

The word-prosody of Proto-Indo-European **-mon-*stems and their implications for (internal) derivation

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

This paper is concerned principally with the word-prosodic patterns of Proto-Indo-European (PIE) animate **-mon-*stem nominals, and more specifically, with those of the **-mon-*stem that were, according to the dominant view, derived from neuter **-men-*stems by INTERNAL DERIVATION (ID), a process held to account for attested nominal pairs like (1) (Widmer 2004:69; Fortson 2010:122–3; Weiss 2011:262–3, *i.a.*):

(1)	<i>*-men-</i> stem (N.NOM/ACC.SG)		⇒	<i>*-mon-</i> stem (ANIM.NOM.SG)	
a.	Ved. <i>bráhma</i>	‘formulation’	:	Ved. <i>brahmá</i>	‘formulator; priest’
b.	Ved. <i>dhárma</i>	‘foundation’	:	Ved. <i>dharmá</i>	‘support(er)’
c.	Gk. <i>t^hêma</i>	‘tomb’	:	Gk. <i>t^hēmón</i>	‘heap’
d.	Gk. <i>mnêma</i>	‘remembrance’	:	Gk. <i>mnémōn</i>	‘mindful’
e.	Lat. <i>augmen</i>	‘addition’	:	Lith. <i>augmuō</i>	‘sprout’
				Ved. <i>ojmānam</i>	‘strength’ (ACC.SG)

This ID process is standardly analyzed as involving a shift in inflectional class (“proterokinetic” (AK) ⇒ “amphikinetic” (AK)), with resulting changes in word stress and ablaut. However, analyzing PIE **-mon-*stems as AK is formally problematic, the most serious issue being the fact that the Vedic reflexes of this class show consistent suffixal stress, which is precisely the position that is “skipped” in the regular AK stress alternation between root and inflectional endings (in strong/weak cases respectively).

I propose an alternative reconstruction of the word-prosodic properties of PIE ID **-mon-*stems. I argue that the properties of this PIE class are directly reflected in Vedic — i.e., full-grade of the root and stressed *[ó]-vocalism of the suffix in all paradigm cells (cf. Kiparsky 2010:167). The analysis is represented schematically for (1b) in (2) below:

(2)	PIE	*[d ^h ér-mŋ]	>	Ved. <i>dhárma</i>	‘foundation’ (N.NOM/ACC.SG)
	⇒	*[d ^h er-món]	>	Ved. <i>dharmá</i>	‘support(er)’ (M.NOM.SG)

This reconstruction accounts for the paradigmatically invariant root full-grade found in attested reflexes of this class across the IE languages, including all examples in (1). More importantly, it better accounts for their observed stress patterns than the traditional analysis. While Greek attests fixed root and fixed suffixal stress in approximately equal proportions (e.g., (1d) vs. (1c) above), the consistent suffixal stress pattern found in Vedic finds direct support (albeit limited) in Baltic, where Lithuanian forms like *augmuō* in (1e) above belong to accent paradigm 3, which points to suffixal stress in PIE (cf. Derksen 2008:6, Jasanoff 2017:109). The status of *augmuō* as an inherited **-mon-*stem is assured by its cognate Ved. *ojmán-* (cf. *NIL*: 328).

Moreover, indirect support for suffixal stress comes from deverbal **-mon-*stems in Greek and Anatolian, which show suffixal stress, e.g., (3); if this deverbal usage of **-mon-* arose via reanalysis of ID **-mon-*stems (as generally held; Melchert 1983:23, Weiss 2017:386–7), then the capacity of **-mon-* to attract stress in these formations is most plausibly explained under the assumption that the suffix was

also stressed in the ID **-mon*-stems on which they were based. The only remaining fact that requires explanation are the Greek forms with root stress (more accurately, “recessive accent;” cf. *noēmōn* ‘understanding’); I suggest that these show the diachronic emergence of the language’s default stress pattern, as observed in certain (historically) oxytone thematic adjectives (Probert 2006) and prehistorically in **-ti*-stems (Lundquist 2015a,b).

