

## REVIEW ARTICLE — RAPPORT CRITIQUE

PAUL GARDE, *L'accent*. Collection Le Linguiste, no. 5. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1968. 171 pp.

### I

The question that intrigued some ancient philosophers was whether the road from Athens to Corinth was or was not the same as that from Corinth to Athens. It seems that the answer depends on what 'same' means in this context. (All circles are 'sames' as geometric loci of all points equidistant from one given point; but not all circles are 'sames' in area.) If it means physically the identical entity, a path stretching between two cities, then it was the same; but if it includes also the view of the land as the traveler beholds it, then it was not the same: the wanderer bound for Corinth continuously saw different sights than the one bound for Athens.

As I traveled through Garde's book I could not but be aware that I had traversed the same landscape before; yet I had seen it all quite differently because I had journeyed in a different direction. All landmarks along the road seemed familiar, yet I had approached them and looked at them from another angle. I had, to be specific, started from the phonological units and used accent as a significant marker and property of these units, while Garde begins with the accent and seeks units associable with it. So whenever Garde says 'This is X', I, coming upon it from the other side, do not perceive it in the same way and in the same frame though it be the same object. But since in linguistic analysis the path toward discovery, the direction of observation, is of the essence (we are merely seeking the best way of arranging in a system objects and events on whose physical nature we can scarcely disagree), I could not but raise

objections on various points of Garde's presentation, especially — as will be seen below — when it comes to determining the locus of the accent, the unit within which it functions. I must therefore admit that I encountered some difficulty in reading this book, because in order to attain and appreciate Garde's perspective I had to keep looking over my shoulder and twisting my neck, as it were. And this is an exercise both fatiguing and disconcerting.

Garde's book must be welcomed by all because it is, to my knowledge, the first attempt by a competent modern linguist to examine accent, not just as a feature of a particular idiom, but as a phenomenon of language. Garde calls this branch of general linguistics *accen-tologie* (and *L'accentologie* would have been as fitting a title for the book as *L'accent*). Since the numerous descriptions of accent in individual languages disagree among themselves on basic theory and details, and contradict one another on definitions and terminology, and since, worse still, a fair amount of the literature comes from the pens of quasi-linguists and pseudo-linguists, a modern scholar might have been inclined to start his labors with a cleansing and scouring of Augean proportions (if not with Herculean speed), and with a pious salvaging and coordinating of the usable residue — which, I believe, is not inconsiderable. Garde chooses instead to ignore all but the very recent past, even in dealing with the classical languages where accent studies go back to the grammarians of ancient Alexandria. As a consequence, bibliographical references are surprisingly few (but I wish that, few as they are, they had been assembled somewhere in the book). Even assuming that Garde knows the literature, I still should have liked to have him refer to it explicitly and more extensively, especially to those publications with which he ostensibly disagrees (sometimes, in my view, unjustifiably).<sup>1)</sup>

Naturally, 'une étude de linguistique générale ne peut prétendre fonder les propositions qu'elle avance par voie inductive, à partir d'un examen des matériaux de toutes les langues du monde'; but

---

<sup>1)</sup> Too many recent books in linguistics, indeed schools of linguistics, have succumbed to the comfortable but treacherous notion that innovation implies eradication or oblivion of the past. It would be well to remind younger scholars that their predecessors have said a lot which is neither inconsequential nor obsolete, which is indeed indispensable to their own efforts. Of course, some would then also make the distressing discovery that they had overestimated their own originality.

from an analysis of a number of languages, and of course from the experience and the good sense of the linguist, 'se dégage une théorie de l'accent. Il resterait à vérifier si, comme on peut raisonnablement l'espérer, cette théorie a une valeur générale et rend compte également des faits qui n'ont pas été envisagés dans son élaboration'. (167)

Garde's definition of the term 'accent', and the manner and means by which he distinguishes it from phonically similar but functionally dissimilar phenomena, are sound and attractive. They should not be overlooked by anyone henceforth dealing with any of the supra-segmental features of language (all of which, it seems to me, may well be treated in an equivalent, parallel fashion). For Garde, 'l'accent a pour fonction d'établir un contraste dans chaque mot entre la syllabe accentuée et les syllabes inaccentuées.' (50). In this definition the term 'contrast' has specific reference to the syntagmatic, as differentiated from 'opposition', which refers to the paradigmatic domain. Hence the accent, whatever its phonic realization (mostly either power or pitch, or a combination of the two, although other acoustic phenomena usually play a role) is not a distinctive feature (in Jakobson's sense) that concerns only the phoneme, and through it the morpheme in which it occurs, but is a linguistic feature pertaining always to a segment of the utterance at a level higher than that of the morpheme.<sup>2)</sup> This segment is Garde's *unité accentuelle*, henceforth translated in my text as 'accentual unit', which for Garde is generally coextensive with the word (Garde's *mot*, about which more will be said below). 'Pour un trait distinctif, la question qui se

---

<sup>2)</sup> Garde always writes *unité plus grande* or *unité plus petite*, when referring, not to mere extensity, but to higher or lower levels. A morpheme is not necessarily 'plus grand' than a phoneme, or a lexeme 'plus grand' than a morpheme. 'Ainsi (writes Garde) la phrase est à la fois un ensemble de syllabes et de mots' (22); not necessarily: *Viens!* is one syllable, one lexeme, one phrase, indeed a whole utterance. '... le mot est un ensemble de morphèmes' (22); not necessarily: *cher* is a one-morpheme lexeme. '... la syllabe est un ensemble de phonèmes et le phonème un ensemble de traits distinctifs' (22-23); while this is true with respect to the phoneme (by definition), a syllable may consist of one phoneme, for example French *y* /i/, or *est* /ɛ/. Of course Garde knows this: 'il y a des mots d'un seul morphème', 'il y a des phrases d'un seul mot' (18). But he should be more careful, lest definitions become vague and inoperable – a difficulty which will attach itself in particular, as will be seen later, to his *mot*.

pose en chaque point de la chaîne susceptible d'en être affecté est seulement de savoir s'il est là ou s'il n'y est pas; pour l'accent, c'est de savoir s'il est là ou s'il est ailleurs'. (8) One could perhaps say that the oppositional features in a phoneme are absolute in that they are identifiable upon perception of the phoneme by their very presence; but the contrastive features (accent realized by power, pitch, etc.) are relative in that they are identifiable by comparison upon perception of other neighboring phonemes. In other words, as a contrastive feature accentual stress is power expressed not by loudness but by, as it were, louder-ness, or loudest-ness; accentual tone is not pitch expressed by highness but by higher-ness, or highest-ness. (In general, accent is produced by an increment or enhancement of a phonic quality already inherent in the phone; but a reduction of the quality for accentual purposes is not excluded on principle.) If one discovers instances where phonic properties often associated with 'accent' fulfill no such contrastive function in the word but rather have a purely morphological function (like, for example, degrees of loudness in Campa, an Indian language of Peru, or variations in pitch in all so-called tone languages) and are therefore oppositional in the paradigmatic dimension, then one is faced with a feature other than accent and ought to give it a different name, perhaps a neutral phonic or acoustic one: power or intensity instead of stress, pitch

