *u*-stems. There seems to be agreement among scholars that the following words were *u*-stems: PSl. \**domъ* 'house', \**medъ* 'honey', \**polъ* 'half', \**synъ* 'son', \**volъ* 'ox' and \**vbrxъ* 'top, summit'. All *u*-stems in Proto-Slavic were masculine. It has also been thought that the *u*-stems in Proto-Slavic were all monosyllabic, although there might have been some disyllabic *u*-stems as well (Orr 1996: 316-317). Several indications serve to establish whether a word was an original *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic, for example, the occurrence of derivatives of the word in *-ov-*. Roots with the structure *CbRC-*, *C̄bRC-* relatively often have *u*-stem endings (Orr 1996: 319-320). Mobile accentuation, AP (c), is thought to be the most frequent accent paradigm with the Proto-Slavic *u*-stems (Stang 1957: 77-83, Illič-Svityč 1979: 126-129). From the six certain *u*-stems listed above, four of them have AP (c); only PSl. \**volъ* and \**vbrxъ* have AP (b). Proto-Slavic *u*-stems with AP (a) seem to have been exceedingly rare or even nonexistent (Stang 1957: 81). Stang analysed the 27 Old Church Slavic words cited by Diels that have a number of *u*-stem endings (not taking into account the forms with the Gpl. ending *-ovъ*, which was productive in Old Church Slavic). These words are all monosyllabic masculines and only about six of these words are not reconstructed with Proto-Slavic mobile accentuation (1957: 79, cf. Diels 1932: 153-158). In addition, eleven of the words cited by Diels have a particular type of mobile stress in Russian with fixed end stress throughout the plural. Stang connects this stress pattern to the Proto-Slavic *u*-stems. PSl. \**dъlgъ* is one of the forms that has this type of accentuation in Russian (Stang 1957: 77-83).

In view of the indications cited above, PSl. \**dъlgъ* might very well have been an *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic (even though the Gothic donor form is no *u*-stem): the word is monosyllabic and masculine and has the root structure *C̄bRC-*, it shows *u*-stem endings in Old Church Slavic (Diels 1932: 154), as well as, e.g., the "second locative" *ν dolgú* in Russian, and the adjective formation R *dolgovój*.<sup>150</sup> It has AP (c) of the type that has by Stang been connected to the Proto-Slavic *u*-stems. It may thus be supposed that PSl. \**dъlgъ* was an original *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic and for that reason became mobile in Proto-Slavic.

The question remains why PSl. \**dъlgъ* would have become an *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic, whereas other monosyllabic masculine loanwords from Germanic became *o*-stems. Professor Kortlandt suggested to me that the explanation may

---

<sup>150</sup> Leskien considers OCS *dъlgъ* without doubt to be an old *o*-stem, but does not explain why (1962: 78).

be found in the stem-final velar of the word. As an *o*-stem, the velar would be palatalised in the locative (singular and plural, also in the vocative), and this would be unattractive for a loanword. Compare in this respect Polish, where masculine nouns with a stem in a velar regularly have a locative in *-u*.

PSl. *\*krěpъ*, which has been reconstructed with AP (c) as well (Dybo 1981: 105-106, Zaliznjak 1985: 138) is also likely to have been an *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic, because of the Proto-Slavic formation *\*krěpъkъ*: the suffix in *-k-* has been connected to original *u*-stems as well (Orr 1996: 315, 329, cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. *\*krěpъ(kъ)*). PSl. *\*bergъ* might also have been an original *u*-stem, in view of the accentuation according to AP (c), as well as the adjective formation *beregovój* and the “second locative” *na beregú* in Russian (cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. *\*bergъ*).

PSl. *\*jbstъba* may have become mobile on the basis of the suffix. According to Dybo, the Balto-Slavic suffix *\*-ib-â-* was recessive (2009: 32). In his analysis, the choice of an accent paradigm in Balto-Slavic depended on two factors, viz., whether the root had fixed stem stress (i.e., Lithuanian accentuation types (1) and (2)) or mobile stress (i.e., Lithuanian accentuation types (3) and (4)) and whether the suffix was recessive or dominant. Words with a recessive suffix on a mobile root joined AP (c) in Proto-Slavic (ibid.). The fact that the suffix *\*-vbā* in Proto-Slavic was recessive explains why these words mainly had AP (c) (cf. Dybo 2009: 53-56). PSl. *\*jbstъba* could have become mobile in analogy to these forms.

PSl. *\*lbtъ* is a feminine *i*-stem. On the basis of the structure of the word, the expected accent paradigm of this loanword is AP (b) because the syllabic nucleus of the word is light (see below). However, feminine *i*-stems with AP (b) are extremely rare in Slavic: in his overview of words arranged according to accent paradigm, Zaliznjak lists 25 feminine *i*-stems with AP (a), four with AP (b) and 63 with AP (c) (1985: 132-140). In Croatian, there are no (masculine or feminine) *i*-stems with AP (b) at all (Kapović 2009: 241 fn.). Kapović assumes that there was a tendency in Proto-Slavic already towards generalising AP (c) in the *i*-stems, which started in Proto-Slavic and remained in different degrees productive in the individual Slavic (mainly South Slavic) languages (2009: 236-243). This explains why PSl. *\*lbtъ* (analogically) joined AP (c) instead of AP (b).

### 8.3.2 AP (B) WITH A LIGHT SYLLABIC NUCLEUS

Loanwords from Germanic with a light syllabic nucleus regularly joined AP (b). Light syllabic nuclei are syllables in which the vowel is the reflex of a PIE short vowel, without a following laryngeal or glottalized stop, i.e., PSl. *\*b*, *\*z*, *\*e*, *\*o* (Vermeer 1992: 120).<sup>151</sup> Light syllabic nuclei did not occur in AP (a), where the acute intonation was caused by laryngeals and glottalized stops. It follows that Proto-Slavic words with a light syllabic nucleus could only join AP (b) or AP (c). As was shown above, the mobile AP (c) is highly irregular among the Germanic loanwords, which can be explained from the fact that Germanic had fixed initial stress. This is the reason why Germanic loanwords with a light syllabic nucleus regularly follow AP (b). AP (b) in these words is irrespective of their Germanic origin and concerns the following words: the Gothic loanwords PSl. *\*kotǫlǫ*, *\*lǫvǫ*, *\*osǫlǫ*, *\*stǫklo*, *\*velǫblǫdǫ*; the West Germanic loanwords PSl. *\*gonoziti*, *\*goneznǫti*, *\*kǫbbǫlǫ*, *\*kǫnǫdǫzǫ*, *\*nebozǫzǫ*/*\*nabozǫzǫ*, *\*ovotǫb*/*\*ovotǫje*, *\*petǫlja*, *\*redǫky*/*\*rǫdǫky*, *\*xrǫstǫ* and PSl. *\*brǫnja*, *\*krǫstǫ*, *\*pǫpǫ*, *\*postǫ*, *\*postiti sǫ*, *\*skotǫ*, which are of unknown origin.

In Germanic, these words were generally stressed on the initial syllable of the word and they retained the initial stress in Proto-Slavic (but see below on PSl. *\*kotǫlǫ*, *\*osǫlǫ* and *\*kǫbbǫlǫ*). With the operation of Dybo's law, the stress of these words regularly shifted to the following syllable.

A number of these words has a full vowel in the initial syllable and a jer in the second syllable. If these words were originally stressed on the initial syllable, the expected reflex would be fixed initial stress. This is the case with PSl. *\*petǫlja*, *\*redǫky*/*\*rǫdǫky* (also PSl. *\*smoky*, in the oblique cases *\*smokǫv-*, which is disputably of Germanic origin, cf. §6.2). Because of their fixed initial stress, Kuryłowicz regards these words as very late borrowings, for which he created "période 3" in his accentological distribution of Germanic loanwords (1958: 235 and cf. §3.3.3). The accentuation of these words is, however, no more than regular: the words were borrowed from Germanic with fixed initial stress. The stress regularly shifted to the following syllable with Dybo's law and moved back when the jers lost their stressability.

As Meillet already observed (1902: 186), the accentuation of PSl. *\*kotǫlǫ*, *\*osǫlǫ* and *\*kǫbbǫlǫ* is irregular because the stress did not move back from the medial jer to the initial syllable after the jers lost their stressability. The reflexes of these words in the different Slavic languages rather suggest a late Proto-Slavic (post-Dybo's law) accent pattern of the type *\*kotǫl*, Gsg. *\*kotǫla* (hence R *kotǫl*,

<sup>151</sup> The vowel of a heavy syllabic nucleus is the reflex of a long vowel of whatever origin or diphthong consisting of a sequence of vowel and *\*i*, *\*u*, *\*m*, *\*n*, *\*r*, *\*l* (Vermeer 1992: 120).

