

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

SLAVIC LENGTH AGAIN

The author explains some of the details of the development of Slavic length while comparing his own theory with the theory of Frederik Kortlandt. The author tries to prove the advantages of his own theory and shows some of the apparent shortcomings of the other approach which is found inadequate in describing the language material. In the article, the following problems are discussed (among others): the shortening of the final length, the reflection of the old acute and short neo--acute in Czech, the accentuation of the a.p. b definite adjectives, the problem of pretonic and posttonic length in South and West Slavic etc.

1. Introduction¹

I have recently (Kapović 2003, 2005a) presented my theory on the development of Slavic length – pretonic, posttonic and accented length. The reaction to the proposed conclusions was not uniform. Georg Holzer adopted them for his highly systematic and valuable treatment of the relative chronology of prosodic developments of Common Slavic and Early Croatian (Holzer 2005). However, the main proponent of the Leiden Accentological School, Frederik Kortlandt (2005), has, as expected, refused to accept them. It would be highly unlikely to presume that Kortlandt would give up his own theory of Slavic accentuation which he has been advocating since the early '70-ies of the last century. In this article, I shall reply to the criticism Kortlandt has directed at my theory and I shall also try to illuminate some aspects of the development of Slavic length which require further clarification.

¹ I would like to thank Thomas Olander and Sergei Tarasov for his comments on the first draft of the paper and Kristina Marenčić for reading the text thoroughly.

2. Shortening of the long vowels in final open syllables

Kortlandt begins with the claim that I disregard »the evidence from all Slavic and West Slavic languages« by maintaining the shortening of long vowels in final open syllables in Proto-Slavic. However, this is very far from the truth. It is clear that most cases of length in final open syllables can be accounted for by simple analogies and processes of post-Common-Slavic origin. Thus, the shortening of the long vowels in final open syllables is actually the simplest theory. Kortlandt says that this supposition drives me to »assume massive analogical spread of vowel length under obscure conditions«. For instance, he gives an example of Croatian gen. sg. *ženē*. For some reason Kortlandt believes that the explanation of this length (originally neo-acute *-ē*) as secondary, taken from the pronoun *tē* < **tojē*, is »obscure«. He also finds it strange that this analogy occurred only in gen. sg. *-ā*-stems and not in other cases (like acc. sg. *-u* or nom. acc. pl. *-e*) or in other flexion classes. Let us start from the beginning. First of all, it is really difficult to understand why would the supposed analogical change of **tē ženē* ⇒ *tē ženē* be »obscure«. Every comparative linguist, especially Indo-Europeanists, should be well aware of the fact that the inflection of pronouns can influence the inflection of nouns. Cf. for instance the change of PIE **toy wlkʷōs* 'those wolves' (Sanskrit *te vṛkās*, Gothic *hai wulfōs*) to **toy wlkʷoy* (OCS *ti vlčci*, Lithuanian *taĩ vilkaĩ*, Latin *istĩ lupĩ*, Greek *óι λύκοι*) or the pronominal ending *-am* in the *o*-stem dat. sg. in Latvian. If several languages can independently take the pronominal ending in nom. pl. of *o*-stems, how come it is impossible to assume this would happen in *tē ženē*? Kortlandt also objects, as already said, that there is no analogy in other case forms of the same paradigm (acc. sg. *-u*, nom. acc. pl. *-e* etc.). This is even a more difficult concept to grasp. Does Kortlandt actually believe that analogical changes are supposed to be regular? Should we try to find a phonological explanation for Balto-Slavic, Latin and Greek reflection of PIE **-oy* in nom. pl. because the supposed analogy operated only in the nom. pl. and not in other cases? Should we try to find a phonological explanation for Latvian dat. sg. *-am* as well? If Kortlandt really thinks that it is strange that this analogy could have worked only in gen. sg., how would he explain that in Old Irish, ending **-ōs* gets analogically changed only in nom. pl. but remains unchanged in voc. pl. (cf. Old Irish nom. pl. *fir* < PIE **wiHroy* ⇐ **wiHrōs*, voc. pl. *firu* < PIE **wiHrōs*). Also, it is completely unclear how this analogy could work in other declensions. How could there be any analogy in **togó vīlka* (*o*-stems), **togó gōsṗodī* (masc. *i*-stems), **tē* (< **tojē*) *nđt'i* (fem. *i*-stems) etc.? Clearly, the analogy worked only in **tē ženē* because here the ending was identical, with the exception of accent. The original short ending is preserved in non-palatal ending **-y* in North Čakavian gen. sg. *-ì*. Thus, one must conclude that Kortlandt's argument is simply false. He does not have to accept this *-ē* as being analogical and

secondary, but implying that this process is not at all possible, as he tries to insinuate, is simply distorting of the facts and all principles of historical grammar.

3. The reflection of the old acute and short neo-acute in Czech, Slovak and Upper Lusatian

Traditional view, with which I agree, states that the old acute remained long in Czech (and Upper Lusatian in TorT syllables), cf. **vǫrna* ‘crow’ > Czech *vrána*, UL *wróna*, but Croatian *vràna*. Kortlandt unnecessarily assumes that the old acute was first shortened and then lengthened again in Czech and UL.² To support his hypothesis, he adduces four reasons why the length in Czech and UL must be reintroduced and not preserved. However, none of the four reasons he gives are very convincing. Kortlandt assumes that the quantitative alternation in Czech *kráva*, inst. sg. *kravou*, gen. pl. *krav*, inst. pl. *kravami* etc. can only be explained by the lengthening of earlier shortened Proto-Slavic **à* (supposedly from **ǣ*). However, this is again a false claim. »Traditional« theory, as Kortlandt refers to it, has no trouble explaining *kráva*, *kravou*. The length in Czech is preserved in mono- and disyllables, in words with three or more syllables (like **kǫrvojo* > *kravou*), it is regularly shortened (Carlton 1991:195, Kapović 2005a). There is no reason whatsoever which would point to the shortening and then again lengthening of the old acute in Czech rather than preservation. A typological parallel for this shortening in polysyllabic words but not in mono- and disyllabic is clear in Croatian where the circumflex is preserved in mono- and disyllabic words (*sîn*, *sîna*) but shortened in polysyllabic ones (*sînovi*). Kortlandt also adduces the **vǫl’ã*-type example Czech *kůže* ‘skin’ but instr. pl. *kožemi* where we find the same alternation as in *kráva*. He sees this as a clear example of lengthening in Czech. I agree that Czech *kůže* is lengthened from **kǫža* and that there was no lengthening in front of two moras (thus long or two short vowels), but I do not agree with him that this was regular. I side with Carlton (1991:202–205) who says the supposition that both short and long neo-acute produced regularly length in Czech does not really solve anything. The long reflection of the short neo-acute in Czech (and Slovak) is very sporadic and cannot be taken as regular. We find it in Czech *můžeš* (Slovak *môžeš*), *stůněš*, possibly in Slovak *nôž* (Czech *nůž* is not so reliable), *bôb* (but Czech *bob* and also Czech/Slovak *snop*), in **vǫl’ã*-type nouns (cf. Kapović 2006): Czech *vůle*, *chůze*, *vůně*, *nůše*, *tůně*, Slovak *vôľa*, *chôdza*, *vôňa*, *tôňa*, but *koža*, *noša*. In **vǫl’ã*-type nouns, the analogical long neo-acute has spread to all originally short neo-acute roots in Czech. In Slovak, there is no

² That is actually what happened in Slovene but it is clear that Slovene lengthening of all non-final syllables does not have anything to do with Czech.

length in *koža* and *noša*. But these are all cases of sporadic lengthening, Czech normally has a short reflex of the short neo-acute (the neo-acute on *o, *e, *b, *v). Cf. Czech *bob* ‘bean’, *snop* ‘bundle’ (a.p. b) etc. The occasional and sporadic lengthening of the short neo-acute is not attested only in Czech and Slovak, cf. also Polish *szósty* ‘sixth’, *siódmy* ‘seventh’, *ósmy* ‘eighth’ by analogy to *piąty* ‘fifth’, *dziewiąty* ‘ninth’, *dziesiąty* ‘tenth’, Croatian dial. *šestī*, *sědmī*, *ōsmī* instead of also attested *šestī*, *sědmī*, *ōsmī*, Croat. dial. *grōžde* ‘grapes’, *zělje* ‘greens’ instead of also attested *grōžde*, *zělje*, Croat. *jěž* < *jěž* ‘hedgohog’, *nōž* < *nōž* ‘knife’ instead of ***jěž*, ***nōž*. Cf. also Slovene lengthened **jěž* (Slovak *jež*), but original *nōž*. The typological parallel of this development could be seen in the phenomenon known as *kanovačko duljenje* (cf. Kapović 2005c) in some modern Serbian and Croatian dialects where the lengthening of the short rising accent is irregular and sporadic in many cases (for instance in some dialects *òsip* ‘rash’ but *òmot* ⇒ *ómot* ‘wrapper’). There is also one additional proof that the old acute length was indeed preserved long in Czech and that the length of the short neo-acute is not regular. If the old acute was shortened and then lengthened again together with the short neo-acute, how can one explain the fact that the old acute always provides us with the long vowel in Czech (in mono- and disyllabic words) but that the reflection of the short neo-acute is long only sporadically, as we have already said?³ That does not point to overall shortening and lengthening.

As for the third example Kortlandt adduces, Czech *lžíce* ‘spoon’, but gen. pl. *lžic*, inst. pl. *lžicemi* represents the same type as *kráva* – the length of the old acute is preserved in *lžíce*, where the initial *jer* (**lʷžícā*) must have been dropped rather early which is the reason why *lžíce* represents the same type as *kráva* (because of the early dropping of the *jer* in the first syllable, *lžíce* is treated like a normal disyllabic acute word in Czech). The same goes for Czech *psáti* ‘write’ < **psāti*. Czech *psal*, which should be *psál* since it comes from **psālʷ* (a.p. b), is short because of an analogy to Czech *dáti* ‘give’, *dal* < **dālʷ* (a.p. c). Czech *spáti* ‘sleep’, supine *spat* is also not at all unexpected in the »traditional« theory – cf. Kajkavian *spàti*, but *spât*. The length of the old acute is also preserved in TorT formulas in UL as well: *wróna* ‘crow’, *klóda* ‘log’ (Czech/Slovene *vrána*, *kláda*, Croat. *vràna*, *klàda* etc.).

4. **mōldostʷ*

In the next section Kortlandt posits Croat. *mlādōst* as analogous to oblique cases and takes Čakavian (Hvar) *mlādost* (he does not mention gen. sg. *mlādo-*

³ There are of course examples like Czech *ryba* ‘fish’ and *pleva* ‘chaff’ which are unexpectedly short (cf. Croat. *ri̇ba*, *pljèva*) but these were long in Old Czech and their shortening is of a younger date.

sti) as original. However, this is very suspicious since the form *mlâdost* could be innovative as well and there is no point in discussing just one isolated example without looking at the whole system.⁴

5. Dybo's Law, Ivšić's Rule and weak *jer*s

Kortlandt objects to my (and the 'traditional') theory that the neo-acute in Croat. dial. *kūt* 'angle', *pūtnīk* 'traveler' and *dužnīk* 'debtor' is due to the retraction from the following weak *jer* (Ivšić's Rule). He thinks this »requires massive analogical lengthening in the oblique cases«. However, there is no need for any analogy here, and especially for »massive analogical lengthening«. In *kūt*, there is gen. sg. *kūtâ*, dat. sg. *kūtû*, in *pūtnīk* < **pōtbnīk*v; same happens in gen. sg. *pūtnīka* < **pōtbnīka*, and in *dužnīk*, gen. sg. etc. is also regular *dužnīkâ* (Kapović 2003:65, 2005a). When mentioning the need for »massive analogical lengthening« in oblique cases, Kortlandt speaks in terms of his own framework, not the »traditional« one. In the »traditional« theory, there is no need for analogies here, as I have already mentioned. Kortlandt also says that my interpretation does not explain »the quantitative and timbre alternations in the Slovene paradigm of the word *kōnj* 'horse' (cf. Kortlandt 1975:13–19)«. However, in the Slovene paradigm of the word *kōnj*, I cannot see anything which would compel me, or others, to accept Kortlandt's idea that the accent could not be shifted to a *jer* by Dybo's Law.

6. A.p. *b* and a.p. *c* in the present tense and definite adjectives

Following Stankiewicz's idea on the chain-reaction in a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* present tense and definite adjectives (1993:14)⁵, in my article (Kapović 2005a) I have suggested the existence of a tendency to preserve the formal distinction between a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* in the present tense of the verb (thus **tōnešb* 'sink' < **toněšb* in a.p. *b* when **zověšb* 'call' < **zovešb* in a.p. *c*). This, together with Ivšić's Law (usually called Stang's Law) could explain the a.p. *b* neo-acute stress in the present tense and definite adjectives without any disappearing lengths in **možěšb* etc. which Kortlandt is forced to assume. Kortlandt states that he sees »absolutely no reasonable motivation« for this tendency to preserve the formal distinction between a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* in the present tense. This is quite a strange claim. If there is »absolutely no reasonable motivation« for the preservation of the distinction, how would one explain that for instance Modern

⁴ Kortlandt is not explicit as to why he considers *sŕce* 'heart' and acc. sg. *djěcu* 'children' (cf. Kapović 2005b) as original but *mlâdōst* as secondary.

⁵ Concerning the idea of a chain-reaction in definite adjectives, cf. also Micklesen 1986.

Russian (and other Slavic languages) still preserve the very same distinction of a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* in the present tense? If there is no motivation for the preservation of the distinctions of different accentual paradigms (which happened of course in some Slavic languages, like Macedonian), we would not be having this discussion today because all Slavic languages would have long ago lost all accentual distinctions they possess. However, since we all know that many Slavic languages still preserve very complicated accentual systems in which all three a.p. are still clearly deducible, why would it be strange that already in Common Slavic there was a tendency to preserve this distinction in cases when regular phonological developments exposed them to danger of being lost? In any case, chain-reaction is hardly an obscure process in languages (cf. Labov 1994 for the phonological chain-reactions).

Kortlandt explains the difference of a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* definite adjectives, like Čakavian *bělī*⁶ ‘white’: *suhī* ‘dry’ or Czech *bílý*: *suchý*, by reconstructing **bělīy*⁷ < **bēlīy* < **bēlīy* versus **suxīj*⁵ < **suxīj̆*. However, one cannot derive Croat. dial. *suhī* from his **suhīj* with the neo-acute.

The problem of the a.p. *b* definite adjectives requires special attention.⁸ In all the languages we find the neo-acute on the root in a.p. *b* and the final accent in a.p. *c*. Thus in a.p. *b* – **bēlīy̆*, **bēlaja*, **bēloje* ‘white’: Croat. dial. *bělī*, *bělā*, *bělō*, Russ. *бѣлыи*, *бѣлая*, *бѣлое*, Czech *bílý*, *bílá*, *bílé*, Slovene *běli*, Slovincian *bjālī* etc. In a.p. *c* – **moldīy̆*, **moldāja*, **moldoje* ‘young’ > Croat. dial. *mladī*, *mladā*, *mladō*, Russ. *молодōи*, *молодāя*, *молодōе*, Czech *mladý*, *mladá*, *mladé*, Slovincian *mlodī* etc. The ending is not contracted in nom./acc. sg./pl. in Russian, in Old Russian the contraction was not finished even in the oblique cases and the results of the contraction are different in the oblique cases in different languages – cf. OCS *bělajego*, *bēlaago*, *bēlago*, Croat. *bělōga* (with the *-ō-* analogous to *tōga*), Russ. *бѣлозо* (*-o-* is secondary as in Croat.), Czech *bilého*, Polish *bialego* etc. This is a clear indication that the contraction of the ending in definite adjectives was a younger development which has nothing to do with the accentuation.⁹ The contraction is very diverse while the accentuation is the same everywhere. In a.p. *b*, one would expect, according to the indefinite **bēlīb̆* (> **bēlīb̆*), **bēlā*, **bēlō* the forms **bēlīy̆*, **bēlāja*, **bēloje*. In a.p. *c*, with the application of Vasilev–Dolobko’s Law (Dybo 1981:48–54), from the indefinite

⁶ /e/ stands here for any Čakavian phonetic realisation of *ě.

⁷ Kortlandt’s *’ stands for the long neo-acute which is *’ in my notation.

⁸ I would like to thank Bulcsú László for discussing this problem with me.

⁹ The view that the accentuation of the definite adjectives of a.p. *b* is due to the retraction by Ivšić’s Law which in turn is due to a previous contraction is held for instance by Stang 1957:101–102. However, it is highly unlikely that such a uniform accentuation of the a.p. *b* definite adjectives could be the result of such a late and diverse contraction.

*môldъ, *moldâ, *môldo, one should get definite *moldъjъ, *moldajâ, *moldojê. However, when *moldъjъ > *moldъjъ by Ivšić's Rule, this became identical to a.p. b *bělъjъ (fem. was already the same). At first, the accent in a.p. c was either on the first or the second syllable of the ending, cf. *moldâja, but *moldojê, gen. sg. m. *moldajêgo but f. *moldý(je)je etc. Then, the accent of the a.p. c was generalized on the first syllable of the ending – thus *moldoje, *moldajego (cf. Russian *молодѣ, молодѣго*) after *moldъjъ, *moldâja etc. Because of that the a.p. c and a.p. b would get identical – in order to prevent that, the a.p. b adjectives shift the accent to the root thus creating a neo-acute on it. The creation of a fixed neo-acute on the root was enabled by the indefinite nom./acc. sg. m. which had already had the neo-acute on the root due to Ivšić's Rule (*bělъ) and which was thus a role-model for the new accentual pattern of the definite adjectives. This development is of course not really a regular chain-shift since we are really dealing with two analogies here – first, the analogical generalization of the stress on the first part of the ending in a.p. c and then the analogical generalization of the neo-acute on the root in a.p. b by analogy to the nom/acc. sg. indefinite adj. to avoid the merger of two a.p.

