

Kraćenje, duženje i rekonstrukcija: bilješke iz slavenske povijesne akcentologije

Kapović, Mate

Source / Izvornik: **Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2019, 45, 75 - 133**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.31724/rihjj.45.1.4>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:770290>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-08-19**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



Mate Kapović

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb
mkapovic@ffzg.hr

SHORTENING, LENGTHENING, AND RECONSTRUCTION: NOTES ON HISTORICAL SLAVIC ACCENTOLOGY

The paper is a part of an ongoing discussion on various topics of historical Slavic accentology with Frederik Kortlandt. The topics discussed in the paper are: the reflex of the Proto-Slavic short neo-acute in Kajkavian; the reflex of pretonic and posttonic length in West and South Slavic; the reconstruction of the ending *-ъ in Slavic genitive plural, its accentuation, and the ending -*ā* in Štokavian and Slovene; the lengthening of the *bōg* 'god' and *kðkōt* 'rooster' type in Western South Slavic; the *oborna 'defense' and *čr̥nina 'blackness' type accent and retractions of contractional neo-circumflexes; the reflex of Slavic *ò in Slovak and Czech monosyllables; and the valence theory and Proto-Indo-European origin of Balto-Slavic accentuation.

0. Introduction¹

Frederik Kortlandt has, in one of his articles (Kortlandt 2016: 478–479), criticized a few random issues out of my recent monograph (Kapović 2015), while misinterpreting some of my stances. I responded to his criticism in Kapović 2017a and he responded back in Kortlandt 2018. In this article, I will respond to him once again, while taking the chance to discuss some issues in historical Slavic accentology, since I have to admit I do not actually believe that there “is simply no viable alternative to the theory of Slavic accentuation that [Kortlandt]

¹ I would like to thank Siniša Habijanec for his kind help with certain Slovak issues and Mislav Benić, David Mandić, Mikhail Oslon, and Tijmen Pronk for reading and commenting on the early drafts of the paper.

proposed 45 years ago” (Kortlandt 2018: 295). However, I would like to thank my co-discussant for providing me with an opportunity to present and further elaborate some of my views. I hope that other scholars will find our discussion useful and interesting, despite occasional heavy words and heated argumentation.

Before we start with the actual issues, a few notes on the *modus operandi* and rhetorical strategies of the other discussant are in order. Kortlandt’s response is written in his usual style. He often does not really criticize other scholars’ views with arguments and discussion – he just dismisses them out of hand. He also tends to ignore the data that do not fit into his theories and rarely discusses anything outside of his framework. Likewise, instead of actual discussion he has a tendency to denounce certain ideas as a product of other scholars’ ignorance or as “outdated”, even in case of ideas held by most scholars outside of his own school of thought.

In his article, Kortlandt constantly accuses me of my “lack of a chronological perspective”, which seems to be a code for “not accepting Kortlandt’s ideas on relative chronology”. I can indeed confess that I have neither tried to present my complete version of a prosodic relative chronology from Proto-Indo-European to Slavic, nor to criticize the totality of Kortlandt’s ideas on relative chronology of historical Slavic accentuation – that would take a whole monograph, and while it could perhaps be interesting and useful, it is nonetheless my view that there are much more important issues still to be solved in historical Slavic accentology than criticizing views of just one scholar. My aims were always quite modest – I merely attempted to show that some of Kortlandt’s theories, parts of his grand relative chronology scheme, simply do not work, are not convincing, or do not actually explain the data. Before trying to fit one’s ideas into a neat chronological perspective, one must be sure that the theories actually explain the facts – the problem with at least some of Kortlandt’s ideas is that they do not or that they do it much more poorly than the alternative explanations. All the chronological perspectives in the world cannot fix disregarding of data and implausible analogies. While relative chronology is indeed important, it is not everything and the data and obvious explanations should not be twisted in order for them to nicely fit a preimagined wider hypothesis. One can take the example of the Moscow Accentological School (MAS), which does not deal with relative chronology at all. Not because it is not important but because the main aim of MAS is paradigmatical reconstruction of morphologic and derivational categories. MAS scholars compile enormous amounts of data and work with full sets of words (e.g. of various types of verbs,

derivatives, etc.), trying to reconstruct Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms for all of them. That is hardly less valuable than operating with a few chosen words (repeated in paper after paper) in order to try to make an elaborate relative chronology.

1. The reflex of the Proto-Slavic short neo-acute in Kajkavian

When discussing Kajkavian forms like *ôsmi* ‘eighth’ and *rešêta* ‘sieves’ (Kortlandt 2016: 475), it is a shame that Kortlandt did not take into account new analyses from my book (Kapović 2015), because it might have been useful for him to acknowledge the lengthening of the short neo-acute in the positions Ivšić (1936: 72) has missed – most importantly loc^{sg} *stôlu* ‘table’ < *stôlu² (Kapović 2015: 379, 384–386) and also derivatives like *sêlce* ‘hamlet’ < *sêlъce, in opposition to no lengthening in forms like *smôkva* ‘fig’ < *smôkъv- (*ibid.* 390–396).³ Had he done so, perhaps he would not need to reconstruct such a complex and unnecessary system like the supposed Proto-Slavic distinction of *ê/ò : *ě/ō : *i/è/ù (in my opinion, it is enough to reconstruct *è and *ò only) or to make rather dubious claims that Kajkavian forms like *nôsîm* ‘I carry’ (a. p. B) are “evidently analogical” (Kortlandt 2016: 476). That is not only not “evident” but is very unlikely: it would entail a staggering analogical development in the Kajkavian accentual paradigm B where the whole present *nôsîm* – *nôsîš* – *nôsî* – *nôsîmo* – *nôsîte* – *nôse* (cf. Kapović 2018: 230–231), in all six persons in both singular and plural, would have a secondary accent! To make things worse, this supposedly innovative accent (*nôs-* in all forms) would be due to analogy to the sole original but not attested 1^{sg} *nošù (and perhaps to other non-present forms like the imperative *nosîte!* and the like) (cf. also Kapović 2017b: 611¹⁶). How likely

² Lengthened in front of a long dominant open final syllable (which was also the reason the accent was not shifted to the ending): loc^{sg} *stôlŭ (Kapović 2015: 380, Kapović 2017b: 610¹⁶). For those scholars who do not prefer to operate with Proto-Slavic valences of the Moscow Accentological School (dominant syllables having high tone and recessive low tone), the length can be interpreted as analogical to a. p. c, where it was stressed (though this is a less convincing option).

³ The difference between *sêlce* (also *pêrce* ‘little feather’, *pečênka* ‘roasted meat’, *žêlva* ‘turtle’, Ivšić’s *stôlŭak* ‘tablecloth’, Bêllosztênêcz’s *Szêlfztvo* ‘paganitas’, *Szêlnik* ‘fundarius’, and *Sztôlchecz* ‘sedicula’, etc.) and *smôkva* (also *lôkva* ‘puddle’, *kôcka* ‘dice’, *lôpta* ‘ball’, *vôcka* ‘fruit tree’, *kvôcka* ‘hen’) is in the consonant preceding the former yer – resonant or non-resonant respectively. The Slavic short neo-acute * lengthens to ̃ in Kajkavian before a resonant and a medial weak yer (as in *sêlce*) but not before a non-resonant (as in *kôcka*) – the lengthening also occurs if there is a *j after the yer, in which case the consonant before the yer does not need to be a resonant (cf. *pêrje* < *pêrĭje ‘feathers’ but also *grôbje* < *grôbĭje ‘graveyard’). For details, discussion, and more examples cf. Kapović 2015: 390–396 (briefly also in Kapović 2017b: 610¹⁶).

is it that a single form would influence five other forms in such a way (or eight if one considers the now extinct dual as well)? To make things even worse, this original *nošü (and other forms like the imperative), did not even have *nðs-* but only unaccented *nos-*. So one would have to assume that the original *nošü – **nðsiš – **nðsi – **nðsimo – **nðsite – **nðse somehow magically changes to *nðsim – nðsiš – nðsi – nðsimo – nðsite – nðse* without any remnants of the “original” forms and through a very suspicious process (**nðs- > *nðs-* by analogy to *nos-). How can this be “evidently analogical”? Unfortunately, Kortlandt does not even discuss this “evident analogy”, thus leaving a false impression on an uninitiated reader that this supposed analogy is indeed easy and reasonable. Kortlandt very often avoids discussing the details and problematic issues. He usually leaves out discussion and argumentation even of his own hypotheses (together with counterexamples and most data that do not fit his theories), which results in obfuscation of the problem and leaves many uninitiated readers unable to judge for themselves if a certain hypothesis is convincing or not. I point to a similar case in Kapović 2017a: 395³¹, the fact that Kortlandt believes that the present tense forms 1^{pl} *nðsimo – 2^{pl} *nðsite in Slavic a. p. *b* are actually supposedly analogical to 2^{sg} *nðsišb – 3^{sg} *nðsitb – 3^{pl} *nðsetb, but he never puts it in so many words, nor does he explain why there are no traces anywhere of the supposedly original **nosîmo > **nosîmo – **nosîte > **nosite (one finds only forms like *ložit – ložitmo/ložitmò* ‘we make fire < lay’ in a. p. *b*₂ in some dialects, but those have a neo-acute, cf. Kapović 2017b: 395). To get back to Kajkavian *nðsiš* ‘you carry’, there is nothing “evidently analogical” about it – it is a perfectly expected reflex of Slavic * in Kajkavian in initial/medial syllables in a position before a non-contractional length (cf. Kapović 2015: 380–381). The same reflex is also seen in Kajkavian forms like *mðreš* ‘you can’ < *mðžešb or *nðšen* ‘carried’ < *nðšenb (both with a short following syllable). The difference between Kajkavian *nðsiš* and gen^{pl} *nðvih* ‘new’ is in the contractional origin of *-i-* in the latter form (*nðvyjixb),⁴ where the contractional length was originally probably super-long at the time of the lengthening of the short neo-acute in Kajkavian (and Slovene),⁵ cf. Kapović 2015: 388–389).

⁴ This occurred prior to the retraction of *kopáješb > *kopášb > *kòpašb > *kòpaš* in a part of Kajkavian/Slovene dialects (otherwise one would find **kòpaš there).

⁵ In Slovene, the original lengthening of the short neo-acutes is usually more difficult to attest because of the later lengthening of all non-final syllables in most Slovene dialects. However, there are still clear traces of it in Slovene as well (cf. again Kapović 2015: 377–399). For a critique of Pronk (2016), a scholar that works within Kortlandt’s framework, and his mistaken view that there was no original lengthening of the short neo-acute in Slovene see Kapović 2017b: 610¹⁵.

2. Pretonic and posttonic length in Slavic

In my last article (Kapović 2017a: 385–386), I pointed out numerous problems with Kortlandt’s unorthodox theory that the length in a. p. *c* forms like Neo-Štokavian *rúka* ‘arm’ is secondary because it was supposedly shortened originally:

a) no forms like ***rùka* or ***rūkà* are attested anywhere in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian (cf. also Neo-Štokavian a. p. *C* forms like *loc^{sg} rúci* ‘arm’, *loc^{sg} vrátu* ‘neck’, *loc^{sg} rijéci* ‘word’, *nom/acc^{pl}* (older) *pecíva* ‘buns’, *trésti* ‘to shake’, *2^{sg} grízeš* ‘you bite’, older *1^{pl} činímo* ‘we do’, *bíla* ‘she was’, etc., which are also always and everywhere long⁶)

b) according to Kortlandt, a somewhat similar massive analogical shortening in West Slavic is not plausible (cf. Czech *ruka* by analogy to *acc^{sg} ruku*), in spite of the attestation of length in some forms (cf. Czech *trásti* ‘to shake’, *gen^{sg} devíti* ‘nine’), while a much more difficult analogical reintroduction of length in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian is not problematic (despite the complete lack of the supposedly original shortened forms)

c) the supposedly reintroduced length in a. p. *C* would have to affect some forms always with no exceptions (Čakavian *nom^{sg} rúkà*, *loc^{sg} rúci*), while elsewhere the shortened roots were preserved (Čakavian *gen^{sg} rúkě*, *instr^{sg} rúkôm*, *gen^{pl} < *gen^{du} rúkû*, *dat^{pl} rúkâm*, *loc^{pl} rúkàh*, *instr^{pl} rúkàmi*), which is unconvincing (what is the exact plausible motivation for *rúkà* to have a “reintroduced” length everywhere but for *rúkàh* not to have it?)

The generalization of brevity in a. p. *c* of e.g. *ā*-stems in West Slavic (Czech *ruka* – *acc^{sg} ruku*) would entail only the generalization of the original accent in forms like **rôkq*, for which there are ample typological parallels (cf. the footnotes in Kapović 2017a: 383), or the generalization of a short vowel, which is in any case expected in the great majority of cases – in 17 of 21 (Kapović 2015: 429, 2017a: 383). Thus in Czech (and West Slavic in general), it is a simple question of a complete generalization of **rūk-* instead of the older alternation of **rūk-* (17x) and **rük-* (4x), or a simple complete generalization of **rūk-* (which originally occurred in 9 of 21 case forms) in all the cases. In Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian, Kortlandt’s supposed reintroduction of length in a. p. *C* is much

⁶ Except if affected by very late general or partial shortenings of pretonic length (cf. Kapović 2015: 747–749).

more complicated and unconvincing because it would have entailed the change of ***rūkà* to **rūkà* by analogy to **rūku* (thus a lengthening of a short unaccented vowel by analogy to a long accented vowel), while forms like *dat^{pl} **rūkàm* would for some reason remain unaffected (because there was no complete generalization).⁷ Kortlandt's (2018: 290) solution that the length is not restored “in polysyllabic word forms” is an attempted description, not an explanation. First of all, why was the supposed analogy always and everywhere perfect in disyllabic forms, while it did not affect polysyllabic forms?⁸ Secondly, Kortlandt's (not really explanatory) description is imprecise because it would be a stretch to claim that Čakavian *dat^{pl} rūkàm*, *loc^{pl} rūkàh* (which obviously have the same kind of shortening as Neo-Štokavian *rūkama*)⁹ are “polysyllabic” and that would entail counting the final yers in order for this to work. Additionally, Kortlandt's disyllabic/polysyllabic terminology is confusing and imprecise in one more way – aren't forms like Čakavian *planīnà* ‘mountain’ or *lovīmò* ‘we hunt’, which one would expect to behave like Čakavian *rūkà*, also polysyllabic? And isn't *gen^{sg} rūkē* also disyllabic?

Kortlandt's (2018: 290) response to these critiques is surprising. Though one would expect him to defend his theory and try to offer some kind of justification for the raised objections or take the opportunity to provide some details for his theory, he does no such thing. This is what he has to say. First of all, there is the mantra of my supposed “lack of chronological perspective”, though the problem is not in chronological perspective but in Kortlandt's unconvincing massive reintroduction of pretonic length in a. p. C. Then he reiterates once more where the supposed restoration of length in a. p. C comes in his relative chronology (though that is not the issue) and says that I am disregarding the difference between a. p. *b* and *c* (which makes no sense at all). And that's it – no real explanation is provided.

⁷ Near-complete generalization occurs only later, e.g. in many modern Neo-Štokavian (and other) dialects, where older forms like *dat/loc/instr^{pl} glávama* ‘heads’ are replaced with younger *glávama* (usually with the only exception being *rūkama*, both because it is very frequent and supported by *gen^{pl} rùkū*) – cf. Kapović 2011a: 164.

⁸ The tendency of shortening in longer (polysyllabic) forms can be seen in different situations in Slavic, but it is not clear why that kind of a tendency would be involved in an analogical restoration of length, which is not a phonetic process.

⁹ On a minor point, Kortlandt's (*ibid.*) using of Hvar Čakavian form *rukīma* (without reference – the same in Kortlandt 2011: 263) is not adequate since it obviously has an innovative ending. What is even more inadequate is that he at least twice quoted the said form wrongly – Hvar Čakavian (Hraste 1935: 29) has *dat/loc/instr^{pl} rùkīma(n)* (with not only a secondary ending but also a secondary pretonic length, cf. also Šimunović 2009: 41 for Brač *dat/loc/instr^{pl} dūšīma(n)* ‘souls’) and not ***rukīma*.

Another problematic issue is the one of *e*-presents in a. p. *c* (Kapović 2017a: 386–387). According to my theory, both the West Slavic and Western South Slavic attested paradigms are very easy to understand. In Czech, the whole paradigm shows a short root (*třesu* – *třeseš* – *třese* – *třese* – *třese* – *třese* – *třesou*) because this is what you would expect in the majority of original forms (1^{sg}, 1/2/3^{pl}) (*ibid.* 386). The oldest attested paradigm type in Western South Slavic is preserved in some Čakavian dialects: (*trēsèn*) – *trēsěš* – *trēsè* – *trěsemò* – *trěsetè* – *trēsũ*.¹⁰ This is exactly what one would expect (cf. Kapović 2015: 417–419). However, in Kortlandt’s framework, the archaic Čakavian paradigm is again difficult to explain. Kortlandt (2018: 290) states that the restoration of length in *trēsěš* – *trēsè* but not in *trěsemò* – *trěsetè* “is a consequence of the fact that pretonic length was limited to the first pretonic syllable”. If this has something to do with pretonic length in word forms which experienced Dybo’s law, where there was indeed no pretonic length outside of the first pretonic syllable, how is then one to explain forms like Štokavian *zábava* ‘fun, party’ and *národ* ‘people’ with Dybo’s law (as per Kortlandt 2018: 289) but no length in forms like *rùkama* or dialectal loc^{pl} *rùkàh* in a. p. *c*? If one could find length in new forms (created by Dybo’s law according to Kortlandt) like *zábava* < *zābāva* and *národ* < *nārōd* in the system, why was there no restoration of length in the same positions in a. p. *c* (*rùkama* and *rùkàh*)?

Of course, when talking about the present tense paradigm Kortlandt does not mention the inconvenient fact that the primary source (i.e. one of the present tense forms) for the supposed restoration of length in *trēsěš* – *trēsè* can only be the early disappearing and unattested old 1^{sg} **trēsu*,¹¹ which makes the whole thing suspicious (again, as in the case of *rùkà*, one would have to assume the analogy of a pretonic vowel to an accented one). Kortlandt conveniently leaves out one more crucial point: according to his doctrine one would expect not *trēsěš* – *trēsè* but rather ***trēsěš* – ***trēsè*,¹² where one would presumably expect the short pretonic vowel as in 3^{pl} *trēsũ*. The length would thus have to be restored from the unattested and early eliminated 1^{sg} **trēsu* to 2^{sg} ***trēsěš* – 3^{sg} ***trēsè*

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Šimunović 2009: 51 for Brač.

¹¹ The ending *-u* is, of course, amply attested in the older language but there seems to exist no attestation of the accent in present tense 1^{sg} of *e*-verbs (in *ě/a*-verbs, a. p. C *věju* ‘I say’ is attested even today in some dialects).

¹² Cf. e.g. Kortlandt 2011: 94 (“short vowels were lengthened... by the retraction of the stress from final jers”), Vermeer 1984: 362–363, 365–366.

but not to 3^{pl} *trěšŭ*. Though one could obviously claim that pretonic length was reintroduced in the singular only, it would be strange that the forms with the short root in 2/3^{sg} are not attested anywhere (unlike 3^{pl} *trěšŭ*). Likewise, would it not be strange that no dialect generalized the secondary ***trěšēm* by analogy to the supposedly original ***trěšěš* – ***trěšě*? In any case, even if one is to accept Kortlandt's analogies as plausible, we still remain with a number of forms in pretonic a. p. *c* syllables that have to be explained by analogies instead of regular phonetic developments. If one has to choose which development is secondary and which is original in a. p. *c* – the shortened pretonic syllables in West Slavic or the long pretonic syllables in Western South Slavic, the latter seems a better bet, since the required generalizations are much simpler in West Slavic (see above) and remnants of the old pretonic length in a. p. *c* do exist there (Czech *trásti*, gen^{sg} *devíti*), while the required restoration of pretonic length in Western South Slavic is very messy and problematic and there are no traces whatsoever of the supposedly original forms like ***rŭkà* with shortened pretonic length in a. p. *C*.

In his works, Kortlandt has maintained the claim that there are no traces of pretonic length in a. p. *c* in West Slavic. Curiously, he usually ignored the length that occurs in West Slavic a. p. *c* infinitives of *e*-verbs like Slavic **orsti* ‘to grow’ (cf. Štokavian *rásti*) > Czech *rŭsti*, Slovak *rásť*, Polish *rosć*; Slavic **tręsti* ‘to shake’ (cf. Štokavian *tręsti*, Slovene *tręsti*) > Czech *trásti*, Slovak, *triasť*, Polish *trząść*, Slovencian *trǐsc*, etc. (for more such infinitives in West Slavic cf. Stang 1957: 153, Kapović 2015: 431). While he had previously skipped Czech *trásti* with no real explanation (Kortlandt 2011: 264), I am glad to see that he has now (Kortlandt 2018: 290) accepted my suggestion (Kapović 2015: 431–432, 2017: 384) that from his perspective this length might be explained as analogical to the *l*-participle (Czech *trásl*, Slovak *triasol*, Polish *trząszl*). However, as I have already pointed (*ibid.*), this kind of explanation might work in the case of verbs with stems ending in a consonant (like **tręs-ti*, **orst-ti*), which had *b*-forms in *l*-participles (**trěslb*) but not in the case of verbs with stems ending in a vowel¹³ (like **klęti* ‘to swear’, **mertí* ‘to die’), which had regular *c*-forms in *l*-participles (**klęlb*, **mǐrlb*) (cf. Kapović 2018: 171–172 for the apparent – > ± metatony in *l*-participles of verbs with stems ending in a consonant). Obviously, Kortlandt

¹³ Including diphthongs of **Vr/Vl* type (**er*, **or*, **br*, **br*, **el*, **ol*, **bl*, **br*).

cannot accept that because it would undermine his theory of phonetic shortening in pretonic syllables in a. p. c¹⁴ since in the case of Czech *klíti* ‘to swear/curse’ – *klel* and *mříti* ‘to die’ – *mrel* there is no ad hoc solution to explain away the length in the infinitives through an analogy to the length in the *l*-participle. So how does he deal with these crucial word forms?

Kortlandt (*ibid.*) says: “The retraction of the stress in Czech *klíti* ‘to swear’ and *mříti* ‘to die’ was much earlier (stage 4.4)”, thus introducing a retraction without any additional explanation or argumentation on why this supposed change would have occurred except in order to be an ad hoc “solution” for problems with his theory of pretonic length. It is unclear how such a retraction could have taken place in infinitives like **kleṭi*, **merti*, but not in forms like **roka* ‘arm’ or loc^{sg} **žlčī* ‘bile’ (especially considering the fact that the infinitive ending *-*t-i* has the exact same historical origin as loc^{sg} *-*i* of *i*-stem nouns).

In a. p. c, the end-stress in **kleṭi* and **merti* is expected (cf. Дыбо 1981: 233, 235),¹⁵ just like in **tręsti*, and directly attested in Štokavian *klēti*, *mrijēti* and older Russian (Stang 1957: 152) *умрету́, взяту́* ‘to take’.¹⁶ Kortlandt does claim some kind of relation of this supposed retraction with “S/Cr. *vṭi* ‘to twist’, *grṣti* ‘to bite’, *sjěci* ‘to cut’” (*ibid.*), but this makes no sense since these forms underwent Hirt’s law, a known and almost universally accepted phonetic law (though details of it are disputed), which occurs in word forms with acute pretonic syllables (as traditionally conceived), while forms like **kleṭi*, **merti*, **ęti* ‘to take’ do not have acute roots (as seen by their reflexes). While not bothering to elucidate on his position, Kortlandt repeats the mantra of my supposed “lack of chronological perspective” (i.e. not accepting Kortlandt’s theories). However, the problem is that all West Slavic infinitive forms with length are completely expected in traditional theory (cf. also Stang 1957: 153), while in Kortlandt’s theory forms like Czech *klíti*, *mříti* cannot be explained in the same way as *trásti* and he offers no acceptable solution for the problem. Thus, one must assume that these infinitives indeed preserve the old pretonic length of a. p. c (which was ousted in most

¹⁴ Cf. a similar view in, curiously, Николаев 2012: 41.

¹⁵ Interestingly enough, Derksen (2008), a member of the Leiden Accentological School like Kortlandt, leaves the forms **merti* and **ęti* ‘to take’ unaccented in his dictionary (though almost all his Proto-Slavic reconstructions are usually accented).

¹⁶ Western Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian forms like *klēt(i) < klēt(i)* (Kapović 2015: 634–638, 2018: 174) and modern Russian forms like *мереть* (Stang 1957: 151–152) are clearly much younger.

other forms in a. p. *c* by analogy to word forms where it was not phonetically expected). Kortlandt's additional and implausible ad hoc sound laws in order to preserve his general doctrine are unnecessary and superfluous.

Following Stang (1957: 88), I maintain that Slavic **děvęťь* 'nine', **děsęťь* 'ten' (a. p. *c*) had the archaic and original end-stress in gen/loc^{sg} **devęti* and **desęti* (attested directly in Russian gen/loc^{sg} *девятѹ, десѹтѹ*), and that the pretonic length of these original forms is directly attested in Czech gen/loc^{sg} *devęti, desęti* (cf. also Carlton 1991: 209), which would be one of the few traces of the original preserved pretonic length in a. p. *c* in West Slavic (in most other forms, this length was analogically removed). The old end-stress of gen^{sg} **devęti* and **desęti*, disappearing analogically in nominal *i*-stems like gen^{sg} **kōkoši* 'hen' (cf. Stang 1957: 87–88, also Дыбо 1981: 25, 28, 30), is confirmed by the Lithuanian end-stress in gen^{sg} *-ięs* in mobile nouns (a. p. 3/4). However, these straightforward reflexes of Czech *devęti, desęti* are opposed by Kortlandt (2018: 290) because they are not in accord with his theory that pretonic length in Slavic phonetically shortens.

I am glad to see that Kortlandt (*ibid.*) has accepted my suggestion that Štokavian *dęvet, dęset* beside *dęvēt, dęsēt* 'nine', *dęsēt* 'ten' are a result of allegro shortening (together with possible analogy to *sędam* 'seven', *ęsam* 'eight'), because his own explanation of the shortening was hardly convincing.¹⁷ However, there is no need to assume allegro shortening for West Slavic (Czech *desęt*, Slovak *desať*, Polish *dziesięć*) as Kortlandt does, since posttonic length is clearly phonetically shortened in West Slavic in a. p. *c* (see below). We find a similar problem with the way Kortlandt (*ibid.*) explains Czech gen^{sg} (also dat/loc/instr^{sg})¹⁸ *devęti, desęti*, by positing that the length is preserved from the barytone forms – again, the view

¹⁷ Kortlandt (2011: 266, 343) claimed that *dęvet* and *dęset* have "preserved a trace of the original shortening of pretonic vowels". However, the problem with that supposed analogy is that these numerals are indeclinable since the earliest attestation in Štokavian (cf. ARj – in Kajkavian, the numerals 5–10 can be declinable, but the endings are usually innovative, i.e. taken from the plural), and even if it were not so the analogy would still be problematic. The end-stress in gen^{sg} of *i*-stems is, as far as it is known, not attested in Western South Slavic (unlike in Russian, cf. Stang 1957: 87) – thus there is no trace of gen^{sg} **desęti*. In loc^{sg}, there seem to exist no traces of **desęti* either – there are only traces of the alternative ending *-e, i.e. loc^{sg} **desęte* (cf. Old Church Slavic loc^{sg} *desęti* and *desęte*). This is preserved in older forms like *dvanaesete* 'twelve' (ARj), which yields modern Štokavian *dvánaest*. However, *dvánaest* < **dvānāest* points to the old initial stress in this form (< **dvānādesete*, i.e. **nādesete* from the original loc^{sg} **dęsęte* – **nādesęte*). Thus, the only potential form with end-stress would be instr^{sg} **desętјq* or even instr^{sg} **desęti*, but this is also problematic in the light of the tendency to generalize the initial accent in instr^{sg} as well. For the accent of the consonant gen^{sg} **desęte* cf. Kapović 2015: 433¹⁵⁹².

¹⁸ The original **devęti*, **desęti* can be expected, besides the gen^{sg}, in loc^{sg} and perhaps in instr^{sg}, while in dat^{sg} it must be analogical to other cases.

that West Slavic preserves posttonic length in a. p. *c* is patently wrong (as shown below). Thus, Czech *devíti*, *desíti* cannot be explained from **děvēti*, **děšeti* (the forms expected in dat^{sg}). In any case, it would be strange, even if old posttonic length was indeed preserved in West Slavic (which clearly it is not), that it would disappear in Czech nom/acc^{sg} *devět*, *deset* but not in oblique *devíti*, *desíti*.¹⁹

Kortlandt (e.g. 2011: 30) believes that, unlike pretonic length (which is supposedly always shortened), posttonic length (in disyllabic words like **měšecь* ‘month’, **öbvolkъ* ‘cloud’, not counting final yers)²⁰ is originally preserved both in West and South Slavic, in both a. p. *a* (in words like **měšecь*) and a. p. *c* (in words like **öbvolkъ*). To explain the actual reflexes, Kortlandt (*ibid.*) has to assume vast analogies in both South and West Slavic a. p. *C*. Thus, Štokavian old pretonic length (which should be shortened according to Kortlandt) in loc^{sg} *oblaku* (ARj) would supposedly be analogical to posttonic length in *öblāk* ‘cloud’ – gen^{sg} *öblāka*, etc., while Czech short second syllable in *oblak* ‘cloud’ (which should be long according to Kortlandt) would be analogical to original end-stressed forms like loc^{sg} *oblaku*²¹ (where the pretonic length should shorten according to Kortlandt). However, in my view both Štokavian *gölüb* – gen^{sg} *gölüba* and Czech *holub* – gen^{sg} *holuba* have completely regular phonetic reflexes of posttonic length in most cases²² and no analogies are needed. While posttonic length is consistently preserved in Štokavian/Čakavian no matter the original accentual paradigm²³ (cf. the examples like *mjěsēc*, *gölüb* in Kapović 2015: 504–506, 509),²⁴ West Slavic shows clear difference in the treatment of posttonic length in a. p. *a* and a. p. *c*. In a. p. *c*, the length is always shortened (cf. e.g. Czech²⁵ *čeled’* ‘family’, *čelist*

¹⁹ The variant modern oblique (gen/dat/loc/instr^{sg}) *deseti* is analogical to nom/acc^{sg} *deset* (and to the original dat^{sg} and probably instr^{sg} *deseti*). Cf. also the generalized nom/acc^{sg} *pět* ‘five’ – oblique *pěti*.

²⁰ The same in trisyllabic forms.

²¹ The ending *-u* in loc^{sg} is actually innovative here so one can take loc^{pl} *oblacích* as an example instead.

²² Except in forms where the shortening of old pretonic length is expected (cf. Kapović 2015: 416–419), i.e. before a long ending or internal old acute accent.

²³ In Slovene/Kajkavian, only indirect traces of posttonic length can be seen via the neo-circumflex, but obviously only in a. p. *a*, which had original old acute in the root.

²⁴ I have to correct my earlier views (Kapović 2015: 514–516) on the preservation of length in forms like **CVCVCVĚCъ*. While forms like *rānenik* ‘wounded person’ are indeed not decisive because the length in suffixes like *-nik* is generalized, the apparent shortening in forms like *mjěstanin* ‘local (person)’ (from *mjěsto* ‘location’, a. p. *a*) is probably not phonetic, but due to analogy to the original forms like **građānin* (from *grād* ‘city’, a. p. *c*), cf. Kapović 2015: 512¹⁸⁴⁶. That the length in the penultimate syllable of the **CVCVCVĚCъ* type is probably originally preserved (as it surely is in the **CVCVĚCъ* type like *mjěsēc*, *gölüb*) is to be concluded from forms like *kōlovřāt* (gen^{sg} *kōlovřāta*) ‘spinning wheel’, where the length can hardly be analogical (it is unlikely that *kōlovřāt* could have the length by analogy to *vřāt* ‘neck’).

²⁵ For the sake of simplicity, I will adduce only Czech forms here (for other West Slavic forms cf. Kapović 2015: 503–513).

‘jaw’, *deset*, *devět*, *holub* ‘pigeon’, *kolovrat* ‘spinning wheel’, *oblak* ‘cloud’, *oblast* ‘region’, *obruč* ‘hoop’, *rozum* ‘sense’, *tetrev* ‘capercaillie’, *žalud* ‘acorn’ + *předivo* ‘spinning material’, *pečivo* ‘pastry’)²⁶ – a few cases with length are easily explained as secondary (cf. e.g. Czech *jeřáb* ‘partridge’, *ovád* ‘horsefly’).²⁷ However, in a. p. *a* one finds numerous examples of preserved posttonic length (cf. e.g. Czech *měsíc* ‘month’, *zajíc* ‘hare’, *pavouk* ‘spider’, *peníz* ‘penny’, *tisíc* ‘thousand’, participles like *řezán* ‘cut’, *jestřáb* ‘hawk’, personal names like *Branimír*, Slovak *pavúz* ‘shaft for pressing hay in a carriage’) but also many of them with shortening (Czech *havran* ‘raven’, *labuť* ‘swan’, *paměť* ‘memory’, *kaprad* ‘fern’, *vítěz* ‘winner’).²⁸ Thus, Kortlandt (2018: 290–291) is not correct when saying that “posttonic long vowels were consistently preserved in accent paradigm (a)” (also, the fact that the length is preserved in a. p. *a* does not automatically mean that it was originally the same with a. p. *c*, as he claims, and that only later the length was lost in a. p. *c* in West Slavic due to analogy to end-stressed forms). They are indeed preserved in many words, but hardly consistently. This clear difference of the reflexes of posttonic length in a. p. *a* (length preserved in slightly more than half of the words/forms) and a. p. *c* (length always shortened except in a few usually clearly secondary words) would point to the regular phonetic reflexes originally being different in a. p. *a* and a. p. *c* in West Slavic.

My view is that posttonic length was originally phonetically shortened in a. p. *c* in West Slavic (but not in the posttonic length preserving area of South Slavic, i.e. in Štokavian/Čakavian). This not only explains the material with no need for analogies, but also provides a unitary theory for the reflexes of both a. p. *c* polysyllabic root forms like Czech *oblast* ‘region’ < *öbvolstь and a. p. *c* monosyllabic root forms like Czech *vlast* ‘country’ < *vōlstь (cf. Štokavian *öblāst* ‘region’, *vlāst* ‘rule, reign’), that would have to be completely separated if one is to accept Kortlandt’s theory.²⁹ The rule in West Slavic would be simple

²⁶ Kapović 2015: 509, 511.

²⁷ Both forms end in a voiced segment, which is hardly accidental, where Czech often experiences secondary lengthening (e.g. *bůh* ‘god’, cf. Kapović 2017a: 397). Additionally, *jeřáb* might have been influenced also by *jestřáb* ‘hawk’ (originally a. p. *a*, with expected length) or, less likely, the originally diminutive *jeřábek* ‘hazel grouse’ (where the length is expected and generalized). The length in Polish *kolowrót* ‘windlass’ (gen^{sg} *kolowrotu*) is secondary, just like in *powrót* ‘return’ and *przewrót* ‘overthrow’ – Old Polish had the expected *kolowrot* (I would like to thank Miša Osłon for pointing this out to me).

²⁸ Kapović 2015: 503–508.

²⁹ According to Kortlandt, the short vowel in Czech *vlast* is phonetically regular (the shortening of the old circumflex), while the short second vowel in Czech *oblast* is analogical.

– the length is always shortened in accentless word forms, as a. p. *c* forms with initial circumflex are usually described. All forms with an automatic phonetic initial circumflex in phonologically accentless words (thus both the *vōlstь and *ōbvolstь type) would have been shortened – regardless of whether original long vowels (as *-ol- in *volstь) were under phonetic initial circumflex stress (as in *vōlstь) or not (as in *ōbvolstь).³⁰

How to explain the almost haphazard reflexes (e.g. Czech *peníz* but *havran*) of posttonic length in a. p. *a* forms in West Slavic? One may obviously consider the analogical influence of polysyllabic forms (where the length would be expectedly shortened)³¹ in declension, like Czech (secondary) dat/loc^{sg} *havranovi*, instr^{sg} *havranem*, (secondary) nom^{pl} *havranové*, gen^{pl} *havranů*, dat^{pl} *havranům*, loc^{pl} *havranech*, or in derivation, like Czech *pamětný* ‘memorial’, *pamětlivý* ‘mindful’, *pamětník* ‘witness’, etc. However, such an otherwise possible explanation perhaps does not look too convincing in light of a rather good agreement within West Slavic of the forms with a short suffix (Czech/Slovak *havran* ~ Polish *gawron*; Czech/Slovak *labuť* ~ Polish *łabędź*; Czech *paměť* ~ Slovak *pamäť* ~ Polish *pamięć*; Czech *kaprad’* ~ Slovak *paprad’* ~ Polish *paproć*). Shortening by analogy to longer forms would probably result in more variety in West Slavic reflexes, i.e. not all West Slavic languages would have the short reflex in exactly the same words. Thus one should perhaps entertain a Moscow Accentological School type of explanation via the valences of the suffixes. If one is willing to accept valences as a phonetic reality at the time of this shortening,³² an explanation of the length being preserved only in dominant suffixes becomes possible (cf. the detailed analysis of the suffixes in Kapović 2015: 508). This would then be in agreement with the shortening of length in recessive suffixes in a. p. *c* as well.

Kortlandt (2018: 291) attributes the lack of length in some a. p. *a* forms (like Czech *labuť* ‘swan’) to an early shift of a. p. *a* to a. p. *c*.³³ This is ad hoc but not

³⁰ At the time of the shortening, the Proto-Slavic tonemes were obviously still distinctive – “phonologically accentless” forms had initial falling tone (*, *), unlike the the rising “neo-acute” tone (*, *) and a different kind of rising (or perhaps originally even glottalized) “old acute” tone (*). The shortening occurred only in the words with initial falling tone (*, *).

³¹ Cf. Kapović 2015: 511–516.

³² Dominant morphemes probably having a high tone and recessive morphemes having a low tone.

³³ It is unclear why Kortlandt (*ibid.*) says that this shift occurred “before the early metathesis of liquids” because forms like Czech *labuť* clearly show the acute-syllable treatment of the original *ol- (#*la*- and not #*lo*-). Any secondary shift to a. p. *c* would have had to occur after *ōl- > *la*, not before.

impossible. However, one should note that that explanation also works better in my framework because I posit the phonetic shortening of posttonic syllables in a. p. *c*, while he needs not only the shift from a. p. *a* to a. p. *c* but also the subsequent analogy of posttonic long vowels to the shortened pretonic vowels (in other cases). Similar goes for Czech *pekař* ‘baker’ and *rybář*, for which Kortlandt (2011: 266) says I dismiss them “without discussion”. If the first one is originally a. p. *c* (which would be strange because although *pek- is indeed a recessive root, *-arъ is nonetheless a dominant suffix,³⁴ though Štokavian *pěkār* would at least formally account for such a reconstruction)³⁵ and the other a. p. *b*, the forms are self-explanatory in my model (the shortening of posttonic length in a. p. *c* and the preservation in a. p. *a* in West Slavic) with no analogies needed. In Kortlandt’s framework both work as well, but *pekař* again needs an analogy to forms with *-ař-* in pretonic position. As always, Kortlandt’s theories need much more analogies, though he tries to present the picture otherwise. In any case, Kortlandt’s theory ignores a clear difference in the phonetic treatment of posttonic length in a. p. *a*, with most but not all words preserving the length (some 8 words or types of forms³⁶ with length and 5 with a shortened suffix), and a. p. *c*, with almost all words showing a shortened suffix (14 a. p. *c* words with the shortening and 3 with length, most easily explained as secondary),³⁷ while also disregarding the connection of words such as Czech *vlast* and *oblast* and the same kind of shortening occurring in all-recessive (“phonologically accentless”) word forms. Again, his theory is substandard in explaining the material.

According to Kortlandt’s theory, a. p. *b* verbs like *xvaliti ‘to praise’ or *skakati ‘to jump’ should preserve the original length of the root in all positions, because the accent was still on the root (*xvāliti, *skākati) at the time of the supposed general shortening of pretonic length (in a. p. *c*). The length is indeed what we see in major Slavic languages in these positions, cf. e.g. Štokavian *hvāliti*, Czech *chvāliti* and Štokavian *skākati*, Czech *skākati*. However, as I have warned re-

³⁴ Cf. Дыбо 1981: 176–178.

³⁵ Deriving *pěkār* from *pěka* ‘baking bell’ (as per ARj) is not semantically challenging (cf. below the meaning ‘oven’ in Čakavian), but its accent hardly looks old (however, cf. e.g. *pěka* ‘oven’ also in Šimunović 2009 and *pěka* < *pěka in HHG: 171 for Čakavian). Vasmer believes *pekar* is a Germanic loanword in Slavic, though, if so, it must have been subsequently motivated by Slavic *pek-* ‘bake’ – cf. also Ослон 2017: 38⁹.

³⁶ Participles in *-án* (though one could claim this is a generalization from variants with **-āns*), personal names in *-mír*.

³⁷ According to Kapović 2015: 504–511. There are some minor differences between languages, e.g. Slovak *pavúz* but Czech (dialectal) *pavuz*.

peatedly (most recently in Kapović 2017a: 387–388), this does not work for the original reflexes in West Slavic and the adduced infinitives have actually reintroduced the secondary length by analogy to the present tense forms like Štokavian 2^{sg} *hvālīš, skāčēš* (dialectal and older *hvālīš, skāčēš*), Czech *chvālīš, skāčeš*. The original shortened root in a. p. *b* is seen in Old Polish infinitives like *sędzić* ‘to judge’, *przystępić* ‘to approach’ and *żędać* ‘to demand’³⁸ but not in the present forms 2^{sg} *sządisz* and *przystąpisz*.³⁹ Crucially, the problem for Kortlandt’s theory is Slovincian, which, unlike other Slavic languages with preserved quantitative distinctions or remnants of it, has regular short vowels in a. p. *b* infinitives (but a long one not only in the present but in the *l*-participles as well),⁴⁰ e.g. Slovincian *sāzēc* ‘to judge’ – present 2^{sg} *sōuziš* – *l*-participle *sōuzěl, stāpjic* ‘to step in’ – present 2^{sg} *stōupjīš* – *l*-participle *stōupjěl* (cf. the complete list of such verbs in Дыбо 2000: 91–92). The same is true of Slovincian *a-je*-verbs like *kāpac* ‘to bathe’ – present 1^{sg} *kōupja* (cf. the list in Stang 1957: 42 and also Stankiewicz 1993: 315–316, 318 for both). The shortened root in the imperative (which behaves like the infinitive as it also has a dominant *-i-) of a. p. *b* can be found in the Czech (Moravian) Hanakian dialect:⁴¹ imperative 2^{sg} *mlat!* – 2^{pl} *mlatě!* but present 2^{sg} *mlátīš* and *l*-participle *mlátīl* (the infinitive *mlátīl* has a secondary length probably by analogy to the original supine).⁴² Further evidence for such a distinction in the treatment of infinitive/imperative (shortened root) and *l*-participle (preserved length in the root) can possibly be found in the Middle Bulgarian manuscript *Apostle* from the 14th century, where the stress seems to have moved only to the dominant *-i-:⁴³ infinitive *сждѣти*, imperative *сждѣте!* but *l*-participle *сждѣль*.

Instead of addressing the Slovincian data (or for that matter Hanakian or Middle Bulgarian), Kortlandt (2018: 291) chooses to address the three Old Polish verbs in

³⁸ Cf. Stang 1957: 42, Kapović 2015: 474, 2017a: 387.

³⁹ Дыбо (2000: 91) mentions such a. p. infinitives with shortened roots for Old Czech as well, but does not adduce any examples.

⁴⁰ The infinitive has a dominant *-i- and the *l*-participle a recessive *-i- in the doctrine of the Moscow Accentological School (see the last section of the article for the valence theory).

⁴¹ Bartoš 1886–95.

⁴² Дыбо, Замятина and Николаев 1993: 8. The supine has a recessive *-i-. The dominant/recessive nature of *-i- is seen in a. p. *c*, where the dominant morphemes “attract” the accent and the recessive ones do not. Cf. the verb ‘to hunt’ (a. p. *c*) in Kajkavian to illustrate the stress position in the original a. p. *c* in Slavic: dominant *-i- in the infinitive *lovīti* and imperative *lovī(te)!* but recessive in the supine *lōvit* and *l*-participle *lōvil*.

⁴³ Дыбо, Замятина and Николаев 1993: 8.

detail, as if the problem was only those three verbs and not the whole system in Slovincian (supported by other data). Old Polish examples only corroborate that Slovincian system is indeed archaic and that West Slavic in general originally had the same quantitative alternation. In his discussion of the Old Polish *sędzić* – *sządisz* and *przystępic* – *przystąpisz*, Kortlandt says (*ibid.*) that the “short root vowel (...) offers a serious problem for the theory that these verbs belong to accent paradigm (b)”. There is no point in a detailed critique of Kortlandt’s rather elaborate ad hoc schemes, using which he tries to explain these forms that are very problematic from the point of view of his theory, since there is absolutely no reason why these two verbs should be considered anything else than a normal a. p. *b*. Neither Old Polish nor anything else in Slavic merits such wild theories to explain these two verbs – the only reason not to reconstruct the usual **sōdǫti* (a. p. *b*) and **stōpǫti* (a. p. *b*) is that their reflexes in Old Polish do not fit well with Kortlandt’s doctrine on length in Slavic. These two verbs belong to a normal a. p. *b* without any doubt and have always been reconstructed as such – cf. Дыбо 2000: 441–442 (for Slavic in general), Kapović 2011b: 210–211 (for Croatian dialects) and **sōdъ* ‘court of law’ (a. p. *b*).

Still, I would like to address a methodological point concerning Kortlandt’s struggle to explain Old Polish *sędzić* – *sządisz* and *przystępic* – *przystąpisz* because they are a good example of his *modus operandi*. When he cites (*ibid.*) the data from the Čakavian dialect of Kukljica, it is interesting to note that he does not mention where it is taken from. He mentions neither Benić 2011 nor Benić 2014, where the data can be found. This is not only scholarly inappropriate, since he is not giving proper respect to the fieldworker but is also methodologically incorrect since it does not allow the reader to check the data himself and assess it in the context. Unfortunately, this kind of erasure of other accentologists is quite in line with Kortlandt’s general suppressing of most modern non-Leiden scholars in most of his works (outside of his usually very scathing reviews of new accentological works that are not written within the framework of the Leiden Accentological School), which I have already mentioned before.⁴⁴ It is methodologically incorrect to look at one or a couple of forms without context, as

⁴⁴ In his new paper (Kortlandt 2018), Kortlandt does the same thing I already noted in Kapović 2017a: 388¹⁷. The references in his paper (*ibid.*) are mostly to his own work (10 items) or that of scholars from Netherlands working within his framework (4 of them – Hendriks, Vermeer 2x, Verweij). All non-Leiden references (8 of them), except for my article (Kapović 2017a) and one more (Osion) that he just passingly dismisses within the context of criticizing my paper, are older than 1976. It would seem that there is no accentological literature worthy of citing from the last almost half a century except for the one coming from the United Provinces.

Kortlandt tends to do, like in the question of the Kukljica forms such as *budīn* – *prebūdīn* ‘I wake up’ (Benić 2011: 7). Kortlandt completely ignores the known process in Čakavian (and Štokavian) through which the old long a. p. *c* verbs first yield a mixed a. p. C-C:, and then later shift to either a completely shortened a. p. C (rarely) or to an innovative a. p. B: (Kapović 2011b: 228–231, 2015: 477–488). The forms in question are probably connected to the *poluotmetnost* phenomenon as well (the prefixal accent, cf. Дыбо, Замятина and Николаев 1993: 43–51, Kapović 2018: 218), however the historical process of the a. p. C(-C:) > B: cannot be left out of the picture in a serious treatment of the problem (cf. especially Kapović 2015: 487–488).

To get back to the topic, Kortlandt (2018: 291) does not completely ignore the Slovincian data. He does mention two Slovincian *a-je*-verbs and explains the short root in the infinitive through the original short ablaut in them (cf. OCS *pъsati* ‘to write’, *dъxati* ‘to breathe’). However, he conveniently ignores the rest of the examples where no such explanation is possible (like the cognates of OCS *lizati* ‘to lick’, *skakati* ‘to jump’, **kъpati* ‘to bathe’), just like he ignores the *i*-verbs in general. He does, on the other hand, falsely attribute (Kortlandt 2018: 291¹) the claim that these different stem formations have something to do with dominant and recessive suffixes. They do not and I have never said that they do: it is inappropriate of Kortlandt to discuss *a-je*-verbs like **pъsāti* – **pīšeš* only and then make reference to my paper where I discuss *i*-verbs (*i*-verbs that he otherwise completely ignores). By the way, the explanation of the West Slavic (and Middle Bulgarian) forms through the earlier progressive accentual shift to the dominant acute syllables (as explained in Kapović 2017a: 291) is, of course, not mine but of the Moscow Accentological School (Дыбо, Замятина and Николаев 1993: 7–9, Дыбо 2000: 92–93), that Kortlandt has not commented on for a quarter of a century now, even though the West Slavic data goes against his whole theory on the development of pretonic length in Slavic.

To conclude, Kortlandt’s theory is again inadequate when dealing with real data. Unfortunately, the way he seems to deal with obvious shortcomings of his doctrine is to focus on irrelevant details (coming up with complex and unnecessary hypotheses out of thin air in the process) like the three Old Polish verbs, present the problematic data partially (as in the case of *a-je*-verbs in Slovincian), and ignore most of it (the Slovincian *i*-verbs). However, serious historical accentology cannot be based on just a few chosen forms. One has to look at the whole system.

3. The genitive plural

Following Дыбо (2000: 21), I interpret the lengthening in gen^{pl} (in Western South Slavic and West Slavic – though the situation in the latter is not as clear) of all accentual paradigms – cf. dialectal Croatian (Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian) gen^{pl} *krâv* ‘cows’ (from *kràva*, a. p. A), gen^{pl} *žēn* ‘women’ (from *ženà*, a. p. B), gen^{pl} *vōd* ‘waters’ (from *vodà*, a. p. C) – as caused by the old ending *-ṛ < post-Proto-Indo-European *-ōm (cf. more details with references in Kapović 2017a: 389–390). The advantage of such a theory is that it not only explains the reflexes in all three accentual paradigms phonetically and in a simple manner (a long ending that has a tendency to drop, at least in certain conditions, lengthens the preceding syllable), but also simply and convincingly explains otherwise aberrant endings – Neo-Štokavian *-ā* (Old Štokavian *-ã*) and Slovene *-á* (cf. Kapović 2015: 537–540).

Kortlandt’s explanation, on the other hand, is not phonetically regular for all accentual paradigms and involves analogies, some of which are completely unbelievable. In his view (e.g. Kortlandt 2011: 54), only *vōd* (C) is phonetically regular. Gen^{pl} *žēn* (B) is analogical to *vōd*, which is not impossible although it introduces an unnecessary analogy, but the real problem is *krâv* (A) (the same in Slovene, cf. also Czech *krav* from *kráva*) where the supposed analogy, which Kortlandt does not really explain, looks very strange. It is difficult to grasp how *krâv* can be analogical to *vōd*. Likewise, the old long *-ṛ can explain length in posttonic syllables of a. p. *a* forms like gen^{pl} *jăgōd* ‘strawberries’ phonetically (again, a long ending with a tendency to disappear in certain conditions lengthens the preceding syllable), while in Kortlandt’s theory those also have to be analogical.

Additionally, what is problematic is his explanation that the supposedly only phonetic lengthening, the one in *vōd* (C), is due not to the old *-ṛ but to the retraction of the accent from the old **vodṛ* – Kortlandt believes that retraction of stress from a weakening yer causes regular lengthening of a preceding short vowel. While I agree that such a retraction causes regular phonetic lengthening in the case of a resonant (or at least **m* and **v*) preceding the final yer (cf. the lengthening in the dat^{pl} – Old Štokavian *sinovōm* ‘sons’, Slovene *možēm* ‘husbands’,⁴⁵ Old Kajkavian (Pergošić) *lughoom* ‘groves’⁴⁶ and the lengthening

⁴⁵ By itself, Slovene dat^{pl} *možēm* could be analogical to loc^{pl} *možéh* (from the expected *-ṛxṛ).

⁴⁶ Cf. the details and references in Kapović 2015: 366–367. Czech dat^{pl} *-ům* is not informative since it could be secondary because of a later preresonant lengthening (cf. *dům* ‘house’ < **dōmṛ*).

in gen^{pl} like Old Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian *sinōv* ‘sons’, Slovene *sinóv*)⁴⁷ I do not find the cases with non-resonants convincing. Cf. the lack of the supposed retraction lengthening in forms like Štokavian *jěst* ‘is’ < **jestb* (cf. also Czech *jest*), (secondary) Štokavian aorist *rěkoh* ‘I said’ < **rekoxb* (cf. also Old Czech *řečech* ‘I said’,⁴⁸ *vedech* ‘I knew’), and Štokavian 2^{sg} *tréseš* ‘you shake’ < **tręsešb* (cf. also Czech *třeseš*). While one could imagine that Štokavian *jěst* is analogical to *jěsi* ‘thou are’ (however, Czech *jest* can hardly be analogical to *jsi* and other forms in *js-*) and *rěkoh* to *rěkosmo* ‘we said’, *rěkoste* ‘you said’ (where no lengthening is possible), the same is not true for forms like *tréseš*. Though forms like *trésěš* (older/dialectal *trēsěš*, cf. also Slovak *trasiěš*) do indeed exist (cf. Kapović 2015: 367–370), they can be easily explained as analogical to the 2^{sg} *lovíš* ‘you hunt’ type, and the final *-ěš*, *-ě* can hardly be original since in that case, as we have already mentioned in the paper, one would expect a shortened root vowel in Western South Slavic (i.e. ***trēsěš*, ***trēsě*), which is not attested anywhere. Thus, the case for a general retraction lengthening from a falling yer seems to be weak and, in any case, it is hardly necessary to explain the lengthening in genitive plural forms.

Kortlandt (2018: 292) first says that “Kapović still adheres to the outdated view that the Proto-Indo-European gen.pl. ending was *-ōm, for which there is no evidence”. However, Kortlandt actually misrepresents my position. I take the short *-om (not *-ōm) to be the original Proto-Indo-European gen^{pl} ending⁴⁹ and consider the long *-ōm a post-Proto-Indo-European contractional development in *o*-stems (*-o-om)⁵⁰ and *eh*₂-stems (*-eh₂-om), which is then generalized in certain languages. This is hardly an unusual position – for an overview of different reconstructions and problems concerning the Proto-Indo-European gen^{pl} cf. e.g. Olander 2015: 255–257, 261–265.⁵¹ Still, negating the existence of Proto-Indo-European *-ōm with harsh rhetorics⁵² is hardly a proper way to go when

⁴⁷ In trisyllabic forms, the old short *-b would be expected (see below), thus *-ōv* should probably be derived from *-*ovb* (not *-*ovb̄*) < Proto-Indo-European *-*ew-om* (with a short *-om).

⁴⁸ However, the older *řech* ‘I said’ (cf. Lamprecht, Šlosar and Bauer 1986: 240) lacks (the expected) length as well.

⁴⁹ Cf. Kapović 2017d: 63, 65, 67.

⁵⁰ Proto-Indo-European most likely still had non-contracted *-o-om but a seemingly contracted *-ōm is often traditionally reconstructed in this and similar cases.

⁵¹ Unfortunately, Olander somehow almost completely misses to comment on the possibility that Slavic *-b* was perhaps really *-*b̄*, together with the accentological indications for that theory.

⁵² Even if one does not agree with a view, the view should be acknowledged and tackled, especially if it is widespread (cf. Olander 2015: 256).

evaluating Slavic evidence for the reconstruction of *-ǭ. This long *-ǭ seems to have yielded the same results as the plain *-ǫ in most Slavic dialects (e.g. in East Slavic), but has left accentual (the mentioned lengthening of the *krāv*, *žēn*, *vōd* type), and more rarely morphological (Old Štokavian -ǭ, Slovene -ǭ) traces in Western South Slavic and the Czech-Slovak area of West Slavic.⁵³

As concerns the Štokavian gen^{pl} ending -ǭ, Kortlandt (2018: 292) simply says “The S/Cr. ending -ǭ does not continue an original long jer but was introduced on the analogy of the loc.pl. ending of the *i*- and *u*-stems”, adding references that elucidate his opinion on the matter. It seems that Kortlandt believes that Old Štokavian -ǭ (-ьъ in 14th century Old Serbian texts⁵⁴) and Slovene -ǭ, though they look as the same ending, are not actually genetically connected in any way. Kortlandt (1978: 286) apparently follows Oblak (1890: 439–440) for the explanation of Slovene -ǭ and Johnson (1972: 349–358) for the explanation of Štokavian -ǭ – neither of those explanations are either convincing or simple.

Oblak (*ibid.*) believes that the (standard) Slovene gen^{pl} variant ending -ǭ (*gorá* together with *gór* ‘mountains’) somehow originates in analogy to dat^{pl} -*am*, loc^{pl} -*ah*, instr^{pl} -*ami*. It is completely unclear how a new ending can spring right

⁵³ Kortlandt (2018: 292) adduces several West Slavic gen^{pl} forms in order to prove that the lengthening is found only in old mobile stems, but they are hardly decisive (cf. Kapović 2017a: 397–398 for Old Czech gen^{pl} forms mentioned by Trávníček 1935: 270). Forms like Polish gen^{pl} *blot* ‘marshes’ are expected, whether one wants to derive them from *bǫltъ or *bǫltъ (as in Czech). Polish does have gen^{pl} forms like *stóp* ‘feet’, *cnót* ‘virtues’, *robót* ‘construction works’, *mąk* ‘torments’ but these are probably analogical to *osób* ‘persons’, *szkod* ‘damages’, *gęb* (also *gęb*) ‘faces’ with the length caused by the original final voiced segment (cf. Ivšić 1911: 185). Czech gen^{pl} forms like *krav* ‘cows’ (as opposed to *kráva* < *kǫrva) are traditionally (and rightly so) derived from *kǫrvъ (like the Western South Slavic *krāv*). Slovincian gen^{pl} *mjōyn* ‘names’ (Lorenz 1903: 266) is not reliable because of the automatic Slovincian lengthening before final voiced segments (cf. Lorenz 1903: 241–242, 266, Stankiewicz 1993: 302–303), which “apparently superseded the morphological lengthening in the gen. pl. with the zero ending” (Stankiewicz 1993: 308). The Slovincian gen^{pl} *votrěčōut* ‘children’, as opposed to gen^{pl} *jāghāt* ‘lambs’ (Lorenz 1903: 201, 269–270), only shows a length typical for end-stressed gen^{pl} forms with zero ending (cf. *ibid.* 242), which is in synchronic agreement with the always long end-stressed endings in mobile paradigms (Stankiewicz 1993: 303–306). The difference of *jāghāt* and *votrěčōut* is due to their different synchronic paradigms, which is synchronically connected to their different number of syllables in nom^{sg} (Lorenz 1903: 201, 269–270). The automatic relation of accent and length is clearly seen in the variants in gen^{pl} *votrěčōut* (end-stress and length) and *votrěčāt* (penultimate stress without length) (Lorenz 1903: 201, 270, Stankiewicz 1993: 307). All this makes Slovincian forms historically unreliable. Lengthening also occurs in some words with a fixed stress and a monosyllabic root, e.g. in gen^{pl} *kāuč* (besides *kāč*) and *sārċ* (besides *sārċ*) from *kāčā* ‘duck’ and *sārċā* ‘magpie’ (Lorenz 1903: 254, Stankiewicz 1993: 303). Dialectal (Jastarnia) gen^{pl} forms *dūs* ‘souls’, *rǫċ* ‘arms’ (Stankiewicz 1993: 308, with his transcription) are expected from the old *dūšъ, *rǫċъ. Ukrainian gen^{pl} *kolōd* ‘logs’ < *kǫldъ but *ōpōd* ‘beards’ < *bǫrdъ, that Kortlandt (*ibid.*) also adduces, would only point to possible different reflexes of the old *ǫR and *ǫR (though there are many counterexamples).

⁵⁴ Brozović and Ivić 1988: 24.

out of thin air by analogy to a the first syllable of other endings. While this explanation may seem formally satisfying at first glance, it is difficult to imagine how this kind of analogy would actually work. What is more, this analogy does not explain the accent of Slovene *-á*. If this is an analogy to *dat^{pl} -àm*, *loc^{pl} -àh*, *instr^{pl} -âmi*, why does *-á* have a completely different accent? How is that motivated? Now, an easy solution would be to say that *-á* has the accent by analogy to the *i*-stem *gen^{pl} -í*, but where is the motivation for that? Why would *gen^{pl} gorá* be made by analogy to *gen^{pl} kostí* ‘bones’? Where is e.g. the structural similarity of *gen^{pl} gorá* – *dat^{pl} goràm* – *loc^{pl} goràh* – *instr^{pl} gorâmi* and *gen^{pl} kostí* – *dat^{pl} kostêm* – *loc^{pl} kostêh* – *instr^{pl} kostmi*? Both the endings and accents in *dat/loc/instr^{pl}* of *ā*- and *i*-stems are different. Neither Oblak nor Kortlandt provide answers to these questions. Now, one of the reasons why Oblak (*ibid.*) thinks that the it is “schwerlich zu glauben” in the genetic relation of Štokavian *-ā* and Slovene *-á* is the fact that the Slovene ending is attested only from the 17th century. This is indeed a valid point – however, if one is to take that Slovene *-á* derives only from **-ǣ* (thus in a. p. c), only in certain positions (originally in trisyllabic forms – see below) and only in some dialects (in others, **-ǣ* may have phonetically just disappeared like **-ǣ* and **-ǣ*), this becomes far less suspicious. In any case, if one is to believe that Slovene *-á* is somehow secondary (in spite of the fact that Oblak’s hypothesis looks very unconvincing and does not take accent into account at all), then one should also believe the following:

- a) it is just a coincidence that Slovene and Štokavian happen to have exactly the same (variant) ending⁵⁵ in *gen^{pl}*
- b) it is just a coincidence that a long (accented) yer, if it were not to disappear, would yield exactly that in both Slovene and Štokavian (cf. *dân* ‘day’ < **dǣnъ* in both)
- c) it is just a coincidence that the old Slavic ending was *-ǣ* and that Old Serbian Cyrillic texts (14th century) have *-bb* attested
- d) it is just a coincidence that *-á* appears only in the old a. p. C in Slovene (exactly where one would expect the accented **-ǣ*, whether long or short)

Can all of that be just a coincidence? Certainly, but not very likely.

⁵⁵ Many Štokavian dialects preserve(d) traces of *gen^{pl} -Ø* ending in some cases (e.g. *stòtìn* ‘hundreds’).

Johnson's (1972: 349–358) scenario for a secondary origin of Štokavian *-ā* is very similar to Oblak's Slovene scenario and has similar problems. His basic claim (*ibid.* 356) is that Štokavian new gen^{pl} *žēn-ā (dat^{pl} *ženam – loc^{pl} *ženah – instr^{pl} *ženami) somehow analogically mirrors *i*-stem gen^{pl} *kost-ī (dat^{pl} *kostim – loc^{pl} *kostih – instr^{pl} *kostimi⁵⁶). Again, the analogy in *ā*-stems internally is very abstract and it is hard to picture it and the analogy to the less frequent *i*-stems is also doubtful. Again, neither Johnson (*ibid.*) nor Kortlandt (1978: 286) explain the accentual details (i.e. how one gets from the older *glāv to younger *glāvā, etc.), which are highly problematic. If one derives the final *-ā* from the old *-ī, the form *glāvā* is more or less a direct reflex and easy to understand (disregarding here the length of the root and the disyllabic form – see below). But if one starts from the original *glāv* and adds a secondary *-ā* of whatever origin, it is not so easy to explain the actually attested *glāvā* > *glāvā*. Yes, *glāvā* could perhaps be analogical to the *i*-stem gen^{pl} *vlāstī* 'governments' or gen^{pl} *slūgū* 'servants' (though *slūgū* is older) and perhaps instr^{sg} *glāvōm*, but that kind of analogy is hardly simple and it is strange that no dialect shows ***glāvā* > ***glāvā* from a supposedly direct combination of *glāv* plus the secondary *-ā*. Now, if one wants to put the *ā*-stems in correlation to the *i*-stems as Johnson did,⁵⁷ gen^{pl} *glāvā* 'heads' (C:) can theoretically be, as already said, analogical to the *i*-stem *vlāstī* 'governments' (C:), while *trāvā* 'grass [pl]' (B:) can be analogical to *glāvā* (C:). However, *vōdā* 'waters' (C) is not in accord with *i*-stem *kōstī* 'bones' (C) and *krāvā* 'cows' (A) is also different from *i*-stem *smrītī* 'deaths' (A) (there is no root lengthening in the *i*-stem a. p. A). Thus, the accent in long a. p. C: should be analogical to *i*-stems (**glāvā* in analogy to **vlāstī*) in order to get the actually attested forms, but in short a. p. C the long root of **vōdā* must not conform to the *i*-stem **kōstī* (the same in a. p. A) in order for the forms to work. All this is perhaps not impossible but does not look very convincing.⁵⁸

The major problem with Johnson's hypothesis is that, even if one takes his *-a* by analogy to *-am/-ah/-ami* suggestion as possible, Štokavian *-ā* would be an

⁵⁶ These supposed dat/loc/instr^{pl} forms are actually all innovative and younger.

⁵⁷ We'll take the Neo-Štokavian forms as example further on.

⁵⁸ Of course, analogies are needed in other theories as well – also in mine that I will present further on. However, in my theory, all the analogies occur in *ā*- (and *o*-) stems internally, which is much simpler and convincing and there is no need for the supposed and problematic influence of the less frequent and less prototypical *i*-stems. E.g. in my theory (see below), *žēnā* 'women' (B) is analogical to *vōdā* (C) (old *žēn* = *vōd*), while disyllabic *vōdā* (C) is analogical to trisyllabic *iz_vōdā* (C) and *sramótā* 'shame [pl]' (C). These are all rather trivial analogies unlike the ones Johnson's (and presumably Kortlandt's) hypothesis would have to entail.

original *a, not a yer. Now this contradicts not only Old Serbian *-bb* but also Montenegrin dialectal *-ǣ(h)*, where [ǣ] points to *ь/ъ and not to *a. Kortlandt (1978: 297¹¹) does not mention *-bb* and tries to relativize *-ǣ(h)* by pointing to some secondary forms where *ǣ* occurs for old *a (cf. Милетић 1940: 225–239 for the historical origin of *ǣ* in the Montenegrin dialect of Crmnica). However, certain secondary forms in some Montenegrin dialects hardly dispute the fact that /ǣ/ generally derives from *ь/ъ. Kortlandt (*ibid.*) explains *-ǣ(h)* by claiming “the vowel timbre of the gen. pl. ending must be derived from the original loc. pl. endings of the *i*- and *u*-stems, which contained a jer”, which is one more complication in his explanation.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ Speaking of loc^{pl} of *i*- and *u*-stems, there is another hypothesis of the supposed secondary origin of Štokavian *-ā*. Stankiewicz (1978: 674–675) claims that Štokavian *-ā* originated directly from loc^{pl} endings *ьхъ/ъхъ, which would explain the vocalism in Montenegrin dialects. While there are certainly good reasons for the connection of genitive and locative (cf. the same original forms in adjectival-pronominal declension as gen/loc^{pl} *nasъ* ‘us’ or *dobryxъ* ‘good’ and Montenegrin gen/loc^{pl} *-ǣ(h)*), the transference of the original locative ending to the genitive is hardly simple and self-explanatory. What is especially problematic is that an ending should be taken from the not so frequent *i*-stems (Štokavian has no trace of the original *ьхъ in the loc^{pl} of *i*-stems in modern dialects) and moribund *u*-stems (which have disappeared early altogether, though leaving traces in *o*-stems) to both *o*- and *ā*-stems, while simultaneously changing cases. The spread of the gen^{pl} ending *-ovъ* from the *u*-stems to the *o*-stems (and its later spread through the whole *o*-stem plural in some dialects, due to influence of the frequent words like nom^{pl} *synove* ‘sons’) is much easier to understand (forms like *gradōv* ‘towns’ are more morphologically transparent and salient than the original gen^{pl} *grād, which differs from the nom/acc^{sg} in accent only), just like the spread of the old *u*-stem ending loc^{sg} *-u* (*gradu* instead of *gradě* by analogy to *synu*), etc. However, it is difficult to imagine why gen^{pl} *ženъ* or *zobъ* ‘teeth’ would change to the supposed gen^{pl} **zěpъхъ or **zōbъхъ by analogy to loc^{pl} *kostryxъ* ‘bones’ and *synъxъ*. The final *-h* in gen/loc^{pl} in *-ǣh* (> *-ǣk*, *-ǣg*) in Montenegrin dialects (where *ǣ* is the regular reflex of the yers) is more easily explained as analogical to adjectives (gen^{pl} *dobrijeh koňǣ* > *dobrijeh koňǣh* ‘good horses’), which would also explain the gen/loc^{pl} case syncretism since these are the same in definite adjectives. In some Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects, the adjectival gen^{pl} ending *-ih* is secondarily adopted by nouns as well (e.g. *koňih* ‘horses’). Even if one is to accept that the gen^{pl} *-ā* is originally *ах < *ь/ъхъ, not only does that ending have to change both the case and the declension, but the length of that **āх has to be explained as secondary (presumably by analogy to the nominal *-ī*, *-ū* and/or adjectival-pronominal *-ijēh*, *-īh*), which is possible but adds another analogy necessary for this theory to work. What is more, the accent itself is problematic just like in Johnson-Kortlandt’s scenario. Furthermore, older texts, that should supposedly have the final *-h* in the gen^{pl}, never seem to have it – cf. the already mentioned Old Serbian (14th century) *-bb* with no *-h* at the end. An indicative case that proves the original *h*-lessness of the gen^{pl} ending *-ā* in Štokavian is the dialect of Dubrovnik. There, unlike most modern Štokavian dialects, the old *x is preserved in almost all positions (one exception in e.g. Držić’s (1996: 59) language is that the imperfect form *htijah* ‘I wanted’ changes to *ktijah*, i.e. *ht-* > *kt-*), but it still never has it in the genitive plural nominal endings. Cf. already in Marin Držić’s 16th century play *Novela od Stanca* the phrases *s Duičinih skalina* ‘from Duičina’s stairs’, *od trava oda svih* ‘of all the grass’, *od ovih junaka* ‘of these heroes’ (Držić 1996: 60, 69, 77), where the adjectives and pronouns (gen^{pl} *Dučinih*, *svih*, *ovih*) show the regular final *-h*, while the nouns lack it (gen^{pl} *skalina*, *trava*, *junaka*). One could theoretically claim that this is analogical to phrases like *smješnijeh tvojijeh riječi* ‘your funny words’ (Držić 1996: 73), but it is not very likely that the supposedly older **travah, **junakah would become *travā*, *junakā* by analogy to *riječi* (and perhaps those rare genitive dual → plural forms like *slugū* ‘servants’) – for the Dubrovnik gen^{pl} in general, cf. also Rešetar 1933: 165–166.

In my view (cf. Kapović 2015: 539), the original *-ǭ in gen^{pl} (of *o*- and *ā*-stems),⁶⁰ stemming from the older *-ōm (< Proto-Indo-European *-o-om and *-eh₂-om), behaved as the short *-ǭ in some Slavic areas (e.g. in East Slavic). However, in South Slavic (with traces mostly in Western South Slavic)⁶¹ and West Slavic the ending *-ǭ lengthens preceding syllables (the situation is less clear in West Slavic than in South Slavic). The ending *-ǭ itself always disappears in West (and East) Slavic, just like the short *-ǭ, and the same may easily be true for Kajkavian and Čakavian (and perhaps even for some Štokavian dialects) in South Slavic. In Štokavian and Slovene the old *-ǭ disappears in most cases, but not in all of them. It is originally preserved when under accent (thus in a. p. *c* only) in trisyllabic forms,⁶² where it yields *-ǭ̄. This variant ending can then disappear in some dialects, linger on as remnant in others (as a variant in Standard Slovene, e.g. gen^{pl} *gorá* together with *gór* ‘mountains’), while in some it may eventually secondarily and gradually spread to become the main ending in gen^{pl} of *o*- and *ā*-stems (as is the case in most Štokavian dialects). The original reflexes must have been something like the following⁶³ (nouns with the originally short root are adduced for a. p. *b* and *c* to indicate the lengthening):

	a. p. A	a. p. B	a. p. C
disyllabic	*krāv ‘cows’	*žēn ‘women’	*vōd ‘waters’
trisyllabic	*jǎgōd ‘strawberries’ *lǒpāt/lopāt ‘shovels’ ⁶⁴	⁶⁵	*iz_vōdǭ ‘from the waters’ *sramōtǭ ‘shame’

⁶⁰ Other stems had a short *-ǭ/-ǭ from Proto-Indo-European *-om (cf. Kapović 2017d: 107).

⁶¹ The only trace of the lengthening in Bulgarian seems to be the retracted accent in gen^{pl} *zōdinъ* from *zōdina* ‘year’ (Stang 1957: 25).

⁶² In accordance with the general rules of reflection of old length in final open (dominant) syllables, where length is preserved in trisyllables and shortened in disyllables. Cf. forms such as Croatian dialectal nom^{pl} *drvà* ‘wood’ but *nebesā* ‘heaven’ (in same dialects), Slovene *bila* (< *bīlā) ‘hit’ but *nosīla* (< *nosīlā) ‘carried’, Slovene *kráva* ‘cow’ and Kajkavian *kráva* (< *kōrvā) but Slovene/Kajkavian *otāva* ‘aftermath (second mowing)’ < *otāvā, Bednja Kajkavian *grīsti* ‘to bite’ (< *grýstī) but *pregrēisti* ‘to bite through’ (< *pergrýstī). Cf. the details and references in Kapović 2015: 526–531.

⁶³ Only *ā*-stem nouns are given as an example, but the same would go for *o*-stem (masculine and neuter) nouns as well (e.g. gen^{pl} *rāt ‘wars’, *jèzik/jezik ‘languages’ (A); *kōn ‘horses’, *živōt ‘lives’ (B); *rōg ‘horns’, *od_rōgǭ ‘from the horns’, *korākǭ ‘steps’ (C)), but there the *u*-stem gen^{pl} ending *-ov* made an early entrance as well.

⁶⁴ Cf. Kapović 2015: 349–354 for the retraction in Štokavian and southern Čakavian.

⁶⁵ Old trisyllabic a. p. *b* *ā*-stems with a short final root vowel were rare (e.g. recessive-root *-ьca derivatives).

	Lengthening in front of unaccented *-ǫ before it dropped.	The original short neo-acute is lengthened (*žǫnǫ > *žǫn) before the yer dropped.	<p>In disyllables (*vodǫ), the yer lengthens the root (*vōdǫ), then it shortens (*vōdǫ^o),⁶⁶ the accent retracts to the root (*vōdǫ), and the yer drops.</p> <p>In trisyllables, the final long yer is preserved under accent (*sormotǫ > *sramotǫ). The length of the originally short root vowels is the result of later generalization.⁶⁷</p>
--	---	---	---

Kortlandt (1978: 286) claims that Štokavian *-ā* cannot be old because “Final *-ǫ* was lost in the Serbo-Slovenian dialectal area as early as the tenth century, while the gen. pl. ending *-ā* appeared in Serbo-Croat in the 14th and in Slovene in the 17th century.” The argument with the loss of the final short *-ǫ* is hardly compelling since the very essence of the theory we have laid out here is that the long final *-ǫ* had a different reflex in some positions (when stressed in a. p. c in trisyllabic forms) in some (Štokavian) dialects. The time of attestation of the ending in Štokavian and Slovene is also hardly a problem, since the material in general is very scanty – so much so that some (e.g. Svane 1958: 80) believe that attempts at explaining the ending *-ā* are doomed to fail from the very start. If

⁶⁶ By **o* I here represent the (shortened) old acute, which merges with the old long “neo-acute” (= Balto-Slavic dominant circumflex) in disyllables. The lengthening of the root (*vōd-) is preserved due to the shortening of the original final **o* (the shortening of *-ǫ* in disyllabic forms must have occurred after the lengthening of the root but before the general shortening of all long vowels before *o*, cf. Kapović 2015: 498–501). One could theoretically presume that the final accented yer was preserved in disyllabic forms as well, but then we would have the original **vōdǫ with a shortened root and the modern lengthening of trisyllabic forms like *sramótā* ‘shame (pl.)’ would be more difficult to explain (i.e. the lengthening of the stem in a. p. C should then be analogical to a. p. B, which is less convincing). That would also go against the rule in open final syllables in Slavic that length is preserved in trisyllables and shortened in disyllables.

⁶⁷ Since the originally short roots were lengthened in **vōdǫ* (> **vōdǫ* > **vōdǫ*), it makes sense that it was probably originally lengthened in **sramōtǫ* as well, which would subsequently be again shortened, since there were no long syllables before long neo-acute (and long stressed vowels in general), and again lengthened by analogy later (thus the modern Neo-Štokavian *sramótā*).

one is to originally start with a complex gen^{pl} ending distribution (*krâv – *žĕn – *planinĕ) in some (Štokavian) dialects only, why would it be strange that -ā is attested from the 14th century (the same goes for Slovene *mutatis mutandis*)? It is simple enough – the ending -ā was attested when it started to spread (both internally in the system – at the expense of -Ø – and through diffusion between different dialects). Kortlandt’s (*ibid.*) point that “the rise of the medial syllable in SCr. *sestārā, otācā* would remain unexplained if -ā continued the Proto-Slavic ending -b” is valid (cf. the same objection in Oblak 1890: 439), but only if one is to assume that *-b̄ yielded -ā generally. If one is to take that -ā is the phonetic reflex only in some positions,⁶⁸ one can just assume the original forms such as gen^{pl} *metāl ‘brooms’ < *metb̄l̄ with the same development as in *vōd < *vodb̄.⁶⁹ The ending -ā in forms like *metālā* would then be secondary, just like in *jägōdā, vōdā*, etc.

To conclude, Kortlandt’s doctrine presupposes a number of analogies (some of which, like gen^{pl} *krâv* supposedly by analogy to *vōd*, or gen^{pl} *vōdā* supposedly by a very abstract and strange analogy, seem completely implausible) and bases itself on dubious claim of the general retractional lengthening in Slavic (which is not really supported by the data, especially by the 2^{sg} *trĕsĕš* type), while my theory explains the root lengthening in the genitive plural phonetically and additionally provides a rather simple phonetic interpretation of the Štokavian/Slovene -ā as well.⁷⁰

4. The accentual type *bôg/kòkôť*

As I have shown clearly and in detail (Kapović 2015: 231–233, 627, 2017a: 391–394), in Western South Slavic the old short circumflex is lengthened in monosyllabic roots (plus a final yer), thus *bôgь ‘god’ > Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajka-

⁶⁸ Cf. also Brozović and Ivić 1988: 24 (Ivić does not give the specifics on the exact original reflexes/distribution of -ā and -Ø) and Matasović 2008: 186 (he speculates that -ā originally appeared only in a. p. B and C).

⁶⁹ Forms like *metb̄l̄ would behave like *vodā in the same way in which *gŭmb̄nô ‘threshing floor’ behaves like *vīnô ‘wine’ and *ôťčŭx̄ ‘step-father’ like *kōrākъ ‘step’ when it comes to the development of pre- and posttonic length (i.e. the yer in words like *metb̄l̄ would not count as a third syllable and the word would be treated as disyllabic, just like *vodā), cf. Kapović 2015: 539¹⁹⁹¹.

⁷⁰ Due to reasons of space, not all of the problems concerning the gen^{pl} ending could be tackled here – for additional details cf. Kapović [to appear].

vian *bôg*, Slovene *bôg*. The same lengthening occurs in polysyllabic forms in Štokavian/Čakavian with an initial circumflex in a. p. *c*, where the unaccented last syllable of the root is also lengthened (Štokavian/Čakavian *kòkòt* ‘rooster’) – this lengthening cannot be seen in Kajkavian/Slovene due to the early disappearance of posttonic length in them and/or progressive shift of the circumflex (cf. Slovene *kokôti*). Though the change is subsequently somewhat obfuscated by later changes (like preresonant lengthening in Čakavian or the secondary *kàmēn* ‘rock’ type in Neo-Štokavian),⁷¹ it is clear that the lengthening in the *kòkòt* type cannot be separated from the lengthening in the *bôg* type – both occur in a. p. *c* only, in forms with initial circumflex only, and regardless of the final consonant or declension (cf. the *i*-stem type *mlàdòst* ‘youth’). The lengthening in the Štokavian/Čakavian *kòkòt* type is in line with the general lengthening tendency in a. p. *c* forms with initial accent, not only with (Western South Slavic) **bògъ > bôg* and the already mentioned Slovene (and marginally Kajkavian and Čakavian) **kòkòtъ > kokôti* type, but also with the (Western South Slavic) **s’to > stô* ‘hundred’ type.⁷²

That the lengthening in the *kòkòt* type is the same as the one in the *bôg* type is also clear when one considers Štokavian polysyllabic forms like *pòmòc* ‘help’ (gen^{sg} *pòmòci*) with monosyllabic forms like *mòc* ‘power’ (gen^{sg} *mòci*) – acc^{sg} *pò mòmòc* ‘for the power’.⁷³ The lengthening in the polysyllabic *pòmòc* and the prepositional phrase *pò mòmòc* is obviously exactly the same phenomenon. Otherwise, one should have to, disregarding the Occam’s razor rule to an utmost extreme, interpret the length in *pò mòmòc* as analogical to the form *mòc* (which is unnecessary), while the length in *pòmòc* would have to be, unconvincingly, something completely different.

⁷¹ Cf. Kapović 2015: 554–583, 639–640. The *kàmēn* type analogical secondary lengthening occurs only in originally a. p. *a* *o*-stems ending in an *-n#* and *-r#* (cf. also *gùštēr* ‘lizard’) and, surprisingly, in the acc^{sg} *màtēr* (which is not completely clear – an analogy to the *i*-stem acc^{sg} *kčēr* ‘daughter’ or even *vèčēr* ‘evening’ does not look all too convincing), but not in *n*-participles like *pàžēn* ‘watched out for’ or adjectives like *màtōr* ‘old’ (interestingly enough, there are no a. p. *C* forms with initial stress in *n*-participles). This would point to the analogical origin of the length: e.g. *kàmēn* (< acc^{sg} **kāmēnъ*, a. p. *a*) by analogy to *grèbēn* ‘ridge’ (< acc^{sg} **grèbēnъ*, a. p. *c*) and *jāvōr* ‘maple’ (< **āvōrъ*, a. p. *a*) by analogy to *gōvōr* ‘talk’ (< **gōvōrъ*, a. p. *c*). See also footnote 80 in this article for the *A* → *C* shift in *o*-stems, which is connected to this process.

⁷² Cf. the details in Kapović 2015: 233–238.

⁷³ I deliberately adduce the example where the pronunciation of the etymologically identical prefix-derivative and the prepositional phrase is completely the same in order to illustrate the point. Of course, there are hundreds of examples which are not derivationally connected, e.g. *gòspōd* ‘Lord’ (gen^{sg} *gòspoda*) and *ròd* ‘kin’ (gen^{sg} *ròda*) – acc^{sg} *pò ròd* ‘for the kin’.

Kortlandt pushes the lengthening of *bǫgъ further back into the history and fails to see the obvious connection of this type to the *kǫkōt* type lengthening. Kortlandt (2018: 292) explains that when “Dybo’s law shifted the stress to the following syllable (...) yielding long falling vowels in opposition to short and long rising vowels in non-initial syllables, the tonal opposition on short vowels became limited to monosyllables, e.g. *bǫgъ versus *kǫηъ. This anomalous distribution was resolved by lengthening short falling vowels in monosyllables (...), resulting in the same opposition between short and long rising versus long falling vowels that existed in non-initial syllables (...)”. The problem with this explanation is that it obliges one to accept certain questionable views. The first one is that it is not at all clear that all *’ (and *’’) not preceding a yer shifted to the right, e.g. in forms like 2^{sg} *mǫžešъ ‘you can’, *nōsīšъ ‘you carry’, definite adjective *nǫvъjъ ‘new’, etc. (cf. Kapović 2017a: 390²¹). The second one is that Kortlandt’s theory only works if one accepts that the result of the rightward shift onto a long non-acute vowel yields a new long falling accent (e.g. **nōsīšъ), which is bogus (see the next section of this paper). The supposed Common Slavic *bǫgъ > **bǫgъ is a nice symmetrical explanation from the point of view of Kortlandt’s doctrine, but it is set upon questionable or clearly false presumptions and does not change anything substantial since the reflexes in all Slavic languages remain the same (*bǫgъ and **bǫgъ would yield exactly the same reflex in all languages). Thus, there is no point in reconstructing **bǫgъ instead of the obvious *bǫgъ. There was no lengthening in Common Slavic due to Dybo’s shift in order to set the same kind of the supposed tonal distinctions in initial as in medial syllables. The *bǫgъ > bǫg and *kǫkōtъ > kǫkōt lengthening was a later Western South Slavic innovation due to a simple compensatory lengthening caused by the fall of final yers, which occurred in all “phonologically accentless” forms in a. p. c⁷⁴ with an original final yer (except in instr^{sg} forms like *bǫgom* in a. p. C, where it probably disappeared early by analogy to *popǫm* ‘priest’ in a. p. B and *rǫtom* ‘war’ in a. p. A). Kortlandt (*ibid.*) has nothing to say on the lengthening in the *kǫkōt* type except that it is supposedly “a more recent development of analogical origin that did not reach all S/Cr. dialects and has nothing to do with the lengthening in

⁷⁴ Phonetically speaking, “phonologically accentless” forms had the absolute initial falling tone (*, *’), in opposition to the rising “neo-acute” tone (*, *’) and also rising (but different from the “neo-acute”) “old acute” tone (*’) – cf. the opposition of ~ and ’ in some modern Štokavian/Čakavian dialects as a typological parallel for two rising tonemes in a pitch system. Alternatively, “old acute” may have originally even been prosodically glottalized or the like.

bôg.” He adds nothing to prove that it is “more recent”, nothing to prove that it is “of analogical origin” (analogical to what exactly?), he remains vague about the change supposedly not reaching “all S/Cr. dialects” (though it is clear, as I have shown, that it is a trait of all Štokavian/Čakavian dialects,⁷⁵ while it cannot be present in Slovene/Kajkavian, which have no posttonic length and/or have progressive shift of the circumflex), and he offers no argumentation on why the length in *kòkòt* supposedly has nothing to do with the length in *bôg*. However, an ad hoc claim that a phenomenon is “more recent” and “of analogical origin”, without any argumentation to back it up, is hardly valid in a serious linguistic discussion. Pages of careful detailing of the *kòkòt* lengthening in Štokavian and Čakavian and discussing of data from different local dialects cannot just be dismissed without a shred of evidence – even if such claims would not produce strange assumptions like the one that *pòmôc* and *pòmôc* (also *môc*) have completely different origins of the length in the second syllable.⁷⁶

However, what is astonishing is the following claim (Kortlandt 2018: 292): “The length in S/Cr. *gòspòd* ‘lord’, *kòkòt* ‘rooster’, *kòkòš* ‘hen’, *mlàdòst* ‘youth’, *bòlèst* ‘illness’, *gòvòr* ‘speech’, *kòrèn* ‘root’, *plàmèn* ‘flame’, *jàblàn* ‘poplar’ beside *gòspod*, *kòkot*, *kòkoš*, *mlàdost*, *bòlest*, *gòvor*, *kòren*, *plàmen*, *jàblan* (...)”. This is simply factually wrong on a very basic level. First of all, there is no “beside” – there are no old variants with these words. As I have shown (Kapović 2015: 231–233, 2017a: 392–394) the lengthening of the unstressed syllable in forms ending in a yer in a. p. c is completely regular and expected in Štokavian and Čakavian (as already said, Slovene/Kajkavian lost posttonic length early and is thus irrelevant in this regard). There are no variants like *gòspòd*, *kòkòt*, *kòkòš*, *mlàdòst*, *bòlèst*, *gòvòr*, *kòrèn*, *plàmèn*, *jàblàn* anywhere in Štokavian/Čakavian, except in dialects without posttonic length (or with late phonetic loss of posttonic length in some positions)⁷⁷ or in very

⁷⁵ The situation in Štokavian is clear, the one in Čakavian is a bit more obfuscated (cf. Kapović 2017a: 392–394).

⁷⁶ Even if one was to claim that the length in both *pòmôc* and *pòmôc* is analogical to *môc*, that would neither be necessary nor would it help at all. While the length *pòmôc* can be connected to *môc*, how would one go about it if it comes to the length in words like *kòkòt*? If, on the other hand, the length in *pòmôc* does not have anything to do with the length in *môc*, but would have an origin in some completely different analogy of Kortlandt’s, that would be very peculiar, to say the least. How can one plausibly claim the the length in *pòmôc* has absolutely nothing to do with the length in *pòmôc* (and thus *môc*)?

⁷⁷ Cf. Kapović 2015: 750–762 for phonetic loss of posttonic length in Štokavian and Čakavian.

infrequent cases of clear later analogies. The famous Čakavian dialect of Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 1973) is, for instance, a very rare and exceptional example of a dialect with a late analogical loss of length in *o*-stems like *gòvor* ‘speech’. Kortlandt seems to believe that this is widespread, but that is not the case. The Vrgada forms are exceptions and, more so, easily explainable exceptions. The Vrgada forms like *gòvor* could be simply interpreted as analogical to all other cases (like gen^{sg} *gòvora*),⁷⁸ but were probably more influenced by the original a. p. A pattern.⁷⁹ That this is a late and simple analogy in Vrgada is proven by *i*-stems, where the expected lengthening in the nom/acc^{sg} is found in all cases like *kòkòš* ‘hen’ – gen^{sg} *kòkoši* (cf. the analysis in Kapović 2017a: 393–394), which is not accidental but is connected to the preservation of the original mobile a. p. C pattern in *i*-stems and the early loss of old polysyllabic a. p. *a* *i*-stems.⁸⁰ All Štokavian dialects (including literary Neo-Štokavian) that preserve posttonic length regularly have forms like *kòkòt* – gen^{sg} *kòkota*

⁷⁸ In other dialects, one may similarly find a later spread of length in all cases (e.g. gen^{sg} *gòvora* by analogy to the original *gòvor*).

⁷⁹ There is not enough data, but this analogical loss of the old quantitative alternation in the original a. p. C seems to be connected to the loss of end-stress in polysyllabic a. p. C words (and perhaps a complete shift to the a. p. A – but we cannot know if there are any old *preskakanje* forms like **nàkoren*, which would preserve the partial synchronic a. p. C even if forms like the old loc^{sg} **korenù* were lost), cf. loc^{sg} *u kòrenu* ‘root’ (Jurišić 1973), loc^{sg} *u blāgoslovu* ‘blessing’ (Jurišić 1966: 73). Thus, the old a. p. C words with a short suffix seem to have adapted the pattern of the a. p. A words like *kāmen* – gen^{sg} *kāmena*, which had no quantitative pattern and no accent mobility. Cf. also the word *nòhat* ‘nail’, where no original lengthening is expected because of the yer suffix (**nògътъ*), which also lacks the original end-stress in loc^{sg} but has *nànohtu* (like the acc^{sg} *pòd nohat*) (*ibid.*). However, the original a. p. *a* word (but with a long suffix) *mīsēc* ‘month, moon’ has a secondary C-end-stress in loc^{sg} *u misēcū* ‘month’, which would point to an opposite tendency, perhaps in words with a long suffix (this could be connected to the very frequent and dialectally widespread secondary mobility in the plural, especially oblique, cases of this word – cf. Vrgada gen^{pl} *misēcī* and Neo-Štokavian *mjesécī*).

⁸⁰ Unlike the *o*-stems, where the loss of the original *gòvōr* – *gòvora* pattern seems to be connected to the loss of the original stress mobility in old a. p. C words (cf. the already cited secondary loc^{sg} *u kòrenu* instead of the expected **u korenù* by analogy to the original *na kāmenu* in a. p. A), the old mobile stress has been preserved in *i*-stems in Vrgada: cf. loc^{sg} *u jesenī* ‘autumn’, *u mladostī* ‘youth’ (also with long suffixes: *po zapovīdī* ‘order’) (Jurišić 1966: 81). This preservation of the old mobility in *i*-stems is not an accident. In the *o*-stems, the original a. p. *a* words (like *kāmen*) were numerous and well preserved and could have influenced the original a. p. *c* words (like *plāmen* ‘flame’) both in the quantitative alternation elimination (*plāmēn* instead of the older **plāmēn*) and in the accentual mobility (cf. the secondary loc^{sg} *u blāgoslovu* instead of the expected **u blagoslovū*). However, in the *i*-stems the original a. p. *a* polysyllabic words (with initial *ī*) shifted completely to a. p. C in all the dialects, as far as is known (Kapović 2007: 74). This occurred in Vrgada as well, cf. loc^{sg} *u starostī* ‘old age’ and *na pamēī* ‘mind’ (Jurišić *ibid.*) in words belonging originally to a. p. *a* (**stāroost*, **pāmęty*). Because of this early shift of *a* → C there was no possibility of an interparadigmatic analogical generalization of brevity as in *o*-stems and the possible intraparadigmatic generalization of brevity obviously never occurred. Thus it is clear that the preservation of the old a. p. C mobility and the old a. p. C quantitative alternation go hand in hand in the Vrgada dialect.

in *o*-stems (*kòkōtь, a. p. *c*)⁸¹ and *kòkōš* – gen^{sg} *kòkoši* in *i*-stems (*kòkošь, a. p. *c*),⁸² cf. the lack of length in Standard Neo-Štokavian forms like *pàžen* ‘taken care of’ < *pàžēnь (a. p. *a*) or *nòšen* ‘carried’ < *nòšēnь (a. p. *a*), which point to no lengthening outside of a. p. *c* (i.e. outside of forms with an initial old circumflex).⁸³ As my careful analysis of Čakavian has shown, the *kòkōš* – gen^{sg} *kòkoši* type in *i*-stems is found in all Čakavian dialects that preserve posttonic length phonetically. Except for Vrgada, which has lost all *gòvōr* type lengths analogically, all other Čakavian dialects show the length in *o*-stems as well (I have provided numerous examples of that in Kapović 2010: 88, 2015: 232⁸⁴², 2017a: 393), but the data is not easy to find in the sources because most Čakavian dialects have phonetically lost posttonic length, while those that did not often have preresonant lengthening in posttonic syllables, which makes forms like *gòvōr* irrelevant. This leaves only *kòkōt* ‘rooster; sea robin’, *gòspōd* ‘Lord’, and *tròskōt* ‘some kind of weed/grass (e.g. knotgrass)’⁸⁴ of the more known *o*-stems not ending in a resonant to show the original a. p. C lengthening. However, *gospod* seems to be missing or is at least not attested in many Čakavian dialects (this is not an everyday word even in the standard

⁸¹ The situation is, as already mentioned, somewhat obscured by a secondary analogical spread of the original a. p. C pattern *gòvōr* – gen^{sg} *gòvora* onto the originally a. p. A forms like *kāmēn* ‘rock’ – gen^{sg} *kāmēna* in Štokavian (cf. Kapović 2015: 639–640). This is not strange because there is a tendency to unite the old a. p. A and a. p. C (because the reflexes of the old acute and circumflex are superficially the same in polysyllabic forms, cf. *kāmēn* = *gòvōr* = *būsēn* ‘sod’ < *kāmy ≠ *gòvōrь ≠ *būsēnь), thus one gets secondary forms like loc^{sg} *kamēnu* or acc^{sg} *nākamēn* (i.e. there is a A → C shift) or often an immobile accent in modern dialects – cf. Kapović 2010: 97–98. However, the dialect of Dubrovnik preserves (with minor vacillation) the old opposition of polysyllabic a. p. A and a. p. C that seems to have disappeared elsewhere – cf. Ligorio and Kapović 2011. This A → C shift in *o*-stems is also connected to the secondary analogical length in nom/acc^{sg} type *kāmēn* (see footnote 70 in this article).

⁸² Brevity in instr^{sg} forms like *bōgom* ‘god’ (*bōgomь) has been early eliminated by analogy and posttonic yers are never lengthened – e.g. always *nòkat* ‘nail’ < *nògьtь (Kapović 2015: 233).

⁸³ Some Štokavian dialects do have *pàžen* and *nòšen* but as clear cases of preresonant lengthening (cf. Kapović 2015: 554–583).

⁸⁴ Interestingly enough, all the accentuated *o*-stems with the suffix *-ot* (like *čòkōt* ‘vine’) mentioned by Jurišić (1992: 135) have the a. p. C accent (with the expected posttonic length, of course). The only non-C *-ot* derivative seems to be the southern variant (Dubrovnik and Korčula) *tròskot/tròskōt* (see footnote 85 below) and the derived Štokavian *hòbotnica* ‘octopus’, which would point to the original *hòbot. However, Budmani (in ARj) attests *hòbōt* – gen^{sg} *hòbota* ‘a kind of a big octopus’ for Dubrovnik (cf. Russian *xòbom* ‘trunk’), though he thinks that it is a younger derivative made from *hòbotnica* (for the Dubrovnik form cf. also Ligorio and Kapović 2011: 340–341). Of course, original accentual paradigms of derivatives in *-ot* are not very relevant for our topic here – whatever the exact origin of the almost generalized a. p. C in the *-ot* derivatives, the only important thing for our discussion is the clear attestation of the a. p. C type accentuation in it (of the *kòkōt* type).

language), while *kokot*⁸⁵ and *troškot*⁸⁶ are often attested in dialects that have not preserved distinctive posttonic length. Less frequent a. p. C forms not ending in a resonant like *gròdhòt* ‘loud laughter’ or *tròpòt*⁸⁷ are only rarely attested because dictionaries of Čakavian local dialects often, quite irritatingly, prefer to attest Romance loanwords (or “unusual” words of Slavic origin, like those not present in the standard language) instead of the “normal” inherited Slavic lexicon.⁸⁸

To conclude the point, there are no relevant old short variants “*gòspod, kòkot, kòkoš, mlàdost, bòlest, gòvor, kòren, plàmen, jàblan*” that Kortlandt adduces (and thus wrongly informs the uninitiated reader) – in Štokavian, these are always clear later local developments and in Čakavian they are, as we far as we know, limited to the dialect of Vrgada due to a specific innovative process in the *o*-stems (while the Vrgada *i*-stems preserve the expected a. p. C mobile pattern together with the expected quantitative alternation). In Štokavian, there are even such cases as in the dialect of Dubrovnik, where one can without any doubt show that in the past the old a. p. C quantitative alternation was present, but that it was subsequently analogically lost in some words – e.g. modern Dubrovnik *kòkòt* ‘rooster’ now has the short second syllable by analogy to the oblique cases like gen^{sg} *kòkota*, but in older Dubrovnik dialect the old and expected *kòkòt* – gen^{sg} *kòkota* is attested, as written down by not one but four earlier scholars of the

⁸⁵ For *kokot*, cf. now Vuletić and Skračić 2018: 89. Unfortunately, all their numerous attestations of *kòkòt* in northern Dalmatia – with the meaning ‘Triglidae (sea robin, gurnard)’ only – are from local dialects which have lost distinctive posttonic length. While Jurišić 1973 adduces *Kòkòt* as a nickname in the Vrgada local dialect, the word *kokot* as a common noun does not exist on Vrgada today, as Nikola Vuletić (personal communication) informs me (his oldest informant explicitly rejected the existence of *kokot* in the dialect).

⁸⁶ In Čakavian, Blato (Milat Panža 2014) has *tròškòt*. Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) *tròškòt* has the expected secondary shortening in a. p. C. For Čakavian a. p. C in this word in dialects that have lost phonetic posttonic length cf. also Sali (Piasevoli 1993), Rivanj (Radulić 2002), Beli (Velčić 2003), Jelsa (Matković 2004), Brač (Šimunović 2009), Medulin (Peruško 2010), Pitve and Zavala (Barbić 2011), Ošljak (Valčić 2012), Bibinje (Šimunović 2013) *tròškot* and Iž (Martinović 2005) *tròškot*, Ist (Smoljan 2015) *tròskut* – gen^{sg} *tròškuta* (with younger lengthening of the stressed syllable). Štokavian also usually has a. p. C – cf. Vuk’s *mpòckòm*, Bačka (Sekulić 2005), Studenci (Babić 2008), Prapatnice in Vrgorska krajina (my data) *tròškòt*. However, Della Bella has <tròškòt> for Dubrovnik (cf. also ARj), an accent that agrees with the near-by Korčula Čakavian (Kalogjera, Fattorini Svoboda and Josipović Smojver 2008) *tròškot*, which is obviously a southern isogloss (though this variant seems to appear elsewhere in Štokavian as well).

⁸⁷ Cf. this a. p. C form in Grobnik (Lukežić and Zubčić 2007) in the innovative meaning ‘motorcycle’ [archaic], originally obviously ‘rattle’ (cf. *tròpòt* in ARj).

⁸⁸ The word *troškot* is probably frequently attested due to its semantics – local dialectal lexicographers love to attest “strange” words for plants, even those of Slavic origin.

dialect: della Bella, Rešetar, and Bojanić and Trivunac (cf. the analysis and the references for this and other words in Ligorio and Kapović 2011: 343).⁸⁹

Furthermore, the examples Kortlandt adduces are very different among themselves and cannot be listed together. The first two (*gospod*, *kokot*) are *o*-stems (just like *plamen*), where the usual quantitative pattern (*gõspõd – gõspoda*) is attested almost everywhere (with rare specific and local later generalizations of brevity or length). The next three are *i*-stems (*kokoš*, *mladost* ‘youth’, *bolest* ‘illness’), which show the expected a. p. C alternation (*kõkõš – kõkoši*) everywhere in both Štokavian and Čakavian. The form ‘root’ has the old variant suffixes (*-енъ/-енъ and *-енъ), where *koren* would be the type like *gõvõr* (short suffix lengthened only in nom/acc^{sg})⁹⁰ and *korijen* would belong to the *õblāk* ‘cloud’ – *õblāka* type (the old long suffix with length in all cases). The last word (*jablan* ‘poplar’) does not belong to this group at all, as it is originally not only a word with a long suffix, like *õblāk* (cf. the usual Štokavian *jāblān – gen^{sg} jāblāna*), but also an original a. p. *a* word (*ābolnъ),⁹¹ unlike all the other words in the list which are originally a. p. *c*. The inclusion of *jablan* in this list (which Kortlandt obviously put there under the influence of my mentioning the word,⁹² though in a different context),⁹³ again points to Kortlandt’s inadequate approach.

To conclude this section, Kortlandt, as elsewhere, unfortunately avoids argumentation, he does not seem to have a complete grasp of the material, and ig-

⁸⁹ The modern Dubrovnik dialect has an exceptional number of later developments in such cases, with some forms preserving the old alternation (*gõvõr – gen^{sg} gõvora – loc^{sg} u govõru*), while others can lose the original length in nom/acc^{sg}, generalize it in all cases, or have it variantly in all cases (Ligorio and Kapović 2011: 361–362). One should point here that this is rather unusual for Neo-Štokavian – most of the posttonic-length-preserving Neo-Štokavian dialects (and Standard Štokavian as well) tend to be quite conservative in their preservation of the old alternation (*gõvõr – gen^{sg} gõvora*).

⁹⁰ In Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) *kõrěn – gen^{sg} kõrena – loc^{sg} u kõrenu* (by analogy to the originally a. p. *a* form *na kāmemu*) shows the expected analogical lack of length like other a. p. C forms with a short suffix (cf. also *blāgostlõv* ‘blessing’, *trõškõt* and even *blāgdān* ‘holiday’ – cf. the usual Štokavian *blāgdān*, *gen^{sg} blāgdāna* with a generalized length as in *dān*, *gen^{sg} dāna* ‘day’).

⁹¹ Cf. Ligorio and Kapović 2011: 341, Kapović 2015: 503¹⁷⁸⁹ for the reconstruction of the original a. p. *a* based on derivatives like Štokavian *jāblanovina* ‘poplar timber’ (etymologically also *jābuka* ‘apple’).

⁹² Kapović 2017a: 394.

⁹³ As the only case with a secondary short suffix instead of the original length in the Vrgada dialect (Jurišić 1973): obviously through a process of **jāblān – *jāblāna* (this type is otherwise preserved on Vrgada, e.g. in *jāstrēb – jāstrēba* ‘hawk’) → **jāblān – *jāblāna* (by analogy to the original, now lost, short-suffix a. p. C type like **gõvõr – gõvora*) → *jāblān – jāblāna* (by analogy the original short-suffix a. p. A type like *kāmen – kāmēna*). Here I have to admit that it was obviously my imprecise wording in Kapović 2017a: 393–394 that has led Kortlandt astray into thinking that *jablan* can be placed in a list with otherwise a. p. C words. However, he should have noticed that *jāblān* had the originally long suffix, unlike the *gõvõr* type words, and that it is obviously not of a. p. *c* origin.

nores obvious points. Some of the implicit outcomes of what he claims, like the one that the length in Štokavian *pǝmōc* and *pǝ̄mōc* is of different origin, seem almost bizarre.

5. The *obǝrna and *čǝrnĭna type accent and retractions of contractional neo-circumflex

Slavic prefixed derivatives like *narǝdъ ‘people’, *obǝrna ‘defense’, *sǝdǝrnъ ‘healthy’ and *o*-compounds like *bosonǝgъ ‘barefoot’, *golobǝrdъ ‘barefaced’ seem to point to a frequent or even (near-)generalized fixed accent (a. p. *a*) on the root following the prefix or the compositional *-o- (* on short roots, *’ on long roots), even when the root does not originally have the fixed accent (cf. *rǝdъ ‘kin’, *bornĭti ‘to defend’, *dǝrvo ‘tree’, *nogǝ ‘foot’, *bordǝ ‘beard’). The accent in these formations obviously cannot be analyzed by means of valences (or by means of acute and non-acute syllables) as is usually possible in Slavic, which would point to a later generalization of accent in this type (cf. Kapović 2017a: 396). One could typologically compare the secondary spread of the acute to the spread of non-etymological length in some modern Neo-Štokavian dialects in prefix-derivatives like *pǝnos* ‘pride’, *prǝlaz* ‘passage’, *ǝmot* ‘wrap’ (instead of the older *pǝnos*, *prǝlaz*, *ǝmot*),⁹⁴ before the *-na* suffix (cf. the secondary length in *vǝžna* ‘drive’, *nǝžna* ‘attire’ compared to *vǝziti* ‘to drive’, *nǝsiti* ‘to carry’ but the expected length in *kǝpna* ‘buying’ ~ *kǝpiti* ‘to buy’),⁹⁵ or to the generalization of secondary length in the root in *-je* derivatives in some modern Neo-Štokavian dialects, as in *grǝbĭe* ‘graveyard’ (but *grǝb* ‘grave’, older/dialectal *grǝbĭe*), *grǝžde* ‘grapes’ (older/dialectal⁹⁶ *grǝžde*), or *narǝčje* ‘armful’ (cf. the expected root length in *lĭšce* ‘leaves’, *prĭžemĭe* ‘ground floor’).⁹⁷ A tendency of a secondary spread of a certain type of accent in a specific derivational type is hardly unusual – in such cases, a specific derivational type is “strengthened” through a specific generalized accentual type.

Kortlandt (2018: 293) tries to solve this problem by assuming a generalized original accent on the prefixes (e.g. *ǝborna) and the connecting *-o- (e.g.

⁹⁴ Cf. Kapović 2015: 742–743.

⁹⁵ Cf. Kapović 2015: 743.

⁹⁶ E.g. in Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina) – my data.

⁹⁷ The basic root in *lĭšce* is long (*lĭst* ‘leaf’), while in *prĭžemĭe* the long *-ĕ-* is due to preresonant lengthening (i.e. to the *-mĭ-* cluster).

**bosònogъ). The generalization of the accent on the prefix (i.e. the generalization of dominant prefixes) may indeed be a possible origin in at least some of the adduced forms. However, this does not solve the unexpected and non-etymological old acute in the long roots (as in *obòrna), except in Kortlandt's doctrine. Kortlandt (e.g. 2011: 322, 340) believes that the accent shift via Dybo's law results in a new long falling accent on the originally long vowel, e.g. *òborna > **obòrna. This is the first problem because, as I have pointed out, this medial long falling accent (originating in Dybo's law) is a mirage, as is clear from examples like the North Čakavian type *črnīna* 'blackness', *ravnīca* 'plane' (Kajkavian *kraľīca* 'queen'), *dvorišće* 'courtyard', *popīc* 'little priest', the accentual development of Slavic types like Slovene *volár* 'ox-keeper', Old Štokavian (Posavina) *sestrīn* 'sister's', etc. (cf. Kapović 2017a: 395 with further references). Examples like these prove that the new accent, resulting after the progressive shift of * and *~ (Dybo's law), is the neo-acute (e.g. *č̣rnīna > *č̣rnīna). The other problem with Kortlandt's theory is that it presupposes that this supposed new long falling accent retracts (via "Stang's law") from final syllables (not counting final yers) but shortens in medial ones (Kortlandt 2011: 8, 322, 2018: 293), which then accounts for examples like *nòsišъ 'you carry' but **obòrna (which would have the same reflexes as *obòrna). However, as I have already pointed out (Kapović 2017a: 395³¹), this would account for numerous alleged alternations and variations that are simply not attested anywhere. In a. p. *b* presents, one finds only reflexes of the initial accents like 2^{sg} *nòsišъ, though one would expect such an accent in that form and 3^{sg} *nòsitъ 's/he carries', 3^{pl} *nòsetъ 'they carry' but not in 1^{pl} *nòsimo/ъ/e 'we carry' and 2^{pl} *nòsite 'you carry', where Kortlandt's theory envisages the reflexes of **nosimo, **nosite (i.e. the same as **nosímo, **nosíte in traditional reconstruction) that simply appear nowhere in the present tense. In the *povòrtъ '(re)turn' type, Kortlandt's theory would provide the expected reflexes in oblique cases like the gen^{sg} *povòrta, but not in the frequent nom/acc^{sg} where his supposed **povòrtъ should retract the accent. Again, no such forms are found.⁹⁸ Thus, to summarize, while the generalization of the

⁹⁸ The Neo-Štokavian type *zâpad* 'west' or *sâbor* 'parliament' is infrequent and also obviously younger. The younger accentual type *òbrana* in Štokavian/Čakavian (cf. the old and expected accent in the adjective *òbrambenī* 'defensive') cannot be connected to this because according to Kortlandt's theory the retraction would be expected in gen^{pl} only and there one finds the still active alternation in Štokavian/South Čakavian even today (cf. *lòpata/lopàta* – gen^{pl} *lòpāt(ā)*) but with a retraction of a different (and local) origin (cf. Kapović 2015: 349–354).

original accent on the prefixes might work, Kortlandt's views on the results of the progressive shift and the supposed retraction and shortening of the assumed medial long falling accent are simply untenable.

Kortlandt (2018: 293) begins his discussion of these topics with incorrect imputations. He says I did not explain the origin of the non-etymological old acute in forms like *sʙgǫrda, which I did,⁹⁹ and that I do not “explain the Slovene neo-circumflex” in forms like *zgrāda* ‘building’, though I actually dealt with the problem extensively and consider the neo-circumflex as the phonetic and expected reflex before the dominant length as in *sʙgǫrdā (cf. Kapović 2015: 317–325). The same applies to Kortlandt's (*ibid.*) claim that I do not give an explanation of the accentuation of forms like *golòbrad* or *zlòduh* ‘evil spirit’. As already said, I believe that the accent like *golobǫrdь and *zʙloduxь is secondary, originating in a tendency to generalize the original *vʔkoldlākь type accent. The expected original accent would be *gòlobordь > (post-Dybo) *golòbordь and *zʔloduxь > (post-Dybo) *zʙlòduxь due to *gòlь and *zʔlь having dominant roots (i.e. a. p. *b*) – see below for the valence theory, according to which the stress is assigned to the first dominant syllable in a word. In most cases and in some types in general, the new accentual type was generalized (as in *golòbrad* and *zlòduh*),¹⁰⁰ however there are indeed cases where the old and new accent both exist. Cf. the original accent in Štokavian *kòlovrat* ‘spinning wheel’ (*kòlovortь – cf. *kòlo ‘wheel’ and *vòrtь ‘neck’, a. p. *c*)¹⁰¹ but the innovative, generalized accent type in Russian *коловорóт* ‘brace, drill’ (*kolovórtь). Cf. also perhaps Neo-Štokavian *zàpād* ‘west’ which agrees with *pād* ‘fall’ (C) together with the usual type *západ* < *zapǫdь.¹⁰²

The generalization of the acute on the long roots in prefix derivatives is, when the situation is looked at carefully, not really so hard to understand. If one starts with generalized dominant (i.e. accented) nominal/adjectival prefixes (which is

⁹⁹ I explained it as a “tendency to generalize the old acute (on long vowels)/short neo-acute (on short vowels) on the beginning of the second part of the derivative/compound, irrespective of the original accentual properties of the root” (Kapović 2017a: 396).

¹⁰⁰ The variant *gòlovrad* in Štokavian seems to be young/innovative (cf. also *vùkoldlāk* instead of *vukòdlak*, which also must be secondary).

¹⁰¹ We can disregard the option that both of these words were originally a. p. *d* because it is not relevant here (nom/acc^s forms would be *enclimena* no matter what).

¹⁰² Štokavian *pād* – gen^s *pāda* would perhaps point to an original recessive acute (i.e. “Meillet’s law”) in *pǫdь (a. p. *c*) and the original a. p. *a-c* (and not a. p. *a*) of the verb *pǫsti ‘to fall’ (*pǫdq) (cf. Kapović 2018: 177). However, Slovene *pād* – *pāda* (Pleteršnik) and Czech *pád* – gen^s *pādu* would point to *pǫdь (a. p. *a*).

what Kortlandt himself does),¹⁰³ one would originally expect pre-Dybo forms like:

*zǎstava – *òborna – *prǐroda

[~ *stǎviti ‘to put’ (a) – *bornǐti ‘to defend’ (b) – *ròďь ‘harvest, crop’ (c)]

The accent on the syllable due to Dybo’s law depended on the characteristics of the syllable which got the new accent – i.e. on whether it was short or long and whether it was acute or non-acute. If it was short, *´ appeared (cf. *gòtovъ > *gotòvъ ‘ready’). If it was non-acute and long, *~ was the result (cf. *bělina > *bělīna ‘whiteness’). If it was acute (and long), it was *´ (cf. *bōrni > *bornǐti). Applying those rules, one would expect post-Dybo forms:

*zastáva – *obōrna – *priròda

Since the opposition of acute and non-acute was possible only on long vowels, all short roots had the same accent (*´). Thus, the system was characterized by the opposition of only *´ on short vowels to both *´ and *~ on long vowels.¹⁰⁴ What occurred was the simplification of the system in that type of forms to a simple opposition of *´ on short to *´ on all long syllables. Thus, we got the innovative:

*zastáva – *obōrna – *priròda

This is then reflected in Slavic languages and we get: Russian *застава* ‘outpost’, *оборона* ‘defense’,¹⁰⁵ *природа* ‘nature’, Slovene *zastáva* ‘flag’, *obrâna*, etc.¹⁰⁶ The same kind of generalization occurred in other prefix derivatives like *naròďь,

¹⁰³ Cf. the prepositions (etymologically identical to the prefixes) which are always recessive (cf. *nā golvq ‘on the head’) and the verbal prefixes which are generally also recessive (cf. *počinǐti ‘to do’), which also must be secondary (originally, one would assume that some prepositions/prefixes were dominant, while others were recessive, as is the case with all other words). For dominant verbal prefixes in the *nāstojati > *nastòjati type (Neo-Štokavian *nāstojati* ‘to strive’) cf. Дыбо,Замятина and Николаев 1993: 41, Николаев 2013: 176–177, Kapović 2015: 458¹⁶⁶².

¹⁰⁴ Cf. also Дыбо and Николаев 1998: 60 for *slugá ‘servant’ but *zaslūga ‘credit, merit’.

¹⁰⁵ Of course, Russian *оборона* could theoretically reflect *obōrna just as *obōrna, but other Slavic data points to *obōrna, not just Western South Slavic but also West Slavic – Czech *obrana* is a regular reflex of *obōrna, while *obōrna would yield Czech **obrána.

¹⁰⁶ Slovene *priròda* and Štokavian *priròda* are 19th century Russian loanwords (though the accent is as would be expected). Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian later innovated (in a not completely clear manner) in the regard of the accent of most of these formations, thus one gets Štokavian *òbrana* and *zǎstava* or *zǎstava* ‘flag’ (cf. Kapović 2015: 454–458). However, the old accent is also attested, cf. *zábava* ‘party’ (together with the variants *zābava* and *zābava* ← *zābava), *prilika* ‘chance’, *pòklade* ‘carnival’, or dialectal (Prapatnice) *pòtriba* ‘need’ (Standard Štokavian *pòtreba*). Vuk in his dictionary has the oldest accent *zǎstave* ‘embroidery on socks’ attested for Rudnička nahija, but also younger variants *zǎstava* ‘place at the end of the table’ (and ‘flag’ for Croatia) and *zǎstava* ‘ambush’ for Montenegro. That forms such as *zǎstava* are indeed younger is often clear from the expected accent in derivations, such as *zǎstāvnik* ‘flag-bearer’.

*prirodънь, *zaslŭžънь ‘deserving’ (cf. *zaslŭga), *povŏrtъkъ ‘return’ (cf. *povŏrtъ ‘return’), etc. Thus, almost all nominal/adjectival derivatives of this type generalized the innovative synchronic rule that the first syllable after the prefix (and after *-o- in compounds) is always stressed and the accent is either *’ if the syllable (root) is short or *’’ if the syllable (root) is long. Just like the original opposition of dominant and recessive morphemes is gone (in both the prefixes and the nominal/adjectival roots), the original opposition of long acute and long non-acute roots disappears as well.¹⁰⁷

Kortlandt (2018: 293) goes on to claim that I reconstruct “Slovak *pŷta* < **pŷtā* < **pytāje* without explaining the long vowel and the difference between Čakavian *pītā* ‘asks’ and *kopā* ‘digs’, Bulgarian *pīta* versus *kopāe*, Old Polish *kopaje*.” However, I have indeed tackled this problem extensively in my book (cf. Kapović 2015: 341–354), much more so, at least concerning the Western South Slavic material and history, than Kortlandt himself ever has. I even explained for the first time the difference between Čakavian North and Štokavian/Čakavian South when it comes to forms like **kopā*(mo) (*ibid.* 351–354) and why we find both 3^{sg} *kōpā* and *kopā* ‘digs’ in Čakavian (or *kōpā* and *kopā*, and *ně_znā* and *ně_znā* ‘doesn’t know’ in Neo-Štokavian), the answer being in the different rules for retraction to preceding short vowels in Štokavian/Čakavian South and Čakavian North.¹⁰⁸ I also thoroughly discussed a later similar and connected retraction in Štokavian/Čakavian in masculine nom^{sg} of *l*-participles in *-a-* (**kopāo* > **kopō* > *kōpō* ‘dug’) and in the *a*-imperfects of the Montenegrin dialect of Pljevlja *dŕžāg* ‘I held’ < **dŕžāh* < **dŕžāah* (cf. the details and references in Kapović 2018: 261–267).¹⁰⁹ Kortlandt’s (*ibid.*) approach to data seems to be quite lax when quoting Čakavian as having *pītā* ‘asks’ and *kopā* ‘digs’, which is true only for *pītā* – as already said, in the *kopa* type Čakavian has both *kopā* and *kōpā* (depending on the dialect), sometimes with a generalized one or the other type in all verbs and sometimes with a combination of both depending on the verb (cf. Kapović 2015: 344–345).

¹⁰⁷ Of course, there are some dominant acute prefixes – like **vŷ-* ‘out’.

¹⁰⁸ In Štokavian/Čakavian South the neo-circumflex is retracted from the last syllable (thus phonetically gen^{pl} *lōpāt* ‘shovels’, 3^{sg} *kōpā*, 3^{sg} *ně_znā*) but not from medial ones (thus phonetically 1^{pl} *kopāmo* > *kōpāmo*, 1^{pl} *ne_znāmo* > *ně_znāmo*), while in the Čakavian North the neo-circumflex is retracted only from medial syllables (thus phonetically gen^{pl} *lopāt*, 3^{sg} *kopā* but 1^{pl} *kōpāmo*, *pōkāt_se* ‘to repent’ < **pokāti* < **pokājati*). Later, original alternating types (**kōpā* – **kopāmo* and **kopā* – **kōpāmo*) generalize and one gets dialects with only one type (all verbs like *kōpā* or all verbs like *kopā* > *kōpā*) or a mix (e.g. *kopā* but *věslā* or variant forms like Neo-Štokavian *ně_znā* and *ně_znā* in some dialects). (Kapović 2015: 351–354)

¹⁰⁹ To be fair, this was published in the same issue as Kortlandt 2018, so he could not have known this at the time of writing his article.

When talking about my objection on his formulation of “Stang’s law” and the lack of non-retracted forms in present 1/2^{pl}, he (Kortlandt 2018: 293) adduces the following: “Carpathian (Ublja) *byváuu*, *bývaš*, *bývat’*, *byvá’eme*, *byvá’ete*, *byvá’ut’*”. However, this is neither what I was talking about, nor does it prove what Kortlandt wants it to prove. My point (see above) was that there are absolutely no traces anywhere of the supposed phonetic forms like 1^{pl} ***nosímo* > ***nosimo* ‘we carry’ (where Kortlandt’s supposed neo-circumflex should be shortened but not retracted from the medial syllable). In his Carpathian forms, the situation is quite simple. There is no imaginary “restoration of the thematic vowel in **-à(e)me*, **-à(e)te* on the analogy of **kopà(j)e-*” (*ibid.*) – forms that look uncontracted (like 2^{pl} *byvá’ete*) indeed had no contraction. Forms with contraction show also the retraction (2^{sg} *bývaš*, 3^{sg} *bývat’*), while forms without contraction have no retraction (1^{sg} *byváuu*, 1^{pl} *byvá’eme*, 2^{pl} *byvá’ete*, 3^{pl} *byvá’ut’*). One can compare that to Neo-Štokavian where the only present form without contraction also has no retraction (3^{pl} *pítajū* < *pītājū* ‘they ask’), while all other forms have contraction and thus also the retracted accent (e.g. 2^{pl} *pītāte* < *pītāte*). Again, this has nothing to do with the complete lack of attestation for the supposedly original ***nosíte*, which Kortlandt simply ignores.

To my arguments against “Stang’s law” (Kapović 2017a: 390²¹, 391²²) Kortlandt sadly has nothing to say but to apodictically claim that “they have adequately been refuted in the literature”, while citing works of his own and a paper by Vermeer (a Dutch scholar working in Kortlandt’s framework). Once more, simply stating that something is the case does not actually prove it. Obviously, I am well aware of the usual (and Kortlandt’s) arguments for “Stang’s law”, but, as already argued, I simply do not find them convincing when positing the emergence of a neo-circumflex from Dybo’s law (as in the supposed 1^{pl} **nòsimo* > ***nosímo*). The only real neo-circumflexes that can retract (which one can call Stang’s law, though Ivšić was actually the first to explain it)¹¹⁰ are those of contractional origin (like in the mentioned 3^{sg} **pŷtatŷ* < **pytâtŷ* < **pytájetyŷ*).¹¹¹ Other retractions are local (like gen^{pl} *lõpāt(ā)* in Štokavian/Čakavian) or later.

Kortlandt (2018: 293) completely misses my point when discussing forms like Čakavian *črnīna* ‘blackness’, *ravnīca* ‘plane’, *dvorišće* ‘courtyard’, etc. (see

¹¹⁰ Cf. Ivšić 1911: 163–165.

¹¹¹ Ukrainian dialectal forms like 3^{sg} *numá* (if not secondary) would perhaps point to the fact that this early retraction to preceding long vowels was perhaps not pan-Slavic.

above). He says that “Vowel length in derivational suffixes is mostly generalized, e.g. S/Cr. *-at*, *-av*, *-ica*, *-ina* versus *-ār*, *-īk*, *-īn*, *-īna* (cf. Dybo 1968)”. The problem is that he does not see that I have adduced forms that clearly show that there are suffixes that have not generalized length in modern dialects¹¹² (that accentologists have up to now disregarded – including Dybo, cited above). Cf. e.g.¹¹³ Vrgada Čakavian¹¹⁴ *planīnà* ‘mountain’¹¹⁵ (cf. the secondarily shortened *planīna* in Neo-Štokavian) but *travīna* ‘grass [pejorative]’ (Neo-Štokavian *trāvina*),¹¹⁶ Neo-Štokavian nom^{pl} *kolīca* ‘cart’¹¹⁷ but *glāvica* ‘little head’,¹¹⁸ Neo-Štokavian *zidić* or *zidīć* ‘little wall’ (depending on the dialect – both variants, *-īć* and *-īč*, occur in Čakavian and Kajkavian/Slovene as well),¹¹⁹ Posavina Old Štokavian¹²⁰ *sestrīn* ‘sister’s’ but Neo-Štokavian *sèstrin*,¹²¹ and Senj Čakavian¹²² *dvorišće* ‘courtyard’ but *toporišće* ‘axe handle’ (cf. Neo-Štokavian both *-ište* and *-ište* depending on the dialect).¹²³ I call these “the Hirt suffixes” (cf. Kapović 2015:

¹¹² In the case of posttonic acute length, the expected length was often lost by analogy. E.g. Standard Štokavian *čistiti* (a. p. A) ‘to clean’ has the short *-i-* by analogy to *mōliti* (a. p. B) ‘to pray’ and *loviti* (a. p. C) ‘to hunt’. The original length (in forms like *čīstīti*) is still seen dialectally (e.g. in South-West Štokavian). The same is seen in Czech, cf. Czech *čistiti*, *modliti*, *loviti*, though one cannot be sure that it is not a result of the phonetic shortening of posttonic acute length in West Slavic. Cf. the detailed treatment of posttonic acute length in Kapović 2015: 516–525.

¹¹³ The full list of examples with references is given in Kapović 2015: 184–193.

¹¹⁴ Jurišić 1973.

¹¹⁵ The North Čakavian *črnīna* type has the same non-acute variant of the suffix but originally appears after dominant non-acute stems (i.e. in derivation from a. p. *b* words) like **čьнъ* ‘black’.

¹¹⁶ Dybo (1981: 56, 144–146, 173) reconstructs both the acute dominant **-īna* and the recessive **-inā*, but does not comment on the relation of these two suffixes.

¹¹⁷ Cf. also the dialectal Neo-Štokavian type *groždīca* ‘raisin’ (e.g. in Neo-Štokavian Eastern Slavonia). The same non-acute dominant suffix is seen in Čakavian/Kajkavian *-īca* (which originally occurs in forms derived from a. p. *b* words).

¹¹⁸ Dybo (1981: 173) mentions only the acute dominant **-īca*.

¹¹⁹ Dybo (1981: 173–174) reconstructs only the acute dominant **-īťъ* and considers the *-īč* variant in South Slavic secondary by analogy to the suffix **-īць*. While modern a. p. B in Russian (gen^{sg} *-učá*) is indeed secondary (as proven by Old Russian), this kind of simple explanation (A → B secondary shift) is not possible in South Slavic dialects (which preserve both tonal and quantitative distinctions unlike East Slavic), since there is no reasonable analogical shift that would change *zidić* – gen^{sg} *zidića* (A) to *zidīć* – *zidīčā* (B). Both variants are widespread and neither can be interpreted as secondary and innovative.

¹²⁰ Ivšić 1913/II: 48.

¹²¹ Dybo (1981: 178–180) does not reconstruct Proto-Slavic forms for this suffix. Cf. also Neo-Štokavian short and long suffixes in forms like *gospòdin* ‘gentleman’ but *vlastèlīn* ‘nobleman’, *tùpan* ‘bonehead’ but *lepòtān* ‘pretty boy’.

¹²² Moguš 2002.

¹²³ The non-acute/acute opposition in suffixes is also found in some masculine/feminine forms, cf. Proto-Slavic **-ьнїкъ* but **-ьнїца*, **-āғъ* but **-āra*, **-āčъ* but **-āča*, **-īкъ* but **-īka*. However, these probably have a different origin than the ones already adduced, stemming from Nikolaev’s metatony. Cf. the details and references in Kapović 2015: 194–195.

184–193 for detailed treatment with references) because I believe that the non-acute/acute and recessive/dominant variants in them originally stem from Hirt’s law. Originally, one should start with a suffix like the nom^{sg} *-ina,¹²⁴ where the first syllable (*-in-) would be acute and recessive (–). Before the secondary dominant (±) ending *-a, the suffix would metatonize to secondary dominant (±) while remaining acute – i.e. in non-valence terms, the acute syllable *-in- would attract the accent from the originally stressed ending *-ǎ. This metatony/retraction is what one calls Hirt’s law. However, in cases like the acc^{sg} the ending *-o was recessive (in non-valence terms, it was unaccented), where there would be no Hirt’s law (because the ending was not dominant/accented). Thus, one would expect the original nom^{sg} *dolǐna ‘valley’ but acc^{sg} *dòlinǒ with the mixed a. p. *a-c*. This would then, as is often the case with Hirt’s law,¹²⁵ lead to generalization and one gets variant suffixes (and regular a. p. *a* and a. p. *c*): one dominant/acute (*dolǐna – *dolǐnǒ, a. p. *a*, with the new acc^{sg} analogical to the nom^{sg}) and the other recessive/non-acute (*dolinǎ – *dòlinǒ, a. p. *c*, with the new nom^{sg} made in accordance to the acc^{sg}). The first type *dolǐna (a. p. *a*) can be seen in the Neo-Štokavian variant *dòlina* and Russian *долина*. The second type *dolinǎ (a. p. *c*) can be seen in the Neo-Štokavian variant *dolina*.¹²⁶ These acute/dominant and non-acute/recessive variants generalize depending on dialect/language, different word-forms, and semantics. Sometimes, only one variant is preserved in a dialect/language, sometimes both are. In any case, both variant suffixes can follow a. p. *a*, *b*, and *c* roots, e.g. *stǎrǫ (a) ‘old’, *čǝrǫ (b) ‘black’, *žǐvǫ (c) ‘alive’ – cf. Neo-Štokavian *stǎrina* ‘antiquity’, secondary *crnina* ‘blackness’ (the original accent is seen in North Čakavian type *črnǐna*, which has usually been generalized),¹²⁷ and *živina* (older acc^{sg} *živinu*) ‘cattle’. What is relevant for our present discussion is that in cases of such non-acute/recessive suffixes when they are added to the dominant non-acute (a. p. *b*) roots we see that the original *čǝrǐnina (before Dybo’s law, i.e. before the progressive shift of dominant circumflexes) yields *čǝrnǐna with the neo-acute (as attested in numerous, already

¹²⁴ For sake of simplicity, I write simply *-ina, not *-inǎ, and I do not mark the acuteness of the syllables.

¹²⁵ Cf. Kapović 2015: 179–183.

¹²⁶ Some Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects preserve the original *-inǎ* with pretonic length, while Štokavian *-ina* < *-inǎ* has the analogical brevity by analogy to the original *-ina* type (cf. Kapović 2015: 186).

¹²⁷ Cf. Novi Vinodolski (Белић 2000: 161–163), which generalized *starina*, *črnina*, *težina* ‘weight’ (cf. *tǝgǝ-kǝ ‘heavy’, a. p. *c*), with the only exception being *planinǎ*. The original system was *stǎrina – črnǐna – *težinǎ. In North Čakavian, the original *črnina* type usually wins, while in Štokavian the *težina* type wins while the *črnina* type is eliminated (however, the *stǎrina* type is preserved).

adduced, forms in Čakavian, Old Štokavian, and Kajkavian). This in turn proves that Kortlandt's supposed **čьrnîna (with the alleged long falling medial tone after Dybo's law) > **čьrnîna (with the alleged shortening of this long falling tone) is an illusion. This then means that his explanation of prefix forms like *obôrna, however simple, cannot be correct.

Thus, Kortlandt's (2018: 293) explanation that “[v]owel length in derivational suffixes is mostly generalized” unfortunately means nothing. His claim (*ibid.*) that the “Original differences have been preserved e.g. in *dvòrište* (b) ‘yard’ versus *blätīšte* (a) ‘mud-pit’ and Czech *pekař* (c) ‘baker’ versus *rybář* (a) ‘fisherman’” also have nothing with to do with my argument. I have already discussed Czech *pekař* and *rybář* (see above) but this has nothing to do with the neo-acute as the result of Dybo's law in the case of non-acute suffixes. As for Štokavian dialect preserving the opposition of the *blätīšte* – *dvòrište* type,¹²⁸ the situation is not as simple in *mjèštāni* ‘locals’ – *sèłani* ‘villagers’ type (which is the only widespread and Standard Neo-Štokavian example of the preserved length in an originally acute suffix),¹²⁹ because the *-ište* suffix has both *-ište* and *-ĩšte* variant (see above). Thus Neo-Štokavian *-ĩšte* can be both the reflex of the unaccented acute posttonic length (corresponding to the accented *-ište*) or the reflex of the unaccented non-acute posttonic length (corresponding to the accented *-ĩšte*). In any case, the origin of the long *-ĩšte* in words like *blätīšte* is irrelevant for our topic here and the form *dvòrište* in no way disproves the forms in *-ište* that also exist, which cannot be secondary because there is no phonetic or analogic way by which *-ište* could yield *-ĩšte* (one simply must reconstruct both types of accent in this suffix, as in the other mentioned suffixes).

Again, as previously, Kortlandt unfortunately misinterprets my claims, seems not to understand certain obvious and simple examples, does not even try to explain the lacunae in his theory, ignores the important problems, and simply re-

¹²⁸ Actually, the forms Kortlandt adduces, *blätīšte* and *dvòrište* (without citation), do not originate from the same system (though such systems do indeed exist, cf. Kapović 2015: 521) so they should not be cited as such (especially considering the somewhat artificial origin of the accentuation of Standard Neo-Štokavian). They are adduced as such in Vuk's dictionary (and, following him, in ARj), but Vuk cites *blāmūume* as the word from Boka Kotorska (in Montenegro) with the meaning of ‘place where mud/lake used to be’, while the word *blāmūume* from his own dialect (the augmentative meaning ‘big mud’) has the secondary accent and the short suffix (cf. similarly the secondary *dvòrište* by analogy to the old *blätīšte* type in other Štokavian dialects). His form *dvòpuume* ‘courtyard’ he cites as being used in Croatia, while he also adduces the form *dvòpūume* ‘ruines of the old court’ (with the analogical accent of *dvòr* ‘court’).

¹²⁹ Cf. Kapović 2015: 519–520.

peats the forms he always repeats (as Czech *pekař* and *rybář*), which are simply not pertinent at all to the subject being discussed.

6. The reflex of *ò in Slovak and Czech monosyllables

Concerning the reflex of *ò in Slovak/Czech monosyllables, Kortlandt (2018: 293–294) sticks to his view that the length in *o*-stem monosyllables like Slovak *kôň*, Czech *kůň* ‘horse’ “did not arise phonetically but was adopted from the case forms where the accent had been retracted in accordance with Stang’s law before the loss of weak jers, the shortening of long falling vowels in initial syllables, the loss of distinctive tone, and the fixation of the stress on the initial syllable”, while I maintain “the traditional view that Czech *ů*, Slovak *ô* is the phonetic reflex of *ò in monosyllables.” (which is true, though I stress that Czech monosyllables are less convincing due to the later tendency of generally lengthening *o* > *ů* before voiced final segments).

