

## On the history of Slavic accentuation

0. During the last 20 years the study of Slavic accentuation has gone through a unique period of progress<sup>1</sup>). The rapid development in this field of investigation has rendered a number of older views obsolete and placed others in a new perspective. It has also created a gap between those of us who have specialized in the area and colleagues who work on other parts of Slavic and Indo-European linguistics and do not have the time and the opportunity to gather the necessary information from the scattered sources which are available. The difficulty is all the more serious for Indo-Europeanists who have no access to Russian publications because the fundamental contributions by Dybo and Illič-Svityč have not, to my knowledge, been translated. Moreover, Shevelov's well-known monograph (1964), which is so useful as a first introduction to most subjects in the field of Slavic historical phonology, can only lead one astray in matters of accentology. Thus, there seems to be a need for an introductory survey of the progress which has been made, especially in view of the rapidly growing interest in problems of Proto-Indo-European accentuation<sup>2</sup>). These considerations have led me to write the following sketch of the principal ideas and results which the research of recent decades has produced. As a starting-point I have chosen the publication of Stang's monograph (1957), which marks an era in the study of the subject.

As I view it, the history of Slavic accentuation is not really difficult, but it is complex because of the heterogeneity of the material and the unusual abundance of relevant details. For this reason I shall limit myself in the following to the main lines of thought and omit as much of the detail as is reasonably possible. It should be borne in mind, however, that the particular strength of the new theory lies in the fact that it offers a straightforward explanation for so many of the minor difficulties which remained unsolved in the classical doctrine.

---

<sup>1</sup>) Cf. especially Stang 1957, Dybo 1962, Illič-Svityč 1963, Ebeling 1967, Dybo 1968, Kortlandt 1975, Garde 1976, Winter 1976.

<sup>2</sup>) Cf., e.g., Schindler 1975.

1. The importance of Stang's monograph on the history of Slavic accentuation can hardly be overestimated. In view of this, I shall quote his conclusions in full (1957:179).

1. De Saussure's law did not operate in Slavonic.

2. The neo-acute is not due to metatony but to a retraction of the stress from a semi-vowel or from a non-initial vowel with falling intonation.

3. The neo-circumflex did not belong to the proto-Slavonic period.

4. We find 3 proto-Slavonic intonations:

a. Acute, which can occur on any syllable, and which keeps its stress constantly throughout the paradigm.

b. Neo-acute, which can occur on any syllable, provided that other forms of the paradigm or the etymological group concerned have stress on the subsequent syllable, and provided also that no skipping of syllables ever takes place in the process concerned.

c. Circumflex, which occurs on the first syllable when other forms of the paradigm have the stress on the last syllable.

5. All — nominal and verbal — paradigms could be:

a. immobile with *a*) the stress on the first syllable or *β*) the stress on a medial syllable. The stress was retracted from a circumflex vowel in a medial syllable and — in verbs — analogically from *-e/-o-*. The new ictus syllable received neo-acute.

b. mobile with stress in some forms on the first syllable, in others on the last, skipping the medial syllables. In the verbs few traces of mobility survive. In most forms stress has analogically been transferred to the last syllable.

6. The mobile nominal paradigms of Slavonic are closely related to those we find in Baltic. The immobile type with the stress on the last stem syllable, which in some cases coalesced with the ending, has disappeared in Lithuanian.

7. In the Slavonic paradigms:

Acute intonation was characteristic of the paradigms with constant root stress. Neo-acute was characteristic of paradigms with recessive stress in certain forms. Circumflex was characteristic of paradigms with mobile stress.

