

Frederik KORTLANDT
 Leiden University

ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL

A few years ago, Jasanoff adopted the central tenet of my accentological theory, viz. that the Balto-Slavic acute was a *stod* or glottal stop, not a rising tone (cf. Kortlandt 1975; 1977; 2004; Jasanoff 2004a). Of course, nobody will believe Jasanoff's claim that he arrived at the same result independently thirty years after I published it and ten years after we discussed it when he came to Leiden to visit us. Though at the time he haughtily dismissed "the tangle of secondary hypotheses and "laws" that clutter the ground in the field of Balto-Slavic accentology" (Jasanoff 2004b, 171), he has now recognized the importance of Pedersen's law, Hirt's law, Winter's law, Meillet's law, Dolobko's law, Dybo's law and Stang's law and largely accepted my relative chronology of these accent laws, including the loss of the acute shortly before Stang's law (cf. Jasanoff 2008). He has also accepted my split of Pedersen's law into a Balto-Slavic and a Slavic phase (to which a Lithuanian phase must be added), my thesis that the tonal contours of Baltic and Slavic languages are post-Balto-Slavic innovations (cf. Jasanoff 2008, 344, fn. 10), and the rise of a tonal distinction on non-acute initial syllables before Dybo's law which I discussed at some length in my review (1978) of Garde's monograph (1976). This is great progress.

Though Jasanoff has come a long way in the last few years, he has not yet understood the origin of the Balto-Slavic glottalization, nor the origin of the Baltic and Slavic tonal contours, nor the origin of distinctive vowel length in Slavic. He has not yet understood the exact conditions of Hirt's law, nor of Stang's law, nor of the distribution of the *o*-stems over the accent classes. He evidently has not grasped the basic problem of Proto-Slavic quantity which is central to a correct understanding of the developments and their chronology. Perhaps it is only a matter of time before such insights get through to the Indo-Europeanist scholarly community. A major problem will be that much of the relevant literature is in Baltic and Slavic languages and therefore

not easily accessible to scholars without at least a reading knowledge of these languages. Some news travels slowly.

For the time being, Jasanoff's contribution to our knowledge of Baltic and Slavic accentuation is zero. He calls his recent article "programmatically" (Jasanoff 2008, 339 and 371), which appears to be newspeak for a shot in the dark without calculating the consequences. Following the example of Ebeling's work (1967, 580, cf. Jasanoff 2008, 360), he offers an effort to reformulate Pedersen's law and Dolobko's law as a basic principle generating lateral mobility from stress on medial syllables. He proposes that Pedersen's law "moved the accent one syllable to the left, producing a contrastive intonation on the newly accented syllable" whereas Dolobko's law (in his jargon "Proto-VDL") moved the accent to the final syllable in sequences of four or more syllables when the initial syllable had such a contrastive accent (Jasanoff 2008, 349 and 367f.). There are three strategies to deal with counter-evidence in Jasanoff's methodology: (1) ignore it, (2) assume irregular analogical leveling, (3) propose additional specific rules for specific instances (cf. already Kortlandt 2004). Thus, Jasanoff dismisses "late and productively formed [Lith.] stems in *-imas*, *-inis*, and the like" (p. 349), "a word like Lith. *sūnùkas*" and Slavic **vbdovà* (p. 350), Slavic **vèdǫ* for ***vèdǫ* and **vedetǫ* for ***vèdetǫ* (here I substitute the usual accent marks for Jasanoff's idiosyncratic notation) but Lith. *nèvedame*, *nèvedate* for his expected final stress (p. 367), Slavic **prošǫ*, **pròsitǫ* for his ***pròšǫ*, ***pròsitǫ* (p. 369), similarly in the nasal presents (p. 371), and so on and so forth. He admits that it "is not clear, however, why non-mobile presents are as numerous as mobile presents" in the stative *i*-presents "or how the non-mobile forms came to be accented on the root syllable rather than the endings" (p. 372). He does not mention the word for 'mother', which escaped Meillet's law, and arbitrarily assumes restoration of accentual mobility in the words for 'son' and 'alive', which escaped Hirt's law (p. 353). He simply does not explain the data as we have them. Note that Jasanoff's adaptation of Pedersen's law and Dolobko's law is the exact opposite of Olander's (2006), known to him at least from my publications but not mentioned by him, where Pedersen's law is reformulated as loss of accent on a non-acute final syllable with rise of contrastive tone on the initial syllable and Dolobko's law is reformulated as a part of Dybo's law, which moved the accent one syllable to the right.

