

Keith LANGSTON

University of Georgia, Germanic and Slavic Languages  
Athens, Georgia 30602, USA

## ANALYZING THE ACCENTUAL PATTERNS OF ČAKAVIAN DIALECTS

This paper provides a survey of various treatments of accentual alternations in previous studies of čakavian dialects and proposes a more systematic approach based on a thorough phonological analysis of these accentual systems. This approach is illustrated by an outline of the analysis of the accentual alternations of the noun in the čakavian dialects.

### 1. INTRODUCTION: THE TREATMENT OF ČAKAVIAN ACCENTUAL ALTERNATIONS IN PREVIOUS STUDIES

The importance of čakavian data for the study of Slavic accentuation and the reconstruction of the proto-Slavic accentual system has long been recognized. The original distribution of quantity and stress has in general been better preserved in čakavian than in other Slavic languages and dialects, and čakavian is one of only three major dialect groups where the proto-Slavic neoacute is represented by a separate accent that is distinct from the reflexes of the original acute and circumflex. Moreover, the morphological systems of many čakavian dialects are relatively conservative and for this reason they offer important evidence for the reconstruction of the original patterns of accentual alternations in different grammatical forms of words.

However, most descriptions of čakavian dialects provide only minimal information about their accentual systems. Normally one finds basic data about the prosodic inventory, such as whether or not the dialect has a "two-accent" or "three-accent" system (among other possibilities), whether quantitative oppositions are preserved in unstressed syllables, etc. Aside from this, the usual practice is to provide accentuation for all of the forms cited in the text, although this

is unfortunately not true of all descriptions. But only a relatively small number of studies of individual dialects give a sufficiently detailed description of the morphological system to enable us to determine with some degree of certainty the types of accentual alternations that exist.

Even in these more comprehensive studies there is no consistent approach to the presentation of accentual data. The descriptions of the phonology and morphology provide useful information, but in many works the accentual alternations are not explicitly discussed and no attempt is made to organize the data according to different accentual types; see, for example, Finka and Šojat (1968) or Houtzagers and Budovskaja (1996). As a result of the lack of attention to accentual questions, the information that may be gleaned from these descriptions often contains serious gaps. Other studies offer purely descriptive statements listing the accentual alternations attested in the surface forms, often following a traditional organization based on the accentuation of the nominative singular and the number of syllables in the word.<sup>1</sup> To cite a typical example, Mihanović's description of the Poljica dialects treats the accentuation of monosyllabic stems such as *krāj* (kralj), *nōž* and disyllabic stems such as *kopāč*, *vozāč* separately, even though they follow the same accentual pattern. For monosyllabic masculine nouns with a long falling accent on the first syllable in the N sg., he states that this accent changes to a rising accent in the locative singular (*cřv*: *cřvu*, *būs*, *búsu*, *mrāv*: *mrávu*; but *stōl*: *stōlu*, *vōl*: *vōlu*), and to what he refers to as the "otegnuti" accent in the G pl. (*cřvī*, *mravī*, *stolōv*). However, he does not comment on the discrepancies between such forms as *cřv*, L sg. *cřvu*, N pl. *cřvi* and *vōl*, L sg. *vōlu*, N pl. *vōli* (Mihanović 1971: 168–9). These clearly represent two different accentual types, not one as is implied by this description.

A few studies attempt to organize the accentual data in a more meaningful manner, but the approaches that have been used are not entirely adequate. In his classical study of the dialect of Novi Vinodolski, Belić (1909) sets up two different accentual categories for masculine nouns: (a) fixed accent and (b) mobile accent. Under type (b) he lists nouns such as *krōv*, G sg. *krovā*; *brēst*, G sg. *brēstā* which have a stress on the grammatical ending in most forms. Under type (a) he includes nouns where the accent always falls on the same syllable of the stem (e.g. *brāt*, *čās*, *sřp*, etc.) as well as nouns where the accent may shift in certain grammatical forms; e.g. *vlās*, GL pl. *vlāših/vlāših*; *gōlūb*, GL pl. *golūbīh/gōlūbīh*. No explanation is given for the differences in the accentuation of forms that sup-

<sup>1</sup> According to Moguš (1966: 63) this method of classification was introduced by Daničić (1913). Although this approach has been criticized at various times by a number of linguists, a similar organization of accentual types has been used in many works up to the present; see, for example, Barić et al. (1979), Matešić (1970).

posedly belong to the same accentual category. For feminine nouns he labels the two accentual types differently: (a) accent on a non-final syllable (b) accent on the final syllable. Here it is group (b) which includes nouns with different accentual patterns: those of the type *ženà*, A sg. *ženù* and those of the type *gorà*, A sg. *gòru*. A similar system of accentual classification is used by Hraste in his studies of the dialects of Hvar and Brač (1935, 1940). Jurišić's description of the dialect of Vrgada also sets up the same two accentual categories for masculine nouns as Belić (although he labels them differently), but the author does not apply this to the other genders. For the neuter nouns and feminine *a*-stems he only offers comments on the possible accentual relationships between various forms, while for the feminine *i*-stems he lists 13 different accentual patterns (Jurišić 1966: 70–81).

In another important description of a čakavian dialect, Moguš (1966) describes the accentuation of nouns in the dialect of Senj in terms of the following types: (1) *isti akcenat na istome mjestu*, (2) *različit akcenat na istome mjestu*, (3) *različan akcenat na različitu mjestu*.<sup>2</sup> This classification represents a logical means of organizing accentual data that can easily be applied to nouns of all declensional types as well as the other parts of speech, and it has been used in a number of other studies (e.g. Moguš 1981–82; Menac-Mihalić 1995, 1996). However, it too encounters difficulties: within these categories we find sub-types which exhibit fundamental differences in their accentual behavior. In the data from Senj, Type 2 includes nouns such as *stàrac*, G sg. *stârca* in which the only alternation is the phonologically predictable lengthening of a stressed vowel in a syllable closed by a sonorant (otherwise these forms behave exactly like nouns of Type 1), as well as nouns which exhibit a morphologically conditioned alternation in the oblique cases of the plural; e.g. *sîn*, N pl. *sîni*, G pl. *sîni*, DIL pl. *sînin*. Similarly, Type 3 includes nouns like *pòp*, G sg. *popà* where the accent is always on the grammatical ending<sup>3</sup> and nouns with an alternating pattern like *brôd*, G sg. *bròda* which exhibit a shift of stress to the ending in the L sg. and G pl. (*brođù*, *brođi*).

Steinhauer (1973: 86) proposes a different accentual classification in his analysis of Moguš's data from the dialect of Senj: (1) forms where the accentuation of the D sg. is distinct from that of the L sg.; (2) forms where the G sg. is stem-stressed and the G sg. and G pl. differ in their accentuation; and (3) all others. Although the criterion cited for Type 1 identifies a coherent group with similar accentual behavior for nouns of all declensions, that of Type 2 does not. Type 2 includes masculine nouns that exhibit exactly the same accentual features as the

<sup>2</sup> The fourth logical possibility, »*isti akcenat na različitu mjestu*« is attested only marginally in the noun; see Moguš (1966: 72).

