# Class 12 <br> Case studies in comparative reconstruction <br> 10/22/19 

## Take-home midterm due by noon on 10/28 <br> No class on 10/24

## 1 Today's agenda

- Review plan for the midterm
- Cover any questions from the PSet
- Finish up Grimm's Law
- Saussure and the Indo-European "Laryngeals"


## 2 Grimm's Law

- Last time, we established the correspondence sets:
(1) Correspondence sets

|  | Skt | AGk | Lat | Goth | Eng | context? | Proto-Indo-European |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Set \# 1 | p | p | p | f | : f | (elsewhere $\downarrow$ ) |  |
| Set \# 10 | p | p | p | p | p | / C_ |  |
| Set \# 2 | t | t | t | $\theta$ | : $\theta$ | (elsewhere $\downarrow$ ) |  |
| Set \# 11 | t | t | : t | t | : t | / C_ |  |
| Set \# 3 | ऽ | k | k | h | h | (elsewhere $\downarrow$ ) |  |
| Set \# 12 | - | - | : k | k | : k | / C_ |  |
| Set \# 4 | b | b | b | p | p |  |  |
| Set \# 5 | d | d | d | t | t |  |  |
| Set \# 6 | f | g | : g | k | : k |  |  |
| Set \# 7 | $\mathrm{b}^{\text {h }}$ | $\mathrm{p}^{\text {h }}$ | f | : b | : b |  |  |
| Set \# 8a | $\mathrm{d}^{\text {h }}$ | $\mathrm{t}^{\text {h }}$ | f | d | : d | / \# |  |
| Set \# 8b | $\mathrm{d}^{\text {h }}$ | $\mathrm{t}^{\text {h }}$ | d | d | : d | / V_V |  |
| Set \# 9a | h | $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}}$ | $\emptyset$ | : g | : g | / \#_ |  |
| Set \# 9b | h | $\mathrm{k}^{\text {h }}$ | : h | : g | : g | / V_V |  |

$\rightarrow$ Using these correspondence sets:
(2) a. Reconstruct the proto-phonemes in PIE
b. Identify all the sound changes
c. Figure out any subgroupings that might exist

## 3 The Indo-European "Laryngeals"

- Through comparative reconstruction (...plus some internal reconstruction), you can sometimes reconstruct sounds that have completely disappeared. This is what happened with the Indo-European "laryngeal" consonants.


### 3.1 Preliminaries

- The Indo-European languages had an extensive system of "ablaut": short vowels delete in some morphological contexts.
- This leads to alternations like the following from Sanskrit:
(3) Sanskrit singular $\sim$ plural alternations in the perfect tense:

| Singular | Plural |
| :--- | :--- |
| ji-ge:-t ${ }^{\text {ha }}$ | ji-gy-ur |
| ju-jo:s-a | ju-juş-ur |
| da-darç-a | da-drç-ur |
| ja-gam-a | ja-gm-ur |

$\rightarrow$ When the root vowel is followed by a sonorant consonant in the singular, the plural usually shows just a reflex of the consonant (the vowel is deleted).
$\star$ We call the categories that have the vowel the full grade
$\star$ We call the categories that don't have the vowel the zero grade.

- We find a wide range of outcomes for the (V)R sequences in the Indo-European daughter languages.
- These are the outcomes in Greek and Sanskrit:
(4) Full grade $\sim$ zero grade alternations (in pre-consonantal position)

| Greek | Sanskrit | PIE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $e i \sim i$ | $e: \sim i$ | $*_{e} i \sim *_{i}$ |
| eu~u | o:~u | *eu~*u |
| $e r \sim a r$ | $a r \sim r$ | *er~*r |
| $e l \sim a l$ | $a r \sim r$ | *el~*! |
| $e n \sim a$ | $a n \sim a$ | *en~*n |
| $e m \sim a$ | $a m \sim a$ | *em~*m |

- We can derive the Greek and Sanskrit outcomes with the following rules:
a. $\quad$ PIE *e $>$ Skt a
b. PIE *l $>$ Skt r
c. PIE *N $>$ Skt a, Grk a
d. Pre-Skt *ai, *au > Skt e:, o:
e. Pre-Grk *l, *r $>$ Grk al, ar


### 3.2 Other correspondences...

- But then some people noticed that there were other cognate sets with different kinds of correspondences:
(6) Cognate forms for three roots in IE

|  | Sanskrit | Greek | Latin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 'place' | da-d ${ }^{\text {h }} \mathbf{a}$ :-mi $:$ hi-ta:s | ti-t ${ }^{\text {h }} \mathbf{e}$--mi $: \mathrm{t}^{\text {h }} \mathbf{e}$-tos | fe:-k-is: fa-k-tus |
| 'give' | da-da:-mi : di-tis | di-do:-mi : do-tos | do: : da-tus |
| 'stand' | ta-st ${ }^{\text {h }} \mathbf{a}$ :-mi : st ${ }^{\text {h }} \mathbf{i}$-tis | hi-sta:-mi : sta-tos | sta:-men : sta-tus |

