THE NOTATION OF STRESS IN DAUKŠA’S 1595 CATECHISM

As we mark the 450 years since the appearance of the first book written in Lithuanian, I would like to draw attention to another Lithuanian work which appeared just over 4 centuries ago: Mikalojus Daukša’s 1595 translation of the Spanish Jesuit Jacobus Ledita’s popular Catholic catechism. Daukša’s small work, which relies on an anonymous Polish translation of an Italian copy of the catechism, is significant in several respects: it was the first Lithuanian publication to appear in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, it helped lay the foundation for a Lithuanian literary language in the Grand Duchy, and, of more immediate interest here, it is the oldest systematically accented text in Lithuanian.

Daukša’s Catechism survives in a single copy, which had been kept at the Vilnius Public Library (the present University Library) until 1915, when it was removed to Russia along with other rare books, allegedly for safe-keeping during the First World War. Its return to Vilnius from Moscow was negotiated in 1956 by the Vilnius University Library, where the book is once again housed. There are 19th-century references to a copy of the Catechism at the Public Library in St. Petersburg, but its whereabouts are now unknown.

The Catechism consists of two parts: the 108-page Catechism proper, titled Kathechismas arba Mokšlas kiekvienam kriksczcionii priwalus, and an 88-page confessional aid, the Trumpas būdas pasisakymo, arba išpažinimo nuodėmių. As in the Polish model, each has a separate title page and foreword, but they are bound together as a single book with a single consecutive pagination throughout. Before the 1995 republication of the original, two scholarly editions of the Catechism had been published: an 1886 edition by Eduard Vol’ter, who had discovered the Catechism in the Vilnius Public Library two years earlier, and a 1929 edition by Königsberg professor Ernst Sittig. Sittig’s edition is an interlinear comparison of three texts: the

---

1 On the return of the Catechism, see especially: J. Lebedys, Du unikumai, – Literatūra ir menas, Nr. 5, Feb. 2, 1957.
3 E. Vol’ter, Литовский катихизис Н. Даукши. По изданию 1595 года, вновь перепечатанный и снабженный объяснениями Э. Вольтером. Приложение к III-му тому Записок Имп. Академии Наук, № 3, Санкт-Петербург, 1886.
Catechism’s Polish model, Daukša’s Lithuanian translation, and an anonymous 1605 translation into the East Lithuanian dialect of Vilnius. In preparing his edition, Sittig (p. 11) laments that, despite his various efforts, he was unable to ascertain the whereabouts of Daukša’s original, and he places his hopes in the reliability of Volter’s edition, which he used instead.

During a research stay in Vilnius some 15 years ago, I had the opportunity over several weeks to compare Volter’s and Sittig’s editions of the Catechism with the original. In short order, I discovered that Sittig’s confidence in the reliability of Volter’s edition was in fact seriously misplaced, at least with regard to stress. Despite Volter’s claims of a “diplomatically correct” reproduction of the original text (p. XVI), there are numerous false readings and omissions involving diacritics (see below).

Especially noteworthy in this regard is the regular omission of acute stress on the letter i. In the foreword to his edition of the Catechism (p. LXX), Volter lists the following combinations of vowel characters with acute [‘], caret [˘], and dot [·] diacritics used to represent stress: á, â, à; é, ê, è; ã; ò, ô, ò; ú, ü, ū. Two omissions from this set are striking: ù and i. Volter makes no mention here of either. But in the first fascicle of his edition of Daukša’s Postilla5 (p. IV), he refers to the difficulty in distinguishing acuted i from ordinary i: “Как ни желательно было отличать i от ¯, невозможно было сделать это, вследствие того, что в оригинале i и ¯ очень часто смешиваются или настолько совпадают, что не могут быть точно различаемы”6. (It should be noted that Volter nevertheless does show 9 correct readings of i with acute, out of nearly 1400 instances of acuted i in the Catechism text; page and line numbers refer to Volter’s edition: Diewo 12, 31 | Passikėla 16, 18 | ūkibes 18, 27 | darit 18, 29 | W. ipácžëi [Sittig has ipácžëi] 22, 7 | všilaikit 32, 6 | efš 45, 10 | prima 53/30 | Vžginimas 56, 27. In addition, Volter has three seemingly false readings of acute: bvečėušioli 11, 3; Bažniczia 21, 30; and priėžaštim’ 54, 15.)