<sup>3</sup> Except for the vocative; there is a general rule that nouns of this type have an initial stress in the vocative singular (and sometimes also in the vocative plural). The nominative singular, which has no ending in the surface forms, can be analyzed as /pop-'A/ at the underlying level; see §2.

nouns in Type 1, except for the fact that they lack an alternation in the L sg. because they are disyllabic or refer to animate beings (see §4.2.3.1); compare, for example, Type 2: *sîn*, G pl. *sîni*, DIL pl. *sînin*; *mîsec*, G pl. *misēci*, DIL pl. *misēcin* with Type 1: *zûb*, G pl. *zûbi/zûb*, DIL pl. *zûbin*. Within the same Type 2 we also find stems with a fixed stress where the only alternation is the lengthening of the final stem vowel before the G pl. ending -Ø; e.g. *bubrîg*, G pl. *bubrîg*; *rîba*, G pl. *rîb*. But this lengthening is actually characteristic of all nouns in čakavian that have this ending in the genitive plural, regardless of the accentual type to which they belong. Finally, Type 3 has no single identifying feature; it is posited as a catch-all for the remaining surface patterns of accentuation and includes both nouns with a fixed stress on the endings and those with a fixed stress on the stem; e.g. *veslô*, NA pl. *veslâ*, *igrâ*, A sg. *igrû* and *mîš*, G sg. *mîša*, *stârac*, G sg. *stârcâ*.

A common feature to all these approaches is that they are based solely on the surface accentual relationships between different forms. As a result, accentual patterns that are essentially the same may be listed as separate types because of predictable alternations caused by the operation of regular phonological rules. At the same time, accentual behaviors that are fundamentally different from each other are sometimes lumped together because of a failure to select meaningful criteria for defining the different accentual categories.

In order to gain a clearer understanding of how the čakavian accentual systems function, as well as to make it possible for these data to be used for comparative purposes, there must be a better system for describing the čakavian accentual alternations. One of the key insights of linguistics in the twentieth century is that the physical sounds that we can hear and transcribe are only part of the picture. Underneath this lies a more abstract system of representations that constitute the foundation of our ability to comprehend and produce linguistic forms; these underlying representations are related to the surface forms by a highly organized set of rules.<sup>4</sup> It is not sufficient then simply to enumerate the different surface accentual relationships that we find in the čakavian dialects. A simpler and more coherent picture emerges once we penetrate deeper into these systems to distinguish surface forms from the underlying representations, and alternations that are purely phonological from those that involve morphological conditioning factors.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Or constraints. An alternative to the rule-based generative approach to phonology has become prominent in recent years. This approach, known as Optimality Theory (OT), operates with a system of violable constraints which are generally held to be universal but are ranked differently from language to language. Although OT eliminates the traditional phonological rules, it still posits a distinction between an underlying and a surface representation.

<sup>5</sup> This approach to the analysis of Slavic accentuation is exemplified in numerous works by Stankiewicz, the most comprehensive of which is Stankiewicz (1993). The present article follows his framework.

2. ČAKAVIAN PROSODIC SYSTEMS AND ACCENTUAL TYPES OF STEMS

The “classical” čakavian three-accent system utilizes the prosodic features of tone, quantity and stress. The distribution of these features may be limited in a number of ways; in the maximally unrestricted system tone is distinctive only in long stressed syllables, quantity is distinctive in tonic, pretonic and posttonic syllables, and the stress may fall on any syllable of the word. Individual dialects may impose additional restrictions on the occurrence of the prosodic features,<sup>6</sup> but this maximal system is the fundamental čakavian type from which all others developed. The prototypical čakavian system may be illustrated by the following diagram (Stankiewicz 1958: 316).

(1)

long	+		-	
stressed	+	-	+	-
rising	+	-		

In general terms, the place of stress is the least restricted prosodic feature in the čakavian dialects, and we may identify three basic accentual types of stems in čakavian on the basis of this feature. These are illustrated below for the noun, with examples cited from the dialect of Novi, but the same three accentual types are also characteristic of the adjective and (with some modifications) the verb.<sup>7</sup>

Type A: forms which bear a (generally) fixed stress which may fall on any syllable of the stem; e.g. *jābuka*, *plāća*; *besèda*, *buřiga*, *daljina*; *govèdina*, *prepelica*

Type B: forms in which the accent typically falls on the grammatical ending; e.g. *sestrā*, *ženā*; *selò*, *vretenò*

<sup>6</sup> Some dialects have completely lost certain prosodic oppositions. Most often it is tonal distinctions that have been eliminated, but a few dialects have also lost distinctions of quantity or stress. For example, in the dialect of Weingraben only stress is distinctive (Neweklowsky 1978), while in Oštarije and Generalski Stol the place of stress is predictable and only quantity is distinctive (Ivić 1961: 200).

<sup>7</sup> The čakavian accentual systems are probably better analyzed in terms of tone rather than stress at the underlying level, but a formal autosegmental analysis would unnecessarily complicate the present discussion. The underlying representations given here can easily be reanalyzed in terms of tone; see Langston (1998) for an outline of this approach. The three accentual types posited here are essentially the same as those reconstructed for proto-Slavic (see Stang 1957) although in the contemporary čakavian systems the original distribution of stems among types has in some cases been altered. To the best of my knowledge, this three-way classification has been used previously in only two published studies of čakavian dialects, Houtzagers (1985) and Kalsbeek (1998). However, Kalsbeek does not define the three accentual types in the same way for all nominal declension patterns.

Type C: stems which are inherently unaccented. The stress falls on the grammatical ending if the ending itself is inherently accented. Otherwise, these forms receive an accent on the initial syllable as the result of a default rule of stress assignment; e.g. *brôd* (G sg. *brôda*), *sòkôl* (G sg. *sòkola*); *grâd*, *kômâd*; A sg. *gòru*, *rûku*. The initial stress in such forms may be realized on a preceding proclitic; e.g. *vã grâdi*, *zã goru*.

Forms belonging to Type B with a phonologically null ending, resulting from the deletion of a historical jer vowel, are assumed to carry the basic final stress that is characteristic of this type; e.g. N sg. *pop-’Ø*. For the purposes of the present article we will use a capital A to indicate the reflex of the jer vowels in the phonological systems of the contemporary čakavian dialects. When this underlying segment is deleted, the stress automatically retracts to the final syllable of the stem; the retracted stress is realized as a rising accent when this final stem syllable is long.<sup>8</sup>

- (2) N sg. /pop-’A/ → *pòp*  
 N sg. /kljũč-’A/ → *kljũč*  
 G pl. /svīć-’A/ → *svīć* (N sg. *svīćã*)

This analysis also applies to the G pl. of Type C stems; e.g. /nog-’A/ → *nòg*, /rūk-’A/ → *rīk*.

In order to illustrate the theoretical approach proposed here, I will provide a brief analysis of the accentuation of the noun in čakavian. The discussion will focus primarily on dialects with more conservative accentual systems since these exhibit the widest variety of alternations. This is not intended as a complete description of all the possible accentual alternations of the noun that occur in individual dialects, but rather as an overview of the most typical accentual patterns that are found in the čakavian group.

### 3. PHONOLOGICALLY CONDITIONED ALTERNATIONS

The phonologically conditioned alternations in čakavian are primarily alternations of quantity, although for stressed vowels which undergo lengthening the realization of the accent as a rising or falling pitch must also be specified.

3.1. Underlying short vowels are lengthened in the final closed syllable of Type C stems.

---

<sup>8</sup> For a more detailed discussion of possible treatments of the jer vowels in the modern Slavic phonological systems, see Langston (1999, to appear).

(3)	Novi Vinodolski	<i>brôd</i> , G sg. <i>bròda</i> , <i>mêd</i> , G sg. <i>mêda</i> <i>nôc</i> , G sg. <i>nôci</i> , <i>pêc</i> , G sg. <i>pêci</i>
	Senj	<i>bôg</i> , G sg. <i>bôga</i> , <i>rôd</i> , G sg. <i>ròda</i> <i>kôst</i> , G sg. <i>kôsti</i> , <i>sôl</i> , G sg. <i>sôli</i>
	Hvar	<i>lêd</i> , G sg. <i>lêda</i> , <i>rôg</i> , G sg. <i>rôga</i> <i>môc</i> , G sg. <i>môci</i>

(Underlying representations (URs): /brod-/ , /med-/ , /noc-/ , /pec-/ , etc.)

