REVIEW ARTICLE

A HISTORY OF SLAVIC ACCENTUATION
A review of Paul Garde, *Histoire de l'accentuation slave**

Frederik KORTLANDT

University of Leiden, The Netherlands

0.

During the last 20 years the study of Slavic accentuation has gone through a unique period of progress. The publication of Stang's monograph (1957) marked an era in this field of investigation. The author demonstrated that a number of hitherto acknowledged truths could not be maintained and established the existence of three Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms:

(a) a paradigm with fixed stress and acute intonation on the stressed syllable,

(b) a paradigm with accentual mobility between adjacent syllables and neo-acute intonation on a non-final stressed syllable,

(c) a paradigm with accentual mobility between the initial and the final syllable of the word and circumflex intonation on a stressed initial syllable. Stang concluded that the neo-acute intonation had arisen as a result of a retraction of the stress from the following syllable and that de Saussure's law never operated in Slavic. Moreover, he showed that the neo-circumflex intonation was not a Proto-Slavic development.

After these discoveries, the importance of which can hardly be overestimated, Dybo (1962) and Illič-Svityč (1963) complemented Stang's results by establishing a progressive accent shift, which will henceforth be referred to as "the" (Proto-Slavic) progressive accent shift. The above-mentioned paradigm (b) resulted from the successive operation of the progressive accent shift and Stang's retraction of the stress. Subsequent investigations have only corroborated the correctness of these findings, which have finally provided the basis for a solution of numerous long-debated problems. Indeed, we can say that since the formulation of

* Institut d'études slaves, Paris, 1976, 2 vols., xi + 526 pp. Ffrs. 160.

Winter's law (1976), no major gaps remain in our understanding of the rise and development of the Slavic prosodic system.

P. Garde's *Histoire de l'accentuation slave* is the first introductory handbook which is based on the work by Dybo and Illič-Svityč in the 'sixties. It has been published in two volumes. The first volume contains an exposition of the history of Slavic accentuation along the lines of the author's conception. It consists of three parts, entitled 'Le balto-slave' (pp. 1–188), 'Du balto-slave aux langues modernes' (pp. 189–295), and 'Balto-slave et indo-européen' (pp. 296–379). The second volume contains the bibliography (pp. 391–426), the notes (pp. 427–462), an appendix (pp. 463–469), and a word index (pp. 471–518). In order to make the book more easily readable, any discussion of deviating views and all bibliographical references have been relegated to the notes in the second volume. This mode of presentation has increased both the consistency of the text and the personal character of the exposition.

In the following I shall first shortly review the theory as it is presented by the author (section 1). Then I shall discuss the two major points where Garde's views differ from the doctrine currently adopted by Dybo and others, viz. the Proto-Slavic circumflex intonation, which Garde regards as a mere variant of unstressed syllabicity (section 2), and the progressive accent shift, which according to Garde did not operate in the West Slavic dialects (section 3). Furthermore I shall give a list of minor inaccuracies and disturbing misprints (section 4) and a supplementary bibliography (section 5).

1.

The first part of Garde's monograph presents a synchronic description of the Balto-Slavic accentual and prosodic system as it can be reconstructed on the basis of the comparative method. The author defines a "tranche syllabique" as the non-consonantal part of a syllable and distinguishes three types of "tranche syllabique" in Balto-Slavic: long vowels, short vowels, and diphthongs. Long vowels and diphthongs were either acute or circumflex in Balto-Slavic, while there was no tonal opposition on short vowels. The tonal characteristics of a syllable were independent of the place of the stress. Continuing the line of thought which he developed earlier (1968), Garde distinguishes between "mots accentogènes", the presence of which entails the presence of an accent, and "clitiques",

which sponge on the accent of a "mot accentogène". The former category is divided into "mots accentogènes accentuables", which bear their own accent, and "mots accentogènes inaccentuables", which, while producing an accent on a neighbouring word, are themselves unstressed. If a word from the latter category is neither preceded by a "mot accentuable", nor followed by a clitic, it receives an "accent récessif" on its initial syllable. A "mot accentogène" together with the surrounding clitics is called a virtual accentual unit. The place of the stress within the limits of an accentual unit is determined by the accentual properties of the morphemes constituting the unit (cf. below).

Garde recognizes three phonetic laws of accentuation, which he formulates as follows:

(1) De Saussure's law: at a certain prehistoric stage of Lithuanian, every stressed non-acute syllable lost the accent to the following syllable if the latter was acute, e.g. *blusà* 'flea', gen. *blùsos*.

(2) The progressive accent shift: every stressed non-acute syllable lost the accent to the following syllable in East and South Slavic, e.g. Russ. *blox'á* 'flea', acc. *blox'u*.

(3) The neo-štokavian retraction: in the majority of Štokavian dialects of Serbo-Croat, every non-initial stressed syllable lost the accent to the preceding syllable, which received a rising tone, whereas an originally stressed initial syllable became falling, e.g. *bùha* 'flea' (rising) vs. *kràva* 'cow' (falling).

In the following chapters Garde discusses the role of the accent in the nominal flexion, derivation, and composition of Balto-Slavic. The author distinguishes between strong and weak stems, and between strong and weak endings. If the stem is strong, a paradigm has fixed stress on the stem. If the stem is weak, a word form is end-stressed when the ending is strong and unstressed when the ending is weak. Since these properties are independent of the tonal characteristics of the stem and the ending, the phonetic laws mentioned above transform the two accentual paradigms (fixed and mobile) into three paradigms in Slavic (a, b, c) and into four paradigms in Lithuanian (1, 2, 3, 4). The common origin of the distribution between strong and weak endings in Slavic and Lithuanian and the etymological correspondence between strong and weak stems in Baltic and Slavic were established by Stang (1957) and Illič-Svityč (1963), respectively. According to Garde, the vocative was always unstressed and all pronominal endings were strong in Balto-Slavic.

The chapter on derivation is based on Dybo's analysis of the material

(1968a). Garde distinguishes between "suffixes dominants", which by themselves determine the accentuation pattern of the stem (Dybo's "categorial accent"), and "suffixes ordinaires", which influence the accentuation pattern in the same way as desinences do. Dominant suffixes are "strong" (S +) if the stress is fixed on the suffix, "weak" (s +) if the stress is mobile, and "negative" (s −) if the stress is fixed on the radical. Ordinary suffixes are "strong" (S) if the stress is fixed either on the radical (if the latter is strong) or on the suffix (if the radical is weak), and "weak" (s) if the stress is either fixed on the radical (if the latter is strong) or mobile (if it is weak). In terms of the generalized rule which was first put forward by Dybo (1973a: 10), the stress falls on the first strong morpheme of a word form. This neat system of accentuation patterns has been obscured by the phonetic accent shifts and by morphological generalizations, as a consequence of which ordinary suffixes have tended to become dominant.

The accentuation of the verbal system is discussed along the same lines. Garde concludes that the evidence for dominant strong and weak suffixes in the Balto-Slavic verb is extremely rare. According to the author, the distinction between negative and ordinary weak suffixes has been preserved better in the verb than in the noun. The nominal forms of the verb seem to reflect the Balto-Slavic state of affairs most faithfully.

The second part of the book describes the development of the Balto-Slavic accentual and prosodic system up to the contemporary languages. The central point in the discussion is the so-called "réaccentuation des formes inaccentuables" (forms consisting of weak morphemes only), which in the author's opinion took place independently in the different languages at different stages. In Lithuanian, unstressed nouns received an accent on the initial syllable of the stem, e.g., acc.sg. *gálvą* 'head', *žiẽmą* 'winter', while unstressed verb forms conformed to this rule unless they contained a prefix: in the latter case, the syllable which immediately preceded the root received the stress, e.g. *nèneša* 'do(es) not carry', *atìdavė* 'gave back'. The "réaccentuation" was anterior to de Saussure's law, cf. acc. pl. *žiemàs*. Both developments were anterior to the neutralization of tonal oppositions in unstressed syllables.

The relative chronology of the "réaccentuation" and the neutralization of tonal oppositions was different in Slavic. In syllables which preceded the stress and in unstressed word forms, the latter change took place in the early Common Slavic period. This development is generally known as Meillet's law. Another change which is Common Slavic in the author's opinion is the shortening of final long vowels, which was anterior to the

fall of the jers. On the other hand, Garde states that the progressive accent shift, which he calls Illič-Svityč's law, operated in the East and South Slavic dialects only. This development entailed the shortening of acute syllables and the loss of the tonal opposition in the latter languages. The West Slavic dialects retained the opposition between acute and circumflex syllables under the stress and after the stress up to a much later period.

After these developments, Garde supposes that the stress was retracted in the following cases:

(1) from a long syllable (in East and South Slavic only),

(2) from a weak jer,

(3) from a vowel which preceded an intervocalic *j*,

(4) from a syllable which contained a post-consonantal *j* (in East and South Slavic only),

(5) under certain morphological conditions. The formulation of these retractions presents a large number of chronological difficulties, some of which are discussed by the author.