But despite Volter’s assertion, acuted and ordinary i are in fact, for the most part, not difficult to distinguish on a careful reading7 – particularly in the Catechism, where a faint impression of the type on the paper assists in distinguishing these diacritics. And as the following chart of vowel letter frequencies shows, i is in fact the most common vowel letter in the Catechism text, by virtue of its use not only as a vowel,

---


6 The 1995 edition of the Catechism also declines on principle to distinguish acuted i (p. 34: „...dėl to, kad iš originalo dažnai sunku pasakyti, kur ant i raidės yra taškas, o kur akuoto formos ženklas, visur čia rašomas taškas”). Nevertheless, this edition marks acuted i in two instances (page and line numbers refer to this edition): diewo 119, 11-12, žino 159, 8.

7 See, for example, Appendix I: the title page of the Trumpas Budas (Catechism p. 109), in which the acuted i’s of „žapažinimo“ and „kurie“ are quite distinct. Readings of acute may be confirmed after the fact by parallels with caret, as in the set: atminimas 98/8 = Atminimas 107/8, Atminimas 118/22 = atminimas 146/30 (cited according to Sittig).
but also as a marker of a preceding soft consonant and as „jot“. In both of these instances, as we will see below, the i can bear stress, either acute or caret. Acuted i, in fact, has the greatest frequency of all stressed vowel letters. (In the following counts, done with the aid of a computer, page headers and marginal glosses in the Catechism have been omitted. Within the text, only lower case characters are considered, since these alone may bear stress.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. lower case: total number (number of attestations, followed by % among all stressed characters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a (incl. ə³) 7905 1318 (20%) 486 (7%) 39 (.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (incl. ɛ³) 4538 997 (15%) 328 (5%) 3 (.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ə 1387 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (incl. ɪ², ie) 10316 1390 (21%) 412 (6%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y 232 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 3067 351 (5%) 301 (5%) 2 (.03%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u (incl. u³) 3918 667 (10%) 291 (4%) 3 (.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŭ 467 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 31830 4723 1877 47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, three instances of grave accent are discernible in the text; these may in fact be broken or unclear carets (citations according to Sittig’s edition): baźničzioi 57, 2 (= baźničzoi? thus Vol’ter 19, 22), lanpē (sic, for launpē) 77, 14, wīsfō =gālīfīs 156, 26.

***

Before returning to the question of stressed i in the Catechism and a characterization of the stress notation in Daukša, I would like to illustrate some of the accentual discrepancies in Vol’ter’s edition of the Catechism which do not involve the letter i. In what follows, citations refer to Vol’ter’s edition.

A. Vołter fails to show stress (’, ^, ‘) on a vowel (other than acute i): (150 + cases)

waikėlemus ⇒ waikėlemus 3, 4 | Zadėiţu ⇒ Zadėiţu 5, 1 | [krauiû] fawû ⇒ fawû 5, 27 | Baźničzios ⇒ Baźničzios 7, 18–19 | [ing...] wieśpātį ⇒ wieśpātį 8, 21 | [eit] faķitû ⇒ faķitû 9, 6 | faugodi ⇒ faugodi 10, 9 | [ātnēbe...] iţgānimą ⇒ iţgānimą 12, 13 | dągu ⇒ dągu 15, 12 | Toii ⇒ Tōii 16, 11 | [giwāţa, fałduţe, ir pâduxe múfûţ]

8 It is curious that there are almost no instances of a nasalized vowel character accompanied by the caret diacritic; the sole example of a nasalized -ā– is fādār 101, 26; there are two examples of a nasalized -ū–: ikānimino 18, 5 and faķāmē 59, 29. All other stressed nasalized vowels – 519 in my reading – are accompanied by acute. But even under acute, there is only one example of stressed nasalized -i–: priţmawo 137, 6. There are no examples of a nasalized vowel accompanied by a dot diacritic.