---

<sup>3)</sup> Garde uses *intense* and *intensité* in a relative sense (as indeed one uses colloquially 'loud' and 'loudness' in English), implying that a sound is *intense* if it is 'louder', or 'the loudest' in a unit. But in French as well as in English acousticians use *intensité* or 'intensity', like 'loudness', to indicate the presence of acoustic power, whether great or small, greater or smaller (see below, fn. 17). Garde's relative usage of *intense* emerges from passages like the following: 'En campa . . . chaque syllabe peut être intense ou non-intense, et le nombre de syllabes intenses dans un mot n'est pas limité'. (41) Campa being, as mentioned, a language in which variations of intensity have not accentual (contrastive) but morphological (oppositional) function, its *syllabes intenses* are those syllables in an accentual unit which have greater intensity or power as part of their phonological character determining the meaning of the morpheme or morphemes in which they occur. That this kind of *intensité* is morphological rather than accentual is proved by the fact that a single accentual unit may have more than one *syllabe intense*, while only one syllable of greater *intensité*, the syllable of greatest *intensité*, the loudest syllable in the accentual unit, can fulfill, by Garde's own definition, accentual function. Hence in Campa greater intensity is not a contrastive but an oppositional prosodic feature. (See also below, fn. 19.)

instead of tone.<sup>3</sup>) The accent, therefore, – if there is one, and if it functions (in Garde's sensible and useful definition) so as to contrast one syllable in an accentual unit with all the others – cannot be realized in any language by a phonic quality that is employed for non-accentual, morphological purposes. (Thus it appears that Campa cannot use loudness to convey accentuation of a syllable, nor Thai, a tone language, pitch, nor Czech, a language where vocalic quantity is distinctive, duration). 'Le critère de l'appartenance au morphème ou au mot est donc universellement applicable, et il nous permettra de déterminer le caractère distinctif ou accentuel d'un trait phonique dans tous les cas' (41).<sup>4</sup>)

The gist of all this is that an accented syllable is not just one which is louder, or higher pitched (possibly also less loud, or lower pitched) than are other syllables in an utterance. Rather, to establish that a syllable is really accented, one must first determine that the phonic property which distinguishes it from other syllables fulfills a syntagmatic function in the word, and not a paradigmatic one in the morpheme.

## II

Since the word, or *mot*, plays such a large role in Garde's theory, I must attach to its usage a major criticism, or at least an elaboration. Garde complains that 'la linguistique contemporaine n'est pas encore parvenue à élaborer une définition du mot se fondant sur des critères objectifs universellement valables' (16). But I do not think that it is helpful to conclude: '... nous serons donc contraints de ne

---

<sup>4</sup>) As the preceding quotation shows, Garde uses *distinctif* in the sense of oppositional and paradigmatic, as differentiated from *accentuel*, which is contrastive and syntagmatic. This leads to his saying that 'l'accent n'a jamais de fonction distinctif' (9), which seems to contradict oddly such cases as Italian *bravo* /brávo/ 'valiant, good' side by side with *bravò* /bravó/ 'he bragged, braved' (3), or Russian *múka* /múka/ 'torment' side by side with *muká* /muká/ 'flower' (4), and thousands of others in numerous languages, where the accent placement indeed serves to distinguish two otherwise homophonous items. In Garde's terminology, then, *distinctif* has a technical meaning which may confuse those who think of 'distinctive accent' as equivalent with 'free, non-predictably placed accent', and of 'non-distinctive' with 'fixed, predictably placed accent'. The matter is fully dealt with in Chapter V, *La place de l'accent* (97–139).

pas nous appuyer sur une définition exhaustive du concept de mot, mais de nous contenter de certains éléments d'une telle définition, qui ne sont pas sujets à controverse' (16-17). In that direction lies trouble. (Trouble, if for no other reason, then at least because a definition, like a system, does not have replaceable and removable elements: once an element is replaced or removed, the system is no longer the same. The elements still missing in the definition of *mot* may, if added, render quite senseless the elements now regarded as non-controversial.)

To be sure, the locus of the accent is for Garde the accentual unit. But what is the accentual unit morphologically? If Garde does not equate the accentual unit with the *mot*, he says at least that 'la notion d'unité accentuelle est voisine à celle de mot' (16), and that 'l'unité accentuelle obéit à des principes de délimitation qui lui sont propres et ne se confond pas nécessairement avec le mot, mais qu'elle est en rapports étroits avec lui' (16) – but with *mot* remaining undefined in all these statements. Now a *mot* that by its syntactic nature has an accent is a *mot accentogène*, and it is of course an accentual unit. It is also a *syntagme accentogène* since 'on peut définir dans chaque langue à accent des *syntagmes accentogènes*, c'est-à-dire des groupements de morphèmes qui ont la propriété de constituer des unités accentuelles' (19). But such a *groupement de morphèmes* may include, in addition to a *mot accentogène*, also a *mot non-accentogène*, or a clitic (19, 20). Now since a clitic is also a *mot*, but, not being *accentogène*, incapable of being a *syntagme accentogène*, it is defined as a 'syntagme appartenant à une catégorie normalement accentogène [c'est-à-dire, mot], mais qui lui-même ne l'est pas' (20). Thus it is the case that 'en français, tout syntagme apte à être sujet est un mot, mais parmi les mots-sujets les substantifs sont effectivement accentogènes et la plupart des pronoms proclitiques' (20). So far, then, we have something called *mot* that can be either *accentogène*, hence coextensive with a *syntagme accentogène*, or a clitic. This classification would be tolerable (but just barely) if it meant that every *mot* is by nature *accentogène*, though in some context it may be deprived of its accent and appear in the guise of a clitic. This seems to be endorsed if it is said that 'la délimitation syntaxique de l'unité accentuelle dans chaque langue se fait en deux étapes: la première aboutit à la délimitation du mot, syntagme normalement accentogène, la seconde à celle de l'unité accentuelle effective' (20) – which

can only mean that first one counts the *mots*, and then tries to find out how many of them are clitics and do not constitute accentual units. In the chapter entitled *L'unité accentuelle et le mot* (67–96) one is reassured that 'on peut, dans chaque langue, définir grammaticalement des types de syntagmes qui sont normalement appelés à constituer des unités accentuelles: ces *syntagmes normalement accentogènes* sont les *mots*' (67). In other words, *syntagme accentogène* is *mot*, and *mot* is *syntagme accentogène* (and both are the *unité accentuelle*) – in an equation that not only is circular but in which one element, the *mot*, is still undefined; hence both sides of the equation define *ignotum per ignotius*. But in any event, the implication is plainly that all *mots* are normally *syntagmes accentogènes*, hence *unités accentuelles*, even though some may sometimes be afflicted by loss of accent and thereby become clitics.

