

Nominal Accent Classes in Lithuanian as Compared
to Slavic and Indo-European

Bill J. Darden
University of Chicago

Greek and Sanskrit nouns can be divided into those with accent on the stem (barytones) and those with accent either constantly on the ending or alternating between the ending and the stem final syllable (oxytones). For Balto-Slavic it is generally accepted that with some exceptions, long vowels in stems attracted the accent, eliminating any possible distinction between stem-stress and end-stress.¹ In Lithuanian, if we eliminate the effects of DeSaussure's Law, there are two classes of short vowel stems--those with fixed stem accent (classes one and two) and those with an accent alternation between the stem and the ending (classes three and four). In Slavic there are also two possibilities for noncompound stems with short vowels--accent on the ending (theme vowel) and an accent alternation like that of Lithuanian.

Since each of these languages has two accent classes for nouns, it is obviously tempting to try to relate them. Kurylowicz (1968:115-8) found no relationship between the classes of Balto-Slavic and the other languages. He argued that all 'unmotivated' short-vowel stems became mobile, while the class of fixed accent in Lithuanian and theme-vowel accent in Slavic was secondary. He postulated a Balto-Slavic class of oxytones which, with accent retraction, is the major source of class two substantives in Lithuanian.

Illic-Svityč (1963), in a detailed study of Baltic and Slavic accent, came to a different conclusion. For Lithuanian in particular, he proposed a simple relationship with Greek and Sanskrit, whereby stem-stress in those languages remains stem-stress in Lithuanian, while the class of end-stress/mobile nouns in Greek and Sanskrit corresponds to the Lith. mobile paradigm. He argued that Kurylowicz was led to a wrong conclusion because he used data from literary Lithuanian, which is based on a dialect which tends to generalize mobile accent. When an I.E. cognate of a Lithuanian word has barytonic accent, the literary language often has mobile accent, but Illic-Svityč was almost always able to find traces of fixed stem-stress in earlier manuscripts or in dialects.

Illic-Svityč writes very convincingly, but there are some suspicious aspects of this study. We can often tell that two words in related languages are from the same I.E. root, but if we are to compare the accent, we must be sure that they are actually the phonetic des-

cendants of the same I.E. word. That is very hard to prove. Most of Illič-Svityč's examples are -o- and -ā-stem nouns, which were productive types of formations in all four languages. We can never be sure that a particular word has not been created anew by a productive process in the language after the break-up of I.E.²

Furthermore, we must be very careful in using dialect information to reconstruct the accent in Lith. There is always some variation in accent systems, and if we allow ourselves to pick and choose the data from different dialects, we could prove anything. Illič-Svityč seems to have used the data intelligently, but there is always the danger that he overemphasized the importance of the variants which fit his hypothesis.

Slavic and Baltic are lexically very close, and their accent systems are closely related, so we would expect to have a greater chance of reconstructing actual words from Baltic and Slavic cognates. Illič-Svityč, however, posits several accentual innovations for Slavic. Only the ā-stems have a simple relationship to the I.E. and Baltic classes. I.E. oxytones and Baltic mobiles correspond in the ā stems to Slavic mobiles. The I.E. barytones changed to an end-stress paradigm in Slavic.

Original o-stem masculines, he says, are all mobile. But original o-stem neuters with stem stress have become masculine with end-stress. Illič-Svityč proposes that the merger of masculine and neuter endings took place in unstressed position (-*om → -um → u), and then the stress was shifted forward one syllable by Dybo's law, which shifts the accent forward off a short or circumflex syllable. I.E. end stress neuters, according to Illič-Svityč retain this pattern in Slavic.

We might mention that a different interpretation of the o-stem pattern in Slavic fits Kurylowicz's hypothesis very closely. All the original o-stem masculines are mobile, as he predicts. If we consider the end stress masculines which have neuter cognates to be new masculine formations rather than phonologically transformed neuters, then we can trace their end-stress to a derivational process. This leaves only the end-stress neuters, and there I find at most two convincing etymologies.

I am not an etymologist, however, so I hesitate to criticize Illič-Svityč's etymologies directly. What I have done is take the predictions that Illič-Svityč makes about the relationship between Baltic and Slavic and test them. Since we have a better chance of reconstructing Balto-Slavic words, generalizations based on Baltic and Slavic should have a better chance of being true.

