

Evidence for non-linear phonological structure in Indo-European: The case of fricative clusters

Götz Keydana

Sprachwissenschaftliches Seminar

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

In this paper I argue for the necessity of reconstructing hierarchical phonological structure for onset clusters containing fricatives. The first part deals with /s/ in obstruent clusters. I show that it was subsegmental in Germanic and Latin, while in Greek and Indo-Iranian it was parsed into a semisyllable. In the second part the analysis is extended to laryngeals in onset clusters. Based mainly on Indo-Iranian evidence I argue that in PIE laryngeals were semisyllabic like /s/. PIE word-initial semisyllables were licensed just in case they contained a fricative. The last part of the paper deals with *s*-mobile in clusters with plosives, which can be explained by the semisyllabic status of *s* in these configurations. I argue that semisyllabic /s/ was highly marked and prone to lexically gradual change. The markedness of semisyllabic /s/ is backed by observations from language acquisition, its diachronic instability by typological data.

1 Introduction

In this paper I argue for the importance of non-linear phonological structure for understanding PIE phonotactics. I show that a better grasp of prosodic phenomena sheds light on the segmental make-up of PIE phonemes.

First I give a short sketch of the perfect reduplication in ancient IE languages. Then I discuss the behaviour of onset clusters with initial /s/ or laryngeal followed by a plosive in reduplication. The observed anomalies are explained with recourse to subsegmental and supersegmental structure. In the final part of the paper I give a tentative explanation for at least one subgroup of *s*-mobile-phenomena based on a prosodic analysis.

2 Reduplication

Reduplication is important for the study of phonotactics, because the shape of the reduplicant is always determined by melodic specifications copied from segments of its base. The copy, however, is not necessarily faithful. In general, deviations from faithfulness lead to a very simple syllabic make-up, often a CV-template. Therefore, reduplication is seminal for investigating markedness in onset clusters.

A case in point is the IE perfect reduplication. In (1) some core data are given:

- 1 a Old Latin *currō, cecurrī*
- b Greek *τρέφω, τέτροφα*
- c Vedic *kar, cakāra*
- d Vedic *prath, paprātha*

Two interesting patterns emerge. One concerns the vowel, which is an /e/ in PIE, regardless of the vowel of the base.¹ The other is the fact that only one of the onset consonants of the first syllable of the base is copied into the reduplicant.

In the languages under discussion, perfect reduplication was a fully active synchronic morphological operation, so that in Vedic and Greek every verbal root (except for the descendants of PIE **ueǵd*) with the capacity of forming a perfect stem was potentially subject to reduplication. The process was productive, as it was also applied to newly formed verbs.² While Latin had restricted reduplication to a small number of roots,³ the process was still fully active, if not productive. This is evident from the fact that in the development from Old to Classical Latin, the reduplicant /e/ was systematically replaced by the vowel of the base.⁴

1 See Keydana (2006) for details.

2 Cf. Late Vedic *mlecch* with its perfect *mimleccha*, which is probably of onomatopoeic origin (Goto (1987: 253), or Greek denominative *δειπνέω* with perfect *δεδείπνηκα*, already quoted by Schwyzler (1939: 765) as evidence for the “Lebendigkeit der Reduplikation”.

3 For an overview see Meiser (2003: 181).

4 The exceptions, which in themselves also show a regular pattern, are discussed in Keydana (2006: 79–80).

These observations lead to the following sketch of perfect reduplication as part of the grammar in the ancient IE languages and PIE.

The reduplicant as part of the lexicon was specified as a CV-template on the timing tier, and the V-slot was linked to a full featural specification on the melody tier:

$$\begin{array}{l} 2 \text{ RED} = \text{C V (timing tier)} \\ | \\ \text{e (melody tier)} \end{array}$$

In a first approximation the grammar may be sketched as in (3):

- 3 a Attach RED to the left edge of the perfect stem (its base).
- b Copy the melodic specification of the base-initial consonant to the C-slot of RED.

(3a) leads to morphological structures of the type *Ce-k^wor-e.⁵ The phonological grammar then copies the melodic specification of the base-initial *k^w into the C-slot of the reduplicant, resulting in *k^wek^wore.

3 PIE */s/ in reduplication

3.1 Subsegmental structure

In data like (1b) and (1d), only the first segment of an onset cluster of the base is copied into the reduplicant. S-clusters, however, show a more complex behaviour. The present subsection deals with Gothic and Latin data, the following with Greek and Vedic material.