But immediately after, instead of having it confirmed that we must find out in a given utterance the extent of the *mot* and the *unité accentuelle effective*, the latter being not a single *mot* but a *mot* plus another *mot* which happens to be *non-accentogène*, we are now told that 'il faut donc, pour certaines catégories de mots de certaines langues, donner la liste des clitiques, les autres mots conservant leur caractère accentogène' (67), which implies the existence of two lists of *mots*, namely, accented ones and clitics. And this is unambiguously restated in the phrase that 'l'appartenance à l'une ou l'autre liste est une propriété syntaxique permanente de chaque mot' (73) – though it seems that, if there be two lists, cliticness is not a syntactic but a morphological or lexical characteristic of every *mot* in a given language. But this is a different proposition altogether because it is now no longer the case that 'certains [mots], les clitiques, *peuvent être dépourvus* du caractère accentogène propre à la majorité des membres de leur catégorie' (67; italics added), nor is there a question of 'les autres mots *conservant* leur caractère accentogène' (67; italics added); instead, every language is presented as having a fixed list of *mots accentogènes* and a fixed list of clitics, so that a *syntagme accentogène* or *unité accentuelle*, consists either of one *mot accentogène* or a *mot accentogène* plus clitic (or, presumably, clitics). And this notion I reject entirely. So does, in fact, Garde himself when he says in another context that 'il n'existe pas, dans la langue [française], un seul mot qui ne soit susceptible, dans certaines positions, de perdre son accent. L'accent affecte en fait non pas des unités dont on puisse

donner une définition grammaticale permanente, mais des unités dont les limites varient d'un énoncé à l'autre' (94). I hope that I do not misread or fail to understand what Garde has in mind, and therefore do him an injustice; but if I do, may I not put the blame on the murky, baffling terminology to which Garde has committed himself? (A terminology which could, I believe, be clarified, as I shall try to show presently, if a distinction were made between the lexical word, or lexeme, and the phonological word.)

French is called a language 'à syntagmes accentogènes' (69), as are allegedly 'toutes [les langues] des groupes roman, slave, hellénique' (68). But then again the French *syntagme accentogène* is not like the others (once more, as in the case of *mot*, the use of one term for more than one thing), its peculiarity being that it may contain a word which is normally accented (that is, not from the list of clitics) but which 'perd son caractère accentogène si elle [la racine, le morphème radical accentogène] perd son autonomie syntaxique pour entrer dans un mot composé' (69). And how does one recognize a *mot* thus having lost its *autonomie syntaxique*? By its not being accented, of course. Take the case of *lit de mort*, for example, which has but one accent on *mort* (with *lit* having 'lost' its accent) and is therefore a *syntagme accentogène*. If *syntagme accentogène* is still, according to the definition cited above, equated with *mot*, then *lit de mort* is a *mot composé*, which is also a *mot*. The *mot* accordingly may consist, not only of *mot accentogène* plus clitic, but also of more than one *mot* from the list of *mots accentogènes*, provided that all but one of them have lost their accent. It is explained that *lit de mort* is a single *unité accentuelle*, or a *syntagme accentogène*, or a *mot*, because it is 'morphologiquement un composé, mais se comporte syntaxiquement comme un substantif unique (impossibilité de séparer les éléments ou d'ajouter un déterminant particulier au mot *mort*)' (69). On the other hand, 'dans l'allemand *St'erbe-b'ett* 'lit de mort' les deux éléments *sterbe* et *bett*, étant l'un et l'autre des morphèmes radicaux, conservent leur accent' (69) — the reason being that German is a language 'à morphèmes accentogènes' (68), that 'en allemand, le caractère accentogène est conféré aux racines (et à certains suffixes) par leur seule identité morphologique', whereas 'en français, en russe etc., il ne leur appartient que si certaines conditions syntaxiques se trouvent réunies, c'est-à-dire qu'il est en dernière analyse une propriété de certains types syntaxiques' (69). But since these *conditions syntaxiques* in French



are defined by the presence of a single rather than several accents, and the presence of a single accent by *certaines conditions syntaxiques*, no definition but only complete circularity is attained. (I shall discuss below why in Garde's view *Sterbebett* must in any event have two accents on phonological rather than, as he says in the citation above, morphological or syntactic grounds.) But there is still more to be said about the accent in French.

Not only accented *mots* but also entire *syntagmes accentogènes* may lose their accent in still larger accentual units. 'Dans certaines langues il peut arriver que l'accent . . . disparaisse dans certaines positions de la chaîne parlée' (93), says Garde, and explains that in French 'il n'existe pas un seul mot qui ne soit susceptible, dans certaines positions, de perdre son accent' (94). For example, in *vous tourn'ez le c'oin de la r'ue* there are three accents upon three accentual units, or *syntagmes accentogènes*, consisting of clitic(s) followed by a *mot accentogène*. But this sentence 'peut fort bien être prononcée d'une seule traite et former une seule unité accentuelle avec un seul accent sur *rue* . . . En revanche, cette phrase ne pourra en aucun cas dans la parole normale recevoir plus de trois accents'. (95) If the sentence is pronounced with one accent only, 'nous dirons que *vous tournez, le coin, de la rue* constituent des unités accentuelles virtuelles, même si dans tel ou tel énoncé leur accent ne se trouve pas réalisé' (96). (Presumably Garde means, not *même si*, but *puisque*). This implies that *tournez, coin, and rue* belong among the accented words, *vous, le, de, and la* among the clitics.<sup>5)</sup>

<sup>5)</sup> Note also this statement (71): 'En français, les phrases *les voisins regardent la télévision* (3 accents) et *ils la regardent* (1 accent) sont syntaxiquement équivalentes, mais dans la première le sujet et l'objet sont des substantifs pleins, accentogènes; dans la seconde ce sont des pronoms. proclitiques'. (Are these sentences really *syntactiquement équivalentes*? What does *équivalentes* mean here? The equivalence is, I should say, semantic; but syntactically they are altogether different, though transformable one into the other. But does not transformation imply syntactic re-shaping?) The fact that the pronoun *la* does bear the accent in the sentence *Regardez-la!* is dealt with by Garde thus (72): 'On voit qu'ici l'enclitique porte l'accent'. Is not 'accented clitic' a contradiction in terms? Garde takes the position that a clitic is always a clitic, and although an accented clitic may occur it does not belong to the class of regular *mots accentogènes*. Hence it is said of the *mot non-accentogène*, or clitic, *pas* in *je ne le vois p'as* (side by side with *je le vois*). 'C'est ici le verbe qui est accentogène est la négation qui est accentuée'. (70).

Similarity in Czech *na mostě* 'on the bridge', which is a single accentual unit,

Since *vous tournez le coin de la rue* can under no circumstances have more than three accents, the three *unités accentuelles virtuelles* are also *unités accentuelles minimales* (the term is used on p. 98).<sup>6</sup> Hence an *unité accentuelle* in French may be composed of several *syntagmes accentogènes*, of which only one conserves its accent. But since this larger, non-minimal unit is at the same time a *syntagme accentogène*, too, it is also a *mot* — thus adding another use of the term *mot*. And clearly, if not only French but also 'toutes [les langues] des groupes roman, slave, hellénique' (68) are languages 'à *syntagmes accentogènes*' (68), it follows that *syntagme accentogène* is defined differently in French than it is in the other languages — for in fact none of these other languages has *unités accentuelles* that must be defined, in terms of extent and boundaries, like those of French. (See below, p. 378 ff.)

the accent must be on the first syllable because in Czech the accent always rests upon the first syllable of the accentual unit, whether it is a single accented lexeme or a combination of accented lexeme and clitic(s) — hence *n'a mostě*. And here again, according to Garde's analysis, *mostě* is a *mot accentogène* without accent, and *na* a clitic (in Czech all clitics must be enclitics) with an accent. Garde complains that 'la terminologie linguistique refuse le nom d'enclitique appliqué à fr. *le* dans *prends-le* ou de proclitique pour tch. *na* dans *n'a mostě*, parce que ces mots portent l'accent. Elle ne tire pas toutefois les conséquences logiques de cette décision, qui consisteraient à qualifier *prends* de proclitique et *mostě* d'enclitique' (73). Actually, I for one see no objection to delating *prends* and *mostě* clitics, and *le* and *na* accented lexemes, in the environments specified. This becomes impossible only if one takes the position, which is in fact Garde's own, that clitics belong to a class rather than that they are determined by occurrence: '... l'appartenance à l'une ou l'autre liste [de mots accentogènes ou de clitiques] est une propriété syntaxique permanente de chaque mot' (73). I deny this, and I shall state my case presently: see below, p. 387 ff.

My colleague Ladislav Matejka tells me, by the way, that in current Standard Czech the second lexeme in *na mostě* may indeed bear the accent — but if it does, so does the first: *n'a m'oste* and *n'a moste* are, according to him, equally acceptable variants. (In terms I shall explain below, I should then say that the first variant consists of two phonological words, each with its accent, and that the second variant is a nexus consisting of two lexemes that behave together accentually like a single phonological word. See below, p. 387 ff.)

<sup>6</sup> This establishes three minimal phonological units (three minimal *cursus*, as I call them: see below, p. 388 ff) in this sentence. A student of mine, Mr Jurgen Klausenburger, is analyzing and describing such minimal *cursus* in his doctoral dissertation *French prosodics and phonotactics: An historical typology* (Ann. Arbor 1969), chapter 4.

Now it seems to me that the analysis by means of these units in the manner and terms proposed by Garde, is reaching the very edge of usefulness. Still, we are talking here about an analysis, about a theory of accentual units (see my remarks below on the 'wrongness' of a theory, p. 387), and not about facts. But now I must draw attention to a part of Garde's argument that is really based upon faulty observation of the facts, which forces him to adopt an analysis and a terminology of ever greater complexity, one that cannot but be actually wrong because the facts are wrong.

### III

I have mentioned that Garde's analysis of German *Sterbebett* as consisting of two accentual units and therefore having two accents, really has, if one adheres to Garde's phonological analysis of German, phonological rather than morphological-syntactic reasons to begin with. He says: 'En allemand, dans la partie indigène du vocabulaire (c'est-à-dire en exceptant les emprunts étrangers récents) une seule voyelle est admise en syllabe inaccentuée, c'est la voyelle neutre /ə/. . . ' (59). This (quite apart from the curious view that /ə/ is, as compared with other vowels, 'neutral': what does this mean phonetically or phonemically?) is patently incorrect. German is full of unaccented vowels other than /ə/, and in a case like *warum* /varúm/ 'why' and *worum* /vorúm/ 'about (around) what' unaccented /a/ and /o/ clearly distinguish members of a minimal pair. It may be said, to be sure, that German is a language where in some styles of speech (still within the standard – though severe arbiters of propriety may dispute this) the number of [ə]'s in unaccented position may be large – but all these [ə]'s, except those which are actually allophones of the phoneme /ə/, must then of course be viewed as allophones, albeit phonetically like ones, of different phonemes. Hence /varúm/ [varúm] and /vorúm/ [vorúm] may occasionally, in the mouths of some speakers, both sound like [vərúm] (which, by the way, they certainly will not if the speaker does not wish to be misheard).

To escape this phonological trap of his own making, Garde is forced to assign an accent to every vowel which he cannot hear as [ə] and which cannot be classified as /ə/ – and there are not few of these. This applies, then, whatever the morphological and syntactical condition allegedly at the bottom of it, to the first and third

vowels in *Sterbebett* /stérbabét/, and to all three vowels of *Waschhandschuh* /váshantšu:/ 'washable (or washing) glove', rendered as *W'asch-h'and-sch'uh* (68) by Garde. But if it is also said that 'toute racine [en allemand] est accentogène' (68) and that for this reason *Waschhandschuh* has three accents, then either the phonological or the morphological explanation is redundant, or the whole thing is circular, or one of the two causes does not really apply. Elsewhere, however, this German compound is said to have 'un accent principal sur *Wasch* et un accent secondaire sur *hand*, et ceci dans tous les contextes possibles' (47), while no accent is assigned to *schuh*.<sup>7)</sup>

In German, as noted, all roots are alleged to be by nature *accentogènes*; so are some, but not all, suffixes, their condition depending, however, not on their morphological character but on their phonological shape. Among the *accentogènes* suffixes is, for example, *-lein* /lajn/ (hence *G'ärt-l'ein* 'little garden'), among the *non-accentogènes* is *-chen* /çən/ (hence *G'ärtchen* 'little garden'). (Examples from p. 68).<sup>8)</sup> And German is, we are told, 'une langue à *morphèmes accentogènes*, puisque la liste [N.B.] des éléments accentogènes y sera en fait une liste de morphèmes dressée indépendamment des combinaisons dans lesquels [sic] ils entrent' (68). I fear, however, that the accentual analysis of *Gärtlein* and *Gärtchen* on these theoretical premises is absurd not only on the face of it but also because it appears absolutely senseless to a speaker of German, to whom *Gärtlein* and *Gärtchen* are synonymous (indeed as synonymous as two lexemes can ever be) and have precisely the same accentual pattern: an accent on the first, and no accent on the second syllable. But all these accentological complexities Garde must conjure only to accommodate a phonological analysis of German that is unsound to begin with.

Another device for admitting vowels other than /ə/ in unaccented syllables (but clearly inapplicable to *-lein*) is to consign the items containing them to a class of 'emprunts étrangers récents' (59; see also above). Now if a loan is defined synchronically (and we are here describing the language and not telling its history), then its hall-

<sup>7)</sup> On the grading of accents see below, fn. 17.