Gsg. *kotlá* and not R *kotěl*, Gsg. *\*\*kótla*). This seems to imply that the stress was on the second syllable before the operation of Dybo's law. For this reason, Meillet suggested that PSL. *\*kotvľ̥*, *\*osvľ̥* and *\*kǫbvľ̥* were borrowed from Latin rather than from Germanic because in Latin, the stress was in principle fixed on the penultimate syllable (and on the antepenultimate when the penultimate was short). From phonological, morphological and semantic viewpoints, however, these words are better explained as loanwords from Germanic (cf. §5.4). Berneker regards the accentuation of these words to be secondary after words as PSL. *\*kozvľ̥* 'he-goat' and *\*orvľ̥* 'eagle' (1924: 591), which were stressed on the suffix *\*-vľ̥* (cf. Derksen 2008: 242, 376). This may very well be correct and this would mean that in the words PSL. *\*kotvľ̥*, *\*osvľ̥* and *\*kǫbvľ̥*, the place of the stress does not give indications of either Germanic or Romance origin.

### 8.3.3 AP (A) AND (B) WITH A HEAVY SYLLABIC NUCLEUS

The main group of words for which an explanation is to be found are the words with a heavy syllabic nucleus, which belong either to AP (a) or AP (b). These words are:

of Gothic origin:

- AP (a): *\*bljudo*, *\*lixva*, *\*xlěbv̥*;
- AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *\*kupiti*, *\*kusiti*, *\*lěkv̥*, *\*vino*, *\*vinogord̥*;

of West Germanic origin:

- AP (a): *\*bukv̥*, *\*buky*, *\*lukv̥*, *\*nuta*, *\*pěnědžv̥*, *\*plugv̥*, *\*šelmv̥*, *\*skrin(j)a*, *\*stǫpa*, *\*tynv̥*, *\*vitědžv̥*, *\*xyzv̥/-a*, *\*xysv̥/-a*, *\*xyžv̥/-a*, *\*xyšv̥/-a*;
- AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *\*cǫrky*, *\*grědelv̥*, *\*korľ̥v̥*, *\*lagy*, *\*lugv̥*, *\*ǫborv̥(kv̥)*, *\*trǫba*, *\*xlěv̥v̥*;

of unknown origin:

- AP (a): *\*duma*, *\*koldědžv̥*, *\*orky*, *\*volxv̥*;
- AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *\*cěsarv̥/\*cesarv̥/\*cǫsarv̥*, *\*myto*, *\*pǫlkv̥*, *\*skutv̥*, *\*xǫsa*, *\*xǫlmv̥*.

It is clear from the overview above that the words are distributed in almost equal numbers over the accent paradigms (a) and (b). Contrary to what has been assumed before (cf. chapter 3), I suppose that the 'default' accent paradigm for Germanic loanwords with a heavy syllabic nucleus to join was not AP (a), but rather AP (b), in which the stressed vowel carried a rising tone.

A number of words joined the glottalized AP (a), but only when there were specific reasons to do so. Judging from the material, it seems that there were at least two groups of words that regularly joined AP (a):

1. The Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems deriving from Germanic masculine words;
2. The West Germanic loanwords with a root ending in a voiceless stop.

### 8.3.3.1 *PROTO-SLAVIC MASCULINE O-STEMS*

Many Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems regularly derive from Germanic masculine *a*-stems, but there are also Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems that derive from a Germanic neuter (or feminine) donor form. The Germanic neuter nouns are thought to have regularly changed their gender into masculine when they were borrowed into Proto-Slavic (cf. §7.3.3). It turns out, however, that there is an accentological difference between the words that were masculine in the Germanic donor language, on the one hand, and the Germanic neuter (or feminine) words on the other hand: the Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems deriving from Germanic masculine words joined AP (a), whereas those from Germanic neuter (or feminine) forms joined AP (b).