Gothic and Latin exhibit the following patterns:

- 4 a Gothic (*ga*)-*stalda*, *staistald*, not †*saistald*
- b Latin *spondeō*, *spōndī*, not †*sospondī* or †*spospondī*

Both languages copy the entire cluster into the reduplicant. In Latin an additional complexity arises, as the cluster is simplified word-internally.⁶


5 For ease of printing the timing tier and the melody tier are conflated in this notation.

Turning to the cluster in the reduplicant first, a rather straightforward – albeit simplistic – solution emerges: if the reduplicant offers only one slot for a non-peak segment, /st/ in onsets must count as one segment in Latin and Gothic.

This may come as a surprise when dealing with *st*-clusters, but it is a fairly accepted analysis for affricates. Their internal make-up prohibits their treatment as one phoneme, yet in languages such as German they are distributed like monosegmentals. With different tiers in the phonological structure, they are best viewed as one slot on the timing tier associated with two melodic specifications on the melody tier.

The analysis can be extended to *st*-clusters in Gothic and Latin as, in the words of Wiese (1996: 262), these clusters simply show “a mirror shape [relative to affricates, G.K.]”. Modifying a proposal by Weijer (1994), we postulate the following structure for clusters consisting of *s* and a plosive in Latin and Germanic:

5



In the Germanic languages, subsegmental structure in *s*-clusters is evident from the earliest attestations up to the modern languages (Wiese (1996: 43)). Latin subsegmental structure, however, is more recent. The lexicalized relic form *sistō* shows that *s* had segmental status in an earlier period.⁷

6 This phenomenon cannot be explained by dissimilation (cf. Meiser (1998: 210)) as long as reduplication is still an active morphological process. See Keydana (2006: 81) for details.

7 It is also short-lived. The Romance languages do not treat *s*-clusters as monosegmental. Cf. the Old French data below.

The assumption of subsegmental structure in Latin and Gothic *s*-clusters helps to clarify a variety of other, seemingly unrelated, facts.

In both Latin and Gothic, *s*-clusters violate the Sonority Sequencing Principle (SSP), because sibilants are inherently more sonorous than plosives. The SSP is a constraint on the well-formedness of syllables forcing the sonority within the syllable to rise through the onset, reach its peak at the nucleus, and fall throughout the coda.⁸ *S*-clusters violating the SSP cannot be accounted for by reducing the principle to a mere tendency, as the exceptions to the SSP are highly regular. Nor can it be explained by assuming a single stratum for all obstruents on the sonority hierarchy. In Latin reduplicated perfects, the *s*-cluster is always reduced to the plosive word-internally, showing that plosives have a higher margin-affinity than sibilants.

However, subsegmental structure allows for an elegant solution: the SSP is a condition on segments within and licensed by a syllable.⁹ It is evaluated by computing the sonority of each segment and deriving a sonority grid from this computation. However, subsegmental structure is licensed and dominated by a segmental slot. The decline in sonority within *s*-clusters is therefore not in the domain of the SSP.

Subsegmental structure is also the reason why word-internal *s*-clusters are simplified, since highly marked phonological structure is often positionally constrained.¹⁰ In Latin, monosegmental *s*-clusters are restricted to the onset of prosodic words. If we further assume that the right boundary of the reduplicant is aligned to the right edge of the syllable,¹¹ word-internal *sp* would have to be parsed into an onset, but as that is blocked, it has to be reduced to a non-branching segment (i.e., a segment without subsegmental structure).

8 The SSP goes back to Sievers (1901: 204). For a modern account see Clements (1990).

9 Licensing is an important concept in non-linear phonology, as phonological material and / or structure is only allowed for if it is properly embedded into a higher structural domain. Constraints on structure and / or material are always local: they apply only within the immediate domain of a given structure and / or given material.

10 Cf. the distribution of monosegmental *s*-clusters in Germanic.

11 On the alignment of morphological and prosodic structure see McCarthy & Prince (1993).

Subsegmental structure also explains why verbs with *s*-clusters show reduplication at all, as reduplication is otherwise restricted to verbs with monosegmental onsets in Latin (Keydana (2006: 81)).

A last point illuminated by assuming subsegmental structure is the behaviour of *s*-clusters in Germanic alliterative verse. In Old High German, for example, the domain of alliterative verse is always the first segment of the word-initial syllable, be it a non-branching onset or the first part of a complex onset. The only seeming exception to this rule is constituted by *s*-clusters, which alliterate as wholes. If alliteration is defined in terms of segments, this behaviour is predicted by the analysis proposed here, since *s*-clusters are in fact segments.