The main problem with Jasanoff's reformulation of Pedersen's law as a leftward accent shift is that we would expect a rising tone on the newly ac-

cented syllable, as in SCr. *vòda* ‘water’ < **vodà* (cf. Jasanoff 2008, 348), whereas we actually find a falling tone as its Slavic reflex, e.g. in acc.sg. *vòdu*. Jasanoff’s solution to this problem is that he simply disregards the data, stating that no inference should “be drawn about the nature of the phonetic difference between the left-marginal [retracted] and in situ [unretracted] accents, other than that such a difference existed” (p. 351). The more unspecified distinctions one assumes, the more different forms one can “explain”. Jasanoff reconstructs a Proto-Balto-Slavic prosodic system with nine different possibilities (p. 350f.): short, long acute, and long non-acute syllabic nuclei combined with retracted, unretracted, and no accent. His use of the grave accent mark for the retracted accent is particularly unfortunate because the grave accent is the conventional symbol for a short rising tone in Slavic, where the retracted accent is reflected as a (short or long) falling tone. Jasanoff states that the acute became a rising tone in Slavic (p. 352) without explaining why it did not merge with the other (neo-acute) rising tone. He states that in unstressed syllables “the glottal component of acuteness was lost without a trace” (p. 353) without explaining the rise of the Slovene neo-circumflex.

Jasanoff’s treatment of the Balto-Slavic verb is so full of mistakes that it would be pointless to subject his account to a detailed critique. It is not true that extra-presential forms “tend (at least in Slavic) to derive their accentual properties from the present” (p. 354, fn. 27). Jasanoff ignores the athematic origin of the *i*-flexion (p. 356, cf. Kortlandt 1979; 1987; 1989). It is not true that “the overwhelming majority of athematic presents in Balto-Slavic are conspicuously non-mobile” (p. 358). It is not true that the verb *ei-* ‘go’ had an immobile present in Baltic, as is clear from Latvian (Varakļāni) 1st sg. *èimu*, 2nd sg. *èi*, 3rd *ît* (cf. Kortlandt 1977, 327). The concept of “Narten” present is an outdated phantom (cf. de Vaan 2004). It is not true that the Slavic copula owes its oxytone forms to Dybo’s law (p. 359), as is clear from the long rising vowel in Čakavian and Posavian *jě* ‘is’ (e.g. Jurišić 1973, 24f.). Lith. *nèvedu* does not continue the Balto-Slavic place of the accent (as suggested on p. 363) because the stressed vowel is not lengthened. It is not true that the “word-final accent in Proto-Slavic was non-contrastively falling” (p. 364, fn. 47) because it is rising in the languages which have preserved distinctive tone. It is not true that the Baltic verb **ded-* ‘put’ had an immobile present (p. 372, fn. 61). It is not true that aorists of Slavic verbs with mobile presents have “originally accented endings in the sigmatic forms” (p. 373).

