Frederik KORTLANDT
Leiden University

BALTO-SLAVIC ACCENTUAL MOBILITY

Thomas Olander's dissertation (2006) offers a useful introduction to the history of Balto-Slavic accentuation supported by an impressive command of the scholarly literature. The problem is best discussed against the background of my relative chronology of Balto-Slavic accentual developments (Kortlandt 1977, 320–323; 1989, 43–46; cf. Olander 2006, 31f.), which can be summarized as follows:

1. Loss of PIE accentual mobility, of which there is no trace outside the nominal flexion of the consonant stems, e.g. Lith. *duktẽ* 'daughter', *piemuõ* 'shepherd', and the flexion of the athematic verbs, e.g. *duodą̃s* 'giving' (cf. Kortlandt 1985 on the latter).

2. Pedersen's law: the stress was retracted from medial syllables in mobile accent paradigms, e.g. acc.sg. *dùkterį, píemenį*, Greek θυγατέρα, ποιμένα.

3. Barytonesis: the retraction of the stress spread analogically to vocalic stems in the case forms where Pedersen's law applied, e.g. acc.sg. *ãvį* 'sheep', *sū́nų* 'son', *diẽvą* 'god', *žiẽmą* 'winter'.

4. Oxytonesis: the stress is shifted from a medial syllable to the end of the word in paradigms with end-stressed forms, e.g. inst.sg. *sūnumì*, inst.pl. *žiemomìs*.

5. Hirt's law: the stress was retracted if the vowel of the pretonic syllable was immediately followed by a laryngeal, e.g. *dúona* 'bread', *výras* 'man', *dū́mai* 'smoke', Vedic *dhānā́s*, *vīrás*, *dhūmás*.

6. Winter's law: the PIE glottalic stops dissolved into a laryngeal and a buccal part. The former merged with the reflex of the PIE laryngeals and the latter with the reflex of the lenes stops, e.g. Latvian *pę̂ds* 'footstep' < **pedóm*, *nuôgs* 'naked' < **nog^{w}ós*, *duômu* 'I give' < **dodH$_3$mí*.

7. Retraction of the stress from final open syllables of disyllabic word forms unless the preceding syllable was closed by an obstruent, e.g. Lith. gen.sg. *vil̃ko* 'wolf', dat.sg. *vil̃kui*, *gálvai* 'head', *nẽša* 'carries', Serbo-Croatian *vûka*, *vûku*, *glâvi*, *nȅse* 'carried', neuter *pîlo* 'drank', but Lith. gen.sg. *aviẽs*, gen.pl. *vilkų̃* < **-òm*, nom.sg. *galvà* < **-àH*, Russian *pilá* 'she drank' < **-àH*, neuter *nesló*, infinitive *nestí*, where syllable-final consonants (including word-final laryngeals) prevented the retraction of the stress.

Olander objects to developments 2, 3 and 4 because (unlike 5, 6 and 7) their operation depends not only on phonetic conditions but also on properties of the paradigm to which the affected forms belong. The problem was already recognized by Saussure, who stated when he proposed the retraction in *dùkterį* that it is "difficile de dire le caractère exact qu'aurait cette loi, car il y a des obstacles à la transformer en loi phonétique pure et simple" (1896, 163 = 1922, 533). Pedersen observed that "c'est là une loi phonétique d'un type dont les 'néogrammairiens' de la période du renouvellement de la linguistique indo-européenne n'avaient certainement pas rêvé" (1933, 25), and this is why I have called the retraction "Pedersen's law" (Kortlandt 1975, 9). Olander's dissertation is a brave attempt at finding a neogrammarian "loi phonétique pure et simple" to account for the rise of the Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms. His solution is to adapt the retraction proposed under 7 above in such a way that it covers the barytonesis, to explain the retraction in *dùkterį* by analogy, and to identify the oxytonesis with Saussure's law in Lithuanian and with Dybo's law in Slavic.

