

Rick DERKSEN  
Leiden University

## JONAS KAZLAUSKAS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO ACCENTOLOGY

0. During his regrettably short career Jonas Kazlauskas managed to publish a considerable number of articles and books that are still of interest to today's Baltologists. His publications on accentology, though small in number, reflect their author's versatility and erudition as much as his other publications. In particular the first chapter of Kazlauskas' *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika* (1968), which incorporates his earlier accentological investigations, remains recommended reading. Here attention is paid to such different topics as the prosodic patterns of Lithuanian dialects as well as the standard language, the Indo-European background of Lithuanian and Latvian accentuation, and the accentuation of the verb in Daukša's writings. It is obvious that this chapter still has a lot to offer to students of historical linguistics and specialists alike.

When Kazlauskas began to publish on accentology, back in 1963, this particular field of linguistics was developing rapidly. Stang's epoch-making monograph *Slavonic accentuation* (1957) was gradually being absorbed by the scholarly community and the Russian accentologists Illič-Svityč and Dybo succeeded in clarifying the earlier stages of Proto-Slavic accentuation. These developments were duly noticed by Kazlauskas. Here we shall try to determine Kazlauskas' position as an accentologist and investigate to what extent some of his ideas have withstood the test of time.

1. In his article on the development of Lithuanian nominal accentuation (1963, 171–172), Kazlauskas characterizes Stang's views on the development of the Baltic and Slavic accentual systems as original: Stang's theory differs both from the traditional views on the subject and from Kuryłowicz' theory. To us this verdict may seem obvious, as nowadays most scholars would agree that *Slavonic accentuation* initiated a revolution in Balto-Slavic accentology. One must keep in mind, however, that most early reviewers of Stang's monograph failed to appreciate its originality and significance, as has recently been demonstrated by the Dutch accentologist Willem Vermeer (1998). In spite of the many differences between Stang's and Kuryłowicz' views, several scholars associated Stang mainly with Kuryłowicz, sometimes even depicting him as a mere epigone. Others regarded him as essentially a traditionalist. In this light Kazlauskas' evaluation of Stang 1957 is remarkably apt.

Kazlauskas' accentological publications make it abundantly clear that he held Stang's work in high esteem. His respect for the Norwegian linguist is also apparent

from his review of Stang's *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen* (Kazlauskas 1968b). Nevertheless, Kazlauskas did not subscribe to all aspects of Stang's theory of Balto-Slavic accentology. Like Stang – and Kuryłowicz – he believed that Saussure's law did not operate in Slavic. In fact, he was inclined to assume that the law was limited to Lithuanian (1963, 172; cf. 1968a, 33). He also thought that Stang had convincingly demonstrated the identity of the Baltic and Slavic mobile paradigms. Kazlauskas did not believe, however, that Stang's Proto-Slavic accentual paradigm (b), which was originally oxytone, had a Proto-Baltic counterpart (1963; 1968a, 95; 1968b, 130–131).

In his first publication on accentology, Kazlauskas reached the conclusion that Lithuanian nominal accentuation points to an earlier system with two accentual paradigms, a mobile and an immobile paradigm (1963, 180–181). Of course, Stang was well aware of the fact that Lithuanian offers no evidence for an original oxytone paradigm. His hypothesis that Proto-Baltic had three accentual paradigms was based on rather flimsy Old Prussian evidence, as Stang himself readily admitted, and on a general feeling that it is easier to derive the Baltic state of affairs from the Slavic one than vice versa (1957, 60). In the early sixties the Russian accentologists Dybo and Illič-Svityč finally proved that Stang was wrong (Dybo 1962; Illič-Svityč 1963). They showed that the Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms (a) and (b) are in complementary distribution as to the original intonation of the root and that the rise of (b) can be attributed to a progressive stress shift. Furthermore, the relevant etyma appear to correspond, as a rule, to barytona in other branches of Indo-European.

The question suggests itself if Kazlauskas 1963 was written under the influence of the above-mentioned publications by Dybo and Illič-Svityč. A straightforward answer is provided by Kazlauskas himself. In a footnote (1963, 172), Kazlauskas mentions three articles by Dybo and three by Illič-Svityč from the period 1958–1962, which he qualifies as “interesting”. He goes on to say that having finished his article, which was submitted for publication in November 1962, he came across two more publications, viz. Dybo 1962 and Aitzetmüller 1962. So Kazlauskas was a keen follower of the activities of what we may call the Moscow school of accentology, but had not yet read the article which demonstrated that the Proto-Slavic accentual paradigm (b) is an innovation. In later publications Kazlauskas referred to Dybo's progressive shift a number of times, designating the rule as a reformulation of Fortunatov's and Saussure's law (1968a, 31) or even as Fortunatov's and Saussure's law plain and simple (1968a, 95). These designations are most unfortunate and also unexpected, considering that they come from someone who believed that Saussure's law, as I prefer to call it, operated exclusively in Baltic or even exclusively in Lithuanian. A common name for the Proto-Slavic progressive shift is Dybo's law, but it quite confusingly also goes under the name Illič-Svityč' law. It is an irony of fate that recently the Moscow accentological school seems to

have abandoned Dybo's law and Stang's law, two keystones of modern accentology, in favour of the reintroduction of Saussure's law as a Balto-Slavic rule.

2. In his article on the development of accentuation in the Baltic languages from a phonological point of view (1966–1967 = 1968a, 5–30), Kazlauskas tried to show how the diversity that we encounter if we compare the prosodic systems of Lithuanian (and Latvian) dialects came about. This study, which reflects its author's desire to understand why the systems developed as they did, reminds the reader of the preface to Kazlauskas' historical grammar, where the author notes that the Neogrammarians were preoccupied with comparing Indo-European languages and neglected internal analysis. The article includes a new interpretation of Saussure's and Leskien's laws. Kazlauskas assumes that at a stage when Proto-Baltic or Proto-Lithuanian still had melodic stress, acute final syllables, which had a high tone, attracted the stress from a preceding lower syllable. The rise of dynamic stress subsequently entailed a weakening (loss of energy) of final unstressed syllables and analogically of final stressed syllables. The acute final syllables could no longer be pronounced with the required length and merged with the short syllables (see also 1968a, 98).

Why did Kazlauskas feel that the traditional interpretations of Saussure's and Leskien's laws were unsatisfactory? In the first place, he felt that it was unattractive to derive the realizations of the acute and circumflex intonations in the various Baltic and Slavic languages from a system with rising and falling tonal contours (1967, 21; 1968a, 29–30). In the second place, he agreed with Kuryłowicz that in languages where tone must be analyzed in terms of stressed and unstressed morae it is impossible to have rising and falling tones in unstressed syllables (1968a, 32). Since Saussure's law requires a distinction between acute and circumflex intonations in unstressed syllables, the prosodic contrast must have been of a different nature. The problem was also recognized by Stang (1966, 137), but unlike Kazlauskas he did not wish to commit himself to a hypothesis about the nature of the opposition between acute and circumflex syllables.

The idea that the acute was originally a high tone certainly invites speculation about its Indo-European background. In this connection Kazlauskas (1968a, 30) has referred to Vaillant's theory that acute syllables resulted from the loss of a laryngeal (Vaillant 1936, *passim*). In Kazlauskas' opinion, this development, which was accompanied by lengthening, may have generated an opposition between syllables with high and syllables with low tone. I feel that Kazlauskas was close to what I consider the most attractive solution, viz. Kortlandt's theory that the laryngeals were preserved as a glottal stop in Balto-Slavic – this is also what Vaillant seems to have had in mind in his early publications on the subject (cf. 1936, 114–115) – and then were lost in the individual languages under different circumstances and with different results. For Proto-East Baltic Kortlandt assumes that the glottal stop became a vocalic feature. The glottalic pitch was preserved in originally unstressed syllables in

Latvian and in originally stressed syllables in Žemaitian. Elsewhere it developed into a tonal contour (K o r t l a n d t 1977, 325–326). The assumption that the East Baltic distinction between acute and circumflex syllables was originally equivalent to presence vs. absence of glottalic pitch avoids the difficulties connected with rising and falling tones in unstressed syllables. Moreover, it does not provide any specific problems with respect to the prosodic systems that are actually attested in Baltic, such as a reversal of tones. From this point of view, Kazlauskas' rise of a high tone from the loss of a laryngeal and the change from melodic to dynamic stress seem to be unnecessary intermediate steps.

3. As I have already mentioned, Kazlauskas was well versed in the intricacies of Lithuanian dialectology. Lithuanian dialect data played an important role in his accentological studies, for instance in his investigation of the development of Lithuanian verbal accentuation (1968a, 49–108). Equally important was the evidence of accented old texts, of which Daukša's writings occupy a prominent position. In this respect Kazlauskas may be viewed as an exponent of a Lithuanian tradition (cf. S k a r d ž i u s 1935). Whatever Kazlauskas' inspiration may have been, it is unmistakably true that his interest in the accentuation of old texts completely fitted the direction accentology had taken since S t a n g 1957. Stang's book sparked a renewed attention to the factual foundations of accentology, be it descriptions of accented old texts or dialect studies devoted to accentuation (cf. V e r m e e r 1998, 245, 251). This is not the place to name a list of publications which would illustrate this point. Suffice it to say that here Stang's influence lasts until the present day.

4. I hope to have shown that both Kazlauskas' views on accentology and his methodology, i.e. the fact that he made extensive use of dialect material and accented texts, warrant the conclusion that from his very first accentological publication onwards he was a modern accentologist. There is every indication that he would have made many more important contributions to the field, had the time been granted to him. As in the case of Illič-Svityč, who died at an even younger age, we shall never know what these contributions would have been.

## REFERENCES

- Aitzetmüller R., 1962, Das baltoslavische Akzent- und Intonationssystem. Grundzüge und Grundprobleme, dargestellt nach dem heutigen Stand der Forschung, – *Die Sprache*, VIII, 46–58.
- Dybo V.A., 1962, O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole, – *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, VI, 3–27.
- Illič-Svityč V.M., 1963, Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom: sud'ba akcentuacionnyx paradigm, Moskva.
- Kazlauskas J., 1963, Dėl lietuvių kalbos vardažodžio kirčiavimo sistemos raidos, – *Kalbotyra*, VII, 171–181.

- Kazlauskas J., 1966–1967, Fonologinė kirčio raidos baltų kalbose interpretacija, – *Baltistica*, II(2), 119–132; III(1), 13–23.
- Kazlauskas J., 1968a, Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika, Vilnius.
- Kazlauskas J., 1968b, Review of Stang 1966, – *Baltistica*, IV(1), 125–135.
- Kortlandt F. H. H., 1977, Historical laws of Baltic accentuation, – *Baltistica*, XIII(2), 319–330.
- Kuryłowicz J., 1952, *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes*, Kraków.
- Skardžius P., 1935, *Daukšos akcentologija*, Kaunas.
- Stang C. S., 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo.
- Stang C. S., 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo etc.
- Vaillant A., 1936, *Le problème des intonations balto-slaves*, – *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris*, XXXVII, 109–115.
- Vermeer W. R., 1998, Christian Stang's revolution in Slavic accentology, – J. I. Bjørnflaten, G. Kjetsaa, and T. Mathiassen (eds.), *The Olaf Broch Symposium. A Centenary of Slavic Studies in Norway*, Oslo, 240–254.