Rising mobility in Slavic *i*-stems

Mate Kapović

Abstract: In this article[1] dealing with Slavic accentuation, the author points to the secondary spread of accentual paradigm *c* instead of the original accentual paradigm *a* in Slavic *i*-stems. It is claimed that the phenomenon of the rising mobility in *i*-stems begun already in Proto-Slavic and that is has continued to be active during the histories of all Slavic languages and dialects up to this day. Various examples are discussed, most notably the word *zvěrь „beast" for which it is claimed that it was originally a. p. *a* and not a. p. *c* (*zvě̃rь) as usually reconstructed.

In Proto-Slavic, nominal *i*-stems belonged to any of the usual three Slavic accentual paradigms – a. p. *a*, a. p. *b* or a. p. *c*[2]. For instance - *nĩtь „thread", gen. sg. *nĩti (a. p. *a*), *ògńь „fire", gen. sg. *ogńì (a. p. *b*) and *kòstь „bone", gen. sg. *kòsti (a. p. *c*). Later in Slavic languages, many of the old (masculine) *i*-stems changed their declension to *o*-stems, cf. for instance Croat. *òganj*, gen. sg. *ògnja* (cf. the original accent in the Posavina dial. of Orubica *ògāń*, gen. sg. *ògńa*), Russ. огóнь, gen. sg. огня́ (with a secondary oxytonesis in nom. sg.) or younger Croat. *pũt* „way" (dial. *pũt*), gen. sg. *púta* (dial. *pūtã)* but Russ. путь, gen. sg. пути́ and Slovene *pọ̑t*, gen. sg. *potí* (but also *pọ̑t*, gen. sg. *pọ́ta*). These secondary changes of declension were attested already in OCS and vary widely in different Slavic languages and dialects. From an accentological point of view, the most interesting tendency concerning *i*-stems is the tendency of rising mobility (i.e. the secondary spread of a. p. *c* in *i*-stems), which has begun already in Proto-Slavic and is still active in some Slavic languages (Croatian for instance). This basically means that many original a. p. *a* stems in Slavic have been secondarily transferred to a. p. *c* stems[3], some already in Proto-Slavic (for instance *vȏltь „blade of grass") and most of them later in the separate histories of Slavic languages and dialects. This tendency is most prominent in South Slavic (Croatian, Slovene, Bulgarian), but it affected at least a few examples in all Slavic languages. Of course, this is a simplification. One can hardly consider all the *i*-stem examples of a. p. *a* > a. p. *c* as a result of one and only Slavic change. The „rising mobility" should be considered as just a name which encompasses all of these different changes which have occurred since Proto-Slavic up till now. The tendency begun already in Proto-Slavic and was later continued in one or the other fashion in most Slavic languages.
The scope of this tendency is clearly seen if we compare Old Russian, which has preserved the original a. p. *a* in most cases (cf. the examples in Зализняк 1985: 132-

---

[1] I would like to thank Bulcsú László for many useful examples and ideas concerning the subject and to Kristina Marenić for reading the text carefully. Of course, all the mistakes and interpretations are just mine.

[2] Cf. for instance Дыбо 2000: 42. I use small letters (*a*, *b*, *c*) when talking about Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms but capital ones (A, B, C) when talking about synchronic accentual paradigms in later Slavic languages/dialects (derived from Proto-Slavic paradigms).

[3] Typologically, one can compare this tendency to a Lithuanian secondary spread of mobility in *o*-stems which was also a process which occurred mostly in historical time with different outcomes in different dialects. Cf. for instance Illich-Svytich 1979: 32.

133), and modern Croatian in which only three non-prefixed simple monosyllabic *i*-stems still belong to a. p. a[4]. These three nouns in Croatian are *smȑt* „death", *mjȅd* „brass" and *nȋt* „thread"[5], but the a. p. *c* forms *mjêd* and *nît* are also attested, in Slovene all three forms have either a „mixed" a. p. *a/c* paradigm or a. p. *c* (see below), and in Old Russian мѣдь and нить are a. p. *a*, but съмьрть is already a. p. *a* or a. p. *c* (only a. p. *c* in modern Russian) (Зализняк 1985: 132, 136).

We shall illustrate the rising of mobility in *i*-stems with some examples – first by some possible cases of a secondary a. p. *c* already in Proto-Slavic and then by the examples of Proto-Slavic a. p. *a* *i*-nouns which have become a. p. *c* nouns in at least some Slavic languages or dialects (as we shall see, sometimes almost all the languages have the secondary form).

*vôltь, *vôlti (a. p. *c*) „blade of grass" > Croat. *vlât*, gen. sg. *vlâti*, Slovene *(v)lât*, gen. sg. *(v)latî,* Russian *вóлоть*, Old Czech *vlať*. Cf. also *o*-stem *vôltъ* (a. p. *c*) > Croatian *vlât*, gen. sg. *vlâta*, Slovene *(v)lât*, gen. sg. *(v)lâta*, Ukrainian *вóлот*. For the acute cf. Lith. *váltis* (a. p. 1) (if Lithuanian has a. p. 1, one would expect a. p. *a*, i.e. **vőltь in Slavic)[6].

Balto-Slavic would perhaps point to PIE *wolHtis (cf. also Snoj: 346), but cognates like Greek λάσιος „hairy; overgrown" (*wl̥tyos) or Old Irish *folt* „hair; leaves" (*woltos) are laryngealless. The laryngeal is also seen in PIE *wl̥h₂neh₂ „wool" if these words belong to the same root. In this word, one must assume the change of a. p. *a* to a. p. *c* already in Proto-Slavic (or pre-Proto-Slavic) since no Slavic language points to a. p. *a*. However, it is also possible that one should reconstruct a. p. *a* in Proto-Slavic which later changed to secondary a. p. *c* in all Slavic languages.

There are a few other cases of the change of a. p. *a* to a. p. *c* already in Proto-Slavic. In the case of the word *děverь (a masculine *i*-stem, but PIE *r*-stem), Lithuanian *díeveris* (LRKŽ) (with secondary a. p. 1 > a. p. 3, i.e. *díeveris > dieverìs*) and Latvian *diêveris* clearly point to the acute. This is traditionally explained as a case of Hirt's Law derived from PIE *deh₂ywēr „brother-in-law" (cf. Vedic *devā́,* Greek *δāήρ*). One would also expect Slavic *dě̋verь, as indeed reconstructed by Illich-Svytich (1979: 137, 143) and Дыбо (1981: 18, but also *dě̂verь in 1981: 158). However, it is much more likely that Slavic *dě̂verь (a. p. *c*) is to be reconstructed. Croatian *djȇvēr, djȅvera* is by itself inconclusive[7], but Štokavian derivates like *djevèriti, djevèrnjī, djevèrskī, djeveròvati*

---

[4] Cf. Kapović 2007.

[5] Croatian *pȕt, pȕti* „complexion" is not originally a. p. *a* (*plъ̋tь, *plъ̋ti) but rather has the nominative *pȕt* instead of the expected *pût*. The expected alternation *pût, pȕti* has produced standard *pȕt, pȕti* and dialectal *pût, pûti* as results of different leveling, cf. Kapović 2007.

[6] Stang (1957: 9) and Kortlandt (1975: 55) list Lithuanian *klétis* (a. p. 1) ~ Slavic *klě̑tь (a. p. *c*) together with *vôltь as examples of Meillet's Law. They seem to pay no attention to whether or not the words are mobile in Baltic (they are not!) and also do not note that Lith. *klétis* is a loanword from Slavic (PIE *kloyt-, cf. Old Irish *cliath*).

[7] *dě̂verь would yield *djȅvēr* like *gȍvorь > *gȍvōr* and *dě̋verь would yield also *djȅvēr* like *kȁmenь > *kȁmēn* because of the secondary lengthening before resonants in two syllable a. p. *a* stems in Croatian (cf. Kapović 2005a: 58).

(ARj) as well as the Kajkavian dialect of Bednja form *devâr* (like *eblâok* „cloud",
gelôub „pigeon" ~ Croat. standard *òblāk*, *gòlūb*, a. p. C) point rather to Proto-Slavic
*dȇverъ than *dȇverь[8]. In Slovene, there is both *devẹ̑r* and *dẹ́ver* - examples like these
are unreliable in Slovene. However, note that Pleteršnik adduces both *devẹ̑r* (a. p. C)
and *dẹ́ver* (a. p. A) but only *sẹ́ver* (a. p. A, originally a. p. *a*). Old Russian *дьверь* is
also a. p. C (Зализняк 1985: 138). If one should indeed reconstruct Proto-Slavic
*dȇverъ, this would also be a case of a secondary mobility in Slavic *i*-stems.

There are two other examples of a. p. 1 *i*-stem in Lithuanian corresponding
unexpectedly to a. p. *c* in Slavic. Cf. Lithuanian *kū̃jis* (a. p. 1) „hammer" and Slavic
*kȳ̂jь (a. p. *c*) > Slovene *kȋj*, Czech *kyj*, Russian *кий*, gen. sg. *кия́*, nom. pl. *кии́*.
However, Illich-Svytich (1979: 138) sees an original *u*-stem here. Since Lithuanian
péntis (a. p. 1) corresponds to a Slavic *ā*-stem *pętà (a. p. *c*), no firm conclusion can be
made there.

Secondary mobility is also seen in two examples in Slavic *o*- and *u*-stems. In spite of the
fact that Lithuanian *sūnùs, sū́nų* (a. p. 3) „son" is very often taken for granted, in Old
Lithuanian the form *sū́nus* (a. p. 1) (Illich-Svitych 1979: 59) is attested and modern
sūnùs seems to be secondary. One would also expect Lithuanian a. p. 1 (cf. Vedic *sūnúš*,
PIE *suHnus) as in Lithuanian *výras* (a. p. 1), Latvian *vĩrs* < PIE *wiHros „man"
(Vedic *vīrás*). The secondary mobility is also seen in Slavic *vȋdъ (a. p. *c*) „sight"
(Croat. *vîd*, gen. sg. *vîda*, `ız vída, loc. sg. *u vídu*, Slovene *vîd*, gen. sg. *vîda*, Russ. *вид*,
loc. sg. *в виду́*, Bulgarian *вид*, def. *видъ́т*, but pl. *вѝдове*) compared to Latv. *veĩds* and
Lithuanian *véidas* (a. p. 1 > 3)[9].

Now we shall list some of the examples of Slavic a. p. *a* *i*-stems which have secondary
a. p. C reflexes in some Slavic languages/dialects due to the tendency of rising mobility
in *i*-stems:

*sъmȇ̋rtь[10], *sъmȇ̋rti (a. p. *a*) „death" > Croat. *smȑt*, gen. sg. *smȑti*, *dò smrti*, acc. sg. *nà
smrt*[11] (cf. secondary `ı smrti in Budmani 1867: 170), Slovene *smȓt*, gen. sg. *smȓti*
(Pleteršnik, cf. also younger *smȓt*, gen. sg. *smȓti* in Snoj), Russ. *смерть,* gen. sg. *при́
смерти*, gen. pl. *смерте́й* (a. p. C), a. p. A/C in Old Russian (Зализняк 1985: 136),
Bulgarian *смърт*, def. *смъртта́*[12].
*nȋtь, *nȋti (a. p. *a*) „thread" > Croat. *nȉt,* gen. sg. *nȉti* (also secondary, but clearly
younger *nît*, gen. sg. *nîti* – for instance Orubica), Slovene *nìt*, gen. sg. *níti*, Russ. *нить,*
gen. sg. *ни́ти*, a. p. A in Old Russian (Зализняк 1985: 132), cf. also Lith. *nýtis* (a. p. 1).

---

[8]   Cf. Kapović 2005a: 58.
[9]   PIE *weyd- (Vedic *ved-*) with Winter's Law lengthening. The a. p. *c* in Slavic *vȋdъ is perhaps due to
     analogy with cases like *rězati (a. p. *a*) „to cut" ~ *rězъ (a. p. *c*) „cut", *běgťi (a. p. *a*) „to run away"
     ~ *běgъ (a. p. *c*) „escape" etc. where the a. p. *c* in Slavic is the expected correspondent to Lithuanian
     a. p. 3 (cf. Lith. *rėžas* and *bėgas*).
[10] The acute is also structurally expected because this is a compound („good death").
[11] In standard language and for instance in Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina).
[12] Standard Bulgarian *i*-stems are not relevant since the definite ending –*mà* is always stressed.

*mědь, *medi (a. p. *a*) „brass" > Croat. *mjȅd,* gen. sg. *mjȅdi* (cf. Prapatnice *o*-stem *mȉd,* gen. sg. *mȉda* but Orubica *mȋd,* gen. sg. *mȋdi*), Slovene *mẹ̑d,* gen. sg. *medȋ* (a. p. C), Russ. *медь,* gen. sg. *мéди,* a. p. A in Old Russian (Зализняк 1985: 132), Czech *měď* (points to a. p. *c*), Bulgarian *мед,* def. *медтà.*

*mýšь, *mýši (a. p. *a*) „mouse" > Slovene *mìš,* gen. sg. *míši,* Croat. *mȉš,* gen. sg. *mȉša* (*o*-stem), Russ. *мышь,* gen. sg. *мыши,* gen. pl. *мышéй* (secondary mobility), but a. p. A in Old Russian (Зализняк 1985: 132).

*rýsь, *rýsi (a. p. *a*) „lynx" > Croat. *rȉs,* gen. sg. *rȉsa* (with the transfer to *o*-stems), Slovene *rȋs,* gen. sg. *rȋsa* (with the transfer to both *o*-stems and a. p. C), Russian *рысь,* gen. sg. *рыси* (cf. the adjective *рысий* for a. p. A), Czech *rys* (points to a. p. *c* if the short vowel is old), Bulgarian *рис,* def. *рùсът,* pl. *рùсове* (a. p. A). For the acute cf. also Lith. *lū́šis,* Latv. *lũsis.*

*rítь, *ríti (a. p. *a*) „ass, butt" > Croat. *rȉt,* gen. sg. *rȉti* (cf. also *rȉtica* „little butt"), Slovene *rìt,* gen. sg. *rȋti,* Czech *řiť* (points to a. p. *c* if the short vowel is old). For the acute cf. also Lith. *ríetas* „thigh", Latv. *riẽta* „leg".

*žālь (a. p. *a*) „sorrow" > Croat. *žȁo* (today indeclinabile, but cf. *nàžao, ȉ žao* for a. p. C; cf. also the verb *žȁliti*), Slovene *žàl, žȃli* (cf. also younger *žȃl* in Snoj), adjective *žàl.* Cf. Lith. *gélti* „to stab", Latv. *dzeĨt* for the acute.

*kořístь (a. p. *a*)[13] „usefulness, benefit etc." > Croat. *kòrist,* gen. sg. *kòristi* and secondary *kȍrīst,* gen. sg. *kȍrīsti* (Kapović 2007), cf. the verb *kòristiti,* Slovene *korȋst* (but cf. the verb *korístiti,* pres. 1. sg. *korȋstim*), Russian *корысть,* Bulgarian *кòрист,* def. *кориcттà.*

*mýslь (a. p. a) „thought" > Croat. *mȋsao,* gen. sg. *mȋsli,* Slovene *mȋsəl,* gen. sg. *mȋsli* (secondary instead of **mislȋ*), Russ. *мысль,* a. p. A in Old Russian (Зализняк 1985: 132), Czech *mysl* (points to a. p. *c*), Bulgarian *мùсъл,* def. *мисълтà.*

*pěsnь (a. p. *a*) „song" > a. p. A in Old Russian (Зализняк 1985: 132), Czech *píseň* (points to a. p. *a*), but Slovene (older and dial.) *pẹ̑sen.* Croatian accent in *pjȅsan* (ARj) is not reliable (the word is archaic, cf. the comment „dok se riječ govorila, jamačno je bio takav akc.").

*dŏlnь (a. p. *a*) „palm" > Croat. *dlȁn,* gen. sg. *dlȁna* (with transfer to *o*-stems), a. p. A in Old Russian (Зализняк 1985: 132), Slovene *dlàn,* gen. sg. *dlanȋ* (Pleteršnik, but Snoj has younger *dlȃn,* gen. sg. *dlanȋ*), Czech *dlaň* (points to a. p. *c*). Cf. Lith. *délnas,* dial. *dálna* and Latvian *dęĨna* for the acute.

---

[13] Snoj reconstructs *kȍristь (a. p. *c*).

In the given examples, we have seen clear examples of secondary mobility in original a. p. *a* *i*-stems in various Slavic languages/dialects. The tendency to transfer a. p. *a* to a. p. *c* in *i*-stems is strong even today in some Slavic languages.

In old a. p. *a* in Slovene, one would *a priori* expect reflexes like *mìš*, gen. sg. *míši*. However, what one gets (if the word is not completely transferred to a. p. *c* like *mêd* etc.) is the type *nìt*, gen. sg. *nîti* (cf. the same pattern in *smŕt*, *rìt*, *žàl*, *dlàn*). Дыбо (2000: 26) thinks that Slovene *nîti* is the old loc. sg. analogically extended to gen. and dat. sg. However, this pattern could also represent a middle phase in the transfer of a. p. *a* to a. p. *c* – *mìš*, gen. sg. *míši* representing the old pattern, *mêd*, gen. sg. *medî* representing the new pattern (cf. also the younger variants *smŕt*, *dlân*, *žâl* in Slovene), and *nìt*, gen. sg. *nîti* representing the „mixed" pattern between the old and the new one. It is also possible that the old locative singular forms with the neo-circumflex might have helped the rising mobility in Slovene *i*-stems that has lead to either „mixed" paradigms or a. p. *c* (in some cases, the a. p. *a* is preserved of course).

One of the words which is often adduced as a mobile *i*-stem in Slavic is **zvě̃rь* „beast", compared to Lith. *žvėrìs, žvė́ri̧*, Latvian *zvêrs*[14]. Kortlandt (1975: 54) excludes this word from his Meillet's Law wordlist because he sees *žvė́ri̧* as a result of Lithuanian metatony and variant *žvė́ri̧* as original[15]. But the real problem is in Slavic, where **zvě̃rь* does not seem to be original as is usually thought, in spite of Croat. *zvijêr*, gen. sg. *zvijêri*, Slovene *zvȩ̂r*, gen. sg. *zverî,* Old Russian *ú звѣ̃ри*[16], Czech *zvěř*, Bulgarian *звяр*, def. *зверъ̀т*, pl. *зверовѐ* etc.
In standard Croatian, the verb *zvjȅrati*[17] „to look around" and the dialectal *zvjȅre, zvjȅreta* „beast" (besides *zvijére, zvjȅreta* and dial. *zvîre, zvı̃reta*) point to the original acute on the root syllable. Moreover, in Štokavian dialect in Sandžak („novopazarsko-sjenički govor") we find the form *zvȅr*, gen. sg. *zvȅri* or *zvȅra*[18] with the acute on the first syllable! This example can only be explained as an archaism and it points to Slavic **zvě̃rь*. Thus, Sandžak novopazarsko-sjenički dialect would preserve the original form *zvȅr, zvȅri* (*zvȅra*) < **zvě̃rь* and the forms with the circumflex (Croat. *zvijêr,* Slovene *zvȩ̂r*, Old Russian *ú звѣ̃ри* etc.) would be secondary, due to the tendency of the spreading mobility in Slavic *i*-stems, for which we have already seen many examples. What is problematic is the discrepancy of a. p. *a* in Slavic and Lithuanian *žvėrìs* (a. p. 3/4)[19]. If the Slavic form is archaic, that would point to PIE root-noun **ǵʰweh₁r* (the *i*-stem form in Balto-Slavic is probably not very old).

---

[14] Cf. Stang 1957: 9, Дыбо 1981: 25, Дыбо, Замятина, Николаев 1990: 45 etc.

[15] The real reason for rejecting this example is Kortlandt's belief that only laryngeals produce BSl. acute, and PIE lengthened grade (such as **ǵʰwēr*, with Szemerényi length later analogically introduced from nominative to other cases) does not. However, one can easily reconstruct PIE **ǵʰweh₁r* in this case as well.

[16] Дыбо 1981: 47. Cf. also Зализняк (1985: 138) for a. p. C in Old Russian.

[17] Which can be derived only from **zvjȅr.

[18] Барјактаревић 1966: 83. Cf. in the same dialect *jȁd*, gen. sg. *jȁdi/jȁda* (a. p. A) and *glȃd*, gen. sg. *glȃdi/glȃda* (a. p. C), *smrȃd*, gen. sg. *smrȃdi/smrȃda* (a. p. C).

[19] Cf. the known case of disagreement with Slavic **rǭkà* (a. p. *c*) and Lith. *rankà* (a. p. 2). Lithuanian a. p. 3 could in theory be secondary, but a. p. 1 variant is nowhere attested.

The rising mobility in *i*-stems in Slavic is perhaps also seen in the examples like Croat. *zèlen* „green", Slovene *zelèn* (a. p. B) > Croat. *zèlēn* „greenstuff", Slovene *zelện* (a. p. C); Croat. *čètvr̄tī* „fourth", Slovene *četŕti* (a. p. B) > Croat. *čètrvr̄t* „quarter", Slovene *četȓt* (a. p. C) etc. Cf. also Slavic *lǔčь, gen. sg. *lūčì (a. p. *b*) „light" (Slovene *lúč*, gen. sg. *lúči/lûči*, Czech *louč*; cf. also Croat. *o*-stem *lûč*, gen. sg. *lúča*) which has secondary a. p. C in Croat. *lûč*, gen. sg. *lûči*[20] (cf. also Slovene gen. sg. variant *lûči* instead of the older *lúči).*

It is also interesting to note that Slavic suffixless *i*-stems and *i*-stems with the suffix *-tь are often a. p. *c* even if the corresponding verb is a. p. *a*. It is not clear whether (all of) these examples are to be attributed to the rising mobility in *i*-stems. Some of them might be results of other processes, such as Meillet's Law (whether defined traditionally as the loss of the acute in mobile accentual paradigms in Slavic or by the different outcome of Balto-Slavic (-) acute in Slavic in different conditions as held by Moscow Accentological School). Here are the examples:

*kǎpati (a. p. *a*) „to drop, to pour" ~ *kâpь (a. p. *c*) „drop"
Croat. *kàpati - kâp*, gen. sg. *kâpi*, Slovene *kápati*, pres. 1. sg. *kâpam - kâp* „stroke", gen. sg. *kapî*, Russ. dial. *капь*. For the acute cf. also Croat. *kàplja,* Slovene *káplja*, Russ. *капля* (*kǎpl'ā) and Lith. *kópti* „go", Latv. *kâpt*.

*jьzpověditi (a. p. *a*) „to confess" ~ *jьzpovědь (a. p. *c*) „confession"
*zapověditi (a. p. *a*) „to order" ~ *zâpovědь (a. p. *c*) „order"
Croat. *ispòvjediti, zapòvjediti – `ıspovijēd*, gen. sg. *`ıspovijēdi, zàpovijēd,* gen. sg. *zàpovijēdi*, gen. pl. *zapovijédī, prȍpovijēd* „sermon", Slovene *izpovẹdati, zapovẹdati, propovẹdati –izpộved, zapộved, propộved*, Russian *исповéдать, заповéдать – úсповедь, зáповедь*, Bulgarian *изповя́дам, заповя́дам – ѝзповед*, def. *изповедтà, зàновед*, def. *заповедтà*. Cf. also Croat. *zàpovijēst, prȉpovijēst, `ıspovijēst* with the suffix *-tь.

*ěsti (a. p. *a*) „to eat" ~ *ȇdь (a. p. *c*) „food"
Croat. *jȅsti – jâd,* gen. sg. *jâdi* (arch.), Slovene *jẹsti - jẹd,* gen. sg. *jedî* (cf. also *pojẹd*). Cf. also OCS *jadъ*, Croat. *ȍbijēst* „wantonness", *nà(i)jēst* „satiety", Slovene *obẹst, opâst* „eine mit Schnee bedeckte Bergspitze" with the suffix *-tь.

*pǎsti (a. p. *a*) „to fall" ~ *pâstь (a. p. *c*) „hole"
Croat. *pàsti*, *l*-part. fem. *pàla*, Slovene *pásti – pâst, pastî,* Old Czech *pásti* – Czech *past,* Russ. *пасть* – dial. *насть*. See also *prȍpāstь below.

*propǎsti (a. p. *a*) > *prȍpāstь (a. p. *c*) „abyss, chasm etc."
Croat. *prȍpasti – prȍpāst*, gen. sg. *prȍpāsti* „disaster, fall (fig.)" (cf. deadjectival *upropástiti* „to ruin"), Slovene *propásti – propâst*, Russian *пропáсть – прóпасть*, gen. pl. *пропастéй,* Bulgarian *пропàдам – прòпаст*, def. *пропасттà*, Czech *propásti -*

---

propast. But cf. also *napǎstъ/nâpāstъ (Croat. *nápast* „temptation“, Russ. *напа́сть* „misfortune“, but Bulg. *на̀паст*, def. *напастта̀* „scourge, plague“, Slovene *napâst* „accident“)[21]. Cf. also Croat. *ȍpāst* „slander“.

*mǎzati (a. p. *a*) „to smear“ ~ *mâstъ (a. p. *c*) „ointment, fat etc.“
Croat. *mǎzati* – *mâst*, gen. sg. *mâsti* (cf. deadjectival *mástiti*), Slovene *mázati/mâzati, mâžem - mâst*, gen. sg. *mast̂i* (cf. deadjectival *mastíti)*, Russian *ма́зать* – *масть*, gen. pl. *масте́й* „hair-color“ (also a. p. C in Old Russian, cf. Зализняк 1985: 138), Bulgarian *ма̀жа* – *маст*, pl. *ма̀сти*, Czech *mazati* – *mast*. Cf. Lith. *mĕ̌žti*, Latv. *mêzt, muõzêt*[22] for the acute.

Cf. also Slovene examples *rȇzati,* pres. 1. sg. *rȇžem* (a. p. A) - *rȇz, reẑi* (a. p. C) and *gáziti*, pres. 1. sg. *gâzim* (a. p. A) - *gâz*, gen. sg. *gaẑi* (a. p. C). The secondary a. p. *c* is also seen in the example *dъ̀lžъ (a. p. *c*) „length“ derived from the adjective *dъ̑lgъ (a. p. *a*) „long“ – cf. Croat. *dȕg*, fem. *dȕga* – *dûž*, loc. sg. *dúži* (ARj), cf. also the preposition *ȕzdūž* „along“ and Slovene secondary *dộlg* – *dộlž*, gen. sg. *dolž̂i, vzdộlž*. Cf. Russian *до́лгий* and Lith. *ìlgas* for the acute.

As we have seen, there are more than enough evidence for the secondary spread of mobility in *i*-stems in Slavic, i.e. for the secondary a. p. *c* instead of the expected a. p. *a* (sometimes also instead of the expected a. p. *b*). This tendency had its beginning probably already in Proto-Slavic and it has remained alive even in some modern Slavic languages and dialects. The results are different in different words and different languages – sometimes the old a. p. *a* was preserved and sometimes it was replaced with a. p. *c* in all (*vôltъ) or nearly all Slavic languages/dialects (*zvěrь > *zvě̑rь). In the light of this conclusion, the a. p. *c* in Slavic *i*-stems should never be taken at face value since it is possible that it might be secondary.

Mate Kapović
Filozofski fakultet
Odsjek za lingvistiku
Ivana Lučića 3
Zagreb
Croatia
mkapovic@ffzg.hr
http://mudrac.ffzg.hr/˜mkapovic

---

[21]   The possible difference of *prȍpāstъ and *napǎstъ is not clear. Clearly what is important is the shortness/length of the prefix but the reason for such patterning in Croatian and Russian is not clear.

[22]   Note that V-verbs (*-i-ti, *-a-ti) in Slavic are a. p. *a* if they are mobile acute in Baltic (ˆ in Latvian), cf. Latv. *gâzt, kâpt, mêzt* ~ Slavic *gǎziti, *kǎpati/kǎpiti, *mǎzati.

References

Барјактаревић, Данило (1966). Новопазарско-сјенички говор. In: Српски дијалектолошки зборник. XVI. 1-177.

Budmani, Pietro [= Petar] (1867). Grammatica della lingua serbo-croata (illirica). Vienna.

Дыбо, Владимир А. (1981). Славяанская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском. Москва: Издательство „Наука".

— (2000). Морфологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис. Том I. Москва: Язык русской культуры.

Дыбо, В.А., Замятина, Г.И., Николаев, С.Л. (1990). Основы славянской акцентологии. Москва: Издательство „Наука".

Illich-Svitych, V. M. (1979). Nominal Accentuation in Baltic and Slavic. Cambridge & London: The MIT Press. [original: Иллич-Свитыч, Владислав М. (1963). Именная акцентуация в балтийском и славянском. Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР.]

Jedvaj, Josip (1956). Bednjanski govor. In: Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik. I. 279-330.

Kapović, Mate (2005a). Nove duljine u hrvatskom jeziku (nakon općeslavenskoga razdoblja) [The New Length in Croatian Language (after Common Slavic period)]. In: Filologija. 44. 51-62.

— (2005b). Naglasak praslavenske riječi *sьrdьce [The Accent of Proto-Slavic Word *sьrdьce]. In: Croatica & Slavica Iadertina I. 125-133.

— (2007). Naglasne paradigme imeničnih *i*-osnovâ u hrvatskom [Accentual Paradigms of Nominal *i*-stems in Croatian]. In: Croatica & Slavica Iadertina. III (forthcoming).

Kortlandt, Frederik H. H. (1975). Slavic Accentuation. A Study in Relative Chronology. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.

Stang, Christian S. (1957). Slavonic accentuation. Oslo: I kommisjon hos H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).

Зализняк, А. А. (1985). От праславянской акцентуации к русской. Москва.

Dictionaries

ARj = (1881-1976). Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. I-XXIII. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

LRKŽ = Lyberis, Antanas (1971). Lietuvių-rusų kalbų žodynas. Vilnius: Leidykla „Mintis".

Pleteršnik, Maks (1894-5). Slovensko-nemški slowar. I-II. Ljubljana.

RSBKE = (1955-1959). Речник на съвременния български книжовен език. I-III. София: Българска академия на науките.

Snoj, Marko (2003). Slovenski etimološki slovar^2. Ljubljana: Modrijan.