Steven YOUNG
University of Maryland Baltimore County

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 Ledisma'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[1]. 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 Mokslas kiekwienam krikszczionii 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[2], two scholarly editions of the Catechism had been published: an 1886 edition by Eduard Vol'ter[3], who had discovered the Catechism in the Vilnius Public Library two years earlier, and a 1929 edition by Königsberg professor Ernst Sittig[4]. 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.

[2] Mikalojaus Daukšos 1595 metų katekizmas, parengė V. Jakštienė ir J. Palionis, Vilnius, 1995.

[3] Э. Vol'ter, Литовский катихизис Н. Даукши. По изданию 1595 года, вновь перепечатанный и снабженный объяснениями Э. Вольтером. Приложение к LIII-му тому Записок Имп. Академии Наук, № 3, Санкт-Петербург, 1886.

[4] E. Sittig, Der polnische Katechismus des Ledezma und die litauischen Katechismen des Daugßa und des Anonymus vom Jahre 1605 nach den Krakauer Originalen und Wolters Neudruck interlinear herausgegeben, Göttingen, 1929.

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 Vol'ter'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 Vol'ter's and Sittig's editions of the Catechism with the original. In short order, I discovered that Sittig's confidence in the reliability of Vol'ter's edition was in fact seriously misplaced, at least with regard to stress. Despite Vol'ter'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), Vol'ter lists the following combinations of vowel characters with acute ['], caret [^], and dot [·] diacritics used to represent stress: *á, ą́, â, ȧ; é, ę́, ê, ė; î̇; ó, ô, ȯ; ú, û, u̇*. Two omissions from this set are striking: *ú* and *í*. Vol'ter makes no mention here of either. But in the first fascicle of his edition of Daukša's Postilla[5] (p. IV), he refers to the difficulty in distinguishing acuted *i* from ordinary *i*: „Как ни желательно было отличать *í* от *i*, невозможно было сделать это, вследствие того, что в оригинале *í* и *i* очень часто смешиваются или настолько совпадают, что не могут быть точно различаемы"[6]. (It should be noted that Vol'ter 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 Vol'ter's edition: *Díewo* 12, 31 | *Paſſikė̊la* 16, 18 | *ſękíbes* 18, 27 | *darít* 18, 29 | W. *ipáczė̊i* [Sittig has *ipáczė̊i*] 22, 7 | *vſsiłaikít* 32, 6 | *eſsí* 45, 10 | *príima* 53/ 30 | *Vžgimímas* 56, 27. In addition, Vol'ter has three seemingly false readings of acute: *ßwęczė̊uſioii* 11, 3; *Baźníczia* 21, 30; and *priêžaſtím'* 54, 15.)

But despite Vol'ter's assertion, acuted and ordinary *i* are in fact, for the most part, not difficult to distinguish on a careful reading[7] – 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,

---

[5] E. Vol'ter, Postilla Catholicka Якуба Вуйка в литовском переводе Николая Даукши перепечатанном под наблюдением Ф. Ф. Фортунатова Э. А. Вольтером, вып. I, Санкт-Петербург, 1904.

[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 akūto formos ženklas, visur čia rašomas taškas"). Nevertheless, this edition marks acuted *i* in two instances (page and line numbers refer to this edition): *díewo* 119, 11–12, *žíno* 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 „*ižpažinímo*" and „*kuríe*" are quite distinct. Readings of acute may be confirmed after the fact by parallels with caret, as in the set: *atminímas* 98/8 = *Atminímas* 107/8, *Atminîmas* 118/22 = *atminîmas* 146/30 (cited according to Sittig).

160

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.)

