

Bonifacas STUNDŽIA

*Vilnius University***DOMINANCE AS AN ACCENTUAL (PROSODIC)  
PROPERTY OF MORPHEMES\***

The term *dominance / domination* (Fr. *dominance / domination*, Germ. *Dominanz, Domination, Dominierung*) has a relatively long tradition of usage in linguistics. It has been and is still used in various meanings, sometimes lacking precision (cf. Gołąb et al. 1986, 130). The primary meaning of this term seems to be connected with the domination of one element or some elements as compared with any other element(s) in opposition, e.g.: vowels dominate consonants in syllables, X dominates Y in tree diagrams, left nodes are dominant in ‘left-dominant’ feet (see Knobloch 1986; Crystal 2008, 155f.), etc.

It seems that Louis Hjelmslev was the first to introduce *dominance* to morphology, giving the term a narrower meaning. He considers dominance to be one of the functions of morphemes that establish correlations, the members of which are in relation of complementary distribution (“*Dominance = fonction qui établit une corrélation. Les membres d’une telle corrélation sont complémentaires*”, Hjelmslev 1959[1938], 163), e.g. the Lith. nominal suffix *-imas* dominates the allomorph *-ymas* because the latter is added only to the nouns derived from *-yti*, *-o*, *-ė* verbs, cf. *buvimas* (↔ *bùvo*, *búti*), *keliãvimas* (↔ *keliãvo*, *keliãuti*) and *sãkymas* (↔ *sãkė*, *sãko*, *sakýti*).

Jerzy Kuryłowicz interprets morphological dominance as a phenomenon characteristic of affixes that **determine** the phonetic shape of the root of a word, causing apophony or assimilation in it (see Kuryłowicz 1960[1938], 60ff.). The Lith. nominal ending *-is* causes apophony in the root of paradigmatic derivatives, cf. *šũk-is* and *šãũk-ti*, *šãũk-ia*, *šãũk-ė* (cf. Urbutis 1978, 230f.; <sup>2</sup>2009, 272). In the North Žemaitian Telšiai

---

\* I am obliged to Professor William R. Schmalstieg, dr. Birutė Ryvitytė and Jayde Will for the corrections of this text.

subdialect, the closed (narrow) or half-open character of high stem vowels /i/ and /u/ depends on the quality of the vocalism of endings (the so-called assimilation of vowels, or vowel harmony), cf. e.g. nom. sg. *kinis* and gen. sg. *kē-ne* ‘nest’; acc. pl. *mùsis* and nom.sg. *mòsēs* ‘fly’ (Girdenis 1962). In this case, endings dominate roots. However in agglutinative languages, roots dominate suffixes because of the fact that the vocalism of the suffixes is determined by root vocalism (this phenomenon is called vowel harmony, cf. Bußmann 2008, 782; Gołąb et al. 1986, 132). Thus, Kuryłowicz interprets dominance as a phenomenon of morphonological influence of some morphemes upon other morphemes: e.g. suffixes exert influence on the roots of derivatives or derived forms causing alternations in them. Kuryłowicz’s morphonological dominance of affixes can be interpreted as a phenomenon parallel to valency, which is characteristic mostly of verbs determining the behaviour of subjects and objects in a sentence<sup>1</sup>.

Paul Garde has introduced *dominance* to accentology as a term for the accentual power of suffixes (Garde 1976; 1980; in the earlier version of his theory, Garde used the term *accentual power*, Fr. *force accentuelle* [Garde 1968], in the meaning of the later term *accentuation*). Garde treats *dominance* as an accentual property of derivational suffixes, which neutralises the accentual properties of base stems. Therefore, the placement of stress in derivatives is predetermined exclusively by dominant suffixes, which are classified into auto-accented, pre-accented and post-accented. *Dominance* is used by Andrej Zaliznjak (e.g. 1985, 35f.) and Werner Lehfeldt (e.g. 2003, 64ff.; 2006, 91ff.) in a similar way, while Dybo in this case uses the term *categorical accent* (kategorial’nyj akcent) (see Dybo 2000, 9), and interprets *dominance* as Garde’s *accentuation* (see footnote 1).

Garde, Lehfeldt, Zaliznjak and other accentologists interpret *dominance* (or *categorical accent* in the case of Dybo) as a syntagmatic phenomenon which determines the place of the stress of derivatives, while Aleksas Girdenis (1985; 1994; 1997; 2005; 2006) first of all emphasizes the paradigmatic character of *dominance* (*relative accentual value* according

---

<sup>1</sup> Vladimir Dybo uses the term *accentual valency* (akcentnaja valentnost’) distinguishing between dominant (+) vs. recessive (–) morphemes in the meaning of Garde’s *accentuation* covering accented vs. non-accented morphemes (see Dybo 1981, 260ff.; 2000, 11ff.).

to his terminology), distinguishing between strengthening and weakening suffixes in nominal derivation. Girdenis' classification is based on the effect dominant suffixes have on the *accentuation*, i.e. the paradigmatic accentual property, of base stems. Antanas Pakerys (2008, 28), on the contrary, argues that "the classification of nominal suffixes into strengthening and weakening ones should be based on the effect these suffixes make on the stems of the derivatives rather than on the stems of the base words" (for more about different interpretations of *dominance* see Rinkevičius 2010, 13–20). The strengthening suffixes are then classified into strong (accented), weak (non-accented) and neutral (their relation to stress depends on the *accentuation* of base stems) according to the *place of stress*, a syntagmatic accentual property (see Girdenis, op. cit.).

The author of this paper (Stundžia 1995, 15f.) develops Kuryłowicz's conception of *dominance* as a morphonological influence of suffixes over base stems by adding metatony to the phenomena, for which dominant affixes are responsible, thus distinguishing between metatonic and non-metatonic non-accented (weak) affixes.

This paper is an attempt to show that by understanding *prosodic dominance* as a morphonological property of affixes, which influences all prosodic properties of base stems (i.e. *place of stress*, *tone*, and *accentuation*) and thus determines the prosodic shape of derivatives, and by taking into account both syntagmatic and paradigmatic aspects of dominance, a scholar is able to carry out a more thorough investigation of the history of accentuation systems.

All languages with free stress and a paradigmatic accentual system possess two accentual properties that are characteristic of all morphemes, i.e. *place of stress* and *accentuation*. As far as Lithuanian is concerned, we need *tone* as a property of stem morphemes with a long stressed syllable. The *place of stress* and *tone* are syntagmatic accentual properties, while in the case of root or stem *accentuation* is a paradigmatic accentual property. Dominant affixes exert influence upon all accentual properties, i.e. *place of stress*, *tone* and *accentuation*. The influence on *place of stress* and *tone* of a base stem can be illustrated by the Lith. paradigmatic derivatives<sup>2</sup> *vasāris* 2

---

<sup>2</sup> Or inflectional derivatives (Lith. *galūnių vediniai*) according to Lithuanian linguistic tradition (see Urbutis 1978, 283ff.; 2009, 333ff.).

‘February’ ⇔ *vāsara* 1 ‘summer’ and *puōdžius* 2 ‘potter’ ⇔ *púodas* 1 ‘pot’. In these cases the influence of dominant affixes has been realised on a syntagmatic level: the first derivative is characterised by the shift of stress one syllable further, i.e. to the penultimate syllable, with the second derivative having undergone circumflex metatony, while accented roots of base words remain accented also in derivatives. There are also derivatives with double dominance, i.e. including the change of *accentuation* of the base stem as well, e.g. *piemēnė* 2 ‘shepherdess’ ⇔ *piemenį* (acc.sg.), *piemuō* 3<sup>a</sup> ‘shepherd’ (the stress has shifted one syllable further, i.e. to the penultimate syllable, and the non-accented base stem has become accented in the derivative), *vilké* 1 ‘she-wolf’ ⇔ *vil̃kas* 4 ‘wolf’ (acute metatony and change of non-accented base stem to the accented one in the derivative).

The influence of dominant affixes upon *accentuation*, a paradigmatic property of base stems, is realised in two ways.

1. Non-accented base stems are substituted for accented ones in derivatives (a), while accented base stems do not change their property (b), e.g.: a) *bėrnas* 3 ⇔ *bėrniškas*, -a 1, *vil̃kas* 4 ⇔ *vil̃kiškas*, -a 1; b) *výras* 1 ⇔ *výriškas*, -a 1, *miėstas* 2 ⇔ *miėstiškas*, -a 1. The *place of stress* and *tone* of base stems are preserved in the derivatives, while non-accented base stems of *bėrnas* and *vil̃kas* have become accented in the derivatives in question.
2. Accented base stems are substituted for non-accented ones in derivatives (a), while non-accented base stems do not change their property (b), e.g.: a) *ámžius* 1 ⇔ *ámžinas*, -à 3<sup>a</sup>, *šiùkšlė* 2 ⇔ *šiùkšlinas*, -à 3<sup>b</sup>; b) *mėšlas* 3 ⇔ *mėšlinas*, - à 3<sup>a</sup>, *laikas* 4 ⇔ *laikinas*, -à 3<sup>b</sup>. The *place of stress* and *tone* of the base stem have been preserved in the derivatives, while accented base stems of *ámžius* and *šiùkšlė* have become non-accented in the derivatives in question. Besides, there are derivatives with double dominance, i.e. including the change of tone as well, e.g. *ántis* 1 ‘duck’ ⇔ *añtinas* 3<sup>b</sup> ‘drake’.

As stated above, the influence of the suffix *-iškas*, -a is realised by substituting non-accented base stems for accented base stems in derivatives in standard Lithuanian. On the basis of data taken from old writings and dialects, it is evident that the dominant character of suffix *-iškas*, -a is an innovation, cf. Old and dialectal Lith. *výriškas*, -a 1 ⇔ *výras* 1, *miėstiš-*

*kas*, -a 1 ⇔ *miėstas* 2 (accented stems both in base words and derivatives) and *bėrniėskas*, -à 3<sup>a</sup> ⇔ *bėrnas* 3, *viėkiėskas*, -à 3<sup>b</sup> ⇔ *viėkas* 4 (non-accented stems both in base words and derivatives). On the syntagmatic level, the accentuation of derivatives follows the basic accentuation rule, i.e. stress falls on the first accented morpheme. When all morphemes are non-accented, stress falls on the first (i.e. root) morpheme. On the paradigmatic level, or, as far as the accentual property *accentuation*, or *accentual power*, of stems is concerned, it seems that the accentuation of derivatives has been based on the accentuation of base words (cf. Girdenis 1971).

According to Aleksas Girdenis, suffixes did not receive stress in Old Lithuanian (and most probably in Baltic) nominal accentuation, and it was de Saussure's Law that shifted stress from circumflex or short stems to the adjacent acute suffixes<sup>3</sup>, e.g. Old Lith. \**lapuotas*, -ā 1 (⇔ \**lapas* 1) → \**lapuotas*, -ā́ 1 → modern Lith. *lapuotas*, -a 1. Contrary to Girdenis, Vladimir Dybo reconstructs two classes of suffixes, characteristic of Proto-Slavic, Balto-Slavic and Baltic accentuation. The behaviour of the suffixes of the first class corresponds to the reconstruction by Girdenis, while the suffixes of the second class receive stress in cases when base stems are non-accented, cf. Old Lith. *tėviėkė* 1 ⇔ *tėvas* 1, *dvėriėškis* ⇔ *dvėras* 2 (accented stems both in base words and derivatives) and *berniėkė* 2 ⇔ *bėrnas* 3, *namiškis*, -ė 2 ⇔ *namaĩ* 4 (accented stems in derivatives vs. non-accented stems in base words). On the syntagmatic level, the accentuation of derivatives with the second class suffixes (according to Dybo's terminology) follows the basic accentuation rule, i.e. stress falls on the first accented morpheme, while on the paradigmatic level, non-accented base stems are in contrast with accented stems of derivatives. The accented character of stems of derivatives is predetermined by the suffix *-iėkis*, *-ė*, the dominance of which is manifested on the paradigmatic level. The dominance in this case seems to be an innovation as well, and it has a connection with the development of accentuation of *-iĵo*, *-ē* stem derivatives in general. As far as pairs of suffixes ending in hard and soft consonants are concerned (cf. *-iėkas*, *-a* and *-iėkis*, *-ė*, *-inas*, *-a* and *-inis*, *-ė*, etc.), it has to be said that the 'hard' suffixes are more archaic than the 'soft' ones. The origin

<sup>3</sup> A more correct formulation would be as follows: the stress shifted from circumflex or short stem syllable to the adjacent acute syllable of the suffix.

and development of the two types of dominance, i.e. paradigmatic and syntagmatic dominance, will be the topic of my next article. This time I wanted to draw attention to different interpretations of dominance as an accentual (prosodic) property of morphemes, as well as to the importance of distinguishing between syntagmatic and paradigmatic aspects of dominance both from the synchronic and diachronic point of view.

## DOMINACIJA KAIP AKCENTINĖ (PROZODINĖ) MORFEMŲ SAVYBĖ

### *Santrauka*

Terminas *dominacija* kalbotyroje vartojamas iš seno įvairiomis reikšmėmis ir ne visada preciziškai. P. Garde'as, įvedęs šį terminą į akcentologiją, dominaciją supranta kaip afiksų (paprastai priesagų) sintagminę akcentinę savybę, neutralizuojančią pamatinio kamieno akcentines savybes ir sąlygojančią vedinio kirčio vietą, tuo tarpu A. Girdenis, vartojantis platesnės reikšmės terminą *santykine akcentologinė vertė*, pirmiausia pabrėžia paradigmą dominacijos pobūdį (plg. jo skiriamas stiprinančiąsias ir silpninančiąsias vardažodžių darybos priesagas, keičiančias pamatinio kamieno akcentinę vertę).

Šio straipsnio autorius, plėtodamas J. Kuryłowicziaus idėjas, anksčiau yra išdėstęs platesnį požiūrį į akcentinę, tiksliau – prozodinę, dominaciją kaip morfonologinę afiksų savybę daryti įtaką visoms pamatinio kamieno prozodinėms savybėms, t. y. *kirčio vietai*, *priegaidei* ir *akcentuacijai*. Dominacijos įtaką pamatinio kamieno *kirčio vietai* ir *priegaidei* rodo tokie lietuvių kalbos galūnių vediniai kaip *vasāris 2* ⇔ *vāsara 1* ir *puōdžius 2* ⇔ *púodas 1* (pirmo vedinio kirtis yra pasislinkęs iš pradinio skiemens į penultimą, o antras vedinys yra patyręs cirkumfleksinę metatoniją). Dominacinių afiksų poveikis pamatinio kamieno *akcentuacijai* (*akcentinei vertei* / *galiai*) yra dvejopas: 1) nekirčiuoti (silpnieji) pamatiniai kamieniai vediniuose tampa kirčiuoti (stiprieji), o 2) kirčiuoti pamatiniai kamieniai, atvirkščiai, vediniuose tampa nekirčiuoti, plg.: *vīlkas 4* (nekirčiuotas kamienas) ir *vīlkiškas, -a 1* (kirčiuotas kamienas), *āmžius 1* (kirčiuotas kamienas) ir *āmžinas, -à 3<sup>a</sup>* (nekirčiuotas kamienas). Priesagos *-iškas, -a* dominacinis pobūdis laikytinas inovacija, plg. sen. ir tarm. lie. *vīlkas 4* ir *vīlkiškas, -à 3<sup>b</sup>* (ir pamatinis, ir išvestinis kamieniai yra nekirčiuoti). Vediniai šiuo atveju kirčiuojami pagal pagrindinę kirčiavimo taisyklę: kirtį gauna pirmoji (kirčiuota / stiprioji) morfema (sintagminis aspektas), tuo tarpu paradigminiu lygmeniu vedinių kirčiavimas greičiausiai yra buvęs grindžiamas pamatinių žodžių kirčiavimu.