<sup>8)</sup> The English suffixes [-'eɪʃən] and [-'ɪzəm] (these transcriptions for *-ation* and *-ism* are Garde's, on pp. 84 and 85; but on p. 122 he writes [-'ɪzm]) are treated analogously (84, 85).

mark is that it has not yet been naturalized in the borrowing language – though of course some day it may be. Only some trait of foreignness lets us recognize a loan descriptively and without reference to history. For descriptive purposes, then, *cocktail*, if pronounced /kɔktɛl/ is in no respect un-French; indeed it might as well be written *coquetel* (and some loans are so respelled after their naturalization: *bifteck* for *beefsteak*). That /kɔktɛl/ is a loan can be guessed from the spelling *cocktail*, or can be learned from historical grammar (albeit a very recent chapter of it) – but these are criteria irrelevant for the analysis in which we are engaged. The word is naturalized also morphologically and syntactically (plural *les cocktails* /lɛkɔktɛl/, and both singular and plural behave like any other noun in a French sentence).<sup>9</sup> If this doctrine is abandoned, and if lexemes are called loans in a description on other than descriptive grounds, and if in particular they are chosen to play that part so as to satisfy a rule on accentuation (which is, circularly, derived from and at the same time the reason for a phonological analysis that is false in the first place), then the result cannot but be less than satisfactory at best, chaotic at worst.

For example, German *Bäckerei* /bɛkɛrɛi/ 'bakery' is said (by Garde) to have a native root and a borrowed suffix *-ei*. No one can deny that there is an accent on the final syllable; but Garde has two reasons for assigning an additional accent to the initial syllable: first, because it contains a vowel other than /ə/; second, because it is a Germanic root, hence inherently *accentogène* and always accented (i.e., not susceptible of becoming a clitic); cf. p. 116: '... en allemand tous les morphèmes accentogènes sont toujours accentués ... ; sont accentogènes toutes les racines'. Hence *B'äcker''ei* with two accents, denoting the presence of two accentual units (118; as for the double accent mark, 'une différence de force existant entre deux accents voisins, le plus fort est noté par'' : all. *Str''assenb'ahn* [tramway] – p. 1).<sup>10</sup> Two remarks need to be made here: (1) there is no German speaker in the world who, no matter how coaxed or coached, could ever hear anything but a final accent in *Bäckerei*; and since

<sup>9</sup> The chauvinistic sniffing out of recent loans, and their proscription by zealots has of course no bearing on the linguistic condition and analysis, nor, I dare say, on the history of French: *franglais* is here to stay.

<sup>10</sup> To be consistent Garde would have to write *W''asch-h''and-sch''uh*; but he never uses''.

German has a distinctively placed accent ('*erblich*' hereditary' – *erblich* '(he) turned pale') a German speaker knows when a syllable is accented; (2) that *-ei* is an ancient loan is historically true but descriptively irrelevant: not only is there nothing un-German about it, but it certainly does not fall into the class of 'emprunts étrangers récents' (59), unless Old High German is 'récent'; *-ei* is a loan in German to the same degree and in the same sense as *jardin* (from Frankish *gardo*) is a loan in French.<sup>11)</sup>

Different, however, is the case of German *Konditorei* 'pastry shop', we are told, because, though it contains the same *accentogène* borrowed suffix *-ei*, it also has a borrowed root *Konditor-*. The suffix *-ei* continues to attract upon itself the accent, but since the root is non-German it does not have to be accented, nor need it obey the rule that only /ə/ can appear in unaccented position. Hence this word is rendered as a single accentual unit *Konditor'ei* (119). To this analysis I could add the same remarks as in the case of *Bäckerei* with regard to native reaction and foreignness, and the additional assertion that, like *Gärtlein* and *Gärtchen*, *Konditorei* and *Bäckerei* have identical accentual patterns: both have but one accent, on the final syllable. Garde's odd analysis, however, comes about because 'loan' is defined, at least in part, by accentuation, and then, circularly and unenlighteningly, the accentuation is explained as due to the fact that the item under examination is a loan.<sup>12)</sup>

English is said to have in unaccented position only /ə/ and /ɪ/ (Garde writes /i/, without making a distinction between the tense and lax high front vowel phonemes of English), and /ou/ in final

11) Garde's view of loans raises an interesting question on the status of *tennis* in Modern French. There is nothing un-French about it, but historically the word is of course the borrowed English *tennis*. Yet this English word is itself the Middle French *tenes* /təné/, the warning call of the server to his opponent, which became the name of the game upon its being imported to England. So does now *tennis* in French cease to be a loan from English because ultimately it is French? Of course, this is a pseudo-problem, but one that arises from a vague or sterile definition of 'loan'.

12) It may well be that Garde's elaborate scheme of native and borrowed roots and native and borrowed suffixes (117–124, for German and English) provides a historical *explanation* for the present position of the accent, and as such it is of course welcome; but it is irrelevant in a synchronic *description*, especially as a criterion for classification in instances where the condition of a form as being 'borrowed' is not discoverable from its present shape and use.

position, as in *follow* (80). Again one must say, as in the case of German, that English unaccented vowel phonemes are often (certainly more often than the German ones) realized by [ə], but that Garde's phonological statement is incorrect. (This is so at least for the present point in the history of standard English, even though there is discernible a trend toward a universal unaccented phoneme /ə/.) As a consequence of this analysis, together again with the shaky distinction of native and borrowed root morphemes and affixes, there arise the same difficulties with regard to accentuation as were commented on in German. (Loans in English are, Garde says on p. 120, 'beaucoup plus nombreux qu'en allemand, mais mieux intégrés dans le système de la langue' — statements which betray Garde's willingness to go back all the way to the year 1066 to determine what is a loan for accentual purposes ('emprunts étrangers récents?'), and which are moreover oddly contradictory, for whatever is *intégré* is, by definition, not anything foreign any longer in synchronic terms. But since any word of non-Germanic origin, even if it has been used by speakers of English for several centuries and is fully naturalized (and about 50% of the English lexicon fall into that category), may be a loan to Garde in matters accentual, and since at the same time he finds a greater incidence than in German of /ə/ and /I/ in unaccented position, it cannot but follow, though on the wrong premises, that loans in English are 'mieux intégrés' than they are in German.<sup>13</sup>)

<sup>13</sup>) On p. 121 the word *realize* is transcribed as [r'is'aiz] and *taylorize* (I suppose such a word could exist and be understood, though I do not know it; but it would no doubt be spelled *tailorize*) as [t'eilar'aiz], with the same accentual pattern. In both cases we are dealing with the 'borrowed' suffix [aiz] (which is, *pace* Garde, one of the most lively and productive derivational morphemes of Modern English on all social linguistic levels, and sounds borrowed to no one but the historical linguist), which is always *accentogène* (Cf. p. 121: '... en anglais [en contraste avec l'allemand] les affixes empruntés ont chacun un comportement constant: les uns sont toujours accentogènes, les autres jamais'.) The suffix is preceded by the 'racine empruntée' *real* and the 'racine germanique ou assimilée' *taylor-*, both of them *accentogènes*. As a result *realize* and *taylorize* consist of two accentual units each (121). Without examining once more the question of two accentual units in a single lexeme, and without emphasizing that Garde's phonological analysis of English, apart from his morphological rule on the accentuation of suffixes, would suffice to impose an accent upon [aiz], I should like to ask the following questions: (1) Why is *real-* 'empruntée' and *taylor-* 'germanique ou assimilée' (is there a choice?) if historically they are equally 'empruntées' (the first from Latin, the

## IV

I cannot help thinking that all these enormous complexities that tax one's tolerance, especially since some of them are based upon faulty analysis of the evidence, cause this portion of Garde's accentology on the place of the accent to be unacceptable. The pity is that it occupies rather a pivotal place in the theory as a whole.