3.2 Semisyllables

S-clusters in Greek and Vedic take the following shape:

- 6 a Greek *στρατεύω, ἐστράτευκα*
- b Vedic *stambh, tastámbha*, not †*sastámbha*

In both languages *s*-clusters are treated like other clusters, and only one segment is copied into the reduplicant. The clusters must therefore be sequences of distinct segments without subsegmental structure. Still, the data require some explanation. First, the segment that is copied differs: in Greek (or rather Pre-Greek) it is *s*, whereas in Vedic it is the plosive.

The second question concerns the sonority. *S*-clusters in Greek and Vedic are not subsegmental and should therefore violate the SSP. Since no other cluster violates this constraint, we would again be ill-advised to reduce it to a tendency. Rather, a principled explanation is called for. A possible explanation already discussed for Latin is that of a language specific sonority hierarchy. However, it must be wrong at least for Vedic, since the data show that plosives in onset position are preferred (see below). Vedic, therefore, has the same sonority hierarchy as Latin:¹²

12 The hierarchy is given as a cascade of OT constraints, because it is part of the grammar. $*(a/MAR)$ is a ban on non-high vowels (*a*) in the onset or coda (the margin) of the syllable, $*(t/MAR)$ a ban on voiceless plosives (*t*) in the margin. The ranking ensures that whenever faithfulness to the lexical input allows for a

7 $*(a/MAR) \gg *(i/MAR) \gg *(r/MAR), *(m/MAR) \gg *(s/MAR) \gg *(t/MAR)$


In short: $*(a \triangleright t/MAR)$

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it seems reasonable to extend this hierarchy to Greek (and probably PIE).

The best option is to assume some additional structure preventing the cluster from being accessible to the SSP. The subsegmental approach advocated for Latin and Gothic is of this type, but since reduplication patterns show the cluster was not subsegmental in Greek and Vedic, an alternative is called for. I therefore propose to promote part of the cluster into a structural domain outside the syllable. Following ideas going back to Sievers (1901: 205–6), I will assume that initial *s* in clusters forms a semisyllable.

Semisyllables are non-moraic syllables (Cho & King (2003)). Lacking both nucleus and coda, they consist of an onset only. Under the semisyllabic approach, Vedic *stambh* has the following phonological structure:

8



In this configuration, both the semisyllable and the moraic syllable satisfy the SSP.

Semisyllabicity of *s* in onset clusters may seem completely ad hoc; however, a comparison with semisyllables in other languages shows that, typologically, it is highly plausible. Semisyllables are typically aligned with the margin of morphemes. This is exactly the case with $[_\zeta s]$, which only occurs on the left margin of root morphemes. Besides, semisyllables are often restricted as to possible melodic specifications. This, too, seems to hold true

choice, voiceless plosives in the syllable margin are preferred over fricatives, fricatives over nasals, nasals over liquids, and so on.

for Vedic and Greek: the only semisyllables identified so far contain the sibilant.¹³

As three of the four languages under discussion show semisyllabic structure in their earliest attestations,¹⁴ it seems reasonable to assume semisyllabicity for PIE as well.

The second question mentioned above concerns the choice of the segment copied into the reduplicant. The Vedic behaviour is predicted if we take $*(a \triangleright t/MAR)$ to be part of the reduplication grammar. This constraint will always favour the least sonorous consonant as a target for the copying mechanism. In Vedic this constraint outranks another one, called *DISTANCE*,¹⁵ which opts for copying the nearest possible consonant of the base.¹⁶ In Greek, however, nearness is more important than margin-affinity. Both types are expected, as the interplay of $*(a \triangleright t/MAR)$ and *DISTANCE* leads to the following factorial typology:

- 9 a $*(a \triangleright t/MAR) \gg \text{DIST}$: A Vedic-type grammar which selects the least sonorous consonant from the onset of the base.
- b *DIST* $\gg *(a \triangleright t/MAR)$: A Greek-type grammar which selects the nearest consonant of the base.¹⁷

We are now in a position to update the grammar in the following way:

- 10 a Attach *RED* to the left edge of the perfect stem (its base).
- b Copy the melodic specification of the consonant of the base to the C-slot of *RED* which optimally satisfies a nearness constraint and a constraint on margin-affinity.