7. Pretonic and posttonic length

I hold the view that the first pretonic syllable in Slavic regularly preserves the length, thus *trǫbâ 'trumpet' (a.p. b) > Croat. *trúba*, Sln. *trǫba*, Czech *trouba*, Slk. *trúba*, Polish *trąba*, Slovincian *tr'ǫba*¹⁰ In a.p. c however, the accent is mobile, *rǫkâ, *rǫkǫ 'arm' > Croat. *rúka*, *rúku*. In West Slavic, the circumflex is regularly shortened and thus *rǫkǫ > Czech *ruku*, Slk. *ruku*, Polish *rekę*, Slovincian *rąka*. Analogically to the acc. sg., the nom. sg. which would have preserved the length is also shortened – Czech/Slk. *ruka*, Polish *reka*, Slovincian *rąka*. In Slovene, the circumflex of the acc. sg. is shifted regularly to the following syllable and the root becomes automatically short since there are no unaccented long vowels in Slovene: *rokǫ*. Analogically, nom. sg. also becomes short (*róka* instead of **rǫka*). In Kortlandt's theory, all pretonic long vowels are shortened before Dybo's Law and that is why there is no length in West Slavic and Slovene. He believes that the length in Croatian *rúka* is analogous to *rúku*. Slovak *trúba* etc. is long because the accent shift *tr'ǫba > *trǫbâ by Dybo's Law supposedly took place only after all pretonic long vowels shortened.

Kortlandt objects to the »traditional« theory that one has to assume massive analogical shortening in West Slavic and Slovene which do not show any trace of length in these positions. However, that is not really the case since here we are not dealing with massive analogical shortenings in every separate

¹⁰ Slovincian is quoted in the notation suggested by Stankiewicz 1993 and not in the traditional (Lorentz's) which is not so apt for historical research.

word as one could conclude from Kortlandt's suggestion. In a.p. *b* one expects long root vowel regularly in 8 cases and short in 6 cases (see Kapović 2005a). In a.p. *c*, we expect the short root vowel regularly in 10 cases and long one in only 4 cases (in Slovene, the ratio is even higher – 11:3 in a.p. *c*). Therefore it is no wonder that short forms are generalized in West Slavic and Slovene. In West Slavic, the short root vowel becomes a salient mark of a.p. *c* and in opposition to it, a.p. *b* takes the generalized length as its salient mark.¹¹ Thus it is no wonder that there is no trace of length in a.p. *c* in West Slavic – these forms were very rare among the short ones to begin with and since the brevity of the root is taken as a mark of a.p. *c*, all long forms are dispensed with. It is also not surprising that length is generalized in a.p. *b* since that is exactly what distinguishes it from the old a.p. *c*.¹² Kortlandt thinks that it is »quite unclear why accentual patterns (b) and (c) must everywhere be kept apart by large-scale analogical developments when they merged phonetically in the majority of case forms«. He also states that there is »no plausible motivation for maintaining the redundant formal distinction between the accent patterns (b) and (c)«. It is a somewhat strange claim that there is no plausible motivation for maintaining the distinction between a.p. *b* and *c*. Perhaps one should tell this to a speaker of Croatian or Russian since they surely do not know that there is simply no plausible motivation for them to maintain the distinction of *rúka*, *rúku* – *pyká*, *pýky* and *trúba*, *trúbu* – *mpyóá*, *mpyóý*. If even the present day speakers of some Slavic languages feel the need to preserve the difference between a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* nouns some ten centuries after the Common Slavic period, why would it be strange for early West Slavs to do the same? Furthermore, if one accepts Kortlandt's position that Štokavian *rúka* and Čakavian *rūkà* have a secondarily reintroduced length, is it not somewhat strange that there is no attestation of the pattern ***rukà*, *rúku* in any Štokavian or Čakavian

¹¹ Instead of talking about the salient brevity and length of the root, we could also speak about the salient circumflex in a.p. *c* or the salient neo-acute in a.p. *b*. Thus, in West Slavic, in a.p. *c* one would have generalized **gólva*, *gólvo* (instead of **golvá*, **gólvo*) and in a.p. *b* **trōba*, **trōbo* (from **trōbá*, **trōbō*). Cf. Illič-Svityč 1979(:161): »It can be proposed that, in West Slavic, the rising intonation that appeared as the result of stress retraction to a long root syllable (...) was replaced by a falling intonation, characteristic of the barytone forms of the mobile AP (Nom. Sing. **rōkà* to **rōka* to **rōka* under the influence of the Acc. Sing. **rōko*, cf. SC dial. *rúka*, *rúku*)«.

¹² A typological parallel can be found in Proto-Latvian. There, two accentual paradigms were differentiated in a way that one had the sustained tone \sim in all the forms and that the other had \sim in some and the broken tone $\hat{\text{}}$ in other forms. The first a.p. remained the same and in the second one $\hat{\text{}}$ was generalized in all the forms because it was the salient mark of this paradigm. Cf. also another typological parallel suggested by Illič-Svityč (footnote 10): *rūkà/rúka* \Rightarrow *rúka*, *rúku* in certain Štokavian/Čakavian dialects. Of course, it is quite conceivable that something like this could have occurred in West Slavic as well.

dialect? Since Čakavian preserves the original alternations of long and short root very well (*rūkà, rukē, rūci, ruku, ruko!, rukōn, ruke, rukū, rukām, ruke, rukāh, rukāmi*), is it not a bit surprising that absolutely nowhere is this supposed ***rukà* attested. Also, most archaic Croatian dialects (like Dubrovnik) preserve the shortened root vowel in a.p. *b* as well as in a.p. *c* (*trùbama, svjēcama* ‘candles’ like *rùkama, glàvama* ‘heads’). The opposition of *strijelama* : *rùkama* found in some dialect is a clear innovation due to the overall tendency of ‘ to be generalized in all the cases (cf. Standard Croat. *nàrodi* ‘peoples’, gen. pl. *nârôdā* with original *nàrodi*, gen. pl. *nârôdā* found in many Montenegrò dialects).