The explanation for this distribution can be found in Illič-Svityč's law, according to which Proto-Slavic barytone masculine *o*-stems without an acute root vowel (i.e., the words with AP (b)) generalized accentual mobility and secondarily joined AP (c) (cf. also §2.5 and §7.3.3). This means that Proto-Slavic had no masculine *o*-stems that belonged to AP (b) because these words had all joined AP (c).<sup>152</sup> I assume that for this reason, the Germanic masculine donor words joined AP (a) in Proto-Slavic: the new Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems could not join AP (b) because this accent paradigm did not include any masculine *o*-stems, nor could they join AP (c) because AP (c) was mobile.

It follows that the elimination of masculine *o*-stems from AP (b) according to Illič-Svityč's law must have taken place before the borrowing of the loanwords from Germanic (both from Gothic and from West Germanic). Had Illič-Svityč's law operated after the borrowing of the loanwords, then the masculine *o*-stems with a non-acute root vowel would have partaken in the analogical shift towards mobility and joined AP (c).<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>152</sup> It has been thought that traces of the original accentuation pattern were retained in Croatian dialects in Istria and on Susak (Illič-Svityč 1963: 109-119). This led to the postulation of a separate AP (d), in which the NAsg. were accented according to AP (c) and the other case forms according to AP (b). It has however, been shown that the material on which AP (d) in the Croatian dialects is based, is not very reliable (Vermeer 2001a: 131-161, Langston 2007).

<sup>153</sup> The only masculine *o*-stem that follows AP (c) is PSl. \**dǫlgǫ*, which probably stems from Gothic. It would be a rather *ad hoc* explanation to assume that this word was the only one

The secondary transfer of AP (b) masculine *o*-stems to the mobile AP (c) did not include the masculine *jo*-stems. This explains why the words that are borrowed into Proto-Slavic as masculine *jo*-stems, viz., PSl. *\*česarb*/*\*cesarb*, *\*grędelb*, *\*korljb*, are by default stressed according to AP (b).

The Proto-Slavic masculine words that, on the other hand, only became *jo*-stems after the progressive palatalization of velar consonants were initially borrowed into Proto-Slavic as masculine *o*-stems and thus did regularly join AP (a). This concerns the words that have the Proto-Slavic suffix *\*-ędźb* from Germanic *\*-inga-*: PSl. *\*koldędźb*, *\*přenędźb* and *\*vitędźb* regularly joined AP (a). The accentuation of PSl. *\*gobvdźb*, *\*retędźb*, *\*skvłędźb*/*\*stvłędźb*/*\*štvlędźb* and *\*userędźb* is unknown and cannot be determined on the basis of the attested forms. Since the syllabic nucleus of PSl. *\*retędźb* and *\*skvłędźb*/*\*stvłędźb*/*\*štvlędźb* is light, these words could not have joined AP (a), and the same goes for PSl. *\*kvnędźb*, which can be reconstructed with AP (b), instead of AP (c) as is often suggested (cf. §8.3.1).

The following overview shows the Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems with a heavy syllabic nucleus and AP (a) or (b) and the supposed gender of the Germanic donor word:

Proto-Slavic	Accent paradigm	Gender of the donor form
<i>*bljudb</i> (> <i>*bljudo</i> )	AP (a)	masculine
<i>*bukb</i>	AP (a)	feminine (secondarily masc. in Slavic, cf. §5.2)
<i>*koldędźb</i>	AP (a)	masculine
<i>*lukb</i>	AP (a)	masculine
<i>*přenędźb</i>	AP (a)	masculine
<i>*plugb</i>	AP (a)	masculine
<i>*šelmb</i>	AP (a)	masculine
<i>*tynb</i>	AP (a)	masculine

---

borrowed before the operation of Illič-Svityč's law. I suggested in §8.3.1 that the reason for *\*dvlgb* to have AP (c) can be explained if the word had become an *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic.

*vitędźb	AP (a)	masculine
*volxǫ	AP (a)	masculine
*xlębǫ	AP (a)	masculine
*xysǫ/-a, *xyžǫ/-a, *xyšǫ/-a	AP (a)	neuter <sup>154</sup>
*lękǫ	AP (b)	Proto-Slavic derivative
*lugǫ	AP (b)	feminine (secondary masc. in Slavic)
*ǫborǫ(kǫ)	AP (b)	neuter or masculine?
*pǫlkǫ	AP (b)	neuter
*skutǫ	AP (b)	probably neuter
*vinogordǫ	AP (b)	AP (b) after PSl. *vino
*xlęvǫ	AP (b)	neuter
*xǫlmǫ	AP (b)	neuter or masculine?

