UDK 811.16'342.8
Izvorni znanstveni rad
Rukopis primljen 8. V. 2017.
Prihvaćen za tisak 25. VIII. 2017.

Mate Kapović
Odsjek za lingvistiku
Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb
mkapovic@ffzg.hr

ON SHORTENING, LENGTHENING, AND ACCENT SHIFTS IN SLAVIC

The paper deals with several problems of Slavic historical accentology – pretonic length in the accentual paradigm *c* (and *b*) in South and West Slavic, the neo-circumflex phenomenon (including the accent in the genitive plural), the *kȍkōt* 'rooster' type lengthening in Čakavian, the *ograda* 'fence' type accent in Slavic, the reflex of Proto-Slavic *ò in Czech monosyllables (*kůň* 'horse' type words), as well as certain accent shifts (like the one in accentual paradigm *b*). The author criticizes the often untenable positions of Frederik Kortlandt on these issues, together with certain problematic aspects of his accentological *modus operandi*.

Frederik Kortlandt (2016: 478–479)[1] has recently briefly discussed my monograph on historical Slavic accentology (Kapović 2015).[2] Unfortunately, his critique is rather unsubstantiated and unnecessarily combative, which may lead potential readers astray. In this paper, I will try to respond to his criticism,[3]

[1] All his quotes (unless otherwise mentioned) are from this source (mostly from p. 479).

[2] I would like to thank Tijmen Pronk for his help with certain aspects of the Leiden accentological school doctrine.

[3] However, it is not easy to reply to everything since Kortlandt is often rather vague. For instance, he patronizingly suggests that I have supposedly adopted his earlier views on posttonic vowel length, but references his article that does not relate to that topic, not stating clearly what he means by that (since "posttonic length" is a rather diverse topic, cf. Kapović 2015: 502–550). In any case, my analysis of posttonic length in Slavic has nothing to do with adopting Kortlandt's "earlier views", but with a careful treatment of all the relevant data (for those interested, my early takes on this question, which I later revized and updated, can be found in Kapović 2003 and Kapović 2005a).

explain some of my views which he either completely misunderstood or presented incorrectly, correct some of his factual errors, and use the opportunity to further discuss some problems in Slavic historical accentuation.

Kortlandt says my "account still largely reflects the outdated views from the period before the revolutionary studies of Stang (1957) and Dybo (1962)". This is a strange claim since many of my views are new and in many ways concerning the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic (and Proto-Indo-European), I clearly acknowledge that I follow, though critically and sometimes only partially, the Moscow Accentological School, of which the very same Dybo is the main protagonist. In addition, as I will show in this paper, it is Kortlandt – not me – who has failed to read Stang carefully, whose work was indeed revolutionary (cf. Vermeer 1998), though now dated in certain aspects.

1. Pretonic length in accentual paradigm *c* (and *b*)

Kortlandt claims that I lack "chronological perspective" and do "not distinguish between accent paradigms (a), (b) and (c)" in my treatment of pretonic long vowels (Kapović 2015: 416–501). These claims are hardly true, for the acce nt paradigms are always taken into account. What I do lack, though, is acceptance of Kortlandt's theories, which I discuss, but simply do not find satisfactory, while often discussing the advantages and disadvantages of both positions (which is something Kortlandt never does). He says I have "to assume massive analogical shortening in accent paradigm (c) where pretonic length is found nowhere except in Serbian and Croatian disyllabic word forms where it can easily have been restored, and massive analogical lengthening in accent paradigm (b), where pretonic length is regular both in flexion and in derivation". There are two factual problems within this claim. First of all, it is not true that pretonic length in a. p. *c* is found only in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian – it can also be seen, at least in some forms, in Slovene and West Slavic (Czech/Slovak/Polish). And second, it is not true that length could have easily been restored in disyllabic forms in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian (and even if it could have, that does not account for the Slovene and West Slavic cases). The first case is especially problematic – it is one thing to try to explain the a. p. *c* forms with length as secondary, but it is quite another to claim that something does not exist if that is clearly not the case.

But let us start at the beginning. Of course, I do indeed acknowledge that one has to assume a rather consistent analogical leveling of shortening in West Slavic in a. p. *c* *ā*-stems, cf. Czech *hlava* ~ (archaic) Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian *glāvȁ* 'head'. That is an old problem. However, as I point out in my book

(Kapović 2015: 429), there are only four a. p. *c ā*-stem forms where one could expect length (such as nom^{sg} *golvà), while there are seventeen of them (such as acc^{sg} *gôlvǫ or dat^{pl} *golvā̋mъ) where that would not be the case. Thus, a generalization of short vowels does not appear that difficult after all. It may just well be that Illich-Svitych (Иллич-Свитыч 1963: 90[1]/Illich-Svitych 1979: 161) was right when he proposed that what one is dealing with here is actually the early generalization of *ˆ in all forms, i.e. innovative *gôlva, *gôlvamъ, etc. There are similar typological examples of this in some Štokavian[4]/Čakavian[5]/Kajkavian[6] dialects (cf. Иллич-Свитыч *ibid.*, Kapović 2015: 439–440), where consistent innovative paradigms such as *glâva* – acc^{sg} *glâvu* appear. We even have a possible indication of such a process in Slovincian *'broda* 'beard', *'glova* 'head', etc. (cf. Stankiewicz 1993: 293, 295, Kapović 2015: 440). Thus, my having assumed a "massive analogical shortening" is not quite as problematic as Kortlandt makes it seem.

In any case, there are good reasons to consider such a generalization in ā-stems in West Slavic, since there are indeed very good examples of preservation of pretonic length in a. p. *c* not only in West Slavic but also in Slovene, despite Kortlandt misleadingly and falsely claming that such a thing is "found nowhere". Slovene does point to original short vowels in forms like *péta* 'heel'

[4] Such analogical accentuation (like *nȍga* 'leg', *rûka* 'arm') is, for instance, frequent in Montenegrin Old Štokavian dialects (Peco 1978: 62, Brozović; Ivić 1988: 63, Ивић 2001: 210, cf. also Rešetar 1900: 85–86). Thus, in Piperi (Стевановић 1940: 119–120) the old end stress in a. p. B in *врстȁ* 'kind', *влāдȁ* 'government', *шēвȁ* 'lark', *гӣјȁ* 'snake', *сестрȁ* 'sister', *вӣлȁ* 'fairy', *клӣпȁ* 'bench', *трāвȁ* 'grass', *слӣгȁ* 'servant', *дрӯгȁ* 'lady-friend', *слāнȁ* 'hoar', *срнȁ* 'doe', *снāгȁ* 'strength', *свӣњȁ* 'swine', *росȁ* 'dew', *жељȁ* 'wish' (the last four are secondary in this a. p., cf. Kapović 2011a: 168), but the analogical stem stress in nom^{sg} of the old a. p. C in *зе̏мља* 'land', *вȍда* 'water', *гȍра* 'mountain', *зȏра* 'dawn', *лȏза* 'vine', *ȍвца* 'sheep', *нȏга* 'leg', *грâна* 'branch', *глâва* 'head', *вȍјска* 'army', *рȗка* 'arm', *стрâна* 'side', *нêта* 'heel' (here the forms *жȅна* 'woman', by analogy to the frequent voc^{sg}, and the unexpected *лӣ̂ка* 'port', *пêса* 'tuft' also belong – cf. Kapović 2011a: 160). The dialect of Piperi exhibits numerous analogical levelings in paradigms with accent alternations (a. p. B and C), which is probably what one would expect in West Slavic prior to the complete disappearance of free stress and distinctive tone.

[5] Cf. for instance in Pagubice (Vranić 2013: 531) *muokȁ* 'flour', *zvīzdȁ* 'star', *źenȁ* 'woman' (a. p. B) but *gluôva* 'head', *rûka* 'arm', *nôγa* 'leg', *vôda* 'water' (from old a. p. C).

[6] Cf. for instance in Šemnica Gornja (Oraić Rabušić 2009: 258, 261–264, 267–268, 270, 277) in a. p. B *žę̄jȁ* 'thirst', *sę̄strȁ* 'sister', *trāvȁ* 'grass', *xę̄rjȁ* 'rust', *vę̄rbȁ* 'willow', *sviēčȁ* 'candle', but for the old a. p. C *nȍga* 'leg', *vȍda* 'water', *snę̑xa* 'daughter-in-law', *dę̑ska* 'board', *zę̑mļa* 'ground', *mę̑kla* 'broomstick', *čę̑la* 'bee' (cf. a. p. C in Bednja), *mę̑ja* 'uncultivated land' (*mę̑ja* with facultative/sporadic retraction), *glâva* 'head', *dûša* 'soul', *rûka* 'arm' (also *rūkȁ*), and with secondary short vowel (by analogy to the short stems, cf. Kapović 2015: 732, note 2728) *cę̑na* 'price', *zvę̑zda* 'star', *svïńa* 'swine' (cf. Jedvaj 1956: 302 for a. p. C for the last two). The sole exception to this generalization of initial stress in the old a. p. C is *zīmȁ* 'winter'.

and *róka* ‘hand’. However, it takes a simple analogy with the acc^{sg} *petô*, *rokô* to explain this. And we do find verbal forms with reflexes of pretonic length in Slovene (Kapović 2015: 428) – cf. infinitives like *trẹ́sti* ‘to shake’, present forms like *trẹ́seš*, and *l*-participle forms like *počẹ́la* ‘she began’ (though the latter is supported by *počẹ̑lo*, etc. as well). Even in a. p. *c* ā-stems with *ě in the stem, one finds the forms *cẹ́na* ‘price’, *stẹ́na* ‘stone’, and the variant *dẹ́ca* ‘children’[7] (Kapović 2015: 427–428).

In West Slavic, length in the old a. p. *c* is well attested in infinitive forms of *e*-presents, like the Slavic *trę̄stь ‘to shake’ (Štokavian *trésti*) > Czech *třásti*, Slovak, *triasť*, Polish *trząść* or *orstь ‘to grow’ (Štokavian *rásti*) > Czech *růsti*, Slovak *rásť*, Polish *róść*, etc. (see more examples in Kapović 2015: 431 and, earlier, Stang 1957: 153). Let us also remember that infinitives are originally locative singular forms of *-tь *i*-stems – thus, loc^{sg} *pekti ‘in the oven’ from *pèkťъ ‘oven’ is identical to the infinitive *pekti ‘to cook/bake’. The only difference is that the infinitive forms were relatively isolated (i.e. they were not part of a paradigm) and they were able to preserve the original length (inspite of the generalized short root in present forms like 2^{sg} Czech *třeseš*, Slovak *trasieš*, Polish *trzęsiesz*, etc. – see below), while in *i*-stems the original forms like loc^{sg} *volstь were replaced by analogical *vôlsti (or brevity) from other cases (thus Czech loc^{sg} *vlasti* ‘country’). The length in the Czech *třásti* is supported by the length in the *l*-participle *třásl*, but Czech forms like *klíti* ‘to swear’ and *mříti* ‘to die’ are especially impressive since they contrast with shortened C-forms in the Czech *l*-participles *klel* (Slovak *klial* is analogical to the infinitive *kliať*) and *mřel* (Kapović 2015: 432). Of course, this does not impress Kortlandt. He just pretends that these forms do not exist because they do not fit with his hypothesis.[8]

One more case in which Kortlandt openly disregards the forms that do not correspond to his hypothesis on the general shortening of pretonic long vowels in a. p. *c* is the archaic genitive singular of the numerals ‘nine’ and ‘ten’ (cf. Trávníček 1935: 252, Stang 1957: 41, Carlton 1991: 209, Kapović 2015: 432–

[7] Cf. also Slovene *srẹ́da* ‘middle’ but *srẹ̑da* ‘Wednesday’ (with the accent from forms like *v srẹ́do* ‘on Wednesday’). It is interesting that one finds in Czech *střída* ‘crumb’ but *středa* ‘Wednesday’ (cf. e.g. Snoj’s dictionary for the parallel), but it is questionable if it would be possible to reconstruct a. p. *c* for ‘Wednesday’ and a. p. *b* for ‘middle’ (cf. Štokavian *srijéda* – acc^{sg} *srijêdu* in both meanings and a. p. C in Old Russian – Зализняк 2010: 138).

[8] Kortlandt (2011: 264) does mention Czech *třásti* – (present) *třese-* but offers no plausible explanation, except mentioning “the alternation between desinential and mobile stress”, which means nothing since infinitives are, as already said, the same as the loc^{sg} of nominal *i*-stems and the infinitive *-ti is just a simple dominant ending in a. p. *c*, just like *-a in *golvà (and so the difference in Czech *hlava* and *třásti* has to be explained). Thus, a. p. *c* infinitives are also part of the mobile paradigm (cf. the initial accent in supines like *trę̑stъ).

433). There one finds the Czech gen^{sg} *devíti*, *desíti*,[9] Slovak gen^{sg} *deviati*, *desiati* with preserved length from the Slavic gen^{sg} *devę̑ti ‘nine’, *desę̑ti ‘ten’ (for the archaic end-stress cf. Russian gen^{sg} *девя́ти*, *деся́ти*), which contrasts with the short second vowel in nom/acc^{sg} in Czech *devět*, *deset*, Slovak *deväť*, *desať*[10] (cf. Štokavian *dȅvēt*, *dȅsēt*[11] and Russian *дéвять*, *дéсять*). Czech gen^{sg} *devíti* etc. is an archaism in the same way as the end-stress in Russian (and Slavic) gen^{sg} *дeвя́ти* is an archaism (which corresponds to the Lithuanian *-iẽs*, while nominal *i*-stems have a secondary initial accent in forms like gen^{sg} *kȍkoši ‘hen’, cf. Stang 1957: 87–88).

With the same lack of interest in details and existing material, Kortlandt is quick to pronounce that the pretonic length in a. p. *c* could have easily been restored in disyllabic forms in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian. However, that is not the case – what Kortlandt considers easy is actually mission impossible (Kapović 2015: 436–437, cf. also Kapović 2005b: 36–37). Kortlandt assumes that the length in the Neo-Štokavian *rúka* (older *rūkȁ*) is analogical to forms like acc^{sg} *rûku*. However, that kind of analogy is far from simple. The supposed original **rùka < **rŭkȁ (or analogical **rùku) is nowhere to be found in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian (see above for the Slovene *róka*). The same goes for all a. p. C end-stress forms – like the Neo-Štokavian loc^{sg} *glávi* ‘head’, loc^{sg} *grádu* ‘city’, loc^{sg} *vlásti* ‘government’, nom/acc^{pl} (older) *pecíva* ‘buns’, *túći* ‘to fight/beat’, 2^{sg} *sijéčeš* ‘you cut’, older 1^{pl} *lovímo* ‘we hunt’, *dála* ‘she gave’, etc. There are no cases of short vowels attested anywhere – and by that I mean literally nowhere, in contrast to Kortlandt’s “nowhere”, which completely disregards the Slovene *tŕ́esti*, *počḗla*, *cḗna* or Czech *třásti*, gen^{sg} *devíti*. It is interesting that what Kortlandt finds impossible in West Slavic (“massive analogical shortening in accent paradigm *c*”) is supposedly easy in South Slavic (where the length in a. p. C “can easily have been restored”). How is it impossible in one case (the generalization of brevity in West Slavic), but easy in another (the generalization of length in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian)? And how is it plausible that in the first case (which is supposed to be impossible) one finds remnants of pretonic length in a. p. *c* in Slovene and West Slavic (see above), while in the other case (where the length is supposedly “easily restored”) one finds absolutely no trace of what Kortlandt considers regular phonetic developments?

[9] The Czech variant *desiti* is obviously secondary (with the short vowel in analogy to the nom/acc^{sg} *deset*), which is clear from its vocalism – Old Czech *desieti* (Gebauer 1896: 351) regularly yields Czech *desíti* (Old Czech *ie* > Modern Czech *í*) and the brevity has to be secondary (*desiti* ← *desíti*).

[10] Posttonic length is always shortened in a. p. *c* in West Slavic – cf. Kapović 2015: 508–511.

[11] The frequent Štokavian variants *dȅvět*, *dȅsět* without length are either *allegro*-forms (numerals are frequently used and often in rapid speech) or analogy to the short vowel in *sȅdam* ‘seven’, *ȍsam* ‘eight’ that precede them.

To make matters even worse for Kortlandt and his strange double standards regarding generalizations in West Slavic and South Slavic, there is an additional problem in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian. In Czech, words like *ruka* one finds the short *ruk-* in all cases (gen^{sg} *ruky*, dat^{sg} *ruce*, acc^{sg} *ruku*, voc^{sg} *ruko*, etc.). Now, if one was similarly to only find the long *rūk-* in all cases in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian, Kortlandt's hypothesis could perhaps be plausible. However, that is not at all what one finds. What we find in Štokavian is an intricate alternation of brevity and length in the root:

nom^{sg} *rúka*, gen^{sg} *rúkē*, dat^{sg} *rûci*, acc^{sg} *rûku*, voc^{sg} *rûko*!, loc^{sg} *rúci*, instr^{sg} *rúkōm*

nom/acc/voc^{pl} *rûke*, gen^{pl} *rùkū*, dat/loc/instr^{pl} *rùkama*

In Čakavian and Kajkavian (rarely in Štokavian – cf. Kapović 2015: 499–500), one also often finds the short root in the gen^{sg} *rŭkẽ*, instr^{sg} *rŭkõm* (though this is not always necessarily old). In West Slavic, the generalization of the shortened root is indeed very consistent, but is at least found in all cases in the declension, and the generalization can somehow be understandable. However, in the case of Western South Slavic, Kortlandt would have us believe that the length in cases like *rūkà*, loc^{sg} *rūcì* was restored everywhere without a single exception, while for some reason the original short vowel is left untouched in gen^{pl} *rŭkũ*, dat^{pl} *rŭkàm*, loc^{pl} *rŭkàh*, instr^{pl} *rŭkàmi*. Now, even this could be distinctly plausible if there were not another problem with Kortlandt's "easy restoration" of pretonic length.

In *e*-presents with the original long root (i.e. in verbs like Štokavian *trésti*), Kortlandt's "easy restoration" of pretonic length is downright impossible (cf. Kapović 2015: 436–437). In the case of Czech (Kapović 2015: 431), the brevity in the root found in the present tense *třesu – třeseš – třese – třeseme – třesete – třesou* is easy to understand, since one expects it in most forms (1^{sg} *trę̂sǫ – the West Slavic shortening of the long circumflex, 1^{pl} *tręsemė, 2^{pl} *tręsetė – the shortening of the propenultimate syllable,[12] 3^{pl} *tręsǫtь > *tręsõtь – the shortening before the long neo-acute[13]) it is easy to see that the 2^{sg} *třeseš*, 3^{sg} *třese* can be analogical (in Slovak, where one finds *-ieš*, *-ie* from the long *-ẽš, *-ẽ, even this analogy is not necessary). However, in the Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian *e*-present paradigm, this is not so. According to Kortlandt's hypothesis, all persons from the 2^{sg} to 3^{pl} should have the expected short vowel, while the old length is only preserved in the 1^{sg} *trêsu, where the old ending *-u* has al-

[12] Cf. Kapović 2015: 463.
[13] Cf. Kapović 2015: 498–501.

most been eliminated today.[14] How plausible is it that the length spread to other persons from the early disappearing 1st person *-u* form only (and perhaps *l*-participle *trẽsal*)? How plausible is it that, supposedly expected, forms like **trěsèš > **trèseš are not found anywhere? How plausible is it that again in Čakavian one finds patterns like 2sg *trēsȅš* – 3sg *trēsȅ* but 1pl *trěsemȍ* – 2pl *trěsetȅ* (similar to the nomsg *rūkȁ*, locsg *rūcȉ* but datpl *rŭkȁma*)? What is it about Kortlandt's "easy restoration" of length that leads it to occur only in some forms? Why would *trêsu (unattested as such anywhere!) influence *trēsȅš – trēsȅ* but not *trěsemȍ – trěsetȅ – trěsũ*? Kortlandt does not explain this. However, what is clearly seen is that his hypothesis (of the general shortening of pretonic length in a. p. *c* in Slavic) is not really necessary to explain the Czech *třeseš – třese* (and other West Slavic forms), while it cannot convincingly explain what we see in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian.

As concerns the accentual paradigm *b*, Kortlandt assumes that the length of the root (later pretonic length) was preserved in all cases. This indeed may appear to be the case, due to the later generalization of length e.g. in infinitives such as *moltĭ́ti 'to beat' by analogy with present forms like 2pl *mõltite (cf. Stang 1957: 41–42, Дыбо 2000: 90, Kapović 2015: 473–474) – thus the Neo-Štokavian *mlátiti* has length by analogy with *mlâtīte* (< older/dialectal *mlãtīte*). However, Kortlandt's theory is clearly disputed by the Slovincian and old West Slavic data. In Old Polish, one finds a. p. *b* verbs with short vowel reflexes in infinitives like *sędzić* 'to suppose' (present *sządisz*, analogical *sądzić* in Modern Polish), *przystępić* 'to begin' (present *przystąpisz*, analogical *stąpić* in Modern Polish, now archaic), *żędać* 'to demand' (analogical *żądać* in Modern Polish) (Stang 1957: 42, Kapović 2015: 474). The short vowel in an a. p. *b* infinitive seems to be preserved in the Modern Polish *chronić* (not **chrónić) 'to protect' as well (Дыбо 2000: 88, generalized in the present *chronisz* as well). Kortlandt (2011: 264) did try to explain these two examples, but it is difficult to take his far-fetched explanations, which are more than *ad hoc*, seriously. He tries to explain the Old Polish *sędzić* from a completely imaginary **sǫdьjiti (!), which is not attested anywhere, and tries to posit an a. p. *c* for *stǫpiti, which is also completely concocted and has no basis in the reflexes (cf. Kapović 2005b: 39). In any case, this is not a question of two supposedly aberrant verbs, because the root is generally short in the a. p. *b* infinitives not only in Old Polish but in Old Czech as well (Дыбо 2000: 91). But even if Kortlandt could find a plausible solution for Old Polish (which he cannot), the problem of Slovincian remains,

[14] The process of the spreading of the new *-m* in 1st began as early as in the fourteenth century (HG: 630).

which, unlike other modern Slavic languages that display length or traces of it, has regular short vowels in a. p. *b* infinitives (Stang 1957: 42, Дыбо 2000: 91–92), cf. Slovincian *stą̃pjĭc* – present 2^{sg} *stǫ̃pjiš*. Kortlandt's "solution" for Slovincian infinitives is to ignore them. To make things even more problematic for his hypothesis, the Moscow accentological school (Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев 1993: 9, Дыбо 2000: 92–93) points to the fact that Slovincian, and originally the whole of West Slavic, has short vowels only in a. p. *b* infinitives and not in a. p. *b l*-participles (cf. Slovincian *stǫ̃pjėl*), which the Moscovites explain through their concepts of the difference of recessive (in *l*-participle) and dominant (in infinitives) acutes (cf. *nosíti (*b*) 'to carry'/*lovíti (*c*) 'to hunt' but *nosílъ (*b*) 'carried'/*lòvilъ (*c*) 'hunted') and the gradient advancement of accent in a. p. *b*[15] (Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев 1993: 18–21). There is no way that Kortlandt can convincingly explain such data in terms of his decades old hypothesis.[16] So his "solution" once again is to ignore the facts that he does not like, just as he ignores almost all the post-1993 Moscow accentological school works.[17] As Hendriks (2001: 107) puts it in his paper on Stang's Law (which the Moscovites have rightly rejected, while Kortlandt still stubbornly clings to it): "the silence from the Netherlands was striking".

2. The neo-circumflex and the genitive plural

While I cannot be certain this issue does not relate to language comprehension problems, Kortlandt claims the following: "The lack of chronological perspective

[15] Typologically, this gradient tendency to shift the accent to the right in a. p. *b* is best compared to the (partial) progressive shift of the old circumflex on the Slovene-Kajkavian border (cf. Kapović 2015: 251–272) and Štokavian retractions in Old Štokavian dialects (cf. Kapović 2015: 710–718). Like the shift in a. p. *b* (cf. Kapović 2015: 103–134), in these cases there are also exceptions, not everything is clear, and the conditions of the shifts are often highly complex. The classical "Dybo's Law" (i.e. the accent always unconditionally shifting to the right in a. p. *b*) could be typologically compared to the progressive shift of the old circumflex in most Slovene dialects, but this just does not explain the data convincingly.

[16] The shortening is also seen in numerous derivatives from a. p. *b* forms in West Slavic, cf. Czech *trouba* 'trumpet' – *trubice* 'tube' ~ Štok. *trúba* (acc^{sg} *trúbu*) – *trùbica* 'little trumpet' (cf. Kapović 2015: 466–467 for examples).

[17] The list of people whose work he makes reference to in the main body of his paper (2016) is very interesting in light of Kortlandt's *modus operandi*. Besides references to his own work (10), most of them go to his fellow countrymen, all of them present or former members of his University of Leiden – 13 to Tijmen Pronk, 2 to Arno Verweij, and one per person to Rick Derksen, Robert Beekes, Michiel de Vaan, and Janneke Kalsbeek. Compared to these twenty-nine Leiden references, only four are made to non-Leiden academics. Moreover, while the references to the Leiden academics are all recent (post-1994, though some in reprints), the references to the rare non-Leiden academics are mostly from the 1950's and 1960's.

is also the basis of other typical features of Kapović's account, such as the assumption of a Proto-Slavic neo-circumflex." I do not understand the point of this false dismissal, since it is clear from my book (e.g. Kapović 2015: 272–273) that I consider the neo-circumflex to be a dialectal and later innovation, as stated explicitly a number of times.[18] In any case, the observation that the neo-circumflex is a dialectal innovation in Slavic is obvious and hardly a very unique or revolutionary claim. However, it is strange that Kortlandt, instead of taking on another aspect of this phenomenon (my account of the neo-circumflex is probably the longest and most detailed ever in Slavic accentology, cf. Kapović 2015: 272–363), insists on trying to make a point of something trivial and not even asserted in the monograph.[19]

As concerns the neo-circumflex in the genitive plural, which Kortlandt mentions, it must be noted that his account of the accent in the gen^{pl} in general is hardly satisfactory. As concerns the lengthenings in the gen^{pl}, Kortlandt (e.g. 2011: 46, 54) thinks that only the type (Old Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian) *gȏr* 'mountains' in a. p. *c* is phonetically regular (due to accent retraction), while the type *žẽn* 'women' in a. p. *b* is analogical, as well as the type *krâv* 'cows' in a. p. *a* (though the latter analogy in a. p. *a* hardly makes any sense). It is much simpler to accept the solution (cf. Дыбо 2000: 21, Kapović 2015: 276, 365–366) that compensatory lengthening in a. p. *a*, *b* and *c* took place in some Slavic dialects due to the special long *-ъ̄ (cf. Lithuanian -ų̃) < Proto-Indo-European *-ōm (cf. e.g. Kapović 2017: 70, 107).[20] This explains phonetically not only *krâv < *kȍrvъ̄ (*a*) but also *žẽn < *žènъ̄ (*b*) and *võd < *vodъ̃ (*c*), not to

[18] E. g. "Sâm naziv obično pokriva više različitih fenomena koji su se dogodili u nekim općeslavenskim dijalektima ili u povijesti zasebnih jezika/dijalekata." (Kapović 2015: 272).

[19] I should add here that Kortlandt himself makes some mistakes in his attempts at explaining the neo-circumflex. One important omission is that he (Kortlandt 2011: 51–58, 2013: 118) does not even mention the important neo-circumflex type *nosîti* 'to carry' (cf. Rigler 1978: 371, 2001: 342, Toporišič 2004: 375, Kapović 2015: 308–309). To be fair, Dybo (2000: 26–31) also misses it. Kortlandt (2011: 58) also incorrectly interprets Čakavian (Cres) *kâmik* 'stone' and *kâvran* 'raven' as examples of the neo-circumflex (which does not occur in these positions in the Čakavian North), while these are obvious instances of secondary lengthening in stressed syllables, typical for many Čakavian dialects (cf. Kapović 2015: 618–619 for Cres).

[20] The gen^{pl} *-ъ̄ is the only reflex of an original *-ōm from Proto-Indo-European – forms like *dō(m) 'home' or *d^{h}eǵ^{h}ō(m) 'earth' (cf. e.g. Kapović 2017: 77) are not reflected as such in Slavic. While the gen^{pl} *-ōm has no acute (cf. Lithuanian gen^{pl} *-ų̃*), the secondary *-oh$_2$-m > Slavic *-ǫ* in 1^{sg} present does (cf. Lithuanian 1^{sg} *-ù*, *-úosi* without the secondary *-m), and yields the same result as the feminine ā-stems acc^{sg} *-eh$_2$m > Slavic *-ǫ* (which is, however, non-acute since it loses its laryngeal early according to Stang's Law – Stang 1966: 199, Kapović 2017: 70). PIE *-ō(n) in *n*-stems nom^{sg} is not reflected directly in Slavic and the ending *-y* is to be derived from secondary formed *-ōns (cf. Kapović 2017: 76). The gen^{pl} *-ōm was probably already some kind of *-ūm at the time of the secondary addition of *-m to the 1^{sg} present *-ō, which then coalesced with the acc^{sg} *-ām to Slavic *-ǫ*. In any case, there seems to be no major problem in interpreting the gen^{pl} *-ъ̄ as the only reflex of the PIE *-ōm.

mention the Old Štokavian (Posavina) gen^{pl} *-ã* and Slovene *-á* (Kapović 2015: 537–540, cf. also Brozović & Ivić 1988: 24, Matasović 2008: 185–186 for *-ъ̄). The *yer* origin of the Štokavian *-ā* is indicated by Montenegrin dialects, cf. e.g. Piperi (Стевановић 1940: 7, 12) *дьа̄н* 'day', gen^{pl} *дӣа̂нь^{ā}* 'palms' or Paštrovići (Јовановић 2005: 93–98), as well as by the writing of the gen^{pl} ending as *-ьь* in Old Serbian Cyrillic texts in the fourteenth century (Brozović & Ivić 1988: 24). Though the details are complex, the answer is obvious – and there is no need for Kortlandt's massive and strange analogies.

Additionally, Kortlandt claims that the difference between the Kajkavian *osnôva* 'base' (< *osnòva) and nom/acc^{pl} *rešẽta* 'sieves' (< *rešèta) are easily explained via the earlier *òsnovā but *rešetâ. However, the question of the rise of the Kajkavian/Slovene lengthened short neo-acute (cf. Kapović 2015: 377–388) and of the tendency to replace it with a secondary neo-circumflex by analogy (cf. Kapović 2015: 338–339, 396–399) is much more complex and the secondary spread of the neo-circumflex in many categories is not in question. In any case, the neo-circumflex is expected in words like *ogrâda* 'fence' (< *ogőrda – see below for this type of derivative) and a generalization of the neo-circumflex in these types of words is hardly unimaginable. Furthermore, Kortlandt's simplistic and outdated model of "Dybo's"[21] and especially "Stang's Law"[22] is generally problematic.

[21] There are many reasons why a unitary and simple "Dybo's Law" is problematic – most of which are usually just ignored. For instance, the results of rightward stress shifts are complex even in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian (Kapović 2015: 125–133), cf. e. g. Neo-Štokavian *sȅla* 'villages' – *vráta* 'door' – (dialectal) *nà ȗrāta* 'to the door' – *rešèta* 'sieves'. The results of this progressive shift are complex just as the results of much later regressive shifts in some Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian dialects (Kapović 2015: 671–733). There are also forms with no shift anywhere in Slavic that are not always easy to interpret (but cannot be interpreted the way Kortlandt does). The biggest problem are definite adjectives like *nòvъjь 'new' (there is no contraction in East Slavic, cf. Kapović 2011c: 126–127, and thus no possibility for "Stang's Law" from the supposed falling syllables). For the stem stress in a. p. *b* present forms like *mòžete 'you can' see the following footnote. In *en*-participles like *nòšenъ 'carried', Kortlandt's supposed **nošȇno etc. via van Wijks's lengthening due to *-j- (2011: 8, he needs the long falling accent in order to account for the attested *nòšeno via the retraction by "Stang's Law") could be theoretically convincing in the light of Slovene/Kajkavian forms like *pozdrâvljen* 'greeted', but the neocircumflex here could be analogical to *-ān- participles like *brîsan* 'erased', and there are no other traces of length in *en*-participles. Even more problematic are comparative adverbs like *mь́ńe 'less' with no shift (with exceptions – cf. Kapović 2015: 116–117), where there are no traces of the supposed van Wijk's lengthening as well. Forms like gen^{sg} *koń̀a 'horse' (with no length and a regular stress shift) are also problematic for explanations via van "Wijk's Law," which is very questionable for other reasons as well – cf. Langston 2007: 86 for typological reasons and Babik [to appear] for the question of relative chronology. Typologically, one might try to compare the high (dominant) and low (recessive) tones that, according to the Moscow accentological school, have coexisted with the traditional prosodemes (the acute, the circumflex, and the

3. The lengthening in the type *kȍkōt* ‘rooster’

As concerns the lengthening in a. p. *c* words ending in a *yer*, Kortlandt states the following: “Another example is the Proto-Slavic lengthening of short falling vowels in monosyllables, e.g. *bôg* ‘god’, which Kapović extends to polysyllabic words such as *gȍvōr* ‘speech’ (2015: 231–233). However, the latter lengthening is a more recent S/Cr. development that did not reach some of the dialects (cf. Kortlandt 2006: 35–38).” There are a number of problems with this. First of all, Kortlandt’s claim (cf. also 2011: 20) that *˜ was lengthened already in Proto-Slavic (for instance, Derksen 2008 reconstructs forms like **bôgъ ‘god’ for Proto-Slavic in his dictionary) is completely unnecessary and unprovable. There is no point in reconstructing **bôgъ instead of *bȍgъ (cf. gen^{sg} *bȍga, etc.) for Proto-Slavic. The opposition to *kòńь ‘horse’, *kõrļь ‘king’ (and, of course, to *pőrgъ ‘doorstep’) exist either way, and this imaginary **bôgъ would have yielded the same reflex as *bȍgъ everywhere (*ˆ would yield no special reflex in West, East, and South-East South Slavic, just as *˜ does not). The only area that actually shows this lengthening is Western South Slavic, i.e. Slovene, Kajkavian, Čakavian, and Štokavian (Kapović 2015: 231–233, 627). Kortlandt pushes this particular local innovation back to Proto-Slavic for no real reason. For some reason he thinks that Proto-Slavic had *gȍvorъ, not **gȍvōrъ, although if one reconstructs the Proto-Slavic **bôgъ, **gȍvōrъ would be just as possible. Kortlandt simply informs us that the *gȍvōr* type “is a more recent S/Cr. development that did not reach some of the dialects.” As is often the case with his work, he does not say why, just like

neo-acute – though these can be interpreted in various ways, e. g. as prosodic glottalization, lack of phonological stress, and the non-glottalized stress) in the times of progressive stress shift in a. p. *b* (cf. Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев 1993: 18), with the coexistence of high and low tones with Neo-Štokavian accents (similarly in Slovene), where the stressed syllables, the syllables after the rising accents, and the syllables before the stress are high (H), while the other syllables are low (L) (e.g. *krȁva* ‘cow’ HL, *dàska* ‘board’ HH).

[22] The most important arguments (besides the ones adduced in the preceding footnote) against “Stang’s Law” (as an explanation of stem stress in a. p. *b*) are: the shift of accent to the right in a. p. *b* does not yield a falling accent but a neo-acute (see below); *-e- in the a. p. *b* present tense is short in many Čakavian dialects (cf. Kapović 2015: 290, note 1075, 292, note 1087), often in West Slavic (though length also appears in old texts – cf. Stang 1957: 118), and even sometimes in Štokavian (Kapović 2015: 292). Daničić’s (1896: 54, 87) often cited 2^{sg} *mȍžēš* ‘you can’ (cf. e.g. Stang 1957: 114) is obviously innovative (cf. already Stang 1957: 118 calling it problematic), with the original *mȍžēš* and *hȍćēš* ‘you want’ preserved in Western Štokavian (and Standard Croatian) as the only such verbs (together with the archaic ending *-u* in 1^{sg} and the archaic a. p. B paradigm of 1^{sg} *mògu* – 2^{sg} *mȍžeš*). Though Old Czech also has *možéš*, it must be noted that the variant *můžeš* (with a long reflex of *ò) would not be possible with a long last syllable (cf. Kapović 2015: 411–412, Kortlandt 2011: 20–21), cf. Czech *nosíš* ‘you carry’. In any case, the fleeting and secondary length on *-e- in a. p. *b* cannot be responsible for the all-Slavic stem-stress present of a. p. *b* in Slavic (the possible exception being the East Russian *можéт* – Дыбо, Замятина & Николаев 1993: 15[8]). For a. p. *b* definite adjectives see the previous footnote.

he does not say what "some of the dialects" refers to exactly. In Kortlandt 2011: 270 all he says is that he regards the length in *gȍspōd* 'lord' and *kȍkōš* 'hen' "as analogical" – again, no arguments whatsoever are provided.

Let us now try to tackle this problem seriously. As already said, the lengthening in *bôg* (Slovene *bọ̑g*) only occurs in Štokavian, Čakavian, Kajkavian, and Slovene. This is a lengthening that occurs only in a. p. *c* (i.e. words with an initial *ˇ) in forms that end in *-ъ/-ь, which means that it is a kind of compensatory lengthening. In Štokavian, the same kind of lengthening occurs in posttonic syllables, such as *gȍspōd*, *kȍkōt*, *kȍkōš*, etc. This length is also seen in Čakavian, though sometimes less clearly (see below). Kajkavian has no posttonic length and neither does Slovene, which additionally shifts the accent to the following syllable (*gospọ̑d*, *kokọ̑t*, *kokọ̑š*), so the lengthening, even if it occurred there originally, cannot be seen. Since in both *bôg* and *kȍkōt* (*gȍspōd*, *gȍvōr*, etc.) we are dealing with the lengthening of the last syllable in words originally ending in a *yer*, it seems only natural to assume that both lengthenings are a part of the same process – the only problem being that this can be observed, obviously, only in dialects that preserve posttonic length (i.e. Štokavian and Čakavian).

While the situation in Štokavian is rather clear (in spite of later innovations and complications[23]), the situation in Čakavian is a bit more complex. First of all, many Čakavian dialects lose posttonic length altogether. Second, those that do not often have preresonant lengthening (cf. Kapović 2015: 554–583) in posttonic position (e.g. *mȍkār* 'wet' < *mȍkrъ), which means that a lot or all of the -VR# are lengthened anyway so that cases like *gȍvōr* are inconclusive (of the more frequent old a. p. *c* disyllabic *o*-stem words, only *gospod* 'lord' and *kokot* 'rooster' do not end in a resonant). Thus, it is no wonder that Langston (2006: 242–243) says that this kind of length "is reliably attested only in feminine *i*-stems" and wonders if the lengthening took "place in masculine nouns in čakavian". However, it must be said that it is difficult to imagine how a lengthening would occur phonetically in *mlȁdōst* 'youth'[24] but not in *gȍvōr*. As I have

[23] Cf. Kapović 2015: 639–640 for the secondary *kȁmēn* ('stone') type lengthening and Ligorio & Kapović 2011 for the curious case of the Dubrovnik dialect with its various complex developments.

[24] Kortlandt (2011: 262) claims the "short vowel of SCr. *mlȁdōst* 'youth' was taken from the oblique cases". As usual, he does not back up his claim. The shortening in *mlȁdōst* is clearly phonetic (cf. Kapović 2015: 248) and can be seen in other *i*-stems like *žȉvōst* 'liveliness', *lȕdōst* 'craziness', etc., words like *bȕsēn* 'sward' (cf. *bûs*), *plȁmēn* 'flame' (cf. Ligorio & Kapović 2011: 351–352 for a. p. *c*), *rȁzūm* 'sense', *sȕmrāk* 'dusk', *prȁsād* 'pigs' (cf. *prâse* 'pig'), *nȁ brōd* 'onto the ship', etc. Kortlandt (*ibid*.) also does not get that only *mȕškī* 'male' is original and that the variant *mȕškī* is secondary to a. p. B adjectives and the adverb *mȕškī* 'manly' (cf. Kapović 2015: 242).

shown (Kapović 2010: 88, 2015: 232, note 842), though the data is scarce, there are traces of the old *kȍkōt* type in Čakavian – cf. Pučišća (Brač) loc^{sg} *po˻govu̯ōrù* (with the length from the old nom^{sg}), Rukavac *nȅbōg* 'poor', Kastav *grȍhōt* 'horse laugh', Omišalj *vȅčēr* 'in the evening' (not preresonant lengthening), etc.

There is more data in Čakavian that points to the same basic lengthening in original a. p. *c* forms ending in *-ъ/-ь as in Štokavian. Cf. in Blato on Korčula (Milat Panža [2014]) *kȍkōt* – gen^{sg} *kȍkota*, *trȍskōt* – gen^{sg} *trȍskota* 'knotgrass', and *kȍkōš* – gen^{sg} *kȍkoši*; in Crikvenica (Ivančić Dusper & Bašić 2013) *kȍkōš* – gen^{sg} *kȍkoši*, *mlȁdōst* – gen^{sg} *mlȁdosti*; in Novi Vinodolski (Белић [1909] 2000: 139, 150, 164, 179) *bȍlēst*, *mlȁdōst* – gen^{sg} *mlȁdosti*, *kȍkōš*; in Grobnik (Lukežić & Zubčić 2007) *grȍhōt* – instr^{sg} *grȍhōtōn* (with the generalized nom/acc^{sg} length)[25] and *mlȁdōst* – gen^{sg} *mlȁdosti*. Cf. also the form *Blagóst* /*blȁgōst*/ 'mildness' (Kapović [to appear]) in Kašić's dictionary from 1599. As can be seen, there is more data for *i*-stems than for *o*-stems.[26] This is probably just accidental in many cases – some *o*-stems (like *kokot*) do not exist in some dialects,[27] while many forms, like the Novi Vinodolski *gȍvōr* – gen^{sg} *gȍvora*, (Kapović 2010: 153) are irrelevant due to posttonic preresonant lengthening, while *i*-stem forms in *-ost* and words like *mladost*, *kokoš*, *bolest* exist everywhere. However, there is one Čakavian dialect where we see the length only in the nom/acc^{sg} of *i*-stems. On Vrgada (Jurišić 1966: 71, 81, Jurišić 1973) we see the length in *i*-stems: *mlȁdōst* – gen^{sg} *mlȁdosti*, *bȍlēst* – gen^{sg} *bȍlesti* 'sickness', *kȍkōš*, *vȅčēr* – gen^{sg} *vȅčeri* 'evening' (the dialect has no posttonic preresonant lengthening, unlike the dialects already mentioned, cf. *otvȍren* 'open'), *zȅlēn* – gen^{sg} *zȅlēni* (with the generalized nom/acc^{sg} length) 'greenery'. But the *o*-stems (well attested in this dialect because there is no posttonic preresonant lengthening) show the short vowel in the nom/acc^{sg}: *Kȍkot*, *-a* (a nickname), *gȍvor*, *-a*; *kȍren*, *-a* 'root', *plȁmen*, *-a* 'flame', *čȅmer*, *-a* 'distress'. In contrast to the old a. p. *c* polysyllabic words with the original short vowel on the second syllable, the length is present in the old a. p. *c* polysyllabic words with the original long vowel on the second syllable like *gȍlūb*, *-a* 'pigeon',[28] etc. (the only exception

[25] The dictionary also adduces the form *gȍspŏd*, but this may be artificial since it is said that only the phrase *gȍspode bȍže!* 'good lord!' is used.

[26] Cf. e.g. Kapović 2010: 88, note 187 for Brač.

[27] *Gospod* is an old *i*-stem (*gospodь), meaning 'lord' (as in 'god'), which is not present in all dialects and is most often used solely in religious contexts, while the word for 'rooster' varies widely across dialects (with forms like *pijetao*, *pijevac/pivac*, *peteh*, *oroz*, etc. being used as well). However, *kokot* is sometimes used with other meanings (like 'kind of a fish', 'dick'). One additional big problem is that dialectal dictionaries (and other dialectological) work most often provide a rather limited lexicon (Čakavian dictionaries often stressing the Romance loanwords and not the inherited lexicon), which makes it difficult to search for other *gospod* type words.

[28] Cf. also Kapović 2010: 87, note 182 for the list.

being *jȁblăn*, *-a* ‘poplar’). However, in light of the length in the Vrgada *kȍkōš* type and the data from other Čakavian dialects, there is no doubt that Vrgada is innovative here and that forms like the nom/acc^{sg} *gȍvor* are due to simple analogy with the short vowel forms in oblique cases. This generalization has been completed in the old short vowel *o*-stems, while elsewhere we just find the mentioned *jȁblăn*, *-a* and gen^{sg} *zȅlēni*.

In any case, though the Čakavian data for *o*-stems (unlike that for *i*-stems) is not as easy to find as Štokavian due to later innovation (and despite the aberrant cases such as the Vrgada case), there seems to be no reason to assume that Čakavian originally differs from Štokavian as concerns the *kȍkōt*/*kȍkōš* lengthening. Just as there is no reason not to attribute the lengthening in *kȍkōt* to the same process as the lengthening in *bôg*.

4. The *ograda* ‘fence’ type nouns

Kortlandt claims that “Kapović’s lack of chronological perspective allows him to reconstruct a metatonical acute in the Russian *ogoród* ‘kitchen-garden’ and *pozolóta* ‘gilding’” and that my “lack of chronological perspective prevents [me] from seeing the difference between long falling vowels in non-initial syllables that arose from Dybo’s law, as in these instances, and long falling vowels that arose from later dialectal contractions, as in the Čakavian *kopâ* ‘digs’, Bulgarian *kopáe*, Old Polish *kopaje*”. However, this is not my “lack of chronological perspective” but Kortlandt’s *ad hoc* conjecture – both the rise of the supposed new internal falling accent (and it’s subsequent supposed shortening) and it being earlier than the contractional neo-circumflex. Indeed, *ad hoc* “chronological perspectives” (i.e. stating something is an earlier change than another one) are the easiest way to explain conflicted data, but are highly problematic when their foundation is shaky (i.e. used in circular explanations).

Kortlandt reconstructs the presumed new medial long falling accent in cases like **sъdrâwȳ ‘healthy’, **powrâtъkъ ‘return’, **zāslûžьnъ ‘deserving’, **sъgrâdā ‘building’ (cf. e.g. Kortlandt 2011: 322, 340, 2016: 473), where I would reconstruct[29] simple *sъdőrvъjь, *povőrtъkъ, *zaslűžьnъ, *sъgőrda[30] (with the generalized, non-etymological old acute typical in prefixed deri-

[29] In the usual formal reconstruction of Proto-Slavic.

[30] As a side note, Čakavian does not always have the original medial accent (like in *rōzlȉka* ‘difference’, *zᵒādȕha* ‘astma’, etc.) in this type as Kortlandt (2011: 69) mistakenly thinks – Čakavian today exhibits innovative accents such as *prȉvara* ‘hoax’ just as Štokavian does (cf. Kapović 2015: 457). For the older medial accent cf. in Kašić’s 1599 dictionary (Kašić 1990) the forms like *Odlùka* ‘decision’, *Ogràda*, *Omràza* ‘hate’, *Postàva* ‘cloth, linen’ (<ˋ> stands for ̀).

vatives and compounds). Kortlandt claims that this new supposed falling accent originates in "Dybo's Law", and then somehow shortens (but before the emergence of contractional forms like *kopâ*). This supposed long falling accent is problematic even if we disregard *kopâ*, the Old Štokavian/Čakavian *pĩtā* 'asks', Slovene *píta*, Slovak *pýta* < *pȳtâ < *pytā́je type (cf. Kapović 2015: 342–343), and the supposed "Stang's Law" in the present tense (where the accent is supposedly always retracted).[31] The new medial circumflex originating from a progressive stress shift in a. p. *b* is a mirage – the shift to the non-acute long medial syllable in a. p. *b* yields a long neo-acute, not a neo-circumflex, cf. Čakavian type *črnĩna* 'blackness', *ravnĩca* 'plane', *dvorĩšće* 'courtyard', the accentual development of Slavic types like Slovene *volár* 'ox-keeper', Čakavian *popĩć* 'little priest', Old Štokavian (Posavina) *sestrĩn* 'sister's',[32] etc., (Дыбо 1981: 145–146, 178, 184; Дыбо 2000: 203–204; Kapović 2015: 184–195, with more examples/types than Dybo adduces and dialectological references). The late confusion of a. p. b_2 and a. p. *c i*-verbs (i.e. *sèlišь > *selĩšь 'you move' and *lovišь > *lovĩšь 'you hunt') also points to the neo-acute (cf. Kapović 2011b for this kind of process in Croatian dialects).

Additionally, while an original accent on the prefix (e.g. *òsnova) can indeed be presumed in some cases, this is far from certain for all of them, and the biggest problem is that accentual type like *bezgőlvъ 'headless' (Štokavian *bèzglav*, Russian *безголо́вый*)[33] or *bezbőrdъ 'beardless' (Štokavian *bèzbrad*, Russian *безборо́дый*) can hardly be separated from the accentual type of compound adjectives like *golobőrdъ 'barefaced' (Štokavian *golòbrad*, cf. the a. p. *c* *bordȁ 'beard'), *bosonògъ 'barefoot' (Štokavian *bosònog*, Russian *босоно́гий*, cf. the a. p. *c* *nogȁ 'leg'), and of nouns like *zъlodűxъ 'evil spirit'[34] (Štokavian *zlòduh*, cf. the a. p. *c* *dûxъ 'spirit') and *kolovőrtъ[35] 'spinning-

[31] If one expects *òborna > **obôrna 'defense' (with a supposed shortening to **obòrna), one would expect the same in the present tense *bõrnite > **bornîte 'you [pl.] defend' – however, what one gets is reflexes of *bõrnite and (what looks like) *obőrna (despite not having the etymological acute in the root). Kortlandt (2011: 8, 322) thinks that "Stang's Law" retracts the stress only from "long falling vowels in final syllables, not counting final jers", which does not help much – 1^{pl} *bõrnimo, 2^{pl} *bõrnite would have to be analogical to 2^{sg} *bõrnišь, etc., while nouns like Štokavian *pòvrat* 'return', Russian *поворо́т* 'turn' would have to be analogical to oblique forms like the gen^{sg} *povorta (of course, none of this is actually discussed by Kortlandt). In my view, what one should reconstruct is what one actually sees: simple *bõrnišь – *bõrnite (with no accent shifts) and *povőrtъ – *povőrta (with the generalized acute) with no analogies or suspicious additional accent changes needed.

[32] These accentual types occur in other dialects as well, of course.

[33] Note also the multiple prefix type in *ponedě̋ļьkъ 'Monday', which would have to be derived from **ponèděļьkъ and not **pòneděļьkъ.

[34] Cf. the Russian type *злосло́вие* 'slander' (*slòvo 'word' is a. p. *c*), etc.

[35] The variant *kòlovortъ (cf. Kapović 2015: 509) shows the expected, non-generalized accent.

wheel' (Russian *коловоро́т*, cf. the a. p. *c* *vôrtъ 'neck') – and these can hardly be derived from an earlier "pre-Dybo" **golòbordъ, **bosònogъ, etc. Why would the accent be on *-o-? What is clearly seen in these types of derivatives/compounds is a tendency to generalize the old acute (on long vowels)/short neoacute (on short vowels) on the beginning of the second part of the derivative/compound, irrespective of the original accentual properties of the root. If this kind of a secondary generalization is the case, it is easy to see the connection between derivatives and compounds of the *ogőrda/*golobőrdъ/*kolovőrtъ type – there is a tendency for the unetymological old acute (short neoacute on short syllables) on the root syllable in the second part of such word-formations to spread,[36] originally appearing in formations like *zabā́va 'fun' (where the acute is expected, cf. Štokavian *bȁviti se* 'deal with') or *vьlkodlā́kъ[37] 'werewolf' (Štokavian older *vukòdlak*, Slovene older *volkodlȃk*, Russian dialectal *волко(д)ла́к*, cf. Štokavian *vûk* 'wolf' and *dlȁka* 'a hair'). While assuming the original (or generalized) *ògorda/zãbava/pòvortъkъ type (before or after the stress shift to the right) was possibly an important part of the process of the generalization of stress in such formations, the original **golòbordъ, etc. would make much less sense, and, as already said, there seems to be no point in separating the two.

5. Czech *kůň* 'horse'

While I cannot discuss here the entire problem of the short neo-acute as detailed in Kortlandt (2016: 472–478),[38] I would finally like to add a short note on the problem of monosyllabic words with *ò in Czech and Slovak. Kortlandt (2011: 345–346, 2016: 476) thinks that the length in old a. p. *b o*-stems like Czech *kůň* 'horse', *stůl* 'table', *nůž* 'knife', Slovak *kôň*, *stôl*, *nôž*, etc. "did not arise phonetically but was adopted from the case forms where the accent had been retracted in accordance with Stang's law". It is not very likely that the length could have been introduced into the nom(/acc)^{sg} from the loc^{sg}, gen^{pl}, loc^{pl}, instr^{pl} (Kortlandt 2011: 346). In my monograph (Kapović 2015: 407–409),

[36] I.e. the old acute/short neo-acute would originally appear only in formations in which that would be the first (acute) dominant (+) morpheme in the word or where it would get the accent (on the acute syllable in the case of long vowels, as in *nòsiti > *nosíti 'to carry') after the accent shift from a first dominant morpheme in a. p. *b*.

[37] Cf. e.g. Snoj's dictionary for a different etymology of the second part (i.e. the *-d- being a folk etymology).

[38] Btw. it is interesting and indicative to note how Kortlandt simply ignores e.g. my discussion of the development of the short neo-acute in Kajkavian (Kapović 2015: 377–399), even though this discussion provides lots of new data even if one does not accept my hypothesis about it and is the most detailed treatment of the problem in Slavic historical accentology ever.

I argued, as is usual, that the reflex *ô* is regular in Slovak, since we find there some fourteen to fifteen (including dialectal) forms with *ô* from *ò in a. p. *b* and some nine forms with *o* (presumably originally from oblique cases). However, what is convincing in Slovak is that almost all old a. p. *c* forms have *o*, like *boh* 'god', *dom* 'home', etc.[39] In Czech, the assumption that *ů* is the regular reflex of *ò in monosyllables (cf. e.g. Verweij 1994: 527) is not so much hindered by the fact that this kind of length is found in some eight old a. p. b words (including Old Czech) and is not present in nine of them like *krov* 'roof' (cf. Kapović 2015: 408), but by the fact that we find *ů* also in some six (including Old Czech) old a. p. *c* nouns like *dům* 'home' (while the remaining seventeen or so a. p. *c* nouns have *o*, like *most* 'bridge'). While the number of *ů* words is more numerous in the old a. p. *b*, the lengthening is present in both a. p. *b* and *c*, which makes the case much more difficult than the Slovak case. Still, there is one indication that differs the *ů* forms in the old a. p. *b* and *c* – in the old a. p. *c*, *ů* is found exclusively before the final old voiced fricatives (*bůh* 'god', *vůz* 'carriage', Old Czech *róh* 'horn'), resonants (*dům*, *důl* 'trough'), or semi-vowels (*hnůj* 'manure'). However, in the old a. p. *b*, the length is found not only in the mentioned conditions (*nůž*, *dvůr* 'court', *kůl* 'stake', *kůň*, *stůl*, *vůl* 'ox'), but also in front of voiceless stops or clusters (*půst* 'fast', Old Czech *kóš* 'basket'). This would point to *ů* being the regular phonetic reflex of *ò, which was later obscured by analogies in the old a. p. *b* and by sporadic lengthening in front of voiced segments in the old a. p. *c*.

This alternation of nom^{sg} length and oblique brevity may have had an influence on the old a. p. *a o*-stems, where besides the original *mák* – gen^{sg} *máku* 'poppy' (shortening would be expected only in polysyllabic dat^{pl} *mắkomъ, loc^{pl} *mắcěxъ, perhaps in instr^{sg} *mắkъmь, and in gen^{pl} *mâkъ → *mắkovъ), one finds innovative patterns *rak* – gen^{sg} *raka* 'crab', and *mráz* – gen^{sg} *mrazu* 'frost' (cf. Verweij 1994: 525–526, Kapović 2015: 227–228). Kortlandt (e.g. 2011: 174, 262, Verweij 1994: 526) thinks that phonetically one should expect here the same as in a. p. *b*, however the problem is that the pattern Kortlandt says would be phonetically expected (**mraz – gen^{sg} **mrázu) is the only one that does not exist synchronically, which makes his hypothesis rather unlikely (cf. also Verweij 1994: 526 for pointing out this problem).

As for the gen^{pl} (see above), the data is inconclusive. Modern Czech usually has a short vowel in gen^{pl}, while length appears in the Old Czech *nóh* 'legs', *vód* 'waters', *hór* 'mountains', *zém* 'countries', *vóz* 'carriages', *slóv* 'words', *škól*

[39] Slovak *bôľ* 'pain' is either an exception (cf. the a. p. *c* *bȍlь) or a reflex of a speculative *bȍl̥ь (a. p. *b*), where the suffix *-j- causes the change to a. p. *b* – cf. the fact that all the *o*-stems with *-jь seem to be a. p. *b* (cf. Kapović 2015: 109, note 319).

'schools' (Stang 1957: 98, Verweij 1994: 507). However, forms like *vód* could reflex either old *vòdъ or *võdъ (or even a secondary lengthening of the analogical short *vod) so they are irrelevant for a discussion of accents in the gen^{pl}.

6. Conclusion

To conclude – stating "I disagree with this" is not an argument. Ignoring, not discussing and not mentioning facts that contradict one's hypothesis, calling other scholars' hypotheses "obsolete", without providing hard evidence for such assertation, and trying to win an argument by completely misrepresenting other scholars' views is not how scholarly discussions should be conducted. Frederik Kortlandt, despite being a well-known figure in the world of Slavic accentology, all too often writes as if he just knows "the truth", making pronouncements without arguments, attempting to solve complex problems via short statements and a few random examples without an in-depth analysis,[40] while never being willing to discuss alternatives, or acknowledge that there may be more than one solution to a problem, or that something is still murky and unclear. This does not mean that Kortlandt has no interesting insights – indeed he sometimes does. However, it is time for him to give up on the hypotheses that are obviously not correct instead of trying to defend the indefensible at all costs and by all means. The aim of scholarly discussion is not to win in a polemic at all costs but to try to come to the best solution and analysis. In that regard, I hope I have succeeded in elucidating certain issues in historical Slavic accentuation in this paper.

References:

Babik, Zbigniew. [to appear]. The hypothesis of a postpositional compensatory lengthening (so-called van Wijk's law) vs. the relative chronology of Common Slavic phonological developments – in search of inconsistencies. *Baltistica.*

Белић, Александар. 2000. Белешке о чакавским говорима. In: *О дијалектима* (*Изабрана дела А. Белића* 10). Завод за уџбенике и

[40] See his typical take on the question of pretonic length in Slavic – three sentences (Kortlandt 2011: 168), three sentences (Kortlandt 2011: 342–343), five sentences (Kortlandt 2011: 29–30), etc. Longer treatments appear only when he tries to challenge other scholars – cf. one short paragraph when discussing Georg Holzer's views (Kortlandt 2011: 273) and Kortlandt's largest take on the problem in his discussion concerning my previous views to which he dedicates almost one page and a half (Kortlandt 2011: 262–265). Compare with this my almost hundred pages long take on the question of pretonic length (Kapović 2015: 416–502), where I discuss almost all relevant instances, together with different opinions and possible solutions.

наставна средства. Београд. 136–186. [translation of: Беличъ, А. И. 1909. Замѣтки по чакавскимъ говорамъ. *Извѣстія Отдѣленія русскаго языка и словесности Императорской Академіи Наукъ* XIV/2. 181–266.]

Brozović, Dalibor; Ivić, Pavle. 1988. *Jezik, srpskohrvatski/hrvatskosrpski, hrvatski ili srpski*. Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod "Miroslav Krleža". Zagreb.

Carlton, Terence R. 1991. *Introduction to the phonological history of the Slavic languages*. Slavica Publishers, Inc. Columbus.

Daničić, Đuro. [2]1896. Akcenti u glagola. *Djela Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 17. 47–158.

Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Brill. Leiden – Boston.

Дыбо, Владимир А. 1981. *Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском*. Издательство "Наука". Москва.

Дыбо, Владимир А. 2000. *Морфонологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис*. Том I. Языки русской культуры. Москва.

Дыбо, В. А.; Замятина, Г. И.; Николаев, С. Л. 1993. *Основы славянской акцентологии. Словарь*. Издательство "Наука". Москва.

Gebauer, Jan. 1896. *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl III. Tvarosloví. I. Skloňování*. Náklada F. Tempského. Praha – Víden.

Hendriks, Pepijn. 2003. A Note on Stang's Law in Moscow Accentology. *Dutch Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana. Linguistics.* SSGL 30. 107–123.

HG = Barić, Eugenija; Lončarić, Mijo; Malić, Dragica; Pavešić, Slavko; Peti, Mirko; Zečević, Vesna; Znika, Marija. [2]1997. *Hrvatska gramatika*. Školska knjiga. Zagreb.

Illich-Svitych, Vladislav M. 1979. *Nominal Accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. The MIT Press. Cambridge – London. [translation of: Иллич-Свитыч, Владислав М. 1963. *Именная акцентуация в балтийском и славянском.* Судьба акцентуационных парадигм. Издательство Академии наук СССР. Москва.]

Ivančić Dusper, Đurđica; Bašić, Martina. 2013. *Rječnik crikveničkoga govora.* Centar za kulturu Dr. Ivan Kostrenčić. Crikvenica.

Ивић, Павле. [3]2001. *Дијалектологија српскохрватског језика. Увод и штокавско наречје*. Издавачка књижарница Зорана Стојановића. Сремски Карловци – Нови Сад.

Jedvaj, Josip. 1956. Bednjanski govor. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1. 279–330.

Јовановић, Миодраг. 2005. *Говор Паштровића*. Универзитет Црне Горе. Подгорица.

Jurišić, Blaž. 1966. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade*. *I dio*, *Uvod*. JAZU. Zagreb.

Jurišić, Blaž. 1973. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade*, *uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima*. *II dio*, *Rječnik*. JAZU. Zagreb.

Kapović, Mate. 2003. Razvoj starih dugih samoglasa u hrvatskom i ostalim slavenskim jezicima. *Filologija* 41. 51–82.

Kapović, Mate. 2005a. The Development of Proto-Slavic Quantity (from Proto-Slavic to Modern Slavic Languages). *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51. 73–111.

Kapović, Mate. 2005b. Slavic length again. *Filologija* 45. 29–45.

Kapović, Mate. 2010. Naglasak *o*-osnova muškog roda u hrvatskom – povijesni razvoj. *Filologija* 54. 51–109.

Kapović, Mate. 2011a. Naglasak *ā*-osnova u hrvatskom – povijesni razvoj. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 17. 147–172.

Kapović, Mate. 2011b. The Accentuation of *i*-verbs in Croatian Dialects. Eds. Pronk, Tijmen; Derksen, Rick. *Accent matters: papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 37. Rodopi. Amsterdam – New York. 109–233.

Kapović, Mate. 2011c. Historical Development of Adjective Accentuation in Croatian (suffixless, *-ьпъ and *-ъкъ adjectives). Ed. Rinkevičius, Vytautas. *Proceedings of the 6th IWoBA (Baltistica VII Priedas*). 103–128, 339–448

Kapović, Mate. 2015. *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije*. Matica hrvatska. Zagreb.

Kapović, Mate. 2017. Proto-Indo-European Morphology. Ed. Kapović, Mate. *The Indo-European Languages*. Routledge. London – New York. 61–110.

Kapović, Mate. [to appear]. Naglasak u rukopisnom rječniku Bartola Kašića (1599).

Kašić, Bartol. 1990. *Hrvatsko-talijanski rječnik s konverzacijskim priručnikom*. Kršćanska sadašnjost – Zavod za jezik IFF. Zagreb.

Kortlandt, Frederik. 2011. *Selected writings on Slavic and general linguistics*. Rodopi. Amsterdam.

Kortlandt, Frederik. 2013. The Slovene neo-circumflex revisited. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 38/I. 117–122.

Kortlandt, Frederik. 2016. On the rise of neo-acute **e* and **o*. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 42/2. 471–482.

Langston, Keith. 2006. *Čakavian Prosody*. *The Accentual Patterns of the Čakavian Dialects of Croatian*. Slavica. Bloomington.

Langston, Keith. 2007. The neocircumflex in western South Slavic. *Slovenski jezik*/*Slovene Linguistic Studies* 6. 77–95.

Ligorio, Orsat; Kapović, Mate. 2011. O naglasku dvosložnih *o*-osnova s kratkosilaznim naglaskom u Dubrovniku. *Croatica & Slavica Iadertina* VII/2. 327–366.

Lukežić, Iva; Zubčić, Sanja. 2007. *Grobnički govor XX. stoljeća* (*gramatika i rječnik)*. Katedra Čakavskog sabora Grobništine. Rijeka.

Matasović, Ranko. 2008. *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Matica hrvatska. Zagreb.

Milat Panža, Petar. 2014. *Rječnik govora Blata na Korčuli*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.

Oraić Rabušić, Ivana. 2009. Fonološki opis govora Šemnice Gornje. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 35. 257–279.

Peco, Asim. 1978. *Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata*. Naučna knjiga. Beograd.

Rešetar, Milan. 1900. *Die serbokroatische Betonung südwestlicher Mundarten*. Alfred Hölder, K. u K. Hof- und Universitäts-Buchhandler. Wien.

Rigler, Jakob. 1978. Akcentske varijante III. *Slavistična revija* 26. 365–374.

Rigler, Jakob. 2001. *Zbrani spisi 1*. *Jezikovnozgodovinske in dialektološke razprave*. Založba ZRC. Ljubljana.

Snoj, Marko. [2]2003. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Modrijan. Ljubljana.

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

Stang, Christian S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Universitetsforlaget. Oslo – Bergen – Tromsö.

Стевановић, Михаило С. 1940. Систем акцентуације у пиперском говору. *Српски дијалектолошки зборник* X. 67–184.

Toporišič, Jože. [4]2004. *Slovenska slovnica*. Založba Obzorja. Maribor.

Trávníček, František. 1935. *Historická mluvnice česko-slovenská*. Praha.

Vermeer, Willem R. 1998. Christian Stang's revolution in Slavic accentology. Eds. Bjørnflaten, Jan Ivar; Kjetsaa, Geir; Mathiassen, Terje. *The Olaf Broch symposium: a centenary of Slavic studies in Norway*. Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters. Oslo. 240–254.

Verweij, Arno. 1994. Quantity patterns of substantives in Czech and Slovak. *Studies in Slavic and General linguistics. Dutch Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists*. 22. 493–567.

Vranić, Silvana. 2013. Zasebnosti čakavskoga buzetskoga dijalekta u odnosu na čakavski ekavski dijalekt. *Od indoeuropeistike do kroatistike*. *Zbornik u čast Daliboru Brozoviću*. HAZU. Zagreb. 519–536.

Зализняк, А. А. 2010. *Труды по акцентологии. Том I*. Языки славянских культур. Москва.

O kraćenju, duljenju i naglasnim pomacima u slavenskom

Sažetak

Članak se bavi s nekoliko problemâ slavenske povijesne akcentologije – prednaglasnom dužinom u naglasnoj paradigmi *c* (i *b*) u južno- i zapadnoslavenskom, fenomenom neocirkumfleksa (uključujući i naglasak genitiva množine), duženjem tipa *kȍkōt* u čakavskom, naglaskom u riječima tipa *ograda* u slavenskom, odrazom praslavenskog *ò u češkim jednosložnim riječima (tj. riječima tipa *kůň* 'konj'), kao i određenim naglasnim pomacima (npr. onim u naglasnoj paradigmi *b*). Autor kritizira često neodržive stavove Frederika Kortlandta oko ovih problema, kao i određene problematične aspekte njegova akcentološkoga *modus operandi*.

Ključne riječi: slavenski, akcentuacija, naglasak, prednaglasna dužina, neocirkumfleks, duženje, kraćenje

Key words: Slavic, accentuation, accent, pretonic length, neo-circumflex, lengthening, shortening