A confrontation of Olander's views with mine requires first of all an elucidation of the concept of "unaccented word-forms". Olander uses the term "accent" to refer "to the prominent syllable of a word in prosodic systems where no more than one syllable of a word is prominent relative to its neighbouring syllables" (2006, 10) and mentions Russian, Bulgarian and English as "stress languages" and Vedic, Greek and Japanese as "pitch-accent languages", claiming that "unaccented word-forms" are found in Vedic and Japanese as well as in Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Balto-Slavic and Proto-Slavic. "When pitch, apart from contributing to marking the prominent syllable of a word, has a distinctive function", Olander uses the term "tone" (2006, 11), adducing Štokavian, Čakavian, Lithuanian and Greek as examples. He states that "languages like Vedic and Japanese may also be said to have distinctive tone" but that "we may account economically for prosodic systems of this type also in terms of accent" (ibidem). This is a confused report of the facts. In Tokyo Japanese, *hasi* 'edge' and *hasi* 'bridge' are homophonous, both having a low-high tone contour. The difference between the two is that a following particle has high tone after 'edge' but low tone after 'bridge'. If we define accent in this language as the last of a series of high tones (as is customary), the word for 'edge' is unstressed before a stressed particle but stressed if no particle follows whereas the word for 'bridge' is always stressed on the second syllable and the word *hasi* 'chopsticks', which has a high-low tone contour, is always stressed on the first syllable. In Vedic Sanskrit, on the other hand, monosyllables could have either high or low tone while polysyllabic word forms lost their only high tone under certain syntactic conditions, giving rise

to sequences of up to ten or more syllables with low tones only (cf. Kortlandt 1986, 156). Unlike Tokyo Japanese, Vedic Sanskrit was a restricted tone language, comparable to Serbo-Croatian. While Proto-Japanese had a distinctive opposition between high and low tone on every syllable (cf. Kortlandt 1993; de Boer 2005), Proto-Indo-European probably had a free pitch accent which was lost under certain syntactic conditions. This system has left an interesting trace in modern Greek, which allows two high tones on a word form in spite of being an accent language, e.g. *το αυτοκίνητό μας* 'our car'.

Another distinction which can easily cause confusion is the one between "acute" and "circumflex", which Olander defines in a satisfactory way as follows (2006, 12): "Proto-Balto-Slavic final syllables are referred to as acute if glottalised (or similarly marked), and circumflex if not; the same distinction applies to pre-Lithuanian and pre-Latvian syllables in all positions, and to the reflexes of these syllables in Lithuanian and Latvian". This definition should apply to all Proto-Balto-Slavic and Proto-Slavic final and non-final syllables. Unfortunately, Olander equates "acute" with "long" and "circumflex" with "short" in non-final syllables of his reconstructed forms (ibidem), thereby depriving himself of the possibility to give an adequate account of the data. Consider the following words:

(a) SCr. *krȁva* 'cow', Slovak *krava*, Polish *krowa*, Czech *kráva*, Upper Sorbian *kruwa* < *krówa*;

(b) SCr. *brázda* 'furrow', Slovak *brázda*, Polish *bruzda* < *brózda*, Czech *brázda*, Upper Sorbian *brózda*;

(c) SCr. *bráda* 'beard', Slovak *brada*, Polish *broda*, Czech *brada*, Upper Sorbian *broda*.

It is clear that we have a distinction between acute (a), long (b) and short (c) vowels here, all of which are reflected as *a* in South Slavic and Czecho-Slovak and as *o* in Polish and Sorbian. The acute vowels were lengthened in Czech and Upper Sorbian after the rise of the new timbre distinctions while they remained short in Serbo-Croatian, Slovak and Polish (cf. Kortlandt 1975, 31). In a similar way, the acute vowel of Ukrainian *moróz* 'frost' remained distinct from both the falling tone in acc.sg. *hólovu* 'head' and the long rising tone in gen.pl. *holív* of the same word. It follows that the glottalization of acute syllables was preserved after the Common Slavic rise of the new timbre distinctions, the metathesis of liquids in West Slavic and the pleophony (*polnoglasie*) in East Slavic.

Ancient Greek was a restricted tone language, comparable to Vedic Sanskrit but with a limited distribution of high tones and without "unaccented word-forms" except monosyllabic clitics. The Greek "circumflex" was either automatic (cf. Bally 1945,

41f.) or the reflex of a disyllabic sequence of two vowels (cf. Kortlandt 1986, 153f.), e.g. *οἴκοι* 'at home' < **-oï*, *τιθεῖεν* 'they may put' < **-eïen(τ)* as opposed to *οἶκοι* 'houses', *λύσειαν* 'they may loosen' with nonsyllabic **ι*, also *βοῦς* 'ox' < **gʷeH₃us* versus *Ζεύς* without an intervocalic laryngeal. The accentual mobility in *μήτηρ* 'mother', acc. *μητέρα*, gen. *μητρός* was probably an innovation of the central Indo-European languages (Indo-Iranian, Greek, Balto-Slavic, Germanic) on the analogy of the words for 'father' and 'daughter' (cf. Beekes 1985, 133). Hirt's law restored the initial accentuation in Lith. *mótė*, SCr. *màti*. Thus, I am in agreement with Olander on the starting-point of our reconstructions: "The prosodic system of Proto-Indo-European was similar to that of Vedic" (2006, 72), with the proviso that "unaccented word-forms" were syntactically conditioned variants with low tones only of certain word forms which had a single high pitch elsewhere. I have argued that this system originated from the Indo-Uralic syllable structure (Kortlandt 2004). Unlike Olander, I think that accentual mobility was widespread in Proto-Indo-European outside the *o*-stems and the thematic present and that it was largely eliminated in the daughter languages (cf. Beekes 1985, passim; Kortlandt 1997).

In search of "unaccented word-forms" in Balto-Slavic, Olander adduces several arguments which require attention (2006, 91, 105, 110, 114). In Lithuanian mobile accent paradigms, the accent falls on the syllable preceding the enclitic particles *n(a)* 'into' of the illative and *p(i)* 'at' of the allative, e.g. *galvõn* 'head', *darbóp* 'work', which is reminiscent of Dolobko's law in Slavic (cf. Kortlandt 1975, 39). In fact, the original accentuation of these case forms is identical with that of the accusative and the genitive, respectively, and the more recent accentuation was taken from the locative (inessive) after Saussure's law (cf. Kortlandt 2005a). The final stress in the locative was an East Baltic innovation of the demonstrative pronoun *tàs*, which originally had fixed stress (2).

In Latvian, the acute is reflected as a broken tone not only in originally unstressed syllables but also in previously barytone forms of accent paradigm (3), where we would expect a stretched tone if these were prosodically identical with accent paradigm (1). In my view, the tonal oppositions in the East Baltic languages originated from the retraction of the stress from a prevocalic **i* (cf. Kortlandt 1977, 324–328). This development is wholly analogous to what we find at a more recent date in the žemaitian dialects of Lithuanian (cf. Aleksandravičius 1957; Grinaveckis 1973, 83–97). Since the new tone movements were incompatible with glottalization, either the tones or the glottalization had to be eliminated in accent paradigms (1) and (3). While glottalization was lost under the stretched tone in paradigms with fixed stress (1), this solution would yield an alternation between stretched tone and glottalization

in paradigms with mobile stress (3). The generalization of glottalization and loss of the stretched tone in paradigms with mobile stress is therefore to be expected. Olander asserts that the generalization of glottalization is unexpected in *o*-stems which are rarely or never used in the plural such as Lavian *ârs* 'open air', *zuôds* 'chin', Lith. *óras, žándas*. In fact, *oraĩ* is quite frequent in Lithuanian, which has preserved pluralia tantum rather than singularia tantum in such instances as *linaĩ* 'flax', *lipaĩ* 'glue', *namaĩ* 'dwelling', *paišaĩ* 'soot', *plaušaĩ* 'bast', also *mėsà* 'meat', Latvian *mìesa*, Prussian *mensā* and *crauyo* 'blood', *sticklo* 'glass', unlike *prassan* 'millet', which is a borrowing from Slavic *proso*. The original meaning of Slavic *męso*, Vedic *māṃsám* is 'piece of meat' rather than simply 'meat'.

In Prussian, the absence of a macron in words of the type *deiws* 'god', acc.sg. *deinan* 'day' may suggest that these were unaccented. It seems to me that no conclusions can be drawn from the absence of a macron. The frequency of these lexemes is in fact an argument against such a conclusion because the orthography of the Enchiridion is particularly consistent in frequent forms, such as *bhe* 'and', the 1st pl. ending *-mai* (101x, no exceptions), *-ck-* in *tickars, tickra, tickran, tickrai, nitickran, entickrikai, tickrōmai, tickrōmien, tickrōmiskan* (16x, 1 exception), *-inn-* in nasal presents with suffixal stress (25x, no exceptions) versus single *-n-* in nasal presents with radical stress (30x, 2 exceptions), etc. Olander rejects my Prussian accent shift without informing his readers how he explains the shifted accent in *semmē, weddē, twaiā, twaiāsmu, swaiāsmu, tennā, tennēismu, tennēison, tennēimans, gennāmans, widdewū, widdewūmans, prakāisnan, dessīmts*, and perhaps in *podīngan, pogālbenikan, pogāunai*, which have a metatonical circumflex (cf. Kortlandt 1974, 302ff.), or how he accounts for the difference between *po-* and *pa-* or between *no* and *na* (cf. Kortlandt 1988, 90f.). Moreover, he does not explain the presence of a macron in the "unaccented word-forms" *mērgan, āntran, āusins, lāiku, lāikumai, kīrdimai*, cf. *mergūmans, antrā, laikūt, kirdīt*.

In Slavic, "unaccented word-forms" are identified with non-desinentially accented word forms of mobile paradigms, which lost the stress to proclitics, prefixes and enclitics, e.g. Russian *zá gorod* 'out of town', *pródal* 'sold', SCr. *zìmūs* 'this winter', and changed an acute into a circumflex root syllable (Meillet's law), e.g. SCr. acc.sg. *glâvu, sîn*, Lith. *gálvą, sū́nų* (3). Olander agrees with my view that the phonetic realization of the "unaccented word-forms" was different from that of "initially accented word-forms" (2006, 112), which implies the existence of a tonal opposition (high versus low?) on initial syllables, as in Vedic and Serbo-Croatian (but not in Tokyo Japanese). Unlike Olander, I think that there was no historical continuity between the Proto-Indo-European prosodic system reflected in Vedic, where the

"unaccented word-forms" were syntactically conditioned variants of high-pitched word forms, and the Proto-Slavic system, which was largely identical with that of modern Serbo-Croatian. Apart from the fact that there is no evidence for "unaccented word-forms" in Baltic (see above), it is difficult to see how accentual mobility could spread in the masc. *o*-stems, e.g. SCr. *zûb* 'tooth', Lith. *žam̃bas*, Gr. *γόμφος*, unless the root-accented forms of accent paradigms (2) and (4) were prosodically identical (cf. Olander 2006, 125f.). Note that in Olander's alleged counter-example Lith. *brangùs* (3) 'dear' for original *brángus* (1), the accentuation remained unchanged in acc.sg. *brángų, brángią,* inst.sg. *brángiu, brángia,* dat.sg. *brángiai,* nom.pl. *brángūs, brángios,* acc.pl. *brángius, brángias,* nom.acc.du. *brángiu, brángi,* which together are probably more frequent than the case forms where the accentuation was actually changed. Thus, we are left with the question: when did the "unaccented word-forms" lose their high-pitched variants? Even if one sticks to Olander's framework, the question remains: when did the "unaccented word-forms" lose their syntactic conditioning?

Olander interprets the Slavic change of acute into circumflex root syllables in mobile accent paradigms (Meillet's law) "as a neutralisation of this opposition in unaccented syllables, i.e. as a phonetic change, not an analogical development" (2006, 114). This cannot be correct because the prosodic merger of acute and circumflex in Slavic was limited to pretonic and post-posttonic syllables. Under the stress and in the first posttonic syllable, the distinctive opposition between acute (glottalized) and non-acute syllables was preserved until the loss of glottalization yielded short vowels with the timbre of the earlier long vowels (cf. Kortlandt 1975 and 1989, passim; Vermeer 1992, 125–130). Unfortunately, Olander does not distinguish between acute and circumflex in non-final syllables and is therefore unable to give an adequate account of the data. As in the case of Latvian, he adduces Slavic **smôrdъ* 'stench' and **tûkъ* 'fat' as alleged singularia tantum against the possibility of an analogical circumflex in mobile accent paradigms. Apart from the fact that I reconstruct nom.sg. **-òs* and inst.sg. **-òH*, as in Russian *včerá* 'yesterday', for the mobile *o*-stems, his argument is invalidated by Lith. *taukaĩ*. I shall not discuss Olander's interpretation of Stang's law (ibidem), which is entirely wrong (cf. Kortlandt 2006).

Olander's biggest mistake is the assumption that there was no distinction between acute (glottalized) and non-acute non-final syllables in Balto-Slavic, in spite of his assertion that "Proto-Balto-Slavic non-final long syllables group with final long syllables containing tautosyllabic PIE **Vh* in attracting the accent by Saussure's Law in pre-Lithuanian" (2006, 126), in opposition to final syllables not containing

tautosyllabic sequences of vowel plus laryngeal. Following his teacher Rasmussen, Olander thinks that the syllabic nuclei of the sequences **V̄*, **VH*, **VRH* and **VD* merged after Hirt's law, "yielding a Proto-Balto-Slavic acute (i.e. long) vowel" (2006, 100). However, like his predecessors (cf. Kortlandt 2005c), Olander does not come up with a single example of an acute lengthened grade vowel. Note that original lengtened grade vowels are reflected as non-acute vowels in Latvian *âbuõls* 'apple', not broken *-uô-*, SCr. *žȅrāv* and Czech *žeráv* 'crane', not short *-av*, Lith. *gėlà* (4) 'pain', *žolẽ* (4) 'grass', *mėsà* (4) 'meat', *bẽrė* 'strewed', *lẽkė* 'flew', *srẽbė* 'sipped', SCr. 1st sg. *dònijeh* 'brought', *ùmrijeh* 'died', *zàklēh* 'swore' with a non-acute long root vowel and without mobile stress, thus reflecting the lengthened grade root vowel and fixed radical stress of the Proto-Indo-European sigmatic aorist, and the etyma which I have listed elsewhere (Kortlandt 1975, 73ff.). It is not true that the accentuation of the sigmatic aorist can be derived from that of the infinitive (thus Olander 2006, 120), as is clear from *dònijeh* beside *nèsti*, which gave rise to a new infinitive *dònijeti*, similarly (Dubrovnik) *rȉjet* beside *rèći* 'to say', rather than the other way round, cf. also *prȅsti* 'to spin', *sjȅći* 'to cut', 3rd sg. aorist *prêde*, *sȉječe*.

As a result of his disregard of non-acute long vowels in Balto-Slavic, Olander gives a mistaken account of Dybo's law, "according to which the accent was advanced from an accented short syllable to a following syllable" (2006, 115), so that "we do not expect the accent to be advanced from a long vowel" (2006, 120). In fact, Dybo already showed 38 years ago (1968) that the accent was advanced from any non-acute long or short vowel in any non-final syllable except initial syllables in mobile accent paradigms. The accent did not shift to final jers, as I have shown in detail elsewhere (Kortlandt 1975, 13–19). "Somewhat surprisingly, the question of the prosodic properties of the syllable which receives the accent by Dybo's Law is often left unmentioned", according to Olander (2006, 124). It is all the more surprising that he does not mention my treatment of the problem (Kortlandt 1975, 32f.; 1989, 53f.).

