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Modern Slavic accentology is based on the reconstruction of the late Proto-Slavic accentual system by Stang in his Slavonic Accentuation (1957) and the establishment of the historical connection between the Proto-Baltic and Proto-Slavic accentual systems and their correspondences in other Indo-European languages (Vedic, Greek, Germanic) by Illič-Svityč in his Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom Sud‘ba akcentuacionnyx paradigm (1963) The latter book has now been translated into English We must be grateful to the translators for making this extremely important monograph accessible to those students of comparative linguistics who do not have a reading knowledge of Russian

The book consists of two parts, the first dealing with Baltic and the second with Slavic “This order of presentation was chosen because of the greater simplicity of the Baltic accentual system and its greater similarity to the Proto-Indo-European system In the second (Slavic) part of the work Baltic materials are used as evidence for certain Indo-European accentual relationships Certain characteristics of the Baltic and Slavic reflexes of PIE nominals with long vowels or long diphthongs in the root have made it necessary that such nouns be treated separately from those having a short vowel or a short diphthong in the root” (3f)

As F de Saussure has shown, the four nominal accent classes of contemporary Lithuanian reflect two Proto-Baltic accentual paradigms barytone and mobile The
bifurcation into four classes was a result of the development which is known as de Saussure’s law: a stressed nonacute syllable lost the stress to a following acute syllable. De Saussure advanced the hypothesis that the opposition between barytone and mobile accentual paradigms in Lithuanian is historically connected with the opposition between barytona and oxytona in Proto-Indo-European. This hypothesis could only be tested by a direct comparison of the accentuation of inherited nouns in Baltic with the accentuation of the corresponding nouns in other Indo-European languages.

The difficulty with this comparison is that the distribution of individual words within the accentual paradigms of Lithuanian varies throughout the dialects. The dialect data on the accentuation of a given word are extremely important for establishing the original accentual paradigm in Lithuanian, since the evidence of the literary language (based on the southern varieties of the western Aukštaitian dialect) is by no means always indicative of the original state of affairs. (...) Apparently, the innovations favoring the spread of the mobile accentuation began in the southeast section of the Lithuanian linguistic area (the modern southern Lithuanian Dzuk dialects); they spread primarily to the eastern Aukštaitian, central Aukštaitian, and western Aukštaitian dialects, which adjoin this area on the northeast, north, and west. The most archaic state of affairs has been preserved in the adjacent northwestern and western Žemaitian dialects (and also in the now extinct western Aukštaitian dialects of former Prussian Lithuania) on the one hand, and on the other hand in the bordering eastern Aukštaitian and east Lithuanian Dzuk dialects. (...) The dialects upon which the literary language is based are therefore among those which display a significant amount of accentual innovation" (15f). Iliič-Svityč was able to make use of the data from the card files of the Lithuanian Dictionary and the Lithuanian Dialect Atlas to overcome this difficulty. He also made extensive use of the Old Lithuanian accented texts, which constitute a source of primary importance, in particular the works of M. Dauksa (late 16th century). The examination of the accentuation of nominals with short roots leads to a conclusion which fully supports de Saussure’s hypothesis: PIE barytone nominals are barytone in Lithuanian and PIE oxytone nominals have mobile accentuation in Lithuanian if we make allowance for the operation of de Saussure’s law.

"For nominals with long roots our information on the accentual paradigm of a word is not limited, however, to Lithuanian material. Extremely important evidence in this regard can be obtained from the tonal characteristics of the initial syllable of the corresponding word in Latvian” (51). The most archaic Latvian accentual system is preserved in two unconnected areas. These two groups of dialects distinguish three tones in initial syllable, original long syllables having sustained or broken tone, and original short syllables having, as a rule, falling tone. In the dialects of western Latvia, the falling tone merged with the broken tone; in the eastern Latvian dialects, the sustained tone merged with the falling tone. Endzelin established that in Latvian dialects with three tones, nominals and verbs with sustained tone on the initial syllable regularly correspond to Lithuanian nominals and verbs with long roots and barytone accentuation, while nominals and verbs with broken tone on the initial syllable correspond to Lithuanian nominals and verbs with long roots and mobile accentuation. The contrast of sustained and broken tone in initial syllables in Latvian
reflects an older distribution of nominals by accent class than does modern Lithuanian, where analogical processes of merging the accentual paradigms have taken place. Therefore, evidence from Latvian is decisive in filling out sets of correspondences for nominals with long roots. Illicić-Svityč’s analysis of the distribution of nominals with long roots in Latvian and Lithuanian confirms Hirt’s hypothesis that the stress was retracted to a syllable with a long nonapophonic syllabic element. As a result of this process, a number of PIE oxytone forms are barytone in East Baltic. Leaving aside this group, nominals with long roots display the same distribution into accentual paradigms as do nominals with short roots.