A theory, or a hypothesis, is a statement about observed facts, a generalization on a plane higher than the facts themselves. Hence it can be 'wrong' only if the facts were inaccurately or inadequately observed; otherwise, if it is not satisfactory, it can be anything from inconvenient or unfertile to trivial or silly. To the extent that Garde's theory is based upon an erroneous view of the facts, as I noted in the preceding section, it will not hold water. For the rest, opinions on it are certain to vary, and I do not presume to sit in final judgment. I shall say, however, that I find extremely awkward Garde's treatment of the locus of the accent (by which I mean, not the place of the accent in the accentual unit, but rather the description and definition of the unit that can be regarded as being 'accented', that is, of the accentual unit which bears, in Garde's own thesis, one and no more than one accent that fulfills the contrastive function required correctly by Garde). Since I have recently occupied myself with this problem (although I approached it, as I said in my introductory remarks, from another direction entirely, and although I dealt with it only in connection with another topic) I am taking the liberty to submit my view briefly and in rough outlines.<sup>14</sup> It will be seen that in essence it is not too far removed from Garde's, and I hope that Garde's and my own conceptions are in some measure compatible and complementary rather than antithetical.

I find it useful to distinguish the lexeme from the word. The first designates a morphological-lexical item, a minimum free form (either a single free morpheme, or a free plus one or more bound morphemes, or a composition of bound morphemes; but an item consisting of two

---

second from Old French), and descriptively equally 'assimilées'? (2) Why is *taylor-* 'germanique ou assimilée', or just plain 'germanique' (also on p. 211), if in fact it is derived from Old French *tailleur* (Latin *taliare* 'to cut')?

<sup>14</sup> Details will be found in my book *Syllable, word, nexus, cursus* (The Hague 1969).



or more free morphemes I call a compound lexeme, or a compound);<sup>15)</sup> the second is a phonological unit, that is, an item coextensive with, or longer than, a lexeme, which in an utterance behaves phonologically – as regards boundary signals and accentuation – like a single lexeme in citation. In French, for example, every lexeme as citation form has an accent on the final syllable (except if the vocalic nucleus of that syllable is /ə/ and occurs in a form other than a pronoun object following an imperative, in which case the accent is on the penultimate syllable; but since in most types of French discourse these final /ə/'s are optionally omitted, French lexemes have a strong tendency to be oxytonic); but in a longer utterance it is the so-called breathgroup (which is misnamed since it has nothing to do with breathing) that constitutes the phonological word: no smaller morphological or syntactic units within it are set off from one another through boundary signals (lexeme boundaries are obliterated – cf. the nature and purpose of the liaison), and it bears one accent on its final syllable (with the exception noted). Hence all lexemes within it but the last are clitics (specifically, proclitics), and since any French lexeme can so occur there is no special class of clitics. If such a phonological word is bounded – as it is in French – at both termini by a phoneme of pause, realized by silence and otherwise discernible by the occurrence of postpausal and prepausal allophones of the unit-final and unit-initial phonemes, and possibly by other postpausal and prepausal features typical of the language (phoneme distribution, for example), I call it *CURSUS*. French is a typical *cursus* language because each of its phonological words, no matter how many lexemes it is made up of, is a *cursus*. And the *cursus* is the locus of the accent, which predictably falls, in French, on the *cursus*-final syllable. Thus both the accentual unit and the place of the accent are defined, in phonological terms, by the equation: accentual unit = phonological word = *cursus*. (The *cursus* in French is also, by the way, the locus of intonation and syllabation; that is, intonational curves are describable as properties

---

<sup>15)</sup> Not all languages form compounds with equal ease, and some cannot form them at all. The Romance languages do it rarely, and generally as calques after Germanic originals (like French *station-service* or Italian *stazione servizio* after English *service station*), and among the Germanic languages German is more apt to form compounds, and long ones, than English. (See also below, fn. 17.)

of the *cursus*, and syllabation ignores all morphological and lexical boundaries within the *cursus*. (It should be noted, however, that in some languages, while lexeme boundaries are phonologically obliterated, each lexeme retains its accentual or other suprasegmental identity. Classical Sanskrit seems to have been of this type. One should therefore distinguish between two types of *cursus* languages.) The *cursus* corresponds mostly to that among Garde's *syntagmes accentogènes* which is composed of more than one minimal *syntagme accentogène*, that is, the one in which all but one *syntagmes accentogènes* lose their accent. But it must be observed that the *cursus*, being defined by its boundaries of pause, can also consist of but one *syntagme accentogène*, indeed of one lexeme occurring as a one-lexeme phonological word.<sup>10)</sup>

In other languages, like English and German, for example, the phonological word is not bounded by pauses but it consists of one or more lexemes just like the *cursus* (though more often than not of fewer than does the *cursus*), and of course it bears, by definition, one accent only. This kind of phonological word I call *NEXUS*. Hence if more than one lexeme forms the *nexus*, only one lexeme is accented. Because of the relative shortness of the *nexus* compared with the *cursus*, and because frequently it does not comprise a whole phrase, let alone a clause or sentence, fewer lexemes within any given utterance are clitics, and there is a tendency for certain types of lexemes (pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, function words in general) to appear as clitics more frequently than do other types (nouns, verbs). Nonetheless it still remains impossible to establish two classes — accented words and clitics — with permanent membership. The *nexus* corresponds more or less to Garde's single *syntagme accentogène*, or to the *unité accentuelle minimale* in the non-single *syntagme accentogène*. Languages in which the *nexus* is the typical accentual unit are called *nexus* languages.

Finally, if every lexeme in the lexical inventory of a language occurs in every utterance as a phonological word, with its boundaries and accentuation intact, if neither *nexus* nor *cursus* ever occur in speech, if, in other words, no clitics may ever be discerned, then one

<sup>10)</sup> Current linguistic theory has no means of determining the length of the various *cursus* within an utterance, and of stating rules on their boundaries. This must be left to stylistic and aesthetic criteria as yet unstatable in linguistic terms. But see above, fn. 6.

might speak of a typical word language. But I know of no example of such an idiom. Such words are the *mots accentogènes* of Garde, which, like my one-lexeme phonological words, are never the exclusive components of an utterance, the sole accentual units, of any language Garde cites.

