

## ON DE SAUSSURE'S LAW

Bill J. Darden  
*University of Chicago*

In this paper I am going to try to relate three separate phenomena in Lithuanian and Balto-Slavic accentuation. One of these is de Saussure's law, which is used to account for a shift of accent from a short or circumflex syllable onto a following acute syllable in Lithuanian. The second is in some analyses known as Dybo's Law. This is a postulated accent shift in Slavic which moved the original Balto-Slavic accent from a short or circumflex syllable one syllable to the right. This accounts for the existence of words in Slavic which have their accent one syllable to the right of their Lithuanian cognates. Other people have accounted for the same facts by postulating a shift of accent one syllable to the left in the Lithuanian words. The third phenomenon as far as I know has no name. It is a morphophonemic process in Lithuanian which shifts the accent from a verbal stem onto a preceding proclitic element when the verb has short or circumflex intonation.

We thus have three postulated processes which shift the accent from a short or circumflex syllable—one that shifts it to the right, one that shifts it to the left, one that, depending on whom we believe, shifts it to the right or the left. What I would like to propose is that we can just as adequately account for all the relevant facts by postulating a single accent shift—an accent shift that applied in Lithuanian alone, and which moved the accent from a short or circumflex syllable one syllable to the left. The most radical reinterpretation involved is that of de Saussure's Law—whence the title of the paper.

Given the nature of the problem, I cannot hope to prove that my analysis is the only correct one. I can only hope to show that it is a legitimate alternative to previous analyses, and that it involves fewer assumptions about the protolanguage which are unsupported by evidence.

We will deal with the phenomena in reverse order, beginning with the accent retraction in the verb. This involves retraction of the accent onto a prefix or particle in the present or past tense indicative. Examples are:

Infinitive	3rd sing. pres.	3rd sing. past
su-viĩkti 'drag together'	sùvelka	suviĩko
ap-rėkti 'shout at'	ap̃rėkia	ap̃rėke
iš-rìsti 'untie'	išrisa	išrìso
at-si-kiĩsti 'cut off'	atsikerta	atsikiĩto
api-baĩti 'scold'	ap̃bara	ap̃barė
ati-dúoti 'give back'	atidúoda	atidavė (dãvė)

When there are two proclitics, the accent falls on the one next to the stem (*atsikerta*) and when there is a two-syllable prefix, the accent falls on the syllable next to the stem (*ap̃bara*, *atidavė*). For these reasons the accent is best considered to be the result of a retraction from the stem, rather than a direct accent assignment to initial position, as in Slavic.

This rule has morphological conditioning and exhibits exceptions. In the present the shift is basically from short syllables only, but there are exceptions both ways. A short stem without the shift is *ne tũri* 'does not have'; a circumflex (long) stem which does is *sùvelka*. In the past, the shift is regular from both short and circumflex syllables in unsuffixed verbs whose preterit morpheme is *-ė-*. It does not take place when the preterit is formed with *-o-*; nor does it take place in the *-ė-* preterits of the causatives in *-y-*, which are the only suffixed verbs which take *-ė-* (*apmatỹti*, *apmãto*, *apmãtė* 'survey').

It seems reasonable to assume that at one time there was a retraction from both circumflex and short, that the environment ceased to be transparent, and that there has been a tendency to regularize the alternation along both phonological and morphological lines. Stang (1957:160) relates the stems with accent retraction to Slavic verbs with mobile accent, and the nonacute stems which do not retract to Slavic stems with oxytonic (desinential) accent. Slavic mobile stems do exhibit prefixal stress, but in Slavic it is clear that this is not the result of retraction. It is rather the result of the fact that in a category that took initial accent at least one proclitic could be considered part of the accentual word. Russian *pėre-dal* 'he passed' shows that this accent is initial. Stang, who assumes that Lithuanian prefixal accent reflects the unshifted accent of the mobile paradigm, does not mention the problem posed by the lack of parallelism between Rus. *pėredal*,

Lith. *atĩdavė*. Slavic also allows the initial accent to fall on a preposition, which Lithuanian does not; e.g. Russian *ná golovu* 'on (its) head,' Lith. *gálvą*. We might then argue that if there was a common Balto-Slavic pattern with proclitic accent, then this was lost in Lithuanian, and that the synchronic proclitic accent in the verb has another source.