To be more precise, Kortlandt (2011: 345–346) thinks that the long reflexes in nom/acc^{sg} (as Slovak *kôň*, Czech *kůň*) is analogical to loc^{sg}, gen^{pl}, loc^{pl}, instr^{pl}, which according to him all had *ò in the first syllable:¹³⁰ loc^{sg} *kòní,¹³¹ gen^{pl} *kòňь,¹³² loc^{pl} *kòňixъ, instr^{pl} *kòňi.¹³³ His explanation for this analogy (the transfer of the original length from loc^{sg}, gen^{pl}, loc^{pl}, instr^{pl} to nom/acc^{sg}, where it is supposedly not phonetically expected) is that the length was generalized in all forms with an initial accent – i.e. initial-stress forms like nom/acc^{sg} *kòňь, instr^{pl} *kòňi had length (whether it was original or not), while end-stressed forms

¹³⁰ I have adapted Kortlandt’s notation here.

¹³¹ Stang (1957: 70) disagrees with the reconstruction *kòňi (stem-accent because of the preserved final length – cf. Kapović 2015: 527–528), but there are forms like Belorussian dialectal loc^{sg} *na snóp’i* (cf. gen^{sg} *snopá*) which would point to it (cf. Дыбо, Замятина and Николаев 1993: 24–26). However, Slovene secondary loc^{sg} *kònjū* is not the best comparison for that – first of all, that is a different ending (originally a *u*-stem ending), and secondly, Slovene (archaic/dialectal) forms like loc^{sg} *pòdu* ‘floor’ or Kajkavian loc^{sg} *kòňu* ‘horse’ are more archaic (cf. Kapović 2015: 384–386). Also, a preserved long *-í (not attested today) would yield a short, not long, root originally in Slovak.

¹³² This should be short according to Kortlandt’s doctrine (see above), so he has to assume the analogical length here as well.

¹³³ Kortlandt reconstructs only initial accent in a. p. *b* in these two cases, but Nikolaev reconstructs dialectal variants: loc^{pl} *kòňixъ and *koňixъ, instr^{pl} *kòňi and *koňi (Дыбо, Замятина and Николаев 1990: 112). Starting with an end-stress would originally yield short stems in Slovak and so would *kòňixъ > *koňich. It is difficult to understand why Kortlandt imagines a long reflex for *kòňixъ.

like gen^{sg} *końá, dat^{sg} *końú had a short root. Kortlandt (*ibid.*) then says that in the oblique cases the length was later lost “before the new long case endings in gen.pl. -óv,¹³⁴ -í and loc.pl. -iech, -ích”¹³⁵ and “the paradigm could be further regularized by generalization of the short root vowel (...)”.

If one accepts Kortlandt’s reconstruction of a. p. *b* forms and its reflexes, which are hardly certain and doubtfree (see the footnotes above), his scenario would not be impossible, but accepting it would presume accepting a lot of unnecessary analogies, none of which have any real function except being a part of Kortlandt’s wider ideas on historical development of Slavic accentuation. When Kortlandt (2018: 294) says, yet again, that my “treatment again lacks a chronological perspective”, it is clear that means that I am unwilling to accept his reconstructions and his vision of relative chronology, i.e. his completely unnecessary and complex analogies and generalizations. Is it imaginable that Czech originally had *skot, which was then changed to the attested Old Czech *skót* ‘cattle’ (by analogy to some of the oblique cases), which later again changed to the modern Czech *skot*? Yes, it is perhaps imaginable, but it is neither economical nor necessary. Leaving Kortlandt’s elaborate relative chronology aside, it is an unnecessary complication to assume that the only form where the length is today attested (nom/acc^{sg} forms like Slovak *kôš* ‘basket’) is actually secondary, while none of the forms that supposedly originally had the length now do not have it (cf. Slovak loc^{sg} *koši*, gen^{pl} *košov*, loc^{pl} *košoch*, instr^{pl} *košmi* – however, the last three have innovative endings). On the other hand, should one start with the expected length in nom/acc^{sg}, the modern paradigm is quite straightforward even if one has to explain the root in forms like loc^{pl} *košmi* (with a secondary ending) as analogical (though that is hardly certain – see above).

An important reason why Kortlandt assumes all these subsequent analogies is his idea that the reflex of Slavic *` and *” merge in Czech (i.e. yield brevity in monosyllables and length in disyllables in front of a short vowel). However, while it is not impossible that *` and *” indeed merge in Czech, that is hardly the likeliest option. Kortlandt’s theory that the old acute phonetically yields short

¹³⁴ Cf. dialectal Slovak -vóv (Stanislav 1958: 69). In Central Slovak, *-ôv [-wov] dissimilates to -ov (*ibid.* 71). Similarly, cf. Slovak Cvô- > Cvo- in *tvoj* ‘your’, *dvor* ‘court’, and *chvost* ‘tail’, with the length preserved dialectally (Habijanec 2016: 349).

¹³⁵ *-ích is not a new ending, though. As already said, *` would not yield a long reflex in front of it.

vowels in monosyllables (cf. *mǎkъ > Czech *mák* ‘poppy’) is not very persuasive (cf. Kapović 2017a: 397) and the general merger of the two Common Slavic prosodemes is very much in question taking into account paradigmatic reflexes such as Czech 2^{sg} *můžeš* ‘you can’ < *mòžeš but *javor* ‘maple’ < *ǎvorъ (for details cf. Kapović 2019).

Kortlandt (2018: 294) ends his short comment on the problem with a statement that the traditional (and my) view “does not explain the short vowel in Czech *osm*, Slovak *osem* ‘eight’ < *òsmь”. However, this is an oversimplification of a complex issue. There are a lot of counterexamples for both the possibility that *ò yields length and that *ò yields brevity in Czech/Slovak. Short reflexes in *osm/osem* can be easily explained in a variety of ways. As Verweij (1994: 515), who works in Kortlandt’s framework, notes, there are generally no long reflexes in initial *o- (this may have even been a separate phonetic law). It could also be an analogy to *sedm/sedem* ‘seven’ (monosyllables never show length from *è) or analogy to *osmý* ‘eighth’ in Czech (however, Slovak ordinal *ôsmý* has the long reflex which must be secondary).¹³⁶ In any case, *osm/osem* is hardly a crucial or only example which would prove a point. For more details on my take on the reflexes of *’ in general in West Slavic cf. Kapović 2019.

7. The valence theory and the Proto-Indo-European origin of Balto-Slavic accentuation

Kortlandt (2018: 295) ends his paper with the remark that “[a]ttempts to solve classic problems in terms of dominance patterns have resulted in complete failure”. By this, he means to say that the Moscow Accentological School approach to the issue of the origin of Balto-Slavic accentuation, which sees it as the most archaic reflex of the original Proto-Indo-European tonal system,¹³⁷ is wrong and that one should stick to the dominant norm of Western Balto-Slavic scholarship in the last half of century, which basically means deriving Balto-Slavic com-

¹³⁶ Slovak secondarily generalized length also in *šiesty* ‘sixth’, *siedmy* ‘seventh’, probably by analogy to *piaty* ‘fifth’, *deviaty* ‘ninth’, *desiaty* ‘tenth’ (cf. the neo-acute in *pěti*, *devěti*, *desěti* in Old Štokavian/Čakavian).

¹³⁷ First laid out shortly in Dybo, Nikolayev and Starostin 1978. Cf. also more recently e.g. Дыбо 2014, 2011, 2007, 2003, 1999.

plex paradigmatical accent from a simple “Graeco-Aryan” Proto-Indo-European accentual system (i.e. Proto-Indo-European accentual system reconstructed primarily on the basis of Ancient Greek and Vedic).¹³⁸ However, it is quite the opposite – mainstream Western Balto-Slavic historical linguistics has been sleeping on the problem and is still desperately clinging on to implausible sound laws and a Vedic-centric Proto-Indo-European reconstruction, which has been abandoned long ago in other spheres of Indo-European linguistics. I will point to a couple of problems with the usual way of deriving Balto-Slavic accentuation from a simple Proto-Indo-European accent, reconstructed primarily on the basis of Vedic and Greek.

When comparing Balto-Slavic accentuation with Vedic/Greek accentuation, what is immediately clear is that the Balto-Slavic system (even if one does not accept the valence theory) is much more complex. In Vedic/Greek accentual system, the accent can be mobile in a very limited way: usually only in athematic nouns with monosyllabic roots like Vedic *pát* – gen^{sg} *padás* and Greek *πούς* – gen^{sg} *ποδός* (which is then reconstructed as PIE **pōds* – **pedós* ‘foot’). However, in Vedic not all athematic root-nouns have mobile accent¹³⁹ (cf. Vedic *śvā* ‘dog’ – gen^{sg} *śúnas*),¹⁴⁰ while in Greek it is automatic there¹⁴¹ (cf. Greek *κύων* ‘dog’ – gen^{sg} *κυνός*), which is often disregarded. In Greek, the verb (except for participles, which behave like nominal forms) usually has the predictable pro-penultimate or penultimate stress, while the accent in Vedic verb is connected to ablaut, which must be secondary (and not original as the Indo-Europeanist mainstream holds). Unlike both Vedic and Greek, the original Balto-Slavic accentual

¹³⁸ Kortlandt (e.g. 2011: 14, 2010: 64–65, 75–76) thinks that Balto-Slavic mobility in the *o*- and *ā*-stems originates in analogy to theconsonant stems (since Vedic and Greek have some accentual mobility in the latter but not in the former).

¹³⁹ Cf. the list of Vedic immobile and mobile root-nouns in Дыбо 2003: 136–139.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. also the same initial stress in Hittite gen^{sg} *ku-ú-na-aš* /*kūnaš*/ from nom^{sg} *ku-wa-aš* ‘hound-man’. There is no reason to ad hoc assume that this is a secondary accent, as it is usually done (cf. e.g. Kloekhorst 2008: 506 and also Ringe 2006: 15, Beekes 2010: 811) because of the dogma that Proto-Indo-European had a Greek-like accentuation with automatic mobile accent in monosyllabic athematic stems. If the accent in Vedic and Hittite is in accord (however, Lithuanian *šuō* (4) must be secondary – here, I disagree with Дыбо 2003: 136, 144–146, who thinks that **k̑wōn* is originally mobile because he did not take into account the Hittite form), and the Greek form is irrelevant (since monosyllabic words always have this type of accent – unlike Vedic), why stick to the dogma of the unaccented zero Ablaut in **k̑unos* (since there are plenty of examples like PIE **septṛīn* ‘seven’ or **h₂ǵktos* ‘bear’ in classical reconstruction that contradict it anyway)? This is one of the blind spots of the usual reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European accent (for a critique cf. Kapović 2017c: 55–56, 2017d: 68).

¹⁴¹ Дыбо 2003: 134–135.

system has non-trivial and unpredictable¹⁴² accentual classes in both nouns and verbs (and elsewhere) – all words belong either to an immobile or mobile class. There is no way to predict which word will belong to which class – neither phonological, morphological, nor semantic criteria have any say in this.¹⁴³ In Balto-Slavic, the whole system shows the opposition of immobile and mobile stress, while Vedic and Greek show only traces of that – this must mean that the more complex system, the Balto-Slavic one, where there is no morphological limitation to the mentioned opposition, is older, in spite of the traditional belief that the classical languages must be the most archaic.

Besides tradition, the implicit reason to assume that Vedic and Greek must have a more archaic accentuation than Balto-Slavic seems to be the timeframe of the attestation of these Indo-European branches. Since both Indo-Iranian and (Mycenaean) Greek were attested already in the second half of the second millennium BCE and Balto-Slavic is attested only much later (Slavic from the 9th century and Baltic from the 14th century), the implicit reasoning is that Vedic and Greek must have a more archaic accentual system (though Vedic was written down much later and the Greek tradition of writing of the accents begins only in 3rd-2nd century BCE). However, this is not necessarily so. If Balto-Slavic accentuation in the 1st millennium BCE was such as we can reconstruct it – why would it necessarily be more innovative than Vedic or Greek just because it was accidentally not attested in writing? We do know that Balto-Slavic languages are very archaic in other regards – e.g. many of them preserve seven (of eight Proto-Indo-European) cases, while Ancient Greek preserved just five cases (Modern Greek only four)¹⁴⁴ and Modern Indo-Aryan languages have lost all but two of the Old Indo-Aryan eight cases already a thousand years ago.¹⁴⁵ And if Modern Greek has more or less preserved the free stress of Ancient Greek up till

¹⁴² Vedic *ásmi* ‘I am’ – *smás* ‘we are’ is trivial/predictable because of ablaut (PIE *h₁esmi – *h₁esmes), while Greek νύξ ‘night’ – gen^{sg} νυκτός is trivial/predictable because all root nouns have such a accentuation (just as trivial as Greek ἄνθρωπος ‘man’ – gen^{sg} ἀνθρώπου with mobility due to the long ending in the second form). Unlike the Greek word for ‘night’, Old Lithuanian *naktis* (2) (Illich-Svitych 1979: 46, Дыбо 2003: 139) is not irrelevant because there is no synchronic rule that it has to be either immobile or mobile (Slavic *noktĭ ‘night’ (a. p. c) is secondary due to the later spread of mobility in *i*-stems – cf. Kapović 2009).

¹⁴³ This is still the case in archaic Balto-Slavic languages. There is no way one can predict the accent of Štokavian acc^{sg} *kūku* ‘hook’ (a. p. A), *lūku* ‘port’ (a. p. B), and *rūku* ‘arm’ (a. p. C) (~ nom^{sg} *kūka*, *lūka*, *rūka*).

¹⁴⁴ Interestingly enough, Modern Greek and Modern Lithuanian are the only Indo-European languages that preserve the old Proto-Indo-European nom^{sg} *-os (Greek -ος, Lithuanian -as).

¹⁴⁵ Kulikov 2017: 250.

today, just like Modern Pashto (and some other modern Indo-Iranian languages) preserved reflexes of a free stress system similar to what is attested in the 2nd millennium BCE Vedic, why would it be strange that some modern Balto-Slavic languages preserve archaic traits of the 1st millennium BCE Proto-Balto-Slavic? Given the otherwise famous archaic nature of Lithuanian, that would hardly be impossible.¹⁴⁶

The mainstream Western Indo-European and Balto-Slavic accentology usually presumes that the mobility in Balto-Slavic *ā*-stems (and *o*-stems and polysyllabic athematic stems) is somehow secondary (in comparison to Vedic and Greek columnar oxytone accent in *ā*-stems). However, there is a big problem, usually ignored, concerning this. Cf. the *ā*-stem ‘head’ in Proto-Slavic (*golvǎ) and Lithuanian (*galvà*) with the accentuation of a polysyllabic (*vanden-*) athematic stem in Lithuanian (*vanduō* ‘water’) and an athematic stem (ἀρήν ‘lamb’) with monosyllabic root (ἀρν-) in Greek:

	Proto-Slavic	Lithuanian	Lithuanian	Greek
nom ^{sg}	*golvǎ	<i>galvà</i>	<i>vanduō</i>	ἀρήν
gen ^{sg}	*golvŷ	<i>galvōs</i>	<i>vandenš</i>	ἀρνός
acc ^{sg}	*gōlvq	<i>gálvq</i>	<i>vādenī</i>	ἄρνα
nom ^{pl}	*gōlvvy	<i>gálvos</i>	<i>vādenys</i>	ἄρνες
gen ^{pl}	*golvǔ	<i>galvū</i>	<i>vandenū</i>	ἀρνῶν
acc ^{pl}	*gōlvvy	<i>gálvas</i>	<i>vādenis</i>	ἄρνας

Now, the usual approach is to assume that Balto-Slavic forms as the ones in the table have a secondary mobile accent that is due to some innovations, usually retractions of some sort – cf. recently e.g. Olander 2009¹⁴⁷ and Jasanoff 2017¹⁴⁸ for this type of approach. The most usual and traditionally accepted retraction is some kind of “Pedersen’s law”, which interpretes the initial accent in mobile stems like Lithuanian acc^{sg} *dūkterī* ‘daughter’ (Slavic *dǔkt’erĭ) as retracted from the supposedly original PIE *d^hugh₂térṃ (reconstructed on the account of

¹⁴⁶ Cf. also the early attested Italic and Celtic branch (attested from the 7th and 6th century BCE respectively), which had the innovative initial accent from the earliest historical times (though they preserve traces of the original Proto-Indo-European free stress through vowel shortening).

¹⁴⁷ For a review from the perspective of the Moscow Accentological School, cf. Oslon 2010.

¹⁴⁸ For a review from the perspective of the Moscow Accentological School, cf. Oslon 2017.

Vedic acc^{sg} *duhitáram* and Greek acc^{sg} θυγατέρα).¹⁴⁹ The other approach may be to explain the mobility in thematic stems or polysyllabic forms like *duktě* – acc^{sg} *dùkteri* as somehow analogical to the athematic root-nouns (as Kortlandt does), though that would be very strange since thematic stems were much more productive than the athematic ones, which tended to weaken and eventually even disappear altogether in most later Indo-European languages. In any case, if the Balto-Slavic mobility in most of the nominal stems is due to some kind of innovative retraction or some similar process (something like “Pedersen’s law” or Olander’s “mobility law”), how is it possible that what one gets is exactly the same kind of mobility as seen in Vedic and Greek root-nouns? As the table above clearly shows, acc^{sg}/nom^{pl}/acc^{pl} is barytonic everywhere, while nom^{sg}/gen^{sg}/gen^{pl} is oxytonic. Is this just a coincidence?¹⁵⁰ Is it possible that some kind of innovative sound law in Balto-Slavic (“Pedersen’s law” or some law similar to it) would provide the same type of mobility that was supposedly originally already there in athematic root-nouns?¹⁵¹ Is it possible that Balto-Slavic also secondarily developed the same kind of immobile/mobile opposition in verbs as well? What were these strange retractions (or even stranger analogies) that produced a Balto-Slavic split of the verbal system to immobile and mobile stems, completely parallel to the accentual split in nouns, and at the same time completely unknown in the traditionally reconstructed “Graeco-Aryan” Proto-Indo-European accentual system? If all this were true, that would be one enormous coincidence and one very unusual development. Why wouldn’t one rather assume that the opposition of immobile and mobile stress was originally present in all stems and that it was later lost almost everywhere in Vedic and Greek except in the athematic root-nouns, with the thematic and polysyllabic athematic stems generalizing the

¹⁴⁹ Interestingly enough, Greek variant (Homer) acc^{sg} θυγατρα (appearing e.g. in the 13th verse of the Iliad) and nom^{pl} (epic/lyric) variant θυγατρεις (cf. the classical Greek θυγατέρες ~ Vedic nom^{pl} *duhitáras*) (Дыбо 2003: 147) seem to never be mentioned in mainstream Western literature. Though one might try to explain these forms with a secondary -τρ- (initial stress cannot go with the full -τερ- because the accent would be on the fourth syllable from the end, i.e. **θυγατερα – **θυγατερες, which is impossible in Greek) as due to the “not sufficiently well-founded and (...) now mostly and rightly forgotten” (Collinge 1985: 86) Hirt’s law in Greek (not the same as Hirt’s law in Balto-Slavic), the silence concerning these forms is very unusual and troubling.

¹⁵⁰ To his credit, Kortlandt does not seem to think so.

¹⁵¹ Jasanoff (2017: 113) is at pains to prove that Balto-Slavic mobility is somehow completely different than the one he considers Proto-Indo-European. However, the problem lies exactly in the mainstream equation of athematic ablaut types with accent (*ibid.* 4–7), which includes fanciful reconstructions such as **méntis ‘thought’ (instead of the actually attested *mǵtis) (*ibid.* 113). For a critique of such an approach to the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European accent (in relation to ablaut) cf. Kapović 2017c: 55–56, 2017d: 67–69.

columnar oxytone accent (e.g. Greek θεά ‘goddess’ – acc^{sg} θεά)? A typologically similar development can be seen in many contemporary Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian dialects, which have (similarly to Vedic and Greek so many centuries ago) lost the mobility in a. p. C except in nouns with monosyllabic roots – cf. Modern Štokavian loc^{sg} *zúbu* (from *zúb* ‘tooth’) but loc^{sg} *òbrūču* (from *òbrūč* ‘hoop’) instead of the older loc^{sg} *òbrúču*, or acc^{sg} *glāvu* (from *gláva* ‘head’) but acc^{sg} *sramòtu* (from *sramòta* ‘shame’) instead of the older acc^{sg} *sràmotu*. The same can occur in dialects without the accent retraction – cf. Brač Čakavian (Šimunović 2009: 35–37) mobility in monosyllabic *vrôg* ‘devil’ – gen^{sg} + *vrôga*¹⁵² – loc^{sg} *vrôgŭ* – nom^{pl} *vrôzi* – gen^{pl} *vragôv* – dat/loc/instr^{pl} *vrôzima(n)* (thus in most monosyllabic a. p. C stems) but lack of it in disyllabic *gòlub* ‘pigeon’ – gen^{sg} *gòluba* – loc^{sg} + *gòlubu* – nom^{pl} *gòlubi* – (gen^{pl} + *gòlubih*) – dat/loc/instr^{pl} + *gòlubima* (thus in most disyllabic old a. p. C stems).¹⁵³

According to the valence theory,¹⁵⁴ the attested accentual system in Balto-Slavic (prior to the operation of de Saussure’s and Dybo’s law) can be analyzed by assuming that all syllables (or morphemes) were either dominant (+, probably high tone) or recessive (–, probably low tone),¹⁵⁵ somewhat similar to modern Japanese. The stress is attributed to the first dominant syllable in a word (e.g. *kǝrvǝ ‘cow’, *vǝdǝ ‘water’). If all syllables are recessive, the word is phonologically unstressed, which means it gets an automatic initial circumflex (acc^{sg} *vǝdǝ ‘water’), which can then shift further to the left if it gets a preceding recessive clitic (*nǝ_vǝdǝ ‘onto the water’). Dominant morphemes are a. p. *a* and *b* roots (*kǝrv-, *sǝstr- ‘sister’) and accent-“attracting” endings in a. p. *c* (nom^{sg} *vǝdǝ) and suffixes (*vǝdǝçǝ ‘little water’). Recessive morphemes are a. p. *c*

¹⁵² + marks the forms not directly attested as such but regularly derived according to the presented accentual type.