The following chapters deal with the subsequent evolution of the accentual and prosodic system in the separate Slavic languages. In Garde's conception, unstressed forms received a falling tone on the initial syllable in Serbo-Croat, e.g. acc. sg. *glâvu* 'head', and on the second syllable in Slovene, e.g. acc. sg. *vodô* 'water'. This development was followed by the neutralization of the tonal opposition and a retraction of the stress in Štokavian and by the neutralization of quantitative oppositions in non-final syllables and several retractions of the stress in Slovene. In Russian, where unstressed forms received an accent on the initial syllable, the author dates the "réaccentuation" after the loss of quantitative oppositions, the pleophony, and the vocalization of the strong jers. The evolution was different in West Slavic, where long vowels were shortened in syllables which preceded the stress and in unstressed word forms. After the almost general shortening of acute syllables, the tonal opposition was lost in this area and secondary developments blurred the original quantitative relationships. In Garde's opinion, Kashubian reflects the Common Slavic accentual system better than any other language, in spite of a retraction of the stress in polysyllabic words and a generalization of accentual mobility in flexional paradigms. The other West Slavic languages lost distinctive stress.

In the third part of the book the Indo-European origins of the Balto-Slavic accentual and prosodic system are discussed. Garde states that the Balto-Slavic acute reflects an Indo-European "trâche vocalique" which

ended in a laryngeal (VH, RH, VRH), whereas the circumflex continues any other type of syllable (containing VV, VHV, VR, VHR, etc.). A similar explanation is suggested for the Greek tonal opposition.

The author describes the accentual system of Sanskrit and Greek along the same lines as the Balto-Slavic system. Stems are called "strong" if they are stressed on a non-final syllable, otherwise they are "weak". Endings are "strong" if they attract the stress from a weak stem, otherwise they are called "weak". The correspondence between the accent classes in Balto-Slavic and in the other Indo-European languages was established by Illič-Svityč (1963). Garde concludes that Indo-European endings were strong if and only if they contained a sequence CV and puts forward the hypothesis that the difference between the accentual systems of Balto-Slavic and the other Indo-European languages dates from the period when the flexional endings came into being as a result of the fusion of enclitic particles with a preceding stem. The author sees a confirmation of his view that this fusion took place relatively late in Balto-Slavic in the accentuation patterns of nominal compounds.

The accentual properties of derivational suffixes in Sanskrit and Greek are stated in the same terminology as was used for the Balto-Slavic system, though the meaning of the terms is somewhat different. In this chapter Garde calls dominant suffixes "weak" (s +), "strong" (S +), and "negative" (s −) if the stress falls on the stem-final, the pre-suffixal, or the radical vowel, respectively. Ordinary suffixes are called "strong" (S) if either the (strong) radical or (if the radical is weak) the pre-suffixal vowel is stressed, and "weak" (s) if either the (strong) radical or (if the radical is weak) the stem-final vowel is stressed. A large number of suffixes belong to two different classes. In spite of the divergences between different languages and the paucity of the material, Garde states that a comparison of the Balto-Slavic and the Sanskrit and Greek material suggests an underlying system of two or three Indo-European accent classes. In the final chapter the author speculates about the origins of the Indo-European accentual system.

2.

Garde's new monograph has not convinced me of the usefulness of a distinction between "mots accentogènes" and "clitiques". On the one hand, a word from the former category does not necessarily imply a

separate accent because the word may behave as a clitic if it is preceded by a "mot accentuable". On the other hand, a "mot inaccentuable" receives an accent on its initial syllable unless it is either preceded by a "mot accentuable" or followed by a clitic. Moreover, a sequence of clitics may have an accent which does not originate from the presence of a "mot accentogène". The alternative statement, according to which a certain definable group of words lose the (initial) stress to an accompanying clitic and may behave as a clitic if the preceding word is stressed, has the advantage of being closer to both tradition and phonetic reality. In fact, Garde's terminology only obscures the one essential distinction in accentology, viz. between inherent and configurational features (cf. Kuznecov 1970; Ebeling 1968). The latter type of feature contrasts two variables within one and the same time sequence, whereas the former presupposes a choice between two alternatives admissible in the same position within a sequence. Garde falls a victim to this pitfall when he states that there are two accents in the German word *Nashorn* 'rhinoceros' (p. 313). The impression that this word is stressed twice is created by the combination of an inner morpheme boundary and a non-reduced vowel in the second syllable. The morpheme boundary is absent in the word *Ahorn* 'maple', which has an identical second syllable. The opposition between the non-reduced vowel and a *schwa* is a timbre distinction which is comparable to the one between *nòž* 'knife' and *dàž* 'rain' in Slovene and has nothing to do with accentual properties.

I agree with Garde that there was a Proto-Slavic set of word forms without a stress in certain environments at a certain stage. The points where we find ourselves in disagreement concern the frequency, the origins, and the decline of the unstressed word forms. Counting in 90 lines from I. Andrić's *Priče o kmetu Simanu* the forms which in Proto-Slavic were unstressed and not followed by a clitic according to Garde's rules, I found 38 cases where the stress would actually be lacking and no less than 24 instances of "accent récessif" resulting from the absence of a preceding "mot accentuable". The real problem which poses itself in this connection is the tonal character of the "accent récessif". (Incidentally, the choice of this term is rather awkward because it is used in a completely different sense in Stang's classical monograph (1957). It seems preferable to stick to the term "circumflex" in accordance with traditional usage.) The matter is interesting because we find disagreement here between Dybo (1962) and Illič-Svityč (1963) in their original formulations of the progressive accent shift. The latter author did not assume a tonal difference

on a non-acute stressed initial syllable between fixed and mobile accentual paradigms (Illič-Svityč 1963: 160f). If this were correct, we would expect traces of the original distribution of phonetically and analogically end-stressed forms, which we do not find. It was Dybo (1962: 8) who drew the logical conclusion from the phonetic character of the progressive accent shift and pointed out that the law requires the existence of a tonal opposition on non-acute stressed initial syllables at a stage which is anterior to the late Proto-Slavic retractions of the stress.

The traces of unstressed forms in the historical languages which Garde adduces (p. 11) are open to more than a single interpretation. Numerals such as Russ. *čet¹yrnadcat'* 'fourteen', which still appear as sequences of three words in Old Church Slavic texts, may have lost their second accent after the end of the Common Slavic period. The scansion of the bylines in such cases as *bel¹y grudi* only points to the fact that the rising tone was more prominent than the falling one at the stage which preceded the loss of the tonal opposition in East Slavic. The same holds true for such Slovincian instances as *jáu robjǫ* 'ich arbeite', which point to the relative prominence of the constituting parts at the stage before the loss of distinctive tone in West Slavic. It seems probable to me that there was a causal relation between the loss of the tonal opposition and the rise of this type of accentual unit. It is remarkable that Garde does not adduce any examples from the languages which have preserved distinctive tone. Cf. also Bulg. *Č¹erno more* 'Black Sea', etc.

Though I think that the suppression of an accent discussed in the preceding paragraph is relatively young, I agree with Garde that the retraction of the stress to a preposition or a verbal prefix dates from the Proto-Slavic period. We are in disagreement on the interpretation of the Baltic facts, however. Garde dates the rise of unstressed forms to the Balto-Slavic period and asserts that the "réaccentuation" of the unstressed forms took place independently in Lithuanian and Latvian (pp. 189–196). I would maintain that there is no reason to assume at any stage of the Baltic development a category of unstressed forms comparable to what we find in Slavic. The retraction of the stress to a verbal prefix in such forms as Lith. *nèneša* 'do(es) not carry', which Garde adduces in support of his point of view and which Hamp has recently (1976) tried to explain on an Indo-European basis, cannot be old because of the quantity of the stressed vowel. An originally short *e* or *a* was lengthened in Lithuanian at a certain stage, e.g. in *rãtas* 'wheel' (which had fixed stress until de Saussure's law operated). Consequently, the retraction in *nèneša* must have been posterior

to the lengthening of stressed *e* and *a*. Another piece of evidence is offered
by the East Baltic diphthongization of *ei/ai* and *ō* into *ie* and *uo*, which was
phonetically limited to stressed syllables (cf. Stang 1966: 59). If the root
was not stressed in such words as *diẽvas* 'god', the diphthongization would
not have taken place. For the details of the Baltic development I refer to
my article in *Baltistica* (1977).

Since the Baltic facts do not support the theory of unstressed word forms
proposed by Garde, the question must be asked if we can find a *terminus
post quem* for the rise of unstressed words in Slavic. I think that such a
chronology can actually be established. Illič-Svityč pointed out (1963: 119)
that masc. *o*-stems with fixed stress on the stem obtained accentual
mobility in Slavic, e.g. SCr. *zûb* 'tooth', cf. Gr. γόμφος. This analogical
development was a consequence of the fact that in this flexion class the
two accentual paradigms had merged in the singular. If the barytone case
forms of the mobile paradigm had been unstressed at this stage, the
analogical development could not have taken place. We have to conclude
that the rise of unstressed forms in Slavic was posterior to this develop-
ment, which was in turn posterior to the dissolution of the Balto-Slavic
unity. Moreover, acute roots did not take part in the change, which proves
that there were no mobile acute paradigms any more at this stage. It
follows that we have to date Meillet's law between the end of the Balto-
Slavic period and the analogical development established by Illič-Svityč.
As a consequence of the chronological relationships, Garde's explanation
of Meillet's law in terms of unstressed forms cannot be maintained either.