Now we come to Olander's solution for the rise of Balto-Slavic accentual mobility: "a change of a high tone to a low tone in final short or hiatal syllables" (2006, 133), where the hiatus may or may not have originated from the loss of an intervocalic laryngeal. This is a peculiar development. While the shift of a high tone to the left or to the right is a common phonological change and the loss of a high tone under certain syntactic conditions is attested in Vedic Sanskrit and other languages (including Tokyo Japanese), I do not know any example of phonological loss of a high tone on the basis of its position in a word form. Moreover, this solution does not work, as a comparison

with the developments cited under 2, 3, 4 and 7 above shows. First of all, the oxytonesis must have preceded Hirt's law because accentual mobility was preserved in Slavic **klětъ* 'store-room', **kyjъ* 'stick', **synъ* 'son', **darъ* 'gift', **stanъ* 'stand', cf. Lith. *klétis*, *kū́jis*, *sūnùs*, all of which would have received root stress (1) if the accent had been fixed on the second syllable before Hirt's law. It follows that the oxytonesis cannot be attributed to Saussure's law in Lithuanian and to Dybo's law in Slavic. Besides, the accentuation of most case forms remains unexplained (cf. Olander 2006, 136–160):

Nom.sg. Olander correctly predicts Lith. *lángas* 'window', neuter *šálta* 'cold', *galvà* 'head', fem. *saldì* 'sweet' *duktẽ*, *piemuõ*, but not *žvėrìs* 'beast', *lietùs* 'rain', *arklỹs* 'horse', *piktàsis* 'the angry', where he has to assume analogical developments. It rather appears that the retraction of the accent was prevented by the final **-s* here.

Acc.sg. Olander correctly predicts *lángą*, *žvė́rį*, *lietų*, but not *gálvą* < **-ām* (cf. Kortlandt 2005b, 153f.), *dùkterį*, *pìemenį*.

Gen.sg. Olander assumes an original hiatus in *lángo* < **-ā*, but not in *galvõs*, in spite of the circumflex in both Greek and Lithuanian pointing to **-aHas*, and has to assume analogical developments for *žvėriẽs*, *lietaũs*, *dukteř̃s*, *piemeñs*, also Russian *desjatí* 'ten', etc. It rather appears that the retraction of the accent was prevented by the final **-s* here.

Dat.sg. Olander assumes an original hiatus in *lángui* < **-ōi* and *gálvai* < **-āi*, early haplology in **-eiei*, and analogy for **-euei*.

Inst.sg. Olander posits both a hiatus and a final laryngeal in *lángu* < **-óeH* and *gálva* < **-áHaH-N* in order to account for the combination of retracted stress with an acute ending. This is an arbitrary reconstruction. In my view, the retracted accent points to an earlier ending **-oi* (cf. Kortlandt 2005b, 154). Olander attributes the final stress in *žvėrimì* and *lietumì* to Saussure's law and in their Slavic counterparts to Dybo's law. The latter cannot be correct because Dybo's law did not shift the accent to final jers (cf. Kortlandt 1975, 15).

Loc.sg. Olander assumes regular loss of a high tone in **-oi* but not in **-ēi* and **-ēu* and analogical elimination of the laryngeal in **-āi* for **-aHi*. This seems quite arbitrary to me.

Nom.acc.du. Olander has to assume analogical developments for *lángu*, *žvė́ri*, *sū́nu* and Slavic **sъ̑tě* 'hundred' and posits both a hiatus and a final laryngeal in *gálvi* < **-áHiH* in order to account for the combination of retracted stress with an acute ending. I reconstruct a dual ending **-H_1* for animates and **-i* for inanimates (Kortlandt 1991, 5f.), which yields a retraction from **-oi* in the inanimate *o*-stems and an acute ending for the animates.

Nom.pl. Olander's rules correctly predict *gálvos* and Slavic **sъtà* but yield the wrong output for *langaĩ*, *geŕieji* 'the good', *žvérys*, *sū́nūs*, *dùkteres*, all of which therefore require analogical explanations.

Acc.pl. Olander assumes regular loss of a high tone in the endings of *lángus*, *gálvas*, *žvéris*, *lĩetus* followed by phonetic lengthening of short vowels before **-ns*, allegedly giving rise to glottalization in the final syllable. In my view, the acute ending spread from words with a stem-final laryngeal which was lost before **-m* but not before **-ns*, yielding an alternation between acc.sg. **-ām*, **-īm*, **-ūm* and acc.pl. **-aHns*, **-iHns*, **-uHns*, which was followed by a generalization of the glottalization in the acc.pl. endings (cf. Kortlandt 2005b, 153f.).