B. Volter shows ë in place of a stress mark (‘,) (These are in fact easy to confuse): 

C. Volter shows a stress mark (‘,’) in place of ê: 

D. Volter shows stress on a vowel which is not stressed in the original:

a. He shows a stress on the word: forms with a * do not accord with modern 
norms: *ýra ⇒ yra 6, 13 | [wifsi ...] *turî ⇒ turi 13, 33 | *mûfû ⇒ mûfû 24, 10 | [qunt'] 
wifso ⇒ [qunt'] wifso 28, 2 | *paßkândinimo ⇒ paßkândinimo 29, 18 | Paßﬃnî ⇒ Paßﬃnî 33, 10 | *pridektas ⇒ pridektas 40, 3–4 | [Dêwe] mîelûsusio ⇒ [Dêwe] mîelûsusio 40, 5 | [piредt wifss] nußsideîmus ⇒ nußsideîmus 42, 4 | [fu] *didëfnû [nô- 
ru] ⇒ [fu] didëfnû [nôru] 46, 18 | *nûdëmëmis ⇒ nûdëmëmis 48, 11 | *dwaṣû ⇒ 
dwaṣû 49, 28 (the forms are exclusively a.p. 2 in the Catechism, i.e., dvâṣû) | 
bweczëfifis ⇒ bweczëfifis 53, 17 [...]

b. He shows two stresses on a word which has only a single (generally correct) 
stress in the original9:

påfâulo ⇒ pašûluo 8, 7 | mûfû ⇒ mûfû 12, 2 | nûplástus ⇒ nûplástus 13, 25 | [ape] 
fépûnis [Sâkrâmontûs] ⇒ [ape] fépûnis [Sâkrâmontûs] 29, 28 | reïkâlfû ⇒ reïkâlfû 39, 
21 | tûréio ⇒ tûrêio 40, 11 | [Wieb] pâtis ⇒ [Wieb] pâtis 40, 14 | izgâ-
imûs ⇒ izgâнимûs 43, 24 | prârkoçç ⇒ prârkoçç 47, 4 | Sutwërenëu ⇒ Sutwërenëu 49, 

---

9 There are many cases of double stresses in the Catechism, but most stress seem to be motivated.
10 Concerning this form, J. Hanusz in his 1887 review of Volter (AaSIPh X 642–648) says that 
since we cannot check Wolter’s „diplomatically true“ copy with the original, we need to take it on his 
word that „Maiëfetû“ actually occurs in the original. But as we have seen, this is one of Volter’s 
misspellings for the original and quite normal (fu) Maiëfetû [for Maiëfioû].
An apparent graphic innovation on the part of Daukša which has hitherto gone unremarked due to the lack of information on stressed -i- in the scholarly editions of both the Catechism and Postilla, is the notation of stress on sequences of -i- plus vowel. In such sequences, the stress mark may be found either on the vowel itself, in the form of acute, caret, or dot; or on the preceding i, in the form of acute or caret. Indeed, a diacritic on a preceding i is the more usual way of marking stress, and seems to be characteristic only of Daukša, who, as we learn from Z. Zinkevičius (Lietuvių kalbos istorija, III, 1988, 184), was innovative in other ways, such as expressing the nasality in į and ų on the pattern of the nasalized ė and ė̆ found in the Lithuanian texts of East Prussia. The function of the i in these sequences is immaterial: it may constitute part of the gliding diphthong ie, it may represent word-initial or intervocalic jot, or it may represent softness of a preceding consonant, as in modern practice. In the latter two cases, the stress is read on the following vowel. In fact in cases such as labḗ̄u̇̄s, daguī̆̄, fu kokiū̄, or acc. pl. masc. kuriū̄s (7x, as opposed to 3x with no stress, and no examples of stress on first syllable), stress can be represented only on the preceding -i-, since composite vowel characters never bear stress in these texts. Indeed, this may have been one of the motivating factors for representing stress this way\(^{11}\).

The following categories of representative examples illustrate stress notations which are equivalent among themselves (in the cover notation CiV, acute stands in for any stress diacritic; page and line numbers refer to Sittig’s edition). Indeed it is not difficult in the material to find parallel notations such as žmoniū̄̄ 49, 16 = žmoniū̄̄ 88, 24 = žmoniū̄̄ 101, 2; krauī̆̄ 15, 14 = krauī̆̄ 38, 8 = krauī̆̄ 98, 2.

In A, the -i- functions as a marker of a soft consonant:

A. CiV, where V is a back vowel: read CiV: (110 ± ĩ; 10 ± ĩ)

    Tikiu 22, 23; keturiomus 34, 29; [nû̆g wiffjū] žmoniū̄̄ 49, 16; draugia (draugė̆̄) 66, 2;
    kuriū̄̄s [dāromē̆'] 69, 8; kokio [dāktō] 94, 8; [grinieii] dwaśtoi 103, 2; tabiaus 115, 4;
    [méina teip] štrė̈̄̆ria (instr. sg. fem.) 147, 24.
    = CiV, where V is a back vowel: read CiV: (80 + 🜣; 25 ± 🜣)

    tokiū 8, 27; [fu Sunumir ir] Dwaśtoi 28, 5; Pirmiaus 33, 1; turiū 65, 20; Kokiás [ěft]
    75, 29; žmoniū̄̄ 88, 24; kuriō̄̄s [nom. pl. fem.] [prīē̆̀] 102, 2; kuriō̄̄fe 112, 28; labiaus
    149, 12; Tikiu 153, 8.

\(^{11}\) V.M. Illich-Svityčh (Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic, Cambridge, 1979, 159, note
72) refers to P. Skardžius’ suggestion (Daukšos akcentologija, Kaunas, 1935, 90) that the Postilla
spellings dūnā, Gen. Sing. dūnōs, Acc. Pl. dūnās may be „instances of placing the stress mark on a
syllable contiguous to the stressed one in the absence of a special symbol for stressed ā“. There seems
to be nothing of the sort in the Catechism (where, indeed, „dūna“ in its various forms is never accompany-
ned by stress). In fact, I doubt if any notation like the one suggested is real for the Postilla, which is far
less consistent a corpus than the Catechism.
= CiV, where V is a back vowel: read C’V: (20 ± , both)
kuriōs 50, 20; Del kurūi 63, 7; lieżuwi 74, 8; zmoniū 101, 2; fēkio 119, 22; dwaśiā
147, 4.

In B, the -i- is part of the gliding diphthong -ie-:

B. CiV, where V is e, forming the gliding diphthong ie: read C’e12: (230 ± ; 20 + )
Diewo 14, 22; bńwistieii 20, 15; mēs kurie 26, 8; Wieśpati 42, 16; âwī prieziastī 110,
18; iź nieko 123, 4; [bīa] diena 138, 10; mieleufes [Wieśpatiē] 157, 32; [bīa] dienā 162,
14. (There are a few examples where the reading -ie- involves stressed vocalic i followed
by another vowel across a morpheme boundary: prieme 27, 27; priemei 134, 28;
and with two stressed vowels: [fēkē] priēemus 9, 8.

= CiV, where V is e, forming the gliding diphthong ie: read C’e: (110 ± ; 6 )
Diewo 9, 2; Wieśpati 33, 19; kurie 39, 5; wisiēmus 50, 5; pirmīei 72, 2; kurie 121,
26; [Pēkē] linxīmiēi 154, 29; Wieśpatiē 157, 32. (There are a few examples where the reading -iē-
involve unstressed vocalic i followed by a stressed vowel across a morpheme boundary: [kam] priēitiś [bītie artikūlā] 24, 20; priēmes 114, 26.)

= CiV, where V is e, forming the gliding diphthong ie: read C’e: (60 + , both)
wieśpati 37, 20; gēriēi 40, 17; kitiēmus 51, 32; Diewo 56, 27; [bēiā] Diēnā 64, 26; kurie
93, 5; ne wīēnas 110, 8; Wieśpatiē [mānas] 131, 20; kokēmus (sole example with )
161, 8. The situation differs a bit when a sequence contains two i’s (followed by a con-
sonant):

C. CiV, where V is i: both i’s are vocalic, separated by a morpheme boundary (read
Ci-i):

priima 14, 5; priimt* 138, 14; priima 150, 4; 150, 8.

= CiV, where V is i: both i’s are vocalic, separated by a morpheme boundary (read
Ci-i):

priimt* 98, 29; priimk 127, 18; priimt* 133, 20; priimdawo 137, 6; priim 139, 24;
prīmt** 148, 4.

In D and E, the -i- functions as intervocalic jot:

D. ViV: -i- functions as intervocalic jot, stressed vowel follows: read VjV: (30 ± ; 3 )
kraiū [fawū] 15, 14; fudeiimq 23, 29; [per ... ] treiis [metūs] 30, 12; daguie 97, 14;
Ant’ igyūmo 100, 8; Pēkī paiautiū 106, 32; iūriuntas (i.e., iūriuntas) 135, 8; Ineiei 144,
16; ataiei 148, 10; [swēikā] daguieiis (i.e., dangujejis) (= niebiefi) 149, 10.

= ViV: -i- functions as intervocalic jot, stressed vowel follows: read VjV: (25 ± ; 4 )
kraiū 38, 8 [instr. sg.]; [kuriyra] daguiai 57, 26; Apširyīmas 90, 8; [fū tokiu czīftumū]
widuryiei (i.e., viduryje-ju) 116, 16; prieiimop 122, 26; nē ataiei 134, 24.

= ViV: -i- functions as intervocalic jot, stressed vowel follows: read VjV: (8, both)
daguia 63, 13; dēsintiā 70, 11; [wīnas (pawīstā)] kraiūa 98, 2; [Tarp tū] dwielį
111, 28; widuryieio (i.e., viduryje-jo) [ikwepimo] 116, 28; padeiēio 127, 12.

12 Note also the single instance of a bar above an i, apparently marking stress: tiektai 10, 4.
E. VīV: -i- functions as intervocalic jot after a stressed vowel: read VīV- (90 ± 140 ±)

  tikrōtē [...pažintie] 10, 16; Žadēi [a] 13, 17; Zadēi [a] 13, 19; igūle (= dostaie) 13, 26; 
  wienatūtes [fūnu] 14, 22; bštōlii 22, 17; atāio 33, 19; bē abšōjōmo 53, 14; [gārbā] dągūšēq 
  („dangūjeja“) 91, 5; nē turēiōs 118, 8; norēi 132, 4; laimūi [pabagā] 152, 6; manę 
  nusidējuši 152, 8; anī dumōjōmo 154, 23; Nukrižewōīumas 155, 29; prirašiņēiu 161, 10. 
  = VīV-: -i- functions as intervocalic jot after a stressed vowel: (7)

Ką bitōiome 60, 26; grausmēiš 79, 29; tōi [dēŭniš] 86, 5; Abēiioiunczēm [gērai 
  pamīnēt] 105, 11; [mēila] tikrāiš [instr. sg. fem.] 147, 22; girdēiīmas 153, 6; Dągūiš 
  156, 20.

F. CīiV: the first i is vocalic and stressed, and the second i functions as jot: read 
  CīiV:

  Except for Prēkiūs 122, 1, all show caret diacritic: igūle 13, 26; wienatūtes funus 14, 
  22; kurūi 37, 5; [artēs vra dāuś] Marūi 57, 23; O faldii mērga 60, 17; [Lięktigu dūna] 
  Hošṭīoī 97, 23; Prēktiūs 122, 1; widurō [b̥i[r]diēs] 146, 12; laimūi [pabagā] 152, 6.

  Finally, the i may function as a word-initial jot:

G. #iV: the -i- functions as word-initial jot, stressed vowel follows: read jīV-: (12')
  ieigū 9, 18; iokio 21, 4; iog 31, 2; io 36, 8; iēi 54, 21; iōs 58, 12; iq 59, 2; iūj 103, 29; 
  iōg 111, 16; iōg 116, 26; i̞emus 120, 30; īemp' 149,2.

  #iV: the -i- functions as word-initial jot, stressed vowel follows: read jīV- (10'; 4')
  iūp 9, 26; iēfaus 12, 23; iā 46, 14; vī iās 64, 29; iām' 68, 31; vz iās 70, 5; iūs 77, 32; iōg 
  112, 6; iā 114, 18; iōs 116, 12; iū 117, 26; 119, 10; iēškaus 128, 4; iā 144, 12.