The study of Slavic accentuation was long hampered by the false assumption that de Saussure’s law operated in Slavic. In 1957, Stang demonstrated that the cases where de Saussure’s law is supposed to have operated either can or must be explained in another way. Moreover, it is very difficult to explain the movement of ictus in the Slavic paradigms if one assumes the operation of de Saussure’s law, as is clear from the absence of a shift to acute endings, for example in the dual and acc pl forms of the Slavic paradigms, in contrast with Lithuanian. Stang established a connection between each accentual paradigm and a particular tonal characteristic of the root:

(a) the acute tone is restricted to paradigms with fixed stress on a nonfinal syllable,
(b) the neo-acute tone is found in paradigms where the next syllable is stressed in other forms,
(c) the falling tone occurs on the first syllable of paradigms with final stress in other forms.

Since the neo-acute is due to a retraction of the stress from a jer or from a non-initial vowel with falling intonation, paradigm (b) had fixed stress on a noninitial syllable at an earlier stage (cf. Stang 1957 168ff and passim). Meillet had already pointed out that the mobile accentual paradigm (c) is identical to the one in Baltic if we take into consideration that an original acute intonation in the root became circumflex in Slavic mobile paradigms (cf. Meillet 1902, also 1916). The great Soviet scholar Dybo drew attention to the complementary distribution of the types (a) and (b) and put forward the hypothesis that the latter type arose phonetically as a result of a progressive accent shift (Dybo 1962, cf. also 1968). According to this hypothesis, a stressed vowel which had neither acute nor falling tone lost the stress to the following syllable in Slavic. The comparative proof of Dybo’s law is supplied by Illicić-Svityč in the book under review. His conclusions can conveniently be summarized in a series of quotations:

“In reconstructing the Proto-Slavic accentual paradigm of ā-stems one can, of course, make use of material only from those languages, dialects, or texts in which the opposition of mobile versus oxytone accentuation has been retained in one form or another. On the basis of these data the claim can be made that the Proto-Indo-European opposition of barytone versus mobile/oxytone accentuation has been retained in Proto-Slavic ā-stems in an altered form oxytone versus mobile accentuation. Proto-Slavic as well as Baltic mobile accentuation correspond to the oxytone paradigm of Sanskrit, Greek, and the Germanic languages, the Slavic oxytone accentual paradigm corresponds to the barytone accentual paradigm of the other Indo-European languages (including Baltic)” (84)

“In examining the Slavic masculine nouns which are reflexes of Proto-Indo-
European masculines, we find that they have, for the most part, mobile accentuation, without regard to the accentual paradigm of the corresponding words in other Indo-European languages, mobile/oxytone or barytone” (95). “It can be assumed that originally the coalescence of the two paradigms in Slavic was only partial. There seems to be some evidence for this in the data from Serbo-Croatian dialects from the island of Susak and northeastern Istria. In the Susak dialect a number of masculine o-stems (corresponding with mobile accentuation in all other Serbo-Croatian dialects) have an unusual accentual paradigm with oxytone accent in the oblique cases of the singular; in the Čakavian dialects of Istria certain nominals of the same class have parallel oxytone forms in a number of cases. As a rule, this accentuation is found in nominals which have barytone correspondences in other Indo-European languages; reflexes of oxytone forms in these dialects have the usual mobile accentuation” (103).

