BALTISTICA XLVII(2) 2012 255–259

Frederik KORTLANDT
Leiden University

DOMINANCE AND MONOPHTHONGIZATION: METHOD VERSUS INSIGHT

Bonifacas Stundžia has called attention to the widely divergent meanings attached to the concept of dominance in linguistic usage (2011). Following Kuryłowicz's interpretation that affixes determine the phonetic shape of the root in derivation, he defines prosodic dominance as a property of affixes which influences the place of stress, tone and accentual paradigm of derivatives in order to arrive at a better understanding of the history of accentuation systems. As he points out, the accentual paradigm of derivatives is often regularized by analogy, e.g. Lith. *výras* (1), *miẽstas* (2), *bérnas* (3), *viĨkas* (4), but *výriškas*, *miẽstiškas*, *bérniškas*, *viĨkiškas*, all fem. *-a* (1), also *ámžius* (1), *šiùkšlė* (2), *méšlas* (3), *laĩkas* (4), but *ámžinas*, *šiùkšlinas*, *méšlinas*, *laĩkinas*, all fem. *-à* (3). In the older language and the dialects we still find *výriškas*, *miẽstiškas* (1) versus *bérniškas*, *viĨkiškas* (3), where the accentual paradigm of the derivative agrees with that of the base word. The latter distribution is clearly more archaic. In secondary derivation we find e.g. *tévas* (1), *dvãras* (2), *téviškė* and *dvãriškis* both (1) versus *bérnas* (3), *namaĩ* (4), *bernìškė* and *namìškis*, *-ė* both (2). Stundžia correctly observes that the "hard" suffixes are more archaic than the "soft" ones here. The latter originated from the East Baltic retraction of the stress from a prevocalic **i*, as in *vìlkė* (1) < **wilkìH-aH*, *aũkštis* (2), *vandẽnis* (2), cf. *viĨkas* (4), *áukštas* (3), *vanduõ* (3), Sanskrit *vṛkī́s*, *udaníyas*, with metatony if the preceding syllable was long (cf. Stang 1966, 144–148; Kortlandt 2009, 7, 106). Like the dominance of the root (e.g. before *-iškas*) or the suffix (e.g. with *-inas*), both metatony and its absence spread analogically in various nominal and verbal formations (cf. Derksen 1996, 369–376). It follows that the establishment of dominance patterns does not automatically yield insights into the history of accentual paradigms. As in the case of segmental features, it is necessary first to identify the results of analogical developments and to separate them from the original regularities (see further Kortlandt 2012). While Stundžia emphasizes the importance of analyzing the syntagmatic properties of stress and tone and

the paradigmatic system of accentuation on a synchronic level before investigating their origins and historical development, the contribution of Mixail Oslon in the same volume (2011) exemplifies the pitfalls of uncritically applying the method of assigning dominance patterns to sequences of morphemes and extrapolating them without regard to the phonetic and analogical developments which gave rise to the consecutive systems of accentuation and their relative chronology.

It has long been recognized that Latvian and Lithuanian *ie* developed from stressed **ei*, **ai*, **oi* through an East Baltic monophthongization and later diphthongization (cf. Hirt 1892, 37; Stang 1966, 52–68; Kortlandt 2009, 6). The diphthongization of East Baltic **ę̄* to *ie* in the standard languages was a recent development (cf. McKenzie 1918). As a result of the monophthongization of the *i*-diphthongs, the triangular long vowel system **ī*, **ē*, **ā*, **ō*, **ū* became quadrangular **ī*, **ę̄*, **ē*, **ā*, **ō*, **ū* in stressed syllables, e.g. Lith. *gýti*, *líeti*, *dė́ti*, *jóti*, *dúoti*, *bū́ti*. In unstressed syllables **ā* and **ō* merged, so as to yield quadrangular **ī*, **ē*, **ā*, **ū*, e.g. gen. sg. *viĨ̃ko* < **-ā* < **-ō(d)*, though the distinction between posttonic **-āi* and **-ōi* was preserved in dat. sg. *rañkai* versus *viĨ̃kui*, dial. *viĨ̃kuo*, but in the instr. pl. *vilkaĩs* < **-ōis* the long diphthong was shortened in a closed syllable (cf. Stang 1966, 70). The change in the vowel system entailed a shift in the ablaut relations: the parallelism between **ē* and **ō* was broken and the new lengthened grade **ā* became very productive. While the monophthongization of the *u*-diphthongs was apparently limited to the loss of the semivowel in **ōu*, cf. gen. sg. *sūnaũs* < **-ous* and adv. (loc.) *pusiaũ* < **-ēu*, the apophonic relationship between **i*, stressed **ę̄* and unstressed **ai* is paralleled by a similar alternation between **u*, stressed **ō* and unstressed **au*, which is still reflected e.g. in such doublets as *plúostas* beside *pláustas*, with Latvian *pluôsts* pointing to accentual mobility, and in the Lith. verbs in stressed *-úoti* and unstressed *-auti*, a distribution which was blurred by de Saussure's law (cf. Kortlandt 2009, 183f.). The East Baltic retractions of the stress from prevocalic **i* and from final **-a* (Derksen's law, cf. Kortlandt 2012) gave rise to new stressed **ei*, **ai* with metatony beside the original alternation between **i*, stressed **ę̄* and unstressed **ei*, **ai*. The analogical introduction of new **ę̄*, **ō* in unstressed syllables evoked further paradigmatic levelings. As a result, both apophony and metatony became highly productive in Latvian and Lithuanian word formation, leading to complex morphonological relationships which confront the historical linguist with considerable opacity of the material in the separate

languages. Thus, we find e.g. Lith. *míelas* (1, 3), *méilė*, *meilùs* (1, 3, 4), adv. *meĩliai*, *méilintis*, *meĩlintis*, *meĩlyti* beside *mýlas*, *myléti* (*mýli* and *mỹli*), *mýlintis*, *mỹlintis*, *pamìlti*, Latvian *mīļš*, *mĩlêt*, *miẽluôt*, *mĩlinât*, also Lith. *tiesà* (4), *tiesùs* (4), *tiẽsti*, *tiẽsinti*, *teisùs* (4), *teĩsti*, *téisė*, *téisinti*, Latvian *tìesa*.