One of the chief differences between Garde's view and my own on what constitutes an accentual unit, and what it consists of, lies in the distinction between accented word and clitic. Garde insists that there are two kinds of lexemes (*mots*), and claims that 'l'appartenance à l'une ou l'autre liste est une propriété syntaxique permanente de chaque mot' (73); see also fn. 5, above). This obliges him to operate with non-accented *mots accentogènes* and with accented clitics (*mots* and *prends*, and *na* and *le*, respectively, in Czech *n'a moste* 'on the bridge' and French *prends-l'e*); to provide compositions of lexemes or morphemes that clearly form one single semantic unit with more than one accent and to declare them to be composed of several accentual units (like *Wasch-h'and-sch'uh*); and to formulate elaborate and complex rules as to when, where, and how such con-ingen-encies come about.<sup>17)</sup> To me, on the other hand, a lexeme occurs either

---

<sup>17)</sup> If it is explained (47) that *Waschhandschuh* has but one primary accent, on *Wasch-*, and a secondary on *-hand-* (does *-schuh* have a tertiary, or would it have one in *Waschhandschuhmacher* 'maker of ...?'), is it then not also admitted that only the primary is *the* accent of the whole unit since it is the one that provides the contrastive function? Or can one pretend that *Waschhandschuh* has three equally functional accents – among which, however, one is more equal than the others? Is not therefore the adjective 'primary' redundant, and the adjective 'secondary' merely referring to a phonetic rather than a functional, accentual contrast? Of course, each syllable must have some loudness or *intensité* to be audible, but only one has the loudest-ness that gives it contrastive force. (Does at this point Garde's use of *intensité* in the sense of 'accentedness' rather than '(acoustic) power' bear poisonous fruit? See above, fn. 3.) Is it not true that the loudness of *Wasch-* alone, and not that of the other syllables, is of the kind that answers the accent-defining question 's'il [l'accent] est là ou s'il est ailleurs' (8)? This does not exclude that various degrees of intensity may have some other functions; but only one per unit has accentual function.

How many accents, by the way, would there be in the compound (and of course I call it so, not just because I spell the whole thing between two blank spaces, but because it is a single nominal unit) *Donaudampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft* 'Danube Steamship Company', or in *Donaudampfschiffahrtsgesellschaftsbeamtenwitwenvereinigung* 'Association of Widows of Employees of the ...'

accented or unaccented (clitic) according to its relation to the phonological word, rather than according to its membership in either of two lists.

I am quite aware that in a *cursus* language a great many more of the lexemes that one might list as *mots accentogènes* may occur as clitics than do in a *nexus* language. (In a word language the problem would of course not arise since there are, by definition, no clitics.) And I am quite aware that in a *nexus* language some or many lexemes regularly occur as clitics and thus actually constitute a list. (We owe the terms 'proclitic' and 'enclitic' to the ancient Greek grammarians, who were able to draw up such lists. But observe that in Greek grammar, too, provision must be made for enclitics, which – as it is often phrased – are words that lose their accent and are pronounced as if they were part of the preceding word, with which they form – as I should phrase it – a *nexus*.) But if one wants to fashion (as do Garde and myself) a general theory of accentuation, one ought to prefer the description that furnishes the more general statements.

## V

As distinctive features are attached to the morpheme (through the intermediacy of the phoneme), and accentual features to the phonological word (if I may now thus reinterpret Garde's *mot*), so intonational features are attached to the phrase (31, 43, 49, etc.). For example, in the question *il pleut?* the higher pitch on the verb 'n'est pas une propriété du morphème *pleut* ni de l'unité accencuelle [cursus] *il pleut*, puisque ces mêmes unités peuvent se rencontrer avec une intonation différente (*il pleut*, intonation descendante), et que la même intonation montante peut affecter de façon identique des unités totalement différentes, tout en continuant à correspondre au même signifié 'interrogation'. (43)<sup>18</sup>) To this one ought to add that

---

– the second admittedly a stylistic monster but not grammatically un-German, and indeed theoretically expandable (*-sferienfahrt* 'Vacation Trip of the ...').

<sup>18</sup>) It is possible to analyze the French pronoun subject + verb as a single lexeme with preposited inflexional marker: *ilpleut*, as it were, (often *ipleut*), wherein *il* (*i*) corresponds exactly to the inflexional morpheme *it* in Latin *pluit*. But as long as it possible to insert another morpheme between *il* and

sometimes a phrase may be – in the shape of a word, or nexus, or *cursus* – a single phonological word, in which case the intonation becomes coincidentally a feature of the phonological word (see my remarks, above, on the French *cursus* as the locus of intonation), which may even be coextensive with a single morpheme.

A vigorous blow is here struck – and high time it is – against the various ‘pitch phonemes’ in other than tone languages, where these so-called phonemes of pitch patently do not, though they do in tone languages, form part of a morpheme. Tone (of a morpheme) and intonation (of a phrase) are thus happily divorced (the marriage should never have taken place), and both are kept distinct from accent in Garde’s reasonable and useful definition.

Beside the accentual unit an important notion in Garde’s scheme is the accentuable unit (*unité accentuable*), which ‘dans beaucoup de langues se confond avec celle de *syllabe*’ (13), and in some few, notably Classical Greek, with the *mora*. ‘La notion de *mora* s’applique à des langues où il peut y avoir mouvement de l’accent non seulement d’une syllabe à l’autre, mais aussi d’un fragment de syllabe à un autre. On appelle alors *mora* tout fragment de syllabe apte à recevoir l’accent par lui même’. (14) Garde’s treatment of the *mora* in relation to the syllable is the best and most sensible I have come across.

Since the syllable is involved in Garde’s accentology one would expect it to be defined. It is not, however, and Garde merely remarks that everyone agrees that it is ‘une unité non-signifiante’ and that ‘la coupe de syllabe se déduit de la structure phonématique de chaque segment’ (14). This is true, though it is not a definition. (No commonly accepted definition is in fact available. But I hope that my forthcoming book cited earlier will offer an acceptable one.) For the purposes of accentuation, however, the important charac-

---

*pleut*, as in *il ne pleut pas* (whereas *pluit* is completely amalgamated: *non pluit*, not \**plu non it*), it is perhaps better to maintain two lexemes, *il* and *pleut*, which, however, occur invariably as a single morphological word (or possibly as part of a yet longer morphological word, or *cursus*). Presumably it is this accentual singleness, their being one phonological word, which may eventually facilitate their coalescence into one lexeme. Such is, one may surmise, the process whereby inflexional morphemes (bound morphemes) arose from original lexemes (free morphemes) – for one can scarcely assume that bound morpheme were, in any language, original, primary, primitive meaningful units.

teristic of the syllable is not its boundaries but its accentuable portion, its nucleus, which is always a (phonemic) vowel. Each syllable contains one and only one vowel, and each utterance has as many syllables, or accentuable units, as it has vowels. Thus the absence of the definition of the syllable in terms of its extent and boundaries, of its shape, is not a crucial shortcoming in accentology.

It is worth noting, however, that the locus of syllabation is the same as the locus of accentuation, namely, the phonological word (word, nexus, or cursus). That is to say that within the phonological word, or accentual unit, all morphological boundaries are obliterated phonologically; and since the syllable is a phonological rather than a morphological unit (possible coincidences notwithstanding), syllable boundaries ignore morpheme and lexeme boundaries. Hence *aux États-Unis* (assuming this to be a phonological word, or cursus) is syllabized /o-ze-ta-zy-ni/. To be sure, nothing having to do with the accent is thereby affected; but the congruence of the locus of accentuation and the locus of syllabation is interesting. Garde's correct view that 'la division en unités accentuables (syllabes ou mores) est sans rapport avec celle en unités significatives ou morphèmes' (15) may now be extended by adding '... ou lexèmes'.