Gen.pl. The original gen.pl. ending was **-om*, as in Vedic *asmā́kam*, Latin *nostrum*, Old Norse *vár* 'of us', identical with the neuter ending of the possessive adjective, and regularly developed into Balto-Slavic **-un* in all flexion classes, preceded by the zero grade of a formative suffix (cf. Kortlandt 1978). Olander reconstructs an accented full grade suffix in **-óom*, **-áHom*, **-éiom*, **-éuom*, which forces him to assume analogical developments for Lith. *langų̃*, *galvų̃*, *žvėrių̃*, *lietų̃* and similarly for the Slavic *o*- and *aH*-stems, attributing the final stress in the Slavic *i*- and *u*-stems to Dybo's law. The latter cannot be correct because Dybo's law did not shift the accent to final jers (cf. Kortlandt 1975, 15). I would maintain that the retraction of the accent was prevented by the final nasal consonant in these forms.

Dat.pl. Here again, Olander mistakenly attributes the final stress in Slavic to Dybo's law. In the Slavic *i*- and *u*-stems, the accent was retracted from the endings **-ьmь̀*, **-ъmь̀* to the preceding full vowel because the pretonic medial jer had lost its stressability at the time of the retraction, e.g. Russian *détjam* 'children', *ljúdjam* 'people', as is also clear from Slovene gen.pl. *ọ́vəc* 'sheep' < **ovьcь̀* and *dánəs* 'today' < **dьnьsь̀*. While the regular long rising tone was preserved in the latter instances, it was evidently replaced by the falling tone in the dat.pl. form of the *i*- and *u*-stems on the analogy of the nom.pl. form, as is clear from Slovene *kostệm* 'bones', *možệm* 'men' (the latter of which adopted the accent of the *u*-stems). Note that Stang's law also skipped pretonic medial jers, e.g. SCr. *pȍčnēm* 'I begin', where the thematic vowel had received the stress from the radical jer as a result of Dybo's law (cf. Stang 1957, 115). Contrary to Olander's statement (2006, 155), Slavic **rǫ́čьka* < **rǫčь̀ka* did not receive the accent on the medial jer as a result of Dybo's law but is an analogical formation (cf. Dybo 1968, 158, 177).

Inst.pl. In order to avoid the wrong output in Lith. *langaĩs* < **-ōis*, Olander posits a non-hiatal long vowel here, in spite of the Greek circumflex ending *-οῖς*. I would maintain that the retraction of the accent was prevented by the final **-s* of this ending.

Olander regards the final accentuation of *galvomìs* as analogical and attributes the final stress in *žvėrimìs* and *lietumìs* to Saussure's law and in their Slavic counterparts to Dybo's law. He does not discuss the length of the vowel in the Slavic endings **-ȳ* and **-mī*, e.g. Slovene *stəbrí* 'pillars', *kostmí* 'bones', which is incompatible with the operation of Dybo's law in these forms (cf. Kortlandt 2006). The non-acute stem vowel of Lith. loc.sg. *viẽtoje* 'place', dat.pl. *viẽtoms*, inst.pl. *viẽtomis*, loc.pl. *viẽtose* was taken from the pronoun (cf. Kortlandt 2005a, 68).

Loc.pl. The accentuation of these forms was apparently the same as that of the dat.pl. forms. Note that the Latvian locative represents the illative, not the inessive (cf. Vanags 1994; Kortlandt 2005a).

I shall not discuss the verbal paradigms here but limit myself to the observation that Olander's theory cannot account for the difference in vowel length between SCr. *sjȅći* 'to cut' and *sijèčēm* 'I cut' or between Slovak *mohol* 'could' < **mòglъ* and *niesol* 'carried' < **neslъ*. I conclude that he has not succeeded in deriving the accent patterns of Balto-Slavic mobile paradigms from a "loi phonétique pure et simple" acceptable to the neogrammarians. Le problème reste posé.