  * * *

For the most part, the newly recovered acuted i's, together with the above 
interpretation of stress notation, simply increase the number of stressed forms in Daukša's 
Catechism which conform to modern norms. The dozens of examples of various case 
forms of high frequency words such as kuris and visas, for instance, show essentially 
no stress deviations; and all stressed instances of the instrumental forms sūnumi, 
śnumis, manimi, tavimi, savimi, show expected end stress13. Indeed, after adjustments 
amre made for Vol'ter's errors and omissions, the overall impression of Daukša's 
Catechism text with regard to accentuation is one of great consistency, especially in 
comparison with the much larger Postilla.

The greater accentual consistency and systematicity in the Catechism suggests 
that it should serve as a touchstone for questions of Daukša's accentuation before 
the less tractable material of the Postilla is considered. For example, Sk l a r d ž i u s

13 The apparent lack of stressed i in these forms in the Vol'ter and Sittig editions led J. Endzelin 
(KZ XLIV, 1911, 51) to speculate that „betontes kurzes i der Endsilbe pflegt kein Akzenteichen zu 
haben“.
(Daukšos akcentologija, Kaunas, 1935, 192–93) discusses the possibility of original initial stress in the 1st and 2nd present singular athematic forms of „to be“ on the basis of corresponding forms in the Postilla. But the data of the Postilla are quite contradictory: Skardžius gives 5 attestations for ėsmi, 2 for esmi; and 5 for ėsi, 1 for esi. In the scholarly editions of the Catechism, no stressed forms of the 1st sg. appear. The 2nd sg. is attested in two forms in Vol’ter: ėsi 45, 10 and ėski 52, 18: in Sittig only the latter appears (146, 18). But on my reading, all four accented instances of esmi in the Catechism are in fact end-stressed (there is no *ēsmi): ēsmi (124, 28; 138, 24); ēsmi (133, 28; 134, 10); and all 5 accented instances of esi are end-stressed (there is no *ēsi): ēsi (127, 30; 138, 10; 139, 6; 152, 14); ēski (146, 18). Here again, the Catechism presents a consistent accentual picture, one which, in this case, supports end stress for these forms.

This overall relative consistency in the accentuation of the Catechism gives us the confidence to treat apparently deviant forms as motivated. An example is the single instance of po akîmî [sôfto Kûniško] 132, 10, apparently the instrumental dual of akîs (a mobile stem); the more common phrase is the apocopated po akîm 133, 8; po akîm tawom ūwëtûm 132, 18. For comparison, note instr. pl. akîmus, Postilla 229, 8, but dat. pl. akînûs manônûs Catechism 127, 4 (= ocôm moîm).

Finally, the lack of forms with stressed i in the scholarly editions of the Catechism occasionally leads to a distorted representation of stress in Daukša: for example, all of Skardžius’ forms for stebuklingas from the Postilla show stebûklingas; similarly for all of Vol’ter’s stressed examples in the Catechism. While there is no denying the reality of this form (Catechism examples include: O kaip’ didis ir stebûklingas 149, 30; anôşp stebûklingai gërûšp 152, 8), the Catechism in fact reveals a competition with the modern norm stebuklingas: O stebûklingas ape mus tawo numitëîmo fušsimilimas 139, 14; O kaip’ stebuklinga akûîte ërûdûs mañûs 129, 12; ir stebûklingai mañônûs Maieftûto iâwo 163, 12 (double stressings in Daukša are sometimes indications of stress variants).

Pranas Skardžius had mentioned the disappearance of the Catechism as a serious obstacle to his writing Daukšos akcentologija, still the only complete treatment of the stress of the Daukša texts. This, together with an uncertainty concerning stressed i in the Postilla – there are almost no examples of forms with accuted i in his monograph – may have been the reason for Skardžius’ well-known reluctance to invoke relative frequencies for various entries, a cautious stand for which he was reproached in reviews by van Wijk and Brender. The present study represents a first step toward addressing the residual gaps in our accentual knowledge of 16th-century Lithuanian.