Kreipiant dėmesį ne tik į sintagminį, bet ir paradigmą afiksų prozodinės dominacijos vaidmenį galima visapusiškiau išnagrinėti kirčiavimo sistemų raidą.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bußmann, Hadumod (Hrsg.) 2008, *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*, 4. Auflage unter Mitarbeit von Hartmut Lauffer, Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner.

Crystal, David 2008, *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*, 6th ed., Oxford: Blackwell.

Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič 1981, *Slavjanskaja akcentologija. Opyt rekonstrukcii sistemy akcentnykh paradigm v praslavjanskom*, Moskva: Nauka.

Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič 2000, *Morfonologizovannye paradigmatičeskie akcentnye sistemy. Tipologija i genezis 1*, Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Garde, Paul 1968, *L'accent*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

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

Garde, Paul 1980, *Grammaire russe 1: Phonologie. Morphologie*, Paris: Institut d'études slaves.

Girdenis, Aleksas 1962, Balsių asimiliacijos reiškiniai Tirkšlių tarmėje, *Kalbotyra* 4, 141–150.

Girdenis, Aleksas 1971, Lietuvių kalbos vardažodžio priesagų kirčio susiformavimas, *Baltistica* 1 priedas, 66–72.

Girdenis, Aleksas 1985, Akcentuacija, in Vytautas Ambrazas (red.), *Grammatika litovskogo jazyka*, Vilnius: Mokslas, 61–68 (= Girdenis 1994; <sup>4</sup>2005; 1997; <sup>2</sup>2006).

Girdenis, Aleksas 1994, <sup>4</sup>2005, Kirčiavimas, in Vytautas Ambrazas (red.), *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, Vilnius: MEL(I), 49–53.

Girdenis, Aleksas 1997, <sup>2</sup>2006, Accentuation, in Vytautas Ambrazas (ed.), *Lithuanian Grammar*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 77–83.

Gołąb, Zbigniew, Adam Heinz, Kazimierz Polański 1968, *Słownik terminologii językoznawczej*, Warszawa: PAN.

Hjelmslev, Louis 1959[1938], Essai d'une théorie des morphèmes, in Idem, *Essais linguistiques*, Copenhagen: Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag, 153–164.

Knobloch, Johann (Hrsg.) 1986, *Sprachwissenschaftliches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy 1960[1938], Struktura morfemu, in Idem, *Esquisses linguistiques*, Wrocław, Kraków: Wydawnictwo PAN, 51–65.

Lefel'dt, Verner 2006, *Akcent i udarenie v russkom jazyke*, Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury (translation of Lefeldt 2003).

Lefeldt, Werner 2003, *Akzent und Betonung im Russischen*, München: Verlag Otto Sagner (Russian translation: Lefel'dt 2006).

Pakerys, Antanas 2008, Dėl akcentinės lietuvių kalbos vardažodžių priesagų galios, *Baltistica* 43(1), 17–29.

Rinkevičius, Vytautas 2010, Kai kurie teoriniai morfologinės akcentologijos koncepcijos aspektai, *Baltistica* 45(1), 9–43.

Stundžia, Bonifacas, 1995, *Lietuvių bendrinės kalbos kirčiavimo sistema*, Vilnius: Petro ofsetas.

Urbutis, Vincas 1978, <sup>2</sup>2009, *Žodžių darybos teorija*, Vilnius: Mokslas, <sup>2</sup>MELI.

Zaliznjak, Andrej Anatol'evič 1985, *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj*, Moskva: Nauka.

*Bonifacas STUNDŽIA*

*Department of Baltic Linguistics*

*Vilnius University*

*Universiteto 5*

*LT-01513 Vilnius*

*Lithuania*

[[bonifacas.stundzia@ff.vu.lt](mailto:bonifacas.stundzia@ff.vu.lt)]