According to de Saussure's law, a stressed non-acute syllable lost the stress to a following acute syllable in Lithuanian. This rule, which presupposes the existence of an opposition between acute and non-acute pitch in both stressed and unstressed syllables at the time of its operation, explains the development of four

nominal accent classes out of two earlier patterns in this language. The following example may clarify the issue:

	'linden'	'hand'	'head'	'winter'
nom. sg.	<i>lěpa</i> (1)	<i>rankà</i> (2)	<i>galvà</i> (3)	<i>žiemà</i> (4)
gen. sg.	<i>lěpos</i>	<i>raňkos</i>	<i>galvōs</i>	<i>žiemōs</i>
nom. pl.	<i>lěpos</i>	<i>raňkos</i>	<i>gálvos</i>	<i>žiemos</i>
acc. pl.	<i>lěpas</i>	<i>rankàs</i>	<i>gálvas</i>	<i>žiemàs</i>

The root syllable is acute in paradigms (1) and (3) and circumflex in paradigms (2) and (4). The nom. sg. and acc. pl. endings are acute whereas the gen. sg. and nom. pl. endings are not. In accordance with the rule given above, the stress shifted to the ending in the nom. sg. and acc. pl. forms of paradigm (2) and in the acc. pl. form of paradigm (4). Before the operation of de Saussure's law the paradigms (2) and (4) had the same stress placement as the paradigms (1) and (3), respectively. As will be shown below, the latter two accentual paradigms reflect the Balto-Slavic state of affairs.

The classical theory of Slavic accentuation was based on the erroneous assumption that de Saussure's law operated in Slavic too. In Stang's words, "it can be shown that the cases where de Saussure's law is supposed to have operated either can or must be explained in another way" (1957:15). Moreover, it can be demonstrated that de Saussure's law was relatively recent in Lithuanian and did not operate in the other Baltic languages (cf. Kortlandt 1977). Since it does not seem useful to reproduce an argumentation which is easily accessible and requires a detailed analysis of the material, I refer the interested reader to the discussion in Stang's monograph (1957:15-20).

According to the classical doctrine, a circumflex or acute tone changed under certain conditions into a neo-acute or neo-circumflex tone, respectively. This phenomenon, which yielded a system of four distinctive tones, is called metatony. As Stang pointed out in his monograph, however, the neo-acute is not due to metatony but to a retraction of the stress and the neo-circumflex was not a separate Proto-Slavic tone<sup>3</sup>). There is no reason to assume the existence of a tonal opposition in unstressed syllables for the later stages of Proto-Slavic. Since the various instances of neo-acute are conveniently listed and classified by Stang (1957:168-173), I can refrain from adducing the rather extensive material here. Let me

<sup>3</sup>) On the neo-circumflex cf. Stang 1957: 23-35 and Kortlandt 1976.

only add that the comparative form of the adjective fits into the picture more neatly than Stang suggests (cf. Kortlandt 1975:40).

Thus, we arrive at a system of three distinctive tones for the last stage of Proto-Slavic. The most important result of Stang's research is his conclusion that the three tones correlated with three types of accentual paradigm, which are conventionally labelled (a), (b), (c) in the recent literature. Paradigm (a) is characterized by fixed stress on an acute syllable. Paradigm (b) is characterized by neo-acute tone in some forms and a short accent on the immediately following syllable in others. Since the neo-acute is due to a retraction of the stress, this paradigm had fixed stress on a non-initial syllable at an earlier stage. Paradigm (c) is characterized by circumflex tone on the initial syllable in some forms and final stress in others. The latter paradigm is closely related to the Lithuanian paradigm (3) as far as the stress placement is concerned.

As was pointed out above, the Lith. accent class (4) had the same stress pattern as class (3) before de Saussure's law operated. Thus, the type of accentual mobility was independent of the pitch of the root at that stage. In Slavic, the circumflex tone was generalized in mobile paradigms at an early stage (cf. Stang 1957:10). This rule, which was first observed by Meillet (1902) and is therefore known as Meillet's law, accounts for the difference between the circumflex in Serbo-Croat *sin* 'son', acc.sg. *glavu* 'head' and the acute in Lith. acc.sg. *sūnu*, *galvą*. These words belong to type (c) in Slavic and to class (3) in Lithuanian.