(7)

| Correspondence sets |
| :--- |
| Sanskrit $\quad$ Greek $\quad$ Latin |
| a: $\sim \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{e}: \sim \mathrm{e}=\mathrm{e}: \sim \mathrm{a}$ |
| $\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{o}: \sim \mathrm{o}=\mathrm{o}: \sim \mathrm{a}$ |
| $\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{i} \quad=\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{a}=\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{a}$ |

### 3.3 Explaining the correspondences

- All of these can be characterized as an alternation between a long vowel and a short vowel, but there's a lot of different vowel qualities going on.
- In the late 19th century, Ferdinand de Saussure noticed that there might be an analogy with the Sanskrit $e: \sim i$ and $o: \sim u$ alternations.
(8) *eu $^{\text {> o: }: ~}$ : : $*_{e} X>a:$ :i
- In Sanskrit, it looks like there could be just a single $X$, since all the outcomes in all three pairs of correspondences are identical.
- But Greek and Latin seem to distinguish among the sets
- Greek has three different outcomes in both the full grade and the zero grade
- Latin has three different outcomes in just the full grade
- So Saussure realized that you needed three different $X$ 's.
(9) Preliminary reconstruction

| Sanskrit | Greek $\quad$ Latin | PIE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{e}: \sim \mathrm{e}=\mathrm{e}: \sim \mathrm{a}$ | $<* \mathrm{eH}_{1} \sim * \mathrm{H}_{1}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{o}: \sim \mathrm{o}=\mathrm{o}: \sim \mathrm{a}$ | $<* \mathrm{eH}_{2} \sim * \mathrm{H}_{2}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{a}=\mathrm{a}: \sim \mathrm{a}<* \mathrm{eH}_{3} \sim * \mathrm{H}_{3}$ |  |  |

$\star$ Reconstructing three different phonemes would entail the following sets of changes:

- $/ \mathrm{H}_{1} /, / \mathrm{H}_{2} /$, $/ \mathrm{H}_{3} /$ alter the vowel quality of the preceding vowel:
(10) a. $/ \mathrm{e} / \rightarrow[\mathrm{e}] / \_\mathrm{H}_{1}$
b. $\quad / \mathrm{e} / \rightarrow[\mathrm{a}] / \mathrm{H}_{2}$
c. $\quad / \mathrm{e} / \rightarrow[\mathrm{o}] / \mathrm{CH}_{3}$
- Sanskrit merges PIE $*_{e}, *_{a}, *_{o}>a$ (see above), so these affects are obscured in Sanskrit, but stick around in Greek and Latin.
- $/ \mathrm{H}_{1} /$, $/ \mathrm{H}_{2} /$, $/ \mathrm{H}_{3} /$ later delete in all languages and yield compensatory lengthening:

```
*VH > V:
```

- The syllabic versions yield the same vowel quality effects in Greek:
(12) $\quad$ a. $\quad / \mathrm{H}_{1} / \rightarrow[\mathrm{e}] / \mathrm{C}_{-} \mathrm{C}$
b. $\quad / \mathrm{H}_{2} / \rightarrow[\mathrm{a}] / \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}$
c. $/ \mathrm{H}_{3} / \rightarrow[\mathrm{o}] / \mathrm{C}$ - C
- But in Sanskrit and Latin, they yield just a single reflex: Skt $i$ and Lat $a$.
- This means that Sanskrit and Latin independently underwent sound changes that merged the syllabic H's.
(13) a. PIE $* H_{1}, * H_{2}, * H_{3}>$ Pre-Sanskrit $* H_{1}>$ Sanskrit $i$
b. PIE $* H_{1}, * H_{2}, * H_{3}>$ Pre-Latin $* H_{1}>$ Latin $a$
- There are many more systematic correspondences within the IE languages that support a consistent distinction between three different $H$ 's.


### 3.4 Confirming the existence of the laryngeals

- People came to refer to these three $H$ 's as the "laryngeals", hypothesizing that they might be some sort of sound made in the back of the throat (perhaps similar to some of the sounds in the Semitic languages).
- Shortly after Saussure (and others) made these hypotheses, Hittite was discovered and deciphered.
- Hittite is the oldest attested Indo-European language, belonging to a previously unknown branch of IndoEuropean called Anatolian.
- It is written in a version of cuneiform borrowed from the Akkadians (who borrowed it from the Sumerians).
- When Hittite was deciphered, lo and behold, in some of the places where Saussure had reconstructed one of these *H consonants, Hittite had a real consonant!
- Specifically, ${ }^{*} H_{2}$ was consistently written with a sign that Akkadian used to write dorsal/pharyngeal fricative.
$\Rightarrow$ This is direct evidence that confirms Saussure's hypothesis, which had been based purely on comparative and internal reconstruction.