What I have found indicates a situation which corresponds much more closely to the position of Kurylowicz than to that of Illič-Svityč. Instead of the

complex relationship between Baltic and Slavic, I find evidence for a simple relationship whereby mobility in Lithuanian corresponds to mobility in Slavic, and fixed stem-stress on the stem-final syllable in Lithuanian corresponds to theme-vowel stress in Slavic.

This corresponds to what Illič-Svityč postulates for \bar{a} -stems, but while I agree with it, I cannot say honestly that my data prove that. There is so much variation in the accent of \bar{a} -stems within Lithuanian and Slavic that I would hesitate to use them to prove anything. I will concentrate on the o-stems.

We will begin with the Lithuanian-Slavic cognates which are neuter in Slavic. According to Illič-Svityč, only original end-stress neuters survive as neuters in Slavic, and these should correspond to mobile masculines in Lithuanian (Lith. has no neuter substantives).

I found only one cognate that fits this pattern: Lith. dūgnas (4) 'bottom', which, if we can account for the Lith. /g/, is cognate with Rus. dnò 'bottom', S.C. dnò, Sln. dno. The shortness of the /o/ in S.C. and Sln. indicate old end stress.

On the other hand, I found three examples where Lith. and Slavic agree in having mobile accent: Lith. šimtas (4) 'hundred', S.C. stò, Sln. stò; Lith. ēžeras, āžeras (3) 'lake', Sln. jēzero/jezēro, Rus. ózero 'lake'; Lith. siēnas (4) 'hay', Rus. sēno 'hay', Sln. sēno, S.C. sljeno.

There are five cognates which have end-stress in Slavic but stem-final stress in Lith. Three are semantically good candidates for being B.S. words: Lith. pentinas 'spur', Rus. pjatnò 'spot', Serb. Church Slavic petano 'spur'; Lith. plaučiai (2) 'lungs', S.C. plúca, Slk. pl'úca, Cz. plíce 'lungs'; Lith. vartai 'gate', Rus. dial. vorotá 'gate', Blg. vrata, S.C., Sln. vráta. These forms indicate end stress in Slavic, but end stress in a neuter plural is ambiguous, since mobile paradigms have end stress in the plural. Illič-Svityč quotes Cz. dial. vráta, Slk. vráta, S.C. dial. vráta which favor end stress, while Lit. Cz. vrata, Pol. wrota favor mobility. Lith. keñslas (2) 'cutting instrument', Rus. čeresló 'plowshare' are cognates, but the difference in meaning could allow us to doubt that they are the same word. Lith. piešimas (2) 'drawing' and Rus. pis'mó 'writing, letter' are formal cognates, but -imas is productive in Lith. and it is doubtful that piešimas should be compared to pis'mó.

These data directly contradict the prediction of Illič-Svityč and confirm a pattern of agreement for mobility, and Lith. class two corresponding to Slavic end stress.

We can now turn to the cognates which are masculine in both languages. There is general agreement

that there exist a set of cognates with mobile accent in both languages. Examples are: Lith. draūgas (4) 'friend', S.C., Sln. drūg 'friend'; Lith. dial. kařbas (4) 'basket', Rus. kórob 'basket'; Lith. vařnas 'raven', S.C., Sln. vřan 'raven', Rus. vóron 'raven'. According to Illič-Svityč, this class should be made up of original oxytonic masculines. Those with cognates in Greek or Sanskrit are: Lith. mařsas 'sack', S.C. mêx, Sln. mêh, Rus. mex 'fur', (note mesok 'sack') Sanskrit meşás 'ram'; Lith. miēgas 'sleep', S.C., Sln. mīg, Rus. mig 'instant', Skt. meghás 'cloud'; Lith. sakař 'resin', S.C. sôk, Sln. sôk, Rus. sok 'juice, sap', Gk. ὄπιός 'juice'; Lith. taūras 'bison', S.C. tūr, Rus. tūr 'bison', Gk. ταῦρος 'bison'; Lith. viřkas 'wolf', S.C. vūk, Sln. vôlk 'wolf', Skt. vřkas 'wolf', Gk. λύκος 'wolf'.

The cognates for mařsas and miēgas can hardly be taken as clear evidence of the existence of a single I.E. word as their precursor. Of the remaining three, taūras and viřkas are cognate with barytones. Illič-Svityč rejects Gk. ταῦρος as a cognate because of the /a/, a decision I cannot judge, but even so there is no good evidence that this class corresponds to Greek and Sanskrit oxytones.

