
The Development of Proto-Slavic Quantity (from Proto-Slavic to Modern Slavic Languages)

Author(s): Mate Kapović

Source: *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, Vol. 51 (2005), pp. 73-111

Published by: Harrassowitz Verlag; Austrian Academy of Sciences Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24749752>

Accessed: 29-07-2017 00:27 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Harrassowitz Verlag, Austrian Academy of Sciences Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*

MATE KAPOVIĆ

The Development of Proto-Slavic Quantity (from Proto-Slavic to Modern Slavic Languages)¹

INTRODUCTION

In Common Slavic², the distinctive vowel quantity was replaced by the distinctive vowel quality. The old opposition of, for instance, *a : *ā was replaced by the opposition of *o : *a³ (*radu ≠ *rādu > *rodъ «genus» ≠ *radъ «work»). In some positions, new *a remains long [ā] (and *o short, cf. Croatian gen. sg. *rāda* ≠ *rōda*), while in the other it is shortened – Croatian *glāva* «head» : *glāvica* «head (diminutive)»⁴. The aim of this paper is to determine precisely in which cases the shortening

¹ I am grateful to my professor Bulcsú László for his help with this paper and for everything I have learned from him. All the shortcomings are of course just mine. I would also like to thank Kristina Marenic for reading the text carefully and to Siniša Habijanec for a couple of useful points. – Abbreviations: > – yields; ⇒ – yields by analogy; ~ – is connected with; ≠ – different from; # – beginning/end of a word; V – vowel; V: – long vowel; C – consonant; R – sonant.

² The reconstruction of Common Slavic (or Late Proto-Slavic) is traditional, thus only a formula. The reason for this lies in the fact that Slavic languages have already been clearly differentiated in the period for which the accentual system can be reconstructed directly. The accentual system of Proto-Slavic, the real proto-language from which all present-day Slavic languages can be derived, cannot, however be reconstructed directly. The language here referred to as Proto-Slavic was the homogeneous language spoken around year 600. The language here referred to as Common Slavic is a heterogeneous language spoken in the period between the 7th and the 11th century (cf. for instance Holzer 1995 or 2003). During this period, some pan-Slavic changes still occurred (together with the changes typical for separate Slavic languages only). After the 11th century there were no more pan-Slavic changes (and thus there was no more Common Slavic).

³ Other changes: *e > *ē, *ē > *ĕ; *i > *ī, *ī > *i; *u > *ū, *ū > *y. The old diphthongs: *ey > *i; *ay > *ē; *aw (> *ō) > *u; *em/en/im/in > *ē, *am/an/um/un > *o. The vowels *a, *ĕ, *i, *u, *y, *ē, *o were originally always long and *e, *o, *ī, *ū were originally always short (so the quantity was at first redundant, not distinctive).

⁴ This and other types of shortening, together with the new lengthening of the old short vowels (like *bōgъ > Croatian *bōg*, cf. Kapović 2005b), resulted in the development of the new distinctive length in Slavic. After that all the vowels could have been either short or long (in Croatian for instance *a, e, i, o, u* : *ā, ē, ī, ō, ū + r, ȑ*). In Proto-Slavic and pre-shortening/pre-new-lengthening Common Slavic this was not the case.

of the old long vowels in various Slavic languages occurred as well as to show in what instances the old long vowels remained long.

The conditions in which the old length is preserved are not the same in all Slavic languages. It depends on the intonation of the long syllable (for instance, Czech preserves the length from the old acute and neo-acute while Croatian preserves the length from the old circumflex and neo-acute), on the number of syllables in a word (the length tends to be preserved in shorter words and shortened in longer ones) and on the position in the word (for instance, in the first pretonic syllable the length tends to be preserved but in the second pretonic syllable it is shortened).

Old Slavic (more precisely Old Russian and Old Polish) loanwords in Finnish, Karelian, Estonian, Lithuanian and Latvian show that the length of the originally long vowels in Slavic (*a, *ě, *i, *u, *o, *ę) is preserved regardless of the intonation, the position in the word or the number of syllables (Stang 1957: 52-55). The preserved features are: the old acute length (Lithuanian *knygà* ~ Croatian *knjīga* «book», Finnish *määra* ~ Croatian *mjěra* «measure»), the circumflex length (Lithuanian *pỹvas* ~ Croatian *pīvo* «beer»), the neo-acute length (Lithuanian *sūdas* ~ Croat. dial. *sūd* «court of law»), the length of the old acute in the first syllable of trisyllabic words (Lithuanian *mōčeka* ~ Croatian *māćeħa* «stepmother»), the length of the old acute in the second syllable of trisyllabic words (Lithuanian *bagótas* ~ Croatian *bogat* «rich»), the pretonic length of the first syllable of trisyllabic words (Lithuanian *pūstyti* ~ Croatian *pūstīti* «let go», Karelian *siivatta* ~ Croatian *život* «life»), the posttonic length of the second syllable in trisyllabic words (Lithuanian *zėrkolas* ~ Russian *зėркало* «mirror»). These loanwords show no trace of the old nasality of *ę and *o (cf. Lithuanian *sūdas* ~ Old Church Slavic *sođь* and Lithuanian *rėdas* ~ OCS *ređь* «order» with Lithuanian -ū- and -ė- where the nasals should be). This leads us to the conclusion that the original Proto-Slavic length (i. e. the redundant length of the Slavic *a, *ě, *i, *u, *o, *ę) was preserved in all positions and conditions even after the denasalisation of *o and *ę. Thus, the shortening of the old (redundant) length, which will be discussed in this article, must be viewed as a post-Common Slavic development, even though the process of shortening is very similar in various Slavic languages and shows clear common tendencies of development.

SOME PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS ON PROTO-SLAVIC QUANTITY

The problem of Slavic quantity has rarely been discussed in great detail and in an entirely satisfactory manner, to the best knowledge of the author of this article. Here, we will take a look at two somewhat longer presentations of the problem – Christian Stang's (1957) and Terence R. Carlton's (1991)⁵.

Stang deals with some of the problems discussed in this article in the chapter «Accent and quantity» (1957: 35-55) in his monograph *Slavonic accentuation*. His

⁵ Frederik Kortlandt's (1975) ideas about quantity are briefly discussed further on in the article. Cf. footnotes 50 and 120.

presentation is very good but not very detailed – he touches on some problems which are not discussed here, but he fails to mention a lot of special cases discussed in this article. Here we will point out some of the shortcomings of Stang's treatment of the problem. Stang for instance says that the Czech short *-i-* in *tišina* «silence» is not clear – this short vowel is of course due to generalization of a regularly short *-i-* in original a. p. *c* nouns in *-ina* like Czech *planina* «mountain». He leaves Croat. nouns with the unexpected short vowels like *crnina* «blackness» unexplained. However, these are due to a simple analogy with the other (short < originally acuted) suffix *-ina* we see in Croat. *slànina* «bacon» (see further in the text). He also fails to explain the Croat. verb type *trùbiti*, *trùbim*. While discussing the posttonic length, Stang adduces a large number of useful examples but not systematically (he does not treat a. p. *a*, a. p. *b* and a. p. *c* stems, acuted and circumflexed posttonic length separately etc.), which prevents him from making more coherent conclusions.

Carlton, while discussing the Slavic accentuation in his *Introduction to the phonological history of the Slavic languages* gives a short overview of the length problem («The preservation of Proto-Slavic length», 1991: 208-214). His presentation also has some shortcomings. He fails to see that the length in the examples like Czech *útěcha* or *útroba* has to be secondary (cf. Croat. *ùtjeha*, *ùtroba*, dial. *ùtroba*) because the pretonic length in the first syllable is regularly shortened in trisyllabic words (see further in the text). He does however see the regularity of the shortening in **malīna* > Croat. *màlina*. He adduces the examples like **pīs̥mō* and **polt̥nō* as the evidence for the length preservation but does not note that these examples are not fully reliable because the length could be secondary. He adduces the words **mēs̥ēcs̥*⁶ and **prēdīvo* (Czech *měsíc* and *předivo*) as the example of the different treatment of the posttonic length in Czech but does not note the importance of the intonation of the first syllable. He considers the reflection of the posttonic length as generally sporadic, which is in fact true only for the a. p. *a* in West Slavic. He assumes that **žīvinō* yields Croat. *žīvinu* by the regular shortening of the posttonic length in trisyllables which is incorrect (cf. below) etc. Neither of the two treatments analyzes all the relevant cases and examples and both show misunderstanding of particular details. We will try to explain them in this article.

THE RETAINMENT AND SHORTENING POSITIONS

There are several major conditions for the development of the old length. Firstly, the final open syllables. Secondly, the accented length (under acute, circumflex and neo-acute). Thirdly – pretonic length, and fourthly – posttonic length. Thus, we look at length in all possible positions – accented and unaccented (before or after the accent) and in final open syllable (which is a special case).

⁶ For technical reasons, **ę* is written instead of **ě* when it is accented.

I) The final open syllables

Common Slavic	Croatian	Czech	Slovak
acc. sg. *zīmǫ «winter»	<i>zīmu</i>	<i>zimu</i>	<i>zimu</i>
gen. sg. *vīlkā «wolf»	<i>vūka</i>	<i>vlka</i>	<i>vlka</i>
dat. sg. *vīlkū	<i>vūku</i>	<i>vlku</i>	<i>vlku</i>

The final open syllables, if originally long (*-a#, *-i#, *-u#, *-y#, *-e#, *-o#, *-ě#), are shortened. They are shortened in posttonic position (*zīmǫ), as well as under the stress (A. *ženǫ). The former length of the acc. sg. ending *-ǫ is evidenced in Croatian *zimūs* «last winter» < *zimūs* < *zīmōš (formal reconstruction, one would expect CSI acc. sg. *zīmǫ šǫ «this winter»). The former length of the dat. sg. ending *-u (*vīlkū < PIE *wǵkʷōy) is seen in Vedic *vṛkāy-a*, Greek λύκω, Latin *lupō*.

All long vowels in final open syllable in Slavic are secondary⁷.

II) Acute

*kōrva «cow» > Croat. *krāva*, Sln. *kráva*, Bulg. *кpàвa*, Czech *kráva*, Slk. *krava*, Pol. *krowa*, Slovincian *'krova*, Russ. *кopóвa*

CSI	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	ULus.	Russ.
*bērza «birch»	<i>brēza</i>	<i>brěza</i>	<i>břiza</i>	<i>breza</i>	<i>brēza</i>	<i>берěза</i>
*bōlto «mud»	<i>blāto</i>	<i>bláto</i>	<i>bláto</i>	<i>blato</i>	<i>blóto</i>	<i>болóто</i>
*kōrva	<i>krāva</i>	<i>kráva</i>	<i>kráva</i>	<i>krava</i>	<i>krówa</i>	<i>кopóвa</i>
*sōlma «straw»	<i>slāma</i>	<i>sláma</i>	<i>sláma</i>	<i>slama</i>	<i>slóma</i> ⁸	<i>солóма</i>
*vōrna «crow»	<i>vrāna</i>	<i>vrána</i>	<i>vrána</i>	<i>vra</i>	<i>wróna</i>	<i>вopóнa</i>

In Croatian, the acute is reflected as " on the old long vowels (-ā-, -jē-, -ū-, -ī-, -ē- < *ē). In Slovene, the reflection of the old acute in the non-final syllable is rising (first short rising and then later secondary lengthened – length is not distinctive in non-final syllables in Slovene) – *brāta* < *brāt(r)a. In the final syllable, it remains short and becomes falling – *brāt* < *brāt(r)ъ. In Czech, the acute is reflected as length. Upper Lusatian has the trace of the old acute length in the /ó/ and /ě/ vowels

⁷ We cannot go into details here but cf. for instance in Croatian, gen. sg. *ženē* < *ženē* «woman» analogically after gen. sg. *tē* «this (f.)» < *tojē; instr. sg. *ženōm* < *ženōm* < *ženōv* < *zenojū < *zenojǫ; gen. pl. *ženā* with -ā < -āh, analogous to i-stems gen. pl. -ī < *-ijъ (contraction), instead of short -ah < *-ъхъ; 3. sg. present tense *rāni* < *rānītъ; in the definite adj. -ī < *-ijъ, -ā < *-aja, -ō < *-oje etc. Dybo (cf. Dybo 1981: 30-2, the same in Dybo – Zamiatina – Nikolaev 1990: 31-4) believes that only unaccented final syllables (in a. p. c) were regularly shortened but his hypothesis is not very convincing because most of the later length in final open syllables in Slavic can very easily be explained analogically and Dybo's solution encounters many problems which we cannot get into in this article. For a traditional explanation of all *Auslaut* long syllables as secondary, cf. Stang 1957.

⁸ In Upper Lusatian *ó* > *o* in front of velars and labials (Carlton 1991: 262).

in CoRC-syllables (where the metathesis of the liquids operated)⁹. Other West Slavic languages (Slovak, Polish, Slovincian) have no trace of the old acute. In Russian, the stress is on the second syllable in *polnoglasie*: acc. sg. *ворóну* < *vörnŋ (& if from the old circumflex, the stress is on the first syllable, acc. sg. *зóлову* < *gōlvŋ «head»).

The preservation of the length of the old acute in Czech is limited by the number of syllables in a word: mono- and disyllables preserve the length, whereas polysyllables do not: *vrána*, but instr. sg. *vranou* < *vörnŋŋ; *síla* «force», but *silou*; *víra* «faith», but *věriti*¹⁰ «to trust»; *znáti* «to know», but *doznati* «to find out»; *kámen* «rock», but gen. sg. *kamene* etc. The long or the short vowel can be generalized secondarily in all forms¹¹: *bříza*, instr. sg. *břízou* (& *silou*) or *ryba*, instr. sg. *rybou* «fish» instead of Old Czech *rýba*, instr. sg. *rybou*; *místo* «place» and *město* «town». The old acute length in Czech is also preserved in trisyllables with a weak *yer* in the first syllable which was probably dropped very early: *lǣžica (Croat. *žlica*) «spoon» > Czech *lžíce*, *pǣsǣti «to write» > Czech *psáti*, *spǣti «to sleep» > Czech *spáti*, *sǣrǣti «to shit» > Czech *sráti*, *pǣrǣti «to wash» > Czech *práti*, *zǣvǣti «to call» > Czech *zváti* etc.

Upper Lusatian, unlike Czech, preserves the length from the old acute (in CoRC-syllables) in trisyllabic infinitives as well: *plōšić* «to scare» ~ Czech *plašiti*¹² (Croat. *plāšiti*).

In Hungarian loanwords from Slavic, dating from the 9th or 10th century, the length of the old acute is attested in polysyllabic words. In these positions, no trace of the old acute length is preserved anywhere in Slavic.

Common Slavic	Hungarian	Czech
*besęda «talk»	<i>beszéd</i>	<i>beseda</i>
*obędъ «meal, lunch»	<i>ebéd</i>	<i>oběd</i>
*sęsędъ «neighbour»	<i>szomszéd</i>	<i>soused</i>

III) Circumflex

1. disyllables ' • V: • ѡ/ѡ • (full syllable¹³ with ^ and a yer)

*gōlsъ «voice» > Croat., Sln. *glās*, Bulg. *глас* (pl. *гласовѣ*), Cz., Slk. *hlas*, Pol. *głos*, Slovenc. *glos*, Russ. *зóлоц*

⁹ ULus. *blóto* & *zloto* «gold», *bręza* & *drjewo* «tree» ~ Croat. *blāto* & *zlāto*, *bręza* & *drijęvo* (Carlton 1991: 195-6, 261-2).

¹⁰ In Czech, we shall write the infinitives consistently with a full -*ti*, according to the older norm.

¹¹ Carlton 1991: 195.

¹² Carlton 1991: 261-262.

¹³ Here, any syllable except a syllable with a yer (ъ or ѡ) is considered a full syllable.

CSl	Croatian	Slovene	Czech	Russian
*gōlsъ ¹⁴	<i>glās</i>	<i>glās</i>	<i>hlas</i>	зѡлос
*gōrdъ «town»	<i>grād</i>	<i>grād</i>	<i>hrad</i>	зѡроѡ
*kōlsъ «ear»	<i>klās</i>	<i>klās</i>	<i>klas</i>	кѡлос
*vōrgъ «enemy, devil»	<i>vrāg</i>	<i>vrāg</i>	<i>vrah</i>	вѡрог
*vōrtъ «neck»	<i>vrāt</i>	<i>vrāt</i>	<i>vrat</i>	вѡром

In Croatian, the length is retained in disyllable *glās* (cf. *mrāz* < *mōrzъ), but it is shortened in plural (trisyllable • V • V • V •) – *glāsovi*. In Slovene, there is *glās* and gen. sg. *glasā* with the progressive shift of the circumflex (cf. *mrāz*, gen. sg. *mrāza* < *mōrzъ).

In Croatian and Slovene, the last syllable of a. p. c nouns is lengthened in nom. sg., cf. Croat. nom. sg. *bōg*, Sln. *bōg* < *bōgъ «god», which is thus, in nom. sg., the same as Croat. *zūb*, Sln. *zōb* < *zōbъ «tooth». The gen. sg., with the progressive shift of the circumflex, is also the same in Sln., *bogā* = *zōbā*, whereas the difference is maintained in Croat., *bōga* < *bōga ≠ *zūba* < *zōba.

In Czech, as in all other West Slavic languages, the circumflex is shortened (cf. *hlas*, *hrad* etc.). Czech preserves the acute length though (*dar* < *dārъ «gift» ≠ *māk* < *mākъ «poppy»). This difference is also maintained in Russian nouns with *pognoglasie*, cf. зѡлос < *gōlsъ ≠ морѡз < *mōrzъ «frost».