2. After Stang's reconstruction of the last stage of Proto-Slavic accentuation, Dybo and Illič-Svityč complemented his findings by reconstructing some of the earlier stages. Their principal result is the establishment of a progressive accent shift which reduces the accentual paradigms (a) and (b) to a single early Slavic paradigm. As was pointed out above, the accentual type (b) was characterized by fixed stress on a non-initial syllable before the rise of the neo-acute. An original long vowel in the pretonic syllable was not shortened in this accent class. Since type (a) had fixed stress on a non-final acute syllable and acute vowels were shortened in Proto-Slavic, the accentual paradigms (a) and (b) are in complementary distribution. Thus, the rise of type (b) can be explained phonetically if we assume that a stressed vowel which was neither acute nor circumflex lost the stress to the following syllable in Slavic. Here

again, an example may clarify the issue (I write ' for the acute and ˘ for the circumflex tone, and ´ for the neo-acute):

	˘occupy˘	˘carry˘	˘dry˘
infinitive	<i>bávitì</i> (a)	<i>nòsiti</i> > <i>nosìti</i> (b)	<i>sušìti</i> (c)
1st sg. pres.	<i>bávìq</i>	<i>nòšq</i> > <i>nošq</i>	<i>sùšq</i>
3rd pl. pres.	<i>bávětb</i>	<i>nòšetb</i> > <i>nosětb</i> > <i>nósetb</i>	<i>sušetb</i> > <i>sušětb</i>
3rd sg. aor.	<i>bávi</i>	<i>nòsi</i> > <i>nosì</i>	<i>sùši</i>

The progressive accent shift, which will be referred to as Dybo's law, differs from de Saussure's law in the fact that the shift is independent of the pitch of the syllable which receives the stress. As Dybo pointed out in his early work already (1962:8), it presupposes the existence of three phonologically distinct tones on initial syllables at a stage which is anterior to the rise of the neo-acute.

The comparative proof of Dybo's law was supplied by Illič-Svityč in his monograph on Baltic and Slavic nominal accentuation (1963). He pointed out that the Lithuanian accent classes (1) and (2) and the Slavic paradigms (a) and (b) correspond etymologically to barytona in Sanskrit, Greek and Germanic, and that the Lithuanian paradigms (3) and (4) and the Slavic type (c) correspond to oxytona in the other Indo-European languages. The original distribution was blurred by a number of secondary developments. First, literary Lithuanian is based on Aukštaitian dialects where accentual mobility spread analogically to the majority of non-derived nouns. The original accent classes must be established on the basis of the Žemaitian material. Second, all masc. *o*-stems which did not have an acute root vowel became accentually mobile in Slavic by an analogical development, which did not, however, reach the peripheral dialects of Susak and Istria. The latter dialects still reflect the original state of affairs. Third, barytone neuters became masculine while oxytone neuters remained neuter and became barytone in Balto-Slavic. The surviving neuters became masculine in East Baltic at a later stage, but were preserved in Slavic and Prussian. Fourth, the stress was retracted to a pretonic syllable which contained a non-apophonic long vowel or a long syllabic resonant in Balto-Slavic. This is Illič-Svityč's reformulation of Hirt's law. The following list may serve as an illustration of the historical relationships. For a full account I refer to the source. The Latvian accent which is written as a circumflex corresponds to class (1) in Lithuanian.

- R1. IE barytona which have fixed stress in Balto-Slavic.  
 Gr. *ψέλλα* 'flea', Lith. *blusà* (2), Sl. *blъxa* (b).  
 Gr. *δμίχλη* 'mist', Lith. *miglà* (2/4), Sl. *mъgla* (b).  
 Skt. *úrṇā* 'wool', Latv. *viļna*, Sl. *\*vъlna* (a).  
 Gr. *ῥα* 'service-tree', Latv. *iēva*, Sl. *iva* (a).  
 OHG. *seid* 'cord' (neuter), Lith. *siētas* (2/4), Sl. *sitъ* (b).  
 Gr. *ἀκρος* 'topmost', Lith. *āštras* (2/4), Sl. *ostrъ* (b).  
 Skt. *svásā* 'sister', Lith. *sesuō* (2/3), Sl. *sestra* (b).
- R2. IE oxytona which have mobile stress in Balto-Slavic.  
 Skt. *rasā* 'moisture', Lith. *rasà* (4), Sl. *rosa* (c).  
 Gr. *χολή* 'gall', Lith. *žalà* (4), Sl. *zola* (c).  
 Gr. *πουνή* 'blood-money', Lith. *kainà* (4), Sl. *cěna* (c).  
 Skt. *nīḍām* 'nest', Lith. *liždas* (4), Sl. *gnězdo* (b).  
 Skt. *duhitā* 'daughter', Lith. *duktė* (3), Sl. *\*dъkti* (c).
- R3. IE oxytona which have fixed stress in Balto-Slavic (Hirt's law).  
 Skt. *grīvā* 'neck', Latv. *grīva*, Sl. *griva* (a).  
 Skt. *dhūmāḥ* 'smoke', Latv. *dūmi*, Sl. *dymъ* (a).  
 Skt. *dirghāḥ* 'long', Latv. *ilgs*, Sl. *\*dъlgъ* (a).  
 Skt. *pūrṇāḥ* 'full', Latv. *pilns*, Sl. *\*pъlnъ* (a).  
 Skt. *mātā* 'mother', Latv. *māte*, Sl. *mati* (a).  
 Skt. *devā* 'brother-in-law', Latv. *dīēveris*, Sl. *děverъ* (a).

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 IE opposition between barytona and oxytona. Here again, as so often in other areas, modern research confirms the brilliant conception of F. de Saussure.

Thus, both the internal and the comparative evidence point to the existence of two accentual paradigms (fixed vs. mobile stress) in Balto-Slavic. Following Garde (1976), I shall call a stem "strong" if its paradigm has fixed stress (types (a) and (b) in Slavic, classes (1) and (2) in Lithuanian) and "weak" if it has mobile stress (type (c) in Slavic, classes (3) and (4) in Lithuanian). Similarly, an ending is called "strong" if it is stressed in the mobile accent pattern and "weak" if it is not stressed. It should be borne in mind that this distribution is independent of the tonal characteristics. The same terminology is appropriate in the analysis of derivational suffixes. As Dybo pointed out in his study on word-formation (1968), there were two classes of suffixes in Slavic before the operation of the progressive accent shift. If the root was strong, it was always

stressed. If the root was weak, the accent was mobile in class I and fixed on the suffix in class II. If we call the latter type of suffix "strong" and the former type "weak", we can summarize the facts in the following simple rule: any word form is stressed on the first strong morpheme<sup>4</sup>). Since the Old Lithuanian and East Aukštaitian material betrays the same accentual system as was established for early Slavic, we must assume that this was the Balto-Slavic state of affairs.

3. Thus far we have encountered four laws of Slavic accentuation: Stang's law (the retraction of the stress which gave rise to the neo-acute), Meillet's law (according to which acute weak stems became circumflex), Dybo's law (the progressive accent shift), and Hirt's law (in Illič-Svityč's reformulation: retraction of the stress to a preceding non-apophonic long vowel or long syllabic resonant). Moreover, several accentual developments are implied in the relation between IE oxytona and Balto-Slavic mobilia. The stress was retracted in some inflected forms and shifted to the final syllable in others<sup>5</sup>). Two major accent laws have not yet been mentioned. According to Dolobko's law (1927), barytone forms of mobile paradigms lost the stress to a following enclitic particle. This law may now be reformulated as the statement that enclitics were strong and received the stress in accordance with the general rule. Furthermore, the simplification of a consonant cluster entailed the lengthening of the following vowel. Following Ebeling (1967: 587), I call this rule Van Wijk's law<sup>6</sup>).

<sup>4</sup>) This rule was apparently formulated independently by Dybo and by Garde.

<sup>5</sup>) I find no traces of IE accentual mobility in Balto-Slavic outside the nominal flexion of the consonant stems. Thus, the mobility in the paradigm of Lith. *sūnus* 'son' can be derived from a paradigm with fixed stress on the second syllable. On the other hand, it cannot be demonstrated that, e.g., the final stress of the inst. sg. form *sūnumi* was not inherited. The only thing we can definitely assert is that final stress was not inherited in certain other forms, e.g., in the singular of the athematic present, and that the mechanism which yielded final stress here may also have operated elsewhere. Moreover, there are a few indications that the stress was paradigmatically fixed to a certain extent before the rise of the characteristic Balto-Slavic mobility. Thus, the final accent in Lith. *duktė*, as in Skt. *duhitā*, betrays a stabilization of the stress on the second syllable in this paradigm. (The nom. sg. form of this word was originally root-stressed, as the Greek evidence shows.)

<sup>6</sup>) According to Van Wijk's formulation (1916), the vowel which preceded the cluster received a new rising tone. Since Stang demonstrated that this

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. This problem was tackled by Ebeling (1967), who devised a series of fifteen successive stages of development. As an illustration I shall present a part of the chronology here (the stages are numbered A1–A15).

- A1. Rise of the characteristic accentual mobility.
- A2. Hirt's law.
- A5. Meillet's law.
- A6. Spread of accentual mobility in the masc. *o*-stems.
- A7. Rise of a tonal distinction between fixed and mobile accentual paradigms.
- A8. Metathesis of liquids in pre-Serbo-Croat and pre-Slovak.
- A9. Rise of the new timbre distinctions ( $e:\bar{e} > e:\acute{e}$ , etc.).
- A10. Early contractions.
- A12. Dybo's law.
- A15. Stang's law.

Ebeling found himself unable to give a precise chronology of Van Wijk's law and Dolobko's law, both of which he dated between A5 and A9. The establishment of the chronological order led him to fill a number of gaps which earlier research had left open. Thus, he offered an explanation for the fact that Hirt's law seemingly did not affect *u*-stems in Slavic and for the threefold pitch on prefixes.

My monograph on Slavic accentuation (1975) originated from a critique of Ebeling's article. Retaining the general chronological line, I proposed different solutions for a number of details. Moreover, I think that several developments become more understandable if they are connected with the loss of the IE laryngeals. Illič-Svityč's reformulation of Hirt's law presupposes that the laryngeals were still extant at stage A2 because the stress was retracted if the originally pretonic syllable contained a sequence VH or VHR, but not if it contained a sequence VRH or a long vowel of different origin. Later developments receive a simple explanation if one assumes that the laryngeals were lost at different

---

tone resulted from the retraction of the stress from a non-initial long vowel, the simplest assumption is that the simplification of the cluster resulted in the lengthening of the following vowel, cf. Kortlandt 1975: 30.

stages depending on their position in relation to the place of the stress.

I assume that in early Slavic, shortly after its separation from Baltic, the laryngeals were lost in pretonic syllables, e.g. *\*golvâH* < *\*golHvâH*, *\*sūnumî* < *\*suHnumî*, and eliminated analogically in barytone forms of mobile paradigms. This is Meillet's law, which yielded the circumflex in Serbo-Croat *glâvu* 'head (acc.sg.)', *sîn* 'son'. At the same time, as far as we can see, the laryngeals were lost in posttonic syllables, with the exception of the first posttonic syllable. This provides us with an explanation for the neo-circumflex in Slovene *osnôva* 'base', *nosîla* 'carried (fem.sg.)', *ženâmi* 'wife (inst.pl.)', where the non-initial accent resulted from Dybo's law and the falling tone points to a long final vowel which was not shortened in Proto-Slavic<sup>7</sup>). The laryngeals were retained in the stressed syllable and in the first posttonic syllable until the general loss of final consonants and concomitant changes led to the characteristic absence of closed syllables in Slavic. Then the posttonic laryngeals, like other final consonants, were lost without compensatory lengthening, e.g. *\*žèna* < *\*žènaH*, Russ. *žená* 'wife' after Dybo's law, like *\*sŷmъ* < *\*sūnuN* and *\*slôvo* < *\*slôvos*. The loss of the laryngeals in the first posttonic syllable entailed the rise of the new timbre oppositions */a:o, ě:e, i:ɔ, y:ɔ/*. In stressed syllables a laryngeal lost its segmental status and became a feature of the preceding vowel, as did a nasal resonant: *\*dŷmъ* < *\*dŷHmuN*, Russ. *dŷm* 'smoke', like *\*zŷbъ* < *\*zŷNbuN*, Russ. *zub* 'tooth'. Here the symbol ' denotes the laryngeal feature, and simultaneously the place of the stress. I assume that *\*ŷ*, like *\*ŷ*, was neutral with respect to quantity at the stage which immediately followed this sound change. Finally, the laryngeal feature was lost at a stage between Dybo's law and Stang's law.