According to Illič-Svityč, the I.E. barytonic masculines should have stem accent in Lithuanian, mobile accent in Slavic. We have just seen that taūras and viřkas are possible exceptions to that generalization. He proposes three candidates for Balto-Slavic words which have cognates in Greek or Sanskrit. None are without problems. They are: (1) Lith. bādas 'hunger', S.C. bôd 'prick', Skt. bādhás 'pressure'. Even if we forget the problem of the Sanskrit length, we can easily doubt that the cognates are actually the same I.E. word. Furthermore, there is another equally good Sanskrit cognate—with end stress: bādhás 'oppression' (2) Lith. žāmbas 'edge', S.C. zūb, Sln. zôb, Rus. Zúb 'tooth', Skt. jàmbhas 'tooth', Gk. γόμφος 'nail, thorn'. Again semantics is a problem. Even if we agree that žāmbas was originally a class two substantive, it could easily be a newly derived noun from žēmbti 'cut', rather than an ancient I.E. word. (3) Lith. vakarás 'evening', Sln. večēr, Rus. večer 'evening', Gk. (Homer) ἕσπερος 'evening'. This etymology may be correct, but there are problems with the consonants and it is dangerous to use the Greek form as proof of the original accent (cf. Hamp 1966).

To our doubts about the etymologies we can add doubts about the accents. In each of these cases, Illič-Svityč has had to resort to dialectal or documental evidence that the Lithuanian form had fixed accent. Bādas is mobile throughout the dialects, according to Illič-Svityč, but shows up as fixed in some eighteenth century documents. Žāmbas and vākaras are both predomi-

nantly mobile, but have dialectal variants with fixed accent.

It turns out that all the stems which Illič-Svityč proposes to put in the class of Balto-Slavic barytones are predominantly mobile in Lithuanian. The others are gařdas 'cattle pen', cognate with S.C. grād, Rus. górod 'city', which is mobile except in western dialects, lankas 'arch' cognate with S.C. lūk 'arch', which is mobile except for an adverbial use in one dialect area, rāgas 'horn', cognate with S.C. rôg 'horn', which is mobile throughout Lithuanian, but shows up in some early documents with fixed accent, and sniēgas 'snow', cognate with S.C. snēg 'snow', which is predominantly mobile, but has fixed accent in at least one dialect. Having established a relationship between Slavic mobility and Baltic mobility in accent, we might use the Slavic accents to justify discounting the dialect variants, but first we must establish the normal relationship between reasonably clear class two substantives and corresponding Slavic words.

We will begin with a set of cognate suffixes. The suffix -iniņkas/-inỹkas forms agent-instrument nouns in Lithuanian, and is cognate with the Slavic suffix *-inĭk-u, which has identical function and surprisingly parallel accentual behavior. When the suffix is added to a stem with fixed accent, the accent stays on the stem, but when it is added to a stem with mobile accent, the accent shifts forward. In Lithuanian the accent shifts to the last syllable of the stem (the suffix), while in Slavic it shifts onto the ending. An example of a parallel formation is Lith. naktiniņkas (2) 'night person, night worker', Rus. nochnĭk, nochnĭkă 'night worker'.

The cognate pair Lith. -õkas, Slavic -ak also form class two substantives in Lithuanian, oxytones in Slavic. Parallel formations are: Lith. dial. paršiõkas 'piglet' Pol. prosiak, Lith. teliõkas 'calf', Pol. cielak 'calf'. Compare also S.C. crnjāk, crnjăka 'red wine', Lith. juodõkas 'black horse'.

Diminutives and other types of substantives of accent class two are formed with the suffixes -ĭkas, -ũkas, in Lithuanian. The corresponding Slavic nouns in *-ĭc-, *-ũk- form end-stressed substantives, but only when added to mobile stems, so the accentual correlation is inexact. There are, however, a few cognate pairs: Lith. dial. siuvikas 'shoemaker', Rus. švec, švecă 'shoemaker'; Lith. vainikas 'crown', Rus. venec, vencă 'crown', Lith. sventikas 'saint', Bulg. svetec 'saint'.

Nouns which belong to class two in Literary ³ Lithuanian and show evidence of end stress in Slavic are: Lith. bēbras 'beaver', Sln. béber, bébra. The open /e/ in Slovenian indicates old end stress.

Lith. kařtas 'time'. Slovak krát, with length, indicates end stress, as does the length with preceding

rising pitch in S.C. dvákrāt 'twice', but Sln. krāt indicates acute fixed accent.