- (3) a. Gk. *kēdemōn* ‘attendant’ (← *kēdomai* ‘care for’)
 b. Hitt. *išhimānes* ‘bonds’ (← *išh(a)i-* ‘bind’)

This reconstruction faces two obvious objections. The first is the theory-internal assumption (e.g., in the widely accepted Erlangen Model; Rix 1992) that all nominals with suffixal **o*-vocalism had AK stress patterns. This objection can now be dispensed with: PIE animate **-oi*-stem nouns are securely reconstructible with stressed **o*-grade of the suffix in the strong cases as is regularly the case in Greek and Hittite, e.g., Gk. *peit^hō* ‘persuasion’, Hitt. *ḫurdāiš* ([$\chi^{(w)}$ ortá:is]) ‘oath’ (see Yates to appear). The other is the invariant root full-grade, which is phonologically unexpected in pretonic position, where mid vowels were regularly subject to deletion, e.g., PIE *dh₃-tér* > Gk. *dotér* ‘giver’, PIE **b^hud^h-mén* > Gk. *put^hmén* ‘bottom’. I propose that this unexpected root full-grade in **-mon*-stems is “inherited” from their derivational base — i.e., from neuter **-men*-stems, where full-grade is phonologically regular (under stress). Such base-derivative interparadigmatic uniformity effects (“synchronic analogy”) are well-known cross-linguistically (Benua 1997, *i.a.*) and characteristic of PIE non-primary derivation, as observed by Schindler (1975:260). Directly comparable are non-primary derivatives formed via affixation like (3a) above, which shows the historical root full-grade of its base (*kēdomai*) rather than the zero-grade expected in a pretonic position (see also Yates to appear for similar effects in non-primary **-oi*-stems).

In the remainder of the paper, I explore the possibility that “inheritance” of root vocalism was systematic in ID. This criterion is shown to support the securely reconstructible type of ID in thematic nominals represented in (4a) (Fortson 2010:122; cf. Nussbaum 2017), as well as certain other traditional examples of ID such as (4b):

- (4) a. PIE **[tóm.h₁-o-s]* > Gk. *tómos* ‘slice’ (M.NOM.SG)
 ⇒ **[tom.h₁-ó-s]* > Gk. *tomós* ‘cutting’ (ADJ.M.NOM.SG)
 b. PIE **[h₂óy-u]* > Ved. *áyu* ‘life’ (N.NOM/ACC.SG)
 ⇒ **[h₂oy-ú-s]* > Ved. *áyús* ‘living’ (M/F.NOM.SG)

I suggest, moreover, that this criterion is appropriately restrictive, excluding other commonly cited examples of ID such as Gk. *kratús* ‘strong’ (←[?] Ved. *krátus* ‘strength; resolve’ per Nussbaum 1998:147, Widmer 2004:128, *i.a.*), which have been doubted on independent grounds (Meissner 2005:62 n. 55; van Beek 2013:118–26).

References

- van Beek, Lucien. 2013. The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Syllabic Liquids in Greek. Ph.D. diss., Leiden University.
- Benua, Laura. 1997. Transderivational identity: Phonological relations between words. Ph.D. diss., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. 2010. *Indo-European Language and Culture*, 2 edn. Oxford, U.K. / Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2017. *The Prehistory of the Balto-Slavic Accent*. Leiden / New York: Brill.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2010. Compositional vs. Paradigmatic Approaches to Accent and Ablaut. In Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert and Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, October 30-31, 2009*, 137–181. Bremen: Hempen.
- Lundquist, Jesse. 2015a. Greek Nouns in -σις: History and Prehistory. Paper presented at the 146th Annual Meeting of the Society for Classical Studies.
- . 2015b. On the Accentuation of Vedic *-ti-* Abstracts: Evidence for Accentual Change. *Indo-European Linguistics* 3.42–72.
- Meissner, Torsten. 2005. *S-stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1983. A ‘New’ PIE **men* Suffix. *Die Sprache* 29(1).1–26.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1998. *Two Studies in Homeric Greek and Homeric Linguistics*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 2017. Agentive and Other Derivatives of “τόμος-Type” Nouns. In Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit and Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.), *Adjectifs verbaux et participes dans les langues indo-européennes. Proceedings of the Arbeitstagung of the Indo-European Society, Paris, 24–26 September 2014*, 232–266. Bremen: Hempen.
- Probert, Philomen. 2006. *Ancient Greek Accentuation: Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and Prehistory*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rix, Helmut. 1992. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1975. Zum Ablaut der neutralen *s*-Stämme des Indogermanischen. In Helmut Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9. bis. 14. September 1975*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Weiss, Michael. 2011. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor / New York: Beech Stave Press.
- . 2017. An Italo-Celtic Divinity and a Common Sabellic Sound Change. *Classical Antiquity* 36(2).370–389.
- Widmer, Paul. 2004. *Das Korn des weiten Feldes: Interne Derivation, Derivationskette und Flexionsklassenhierarchie. Aspekte der nominalen Wortbildung im Urindogermanischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta Sofie Irslinger, and Carolin Schneider (eds.). 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Yates, Anthony D. to appear. Suffixal **o*-vocalism without “amphikinesis:” On Proto-Indo-European **-oi*-stems and ablaut as a diagnostic for word stress. In David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison and Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen.