

E. P. HAMP

THE ACCENTUATION OF LITHUANIAN COMPOUND VERBS

The inventory of verb types and classes which, when compounded, show accent mobility or not and which assign such mobility to specific tense formations or not has been carefully studied. But a satisfactory explanation as to how this repartition of paradigms may have arisen has not to my knowledge been given. I propose in this paper to suggest a plausible origin; secondly, the result of such an explanation is then seen to have important implications for the entire history of Indo-European, and to link up with an hypothesis which I outlined in an oral paper before the Linguistic Society of America in December 1970.

At the time that I delivered that paper I had assembled some evidence which I thought led in the direction that I outline in the final result below. But the searching criticism of my friend Warren Cowgill forced me to realize that the data for Lithuanian on which I based my argument were incomplete, or at any rate inadequate. Because I was dealing with evidence drawn from all branches of Indo-European at that time, I had contented myself in the preparation of my paper with taking my Lithuanian material from Leskien. It then became clear that Leskien's brief examples were inadequate, and perhaps even wrong in certain instances; it consequently became obvious that I must base myself upon better materials, and that the work of a sophisticated native scholar of Lithuanian would be the only likely way to avoid the risk of error and heterogeneous source material. Therefore, when I say above that the inventory of the phenomena which interests us has been carefully studied and set forth, we must immediately qualify that estimate with respect to the learned literature of even the highest authority and quality.

As a result, I have found the clearest and most complete accessible account of these phenomena in Pr. Skardžius's book on Lithuanian accentuation, and it is from that that I cite below. For purposes of oral presentation I omit examples of each class discussed, since the broad plan of the facts is in general known and the specific illustrations can be consulted by the interested scholar at greater leisure that the consideration of such material demands. Besides, I wish to invite experts who are closer to the source material than I am to examine the precision

and accuracy of the membership of the relevant inventories and to consider especially the problem of dialect variation; only then will we arrive at a solid and final account of the basic data which is necessary for a theory with such far-reaching implications. Secondly, I wish in this paper to focus upon the essentials of the accentual configurations so as to make clear the essence of my argument and to put the salient points in bold relief.

Briefly, the descriptive facts are as follows: In Lithuanian, compound verbs, unlike simplexes, not only must be classed as (im)mobile (acuted or non-acuted etc.) but also as (non-) retracting with respect to tense (preterite). The problem is to find specifically what engendered these correlations. A compact and characteristically meticulous statement of the general categories is to be found in Stang VGBS 449–51, 459. Although certain of these class-based accentual oppositions must go back to IE, especially as F. H. H. Kortlandt has recently argued, it does not seem in particular that an IE source can be found for the tense-governed (non-) retraction inhering in the verbal base or suffix itself, as Stang's argument (VGBS 474, 478, 480–2) must imply. I proceed, then, to take up the specific categories of behaviour relevant to our problem which characterize the verbal complex (i. e. including compound verbs).

1. The accentual behaviour of the reflexive *-si* is important for our overall theory, and we begin with it. Descriptively, *-si* attracts the accent whenever a non-acuted preverb precedes. This attraction makes it clear that we must explain the retraction which is observed with preverbs more generally than merely by the identity of classes of verb bases and by the properties of preverbs as such. Of course, the presence of *-si* in the position after the preverb is not originally a property of the verbal complex as such, but is a fossilized inheritance of a rule of sentence word order commonly called Wackernagel's Law; for other relics in Baltic of this rule as applied to the reflexive, see Endzelīns CPMBL (1971) 247 § 405. One also wonders whether perhaps an analogy on this attraction has not aided in the generalization of the attraction to suffixed *-si*, discussed carefully by Stang VGBS 478ff.

Although the retraction observed in some presents, e. g. *pasikeičia*, *atsigręžia*, is to be attributed originally to *-si-*, this could have formed a productive model whereby dialectal non-reflexive *pàkeičia àtgręžia* etc. may be explained.

This behaviour of *-si-*, regardless of its sentence origin in the context of Wackernagel's Law, established the valuable principle that (when the accent retracts) it is the inside, or rightmost, preverbal element that carries the accent. We shall have cause to revert to this principle later when we see that there are cases in which we cannot attribute retraction simply to the identity or position of the preverb proper.

2. There are, of course, well known immobile bases (or stems); these are set forth by Skardžius in his § 1 and § 5 of the relevant section. We have here to do with acuted syllables and polysyllables. It is well known that acuted roots could always find an explanation for their behaviour as having earlier (and descriptively, in generative terms) attracted the accent from a preceding non-acute by Saussure's Law as is mentioned by Stang VGBS 449. Thus, acuted preterites (within the framework of our present argument) may always freely be assumed to have been earlier, and to be underlyingly, *prefix-accented.

This same observation also accounts for *pér-* keeping the accent; i. e. it failed to move by Saussure's Law, and this immobility was subsequently generalized to the present tense forms.

3. Stems in *-ā-* are well known to be immobile (Skardžius § 2). Here the immobility in the preterite might be supposed to be modelled on the present, but that is a weak argument. See below, after our full argument becomes clear, for a preferable view.

4. An *a*-stem with a base in $e\tilde{R}$ is mobile when it shows a matching preterite in $i\tilde{R}$ (Skardžius § 2). We may assume that this generalization rested on and originated in the old parallelism of syllable type in the two tenses, even though the $i\tilde{R}$ stem now forms an *ā*-preterite. Therefore the observed mobility in the present would have followed an original mobility characterizing the preterite.

It further appears that a *dvigarsinė* circumflex with a corresponding *-ėjo* preterite follows this same type (Skardžius § 3). One may ask here whether the entire membership of this class consists of bases of the form $a\tilde{R}$.

5. The presents of short vowel bases are mobile (Skardžius § 1). Parallel to the situation seen in (4) above, this could have arisen because these presents often match their preterites in vocalism.

6. Circumflected presents with affixes (*-sta, -n-*) – „charakterisierte Verba“ in Stang's terms (VGBS 449) – are immobile (Skardžius § 3). This is noteworthy and an interesting morphological motivation. Presumably if the stem is a marked present it is immobile. This means that mobility had taken on a role of being automatic and non-distinctive under certain conditions in the present tense, whereby with the attachment of an affix it could be dispensed with. In other words, we see here evidence for the non-distinctive spread of mobility in the present which has been proposed above in (4) and (5).

7. Circumflected presents in *ja* and *i* are immobile (Skardžius § 4), whereas circumflected disyllabic preterites in *é* are mobile. I have already remarked in my paper for the June 1975 conference in Stockholm on the archaic and residual cha-

racter which I see as inhering in the \bar{e} -preterite; that is to say, we may expect to find this preterite type conserving more archaic traits, *ceteris paribus*.

I submit that, after the other factors mentioned have been taken into consideration, the above taxonomy shows that the present formation is fundamentally immobile, while the preterite (when not somehow derived) is fundamentally mobile, i. e. retracting.

It is immediately clear that this retraction cannot be motivated merely by the preverb. The accent must therefore be retracted by some attracting element which we shall label abstractly {PAST}. The sequential position of this element is established by the behaviour already discussed in (1) for *-si*. Hence we arrive at the abstract, and reconstructed, structural formulation

*Preverb + PAST + Verb

Now, what was the phonological character of PAST? It must have once had a segmental constitution that was readily absorbed by neighbouring segments. Therefore a single non-high vowel would be most likely; a high vowel might be expected to have combined to form diphthongs in Baltic, thereby leaving traces which we do not seem to see. Note, moreover, that all preverbs point phonologically to "word-final" shortening — hence the prevailing grave accentuation. Thus, too, **prō pō* etc. might have given early *pra pa* etc. Under these circumstances an adjacent **e* or **o* could easily have been absorbed.

I therefore choose **e* for the manifestation of PAST, and I identify this with the well known augment (AUG) known from Greek, Armenian, Phrygian, and Indo-Iranian, and from the sentence particle *a* of Luwian.

Even though **e* emerges here semantically as PAST (as the abstract label is intended to suggest) in Baltic, I have argued in my 1970 paper above referred to, and I still claim, that the original role of AUG in IE was not simply that of 'past' or 'narrative' or the like, as has been generally claimed. An important, and quite abstractly syntactic, function of AUG was — following Wackernagel's masterly observation — to accompany short verb forms; specifically, I claim that AUG provided a segmental basis for the attachment of a word-accent whereby monosyllabic verb forms in principal clauses could be distinguished phonetically as enclitic, in conformity with the well known Vedic and IE rule of sentence accent. AUG was, in one of its functions, if you like, a crutch for enclisis.

This hypothesis of mine has two important implications for the interpretation of the Baltic facts: This accentual role of AUG in IE explains why in Lithuanian the accent retracts in the preterite (not fundamentally in the present), and not vice versa. It further suggests why \bar{a} -preterites fail to retract the accent: Because they were derived, and hence phonologically longer polysyllabic, forms they

failed to carry the AUG from the beginning. They thus inversely confirm the monosyllabism which I claim was originally associated with AUG.

Quite apart from our interest in explaining some intricate Lithuanian and Baltic phenomena, the importance of this finding for Indo-European is obvious. It has often been asserted – indeed it is the prevailing view – that AUG in the shape of **e* was a dialectally restricted feature of IE. Of course, it is not without significance that Indo-Iranian on the one hand and Greek and Armenian on the other, each of which show features unifying them as late dialectal groups within IE, are marked off as continuing the use of AUG in something like its old function. Myles Dillon has shown that Old Irish *no*, the "empty" preverb that is preposed to all secondary tenses, is old, is to be equated with the Hittite sentence particle *nu*, and is the functional equivalent of AUG. In my 1970 paper I have shown also that the Albanian "reflexive pronoun" *u-* which marks specifically the preterite of middle voice inflexion must go back to **e-ue-*, i. e. AUG + REFLEXIVE (s)*ue*. Thus Albanian conceals, wrapped up with the reflexive pronoun in complementation with middle endings, a trace of AUG too. This Albanian evidence is interesting also in being one more fact binding it closely with Baltic and Slavic; not only do we find the shared evidence of **e* but also Albanian seems to hint at the clue to the replacement of middle voice inflexion by the reflexive pronoun, which was carried through completely in Baltic and Slavic.

As IE branches showing a reflex of AUG, I therefore propose that we now add to Indo-Iranian, Helleno-Armenian, Phrygian, Celtic, and Albanian the Baltic group on the basis of the evidence reviewed above. I further propose that this feature gives us a strong element to serve as an isogloss marking off the classically known IE languages from the Anatolian group, where *a* and *nu* function as sentence particles not yet bound up in the syntax of the verbal complex. The latter development would be a common innovation of the conventional "IE" languages. Therefore, the Baltic and Albanian evidence provides valuable testimony towards a new understanding of the so-called Indo-Hittite hypothesis.

SMULKMENOS

II

On the Baltic verbal ending *-ki*

V. Pisani, *Paideia* 18, 1963, 220, reports Топоров and Трубачёв (Лингвистический анализ гидронимов верхнего Поднепровья, Москва, 1962) as showing that Lithuanian *-k* (*dúo-k*) and Russian *-ka* (*daj-ka*) come from