



ÖSTERREICHISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN
BALKAN-KOMMISSION

UNIVERSITÄT WIEN
INSTITUT FÜR SLAWISTIK

WIENER
SLAVISTISCHES JAHRBUCH

SONDERDRUCK

Verlag der
Österreichischen Akademie
der Wissenschaften



Wien 2011

OAW

INHALT

KONFERENZBEITRÄGE

Aufsätze zur Tagung

„(Neo-)Avantgarde in der tschechischen und slowakischen Literatur/Kunst“

am 7. Mai 2010, abgehalten in Wien

aus Anlass des 75. Geburtstags von Pavol Winczer

(thematisch geordnet)

SIMONEK, S., Offenheit: Ein zentrales Diskursmoment in Programmschriften der westslawischen historischen Avantgarde	7
HOLÝ, J., Der Exotismus und Apollinaires Spuren in Biebls <i>S lodí jež dováží čaj a kávu</i> und <i>Nový Ikaros</i>	21
MATEJOV, F., Das Gedicht „Hlasy“ von Ján Ondruš im Kontext der jungen slowakischen Poesie der späten 1950er und frühen 1960er Jahre. Themalogische und gattungspoetische Überlegungen	37

RABLOFF, U., „... hľadá sa forma pre intermedialitu ...“. Die „Partituren“ von Milan Adamčiak und Dezider Tóth zwischen musikalischer Grafik und Augenmusik	53
ZAND, G., Dušan Hanáks Film „322“ als neo-avantgardistische Synthese der experimentellen Kunst der 1960er Jahre	77

WEITERE AUFSÄTZE

JÍLKOVÁ, H., Semantische Übertragungen und Bedeutungsverschiebungen im Bereich der Tiernamen	85
KAPETANOVIĆ, A., Altkroatisch in Versen	101
KAPOVIĆ, M., Shortening of the Slavic long circumflex – <i>one mora law</i> in Croatian	123
MIHALJEVIĆ, M., Der Dual im Kroatisch-Kirchenslavischen	131
MNICH, R., Ivan Franko und Martin Buber: zwischen Zionismus und Chassidismus	139
NEWEKLOWSKY, G., László Hadrovics kao istraživač jezika i kulture Gradišćanskih Hrvata	151
OSSADNÍK, E. M., Neue Denotate im kroatischen Zivilisationswortschatz: Die Revolution von 1848 und die Gesellschaft im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen Presse	159

WIENER SLAVISTISCHES JAHRBUCH, Band 57/2011, 123–130
© 2011 by Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien

MATE KAPOVIĆ

Shortening of the Slavic long circumflex – *one mora law* in Croatian

INTRODUCTION¹

The general reflexes of the Proto-Slavic old long circumflex (* ̑) in Croatian have been known for a long time. In monosyllabic and disyllabic words (not counting the final *yers*) it yields Croatian long falling accent (̑), cf. PS * gōrdь > Croat. *grâd* ‘town’ and PS * zōlto > Croat. *zlâto* ‘gold’. In contrast to this, the old * ̑

is shortened in trisyllabic and polysyllabic words, cf. PS *sȳnove > Croat. *sĭnovi* (: *sĭn* < *sȳnъ) 'sons', PS *pōrsete > Croat. *prāseta* (: *prāse* < *pōrse) 'pig'. This is uncontroversial and widely accepted². However, this simplified approach does not really tell us what happens with the 'inbetween' cases, i.e. what happens with the words that have three syllables including the *yers*. In these cases, one finds examples which are not really clear at first glance, for instance the preservation of length in cases like *glādno* < *gōldъno 'hungry' but shortening in cases like *mūško* < *mōžъsko 'male' (: *mūž* < *mōžъ 'man'), or the preservation of length in cases like *būbanj* < *bōbъnъ 'drum' but shortening in cases like *vjěčan* < *vēčъnъ 'eternal' (: *vijêk* < *vēkъ 'age'). It is obvious that some kind of explanation has to be given here since the quoted simple rule about disyllables and trisyllables does not help us here.

I have tackled this problem already in one of my articles (Kapović 2005a: 77–81) and I believe that the explanation given there is basically correct (cf. also Kapović 2008: 13). However, some very important examples have not been discussed in that article and the case of the words like *mōžъsko has not been properly explained there. Thus, a more detailed approach to the subject is needed as well as careful examination of additional data. That is the purpose of this article.

¹ I would like to thank Marko Kapović for proofreading the text.

² See for instance Дыбо 2000: 18 for this kind of simple explanation.

I have already tried to explain the shortening of pretonic length in Slavic with the help of morae. The claim is that pretonic lengths in Slavic are shortened in front of two or more morae (cf. Kapović 2005a: 101 and Holzer 2007: 74–75). There, the concept of morae is used to explain in which positions pretonic lengths are shortened and in which ones they are preserved. Mora is defined as follows: Slavic originally long vowels (*a, *ě, *i, *u, *y, *ę, *ǫ and diphthongs *or, *er, *ol, *el, *ьr, *ьr, *ьl, *ьl) count like two morae³, Slavic originally short vowels (*e, *o) count as one mora and the *yers*, the ‘reduced’ vowels (*ь, *ь) count as half a mora. In this article, I shall try to prove that the shortening of the old long circumflex in Croatian can be explained via the morae concept as well.

THE CONDITIONS OF THE SHORTENING OF THE LONG CIRCUMFLEX

Here I shall adduce examples for the long circumflex shortening rule, which point to a variant treatment of the long circumflex in Croatian due to syllabic structure, i.e. to the number of morae after the long circumflex. The examples provided are those with a regular reflex. Words with analogical changes will be dealt with in the following text.

1) PS *mŷ > Northern Čakavian/Kajkavian *mī* we

2) PS *dām > Great. *dān* gift

- 2) PS *darъ > Croat. *dar* gift
- 3) *zôlto > *zlâto* gold
- c) *bôbъnъ > *bûbanj* drum
- d) *môžъsko > *müško* male
- e) *môldostъ > *mlädōst* youth
- f) *sŷnove > *s'novi* sons

The example of *mî* shows the preservation of the long circumflex in monosyllabic words⁴. Additional examples from the same dialects are *tî* thou, *vî* you. As for Štokavian, one could cite aorist 2nd and 3rd person sg. like *pî* < *pî 'drank' (from *pîti* 'drink') for the same kind of development. However, these kinds of examples are not really reliable since it is quite certain that their actual Proto-Slavic form was *pîтъ⁵ and that the ending *-тъ was subsequently lost in Croatian (like in the 3rd sg. of the present tense).

³ Except in the final open syllable where they are shortened (like in *rōkǎ > *rōkà) and thus count as a short vowel. In traditional accentological approach, all lengths in final open syllables are shortened. However, if one accepts that some lengths are preserved in final open syllables (like Croat. dial. instr. sg. -ĩ < *-ỹ in *o*-stems), then, of course, those are counted as two morae as well and pretonic length is shortened in front of them.

⁴ Standard Croatian (i.e. Neo-Štokavian) *mî* derives from the older form *mĩ*, which has a secondary accent by analogy to *jā* (cf. Kapović 2006: 55).

⁵ One would expect this secondary ending exactly in a. p. c, where the circumflex appears (cf. Дыбо 2000: 304–309).

Examples like *dâr* and *zlâto* are not problematic. The long circumflex is always preserved in such examples. The short falling accent in cases like the prefixed 2nd/3rd person aorist like *năpĩ* (from *năpiti* ‘get drunk’) is either regular from the form **năpitъ* (which would behave like **môldostъ*) or is analogical to *pöpĩ* (from *pöpiti* ‘drink up’) that has an original short vowel⁶.

Like *dâr* and *zlâto*, the reflexes *mlădōst* and *sĩnovi* are also not very problematic and here I refer to Kapović 2005a: 80–81. However, a few things need to be discussed. Basically, there is no difference between shortening in *mlădōst* and shortening in *mũško*. In both cases, the long circumflex is shortened in front of one and a half mora (one full vowel + one *yer*), the difference being only in their sequence. Thus, it seems logical to assume that the long circumflex was treated in the same way in both cases. The shortening like *mlădōst* also explains why prepositions, conjunctions and particles that obtain the absolute initial falling accent in the *enclitomena* forms of the mobile accentual paradigm (a. p. c)⁷ like *nă glăvu* < **nă golvô* ‘on the head’ almost always have “. Forms like *nĩ bōg* < **nĩ bogъ* behave like **môldostъ* and forms like *nă oko* < **nă oko* ‘on the eye’ behave like **sĩnove*. However, there is one exception – dialectal forms like *zâ me* < **zâ mę* ‘for me’, *nâ te* < **nâ tę* ‘on you’ etc.⁸ Here, the long falling accent is preserved like in the example *zlâto*.

There are some examples in which there seems to be no shortening of the *sĩnovi*

There are some examples in which there seems to be no shortening of the *sinovi* type. A case in point would be possessive adjectives ending in *-ov* like *vûkov*, *vûkovo*⁹ ‘wolf’s’ or *mûžev*, *mûževo* ‘husband’s’, where one would expect shortening. However, these are easily explained by analogy to the basic nouns *vûk*, *mûž*. Cf. the original shortened forms in dial. forms *kûmovu* (fem. acc. sg.), *kûmovi* (masc. nom. pl.) from *kûm* – *kûma* ‘best man’ in Donja Bebrina in Posavina (Old Štokavian)¹⁰. In the standard language, the accent is levelled – *kûmov*, *kûmovi* by analogy to *kûm*. See also a place name *Vûkovo Selö* in the Lower Sutla (*donjosutlanski*) Kajkavian/Čakavian dialect¹¹ and compare it with the usual possessive adjective *vûkovo*. Secondary analogical length of the same type is also seen in the name *Tijêlovo* ‘Corpus Christi’, where the orthography ⟨Tijelovo⟩ itself points to the length. This is analogical to the basic form *tijêlo* ‘body’ and the original shortened form can be seen in the alternative form *Tjêlovo*, which is also a very common pronunciation.

⁶ The former is a possibility in the case one would refrain from reconstructing the ending **-tъ* in these aorist forms.

⁷ Forms *a*, *b*, *c* are used for Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms and A, B, C for modern (Croatian) accentual paradigms. A colon (:) is used to indicate the length of modern accentual paradigms (B:, C:).

⁸ Cf. Kapović 2006: 43, 80–81.

⁹ The feminine form *vûkova* is analogical, in Proto-Slavic it was **vukovà*, cf. Дыбо 1981: 126.

¹⁰ My data.

¹¹ DGO 2007: 220.

There are more problems concerning examples like **bôbъnъ* > *bûbanj* and **môžъsko* > *müško*. Here we propose that the old long circumflex is regularly maintained in words like *bûbanj* (i.e. words having two *yers* after the circumflex) and that it is shortened in all other cases – that is, in all cases that have one full vowel plus a *yer*, two full vowels etc. So the limit of the preservation of length is at two *yers* after the accent, i.e. one mora. Since every *yer* counts as half a mora, two *yers* count as just one mora, so examples like **bôbъnъ* are in mora terms the same as examples like **zôlto* and that is why the length of the circumflex is preserved there. That is also why we posit the *one mora law* that says: Proto-Slavic long circumflex is preserved in Croatian only in front of one or fewer morae¹².

There are a couple of problems with examples like **bôbъnъ* > *bûbanj*. First of all, one would expect shortening in the oblique forms of the word. Forms like **bôbъna* (gen. sg.) and **bôbъnu* (dat. sg.) should yield **bûbnja*, **bûbnju*, in the same way as **môžъsko* yields *müško*. It is obvious that the attested forms *bûbnja*, *bûbnju* are analogical to the nom/acc. sg. *bûbanj*. This kind of levelling is clearly attested in the word *lakat* 'elbow'. Here, in place of Proto-Slavic **ôlkъtъ* we find in Croatian two variants: *lăkat* and *lâkat*, both widely attested in various dialects. How did this situation come about? What we expect from the old **ôlkъtъ*, gen. sg. **ôlkъti* is Croatian **lâkat*, gen. sg. **lăkta* (with a transfer to *o*-stems). This alternation was

then resolved by various dialects generalizing one form or the other¹². Another clear case of shortening of the *müško* type is the acc. sg. *djěcu* < *dětъcъ ‘children’ (cf. *dijéte* ‘child’). The nom. sg. form *djěca* has the short syllable by analogy to the forms with the initial accent. As for the form *sŕce* ‘heart’, I shall not discuss this problematic form here again. There are many indices that point to the Proto-Slavic form *sŕrdьce and thus to the shortening of the old long circumflex, but this kind of form is problematic in Proto-Slavic (one would expect *sŕrdьcě). For more cf. Kapović 2005a: 80f and Kapović 2005b.

The main chunk of evidence for different results of levellings in the *lăkat/lâkat* type words comes from *-ьнъ and *-ькъ adjectives. Here, in accentual paradigm *c* one can reconstruct Proto-Slavic forms like: *gôlsьнъ – *golsьnà – *gôlsьno ‘loud’ and *têgькъ – *têgьkà – *têgьko ‘heavy’ (cf. Дыбо 1981: 94, 107, Дыбо 2000: 159, 171). Up until now, it has been mostly taken for granted that length is preserved in forms like Croat. *glâsan* – *glásna* – *glâsno* and *têžak* – *téška* – *têško*. However, according to the one mora law we posited, one would not expect a complete maintenance of length but a complicated set of short/long alternations in various forms of these adjectives.

¹² Actually, by analogy to the *two morae law* (pretonic length is shortened in front of two or more morae), one would expect the name *one and a half morae law*, but this name was not chosen for obvious reasons.

¹³ Cf. also the case in Dubrovnik, where *lâkat* is ‘elbow’ and *lăkat* is ‘ell’ (ARj).

In Proto-Slavic, we find¹⁴:

masc. – neut. – fem.

N. *gôlsъnъ – *gôlsъno – *golsnà

G. *gôlsъna – *golsъny̑

D. *gôlsъnu – (*gôlsъně)

A. *gôlsъnъ – *gôlsъno – *gôlsъnq

L. *gôlsъně – (*golsъně̑)

I. (*gôlsъnomъ) – *golsъnojǫ

n. *gôlsъni – *golsъnà – *gôlsъny

(g. *golsъnъ)

(d. *golsъnomъ – *golsъnǎmъ)

a. *gôlsъny – *golsъnà – *gôlsъny

(l. *golsъněxъ – *golsъnǎxъ)

(i. *golsъny̑ – *golsъnǎmi)

In Croatian, one would expect the following paradigm after the phonetic shortening of the one mora law:

masc. – neut. – fem.

N. *glâsan – *gläsno – *glāsnā¹⁵

G. *gläsna – *glasnē

D. *gläsnu

A. *glâsan/gläsna – *gläsno – *gläsnu

L. *glāsně (*gläsnu)

I. *glasnōm

n. *glāsni – *glāsnā – *glāsne

a. *glāsne – *glāsnā – *glāsne

The same type of pattern would be expected in *têžak – *těško – *těškā etc. This kind of length alternation was hardly maintainable, so what occurred was that either short or long forms were generalized. In some cases, only the long form is attested (like in *glâdan* < *gôldьnъ ‘hungry’), in others it is just the short form that is attested (like in *vjěčan* < *vêčьnъ or *krěpak* < *krêpьkъ ‘brisk’) and in some cases both

¹⁴ The forms in brackets are the ones that have not been reflected in Croatian. Instead of them, definite endings were taken.

¹⁵ For the preservation of length here, cf. *plátno* < *polъnô (Kapović 2005a: 89–90).

forms are present (like in *gläsan/glâsan* < *gôlsъnъ or *tëžak/têžak* < *têgъkъ)¹⁶. Generalizing the length meant maintenance of the a. p. C mobile accent, while generalizing the shortened forms meant a shift to a. p. A (*gläsan* – *gläsna* – *gläsno*).

Here is the exact situation in *-ъnъ adjectives¹⁷:

a) only short stem attested

rëdan orderly, *slästan* delicious, *spräsna* with young (of sows), *ždrëban* with young (of mares)¹⁸

b) short stem in some dialects, long in others

bîtan/bîtan important, *gläsan/glâsan* loud, *gnjûsan/gnjûsan* dispicable, *krëpan/krijëpan* brisk, *măstan/mâstan* greasy (A in Kajk.)¹⁹, *mîran/mîran* still (A in Kajk.), *prăšan/prâšan* dusty, *sjăjan/sjâjan* glowy (A in Kajk.), *skrëban/skrëban* caring (A in Kajk.), *snjěžan/snijêžan* snowy, *srâman/srăman* ashamed (A in Kajk.), *străšan/strâšan* terrifying, *svjěstan/svijêstan* aware, *vjěčan* (Vuk *vîječan*), *zrăčan/zrâčan* airy (A in Kajk.), *žüčan/žûčan* bitter²⁰

c) only long stem attested

bijësan furious, *bûdan* awake, *glâdan*, *hlâdan* cold, *mrâčan* dark, *zlâtan* golden²¹

In the *-ѣкъ adjectives, the end results are slightly different, looking at the numbers of various types of levellings (but there are far fewer examples here than in *-ьнѣ adjectives):

a) only short stem attested

br̥idak sharp, *dr̥zak* daring, *kr̥epak*, *kr̥hak* fragile, *sl̥adak* sweet

¹⁶ In some dialects, combined forms are attested, cf. in Sikerevci (Posavina, Old Štokavian – my data) *těžak* – *těškä* – *těško*.

¹⁷ For the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms, cf. Дыбо 1981: 72–107, Дыбо 2000: 154–175. Also, some of the information relevant for the reconstruction of particular accentual types is provided briefly in the footnotes.

¹⁸ Cf. *rêd* – *rêda* order, *slâst* – *slâsti* relish (also *sôldѣкъ ‘sweet’), *prâse* – *prâseta* pig (also Siče in Posavina 3rd sg. *se prasĩ* farrows), *ždrijêbe* – *ždrëbeta* foal (also Siče in Posavina 3rd sg. *se ždrebĩ* foals).

¹⁹ In Kajkavian, generalization of the short variant occurs in cases in which it never occurs in Štokavian or Čakavian.

²⁰ Cf. *bît* – *bîti* essence (also *bĩti* – *bĩla* be – was), *glâs* – *glâsa* voice, *gnjûs* – *gnjûsa* scoundrel, Slovene *krepím* (also *kr̥ěpъкъ ‘brisk’), *mâst* – *mâsti* fat (also Siče in Posavina 3rd sg. *mastĩ*), Kajkavian/Čakavian *mîr* – *mîra* peace (Štokavian *míra* is secondary), *prâh* – *prâha* dust (also Siče 1st sg. *prašĩm*), *sjâj* – *sjâja* glow, *skr̥b* – *skr̥bi* care, *snijêg* – *snijêga* snow, *srâm* – *srâma* shame, *strâh* – *strâha* fear (but *strâšiti* scare), *svijêst* – *svijêsti* consciousness, *zrâk* – *zrâka* air, *žûč* – *žûči* bile.

²¹ Cf. *bijês* – *bijêsa* rage, Siče in Posavina 3rd sg. *budĩ* awakens, *glâd* – *glâdi* hunger, *hlâd* – *hlâda* shade, *mrâk* – *mrâka* dark, *zlâto* gold.

b) short stem in some dialects, long in others

měk(ak)/mêk soft, *pĭtak/pîtak* drinkable, *těžak/têžak*, *vĭtak/vîtak* slim²²

Various kinds of levellings of shortness/length and various types of double forms in *-ьнѣ and *-ѣкѣ adjectives cannot be explained in any other way than by assuming the existence of the one mora law²³. Thus these types of adjectives provide valuable additional data for the discussion of the rules for the shortening of the Proto-Slavic long circumflex in Croatian.

L i t e r a t u r e

- ARj: Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. Vol. 1–97 [parts I–XXIII], Zagreb 1881–1976
- DGO 2007: Božica Jakolić – Jasna Horvat, (ed.), Donjosutlanski govor i običaji. Zbornik kajkavske ikavice, Šenkovec
- Дыбо 1981: Владимир А. Дыбо, Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском, Москва
- Дыбо 2000: Владимир А. Дыбо, Морфологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис, Том I, Москва
- Holzer 2007: Georg Holzer, Historische Grammatik des Kroatischen. Einleitung und Lautgeschichte der Standardsprache, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin

- and Lautgesetze der Standardsprache, Frankfurt am Main – Berlin – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Wien
- Kapović 2005a: Mate Kapović, The Development of Proto-Slavic Quantity (from Proto-Slavic to Modern Slavic Languages), Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 51, 73–111
- Kapović 2005b: Mate Kapović, Naglasak praslavenske riječi *sъrdьce, Croatica & Slavica Iadertina I, 125–133
- Kapović 2006: Mate Kapović, Reconstruction of Balto-Slavic Personal Pronouns with Emphasis on Accentuation, University of Zadar [unpublished PhD dissertation]
- Kapović 2008: Mate Kapović, Razvoj hrvatske akcentuacije, Filologija 51, 1–39
- Kapović *forthc.*: Mate Kapović, Historical Development of the Adjective Accentuation in Croatian (Suffixless, *-ьнъ and *-ькъ adjectives), Baltistica (Proceedings from International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology 6) (forthcoming)

²² Cf. *pĭti* – *pĭla* – *pöpĭt* ‘drink – drank – drunk’ and *vĭti* – *vĭla* – *zävĭt* ‘flutter/wind – folded’. The rest of the *-ькъ adjectives are reconstructed as a. p. *c* by Дыбо.

²³ Shortening also occurs in some *-ьнъ and *-ькъ adjectives that have originally belonged to a. p. *b*, cf. for instance *grěšan* ‘sinful’ and *krătak* ‘short’. However, this process is not directly connected to the shortenings in the a. p. *c* and does not undermine our analysis presented here. More on this in Kapović *forthc.*

A b s t r a c t: *Shortening of the Slavic long circumflex – one mora law in Croatian.* The article deals with the precise rules for the shortening of the Proto-Slavic old long circumflex in Croatian. The conditions of the shortening are explained in mora terms and a special emphasis is put on the evidence coming from -an and -ak adjectives.

K e y w o r d s: Croatian, Proto-Slavic, Slavic, accentuation, shortening, circumflex

Mate Kapović
Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Zagreb
Ivana Lučića 3
10000 Zagreb, Croatia
mkapovic@ffzg.hr