As a result of the rise of the new timbre distinctions in posttonic syllables, the quantitative oppositions in pretonic syllables were reinterpreted as timbre distinctions. When Dybo's law restored the quantitative oppositions in pretonic syllables, the old long vowels became distinctively short, e.g. Polish *reka* 'hand', *język* 'tongue' (with *ę* reflecting a short nasal vowel), Serbo-Croat *mâlina* 'raspberry', *jęzik* 'tongue' (where ' denotes that the stress was retracted to a short pretonic vowel in the Štokavian dialect on which the literary

<sup>7</sup>) For the details of the Slovenian development I refer to my article on the neo-circumflex (1976).

language is based). Furthermore, short vowels were lengthened as a result of Van Wijk's law, which must be dated after the rise of the new timbre distinctions (cf. Kortlandt 1975:30), and by the retraction of the stress from final jers, e.g. in Slovene *góř* 'mountain (gen.pl.)' < \**gorò*. When the laryngeal feature was finally lost, the resulting vowels were short. The common view, according to which the old acute was never shortened in Czech, must be rejected in favour of the conception that it was lengthened secondarily under certain conditions<sup>8)</sup>. In East Slavic, the loss of the laryngeal feature must be dated after the rise of pleophony, cf. Ukrainian *moróz* 'frost' < \**mórzъ* as opposed to both acc.sg. *hólovu* 'head' < \**gólvo* and gen.pl. *holiv* 'id.' < \**gólva*<sup>9)</sup>.

<sup>8)</sup> The Czech rule runs as follows: a short rising vowel in an open first syllable of disyllabic words was lengthened unless the following syllable contained a long vowel (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 19). The length in Czech *kráva* 'cow' etc. cannot be old for at least three reasons. First, the distribution of the long and short reflexes of the old acute tone can only be stated in phonological terms at a stage when the weak jers had already been lost, cf. *psáti* 'to write' < \**psáti*, etc. Second, the rule mentioned here applies to etymological *o* as well, e.g., *mážeš* 'you can', *vôle* 'will'. Third, the Czech lengthening can hardly be separated from the same phenomenon in the adjacent Upper Sorabian language. Thus, Czech *kráva* relates to Slovak *krava* as Upper Sorabian *kruwa* 'cow' (with *u* from *ó* before *w*) to Polish *krowa*. The timbre of the root vowel in *kruwa* shows that the rise of length was at least posterior to the rise of the new timbre distinctions in Slavic.

<sup>9)</sup> This is a correction to Kortlandt 1975: xii. Here I have to add a short comment on the review of my book in *Kratylos* 20, 141–146. It is regrettable when a person undertakes a review on a subject which is beyond his competence. It is unacceptable when a reviewer does not even take notice of the scholarly literature on which the book under review is based and to which reference is made on almost every page. Since it does not seem useful to enter upon a discussion under these circumstances, I shall limit myself to pointing out the false statements which the reviewer incorrectly attributes to me. "Um nun russ. fem. *pílá, lílá* [ . . . ] zu erklären, dürfe man sich nach der Ansicht des Verf.s nicht durch die Gegebenheiten des Altindischen und Griechischen verleiten lassen und als Ausgangsformen \**piHláh*, \**liHláh* ansetzen, sondern diese seien für das Slavische \**pHláh*, \**lHláh* gewesen". The latter reconstructions are based on Skt. *páti* 'drinks', *pāyáyati* 'causes to drink', Gr. *πώνω* 'drink', OPr. *poieviti* 'trinket', Lith. *puotà* 'Trinkgelage', OChSl. *lěju* 'pour', Latv. *lēju* < \**leHioH*, OIr. *dolin* 'flows' < \**lHíná*- vs. Welsh *llin* 'pus' < \**lHíno*-. It must be noted that Skt. *pítáñ* and Gr. *πίνω* are ambiguous because of the laryngeal metathesis in these languages, e.g., Gr. *πῶρ* 'fire', Hitt. *pahhur*, cf. Winter 1965: 192. "Da beim Ansatz einer Form \**doHláh* nach der Vorstellung des Verf.s das Hirtsche Gesetz hätte in Aktion treten müssen, rekonstruiert er, wohl überlegend, daß ihm \**dHóláh* für seine