The distribution according to which the (majority of) masculine *o*-stems deriving from Germanic masculine forms belong to AP (a) and the words that derive from Germanic neuter (or feminine) forms belong to AP (b), applies to both the Gothic and the West Germanic loanwords. According to this distribution, the following words regularly follow AP (a): \*xlębǫ, \*bljudo (from Gothic), \*lukǫ, \*pęnędźb, \*plugǫ, \*šelmǫ, \*tynǫ, \*vitędźb (from West Germanic), \*koldędźb, \*volxǫ (of indeterminable origin).

The Germanic donor forms of the AP (a)-stressed words \*xlębǫ, \*pęnędźb, \*plugǫ, \*šelmǫ, \*vitędźb, \*koldędźb and \*volxǫ are masculine beyond any doubt. PSl. \*bljudo (AP (a)) is, of course, a neuter form. The Germanic donor, probably Goth. *biuþs*, is, however, masculine. As the word is attested in Old Church Slavic as masculine as well, viz., OCS *bljudǫ*, the masculine gender might be original for the Proto-Slavic borrowing and the neuter forms the result of early analogical adaptation. The original gender of NWGmc. \*lauka- and NWGmc. \*tūna-, from reflexes of which PSl. \*lukǫ and \*tynǫ (AP (a)) derive, is

---

<sup>154</sup> NB: PSl. \*xysǫ/-a, \*xyžǫ/-a, \*xyšǫ/-a and \*bukǫ do not comply with the distribution described below.

sometimes thought to be neuter, but in fact seems to be masculine (cf. §7.3.3). On PSl. *\*bukǔ* and *\*xysǔ*, *\*xyžǔ*, *\*xyšǔ*, see below.

Among the loanwords, there are also masculine *o*-stems that belong to AP (b). These forms are: PSl. *\*lěkǔ*, *\*vinogordǔ* (from Gothic), *\*lugǔ*, *\*ǫborǔ(kǔ)*, *\*xlěvnǔ* (from West Germanic), *\*pǫlkǔ*, *\*skutǔ*, *\*xǫlmǔ* (of unknown origin). However, contrary to the words discussed above, in none of these words was the donor form a masculine word without any doubt. The noun corresponding to PSl. *\*lěkǔ* is not attested as such in Germanic (only words deriving from PGmc. *\*lēkja-* ‘doctor’ or PGmc. *\*lekinōn-* ‘to cure’). PSl. *\*vinogordǔ* is a masculine *o*-stem because of the second element of the compound, but the word is accented in accordance with AP (b) according to PSl. *\*vino*. PSl. *\*lugǔ* was borrowed from a reflex of NWGmc. *\*laugō*, a feminine *ō*-stem. The original gender of NWGmc. *\*aimbara-* ‘bucket’, from a reflex of which PSl. *\*ǫborǔ(kǔ)* was borrowed, is unclear and may have been masculine or neuter: both OHG *eimbar* and OS *ēambar* are listed as masculine/neuter in the dictionaries (Seebold 2008: 1061, Holthausen 1974: 15). PSl. *\*xlěvnǔ* derives from a reflex of PGmc. *\*hlew(j)a*, which was neuter. The gender in Gothic and Old Saxon is unclear and might be masculine or neuter (Lehmann 1986: 187, Holthausen 1954: 34), but since the words go back to a neuter proto-form, the word might very well have been borrowed when the original neuter gender was retained. PGmc. *\*fulka-*, from a reflex of which PSl. *\*pǫlkǔ* is derived, is usually reconstructed and attested as a neuter *a*-stem (e.g., Fick/Falk/Torp 1909: 235, cf. §7.3.3). The original gender of PGmc. *\*skauta-*, from a reflex of which PSl. *\*skutǔ* was borrowed is unclear and might be masculine or neuter: Lehmann assumes a neuter for the Gothic Dsg. *skauta* (1986: 311). The word is attested in masculine and feminine forms in Old High German (*scōz m.*, *scōzo m.*, *scōza f.*), ON *skaut* is a neuter form and Old English *scēat* is masculine. The word is often regarded as a borrowing from Gothic and may thus have been borrowed from an original neuter form. PSl. *\*xǫlmǔ* was probably borrowed from an unattested Gothic or Langobardic form. The West Germanic cognates are either neuter or masculine: OS *holm* is neuter according to Kluge (2002), but masculine according to Holthausen (1954: 35) and the Old Norse forms are masculine (De Vries 1977: 248). This seems to point to a prevalence of masculine forms, but the original gender of the donor form is impossible to reconstruct.