We will assume that in Lithuanian verbs, as in the nouns, initial accent placement ignored proclitics. This means that the initial accent of the mobile paradigm would fall on the initial syllable of the root. If we further assume that Stang is correct, and that the class of verbs which do not show accent retraction came from forms with desinential accent, we start with *\*veľka*, *\*suveľka*, *\*rėkià*, *\*aprėkià*. A one-syllable retraction then yields *veľka*, *sùveľka*, *rėkia*, *aprėkia*. The very presence of *rėkia*, *aprėkia* renders the reason for the retraction in *veľka*, *sùveľka* unclear. It is then easy to see why there would be a tendency to regularize it according to grammatical categories.

By accepting Stang's hypothesis about oxytonic accent in Balto-Slavic and postulating a single accent retraction from short and circumflex syllables, we account for four things:

- 1) The accent retraction onto a proclitic
- 2) The elimination of oxytonic accent in Lithuanian
- 3) The presence of nonretracting verb stems
- 4) The circumflex intonation on stems like *rėkti*. Circumflex intonation originated on short diphthongs, and should not occur on etymological long monophthongs. *Rėkti* has an etymological long vowel and should therefore be acute. If we assume that the accent was retracted onto the stem, and that this retraction yielded a circumflex intonation, we can account for the intonation.<sup>1</sup>

All of this of course assumes that there were paradigms with desinential accent in Balto-Slavic, which brings us to the problem of Dybo's law. This law has been used by Dybo (1963), Illič-Svityč (1963), Ebeling (1967), Kortlandt (1975), and Garde (1976:16) (under the name of Illič-Svityč's Law) to account for the existence of a set of cognates with desinential accent in Slavic and stem-final accent on a short or circumflex syllable in Lithuanian (Lithuanian accent class two). The clear evidence is from the nominal system, where there is little formal difference between Baltic and Slavic. The claim that this involves a shift to the right in Slavic rather than a shift to the left in Lithuanian is based on

Illič-Svityč's etymological investigation, which purported to show that this class of nouns corresponded to stem-accented nouns in Proto-Indo-European. In Darden (1979) and (1980), I claim to show that Illič-Svityč's etymologies were faulty, and that there is no evidence for an Indo-European source for this set of cognates. If this is correct, we can revive the idea that this class of nouns could have had desinential accent in Balto-Slavic, and that the historical change was a shift to the left in Lithuanian—the position originally taken by Kuryłowicz (1968:152) and Stang (1966:166). We should stress, however, that neither of them proposed a general retraction from short and circumflex in going from Balto-Slavic to Lithuanian. Stang (1957:11-13) specifically rejects the idea. Kuryłowicz (1968:114), following de Saussure, proposes a retraction from internal short syllables in going from Indo-European to Balto-Slavic.

If we accept the above argument, we can say that it is just as likely that Lithuanian class two substantives come from oxytones as that Slavic oxytones come from barytones. We might then look for evidence as to which is correct. We have rejected Illič-Svityč's comparative evidence, agreeing with Kuryłowicz that this class of nouns is a Balto-Slavic innovation. We might look elsewhere in Baltic. Latvian provides no relevant information, since it has eliminated phonemic stress, but there is some relevant information in Old Prussian. The accent is sometimes indicated by a macron over the vowel, with the position of the macron over the first vowel of a diphthong corresponding to circumflex, the position over the second corresponding to acute. Kortlandt (1974b) uses this and other more controversial evidence for place of accent to reconstruct a system in which the accent agrees with Lithuanian class two stems with circumflex intonation on long syllables, but agrees with Slavic in having oxytonic accent when the noun of this class had a short vowel. Examples with macrons are:

- O.P. swāigstan 'appearance,' Lith. žvaigždė  
'star,' Rus. zvezdá 'star'
- O.P. dellikans 'article,' Lith. dalykas 'thing'
- O.P. malniku [dat] 'child,' Lith. -inỹkas,  
Slavic \*-ini:kũ
- O.P. semmē 'earth,' Lith. žėmė (2) 'earth'
- O.P. gennāmans [dat. pl.] 'woman,' Rus.  
žená 'wife'

O.P. widdewū, widdewūmans 'widow,' Rus. vdová  
'widow'

Kortlandt proposed a shift to the right like that which Illič-Svityč and Dybo had proposed for Slavic, but only from short syllables. Unfortunately, even if Kortlandt is correct in his reconstruction of the Prussian system, the correspondences are just as ambiguous as the Lithuanian-Slavic ones. We could just as well propose a shift backward onto long syllables as a shift forward from short ones. In fact, a retraction onto a preceding long syllable seems phonetically more plausible than a shift forward from short vowels.

Since comparative evidence is inconclusive, we can only look for internal developments which are more easily accounted for with one or the other treatment. One of these might be metatony. If we elect to derive the Lithuanian forms from oxytones rather than the Slavic oxytones from barytones, we again find it possible to account for etymologically 'incorrect' circumflex intonation on long monophthongs, e.g. Lith. *-ōkas*, *-iōkas*, *-ỹkas*, *-inỹkas* which correspond to Slavic *\*-a:kù*, *-ĭa:kù*, *-i:kù*, *-ini:kù* (Stang 1966:166). Since long monophthongs should be acute, Dybo must postulate a metatony of acute to circumflex intonation on these forms before the shift forward. We need only assume that they were unaccented. If acute intonation was not possible on unaccented syllables, then we should not be surprised to find that they show up as circumflex when the accent is retracted.<sup>2</sup>

Except for this, there are no more and no fewer problems in deriving Lithuanian from Slavic than in deriving the Slavic from the Lithuanian. In both cases we are faced with the fact that the proposed change does not affect the class of stems with mobile accent. In Baltic and in Slavic this class of nouns exhibits accentual alternations between the initial and the final syllable of the word. If we use Dybo's Law, we must explain why the initial accent of the Slavic mobile paradigm was unaffected. If we follow my suggestion, and have a retraction from short and circumflex syllables in Lithuanian, we must explain why the forms with final accent in Lithuanian mobile paradigms were unaffected.

This kind of phenomenon, where a phonological change is selectively excluded from a grammatical environment, is an embarrassment to historical linguists, but it is not all that uncommon. We do not assume that the original change was grammatically

conditioned, but that as the change spread in the language, variants with and without the change came into competition, and there was eventual sorting along grammatical lines. This sort of thing is more likely to take place when the innovation is what I would call a change at the level of underlying form, rather than an innovation which remains in the language as a contextually conditioned phonetic process. We would not expect morphological selectivity in aspiration of syllable-initial stops in English, nor would we expect it in voicing assimilation in clusters. In the case of an accent retraction, it is likely to be the case that we simply have a new position of accent, rather than a synchronic phonetic process that moves the accent. The difference between words with and without the change should be easily heard, and in many cases both could be easily pronounced by speakers of the language.

It happens that there are at least three accent retractions in the history of Baltic and Slavic which had the effect of differentiating this particular accentual class (Lith. class two and Slavic oxytones) from the class with mobile accent.

(1) Steve Young, in his forthcoming dissertation, discusses an accent retraction from final syllables in modern Lithuanian which eliminated the end stress in class two nouns, but left intact the end stress of the mobile paradigm.

