

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

## 9 SUMMARY

The aim of this study has been to present an up-to-date overview of the words that are to be regarded as Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic and to establish the distribution of the loanwords over the three Proto-Slavic accent paradigms.

### CONTACTS BETWEEN SPEAKERS OF PROTO-SLAVIC AND GERMANIC

In the Proto-Slavic homeland, which can be located to the foothills of the Carpathians in the area north and northeast of the Carpathian Mountains and on the vast forest steppes around the river Dniester, the Slavs did not come into contact with speakers of Germanic languages at least until the first half of the third century AD. The first contacts between Slavic and Germanic peoples came about either during the Gothic migration (if their migration took the Goths through the Proto-Slavic homeland) or else shortly after the arrival of the Goths in the Pontic area around 238 AD. The contacts with the Goths are likely to have ended in the fifth century, when the Goths moved to Italy and Spain and the remaining Goths lost their power in the Black Sea area. The contacts between the Proto-Slavs and speakers of West Germanic started when the Proto-Slavs moved westwards beyond the Carpathian Mountains. These contacts have never ceased to exist (speakers of Slavic and German still live in close contacts to each other in many areas where the West Slavic languages, Slovene or Croatian border on German). Loanwords from West Germanic languages could therefore enter Proto-Slavic until its disintegration at the beginning of the ninth century.

Contrary to many scholars who suppose a layer of Proto-Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, I assume that a clear distinction can only be made between Gothic and West Germanic loanwords. Occasionally, it is possible to attribute a West Germanic loanword to either High German or Low German. Scholars have often speculated as to which particular Germanic dialect provided the donor of individual Slavic words, sometimes even reconstructing non-existing Germanic dialect forms that formally match the Slavic word. I have as much as possible refrained from this kind of speculation.

In this summary, I will nevertheless hazard a guess as to where and with whom the Proto-Slavs came into contact in central Europe. Both from a temporal and geographical viewpoint, it is attractive to assume that the Langobards were one of the first major Germanic tribes the Slavs met when they moved westwards. In the fifth and sixth centuries, the Langobards occupied a large territory bordering on the Carpathian Mountains in the east and north, more or less corresponding to present-day Slovakia. This means that the speakers of Proto-Slavic that moved westwards from their homeland, as well as the Proto-Slavs that crossed the Carpathians along the river Orava or through

the Moravian gate encountered Langobards. In 528, the Langobards crossed the Alps into Italy, supposedly under pressure of the Avars, who then established their centre of power in the Carpathian Basin, which they retained until they were ultimately defeated by Charlemagne. It has repeatedly been suggested that the Avar armies consisted for a significant part of Slavs, which would prove early contacts between Proto-Slavs and Langobards. I suppose in this dissertation that the Proto-Slavic loanwords *\*pǫlkǫ* and *\*xǫlmǫ* were borrowed from Langobardic, if they were not taken over from Gothic.

Another contact area from where Germanic loanwords may have spread through the Proto-Slavic linguistic unity is Slavic Carantania. This Slavic princedom, which bordered on Bavaria, had its centre in present-day Carinthia. Carantania emerged as a semi-independent Slavic state in the seventh century and became a margraviate of the Frankish empire in the early ninth century. In the mid-eighth century, the Carantanian dukes, Borut, Gorazd and Hotimir, ruled Carantania semi-independently from the Frankish empire. Hotimir was raised in a Bavarian monastery and he installed Christianity among his people. The Proto-Slavic loanword *\*kormola* 'rebellion' may have been borrowed in Carantania because this word describes the initial protests of the Slavic inhabitants of Carantania against the Christianization attempts. Given the fact that the Carantanians are known to have been Christianized relatively early, it could be supposed that the Proto-Slavic Christian terminology from Germanic can originally be located to Carantania.

#### MORPHOLOGY

An interesting morphological peculiarity that has been cleared in this dissertation is the frequent occurrence of feminine *ū*-stems among the loanwords. The occurrence of the feminine *ū*-stems has often been connected to loanwords from Germanic, but is in fact frequently found among the loanwords from Latin and early Romance dialects as well. It turns out that the productivity of the feminine *ū*-stems among loanwords began in the Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic: feminine words with a stem ending in a velar consonant became *ū*-stems, whereas words with a stem ending in any other consonant became *ā/jā*-stems. At a later stage of Proto-Slavic, the *ū*-stem declension became productive for loanwords from other languages as well, especially for words referring to various kinds of plants and containers.