Concerning the length of words like Croat. *gúmno* ‘threshing-floor’, *súkno* ‘cloth’, Kortlandt objects to my derivation **gūmnò* > *gúmno* with the simplest possible retention of pretonic length. He argues that I cannot explain Croat. variant *křzno* or Czech *humno, sukno* and Slovak *humno* (but *súkno*). Croat. *křzno* is explained simply as a form from one of the many dialects which do not have long syllabic *r*. In Slovak dialects, there is also *húmno/húvno* with the attested length (SSN, 640). As for Czech *humno, sukno* and Standard Slovak *humno*, it is true that they are unexpected, but it is not so unusual to get an unexpected short vowel in Czech or Slovak, cf. Croat. *rijéka* ‘river’, Sln. *rěka*, Slk. *rieka*, but Czech *řeka*; Croat. *zvižda* ‘star’, Sln. *zvězda*, Slk. *hviezda*, but Czech *hvězda*; Croat. *júha* ‘soup’, Czech *jícha*, but Slk. *jucha* etc. Moreover, Kortlandt conveniently forgets to mention my other four examples (Kapović 2005a): *plátno* ‘linen’, *písmo* ‘letter’, *vápno* ‘lime’ and *vlákno* ‘fiber’ which show length in all languages – Croat., Czech and Slovak (and also in TorT syllables in Polish and UL). Kortlandt himself derives these words like this: the long vowel is supposed to be the result of retraction by Ivšić’s Law (i. e. Stang’s Law in his terminology) – **sūk̂na* < **suk̂nā* and the sg. supposedly had short vowel: **suk̂nò* < **suk̂no*. However, there is a lacuna in Kortlandt’s own theory. The word **suk̂nò*, being a.p. *b* is to be derived from pre-Dybo’s Law **suk̂no*, pl. **suk̂na* (as Kortlandt himself writes for the sg.). These forms thus had pretonic length syllable (**sūk-*) which, according to Kortlandt, had to be shortened in pre-Dybo’s Law Slavic. That is what happens in the singular, according to his theory, but in plural he gets **sūk̂na* with a long root vowel. Now, how did this long vowel get there if all pretonic vowels were supposed to be shortened? Kortlandt should get **sūk̂na* and not **sūk̂na* here, according to his own theory, and this certainly cannot explain aforementioned examples. Thus Kortlandt has to admit that his own theory is incapable of explaining forms like *vápno* in Croatian, Czech and Slovak.¹³ And if pretonic length had not been shortened here, there was certainly no shortening in a.p. *c* words like **rǫká* etc.

¹³ As I have discussed in Kapović 2005a, the possibility of an analogical length in all the words of *súkno* type is highly unlikely if not impossible.

Further on, Kortlandt comments on the a.p. *b* infinitives. He states that my postulate of general phonetic shortening in polysyllabic words puts me »into major difficulties in the case of infinitives in *-ati* and *-iti*, where we usually find a long root vowel in accent pattern (b) and a short root vowel in accent pattern (c)«. He thus concludes that »he is forced to posit massive analogical lengthening in all South and West Slavic languages and is unable to explain the distribution which is actually attested«. As usual, Kortlandt is misrepresenting the actual attested state and again mistakes something that is widespread for something that is archaic. Long root vowels in a.p. *b* infinitives like Croat. *mlátiti* 'beat', Czech *mlátiti*, Slovak *mlátit'*, Polish *mlócić*, UL *mlóćić* is easily explained as analogous to the present tense which has the neo-acute (Croat. dial. *mlātīm* etc.). That infinitive can be influenced by the present tense accent is clearly seen in Slovene, which besides the older *mlatíti* also has the younger *mlátiti* analogous to the present tense *mlátim*. And while it is very easy to explain these forms as analogical, it is practically impossible to explain Slovincian *ml'ocic* – *ml'ōcīš*, *xv'alic* 'praise' – *xv'ālīš* with the alternation of a short vowel in the infinitive and a long vowel in present tense as secondary. In a.p. *c* (for instance *č'īnic* 'do' – *č'īniš*), Slovincian expectedly has a short vowel in both the infinitive and the present tense. Slovincian *ml'ocic* cannot be explained as analogical in any possible way while the length of the infinitive of a.p. *b* is easily explainable as we have just seen. It is not enough just to say that the root vowel is »usually long« in a.p. *b* because what is »usual« is not necessarily archaic. On the contrary, the feature which can be explained only phonetically should be taken as archaic. And if Slovincian is not enough (although only Slovincian would do here to prove our point), we can also add that some Kajkavian dialects have only short vowels in the infinitive (in both a.p. *b* and a.p. *c*) and the same goes for Molise Croatian spoken in Italy. All this tears to shreds Kortlandt's myth of original pretonic length in a.p. *b* infinitives.

Kortlandt explains Croat. *lōmīm* 'break' : *pōlomīm* as archaic. A.p. *c* *i*-verbs have supposedly had, according to him, compounds with initial stress. However, this is not very convincing. First of all, it is completely unclear why would Proto-Slavic a.p. *c* verb like **lomītè* have a prefixed form like **p'olomīte*. The expected pattern would be **lomītè*, **p'olomītè* – there is no reason whatsoever to expect the initial stress in a.p. *c* prefixed verbs. And secondly, there is also no reason whatsoever to perceive Croat. *pōlomīm* as archaic. Of course there are dialects which have the expected *pōlōmīm*¹⁴ and it is in dialects that one can observe the different stages of the tendency to fix the stress of prefixed a.p. *c* verbs. Thus some dialects do not have this tendency at all, some

¹⁴ Besides modern dialects which preserve this feature, it is also preserved in the dialect of Juraj Križanić.

have it only in *i*-verbs, some in both *i*- and *je*-verbs and the most innovative ones have it even in C-verbs like *pòzovem* ‘call’ instead of the usual and older *pozòvem*. The exact parallel to this development can be seen in the development of the accent of the imperative in various Serbian dialects. In those dialects, there is the same kind of accent change in the imperative of prefixed verbs as in *polòmim* \Rightarrow *pòlomim*. There, in a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* verbs, instead of expected *počèši* ‘scratch!’ (a.p. *b*) and *pozòvi* ‘call!’ (a.p. *c*), one finds innovative *pòčèši* and *pòzovi*. Again, this development is obviously connected with the tendency of prefixed verbs to fix the stress. Since *pòčèši!* and *pòzovi!* are clearly secondary, there is likewise no reason to assume that *pòlomim* must be old.