¹⁵³ Cf. Jasanoff’s (2017: 112) objection that “[h]owever tempting it may be for Balticists and Slavicists to assume that the BSL type of mobility was ‘always there,’ it is scarcely possible, taking a larger view of the IE family, to accept the idea that the ubiquitous mobile *i*- and *u*-stems of Balto-Slavic could all have independently lost their mobility in Vedic, Greek, and Hittite(!), while root nouns and a limited number of obviously archaic suffixed consonant stems agreed in remaining mobile in these languages. It is even more difficult to believe that thematic (*o*-) stems, or the *ā*-stems (...) were mobile in the parent language.” First of all, considering other common innovations (independent or not) of Indo-Iranian and Greek, the loss of mobility was not necessarily independent. Secondly, independent loss of accentual mobility (or tendency to lose it) in polysyllabic stems is exactly what occurred in numerous Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian local dialects. Thirdly, Jasanoff forgets to mention that traces of mobility in thematic and *i*- and *u*-stems can be seen in Germanic as well (cf. Schaffner 2001).

¹⁵⁴ Cf. e.g. Дыбо 2000: 11–14, 1981: 260–262.

¹⁵⁵ We shall disregard here the problem of primary and secondary dominance.

roots (*v_od- ‘water’), together with endings (*-ŏ in acc^{sg} *v_odŏ) and suffixes that do not “attract” the accent in a. p. *c* (*s_ŷnŏv_ŷ ‘son’s’).

What the valence theory is especially good at explaining is the accentuation in Slavic derivation,¹⁵⁶ which the proponents of deriving the Balto-Slavic accentuation from the “Graeco-Aryan” Proto-Indo-European system usually completely ignore. If one takes that all morphemes/syllables in Balto-Slavic were either dominant/high or recessive/low, the accentuation in derivation is very simple to explain – the accentuation in a derivative will simply depend on the valence of the root, the suffix, and the ending. E.g. if a root is dominant (like *kŏrv-), all forms made with this root will be initial-stressed (and the accentual characteristics of suffixes and endings will not matter): dat^{sg} *kŏrvĕ, instr^{pl} *kŏrvamĭ, *kŏrvica ‘little cow’. If a root is recessive (like *v_od-), the accentuation of the forms made with this root will depend on the accentual characteristics of suffixes and endings: dat^{sg} *v_odĕ, instr^{sg} *v_odŏjŏ, instr^{pl} *v_odāmĭ, *v_odīca.

However, if one does not believe in valence theory and derives Balto-Slavic accentual paradigms (which are much more complex than those found in either Vedic or Greek) from the “Graeco-Aryan” Proto-Indo-European system via specific unconvincing retractions and analogies, the accentuation in derivatives is practically impossible to explain.¹⁵⁷ It is not problematic in a. p. *a* and a. p. *b* – there, one can simply claim that derivatives preserve the same immobile root-accent as in basic forms, e.g. *kŏrvica like *kŏrva, *sèstrica like *sèstra.¹⁵⁸ Where the situation becomes problematic is with roots belonging to a. p. *c*. How can one explain that derivatives of words that have mobile accentuation can have any kind of accentual type (except, logically, having a dominant root-stress)?¹⁵⁹ It is very difficult to explain phonetically the accentuation of such forms as *s_ŷn_ŷ ‘son’ – *s_ŷnŏv_ŷ – fem. *s_ŷnŏvā – *s_ŷnŏv_ŷc_ŷ ‘nephew’ – *s_ŷn_ŷk_ŷ ‘sonny’ or *golvā ‘head’ – *nā_golvŏ ‘on the head’ – *golvīca ‘little head’ – *golvāt_ŷ ‘with a big head’ – *golvāf_ŷ ‘chief’ – *gŏlv_ŷn_ŷ ‘main’ – fem. *golv_ŷnā – def. *golv_ŷn_ŷj_ŷ – def. neut. *gŏlv_ŷnŏje if one does not take into account the valence

¹⁵⁶ Reconstructed and described in details by Dybo (cf. Дыбо 2000: 97–209, 1981: 55–200).

¹⁵⁷ Cf. also Ослон 2010: 145.

¹⁵⁸ However, cf. an example of Kortlandt’s ignoring “контурное правило” even in connection with a. p. *b* (*ženāť) in Ослон and Ринкявичюс 2011: 118.

¹⁵⁹ Disregarding here the accentuation of the comparative and certain derivatives (such as Štokavian žīva ‘quicksilver’ from žīv ‘alive’).

theory.¹⁶⁰ What is more, it is implausible that such derivation rules, obviously governed by underlying (high and low) tones, can be derived from a much simpler “Graeco-Aryan” Proto-Indo-European system as is usually reconstructed.

In any case, while the valence theory and the new approach to Proto-Indo-European accentuation is definitely worth at least a serious consideration, it is not difficult to see why such a theory cannot easily become an Indo-Europeanist mainstream. Balto-Slavic is traditionally held as unimportant for the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European accent and the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European accentuation on the basis of Vedic and Greek (with a touch of Germanic via Grimm’s and Verner’s law) is well established and extremely simple. Making Balto-Slavic accentuation perhaps the main cornerstone of reconstructing Proto-Indo-European accentuation is not practical because of its complexity, which is such that even many Balto-Slavic specialists are not too comfortable with it.¹⁶¹ It will be interesting to see what the future brings concerning the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European accentuation.

8. Conclusion

It is understandable that Frederik Kortlandt does not want to give up on or substantially modify the doctrine he has been working on for almost half a century. This, however, does not mean that it is not full of lacunae and that it can explain the real data in a satisfactory manner. But it is Kortlandt’s *modus operandi* that is most disturbing: working with a rather limited set of examples repeated tirelessly (e.g. Czech *pekař* and *rybář*) without taking into account the whole context and system, obfuscating his own theories and making it very difficult for uninitiated readers to properly assess them themselves (e.g. concerning Stang’s law), constantly ignoring important data that do not fit his doctrine (e.g. Slovenian data for pretonic length), avoiding detailed argumentation (e.g. concerning Štokavian/Slovene *gen^{pl} -ā*), having an inadequate grasp of the basic material

¹⁶⁰ Abstractly and theoretically, one could talk of “accent-attracting” morphemes (roots, endings, and suffixes), but that means nothing in real phonetic terms and has to have at least a historical phonetic explanation.

¹⁶¹ There also some additional practical problems, like the fact that the majority of works of the Moscow Accentological School is written in Russian, which makes them inaccessible to most Indo-European scholars.

(e.g. concerning the *kòkōt* type length in Štokavian/Čakavian), and suppressing recent research done outside of his own school of thought. Kortlandt appears to be at pains to defend his clearly problematic doctrine, while unfortunately not being able to produce anything new in its defense except to repeat what he wrote decades ago. Bold rhetorics and fierce conviction may go a long way, but they cannot replace careful argumentation, in-depth knowledge, overview of the data, and honest scholarly discussion.

References:

- ARJ = *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Vol. I–XXIII. JAZU. Zagreb. 1881–1976.
- BABIĆ, IVAN. 2008. *Studenački rječnik*. Župni ured Studenci. Studenci.
- BARBIĆ, ANTE. 2011. *Rječnik Pitava i Zavale*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- BARTOŠ, FRANTIŠEK. 1886–1895. *Dialektologie moravská*. I–II. Nákl. Matice Moravské. Brno.
- BEEKES, ROBERT. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Brill. Leiden – Boston.
- БЕЛИЋ, АЛЕКСАНДАР. 2000. Белешке о чакавским говорима. *Одијалектима (Изабрана дела А. Белића 10)*. Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства. Београд. 136–186.
- BÉLLOSZTÉNÉCZ, JOANNIS. 1740. *Gazophylacium Illyrico-Latinum*. Zagrabia.
- BENIĆ, MISLAV. 2011. Der Akzent bei den Verben der Mundart der Ortschaft Kukljica. *Accent matters: papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 37*. Eds. Pronk, Tijmen; Derksen, Rick. Rodopi. Amsterdam – New York. 1–17.
- BENIĆ, MISLAV. 2014. *Opis govora Kukljice*. Doctoral dissertation. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb.
- 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.
- COLLINGE, N.E. 1985. *The Laws of Indo-European*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam – Philadelphia.
- DELLA BELLA, ARDELIO. 1728. *Dizionario italiano, latino, illirico cui si permettono alcuni avvertimenti per iscrivere e con facilità maggiore leggere le voci illiriche scritte con caratteri italiani, ed anche una breve grammatica per apprendere con proprietà la lingua illirica*. Presso Cristoforo Zanne. Venezia.

- DERKSEN, RICK. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Brill. Leiden – Boston.
- DRŽIĆ, MARIN. 1996. *Dubrava u komediju stavljena*. Mozaik knjiga. Zagreb.
- ДЬБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 1981. *Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском*. Издательство “Наука”. Москва.
- ДЬБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 1999. Праславянская акцентная система как отображение индоевропейской системы тонов. *Slavia* 68. 115–120.
- ДЬБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 2000. *Морфонологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис. Том I. Языки русской культуры*. Москва.
- ДЬБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 2003. Балто-славянская акцентологическая реконструкция и индоевропейская акцентология. *Славянское языкознание. XIII международный съезд славистов. Любляна, 2003 г. Доклады российской делегации*. Москва. 131–161.
- ДЬБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 2007. Балто-славянская акцентологическая реконструкция и индоевропейская акцентология (Глагольные акцентные системы западных индоевропейских языков). *Tones and Theories. Proceedings of IWoBA 2005*. Eds. Karpović, Mate; Matasović, Ranko. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb. 47–73.
- ДЬБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 2011. Балтославянская акцентная система как рефлекс “западноевропейского” варианта праиндоевропейской акцентной системы. *Proceedings of the 6th IWoBA (Baltistica VII Priedas)*. Ed. Rinkevičius, Vytautas. 63–86.
- ДЬБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 2014. Балто-славянская акцентная система и итоги индоевропейской акцентологической реконструкции. *IWoBA VIII. Реферати VIII међународног скупа о балтословенској акцентологији. Нови Сад, 2014*. 17–94.
- ДЬБО, В. А.; НИКОЛАЕВ, С. Л. 1998. Новые данные и материалы по балто-славянской акцентологии. *Проблемы славянского языкознания. Три доклада к Международному съезду славистов*. Российская академия наук. Москва. 5–70.
- ДУВО, V. A.; NIKOLAYEV, S. L.; STAROSTIN, S. A. 1978. A Tonological Hypothesis on the origin of paradigmatic accent systems. *Estonian papers in phonetics* 1978. 16–20.
- ДЬБО, В. А., ЗАМЯТИНА, Г. И.; НИКОЛАЕВ, С. Л. 1990. *Основы славянской акцентологии*. Издательство “Наука”. Москва.
- ДЬБО, В. А., ЗАМЯТИНА, Г. И.; НИКОЛАЕВ, С. Л. 1993. *Основы славянской акцентологии. Словарь*. Издательство “Наука”. Москва.
- НАВЈАНЕС, SINIŠA. 2016. The Slovak language as a source for the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic accentual system. *Baltistica* LI/2. 341–353.
- ННГ = НАММ, JOSIP; HRASTE, MATE; GUBERINA, PETAR. 1956. Govor otoka Suska. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1. 5–213.
- HRASTE, MATE. 1935. Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Hvara. *Јужнословенски филолог* 14. 1–57.

- ILLIČ-SVITYCH, VLADISLAV M. 1979. *Nominal Accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. The MIT Press. Cambridge – London.
- IVŠIĆ, STJEPAN. 1911. Prilog za slavenski akcentat. *Rad JAZU* 187. 133–208.
- IVŠIĆ, STJEPAN. 1913. Današnji posavski govor. *Rad JAZU* 196 (I). 124–254; 197 (II). 9–138.
- IVŠIĆ, STJEPAN. 1936. Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca. *Ljetopis JAZU* 48. 47–88.
- JASANOFF, JAY H. 2017. *Prehistory of Balto-Slavic Accent*. Brill. Leiden–Boston.
- JOHNSON, D. J. L. 1972. The Genesis of the Serbo-Croatian Genitive Plural in -ā. *The Slavonic and East European Review* 50/120. 333–358.
- 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.
- JURIŠIĆ, BLAŽ. 1992. *Nacrt hrvatske slovnice. Tvorba imenica u povijesnom razvoju*. Matica hrvatska. Zagreb.
- KALOGJERA, DAMIR; FATTORINI SVOBODA, MIRJANA; JOSIPOVIĆ SMOJVER, VIŠNJA. 2008. *Rječnik govora grada Korčule*. Novi liber. Zagreb.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2007. Naglasne paradigme imeničnih *i*-osnovâ u hrvatskom. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* III. 71–79.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2009. Rising mobility in Slavic *i*-stems. *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau*. Eds. Lühr, Rosemarie; Ziegler, Sabine. 236–243.
- 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. *Accent matters: papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 37. Eds. Pronk, Tijmen; Derksen, Rick. Rodopi. Amsterdam – New York. 109–233.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2015. *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije. Fonetika*. Matica hrvatska. Zagreb.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2017a. On shortening, lengthening, and accent shifts in Slavic. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 43/2. 381–402.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2017b. The Position of Kajkavian in the South Slavic Dialect Continuum in Light of Old Accentual Isoglosses. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 62/4. 606–620.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2017c. Proto-Indo-European Phonology. *The Indo-European Languages*. Ed. Kapović, Mate. Routledge. London – New York. 13–60.

- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2017d. Proto-Indo-European Morphology. *The Indo-European Languages*. Ed. Kapović, Mate. Routledge. London – New York. 61–110.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2018. Povijest glagolske akcentuacije u štokavskom (i šire). *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 44/1. 159–285.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2019. The Dialectal Dissolution of Proto-Slavonic: Accentological Approach. *The Oxford Guide to the Slavonic Languages*. Eds. Fellerer, Jan; Bermel, Neil. Oxford University Press. Oxford. [to appear]
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. [to appear]. The Genitive Plural Ending in PIE and Slavic. *Proceedings of the Indogermanisch Gesellschaft Arbeitstagung (Ljubljana 2019)*.
- KLOEKHORST, ALWIN. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Brill. Leiden – Boston.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 1978. On the history of the genitive plural in Slavic, Baltic, Germanic, and Indo-European. *Lingua* 45. 281–300.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2010. Balto-Slavic accentuation revisited. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 56. 61–81.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2011. *Selected writings on Slavic and general linguistics*. Rodopi. Amsterdam.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2016. On the rise of neo-acute *e and *o. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 42/2. 471–482.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2018. Rise and Fall of Vowel Length in Slavic. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 44/1. 287–297.
- KULIKOV, LEONID. 2017. Indo-Aryan. *The Indo-European Languages*. Ed. Kapović, Mate. Routledge. London – New York. 205–262.
- LAMPRECHT, ARNOŠT; ŠLOSAR, DUŠAN; BAUER, JAROSLAV. 1986. *Historická mluvnice češtiny*. Státní pedagogické nakladatelství. Praha.
- LIGORIO, ORSAT; KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2011. O naglasku dvosložnih o-osnova s kratkosilaznim naglaskom u Dubrovniku. *Croatica & Slavica Iadertina* VII/2. 327–366.
- LORENZ, FRIEDRICH. 1903. *Slovinzische Grammatik*. Издание Второго Отдѣленія Императорской Академіи Наукъ. Санкт-Петербург.
- LUKEŽIĆ, IVA; ZUBČIĆ, SANJA. 2007. *Grobnički govor XX. stoljeća (gramatika i rječnik)*. Katedra Čakavskog sabora Grobnišćine. Rijeka.
- MARTINOVIĆ, ŽARKO. 2005. *Rječnik govora otoka Iža*. Gradska knjižnica Zadar. Zadar.
- MATASOVIĆ, RANKO. 2008. *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Matica hrvatska. Zagreb.
- MATKOVIĆ, DINKO. 2004. *Rječnik frazema i poslovice govora Vrboske na otoku Hvaru*. Matica hrvatska. Jelsa.

- MILAT PANŽA, PETAR. 2014. *Rječnik govora Blata na Korčuli*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.
- МИЛЕТИЋ, БРАНКО. 1940. Црмнички говор. *Српски дијалектолошки зборник* 9. 209–663.
- MOGUŠ, MILAN. 2002. *Senjski rječnik*. HAZU – MH Senj. Zagreb – Senj.
- НИКОЛАЕВ, СЕРГЕЙ Л. 2012. Восточнославянские рефлексy а. п. d и индоевропейские соотвествия славянским акцентным типам существительных м. р. с о- и и-основами. *Карпато-балканский диалектный ландшафт. Язык и культура* 2. Российская академия наук. Институт славяноведения. Москва. 32–189.
- НИКОЛАЕВ, СЕРГЕЙ Л. 2013. К реконструкции акцентных классов балто-славянских глаголов. *Балто-славянские исследования XIX*. 151–250.
- ОБЛАК, VATROSLAV. 1890. Zur Geschichte der nominalen Declination im Slovenischen. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 12. 1–47, 358–450.
- OLANDER, THOMAS. 2009. *Balto-Slavic Accentual Mobility*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin – New York.
- OLANDER, THOMAS. 2015. *Proto-Slavic Inflectional Morphology. A Comparative Handbook*. Brill. Leiden – Boston.
- ОСЛОН, МИХАИЛ ВЛАДИМИРОВИЧ. 2010. [Review of: Olander 2009]. *Вопросы языкознания* 2. 141–146.
- OSLON, MIKHAIL. 2017. [Review of: Jasanoff 2017]. *Journal of Language Relationship/ Вопросы языкового родства* 15/4. 299–311.
- ОСЛОН, МИХАИЛ ВЛАДИМИРОВИЧ. 2017. К описанию ударения старых полонизмов в украинском языке. *Памяти В. М. Иллич-Свитыча: материалы круглого стола*. Институт славяноведения РАН. Москва. 34–44.
- ОСЛОН, М. В.; РИНКЯВИЧЮС, В. 2011. [Review of: Kortlandt, Frederik. 2009. *Baltica & Balto-Slavica*. Rodopi. Amsterdam]. *Вопросы языкознания* 5. 116–121.
- PIASEVOLI, ANKICA. 1993. *Rječnik govora mjesta Sali na Dugom otoku*. Ogranak Matice hrvatske Zadar. Zadar.
- PERUŠKO, MARIJA. 2010. *Rječnik medulinskoga govora*. Društvo kulturno umjetničkog stvaralaštva Mendula. Medulin.
- PLETERŠNIK, MAKS. 1894. *Slovensko-nemški slovar*. I-II. Ljubljana.
- PRONK, TIJMEN. 2016. Early Slavic short and long o and e. *Slavia Centralis* IX/1. 5–33.
- RADULIĆ, LADISLAV. 2002. *Rječnik rivanjskog govora*. Matica hrvatska Zadar. Zadar.
- REŠETAR, MILAN. 1933. Jezik Marina Držića. *Rad JAZU Razreda historičko-filološkog* III. 248–299.
- RINGE, DON. 2006. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Oxford University Press. New York.

- SCHAFFNER, STEFAN. 2001. *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck. Innsbruck.
- SEKULIĆ, ANTE. 2005. *Rječnik govora bačkih Hrvata*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje – Katolički institut za kulturu, povijest i duhovnost “Ivan Antunović”. Zagreb.
- STANG, CHRISTIAN S. 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*. I komisjon hos H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard). Oslo.
- STANISLAV, JÁN. 1958. *Dejiny slovenského jazyka II. Tvaroslovie*. Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied. Bratislava.
- STANKIEWICZ, EDWARD. 1978. The Inflection of Serbo-Croatian Substantives and Their Genitive Plural Endings. *American Contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*. Ed. Birnbaum, Henrik. Slavica Publishers, Inc. Columbus (Ohio). 666–681.
- STANKIEWICZ, EDWARD. 1993. *The Accentual Patterns of the Slavic Languages*. Stanford University Press. Stanford.
- СТЕВАНОВИЋ, МИХАИЛО С. 1933–1934. Источночрногорски дијалекат. *Јужнословенски филолог* XIII. 1–129.
- SVANE, GUNNAR OLAF. 1958. *Die Flexionen in štokavischen Texten aus dem Zeitraum 1350-1400*. Universitetsforlaget. Aarhus.
- ŠIMUNIĆ, BOŽIDAR. 2013. *Rječnik bibinjskoga govora*. Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Zadru. Zadar.
- ŠIMUNOVIĆ, PETAR. 2009. *Rječnik bračkih čakavskih govora*. Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga. Zagreb.
- TRÁVNÍČEK, FRANTIŠEK. 1935. *Historická mluvnice česko-slovenská*. Melantrich A. S. Praha.
- VALČIĆ, ANTE TONI. 2012. *Rječnik govora otoka Ošljaka*. Matica hrvatska – Ogranak u Zadru. Zadar.
- VASMER, MAX. 1955. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Zweiter Band L-Ssuda*. Carl Winter’s Universitätsverlag. Heidelberg.
- VELČIĆ, NIKOLA. 2003. *Besedar Bejske tramuntane*. Katedra Čakavskog sabora Cres-Lošinj – Tramuntana – Adamić. Mali Lošinj – Beli – Rijeka.
- VERMEER, WILLEM. 1984. On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: the quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and relate issues. *Folia linguistica historica* V/2. 331–395.
- 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.

ВУК = КАРАЦИЋ, ВУК СТЕФ. ⁴1935. *Српски рјечник иступачен њемачкијем и латинскијем ријечима*. Штампарија Краљевине Југославије. Београд.

VULETIĆ, NIKOLA; SKRAČIĆ, VLADIMIR. 2018. *Leksik morske faune u sjevernoj Dalmaciji. Prvi dio: rječnik pučkog nazivlja*. Sveučilište u Zadru. Zadar.

Kraćenje, duženje i rekonstrukcija: bilješke iz slavenske povijesne akcentologije

Sažetak

Ovaj članak predstavlja nastavak rasprave s Frederikom Kortlandtom o raznim temama iz slavenske povijesne akcentologije. U članku je riječ o sljedećim temama: odrazu praslavenskog kratkog neoakuta u kajkavskom; odrazu prednaglasnih i zanaglasnih dužina u zapadnoslavenskom i južnoslavenskom; rekonstrukciji nastavka *-ъ u genitivu množine u slavenskom, o njegovu naglasku te o nastavku -ā u štokavskom i slovenskom; duženju tipa *bōg* i *kōkōt* u zapadnom južnoslavenskom; o riječima tipa *obōrna ‘obrana’ i *čьrnīna ‘crnina’ te o retrakcijama kontrakcijskog neocirkumfleksa; odrazu *ò u slovačkim i češkim jednosložicama; te o teoriji valentnosti i praindoeuropskom izvoru baltoslavenske akcentuacije.

Ključne riječi: slavenski, indoeuropski, akcentuacija, rekonstrukcija, genitiv množine, neoakut, neocirkumfleks

Keywords: Slavic, Indo-European, accentuation, reconstruction, genitive plural, neo-acute, neo-circumflex