Another reason to reject Garde's dating of the rise of unstressed forms is
found in the levelling of pitch in prefixes. The coexistence of **pro* and
*proH is undoubtedly Indo-European. The Lithuanian distribution of
short vowel in the verbal and acute long vowel in the nominal prefix may
reflect the Balto-Slavic state of affairs. The circumflex in the preposition
is a later development of the acute in pretonic syllables. In Slavic, the acute
pitch was lost unless the prefix was not used as a preposition (*pa-, pra-, vy-*),
e.g. SCr. *národ* 'people'. The new tone on the prefix was apparently based
on the tone of the preposition at a stage when the latter had lost the acute
pitch in accordance with Meillet's law. Thus, the development of the new
tone on prefixes requires a stage which was posterior to Meillet's law, but
anterior to the rise of Garde's unstressed forms.

It will be clear from the foregoing paragraphs that the "réaccentuation"
of unstressed forms is a heterogeneous set of phenomena. In Serbo-Croat,
there has never been such a development. The archaic dialects of this

language still preserve the Proto-Slavic type of prosodic system. In Slovene, the "réaccentuation" signifies the replacement of the word-initial "accent récessif" by a falling accent on the second syllable. This change is generally known as the Slovenian accent shift. In Russian, the loss of tonal and quantitative oppositions, which yielded a distinction between open and close *o*, must be dated between the *polnoglasie* and the vocalization of the strong jers. The original distinction between the three Proto-Slavic tones (acute, circumflex, neo-acute) is still reflected in Ukr. *mor˟oz* 'frost', acc. sg. *h˟olovu* 'head', gen. pl. *hol˟iv*.

3.

In his new monograph, Garde sticks to his earlier view (1973) that the progressive accent shift established by Dybo and Illič-Svityč did not operate in the West Slavic dialects. The argument rests mainly on the evaluation of the Slovincian material presented in Lorentz 1903. There are two accentual paradigms in the latter language, which are traditionally called fixed and mobile. If the stem is monosyllabic, accentual mobility is between the stem and the ending. If the stem is polysyllabic, the stress may only shift between the syllables of the stem and does not fall on the ending. This distribution suggests that a final stress was regularly retracted in word forms of more than two syllables.

Garde formulates the Slovincian retraction as follows: "Dans toute unité accentuelle de plus de deux syllabes, tout accent frappant une finale brève est reporté sur la pénultième" (p. 289). The condition of this rule is insufficient because it does not account for the retraction in the oblique plural cases *xorùoscī, xorùoscoum, xorùoscmī* (*xùorosc* 'Krankheit'), cf. *vosí, vosóum, vosmí* (*vùos* 'Achse'). In this simplified variant of Lorentz's transcription, ` and ´ denote short and long accents, respectively. The same argument applies to the loc. sg. and gen. pl. endings of the *o*-stems. Cf. also *ve vùognjū* 'im Feuer' vs. *ftím vognjú* 'in diesem Feuer'. In fact, final stress in word forms of more than two syllables is never old in Slovincian. The inst. pl. forms *břegamí* 'Ufer', *rąkamí* 'Hände' replace older **břegí, *rąkàmjī* (cf. Stang 1957: 38 and 61). The adjectives in *-aní*, such as *koscaní* 'knöchern', have adopted the accent pattern of the (very frequent) type in *-ní*, e.g. *nocní* 'nächtlich'. The old distribution is still attested in *možní* 'möglich' vs. *njemùožní* 'unmöglich'. I conclude that any final accent in word forms of more than two syllables was retracted at an early stage of

the Slovincian development. Final accentuation in polysyllabic word forms was reintroduced analogically in the last mentioned categories and by the loss of the ending in the fem. sg. form of the *l*-participle, e.g. *darovà* 'schenkte'.

This was not the only retraction of the stress in Slovincian. In dissyllabic word forms, which had not been affected by the retraction discussed in the preceding paragraph, final stress was lost in the nom. gen. loc. sg. of the *a*-stems, e.g. *rǫ̀ka*, *rǫ̀kji*, *rǫ̀cə* 'Hand', and in the nom. acc. pl. of the neuter, e.g. *pùola* 'Felder'. The mobile accentuation pattern of the poly-syllabic stems betrays that these forms were end-stressed at an earlier stage (cf. Stang 1957: 62). Indeed, the analogical mobility in *robùota* 'Arbeit', acc. *rùobotǫ*, and *kùolano* 'Knie', pl. *kolàna*, can only have arisen at a stage which was posterior to the former, but anterior to the latter retraction of the stress. I conclude that the stress was retracted at a relatively recent stage from short vowels in final open syllables. The phonetic character of this retraction is confirmed by the fem. sg. preterit forms *pjìla* 'trank', *žə̀la* 'lebte', *bə̀la* 'war', and more generally by the absence of accentual mobility in *l*-participles with monosyllabic stems, which is remarkable because mobility was generalized in *l*-participles with polysyllabic stems whenever there was a model in the corresponding flexion class. The loss of the ending in such forms as *darovà* was posterior to the retraction of the stress, but anterior to the generalization of accen-tual mobility because the latter was preserved in *nabrà* 'sammelte', *doždà* 'wartete', but not in *přiepjila* 'vertrank', which must have received its initial stress on the analogy of *pjìla* at an intermediate stage. Thus, we arrive at the following relative chronology:

(1) Retraction of the stress from a final syllable to a preceding long vowel (see below).

(2) Retraction of the stress from a final syllable in word forms of more than two syllables. This change gave rise to the paradigms *nagùota* 'Nacktheit', acc. *nàgotǫ* (cf. Dybo 1968a: 162) and *jìezoro* 'See', pl. *jezùora*.

(3) Analogical retraction of the stress in those forms of polysyllabic words with fixed stress on the syllable preceding the ending, where the mobile type stressed the initial syllable. This development gave rise to the paradigms *robùota*, *rùobotǫ* and *kùolano*, *kolàna*.

(4) Retraction of the stress from short vowels in final open syllables, e.g. *rǫ̀ka*, *pùola*, *pjìla*, *bə̀la*.

(5) *-àla* > *-à*, e.g. *nabrà*, *doždà*, *darovà*.

(6) Analogical retraction of the stress in such forms as *prìepjila*.

(7) Generalization of accentual mobility in the *l*-participle of stems in *-i-, -a-, nq-*.

(8) Analogical retraction of the stress in the nom. gen. dat. loc. sg. of polysyllabic *a*-stems when these cases differed from the acc. sg. and nom. acc. pl. as to their accentuation. This process was under way at the beginning of our century (cf. Kuryłowicz 1952: 13f). The rise of such forms as *břegamí* may be dated before or after stage 5.

Up to this point I have not taken into consideration any Slovincian forms where the conditions for the progressive accent shift were fulfilled. It follows from the above chronology that trisyllabic forms such as *golùoloud* 'Glatteis', *darùovac* 'schenken' cannot serve as an argument against the operation of the progressive shift in West Slavic because the stress was retracted from their final syllable at stage 2. Indeed, the alternation in *kolùodzei* 'Stellmacher', loc. *kolodzìejū* and in the *l*-participle *darùovoul* 'schenkte', fem. *darovà* points in the opposite direction. Moreover, the early Slovincian accentuation was preserved when the stress was not on the final syllable, e.g. in *dobrodzèistvo* 'Wohlthat', *dobrodzèiskjī* 'wohlthätig', *mjilosèrdzē* 'Barmherzigkeit', *darovàtī* 'freigebig'. The fixation of the stress on the second syllable in the paradigm of the word *golùoloud* must be dated to stage 8.

While the apparent indications that the progressive accent shift did not operate in Slovincian originate from misinterpretation and turn into their opposite upon a closer inspection of the material, there is abundant and unmistakable evidence of its operation in this language. The cardinal point is the distribution of the Slavic oxytona over the Slovincian accent classes. As a rule, the stress of nouns with a monosyllabic stem is fixed if the stem vowel is long and mobile if the stem vowel is short. This distribution, which remains unexplained if we assume that the progressive shift was limited to East and South Slavic, suggests that the stress was regularly retracted to a long vowel in early Slovincian and that the nouns with a short stem vowel joined the mobile type after the retraction at stage 4. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that composita with a nonsyllabic prefix such as *fxóud* 'Eingang' and *zbjég* 'Zusammentreffen' have fixed stress while a few simplicia like *bjég* 'Lauf' are mobile (cf. Van Wijk 1922a: 13). The composita had received root stress as a result of the progressive accent shift and did not join the mobile type because there were no end-stressed forms in their paradigm.

The correctness of the position taken here is confirmed by an analysis

of the dissyllabic stems. If the progressive shift operated in Slovincian like everywhere else, the accentual mobility in such composita as *dùoxoud* 'Einkommen' and *přĭxoud* 'Ankunft' arose at stage 3 in accordance with the rules given above. If the shift did not operate here, both the rise of mobility in this category and especially the absence of mobility in *vɔ̀xoud* 'Ausgang' and in composita with a nonsyllabic prefix such as *fxóud* and *sxóud* 'Abstieg' remain unexplained. The same argument applies to feminine nouns like *zābàva* 'Unterhaltung' and *voų̯trùoba* 'Leber', where the pretonic long vowel can only have arisen as a result of the progressive accent shift. In this category too, fixed stress was preserved in composita with a nonsyllabic prefix, e.g. *spràva* 'Sache', *zgùba* 'Verlust', cf. Sln. *sprâva, zgûba*. The pretonic long vowel in polysyllabic mobilia shows not only that the progressive shift operated in Slovincian, but also that the retraction of the stress to a preceding long vowel was limited to end-stressed forms.