2. disyllables ' • V: • V • (two full syllables, ˘ on the first syllable)¹⁵

*mēso «meat» > Croat. *mēso*, Sln. *mesō*, Bulg. *mecō*, Cz. *maso*, Slk. *mäso*, Pol. *mieśo*, Slovenc. *'mjāso*, Russ. *мясо*

Common Slavic	Croatian	Slovene	Czech
*mēso	<i>mēso</i>	<i>mesō</i>	<i>maso</i>
*sēno «hay»	<i>sijēno</i>	<i>senō</i>	<i>seno</i>
*tēlo «body»	<i>tijēlo</i>	<i>telō</i>	<i>tělo</i>
*tēsto «dough»	<i>tijēsto</i>	<i>testō</i>	<i>těsto</i>
*zōlto «gold»	<i>zlāto</i>	<i>zlatō</i>	<i>zlato</i>

In Croatian, there is no shortening in disyllables – cf. *mēso*, but acc. sg. *srāmotu* < *sōrmotъ «shame» with the shortening in trisyllabic word. In Slovene, because of

¹⁴ *-ol- is a diphthong and that is why it has a long accent (*o is immanently short otherwise). The same goes for *-el-, *-er-, *-or-, *-yl-, *-yr-, *-yl-, *-yr-.

¹⁵ The following conditions of the shortening of the circumflex are of course valid for Štokavian, Čakavian and Kajkavian only. In Slovene, the circumflex is always shifted to the next syllable (if there is one) as ˘ and in West Slavic languages the circumflex always yields a short vowel so there is no need for special conditions of shortening of the circumflex there.

the progressive circumflex shift, *slovô* is the same as *mesô* (< *slôvo «word», *mêso), cf. Croatian *slôvo* ≠ *mêso*. Czech, and all the other West Slavic languages, have a short vowel. In Czech, the acute length is preserved, cf. *zlato* < *zôlto ≠ *bláto* < *bôlto.

3. trisyllables ' • V: • ъ • ъ • (full syllable with \acute and two yers)

*ôlkътъ «elbow» > Croat. *lâkat*, Sln. *lakât*, Bulg. *лákът*, Cz. *loket*, Slk. *laket'*, Pol. *lokiec*, Slovenc. *'lokc*, Russ. *лôкомъ*

Common Slavic	Croatian	Slovene	Czech
*bôbънъ «drum»	<i>bûbanj</i>	[<i>bôbъn</i>] ¹⁶	<i>buben</i> ¹⁷
*dъlъžънъ «indebted»	<i>dûžan</i>	<i>dolžân</i>	(<i>dlužný</i>) ¹⁸
*xôldъnъ «cold»	<i>hlâdan</i>	<i>hladân</i>	(<i>chladný</i>)
*ôlkътъ	<i>lâkat</i>	<i>lakât</i>	<i>loket</i> ¹⁹
*têžъkъ «heavy»	<i>têžak</i>	<i>težâk</i>	(<i>těžký</i>)

In Croatian, *bûbanj* (pl. *bûbnji*) and *lâkat* (pl. *lâkti*) show no shortening, but in long plurals shortening occurs – *bûbnjevi*, *lâktovi*²⁰. The examples *lâkat* < *ôlkътъ (• V • ъ • ъ) with no shortening vs. *mlâdôst* < *môldostъ (• V • V • ъ) «youth» with the shortening show that the yer-syllable is different than a regular full syllable²¹. The length in the adjectives like Croat. *hlâdan* is supported by forms like fem. *hlâdna*, *hlâd* «shade». This goes to show that the adjective forms are not really conclusive as the length there could be analogical. In examples like Croat. *bûbanj*²²

¹⁶ The examples in square brackets mark an unexpected (or irregular) outcome. Sln. *bôbъn* is an analogical accent due to the prepositional phrases like *na bôbъn*. The same analogy is seen in Sln. *pôlje* «field» instead of the older *polje*, because of the generalization of the accent in the prepositional phrases like *na pôlje* (cf. Croat. *na polje*).

¹⁷ Slk. *bubon* and Slovenc. *'bqbel*.

¹⁸ The examples in brackets are here only for the sake of completeness – the root is the same, but the form (or the suffix) is different. Czech adjectives like *dlužný*, *chladný* and *těžký* are definite/long adjectives which correspond to Croat. dial. long forms like *hlâdnî* or *têškî* where the length is shortened in front of the new length due to the contraction (to be discussed later in the text). These short root vowel definite adjectives (Cz. *chladný*, Croat. *hlâdnî*) correspond to the a. p. c. indefinite adjectives with a long root vowel (Croat. *hlâdan*). Cz. *chladný* (a. p. c) is different from *bílý* (a. p. b) «white» (Croat. *hlâdnî* : *bijê-lî*).

¹⁹ Cz. *loket* and Slovenc. *'lokc* with #lo-, and not #la- (cf. Cz. *lačný* «hungry», Čakavian *lâčan* < *ôlčъnъ) also confirm the circumflex (≠ Cz. *râdlo*, Croat. *râlo* < *ôrdlo «plough-share»).

²⁰ *bôbъnî (V • ъ • V) ≠ *môldostъ (V • V • ъ) because of the generalization of the accent of nom. sg. *bôbъnъ or because of the generalization of the accent of gen. sg. *môldosti (where the shortening is certain, like in *ljêpotu* < *lêpotъ «beauty»). The order of the yers could also be important.

²¹ The yer is not lengthened in the last syllable in the nom. sg. of a. p. c (cf. Kapović 2005b: 53).

²² Many nouns have the accentual pattern of *bûbanj* – *bûbnja* – *bûbnjevi*, some of them are younger and some of them are older: *tûtanj*, *pûcanj*, *sijêčanj*, *trâvanj*, *svîbanj*, *lîpanj*,

and *lākat*²³ however, this cannot be the case which proves that the length is indeed preserved phonetically here.

4. trisyllables ' • V : • V • ъ/ь • (two full syllables and a yer, $\hat{}$ on the first syllable)²⁴

**mōldostъ* «youth» > Croat. *mlādōst*, Sln. *mladōst*, Russ. *мóлодость*

Common Slavic	Croatian	Slovene	Russian
* <i>mōldostъ</i>	<i>mlādōst</i>	<i>mladōst</i>	<i>мóлодость</i>
* <i>žīvostъ</i> «liveliness»	<i>žīvōst</i>	<i>živōst</i>	<i>жівость</i>
* <i>zā nokt'ъ</i> «for the night»	<i>zā nōc</i>	<i>za nōč</i>	<i>зā ночь</i>

In a. p. c, the last syllable is lengthened after the dropping of the yer in Croatian and Slovene which is seen in Slovene in monosyllables only – like *bōg* «god», since there is no unaccented length in Sln. and since the progressive shift of the circumflex always yields long falling accent, cf. *sinōvi* «sons» like *mladōst*. Thus in

sřpanj, rŭjan, skrētanj, bācanj, tŭcanj, šŭšanj, stŭpanj, Mŭčanj, Splāvanj etc. (Jurišić 1992b: 87-89). In some, the accent is clearly secondary: *lipanj* «June» (: *lipa* «lime-tree») instead of *lipaŋ* which is attested in the Posavina dialect (Ivšić 1971: [314]).

²³ Note the difference of: *lākat, lāhta* «elbow» and *lākat, lāhta* «ell» in Dubrovnik (ARj V: 883). Some of the other dialects also have the secondary *lākat* (Posavina – Trnava: *dō lakta*; Strizivojna: *ōd lakta*, Ivšić 1971: [250]) instead of *lākat*, but for both meanings – Vrgada, Novi: *lākat, lāhta*. In some dialects, both variants are attested (Lika, Lastovo: *lākat/lākat*). " instead of $\hat{}$ is analogical to the long plural *lāktovi* or to the oblique cases of plural: gen. pl. *lakāt/lakātā* (in the words meaning measures, gen. pl. is very frequent so its accent can influence the other cases: cf. nom. sg. *hiljada* «thousand» : gen. pl. *hiljādā* ⇒ nom. sg. *hiljada* : gen. pl. *hiljādā* or nom. sg. *gōdina* (Sinj) «year» : gen. pl. *gōdīnā* ⇒ nom. sg. *gōdina* : gen. pl. *gōdīnā*), *lāktima* (depending on the dialect but with a short root in oblique cases). Thus for instance, Vrgada (Čakavian) *lākat* by analogy to gen. pl. *lak'āt* with the length regularly shortened before $\hat{}$.

²⁴ The trisyllables of the type ' • V : • ъ/ь • V • (full syllable with $\hat{}$, a yer and a full syllable) are dealt with in a separate article (Kapović 2005a) because of the complexity of the problem. Adjectives like Croat. *hlādno* (**χōldъno*) «cold» have a possible source of analogy for the length in *hlād* «shade», *hlādna* «cold» (fem.), *hlādi!* (imperative of *hlāditi* «to make something cold»); *mŭško* (**mōžъsko*) «man» has a possible source of analogy for the short vowel in the adjective *mŭškī* «man's» and the adverb *mŭški* «manly»; acc. sg. *djěcu* (**děťъco*) «children» is a derivative in which the vowel could have been shortened precisely because it is a derivative; in the example *sřce* «heart» one might wonder if we are dealing with an original a. p. *a* or a. p. *c* word. Croat. variant *nā sřce*, Sln. *sercē*, Russ. *сѣрдце* (*zā sērdce*), pl. *sērdcā* and Croat. *sřditi se* «to be angry», *sřčan* «brave» etc. all point to a. p. *c* (and also Lith. *širdis*, *širdį* : verb *širsti* and Latv. *sirds* by Meillet's Law). On the other hand, Croat. variant *nā sřce*, nom. pl. *sřca*, gen. pl. *sřdācā* (*sřcā*), the diminutive *sřdāšce* and the usual desinential stress in Slavic derivatives with the suffix *-ьce (Croat. *pivce*, Russ. *нуѣо* «little beer») all point to a. p. *a*. The mobile accent in Russ. and Sln. could be secondary, in Russ. like secondary *nā leto* (cf. Croat. *ljeto*, a. p. *a*) and in Sln. *sřcē* instead of **sřce* (< **sřrdьce*) by the misanalysis of the prepositional gen. sg. *iz sřca* «from the heart». However, despite the difficulties, it seems that one should reconstruct Slavic **sřrdьce* as mobile. See more in Kapović 2005a where this problem has been dealt with in detail.

Croatian we get (Štokavian) *mlādōst* < *mōldostъ = *gōlūb* < *gōlōbъ «pigeon», but gen. sg. *mlādosti* ≠ *gōlūba*. In Croatian, the length of the suffix *-ōst* is generalized in a. p. *a* and thus the old a. p. *a* words in *-ōst* become a. p. *c* words, cf. *stārōst* (a. p. *c*) «old age» = *mlādōst* (a. p. *c*) with the basic *stār* (a. p. *a*) «old» ≠ *mlād* (a. p. *c*) «young». Thus *stārōst*, originally an a. p. *a* word, also becomes mobile, like the old a. p. *c* word *mlādōst*, cf. gen. sg. *ōd mladosti*, loc. sg. *u mladōsti* = gen. sg. *ōd starosti*, loc. sg. *u starōsti*. In Croatian, besides the a. p. *c* type like *mlādōst* (+ *stārōst* a. p. *c* < *stārostъ, a. p. *a*), there is also the a. p. *b* type like *múdrost* «wisdom». The posttonic syllable (formerly under accent, Old Štokavian *mūdrōst*) remained short: *múdrost*, *cr̥nost* «blackness», *jednākost* «equality» with short *-ost*. These words can also have younger long *-ōst*: *múdrōst*, *cr̥nōst*, *jednākōst*²⁵.

5. trisyllables ' • V: • V • V • (three full syllables, ˘ on the first syllable)

*sŷnove «sons» > Croat. *sīnovi*, Sln. *sinōvi*

Common Slavic	Croatian	Slovene
*sŷnove	<i>sīnovi</i>	<i>sinōvi</i>
acc. sg. *nā nogō «on the foot»	<i>nā nogu</i>	<i>na nōgo</i>
*prēdīvo «yarn»	<i>prēdīvo</i>	<i>pređivo</i>

The shortening of the circumflex in trisyllables in Croatian is seen clearly in examples like: *stān* – *stānovi* «apartment», *svijēt* – *svjētovi* «world», *rād* – *rādovi* «work», *grād* – *grādovi* «city» (a. p. *c* long plurals); *prāse* – *prāseta* «pig» < *pōr-se-te, *ždrijēbe* – *ždrēbeta* «foal» < *žērbēte (a. p. *c* heterosyllabic neuters) etc. Cf. also the acc. sg. of the polysyllabic *a*-stems like: *ljēpotu* «beauty», *plāninu* «mountain», *rāzinu* «level» (nom. sg. *ljepōta*, *planina* itd.) < *lēpotō, *pōlnīnō etc. and the trisyllabic neuters like: *prēdīvo* (cf. Sln. *pređivo* < *prēdīvo) or *sječīvo* (*sječīvo) «blade» (a. p. *c*, nom. pl. *predīva*, *sječīva*). Cf. also a toponym (originally a trisyllabic neuter adjective with a long first syllable): *Đākovo*, *ŭ Đakovo*²⁶.

IV) Neo - acute

The neo-acute is preserved only in Croatian dialects – Čakavian, Kajkavian and Old Štokavian, as a separate rising intonation. It is preserved in all positions (the neo-acute length in West Slavic is preserved in all positions as well) which makes the case of the neo-acute a special one if compared to the circumflex and the acute. The old acute and circumflex were either both shortened in Slavic languages or,

²⁵ Modern dialects show different generalizations and neutralizations or coexistence of different variants like: *múdrost* (*múdrōst*) and *mūdrōst*, or *svētōst* and *svētost* (*svētōst*) «sanctity» etc.

²⁶ Ivšić 1971: [252].

depending on the language, only one of them yielded length. This length (acute in Czech, circumflex in Slovene and Croatian) is preserved in some positions only – depending on the number of syllables (the length is shortened in polysyllabic words as a general rule). The neo-acute length does not depend on the number of syllables in a word – the former neo-acute vowel remains long in all Slavic languages which have distinctive length or preserve traces of it. The neo-acute in the present tense forms like *mōltīte «you beat» (2. pl.) preserves the long root (in infinitive *moltīti it is shortened, see further in the text) because the stress had been retracted to the root before all pretonic long syllables got shortened in front of two moras in post-Common Slavic period (see further in the text)²⁷. The traces of the neo-acute, due to its younger origin, are preserved in all Slavic languages – even in languages with no trace of the old acute or circumflex both (like Polish or Slovak). In Czech, Slovak and Polish (which has had the distinctive length up until the 15th century) neoacute yields length²⁸. In Polish, there is no distinctive length today but traces of it remain in certain vowels: *ą* (< *ē, *ō), *ó* (< *ō), dial. also *ę* < *ē and *ą* < *ā. In Slovene, the reflection of the neo-acute is the same as the reflection of the old acute *sūša* < *sūša = *kráva* < *kōrva. In Russian, as in Slovene, both rising intonations yield the same reflection: *сторожа* «guard» < *stōrža = *корова* < *kōrva²⁹.

1. the retraction of the ictus from the weak yer³⁰

*kōtъ «angle» > Croat. dial. *kūt*; Sln. *kót*; Czech *kout*; Slk. *kút*; Pol. *kąt* – *kąta*; Slovenc. *k'ōt*, Russ. dial. *kym* – *kymá*

Common Slavic	Croatian (dial.)	Slovene	Czech	Slovak	Polish	Slovincian	Russian
*kōtъ	<i>kūt</i>	<i>kót</i>	<i>kout</i>	<i>kút</i>	<i>kąt</i>	<i>k'ōt</i>	<i>кym, кymá</i> (dial.)
*kljūčъ «key»	<i>kljūč</i>	<i>kljúč</i>	<i>klíč</i>	<i>kl'úč</i>	(<i>klucz</i>)	<i>kl'ūč</i>	<i>ключ, ключá</i>
*sōdъ «court; judgment»	<i>sūd</i>	<i>sód</i>	<i>soud</i>	<i>súd</i>	<i>sąd, sądu</i>	<i>s'ōd</i>	<i>суд, судá</i>

²⁷ Every ~ is originally caused by a retraction to an earlier pretonic long syllable, in one way or the other. This long syllable remains long even in those cases where it would have been shortened had it stayed pretonic/unaccented. This is simply because the retractions causing the neo-acute are older than the general shortening of pretonic syllables in Slavic. The origin of the neo-acute is pan-Slavic and belongs to the Common Slavic period while the shortening belongs to the post-CSI period (see the Introduction).

²⁸ Czech and Slovak length in a. p. *b* is in fact also neo-acute: *xvālā «praise» > *xvāla > Czech *chvála* (= *kráva* < *kōrva), Slk. *chvála* (≠ *krava*). Slovencian behaves like Slovak (*xvālā ≠ *krova).

²⁹ Russian Leka-dialects have a special reflex from the old neo-acuted *ō: *ō* (high round *o*).

³⁰ This retraction was discovered by the great Croatian linguist Stjepan Ivšić (cf. for instance Ivšić 1911: 182-194 or the same in Ivšić 1971: [132-144]), and it is here referred to as Ivšić's Rule. He also discovered the neo-acute as a separate rising intonation in conservative Croatian dialects and interpreted it correctly.