And now the consequences of Kortlandt’s barren approach really begin to unwrap. Because of his wrong conclusion that the length in the a.p. *b* infinitives is original, he is forced to explain Old Polish *sedzić* ‘to judge’ versus *sądz-* in the present tense, which is exactly what is expected in my theory in original a.p. *b* (Modern Polish *sądzić* ‘think’ has the length analogous to the present tense *sądz-*)¹⁵, as if it has **-b̄jiti* > **-îti-* > **-iti* (sic!) in the infinitive and a **-b̄jī-* > **-b̄jī-* > **-î-* with the retraction in the present tense. It is needless to say that this derivation with an imaginary suffix **-b̄ji-* in this verb looks completely *ad hoc* and completely unbelievable. Old Polish *sedzić*, *sądzisz* is a simple a.p. *b* verb **sōdīti*, **sōdīšb* (Čak. *sūdīti*, *sūdīš*, Russ. *cyđúmь*, *cýđuшb*) with the expected short vowel in trisyllabic infinitive and the expected neo-acute long vowel in the present tense. Kortlandt is also at pains to prove that Old Polish type of *przystępić* ‘to approach’, *przystąpi-* in the present tense preserves the quantitative alternation of a.p. *c* (sic!). He obviously tries to connect this (although not explicitly) with Croat. *lòmim*, *pòlomim* type, but again this is just the expected reflection of a.p. *b* verb **pristōpīti*, **pristōpīšb* (a.p. *b* is clear in Čak. *pristūpīti*, *pristūpīš* and Russ. *npucmynúmb*, *npucmýnuшb*) and one cannot dream of a.p. *c* here.

Furthermore, Kortlandt again says that I assume »massive analogical lengthening in trisyllabic deverbal nouns« of the type Croat. *zábava* ‘party’, Czech *zábava* etc. Again, he is misled by bare numbers. Just because most Slavic languages/dialects show length in **zabáva*-type words, he automatically assumes that this must be an archaism. But this is of course not true. The length in *zábava* could have been introduced very easily from long *zá-* in words like *zákon* ‘law’, where the length was preserved phonetically.¹⁶ However, dialectal Štokavian forms like *zábava* or *zābava* (with a secondarily retracted accent) cannot be explained here by any analogy. This must be the same kind

¹⁵ In the case of Polish, it is obvious that the introduction of the length to the a.p. *b* infinitives is an innovation which occurred in historical time.

¹⁶ Pretonic length is preserved in front of less than two moras in Slavic (*jer* being counted as half a mora, short vowel as one mora and long vowel as two moras), cf. Kapović 2005a.

of shortening we find in Croat. *màlina*, Czech *malina* < **malīna* ‘raspberry’. Kortlandt tries to separate **malīna* and **zabāva* using Dybo’s Law. He assumes that at the time of his general pretonic shortening **zabāva* was still **z’ābava*. However, his claim that words like **zabāva* and **osnōva* ‘base’ were actually **z’ābava* and **osnova* in pre-Dybo’s Law Slavic is not certain. If **pergōrda* ‘partition’ is to be derived from **p’ergorda* in pre-Dybo’s Law Slavic why would the root **gord-*, which is normally a.p. *c* root, get the acute accent there (cf. Russian *непезόрода*)? In fact, the fixed stress on the first syllable of this kind of derivative might have nothing to do with Dybo’s Law. The stress might have been in that same position even before Dybo’s Law. The stress of words like **pergōrda*, **osnōva*, **sosēdъ* ‘neighbour’ and **zākōnъ* can be regarded as the same type of stress we find in Slavic compounds like **bosonōgъ* ‘barefoot’ (Croat. *bosōnog*, Russian *босонόгый*) etc. The same rule governs both the derivatives with a prefix and compounds in Slavic – the fixed stress is on the first syllable of the second part of derivative or compound. If the root is long, like **gord-* or **bav-*, it will have the old acute on it, no matter what the original accentuation of this root is, and if it is short, it will get a short accent, identical to the short neo-acute in reflection (cf. Slovene *národ*, *naróda*). The advantage of my theory in opposition to Kortlandt’s is that it does not depend on the operation of Dybo’s Law, comparison to Lithuanian etc. in order to explain the changes that occur with pretonic length in Slavic.

Next we turn to pretonic and posttonic length in polysyllabic words. In my view, the posttonic length has been regularly preserved in Croatian in trisyllabic words (Kapović 2003, 2005a). In West Slavic, the posttonic length has been shortened regularly in a.p. *c* which is governed by the same rule by which the circumflex is shortened – in West Slavic in a.p. *c*, if the last syllable of the word is long, it is shortened; thus Czech *vlast* ‘government’ : *oblast* ‘jurisdiction’ (Croat. *vlást*, *òblást*, Sln. *vlást*, *oblást*). In a.p. *a*, we would expect the preservation of the posttonic length in West Slavic but the attestations of it are inconsistent, probably due to some older West Slavic processes and younger shortenings in various languages. Again, Kortlandt has a complicated theory. He believes that all languages preserve the posttonic length and that the pretonic length is regularly shortened. Thus, in a.p. *a*, where the length can be only posttonic, it is preserved and in a.p. *c*, where the accent is mobile, the length can be posttonic (and thus preserved) or pretonic (and thus shortened). According to Kortlandt, West Slavic has generalized the pretonic short vowels in a.p. *c* and Croatian has generalized the posttonic long vowels. Thus, in Croatian loc. sg. *na koráku*, the length is analogical after the nom. sg. *kòrāk* ‘step’ etc. One has to note that both mine and Kortlandt’s theory predict the same results here – shortened posttonic length in a.p. *c* in West Slavic and preserved posttonic length in a.p. *a*. The difference is that Kortlandt must explain the shortened posttonic length in a.p. *c* in West Slavic by analogy while in my theory it is regular and covered by the same rule which covers the

shortening of the circumflex in West Slavic. Also, Kortlandt must interpret Croat. *na koráku* as analogical while it is perfectly regular in my theory. Since both theories predict the same outcome and mine is clearly much simpler (it needs no analogy and Kortlandt's needs two analogies), it is clear that the hypothesis I proposed is in advantage once again.