The accentuation of the verb developed along the same lines. The stress was retracted at stages 1, 2, and 4, and analogically at stages 3 and 6, e.g. 1st sg. *pjíšą* 'schreibe', *nàpjīšą* 'id.', 2nd sg. *donjìesɔš* 'trägst', imp. *pjìšɔ*, pret. *pjísoul* 'schrieb', *přĭepjīsoul, darùovoul, darùovalo, njùosla* 'trug', *přɔ̀njosla* 'brachte'. The original accentuation was preserved whenever the conditions for the retractions were not fulfilled, e.g. in *nabrà, darovà, pjišɔ̀-mjɔ* 'schreib mir', *pomožɔ̀-mjɔ* 'hilf mir'. The last examples show unam͡biguously that the progressive shift was a Common Slavic development. The prefix *vɔ-* 'aus' is always stressed, as it was in the proto-language.

Another piece of evidence is offered by those words which were stressed on a medial jer before the progressive accent shift (Garde's class of weak radical plus strong suffix). If the shift had not operated, the preceding vowel would have received the stress and been lengthened. Actually we find final accentuation throughout the paradigm of *cenjáu* 'Schatten' and a short root vowel in Polish *sędzia* 'judge', *orędzie* 'missive', *męstwo* 'valour', Czech *slepec* 'blind man', *oruží* 'weapon', *listí* 'leaves', *vraží* 'murderous', *lidstvo* 'mankind'. These reflexes are regular if we assume that the progressive shift operated here like everywhere else. Since the place of the stress is reflected indirectly by the quantity of the root vowel, the argument applies not only to Slovincian but also to the other West Slavic languages, which lost free stress. The same holds for those instances where a Proto-Slavic *o* was lengthened under the neo-acute tone, e.g. Czech *můžeš* '(you) can', *vůle* 'will', Slovak *môžeš, vôl'a*. The absence of lengthening in Czech *mohu* '(I) can' and gen. sg. *koně* 'horse' points to an

earlier accentual difference, cf. also *koli* '(I) prick', *kůleš* '(you) prick'. Incidentally, these examples disprove Garde's *ad hoc* hypothesis of lengthening before a soft resonant in early Czech (p. 232).

4.

The following minor inaccuracies and disturbing misprints call for short comments only. I shall write "3.27" as an abbreviation of "page 3, line 27", etc.

3.27 Lith. *eu* read *iau*.
4.14 Lith. *tapti* read *tàpti*.
9.35 Lith. *gálvą̃* read *gálvą*.
11.28 Kash. *robja* read *robją*.
15.25 Lith. *blũsos* read *blùsos*.
20.14 Lith. *galva* read *galvà*.
21.23 Lith. *elgetà* read *el̃geta*.
21.24 SCr. *götov* read *gòtov*.
24.22 "L(ocative)" read "D(ative)". Add loc. sg. forms.
24.32 These Kash. words have fixed stress because they have a long stem vowel.
25.9 "conservé intact": except for the tone of the stem vowel.
25.33 Lith. *àkmeni̇̃* read *ãkmeni̇*.
25.35 Lith. *sũnui* read *sũnui*.
26.5 Lith. *šyrdysè* read *širdysè*.
27.6 SCr. *gláve* read *glávē*.
27.12 SCr. *glâvă* read *glávā*.
27.13–15 *-am'ŭ, -ax'ŭ, -am'i* read *-'amŭ, -'axŭ, -'ami* (cf. Stang 1957: 62). Russ. *skovorod'a* read *skovorod'ax*.
28.10 (')*nokti* read *nokt'i* (cf. Stang 1957: 87). Russ. *n'oč'* read *n'oči*.
29.22 Lith. *galva* read *galvà*.
30.18 Lith. *sunumì* read *sūnumì*.
30.19 Lith. *širdžia* read *širdžia*.
30.26 Čak. *glaváh* read *glāvàh*. The rising accent of *glāván* is the regular reflex of a short vowel before a word-final resonant and does not point to a retraction of the stress, cf. Sln. *goràm, goràh*.
30.31 These Kash. forms, which should be spelled with *o* instead of *uo*, are secondary, as I have pointed out above (section 3).
34.2 "déterminé" read "indéterminé". The odd divergences in the inst. sg. remain unexplained.
36.6 Length is regular in dissyllabic forms only.
37.4 Latv. *beȓzs* read *bȩ̃rzs*.
37.8 Add Latv. *vãrna*.
37.10 Latv. *ûdris* read *ûdrs*.
37.22 SCr. *sräka* read *svräka*.
38.10 Latv. *eȓce* read *ȩ̃rce*.
38.12 Latv. *suȓs* read *sũrs*.
38.18 SCr. *nît* read *nît*.

38.20 Russ. *pʹoln* read *pʹolon*.

38.22 Lith. *sývas* read *šývas*. This word, and also *pilnas* and *stóras*, belong to accent class (3), not (1).

38.26 Latv. *skīsts* read *šķīsts*.

39.7 Sln. *vẹ́ra* read *vẹ́ra*.

39.13 Sln. *mẹ́ra* read *mẹ́ra*.

39.17 The acute is attested in Latv. *gãrsa*.

39.23 Slk. *mesto* next to *miesto*.

39.27 Sln. *brẹ́me* read *bréme*. Slk. *brema* read *bremä*.

40.1 R read Ř.

40.33 "finale" read "non-finale".

42.24 Slk. *hroza* read *hrôza*.

42.28 Slk. *bob* read *bôb*.

42.34 Slk. *koň* read *kôň*.

42.40 Slk. *post* read *pôst*.

43.10 Lith. *smèlys* (2) read *smẽlis* (2) or *smėlỹs* (4).

43.12 Polish *bobr* read *bóbr*.

43.18 Lith. *vartaĩ* read *vartai*. Russ. *vorʹota* next to *vorotʹa*.

46.28 Latv. *sirds* read *sirds*.

47.6 SCr. short vowels are lengthened in monosyllables, e.g. *lêd*, *nôs*, *dân*.

47.22 Cf. Russ. gen. pl. *golʹov*.

47.27 Cf. Polish gen. pl. *nóg*, *rąk*.

47.32 Kash. *gluovóu̯*, *gluovami* read *glovóu̯*, *glovami*.

48.8 Note Sln. *râz* (Pleteršnik).

48.12 Latv. *zvers* read *zvẹrs*.

48.28 Polish *gęs* read *gęś*.

49.8 Latv. *bàrda* read *bā̀rda*.

49.12 Latv. *darva* read *darva*.

49.18 Add Sln. *krột*.

49.20 Lith. *švẽntas* read *šveñtas*.

49.39 Russ. *spinʹa* has no correspondences in other Slavic languages except for Ukr. *spʹyna* and its Old Polish source, which was a borrowing from Latin.

50.2 Russ. *čas* does not belong here, cf. SCr. *čȁs*, Sln. *čàs*, Old Czech *čás*.

50.4 Russ. *smertʹ* does not belong here, cf. SCr. *smȑt*, Sln. *smȑt*.

52.17 Lith. *kuriusè* read *kuriuosè*.

58.12 "fort" read "faible".

59.29 Lith. *mẽde* read *mẽdė*.

62.16 Interchange "fort" and "faible".

62.18 Interchange "fort" and "faible".

62.24 S read Ś.

76.2 The Lith. suffix belongs to class s— according to Garde's definitions, but causes metatony.

76.20 Lith. *grazýbė* read *gražýbė*.

84.29 Lith. *gyvulinĩkas* read *gyvulinĩkas*.

85.19 Lith. *-ēns* read *-eñs*.

88.9 This suffix is not dominant in Slavic, cf. SCr. *vȕnat* etc. (Dybo 1968a: 195).

88.20 The Lith. suffix is not dominant, cf. Skardžius 1935: 155f.

88.23 The Lith. suffix is not dominant, cf. Skardžius 1935: 158.

91.24–26. The primary deverbative suffixes in *-i-* and *-o-* have become dominant independently in the separate languages. The retraction of the stress in neuters is a late Balto-Slavic phenomenon. For the details I refer to Illič-Svityč 1963.

98.1 Sln. *način* read *način*.

98.15 It is improbable that the Lith. tone is secondary, cf. the Slavic acute prefixes *pa-*, *pra-*, *vy-*. The tone of the other Slavic prefixes was taken from the corresponding prepositions after the operation of Meillet's law (cf. Ebeling 1967: 585).

99.16 The accentuation of SCr. *ishrana* etc. cannot be due to a generalization of the "recessive" stress because these words do not continue an old mobile type (cf. Kortlandt 1978). Moreover, the stress is not retracted to a preposition in this class (cf. Leskien 1899: 397).