The forms that do not follow the distribution described above, are PSl. *\*bukǔ* and *\*xysǔ*, *\*xyžǔ*, *\*xyšǔ*. PSl. *\*bukǔ*, from a reflex of NWGmc. *\*bōkō* ‘beech’ (f. *ō*-stem), is thought to be secondarily masculine after other monosyllabic Proto-Slavic words for trees (REW 1: 139) and is probably accented according to AP (a) after PSl. *\*buky* and/or because of the distribution that is described below (cf. §8.3.3.2). PSl. *\*xysǔ*, *\*xyžǔ*, *\*xyšǔ* derive from a reflex of PGmc. *\*hūsa-*,

which is attested as neuter in all Germanic languages. The expected reflex is therefore AP (b) instead of AP (a).

It turns out that the distribution of the masculine *o*-stems with a heavy syllabic nucleus over the Proto-Slavic accent paradigms (a) and (b) can be predicted on the basis of the gender of the Germanic donor form. There were no original masculine *o*-stems in AP (b) because the original Proto-Slavic non-acute masculine *o*-stems had joined AP (c) according to Illič-Svityč's law. The masculine words that the Proto-Slavs borrowed from Germanic therefore joined AP (a), where masculine *o*-stems occurred frequently. The Germanic neuter (or feminine) donor words that for different reasons turned masculine in Proto-Slavic were able to join AP (b), which was the default accent paradigm that the Germanic loanwords joined. This distribution explains the occurrence of AP (a) or AP (b) for the majority of masculine *o*-stems in Proto-Slavic (except for PSl. *\*bukǫ* and *\*xysǫ*, *\*xyžǫ*, *\*xyšǫ*).

#### 8.3.3.2 WEST GERMANIC ROOTS ENDING IN A VOICELESS STOP

Now that we have explained the fact that words with a light syllabic nucleus joined AP (b) as well as the accentological distribution of the masculine *o*-stems with a heavy syllabic nucleus over the accent paradigms (a) and (b), we will investigate the remaining material. It was supposed that the loanwords with a heavy syllabic nucleus joined AP (b) by default. This leaves the words with AP (a) to be explained. These words are (excluding the masculine *o*-stems): PSl. *\*lixva* (of Gothic origin); *\*buky*, *\*nuta*, *\*skrinja*, *\*stǫpa* (of West Germanic origin); and *\*duma*, *\*orky* (of unknown origin).

It is striking that many more West Germanic than Gothic loanwords follow AP (a). (Note that this is again in defiance of the chronological distribution supposed by Kuryłowicz, who stated that the earlier and not the later loanwords tend to become acute). Whereas (including the masculine *o*-stems) only three probable Gothic loanwords have AP (a), there are twelve probable West Germanic loanwords with AP (a). When we look at the West Germanic loanwords and their distribution over AP (a) and AP (b), a phonologically conditioned distribution stands out: the words with a root ending in a voiceless stop tend to follow AP (a) and those with a root ending in a voiced stop follow AP (b): PSl. *\*buky*, *\*nuta*, *\*stǫpa* (and *\*bukǫ*, *\*lukǫ*, *\*vitędžǫ*, (originally) masculine *o*-stems) have AP (a), whereas *\*grędelb*, *\*lagy*, and *\*trǫba* (and *\*lugǫ*,

*\*ǫborǫ* (*kǫ*), masculine *o*-stems) have AP (b).<sup>155</sup> No such distribution can be found within the Gothic words. PSl. *\*cbrky* is an exception to this distribution. In the following section, it will be argued that the acute intonation of the Proto-Slavic loanwords with a root ending in a voiceless stop from West Germanic can be connected to the preglottalization of the West Germanic voiceless stops. The absence of acute intonation in PSl. *\*cbrky* can perhaps be explained by the presence of *r* between the vowel and the stop, which may have prevented the Proto-Slavs from perceiving the glottalization.