4. The rapid progress of the last 20 years induced Garde to write a handbook of Slavic accentuation (1976) on the basis of the work by Dybo and Illič-Svityč. There are two major issues on which Garde's opinion differs essentially from earlier views. First, he regards the Proto-Slavic circumflex as a mere variant of unstressed syllabicity. Second, he asserts that Dybo's law did not operate in the West Slavic dialects. Since I have discussed the matter in detail elsewhere (1978), I shall not expound here why I think that neither of these proposals can be maintained.

The last major gap in the history of Slavic accentuation was filled by Winter in his contribution to the Ustronie conference on historical phonology (1976). Winter 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, e.g. Lith. *ėsti* 'to eat' OChSl. *jasti*, Skt. *ádmi* 'I eat', Gr. *ἔδω* vs. Lith. *vèsti* 'to lead', OChSl. *vesti*, Skt. *vadhūh* 'bride', OIr. *fedim* 'I lead'. The rule accounts for the glottalic articulation of the root vowel in Latvian *pēds* 'footstep', *sést* 'to sit down', *uóst* 'to smell', *vēdars* 'belly', *bēgt* 'to run', *nuōgs* 'naked', *uōga* 'berry' *āzis* 'billy goat', etc. (This accent is characteristic of words that belong to

---

Erklärung nichts nützen könne, eine Schwundstufige Form \**dHláh*". This remarkable statement is characteristic of the reviewer's approach. The simple fact is that from the Indo-European point of view one expects zero grade before the suffix, cf. Latv. *kusls* 'helpless', *gurlis* 'tired', *jukls* 'confused', *spīrgls* 'lively', *tuksls* 'fat', etc. The monstrum \**dHoláh* remains the sole responsibility of the reviewer. "Gegenüber skr. *bījēg*, *ráz*, slov. *bēg* [i.e. *bēg*], *ráz* (mit zirkumflektierter Intonation) zeige lit. *bēgas*, *rúožas* möglicherweise metatonischen Akut". Actually, I quote these words as examples of Meillet's law, according to which a Balto-Slavic acute became circumflex in Slavic mobile paradigms (1975: 54f.). "Als Folge des Laryngalschwundes habe sich im Slavischen die Neigung eingestellt, geschlossene Silben zu beseitigen". Cf. my statement: "In Slavic, the loss of the laryngeal as a segmental phoneme is part of the general elimination of closed syllables" (1975: 25). The history of Slavic accentuation is apparently more complicated than the reviewer finds appropriate: "Kam die klassische slavische Akzentforschung im wesentlichen mit zwei Gesetzen aus, dem von Hirt und jenem von Saussure, so operiert der Verf. mit mehr als einem halben Dutzend". The point is that the reviewer's "classical" theory (which turns out to be the doctrine professed in Shevelov's handbook) does not explain the facts. Indeed, one should hardly expect that over 3000 years of development can be accounted for by two simple rules. Suffice it to say that Meillet's law dates from 1902, Van Wijk's law from 1916, Dolobko's law from 1927, Stang's law from 1957, and Dybo's law from 1962.

class (3) in Lithuanian.) We can now completely identify OChSl. *azъ* 'I' with Skt. *ahám* as PIE *\*eǵHom*.