As can be seen from these examples, the lengthened vowel carries a falling pitch when stressed. This lengthening occurs in all čakavian dialects, and in fact is a general feature of the entire Croatian, Serbian and Slovene language areas. There is some evidence for positing the same lengthening in unstressed final closed syllables in čakavian, but such examples are less common and the lengthening is not completely regular. It occurs most consistently in feminine nouns with a zero ending in the N sg; e.g. Vrgada fem. *bôlēst*, G sg. *bôlesti*, *mlädōst*, G sg. *mlädosti*; *kôkôš*, G sg. *kôkošē/kokošē* vs. masc. *gôvor*, *kâmen*, *přsten*; cf. standard Croatian *gôvōr*, *kâmēn*, *přstēn*.

3.2. Short vowels are lengthened before a tautosyllabic sonorant consonant. The lengthened vowel carries a rising accent in most čakavian dialects, if tonal oppositions are preserved, but in the dialects to the south of Žirje the accent is falling.

(4)	Novi	<i>dlân</i> : G sg. <i>dlâna</i>	<i>stârac</i> : G sg. <i>stârca</i>
	Žirje	<i>kônj</i> , G sg. <i>kônja</i>	<i>divôjka</i> , G pl. <i>divôjak</i>
	Hvar	<i>dîm</i> : G sg. <i>dîma</i>	<i>mlînac</i> : G sg. <i>mlînca</i>

(URs: /dl'an-/ , /st'arAc-/ , /konj-'l/ , /div'ojAk-/ , /d'im-/ , /ml'inAc-/)

Lengthening before a sonorant is usually restricted to stressed syllables, but some northern čakavian dialects also lengthen vowels in this environment in unstressed syllables; e.g. Novi *konâc*, G sg. *kōncâ*, *přijatêl*, G sg. *přijatela*; Kras *lâkôm*, *lonđc*, NA pl. *lōncê*; cf. Vrgada *koncâ*, *přijatelj*, *lâkom*, *loncì* (note that Vrgada allows long vowels in both pre-tonic and post-tonic syllables).

Lengthening in syllables closed by a sonorant consonant is predictable and does not alter the underlying accentual pattern for a given type of stem. For example, *mîš*: *mîša*, *dîm*: *dîma*, and *stârac*: *stârca* all belong to Type A, while a classification such as the one by Moguš discussed above would assign them to two different types (»isti akcenat na istome mjestu« and »različít akcenat na istome mjestu«). Note that while this type of lengthening is typical of čakavian as a whole, there are numerous dialects where it is not consistently realized or where it is entirely absent; see Lukežić (1990: 61ff.) for a detailed discussion.

3.3. Other types of phonologically conditioned alternations of quantity also occur in various dialects, but they are not characteristic of the čakavian group as a whole. Most common is the shortening of long vowels in unstressed syllables. This usually affects vowels in posttonic syllables, but in some dialects applies to pretonic position as well. The underlying length can appear on the surface if the syllable is no longer in posttonic position as the result of a stress shift; e.g. Senj *gòlub*, G pl. *golūbi* (UR /golūb-/); Hvar *mìsec*, L sg. *mìsecu/misēcū* (UR /misēc-/).

Many dialects also lengthen underlying short vowels in positions other than those discussed above. In addition to the lengthening of vowels before a sonorant, the dialects of Hvar, Brač and Vis lengthen vowels in syllables closed by voiced obstruents; e.g. Hvar *bób*, G sg. *bobā*, *dīd*, G sg. *dīda*, *pōlōg*, G sg. *pōlōga* (cf. *čēp*, *jazīk*, etc.); Brač *dôž*, N pl. *dažjī*, *prōhōd*, G sg. *prōhōda*, *slōb*, fem. *slabā*; Vis *bubrīg*, N pl. *bubrīgi*, *medvīd*. A number of dialects lengthen vowels in all closed syllables; e.g. Dugi Otok *brāt*, G sg. *brāta*, *mladīc*, G sg. *mladīca*, *obēd*, G sg. *obēda*, *pūpak*, G sg. *pūpka*. See Lukežić (1990: 68–77) for additional examples.

#### 4. MORPHOLOGICALLY CONDITIONED ALTERNATIONS

The morphologically conditioned alternations of the noun primarily involve shifts in the place of stress. There is only one morphologically conditioned alternation of quantity which is common to all čakavian dialects, and no morphologically conditioned alternations of tone. Surface alternations involving tone may result from the operation of phonological rules (e.g. the lengthening of an originally short stressed vowel) or may be concomitant with the retraction of stress to a preceding long syllable; see (2) above and §4.2.2. Otherwise we may treat the rising or falling pitch of a long vowel as an inherent feature of the morpheme in question which is realized in the surface forms when this syllable is stressed. This may be illustrated by the following examples from Novi:

(5) a. grammatical endings

inherently rising:

G sg., <i>a</i> -stems	<i>krāvē</i>	<i>gorē</i> , <i>ženē</i>
pres. t., class IV	<i>sriťiš</i> , <i>hīťi</i>	<i>solīš</i> , <i>lovī</i>

inherently falling:

def. adj. endings	<i>dūgī</i>	<i>brzī</i> , <i>novī</i>
pres. t., class V	<i>pīvāmo</i>	<i>kopāmo</i>

b. stems

inherently rising	inherently falling
<i>sūš-a</i> , <i>žēj-a</i>	<i>bandīr-a</i> , <i>butīg-a</i>



#### 4.1. The alternation of quantity

The final stem vowel is lengthened before the G pl. ending -Ø. This alternation occurs in all genders and accentual types.

(6)

##### Type A

- masc. Novi *čās*, G pl. *čās*, *kljīnac*, G pl. *kljīnāc*, *susēd*, G pl. *susēd*  
 Hvar *mīš*, G pl. *mīš*, *mlīnac*, G pl. *mlīnōc* (with o from \*ā)
- neut. Novi *korīto*, G pl. *korīt*, *rālo*, G pl. *rāl*,<sup>9</sup> *srdāšće*, G pl. *srdāšć*  
 Hvar *līto*, G pl. *līt*, *sīto*, G pl. *sīt*
- fem. Novi *bāčvica*, G pl. *bāčvīc*, *besēda*, G pl. *besēd*, *rība*, G pl. *rīb*  
 Hvar *divīca*, G pl. *divīc*, *kūca*, G pl. *kūc*

##### Type B

- masc. Novi *konōp*, G pl. *konōp*, *kosāc*, G pl. *kōsāc/kosāc*, *petēh*, G pl. *petēh*  
 Hvar *pās*, G pl. *pōs*
- neut. Novi *plēcē*, G pl. *plēc*, *rešetō*, G pl. *rešet*  
 Hvar *putō* (pluto), G pl. *pūt*, *tilēsō*, G pl. *tilēs*
- fem. Novi *snahā*, G pl. *snāh*; Hvar *kozā*, G pl. *kōz*, *tetā*, G pl. *tēt*

##### Type C

- masc. Novi *lākāt*, G pl. *lakāt*, *tānac* (A sg. *nā tanac*), G pl. *tanāc*
- neut. Novi *nēbo*, NA pl. *nebesā*, G pl. *nebēs*  
 Hvar *čūdo*, NA pl. *čudesā*, G pl. *čudēs*
- fem. Novi *daskā*, G pl. *dasāk*, *nogā*, G pl. *nōg*, *ovcā*, G pl. *ovāc*  
 Hvar *buhā*, G pl. *būh*, *vodā*, G pl. *vōd*

#### 4.2. Alternations in the place of stress

##### 4.2.1. Accentual type A

For the most part nouns belonging to this accentual type do not exhibit any alternations. A few nouns retract the stress to the initial syllable in the vocative in some dialects; e.g. Vrgada *čovik*: V sg. *čōvīce*, *kapir<sup>o</sup>ān*: *kāpit<sup>o</sup>āne*; *divōjka*:

<sup>9</sup> The lengthening here cannot be phonologically conditioned; if it were caused by the following sonorant consonant, the accent should be rising: \**rāl*.

V sg. *đivōjko*, V pl. *đivōjke*. In a number of dialects the stress retracts from the final stem syllable to the preceding syllable in G pl. forms with a zero ending. This phenomenon seems to be limited to the southern čakavian dialects and does not apply consistently to all nouns of this type; e.g. Vrgada *besīda*, G pl. *bēsīd*, *ledīna*, G pl. *lēdīn*, *Vodīce* TOP, G pl. *Vōdīc*; *kolīno*, G pl. *kōlīn/kolīnōv*, *vraṭīlo*, G pl. *vraṭīl/vraṭīlōv*; but *lopāta*, G pl. *lop°āt*, *moṭīka*, G pl. *moṭīk*, *nesrīca*, G pl. *nesrīc*, etc.; Hvar *kumīca*, G pl. *kūmic/kumīc*, *livāda*, G pl. *līvod*; *kopīto*, G pl. *kōpīt /kopītih*; Brač *nedīja*, G pl. *nēdij/nedīj*, *ponīstra*, G pl. *pōnistr*; *korīto*, G pl. *kōrit*; cf. northern čakavian dialects such as Novi *kraljīca*, G pl. *kraljīc*, *livāda*, G pl. *livād*, *kolēno*, G pl. *kolēn*, Orbanīci *besēda*, G pl. *besīet*, *govēdo*, G pl. *govīet*, *kopīto*, G pl. *kopīt*, etc.

Some southern čakavian dialects have forms with an accent on an underlying jer vowel in the final syllable of the stem; e.g. Hvar *krīvāc*, G sg. *krīvca* /krīv'Ac-/ . In forms where this underlying jer vowel is deleted the accent automatically retracts to the preceding syllable of the stem, yielding a rising accent if this syllable is inherently long. The corresponding forms in other čakavian dialects belong to Type B; compare Hvar *otāc*, G sg. *ōca*; *badōnj*, G sg. *bōdnja* /bad'Anj-/ , *dolāc*, G sg. *dōlca* /do'lAc-/; *gūdāc*, G sg. *gūlca*, *svētāc*, G sg. *svēca* with Novi *otāc*, G sg. *ocā*; *badānj*, G sg. *badnjā*, *dolāc*, G sg. *dōlcā*; *gūdāc*, G sg. *gūcā*, *svētāc*, G sg. *svēcā*.

#### 4.2.2. Accentual type B

All Type B nouns retract the stress to the initial syllable of the stem in the V sg. The V pl. may exhibit the same retraction of stress, or the accentuation may be identical to the N pl.; e.g. Vrgada *jun°āk* (G sg. *jun°ākā*), V sg. *jūn°āce*, V pl. *jūn°āci*, *sūdāc* (G sg. *sūcā*), V sg. *sūce*; *sestrā*, V sg. *sēstro*, *ženā*, V sg. *žēno*, V pl. *žēne*; Senj *pōp* (G sg. *popā*), V sg. *pōpe*, V pl. *popī*, *vōl* (G sg. *volā*), V sg. *vōle*, V pl. *volī*; *svīcā*, V sg. *svīco*, V pl. *svīce*.

Masculine and neuter nouns retract the stress to the final stem syllable in some or all cases of the plural in many dialects.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> According to Stang (1957: 70), in proto-Slavic the stress retracted in the I and L pl. in masculine nouns belonging to Type B. We find the original pattern in some more conservative čakavian dialects, although the alternation also encompasses the G pl. when this case has adopted the original L pl. ending. The retraction is often extended to the G pl. in -Ø as well. Dialects with syncretism of the DIL endings typically exhibit the alternation in both the G and DIL pl. In most dialects with this type of alternation neuter nouns retract the stress in all plural cases. Stang (1957: 83) is of the opinion that this leveling of the accent had already taken place in proto-Slavic, and that the pattern seen in neuter nouns in dialects such as Omišalj has been reintroduced by analogy to the masculine nouns.

(7)

a. masculine

Novi	pl.	Orbanići	pl.
<i>kròv</i>	NA <i>krovì</i>	<i>postuòl</i>	NA <i>postolì</i>
(G <i>krovä</i> )	GL <i>kròvìh/krovìh</i>	(G <i>postolä</i> )	G <i>postòli</i>
	D <i>krovòn</i>		D not attested
	I <i>kròvi/krovì</i>		I <i>postòli</i>
			L <i>postòlah</i>
Vrgada	pl.	Hvar	pl.
<i>kònj</i>	NA <i>konjì</i>	<i>čèp</i>	N <i>čepì</i>
(G <i>konjä</i> )	G <i>kònjèv</i>	(G <i>čepä</i> )	G <i>čèpih/čepòv</i>
	DIL <i>kònjìn</i>		DIL <i>čepìma(n)</i>

b. neuter

Omišalj	pl.	Vrgada	pl.
<i>selò</i>	NA <i>selà</i>	<i>krelò</i>	NA <i>krèl°ā</i>
	G <i>sèl</i>		G <i>krèlòv</i>
	D <i>selòm</i>		DIL <i>krèlìn</i>
	I <i>sèli</i>		
	L <i>sèlìh</i>		

When the final syllable of the stem is long, the retracted stress is realized as a rising accent; e.g. Novi *kopāč*, G sg. *kopāčā*: GL pl. *kopāčìh*; Orbanići *lancūn*, NA pl. *lancūnì*, G pl. *lancūni*, L pl. *lancūnah*. Variant forms without the retraction of the accent are common, and some dialects appear to have eliminated this alternation entirely or else restrict it to stems with a long vowel; e.g. Senj *pòp*, N pl. *popì*, A pl. *popè*, G pl. *popì*, DIL pl. *popìn* vs. *kljūč*, N pl. *kljūčì*, A pl. *kljūčè*, G pl. *kljūči*, DIL pl. *kljūčìn*; *selò*, pl. NA *selà*, G *selì*, DIL *selìn* vs. *krìlò*, NA pl. *krìlā*, G pl. *krìli*, DIL pl. *krìlin*; Dugi Otok G pl. *popòv*, DIL pl. *popìma(n)*/L pl. *popìh*; *selò*, G pl. *selòv*, DIL pl. *selìma(n)*/L pl. *selìh*.

Additional examples of the retraction in the plural:

Masculine nouns

Novi *brèst*, N pl. *brèstì*, GL pl. *brèstìh/brèstìh*, D pl. *brèstòn*, I pl. *brèsti/brèstì*, *konòp*, G sg. *konopä*, GL pl. *konòpìh/konopìh*; Orbanići *krālj*, N pl. *krāljì*, G pl. *krāljì*, D pl. *krāljuòn*, *otāc*, NA pl. *ocì*, GI pl. *đci*, D pl. *ocièn*; Orlec *gròs*, NA pl. *gròzdì*, GI pl. *gròzdi*, L pl. *gròzdeh*; Pag *kònj*, A sg. *konjä*, G pl. *kònjèv*, DIL pl. *kònjìman*, *posāl*, N pl. *poslì*, DIL pl. *pòslìman*; Vrgada *prasāc*, N pl.

*pracì*, G pl. *pràs°āc*, DIL pl. *prācīn*, *tež°āk*, N pl. *tež°ācī*, G pl. *tež°ākōv*, DIL pl. *tež°ācīn*; Šolta *čèp*, N pl. *čèpī*, G pl. *čèpīh*, DIL *čèpīman*, *križ*, N pl. *križī*, G pl. *križīh*, DIL pl. *križīman*

#### Neuter nouns

Novi *sedlō*, NA pl. *sēdla*, G pl. *sēdāl/sedāl*, D pl. *sedlōn*, I pl. *sēdli/sedlī*, L pl. *sēdlīh/sedlīh*, *stāblō*, NA pl. *stābla*, G pl. *stābāl*; Orbaníci *rebrō*, NA pl. *riēbra*, G pl. *riēbar*, L pl. *riēbrah*, *ūknō*, NA pl. *ūkna*, G pl. *ūkan*, L pl. *ūknah*; Orlec *perō*, NA pl. *pēra*, G pl. *pēr*, I pl. *pēri*, L pl. *pēreh*, *selō*, NA pl. *sēla*, G pl. *sēl*, L pl. *sēlah/sēleh*; Vrgada *bretenō*, NA pl. *bretēn°ā*, *gnjīzdō*, NA pl. *gnjīzd°ā*, *veslō*, NA pl. *vēs°ā*, G pl. *vēs°āl*, DIL pl. *vēs°līn*; Hvar *kolō*, NA pl. *kolā*, G pl. *kōlih*, *vīnō*, NA pl. *vīnā*, G pl. *vīnih*, DIL pl. *vīnīma(n)*

#### 4.2.3. Accentual type C

Nouns belonging to Type C have an alternating stress pattern. The accent is on the grammatical ending in certain cases in both the singular and the plural, while in the remaining forms the accent falls on the initial syllable of the stem. The vocative case always has an initial stress.

##### 4.2.3.1. Masculine nouns

Masculine nouns usually shift the stress to the L sg. ending *-u*; e.g. Senj *brōd*, G sg. *brōda*, L sg. *brodū*; *dān*, G sg. *dāna*, L sg. *dānū*; Orlec *grāt*, L sg. *gradū*/*grādu*, *zīt*, L sg. *zidū/zīdu*; Vrgada *nōs*, G sg. *nōsa*, L sg. *nosū*; *brīg*, G sg. *brīga*, L sg. *brīgū*; Hvar *lēd*, G sg. *lēda*, L sg. *ledū*; *kūs*, G sg. *kūsa*, L sg. *kūsū*. The alternation is generally restricted to inanimate nouns (cf. Senj L sg. *sīnu*, *jēžu*), but occasionally nouns representing small or domestic animals may shift the stress in this case; e.g. Hvar *brōv* (brav), L sg. *brōvū/brōvu*, *zēc*, L sg. *zēcū*, but only *sīnu*, *vūku*. There is also a tendency to limit the alternation to monosyllabic stems; compare Senj L sg. *kōmadu*, *mīsecu* with Vrgada *kom°ādū*, *mīsēcū*; Hvar *govorū/gōvoru*, *mīsēcū/mīsecu*.

Some dialects have completely eliminated the alternation in the L sg. (see Lukežić 1990:44 for examples). There is no shift of stress to the L sg. ending *-i/-e* (from proto-Slavic *\*ě*); e.g. Novi *mōst*, L sg. *nā mosti*; *grād*, L sg. *vā grādi*; Orbaníci *liēt*, L sg. *lēde*, *dān*, L sg. *dāne*.<sup>11</sup>

In the plural masculine nouns with a short final syllable exhibit a shift of stress to the ending in the G(L) form or in all oblique cases, depending on the dialect.

<sup>11</sup> Compare Russian, where the L sg. ending *-u* which occurs with a limited number of masculine nouns after the prepositions *v*, *na* always carries the stress. There is no shift to the normal L sg. ending *-e*; e.g. *sad*, L sg. *v sadú* vs. *o sáde*; *les*, L sg. *v lesú* vs. *o lése*.

(8)	Novi	pl.	Vrgada	pl.
	<i>brôd</i>	NA <i>brôdi</i>	<i>môst</i>	NA <i>môsti</i>
		GL <i>brođih/brôđih</i>		G <i>mostôv/môstôv</i>
		D <i>brôdôn</i>		DIL <i>mostîn/môstîn</i>
		I <i>brôdi</i>		
	Senj	pl.		
	<i>brôd</i>	N <i>brôdi</i>		
		A <i>brôde</i>		
		G <i>brođi</i>		
		DIL <i>brôdin/brôdiman</i>		

However, nouns with a long vowel in the final stem syllable display a different pattern of alternation in the surface forms:

(9)	Novi	pl.		pl.
	<i>vlâs</i>	NA <i>vlâsi</i>	<i>ôblâk</i>	NA <i>ôblâci</i>
		GL <i>vlâših</i>		GL <i>oblâčih</i>
		D <i>vlâsôn</i>		D <i>ôblâkôn</i>
		I <i>vlâsi</i>		I <i>ôblâci</i>
	Senj			
	<i>dân</i>	N <i>dâni</i>	<i>gôlub</i>	N <i>gôlubi</i>
		A <i>dâne</i>	<i>/golûb-/</i>	A <i>gôlube</i>
		G <i>dâni</i>		G <i>golûbi</i>
		DIL <i>dânin</i>		DIL <i>golûbin</i>
	Vrgada			
	<i>zûb</i>	NA <i>zûbi</i>		
		G <i>zûbī</i>		
		DIL <i>zûbīn</i>		

Here rather than a shift of stress to the ending, we find a rising accent on the final syllable of the stem in some or all of the oblique plural cases. It seems unlikely that this could represent the original pattern of alternation in čakavian. Nouns of this type have the same shift of stress to the ending in the L sg. regardless of the length of the final stem syllable, and we would expect them to have the same type of alternation in the plural as well.<sup>12</sup> In fact, some examples of the

<sup>12</sup> Cf. alternations in other Slavic languages in nouns historically belonging to this type: e.g. Russian *zub*, NA pl. *zûby*, G pl. *zubôv*, D pl. *zubâm*, I pl. *zubâmi*, L pl. *zubâx*.

expected shift of stress to the endings are attested for stems with a long final syllable; e.g. Novi GL pl. *vlāsīh* beside *vlāsīh*; Vrgada *sīn*: G pl. *sinōv*, DIL pl. *sinīn*; Hvar *zūb*: G pl. *zūbīh/zūbih/zūb* (/zūb-'A/), DIL pl. *zūbīma(n)*.

Given the fact that the long rising accent in čakavian is often the result of the retraction of the stress to a preceding long syllable,<sup>13</sup> an explanation for the accentuation of the forms cited in (9) suggests itself. A sequence of two syllables of the type  $C\bar{V}C\check{V}$  is prosodically marked and often undergoes some phonological change, which varies depending on the dialect and the type of stem. We often find shortening of the unstressed syllable in this environment; e.g. Senj *kljūč*, G *kljūčā*, I *ključōn*; *svīčā*, A *svīčū*: G *svičē*; Vrgada *sīn*, G pl. *sinōv*, DIL pl. *sinīn*; Brač *trōvā* (trava), G sg. *trōvē*. If the length of the pretonic syllable is not lost, the stress usually retracts to the preceding syllable:

$$(10) \bar{V}C\check{V} \rightarrow \check{V}C\bar{V}$$

If we posit a rule of this type, we can then analyze the forms cited in (9) as undergoing the same shift of stress to the endings as the short-vowel stems, followed by a phonologically conditioned retraction of the accent; e.g. Vrgada G pl. /zūb-ī/ → *zūbī*, DIL pl. /zūb-īn/ → *zūbīn*.

It is difficult to determine the extent to which the alternation in the plural of masculine nouns is preserved in čakavian, since oblique plural forms are not well attested for many dialects. Variant forms without the alternation are common, and there seems to be a tendency to eliminate the alternation in stems with a short vowel in the final syllable. In field work conducted in 1998, I did not find alternations in the plural of short-vowel stems in Crikvenica, Dražice, Grižane, Jadranovo, Hreljin, Novi or Viškovo, dialects which are otherwise quite conservative in their accentuation.

Additional examples:

Novi *kōrāk*, GL pl. *korākīh/kōrākīh*, *mīsēc*, GL pl. *misēcīh*; Orbanići *grāt*, L sg. *grāde*, NA pl. *grādi*, G pl. *grādi*, L pl. *grādah*; *riēt*, N pl. *riēdi*, G pl. *riēdi*, L pl. *riēdah*; Senj *rōg*, L sg. *rogū*, N pl. *rōgi*, G pl. *rogī*, DIL pl. *rōgin*, *sīn*, N pl. *sīni*, G pl. *sīni*, DIL pl. *sīnin*; Pag G sg. *dāna*, L sg. *dānū*, G pl. *danōv*, L pl. *dāniman*; Vrgada *brōd*, G sg. *brōda*, L sg. *brodū*, NA pl. *brōdi*, G pl. *brodī/brōdī*, DIL pl. *brodīn/brōdīn*, *kīp*, G sg. *kīpa*, L sg. *kīpū*, G pl. *kipōv/kīpōv*, DIL pl. *kipīn/kīpīn*; Hvar *brūs*, G sg. *brūsa*, L sg. *brūsū*, G pl. *brūsīh/brūsīh*, *črīp* (crijep), G sg. *črīpa*, L sg. *črīpū/črīpu*, G pl. *črīpīh/črīpīh*.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. examples cited above, such as /kljūč-'A/ > *kljūč*; *kopāč*, *kopāčā*: GL pl. *kopāčīh*. The synchronic analysis here obviously corresponds to the historical origin of this accent, which reflects the proto-Slavic neoacute.

## 4.2.3.2. Neuter nouns

Neuter nouns usually do not alternate in the singular, although a few nouns in some dialects may shift the stress to the L sg. ending *-u*; compare Senj *zvòno*, L sg. *zvonù*; Orlec *jâje*, L sg. *jājū*, *môre*, L sg. *morù/môru/môre* with Vrgada *sûnce*, L sg. *nâ sūncu*, Ugljan L sg. *ù moru*, *ù polju*. In the plural the accent may shift to the ending in all cases, but many dialects have eliminated this alternation in the majority of lexical items.

(11) Vrgada	pl.		pl.
	<i>slðvo</i>	NA <i>slov°ā/slðv°ā</i>	<i>jèzero</i>
		G <i>slovōv/slðvōv</i>	NA <i>jezer°ā</i>
		DIL <i>slovīn/slðvīn</i>	G <i>jezēr /jezēr-’A/</i>
			DIL <i>jezerīn</i>

Note that the G pl. form *jezēr* is analyzed as having a shift to the grammatical ending just like the other plural cases. The stress automatically retracts to the preceding syllable in the surface form.

Stems with a long vowel in the final syllable undergo the same phonologically conditioned retraction of stress to the preceding syllable as illustrated above for the masculine nouns (10).

(12) Novi	pl.	Vrgada	pl.
	<i>jâje</i>	<i>črīvo</i>	NA <i>črīv°ā</i>
	G <i>jāj</i>		G <i>črīvōv</i>
	D <i>jājōn</i>		DIL <i>črīvīn</i>
	I <i>jāji</i>		
	L <i>jājīh</i>		

Forms such as these would be analyzed as underlying /črīv-ā/, /črīv-ōv/, /črīv-īn/, for example. In dialects like Novi where not all of the plural endings are inherently long, the rising accent on the final stem syllable in these cases is probably the result of analogy.<sup>14</sup>

The shift of stress to the plural endings is most consistently attested for nouns originally belonging to the consonantal declension.

(13) Novi	pl.		pl.
	<i>brīme</i>	NA <i>brimenā</i>	<i>něbo</i>
		G <i>brimēn</i>	NA <i>nebesā</i>
		D <i>brimenōn</i>	G <i>nebēs</i>
		L <i>brimenīh</i>	L <i>nebesīh/nebēsīh</i>

<sup>14</sup> Note that in Novi the NA pl. ending is long when stressed, according to the data in Belić (1909); see the examples in (13).

## Senj

<i>ime</i>	NA <i>iměna</i>	<i>vrīme</i>	NA <i>vrīměna</i>
	G <i>iměni</i>		G <i>vrīměni</i>
	DIL <i>iměnin</i>		DIL <i>vrīměnin</i>

As can be seen in the examples from Senj, the suffix vowel may be lengthened throughout the plural, probably by analogy to the G pl. where this lengthening is historically justified (see §4.1). In this event these forms display the same phonologically conditioned retraction of stress as the other stems with a long vowel in the final syllable: /imēn-ã/ → *iměna*, etc.

## Additional examples:

Novi *město*, NA pl. *mestā*, L pl. *mestīh*, *jělīto*, NA pl. *jelīta*, G pl. *jelīt*, L pl. *jelītīh*; Orbanići *kuōlo*, NA pl. *kuōla*, L pl. *kuōlah*, *tiēlo*, NA pl. *tiēla*, *ime*, G sg. *imena*, NA pl. *imiěna*; Senj *lěto*, NA pl. *letā/lěta*, G pl. *letī/lēt*, DIL pl. *letīman/lētīman*, *jāje*, NA pl. *jāja*; Pag *zrño*, NA pl. *zrnā*, *vrīme*, G sg. *vrīmena*, NA pl. *vrīmenā*; Vrgada *pōlje*, NA pl. *polj°ā/pōlj°ā*, *sūnce*, NA pl. *sunc°ā* 'sunny days', G pl. *suncōv*, DIL pl. *suncīn*, *čūdo*, NA pl. *čudes°ā*, G pl. *čudēs*, DIL pl. *čudesīn*; Hvar *klūko*, NA pl. *klūkā/klūka*, *brīnce*, G sg. *brīnca/brīnceta*, NA pl. *brīncā/brīnca*, *brīme*, G sg. *brīmena*, NA pl. *brīmenā*, G pl. *brīmēn*.

4.2.3.3. Feminine *a*-stems

Feminine *a*-stems carry the stress on the grammatical ending in all cases other than the A, V sg. and the NAV pl.

(14) Novi		Hvar	
N	<i>gorā</i>	<i>gōre</i>	N <i>rūkā</i> NAV <i>rūke</i>
G	<i>gorē</i>	<i>gōr /gōr-'A/</i>	G <i>rukē</i> G <i>rūk /rūk-'A/</i>
D	<i>gorì</i>	<i>gorān</i>	D <i>rūcì</i> DIL <i>rūkīma(n)</i>
A	<i>gōru</i>	<i>gōre</i>	A <i>rūku</i>
I	<i>gorūn</i>	<i>gorāmi</i>	I <i>rukōn</i>
L	<i>gorì</i>	<i>gorāh</i>	L <i>rūcì</i>
V	<i>gōro</i>	<i>gōre</i>	V <i>rūko</i>

The accentual pattern illustrated in (14) is well attested in čakavian and appears to be more stable than the alternating pattern in Type C nouns belonging to other declensions. However, in some areas the stress of the singular paradigm has been leveled on the basis of the accusative case (e.g. *rūka*, A sg. *rūku*); this pattern may also be extended to the plural (Lukežić 1990: 41). A number of dialects also exhibit an initial stress in the D sg.; e.g. Senj D sg. *nōgi* vs. L sg. *nogì*, D sg. *rūki*, L sg. *rūkì*; Brač D sg. *dūšì/dūši*, *rūcì/rūci*, *srīdì/srīdi*. But in most dialects the initial stress in the D sg. is attested for only a handful of nouns, if it occurs at all.



## Additional examples:

Novi *iglaš*, A sg. *iglu*, *strānā*, A sg. *strānu*; Orbanići *rosā*, A sg. *rōso*, *glāvā*, D sg. *glāvè*, A sg. *glāvo*, Senj *dicā*, A sg. *dīcu*, *brādā*, A sg. *brādu*, Pag G sg. *ovcè*, D sg. *ovcī*, A sg. *ōvcu*, G sg. *zīmē*, A sg. *zīmu*; Vrgada *metlā*, A sg. *mètlu*, *sramotā*, A sg. *srāmotu*, *grēdā*, A sg. *grēdu*; Hvar *čelā*, A sg. *čèlu*, *vodā*, A sg. *vōdu*, *srīdā*, A sg. *srīdu*.

4.2.3.4. Feminine *i*-stems

Generally speaking, feminine *i*-stems have a stress on the grammatical ending in the I and L sg. (in some dialects only in the L sg.) and in the oblique cases of the plural. However, the plural cases are only rarely attested in the literature, so it is not always possible to determine whether or not this accentual alternation exists in a given dialect.

(15) Novi			Vrgada		
	sg.	pl.	sg.	pl.	
NA	<i>kōst</i>	<i>kōsti</i>	NA	<i>kōst</i>	NA <i>kōsti</i>
G	<i>kōsti</i>	<i>kostīh/kōstīh</i>	G	<i>kōsti</i>	G <i>kostī</i>
D	<i>kōsti</i>	<i>kostān</i>	D	<i>kōsti</i>	DIL <i>kostīn</i>
I	<i>kostūn</i>	<i>kostāmi</i>	I	<i>kōščōn/kōsti</i>	
L	<i>kostī</i>	<i>kostāh</i> (or =G)	L	<i>kostī</i>	

From the available data it appears that the restriction of the alternation in the singular to the L case is most common in the southern part of the čakavian dialect area. In some dialects these nouns have the same endings as the *a*-stems in all cases other than the NA sg. and consequently follow the same accentual pattern as the latter group (with a stress on the ending in the G sg. and presumably the D sg. as well); e.g. Orlec *pēc*, G sg. *pecī*, I sg. *pecū*, L sg. *pecè*, N pl. *pēcī*, G pl. *pēc/pēcī*, I pl. *pecāmi*, L pl. *pecāh*; Orbanići *hōljef*, G sg. *holjevī*, I sg. *holjevuōn*, L sg. *holjevè*, NA pl. *hōljevi*, G pl. *holjičf*, I pl. *holjevāmi*, L pl. *holjevāh*.

## Additional examples:

Novi *sōl*, I sg. *solūn*, L sg. *solī*, *mlādōst*, I sg. *mladostūn/mlādosti*, L sg. *mladostī/mlādosti*, *lāz*, L sg. *lāzī*, N pl. *lāzi*, G pl. *lāz/lāzīh /lāz-īh/*; Senj *bōlest*, I sg. *boleščōn*, L sg. *bolestī*, NA pl. *bōlesti*, G pl. *bolesfī*, D pl. *bōlestin*, IL pl. *bolestīn*, *māst*, I sg. *maščōn*, L sg. *māstī*, NA pl. *māsti*, G pl. *māsti /māst-ī/*, DIL pl. *māstīn /māst-īn/*; Pag *nōc*, L sg. *nočī*, I sg. *polnočōn*; Vrgada *pēc*, I sg. *pēcōn*, L sg. *pecī*, *jēsēn*, L sg. *jesenī/jēsēni*; Hvar *mōc*, I sg. *mōcōn*, L sg. *močī*, NA pl. *mōci*, G pl. *mōcih*, DIL *mōcima(n)*, *čōst*, I sg. *čōščōn*, L sg. *čōstī*, NA pl. *čōsti*, G pl. *čōstīh /čōstīh*, DIL pl. *čōstīma(n)/čōstīma(n)*, *pēst*, L sg. *pēsī*, DIL pl. *pēsīma(n)/pēsīma(n)*.

## 4.2.3.5. The accentuation of stems with a “nepostojani a” in the final syllable

Stems with a reflex of a historical *jer* vowel (or a secondary inserted vowel) which appears in the G pl. with a zero ending often exhibit variation in the accentuation of this form. Nouns belonging to Type A which normally carry the accent on the penultimate stem syllable may shift the stress to the final syllable in the G pl.; e.g. Novi *stàrac*, G pl. *starāc/stārāc*; *lādva*, G pl. *ladāv*; Senj *čāvāl*, G pl. *čāvāl*, *opānak*, G pl. *opanāk*; *bāčva*, G pl. *bačāv*, *rešētka*, G pl. *rešetāk*; Vrgada *crīkva*, G pl. *crik<sup>o</sup>āv/crīk<sup>o</sup>āv*. The alternation in these forms is probably due to analogy with the accentuation of Type B and C stems; e.g. Novi *lākat*, G pl. *lakāt*, *kotāl* (G sg. *kotlā*), G pl. *kotāl/kōtāl*. Type B and C stems also exhibit variants with the stress on the initial rather than the final syllable in the G pl.; e.g. Vrgada *sestrā*, G pl. *sēst<sup>o</sup>ār/sest<sup>o</sup>ār*; *zemljā*, G pl. *zēm<sup>o</sup>āl̆j* (cf. Novi *zemāl̆j*); Hvar *sēstor* /*sestōr*; Brač *metlā*, G pl. *mētōl* (cf. Vrgada *met<sup>o</sup>āl̆*).

## 5. CONCLUSION

The outline of the accentual alternations of the noun given above provides only the main features of the accentuation of these forms in the čakavian dialect area. Certain minor details have been omitted, and individual dialects may diverge from these patterns as a result of phonological changes or analogical levelings that took place in their historical development. However, it is hoped that this illustration of the approach to accentual analysis advocated in this article will provide a useful framework for future studies. Instead of positing a multitude of accentual types based on surface accentual features, it has been shown that it is possible to simplify the accentual classification by organizing accentual data on the basis of underlying representations and by distinguishing between phonologically conditioned and morphologically conditioned alternations. This approach allows us to recognize the underlying similarities between forms such as *čās*: G sg. *čāsa*, *đīm*: G *đīma*, *stārac*: G sg. *stārca* (all Type A, with a consistent accent on the stem) or *brōd*, L sg. *brodū*, G pl. *brodīh*; *grād*, L sg. *grādū*, G pl. *grādīh* (both Type C, with a stress that alternates between the initial syllable and the grammatical ending, although in the latter this is obscured by the operation of the phonological rule given in (10) above). This analysis allows for a simple, logical and consistent approach to the accentuation of all čakavian dialects and provides a better understanding of their synchronic accentual systems. At the same time, it facilitates the comparison of čakavian accentuation with that of other Slavic languages and dialects for the study of proto-Slavic accentuation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barić, Eugenija et al. 1979. *Priručna gramatika hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Belić, Aleksandar. 1909. "Zametki po čakavskim govoram." *Izvestija otdelenija ruskoga jazyka i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk* 14, no. 2: 181–266.
- Daničić, Đuro. 1913. "Akcenti u imenica i pridjeva." *Djela JAZU* 24.
- Finka, Božidar. 1977. "Dugootočki čakavski govori." *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 4: 7–178.
- Finka, Božidar, and Antun Šojat. 1968. "Govor otoka Žirja." *Rasprave Instituta za jezik* 1: 121–220.
- Houtzagers, H. P. 1985. *The čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres*. (*Studies in Slavic and general linguistics* 5). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Houtzagers, H. P. 1987. "On the phonology and morphology of the čakavian dialects spoken on the island of Pag." *Studies in Slavic and general linguistics* 10: 65–90.
- Houtzagers, H. P. and Elena Budovskaja. 1996. "Nominal and verbal inflection in the čakavian dialect of Kali on the island of Ugljan." *Studies in Slavic and general linguistics* 23: 143–166.
- Hozjan, Snježana. 1992. "Govor Krasa na otoku Krku (Deklinacija)." *Rasprave Zavoda za hrvatski jezik* 18: 43–55.
- Hraste, Mate. 1935. "Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Hvara." *Južnoslovenski filolog* 14: 1–55.
- Hraste, Mate. 1940. "Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Brača." *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 10: 3–64.
- Hraste, Mate and Petar Šimunović. 1979. *Čakavisches-deutsches Lexikon*. Köln-Wien: Böhlau.
- Ivić, Pavle. 1961. "Prilozi poznavanju dijalekatske slike zapadne Hrvatske." *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 6: 191–212.
- Jurišić, Blaž. 1966. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade*. Vol. 1, *Uvod*. Zagreb.
- Jurišić, Blaž. 1973. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade. Uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima*. Vol. 2, *Rječnik*. Zagreb.
- Kalsbeek, Janneke. 1998. *The čakavian dialect of Orbančić near Žminj in Istria*. (*Studies in Slavic and general linguistics* 25). Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Langston, Keith. 1998. "On the boundary of morphology and phonology: Accentual alternations in the čakavian nominal inflection." *Balkanistica* 11: 31–54.
- Langston, Keith. 1999 (to appear). "The phonological representation of jer vowels in Croatian." *Filologija* 32.
- Lukežić, Iva. 1990. *Čakavski ikavsko-ekavski dijalekt*. Rijeka: Izdavački Centar Rijeka.

- Matešić, Josip. 1970. *Der Wortakzent in der serbokroatischen Schriftsprache*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Menac-Mihalić, Mira. 1995. "Naglasak glagolskog pridjeva radnog u čakavskom narječju." *Filologija* 24–5: 247–251.
- Menac-Mihalić, Mira. 1996. "Naglasni odnosi infinitiva i prezenta u čakavskom narječju." *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 30–31: 9–41.
- Mihanović, Nedjeljko. 1971. "Jezik na području Poljica." *Poljički zbornik* 2, 150–183.
- Milčetić, Ivan. 1895. "Čakavština Kvarnerskih otoka." *Rad JAZU* 121: 92–131.
- Moguš, Milan. 1966. *Današnji senjski govor*. Poseban otisak iz Senjskog zbornika 2. Senj.
- Moguš, Milan. 1981–82. "Akcentat glagola u ličkih čakavaca." *Makedonski jazik* 32–33: 527–531.
- Neweklowsky, Gerhard. 1978. *Die kroatischen Dialekte des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete*. (Schriften der Balkankommission. Linguistische Abteilung, vol. 25.) Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Stang, Christian S. 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademie.
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1958. "Towards a phonemic typology of the Slavic languages." In *American contributions to the 4th International Congress of Slavists*. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton, 301–319.
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1993. *The accentual patterns of the Slavic languages*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Steinhauer, Hein. 1973. *Čakavian studies*. (Slavistic printings and reprintings 306.) The Hague: Mouton.

## Analiza akcenatskih obrazaca čakavskih dijalekata

### Sažetak

Odavno je priznata važnost čakavskoga za proučavanje slavenske akcentuacije i rekonstrukciju praslavenskoga akcenatskog sustava. Nažalost, naše je poznavanje akcenatskih promjena koje se događaju u čakavskome narječju ograničeno zbog nedostatka relevantnih podataka za mnoge pojedine čakavske dijalekte. Čak i u sveobuhvatnim dijalektološkim raspravama koje donose detaljan fonološki i morfološki opis, akcenatski podatci uglavnom nisu sustavno i uporabljivo organizirani što nerijetko rezultira znatnim prazninama u opisu akcenatskih pojava.

Iako neki od dostupnih dijalekatnih opisa nastoje podatke organizirati prema različitim akcenatskim tipovima, principi uporabljenih raščlambi nisu u cjelosti

prikladni. Zajednička je odlika svih dosadašnjih pristupa da se temelje isključivo na površinskim akcenatskim odnosima među različitim oblicima, te da ne razlikuju fonološki i morfološki uvjetovane promjene. Slijedom takva pristupa, akcenatski tipovi koji su u biti jednaki ponekad se navode kao različiti zbog predskazivih promjena uvjetovanih djelovanjem regularnih fonoloških pravila. Istodobno, među bitno različitim akcenatskim ponašanjima ponekad se ne pravi razlika zbog nedostatka razložnih kriterija za određivanje pojedinih akcenatskih kategorija.

U članku se predlaže mogućnost postojanije i logičnije analize čakavskih akcenatskih promjena koja bi uzimala u obzir i dubinske fonološke odraze, odnosno koja se ne bi oslanjala samo na površinsku akcentuaciju. Takav nam pristup omogućuje razlikovanje tri temeljne skupine osnova koje su obilježene osobitim tipovima akcenatskoga ponašanja.

Tip A: Likovi koji pripadaju toj grupi imaju nepomičan naglasak koji se može nalaziti na bilo kojem slogu osnove. U tom su tipu akcenatske promjene rijetke i ograničena dosega.

Tip B: Likove iz te skupine obilježava naglasak na gramatičkim nastavcima.

Tip C: Toj skupini pripadaju nenaglasne osnove.

Ta se tri naglasna tipa mogu uporabiti za kategorizaciju akcenatskih promjena koje se događaju kod svih sklanjanih likova. Taj je sustav u ovome radu predočen kratkim pregledom akcenatskim promjena imenica u čakavskim dijalektima. Ako se izdvoje fonološki predvidive promjene, preostaju sljedeći temeljni obrasci:

Tip A: Jedine su naglasne promjene u vokativu jednine i množine kod nekolicine leksičkih jedinica te u genitivu množine kod dvije fonološki određene podgrupe imenica koje pripadaju tomu tipu.

Tip B: Sve imenice ove skupine povlače naglasak na početni slog u vokativu jednine, a ponekad i u vokativu množine. Imenice muškoga i srednjeg roda mogu povlačiti naglasak na finalni slog osnove u nekim ili svim množinskim padežima.

Tip C: Kako toj skupini načelno pripadaju nenaglašene osnove, naglasak pada na gramatički nastavak ako je nastavak sam naglašen. Inače, ti likovi dobivaju naglasak na početnome slogu kao rezultat automatskog pravila o oznaci akcenta. Taj se inicijalni naglasak može realizirati na proklitici koja prethodi ili na početnom slogu osnove imenice. Kod imenica koje pripadaju tipu C različiti nastavci imaju naglasak na svakom od različitih deklinacijskih tipova: imenice muškog i srednjeg roda, te *a*-osnove i *i*-osnove ženskoga roda.

U radu se pokazuje da je moguće stvoriti jednostavniju i sustavniju raščlambu naglasnih promjena u čakavskome usredotočujući se na temeljne sličnosti i razlike koje se nalaze u pozadini neprojenih površinskih naglasnih obrazaca. Takav tip raščlambe osigurava bolje poznavanje sinkronijskoga sustava čakavske akcentuacije te istodobno omogućuje usporedbu čakavske akcentuacije s akcenatskim sustavima ostalih slavenskih jezika i dijalekata.