

Roman Sukač (ed.), **From present to past and back. Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology**, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang (= *Potsdam Linguistic Investigations / Potsdamer linguistische Untersuchungen / Recherches linguistiques à Potsdam* 7), 2011, 244 p.

During the last years the annual International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology (IWoBA) has become a friendly meeting place for scholars working on Baltic and Slavic accentology. So far the Proceedings of the first six meetings have been published (I: Kapović, Matasović 2007; II: Olander, Larsson 2009; III: Pronk, Derksen 2011; IV: Stadnik-Holzer 2011; VI: Rinkevičius 2011). The volume under review contains the papers presented at the Fifth IWoBA, held at the Silesian University in Opava (Czech Republic) in 2009. It may be qualified as a faithful representative of the diversity of goals and approaches that characterize the field of Balto-Slavic accentology today.

Considering the interests of most potential readers of *Baltistica*, in this review I will mostly focus on papers dealing with Baltic or Balto-Slavic issues.

Two contributions deal with Balto-Slavic in a broader, Indo-European perspective:

As is well known, the origin of Balto-Slavic mobility stands apart as a particularly difficult and urgent problem. Although it has received much attention in recent years (see Olander 2009; Andersen 2009; Kortlandt 2009; Dybo-Nikolaev-Starostin 1978; or Kim 2002, 101ff. for different and often mutually incompatible approaches), it is far from being definitively solved. According to J. Jasanoff, “Balto-Slavic Mobility as an Indo-European Problem” (52–74; building on Jasanoff 2008), the accentual curves of Baltic and Slavic nominal and verbal mobile paradigms arose as a consequence of two successive sound laws: i) “Saussure-Pedersen’s law” (the accent was retracted from word-internal open syllables, yielding a type of accent that

differed from that of baritone words, e.g. acc. sg. \**d<sup>h</sup>ugh<sub>2</sub>tér<sub>1</sub>m* > Lith. *dùkterj*; 1 sg. \**do-ùéd<sup>h</sup>oh<sub>2</sub>* > Sl. \**dò-vedo*); ii) “Proto-Vasil’ev-Dolobko’s law” (the new type of accent that arose through “Saussure-Pedersen’s law” was advanced to the final syllable in word forms of four or more syllables, e.g. gen. pl. \**d<sup>h</sup>ugh<sub>2</sub>tróHom* > \**dùkteroHom* > \**dukteroHòm* > Lith. *dukterū*; 2 pl. \**do-ùéd<sup>h</sup>ete* > \**dò-ùedete* > \**do-ùedetè* > Sl. \**do-vedetè*). Both developments took place very early in Balto-Slavic, prior to Hirt’s law. A detailed criticism of Jasanoff’s proposal cannot be attempted within the limits of this review. It obtains almost surprisingly good results for some endings, but other remain problematic (e.g. the accusative singular and plural). It also requires a generous amount of analogy between different types of paradigm, different root structures, or prefixed and unprefixed forms in order to generate the paradigms we actually have.

V. A. Dybo, “Balto-slawsische Akzentologie und die germanische Konsonantengemination (Zur Verteidigung von F. Kluges Theorie)” (p. 23–39), presents Balto-Slavic evidence supporting the existence of Kluge’s law in Germanic, according to which a cluster of stop + *n* yields a geminate in pretonic position (IE \**-t/dh/dn-’* > *-dd-’*, *-dd-’* > Gmc. *-tt-*), but is preserved in posttonic position. He focuses exclusively on Germanic nasal presents. Verbs with a geminate stop would correspond to mobile verbs in Balto-Slavic, thus indicating “recessive valence” of the root (e.g. Gmc. \**likka-* < \**ligná-* “lick” ~ Sl. \**lbznōti*, \**lbznō*, \**lbznèt<sub>1</sub>* AP *c* “id.”),

whereas verbs with preserved *-n-* would correspond to Balto-Slavic immobile verbs (e.g. Gmc. \**lifna-* < \**lifn<sub>1</sub>-* “be left over” ~ Sl. \**lbpnōti*, \**lbpnō*, \**lbpnet<sub>1</sub>* AP *b* “stick to”). Note that, if correct, this would support Dybo’s theory that the Balto-Slavic accentual valences have an Indo-European background, but Dybo’s treatment of the evidence suffers from several methodological flaws. Verbs with a geminate stop are typically transitive, “expressive” verbs belonging to the second weak class. According to a major view (e.g. Wissmann 1932, 192ff., among others) they simply reflect “expressive gemination”. Be it as it may, in most cases it is a *petitio principii* that they must derive from inherited nasal presents (Sl. \**lbznōti*, for instance, is a regular inner-Slavic perfective to the primary verb OCS *lizati*, *ližo* = Lith. *ližti*, *liežiù* and cannot be directly equated with Gmc. \**likka-*). Verbs with preserved *-n-*, on the other hand, are regular anticausative-inchoative verbs belonging to the fourth weak class (e.g. Go. *us-bruknan* “be broken off” : (*ga-*)*brikan* “break, crush”, etc.). The presence of the nasal suffix is thus determined by the synchronic grammar of Germanic and can offer no evidence for prehistoric phonological developments. *Pace* Dybo, there is indeed some evidence indicating that this type originally bore the accent on the suffix (note Verner’s law in OE *liornian*, OHG *lirnên*, *lernên* < \**liznan* “learn”, cf. Gorbachov 2007, 131f.).

Five contributions are devoted to Baltic, three of them dealing with the verb:

S. Young, “Winter’s law and Baltic ablaut” (237–244), discusses apparent counterexamples to Winter’s law in Baltic. According to Young, one important source is constituted by intransitive-inchoative nasal presents with (secondary) circumflex intonation and derivationally related *u*-adjectives, e.g. Lith. *grūsti*, *gruñda*, *grūdo* “grow sad, grieve”, adj. *grudùs* “(emotionally) moving” beside *grústi*, *grústa* “id.”, tr. *grústi*, *grúdzia* “pound”, or Lith. *skìsti*, *skiñda*, *skido* “get worn out, fall apart”, adj. Latv. *šķidrs* “thin” beside Lith. *skýsti*, *skýsta* “liquify”, tr. *skíesti*, *skíedžia* “dilute, water over”. This would also explain the short vowel of apparent primary nouns or adjectives like Lith. *svidùs* “shiny, glossy” or *ligà* “illness” (the root of Lith. *dubùs* “hollow, concave”, on the other hand, almost certainly was *\*d<sup>h</sup>eub<sup>h</sup>-*, not *\*d<sup>h</sup>eub-*, cf. Kroonen 2011, 255). The phenomenon of “secondary circumflex intonation” among Baltic nasal presents is quite real and had been noticed before (e.g. Kazlauskas 1968, 326f., who correctly reconstructed an original paradigm *\*skýsti*, *skiñda*, *skýdo*). Young suggests that it may be found in Slavic as well, cf. *\*słbzneti* (Cz. *slzne* “will slip”, root *\*sleig-*), OCS adj. *słbzokv* “schlùpfrìg”, subst. *słbza* “tear”. A different matter is how the intonation of presents like *gruñda*, *skiñda* etc. is to be explained. Young (following Rasmussen 1992[1999], 546, or Smoczyński 2007, *passim*) assumes that it spread from nasal presents to TERH-roots. A regular Indo-European nasal present like *\*k<sub>l</sub>-né-H-ti/\*k<sub>l</sub>-n-H-énti* would have ended up as a thematized Balto-Slavic

*\*kil-n-e-ti*, with no reflex of the laryngeal. In Baltic *\*kil-n-e-ti* → *\*kiĺna* was finally metathesized into *\*kiñla* > Lith. *kýla* “rises”. I am a priori suspicious of a scenario deriving the formal properties of the Baltic intransitive-inchoative nasal presents from well-constructed Indo-European formations (see Villanueva Svensson 2011 for my views on the origin of this class). In this particular case I would like to stress that this class was regularly infixal as far back as we can reconstruct (cf. Gorbachov 2007, *passim*; Villanueva Svensson 2011, 36ff.) and that TER(H)-roots almost certainly made *sta*-presents in Proto-Baltic (Nžem. *kilsta*, Latv. *cilstu*; cf. Villanueva Svensson 2010, 208).

V. Blažek, “On the Accentuation of the Baltic Verb” (p. 13–16), explains the acute intonation of verbs like Lith. *dùrti*, *dùria* “pierce”, *kùrti*, *kùria* “create”, *skìrti*, *skìria* “separate”, Latv. *duřt*, *kuřt*, *šķiřt* (from the *aniř*-roots *\*der-*, *\*k<sup>w</sup>er-*, *\*sker-*) as due to the presence of the “essive” suffix *\*-h<sub>1</sub>ie/o-*: inf. *\*k<sup>w</sup>ř-tei*, pres. 1 sg. *\*k<sup>w</sup>ř-h<sub>1</sub>iō*, etc. Leaving aside the fact that the reconstruction of an Indo-European suffix *\*-h<sub>1</sub>ie/o-* is open to serious doubts (see Jasanoff 2002–03) and that it is usually thought to be characteristically intransitive, Blažek fails to provide a motivation for separating apparently unremarkable *ie/o*-presents like *kùria*, *skìria* from other Baltic *ie/o*-presents like *gìrti*, *gìria* “praise”, etc. Most authors, I believe, would rather assume that the acute of inf. *kùrti*, *skìrti* is a secondary, specifically (East) Baltic import from *seř*-roots like *gìrti* (root *\*g<sup>w</sup>erH-*).

V. Rinkevičius, “Akzentuierung der altpreußischen suffigierten Verba” (125–145), presents a survey of the accentual paradigms of the Old Prussian suffixal verbs. After an exhaustive presentation of the evidence Rinkevičius concludes that mobile accent (entailing an opposition between root accentuation in the present stem and suffixal accentuation in the infinitive stem) is attested with certainty only among “semi-thematic” verbs (e.g. *lāiku* : *laikūt*, *gīwu* : *giwīt*). All other suffixal verbs (*-in-*, *-au-*, *-ē-*/*-ī-*, *-ā-*, etc.) present columnar accentuation on the root or on the suffix. Because of the scarcity of material some important issues must necessarily remain open (e.g. the relationship between the accentuation of derived verbs and their derivational basis).

R. Derksen, “The relative chronology of East Baltic accentual developments” (17–22), presents some comments on the different views concerning the relationship between Žemaitian and Aukštaitian, as represented by Girdeņis (1994; originally independent East Baltic dialects followed by a period of convergence) and Zinkevičius (2006; Žemaitian would be a Lithuanian dialect that developed under Curonian substratum). Derksen approaches this debate within the framework of Kortlandt’s relative chronology of East Baltic accentual developments (Kortlandt 1977), apparently favoring Girdeņis’ views.

B. Stundžia, “Some Remarks on Accentual (Neo)mobility in Lithuanian” (188–193), deals with two new patterns of mobility that arose within Lithuanian,

their origin and subsequent development. The type *krikščionis*, *krikščionį* AP 3, characterized by stress alternation between the last and the penultimate syllables, has been typically replaced among nouns (standard *krikščionis* AP 1), but has spread among *u*-stem adjectives and *i*-stem numerals (*įdarbūs*, *įdarbų* AP 4; *septyni*, *septynis* AP 3). On the other hand, the compound type *jaunavedys*, *jaunavedį* AP 3<sup>b</sup>, with stress alternation between the last and the antepenultimate syllables, seems to have been a rather short-lived intermediate stage between traditional mobility (favored in the standard language) and fixed stress (spreading in colloquial Lithuanian).

Slavic. There is just one contribution devoted to Proto-Slavic. K. Ackermann, “On the Prosody of Slavic Continuants of Indo-European Verbal Adjectives in *-to-*, *-no-*, *-lo-*” (1–12), proposes explaining the accent position and intonation of the Slavic type *lo*-ptcp. *\*pīlv*, *\*pilā*, *to*-ptcp. *\*pītv*, *\*pitā* (: *\*pīti* “drink”, pres. *\*pījŕ*, *\*pijetb*, aor. *\*pīxv*, *\*pī(tv)*) as a result of the process of grammaticalization of verbal adjectives as participles. (Balto-)Slavic would here continue an Indo-European accent shift typically associated to the substantivization of adjectives (e.g. Ved. *kṛṣṇá-* “black” → *kṛṣṇa-* “black antelope”), allegedly also seen in examples like Lith. *pīlnas* AP 1/3, Sl. *\*pīlnv* AP *a* “full” (: Ved. *pūrṇá-* “id.”), Lith. *žirnis* AP 1 “pea”, Sl. *\*zīrno* AP *a* “corn” (: Ved. *jīrṇá-* “decomposed, old”), or Sl. *\*stārv* AP *a* “old” vs. Lith. *stóras* AP 3 “fat” (continuing *\*stéh<sub>2</sub>-ro-* and *\*steh<sub>2</sub>-ró-*, respectively). These are

of course cases traditionally explained as due to Hirt's law. It is not entirely clear from Ackermann's text whether she is actually denying the existence of this sound law. In my view, the evidence for Hirt's law is simply overwhelming (see Illich-Svitych 1979, 57ff., which remains the classical treatment of Hirt's law in modern Balto-Slavic accentology). A case like Lith. *žirnis* can conceivably be explained within Ackermann's framework, but this is clearly unattractive for "normal" adjectives like Lith. *pilnas* or Sl. *\*stǎrb* (the mobility of Lith. *stóras* may easily be secondary). It also remains unclear to me how Meillet's law in *\*pīlv*, *\*pilá* etc. is accounted for within her proposal.

Interestingly, most contributions on Slavic are devoted to West Slavic. F. Kortlandt, "West Slavic accentuation" (86–107), and T. Wiśniewski, "Late accent shifts and fixing of stress in West Slavic" (218–236), deal with the historical accentuation of West Slavic, the relative chronology of its accentual developments, and the progressive fixing of the stress. Both authors pay much attention to "minor" languages like Sorbian, Polabian and Slovincian. Z. Topolińska, "Main conclusions of my prosodic research" (216–217), briefly describes the main results of her work on the accentuation of the Lechitic languages. Three papers are devoted to vowel length in Czech. T. Scheer, "Home-made Western Slavic length" (165–187), argues that it is unrelated to Common Slavic length, stress and intonations, but is rather synchronically predictable from certain tem-

plate structures. Iteratives, for example, have to weigh three moras, which entails both lengthening (e.g. *skoč-i-t* "jump" : iter. *skák-a-t*) and shortening (*vyš-i-t* "elevate" : iter. *-vyš-ova-t*) in stems that otherwise would not comply with this restriction. R. Sukač, "Moravian quantitative paradigms" (194–200), on the contrary, assumes that vowel length in Czech is satisfactorily explained through Kortlandt's rule that "short rising vowels in open first syllables of disyllabic word forms were lengthened unless the following syllable contained a long vowel" (Kortlandt 1975, 19). This rule led to the later rise of quantitative paradigms and West Slavic rhythmicity. Z. Holub, "Quantity patterns of *a*-stems and *o*-stems in South-Western Czech dialects (Especially in the Doudleby region)" (40–51), deals with variation of length in dialects.

Three papers are devoted to South Slavic. O. Ligorio, "Concerning New Štokavian retraction" (108–110), discusses the chronology of accent retractions from Old to New Štokavian, with special attention to the dialect of Dubrovnik. M. Oslon, "Über den Silbenakzent in Juraj Križanićs Dialekt" (111–124), aims to reconstruct the accent of Križanić's writings. According to Oslon, it had three phonological accents that were realized as four phonetic tones. Križanić's dialect, which comes closest to the modern dialect of Ozalj, was at the first stadium of the retraction of word-final stress. J. Schallert, "The role of sonority and quantity in the morphophonemic development of stress

in Common Slavic masculine barytona (AP *a*) in Balkan Slavic dialects” (146–164), discusses the presence of oxytona (Bulg. *grad-ít*) beside expected barytona (Bulg. *rák-ít*) among nouns originally belonging to AP *a* in Bulgarian, Eastern Macedonian and Torlak. Secondary oxytonesis is most common among nouns characterized by higher sonority (ending in a voiced stop or a continuant or containing a long vowel *-a-*). These nouns would have been reinterpreted as long and thus suffered the influence of old long (circumflex) stems.

East Slavic is represented by just one article. A. Ter-Avanesova, “The accentuation of *\*a-/\*ja-*stems in East Russian dialects” (201–215), presents a comprehensive survey of the accentuation of *\*(j)a-*stems in East Russian dialects, paying special attention to variants of accentual paradigms and to their relationship to the two *o-*phonemes that characterize these dialects.

Finally, there is one contribution on theoretical matters: Y. Kleiner, “Accentuation and quantity” (75–85), dealing with the concepts of mora and syllable.

## REFERENCES

Andersen, Henning 2009, The satem languages of the Indo-European Northwest. First contacts?, in Angela Marcantonio (ed.), *The Indo-European language family: Questions about its status*, Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 1–31.

Dybo, Vladimir, Sergej Nikolaev, Sergej Starostin 1978, A tonological hypothesis on the origin of paradigmatic ac-

cent systems, in *Estonian papers in phonetics*, Tallinn, 16–20.

Girdenis, Aleksas 1994, Žemaičių savarankiškos raidos pradžia, *Baltistica* 28, 5–20.

Gorbachov, Yaroslav 2007, *Indo-European origins of the nasal inchoative class in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic*, Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

Illich-Svitych, Vladislav 1979, *Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*, Cambridge, London: MIT Press.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2002–2003, “Stative” *\*-ē-* revisited, *Die Sprache* 43, 127–170.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2008, The accentual type *\*vėdō*, *\*vedeti* and the origin of mobility in the Balto-Slavic verb, *Baltistica* 43, 339–379.

Kapović, Mate, Ranko Matasović (eds.) 2007, *Tones and theories. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*, Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.

Kazlauskas, Jonas 1968, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Kim, Ronald 2002, *Topics in the reconstruction and development of Indo-European accent*, PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1975, *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*, Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1977, Historical laws of Baltic accentuation, *Baltistica* 13, 319–330.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2009, Accent retraction and tonogenesis, in Olander, Larsson (eds.), 75–82.

Kroonen, Guus 2011, False exceptions to Winter’s Law, in Pronk, Derksen (eds.), 251–261.

Olander, Thomas 2009, *Balto-Slavic accentual mobility*, Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Olander, Thomas, Jenny Helena Larsson (eds.) 2009, *Stressing the past. Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Pronk, Tijmen, Rick Derksen (eds.) 2011, *Accent matters. Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård 1992, Contributions to the understanding of Lithuanian metatony, *Copenhagen Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 79–89 [quoted from *Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics. With a section on comparative Eskimo*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 1999, 541–550].

Rinkevičius, Vytautas (ed.) 2011, *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology* (= *Baltistica* 7 Priedas), Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Stadnik-Holzer, Elena (ed.) 2011, *Baltische und slavische Prosodie. Interna-*

*tional Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology IV*, Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2010, Baltic *sta*-presents and the Indo-European desiderative, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115, 204–233.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2011, Anticausative-inchoative verbs in the northern Indo-European languages, *Historische Sprachforschung* 124, 33–58.

Wissmann, Wilhelm 1932, *Nomina postverbalia in den altgermanischen Sprachen nebst einer Voruntersuchung über deverbative  $\bar{o}$ -Verba. 1. Teil: Deverbative  $\bar{o}$ -Verba*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas 2006, *Lietuvių tarmių kilmė*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Vilniaus universitetas

Universiteto g. 5

LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania

[miguelvillanueva@yahoo.com]