#### ACCENTUATION OF THE LOANWORDS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

The corpus of certain Germanic loanwords comprises 78 words, 19 of which have AP (a), 19 loanwords have AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus, 20 have AP (b) with a light syllabic nucleus and only 3 loanwords have AP (c). The accentuation of 17 loanwords remains indeterminable.

It is immediately clear that AP (c) is not a regular accentuation type for Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, which is completely understandable from the fact that the stress in Germanic was fixed on the initial syllable of the word. The loanwords could regularly join AP (a) and (b) in Proto-Slavic because these accent paradigms had fixed stress on the root up until almost the end of Proto-Slavic, when the stress in AP (b)-stressed words was shifted to the following syllable according to Dybo's law. The loanwords with a light syllabic nucleus in the root (PSl. \*e, \*o, \*b, \*v̅ from Germanic \*e, \*a, \*i, \*u) regularly joined AP (b), because AP (a) only contains words with a heavy syllabic nucleus. The main question is therefore the distribution of the loanwords with a heavy syllabic nucleus over AP (a) and AP (b). I assume, contrary to the earlier theories, that AP (b) was the 'default' accent paradigm for Germanic loanwords to join. Loanwords joined AP (a) only when there was specific reason to do so. I have found two conditioning factors for the loanwords to join AP (a), which taken together explain almost all the material:

1. The loanword is a Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stem deriving from a Germanic masculine word;
2. The donor of the word is a West Germanic word with a root ending in a voiceless stop.

The first conditioning factor comprises the loanwords both from Gothic and from West Germanic. Since the original Proto-Slavic non-acute masculine *o*-stems had joined AP (c) according to Illič-Svityč's law, there were no original masculine *o*-stems in AP (b). For this reason, the masculine words that the Proto-Slavs borrowed from Germanic joined AP (a), where masculine *o*-stems occurred frequently. The Germanic neuter (or feminine) donor words that for various reasons became masculine in Proto-Slavic were able to regularly join AP (b). This distribution explains the difference in accentuation between such words as PSl. \**plugv̅* AP (a), which was borrowed from a masculine donor, and PSl. \**lugv̅* AP (b), which was borrowed from a feminine donor word.

Secondly, there turned out to be a clear distribution over AP (a) and AP (b) of the West Germanic words with a root ending in a stop. Words with a root ending in a voiceless stop have AP (a) and those with a root ending in a voiced stop have AP (b). This distribution applies to the non-Gothic borrowings ending in a stop, explaining the contrast in accentuation between similar words like PSl. \**lukv̅* AP (a) and \**lugv̅* AP (b) or PSl. \**stppa* AP (a) and \**trqba* AP (b).

I think that the explanation for this distribution can be found in the preglottalization that has been reconstructed for the Proto-Indo-European voiced unaspirated stops. Kortlandt supposes that the preglottalization was retained as such in Germanic until relatively recently in the reflexes of the Proto-Germanic voiceless stops \**p*, \**t*, \**k*<sup>(w)</sup>. In Proto-Slavic, the preglottalized stops (as well as the PIE laryngeals) yielded the acute intonation of AP (a). At

the time when the Slavs came into contact with speakers of West Germanic, they themselves had a series of laryngealized vowels in the words with AP (a), as the Latvians have until the present day in the words with a broken tone. The speakers of Germanic they came into contact with had a system that contained preglottalized stops. The preglottalized stops were retained in modern standard English (where tautosyllabic voiceless stops are preglottalized, e.g., E *leaʔp*, *heʔp*). It is not very far-fetched to suppose that the two phenomena were connected by the Proto-Slavs when they took over the Germanic words, for the difference between a glottalized vowel and a vowel followed by a preglottalized stop cannot have been very large. The distribution of the West Germanic loanwords over AP (a) and AP (b) provides unexpected corroboration for Kortlandt's idea that the glottalization of the PIE voiced unaspirated stops has been retained in West Germanic.