Jasanoff even goes so far as to invent his own “data” in order to support his ill-conceived proposal, positing a Slavic paradigm of the present participle with end-stressed masc. acc.sg. ***vedǫtjb* and gen.sg. ***vedǫtjà* (p. 361) for which there is simply no evidence whatsoever. Contrary to Jasanoff’s statement, Lithuanian does not have the accent “on the root syllable in the longer forms” but shows the regular accent patterns (1) and (3) with final stress in such forms as gen.pl. *vedančiū*, loc.sg. *vedančiamè*, *vedančiojè*, loc. pl. *vedančiuosè*, *vedančiosè*, fem. nom.sg. *vedañti*, dat.pl. *vedančiõms*, with recent transfer to accent class (1) in the standard language (e.g. Endzelynas 1957, 201ff.; Zinkevičius 1981, 149). There is an older pattern in both East and West Baltic with nom.sg. **esints* ‘being’, **eints* ‘going’, other cases **sent-*, **jent-* (cf. Kortlandt 2000, 71), corresponding to Latin *iens*, *eunt-* from Indo-European **eints*, acc.sg. **ientm*, gen.sg. **intos* (cf. Beekes 1985, 70). It follows that Lith. *édqs* ‘eating’, *duodqs* ‘giving’ replace earlier **édints*, **dédints*, adopting the suffixal accentuation of the stem form **dent-*, **d̃dont-*. The original accentuation of the masc. and fem. nom.sg. forms has been preserved in the Slavic gerund, e.g. Old Russian *stója* and *stojací* ‘standing’ (cf. Stang 1957, 140).

It will take some more time before Jasanoff will be in a position to make a contribution to the study of Balto-Slavic accentuation. The good news is that he has now understood the importance of at least some of the previous work in the field, even if he is reluctant to acknowledge his debt to earlier scholarship.

VISKAS YRA GERAI, KAS BAIGIASI GERAI

Santrauka

Nors Jasanoffas pastaraisiais metais yra toli nuėjęs, jo įnašas į baltų ir slavų kirčiavimo mokslą yra nulinis. Gerai, kad jis bent iš dalies suprato ankstesnių akcentologijos darbų svarbą, net jeigu ir nėra linkęs pripažinti remiąsį pirmtakų tyrimais.

REFERENCES

Beekes, Robert S.P. 1985, *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Ebeling, Carl L. 1967, Historical laws of Slavic accentuation, in *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, The Hague: Mouton, 577–593.

Endzelynas, Janis 1957, *Baltų kalbų garsai ir formos*, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Garde, Paul 1976, *Histoire de l'accentuation slave*, Paris: Institut d'études slaves.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2004a, Acute vs. circumflex: Some notes on PIE and post-PIE prosodic phonology, in *Per aspera ad asteriscos* [Fs. Rasmussen], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 247–255

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2004b, Balto-Slavic accentuation: telling news from noise, *Baltistica* 39(2), 171–177.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2008, The accentual type **vèdō*, **vedeti* and the origin of mobility in the Balto-Slavic verb, *Baltistica* 43(3), 339–379.

Jurišić, Blaž 1973, *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade 2: Rječnik*, Zagreb: JAZU.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1975, *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*, Lisse: Peter de Ridder; also www.kortlandt.nl

Kortlandt, Frederik 1977, Historical laws of Baltic accentuation, *Baltistica* 13(2), 319–330.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1978, A history of Slavic accentuation: Review of Garde 1976, *Lingua* 44(1), 67–91.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1979, Toward a reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic verbal system, *Lingua* 49(1), 51–70.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1987, The formation of the Old Prussian present tense, *Baltistica* 23(2), 104–111.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1989, Lithuanian *statyti* and related formations, *Baltistica* 25(2), 104–112.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2000, Old Prussian participles, *Res Balticae* 6, 69–75.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2004, Balto-Slavic accentuation: Some news travels slowly, *Baltistica* 39(1), 13–17.

Olander, Thomas 2006, *Accentual mobility: The prehistory of the Balto-Slavic mobile accent paradigms*, Diss. Copenhagen.

Stang, Christian S. 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Vaan, Michiel de 2004, 'Narten' roots from the Avestan point of view, in *Per aspera ad asteriscos* [Fs. Rasmussen], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 591–599.

Zinkevičius Zigmās 1981, *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika 2*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Frederik KORTLANDT

Cobetstraat 24

NL–2313 KC Leiden

Holland

[f.kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl]