UDK 811.16'344.34(091)
Stručni rad
Rukopis primljen 17. III. 2014.
Prihvaćen za tisak 23. V. 2014.

Frederik Kortlandt
Department of comparative linguistics
Leiden University
P.O. Box 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
www.kortlandt.nl

ON THE ACCENTUATION OF *NESLЪ* AND RELATED ISSUES

In a recent article of major importance (2013), Tijmen Pronk has treated the accentuation of *l*-participles of the type *neslъ* in western South Slavic. Pronk points out correctly that Dybo's law did not shift the accent onto final jers, e.g. in **kòn̨ъ*, **bòbъ*, and that the short vowel was preserved in Slovak *osem* < **òsmь*, *oheň* < **ògn̨ь*, *mohol* < **mògl̥ъ*. Contrary to what Pronk claims, Slovene *nę́səl* is the phonetic reflex of **nésl̥ъ* < **nesl̥̀ъ*, Slovak *niesol*. The Slovene doublets *(v)ǫ̂gəl* < **ǫ̀gl̥ъ* and *(v)ózəl* < **ǫ̀zl̥ъ* suggest an earlier paradigm with *vǫ̂-* < *ǫ̂-* in the nom.sg. form and *ó-* < **ǫ̀-* in the oblique cases. The vowel of *ógənj* < **ògn̨ъ* also stems from the oblique cases. The expected neo-circumflex in the nom.sg. form is actually attested in *rębər* < **rèbrъ* beside *rę́bər* with the reflex of Stang's law from the oblique cases. There is no reason to assume that the accent was not retracted at an early stage in **nesl̥̀ъ*, nor is there any reason to assume that Dybo's law shifted the accent to the final jer in **dòbrъ* and **sèdmь*, as Pronk claims.

In a recent article of major importance (2013), Tijmen Pronk has treated the accentuation of *l*-participles of the type *neslъ* in western South Slavic. Since the author refers to several earlier views which I no longer hold, it is appropriate that I specify the points where his analysis is at variance with my present views. Here I shall follow the order in which they appear in the text of his article.

Pronk points out correctly that Dybo's law did not shift the accent onto final jers, e.g. in **kòn̨ъ*, **bòbъ*. The retraction of the accent from a stressed jer in mobile accent paradigms yielded a long vowel, e.g. gen.pl. Slovene *nǫ́g*, Polish

rąk, which later spread analogically to other accent paradigms. The long vowel which we find in nom.sg. Czech *kůň*, Slovak *kôň*, Ukrainian *kin'*, Russian dial. *kôn'*, Slovak *bôb*, Ukrainian *bib* etc. is the result of later innovations. As Pronk points out, the short vowel was preserved in Slovak *osem* < **òsmь*, *oheň* < **ògnь*, *mohol* < **mòglъ*. I cannot accept the hypothesis that the lengthening in such instances as Czech *kůň* 'horse', *stůl* 'table', *nůž* 'knife', Slovak *kôň*, *stôl*, *nôž* is the result of phonetic conditioning because the number of counter-examples is prohibitive (e.g. Nonnenmacher-Pribić 1961: 94). More probably, the long vowel was adopted from the case forms where the accent had been retracted as a result of Stang's law, viz. loc.sg. **kôňi*, inst.pl. **kôňi*, loc.pl. **kôňix*, and from gen.pl. **kōň*, Slovene *kọ̑nju*, *kọ́njih*, *kọ́nji*, *kọ́njih*, *kọ́nj*, so as to yield a regular alternation between stressed **ô* and unstressed **o* in the paradigm. After the retraction of the stress in gen.sg. **koňa*, dat.sg. **koňu*, inst.sg. **koňem*, nom.pl. **koňi*, acc.pl. **koňę*, dat.pl. **koňem*, and perhaps after the shortening of **ô* to **ò* before the new long case endings in gen.pl. *-ôv*, *-í* and loc.pl. *-iech*, *-ích*, the paradigm could be further regularized by generalization of the short root vowel, a process which has been going on in historical times, e.g. Czech *skot* 'cattle', Old Czech *skót* (see further Kortlandt 2011: 346). In Russian, short rising vowels were lengthened e.g. dial. *kôn'* < **kōn̩* < **kòn̩ь*. In Ukrainian, short vowels were lengthened in monosyllables, e.g. *kin'* < **kōn̩* < **kòn̩ь*.

Pronk writes that the long falling vowel which lost the accent in accordance with Stang's law was not shortened in Lechitic, e.g. in Old Polish *wolå*, *woniå*, *rolå*, *suszå*. This is not correct because we find in Slovincian both *vùolå* and *vùola*, *vùonja*, *roláu* and *rùola*, *cążáu* and *sušáu* beside *cenjáu* and *močáu*. There evidently was before Stang's law a confusion between the flexion types of Old Polish *wolå*, *rolå* < **-â* and *łodziå*, *sędziå* < **-ьjà* after contraction in the latter ending and loss of distinctive tone in this area (cf. Kortlandt 2014). I find no dialectal differences in the operation of either Dybo's law or Stang's law.

The Slovene neo-circumflex originated before a non-final weak jer (which was lost) and before a long vowel in the following syllable (which was shortened), e.g. *bîtka* < **bìtъka*, *osnọ̑va* < **osnòvā*. We also find a neo-circumflex in *kâzən* < **kàznь*, *(v)ọ̑gəl* < **ọ̀glь*, *vẹ̑tər* < **vètrъ*, *mîsəl* < **mỳslь*, but not in *(v)ózəl* < **ọ̀zlъ*, *ógənj* < **ògn̩ь*. Pronk assumes that the loss of the final jer regularly gave rise to the neo-circumflex here because the jer was preserved longer after the consonant cluster (thus already Kortlandt 2011: 52). I no longer think that this is the correct explanation. Since the Proto-Slavic accent was a purely tonal feature, it is improbable that it had any influence on the development of a final jer. When the latter lost its accentuability, it is improbable that this

was blocked by a preceding consonant cluster. The rise of an epenthetic vowel which restored the accentuability of the final syllable was a much more recent development which may have taken place after the eventual phonetic loss of final jers in the South Slavic languages. It follows that the neo-circumflex originated from the rise of new consonant clusters rather than from the loss of weak jers. If this is correct, the short vowel in Kajkavian, e.g. Bednja *vȅter*, need not be analogical (thus Pronk) but may never have been affected by the rise of the neo-circumflex.

After the rise of the new timbre distinctions, **o* was lengthened by a number of developments which yielded different reflexes in Slovene (successive stages will be numbered in accordance with Kortlandt 2011: 170–174 and 304–308):

— retraction of the stress from final jers (8.2), e.g. gen.pl. *gǫ́r*, *ǫ́vəc*,

— lengthening of short falling vowels in monosyllables (8.8), e.g. *bǫ̑g*, *kǫ̑st*,

— retraction of the stress from long falling vowels in final syllables (Stang's law, 9.3), e.g. *nǫ́siš*, *vǫ́lja*,

— retraction of the stress from non-final weak jers, e.g. *pǫ́šlješ*, *kǫ́njski*,

— progressive accent shift (10.7), e.g. *okǫ̑*, *mladǫ̑st*,

— rise of the neo-circumflex (10.9), e.g. *osnǫ̑va*, *podǫ̑ba*,

— retraction of the stress from final short vowels (10.12), e.g. *góra*, *ókno*.

In the language of the Freising manuscripts, the retraction of the stress from non-final jers was under way, as is clear from the forms (**na**)**zodni** *sǫ́dn̥ī* (2×) beside (**na**)**zudinem** *sǭdə̀n̥ēm* and **bozzledine** *poslēdə̀n̥ē*. Stang's law was earlier, as is clear from **-u** for posttonic **-ǫ* in **vuolu** (2×), **vuoliu**, **vueliu**, and the progressive accent shift was later, as is similarly clear from **dusu** (2×), **choku**, **chocu**, **pomngu** (2×), **tuoriv** (2×), which have preserved the original Proto-Slavic accentuation (cf. Kortlandt 2011: 59–65 and 211–222).

Since desinential stress in the gen.pl. form and a falling tone on the initial syllable were limited to accent paradigm (c) whereas fixed stress on the second syllable before Stang's law was a result of Dybo's law and therefore characteristic of accent paradigm (b), there is a clear correlation between Slovene *ǫ* and *ǫ́* on the one hand and accent paradigms (c) and (b) on the other. Regularization in derived formations gave rise to generalization of one or the other, e.g. *dobrǫ̑ta*, *golǫ̑ta*, *mokrǫ̑ta* (Valjavec), *novǫ̑ta*, *ostrǫ̑ta*, *rabǫ̑ta* (Pleteršnik) with *ǫ̑* for *ǫ́* from the acc.sg. form of *lepóta*, *junóta*, *nagóta*, *prostóta*, *tegóta*, *mokróta* (Pleteršnik), *sirǫ̑ta* (cf. Dybo 1968: 162 and 1981: 124). Note that *pę́rje*, *zę́lje*, *kǫ́zji* did not undergo Stang's law (thus Pronk) but retracted the stress from the lost jer, just as *pǫ́šlješ*, *kǫ́njski* and *žę́nski*.

While lengthened **o* is reflected as *ǫ* or *ǫ́* in Slovene, lengthened **e* is always reflected as *ę*, whereas *ę́* reflects earlier jat (except before **r*, e.g. *vę́ra*, *mę́ra*). It follows that *nę́səl* is the phonetic reflex of **néslъ* < **neslъ̀*, similarly *rę́kəl*, *pę́kəl*, *tę́kəl*, Slovak *niesol*, *riekol*. In the adjective, Slovene *dǫ́bər*, *mǫ́kər*, *ǫ́stər* adopted the vowel of the definite form, where it originated from Stang's law, like *sę́dəm* and *ǫ́səm* from *sę́dmi* and *ǫ́smi*, cf. Slovak *osem* versus *ôsmy*, where the original vocalism has been preserved. The Slovene doublets *(v)ǫ̂gəl* < **ǫ̀glъ* and *(v)ózəl* < **ǫ̀zlъ* suggest an earlier paradigm with *vǫ̂-* < *ǫ̂-* in the nom.sg. form and *ó-* < **ǫ̀-* in the oblique cases. The vowel of *ógənj* < **ògnъ* and *tópəl* (Pleteršnik) also stems from the oblique cases. The expected neo-circumflex in the nom.sg. form is actually attested in *rę̂bər* (Valjavec) < **rèbrъ* (b) beside *rę́bər* 'slope' (Pleteršnik, who also gives *vrę̂bər*) with the reflex of Stang's law from the oblique cases (cf. Kortlandt 2011: 341). There is no reason to assume that the accent was not retracted at an early stage in **neslъ̀*, nor is there any reason to assume that Dybo's law shifted the accent to the final jer in **dòbrъ* and **sèdmь*, as Pronk claims. In fact, the neo-circumflex in *rę̂bər* shows the regular development. The short vowel in the reflex of **néslъ* in most South Slavic dialects is evidently analogical because this was the only form with a long vowel in the paradigm.

References:

Dybo, Vladimir A. 1968. Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom. *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie: VI meždunarodnyj sъezd slavistov, Praga, 1968.* Nauka. Moskva. 148–224.

Dybo, Vladimir A. 1981. *Slavjanskaja akcentologija.* Nauka. Moskva.

Nonnenmacher-Pribić, Elisabeth. 1961. *Die baltoslavischen Akzent- und Intonationsverhältnisse und ihr quantitativer Reflex im Slovakischen.* Harrassowitz. Wiesbaden.

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

Kortlandt, Frederik. 2014. Proto-Slavic *j, Van Wijk's law, and *ē*-stems. Paper presented at the 9th IWoBA (Pula 2013).

Pronk, Tijmen. 2013. On the accentuation of *l*-participles of the type *neslъ* in western South Slavic. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 39/1. 105–131.

O akcentuaciji pridjeva tipa *neslъ* i povezanim problemima

Sažetak

U nedavno objavljenome važnom članku (2013.) Tijmen Pronk obradio je akcentuaciju zapadnojužnoslavenskih pridjeva radnih tipa *neslъ*. Pronk ispravno ističe da Diboov zakon nije pomaknuo naglasak na finalne poluglase, npr. **kòn̥ь*, **bòbъ*, i da je kratki samoglasnik sačuvan u Slovačkom *osem* < **òsmь*, *oheň* < **ògn̥ь*, *mohol* < **mòglъ*. Suprotno onome što Pronk tvrdi, slavenski je *nę́səl* fonetski refleks **néslъ* < **neslъ̀*, slovački *niesol*. Slavenske dublete *(v)ǫ̂gəl* < **ǫ̀glь* i *(v)ózəl* < **ǫ̀zlъ* upućuju na postojanje ranije paradigme sa *vǫ̂-* < *ǫ̂* u Njd i *ó-* < **ǫ̀-* u kosim padežima. Samoglasnik u *ógənj* < **ògn̥ь* također dolazi iz kosih padeža. Očekivani neocirkumfleks u Njd zapravo je potvrđen u *rę̂bər* < **rèbrь* uz *rę́bər* s odrazom Stangova zakona iz kosih padeža. Nema razloga pretpostaviti da naglasak nije povučen u ranoj fazi u **neslъ̀*, kao ni to da je Diboov zakon pomaknuo naglasak na finalni poluglas u **dòbrъ* i **sèdmь*, kao što Pronk tvrdi.

Ključne riječi: akcentuacija, glagolski pridjev radni, Diboov zakon, Stangov zakon, neocirkumfleks

Key words: accentuation, l-participle, Dybo's law, Stang's law, neo-circumflex.