BALTŲ IR SLAVŲ KALBŲ KIRČIO MOBILUMAS

Santrauka

Thomas Olanderis nesutinka su tais mano postuluojamais baltų ir slavų kalbų akcentiniais kitimais, kurie priklauso ne tik nuo fonetinių sąlygų, bet ir paradigmos, apimančios paveiktąsias formas, savybių. Jis formuluoja mano vėlyvąjį baltų ir slavų kirčio atitraukimą taip, kad šis apimtų baritonezę, *dùkterį* tipo žodžių kirčio atitraukimą aiškina analogija, o oksitonezę tapatina su Saussure'o dėsniu lietuvių kalboje ir Dybo dėsniu slavų kalbose. Darytina išvada, kad Olanderio aiškinimas nėra pavykęs.

REFERENCES

Aleksandravičius J., 1957, Kirtis ir priegaidė Kretingos tarmėje, – LKK I 97–107.

Bally Ch., 1945, Manuel d'accentuation grecque, Berne.

Beekes R. S. P., 1985, The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection, Innsbruck.

Boer E. de., 2005, The historical development of Japanese pitch accent (Diss., Leiden).

Dybo V. A., 1968, Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom, – Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie: VI meždunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov, Praga, 1968, Moskva, 148–224.

Grinaveckis V., 1973, Žemaičių tarmių istorija, Vilnius.

Kortlandt F., 1974, Old Prussian accentuation, KZ LXXXVIII (2) 299–306.

Kortlandt F., 1975, Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology, Lisse; also www.kortlandt.nl.

Kortlandt F., 1977, Historical laws of Baltic accentuation, – Blt XIII (2) 319–330.
Kortlandt F., 1978, On the history of the genitive plural in Slavic, Baltic, Germanic, and Indo-European, – Lingua, XLV, 281–300.
Kortlandt F., 1985, Slavic *имать*, – International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, XXXI–XXXII, 235–239.
Kortlandt F., 1986, Proto-Indo-European tones?, – JIES XIV 153–160.
Kortlandt F., 1988, Van Wijk's *Altpreussische Studien* revisited, – Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, XII, 89–97.
Kortlandt F., 1989, Od praindoevropskog jezika do slovenskog (fonološki razvoj), – Zbornik za Filologiju i Lingvistiku, XXXII (2) 41–58; English edition: From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic, – www.kortlandt.nl.
Kortlandt F., 1991, A note on the Tocharian dual, – TIES V 5–10.
Kortlandt F., 1992, The Aeolic optative, – Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der 8. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 1987, Innsbruck, 235–239.
Kortlandt F., 1993, The origin of the Japanese and Korean accent systems, – Acta Linguistica Hafniensia, XXVI, 57–65; also www.kortlandt.nl.
Kortlandt F., 1997, Baltic *ē*- and *ī/jā*-stems, – Blt XXXII (2) 157–163.
Kortlandt F., 2004, Indo-Uralic consonant gradation, – Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen, Helsinki, 163–170.
Kortlandt F., 2005a, On the accentuation of the illative, – BF XIV (1) 67–69.
Kortlandt F., 2005b, Holger Pedersen's *Études lituaniennes* revisited, – Blt VI priedas 151–157.
Kortlandt F., 2005c, Noises and nuisances in Balto-Slavic and Indo-European linguistics, – Blt XL (1) 9–11.
Kortlandt F., 2006, From Serbo-Croatian to Indo-European, – Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch, LI, 113–130.
Olander T., 2006, Accentual mobility: The prehistory of the Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms (Diss., Copenhagen).
Pedersen H., 1933, Études lituaniennes, København.
Saussure F. de, 1896, Accentuation lituanienne, – IF VI Anzeiger, 157–166.
Saussure F. de, 1922, Recueil des publications scientifiques, Genève.
Stang Ch. S., 1957, Slavonic accentuation, Oslo.
Vanags P., 1994, Die Entwicklungstendenzen der Kasusendungen in den ältesten lettischen Sprachdenkmälern, – LgB III 121–130.
Vermeer W. R., 1992, In the beginning was the lengthened grade: On the continuity of Proto-Indo-European vowel quantity in Slavic, – Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der 8. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 1987, Innsbruck, 115–136.

Frederik KORTLANDT
Cobetstraat 24
NL–2313 KC Leiden
Holland
[*f.kortlandt@let.leidenuniv.nl*]