V. lower case: total number (number of attestations, followed by % among all stressed characters)

		$\acute{V}$	$\hat{V}$	$\dot{V}$
a (incl. *ą*[8])	7905	1318 (20%)	486 (7%)	39 (.6%)
e (incl. *ę*[8])	4538	997 (15%)	328 (5%)	3 (.05%)
ė	1387	0	0	0
i (incl. *į*[8], *ie*)	10316	1390 (21%)	412 (6%)	0
y	232	0	0	0
o	3067	351 (5%)	360 (5%)	2 (.03%)
u (incl. *ų*[8])	3918	667 (10%)	291 (4%)	3 (.05%)
ů	467	0	0	0
Totals	31830	4723	1877	47

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): *bažnìczioí* 57, 2 (= *bažnîczioi*? thus Vol'ter 19, 22), *lanpſè* (sic, for *laupſè*) 77, 14, *wiſſo=gàtiſsis* 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. Vol'ter fails to show stress (´, ˆ, ˙) on a vowel (other than acute *i*): (150 + cases) *waikelemus* ⇒ *waikélemus* 3, 4 | *Zadeiĕu* ⇒ *Zadêiĕu* 5, 1 | [*krauiu*] *ſawų* ⇒ *ſawų́* 5, 27 | *Bažnicžios* ⇒ *Bažnîcžios* 7, 18–19 | [*ing...*] *wießpáti* ⇒ *wiéßpáti* 8, 21 | [*eit*] *ſakitų* ⇒ *ſakîtų* 9, 6 | *ſaugodami* ⇒ *ſáugodami* 10, 9 | [*átnĕ̋ße...*] *ižganimą* ⇒ *ižgânimą* 12, 13 | *dągui* ⇒ *dągúi* 15, 12 | *Toii* ⇒ *Tóii* 16, 11 | [*giwâta, ſałdųmĕ̋, ir pâduxie mûſſų*]

---

[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 -*â*- is *ſą̂darą* 101, 26; there are two examples of a nasalized -*û*-: *ikữninimo* 18, 5 and *ſałdữmĕ̋* 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*-: *priímdawo* 137, 6. There are no examples of a nasalized vowel accompanied by a dot diacritic.

ʃweika ⇒ *ʃwéika* 20, 13 | *toʃʃe̊* [*dienôʃʃe̊*] ⇒ *tôʃʃe̊* 21, 20 | *ʃaugoio* ⇒ *ʃáugoio* 22, 12 | *ápturi* ⇒ *áptúri* 24, 28 | *apʃaugoiimo* ⇒ *apʃáugoiimo* 27, 29 | *vźʃaugoi* ⇒ *vźʃaugoi* 28, 4–5 | *metůʃę* ⇒ *métůʃę* 28, 14 | [*Sákraméntą*] *aĺtore̊us* ⇒ *aĺtôre̊us* 31, 33 | *priepůlůʃe̊* ⇒ *priépůlůʃe̊* 40, 12 | *ʃaugoi* ⇒ *ʃáugoi* 40, 26 | [*auʃiʃse̊*] *manoʃse̊* ⇒ *manôʃse̊* 44, 20 | *paʃiʃakimo* ⇒ *paʃiʃákimo* 44, 28 | [*ne̊*] *buʃiu* ⇒ *bûʃiu* 46, 3 | [*kurís tawę*] *priimtų* ⇒ *priimtų* 49, 25 | *maĺonęuʃęs* [*Wießpatié*] ⇒ *maĺônęuʃęs* 50, 11 | [*tawóp ßwętóp*] *priʃsakimóp* ⇒ *priʃsâkimóp* 52, 17 | [*idąnt... miĺécze̊... méiĺa*] *tikraię, meiĺá graźiaię* ⇒ *tikráię, méiĺá graźiáię* 52, 33 | *dąguiěiiʃ* ⇒ *dąguiêiiʃ* 53, 18 | *maĺonuʃis* ⇒ *maĺônuʃis* 58, 10 | *ʃmarkiąie̊* [*kanczia*] ⇒ *ʃmarkîąie̊* [*kanczía*] 59, 11. [...]