99.24 Sln. *izrêka, nalôga* read *izrêka, nalôga*. It follows from the timbre of the stressed vowel that the accentuation has resulted from the early Slovenian lengthening before a long vowel in the following syllable (cf. Kortlandt 1976:3), not from a generalization of the "recessive" stress. The latter generalization is attested in *sirôta*, where we find both accentual mobility in other languages (cf. Dybo 1968a: 162) and the required timbre of the *o* in Slovene.

99.31 The accentuation of Russ. *pr'ovoloka* was probably taken from its synonym *pr'ovod*.

101.25 On the original distribution cf. Kortlandt 1978.

105.14 SCr. *bjèzāše* read *bjèžāše*.

108.18 Lith. *išgráuza* read *išgráužia*.

109.27 "suffixé" read "non suffixé".

109.31 SCr. *idohom* read *idosmo*.

110.1–5 On the accentuation of the thematic aorist cf. Dybo 1961: 37. The accentuation of the 3rd pl. form is corroborated by the reflex of the nasal vowel in the Freising Fragments (cf. Kortlandt 1975b: 409).

111.12 > read <.

112.3 Čak. *mogŭ*. I know this form from Susak only and doubt its correctness. All other Čakavian forms which are cited by Garde are from Novi.

113.1 SCr. *vêžeš, mlâtiš* read *vêžēš, mlâtîš*.

113.3 Polish *mlócić, mlócisz* read *młócić, młócisz*.

113.31 Accentual mobility has not been extended to Kash. verbs with the prefix *vȧ-*, which is an indication of the fact that the origin of the analogical extension must be sought in a retraction of the stress. The verb *drãžiec* and verbs with a nonsyllabic stem have fixed stress on the ending. The compounds of *drãžiec* have fixed stress on the prefix.

114.10 Kash. *ńȕosa* read *ńȕosą*.

114.19 Kash. *ńekopȕocä* read *ńeklopȕocä*.

114.37 SCr. *zagrisēte* read *zagrizēte*.

115.3 SCr. *grízemo, grízete, nèsemo, nèsete* read *grízēmo, grízēte, nèsēmo, nèsēte*.

115.7 Čak. *nesȇn* read *nesén* (Novi).

119.3 The operation of Leskien's law shows that the 1st and 2nd sg. desinences were acute and that the absence of final stress in these forms must be explained otherwise.

122.25 SCr. *pomòci* read *pomòći*.

124.14 SCr. *grízem* read *grízēm*.

125.15 s — read s.

126.13 Lith. *nešančiuose* read *nešančiuosè*.

126.19 Lith. *šaltasis* read *šaltàsis*.

127.20 Lith. *nēsančiam, nùnesančiam* read *nēšančiam, nùnešančiam*.

128.13 SCr. *znãjući* read *znãjūći*.

130.19 The assumption that the accentual properties of the suffix *-l-* depend on neighbouring morphemes does not seem in accordance with Garde's principle that the accentuation of a word depends on inherent properties of the constituent morphemes.

132.9 The Lith. suffix cannot immediately be compared with the Slavic one because it is an *u*-stem. Moreover, it is metatonical, e.g. *bėglùs* (4).

135.27 This accentuation is actually attested, cf. Stang 1957: 146.

135.33 The accentuation of the *n*-participle cannot be analogical because there is no model for it. The main fact which calls for an explanation is the difference between, e.g. Sln. *brán, končán* on the one hand, and *brâl, končâl* on the other (cf. Kortlandt 1975a: 7f).

139.17 Sln. *plêst, plêsti* read *plę̂st, plę́sti*.

140.3 Sln. *délat, délati* read *dę́lat, dę́lati*.

146.25 It remains unexplained why de Saussure's law did not operate in Lith. *bùdinti*.

146.27 Lith. *sváita* read *sváiti* or *sváitėja*.

146.32 Lith. *baĩtuoti* shows metatony and no operation of de Saussure's law.

147.26 Latv. *baîdit* read *baîdît* or *baîdît*.

147.27 Latv. *baĩstit* read *bàlstît*.

149.6 Sln. *lésti* read *lę́sti*.

151.29 SCr. *bèrem* read *bèrēm*.

151.37 It remains unclear why the accentual difference between simple and compound verbs should be secondary. In fact, it seems much more probable that this is a very archaic opposition, cf. also Russ. *byl'a* vs. *zab'yla*.

152.19 Latv. *mir̃t* has taken its acute from the present tense *mir̃stu* (cf. Būga 1922: 222). The original accentuation has been preserved in the doublet *mirt*.

152.28 Latv. *cìnitiês* read *cinîtiês*.

152.39 Latv. *bèrt* read *bę̀rt*.

153.7 SCr. *ždr̃ŏ* read *ždr̃o*.

153.25 Here again, the opposition between simple and compound verbs remains unexplained.

153.32–34 There is a Latv. doublet *iẽt* next to *iêt*.

154.19 Type (c) is attested in Čak. *oremŏ* (cf. Stang 1957: 121).

155.24–29 There are Latv. doublets *dêt, lât, mât, sêt*.

155.34 Latv. *vējs* read *vẽjš*.

156.32 Sln. *pél, pét* read *pèl, pę̂t*.

162.4 The short vowel in SCr. *gùbî, stùden, ùčî* is the regular reflex of a pretonic long vowel and dates from the rise of the new timbre distinctions in Slavic, cf. *màlina, jèzik*. The long vowel in *bûdî, vârî, gâsî* was introduced together with the change of their accentual pattern.

167.22 Sln. *ubrân* read *ubrán*.

167.36 Sln. *zvân* read *zván*.

167.37 Sln. *pozvân* read *pozván*.

170.20 Sln. *gorél* read *gorèl* or *górel*.

172.12 Sln. *vérovati, vérujem* read *vę́rovati, vę́rujem*.

172.38 Note Kash. fem. sg. *darovà*.

178.23 Sln. *tónem* read *tǫ́nem*.

178.28 Sln. *tegníl, mahníl* read *tę́gnil, máhnil*.

190.19 The short vowel in Lith. *nèšti, ràsti* makes it probable that these forms received root-stress at a stage which was posterior to the lengthening of *e, a* in non-final syllables. Other infinitives had received root-stress at an earlier stage already, cf. Latv. *nãkt, iêt*. (The tone on the latter word is secondary.)

195.17 Latv. *vàrti* read *vą̀rti*.

196.1 The accentuation of Latv. acc. sg. *galvu* cannot serve as an argument because nominal paradigms never show accentual alternation in this language. Indeed, the large number of accentual doublets makes extensive analogical levelling probable.

196.7 The broken tone cannot have been introduced analogically in Latv. *ar̃t, pît, tît*, where it is isolated.

198.19–26 This is a highly simplified picture of the actual state of affairs. A non-acute long vowel is shortened in SCr. *mlȁdōst, prȁseta, rùkama*. A long posttonic vowel in Serbo-Croat

may be either long or short in West Slavic, e.g. Czech *měsíc, peníz, pavouk* vs. *holub, žalud, oblast*.

200.31 SCr. *zlátník* read *zlätník*.

201.29 Slk. *píšúci* read *píšuci*.

202.27 There is a SCr. doublet *pàmet* next to *pämět*, cf. also *dèset* next to *děsēt*.

203.38 The *ó* in Polish *podbródek* was probably taken from the oblique cases, where it is regular. There is no reason to assume an old tonal opposition to account for such instances.

205.4 The length in Čak. *ženán* was evoked by the following resonant, cf. Sln. *goràm*. The length in Slk. *ženám* is analogical.

214.31 The length in Čak. dat. pl. *ženán* is due to the following resonant, cf. loc. pl. *ženàh,* Sln. *goràm, goràh*.

217.1 It is definitely more probable that the acute was shortened in Czech like everywhere else and lengthened secondarily at a later stage under certain conditions. First, the equal treatment of the acute vowel in *kráva* and *bráti*, as opposed to its development in other positions, suggests that the phenomenon is relatively recent. Second, the lengthening in *kráva* can hardly be separated from the one in *můžeš* and *vůle*. Third, the Czech lengthening can hardly be separated from the one in Upper Sorabian, e.g. in *kruwa* (with *u* from *ó* before *w*), where the timbre of the root vowel shows that the rise of length was posterior to the rise of the Slavic timbre distinctions. Elsewhere (1975a: 19) I have put forward the hypothesis that a short rising vowel in an open first syllable of dissyllabic words was lengthened in early Czech unless the following syllable contained a long vowel. This rule accounts for the absence of lengthening in the gen. pl. *krav* and in *řezati, baviš, nosíš,* and a large number of masc. words such as *čas, děd, had, hněv, jih, kraj, pluh, rak*.

222.18 Čak. *žĕn* read *žén*.

222.31 Čak. *vŏd* read *vód*. The opposition between Sln. nom. sg. *kònj* and gen. pl. *kónj* remains unexplained in Garde's theory (cf. Kortlandt 1975a: 14ff). Note also the accentuation of the present tense endings 1st sg. *-èn*, 2nd sg. *-èš*, 3rd sg. *-é* in the dialect of Vrgada (Jurišić 1966: 89).

224.2 The rising tone of Čak. *glāván* did not result from a retraction of the stress from a jer, cf. Sln. *goràm*.

226.24 The short vowel in Polish *głosek* proves that the progressive accent shift operated in West Slavic like everywhere else. There is no reason to assume that this word is of recent origin.

