

INTRODUCTION

“[...] la fixation d'une chronologie devra être la préoccupation dominante des comparatistes” (Benveniste 1935:2). “La chronologie des faits d'intonation [slaves] ne se laisse pas préciser” (Meillet 1934b:179). The motivation for writing this book lies in the conviction that the former statement is correct whereas the latter can no longer be maintained. The reason why the chronology of the Slavic accentual developments could not be established during the first half of our century must be sought in the fact that the classical doctrine (Belić 1914, Lehr-Splawiński 1917, 1918, Van Wijk 1923), which remained virtually unchallenged until 1957, was based on two untenable principles. One is the assumption that de Saussure's law operated in Slavic. As I have pointed out elsewhere, the law is comparatively recent in Lithuanian and did not even operate in the other Baltic languages. The other principle is the assumption of metatony. In the following chapters I intend to show that there never was any real metatony, in the sense of a substitution of one intonation for another, in Slavic.

The publication of Stang's monograph on Slavic accentuation (1957) marked an era in the study of the subject. The importance of this book can hardly be overestimated. Stang proved that (1) de Saussure's law did not operate in Slavic, (2) the neo-acute is due to a retraction of the ictus from a stressed *jer* or from a non-initial vowel with falling intonation, and (3) the neo-circumflex was not the result of a Common Slavic development. Moreover, he demonstrated that

- (a) the acute is restricted to paradigms with fixed stress,
- (b) the neo-acute is characteristic of paradigms where the next syllable is stressed in other forms, and
- (c) the circumflex occurs on the first syllable of paradigms with final stress in other forms. Thus, the classical doctrine, which aimed at deriving the stress pattern of a paradigm from the intonations of the root vowel and the ending, was replaced by a doctrine which derives the intonation of the root vowel, when accented, from the stress pattern of the paradigm.

Looking back after Stang's discoveries, one cannot but wonder why most scholars stuck to de Saussure's law during such a long period. It is remarkable that Van Wijk, who came closest to the truth in most respects, did not reject the law when chronological discrepancies led him to the assumption that it operated first in the Balto-Slavic period, then in Proto-Slavic, and finally again in the separate Slavic languages.

After Stang's reconstruction of the last stage of Proto-Slavic accentuation, Dybo and Illič-Svityč complemented his findings by reconstructing some of the earlier stages. Their main result is the establishment of a progressive accent shift, which is called Dybo's law in the following chapters. On the basis of this law, the paradigms mentioned under (a) and (b) above can be reduced to a single barytone paradigm. As Dybo pointed out correctly (1962:8), the law requires the existence of three different intonations in the stem at a stage which is by far anterior to the rise of the neo-acute and the neo-circumflex. The latter conclusion was not drawn by Illič-Svityč, who demonstrated on the basis of comparative IE evidence that the law explains the existence of end-stressed nouns in Slavic (1963:160f.). In the same publication Illič-Svityč proved that Kuryłowicz's hypothesis, according to which the Balto-Slavic opposition between fixed stress and accentual mobility is independent of the IE opposition between barytona and oxytona, must be rejected in favour of the classical conception of their historical identity, which was first put forward by de Saussure for Lithuanian. The main deviations from this distribution are explained by Hirt's law, which was reformulated by Illič-Svityč in terms of laryngeals, and by the law which I have called Illič-Svityč's law (cf. below).

Combining Illič-Svityč's connection between Balto-Slavic and IE accentuation, Dybo's progressive accent shift with its implications for Slavic intonation, and Stang's retraction of the stress which gave rise to the neo-acute, Ebeling devised a chronology for the development of Slavic accentuation from IE times up to the end of the Common Slavic period (1967). The present book originated from a critique of Ebeling's article. Retaining the general chronological line, I propose different solutions for a number of details. Moreover, I think that I have found a common motive force for various developments, which become more understandable if they are viewed in connection with the loss of the IE laryngeals. In Chapters 1 and 2 I discuss the main developments before and after the rise of the new timbre distinctions, respectively. Chapter 3 is devoted to the loss of the IE laryngeals

and its significance for the explanation of Slavic accentuation. Some additional problems are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

The historical connection between the Balto-Slavic acute and the IE laryngeals, which is one of the main tenets of this book, was first suggested by Vaillant in 1936. In support of his view Vaillant adduced a number of comparisons between Hittite and Balto-Slavic. Though I subscribe to his idea, I consider the evidence insufficient, not only because I think that the best evidence for laryngeals is not from Hittite, but especially because Vaillant does not discuss the intonation of the lengthened grade in Balto-Slavic. The case for a laryngealist explanation of the Balto-Slavic acute is in fact much stronger, as I try to demonstrate in the following chapters.