B. Vol'ter shows *e̊* in place of a stress mark (´, ^): (These are in fact easy to confuse):

me̊tais ⇒ *métais* 3, 14–15 | *tikrąie̊* ⇒ *tikrąié* 4, 21 | *eʃme̊* ⇒ *eʃmé* 9, 34 | *wiětoi* ⇒ *wiétoi* 16, 29 | [*inġ*] *gerěʃni* ⇒ [*inġ*] *gerêʃni* 54, 1 | *Te̊ʃsi* [*mań*] ⇒ *Têʃsi* [*mań*] [= *Niech mi będźie*] 54, 15 | [*ne̊ palauiąʃis*] *dźěugʃmas* ⇒ [*ne̊ palauiąʃis*] *dźéugʃmas* 54, 26 | [*Pęki*] *linxʃmiěii* ⇒ [*Pękí*] *linxʃmiêii* 56, 24.

C. Vol'ter shows a stress mark (´, ^) in place of *e̊*:

re̊gi ⇒ *rêgi* 9, 31 | *ʃe̊ʃʃêrį* (repeated in the 1995 edition) ⇒ *ʃe̊ʃʃêrį* 32, 7 | [*iź*] *mêiĺes* ⇒ *mêiĺes* 45, 28 | *nuʃsidéiuʃe̊m* ⇒ *nuʃsidéiuʃe̊m* [?] 53, 21 | W. *walgîczie̊* ⇒ *walgîczie̊* 53, 26.

D. Vol'ter shows stress on a vowel which is not stressed in the original:

a. He shows a single stress on the word: forms with a * do not accord with modern norms: **ýra* ⇒ *yra* 6, 13 | [*wiʃsi ...*] **turî* ⇒ *turi* 13, 33 | **muʃʃų́* ⇒ *muʃʃų* 24, 10 | [*ąnt'*] *wîʃʃo* ⇒ [*ąnt'*] *wiʃʃo* 28, 2 | **paʃkąndinimo* ⇒ *paʃkąndínimo* 29, 18 | *Paĺáiminti* ⇒ *Paĺaiminti* 33, 10 | **pridęktas* ⇒ *pridęktas* 40, 3–4 | [*Dîewo*] *miełěuʃio* ⇒ [*Dîewo*] *miełěuʃio* 40, 5 | [*pridet wiʃʃús*] *nuʃsideiimús* ⇒ *nuʃsideiimus* 42, 4 | [*ʃu*] **diděʃniu* [*nôru*] ⇒ [*ʃu*] *diděʃníu* [*nôru*] 46, 18 | **nůdemėmis* ⇒ *nůdememis* 48, 11 | **dwaʃîų* ⇒ *dwaʃíų* 49, 28 (the forms are exclusively a.p. 2 in the Catechism, i.e., *dvãsių*) | *ßwęczęuʃe̊ʃis* ⇒ *ßwęczęuʃe̊ʃis* 53, 17 [...]

b. He shows two stresses on a word which has only a single (generally correct) stress in the original[9]:

páʃáulo ⇒ *paʃáulo* 8, 7 | *mûʃʃų́* ⇒ *mûʃʃų* 12, 2 | *nûpĺâtus* ⇒ *nupĺâtus* 13, 25 | [*ape*] *ʃéptînis* [*Sákramentús*] ⇒ [*ape*] *ʃeptînis* [*Sákramentús*] 29, 28 | *rěikáĺůʃê* ⇒ *rěikaĺůʃê* 39, 21 | *tûrêio* ⇒ *turêio* 40, 11 | [*Wießpatîs*] *átʃunté* ⇒ [*Wießpatís*] *âtʃunte* 40, 14 | *izgâ-nimás* ⇒ *izgânimas* 43, 24 | *prárąkcze̊* ⇒ *prárąkcze̊* 47, 4 | *Sutwêrêiěu* ⇒ *Sutwerêiěu* 49, 28 | [*ape nuʃidêiusį*] *źmôgų́* ⇒ *źmôgų* 51, 10 | [*ʃu*] *Maiéʃtetú* ⇒ [*ʃu*] *Maieʃtetú* 51, 12[10].

---

[9] There are many cases of double stresses in the Catechism, but most seem to be motivated.

[10] Concerning this form, J. H a n u s z in his 1887 review of Vol'ter (AfSlPh 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 „*Maiéʃtetú*" actually occurs in the original. But as we have seen, this is one of Vol'ter's misreadings for the original and quite normal (*ʃu*) *Maieʃtetú* [for *Maieʃtotú*].

<center>* * *</center>

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. Z i n k e v i č i u s (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 *ę* and *ą* 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 *tabiéus*, *dąguíė̃*, *ſu kokíů*, or acc. pl. masc. *kuríůs* (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 *CíV*, 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 *žmoníų* 49, 16 = *žmoníų* 88, 24 = *žmoníų* 101, 2; *krauíu* 15, 14 = *krauiú* 38, 8 = *krauíú* 98, 2.

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

A. *CíV*, where *V* is a back vowel: read *C'V́*: (110 ± *í*; 10 ± *î*)

Tikíu 22, 23; *keturîomus* 34, 29; [*nůg wiſſų*] *žmoníų* 49, 16; *draugía (= draugè)* 66, 2; *kuríůs* [*dâromė̃*] 69, 8; *kokío* [*dáikto*] 94, 8; [*griníeii*] *dwaśíoi* 103, 2; *tabíaus* 115, 4; [*méita teip*] *ſtiprîa* (instr. sg. fem.) 147, 24.

= *CiV́*, where *V* is a back vowel: read *C'V́*: (80 + '; 25 ± ^)

tokiú 8, 27; [*ſu Sunumí ir*] *Dwaſiá* 28, 5; *Pírmiáus* 33, 1; *turiú* 65, 20; *Kokiás* [*ė̃ſt*] 75, 29; *žmoníų* 88, 24; *kuriós* [nom. pl. fem.] [*prídė̃ra*] 102, 2; *kuriôſe* 112, 28; *tabiáus* 149, 12; *Tikiú* 153, 8.

---

[11] V. M. I l l i c h - S v i t y c h (Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic, Cambridge, 1979, 159, note 72) refers to P. S k a r d ž i u s' suggestion (Daukšos akcentologija, Kaunas, 1935, 90) that the Postilla spellings *dūná*, Gen. Sing. *dūnós*, Acc. Pl. *dūnás* 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 *ū*". There seems to be nothing of the sort in the Catechism (where, indeed, „*dūna*" in its various forms is never accompanied 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.

= _CiV́_, where _V_ is a back vowel: read _C'V́_: (20 ±, both)

kuriós 50, 20; _Del kurių_ 63, 7; _liežuwíú_ 74, 8; _žmonių_ 101, 2; _ſĕkîóio_ 119, 22; _dwaśíá_ 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 _Cíe_[12]: (230 ± ´; 20 + ^)
Díewo 14, 22; _ßwiętíeii_ 20, 15; _mĕs kuríe_ 26, 8; _Wießpati_ 42, 16; _dwí priéžaſti_ 110, 18; _iź nieko_ 123, 4; [_ßią_] _díena_ 138, 10; _míelęuſęs_ [_Wießpatié_] 157, 32; [_ßią_] _dîeną_ 162, 14. (There are a few examples where the reading _-íe-_ involves stressed vocalic _i_ followed by another vowel across a morpheme boundary: _príeme_ 27, 27; _príemei_ 134, 28; and with two stressed vowels: [_ſêkła_] _príeemus_ 9, 8.

= _CiV́_, where _V_ is _e_, forming the gliding diphthong _ie_: read _Cíe_: (110 ± ´; 6 ^)
Díéwo 9, 2; _Wiéßpati_ 33, 19; _kurié_ 39, 5; _wiſsiémus_ 50, 5; _pirmiéii_ 72, 2; _kurię_ 121, 26; [_Pękí_] _linxſmiêii_ 154, 29; _Wießpatié_ 157, 32. (There are a few examples where the reading _-ié-_ involves an unstressed vocalic _i_ followed by a stressed vowel across a morpheme boundary: [_kam_] _priêitiś_ [_ßítie artikúłai_] 24, 20; _priêmęs_ 114, 26.)

= _CiV́_, where _V_ is _e_, forming the gliding diphthong _ie_: read _Cíe_: (60 +, both)
wíéßpati 37, 20; _gĕríéii_ 40, 17; _kitíémus_ 51, 32; _Díéwo_ 56, 27; [_ßĕia_] _Díéną_ 64, 26; _kurié_ 93, 5; _ne wíéńas_ 110, 8; _Wießpatié_ [_mânas_] 131, 20; _kokîémus_ (sole example with ^) 161, 8. The situation differs a bit when a sequence contains two _i_'s (followed by a consonant):

C. _CiV_, where _V_ is _i_: both _i_'s are vocalic, separated by a morpheme boundary (read _Cí-i_):
príima 14, 5; _príymt'_ 138, 14; _príima_ 150, 4; 150, 8.

= _CiV́_, where _V_ is _i_: both _i_'s are vocalic, separated by a morpheme boundary (read _Ci-í_):
priímt' 98, 29; _priímk_ 127, 18; _priímt'_ 133, 20; _prįímdawo_ 137, 6; _priímí_ 139, 24; _priímt''_ 148, 4.

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

D. _VíV_: _-i-_ functions as intervocalic jot, stressed vowel follows: read _VjV́_: (30 ± ´; 3 ^)
krauíu [_ſawų_] 15, 14; _ſudeíimą_ 23, 29; [_per ..._] _treíis_ [_metús_] 30, 12; _dąguîĕ_ 97, 14; _Ant' įgyíimo_ 100, 8; _Pękí paíautimai_ 106, 32; _įíudiutas_ (i.e., _įjùdintas_) 135, 8; _Ineíei_ 144, 16; _ataíei_ 148, 10; [_ſwéikas_] _dąguîĕiiś_ (i.e., _dangujėjis_) (= _niebieſki_) 149, 10.

= _ViV́_: _-i-_ functions as intervocalic jot, stressed vowel follows: read _VjV́_: (25 ± ´; 4 ^)
krauíú 38, 8 [instr. sg.]; [_kurí yrá_] _dąguiá_ 57, 26; _Apſiryûmas_ 90, 8; [_ſu tokiŭ cziſtumú_] _widuryiêių_ (i.e., _viduryjè-ju_) 116, 16; _prieíímop_ 122, 26; _nĕ ataiéi_ 134, 24.

= _VíV́_: _-i-_ functions as intervocalic jot, stressed vowel follows: read _VjV́_: (8, both)
dąguíá 63, 13; _dĕßimtiíá_ 70, 11; [_wînas (pawirſta)_] _krauíú_ 98, 2; [_Tarp tų_] _dwieíú_ 111, 28; _widuriíéio_ (i.e., _viduryjè-jo_) [_įkwepimo_] 116, 28; _padeíéio_ 127, 12.

---

[12] Note also the single instance of a bar above an _i_, apparently marking stress: _tiektai_ 10, 4.

E. *ViV*: -*i*- functions as intervocalic jot after a stressed vowel: read *V́jV*- (90 ± ´; 140 ± ^)

tikrôiẽ [...*pažíntiie*] 10, 16; *žadêiei* 13, 17; *Zadêiẽu* 13, 19; *igîie* (= *doſtáie*) 13, 26; *wienatîies* [*ſunus*] 14, 22; *ßwętóii* 22, 17; *atáio* 33, 19; *bẽ̊ abẽióiimo* 53, 14; [*gârbą*] *dągúiẽią* („dangùjeją") 91, 5; *nẽ̊ turėios* 118, 8; *noréiẽu* 132, 4; *łaimîii* [*pabągá*] 152, 6; *manę nuſidêiuſį* 152, 8; *ant dumôiimo* 154, 23; *Nukrižęwôiimas* 155, 29; *priraßinêiu* 161, 10.

= *V́iV*: -*i*- functions as intervocalic jot after a stressed vowel: (7)

Ką biłôiomẽ̊ 60, 26; *grauſmêíẽ̊* 79, 29; *tóii* [*dẽßimtis*] 86, 5; *Abêîoiąnczẽ̊m* [*gẽ̊rái pamįnét*] 105, 11; [*méiła*] *tikráíię* [instr. sg. fem.] 147, 22; *girdéíimas* 153, 6; *Dągúíẽ̊* 156, 20.

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

Except for *Prẽ̊kíiẽ̊s* 122, 1, all show caret diacritic: *igîie* 13, 26; *wienatîies ſunus* 14, 22; *kurîii* 37, 5; [*artés yra dáuǵ*] *Marîių* 57, 23; *O ſaldîii mẽ̊rga* 60, 17; [*Liéktigu dûna*] *Hoſtîiôi* 97, 23; *Prẽ̊kíiẽ̊s* 122, 1; *widurîię* [*ßi*[*r*]*diés*] 146, 12; *łaimîii* [*pabągá*] 152, 6.

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

G. #*íV*: the -*i*- functions as word-initial jot, stressed vowel follows: read *jV́*: (12´)

íeigu 9, 18; *íokio* 21, 4; *íog* 31, 2; *ío* 36, 8; *íẽ̊i* 54, 21; *íos* 58, 12; *íą* 59, 2; *íų* 103, 29; *íog* 111, 16; *íog* 116, 26; *íiemus* 120, 30; *íęmp'* 149, 2.

= #*iV́*: the -*i*- functions as word-initial jot, stressed vowel follows: read *jV́*: (10´; 4^)

iúp 9, 26; *iéſaus* 12, 23; *ią́* 46, 14; *vż iás* 64, 29; *iâm'* 68, 31; *vż iás* 70, 5; *iûs* 77, 32; *iôg* 112, 6; *iû* 114, 18; *iós* 116, 12; *ių́* 117, 26; 119, 10; *iéßkau* 128, 4; *ią́* 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*, *sūnumis*, *manimi*, *tavimi*, *savimi*, show expected end stress[13]. Indeed, after adjustments are 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, S k 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. E n d z e l i n (KZ XLIV, 1911, 51) to speculate that „betontes kurzes *i* der Endsilbe pflegt kein Akzentzeichen 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 *ēsmi*, 2 for *esmí*; and 5 for *ēsi*, 1 for *esî*. 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: *eſsí* 45, 10 and *eſsî* 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 *ésmi): *eſmí* (124, 28; 138, 24); *ẽſmí* (133, 28; 134, 10); and all 5 accented instances of *esi* are end-stressed (there is no *ési): *eſsí* (127, 30; 138, 10; 139, 6; 152, 14); *eſsî* (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 akími* [*sôſto Kûnigißko*] 132, 10, apparently the instrumental dual of *akis* (a mobile stem); the more common phrase is the apocopated *po akím* 133, 8; *po akím tawóm ßwętóm* 132, 18. For comparison, note instr. pl. *akimís*, Postilla 229, 8, but dat. pl. *akímus manômus* Catechism 127, 4 (= *ocżom moim*).

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 *stebùklingas*; 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 ſtẽbúklingas* 149, 30; *anóſp ſtębúklingai gẽróſp* 152, 8), the Catechism in fact reveals a competition with the modern norm *stebuklìngas*: *O ſtębùklìngas ape mus táwo numiłéiimo ſuſsimilímas* 139, 14; *O kaip ſtebuklínga àklîſte ßirdés manós* 129, 12; *ir ſtębúklíngai małônâus Maieſtôto táwo* 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 acuted *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.