Kortlandt objects that my theory does not explain Czech *jeřáb* 'partridge' and *ovád* 'gadfly' which are a.p. *c* (Sln. *jerĕb*, *ovâd*). However, these two examples are not very relevant as I have explained in my original article. Both end in voiced plosive and in Czech sporadic lengthening in front of a voiced plosive at the end of the word is hardly unusual (cf. in a.p. *c* Czech *bůh* 'god', *sníh* 'snow'). Also, Czech *jeřáb* could have the length by analogy to the a.p. *a* word *jestřáb* 'hawk' or to the diminutive *jeřábek*. Kortlandt further objects that my theory does not explain the short vowel in Czech *havran* 'raven', *labuť* 'swan', *paměť* 'mind' and *kaprad'* 'fern' (all originally a.p. *a*), but the same is true for his theory. Czech *havran* might have been influenced by Czech *vrán* 'crow' (Croat./Sln. *vrân*). The shortening in Czech *peníz* 'coin', gen. pl. *peněz*, loc. pl. *penězích* and in Polish *pieniądz*, gen. pl. *pieniędzy*, inst. pl. *pieniędzmi* is expected – gen. pl. **pĕnĕzъ/pĕnĕzъ* with the neo-circumflex (cf. Czech *kráva* – gen. pl. *krav*) and also regular in polysyllabic forms (or in front of a long *-ích* in Czech etc.). Attributing the shortening to the original long final vowel (supposed gen. pl. **-ī* and inst. pl. **-ĭ*), which is Kortlandt's solution, is simply unnecessary. He agrees with me that Czech *havran*, *labuť*, *paměť*, *kaprad'* and *jabloň* are originally a.p. *a* but he thinks that they adopted mobile stress at an early stage. I agree that that could be one of the possible explanations of the unexpected short vowels in West Slavic but I shall not get into Kortlandt's speculation about it except for saying that I find it hard to believe that Slovene *práprot* with *-ro-* is a reflection of **-or-* in a pretonic syllable while *-ra-* in Slovene variant *práprat* is a reflection of posttonic **-or-* especially in the light of the fact that the word for 'fern' is notorious for having many different variants even in the same language (cf. Šivic-Dular 1990). Kortlandt believes that Slovene preserved the original a.p. *a* in *gâvran* but also the a.p. *c* variant in *gavrân*. However, Slovene *gavrân* is most probably an innovation – from the forms like *za gâvrana* (: *gâvran*), the circumflex has wrongly been reinterpreted as being the same as in *za gôloba* ('for a pidgeon', a.p. *c*) and by analogy to *za gôloba* : *golôb* the older *za gâvrana* : *gâvran* became *za gâvrana* : *gavrân*. There is no need to push something to Common Slavic if the same can be explained as a very young innovation in Slovene. Kortlandt thinks that Croatian has preserved a trace of the original shortening of pretonic long vowels in the numerals *děvet* 'nine' and *děset* 'ten'. However this is quite unbelievable since these numbers are indeclinable in Croatian and there is simply no form in which the length could be pretonic in order for the supposed shortening to be transferred to the posttonic position as well. Additionally, *děvet* and *děset* are easily explainable as *allegro*-forms

of also attested and expected *děvēt* and *dēsēt*. This kind of shortening is not unusual in numbers. Kortlandt says that his views on the development of post- and pretonic length are corroborated by Czech derivatives like *pekař* ‘baker’ but *rybář* ‘fisherman’. He accuses me of dismissing these examples without discussion. However it is not clear what Kortlandt wants to accomplish by these examples. If he wants to maintain the idea that the difference between a.p. *c* and a.p. *a* in preserving the length is clear, he should note that if this were so, these examples would also be in accord with my theory (mobile **pĕkār̥b* > Croatian *pĕkār*, Czech *pekař* with no length in a.p. *c*). However, I do not believe that the example *pekař* is archaic since one does not expect mobile accentuation in an **-ar̥b* derivative from the mobile root (cf. Dybo 1981:176–178). Thus one would not expect ***pĕkār̥b*, gen. sg. ***ōtb pĕkāra* but **pĕkār̥b*, gen. sg. **pĕkāra* (Croat. *pĕkār* could be secondary, derived, for instance, from *pĕka* ‘baking lid’).

Kortlandt also thinks that the medial short vowel in Croat. *stàrica* ‘old woman’ and *mìsliti* ‘think’ is regular and not analogical. However he does not explain the Montenegrin and Serbian dialectal forms like *pùškāma* ‘guns’ (a.p. *a*) but *žènama* ‘women’ (a.p. *b*), *nògama* (a.p. *c*).¹⁷ Of course one could say it is regular in some dialects that all posttonic syllables which can be accented (= i. e. have an original acute) are shortened but it is very doubtful that a rule like that could be a strictly phonetic one.