#### GLOTTALIZATION IN WEST GERMANIC?

In his discussion about the differences in accentological treatment between Latin and Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic (in which he describes that Germanic loanwords (regularly) became acute, whereas the Latin loanwords rarely joined the acute accentuation type), Lehr-Spławiński concludes that:

“[i]l ne reste donc que d’admettre que les voyelles accentuées dans des divers dialectes germaniques différaient par leur intonation de celles du latin. Bien que les intonations ne jouaient aucun rôle dans la structure grammaticale des langues en question, la différence était aperçue par les Slaves dont la langue commune possédait un système d’intonations richement développé.” (1929: 709).

Kortlandt also suggested that the reason why some of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic kept their initial stress and follow AP (a) “must be sought in the pitch characteristics of the Germanic dialects from which the words were taken” (1975: 70). This might very well account for the distribution of the West Germanic loanwords over AP (a) and AP (b). There must be a phonetic reason for West Germanic loanwords with a root in a voiceless stop to join the acute AP (a).

In his discussion of the nature of the acute intonation in Proto-Slavic, Holzer discusses the accentuation of Germanic and Romance loanwords in Proto-Slavic (2009: 152-153). He agrees with Kortlandt, et al., who think that typological and structural reasons make it plausible that the Proto-Slavic acute was a glottalic (laryngeal) element, as in Proto-Indo-European. The fact that Germanic and Romance loanwords frequently adopt AP (a) when they are accommodated to the Slavic accentual patterns, according to Holzer, indicates that the Proto-Slavic

---

<sup>155</sup> PSl. *\*plugǫ* supposedly joined AP (a) because it is a masculine *o*-stem deriving from a masculine donor form (see above), just as PSl. *\*lukǫ*, *\*vitǫdǫzǫb*.

acute was a “Prosodem” (a suprasegmental feature) and not a “Segment” (2009: 153):

“Denn damit, dass das Germanische und das Romanische in den betreffenden Positionen selbst ein glottales Element aufgewiesen hätten, ist nicht zu rechnen; wohl aber konnten die betreffenden Silben in den Gebersprachen manchmal allophonisch auf eine bestimmte Weise intoniert oder glottalisiert (mit „creaky-voice“) ausgesprochen worden sein, wobei es sich um lautstilistische oder individuelle Varianten gehandelt haben könnte. Auch die Einbettung einer Silbe in eine bestimmte Satzmelodie könnte von den Slaven als Silbenintonation interpretiert worden sein.“ (ibid.).

I do not think it likely that allophonic pronunciation (“lautstilistische oder individuelle Varianten”) in the Germanic donor language caused loanwords to join AP (a). I rather suppose that some dialects of Germanic indeed had a phonemic glottalic element which caused some of the words to join the acute AP (a) in Proto-Slavic, as Holzer thinks impossible. As was described in §2.2 and §7.2.1.6, Kortlandt reconstructs the PIE voiced unaspirated stops *\*b*, *\*d*, *\*g<sup>(w)</sup>* as preglottalized stops. In Balto-Slavic, the PIE voiced unaspirated stops caused preceding vowels to become long and acute (Winter’s law). Kortlandt states that the acute intonation of AP (a) was caused by the PIE laryngeals and glottalized (= PIE voiced unaspirated) stops only (e.g., 1975: 22, 1978a: 110). The glottal element of these stops and of the PIE laryngeals developed into a feature of the preceding vowel and yielded a contour that can be compared to the broken tone that is found in Latvian and dialects of Lithuanian (Kortlandt, e.g., 1985b: 122).

Kortlandt also supposes that the preglottalization of PIE *\*b*, *\*d*, *\*g<sup>(w)</sup>* was retained as such in Germanic until relatively recent (and until today in modern standard English and the western Jutlandic dialect of Danish) (1988: 6-8). Whereas the preglottalization of PGmc. *\*p*, *\*t*, *\*k<sup>(w)</sup>* would have disappeared at a relatively early stage of Gothic, it caused preaspiration, preglottalization and gemination in almost all Northwest Germanic languages (Kortlandt 1988: 6-9, cf. §7.2.1.6).