Since Garde distinguishes oppositional features attached to the morpheme from contrastive features (like accent) attached to the phonological word, he also holds, consistently and justifiably, that 'il peut y avoir des traits prosodiques oppositionnels qui seront distingués des traits prosodiques accentuels [contrastifs] par les mêmes critères' (35).<sup>19</sup> Thus, 'la quantité en tchèque est un trait prosodique oppositionnel et non accentuel, parce qu'elle entre dans la définition des morphèmes. C'est ce qui la distingue de l'intensité

<sup>19</sup> Garde uses, as I generally do, the term 'prosodic' as synonymous with 'suprasegmental', encompassing all those qualities of a phoneme segment in a chain which are added, for whatever reason or purpose, to those features of which the segment is composed and by which it is identified. (Admittedly, 'suprasegmental', conveying the transcriptional notion of some signs being added above or beside the phoneme, is not the most felicitous term and may be misleading. Perhaps 'extrasegmental' would be better.) Some scholars, however, use 'prosodic' to name only contrastive but not oppositional extrasegmental features; in that case, of course, Garde's distinction between two kinds of prosodic features does not apply. Naturally, the question as to what prosodies 'really' are is senseless, they are what we define them to be, and according to how we operate with them.

en russe, qui n'est déterminable qu'au niveau du mot [phonologique]' (35). Or, stated differently, a phonological word (also a lexeme) in Czech exhibits oppositional prosodic features in every syllable, i.e., every syllable is either long or short; but each Russian phonological word has only one accent, i.e., one syllable that is functionally marked (generally by greater loudness) in comparison with all the others in the same word. (Of course, accent functions in the same way in Czech, except that its position is predictably initial in the phonological word, which in Czech is a word or a nexus: *n'a mostě*.) In other words, when we speak of prosody we must state whether we mean an oppositional or a contrastive prosodic feature.

In the chapter *La place de l'accent* (97–139) Garde makes the customary distinction between fixed (i.e., predictably placed with respect to accentual unit boundaries) and free (i.e., not so predictably placed) accent (97–100, 105–139, respectively). To these he adds the quasi-fixed accent (100–105), and the *accent à liberté limitée* (137–139). Of course, fixed accent placement on phonological grounds (e.g., distance from the beginning or end of the phonological word) is not the same as fixed on morphological grounds: if a lexeme is regularly accented on the same syllable of the root, for example, the accented syllable need not therefore occupy the same phonological place in all forms of the lexeme, because the number of syllables after or before the root may vary according to affixal conditions. (But I rather think that the term 'fixed accent' is generally used in the phonological sense, accentuation itself being usually described as a phonological phenomenon.) Hence Garde concludes that 'l'accent libre se distingue de l'accent fixe par le fait qu'il peut aider, dans certains cas, à déceler la structure morphologique du mot' (109), whence it follows that 'dans les langues à accent libre les morphèmes ont ce qu'on peut appeler des propriétés accentuelles, c'est-à-dire une aptitude à influencer sur la place de l'accent' (110), or, phrased differently, 'les langues à accent libre sont celles où les morphèmes ont des propriétés accentuelles, les langues à accent fixe celles où ils n'en ont pas' (115). One may be a bit uneasy about having this statement set side by side with the definition of accent (of all types) as a contrastive feature pertaining to a level higher than the morpheme. But perhaps the following puts one's qualms to rest: '... les mots seuls sont doués d'un *accent*, les morphèmes, eux, sont doués, d'une part, de traits distinctifs, et de l'autre de *propriétés accentuelles*, dont

l'ensemble forme ce qu'on peut appeler l'accentuation du morphème' (112) — provided that one interprets *mot* as the phonological word, which is defined, at least in part, by the presence of the accent within it, whereas the morpheme or the lexeme either does or does not bear the accent, and accordingly either is or is not accented. Hence accentology and morphology must be kept separate from one another in analysis (112–114), which has not always been done.

I quite agree that 'c'est en effet dans le cadre du mot (plus exactement de l'unité accentuelle [N.B.]) que jouent les lois fixant la place de l'accent' (111), and that 'dans toutes les langues, aussi bien à accent fixe qu'à accent libre, l'application de ces lois [permettant de prévoir la place de l'accent dans le cadre du mot] suppose qu'on connaisse la totalité du mot (de l'unité accentuelle [N.B.])' (114). Unfortunately, on the following pages (as on the preceding pages) the term *mot* is once more used indiscriminately for both accentual unit and lexeme (notably in the classification of *mots* as either *accen-togènes* or *non-accen-togènes*), and the confusion resumes or continues.

The quasi-fixed accent occurs 'où la détermination de la place de l'accent suppose, non seulement la délimitation de l'unité accentuelle, mais encore l'identification de certains morphèmes intérieurs à cette unité, c'est-à-dire des données grammaticales supplémentaires. Ces langues se comportent, dans ces cas particuliers, comme des langues à accent libre, où la place de l'accent dépend de la structure morphématique interne de l'unité accentuelle' (100). Examples of such languages are Polish, Macedonian, and (Classical) Latin (100–105). I suspect that this type of accent could actually be accommodated within the fixed accent, especially as regards Latin. But the argument would lead too far afield. Garde himself says that 'ces cas [sont] marginaux sans doute . . .' (100).

Finally, the accent à *liberté limitée* occurs 'où les règles de place de l'accent font intervenir à la fois les propriétés accentuelles des morphèmes et la limite de mot' (137). More precisely, in such a language 'les morphèmes sont doués de propriétés accentuelles à partir desquelles sont formulées les lois fixant la place de l'accent. Mais ces lois ne jouent qu'à l'intérieur d'une 'zone accentuelle' comptée à partir de la limite du mot. Les exemples les plus connus sont ceux du grec ancien, où la 'zone accentuelle' comprend les trois dernières mores du mot, et du grec moderne, où elle comprend les trois dernières syllabes' (137–138).



The final chapter of the book deals with *L'unité accentuelle et la syllabe* (140–167). It contains an excellent account of the accentuation of Classical Greek (144–148), a classic example for the necessity of the mora concept; Garde's presentation of it seemed to me the most convincing and most usable in the literature. I cannot independently judge the sections on several Slavic idioms in this chapter (148–159), or on Lithuanian (160–165). But Garde finds that among all these languages only Classical Greek and Čakavian require the use of the mora. 'C'est donc la syllabe qui reste, dans l'immense majorité des langues, l'unité accentuable' (166).

Garde's book is a pioneering work for which linguists must be grateful. It is but natural that it is not free of shortcomings – which the critic is able to discover thanks to the presence of all the good things in the book. (If I gave much space to the expression of disapproval, I did so because there were involved matters of principle, and because I wanted not only to criticize but also to suggest some alternative solutions.) Yet it is also but natural that future examinations and discussions in the domain of accentology in general, and of the accentuation of individual languages in particular, will constantly have to refer to this book.

ERNST PULGRAM

*The University of Michigan,  
Department of Romance Languages,  
Ann Arbor, Mich. 48104, U.S.A.*