Against the background of this complex interplay between apophony, metatony and analogy, it is no wonder that Oslon's attempt to explain the distribution of Lith. *ei* and *ie* on the basis of contemporary accentuation in terms of dominance patterns (2011) has resulted in a complete failure. He starts from an outdated reconstruction of acute and circumflex intonations, the former originating from long vowels and diphthongs and from alleged *vṛddhi* and Winter's law and the latter from short diphthongs and metatony (2011, 158). Moreover, he postulates three types of dominance: deriving from the proto-language, from Hirt's law and from *vṛddhi* (ibidem). He assumes three types of syllabic valency (recessive, dominant causing metatony and dominant resulting from metatony) and four tonal contours (High, Low, Rising and Falling), yielding a system of six Balto-Slavic tones (2011, 161): dominant acute (HH and HL), dominant circumflex (LH and H), recessive acute (LL) and recessive circumflex (L), corresponding to the accentual paradigms of Lithuanian (1), (2), (3), (4) and Slavic (a), (b), (c) after Meillet's law and (c) before Meillet's law. He now formulates the following rules in order to arrive at the distribution of Lith. acute *íe* and *éi*:

1. HH-L > HL-L in *míelas*,
2. HH-H > HH-H in *méilus* and *véidas*,
3. LL-HL > HL-LL (Hirt's law) in *síela*,
4. L-L > LL-L (Winter's law) in *díegas*,
5. LL-L > HL-L in *žíedas*.

Thus, the difference between *íe* in *míelas* and *éi* in *méilus* and *véidas* is explained by the hypothesis that the ending was Low in the former and High in the latter words and the difference between *éi* in the latter and *íe* in *díegas* by the hypothesis that only this word had a short diphthong **ei* while the other words had a long diphthong **ēi*, either from the proto-language or from *vṛddhi*. Oslon introduces multiple valencies for the endings **-os* and **-aH* in order to account for the presence versus absence of metatony and concludes that the diphthong **ei* was only preserved if its tone was dominant acute HH or dominant circumflex LH, not if it was dominant acute HL, dominant circumflex H or recessive (2011, 163).

Though the unusually large number of initial assumptions and additional hypotheses create an immense freedom of choice for the analyst, the number

of forms explained is extremely small. Moreover, Oslon does not take the Latvian evidence into account. He is evidently unfamiliar with the standard handbook on Baltic metatony (Derksen 1996). While *métatonie douce* from the East Baltic retractions of the stress from final **-a* (Derksen's law) and prevocalic **i* yielded his dominant circumflex Rising tone LH in Lithuanian (but HL in Latvian, e.g. *sèja*, *spèja*, cf. *sẽt*, *spẽt*), the *métatonie rude* from the same developments is covered by the ad hoc assumption of *vṛddhi* yielding his dominant acute level High tone HH, e.g. in Lith. *láiptas* (1) beside *lìpti* (Oslon 2011, 158, fn. 27), which has an acute from Derksen's law (cf. 1996, 216f., 250), as opposed to the original barytone form *liẽptas* (2). Thus, Oslon's conclusion that **ei* was preserved if its tone was HH or LH is a consequence of the fact that these tones originated from metatony as a result of the East Baltic retractions of the stress to a pretonic syllable, unlike the older tones which he reconstructs as "acute" HL, LL and "circumflex" H, L. There is no reason to assume *vṛddhi* in *véidas* (3), which has an acute from Winter's law and the expected vocalism of the end-stressed case forms.

DOMINACIJA IR MONOFTONGIZACIJA: METODAS PRIEŠ ĮŽVALGAS

Santrauka

Nustatyti dominacijos modeliai automatiškai dar nenušviečia akcentinių paradigmų istorijos. Kaip ir segmentinių požymių atveju, būtina nustatyti analoginės raidos rezultatus ir atskirti juos nuo reguliarių pakitimų. Latvių ir lietuvių kalbų žodžių daryboje labai produktyvios tapo tiek apofonija, tiek metatonija, sukurdamos sudėtingus morfonologinius santykius.

REFERENCES

Derksen, Rick 1996, *Metatony in Baltic*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Hirt, Hermann 1892, Vom schleifenden und gestossenen Ton in den indogermanischen Sprachen, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1, 1–42, 195–231.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2009, *Baltica & Balto-Slavica*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2012, On Derksen's law and related issues, *Baltistica* 47(1), 5–14.

McKenzie, Roderick 1918, Notes sur l'histoire des diphtongues *ie* and *uo* dans les langues baltiques, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 21, 156–174.

Oslon, Mixail Vladimirovič 2011, Raspredelenie diftongov *ei* ~ *ie* v litovskom jazyke, *Baltistica* 7 priedas, 133–170.

Stang, Christian S. 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Stundžia, Bonifacas 2011, Dominance as an accentual (prosodic) property of morphemes, *Baltistica* 7 priedas, 255–262.

Frederik KORTLANDT
Cobetstraat 24
NL-2313 KC Leiden
Holland
[*f.kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl*]
[*www.kortlandt.nl*]