Semisyllabicity in onset clusters helps to clear up another long-standing mystery of IE phonotactics. As can be seen from root structures and Sievers phenomena, the maximal onset cluster in PIE consisted of two seg-

13 In the following section I will extend the PIE semisyllable to fricatives in general. For another type of possible PIE semisyllables cf. Byrd, this volume.

14 Cf. Latin *sistō* above.

15 On the architecture of this constraint see Keydana (2006: 66–7).

16 This constraint is necessary on independent grounds, as it prevents consonants from other parts of the base from being copied into the reduplicant.

17 Avestan data show that the Vedic type is recent. Indo-Iranian was probably of the Greek type. See Keydana (2006: 96–7).

ments (Beekes (1981 [1982]: 110), Keydana (2004: 181–3)).¹⁸ The only exception reconstructible with plausibility are tripartite *s*-clusters as in PIE **streig*.¹⁹ This fact confirms the hypothesis that /s/ was semisyllabic. With semisyllabic *s*, the onset of the moraic syllable is still made up of only two segments and thus in full accordance with the constraints on PIE onsets.

4 PIE *H in reduplication

(11) and (12) give an overview of clusters containing laryngeals in reduplication:

- 11 H + sonorant
 - a Vedic *ānámśa* (: *naś*) < **h₂e-h₂nók^o* (on the second *n* cf. Kümmel (2000: 287)). Cf. Old Irish *-án-aic*.
 - b Greek *ῥώρυχα* (: *ῥύττω*) < **h₃re-h₃ru^o*, not †*ῥυχα* < †*h₃e-h₃ru^o*.
- 12 H + plosive
 - a Vedic *jāgāra* (: *jar*) < **ge-h₁gor^o*, not †*h₁eh₁gor^o*. Greek has changed **éγγγορα* to *έγγήγορα* under the influence of the aor. *έγρε-* (*LIV*² 246). Since there is no evidence for an initial laryngeal in the Vedic form (i.e., **ge-h₁gor-* and **h₁ge-h₁gor-*, as suggested by Krisch (1996) and Kümmel (2000), would yield the same result), it seems appropriate to apply the grammar outlined above and reconstruct a simplex onset (contrary to Krisch (1996), Kümmel (2000)).
 - b Greek *ῥωπα* (: *ῥάω*) possibly < **h₃k^we-h₃k^wo* (with zero grade).

These data show a distribution of onsets reminiscent of *s*-clusters. Pre-Greek laryngeal clusters are always copied as wholes; the laryngeal must

¹⁸ It should be noted that this is a constraint on possible outputs of the phonological grammar. It does not hold for morphological inputs.

¹⁹ On other fricative clusters and especially the tripartite cluster in **h₂stér-* see below. Strunk (1985: 227) arrives at the rather dubious reconstruction **pster* by comparing gr. *ἔπταρε, πτάρνυμαι* with lat. *sternuō*. **psténo-* is also highly doubtful. See Klingenschmitt (1974: 276–7) and especially Hamp (1960: 274), who argues for an original onset in **spt-*.

therefore be subsegmental throughout. Vedic shows a more complex distribution: if the initial laryngeal is followed by a sonorant, it is copied into the C-slot of the reduplicant. This is predicted if *H* is less sonorous than a sonorant. If the laryngeal is followed by a plosive, however, the plosive is selected. This pattern exactly matches that for *s*-clusters and is probably of PIE origin.²⁰ Since laryngeals are on the same stratum in the sonority hierarchy as /s/, the PIE hierarchy can be reconstructed as follows:

- 13 $*(a/MAR) \gg *(i/MAR) \gg *(r/MAR), *(m/MAR) \gg *(s/MAR),$
 $*(H/MAR) \gg *(t/MAR)$

Reduplication data therefore confirm the view held, for example, by Rasmussen (1983), Kobayashi (2004: 22–3), and Kümmel (2007: 327–336), i.e. that the laryngeals – all three of them – were fricatives. Their behaviour and that of their continuants in Pre-Greek and Indo-Aryan proves that they remained fricatives throughout their existence.²¹

As fricatives, laryngeals are expected to form onset clusters with sonorants, but they should not be parsed into tautosyllabic onset clusters with plosives. However, some PIE roots begin with a sequence of laryngeal plus plosive, a convincing example being **h₁ger-* (Keydana (2004: fn.49)), a possible candidate **h₂teuǵ-* (*LIV*² 286). This pattern can be explained by extending semisyllables to laryngeals. Thus, we can conclude that PIE allowed for non-moraic semisyllables in the onset of prosodic words if and only if they contained a fricative which could not be parsed into a moraic syllable.