226.29 The short root vowel is preserved in Czech *listí*.

228.4 Czech *novím* read *novým*.

228.18 *aje* > *ā* in the verb. The difference between Čak. *pítā*, Bulg. *p'ita* on the one hand and Čak. *kopâ*, Bulg. *kop'ae* on the other remains unexplained.

232.28–30 These Czech verbs had apparently adopted the accentual pattern of *mohu, můžeš* at a stage before the lengthening of short rising vowels.

232.37 Slk. *možem* read *môžem*.

233.16–18 Accentual mobility is secondary in this category, which continues Balto-Slavic *ē*-stems (for Russ. *sveč'a* cf. Kolesov 1972: 28ff).

235.9 There is no reason to assume an analogical process because real *jā*-stems were always root-stressed in early Slavic.

235.36 Slk. *vol'a, voňa* read *vôl'a, vôňa*.

236.4 On this lengthening cf. Ebeling 1967: 587 and Kortlandt 1975a: 30.

236.29 This reconstruction, which raises more problems than it solves, does not account for the identical accent pattern in verbs with a nasal suffix.

237.30 The word *sirota* belongs originally to the mobile accent pattern (cf. Dybo 1968a: 162).

238.37 Ukr. *h'ašyš* read *h'asyš*.

240.3 Starting from this assumption one cannot explain the difference between Sln. nom. sg. *kònj* and gen. pl. *kónj*.

241.7 On the neo-circumflex cf. Kortlandt 1976.

241.29 SCr. *kráva* read *kràva*.

242.25–33 Apart from the objections which have already been made, one may observe that such a system is typologically improbable.

245.10 Čak. aor. *trese*. I have not been able to trace this form.

246.7–24 I am not familiar with any Kajkavian dialect which has preserved posttonic length. There is no tonal opposition on short vowels any more, but neo-acute *e*, *o* have become long under certain conditions. The long rising accent in *ósmi* can hardly be analogical.

248.13 The root vowel was not lengthened in SCr. *ìstok*, *prìjerov*, etc.

248.24 "beaucoup plus tard": the motivation for this chronological statement remains unclear.

249.21–22 SCr. *pîšem* read *pîšēm* (2 ×).

252.2 SCr. *čùti, čùjem, čù, pòću* read *čùti, čùjēm, čù, pòču*.

253.13 Sln. *na vodô* read *na vôdo*.

254.32–34 This is incorrect: the lengthened *e* did not merge with the reflex of *ě*. Sln. *poljê, lêd* read *poljê, lẹ̑d*.

254.35 Sln. *besẹda* read *besẹ̑da*.

255.5 Sln. *dnê* read *dnê*.

255.18 Sln. *lêd* read *lẹ̑d*.

257.1 Sln. *poljê* read *poljê*.

258.16–27 Sln. *poljê* read *poljê* (2 ×).

259.3 Sln. *poljê* read *poljê*.

261.24 Sln. *nož, noža* read *nòž, nóža*.

261.37 Sln. *poljê* read *poljê*.

262.10 On the chronology of the Slovenian developments cf. Kortlandt 1976.

263.20 Note Ukr. *mor'oz* vs. *hol'iv*.

264.5 The difference between the acute and the neo-acute is reflected in Ukr. *mor'oz* vs. *hol'iv*.

264.11 The distinction between open and close *o* in Russian dialects reflects a Proto-Slavic tonal opposition (cf. Kortlandt 1975a: 17).

267.14 *e* (< *ě*) read *ẹ* (< *ě*).

273.32 It is improbable that such verbs as Russ. *zap'isyvat'* existed at a stage before the progressive accent shift.

275.28–29 The accentuation of Kash. *rąkamí* is not old, as I pointed out above (section 3). The stress of Russ. *ruk'ami* is corroborated by the Slovenian and Čakavian evidence.

283.29–35 As I pointed out above, the Sorabian evidence supports the hypothesis that the acute was shortened in Czech like everywhere else and lengthened secondarily under certain conditions at a later stage.

286.7 Van Wijk tried to explain the Czech lengthening partly in terms of the old tonal opposition and partly in terms of more recent developments (1916: 337).

291.30 Kash. nom. acc. pl. *rùobocä* read *rùobotä*.

295.20 Polish *przeztán* read *przestań*.

298.31 Lith. *geruõsiuse* read *geruõsiuose*.

300.5–7 This is incorrect, cf. Lith. *duktẽ, akmuõ*. For a short discussion I refer to my remarks about lengthened grade in Slavic (1975a: 72–75) and Indo-European (1975a: 84–86).

300.24 Czech *přelámami* read *přelámati*.

302.13–14 IE *bhergH-, bhr̥gH-* read *bherHǵ-, bhr̥Hǵ-*.

302.21 SCr. *smȑt* read *smȑt*. This word received fixed stress on the root syllable as a result of the progressive accent shift, cf. Sln. *smȑt*.

302.27–28 *e, a, o, i, u* read *ē, ā, ō, ī, ū.*

305.32–34 It is incorrect to assume an underlying laryngeal for every long vowel in Greek and Lithuanian.

309.19–24 It is not recommendable to use the term "mora" in the peculiar sense advocated here.

311.2 Skt. *yatudh'āno* read *yātudh'āno.*

311.9 Skt. *mat'a, pit'a* read *māt'ā, pit'ā.*

316.17 Skt. *rājas* does not exist.

319.13 Gr. λόγ read λόγου.

319.16 Skt. *'aśmana* read *'aśmanā.*

319.20 Gr. ἄκμονων read ἀκμόνων.

319.22 Skt. *k'āmesu* read *k'āmeṣu.*

320.29 Skt. *p'ādan* read *p'ādam.*

321.10 Skt. *'esi* read *'eṣi.*

322.19 Skt. *a'dan* read *ad'an.*

322.22 Skt. *praty'an* read *praty'aṅ.*

322.30 Skt. *pratic'ām, pitṛn'ām* read *pratīc'ām, pitṝṇ'ām.*

322.31 Skt. *praty'agbhias* read *praty'agbhyas.*

322.32 Skt. *praty'aksu* read *praty'akṣu.*

324.21 Skt. *yun'aksi, kṛṇ'osi* read *yun'akṣi, kṛṇ'oṣi.* There is another type of accentual mobility in *b'ibharmi, -ṣi, -ti, bibhṛm'as, -th'a, b'ibhrati.*

325.34 Skt. *viś'aṣi* read *viś'asi.*

326.3 Skt. *agnin'ām* read *agnīn'ām.*

329.23 Skt. *jam* does not exist.

330.3 Čak. *damȍ* read *dāmȍ.*

330.4 Čak. *povimȍ* read *povīmȍ.*

331.17 Skt. *'ūrnā* read *'ūrṇā.*

332.9 Skt. *bhr'ataram* read *bhr'ātaram.*

332.11 Skt. *sv'asaram* read *sv'asāram.*

333.26 Skt. *dirgh'as* read *dīrgh'as.*

333.33 Latv. *vējs* read *vējš.* Skt. *vāy'ūs* read *vāy'us.*

333.35 Skt. *mat'ā* read *māt'ā.*

333.36 Skt. *mat'āram, matr'e* read *māt'aram, mātr'e.*

334.1 SCr. *djèver* read *djèvēr.*

334.2 Skt. *dev'aram* read *dev'āram.* Incidentally, the Latvian examples *kaûls* and *diêveris* disprove Garde's hypothesis that a sequence VHR yields a circumflex in Balto-Slavic (p. 305).

339.30 Skt. *duhitṛn'am* read *duhitṝṇ'ām.*

339.32 Lith. *dukterũ* read *dukterų̃.*

340.5 Lith. *dievą̃* read *dievų̃.*

343.7 Skt. *pots'u, duhit'aram* read *pats'u, duhitṝṇ'ām.*

343.8 Gr. θυγατερῶν read θυγατρῶν.

343.27 Skt. *p'adas* read *p'ādas.*

346.16 Russ. *s'amo* read *sam'o.* This word belongs to accent class (b), cf. SCr. *sámo.*

348.4–5 Skt. *'aśvaprsthas* read *'aśvapṛṣthas.*

350.13 Skt. *'aśvaprsthas* read *'aśvapṛṣthas.*

355.16 Skt. *bhratṛtv'am* read *bhrātṛtv'am.*

355.20 Skt. *dat'ā, dat'aram* read *dāt'ā, dāt'āram.*

355.21 Skt. *datr'e, yast'ā* read *dātr'e, yaṣt'ā.*

356.12 Skt. *jagar'ūkas* read *jāgar'ūkas.*

356.31 Skt. *bhrgavānas* read *bh'ṛgavāṇas.*

356 36 Skt *ks'etram* read *ks'etram*

358 3 Skt *'apatyas* read *'apatyam*

358 5 Skt *āv'istyas* read *'aıstyas*

358 30 Skt *sıustıv'ā* read *srustıv'ā*

358 31 Skt *srust'ı-* read *srust'ı-*

358 36 Skt *ıis'amı* read *ıis'āmı*

359 32 Skt *bh'aıamı* read *bh'aıāmı*

360 1 Skt *vıs'amı* read *vıs āmı*

361 22 Skt *y'astum* read *y'astum*

363 24 Lıth *nunesančıo* read *nunešančıo*

363 25 Ukr *zıuuč'y* read *zyıuč'y*

364 2 Skt *k ıı tıs* read *kırt'ıs* (sıc !)