*pŕŏtŏnĭkъ «traveller»	pŕtŏnĭk	pŕotnik	poutnik	pŭtnik	pątnik		пѹтник
*dŏlžnĭkъ «debtor»	dužnik	dolžnik	dlužnik	dlžnik ³¹	(dłużnik)		должнĭкъ, должника ³²

The retraction of the stress from a weak *yer* (which can no longer be accented) to the preceding length yields a new rising intonation – the neo-acute *~. It is not important whether the weak *yer* is in the final position of the word or in the middle of the word or how many syllables a word has. The old *ŭ*-stems, for instance, could have had the accent on the *yor* in the middle of the word: cf. Croat. dial. *cřkva* «church» (cf. also Sln. *cérkev*, Czech *církev* with a different vocalism) < *cъrkŭ, *cъrkŭve³³, *klětva* «curse» < *klĕtŭ, *klĕtŭve, *gŭžva* «mess» etc.

2. present tense of the a. p. b

*vĕžešъ «you tie up» (2. sg.) > Croat. dial. *věžeš*, Sln. *věžeš*, Czech *vážeš*, Slk. *viažeš*, Pol. *wiążesz*

Common Slavic	Croatian (dial.)	Slovene	Czech	Slovak	Polish	Russian
*vĕžešъ	<i>věžeš</i>	<i>věžeš</i>	<i>vážeš</i>	<i>viažeš</i>	<i>wiążesz</i>	<i>вяжешь</i> (1. вяжѹ)
*pīšešъ «you write»	<i>pīšeš</i>	<i>pīšeš</i>	<i>pīšeš</i>	<i>pīšeš</i>	<i>(piszesz)</i>	<i>пишешь</i> (1. пишѹ)
*slŭžīšъ «you serve»	<i>slŭžīš</i>	<i>slŭžīš</i>	<i>sloužíš</i>	<i>služíš</i>	<i>(służysz)</i>	<i>служишь</i> , (1. служѹ)
*stŏpāješъ > *stŏpāšъ «you march»	<i>stŭpāš</i>	<i>stŏpāš</i>	<i>stoupáš</i>	<i>stúpaš</i>	<i>stąpasz</i>	<i>ступáешь</i>
*mĕšājēšъ > *mĕšāšъ «you mix»	<i>mĕšāš</i> ³⁴	<i>mĕšāš</i>	<i>mícháš</i>	<i>miešaš</i>	<i>(mieszasz)</i>	<i>мешáешь</i>

The length of the thematic vowel explains the retraction of the accent (because it was a long falling accent and there could not have been a falling accent in the

³¹ Czech *poutnik*, *dlužnik* and Slovak *pŭtnik*, *dlžnik* correspond in length to the words from which they are derived – Czech *pout*, *dľuh* and Slovak *pŭt*, *dlh* (cf. Croat. *pŭt* = *pŭtnĭk*, but *dŭg* ≠ *dŭžnĭk*). That is why these forms are not very indicative.

³² Russ. *должнĭкъ* (a. p. b) ~ *долг*, *дѡлга* (a. p. c) «debt» ≠ *нѹтник* (a. p. a*) ~ *нѹтъ*, *нѹтѹ* (a. p. b) «way». The term a. p. a* is used here for a pattern with a fixed long neo-acute stress.

³³ This word is a loanword from Old High German. Germanic languages have a fixed accent on the first syllable which is shifted to the next syllable in Slavic by Dybo's Law (the accent is shifted to the next syllable if the first syllable is not accented – words with the absolute initial accent in a. p. c are phonologically unstressed and hence do not participate in this law, e. g. pre-Dybo Slavic *p'odъ «floor», *p'oda > post-Dybo Slavic *podŭ, *podā > Čakavian *pŏd*, *podā*). Germanic loanwords into Slavic often belong to a. p. b (cf. Matasović 2000).

³⁴ -ĕ- stands here for the different reflections of *yat* (*ĕ) in Croatian dialects.

middle of the word) in examples like Croat. dial. *stŭpāš* < *stŏpāš (contraction³⁵) < *stŏpāješ, *nŏsīš* «you carry» < *nosīš, and even in *kŏljēš* «you slay» < *koļēš (following the presumed compensatory lengthening of *-e- because *lj > *ll > *l by the so called van Wijk's Law)³⁶, but it fails to do so in Croat. *tŏnēš* «you sink» < *tōneš where the length of the thematic -ē- is apparently secondary (cf. Croat. *mŏžeš* «you can», a. p. *b* with no length, Czech *mŭžeš* etc.)³⁷. The retraction of the accent in a. p. *b* in verbs with thematic *-e- can be explained differently – by an analogical retraction to the verbs with the long thematic vowel (*-ī-, *-ā- < *-aje-)³⁸ or by a chain reaction due to the tendency to preserve the distinction of the stress in a. p. *b* and in a. p. *c* because of the weakening of the *yers* and the retraction of the stress in a. p. *c* as a direct result of it³⁹. Thus when a. p. *c* *neseš' «you carry» > *neseš (Ivšić's Rule), in a. p. *b* *možēš (< *možēš) ⇒ *mŏžeš (not a regular sound law!) in order to maintain the difference⁴⁰.

3. the definite adjectives (and ordinal numbers) of the a. p. *b*

*bĕlĭjъ «white» > Croat. dial. *bĕlī*³⁵, Sln. *bĕli*, Czech *bílý*, Slk. *biely*, Russ. *бѣлый*, Slovenc. *bj'ālī*

Common Slavic	Croatian (dial.)	Slovene	Czech	Slovak	Polish	Slovinci-an	Russian
*bĕlĭjъ	<i>bĕlī</i>	<i>bĕli</i>	<i>bílý</i>	<i>biely</i>	(<i>biały</i>)	<i>bj'ālī</i>	<i>бѣлый</i>
*čĕrnĭjъ «black»	<i>črŋī</i>	<i>črni</i>	<i>černý</i>	<i>čierny</i>	(<i>czarny</i>)	<i>čārŋī</i>	<i>чѣрный</i>
*mŏdrgĭjъ «wise»	<i>mŭdrī</i>	<i>mŏdri</i>	<i>moudrý</i>	<i>múdry</i>	<i>mądry</i>	<i>m'ŏdrī</i>	<i>мѹдрый</i>

³⁵ The contraction in this and similar cases, in those Slavic dialects in which it occurred of course, was obviously older than the law of the shortening of all pretonic length in front of two moras (see below).

³⁶ This retraction is usually referred to as Stang's Law because this is the explanation given in his book (Stang 1957). But Stang and most later scholars have disregarded the fact that the very same explanation of the phenomenon, was given 46 years earlier by Stjepan Ivšić (1911: 169-77, the same in Ivšić 1971: [119-27]). Thus, Stang's Law should in fact be called Ivšić's Law and we shall refer to it as Ivšić's Law in this article.

³⁷ For a more detailed account of the problem of the length of the thematic vowel *e in Slavic cf. Kapović 2005b.

³⁸ And by the possible regular retraction in a. p. *b* 3. pl., see footnote number 40.

³⁹ Stankiewicz 1993: 14.

⁴⁰ Thus also in 3. sg. *možēš > *mŏžetš. In 3. pl. the change could have been regular by Ivšić's Law (*mogŏtš > *mŏgŏtš) which might have, among other things, influenced the overall retraction of the accent in the present tense of a. p. *b* (Croat. 3. pl. *mŏgŭ* is, of course, a problem). In 1. sg. there was no need for retraction (a. p. *b* *mogŏ ≠ a. p. *c* *nĕšŏ), and in 1. pl. *možemo/-me and 2. pl. *možete the change would have had to be analogical (in the pre-form of Russian and OCS *mŏžemъ it needs not be analogical). Stang (1957: 117-8) proposes a similar explanation. He also proposes as an alternative solution a possible analogical change *možēš ⇒ *možēš (it becomes falling as in *nosīš) and then regular *možēš > *mŏžeš.

*pěťь «fifth»	pěti	pěti	pátý	piaty	piaty	pj'ōtī	пѣтъ
------------------	------	------	------	-------	-------	--------	------

The neoacute in the definite adjectives of the a. p. *b* (*bělъjъ, *bělaja, *bėlōje) was introduced to preserve the difference of a. p. *b* and a. p. *c* definite adjectives when a. p. *c* generalized the stress on the first syllable of the ending (cf. Russian *сухой*, *сухая*, *сухое*, *сухые*, a. p. *c*). When *suxъjъ > *suxъjъ (Ivšić's Law) and when *suhōje analogically developed to *suhōje (cf. the original *suxāja in the fem.), *bělъjъ, *bělaja, *bėlōje had to shift the accent in order to preserve the difference of a. p. *b* and a. p. *c*⁴¹. Thus, the accent shifted to the beginning and it had to become the neo-acute – *bělъjъ, *bělaja, *bėlōje. The pivotal form for the generalization of the neo-acute on the root must have been the neo-acute in the indefinite masc. nom/acc. sg. *bělъ. Thus a new distinction between the definite adjectives of a. p. *b* and a. p. *c* was formed: *bělъjъ (a. p. *b*) ≠ *suxъjъ «dry» (a. p. *c*) instead of the older *bělъjъ = *suxъjъ after *suxъjъ yielded *suxъjъ by Ivšić's Rule. Before the weakening of the *yers* and Ivšić's Rule: *bělъjъ (a. p. *b*)⁴² ≠ *suxъjъ (a. p. *c*), gen. sg. *bělājego ≠ *suxājego (for the accent of definite adjectives, cf. also Kapović forthcoming a).

The original different stress pattern of the definite adjectives of the a. p. *b* and *c* is faithfully preserved in West Slavic (Dybo 1981: 96-104): cf. for instance Czech a. p. *b* *bílý*, *blizký*, *krátký* and a. p. *c* *suchý*, *těžký*, *slatký*⁴³.

4. the *sūšā-type nouns

*žēd'ā «thirst» > Croat. dial. *žēda*, Sln. *žēja*, Old Czech *žieze*, Pol. *żądza* (dial. *żądź*), Slovenc. *žōza*, Russ. *жажда*

Common Slavic	Croatian dial.	Slovene	Czech ⁴⁴	Upper Lusatian	Polish	Russian	Slovincian
*žēd'ā	<i>žēda</i>	<i>žēja</i>	<i>žieze</i> (Old Czech)		<i>żądza</i>	<i>жажда</i>	<i>žōza</i>
*stōržā «guard»	<i>strāža</i>	<i>strāža</i>	<i>stráž(e)</i>	<i>stróža</i>	<i>stróža</i>	<i>сторожа</i>	
*sūšā «drought»	<i>sūša</i>	<i>sūša</i>	<i>souš(e)</i>		<i>(susza)</i>	<i>суша</i>	<i>(sūš'ā)</i>

⁴¹ Cf. Stankiewicz 1993: 14.

⁴² In pre-Dybo Slavic: *b'ělъjъ (in fact *b'ēluju).

⁴³ In Croatian, the distinction is more or less preserved in some dialects (*bělī* : *sūhī* < *suhī*), but it is often missing because of the secondary spread of the original a. p. *b* pattern in many dialects – younger *sūhī* instead of *sūhī* in order to generalize the length of the indefinite adjective *sūh*, *sūha* < *sūhā*, *sūho* in the definite adjectives as well (cf. Matešić 1970: 174 and Leskien 1914: 386-7). East Slavic often preserves the difference, cf. Russ. *белый* (a. p. *b*) : *сухой* (a. p. *c*) but is in general more innovative than West Slavic (Czech/Slovak, Slovencian).

⁴⁴ In Slk. cf. *hrádza* ~ Croat. *grāda*.

In Slavic, the *ā*-stem nouns of a. p. *b* with the suffix **-ja* always have the neo-acute on the root (**sūsā* or **vòlā*)⁴⁵. This pattern involves some 30 odd nouns in Slavic – mostly younger derivatives (one exception is **vòlā*, cf. Lith. *valià*). The neo-acute accent on the root is explained by van Wijk's Law causing the lengthening of the final **-a* (**sūsja* > **sūsša* > **sūsā* by compensatory lengthening) and then by the retraction of the final falling accent by Ivšić's Law (**sūsā* > **sūsā*) which may not be pan-Slavic. The final long **-ā* is preserved in Slovincian (*v'olā*, *sūsā* – apparently no retraction of the stress in the second example!), Old Polish and Polish dialects (*wolā*, *strózā*). Elsewhere, the normal short *-a* of the a. p. *a* and *c* is generalized. In a. p. *a* and *c* there was no van Wijk's and Ivšić's Law, and accordingly, of course, no neo-acute (cf. Croat. *sāda* «soot», Czech *sáze* for a. p. *a* and Croat. *dúša*, *dúšu*, Czech *duša* for a. p. *c*). For a detailed discussion of the problem of this type of nouns cf. Kapović forthcoming *b*.

V) Pretonic length

When dealing with the reflections of the pretonic length in Slavic, one has to take into account the number of syllables in a word, the position of the pretonic long syllable, the nature of the accent after the pretonic length and the nature of the vowels involved. The accentual paradigm also directly affects the reflection of the pretonic (and posttonic) length in West Slavic and Slovene.

1. disyllables with the final stress • V: • 'V • (two full syllables, pretonic length on the first syllable, accent on the last syllable)

**trǫbā*⁴⁶ «trumpet» (a. p. *b*), **rǫkā* «hand» (a. p. *c*) > Croat. *trúba*, *rúka*, Sln. *trǫba*, *róka*, Czech *trouba*, *ruka*, Slk. *trúba*, *ruka*, Pol. *trąba*, *ręka*, Slovinc. *tr'ǫba*, *r'ąka*

a. p. *b* – length preserved everywhere

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.	Slovinc.	Russ.
<i>*borzdā</i> , <i>*borzdō</i> «furrow»	<i>brázda</i> , <i>brázdu</i>	<i>brázda</i> , <i>brázdo</i>	<i>brázda</i>	<i>brázda</i>	<i>bróзда</i>	<i>'bāřda</i>	<i>бороздā</i> , <i>бороздō</i>
<i>*xvālā</i> , <i>*xvālō</i> «praise»	<i>hvāla</i> , <i>hvālu</i>	<i>hvāla</i> , <i>hvālo</i>	<i>chvāla</i>	<i>chvāla</i>	(<i>chwała</i>)	<i>'xvāla</i>	<i>хвалā</i> , <i>хвалō</i>
<i>*mōkā</i> , <i>*mōkō</i> «flour»	<i>mūka</i> , <i>mūku</i>	<i>mōka</i> , <i>mōko</i>	<i>mouka</i>	<i>mūka</i>	<i>mąka</i>	<i>'mōka</i>	<i>мукā</i> , <i>мукō</i>

⁴⁵ This type of nouns is often called the **vòlā*-type nouns.

⁴⁶ For the etymology of this word regarding the accent see Matasović 2000: 132.

*pīzda, *pīzdō «cunt»	pīzda, pīzdu	pīzda, pīzdo	pīzda		(pīzda)	pī'izda	низодá, низодý
*trǫbā, *trǫbō	trúba, trúbu	trǫba, trǫbo	trouba	trúba	trąba	tr'ǫba	трыба́, трыбý

a. p. c – length preserved only in Croatian

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.	Slovinc.	Russ.
*bordā, *bōrdō «beard»	bráda, brādu	bráda, bradō	brada ⁴⁷	brada	broda	'broda	бородá, бóроду
*golvā, *gōlvō «head»	gláva, glāvu	gláva, glavō	hlava	hlava	głowa	'glova	головá, зóлову
*grēdā, *grēdō «beam»	gréda, grēdu	gréda, gredō	hřada	hrada	grzęda	'grąda	грядá, гряду (ORuss.)
*pētā, *pētō «heel»	péta, pētu	péta, petō	pata	pāta	pięta	'pjąta	нямá, няму (ORuss.)
*rǫkā, *rǫkō «arm»	rúka, rúku	róka, rokō	ruka	ruka	ręka	'rąka	рукá, рукý

In a. p. *b*, pretonic length in disyllables is attested in all the languages. In a. p. *c*, the length is preserved only in Croatian (Neo-Štokavian *gláva*, conservative Croat. dial. *glāvā*). In West Slavic, the circumflex is regularly shortened in the *enclimena* forms like acc. sg. *rǫkō (Czech/Slovak *ruku*, Polish *rękę*, Slovenc. 'rąką). The short vowel of the root, regular only in the forms with the absolute initial (circumflex) accent, is then generalized and thus leaving us with a short root in all the forms (e. g. Czech *ruka*, *ruku* instead of *rúka, *ruku*). In Slovencian, the accent of the original acc. sg. is generalized in the nom. sg. as well (nom. sg. 'rąka analogous to the acc. sg. 'rąką). In Slovene, the circumflex of the acc. sg. is shifted regularly to the next syllable and thus the root becomes short (there are no unaccented long vowels in Slovene): *rokō*. Analogically, nom. sg. also loses its length (*róka* instead of *rǫka).

In a. p. *b*, where one would expect the preservation of the pretonic long syllable in both nom. sg. and acc. sg. – one does indeed find a length there in West Slavic (Czech *trouba*) and in Slovene (*trǫba*). In a. p. *b*, the pretonic length is expected regularly in 8 cases: nom. sg. (*trǫbā), gen. sg. (*trǫbý), dat. sg. (*trǫbē), acc. sg. (*trǫbō), loc. sg. (*trǫbē) and nom. pl. (*trǫbý), gen. pl. (*trǫbъ > *trǫbь) and acc. pl. (*trǫbý). Thus it is generalized in 6 other cases in West Slavic as well: in voc.,

⁴⁷ Upper Lusatian *broda* (a. p. *c*) ≠ *brózda* (n. p. *b*).

instr. sg., dat., loc., voc., instr. pl. In these cases, one would expect a short root because the accent was falling in the vocatives – voc. sg. *trǫbo and voc. pl. *trǫby – and because the other cases were polysyllabic and the pretonic length should have been shortened – instr. sg. *trǫbǫjo, dat. pl. *trǫbǫmъ, loc. pl. *trǫbǫxъ, instr. pl. *trǫbǫmi (see further in the text about the shortening in these conditions). In Czech, in the plural forms of *tráva* (a. p. *b*) there are double forms: dat. pl. *trávám/trávám*, loc. pl. *trávách/trávach*, instr. pl. *trávami/trávami* but that could be due to the influence of the a. p. *a* stems (cf. the secondary gen. pl. *trav* by analogy to *kráva* < *kǫrva, gen. pl. *krav* < *kǫrvъ). In Croatian, the length is not generalized in a. p. *b* in archaic dialects or it is only generalized very recently (cf. nom. sg. *tráva*, acc. sg. *trávu* but dli. pl. *trávama*).

In a. p. *c*, we expect the short stem in West Slavic and Slovene regularly in 10 cases: dat. sg. (*grĕdĕ), acc. sg. (*grĕdǫ), voc. sg. (*grĕdo), instr. sg. (*grĕdojǫ), nom. pl. (*grĕdy), dat. pl. *(grĕdǫmъ), acc. pl. (*grĕdy), voc. pl. (*grĕdy), loc. pl. (*grĕdǫxъ), instr. pl. (*grĕdǫmi). The long vowel is to be expected in only 4 cases: nom. sg. (*grĕdǫ), gen. sg. (*grĕdy)⁴⁸, loc. sg. (*grĕdĕ) and gen. pl. (*grĕdĕ > *grĕdĕ). That the short variant is generalized in a. p. *c* is not surprising because it is far more numerous (10 to 4 forms). This explains the generalization of the long variant in a. p. *b* in West Slavic where the proportion is only 8 long to 6 short forms. The long form in a. p. *b* is generalized because the short one is generalized in a. p. *c*. That the short forms are generalized in all cases in a. p. *c* is not surprising since the same thing occurs in all a. p. *c* paradigms in West Slavic. The circumflex itself is shortened (Czech *hlas*, *tĕlo*) and also the posttonic length in a. p. *c* (Czech *holub*, see below). Thus the shortness (i. e. the generalized circumflex) becomes the distinct mark of a. p. *c* in West Slavic and it should not be surprising that the short forms prevailed in a. p. *c* *ā*-stems as well (cf. also *rŭka*, acc. sg. *rŭku* in some Čakavian and Štokavian dialects instead of *rŭkǎ*/ *rŭka*, acc. sg. *rŭku*).

In Croatian, the length is not generalized in all cases (cf. Štokavian nom. sg. *rŭka*, acc. sg. *rŭku*, but gen. pl. *rŭkŭ*, dli. pl. *rŭkama*, in some Čakavian dialects nom. sg. *rŭkǎ*, acc. sg. *rŭku*, nom. pl. *rŭke* but gen. sg. *rukē*⁴⁹, dat. pl. *rukām*, loc. pl. *rukāh*, instr. pl. *rukāmi*)⁵⁰.

The same thing that is seen in *ā*-stems is witnessed in neuter *o*-stems. Cf. in a. p. *b* stems *gnĕzdo > Croat. *gnijĕzdo*, Sln. *gnĕzdo*, Czech *hnizdo* and in a. p. *c* nom. pl. *mĕsǫ (nom. sg. *mĕso) > Croat. *mĕso*, nom. pl. *mĕsa*, but Czech short *maso* with the generalized *enclitomena* forms accent. Cf. also the a. p. *b* *o*-stem nouns: gen. sg. *korl'ǫ > Croat. *králja*, Sln. *králja*, Czech *krále*, Polish *króla* etc.

⁴⁸ Not in Slovene though, because the generalized *-ę in gen. sg. is secondarily lengthened and thus preserves the original final stress (Sln. gen. sg. *glavĕ*).

⁴⁹ With secondary long -ĕ and the root thus short (see below). If the original -ī is preserved, the root is long – gen. sg. *rŭkŭ* (North Čakavian).

⁵⁰ Kortlandt (1975: 30) assumes the length in Croatian nom. sg. *rŭka* to be secondary, introduced from the acc. sg. *rŭku* but there is no need for such a theory. This problem is connected with the reflection of the posttonic length (see below).

2. trisyllables with the final stress • V • V: • 'V • (three full syllables, pretonic length on the second syllable, accent on the last syllable)

***кѣlbāsā** «sausage» > Croat. *kobāsa*, Sln. *klobāsa*, Czech, Slk. *klobāsa*, Slovenc. *'kolbāsa*, Russ. *колбаса́*

Common Slavic	Croatian	Czech	Slovak	Slovincian
* кѣlbāsā	<i>kobāsa</i>	<i>klobāsa</i>	<i>klobāsa</i>	<i>'kolbāsa</i>
gen. sg. * дѣлѣznīkā «debtor»	<i>dužnika</i>	<i>dlužnika</i>	<i>dlžnika</i>	[<i>'dlužnika</i>]
gen. sg. * рѣkāvā «sleeve»	<i>rukāva</i>	<i>rukāva</i>	<i>rukāva</i>	[<i>'rəkava</i>]
gen. sg. * klobūkā «hat»	<i>klobūka</i>	<i>klobouka</i>	<i>klobūka</i>	<i>'klobūka</i>

In trisyllables with the final accent the length of the second syllable is also preserved (the length of the first syllable is shortened) – in all cases in Croatian, and in a. p. *b* elsewhere⁵¹. In Štokavian, one finds a secondary short syllable in this position in words like: *visīna*, *vīsinu* «hight»; *planīna*, *plāninu* «mountain»; *vrućīna*, *vrūćīnu* «heat»⁵². But in some Čakavian dialects the expected long *-ī-* is attested: cf. Vrgada *višīnā*, *vīšīnu*; *planīnā*, *plānīnu*; *vrućīnā*, *vrūćīnu*⁵³ etc. The short *-i-* of Štokavian and some Čakavian dialects is here analogous to the acute suffix *-īna* < **-īna* as in **malīna* «raspberry», **travīna* «big grass», **lědīna* «field». This suffix **-īna* is secondarily mixed with the circumflexed suffix **-īnā*, that we see for instance in **polnīnā* (thus, Štokavian *-i-* in *planina* is short by analogy to the short *-i-* in *lědina*). Cf. in Croat. two derivatives from the same basic word *slān* «salty» – *slānina* «bacon» with the original **-īna* and *slanina* «saltiness» with the original **-īnā*.

3. trisyllables with the final stress • V: • ъ/ь • 'V • (long full syllable, yer in the second syllable, accent on the third, full, syllable)⁵⁴

***рѣlъnō** «linen» > Croat., Czech, Slk. *plátno*, Pol., Upper Lusatian *plótno*

CSI.	Croatian	Czech	Slovak	Polish	ULus.
* рѣlъnō	<i>plátno</i>	<i>plátno</i>	<i>plátno</i>	<i>plótno</i>	<i>plótno</i>
* рl̃sъmō «letter»	<i>pismo</i>	<i>pismo</i>	<i>pismo</i>	(<i>pismo</i>)	(<i>pismo</i>)

⁵¹ Croat. *tetiva* < **tětivā*, acc. sg. *tetivu* (a. p. *b*) is not in accord with Czech *tětiva* and Slk. *tetiva* with the short *-i-* which would point to a. p. *c*, not a. p. *b* (see further in the text).

⁵² Czech and Slk. *planina* is expected in a. p. *c* (see further in the text).

⁵³ Susak: *živīnā* «animal», but Cres: *živīnā*, Novi: *plāninā*. For a long *-ī-* cf. also Sln. *istina* «truth».

⁵⁴ In cases like • V: • ъ/ь • ъ/ь • the length is preserved: cf. **рѣsъkъ* > Croat. *pijesak*, Sln. *pěsek*, Czech *písek*, Slk. *piesok*, but these examples are not really relevant since there are no counterexamples. That is, all words with the suffix **-ъkъ* show length in the last syllable of the stem because of the generalization of the **рѣsъkъ*-type. Cf. secondary Czech *kožíšek* (diminutive) from *kožich* «leather coat» (~ Croat. *kōžuh* < **kožъhъ*), Croat. *jezičak* (secondary a. p. *b*) but *jèzik*, *-a* (a. p. *a*) etc.

*(v)āрьно «lime»	vāpno	vāpno	vāpno	(wapno)	(wapno)
*volкьно «fiber»	vlākno	vlākno	vlākno	włókno	włokno ⁵⁵

The length is attested in all the languages in the first syllable if the accent is on the last syllable and the *yer* is in the second syllable (if it were a full vowel in the second syllable, the length would not be preserved, cf. Čak. *suhoćā* «dryness» < *suxot'ā, *tresetē* «you shake» (pl.) < *tręsetē etc. – the length has to be immediately in front of the accent in order to be preserved). It is not so easy, though, to find a form in which the length of the root cannot be secondary. For instance, the length of Croat. *sūkno* < *sūkьnō «cloth» could be analogous to the verb *sūkati*, *sūčēm* «twist, twine». The length in Croat. and Czech/Slovak *pismo* could be secondary to the present tense (Croat. *pīšēš* > *pīšēš*, Czech *píšeš*). In Croat. *vlākno*, the length could be analogical to the verb *-vláciti* «to pull» (Czech *-vlékat*, *vléct*). In order to assume the length in Czech *vāpno* or *plātno* is secondary, we would have to assume that the unattested words *polъ (~ Croat. *pōtplat* «sole») and *vapъ (~ Russ. CSl. *vapъ*) were a. p. *b* (Czech *plāt, *vāp ⇒ *plātno*, *vāpno*) in order to yield the analogical length in Czech. However, that is highly unlikely.

One of the more reliable examples is Croat. *gūmno* «threshing floor» < *gūmь-nō. It cannot have an analogical length because the root *gū- < *gaw- (~ *govědo «cow») is not attested in that form in any other word in Slavic⁵⁶. The gen. pl. *gūmā-nā* (dial. *gūvānā* in Prapatnice in Vrgorska krajina), in contrast to the gen. pl. *gōvā-nā*, from *gōvno* «shit» with a secondary length because of the *-vn-*, proves that the length in *gūmno* is indeed old and not only secondary here because the vowel is in front of a sonant in a closed syllable (*-mn-*). In the syllables of the type *-VRC-*, the vowel regularly lengthens in Štokavian (except in Eastern Bosnian dialect, cf. Kapović 2005b). If the vowel in *gūmno* was long only because of the *-mn-* (*gūmno* < *gūmno), then the gen. pl. would be ***gūmānā* (like *gōvānā*) and not the attested *gūmānā*. The possibility that the length in the *gūmьnō-type words is due to analogy to the nom-acc. pl. *gūmьna seems highly unlikely.

4. trisyllables with the central stress • V • 'V • V • (three full syllables, accent on the second/middle syllable)

*malīna «raspberry» > Croat. *màlina*, Sln. *malína*, Czech, Slk. *malina*, Slovenc. 'malina

⁵⁵ Regular short reflection in front of *-k-*, like in *mloko* «milk» < *melkō.
⁵⁶ In Czech and Slovak, the word *humno* has the unexplained secondary short root, but in Slovak dial. one finds the expected reflection: *hūmno/hūvno* (SSN: 640). The root vowel in Czech is also secondarily short in the word *sukno* (cf. Croat. and Slovak *sūkno* < *sūkьnō) and in Slk. (older) *grzno* «fur» compared with Croat. *křzno* < *křzьnō (the variant *křzno* (ARj) is younger). Czech *krzno* is irrelevant (syllabic *r* cannot be long in Czech).

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Slovinc.
*kalīna «privet»	kàlina	kalina	kalina	kalina	'kalina
*kopīna «blackberry»	kùpina	kopina	kupina	kupina	'kapjina
*malīna	màlina	malina	malina	malina	'malina
*orkýta «purple willow»	ràkita	[rakīta]	rokyta	rokyta	

In front of the accented middle syllable, the old length is always shortened in all the languages. Besides the adduced examples cf. also Croat. *blàzina* «pillow», *gùsjenica* «caterpillar» (Slovak *húsenica* is secondary), *jàsika* «aspen», *lèdina* «field», *ràbota* «work» (Czech *robota*), *sjèkira* «axe» (Czech *sekyra*), *slàvina* «tap» etc. In Croatian, the regular shortening is not attested only in the words which are always trisyllabic – it also happens in the trisyllabic forms of the words which have only two syllables in the basic form (the first syllable can thus be long in some forms and short in the other). Cf. in declension: *rúka* : dli. pl. *rùkama*; *zúb* «tooth», nom. pl. *zúbi* : dli. pl. *zùbima*; dial. *úho* «ear» : dli. pl. *ùšima*⁵⁷; *bráda* : *bràdama*; *strijèla* «arrow» : *str(j)èlama*⁵⁸; *dúša* «soul» : *dùšama*, *gréda* : *grèdama*, *péta* : *pètama*, *svínja* «pig» : *svinjama*, *svijéca* «candle» : *svjècama*, *grána* «branch» : *grànama*, *lúka* «harbor» : *lùkama* etc. Štokavian examples like *mísao* «thought» : *míslima*, *mrâv* «ant» : *mrávima*, *grána* «branch» : *grànama*, *strána* «side» : *strànama* etc. are all younger and have an analogical length in these forms⁵⁹. The same shortening is seen in the derivatives: Štokavian *gláva* – *glàvica* «little head», *tráva* – *tràvica* «little grass», *bráda* – *bràdica* «little beard», *rúka* – *rùčica* «little arm», *grána* – *grànčica* «twig»; *zíd* «wall» – *zìdine* «walls, ramparts», *glàs* «voice» – *glàsina* «rumour», *grâd* «city» – *gràdina* «old town», *ljúdi* «people» – *ljùdina* «big man», *rêp* «tail» – *rèpina* «big tail», *svijêt* «world» – *svjètina* «crowd» etc. Cf. also Czech *trouba* – *trubice* «little trumpet» (Croat. *trúba* – *trùbica*)

Infinitive

The examples of the secondary length in the infinitive of the a. p. *b* everywhere except in Slovinc. (and Sln.)

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.	Slovinc.
*kazáti «to show»	kázati	kazáti	kázati	kázat'	(kazać)	k'azac
*kupíti «to buy»	kùpiti	kupíti	koupiti	kúpiť	(kupić)	k'upjic
*kopáti «to bathe»	kùpati	kopáti	koupati	kúpat'	kapać	k'apac

⁵⁷ In this example, some dialects have generalized the short root vowel: thus some dialects, analogically to gen. pl. *ùšijū* and dli. pl. *ùšima*, change *úši* to *ùši* and *úho* to *ùho*. The instability of *-h-* also helps (*úho* > *úo* > *úo* ⇒ *ùho*).

⁵⁸ Budmani 1867: 41. The shortening of the root vowel in dli. pl. like in *rùkama* is typical mostly of the a. p. *c* nouns, while the a. p. *b* nouns generalized the long vowel more easily (*brázdama* analogical to nom. pl. *brázde*). But in the archaic Štokavian dialect of Dubrovnik, the shortening is normal in the a. p. *b* nouns as well (nom. pl. *túge* : *tùgama* «sorrow»).

⁵⁹ In some dialects, both variants exist (for instance, Lika dli. pl. *glàvan* and younger *glávan*). In the forms *rùkama* and *zùbima*, the short vowel is preserved in all the dialects.

*kōsāti «to eat»	kūsati	kosāti	kousati	kūsať	kqsać	kqsac
*moltīti «to beat»	mlātiti	mlatiti ⁶⁰	mlātiti	mlātiť	mlócić	ml'ocic

In the trisyllabic infinitives (*-ǣ-, *-ī-, *-ĕ- and *-ŋo-verbs) of the a. p. *b*, Štokavian, Czech, Slovak, Polish and Upper Lusatian have the analogical length taken from the present tense which has the length preserved because of the neoacute (in the trisyllabic infinitive with the middle stress, the length would have to be regularly shortened in the root). Thus Štok.⁶¹ Czech *mlātiti*, Slovak *mlātiť*, Polish *mlócić*, Upper Lusatian *mlócić*⁶² (*moltīti) with the analogical length taken from the present: Štok. *mlātīš* > *mlātīš*, Czech *mlátīš*, Slovak *mlátīš*, Polish *mlócisz*, Upper Lusatian *mlóciš* (*mōltīš). That this length is secondary in the infinitive is clearly shown by various Slavic dialects and languages which have preserved the original short root vowel in trisyllabic infinitives. Old Polish has a short root vowel in the infinitive of the a. p. *b* (*sędzić* : *sądzisz* «to judge», *przystąpić* : *przystąpisz* «to come to») which proves that the Modern Polish length there is secondary. Many Kajkavian dialects preserve the original distinction of the long vowel in the present and the short vowel in the infinitive completely, cf. Kajkavian *pisāti* – *pīšem* «to write» (a. p. *b*). In these Kajkavian dialects, both the a. p. *b* and the a. p. *c* infinitives have a shortened root vowel. The root vowel in the infinitives of the a. p. *b* verbs is also short in Slovenian and Molise Croatian (see below). Many languages (Czech/Slovak, ULus., various Kajkavian dialects, Modern Polish) distinguish the a. p. *b* infinitive, which has acquired the secondary length from the present, from the a. p. *c* infinitive which has the expected short root vowel (because it is shortened in the present tense as well as in front of more than two moras, see below). For the short root vowel in a. p. *c* cf. Czech *zlatiti*, Slovak *zlatiť*, Polish *złocić* and ULus. *złócić* «to make something golden» (cf. also Bednja Kajk. *hlodīti* «to cool something down» ~ Czech *chladiť*, Slovak *chladiť*, Polish *chłodzić*)⁶³. In Štokavian, both a. p. *b* and (original) a. p. *c* have the secondary length: *mlātiti*; *zlātiti*, *hlāditi* in most of the verbs.

⁶⁰ Present tense: *kāžem*, *kūpim* etc. In Sln., the infinitive can get the analogical accent from the present tense: thus e. g. *čūvati* «to guard», *stōpati* «to march», *zīdati* «to build» or *hvalīti* «to praise», *služīti* «to serve», *pisāti* «to write», *vezāti* «to tie up» together with younger *hvaliti*, *služiti*, *pisati*, *vězati* (analogous to the present tense *hvaľim*, *služim* etc.). Since this occurs only in verbs with former *~ in the root (never in verbs with former *'), this analogy must have happened before the lengthening of all non-final vowels in Slovene.

⁶¹ Cf. also Čakavian *mlāīti*, *mlāīm* and Kajkavian (Bednja) *mlāōīti*, *mlōīm* with the secondary length in the a. p. *b* infinitive.

⁶² Cf. also ULus. *brōnić* «defend», *prēcīć* «obstruct», *klócić* «swing» (a. p. *b*).

⁶³ Bednja (Jedvaj 1956: 315-6): a. p. *b* *brōūniti*, *hrōūniti* «to feed», *kvāōriti* «to spoil» ≠ a. p. *c* *ploīti* «to pay», *gosīti* «to extinguish», *tojīti* «to keep a secret» etc.

The examples of the secondary length in the infinitive of the a. p. *c* in Croat. (Štok.) and the expected short root vowel in West Slavic

Common Slavic	Croatian ⁶⁴	Czech	Slovak	Polish
*gasīti «extinguish»	<i>gāsiti</i>	<i>hasiti</i>	<i>hasit'</i>	(<i>gasić</i>)
*xoldīti «to cool smth down»	<i>hlāditi</i>	<i>chladiti</i>	<i>chladiť</i>	<i>chlodzić</i>
*kypēti «to boil»	<i>kīpjēti</i>	<i>kypēti</i>	<i>kypiet'</i>	(<i>kipieć</i>)
*mladīti «to make sb younger»	<i>mlāditi</i>	<i>mladiti</i>	<i>mladiť</i>	<i>młodzić</i>
*zoltīti «to make smth golden»	<i>zlātiti</i>	<i>zlatiti</i>	<i>zlatiť</i>	<i>złocić</i>

All the verbs in Slovincian, both the a. p. *b* and the a. p. *c*, preserve the original short vowel: *čerpjec*, *šumjec* (: *čerpīš*, *šumīš*); *bl'azic*, *br'oñic*, *b'užic*, *c'ēnic*, *k'up-jic*, *l'epjic*, *s'azic*, *xv'alic* (: *bl'ažīš*, *br'oñīš* etc.); *d'ixac*, *k'azac*, *k'apac*, *l'izac*; *b'ivac*, *m'jēšac*, *p'itac* (: *b'ivāš*, *p'itāš* etc.)⁶⁵ etc. The length is introduced only in the *-nq*-verbs: *c'īgnqoc* «to pull», *k'īxnqoc* «to sneeze», *m'āxnqoc* «to wave», *š'č'īpnqoc* «to pinch» from the present tense *c'īgnēš*, *k'īxnēš*⁶⁶ etc. Slovincian no longer uses the stress position to maintain the difference of a. p. *b* and a. p. *c* in present tense – it uses the quantity instead (the long root vowel in a. p. *b* as a reflection of the neo-acute and the short root vowel in a. p. *c* as the result of the regular shortening of the long vowels before two or more moras in Slavic): *ml'ocic* – *ml'ōciš*, *xv'alic* – *xv'āliš* (a. p. *b*) ≠ *č'iñic* – *č'iñīš*, *s'azic* – *s'ažīš* (a. p. *c*)⁶⁷.

As was already said, Czech/Slovak, Modern Polish, ULus. and some Kajkavian dialects (for instance Bednja) have the short root vowel preserved in the trisyllabic a. p. *c* infinitives in contrast to the analogical long root vowel in a. p. *b*. The length

⁶⁴ In many Štokavian dialects, in *i*-verbs, the long-vowel verbs (and some short-vowel verbs as well) change the paradigm from a. p. *c* to a. p. *b* (cf. also Ivšić 1971: [121-127] and Brozović & Ivšić 1988: 18) in order to reestablish the original long root vowel which has been regularly shortened in both the infinitive and the present tense but not for instance in the imperative (*xoldīti, *xoldīš with the expected shortening in front of two or more moras, see further in the text, and the imperative *xoldi with the expected preservation of the pretonic length, like in *trāvā). The length regularly preserved in the present tense of the a. p. *b* (*mōltīš) and in the derivatives like *xōldī (Croat. *hlād*) also helped in the reintroduction of the long root vowel in the a. p. *c* verbs in many Štokavian dialects. This process did not affect some archaic Old Štokavian dialects in Posavina, Kajkavian dialects and some Čakavian dialects, cf. for instance Posavina: *gradīš* «you build», a. p. *c* and Standard Croatian *grādīš*, secondary a. p. *b*. The process was not general, it did not affect all the words (cf. for instance Croat. *slījēdiš* «you follow») and often the change depended even on the (in)transitivity of the verb (see more in Kapović 2003). Most *ē*-verbs just reintroduce the secondary length in Štok. but remain a. p. *c*: *trīpjēti* – *trīpīš* «to suffer», *šūtjēti* – *šūtīš* «to be silent», *lūdjēti* – *lūdīš* «to become crazy» etc.

⁶⁵ Cf. the analogical length here in all Croatian examples: *trīpjēti* «to suffer», *šumjēti* «to rustle»; *blūditi* «to wonder around», *brāniti* «to defend», *būditi* «to wake sb up», *cijēniti* «to appreciate», *kūpiti* «to buy», *lijēpiti* «to paste», *sūditi* «to judge», *hvaliti* «to praise»; *dīsati* «to breathe», *kāzati* «to show», *kūpati* «to bathe», *lizati* «to lick»; *bīvati* «to be, to exist», *mijēšati* «to mix», *pītati* «to ask».

⁶⁶ See more examples in Stankiewicz 1993: 315-6.

⁶⁷ Stankiewicz 1993: 318.

in a. p. *c* cannot be introduced from the present tense, as was the case in a. p. *b*, because the length was regularly shortened there as well (see below): Czech *chladiti* – *chladíš*, Slk. *chladiti* – *chladíš*, Pol. *chłodzić* – *chłodziysz* and Kajk. (Bednja) *hłoditi* – *hłodim*.

In Czech, the a. p. *c* verbs totally merge with a. p. *a* verbs which also show the short root vowel in both the infinitive and the present tense (because the old acute is shortened in tri- or polysyllabic words): Czech a. p. *c* *chladiti* – *chladíš*, *hasiti* – *hasíš*, *mladiti* – *mladíš* = a. p. *a* *raniti* – *raníš* «to wound», *nuditi* – *nudiš* «to offer», *mysliti* – *myslíš* «to think» (cf. Croat. *hláditi*, *gásiti*, *mláditi* ≠ *rāniti*, *nūditi*, *mīsliti*). The same is of course true for Slovak and Polish as well, since the acute always yields a short syllable there.

In Upper Lusatian, the situation is different than in Czech. Trisyllabic words in ULus. preserve (or perhaps reintroduce it secondarily from the disyllabic forms) the old acute length (in Czech they do not), so there the a. p. *a* merges with a. p. *b*: cf. ULus. *plóšić* (a. p. *a*) = *klóčić* (a. p. *b*) ≠ *złóčić* (a. p. *c*) ≠ Czech *plašiti* (a. p. *a*) = *zlatiti* (a. p. *c*) ≠ *klátiti* (a. p. *b*), cf. Kajkavian *plāšiti* (a. p. *a*) – *klaŕiti/klāŕiti* (*klātim*) (a. p. *b*) – *zlaŕiti* (*zlaŕim*) (a. p. *c*).

The examples with the original short vowel preserved in Croatian and Slovincian

Common Slavic	Croatian (Štokavian)	Slovincian
*bēžāti «to run»	<i>bjēžati</i>	<i>bʹežec</i>
*čīnīti «to do»	<i>čīniti</i>	<i>čʹiŋic</i>
*gubŕiti «to loose»	<i>gūbīti</i>	<i>gʹubjic</i>
*učīti «to teach»	<i>ūčiti</i>	<i>vʹučic</i>
*sēdčeti «to sit»	<i>sjēdjeti</i>	<i>sʹežec</i>

In Croatian, a few verbs, originally belonging to a. p. *c*, have managed to keep the original short root vowel in the infinitive and the present tense as well as the original a. p. *c* (which is often changed to a. p. *b* when the length is reintroduced). Some of the examples are: *ūčiti*, *gūbīti*, *čīniti*, *pūstīti*⁶⁸ «to let»; *bjēžati*, *sjēdjeti*⁶⁹, *trčati* «to run», *držati* «to hold, to keep», *bjēšnjeti* «to rave» etc. In these verbs, the short vowel is generalized and is thus also found secondarily in the imperative: *ūči!*, *bjēži!* etc. In dialects, there are more examples – Prapatnice in Vrgorska krajina (and other dialects): *vŕtit* «to spin», *mūcat* «to be silent», *pŕdit* «to fart», *smŕdit* «to smell», *svŕbit* «to itch» (in this dialect, the syllabic *r* can be long); Posavina: *grīšit*

⁶⁸ The original a. p. *c* is preserved in the Neo-Štokavian dialect of Prapatnice in Vrgorska krajina (personal data): *pūstīti*, *pūstīš*. In most dialects though, the word either just changed the a. p. (*pūstīti*, but *pūstīm*, thus a. p. *b* like in Standard Croatian) or it has reintroduced the length: dialectal *pūstīti*, *pūstīm* > *pūstīm* (also a. p. *b*).

⁶⁹ Different from *sjēdjeti*, *sjēdīm* «to become gray-haired» (a. p. *c*), which has reintroduced the length (an obvious source being the adjective *sjēd* «gray-haired»). Perhaps this opposition had something to do with the preservation of the original short **ē* in *sjēdjeti* «to sit».

«to sin», *sàdit* «to plant» etc. In the standard language (ARj), cf. the secondary long vowel: *vřtjeti*, *múčati*, *prđjeti*, *smřdjeti*, *svřbjeti*, *grijěšiti*, *sàditi* etc.

Of all Štokavian dialects, only the diaspora Štokavian dialect of Molise (Italy) preserves the original short vowel in all the verbs, as a synchronic rule. In all the other Štokavian and Čakavian dialects, the short-vowel a. p. *c* verbs are found only in traces⁷⁰. Molise Croatian confirms that this reintroduction of the long vowel in the infinitives is, at least in some dialects, younger than 15th or 16th century (when the ancestors of the Croats from Molise left Croatia)⁷¹.

The examples of the verbs with secondary length in Stand. Croat. and with the original short vowel in Molise

Common Slavic	(Standard) Croatian	Molise Croatian
*bělŕiti «to make white»	<i>bijěliti</i> , <i>bijělīm</i>	<i>bilŕi</i> , <i>bilim</i>
*budŕiti «to wake up»	<i>búđiti</i> , <i>búđīm</i>	<i>budŕi</i> , <i>búdim</i>
*davŕiti «to strangle»	<i>dáviti</i> , <i>dávīm</i>	<i>davŕi</i> , <i>dávim</i>
*dělŕiti «to share, to divide»	<i>dijěliti</i> , <i>dijělīm</i>	<i>diŕi</i> , <i>diŕim</i>
*obvolčŕiti se «to grow cloudy»	<i>obláčiti se</i> , <i>obláčŕi se</i>	<i>bláčŕi se</i> , <i>bláčŕi se</i>

Trisyllables with the long prefix of the type *zabáva

The examples of the secondary length in the trisyllabic words of the *zabáva-type

Common Slavic	Croatian	Czech	Slovak	Slovincian
*napráva «device»	<i>náprava</i>	<i>náprava</i>	<i>náprava</i>	<i>nāpr'ava</i>
*prisěga «oath»	<i>prisega</i>	<i>přisaha</i>	<i>prisaha</i>	<i>přis'iga</i>
*zabáva «fun, party»	<i>zábava</i>	<i>zábava</i>	<i>zábava</i>	<i>zāb'ava</i>

The *zabáva-type derivatives exhibit a regular acute accent on the first syllable of the stem (cf. Čakavian *zābava*, Russ. *nepezoπόda* «partition»)⁷². The first syllable in this type of words should be short but most languages (Croatian – not always and not in all dialects, Czech, Slovak, Slovincian etc.) reintroduce the length in the prefixes like *nā-, *nād-, *orz-, *per-, *prŕ-, *sŕ-, *ū-, *vŕ-, *zā- etc. in the *zabáva-type words from the forms where the preservation of the length is expected (most importantly from the *nārōdŕ-type words⁷³, see further in the text). Cf. also Croatian: *návala* «assault», *násloga* «layer», *prilika* «chance», *prijévava* «fraud»

⁷⁰ And there are no a. p. *b* verbs of the type like *mŕlŕiti, *mŕlŕīm* like in Kajkavian. All the a. p. *b* verbs in Štokavian (and Čakavian) have a long vowel reintroduced in the infinitive, except of course for Molise Croatian.

⁷¹ For Molise and Croatian in general, see more in Kapović 2003.

⁷² Old acute on the long syllables and short neo-acute on the short ones. The original intonation of the root is not important, cf. Croatian *bāviti se* «to engage in» (a. p. *a*) – *zábava* as well as *prisěci* «to take an oath» (a. p. *b*) – *prisega*. Slovene has a neo-circumflex in most of this type of nouns (but not always): *zabáva*. In Kajkavian *otáva* «aftergrass», but **zabáva* > *zābava* with the retraction because of the secondarily reintroduced length in the prefix.

⁷³ For instance, Croat. *zálog* «pledge», Czech *záloh* : Croat. *zàloga*, Czech **zaloha* ⇒ Croat. *záloga*, Czech *záloha* (analogically after *zálog/záloh*).

etc.⁷⁴; Slovenc. 'nārada «council», 'nāmovā «suggestion», 'přīroda «nature», 'přīsluga «service» (with the retracted accent); nāv'uka «teaching», přēs'ada «exaggeration», zāp'lata «pay», 'nār'ada (with no retraction of the accent in the older variant)⁷⁵; Czech/Slovak nástraha «bait», náhrada «replacement; refund», náhoda «coincidence», nádoba «vessel», záplava «high tide», záhuba «spoiling», Czech přihoda «occurrence, incident», příloha «supplement», útěcha⁷⁶ «comfort», výplata «payment», Slk. prihoda, príloha, útecha etc. In Polish, cf. the secondary length in a trisyllabic word wątroba⁷⁷ «liver» (which does not belong to the *zabáva-type though) analogically to the form *ōtró (cf. Croat. unūtra, unūtri «inside»).

The length can then be secondarily reintroduced into other derivatives, cf. Croat. nāručje «embrace», Rāstušje (toponym); priredba «show», rázudba «obduction» etc. Cf. also Croat. zápis «note», analogical zápisnik «logbook», also Czech zápis, zápisek «note», zápisnik; zápletka «complication» etc. The length can be generalized in derivation, cf. Croat. rázboj, rázbojnik «robber», rázbojništvo «robbery» but this secondarily reintroduced length is specific for every language and is often of recent date. Therefore, it is outside the scope of this paper. Longer, polysyllabic words often keep the original short vowel, cf. Croat. nābreklina «swelling», nādlaktica «upper arm», zādužbina «endowment» etc. The original short vowel is mostly found in prefixed verbs as well (which are always polysyllabic): Croat. nāpadati «to attack», Czech napadati, but Croat. nápad «attack», Czech nápad «idea», Croat. zāpadati «to fall back», Czech zapadati etc.

5. trisyllables with the central stress • V(:) • 'V • Ъ/Ь • (full long syllable, accented full syllable and a final *yer*) and **trisyllables with the final stress** • V: • V • Ъ/Ь • (full long syllable, full syllable, final stress on a *yer*)

*jězъkъ «tongue» > Croat. jèzik, jèzika, Sln. jézik, jezika, Czech/Slk. jazyk, Pol. język, Slovenc. j'azik

⁷⁴ The *zabáva-type is very complicated when it comes to the dialects. The original short prefix is preserved in some dialects: zābava, in others it is transformed to zābava with the secondary length, in others there is a stress retraction: zabāva/zābava ⇒ zābava or zābāva/zābava ⇒ zābava/zābava. Some dialects in Montenegro have all four possibilities in the system at the same time (zābava/zābava/zābava/zābava). Standard Croatian and Serbian are not consistent, all variants are possible depending on the word and some words can have more variants (zābava/zābava, ōtava/ōtava – cf. the dialectal attestations of the latter in ARj). The same goes for the dialects, cf. for instance Brusje on Hvar (Čak.): zōstāva, posūda, but pōnuda, pōkripa, ōsnova (Dulčić & Dulčić 1985) etc. See more in Kapović 2003. A completely different approach to this process is, for instance, taken by Bulatova 1982, but it is not, in the opinion of the author of this article, satisfactory.

⁷⁵ Stankiewicz 1993: 298.

⁷⁶ Cf. Croat. ūtjeha < *ūtjeha without the secondary length but with a stress-retraction.

⁷⁷ Cf. also secondary length in Czech/Slk. ūtroba «guts» to original Croat. dial. ūtroba (Štok., Lika), utrōba (Čak., Vrgada). In Stand. Croat. the accent is secondarily retracted: ūtroba. That is typical of many words in this category.

*kōkolb̑ > *kōkolb̑ «cockle» > Croat. *kúkolj*, Sln. *kókolj*, Czech *koukol*, Slk. *kúkol'*, Pol. *kąkol*, Slovenc. 'kōkōl

*s̑v̑dokb̑ «witness» > Croat. *svjèdok*, *svjedòka*, [Sln. *svèdok*, *svedòka*]⁷⁸, Czech *svědek*

Shortened vowel in front of the second long syllable with the acute and a final *yer*

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.	Slovenc.
*jězŭkъ	<i>jèzik</i>	<i>jézik</i>	<i>jazyk</i>	<i>jazyk</i>	<i>język</i>	'jazik

The pretonic syllable is regularly shortened if it is followed by a long (acute) syllable and a final *yer* (thus it acts just like a regular trisyllabic word with three full syllables and a central accent – the pretonic length is shortened in front of two or more moras). This is not only seen in the example of *jězŭkъ but also in the regular shortening of the derivatives in *-an*, *-at*, *-ič*, *-ić* (CSl. *-ānъ, *-ātъ, *-īčъ, *-īťъ with the acute) in Croatian, cf. *drāg* «dear» – *drāgan* «darling», *tūp* «blunt; dull» – *tūpan* «dull person»; *brāda* «beard» – *brādat* «bearded», *glāva* «head» – *glāvat* «large-headed», *zūb* «tooth» – *zūbat* «toothy»; *brānīm* «I defend» – *brānič* «defender»; *grād* «city» – *grādič* «little city», *zūb* – *zūbič* «little tooth», *prūt* «switch» – *prūtič* «little switch» etc.

The examples with a long prefix in front of the accented syllable and a *yer*

Common Slavic	Croatian	Slovene	Czech	Slovak
*nārōdъ «people»	<i>nārod</i>	<i>nārod</i> , <i>narōda</i>	<i>nārod</i>	<i>nārod</i>
*sōsēdъ «neighbour»	<i>sūsjed</i>	<i>sōsed</i> , <i>sosēda</i>	<i>soused</i>	<i>sused</i>
*zākōnъ «law»	<i>zākon</i>	<i>zākon</i> , <i>zakōna</i>	<i>zākon</i>	<i>zākon</i>

The examples with a long syllable in front of a full syllable and an originally accented final *yer* where the accent is secondarily fixed on the second syllable

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.	Slovenc.
*kōkolb̑	<i>kúkolj</i>	<i>kókolj</i>	<i>koukol</i>	<i>kúkol'</i>	<i>kąkol</i>	'kōkōl
*moldežb̑ «youth»	<i>mlādež</i>	(<i>mlādež</i>)	<i>mlādež</i>		(<i>młodzież</i>)	

The preserved pretonic length of this kind (when the second syllable is short and the final *yer* is accented) can be seen in the a. p. c C-verbs in the present tense: cf. Croatian *tréseš* «you shake», *rāsteš* «you grow», *krādeš* «you steal», dial. *živeš* «you live» < *tȓesešb̑, *orstešb̑, *krādešb̑, *živešb̑ etc. The length in the verbs like *tȓesti* < *tȓestib̑ could be considered secondarily reintroduced from the infinitive or the *l*-participle (*tȓēslb̑, *tȓēslā, *tȓēslō > Croat. *tȓesao*, *tȓesla*, *tȓeslo*). It would seem that this explanation is not possible in the case of the «mixed» a. p. c/a. p. a verbs like

⁷⁸ Sln. *svèdok* points to the type of Sln. *jézik*, *jezika* with a secondary fixed central accent (*svedòka* < *s̑v̑dòka) and not to a a. p. b noun (Croat. *svjedòka* would correspond to Sln. **svedòka*). Slavic *s̑v̑dokb̑, though not technically a trisyllable, for all practical purposes acts like one (the *b̑ in the first syllable is not important here). Thus, we have listed this example here together with real trisyllables.

Croat. *krāsti* < *krāsti which has the length in the present tense (*krādeš*) and the imperative (*krādi!*), but not in the infinitive or the *l*-participle (*krālъ, *krāla, *krālo > Croat. *krāo*, *krāla*, *krālo*). In the *l*-participle, there is a fixed acute on the root, because it would be difficult to imagine that the length of the present could be introduced from the imperative only. However, that is exactly what happened in cases like Croat. *šútjeti*, *slījediti* (see above) so even this is not conclusive and therefore we are left with *kúkolj* as our best example.

In Czech, the present tense forms like *třeseš*, *kradeš* (cf. the length in the infinitive *třásti* < *trēsti, *krásti* < *krāsti) are secondary due to the analogy to the polysyllabic forms like 1. pl. *třeseme*, *krademe*, 2. pl. *třesete*, *kradete*, 3. pl. *třesou*, *kradou* where the shortening is expected⁷⁹.

The examples of the shortening in the first syllable in front of a full short syllable and the preserved a. p. *b* desinential stress

Common Slavic	Croatian	Slovene
*sъvѣdokъ	<i>svjēdok</i> , -ōka	[<i>svēdok</i> , -ōka]
*životъ «life»	<i>život</i> , -ōta	<i>živōt</i> , -ōta
*širokъ «broad»	<i>širok</i> , -ōko	<i>širōk</i> , -ōko
*vysokъ «tall»	<i>visok</i> , -ōko	<i>visōk</i> , -ōko

In words like *jězŷkъ (Croat. *jězik*, Sln. *jězik*, Czech *jazyk* etc.), and in examples like Croat. *bradat* «bearded» (: *brāda* «beard») the length is regularly shortened before a long accented syllable (long syllable = two moras). Thus *jězŷkъ is the same as the trisyllabic *orkŷta-type where there are three full syllables. That *yer* syllables need not be of the same value as the full syllables (which we have already seen in the *gŷmъnō-type) is seen in the *nārōdъ-type words which do not behave as the *prirōda-type words.

The length was regularly preserved in the nom./acc. sg. of *nārōdъ-type words (because the pretonic length was followed by 1.5 mora so there was no reason for shortening, see below). Thus Croat., Czech/Slk. *nārod*, *zākon* show the regular retention of the old long prefix⁸⁰. The length is not expected in the *sqsēdъ-type words which should behave like *jězŷkъ. The length in the *sqsēdъ-type words (Croat. *sŷsjed*, Sln. *sōsed*, Czech *soused*) is easily explained as analogous to the *nārōdъ-type words which have preserved the original long vowel. Thus the prefix is originally long only in the words like *nārōdъ, and in the words like *sqsēdъ it is secondary. That the long vowel was shortened before the long accented syllable is proven by the example *jězŷkъ, in which there was no possibility of a secondarily reintroduced length because the first syllable was not a prefix which could have

⁷⁹ In Štokavian and Čakavian, the more conservative dialects have the difference preserved: *trēseš* < *trēsēš*, *trēse* < *trēsē* but *trēsēmo* < *trēsēmō*, *trēsēte* < *trēsētē* while the innovative ones reintroduce the length in the polysyllabic forms as well (*trēsēmō/trēsēmō*, *trēsētē/trēsētē*). Cf. also in some Štok. dialects *krādem* : *krādū*, *dādem* : *dādū* etc.

⁸⁰ Stang 1957: 42.

been preserved long elsewhere. The Slovak form *sused*, with a short first syllable, is probably an archaism which displays the regular outcome of that type of words. In the **nāròdъ*-type words, the length of the nom./acc. sg. is generalized in all cases (in forms like gen. sg. **naròda* we would expect the shortening of the first syllable like in the **priròda*-type words). Longer words do not preserve the length of the prefix, of course, cf. the **nāròdъ*-type with Croat. *nàbujak* «pudding», *nàdimak* «nickname», *nàglasak* «accent» etc.

The Polish short *roz-* in the **nāròdъ*-type words, like in *rozkaz* «order», *rozgłos* «publicity», *rozlew* «bloodshed» etc., if not analogous to verbs like *rozkazywać* «to order», *rozgłaszać* «to make known», *rozlewać* «to spill» etc., could be due to the analogy working the other way round – the short prefix of the oblique cases being generalized and not the long one of the nom. and acc. sg.⁸¹

The words **kǫkolъ* > **kǫkòlъ* and **moldežъ* > **moldèžъ* behave almost the same as the **nāròdъ*-type words. The only difference is in the fact that the fixed stress on the second short syllable (which is attested in the reflections of these words in Slavic languages) must be secondary. Thus **kǫkòlъ*, gen. sg. **kǫkòla*; **moldèžъ*, gen. sg. **moldèži*, attested in Croat. *kùkolj*, *kùkolja*; *mlàdež*, *mlàdeži* and Czech *koukol*, *koukola*; *mlàdež*, *mlàdeži*, must be secondary (probably already in Common Slavic) for the original **kǫkolъ*, gen. sg. **kǫkolá* and **moldežъ*, gen. sg. **moldeži*. The length in **kǫkòlъ* cannot be secondary because it has no role-model (like **jězýkъ*) – it is not a prefix in which the length could be secondarily reintroduced. The same goes for **moldèžъ*. While Croat. *mlàdež* could easily be secondary considering the forms like the adjective *mlād*, *mlāda*, *mlādo* «young», this is not possible in Czech where there is no length in the adjective: *mladý*, *mladá*, *mladé* (a. p. c, see further in the text). This also proves that the length there is original. Slovene *mlàdež* and Polish *młodzież* are secondary, due to the later spread of mobility in *i*-stems which is well attested⁸². For the original end-stress, cf. also Russian *молодёжь*.

In the **svǫdokъ* or **životъ*-type the a. p. *b* was preserved and thus the root had to be shortened analogically due to the influence of the oblique cases (the root was shortened regularly in forms like gen. sg. **svǫdoká* or **životá* and then analogically in nom. sg. as well)⁸³. The long root could have been preserved only if the accent was secondarily fixed on the second syllable like in **moldèžъ* and **kǫkòlъ*. The suffix *-okъ is immanently desinence-stressed so it is no surprise that a. p. *b* was preserved there⁸⁴.

⁸¹ Because of the complex rules of post-Common Slavic shortenings different kinds of levellings are to be expected.

⁸² Cf. Kapović forthcoming c. Cf. also Croat. dial. *mlādēž*, gen. sg. *mlādeži*.

⁸³ In Croatian, there cannot be a noun with an accentual pattern like **svijédok*, *svjedoka*. However, in some dialects, this kind of pattern can be observed in verbs: Čak. (Vrgada) *tūčēn*, but *tučētē* «to beat», *živēn*, but *živemō* (Jurišić 1966: 89) and Štok. (Dubrovnik) *trēsēm*, *tresēmō*.

⁸⁴ Cf. Croat. *snùbok*, *snubòka* «match-maker», Sln. *otròk*, *otròka* «child», Kajk. *oblòk* «window», Russ. *xodók* «walker», *edók* «mouth» etc. All the adjectives ending in *-okъ belong to a. p. *b*.

Thus we concluded that the shortening was regular in *jězykъ-type words and that the retention of length was regular in *nāròďъ and *kǫkòľъ-type words in nom./acc. sg. and analogically generalized in all the cases (the preservation of pretonic length is connected with the fixation of the stress on the following syllable, cf. *kǫkòľъ, *kǫkòľa). The length in *sǫsěďъ-type words is the result of the analogy with the *nāròďъ-type and the short root in *životъ < *životǫ-type words is due to the analogy with the polysyllabic oblique cases (gen. sg. *životǫ – since the end-stress was preserved, the shortness of the root was generalized). The theory on the shortening of the first syllable in the • V: • 'V: • ъ/ь • but not in the • V: • 'V • ъ/ь • words is useful because it predicts the shortening in *jězykъ and the retaining of length in *kǫkòľъ, and *molděžъ. A theory that the pretonic length was regularly preserved in *jězykъ as well as in *nāròďъ, and that it was shortened in oblique cases like gen. sg. *jězyka, *nāròda might also be suggested. Croat. *jězik* and *národ* would then be the result of a different levelling – in *jězik*, the oblique stem is generalized, and in *národ*, the nominative stem is generalized. The problem with this hypothesis would be that we would have to assume random levelling and if we assume shortening only before the second long syllable everything is predictable (short vowel in *jězik*, long in *kúkolj* etc.). The examples like Croat. *súsjed* are dealt with by a simple analogy and the examples like *svjèdok* are no problem because they preserve desinential stress. The preservation of desinential stress is also not random because it is preserved with certain suffixes like *-okǫ and *-otǫ. The shortening before a long vowel in the second syllable (like in *jězykъ), but not before a short vowel (like in *nāròďъ) is in accord with the general rule that the pretonic length is shortened if there are two or more moras after the pretonic length (see below).

6. polysyllables with the final stress • V • V: • 'ъ/ь • (full syllable, full long syllable, stress on the final *yer*) and definite adjectives • V • 'ъ/ьjъ • (full syllable, stressed *yer* in the second syllable and a final *yer*)

*ďylъnǫkъ «debtor» > Croat. *dùžnik*, Sln. *dolžnik*, Czech *dlužnik*, Slk. *dlžnik*, Russ. *должник, должникá*

*mǫžьskǫjъ «male» > Croat. *mùški*, Sln. *móški*, Czech *mužský*, Russ. *мужской*

The examples of the shortening in front of ~ & ˘ (the result of contraction)

Common Slavic	Croatian	Slovene	Czech	Slovak
*ďylъnǫkъ	<i>dùžnik</i>	<i>dolžnik</i>	<i>dlužnik</i>	<i>dlžnik</i>
*junǫkъ «hero»	<i>jùnāk</i>	<i>junāk</i>	<i>junāk</i>	<i>junāk</i>
*mǫžьskǫjъ	<i>mùški</i>	<i>móški</i>	<i>mužský</i> ⁸⁵	<i>mužský</i>
*gordьskǫjъ «city-» (adj.)	<i>grǫdskǫ</i>	<i>grájski</i>	<i>hradský</i>	<i>hradský</i>
*vylčǫjъ «wolf's»	<i>vùčji</i>	<i>vólčji</i>		<i>vlčí</i>

⁸⁵ Czech/Slovak *mužský* with a short root is not very significant because the base word, *muž*, is also short (the circumflex shortens in West Slavic). The same goes for Slovincian examples like *mlodǫ* «young», *slepǫ* «blind» etc. Croat. *mùž*, but *mùški* and Slovene *môž*, but *móški* is, on the other hand, a clear case of shortening before a long vowel.

The pretonic length is shortened in front of the neo-acute or the neo-circumflex (resulted from contraction), cf. Čak. *junāk*, *gradskī*. As we have also seen, it is shortened in front of the acute as well, cf. Čak. *jazīk*, and in front of two full syllables, cf. Čak. *utrōba*. Thus, a general rule can be set: the pretonic length is shortened in front of two or more moras. Full syllables (*e, *o) represent a mora, long syllables (*a, *ě, *i, *u, *y, *ę, *ǫ) represent two moras (*a, *ě, *i, *u, *y, *ę, *ǫ are not considered long when in absolute final position) and *yers* (*ъ, *ь) have the value of half a mora (thus for instance, a full vowel, *e or *o + *yer* is not enough to cause the shortening of the pretonic length, cf. *gūmъnŏ > Čak. *gūmnŏ*, but *tręsetę > Čak. *tresetę*). Thus • V • V • = • V: •, *jūnāk'ъ = *jūnāk'a = *život'a = *māl'ina = *pōlnino. The pretonic length is shortened in front of two or more moras no matter where the accent is or what kind of accent it is⁸⁶.

As for what appears to be shortening in front of the neo-acute and the neo-circumflex, we see it clearly in many forms (although the length can also be secondarily introduced in some cases). Cf. in Croat. *mljekār* < *mljekār* «milkman» (: *mljeko* «milk»), *zūbār* < *zubār* «dentist» (: *zūb* «tooth») etc. In verbs, cf. *bjèžīš* (: *bijēg* «escape») etc. In declension, cf. in many Čak. dialects gen. sg. *glavē*, instr. sg. *glavōm* (but nom. sg. *glāvā*)⁸⁷. In Neo-Štok. dialects and standard Croat., the length is reintroduced here from other cases: *glāvē*, *glāvōm*. Cf. in standard Croat. gen. pl. *rūkū* but secondary *ljūdī* «people» etc. In the definite adjectives of the a. p. c, the shortening is regular: cf. *gláva* but *glāvnī* «main», *svijēt* «world» but *svjētskī* «world-» (adj.), *svēt* (indefinite adj.) but dial. *svēī* (definite adj.) etc. Some archaic Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects have a synchronic rule that pretonic length is possible only before " and not before ~ and ~⁸⁸.

VI) Posttonic length

When dealing with posttonic length, the accentual paradigms have an important role. So we have divided the evidence into the words with the posttonic length in a. p. a (that is after the old acute) and in a. p. c (that is after the circumflex).

1. trisyllables • 'V • V: • ъ/ь • (full accented syllable, full long syllable, a *yer*)

*męsęcъ «moon, month» > Croat. *mjesęc*, Sln. *męsec*, Czech *męsíc*, Slk. *miesiac*, Pol. *mięsięc*, -a

⁸⁶ In cases like *mǫžъskijъ *-ъjъ really becomes *-yjъ (not in Russian though, but there the *yer* vocalizes to o), so the shortening is expected there as well.

⁸⁷ For the neo-acute here cf. Ivšić 1971: [147-8].

⁸⁸ For more details on the shortening in front of a long syllable in Croatian dialects, cf. Kapović 2003.

a. p. a

All the languages preserve the length

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.
*męśęć	<i>mjęśęć</i> ⁸⁹ , <i>mjęśęca</i>	<i>męsec</i>	<i>měsíc</i>	<i>mesiac</i>	<i>miesiąc</i> ⁹⁰ , <i>miesiąca</i>
*pǫkъ ⁹¹ «spider»	<i>pǫk, pǫka</i>	<i>pǫjek/pǫvok</i> (dial.)	<i>pavouk</i>	<i>pavúk</i>	<i>pająk</i> , <i>pająka</i>
*pęnęzъ ⁹² «money»	<i>pjęnęz</i> , <i>pjęnęza</i>	<i>pęnez</i>	<i>peníz</i> , dat. pl. <i>peněžům</i>	<i>peniaz</i>	<i>pieniądz</i> , <i>pieniądza</i>
*zǫjęć «hare»	[<i>zęc, zęca</i>] ⁹³	<i>zǫjec</i>	<i>zajíc</i>	<i>zajac</i> ⁹⁴	<i>zając</i> , <i>zająca</i> ⁹³
*tysŏrъ «thousand» (gen. pl.)	[<i>tisuća</i> , <i>tisuća</i>] ⁹⁵	<i>tisoč</i>	<i>tisíc</i>	<i>tisíc</i>	<i>tysiąc</i> ⁹⁶
*ręzanъ (passive ptcp.) «cut»	<i>ręzan, -a</i>	<i>ręzan, -a</i>	<i>řezán, -a</i> ⁹⁷		

In West Slavic, only Czech and Polish have the length

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.
*ǫstrębъ (-ъ) «hawk»	<i>jǫstręb</i> , <i>jǫstręba</i>	<i>jǫstreb</i>	<i>jeřáb</i>	<i>jastrab</i>	<i>jastrzǫb</i> , <i>jastrzǫba/jastrzębia</i>

⁸⁹ Croat. *mjęśęć* is today mobile (acc. sg. *nǫ mjesęc*, loc. sg. *u mjesęcu*, gen. pl. *mjesęcī*, dli. pl. *mjesęcima*) but the derivatives like *mjęśęćina* «moonlight», *mjęśęćar* «sleep-walker», *mjęśęćnica* «menstruation», *mjęśęćnik* «monthly magazine» prove that it was originally a. p. a. In Croatian, the nouns with posttonic length (original or secondary) all tend to become mobile in declension so there the distinction of the old a. p. a and a. p. c is not clear. This is because both the old circumflex and the old acute yield short falling accent in Croatian in polysyllables (*gǫlŭb* < *gǫlŭbъ «pidgeon» = *mjęśęć* < *męśęćъ) and so the patterns get mixed up. But the difference of a. p. a and a. p. b is always preserved in the derivatives.

⁹⁰ In Polish, -ą is always long (there is no *-ęć). However, this suffix practically appears only in *męśęćъ and *zǫjęćъ.

⁹¹ The prefix *pǫ- always has an acute on it. In East Slavic, this word has a secondary a. p. b (*pǫkъ) – Russ. *naýk*, *naýká*, Ukr. *naşýk*, *naşýká*, Blr. *naşýk*. It is not very likely that West Slavic reflexes like Slovak *pavúk* are indeed reflexes of the secondary a. p. b like in East Slavic, although this possibility has to be taken into consideration.

⁹² Cf. a loanword in Hungarian *pénz*.

⁹³ Cf. a toponym *Zǫječar* in Serbia which points to *zǫjęć (a. p. a). The *-ę- is regularly shortened in the second syllable in *Zǫječar*.

⁹⁴ In Slovak, there cannot be a long vowel after -j- (because -j- is considered the first part of the diphthong -ia- which is considered a long vowel), cf. Slk. *vojak* : Czech *voják*, Croat. *vǫjǫk* «soldier».

⁹⁵ Croatian gen. pl. is not relevant since all final syllables in the stem are long in gen. pl. In nom. sg. *tisuća* -u- is short by analogy (because the length was wrongly attributed to gen. pl. only and not to the stem). In any case, there are no a-stems with posttonic length in nom. sg. in Croatian.

⁹⁶ But cf. the new gen. pl. *tysięcy*, like secondary gen. pl. *pienędzy*, *miesięcy*.

⁹⁷ Czech has a long suffix in a. p. b (*tesán* «trimmed») as well, but not in a. p. c (because the posttonic length is shortened in a. p. c in West Slavic, see further in the text).

Slovak has the length and Czech and Polish do not

Common Slavic	Czech	Slovak	Polish
*pǫzъ ⁹⁸ «a stick for threshing the hay»	<i>pauz</i>	<i>pavúz</i>	<i>pawqz, pawęza</i> (-u)

Only Croatian has the length (as well as Slovene in one example)

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.
*gǫvornъ «raven»	<i>gǎvrān</i> ⁹⁹ , <i>gǎvrāna</i>	<i>gǎvran</i>	<i>havran</i>	<i>havran</i>	<i>gawron</i>
*ǫlbōd/ъ «swan»	<i>lǎbūd</i> ¹⁰⁰ , <i>lǎbūda</i>	[<i>labōd</i>] ¹⁰¹	<i>labuť</i> ¹⁰²	<i>labuť</i>	<i>łabędź</i>
*pāmęť «mind»	<i>pāmēt</i> , <i>pāmēti</i> ¹⁰³	<i>pāmet</i> ¹⁰⁴	<i>paměť</i>	<i>pamäť</i>	<i>pamięć</i>
*pǫportъ «fern»	<i>pǎprāt</i> ¹⁰⁵ , <i>pǎprāti</i>	<i>práprat</i>	<i>kaprad'</i>	<i>paprad'</i> ¹⁰⁶	<i>paproć</i>

Length in Croat., no neo-circumflex in Sln., a different suffix in West Slavic

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.
*ābolnъ «poplar»	<i>jǎblān</i> ¹⁰⁷ , <i>jǎblāna</i>	<i>jáblan</i> ¹⁰⁸	(<i>jabłoń</i> ¹⁰⁹)	(<i>jabłoń</i>)	(<i>jabłoń</i>)

a. p. c

Only Croatian has the length, West Slavic always has a short suffix

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.
*čę ādъ «people»	<i>čęljād</i> , <i>čęljādi</i>		<i>čeled'</i>	<i>čel'ad'</i>	
*čę ūstъ «jaw»	<i>čęljūst</i> , <i>čęljūsti</i>	<i>čeljūst</i>	<i>čelist</i>	<i>čel'ust'</i>	<i>czeluść</i>

⁹⁸ Croat. *pǫzina* (ARj, Orahovica) points to the acute on the first syllable as well.

⁹⁹ Original acute on the first syllable is proved by the derivatives: *gǎvrānica* «female raven» (and *Gǎvrānica* «a goat-name»), *gǎvrānić* «little raven» (and also a surname *Gǎvrānić*) (ARj), microtoponym *Gǎvrānovac* (Prapatnice) etc. Cf. also a variant *kǎvrān* (Sln. *kǎvran*) and Lith. *kóvarnis* for the acute.

¹⁰⁰ The accent *labūdica* (as marked in ARj) is secondary, instead of the older variant *lǎbudica* «female swan». The original acute is shown by Czech *labuť* with #*la-* and not #*lo-* (cf. *ǫlkъ > Czech *loket*).

¹⁰¹ There also exists a variant *labōd* in Sln., which, if older, could be interpreted as secondary from the original **lǎbōd*, like the secondary variant *gavrān* instead of the older variant *gǎvran*.

¹⁰² Cf. also Croat. *lǎbūt* and Czech (arch.) *labud'*.

¹⁰³ Like *mjęsęc*, the word *pāmēt* is also secondarily mobile in Croatian (as are all the other similar examples, if the mobile pattern is preserved at all in that word in modern language), cf. acc. sg. *nǎ pamēt*, loc. sg. *pri pamēti* etc. The original acute is shown by the derivatives: *pāmetovati* «to act smart», *pāmtiti* «to remember» etc.

¹⁰⁴ Sln. has no neo-circumflex in the examples like *pāmet* or *jáblan* due to derivatives like *pāmeten*, *pāmetovati*, *pāmetiti*, *pāmetnost* etc. where it is not expected (because the posttonic length is shortened in polysyllables, see further in the text). Not all the examples that should have the neo-circumflex can easily be explained like this though.

¹⁰⁵ The original acute is confirmed by the toponym *Prǎpatnice* (personal data, no accent marked in ARj).

¹⁰⁶ Croat. also *pǎprād*, *prǎprāt*, *prǎpāt* etc. Thus also in other Slavic languages and dialects.

¹⁰⁷ The original acute is apparent in the toponyms *Jǎblanac*, *Jǎblanica*, *Jǎblanik*, *Jǎblanovac*, surname *Jǎblanić* and the derivatives *jǎblanak*, *jǎblanovina*, *jǎblanski* (all ARj). Cf. also an etymologically related Croat. *jǎbuka*, Sln. *jábolko* «apple» etc.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. also Sln. *jǎblana/jǎblana*, *jǎblanica/jǎblanica* for the inconsistency of the reflex of the neo-circumflex.

¹⁰⁹ In West Slavic, the suffix is short (*ǎblonъ).

*dēsētъ «ten»	<i>dēsēt</i>	<i>desēt</i>	<i>deset</i>	<i>desat'</i>	<i>dziesięć</i>
*dēvētъ «nine»	<i>dēvēt</i> ¹¹⁰	<i>devēt</i>	<i>devět</i>	<i>devät'</i>	<i>dziewięć</i>
*gōlōbъ «pidgeon»	<i>gōlūb, gōlūba</i>	<i>golōb</i>	<i>holub</i>	<i>holub</i>	<i>gołąb, gołębia</i>
*ōbvolkъ «cloud»	<i>ōblāk, ōblāka</i>	<i>oblāk</i>	<i>oblak</i>	<i>oblak</i>	<i>obłok</i>
*ōbvolstъ «jurisdiction»	<i>ōblāst, ōblāsti</i>	<i>oblāst</i>	<i>oblast</i>	<i>oblast'</i>	
*tētervъ «grouse»	<i>tētrijēb, tētrijēba</i>	<i>tetrēv</i>	<i>tetrev</i>	<i>(tetrov)</i>	<i>cietrzew</i>
*žēlōdъ «acorn»	<i>žēlūd, žēlūda</i> ¹¹¹	[<i>žēlod, želōda/želōd</i>]	<i>žalud</i>	<i>žalud'</i>	<i>żołądz, żołędzi</i>

Shortened length in West Slavic, but seemingly not in Czech

CSl.	Croat.	Sln.	Czech	Slk.	Pol.
*jārēbъ «partridge»	<i>jārēb, jārēba</i> ¹¹²	<i>jerēb</i>	<i>jeřáb</i>		<i>jarzab, jarzēb(i)a</i>
*ōvādъ «horsefly»	<i>ōbād, ōbāda</i> ¹¹³	<i>obād</i>	<i>ovád</i>	<i>ovad</i>	

In Croatian, the case of the posttonic length in the second syllable (in trisyllable words with a final *yer*) is very simple – the posttonic length is always preserved, in both a. p. *a* and a. p. *c*¹¹⁴. In other Slavic languages, it is not so simple. Slovene should have the neo-circumflex in a. p. *a* (cf. Croat. *gāvrān* ~ Sln. *gāvran*) in all the cases, but sometimes it does not. The neo-circumflex is there in 7 or 8 examples (*mēsec, pājek, pēnez, zājec, jāstreb, gāvran, fīsoč*¹¹⁵ and perhaps indirectly in the variant *labōd* if from older **lāboda*) and in the passive participle in *-ānъ in a. p. *a* like *rēzan, māzan* «smeared», *brīsan* «erased» from the verbs *rēzati, māzati, brīsati* (cf. Croat. *rēzati* : *rēzān, māzati* : *māzān, brīsati* : *brīsān*). All this proves that Slovene indeed did preserve the posttonic length in a. p. *a* and that it later disappeared leaving its trace in the neo-circumflex. Only in three examples (*pāmet, prāprat* and *jāblan*) is there no neo-circumflex. This can be accounted by the derivatives¹¹⁶, at least for *pāmet* and *jāblan* while the task is not so easy for *prāprat*. But these three examples are definitely secondary. In a. p. *c*, Slovene is useless since the progressive shift of the circumflex always yields a long falling accent.

In West Slavic, the case is relatively clear in a. p. *c* – the posttonic length is regularly shortened. If we connect this with the rule of the shortening of the circumflex in West Slavic the general rule is simple: the last syllable of

¹¹⁰ The posttonic length is often shortened in numbers in some dialects, thus secondary also *dēvet, dēsēt*.

¹¹¹ Cf. also Russian *жѣлудъ* for the place of the accent.

¹¹² A. p. *c* is confirmed by the derivatives *jarēbica* «female partridge» and the verb *jarēbiti se* (ARj). Cf. also Bulgarian adjective *яребам*.

¹¹³ Also *ōvād, ōvāda*. Cf. also Russ. *о́водъ* for the place of the accent.

¹¹⁴ This only refers to non-acuted posttonic length, that is to the posttonic length in those syllables that are never stressed under the acute (and thus shortened in Croatian). For the acuted posttonic syllables see further in the text.

¹¹⁵ This is indeclinable in Slovene but gen. pl. in origin, so the neo-circumflex is expected.

¹¹⁶ See footnotes 104 and 108.

the word is shortened, if long, in West Slavic in a. p. c. In monosyllabic root-words, the last syllable, which is shortened, is the only syllable and thus it is accented (*vōlstъ «government» > Czech *vlast*). In bisyllabic root-words, the last syllable, which is shortened, is the posttonic syllable (*ōbvolstъ > Czech *oblast*). This formulation is very economic because it gives us the possibility of reducing two rules (the rule of shortening of the circumflex and the rule of shortening of the posttonic length in a. p. c in West Slavic) to one simple rule.

There are two exceptions in a. p. c – Czech *jeřáb* and *ovád* with a long suffix (cf. Sln. *jerēb* and *obād* for a. p. c). These can be explained by the inconsistent secondary lengthening before a final voiced plosive (cf. also Czech *bůh* «god» < *bōgъ, but *roh* «horn» < *rōgъ). There is no such lengthening in Czech *čeled*, *holub* and *žalud*. Czech *jeřáb* could also be interpreted as having borrowed the secondary length from the originally a. p. a word *jestřáb* «hawk» (which is similar to it phonologically and is also a name of a bird) or from the diminutive *jeřábek*¹¹⁷. In the light of the 9 examples with the shortening (and in the light of the short suffix in Slovak *ovad* and Polish *jarzab*, *jarzēb(i)a*), the regular shortening of the posttonic length in a. p. c in West Slavic is indisputable and Czech *jeřáb* and *ovád* are most certainly secondary developments.

The shortening of the posttonic length in a. p. c in West Slavic is generalized and the forms which originally had pretonic length in a. p. c have also shortened it analogically. Thus dat. sg. *ōbvolsti > Czech *oblasti* regularly and loc. sg. *obvolsti > *oblasti* by analogy¹¹⁸.

In West Slavic, the posttonic length in a. p. a is attested but very inconsistently. All West Slavic languages point to the preservations of the length in 5 examples (two of which, *mēsēcъ and *zājēcъ have the same suffix) and in the participles in *-ānъ in a. p. a in Czech. Once the length is attested only in Czech and Polish (*jestřáb*, *jastrzab*/*jastrzaba*) and once only in Slovak (*pavúz*) but in both cases before a final voiced consonant¹¹⁹. In 4 examples, all West Slavic languages show a shortened posttonic length. Czech *havran*, for instance, might have been influenced by Czech *vran* «crow» (Croat./Sln. *vrán*). All this indicates that the case of the posttonic length in a. p. a in West Slavic is a very problematic one¹²⁰.

¹¹⁷ The long syllable before the suffix is generalized here in Czech, cf. *kožich* «leather coat» < *kožūxъ but *kožíšek* (~ Croat. *kòžuš*).

¹¹⁸ Perhaps an example without the generalization of the short variant in a. p. c can be found. Cf. Czech nom. sg. *devět*, Slovak *deväť* < *dēvētъ but gen. sg. Czech *devíti*, Slk. *deviati* < *devēti. However, Czech *deset* has both *desiti* and *desiti* in gen. sg. (Carlton 1991: 209).

¹¹⁹ Cf. also another possible example – Polish *mosiądz*, *mosiądzu* «brass», but Czech *mosaz* and Slovak *mosadz*. However, the accentual paradigm of Slavic *mosēzъ is not known.

¹²⁰ Kortlandt (for instance 1975: 30) has a different opinion on the problem of posttonic length (his ideas about the length are in general quite different from those presented in this article). He believes that all languages preserve the posttonic length and that the pretonic length is regularly shortened. Thus, in a. p. a, where the length can only be posttonic, the length is preserved and in a. p. c, where the accent is mobile, the length can be posttonic (and thus preserved) or pretonic (and thus shortened). According to Kortlandt, West Slavic has generalized the pretonic short vowels in a. p. c and Croatian has

2. trisyllables • 'V • V: • V • (full accented syllable, long syllable, full syllable)

*prĕdīvo «yarn» > Croat. *prĕdīvo*, Sln. *predīvo*, Czech *předivo*, Slk. *pradivo*

Common Slavic	Croatian	Slovene	Czech	Slovak
*prĕdīvo	<i>prĕdīvo</i>	<i>predīvo</i>	<i>předivo</i> ¹²¹	<i>pradivo</i>
*pĕčīvo «bun»	<i>pĕčīvo</i>	<i>pecīvo</i> ¹²²	<i>pečivo</i>	<i>pečivo</i>
*āstrĕba «hawk» (gen. sg.)	<i>jāstrĕba</i>	<i>jāstreba</i>	<i>jastrába</i>	<i>jastraba</i>

The posttonic length is preserved in trisyllable words with three full syllables (of course, not in a. p. c in West Slavic). In polysyllables (four or more syllables of any type), the posttonic length is shortened (see further in the text). This is proven by the Croatian pairs of short and long plurals in which the opposition of trisyllables and polysyllables is still clearly seen: *jāblāni* – *jāblanovi*, *jāstrĕbi* – *jāstrebovi*, *vītēzi* – *vītezovi* «knights», *pōjāsi* – *pōjasovi* «belts», *kōrijēni* – *kōrjenovi* «roots», *gāvranī* – *gāvranovi* etc. That the posttonic length in trisyllables is not secondary is proven by *plurale tantum* nouns like *mōždān* «brains», where there is no possibility of analogical length and by such cases as *mjĕštanin* – *mjĕštāni*¹²³ «townsman», *bŕđanin* – *bŕđāni* «highlander» etc., where there is no length in the singular and which has four syllables because of the singulative suffix *-in*.

3. quadrisyllables and polysyllables • 'V • V • V • V • (full accented syllable, full syllable, two or more syllables of any kind)

*pāmĕtŕnъ «smart» > Croat. *pāmetan*, Sln. *pāmeten*

generalized the posttonic long vowels. Thus, in Croatian loc. sg. *na korāku*, the length is analogical after the nom. sg. *kōrāk* «step» etc. But Kortlandt's theory has many shortcomings. He adduces a limited number of examples (all from Stang 1957), some of which are wrongly interpreted and some of which are not very relevant. He adduces Czech *mĕsíc*, *peníz*, *jeřáb*, *pavouk* as evidence for the preserved length in a. p. *a* in West Slavic, but he does not quote for instance Slovak *jastrab*, Polish *jastrząb*, *jastrzębia* or Czech *havran*, *kaprad'* or *pamět'* with no length. He interpretes Czech *labuť*, Croat. *lābūd* as the case of a. p. *c* even though it is clearly a. p. *a* (#*la-* in Czech, Slovak and Polish). He also adduces as evidence Croat. *pĕkār*, Czech *pekař*, *rybář*, *rybník*, which do not contradict our theory. Kortlandt's theory itself is an unnecessary complication because it requires different levelling in South and West Slavic and nothing is gained by it. It requires the length in Croat. *rūka* or loc. sg. *u slučāju* «in the case of» to be reintroduced analogically, which is unnecessary and not economic. According to the hypothesis of the author of this article, no levelling is necessary and the shortening of the posttonic length in a. p. *c* in West Slavic is explained by the same rule as the shortening of the circumflex. Such a hypothesis is much simpler and much more economic.

¹²¹ The suffix *-īvo is shortened because the noun is a. p. *c*.

¹²² This example is irrelevant. Counterexamples are Sln. *klādivo* «hammer» and *mlĕzivo* «first milk» without the neo-circumflex.

¹²³ Cf. also Slovenc. nom. pl. *'mješčāne* which also shows length.

In quadrisyllables (in which the type of syllables is not relevant – a full syllable or a *yer*, it makes no difference), the posttonic length in the second syllable is shortened¹²⁴. Besides the examples we have already seen like *pāmetan* : *pāmēt*¹²⁵ and *jāblāni* : *jāblanovi* etc., cf. also: Štok. *pāūk* – *pāučina* «spider-web», Kajk. *pāvuk* – *pāvučina*, Czech *pavouk* – *pavučina*¹²⁶, *mješec* – *mješčina* «moonlight», *mjesečnica* «menstruation»¹²⁷ and Croat. *pāuzina* – Slk. *pavúz* etc.

4. posttonic length in a. p. *a* (which is in a. p. *b* and a. p. *c* accented and thus not posttonic) in Štokavian and Čakavian

In Standard Croatian (as well as in Štokavian standard languages), morphemes, which are short when accented (because the old acute was there), are also short when not accented. Thus *ženama* < *ženāma* < **ženāma* «women» (dli. pl.) (a. p. *b*) is regularly short, but so is *vrānama* < **vōrnāma* «crows» (dli. pl.) in a. p. *a*. The same goes for: *ženica* «little woman» – *stārica* «old woman», *čīniti* «to do» – *mīsliti* «to think», *mōlila* «she prayed» (fem. l-ptcp.) – *kītila* «she decorated» (fem. l-ptcp.) etc. The posttonic length here (**stārīca*, **mīslīla* etc.) is analogically shortened after the cases where it was acuted. But in many Štokavian, especially Montenegrin and Serbian, and in some Čakavian dialects short vowels have not been generalized. In those dialects, in a. p. *a*, after short falling accent, the former long vowels (which are short when accented like *nogāma*, dli. pl. «feet») -*a*-, -*e*- (< **ę*), -*i*-, -*u*- and -*ě*- are always predictably long (in Čakavian the rule is often productive only in some categories). Cf. Prčanj/Ozrinići (Rešetar): *pūškāma* «guns» (dli. pl., a. p. *a*) ≠ *ženāma* (a. p. *b*) and *dvīgnūt* «to lift» (a. p. *a*) ≠ *potēgnūt* «to pull» (a. p. *b*) etc. In Čakavian cf. Novi: *ūcīl*, *učīlā*, *ūcīlo* «studied» (l-ptcp., a. p. *c*) and *rōdīl*, *rodīlā*, *rōdīlo* «gave birth» (l-ptcp., a. p. *c*), Hvar *dēlot* «to do» (a. p. *a*), Vis (personal data) *pītot* «to feed», *pādot* «to fall», *māzot* «to smear; to spread», *plākot* «cry», *plīvot* «to swim», *dīzot* «to get sb/smth up», *glēdot* «to look», *slūšot* «to listen», *grījot* «to warm smth up» (all a. p. *a*)¹²⁸ etc. In Standard Croatian, there is no posttonic length in these examples: *pūškama*, *dīgnuti*, *djēlati* (arch.), *pītati*, *pādati*, *māzati*, *plākati*, *plīvati*, *dīzati*, *glēdati*, *slūšati*, *grījati*¹²⁹.

¹²⁴ Posttonic length is possible in the last syllable of polysyllabic words (in front of a final *yer*) if it is supported by length in other forms. Cf. Croat. *pōdupřt* «supported» or *izuzēt* «excluded» which are supported by *ūpřt* «burdened», *ūzēt* «taken», and by feminine (dial. and older) *podupřta*, *izuzēta* which have preserved the length regularly.

¹²⁵ Croat. adjective *ōblāčan* «cloudy» has the length analogically after the base noun *ōblāk* «cloud».

¹²⁶ Pol. *pajaczyna* is levelled after *pajak*.

¹²⁷ The suffix *-nica* is always short, cf. *kōšnica* «beehive», *bōlnica* «hospital» (acuted *-nica*).

¹²⁸ Čakavian (Hvar, Vis): -*ā*- > -*o*- and -*ā*- > -*ā*- in open syllable (secondary developments).

¹²⁹ The generalization of the short variants is not exceptionless – some dialects have generalized the long suffix *-īšte* due to forms like *blātište* «mud-pit» and some the short variant *-ište* due to forms like *dvōrište* «yard» where the suffix was shortened under the acute.

The same kind of generalization of the short (originally acuted) variant attested in some Štokavian and Čakavian dialects is found in Slovene as well¹³⁰: cf. Slovene *dělati*, *dělal*, *dělala*, *dělalo* «work» (a. p. *a*) without a neo-circumflex because *-a-* was acuted (and thus shortened originally) in a. p. *b*, *česáti* (< *česàti), *česal* (< *česál), *česála*, *česálo* (< *česàlo) «to scratch» or *misliti*, *mislil*, *mislila*, *mislilo* «to think» (a. p. *a*) because of *nositi* (< *nositi), *nósil*, *nosila*, *nosílo* (a. p. *b*)¹³¹ «to carry» etc.

SUMMARY: THE RETAINMENT AND THE SHORTENING POSITIONS¹³²

Final open syllables

1. *zīmǫ > Croat. *zīmǔ*

Acute

1. *bǫlto > Croat. *blǎto*, Czech *bláto*

Circumflex

1. *dār > Croat. *dār*, Czech *dar* «gift», 2. *mēso > Croat. *měso*, Czech *maso*, 3. *ōlkъ > Croat. *lākat*, Czech *loket*, 4. *mōldostъ > Croat. *mlādōst*, 5. *sŷnove > Croat. *sīnovi*

Neo-acute

1. *kōtъ, *pōtъnīkъ, *dylъnīkъ > Croat. *kūt*, *pūtnīk*, *dužnīk*, 2. *vĕžešъ > Croat. *věžeš*, 3. *bĕlъjъ > Croat. *bělī*, 4. *žĕdja > Croat. *žěda*

Pretonic length

1. *trōbā, *rōkā > Croat. *trūba*, *rūka*, 2. *kylbāśā > Croat. *kobāsa*, 3. *poltъnō > Croat. *plátno*, 4. *malīna > Croat. *mālina*, 5. *jĕzŷkъ > Croat. *jèzik*, *kōkōlъ > Croat. *kúkolj*, *kúkolja*, *sŷvĕdōkъ > Croat. *svjèdok*, *svjedōka*, 6. *dylъnīkъ > Croat. *dužnīk*, *mōžъskъjъ > Croat. *mùškī*

Posttonic length

1. *mĕšĕcъ > Croat. *mjěsēc*, Czech *měsíc*, *gōlōbъ > Croat. *gòlūb*, Czech *holub*, 2. *prĕdīvo > Croat. *prĕdīvo*, 3. *pāmĕtъnъ > Croat. *pāmetan*

¹³⁰ Stang 1957: 50.

¹³¹ The length in m./n. *l*-ptcp. of a. p. *c* obviously did not help: *gostil*, *gostila* < *gostīlā, *gostīlo* «treated».

¹³² Croatian is here taken as an example, with Czech as an example for West Slavic when necessary. In Croatian, neo-acute is marked as a separate intonation.

Common Slavic accented length

The old acute (´) is shortened in Croat. to short falling accent (˘). In Czech, it remains long in the mono- and bisyllabic words. Croat. *vràna*, Czech *vrána*.

The old circumflex (˘) remains long falling in mono- and bisyllabic words in Croat. (*měso*), and is shortened in longer ones (*gràda* : *gràdovi*). It is shortened in West Slavic (Czech *maso*).

The neo-acute (˘) remains long everywhere, the number of syllables is irrelevant (Croat. *pūtnik*, Czech *poutnik*).

Common Slavic pretonic length

The length is preserved in front of less than two moras, Croat. *trúba*, Czech *trouba*.

The length is shortened in front of two moras (two full syllables or a long accented syllable), Croat. *trúbica*, Czech *trubice*.

Common Slavic posttonic length

After the circumflex (a. p. c): Preserved in Croat., shortened in West Slavic. Croat. *gōlūb*, Czech *holub*.

After the old acute (a. p. a): Preserved in Croat., preserved inconsistently in West Slavic. Croat. *mjěsēc*, Czech *měsíc*.

Postscript. After the completion of this paper I have found out that Frederik Kortlandt's criticism of it will be published in the very same issue of *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*. For my reply to his criticism see Kapović forthcoming a.

L i t e r a t u r e

- AG 1991: Babić – Brozović – Moguš – Pavešić – Škarić – Težak, *Povijesni pregled, glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb
- Богатырев 1995: К. К. Богатырев, *Акцентуация северолехитских говоров с исторической точки зрения* (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 330), München
- Brozović – Ivić 1988: Dalibor Brozović – Pavle Ivić, *Jezik, srpskohrvatski/hrvatskosrpski, hrvatski ili srpski*, Zagreb
- Budmani 1867: Pietro [= Petar] Budmani, *Grammatica della lingua serbo-croata* (illirica), Vienna
- Булатова 1982: Римма В. Булатова, *Акцентологические связи кайкавского диалекта с другими диалектами сербохорватского языка*, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 6, 85-100
- Carlton 1991: Terence R. Carlton, *Introduction to the phonological history of the Slavic languages*, Columbus
- Dulčić – Dulčić 1985: Jure Dulčić – Pere Dulčić, *Rječnik bruškoga govora*, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, knj. 7/sv. 2
- Дыбо 1981: Владимир А. Дыбо, *Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском*, Москва

- Дыбо – Замятина – Николаев 1990: В. А. Дыбо – Г. И. Замятина – С. Л. Николаев, Основы славянской акцентологии, Москва
- FO 1981: Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom, Sarajevo
- HG 1997: Barić – Lončarić – Malić – Pavešić – Peti – Zečević – Znika, Hrvatska gramatika², Školska knjiga, Zagreb
- Holzer 1995: Georg Holzer, Die Einheitlichkeit des Slavischen um 600 n. Chr. und ihr Zerfall, Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 41, 55-89
- Holzer 2003: Georg Holzer, Urslavische Phonologie, Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 49, 23-40
- Ivšić 1911: Stjepan Ivšić, Prilog za slavenski akcenat, Rad JA 187 (1911), 133-208 [reprinted in Ivšić 1971: [83-159]]
- Ivšić 1970: Stjepan Ivšić, Slavenska poredbeni gramatika, priredili Josip Vrana i Radoslav Katičić, Zagreb
- Ivšić 1971: Stjepan Ivšić, Izabrana djela iz slavenske akcentuacije (Gesammelte Schriften zum slavischen Akzent), mit einer Einleitung sowie Berichtigungen und Ergänzungen des Verfassers herausgegeben von Christian Alphonsus van der Berk, Slavische Propyläen (= Texte in Neu- und Nachdrucken 96), München
- Jedvaj 1956: Josip Jedvaj, Bednjanski govor, Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik I, 279-330
- Jurišić 1966: Blaž Jurišić, Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade, I dio, Zagreb
- Jurišić 1973: Blaž Jurišić, Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade, uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima, II dio, Rječnik, Zagreb
- Jurišić 1992: Blaž Jurišić, Nacrt hrvatske slovnice II. Tvorba imenica u povijesnom razvoju, Zagreb
- Kapović 2003: Mate Kapović, Razvoj starih dugih samoglasa u hrvatskom i ostalim slavenskim jezicima, Filologija 41, 51-82
- Kapović 2005a: Mate Kapović, Naglasak praslavenske riječi *sъrdьse, Croatica et Slavica Iadertina I, 125-133
- Kapović 2005b: Mate Kapović, Nove duljine u hrvatskom jeziku (nakon općeslavenskoga razdoblja), Filologija 44, 51-62
- Kapović forthcoming a: Mate Kapović, Slavic Length Again, Filologija
- Kapović forthcoming b: Mate Kapović, The *vǫľa-type Accent in Slavic, in: Tones and Theories. Proceedings of IWoBA 2005 (ed. M. Kapović & R. Matasović)
- Kapović forthcoming c: Mate Kapović, Reexamining Meillet's Law, a presentation on the XII. Congress of Indogermanische Gesellschaft in Kraków in October 2004
- Kortlandt 1975: Frederik H. H. Kortlandt, Slavic Accentuation, a Study in Relative Chronology, Lisse/Netherlands
- Kovačec 1989: August Kovačec, Četverotonski prozodijski sustav nekih kajkavskih govora, Govor 2, 13-27
- László 1996: Bulcsú László, Općitbena bilježnost pri odredbi srbštine i hrvatštine, in: Jezik i komunikacija. Zbornik, Marin Andrijašević, Lovorka Zergollem-Miletić (ed.), Zagreb, 430-451
- Lehfeldt 1993: Werner Lehfeldt, Einführung in die morphologische Konzeption der Slavischen Akzentologie, München
- Leskien 1914: August Leskien, Grammatik der Serbokroatischen Sprache, Heidelberg
- Lončarić 1996: Mijo Lončarić, Kajkavsko narječje, Zagreb
- Matasović 2000: Ranko Matasović, Germanske posuđenice u praslavenskom: pitanja relativne kronologije, Filologija 34, 129-137
- Matešić 1970: Josip Matešić, Der Wortakzent in der serbokroatischen Schriftsprache, Heidelberg
- Moguš 1977: Milan Moguš, Čakavsko narječje: Fonologija, Zagreb

- Popović 1960: Ivan Popović, *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden
 SIHJ 1996: Stjepan Ivšić i hrvatski jezik. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa održanoga u Orahovici od 29. travnja do 1. svibnja 1994. godine o 110. obljetnici rođenja profesora Stjepana Ivšića (1884.-1994.), Božidar Finka (ed.), Zagreb
- Stang 1957: Christian S. Stang, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo
 Stankiewicz 1993: Edward Stankiewicz, *The Accentual Patterns of the Slavic Languages*, Stanford
- Zaliznjak 1985: A. A. Zaliznjak, *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*, Москва

Dictionaries

- ARj: Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika, sv. 1-97 [dijelovi I-XXIII], Zagreb 1881-1976
- Gluhak 1993: Alemko Gluhak, *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*, Zagreb
- Jungmann 1835-9: Josef Jungmann, *Slownjik česko-německý*, díl I-V, Praha
- Krátký slovník slovenského jazyka, Bratislava 1997
- Piccoli – Sammartino 2000: Agostina Piccoli – Antonio Sammartino, *Dizionario dell' idioma croato-molisano di Montemitro / Rječnik moliškohrvatskoga govora Mundimitra*, [Redazione della parte fonematica e croata / Sastavljanje i priređivanje fonološkoga i hrvatskoga dijela: Snježana Marčec – Mira Menac-Mihalić], Montemitro – Zagreb
- Plet.: Maks Pleteršnik 1894-5, *Slovensko-nemški slowar*, I-II, Ljubljana
- Skok: Petar Skok 1971-4, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, Knjiga prva: A-J. Knjiga druga: K-poni¹. Knjiga treća: poni²-Ž. Knjiga četvrta: Kazala. Uredili akademici Mirko Deanović i Ljudevit Jonke. Suradivao u predradnjama i priredio za tisak Valentin Putanec, Zagreb
- Słownik języka polskiego, tom I-VIII, Warszawa 1900-19
- Snoj 2003: Marko Snoj, *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana 2003²
- SSN: Slovník slovenských nářečí, I. A-K, 1994

Mate Kapović
 Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
 Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb (Croatia)
 mkapovic@ffzg.hr; <http://mudrac.ffzg.hr/~mkapovic>