4.1 Maximizing semisyllables

The PIE word-initial semisyllables reconstructed so far consist of a simple non-branching onset containing a fricative. This structure is similar to simple onsets of moraic syllables. However, since the PIE onset was maximally two-segmental, it could be expected that two-segmental semisylla-

²⁰ As all three laryngeals are attested in root-initial clusters and in Attic reduplication (cf. **h₂nek-*, **h₃reuk-*, **h₁ger-*), it seems feasible to view them as one natural class with identical phonotactic behaviour.

²¹ Against Beekes (1994: 451) they did not merge in a glottal stop in Indo-Iranian.

bles were also well-formed. A possible candidate for a two-segmental semi-syllable is PIE $*/h_2stér-/$ with two fricatives preceding a plosive. The word is most probably a hysterodynamic stem with a zero-grade root (Schindler (1969: 155 fn.71), Rieken (1999: 282–3)).²² The initial cluster may have been parsed into a complex semisyllable followed by a moraic syllable with a non-branching onset: $*[_{PrWd}[_{\sigma}h_2s][_{\sigma}tér]]$ (n.sg.).

But the evidence for such a structure is scanty at best, and the cluster is not actually attested in any IE language. Of the languages confirming the initial laryngeal, Greek has $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, which probably goes back to disyllabic $*.h_2\acute{\alpha}s.tér$. Hitt. $hašterza$ is ambiguous. Attested only once (see Puhvel (1991: 238–9)), it is written $\langle ha-aš-ter-za \rangle$,²³ which may be interpreted as $.hsterts$. or $.has.terts$. with a moraic first syllable. The second analysis is advocated by Melchert (1994: 111) among others: he states that “a synchronic triple cluster $/Hst-/$ [...] is possible, but unlikely” and assumes epenthesis (cf. Kimball (1999: 393)).

The reading without epenthesis was first proposed by Schindler (1969: 144 fn. 5), and has recently been taken up by Kloekhorst (2008: 326). Extending assumptions developed in Kloekhorst (2004), (2006), the author claims that word-initial clusters in Hittite were never dissolved by epenthesis. Kloekhorst (email) takes $\langle ha-li-iḫ-la \rangle$ ($/HliHla(i)-/$), a reduplicated verb with a hl -cluster in the onset of the base (cf. Puhvel (1991: 32)), as main evidence for this claim. However, a lack of epenthesis in hl -clusters does not imply that other h -clusters were treated in the same fashion. hl - is in accordance with the SSC and well-formed, unlike hs - or h + plosive, which, from a typological perspective are not very likely.²⁴

Although a clear decision for or against an initial Hittite cluster hst - is impossible, it seems less probable than epenthesis. Therefore, I assume that lexical $*/h_2stér/$ was syllabified as $*[_{PrWd}[_{\sigma}h_2\acute{\alpha}s][_{\sigma}tér]]$ in PIE.

22 See *NIL* 349–50 for an overview of the various stem-formations discussed in the literature. For the hysterodynamic stem see Rieken (1999: 282–3).

23 The writing is affirmed by the place name $^{URU}hašter(a)$ -, which is attested six times (Watkins (1974: 12), Kloekhorst (2008: 326)).

24 Besides hst - Kloekhorst (2008) proposes for example ss - in *ssanti*. Word-initial geminates are attested in at least two Austronesian languages, viz. Leti (Hume *et al.* (1997)) and Trukese (Davis (1999)). Still, they are very rare and should not, without necessity, be postulated for Hittite.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I conclude that PIE semisyllables consist of exactly one fricative. Plateaux (i.e., sequences of equally sonorous segments) are not licensed. This restriction holds for onsets of moraic syllables as well, with the sole exception of plateaux with an initial coronal plosive.²⁵

5 *s*-mobile

In this section the semisyllabic approach is extended to *s*-mobile. As is well known, roots such as **(s)pek* and **(s)teg* come in two avatars, viz. with or without initial *s* as in Vedic *paśyati* vs. *áspaṣṭa*, G.-Avestan *spasiā*, and Greek *τέγος* vs. *στέγος*.

Currently two hypotheses are discussed in the literature (Southern (1999), Rasmussen (2005)). The first takes *s*- to be a preverb. However, this analysis is confronted with serious problems, because, first of all, there is no clear evidence that PIE had preverbs. Rather, since free adverbs are the dominant pattern in the oldest attested texts, prefixation seems to have been a late development.²⁶

Besides, a methodological problem arises: as forms with or without the initial *s*- never show any semantic difference, it is impossible to determine the denotation of the alleged preverb. This means that the lexical entry proposed for PIE consists of the signifier only.

