Indo-European “secondary mobility” and its implications for accentedness

Anthony D. Yates
University of California, Los Angeles
adyates@ucla.edu

Indo-European "secondary mobility" and its implications for accentedness

Anthony D. Yates, University of California, Los Angeles (adyates@ucla.edu)

The empirical focus of this paper is a prosodic alternation that is standardly reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European (PIE) and that can be observed in Hittite (Anatolian) and Vedic Sanskrit (Indic). Like PIE, these languages have a lexical contrast between stress-preferring (ACCENTED) and neutral (UNACCENTED) morphemes and a phonological preference for the single stress-bearing syllable to coincide with the word's left edge (Kiparsky and Halle 1977; Kiparsky 2010; Yates 2016, 2017). The alternation involves words with stem-final accent: stress surfaces on the accented stem-final syllable before unaccented inflectional suffixes, but accented inflectional suffixes induce deletion of the stem-final vowel and attract stress — e.g., (1) vs. (2) (accent/stress marked " ´ "; Ved. forms in IAST, Hitt. in transcription/IPA):

(1) a. Hitt. /pisén-os/ → *pišēnuš* [pisé:n-os] (man-ANIM.ACC.PL) b. Ved. /ukṣán-as/ → *ukṣánas* (ox-ANIM.NOM.PL)

(2) a. Hitt. /pisén-ás/ → [*p*]*išnāš* [pisn-á:s] (man-ANIM.GEN.SG) b. Ved. /ukṣán-ás/ → *ukṣṇás* (ox-ANIM.GEN.SG)

I demonstrate that stress shift onto the inflectional suffix in (2) — referred to by Kiparsky (2010) as "secondary mobility" — depends crucially on the elimination of the accented stem-final syllable nucleus via syncope. Synchronically, this dependence is shown by words with stem-final accent whose vowel cannot undergo syncope for phonotactic reasons — e.g., Ved. /brah-máṇ-ás/ → *brahmáṇas* (priest-GEN.SG) (*[.mn]) — and which thus show fixed stem-final stress. Diachronically, it is shown by the emergence of stem-final stress in words that previously showed the stress shift in (2) after syncope ceased to apply in the (pre)histories of the IE languages (e.g., Hitt. /link-áj-ás/ → *linkiyaš* [liŋk-j-á:s] >> *lingayaš* [liŋk-á:j-as] (oath-GEN.SG)). To capture this dependence, I propose that Vedic and Hittite are trochaic languages in which accented morphemes contain the left edge of a foot in their lexical representation and in which high-ranking faithfulness (ANCHOR-L: "The left edge of a foot in the input corresponds to the left edge of a foot in the output. Assign a violation (*) if a vowel intervenes.") ensures that this foot edge is preserved in the output (cf. Inkelas 1999, Özçelik 2014, Yawney 2018). Under this view, deletion of the stem-final vowel allows a single foot in the output to correspond to two distinct feet in the input; thus in (3) (= (2b) above) the winner (3d) with deletion satisfies ANCHOR-L, which is violated by (3b) and (3c) in which the foot associated with the stem or inflectional suffix fails to correspond with an output foot.

(3)

uk(ṣan-(as		CULMINATIVITY	ANCHOR-L	ALL-FT-L	MAX-V
a.	uk.(ṣá).(nás)	*!		***	
b.	uk.(ṣá.nas)		*!	*	
c.	uk.ṣa.(nás)		*!	**	
d. ☞	uk.(ṣṇás)			*	*
e.	(úk).ṣṇas		*!*		*

I argue that this analysis improves upon (i) traditional templatic analyses of IE word prosody, such as the "Erlangen Model" (Schindler 1975a,b; Rix 1992); and (ii) generative analyses which assume that a lexical accent is an abstract prominence autosegmentally linked to an input vowel (Revithiadou 1999, 2007, Alderete 2001, *i.a.*) rather than prespecified metrical structure. I show that (i) cannot explain why stress mobility of the type in (2) depends on syncope; and that (ii) makes incorrect predictions, either preferring loser (3b) to winner (3d) if the stem-final accent is assumed to be deleted along with its host, or preferring loser (3e) with initial stress if deletion permits a lexical accent to reassociate with another syllable.