364 11–14 Skt *c'odas* means "Werkzeug zum Antreıben der Rosse" (Bohtlıngk) and ıs therefore a "nom d'agent", not a "nom d'actıon" On the semantıcs of the accentual dıstınctıon ın Slavıc cf Kortlandt 1978

365 3 Skt *cakrı'amsam, cakr usa* read *cakrı'āmsam, cakr'usas*

365 9 Lıth *derlus* ıs a *u*-stem and cannot ımmedıately be compared

430 29 Lıth *sunumı* read *sūnumı* As far as I can see, Garde's dıscussıon does not ınvalıdate Lehr-Spławınskı's objectıon

432 34 The argument ıs wrong because the shortenıng ın SCr *ljepotu* ıs regular ın trısyllabıc word forms

435 11 Cf Kortlandt 1978

435 18 Stang wrıtes "It cannot be denıed, however, that both the ınfinıtıve Slov *vedetı* and Russıan *ıedomo* suggest an orıgınal acute root-stress ın thıs verb" (1957 127), so that the root ıs "stıong" and Garde's hypothesıs that the accentual propertıes of a word are determıned by the accentual propertıes of ıts constıtuent morphemes cannot be maıntaıned

447 21 Sln *ıodô* read *ıodǫ* Cf also Kortlandt 1975b

449 18 "Le *o* a l'ınıtıale" read "Le *o* a l'ınıtıale"

454 38 Skt *p'adam* read *p'ādam*

455 4–11 Skt *p'adam* read *p'ādam* (2 ×)

458 17–28 The correct solutıon was found by H Pedersen (1933 25ff), whom Garde does not mentıon Garde's own assumptıon that a "predesınentıal" accent was lost ın Balto-Slavıc cannot be correct because the stress was not retracted ın Lıth *gerasıs, auıẽs, sūnaũs, dıeıaĩ*

461 21 Skt *d'aıu* read *d'āıu* For recent ınsıghts ın the accentual system of the Indo-European proto-language cf Schındler 1975

464 30 Skt *kany'am, kany'ayas* read *kan'yām, kan'yāyās*

5.

Garde's bıblıography contaıns over 600 tıtles. The large number of references makes the absence of some of the most ımportant contrıbutıons to the field (Leskıen 1899; Pedersen 1933; Dybo 1962; Ebelıng 1967) all the more surprısıng Wıth the exceptıon of Belıć's well-known descrıptıon of the Novı dıalect, all major sources on Čakavıan (Hraste, Jurıšıć, Mılčetıć, Moguš, Nemanıć, Tentor) are mıssıng, as ıs our maın source on

Kajkavian (Jedvaj). The following list contains the most important omissions and should be regarded as a supplement to Garde's bibliography.

Aitzetmüller, R., 1962. Das baltoslavische Akzent- und Intonationssystem. Grundzüge und Grundprobleme, dargestellt nach dem heutigen Stand der Forschung. Die Sprache 8, 46–58.

Bajec, A., 1921. O prvotnem slovenskem naglasu ⌒ v rezijanskem narečju, Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino 3, 40–42.

Barber, C.C., 1932. Die vorgeschichtliche Betonung der germanischen Substantiva und Adjektiva, Heidelberg.

Beekes, R.S.P., 1972. The nominative of the hysterodynamic noun-inflection. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 86, 30–63.

Belić, A., 1935–36. O rečeničnom akcentu u kastavskom govoru. Južnoslovenski Filolog 14, 151–158 and 15, 165–169.

Bonfante, G., 1934–35. L'accento lèttone *gestossen* (⌃) e l' "acuto mòbile" lituano. Studi baltici 4, 123–134.

Broch, O., 1907. Opisanie odnogo govora Totemskogo uězda. Sankt-Peterburg.

Buch, T., 1961. Die Akzentuierung des Christian Donelaitis. Wrocław.

Būga, K., 1922. Kalba ir senovė. Kaunas.

Bulatova, R.V., 1975. Staroserbskaja glagol'naja akcentuacija. Moskva.

Bulaxovskij, L.A., 1955. Udarenie starokrymskogo bolgarskogo govora, Sbornik v čest na akademik A. Teodorov-Balan, Sofija, 131–143.

Bulaxovskij, L.A., 1959. Sravnitel'no-istoričeskie kommentarii k bolgarskomu udareniju. Učenye zapiski Instituta slavjanovedenija 17, 3–72.

Dybo, V.A., 1961. Udarenie slavjanskogo glagola i formy staroslavjanskogo aorista. Kratkie soobščenija Instituta slavjanovedenija 30, 33–38.

Dybo, V.A., 1962. O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole. Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija 6, 3–27.

Dybo, V.A., 1968a. Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom. Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie 6, 148–224.

Dybo, V.A., 1968b. O nekotoryx nejasnyx voprosax otraženija praslavjanskix akcentno-intonacionnyx i količestvennyx otnošenij v verxnelužickom jazyke. Přinoški k serbskemu rěčespytej, Budyšin, 64–73.

Dybo, V.A., 1968c. Fragment praslavjanskoj akcentnoj sistemy (Formy-enclinomena v aoriste *i*-glagolov). Sovetskoe slavjanovedenie 6, 66–77.

Dybo, V. A., 1971a. K voprosu ob udarenii proizvodnyx prilagatel'nyx v praslavjanskom (prilagatel'nye s suffiksom -*ęn*). Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku 14, 7–24.

Dybo, V.A., 1971b. K klassifikacii srednebolgarskix akcentnyx sistem (Predvaritel'nye itogi). Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju, Moskva, 63–70.

Dybo, V.A., 1971c. O frazovyx modifikacijax udarenija v praslavjanskom. Sovetskoe slavjanovedenie 6, 77–84.

Dybo, V.A., 1972. Rekonstrukcija udarenija l-pričastija ot glagolov na -*nǫ*- i -*i*- v praslavjanskom (južnoslavjanskie i vostočnoslavjanskie akcentnye sistemy). Issledovanija po serboxorvatskomu jazyku, Moskva, 86–104.

Dybo, V.A., 1973a. Baltoslavjanskaja akcentnaja sistema s tipologičeskoj točki zrenija i problema rekonstrukcii indoevropejskogo akcenta. Kuznecovskie čtenija 1973, Moskva, 8–10.

Dybo, V.A., 1973b. Materialy po istoričeskoj akcentologii bolgarskogo jazyka, 1. Imennoe udarenie v vostočnyx srednebolgarskix tekstax XIII–XIV vv. Izvestija na instituta za bŭlgarski ezik 22, 151–110.

Dybo, V A , 1973c Udarenie pritjažatel'nyx prilagatel'nyx na -ъj- v praslavjanskom Lingvotipologičeskie issledovanija 1, Moskva

Dybo, V A , 1974a Afganskoe udarenie i ego značenie dlja indoevropejskoj i balto-slavjanskoj akcentologii, I Imennaja akcentuacija Balto-slavjanskie issledovanija, Moskva, 67–105

Dybo, V A , 1974b Akcentnye tipy proizvodnyx imen v praslavjanskom. Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas 1972, Moskva, 233–242

Dybo, V A , 1974c Fragment praslavjanskoj akcentnoj sistemy (Vybor akcentnyx tipov u prilagatel nyx s suffiksom -ъsk- Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas 1972, Moskva, 243–257

Ebeling, C L , 1967 Historical laws of Slavic accentuation In To Honor Roman Jakobson, 577–593 The Hague

Ebeling, C L , 1968 On accent in Dutch and the phoneme /ə/ Lingua 21, 135–143

Garde, P , 1968 L'accent Paris

Garde, P , 1973 Le paradigme accentuel oxyton est-il slave commun? Revue des etudes slaves 49, 159–171

Georgiev, V , 1964 Vokalnata sistema v razvoja na slavjanskite ezici Sofija

Gołąb, Z , 1967 The traces of vrddhi in Slavic In To Honor Roman Jakobson, 770–784, The Hague

Grinaveckis, V , 1973 Žemaičių tarmių istorija Vilnius

Hamp, E P , 1976 The accentuation of Lithuanian compound verbs Baltistica 12, 25–29

Hirt, H , 1896–99 Akzentstudien Indogermanische Forschungen 6, 344–349, 7, 111–160 and 185–211 , 8, 267–278, 9, 284–294, 10, 20–59

Hraste, M , 1926–27 Crtice o bruškom dijalektu Južnoslovenski Filolog 6, 180–214

Hraste, M 1935 Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Hvara Južnoslovenski Filolog 14, 1–57

Illič-Svityč, V M , 1962 K istolkovaniju akcentuacionnyx sootvetstvij v kel'to-italijskom i balto-slavjanskom Kratkie soobščenija Instituta slavjanovedenija 35, 63–72

Illič-Svityč, V M , 1963 Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom Moskva

Ivkovic, M , 1921–24 Akcentski sistemi srpsko-makedonskih govora Južnoslovenski Filolog 2, 254–271 and 4, 46–71