“In analyzing the Indo-European correspondences of Slavic neuter nominals with short roots one finds that these correspondences contain as a rule only nominals with oxytone accentuation: they correspond to Indo-European forms with columnar oxytone accent in the singular and barytone in the plural. Indo-European neuter forms with barytone accent in the singular, as will be demonstrated below, have been transferred into the masculine class in Slavic” (105). “The distribution described above for Proto-Indo-European neuter nominals in Slavic can be explained only if one accepts the hypothesis by which final -om becomes -ū in Slavic, a hypothesis which has frequently been advanced by a variety of investigators” (114). “Thus, it may be claimed that the Slavic oxytone class of o-stem masculines developed from barytone o-stem neuters. On the other hand, the class of o-stems with mobile accentuation included only original masculines” (121).

“Traces of the Indo-European opposition of mobile/oxytone versus barytone accentuation are evident in varying degrees in all the remaining stem types in Slavic. Barytone nominals are usually shifted into the oxytone accentual paradigm, and nominals with mobile/oxytone accentuation show up as nominals with mobile accentuation. This distribution is also retained in cases where Slavic has shifted a number of words into other stem types in connection with the loss of several unproductive types” (123).

“The distribution of nominals with long roots according to accentual classes in Slavic is very close to the Baltic distribution. Nominals with barytone accentuation correspond here, as a rule, to barytone forms of other Indo-European languages; Slavic nominals with mobile accentuation and nominals with barytone accentuation may correspond to Indo-European forms with mobile/oxytone accentuation” (132). “It should be noted here that, corresponding to Proto-Indo-European oxytone (in the singular) neuter forms with long roots, we have mobile accentuation in Slavic, which is not the case with nominals having short roots (where the Proto-Indo-European singular oxytone forms show up as the oxytone type)” (135). As in Baltic, the stress was retracted to a preceding nonapophonic long vowel in Slavic in accordance with Hirt’s law. The root tone changed from acute to circumflex in the remaining words with a long root and mobile accentuation, as was pointed out by Meillet.

Ilić-Svityč concludes: “A consistent analysis of the accentuation of various types of nominal stems leads to the conclusion that the Proto-Indo-European opposition
of two accentual paradigms was originally retained in all the categories examined. Corresponding to the oxytone nominals in Sanskrit, Greek, and Germanic and to nominals with mobile accentuation in Baltic, Slavic has nominals belonging to the mobile accentual class, nominals with original long roots in this case having a secondary circumflex tone. Corresponding to barytone nominals of other Indo-European languages, Slavic has barytone nominals in the case of long roots and oxytone nominals in the case of short roots; the transformation of the columnar barytone paradigm into a columnar oxytone paradigm in the case of items with short roots is a specifically Slavic process. Unlike Sanskrit, Greek, and Germanic, in the Slavic class of nominals with a non-apophonic long vowel in the root, accent shift to the root syllable must be assumed; since a similar class is also found in Baltic, this process must be considered very ancient” (140).

After the publication of Illič-Svityč’s monograph we must finally reject the hypothesis of some scholars (e.g. Kuryłowicz, Shevelov) that the Balto-Slavic opposition between fixed stress and accentual mobility is independent of the Indo-European opposition between barytona and oxytona. Here again, as so often in other areas, modern research confirms the brilliant conception of F. de Saussure.

The clarification of the historical relationships between Indo-European, Baltic, and Slavic accentuation enables the investigator to place the established changes in a chronological perspective and to draw a picture of the accentual and prosodic system at the intermediate stages (cf. Ebeling 1967; Kortlandt 1975). The development of the system receives a simple explanation if one assumes that the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals were lost in Slavic at different stages depending on their position in relation to the place of the stress.

The last major gap in the history of Slavic accentuation was filled by W. Winter, who pointed out that a PIE short vowel before a voiced stop became long and acute in Balto-Slavic, whereas a short vowel before a voiced aspirate remained short (in: Fisiak 1978: 431ff). This rule accounts for the glottalic articulation of the root vowel in Latvian pēds ‘footstep’, sēsts ‘to sit down’, mōst ‘to smell’, vēders ‘belly’, bēgt ‘to run’, nuāgs ‘naked’, uāga ‘berry’, āzis ‘billy goat’, etc. It also explains the cases where Illič-Svityč is confronted with an unexpected long vowel in Balto-Slavic: Latv. veids (54), lāūzs, pēds, jūgs (56, 63), Slavic smordū, lōgū, nagū, vidū (134–139), also vēno, which is identical with Gr. ēdnon, PIE *H₁yēdnom. Lith. pādas (37) and Slavic podū (108f) are not from PIE *pōdom, but from *pōdh₂om, as Winter has pointed out (l.c.), cf. Lith. priēdas, Slavic pridū from PIE *prēidh₂om (112). Slavic bogū (101) is a borrowing from Iranian, and ognī is not from PIE *ognis (130), which does not explain the initial u of Lith. ugnis, but from PIE *ug₃nis (cf. Kortlandt 1979). Slavic snēgū and brodū (Lith. sniēgas and brādas) are not from PIE *snōgʷos (102) and *bhrōdōs (123), but from *snōgʷos and *bhrōdōs. Slavic rogū (Lith. rāgas) is not from PIE *rōgos (102), but from *Hrōgʷos or *yrōgʷos, if it is of PIE origin at all.

The reflexes of original neuter and masculine io-stems are different in Lithuanian because the masculine nom. sg. ending *-ias was contracted in East Baltic, whereas no contraction took place in the neuter ending *-ia, e.g. gaidys ‘rooster’, medžias ‘forest’ (34). Elsewhere I have stated the view that the difference is due to the position of the accent at that stage: *gaidiäs versus *mēdia, cf. gen. sg. gaidžio (Kortlandt 1977: 324).
I do not agree with Illič-Svityč that the collective forms in -ā which in Proto-Indo-European were used as plural forms for neuter o-stems were regularly opposed to the singular forms by the position of accent (40). It is probable that this accentual opposition was confined to a limited class of nouns. It must be borne in mind that barytone accentuation was generalized in Greek neuters, so that the material from this language cannot generally be used as evidence.

The appearance of k instead of š from PIE *k in Lith. pėkus ‘cattle’ does not suggest that the word was a borrowing into Baltic (48) because this is the regular reflex before consonantal u plus back vowel (cf. Fisiak 1978: 241). The original flexion was: nom. *pėšu, gen *pėkvės.

According to Illič-Svityč, Hirt’s law did not retract the stress from an acute syllable (64). If this were correct, the retraction in the paradigm of the ā-stems would be phonetically regular in the gen. sg. and pl. forms only, and analogical in the nom. and loc. sg., dat., inst. and loc. pl., and all dual forms. This is untenable. Moreover, the accent was retracted in Russ. grýzla ‘(she) gnawed’, PIE *g*ruHglmH, cf. Gr. brākhlo, where it is difficult to assume analogical stress. The absence of retraction in Latv. pālī ‘(she) gnawed’ is due to the fact that the word was trisyllabic. Moreover, accentual mobility seems to have been productive in Latvian neuters at a prehistoric stage, e.g. krēsls ‘chair’, siēts ‘sieve’, vāks ‘cover’, where Lithuanian and Slavic point to a neuter with fixed stress on the stem.

The account which Illič-Svityč gives of the reflexes of Proto-Slavic tones in the various languages (76) is not quite correct. The reflex of the acute tone in Czech is length only in the first syllable of disyllabic words if it is open and the second syllable does not contain a long vowel, cf. gen. pl. krau of kráva ‘cow’, 3rd pl. reži of režati ‘to cut’, also masc. words such as čas, děd, had, lněv, jih, kraj, pluh, rak. Falling tone on a long syllable is retained as such in Serbo-Croatian only in monosyllabic and disyllabic forms. It is shortened in trisyllabic forms, for example, mladést ‘youth’, gen. sg. prase of prase ‘sucking-pig’. The pretonic long vowel did not retain its length phonetically in such forms as Czech růka because it was already pretonic before the operation of Dybo’s law, cf. jazyk, malina, běžeti, SCR. jězik, mălina, bježati. The long vowel in SCR. růka was introduced on the analogy of the barytone forms, for example, acc. sg. růku, cf. the oblique plural form růkama, where the short vowel was retained because it is trisyllabic (see Kortlandt 1975: 30).

In Slovincian, oxytone nouns have been transferred partly to the mobile and partly to the barytone accent class (84). As a rule, the stress of nouns with a monosyllabic stem is fixed if the stem vowel is long and mobile if the stem vowel is short.7 Slavic süná ‘sleep’ (100) and písů ‘dog’ (103) are probably original barytona which have escaped the analogical transfer into the mobile accent class because there was no model with the same root structure. The masculine o-stems with mobile accentuation which have correspondences (either oxytone or barytone) in other Indo-European languages are of the types *CoCos and *CVRCos. Illič-Svityč’s suggestion that the final accentuation of süná and písů arose after the loss of the jers meets with chronological difficulties and does not explain the different accentuation of SCR. and Sin. dàn ‘day’.

Illic-Svityc holds that stressed *-om developed into -o, unstressed *-om into -u, unstressed *-iom into -je (114–117). Ebeling (1967: 581) has pointed out that this view is phonetically improbable, chronologically untenable, and morphologically
unilluminating (cf. also Kortlandt 1978b: 281ff). On the basis of both chronological considerations and the Old Prussian evidence we have to assume that final *-om became *-um in early Balto-Slavic without respect to the place of the stress (see Kortlandt 1975: 44f, 1978b: 287ff). The Slavic neuter ending -o is of pronominal origin. It was introduced only in original oxytona because the barytone neuters merged with the masculines, the acc. sg. ending of which was always unstressed.

Both the fixed stress and the timbre of the stressed vowel of Sln. spôr, spôra, spôro 'abundant' (126) point to the presence of a nonsyllabic prefix. The medial vowel of Proto-Slavic *sůporu received the stress as a result of Dybo’s law.

The accentual pattern of Sln. pléme ‘tribe’, which points to fixed stress on the second syllable in late Proto-Slavic (131), arose as a result of Dybo’s law from the bifurcation of the type with initial accentuation, which has been preserved under the acute tone in sême ‘seed’.

There is a class of barytone neuters with acute tone in Slavic which have correspondences with barytone accentuation in Lithuanian and the broken tone in Latvian (137). The preservation of the neuter gender in Slavic shows that these words are original oxytona which received fixed stress on the stem as a result of Hirt’s law. The accentual mobility which the Latvian tone suggests is apparently due to a secondary development.

Ilić-Svityč does not assume a tonal difference on a nonacute stressed initial syllable between fixed and mobile accentual paradigms (144). If this were correct, we would expect traces of the original distribution of phonetically and analogically end-stressed forms, which we do not find. Dybo (1962: 8) drew the logical conclusion from the phonetic character of the progressive accent shift and pointed out that the law requires the existence of a tonal opposition on nonacute stressed initial syllables at a stage which is anterior to the late Proto-Slavic retraction of the stress. In fact, every nonacute stressed vowel lost the stress to the following syllable with the exception of vowels in initial syllables of mobile paradigms. This development was posterior to the retraction of the stress to a preposition from barytone forms of mobile paradigms and gave rise to new falling vowels in noninitial syllables, which were subsequently eliminated as a result of Stang’s law.

It is a pity that the translators have not, apart from a single exception, corrected the printer’s errors in the original text. Besides, the English text has its additional share of misprints. Here I shall limit myself to listing the most disturbing errors: nominatives and verbs (52) read nominals and verbs (3 x); nominatives with long roots (53) read nominals with long roots; acc. pl. *zimu (80) read: *zimy; Proto-Indo-European and oxytone forms (80) read Proto-Indo-European barytone and oxytone forms (2 x); vilkât in the Tixoronov Sbornik (99) read: vilkât in the Tixonravov Sbornik; Susak in northeastern Istria (103) read Susak and northeastern Istria; Slavic adjectives with oxytone AP... (124f) is the heading of the following examples; Slavic ã-stems with oxytone AP reflect Proto-Indo-European forms (128) read Proto-Indo-European barytone forms: this is the heading of the following examples. In the notes: from Armenian š (155, 21) read yields Armenian š; nominal stems in -(je)ě and -jo (156, 33) read in -(j) e and -jo; with the symbol ’ (157, 42) read without the symbol ’; a late widening of e (165, 55) read a late spread of e; to note 59 (165) add is unknown.
The history of Baltic and Slavic accentuation is complex because of the heterogeneity of the material and the unusual abundance of relevant details. The epoch-making monographs by Stang and Illic-Svityc have made much of the earlier work in this area of comparative linguistics obsolete. Stang’s book is difficult reading for anyone who does not have a basic knowledge of the many languages involved. One of the nice things about the book under review is that it can be read by anyone who is familiar with the comparative method. It is exemplary from the methodological point of view. I can therefore highly recommend the book as an introduction to the study of the subject for both Indo-Europeanists and Slavists.