(2) The Slavic definite adjective was formed with a postposed article. When this article was added to an adjective with desinential accent, the accent retracted onto the stem. When it was added to a stem with mobile accent, the accent fell on the ending. Examples from Russian are:

	Oxytone		Mobile	
	'white'		'barefoot'	
	Indef.	Def.	Indef.	Def.
Masc.	bél	bélyj	bós	bosój
Fem.	belá	bélaja	bosá	bosája
Neut.	beló	béloe	bóso	bosóe

We can assume that the addition of the particle to an initially accented form shifted the accent forward, but since the accent of the nonarticulated feminines was the same, we cannot explain their differentiation by phonological means. Essentially the same thing happened to Bulgarian substantives with postposed articles (cf. Stankiewicz 1979:133-146). In the Bulgarian literary language, accent alternations between

the articulated and nonarticulated forms have been eliminated, and the accent of the articulated form has most often been generalized. The result is that old mobile stems have end stress, and, particularly in the masculine and neuter forms, old end-stress nouns have stem stress. Examples are:

Bulg.	Russian
mljàko	molokó 'milk'
vīno	vinó 'wine'
vretèno	veretenó 'spindle'
mesò	mjáso 'meat'
polè	póle 'field'
morè	móre 'sea'
pop, pòpet	pop, popá 'priest'
nož, nõžet	nož, nožá 'knife'
grad, gradèt	górod 'town'
brjag, bregèt	béreg 'bank'

3) Stankiewicz (1966) has a similar morphological explanation for the retraction of accent from the theme vowel in the present tense of the Slavic verb. Stang (1957:109) accounts for the retraction from the long vowel of verbs like Rus. *xožú, xódiš, xódit* by assuming a noninitial circumflex, but he must resort to analogy to account for the retraction from the \*e in *pišú, píšeš, píšet* (Stang 1957: 116).

We thus have a whole series of changes which violate norms of good phonological behavior in order to create or preserve distinctions between the class of mobile accent and the class of Slavic oxytones/Lith. stem-final accented nouns and verbs. It seems not unreasonable to assume that the same thing may have happened to effect the relationship between the Slavic accent and that of the Lith. class two stems. We cannot and should not expect to find a neat phonological explanation. We can assume that either there was a general sound change to which the mobile stems were excepted, or that there was a less general change which was extended by selective analogy. Other investigators, as far as I know, have not even approached this problem.

We are now ready to discuss de Saussure's Law itself. As we have noted, de Saussure (1896) described this law as a shift to the right from a circumflex or short syllable onto an acute syllable. There is no doubt that this is the proper synchronic morphophonemic interpretation. As a diachronic process, however, this hypothesis requires that we postulate the existence of intonational distinctions

on unaccented syllables in Balto-Slavic. There is little evidence for this in Baltic or Slavic.

Kuryłowicz, objecting to the notion of intonation on unaccented syllables, proposed a solution which does not require unstressed intonation. He connected de Saussure's Law with Leskien's Law, which shortened acutes in final position or before final *s*. According to this proposal, when a final syllable was shortened, it attracted the stress from a preceding syllable (Kuryłowicz 1968:133-5). He proposed that Leskien's Law, instead of being the shortening of acutes in final position and before final *\*s*, was a shortening of final open syllables, which the accusative plural showing shortening when *\*n* was deleted before *\*s*.

Aside from the difficulty of phonetically motivating the attraction of stress by a shortening syllable, Kuryłowicz's proposal may not account for all of the data, and may involve problems of relative chronology. As we shall see, there are cases where de Saussure's Law seems to operate in nonfinal position (e.g. *dėdīenė*, from *dėdė*, discussed below). Leskien's Law is a relatively late change, and cannot be demonstrated to have occurred outside Lithuanian. Stang (1966:116-7) points out that its results show dialectal differentiation within Lithuanian. This in itself might be no problem, since de Saussure's Law might also be a late, purely Lithuanian change. Kuryłowicz (1931) and Stang (1957:15-20) argue persuasively that it did not occur in Slavic, and Milewski (1966) has only scant evidence for its occurrence in Old Prussian. The problem is that if Leskien's Law is to be postulated as a shortening of all final open syllables, we have trouble explaining why any long finals exist, e.g. the genitive sing. of *\*o*-stems: *-o:* (*\*a:*). This ending may have once had a final *\*t*, but the loss of final *\*t* is common to Baltic and Slavic, and must have taken place long before Leskien's Law.