It is striking that exactly the West Germanic words with a root ending in one of the voiceless, supposedly preglottalized, stops joined AP (a); this fits in well with the idea that the preglottalization had been retained in West Germanic, at least in the dialects with which the Proto-Slavs came into contact when they came to central Europe. When taking over the loanwords, the Proto-Slavs identified the glottalic element of the Germanic voiceless stops with their own glottalic element of the words with AP (a). For this reason, the West Germanic stops with a root in a voiceless stop joined AP (a) in Proto-Slavic. The loanwords with a root in a voiceless stop in Proto-Slavic, reflecting a West

Germanic voiceless (preglottalized) stop thus joined AP (a): \*bukǔ, \*buky, \*nuta, \*stǫpa (\*lukǔ, vitǫdǫzǔ), whereas the words with a root in a voiced stop by default joined AP (b): \*grǫdelǔ, \*lagy, \*trǫba, (\*lugǔ, \*ǫborǔ(kǔ)). This distribution covers all West Germanic loanwords with a root that ends in a stop (except for PSl. \*cǫrky, where the transfer of the glottalic element may have been blocked by the resonant between the vowel and the stop.).<sup>156</sup>

Kortlandt found no evidence for the glottal stop in the Low German area and in Gothic (1988: 8). If the glottalic feature got indeed lost at an early stage in the Low German dialects, we would not expect the Low German loanwords in Proto-Slavic to have AP (a) and this indeed is not the case if one looks at the accentuation of the Low German loanwords in the corpus. The words that supposedly come from Low German are: PSl. \*ovotjǔ/\*ovotje, \*petǔlja, \*pila, \*redǔky/\*rǫdǔky and \*xlǔvǔ. PSl. \*ovotjǔ/\*ovotje, \*petǔlja and \*redǔky/\*rǫdǔky have regularly joined AP (b) because the syllabic nucleus of these words is light. PSl. \*xlǔvǔ has AP (b) and \*pila has AP (b) or (c).

#### 8.3.4 REMAINING WORDS AND EXCEPTIONS

For a number of words, the exact Germanic provenance cannot with certainty be determined. These words are:

- AP (a): \*duma, \*koldǫdǫzǔ, \*orky, \*volxǔ;
- AP (b), heavy syllabic nucleus: \*cǫsarǔ/\*cesarǔ/\*cǫsarǔ, \*myto, \*pǫlkǔ, \*skutǔ, \*xǫsa, \*xǫlmǔ;
- AB (b), light syllabic nucleus: \*brǫnja, \*krǫstǔ, \*pǫpǔ, \*postǔ, \*postiti sǫ, \*skotǔ;
- Unknown AP: \*likǔ, \*pergynja, \*skǫlǫdǫzǔ/\*stǫlǫdǫzǔ/\*štǫlǫdǫzǔ.

See above for the discussion of the accentuation of the words with AB (b) and a light syllabic nucleus, which includes PSl. \*brǫnja, \*krǫstǔ, \*pǫpǔ, \*postǔ, \*postiti sǫ, \*skotǔ (§8.3.2) and the masculine *o*-stems with a heavy syllabic nucleus, which includes PSl. \*koldǫdǫzǔ, \*volxǔ, \*pǫlkǔ, \*skutǔ, \*xǫlmǔ (§8.3.3.1). PSl. \*cǫsarǔ/\*cesarǔ/\*cǫsarǔ joined AP (b) because it was borrowed into Proto-Slavic as a *jo*-stem. It therefore joined the ‘default’ accent paradigm for words with a heavy syllabic nucleus. The same goes for PSl. \*xǫsa.

This leaves the accentuation of PSl. \*duma, \*orky (with AP (a)) to be explained. If we apply the distribution of the words with a root ending in a stop

---

<sup>156</sup> For PSl. \*plǫgǔ, see above.

that is described above, it follows that *\*orky* must be a West Germanic (High German) loanword and that *\*myto* does not derive from Old High German. This is not in conflict with the etymologies that have often been suggested for these words. On the basis of accentological evidence, it can therefore be supposed that PSl. *\*orky* is a West Germanic loanword and that PSl. *\*myto* derives from Gothic (Low German might theoretically also be possible but PSl. *\*myto* has often been thought to derive from Gothic).

The explanations given above for the distribution of the Germanic loanwords over the Proto-Slavic accent paradigms cover the vast majority of the material. The accentuation of a small number of words remains unexplained. The two motivations adduced above for loanwords with a heavy syllabic nucleus for joining AP (a) do not explain why PSl. *\*lixva*, *\*skrin(j)a*, *\*xyzǝ/-a*, *\*xysǝ/-a*, *\*xyžǝ/-a*, *\*xysǝ/-a* and *\*duma* joined AP (a).