Notes

1 This law is relatively recent in Lithuanian and did not operate in the other Baltic languages, cf Baltistica 13(2) (1977), 327

2 Data on the distribution of nouns according to their accentual paradigms in his language were exhaustively collected by Skadžius (1935). Of course, Illic-Svityc did not yet have access to Kudzinowski’s excellent work (1977).

3 On the Old Prussian data cf Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 88(2) (1974), 299ff


5 On the possibility that the accent retraction to a syllable with nonapophonic length was an Indo-European dialectal process which also affected Celtic and Italic see the contributions by Dybo (1961) and Illic-Svityc (1962), and cf my comments (Kortlandt 1975 76ff).

6 This simple rule seems to be unknown to a large number of scholars. Thus, the short r in SCR ‘heart’ does not point to an acute tone, as e.g. Watkins and Hamp seem to think (in Winter 1965 117, 133). Proto-Slavic *sreede had falling tone and mobile accentuation, as is clear from the Slovene and Russian evidence. The circumflex, which was regularly shortened in Serbo-Croat, had arisen as a result of Meillet’s law, cf. Latvian sirds, with Balto-Slavic acute tone as a result of Winter’s law.

7 Cf. Indogermanische Forschungen 40 (1922), 1ff, and Kortlandt 1978a 78.
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Yara Goulatt Liberato, Mario A. Perini (eds.), Ensaios de linguistica I Faculdade de letras da UMFG, Belo Horizonte, 1978 174 pp
Reviewed by Jaromir Tlaskal, Na Ofechovce 61, 162 00 Praha 6, Czechoslovakia

C'est le developpement considerable de la linguistique au Bresil, d'un cote, et le besoin de discussion entre specialistes, de l'autre, qui ont motive la publication du present volume, le premier d'une nouvelle serie. Il est compose de six articles, dont quatre etudient differents problemes du portugais parle au Bresil (phonologie, syntaxe, semantique), l'un comporte une analyse linguistique des methodes de l'alphabetisation, l'auteur du dernier examinant la structure d'une vieille langue indigene du Bresil.

Ma Beatriz Nascimento Decat, Sujar, un ou deux verbes? Selon la conception de Jackendoff (1972) l'expression anglaise OPEN doit etre generée a partir de trois entrees differentes pour distinguer l'adjectif, le verbe transitif et le verbe intransitif. Tout en discutant cette suggestion, l'auteur argumente que les verbes OPEN et SUGAR 'salar' apparaissent tous les deux soit comme transitifs Carlos abriu a porta 'Charles ouvrit la porte', soit comme intransitifs A porta abriu 'La porte s'ouvre'. Ce fait devrait etre suffisant pour que les entrees verbales soient limitees a une seule. L'idee de l'agent (individu qui provoque l'action) est maintenue meme la ou celui-ci n'est pas exprime lexicalment. Sa presence/absence depend du fait que l'item lexical a ete inclus dans la structure profonde Gloria sujou o vestido 'Gloria salit son vete ment' ou non O vestido sujou 'Le vete ment se salit'. Il n'est donc pas necessaire de compter sur deux verbes SUGAR (transitif, intransitif), vu que le passage d'une structure a l'autre se fera a l'aide d'une transformation.

Les donnees de Jackendoff qui veulent distinguer OPEN transitif de OPEN intransitif semblent se fonder plutot sur la structure de surface que sur la structure profonde. L'insertion lexicale se faisant sur la structure de surface, elle ne permet pas une generalisation plus large des faits constates. Par consequent le modele a une entrée, propose par l'auteur, et susceptible d'etre etendu sur d'autres verbes (ABRIR, QUEBRAR,