Lith. pōdas 'bottom of stove', S.C. dial. pōd, podā pōd, podā, Sln. pōd, podā 'floor' all indicate end stress. S.C. pōd, podā means nothing, since it is not a possible original pattern. East Slavic forms show stem stress in the singular (Rus. pod, podā, Uk. pid, pódu, B.R. pod, pódu,) but Illič Svityč quotes Uk. dial. pid, podā and Rus. dial. pōd, which should indicate end stress.

Lith. priēdas 'addition', S.C. prīd, prīda 'addition'.

Lith. piēstas 'pestle', Rus. pest, pestá 'pestle'.

Lith. pirštas 'finger', Rus. perst, perstá 'finger'. Illič-Svityč quotes forms with end stress from Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian dialects, but literary S.C. prst, Sln prst, Slk. prst disagree. However, since the variant forms are inconsistent, and forms with end stress are found in the three areas which preserve accent alternations, we can tentatively classify this as a Slavic end-stress form.

Lith. šāmas (2/4) 'sheat fish', Rus. sóm, somá 'sheat fish', S.C. sóm, sóma, Sln. sóm, sóma.

Lith. stuības 'post', Rus. stolb, stolbá 'post'. In this case the Lithuanian form may be borrowed.

Lith. kibīras (2)/kibīras (3) 'bucket', Sln. čebèr, čebra 'bucket', S.C. čābar, čābra.

Lith. skiētas 'weaver's reed' is relatable to Rus ščit, ščitá 'shield', S.C. štīt, štíta, Slk. štít, but it is certainly doubtful that it was once the same word.

The only clear class-two nouns that are related to clearly mobile Slavic words that I found are three nouns from neřsti 'spawn': Lith. neřstas (2) 'spawning, roe', Rus. neřest 'spawning', S.C. mrēst 'roe' Sln. drēst 'roe'; Lith. nařsas 'spawning', Rus. nóros 'frog roe', Lith. nařstas 'roe', Rus. nórost 'frog roe'.

If we allow ourselves to use dialect variants, we can add another example of a Lith. class two substantive which corresponds to end stress in Slavic. Trautmann gives a variant ēžis (2) of ežys 'hedgehog', which is cognate with Rus. ež, ežá 'hedgehog'.

The justification of the proto-Slavic accent in some of the above words is less than crystal clear, but it seems to me that the data show a pattern of stem-final accent in Lithuanian corresponding to end-stress in Slavic.

My interpretation of the individual words does not differ from that of Illič-Svityč, but my interpretation of the pattern does. Illič-Svityč believes that the correlation between Lith. stem-final accent and Slavic end-stress is limited to a class of original neuters. I think that this is the only pattern there is for Lith. nouns with stem-final accent. It is significant that we do not have to use dialectal evidence to discern this pattern. Furthermore the group of nouns with this pat-

tern includes nouns which one would expect to be masculine, not neuter, e.g. agent-instrument -ininkas, šāmas 'sheat fish', ēžis 'hedgehog'.

Before proposing a specific correlation between Lithuanian class two stems and Slavic oxytones, we should look at the cognates of Slavic oxytones which are not of class two. Aside from sporadic examples such as Rus. kust, kustá 'bush', Lith. kuokštas (1) 'brush'; S.C. plást, plásta 'hay stack', Lith. plúostas (1) 'tussock', there are a set of words with similar shape which have end stress in Slavic and mobile stress in Lithuanian. These words are exceptions to both Illič-Svityč's and Kurylowicz' proposals. They are disyllabic stems whose second syllable contains a short *i or *u. Those that I found are:

Lith. āvinas (3) 'ram', Rus. ovén, ovná 'ram', S.C. òvan, óvna, Sln. oven, óvna, Bulg. oven.

Lith. ākstinas 'cattle prod', Rus. ostén, ostná 'spike', Bulg. ostén, S.C. òstan 'cattle prod', Sln. ósten 'spike'.

Lith. āsilas (3) 'donkey', Rus. osël, oslá 'donkey', S.C. òsao, òsla, Sln. ósel, Bulg. osél.

Lith. āsutas 'horse hair', Rus. osót, ostá 'thistle', O.R., O.C.S. osŭtŭ, Sln. ósat, Bulg. ósat.

Lith. kātilas (3) 'kettle', Rus. kotël, kotlá 'large copper kettle', S.C. kòtao, kòtla, Sln. kótal.

Lith. stūburas (3) 'pillar, tree trunk' (Skok 1973) S.C. stàbar, stàbra 'tree trunk', Sln. stàbər, stàbra 'pillar'.