Finally, the distribution is problematic. Typically *s*-mobile occurs as part of an onset cluster. The few cases with simple *s*-onsets discussed in the literature (Rasmussen (2005: 66–7)) are inconclusive at best. While this distribution may be attributed to chance, it still casts doubts on the preverbal status of *s*-.

An alternative explanation going back to Schindler (Mayrhofer (1986: 120)) is that of reanalysis in a sandhi-context. According to Schindler the

²⁵ See Keydana (2004: fn. 48) for an overview. Plateaux are attested in Greek and Tocharian. The analysis of Schindler (1977) shows that they were always treated as real clusters with no evidence for epenthesis.

²⁶ See Hettrich (1991), Pinault (1995), and Tjerkstra (1999). The univerbations attested with *pe*- and *u*- are Anatolian developments, see Kloekhorst (2008: 617–8) for a recent assessment.

double *s* in sequences like **uiHros spek̑ieti* was simplified and then reanalyzed as **uiHros pek̑ieti*. The process is claimed to be similar to that leading to Engl. *nickname* from **ick-name* in contexts with preceding indefinite *a*. Notwithstanding its elegance, this solution faces serious difficulties. The domain of the reanalysis in the English example is a prosodic word, the article being proclitic. The domain of reanalysis in PIE is less easily established, however, the intonational phrase or the utterance being possible candidates. But coherence in these prosodic domains is less rigid than in the prosodic word (Nespor & Vogel (2007: 217, 245)). Besides, although **°s-s°* was simplified word-internally, there is no evidence that this process extended to higher prosodic units as well.

Another problem which affects some of the most obvious examples of *s*-mobile is of a syntactic nature. Roots like *(*s*)*teg* or *(*s*)*pek̑* are transitive. PIE being an SOV language, transitive verbs were typically preceded by an object. This does not amount to saying that configurations with words ending in *s* preceding (*s*)*teg* or *(*s*)*pek̑* did not occur,²⁷ of course, but it is doubtful whether they were frequent enough to trigger reanalysis.

An alternative explanation for at least some of the data with *s*-mobile is based on semisyllabicity. In cases like *(*s*)*teg* and *(*s*)*pek̑*, the *s* as part of the word-initial cluster had to be parsed into a semisyllable. Being non-moraic, semisyllables are highly deficient phonological structures and therefore marked. As a consequence, they tend to be simplified.

This proposal is backed by empirical evidence from L1-acquisition and typology, as *s*-clusters are always late in L1-acquisition (Barlow & Dinnsen (1998)). Children prefer unmarked structures and typically reduce clusters of this kind to monosegmental onsets to accommodate them to their restricted articulatory capabilities. Such simplifications are usually short-lived, as children are under pressure from the speech community, especially if the error is highly salient. But once in a while, simplifications made in lexical acquisition survive.²⁸ This scenario not only explains why the *s*

27 PIE had plural objects with *s*, of course, and there is every reason to believe that dislocations breaking up the SOV order were possible (cf. Keydana (to appear)).

28 See Hayes & Steriade (2004) and Bermúdez-Otero (2006) on this type of change. A well-documented example is analogy. In phonology, this type of

became mobile at all, it also explains why the loss did not spread in the manner of a regular sound change: the simplification takes place in lexicon acquisition, and is hence lexically gradual.

Typology further strengthens this proposal. In many languages, we can observe a tendency to reduce the markedness of initial *s*-clusters by applying repair strategies. The strategy proposed here is deletion. Alternatives attested in languages throughout the world are prothesis or epenthesis of a vowel.

Data from Anatolian show deletion and – possibly – prothesis: in Hittite, underlying clusters of *s* + plosive are regularly written as <*is-C*>. This may be due to the inappropriate writing system, but the fact that *s* + sonorant is typically written <*sV-R*> (Melchert (1994: 111)) points to a significant difference, which may be interpreted as prothesis.²⁹ More importantly in our context, Luvian shows deletion of *s* (Melchert (1994: 271)), cf. Luvian *par(r)iy-* ‘smear’ as opposed to Hittite *išpar(r)-* ‘strew’.³⁰

Similar evidence comes from the Indo-Aryan languages. Already in Vedic we find word based alternations like *stár-* with nom.pl. *tārah*. In Middle Indian, we get Pāli *tārā* and the Ardhamāgadhī-continuants of Vedic *strī-*, *itthī* with prothesis and *thī* with deletion.

