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 unsuspected 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:
When there are two proclitics, the accent falls on the one next to the stem (ašėkerta) and when there is a two-syllable prefix, the accent falls on the syllable next to the stem (apbāra, atādavē). 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 nē tērī 'does not have'; a circumflex (long) stem which does is sūvelka. In the past, the shift is regular from both short and circumflex syllables in unsuffixed verbs whose preterit morpheme is -k-. It does not take place when the preterit is formed with no-; nor does it take place in the -k- preterits of the causatives in -y-, which are the only suffixed verbs which take -k- (apmatšti, aptūto, apmatš '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 pēre-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. pēredal,
Lith. atidavę. Slavic also allows the initial accent to fall on a preposition, which Lithuanian does not; e.g. Russian на геолог 'on (its) head," Lith. гэлош. 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 proclit-
ic. This means that the initial accent of the mo-
sile paradigm would fall on the initial syllable of
the root. If we further assume that Stang is cor-
correct, and that the class of verbs which do not show
accent retraction came from forms with desinential
accent, we start with ʻveška, ʻšveška, ʻrēkiš,
ʻsprēkiš. A one-syllable retraction then yields
veška, šveška, rēkia, aprēkia. The very presence of
rēkia, aprēkia renders the reason for the retrac-
tion in veška, šveška 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 oxytonec
accent in Balto-Slavic and postulating a single ac-
cent retraction from short and circumflex syllables,
we account for four things:
1) The accent retraction onto a proclitic
2) The elimination of oxytonec accent in
Lithuanian
3) The presence of nonretracting verb stems
4) The circumflex intonation on stems like
rēktē. Circumflex intonation originated on short
diphthongs, and should not occur in etymological long
monophthongs. Rēktē has an etymological long vowel
and should therefore be acute. If we assume that
the accent was retracted onto the stem, and that this re-
traction yielded a circumflex intonation, we can ac-
count for the intonation.1

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), Ilić-Svityč
(1963), Ebeling (1967), Kortlandt (1975), and Garde
(1976b) (under the name of Ilić-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
Iliič-Svityč's etymological investigation, which purported to show that this class of nouns corresponded to stem-accented nouns in Proto-Indo-European, Darden (1979) and (1980), I claim to show that Iliič-
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 re-
jects 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 sub-
stantives come from oxytones as that Slavic oxytones come from barytones. We might then look for evidence as to which is correct. We have rejected Iliič-
Svityč's comparative evidence, agreeing with Kurylo-
wicz that this class of nouns is a Balto-Slavic inno-
vation. We might look elsewhere in Baltic, Latvian provides no relevant information, since it has elim-
inated phoremic stress, but there is some relevant informaion in Old Prussian. The accent is sometimes
indicated by a macron over the vowel, with the posi-
tion of the macron over the first vowel of a diph-
thong corresponding to circumflex, the position over the second corresponding to acute. Kortlanč (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. swäigstan 'appearance,' Lith. évaigštė
'star,' Rus. zvezdë 'star.'

O.P. dellīkana 'article,' Lith. dalīkšas 'thing'
O.P. mainīku [dat] 'child,' Lith. -inėkas,
Slavic *-ini:ků

O.P. semē 'earth,' Lith. žemė (2) 'earth'
O.P. gennāmans [dat. pl.] 'woman,' Rus.
ženā 'wife'
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. -iškas, -loškas, -gškas, -iŋškas which correspond to slavic *-arkʰ, *jar³kʰ, *iškʰ, *iŋškʰ (Stang 1960:166). 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.²

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.²

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oxytone</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'white'</td>
<td>'barefoot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indef.</td>
<td>Def.</td>
<td>Indef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masc.</td>
<td>bel</td>
<td>belýj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>belá</td>
<td>belíja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neut.</td>
<td>beló</td>
<td>belílo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
mlijako                         molokō 'milk'
vino                             vinō 'wine'
vretıno                         vertenō 'spindle'
mesō                            mjdsō 'meat'
polb                            pōlē 'field'
morō                            mōre 'sea'
pop, pophat                     pop, popą 'priest'
nož, nožhat                     nož, nožā 'knife'
grad, gradat                    gōrod 'town'
brjag, bregst                    bōrēg 'bank'

3) Stankiewicz (1966) has a similar morphologi-
cal 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. nožu, nožā,
nož̄ by assuming a noninitial circumflex, but he
must resort to analogy to account for the retrac-
tion from the *e in pīšu, pīšės, pīšet (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 unreasonably 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) de-
scribed this law as a shift to the right from a cir-
cumflex 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 ë. 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 ë, was a shortening of final open syllables, which the accusative plural showing shortening when ë was deleted before ë.

Aside from the difficulty of phonetically motivating the attraction of stress by a shortening of 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. dźěséń, from dźěś, discussed below). Leskien’s Law is a relatively late change, and cannot be demonstrated to have occurred outside Lithuanian. Stang (1966:115-7) 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 *-a-stems: -o; (*2;). This ending may have once had a final *ë, but the loss of final *ë 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 interpreted 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 desintenially accented stems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ranka 'hand'</th>
<th>aamas 'sheet fish'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>Pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. ranka</td>
<td>raatkos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. raatkos</td>
<td>raatku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. raatkai</td>
<td>raatkomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. raatka</td>
<td>raatka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. ranka</td>
<td>raatkomis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. raatkoje</td>
<td>raatkose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rekti 'shout'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>Pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. rekia</td>
<td>rekiamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. rekial</td>
<td>rekiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. rekia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 nuncate 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 unprefix verbs, with the only remaining trace of an old accentual difference being the retraction or lack of retraction onto a
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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:

Sing. Pl.
1. veikā sūveliku aprēkiša : velkame sūvelkame aprēkišame
2. veika sūvelki aprēkiša : velkate sūvelkate aprēkialate

'Veil' to 'veil together' 'drag at'

Singular

'head' (3) 'girl' (4) 'face' (3) 'cowpen' (4)

N. galvā mergā vēdās garās
B. galvās mergās vēdo gaļo
D. galvai mergai vēdui gaļui
A. galvā merga vēda gaļa
I. galva mergā vēdā garā
L. galvojā mergojā veida garā

Plural

N. galvās mergos vedu garās
B. galvās mergos vēdo garās
D. galvās mergos vēdās garās
A. galvās mergos vēdās garās
I. galvās mergos vēdūs garās
L. galvās mergos vēdūs garās

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 rēkti class preserve the original accent on acute endings, the acute intonation shows up with a following reflexive particle; e.g. rēkhosti, rēkfesti). Assuming stem accent in the mobile paradigm of the verb, we would postulate a stage with velko, velkis. 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 -y-. When these verbs have circumflex or short intonation in the present and past stems, the accent shifts to the -y- in the infinitive, e.g., prągły 'ask,' [pres] prądo, [past] prąda. Since these stems never exhibit accent retraction onto a prefix, we could, according to our analysis, assume original desinential accent. The infinitive prągły 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 -st-, and these infinitives agree in accent with the modern Lithuanian forms, e.g. Rus. prość 'ask,' Rus. budší 'awaken,' Lith. pastasudži 'get up.' The Slavic verbs have a different present tense formation, based on a thematic -ti- (Rus. prośćč', lst. sing. prošč, 2nd sing. prośćč). 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. bośdāyati 'awaken.'

There are a few instances in denominative 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 monacute suffix or this kind is -tiškas/-tiška-, cognate with Slavic *-tiške-, 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:

arkliš (3) 'horse': arklišniškas 'groom'
mergę (4) 'girl': mergęniškas 'girl chaser'
šukas (1) 'gold': šukšniškas 'goldsmith'
karvėlis (2) 'pigeon': karvėniškas '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.) dolg' 'debt': dolgščik, [gen.] dolgščik 'debtor.' Derivatives from nouns with fixed accent (corresponding to Lithuanian class (1)) retain the accent on the base: robota 'work,' robotnišk '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. (Gresz' [gresz], [gen] gresz' 'sin'; prasbek' (*prasbek' 'sinner'.) The acute suffixes -ā, -ē, forming denominal verbs, and -enb, which forms nouns that designate wives or female counterparts, act just like -tiškas with the addition of de Saussure's Law:

galvę (3) 'head': galvęti 'think'
dienę (4) 'day': dienoti 'dawn'
kaštę (2) 'time': kartotit 'repeat'
pasaka (1) 'tale': paskotiti 'relate'
sfele (1) 'soul': sfeletit 'grieve'
šilnas (3) 'ass': asilienė 'she-ass'
vilkas (4) 'wolf': vilkišnė 'she-wolf'
dūdė (2) 'uncle': dūdienė 'aunt'
kalvis (1) 'smith': kalvienė 'smith's wife'
Lapiinas (1) Lapienė 'Mrs. Lapinas'

There are traces of similar behavior with the suffix -da-ti-

bérnas (3) 'farm': bernštiti 'work as farm
hand'
tašnas (4) 'servant': tarnštiti 'serve'
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lāpē (2) 'fox'
prüfīuti 'hunt foxes'
Sēbras (1) 'comrade'
Sēbrauti 'be a comrade'
Pařūčīuti (1) 'break-
fast'
Prāryčiautī 'eat break-
fast'

This suffix, however, shows a strong tendency to gen-
eralize suffixal accent with all stems, e.g. wogūti
'gather berries' from dōga (1) 'berry', visēpatūti
'rule' from visēpato (1) 'so reign.'

There is an analogous pattern in the Slavic
derivatives with -az-, the cognate of Lith. -až-, and
traces of that pattern with -ova-/-ož-, the cognate
of Lith. -ož-. Derivatives from stems with mobile
accent have suffixal stress:

Rus. gōloj 'hunger, gōladen 'hungry': golođat' 'starve'
S.Č. glāva 'head' (*glāvā): glāvati (*glāvāti) 'stick
the head out of water (of
fish)'
Rus. pōlie, [pl.] poljā 'field': polevāt', polājū
'hunt'

Oxytomic stems likewise take suffixal accent:
Zenī, [gen.] Zenīkā 'finance': Zenīkāt 'be a fiancé'
Vrač, [gen.] Vračā 'doctor': vračevat' 'to doctor'

Stems with fixed accent retain the accent:
Rabotā 'work': Rabotāt 'work'
Prōba 'attempt': Prōbosit' 'try'

Here again, if we consider the Slavic accent to be primary, the suffixal accent in words like Lith.
Kaštā from kaštās 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 kaštās has
shifted the accent one syllable to the left.

Thus, by the simple expedient of postulating
Balto-Slavic oxytomic accent where Slavic attests
such accent, we have removed the necessity of treat-
ing 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 retrac-
tion which eliminates oxytomic accent in Lithuanian.
We may also, if we wish, link this process to the re-
traction of verbal accent onto proclitics. As we
said at the beginning, there can be no hope of prov-
ing 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 Illici-
Svityč/Dybo analysis in this respect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Hypothesis</th>
<th>Old Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Retraction from short or circumflex</td>
<td>(1) De Saussure's Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Dybo's Law</td>
<td>(3) Stress assignment on proclitics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other assumptions:

(1) Reinterpretation of retraction as shift to right, and application in identical environments
(2) Morphological influence in elimination of oxytona
(3) Metatony changing some long vowels to circumflex before Dybo's Law.

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

Note that we are not claiming that Ṛūtu has itself must come from Ṛūtis, although the circumflex intonation on the long /u/ 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. Ṛūtu is synchronically nonshifting in the present because it has a long vowel in the base. Švelka, being synchronically exceptional, is probably originally mobile. Its Slavic cognate (Scr. *užitaka*) indicates mobility.

There is at least one other class of words where a retraction of accent might explain a problematic metatony. Stang (1966:154) labels as "nicht verständlich" the metatony in words with the suffix -ius; e.g. Žūtvus 'drake,' from Žūtis 'duck.' Slavic cognates with this suffix have desinential accent: Lith. Žūtas 'ram,' Rus. Žven, and 'ram.' In Darden (1979: 336) I suggested that we could make sense of Žūtas and other forms of similar shape (two-syllabic 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 affinities with fixed accent.
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