For the proposal which I am suggesting, it is crucial that we accept two arguments: (1) Kuryłowicz's and Stang's arguments that de Saussure's Law did not operate in Slavic, and (2) my arguments that Illič-Svityč is incorrect in claiming that the class of Lith. barytones, Slavic oxytones represents original Balto-Slavic stem accent, rather than oxytonic accent. If we assume that Slavic oxytonic accent represents the original position of stress, then we find that in the overwhelming majority of cases where de Saussure's Law is supposed to have shifted the accent onto an acute syllable, the Slavic evidence indicates that the accent is still in the original



position. In the cases where de Saussure's Law does seem to move the accent to the right, even when compared to Slavic, we find that the configuration in question is a perfect morphological and morphophonemic match for cases of the former type, and we can simply assume a morphological extension of the alternation. In generative terms, we have a rule reversal, which is a reinterpretation of a historical shift to the left as a morphophonemic shift to the right, and an application of this newly reinterpreted rule in synchronically proper but historically 'incorrect' environments.

In surveying the examples where de Saussure's Law is thought to have taken effect, we will first look at the paradigms of verbs and nouns which I have claimed to be original desinentially accented stems:

	rankà 'hand'		šāmas 'sheat fish'	
	Sing.	Pl.	Sing.	Pl.
N.	rankà	rañkos	šāmas	šāmai
B.	rañkos	rañku	šāmo	šāmu
D.	rañkai	rañkomas	šāmu	šāmams
A.	rañka	rankàs	šāma	šamàs
I.	rankà	rañkomis	šamù	šāmais
L.	rañkoje	rañkose	šamè	šāmuose

rèkti 'shout'

	Sing.	Pl.
1.	rèkiù	rèkiame
2.	rèki	rèkiate
3.	rèkia	

It is easy to see why, in synchronic morphophonemics, these paradigms are interpreted as having basic stem stress which shifts forward onto certain endings. The endings which attract the accent are historical acutes, shortened by Leskien's Law. If, however, we assume that originally these paradigms had the accent on the theme vowel, there is no reason to think that the accent ever left the acute syllable. The accent rather shifted to the left from nonacute syllables.

In the synchronic system, however, the endings which attract the accent in these paradigms will also attract the accent from a preceding short or circumflex syllable in the mobile paradigm. This is clear in the verb, where there has been a total merger in the accentual paradigms of unprefixal verbs, with the only remaining trace of an old accentual difference being the retraction or lack of retraction onto a

proclitic. To see the pattern in the noun, we must compare the acute mobile stems (Class 3) to the monosyllabic circumflex or short stems (class 4). In class (4), the initial accent of the mobile paradigm is also stem final, so the synchronic variant of de Saussure's Law can act to shift the accent onto the ending. Sample paradigms are:

	vĩlkti	suviĩlkti	aprẽkti	
	'drag'	'drag together'	'shout at'	
		Sing.		Pl.
1.	velkũ	sũvelku	aprẽkiũ	: veĩkame sũvelkame aprẽkiame
2.	velkĩ	sũvelki	aprẽkĩ	: veĩkate sũvelkate aprẽkiate
3.	veĩka	sũvelka	aprẽkia	

## Singular

	'head' (3)	'girl' (4)	'face' (3)	'cowpen' (4)
N.	galvã	mergã	vėidas	gaĩdas
B.	galvõs	mergõs	vėido	gaĩdo
D.	gãlvai	meĩgai	vėidui	gaĩdui
A.	gãlvã	meĩgã	vėida	gaĩdã
I.	gãlva	mergã	vėidu	gaĩdũ
L.	galvojẽ	mergojẽ	veidẽ	gaĩdẽ

## Plural

N.	gãlvos	meĩgos	veidaĩ	gaĩdaĩ
G.	galvũ	mergũ	veidũ	gaĩdũ
D.	galvõms	mergõms	veidãms	gaĩdãms
A.	gãlvas	mergãs	vėidas	gaĩdãs
I.	galvomĩs	mergomĩs	veidaĩs	gaĩdaĩs
L.	galvosẽ	mergosẽ	veiduosẽ	gaĩduosẽ