This book is not intended as an introduction to the study of Slavic accentuation. Though I think that it can be read without any previous knowledge of the matter, a basic familiarity with the subject is most recommendable in view of the unusual complexity of the problems involved. Besides, I do not discuss the points where I think that Stang, Dybo, Illič-Svityč, or Ebeling have found the correct solution and where I simply adopt their views. The best introduction to Slavic accentuation is still Stang 1957, especially if one starts reading on p. 56 (noun declension). The best exposition of the classical theory is presented in Nonnenmacher-Pribić 1961. A beautiful book of recent date which should not be omitted in this review is Kolesov 1972.

I have to add a few words about the formulation of the laws in the following chapters. In order to facilitate the discussion I have retained the names which are generally connected with certain accentual developments, even if the formulation of the law has considerably changed. This has in some cases led to a possible discrepancy between my statement of the law and its author's original intentions. Following Ebeling (1967:582), I have adopted Illič-Svityč's laryngealist formulation of Hirt's law. Van Wijk's law is stated in terms of quantity rather than intonation. I accept Ebeling's modification of Stang's law in order to account for such cases as Russ. *sádit*, *kúrit*, but *saditsja*, *kuritsja* (cf. also the Middle Bulgarian and Old Russian material in Dybo 1969).

The large amount of details in the following chapters may diminish the transparency of the overall picture. For the sake of convenience I list the main laws of Slavic accentuation here in their chronological order. The bracketed numbers refer to the relevant sections of the book.

1. Loss of IE accentual mobility and establishment of an opposition between barytona and oxytona.
2. Pedersen's law (1.6).
3. Barytonesis (1.6).
4. Oxytonesis (1.2).
5. Hirt's law (1.3).
6. Ebeling's law (1.4).
7. Loss of the IE laryngeals in pretonic and post-posttonic syllables (1.7).
8. Meillet's law (1.7).
9. Illič-Svityč's law (3.4).
10. Pedersen's law and rise of distinctive tone (3.4).
11. Dolobko's law (4.2).
12. Metathesis of liquids in South Slavic and Czecho-Slovak (3.5).
13. Rise of the new timbre distinctions (3.5).
14. Van Wijk's law (3.5).
15. Contractions in posttonic syllables (4.2).
16. Retraction of the ictus from final *jers* (2.3).
17. Dybo's law (1.2, 2.2, 3.6).
18. Lengthening of short falling vowels in monosyllables (2.3).
19. Loss of the laryngeal feature (3.6).
20. Pleophony in East Slavic (3.6).
21. Shortening of long falling vowels (3.6).
22. Stang's law (1.2, 2.4, 3.6).
23. Lengthening of short rising vowels in Czech (2.5).
24. Progressive accent shift in Slovene (3.6).
25. Rise of the neo-circumflex in Slovene.

Finally, I want to thank my colleagues R. S. P. Beekes, C. L. Ebeling, F. B. J. Kuiper, A. H. Kuipers, C. J. Ruijgh, W. R. Vermeer, and F. M. J. Waanders for their criticism of (parts of) the manuscript. Since most of these persons disagree with my views on one point or another, it goes without saying that they cannot in any way be held responsible for the following text. I thank Miss A. Pols and Mrs. I. Bekker-Timofeeva for their help in proof reading and compiling the index. Once again I am indebted to Mr. P. de Ridder for the quick publication of my work.

F.H.H.K.

August 13th, 1974

NOTE ADDED IN PROOF:

On several places in this book reference is made to my article "On the history of Baltic accentuation". I have just received the offprints of this article, proofs of which — contrary to established usage — had not been submitted for correction. It turns out that the abundance of misprints in the text makes the article largely unintelligible. Most subscript diacritics have been omitted. Nasal vowels are never indicated. A few lines are missing in various places. Consequently, the article should be consulted either with the greatest care or not at all. The most important statement in the article, the relative chronology of the Baltic sound laws, has not been affected by this regrettable course of events.