8. Conclusion

In the conclusion of his paper, Kortlandt accuses me of a supposed heavy reliance on my mother tongue (i. e. Croatian) which, according to him, creates a bias against the West Slavic and Slovene evidence. He also kindly reminds me of a need of a proper assessment of earlier scholars’ opinions. As for the first comment, I shall cite the fourth sentence of Kortlandt’s own paper: »I shall focus on the Serbo-Croatian dialectal area, where the Proto-Slavic accentual system is better preserved than elsewhere«. Now, if Kortlandt himself admits the value of the data of the language which is incidentally my mother tongue, why is he accusing me of doing the same? Of course, these accusations are simply bogus – if one browses through my original article (Kapović 2005a), one will see that there is no truth in the claim that I discriminate other languages because of Croatian. For instance, I note that the distinction of the old a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* definite adjectives is best preserved in West Slavic and not in Croatian, in the case of the pretonic length in verbs, I take Slovincian to be

¹⁷ Kortlandt says that the shortening of the suffix in *potĕgnūt* ‘to pull’ is regular before the lost *-i* but not in *dvìgnūt* ‘to lift’. That claim be understood only within his own doctrine, which I cannot accept. In fact, these examples only show the regular reflection of Common Slavic **potĕgnōti* (the length is reintroduced from the present tense, of course) and **dvìgnōti*. The original length of the second example has not been shortened analogically to *-nūt* verbs here (as is the case in many dialects).

the most archaic etc. As for the objection that I did not assess earlier scholarship, that is simply not true. Although the purpose of my paper was not to assess earlier theories but rather to explain the material in the best possible way I for instance did mention shortly Kortlandt's theory. Indeed, one of the reasons for proposing my own theory on the development of length in Slavic was that I was not happy with the way earlier theories tried to explain it. I think that in this paper I have successfully showed some of the reasons why Kortlandt's theory on Slavic length cannot be acceptable. Kortlandt's theory fails to explain the length in the *súkno*-type words which also disproves his theory about the general shortening of pretonic length. Furthermore, it also fails to explain the short pretonic vowel in a.p. *b* infinitive but a long vowel in the present tense in Slovincian, Old Polish, some Kajkavian dialects and Molise Croatian. He is thus forced to make up the most unbelievable theories in order to explain Old Polish verbs *sędzić* : *sądzisz*, *przystąpić* : *przystąpisz*. Kortlandt cannot explain the short vowel in Croatian dialectal words like *zâbava* and in order to obtain the same results as my theory does in polysyllabic words with the posttonic (and pretonic) length he has to assume different analogies while my theory requires none. Kortlandt also tries to criticize my theory by often claiming that this or that development is impossible or unlikely but in each case his objections are invalid. For instance, the case of analogical accent in Croat. dial. *ženě* is quite clear – nobody can argue that it is impossible for pronoun forms to influence nouns forms. Kortlandt also criticizes my and the traditional treatment of a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* *ā*-stems in West Slavic by saying that this kind of development is not likely, even though we find a similar one in Proto-Latvian, and by saying that there is absolutely no reason to keep the a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* distinct. If the latter were correct, accentologists would have nothing to do since all the different paradigms would have been leveled by now in all the languages. Because of all this and because of apparent lacunae in Kortlandt's theory (like the myth of general shortening of pretonic length and of a long pretonic vowel in a.p. *b* infinitives), one has to conclude that Kortlandt's theory simply does not explain the material in the satisfactory manner and that it has to be modified, if that is even possible, or simply abandoned.

References

- Carlton, Terence R. 1991. *Introduction to the phonological history of the Slavic languages*. Columbus : Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Dybo, Vladimir A. 1981. *Slavjanskaja akcentologija. Opyt rekonstrukcii sistemy akcentnyh paradig v praslavjanskom*. Moskva : Izdatel'stvo «Nauka».
- Holzer, Georg. 2005. Zur relativen Datierung prosodischer Prozesse im Gemeinslavischen und frühen Kroatischen. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 31–71.
- Illič-Svityč, Vladislav M. 1979. *Nominal Accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. Cambridge and London : The MIT Press. [Translation of: *Immenaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*, Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, Moskva 1963.]
- Kapović, Mate. 2003. Razvoj starih dugih samoglasa u hrvatskom i ostalim slavenskim jezicima. *Filologija* 41, 51–82.
- Kapović, Mate. 2005a. The Development of Proto-Slavic Quantity (from Proto-Slavic to Modern Slavic Languages). *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 73–111.
- Kapović, Mate. 2005b. Naglasak praslavenske riječi **sr̥d̥bce*. *Croatica & Slavica Iadertina* I, 125–133.
- Kapović, Mate. 2005c. Nove duljine u hrvatskom jeziku (nakon općeslavenskoga razdoblja). *Filologija* 44, 51–62.
- Kapović, Mate. 2006. The **vòl'ā*-type Accent in Slavic. *Tones and Theories. Proceedings of IWoBA 2005* (forthcoming).
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 1975. *Slavic Accentuation, a Study in Relative Chronology*. Lisse : The Peter de Ridder Press.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2005. From Serbo-Croatian to Indo-European. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 113–130.
- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change, Volume I: Internal Factors*. Oxford and Cambridge (Mass.) : Blackwell.
- Micklesen, Lew R. 1986. Polabian Accentology. *Wiener slavistischer Almanach* 17, 365–381.
- SSN 1994. *Slovník slovenských nářečí I. A–K*. Bratislava : Veda, Vydateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.
- Stang, Christian 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo : I kommisjon hos H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1993. *The Accentual patterns of the Slavic Languages*. Stanford : Stanford University Press.
- Šivic-Dular, Alenka. 1990. Poimenovanje za 'Filix' v slovanskih jeziki. *Razprave* II. razreda SAZU XIII, 73–97.

Opet o slavenskim duljinama

Sažetak

U članku se govori o određenim pojedinostima razvoja duljine u slavenskim jezicima, s usporedbom teorije autora članka s teorijom Frederika Kortlandta. Autor pokušava dokazati prednosti svoje teorije i nedostatke drugoga pristupa koji se pokazuje neprikladnim za opisivanje jezičnoga stanja u slavenskim jezicima. U članku se, između ostaloga, govori: o kraćenju duljine u posljednjem slogu, o odrazu staroga i novoga akuta u češkom, o naglasku određenih pridjeva n.p. *b*, o problemu odraza prednaglasnih i zanaglasnih duljina u južnoslavenskim i zapadnoslavenskim jezicima itd.

Ključne riječi: duljina, akcentuacija, slavenski jezici
Key words: length, accentuation, Slavic languages