Kātilas and āsilas are borrowed, perhaps independently, from Germanic, but they fit the pattern and might be Balto-Slavic borrowings.

All of these words had stem-final syllables with jers in Slavic--vowels which weakened and eventually disappeared. It seems logical to try to link the behavior of these words to that fact. Slavic shows a tendency to interpret a stem-final stressed jer in the nom. sing. masculine as a sign of end stress. Rus. zamók, zamká 'lock' S.C. zájam, zájma 'loan' both show reflexes of end stress in a derivational pattern which normally does not allow it. (Compare Rus. zavód, zavóda 'factory', S.C. zárez, záreza 'cut'.) In fact there is no suffix which contains a jer which allows suffixal accent in derived masculine o-stems. This may reflect an original prohibition, or it may reflect a reinterpretation of these words as having end stress. We could at least consider the possibility that words like ovén originally had the stress on the suffixal jer. The Slavic stress would then be one syllable to the right of the Baltic stress, which is the pattern we find when Lithuanian stem-final stress corresponds to Slavic end stress. It is also the pattern we find in the disyllabic borrowing from Slavic: Lith. gātavas (3)

'ready', Rus. gotóvyj 'ready'. If we then assume that the accent mobility in Lithuanian is secondary--which in this case it has to be--we have a coherent relationship. Whether or not this explanation is correct, these forms are so similar in shape that we must assume that something special happened to them, and we can put them aside in determining the overall relationship between Lithuanian and Slavic.

The relationship which seems to hold most clearly is that mobile accent in Lithuanian corresponds to mobility in Slavic, and stem-final stress on a short or circumflex syllable (class two) in Lithuanian corresponds to end stress in Slavic. This is exactly what Illič-Svityč proposed for the other stem classes (mainly ā-stems), but he was led to reject this relationship for the o-stems in an attempt to establish a simple relationship between Lithuanian accent classes and those of Greek and Sanskrit. This study shows that for the o-stems at least there is no demonstrable relationship between the accent classes of Balto-Slavic words and those of other I.E. languages. We are then left with the conclusion that Kurylowicz was much closer to the truth than was Illič-Svityč.

This should lead us to suspect the relationship that Illič-Svityč proposes for the ā-stems. I am not ready to make any specific claims about the relationship within Balto-Slavic, but I can note that if we apply strict criteria of formal identity, there is not a single example proposed by Illič-Svityč which has stem-final stress in Lithuanian, end stress in Slavic, and any cognate in Greek or Sanskrit. This would fit Kurylowicz's hypothesis that these forms represent a Balto-Slavic derived class. Here, as with the o-stems, I may be distorting the data by insisting on using only words that are demonstrably Balto-Slavic, but if I have erred, it is on the side of caution. I hope that this will encourage Indo-Europeanists to take a hard look at the etymologies where Illič-Svityč relates Lithuanian or Slavic words directly to Greek or Sanskrit.

FOOTNOTES

1) An excellent survey of the literature is found in Illič-Svityč (1963).

2) I am indebted to Eric Hamp for pointing this out, and for other aid and advice in preparing this paper.

3) The indications of old end stress are: Uk., B.R., Rus. end stress; S.C. rising pitch on the stem-final syllable (à, á), and, when there is no ending, retained length on the stem-final syllable with rising pitch on the preceding syllable, dialectal end stress or neo-acute (ã) on the stem-final syllable; Sln. rising pitch on an open vowel (é, ó) or preserved end stress; west slavic preserved

length on long syllables in stem-final position.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dybo, V.A., and V.M. Illič-Svityč. 1963. K istorii slavjanskoj sistemy akcentuacionnyx paradigm. Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie: doklady sovetskoj delegacii v Meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov. Moscow: ANSSSR. 70-87.
- Fraenkel, E. 1955. Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hamp, Eric P. 1966. Three Armenian Etymologies. Revue des etudes arménien. n.s. 3. pp. 11-15.
- Illič-Svityč, V.M. 1963. Immenaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Moscow: ANSSSR.
- Kurschat, F. 1883. Littauisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Halle.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1968. Indogermanische Grammatik. Vol 2: Akzent Ablaut. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Lietuvos TSR mokslu akademija. 1972. Dabartines lietuviu kalbos žodinas. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Skok, Petar. 1971-4. Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Trautman, R. 1923. Baltisch-slavisches Wörterbuch. Göttingen: Bandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Vasmer, M. (Trubacev). 1964-73. Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka. Moscow: Progress.