Winter's law has far-reaching consequences for the reconstruction of the Indo-European consonantal system. It provides the unexpected key-stone for Gamkrelidze and Ivanov's theory that the voiced stops of the proto-language were actually glottalic (1973). This theory, which suggested itself on typological grounds, is now supported by immediate comparative evidence. One arrives at the conclusion that the Balto-Slavic acute continues the IE laryngeals and the glottalic feature of the "voiced" consonants, while the Balto-Slavic circumflex reflects early contractions and lengthened grade<sup>10</sup>). The merger of the glottalic feature with the reflex of the IE laryngeals was posterior to Hirt's law because the stress was not retracted in the forms which were to develop into Latv. *pēds*, *nuógs*.

Thus, we can say that the progress which has been made since 1957 in the field of Slavic historical accentology is no less than spectacular. Though the new theories may not have offered a final solution for every single detail, the positive results of modern research will have to be taken into account in any serious work on Slavic and Indo-European accentuation.

Faculteit der Letteren  
University of Leiden  
Holland

Frederik Kortlandt

### References

- Dolobko, M.  
1927 *Nóð'*—*nočés'*, *ósen'*—*osenés'*, *zimá'*—*zimús'*, *léto'*—*létos'*, *Slavia* 5, 678–717.
- Dybo, V. A.  
1962 O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole, *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznavija* 6, 3–27.

<sup>10</sup>) Here again I have to stress that IE lengthened grade is never reflected by a Balto-Slavic acute, in spite of the current view on this matter (e.g., Watkins 1965). As de Saussure pointed out already, "à part deux ou trois cas spéciaux (allongement du nominatif, allongement de l'aoriste sigmatique, etc.), l'alternance *e-ē* n'est pas indo-européenne" (1922: 493), and in these few cases we find a circumflex in Balto-Slavic. The original distribution has been obscured by various types of metatony and analogy.

- 1968 Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom, *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie: Doklady sovetskoj delegacii na VI mezhdunarodnom s'ezde slavistov*, Moskva, 148–224.
- Ebeling, C. L.  
1967 Historical laws of Slavic accentuation, *To honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, The Hague, 577–593.
- Gamkrelidze, T. & Ivanov, V.  
1973 Sprachtypologie und die Rekonstruktion der gemeinindogermanischen Verschlüsse, *Phonetica* 27, 150–156.
- Garde, P.  
1976 *Histoire de l'accentuation slave*, Paris.
- Illič-Svityč, V. M.  
1963 *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom: Sud'ba akcentuacionnyx paradig*m, Moskva.
- Kortlandt, F. H. H.  
1975 *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*, Lisse.  
1976 The Slovene neo-circumflex, *The Slavonic and East European review* 134, 1–10.  
1977 Historical laws of Baltic accentuation, *Baltistica* 13, 319–330.  
1978 A history of Slavic accentuation, *Lingua* 44, 67–91.
- Meillet, A.  
1902 O někotoryx anomalijax udarenija v slavjanskix imenax, *Russkij filologičeskij vėstnik* 48, 193–200.
- Saussure, F. de  
1922 *Recueil des publications scientifiques*, Heidelberg.
- Schindler, J.  
1975 Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des Indogermanischen, *Flexion und Wortbildung*, Wiesbaden, 259–267.
- Shevelov, G. Y.  
1964 *A prehistory of Slavic: The historical phonology of Common Slavic*, Heidelberg.
- Stang, C. S.  
1957 *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo.
- Watkins, C.  
1965 Evidence in Balto-Slavic, *Evidence for laryngeals*, The Hague, 116–122.
- Van Wijk, N.  
1916 Zur sekundären steigenden Intonation im Slavischen, vornehmlich in ursprünglich kurzen Silben, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 36, 321–377.
- Winter, W.  
1965 Tocharian evidence, *Evidence for laryngeals*, The Hague, 190–211.  
1976 The distribution of short and long vowels in stems of the type Lith. *ėsti* : *vesti* : *mesti* and OCS *jasti* : *vesti* : *mesti* in Baltic and Slavic languages, *Recent developments in historical phonology*, The Hague, 431–446.