In the nouns, the basic mobile accent pattern is exhibited by the class (3) stems. Class (4) has this pattern with the effects of de Saussure's Law superimposed on it. The mobile accent paradigm, which is nearly identical to that of Slavic, involves alternations between the initial and final syllables of the word. Since the initial accent is Balto-Slavic in origin, we cannot claim that the cases where class (4) substantives have end stress in opposition to class (3), the Lithuanian forms have preserved the original place of accent. However, these cases are all identical to cases which exhibit shifts to the right in the synchronic variant of de Saussure's Law in class (2) substantives. We can account them by assuming that once de Saussure's Law was reinterpreted as a shift to the right, it was generalized to apply to all

circumflex or short stems before acute endings. If there is a rule assigning initial stress in the mobile paradigm, this amounts to a reordering of the two rules into feeding order.

The verbal system is subject to the same analysis. Original oxytonic stems of the *rĕkti* class preserve the original accent on acute endings (the acute intonation shows up with a following reflexive particle; e.g. *rĕkiúosi*, *rĕkĭesi*). Assuming stem accent in the mobile paradigm of the verb, we would postulate a stage with *veĭkuo*, \**veĭkie*. After the reinterpretation of de Saussure's Law as a rightward shift, these forms were in the proper environment for that rule to apply, and it applied to them. The prefixed forms, however, already had the accent two syllables to the left of the acute ending, so it failed to apply to them. The result was the separation of the rule which retracts the accent onto a prefix from de Saussure's Law (if we are correct in assuming that it had the same origin). In the modern morphophonemic system, the accent retraction onto the prefix must precede de Saussure's Law.

In the other instances where de Saussure's Law seems to operate, we have Slavic evidence that the acute accent preserves the original place of stress. One of the proposed examples is in the paradigm of causative-iteratives with infinitives in *-ý-*. When these verbs have circumflex or short intonation in the present and past stems, the accent shifts to the *-ý-* in the infinitive, e.g., *prašýti* 'ask,' [pres] *prašo*, [past] *prašĕ*. Since these stems never exhibit accent retraction onto a prefix, we could, according to our analysis, assume original desinential accent. The infinitive *prašýti* would then represent the original place of accent—to the right of the stem. Slavic cognates confirm this analysis. The Slavic forms share the infinitive in *-\*i:-*, and these infinitives agree in accent with the modern Lithuanian forms, e.g. Rus. *prosít'* 'ask,' Rus. *budít'* 'awaken,' Lith. *pasibaudyti* 'get up.' The Slavic verbs have a different present tense formation, based on a thematic *-i:-* (Rus. *prosít'*, 1st. sing. *prošú*, 2nd sing. *prósiš'*). This accent pattern, however, indicates old oxytonic accent in the present, but since the formation is different, we cannot evaluate the significance of this. The same is true of the Sanskrit cognates, which also have the accent to the right of the root, e.g. Skt. *bo:dáyati* 'awaken.'

There are a few instances in denominal derivation where de Saussure's Law seems to take effect. While most derivational suffixes determine the accent

absolutely, independently of the stem to which they are added, there is a small set which interact with the accent of the stem. The only nonacute suffix of this kind is *-iniñkas/-inỹkas*, cognate with Slavic *\*-ini:k-*, Rus. *-nik-*, which forms agent/instrument nouns. This suffix will take the accent when it is added to a stem with mobile accent, but will otherwise leave the accent where it is on the base noun. Examples are:

arklỹs (3) 'horse':	arkliniñkas 'groom'
mergà (4) 'girl':	merginiñkas 'girl chaser'
áuksas (1) 'gold'	áuksininkas 'goldsmith'
karvėlis (2) 'pigeon'	karvėlininkas 'pigeon raiser'

Russian derivatives in *-nik-* have essentially the same system, except that in the case of circumflex accent in Lithuanian, the Slavic accent was one syllable to the right. Slavic has only one mobile accent class. When *-nik'* is added to a mobile stem, the derivative has end stress, as opposed to stem-final stress in Lithuanian; e.g., Rus. *dolg*, [pl.] *dolgi* 'debt': *dolžnik*, [gen.] *dolžniká* 'debtor.' Derivatives from nouns with fixed accent (corresponding to Lithuanian class (1) retain the accent on the base: *robóta* 'work,' *rabótник* 'worker.' The derivatives from Slavic oxytones (corresponding to class (2)) originally had the accent on the first vowel of the suffix, but that vowel has disappeared, and the accent is retracted: *grex* (*\*gre:xù*), [gen] *grexá* 'sin'; *grėšnik* (*\*gre:šini:ku*) 'sinner.'