Old French is another language showing both types of repair. Regularly, initial *s*-clusters were recast by prothesis like in *escrire*, but in loan words deletion is attested, cf. *tricoter*, which goes back to Low German *striken*.

The third type of repair, epenthesis, is attested in Iranian. Cf. Iranian **spāda* (Avestan *spāda*), which is continued by Manichean Parthian *sp̄d* /

change leads to lexical diffusion as described for example by Labov (1994: 421–39).

29 The whole issue is far from being settled. At least *ša/eppikkušta-* ‘pin’ is evidence for a *sp*-onset (Melchert (1994: 111)). The *išpand-/šipand*-variation is another problem (Puhvel (1984: 436), Melchert (1994: 31), Kloekhorst (2008: 404–6)) – the proposal of Forssman (1994: 103), taken up in *LIV*² 577, is rather improbable because of the amount of *ad hoc* hypotheses involved). As Melchert (1994: 31) points out, we either have to assume prothesis (with two unexplained exceptions) or a rather bizarre spelling alternation.

30 A possible counterexample to the Luvian loss is <*sá-pa-tara/i-isa*> ‘religious functionary’, if to be read as */spandaris/* and taken as a derivative from the unattested cognate of Hittite *išpand-*, see Hajnal (1995: 134), Tischler (2006: 1058).

ispaδ with prothesis and Middle Persian *spāh* > Persian *sipāh* with epenthesis.

These data from a variety of IE languages show that both assumptions made for *s*-mobile above are confirmed by typology: *s*-clusters tend to be repaired, and the repair is often word-based.

6 Summary

The preceding investigation into *s*-clusters and laryngeal clusters in reduplication led to the following results: laryngeals and the sibilant form a natural class, as both were fricatives. Onset clusters with initial fricative followed by a plosive had either subsegmental structure (*s*-clusters in Germanic and Latin, laryngeal-clusters in Greek), or the fricative was parsed into a semisyllable (*s*-clusters in Greek, fricative clusters in Vedic).

PIE had semisyllables, and they were licensed (at least) in the onset of phonological words. There is no evidence for semisyllables word-internally. Semisyllables were restricted to one C-slot filled by a fricative. Evidence for clusters is dubious at best. The investigation further showed that PIE onsets maximally contained 2 segments.

Finally, I argued that the instability of semisyllabic structure was at least one origin of the *s*-mobile phenomena.

References

- Barlow, J. E., & D. A. Dinnsen. 1998. Asymmetrical cluster development in a disordered system. *Language Acquisition* 7.1–49.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 1981 [1982]. Review of *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen* by Martin Peters. Wien 1980. *Kratylos* 26.106–115.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 1994. Who were the laryngeals? Discussion paper. In Jens Elmegård Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, 449–454, Wiesbaden. Reichert.

- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 2006. Phonological change in Optimality Theory. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, vol. 9, 497–505. 2nd ed. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Cho, Young-mee Yu & Tracy Holloway King. 2003. Semisyllables and universal syllabification. In Caroline Féry & Ruben van de Vijver (eds.), *The Syllable in Optimality Theory*, 183–212. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clements, George N. 1990. The role of the sonority cycle in core syllabification. In J. Kingston & M. Beckman (eds.), *Papers in Laboratory Phonology 1: Between Grammar and Physics of Speech*, 283–333. New York: CUP.
- Davis, Stuart. 1999. On the representation of initial geminates. *Phonology* 16.93–104.
- Forssman, Bernhard. 1994. Zu hethitisch *šipand-* und *išpand-*. In Jens Elmegård Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, 93–106. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 1987. *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen. Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*. Wien: Österr. Akad. der Wiss.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 1995. *Der lykische Vokalismus. Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft, angewandt auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpussprache* (Arbeiten aus der Abteilung "Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft" Graz 10). Graz: Leykam.
- Hamp, Eric P. 1960. Avestan *fštāna*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 76.273–275.
- Hayes, Bruce, & Donca Steriade. 2004. Introduction: The phonetic bases of phonological markedness. In Bruce Hayes, R. Kirchner, & Donca Steriade (eds.), *Phonetically based phonology*, 1–33. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Hettrich, Heinrich. 1991. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des Ṛgveda. I: *ádhi*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 52.27–76.
- Hume, Elizabeth, Jennifer Muller & Aone van Engelenhoven. 1997. Non-moraic geminates in Leti. *Phonology* 14.371–402.