Ivšic, J , 1931 ě u senjskom govoru Južnoslovenski Filolog 10, 171–178

Jaksche, H , 1962 Probleme der slovenischen Akzentforschung Die Welt der Slaven 7, 97–103

Jedvaj, J , 1956 Bednjanski govor Hrvatski Dijalektološki Zbornik 1, 279–330

Jurišic, B , 1936–38 Govor otoka Vrgade Nastavni Vjesnik 45, 86–96 and 174–184, 46, 17–38

Jurišic, B , 1966 Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade I Uvod Zagreb

Jurišič, B , 1973 Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade II Rječnik Zagreb

Kazlauskas, J , 1966 O meste vozvratnoj morfemy i ee udarenii v litovskom jazyke Baltistica 1, 143–149

Kolesov, V V , 1972 Istorija russkogo udarenija I Imennaja akcentuacija v drevnerusskom jazyke Leningrad

Kolesov, V V , 1974 Akcentnaja xarakteristika morfologičeskogo izmenenija (atematičeskie glagoly v prezense) Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta 2, 109–114

Kolesov, V V , 1975 Udarenie prefiksal'nyx imen v drevnerusskom i praslavjanskom Studia Slavica Hungarica 21, 17–44

Kolesov, V V , 1976 Udarenie v "Slove o polku Igoreve" Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury 31, Leningrad, 23–76

Kortlandt, F H H , 1974 Old Prussian accentuation Zeitschrift fur vergleichende Sprachforschung 88, 299–306

Kortlandt, F H , 1975a Slavic accentuation Lisse

Kortlandt, F.H., 1975b. Jers and nasal vowels in the Freising Fragments. Slavistična Revija 23, 405–412.

Kortlandt, F.H., 1976. The Slovene neo-circumflex. The Slavonic and East European Review 134, 1–10.

Kortlandt, F.H., 1977. Historical laws of Baltic accentuation. Baltistica 13, 103–104.

Kortlandt, F.H., 1978. Sur l'accentuation des noms postverbaux en slave. Dutch contributions to the 8th International Congress of Slavists. Lisse, forthcoming.

Kuiper, F.B.J., 1942. Notes on Vedic noun-inflection. Amsterdam.

Kuryłowicz, J., 1952. Akcentuacja słowińska (pomorska). Rocznik Slawistyczny 17, 1–18.

Kušar, M., 1894. Rapski dijalekat. Rad 118, 1–54.

Kuznecov, P.S., 1970. K voprosu o fonologii udarenija. In: A.A. Reformatskij, Iz istorii otečestvennoj fonologii, 360–367. Moskva.

Lehr-Spławiński, T., 1929. O zapożyczeniach łacińskich w języku prasłowiańskim. Sprawozdania Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności 34, 3–6.

Lehr-Spławiński, T., 1930. Najnowsze prace van Wijka o akcencie słowiańskim. Rocznik Slawistyczny 9, 109–125.

Lehr-Spławiński, T., 1933. O przerzucaniu akcentu ku końcowi wyrazu w języku połabskim. Slavia Occidentalis 12, 1–7.

Leskien, A., 1899. Untersuchungen über Betonungs- und Quantitätsverhältnisse in den slavischen Sprachen. Archiv für slavische Philologie 21, 321–398.

Lorentz, F., 1903. Slovinzische Grammatik. Sankt-Peterburg.

Lubaś, W., 1960. Oboczność rzeczownikowej końcówki miejscownika l.mn. *-ach/-ách* w historii i dialektach języka polskiego. Zeszyty Naukowe UJ, Prace Językoznawcze 3, Kraków, 149–183.

Mareš, F.V., 1956. Vznik slovanského fonologického systému a jeho vývoj do konce období slovanské jazykové jednoty. Slavia 25, 443–495.

Mathiassen, T., 1974. Studien zum slavischen und indoeuropäischen Langvokalismus. Oslo.

Meillet, A., 1914. Sur l'accentuation des noms en indo-européen. Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique 19, 64–84.

Meyer, K. H., 1920. Slavische und indogermanische Intonation. Heidelberg.

Milčetić, J., 1895. Čakavština Kvarnerskih otoka. Rad 121, 92–131.

Moguš, M., 1966. Današnji senjski govor. Senj.

Narten, J., 1968. Zum "proterodynamischen" Wurzelpräsens. Pratidānam, The Hague, 9–19.

Nemanić, D., 1883–85. Čakavisch-kroatische Studien, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien (Philologisch-historische Klasse) 104, 363–428; 105, 505–572; 108, 167–230.

Nieminen, E., 1922. Der urindogermanische Ausgang *-ai* des Nominativ-Akkusativ Pluralis des Neutrums im Baltischen. Helsinki.

Nikolić, B.M., 1970. Osnovi mlađe novoštokavske akcentuacije. Beograd.

Oštir, K., 1925. Baltoslovanska metatonija. Razprave znanstv. društva za humanisticne vede v Ljubljani 2, 55–120.

Pauliny, E., 1963. Fonologický vývin slovenčiny. Bratislava.

Pedersen, H., 1926. La cinquième déclinaison latine. København.

Pedersen, H., 1933. Études lituaniennes. København.

Ramovš, F., 1936. Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika. Ljubljana.

Rigler, J., 1967a. Pripombe k Pregledu osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu. Slavistična Revija 15, 129–152.

Rigler, J., 1967b. O akcentuaciji sufiksa *-ost*. Slavistična Revija 15, 218–229.

Rigler, J., 1970–71. Akcentske variante. Slavistična Revija 18, 5–15 and 19, 1–12.

Rysiewicz, Z., 1939. L'accentazione dell'antico prussiano. Studi baltici 7, 88–147.

Schindler, J., 1975. Zum Ablaut der neutralen *s*-Stämme des Indogermanischen. Flexion und Wortbildung, Wiesbaden, 259–267.

Skardžius, P., 1935. Daukšos akcentologija. Kaunas.

Skok, P., 1911–12. Mundartliches aus Žumberak, Archiv für slavische Philologie 32, 363–383 and 33, 338–375.

Skok, P., 1956. Novi prilozi proučavanju govora žumberačkih čakavaca. Hrvatski Dijalektološki Zbornik 1, 215–278.

Stang, C.S., 1957. Slavonic accentuation. Oslo.

Stang, C.S., 1966. Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen. Oslo.

Stanić, M., 1959. Iz akcentologije. Naš jezik 9, 257–264.

Steinhauer, H., 1973a. Čakavian studies. The Hague.

Steinhauer, H., 1973b. The Latvian vocalic system. Tijdschrift voor Slavische taal- en letterkunde 2, 85–110.

Steinhauer, H., 1975. The phonemic system of the Susak dialect. Linguistics 162, 17–39.

Stepanov, Ju.S., 1972. Udarenie i metatonija v litovskom glagole. Baltistica, 1 priedas, 169–183.

Stevanović, M. S., 1933. Istočnocrnogorski dijalekat. Južnoslovenski Filolog 13, 1–128.

Stevanović, M.S., 1940. Sistem akcentuacije u piperskom govoru. Srpski Dijalektološki Zbornik 10, 67–184.

Stieber, Z., 1959. Materiały akcentowe z dawnej Łemkowszczyzny. Slavia Orientalis 8, 115–121.

Stokhof, W.A.L., 1973. The extinct East Slovincian Kluki dialect. The Hague.

Streitberg, W., 1895. Akzentfragen. Indogermanische Forschungen 5, 231–251.

Tentor, M., 1909. Der čakavische Dialekt der Stadt Cres (Cherso). Archiv für slavische Philologie 30, 146–204.

Tomanović, V., 1935. Akcenat u govoru sela Lepetana (Boka Kotorska). Južnoslovenski Filolog 14, 59–141.

Torbiörnsson, T., 1925. Die bestimmten Adjektivformen der slavischen Sprachen. Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 1, 267–279.

Trubetzkoy, N.S., 1925. Einiges über die russische Lautentwicklung und die Auflösung der gemeinrussischen Spracheinheit. Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 1, 287–319.

Vuković, J., 1940. Akcenat govora Pive i Drobnjaka. Srpski Dijalektološki Zbornik 10, 185–417.

Van Wijk, N., 1916. Zur sekundären steigenden Intonation im Slavischen, vornehmlich in ursprünglich kurzen Silben. Archiv für slavische Philologie 36, 321–377.

Van Wijk, N., 1922a. Zum baltischen und slavischen Akzentverschiebungsgesetz. Indogermanische Forschungen 40, 1–40.

Van Wijk, N., 1922b. Die aus altem Akutus entstandenen sekundären slavischen Intonationen. Indogermanische Forschungen 40, 275–293.

Van Wijk, N., 1924. Das Gesetz de Saussures im Altpreussischen. Tauta ir Žodis 2, 29–34.

Van Wijk, N., 1930. Review of Lehr-Spławiński, O prasłowiańskiej metatonji. Rocznik Slawistyczny 9, 78–109.

Winter, W., 1976. The distribution of short and long vowels in stems of the type Lith. *ésti:vèsti:mèsti* and OCS. *jasti:vesti:mesti* in Baltic and Slavic languages. Recent developments in historical phonology. The Hague (to appear).

Zinkevičius, Z., 1966. Lietuvių dialektologija. Vilnius.