The acute suffixes *-ó-*, forming denominal verbs, and *-ienė*, which forms nouns that designate wives or female counterparts, act just like *-iniñkas* with the addition of de Saussure's Law:

galvà (3) 'head'	galvóti 'think'
dienà (4) 'day'	dienóti 'dawn'
kařtas (2) 'time'	kartóti 'repeat'
pāsaka (1) 'tale'	pāsakoti 'relate'
síela (1) 'soul'	síelotis 'grieve'
āsīlas (3) 'ass'	asilíenė 'she-ass'
vīlkas (4) 'wolf'	vilkíenė 'she-wolf'
dėdė (2) 'uncle'	dėdíenė 'aunt'
kálvis (1) 'smith'	kálvienė 'smith's wife'
Lāpinas (1)	Lāpinienė 'Mrs. Lapinas'

There are traces of similar behavior with the suffix *-áu-ti*:

bėrnas (3) 'farm hand'	bernáuti 'work as farm hand'
tařnas (4) 'servant'	tarnáuti 'serve'

lāpė (2) 'fox'	lapiáuti 'hunt foxes'
sėbras (1) 'comrade'	sėbrauti 'be a comrade'
pūsručiai (1) 'break-fast'	pūsryčiauti 'eat break-fast'

This suffix, however, shows a strong tendency to generalize suffixal accent with all stems, e.g. *uogáuti* 'gather berries' from *úoga* (1) berry, ' *viėšpatáuti* 'rule,' from *viėšpats* (1) 'sovereign.'

There is an analogous pattern in the Slavic derivatives with *-a-*, the cognate of Lith. *-ó-*, and traces of that pattern with *-ova-/-uj-*, the cognate of Lith. *-á-*. Derivatives from stems with mobile accent have suffixal stress:

Rus. gólod 'hunger, góloden 'hungry': golodát' 'starve'
S.C. gláva 'head' (*glāvà): glávati (*glāvàti) 'stick the head out of water (of fish)'
Rus. póle, [pl.] poljá 'field': polevát', polúju 'hunt'

Oxytonic stems likewise take suffixal accent:

ženíx, [gen.] ženixá 'finance': ženixát' 'be a fiance'
vrač, [gen.] vračá 'doctor': vračevát' 'to doctor'

Stems with fixed accent retain the accent:

rabóta 'work': rabótat' 'work'
próba 'attempt': próbovat' 'try'

Here again, if we consider the Slavic accent to be primary, the suffixal accent in words like Lith. *kartóti* from *kařtas* represents the original Balto-Slavic place of accent, rather than an accent shifted to the right by de Saussure's Law. It is made to seem a shift to the right by the fact that *kařtas* has shifted the accent one syllable to the left.

Thus, by the simple expedient of postulating Balto-Slavic oxytonic accent where Slavic attests such accent, we have removed the necessity of treating de Saussure's Law as a shift onto unaccented acutes. We can create the patterns attributed to the action of de Saussure's Law through the same retraction which eliminates oxytonic accent in Lithuanian. We may also, if we wish, link this process to the retraction of verbal accent onto proclitics. As we said at the beginning, there can be no hope of proving that this analysis is correct; we can only show that it involves fewer assumptions about changes from Balto-Slavic to Lithuanian. In closing, we should compare this analysis directly with the Illič-

Svityč/Dybo analysis in this respect:

PRESENT HYPOTHESIS	OLD ANALYSIS
Laws:	
(1) Retraction from short or circumflex	(1) De Saussure's Law (2) Dybo's Law (3) Stress assignment on proclitics
Other assumptions:	
(1) Reinterpretation of retraction as shift to right, and application in identical environments	(1) Unaccented acute (2) Morphological influence on Dybo's Law (3) Metatony changing some long vowels to circumflex before Dybo's Law.
(2) Morphological influence in elimination of oxytona	

It seems to me that this analysis is at the very least a viable alternative to previous ones, and it is at least reasonable to speculate that the accent alternations in Lithuanian are due to a retraction from circumflex and short syllables, rather than an attraction onto acutes.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Note that we are not claiming that *rėkia* itself must come from *rėkià*, although the circumflex intonation on the long /ė/ makes this likely. We are claiming that the category of non-retracting verbs originated as oxytonically accented verbs. Because of later levelings, many verbs could have shifted categories. *Rėkti* is synchronically nonshifting in the present because it has a long vowel in the base. *Sūvelka*, being synchronically exceptional, is probably originally mobile. Its Slavic cognate (Scr. *vići*) indicates mobility.

<sup>2</sup>There is at least one other class of words where a retraction of accent might explain a problematical metatony. Stang (1966:154) labels as "nicht verstandlich" the metatony in words with the suffix *-inas*; e.g. *aĩtinas* 'drake,' from *áintis* 'duck.' Slavic cognates with this suffix have desinential accent: Lith. *ávinas* 'ram,' Rus. *ovén, ovná* 'ram.' In Darden (1979: 336) I suggested that we could make sense of *ávinas* and other forms of similar shape (two-syllable stems with a short high

vowel in the second syllable) if we assume that the original accent in Slavic was on the second syllable of the stem. Slavic shows a tendency to generalize desinential accent in stems of this type. We then have the 'normal' situation, with the Slavic accent one syllable to the right of the Lithuanian. If we further assume that the accent was on the second syllable in Balto-Slavic, we can account for both the place of accent and the metatony by a retraction one syllable to the left. We must then assume that the mobile accent in Lithuanian is secondary. Stang (1966:154), in fact, gives evidence of fixed accent in this class, quoting *añtinas* with fixed accent.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Darden, B.J. 1979. "Nominal Accent Classes in Lithuanian as Compared to Slavic and Indo-European." *The Elements*. Chicago: CLS. 330-338.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1982. "Reflexes of I.E. Barytones among Balto-Slavic and Slavic Substantives." *IJSLP* 25/26:99-108.
- De Saussure, F. 1876. "Accentuation lituaniene." *IF* 6:157-166.
- Dybo, V.A. 1963. "K istorii slavjansko sistemy akcentuacionnyx paradigm." *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie* 5:70-87.
- Ebeling, C.L. 1967. "Historical Laws of Slavic Accentuation." *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, 577-593. The Hague: Mouton.
- Garde, P. 1976. *Histoire de l'accentuation slave*. Paris: Institute d'études slaves.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M. 1963. *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*. Moscow: ANSSSR.
- Kortlandt, F.H.H. 1974a. "On the History of Baltic Accentuation." *Historical Linguistics* 2/15:295-309.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974b. "Old Prussian Accentuation." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88:299-306.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1931. "Le probleme des intonations balto-slaves." *RSL* 10:1-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1968. *Indogermanische Grammatik*, 2: Akzent, Ablaut. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Milewski, T. 1966. "Przyczynki do akcentologii bałto-słowiańskiej." *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 3:113-126.
- Schmalstieg, W.R. 1976. *Studies in Old Prussian*. University Park: The Pennsylvania University Press.
- Stang, C.S. 1957. *Slavonic Accentuation*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltische Sprachen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1966. "Slavic Morphophonemics in Its Typological and Diachronic Aspects." *CTL* 3:495-520.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. The Accent Patterns of Bulgarian Substantives. *Studies in Slavic Morphophonemics and Accentology*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. 133-147.
- Young, Steven. Forthcoming. The Inflectional and Derivational Accentuation of Colloquial Lithuanian. University of Chicago Dissertation.