- Keydana, Götz. 2004. Silbenstruktur und Phonotaktik im Indogermanischen. In Maria Kozianka, Rosemarie Lühr, & Susanne Zeilfelder (eds.), *Indogermanistik – Germanistik – Linguistik*, 163–192, Hamburg: Kovač.
- Keydana, Götz. 2006. Die Indogermanische Perfektreduktion. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 27.61–116.
- Keydana, Götz. to appear. Indo-European Syntax. In Matthias Fritz & Jared S. Klein (eds.), *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics. An International Handbook of Language Comparison and the Reconstruction of Indo-European* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kimball, Sara E. 1999. *Hittite historical phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1974. Griechisch *παρθένος*. In Manfred Mayrhofer, Wolfgang Meid, Bernfried Schlerath, & Rüdiger Schmitt (eds.), *Antiquitates Indogermanicae. Studien zur Indogermanischen Altertumskunde und zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert*, 273–278. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachwiss.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2004. The preservation of $*h_1$ in Hieroglyphic Luwian: Two separate *a*-signs. *Historische Sprachforschung* 117.26–49.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2006. Initial laryngeals in Anatolian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 119.77–108.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5). Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Kobayashi, Masato. 2004. *Historical Phonology of Old Indo-Aryan Consonants*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1996. *Zur Genese und Funktion der altindischen Perfekta mit langem Reduplikationsvokal. Mit kommentierter Materialsammlung*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
- Kümmel, Martin Joachim. 2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen. Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- Kümmel, Martin Joachim. 2007. *Konsonantenwandel. Bausteine zu einer Typologie des Lautwandels und ihre Konsequenzen für die vergleichende Rekonstruktion*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change. Volume 1: Internal Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986. *Lautlehre. Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen* (Indogermanische Grammatik 1). Heidelberg: Winter.
- LIV² = Helmut Rix, Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, & Brigitte Schirmer. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, (2., erw. u. verb. Aufl.)
- McCarthy, John, & Alan Prince. 1993. Generalized alignment. In G. E. Booij & J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1993*, 79–153. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Meiser, Gerhard. 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Meiser, Gerhard. 2003. *Veni Vidi Vici. Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems* (Zetemata 113). München: Beck.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3). Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Nespor, Marina, & Irene Vogel. 2007. *Prosodic Phonology. With a new foreword* (Studies in Generative Grammar 28). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- NIL = Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta Irslinger, & Carolin Schneider. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1995. Le problème du préverbe en indo-européen. In André Rousseau (ed.), *Les préverbes dans les langues d'Europe: Introduction à l'étude de la préverbation*, 35–59. Lille: Presses universitaires du Septentrion.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 1. Words beginning with A. Vol. 2. Words beginning with E and I*. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1991. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 3 Words beginning with H*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård. 1983. Determining proto-phonetics by circumstantial evidence: The case of the Indo-European laryngeals. In Fred Karlsson (ed.), *Papers from the Seventh Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, 371–384, Helsinki. University of Helsinki, Department of General Linguistics.
- Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård. 2005. Review of Southern (1999). *Kratylos* 50.65–71.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1969. Die idg. Wörter für ‘Vogel’ und ‘Ei’. *Die Sprache* 15.144–167.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1977. A thorny problem. *Die Sprache* 23.25–35.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*, 1. München: Beck.
- Sievers, Eduard. 1901. *Grundzüge der Phonetik. Zur Einführung in die Lautlehre der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken 1). 5th ed. Leipzig: Breitkopf u. Härtel.
- Southern, Mark R.V. 1999. *Sub-Grammatical Survival. Indo-European s-mobile and its Regeneration in Germanic* (JIES Monograph 34). Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Strunk, Klaus. 1985. Zum Verhältnis zwischen gr. *πάρωνυμοι* and lat. *Sternuo*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46.221–242.
- Tischler, Johann. 2006. *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*. Teil II/2. Lieferung 14. S/2. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Tjerkstra, F.A. 1999. *Principles of the Relation between Local Adverb, Verb and Sentence Particle in Hittite*, (Cuneiform Monographs 15). Groningen: STYX.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1974. I.-E. ‘star’. *Die Sprache* 20.10–14.
- Weijer, Jeroen van de, 1994. *Segmental Structure and Complex Segments*. Rijksuniversiteit Leiden dissertation.
- Wiese, Richard. 1996. *The Phonology of German*. Oxford: Oxford UP.