

UDK 811.1/2(091)

Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Rukopis primljen 19. IX. 2016.  
Prihvaćen za tisak 30. X. 2016.

Frederik Kortlandt

Department of comparative linguistics  
Leiden University  
P.O. Box 915  
NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands  
F.Kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl  
www.kortlandt.nl

## ON THE RISE OF NEO-ACUTE \*E AND \*O

The question is whether the reflex  $*i\grave{e}$ ,  $*u\grave{o}$  of Stang's law is distinct both from the reflex  $*\acute{e}$ ,  $*\acute{o}$  of the early retraction of the stress from final jers, as in Slovene  $n\acute{e}s\grave{a}l < *nesl\grave{b}$ , gen.pl.  $g\acute{o}r < *gor\grave{b}$ , and from  $*\acute{e}$ ,  $*\acute{o}$  that did not receive the stress as a result of an accent retraction, as in  $b\acute{o}b < *b\acute{o}b\grave{b}$ ,  $dn\acute{o} < *dn\acute{o}\grave{o} < *d\acute{b}n\acute{o}$  (Dybo's law). It is clear that  $*\acute{o}$  and  $*u\grave{o}$  remained distinct in Slovene. In Kajkavian, the reflex  $*i\grave{e}$ ,  $*u\grave{o}$  of Stang's law merged with the reflex  $*\acute{e}$ ,  $*\acute{o}$  of the early retraction of the stress from final jers, not with  $*\acute{e}$ ,  $*\acute{o}$  that had not received the stress as a result of an accent retraction. Here we find a distinction between  $*\acute{e}$ ,  $*\acute{o}$  and  $*i\grave{e}$ ,  $*u\grave{o}$  in initial and medial syllables. In Štokavian,  $*i\grave{e}$  and  $*u\grave{o}$  lost their diphthongal element and merged with  $*\acute{e}$  and  $*\acute{o}$  at an early stage. In Slovak, the distinction between  $*\acute{o}$  and  $*u\grave{o}$  is reflected as *o* versus *ô* while the distinction between  $*i\grave{e}$  and  $*\acute{e}$  is maintained as *e* versus *ie*. The long vowel in Czech *kůň*, Slovak *kôň* did not arise phonetically but was adopted from the case forms where the accent had been retracted in accordance with Stang's law. Slovak *ô* is also the phonetic reflex of long falling  $*\acute{o}$  after a labial consonant, where it had evidently been shortened to  $*u\grave{o}$ . The late Proto-Slavic shortening of long falling vowels yielded  $*u\grave{o} < *\acute{o}$  in Czech, later reflected as *ů*. The possessive pronouns  $*mojb$ ,  $*tvojb$ ,  $*svojb$  and the imperatives  $*(ne) boj\grave{b} s\acute{e}$  '(do not) fear' and  $*stoj\grave{b}$  'stand' have the reflex of  $*\acute{o}$ . Since Lithuanian normally uses uninflected *màno*, *tàvo*, *sàvo* in possessive constructions, I think that the PIE possessive forms were originally uninflected and that Slavic replaced these forms by  $*moiH$ ,  $*tuo\acute{i}H$ ,  $*suo\acute{i}H$ , with stressed  $*iH$ , like Latin *meī*, *tuī*, *suī*. At a later stage, these forms became thematicized and adopted the inflection of the pronoun  $*j\grave{b}$ . For the imperatives  $*stoj\grave{b}$  and  $*boj\grave{b} s\acute{e}$  we may reconstruct  $*stoj\grave{i}$  and  $*boj\grave{i}$  with final stress, followed by loss of intervocalic  $*j$  and resyllabification.

After the loss of glottalization in unstressed syllables and the consequent rise of the new timbre distinctions, the Slavic vowel system was the following (cf. Kortlandt 2011a: 107, 2015b: 24):

<i>i</i>		<i>y</i>		<i>u</i>			
<i>e</i>		ь	ѣ	o	<i>eN</i>		<i>oN</i>
	ě		a			<i>aN</i>	

In stressed syllables, the acute (glottalized) vowels were now half-long while the non-acute vowels could be either long or short. In pretonic syllables, long vowels were shortened and the opposition between long and short vowels was replaced by the new timbre distinctions. In posttonic syllables, vowel length remained distinctive but final nasal vowels were shortened, e.g. Serbian/Croatian nom.acc.pl. *glâve* with a short ending versus gen.sg. *glâvĕ* < \*-ĕ ‘head’, Slovene gen.sg. *krâve* (a) ‘cow’ without neo-circumflex versus *gorĕ* (c) ‘mountain’ with a long vowel, similarly Susak (Croatian) gen.sg. *sestrĕ* (b) ‘sister’ versus *vodiĕ* (c) ‘water’ (if the latter form is reliable). There is no trace of glottalization in final nasal vowels.<sup>1</sup> The mid vowels *e*, *ь*, *ѣ*, *o* were always short, but that was to change very soon.

According to Van Wijk’s law, clusters of consonant plus \*j were shortened with compensatory lengthening of the following vowel, e.g. \**pîšĕ* < \**pîš-je* ‘writes’, \**wòlā* < \**wòlja* ‘will’. New \**ĕ* did not merge with earlier \**ĕ*, which had become *ě* at this stage. Other new long vowels originated from contractions in posttonic syllables, e.g. Čakavian (Novi) *pîtā* ‘asks’, Bulg. *pîta*, cf. Čak. *kopā* < \**kopā(j)e* ‘digs’, Bulg. *kopāe*, Old Polish *kopaje*. Here again, new \**ĕ* did not merge with earlier \**ĕ*, e.g. Czech gen.sg. *nového* ‘new’. New long vowels under the stress arose when the accent was retracted from final jers in mobile accent paradigms, e.g. Slovene gen.pl. *gór* < \**gorĕ* ‘mountains’, *dán* < \**dъnĕ* ‘days’, *óvǎc* < \**owъcĕ* ‘sheep’, Polish *rąk* < \**rǫkĕ* ‘hands’, Russian dat.pl. *dĕtjam* < \**dĕtĕmĕ* ‘children’. The vowel length in the gen.pl. forms subsequently spread analogically to other accent paradigms. This resulted in the following vowel system:

<i>i</i>		<i>ï</i>	<i>y</i>		<i>u</i>			
<i>e</i>		ь	ѣ		o	<i>ĕN</i>	<i>ǫN</i>	<i>oN</i>
	ě		a			<i>äN</i>	<i>aN</i>	

<sup>1</sup> This is why we find long *-ĕ* < \*-ĕ beside short *-i* < \*-y in the gen.sg. ending of the *a*-stems in the dialect of Kastav (Jardas 1957, cited by Kapović 2015: 536).

Non-acute vowels could be long or short both under the stress and in posttonic syllables. Acute vowels were always stressed, and vowels in pretonic syllables were always short.

Under the stress, non-acute vowels were rising or falling in initial syllables and always rising in non-initial syllables, more or less as in standard Serbian/Croatian. (On the misleading notion of “unstressed word forms” for phrases with a falling tone on the initial syllable see Kortlandt 2010a: 343f., 349f., 353–357 and 2011a: 78–82, 138f., 269f., 274.) This system was fundamentally changed when rising vowels lost the stress to the following syllable (if there was one) in accordance with Dybo’s law, e.g. \*ženà ‘woman’, \*osnòwā ‘base’. Newly stressed long vowels received a falling tone, e.g. \*woĵâ ‘will’. Final jers had lost their stressability and therefore could not receive the stress, e.g. Slovene *kònj* < \*kòňb ‘horse’. In pretonic syllables, vowel length became distinctive, e.g. \*nāròdъ ‘people’, \*ōNtròbā ‘entrails’, Slovene *národ*, *vòtroba*. Consequently, the distinction between rising and falling vowels was now limited to monosyllables (not counting final jers), where the rising accent was not lost, and to long vowels in non-initial syllables, which became falling when they received the stress as a result of Dybo’s law. The first anomaly was resolved by the lengthening of short falling vowels in monosyllables, e.g. S/Cr. *bôg* < \*bògъ ‘god’, *kôst* ‘bone’ < \*kòstъ, *dân* ‘day’ < \*dъňb < \*dъňъ, which eliminated the tonal distinction on short vowels. Loss of the acute (i.e. of glottalization) yielded new short rising vowels, e.g. *dýmъ* ‘smoke’, *gorà* ‘mountain’, and reintroduced a tonal distinction on short vowels in the initial syllable of polysyllabic word forms. The second anomaly was resolved by the shortening of long falling vowels in final syllables (not counting final jers) with retraction of the stress in accordance with Stang’s law, yielding new long rising vowels and short rising diphthongs *è*, *ò* in prefinal syllables, e.g. \*w<sup>u</sup>òĵa < \*woĵâ < \*wòĵā (Dybo) < \*wòĵja (Van Wijk), Russian dial. *vólja*, Czech *vůle*, Slovak *vôľa*, Slovene *vólja*, S/Cr. *vòlja*, Rumanian *coajă* ‘bark’ < Slavic \*k<sup>u</sup>òža ‘skin’. Long falling vowels in medial syllables did not lose the stress but were also shortened, e.g. S/Cr. *zdràvī* ‘healthy’ < \*s<sup>ъ</sup>drâwÿ < \*s<sup>ъ</sup>drâwÿ, *pòvratak* ‘return’ < \*powrâtъkъ < \*pòwrâtъkъ, *záslužan* ‘deserving’ < \*zâslūžъňb < \*zâslūžъňb, *zgràda* ‘building’ < \*s<sup>ъ</sup>grādā < \*s<sup>ъ</sup>grādā, Slovene *zgràda* (with neo-circumflex). While jers in medial syllables could receive the stress as a result of Dybo’s law, they could no longer receive the stress as a result of Stang’s law. This accounts for the retraction of the stress to the prefix in older and dialectal Russian *nájdet*, *pójdet*, *podóždet*, *podójdet*, S/Cr. *pòčnēm*, *òtmēm*, *pòděm*, *zàprēm*, Bulg. *dójda*, *zájda*, *òpra*, *póčna*, Slovak *začneš*, *zatneš*, *pôjdeš*.

These developments were followed by lengthening of short rising vowels in Russian and under certain conditions in Czech and Upper Sorbian, and subsequently (cf. Verweij 1994: 556) by shortening of long falling vowels, e.g. Czech *mladost* ‘youth’, acc.sg. *ruku* ‘hand’, S/Cr. *mlādōst* ‘youth’, gen.sg. *prāseta* ‘sucking-pig’, also *sřce* < \**sřdъce*, Slovene *srcē* ‘heart’. The shortening did not affect monosyllables in Slovene and Serbian/Croatian, nor the first syllable of disyllabic word forms in the latter, e.g. S/Cr. *bōg*, *prāse*, acc.sg. *rūku*. Short vowels were lengthened in monosyllables in Ukrainian, e.g. *kiń* < \**kōŋ* < \**kōŋь*, and similarly in Upper Sorbian, e.g. *kón̄*. In Slovene, falling vowels lost the stress to the following syllable, where the newly stressed vowel received a long falling tone, e.g. *okō* ‘eye’, *mladōst* ‘youth’, acc.sg. *rokō* ‘hand’, also *stō* < \**sъto* ‘hundred’, as opposed to *kdō*, S/Cr. *tkō* ‘who’ with final stress as a result of Dybo’s law and secondary lengthening (cf. Pronk 2016: 19<sup>13</sup>). Stressed short vowels were lengthened and received a falling tone in Slovene before a non-final lost jer and before a long vowel in the following syllable, e.g. *būtkā* ‘battle’, *lētā* ‘years’, *osnōva* ‘base’, inst.pl. *ženāmi* ‘women’. This is the famous neo-circumflex. Stressed short vowels in non-final syllables were lengthened and received a rising tone in Slovene, e.g. *lētō* ‘year’, *vōlja* ‘will’. This development, which was more recent than the rise of the neo-circumflex, did not reach the easternmost dialects of the language.

Tijmen Pronk has recently argued (2016) that my \**i̇* and \**u̇* developed from earlier \**ė* and \**ȯ* in the separate languages. It seems appropriate here to specify the points of agreement and disagreement between the two of us. A direct comparison is complicated by the fact that Pronk adopts a set of assumptions which I do not share. While I recognize a single retraction of the stress from final jers yielding new long rising vowels, e.g. in Slovene gen.pl. *gōr* < \**gorъ* ‘mountains’, *dān* < \**dъnъ* ‘days’, *ōvāc* < \**owъcbъ* ‘sheep’, Polish *rāk* < \**rōkъ* ‘hands’, Russian dat.pl. *dētjam* < \**dētъmъ* ‘children’, and a single retraction of the stress from long falling vowels (Stang’s law) yielding a different result, e.g. in Russian dial. *vōlja*, Czech *vūle*, Slovak *vōl’a*, Slovene *vōlja*, S/Cr. *vōlja*, Pronk thinks (2016: 10) that the early retraction of the stress from final jers did not operate in Czech and South Slavic when the jer was preceded by a cluster ending in a resonant, e.g. in \**neslъ*, \**peklъ*, \**bodlъ*, and that in South Slavic Dybo’s law shifted the stress onto a word-final jer which was preceded by a cluster ending in a resonant, e.g. in \**mōglъ* > \**moglъ*, only to be retracted later (cf. already Pronk 2013: 125). This is contradicted by the long vowel of Old Czech *vēdl*, which Pronk mentions himself, and *šēl*, Slovak *šiel* ‘went’ < \**šъdlъ* < \**šъdlъ*, which he does not mention. It is much simpler to assume that the distribution of Slovak *niesol* < \**neslъ* versus *mohol* < \**mōglъ* is Proto-Slavic and

that the short vowel in the reflex of \**nésľb* in Czech and South Slavic is analogical because this was the only form with a long vowel in the paradigm. Note that Pronk's interpretation is also difficult to square with the long vowel of Slovak *dážď* 'rain', Czech *děšť*, Polish dial. *děšč* (Topolińska 1968: 77), Čak. (Orbanići) *dāš* (Kalsbeek 1998: 432), where the stress was retracted from a final jers after a cluster of two consonants plus \*j, viz. \**db̥ždžb* < \**db̥sdj̥b*, like Slovak *niesol*, Polish *niósł* 'carried' < \**nesľb* (cf. Derksen 2009).

The question now is whether the reflex \**è*, \**ò* of Stang's law is distinct both from the reflex \**é*, \**ó* of the early retraction of the stress from final jers, as in Slovene *nésal* < \**nesľb*, gen.pl. *gór* < \**gor̥b*, and from \**è*, \**ò* that did not receive the stress as a result of an accent retraction, as in *bòb* 'bean' < \**bòb̥b*, *dnò* 'bottom' < \**dnò* < \**dn̥no* (Dybo's law). The reflex of \**e*, \**o* that became accented by a retraction of the stress from non-final jers will not be taken into account here because this is a later development (cf. Kortlandt 2014: 129). It is clear from the difference between *gór* < \**gor̥b*, *ónac* < \**ow̥bc̥b* on the one hand and *vólja* < \**woľâ* < \**wòľâ*, *nósiš* < \**nosĩšb* < \**nòsĩšb*, *móreš* 'you can' < \**možēšb* < \**mòžēšb* on the other that \**ó* and \**ò* remained distinct in Slovene. However, the distinction between \**ò* and \**uò* was lost by the rise of the neo-circumflex in *osnôva* < \**osnòwâ* and later by the lengthening in *vólja* < \**w<sup>u</sup>òľa* and *gotóvo* 'ready' < \**gotòwo*, and the same can be assumed for the distinction between \**è* and \**iè*. It follows that an original distinction between \**è*, \**ò* and \**iè*, \**uò* can only be established on the basis of a development that intervened between Stang's law and the lengthening of \**è*, \**ò* in non-final syllables. The only possibility I can think of here is the rise of the neo-circumflex (cf. Kortlandt 2011a: 57), which is actually found in *rêb̥ar* (Valjavec) < \**rèbr̥b* (b) beside *rêb̥ar* 'slope' (Pleteršnik, who also gives *vrêb̥ar*) with the reflex of Stang's law from the oblique cases (cf. Kortlandt 2011a: 341). There is no comparable example with \**ò* in the initial syllable, but the reflex of \**ò* in *osnôva* suggests that it merged with \**uò*, not \**ó*, in agreement with Pronk's position. In Czech and Upper Sorbian, the distinction between \**è*, \**ò* and \**iè*, \**uò* cannot be ascertained because the lengthening of short rising vowels followed soon after Stang's law. Thus, it appears that none of these languages provides direct evidence for a distinction between \**è*, \**ò* and \**iè*, \**uò*. In Kajkavian, however, the reflex \**iè*, \**uò* of Stang's law merged with the reflex \**é*, \**ó* of the early retraction of the stress from final jers, not with \**è*, \**ò* that had not received the stress as a result of an accent retraction, e.g. in *kònj* 'horse', *òsem* 'eight', *selò* 'village', gen.sg. *potòka* 'brook' (cf. Pronk 2016: 16f.). Here we find a distinction between \**è*, \**ò* and \**iè*, \**uò* in initial and medial syllables, e.g. *òsmi* 'eighth', *širòki* 'broad', *zelèni* 'green', pl. *rešèta* 'sieves'. This supports my reconstruc-

tion of Proto-Slavic \**ě*, \**o̅* distinct from both \**é*, \**ó* and \**è*, \**ò*. The neo-circumflex of *vôlja* and the short stressed vowel of *nôsım* are evidently analogical in Kajkavian, as Pronk acknowledges. In Štokavian, \**ě* and \**o̅* lost their diphthongal element and merged with \**è* and \**ò* at an early stage.

In examples where one might expect in Slovene a neo-circumflex from \**ò* in the initial syllable (cf. Pronk 2016: 11), we find either the reflex of pretonic \**o* from the oblique cases, as in *ódar*, *bóbər*, *kópər*, *kósəm*, *óganj*, *tópəl*, or the reflex of Stang's law from the definite form of the adjective, as in *dóbər*, *mókər*, *òstər*, maybe also *sédəm* '7' and *òsəm* '8' from *sédmi* '7th' and *òsmi* '8th'. The original short vowel has been preserved in Slovak *osem*, Czech *osm*, S/Cr. *òsam*. There is no reason to assume that the accent shifted to the final jer and was retracted again in South Slavic, as Pronk maintains. The long root vowel of the ordinal in Polish, Old Czech, Čakavian and Posavian is of analogical origin. The short vowel of Kajkavian *òsem*, *dòber*, *mògel* (Pronk 2016: 15<sup>8</sup>), like *vèter* 'wind' < \**větrь*, is in agreement with standard Croatian and can be attributed to the early rise of an intrusive \**ə*, which may also account for Slovene *sédəm* '7' and *òsəm* '8'. In Slovak, the distinction between \**ò* and \**o̅* is reflected as *o* versus *ô*, e.g. *osem* < \**òsmь*, *mohol* < \**mòglь* but *vôľa*, *môžeš*, *pôjdeš* < -\**o̅*-, while the distinction between \**è* and \**é* is maintained as *e* versus *ie*, e.g. *tretí* 'third' < \**trèti* < \**trèti* (with restoration of the long ending) but *nie-sol* < \**neslь*. This again supports my reconstruction of Proto-Slavic \**ě*, \**o̅* beside \**é*, \**ó* and \**è*, \**ò*. Elsewhere I have argued that the long vowel in Czech *kůň* 'horse', *stůl* 'table', *nůž* 'knife', Slovak *kôň*, *stól*, *nôž*, also *bôb* 'bean', *kôš* 'basket' (Old Czech *kôsš*), *kôpor* 'dill', *vôdor* 'hay-loft' did not arise phonetically but was adopted from the case forms where the accent had been retracted in accordance with Stang's law (Kortlandt 2011a: 345f.). This also requires a distinction between \**ò* and \**o̅*. It appears that Slovak *ô* is also the phonetic reflex of long falling \**ô* after a labial consonant, where it had evidently been shortened to \**o̅*, cf. *ból* 'grief', *bôr* 'pine', *pôst* 'fasting', *vól* 'ox', *vóz* 'car' versus *dol* 'mine', *dom* 'house', *hnoj* 'dung', *loj* 'suet', *sol* 'salt', *kroj* 'costume', *roj* 'swarm', *stroj* 'machine', which have a long vowel in Czech *půst*, *vůl*, *vůz*, *důl*, *dům*, *hnůj*, *lůj*, *sůl*, dial. *kruj*, *ruj*, *struj*. The short vowel of Czech and Slovak *bod* 'point', *boj* 'fight' (but Old Czech *bój*), *bok* 'flank', *moc* 'power', *most* 'bridge', *pot* 'sweat', *vosk* 'wax', also Czech *bol*, *bor* and Slovak *boh* 'god', *pol* 'half' (but Czech *bůh*, *půl*) was apparently taken from the oblique cases. This suggests that the late Proto-Slavic shortening of long falling vowels yielded \**o̅* < \**ô* in Czech. The diphthongal character of Slovak *ô* was lost after the initial cluster in *dvor* 'yard', *svoj* 'one's own', *tvoj* 'your', *tvorca* 'creator', but not in Czech *dvůr*, *svůj*, *tvůj*, *tvůrce* (cf. Nonnenmacher-Pribić 1961: 94, Verweij 1994: 515).

There are a number of additional points where I cannot subscribe to Pronk's views. First of all, Pronk states (2016: 6<sup>2</sup>, 12, 23) that the lengthening of short falling vowels in monosyllables is found in western South Slavic only. This is not acceptable, not only in view of the development in Czech and Slovak (see above), but especially because the lengthening was a consequence of Dybo's law and the later shortening of long falling vowels was an extension of Stang's law. If the lengthening had not operated in other languages, this would have yielded an anomalous vowel system with a tonal distinction on short vowels in monosyllables only. Secondly, the retraction of the stress from final jers yielded *i* < \**ó* in Ukrainian, e.g. *volík* 'dragged', *berih* 'spared', gen.pl. *holív* 'heads', *boríd* 'beards', *storín* 'sides', while \**ò* and \**u* yielded *o*, e.g. *polón* 'full', *moróz* 'frost', *horóx* 'pea', *ohoród* 'garden', *xvoróst* 'brushwood', *storóža* 'guard', *horóža* 'fence', *voróta* 'gate', gen.pl. *vorón* 'crows', *kolód* 'logs' (cf. Pronk 2016: 13). This distribution proves that the distinction between \**ó* on the one hand and \**ò* and \**u* on the other had been preserved in East Slavic, contrary to Pronk's statement that such forms as *holív* are analogical. Thirdly, the suffix \*-*bj-* < \*-*iH-* in abstracts, collectives and possessive adjectives, where Dybo's law shifted the stress from the suffix to the endings (cf. Dybo 1968: 181–191, 1981: 152–170), was always stressed at the outset (cf. Kortlandt 2011a: 323, 2015a: 72–75). The introduction of the suffix in the type \**per<sub>bj</sub>e*, \**zel<sub>bj</sub>e*, \**gro<sub>bj</sub>e* can hardly be dated before Dybo's law (thus Pronk 2016: 10<sup>5</sup>) because unstressed \*-*bj*e would have been contracted to \*-*ē*. The accent was later retracted from the jer to the root. As a result of the posttonic contractions, we must reconstruct \**n<sup>o</sup>òw<sub>y</sub>* (later with analogical -*y* or -*yj*) < \**now<sub>y</sub>* < \**nòw<sub>y</sub>* < \**nòw<sub>bj</sub>*, not \*-*yj* or \*-*yj̄* (thus Pronk 2016: 9, cf. Kortlandt 2011a: 38). Fourthly, the long vowel in S/Cr. *nôž* 'knife', *jěž* 'hedgehog', *dvôr* 'court', Čak. *nôž*, *dvôr*, Kajk. *dvôr*, also Slovene *jěž*, Czech *nůž*, *dvůr*, Slovak *nôž* is the result of an irregular lengthening before *r* and *ž* and does not point to a different accent paradigm, cf. also Polish *góra* 'mountain', *skóra* 'skin', *róża* 'rose'.

A final problem to be discussed here is the accentuation of the possessive pronouns \**mojb*, \**tvojb*, \**svojb* and the imperatives \*(*ne*) *bojb se* '(do not) fear' and \**stojb* 'stand' (cf. Pronk 2016: 7f.). These forms have the reflex of \**ó*, e.g. Slovene *mój*, *stój*, *bój se*, pointing to a retraction from the final jer, as in gen. pl. *gór*. The original possessive forms were PIE \**H<sub>1</sub>mos*, \**tuos*, \**suos* (cf. Beekes 2011: 235) beside gen. \**H<sub>1</sub>mene*, \**teue*, \**seue*, acc. \**H<sub>1</sub>me*, \**tue*, \**sue*, Balto-Slavic \**mene*, \**towe*, \**sowe*, \**mēn*, \**tēn*, \**sēn* (cf. Kortlandt 2013: 6). Since Lithuanian normally uses uninflected *màno*, *tàvo*, *sàvo* in possessive constructions, I think that the PIE possessive forms were originally uninflected and that Slavic replaced these forms by \**mo-iH*, \**tuo-iH*, \**suo-iH*, with stressed \*-*iH*

(cf. Kortlandt 2011a: 323), like Latin *meī, tuī, suī*. At a later stage, these forms became thematicized, like Lith. *mānas, tāvas, sāvas* and Latin *meus, tuus, suus*, and adopted the inflection of the pronoun \*j̄b. This scenario is more probable than the idea that Lith. *māno* and Latin *meī* represent the genitive of the possessive pronoun (thus e.g. Baldi 2002: 338, de Vaan 2008: 368) because it is unclear why the inflection of the pronoun would be lost. For the imperatives \**stojb* and \**boj̄b sę* we may reconstruct \**stoj̄i* and \**boj̄i* < \*-iH<sub>j</sub>(s) with final stress, followed by loss of intervocalic \*j and resyllabification of \*-oī as \*-ój, as in S/Cr. *dôdē, Čak. and Kajk. dôjde* < \**dōbdē* < \**dōbdē* (cf. Pronk 2016: 19<sup>13</sup>).

### Postscript

It may be expedient to add a few words about Kapović's new monograph (2015), which looks at Croatian accentuation from a quite different angle. While I am glad that Kapović has evidently adopted many of my earlier views (e.g. about posttonic vowel length, cf. also Kortlandt 2013), albeit without due acknowledgment, he clearly has not yet understood the major factors underlying the development of tone and quantity in the Slavic languages. His account still largely reflects the outdated views from the period before the revolutionary studies of Stang (1957) and Dybo (1962). Here I shall limit myself to a few remarks on the major differences between the two of us in the assessment of Proto-Slavic vowel length, which I have discussed most recently at the tenth International Workshop on Balto-Slavic accentology in Ljubljana (cf. Kortlandt 2015b, with references).

Proto-Slavic inherited from Proto-Indo-European two types of long vowel, viz. with and without glottalization, a feature that continued the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals and the glottalic feature of the “unaspirated voiced” (i.e. preglottalized) stops of the proto-language. Glottalized vowels are called “acute” in Balto-Slavic accentology; they developed differently under the rising and falling tone movements that originated from accent retractions in Latvian, Lithuanian and Slavic. When glottalization was lost in Slavic, they mostly yielded short vowels with preservation of their timbre. This happened first in pretonic and posttonic syllables and later under the stress. As a result, Slavic acquired distinctively short and long \*i, \*ě, \*a, \*u, \*y and nasal vowels. In stressed syllables, distinctive vowel length was extended to \*e, \*o and jers by the retraction of the stress from final jers and lengthening in monosyllables. In pretonic syllables new long vowels originated from Dybo's law and in posttonic syllables from Van Wijk's law and from early contractions. The present article is about the rise of neo-acute \*e and \*o as a result of Stang's law, which must be dated after all of these developments took place.

Due to his lack of chronological perspective, Kapović does not accept the shortening of pretonic long vowels before Dybo's law and, consequently, does not distinguish between accent paradigms (a), (b) and (c) in his treatment of pretonic long vowels (2015: 416–502). He therefore has to assume massive analogical shortening in accent paradigm (c), where pretonic length is found nowhere except in Serbian and Croatian disyllabic word forms where it can easily have been restored, and massive analogical lengthening in accent paradigm (b), where pretonic length is regular both in flexion and in derivation (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 127–129, 2006: 36f, 2010b: 74f., 2011b: 363f.). The lack of chronological perspective is also the basis of other typical features of Kapović's account, such as the assumption of a Proto-Slavic neo-circumflex (2015: 274–276, cf. also 537–540, rejected by Stang 1957 already) in order to explain the gen.pl. forms of nominal paradigms (for which see Kortlandt 1978, reprinted in 2009: 111–123, not mentioned by Kapović). Another example is the Proto-Slavic lengthening of short falling vowels in monosyllables, e.g. *bôg* 'god', which Kapović extends to polysyllabic words such as *gŏvŏr* 'speech' (2015: 231–233). However, the latter lengthening is a more recent S/Cr. development that did not reach some of the dialects (cf. Kortlandt 2006: 35–38).

Similarly, Kapović's lack of chronological perspective allows him to reconstruct a metatonical acute in Russian *ogoród* 'kitchen-garden' and *pozolóta* 'gilding' (2015: 318) instead of the neo-acute that is evident from similar formations with a short root vowel, e.g. *naród* 'people', *osnôva* 'basis'. And again, his lack of chronological perspective prevents him from seeing the difference between long falling vowels in non-initial syllables that arose from Dybo's law, as in these instances, and long falling vowels that arose from later dialectal contractions, as in Čakavian *kopâ* 'digs', Bulgarian *kopáe*, Old Polish *kopaje* (ibidem, cf. Kortlandt 2005: 122). Another instance is Kapović's claim that the neo-circumflex of Kajkavian *osnôva* 'base' is analogical because he would expect the same accentuation as in *rešêta* 'sieves' (2015: 397). This is a big mistake because *osnôva* < \**òsnovā* received its medial stress as a result of Dybo's law whereas *rešêta* < \**rešetā* < \**rešètā* reflects the operation of Stang's law (with regular shortening of the final vowel) after Dybo's law (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 118–124).

I conclude that Kapović's book is a very useful compilation of data but woefully obsolete in the interpretation of the data.

## References:

- BALDI, PHILIP. 2002. *The foundations of Latin*. De Gruyter. Berlin.
- BEEKES, ROBERT S. P. 2011. *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*, 2nd edition. Benjamins. Amsterdam.
- DERKSEN, RICK. 2009. Slavic evidence for Balto-Slavic oxytona. *Stressing the past: Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology*. Rodopi. Amsterdam. 15–19.
- DE VAAN, MICHEL. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Brill. Leiden.
- DYBO, VLADIMIR A. 1962. O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole. *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 6. 3–27.
- DYBO, VLADIMIR A. 1968. Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom. *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie: VI meždunarodnyj sjezd slavistov, Praga, 1968*. Nauka. Moskva. 148–224.
- DYBO, VLADIMIR A. 1981. *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Nauka. Moskva.
- JARDAS, IVO. 1957. Kastavština. Građa o narodnom životu i običajima u kastavskom govoru. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih slavena* 39. [non vidi]
- KALSBECK, JANNEKE. 1998. *The Čakavian dialect of Orbančići near Žminj in Istria*. Rodopi. Amsterdam.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2015. *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije*. Matica hrvatska. Zagreb.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 1978. On the history of the genitive plural in Slavic, Baltic, Germanic, and Indo-European. *Lingua* 45. 281–300.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2005. From Serbo-Croatian to Indo-European. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51. 113–130.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2006. On the relative chronology of Slavic accentual developments. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 52, 25–41.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2009. *Baltica & Balto-Slavica*. Rodopi. Amsterdam.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2010a. *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European and Indo-Uralic*. Rodopi. Amsterdam.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2010b. Balto-Slavic accentuation revisited. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 56. 61–81.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2011a. *Selected writings on Slavic and general linguistics*. Rodopi. Amsterdam.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2011b. Issues in Balto-Slavic accentology. *Accent matters: Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology*. Rodopi. Amsterdam. 359–366.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2013. Balto-Slavic personal pronouns and their accentuation. *Baltistica* 48/1. 5–11.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2014. On the accentuation of *nes/b* and related issues. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 40/1. 127–131.

- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2015a. Proto-Slavic \*j, Van Wijk's law, and  $\bar{e}$ -stems. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 41/1. 65–76.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2015b. The development of vowel length in Slavic. *Jezikoslovni Zapiski* 21/2. 21–30.
- NONNENMACHER-PRIBIĆ, ELISABETH. 1961. *Die baltoslavischen Akzent- und Intonationsverhältnisse und ihr quantitativer Reflex im Slovakischen*. Harrassowitz. Wiesbaden.
- 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.
- PRONK, TIJMEN. 2016. Early Slavic short and long *o* and *e*. *Slavia Centralis* 9/1. 5–33.
- STANG, CHRISTIAN S. 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*. Universitetsforlaget. Oslo.
- TOPOLIŃSKA, ZUZANNA. 1968. Zakres i chronologia tzw. wzdłużenia zastępczego w językach zachodniosłowiańskich. *Přinoški k serbskemu řečespytej*. Domowina. Budyšin. 75–83.
- VERWEIJ, ARNO. 1994. Quantity patterns of substantives in Czech and Slovak. *Dutch contributions to the 11th international congress of Slavists: Linguistics*. Rodopi. Amsterdam. 493–564.

## O usponu novoakutiranih \*e i \*o

### Sažetak

Pita se, je li odraz \* $\bar{e}$ , \* $\bar{o}$  koji je nastao Stangovim zakonom različit od odraza \* $\acute{e}$ , \* $\acute{o}$  koji je nastao ranim povlačenjem naglaska s krajnjega poluglasa, kao u slovenskome *něsəl* < \**neslъ*, gen.mn. *gór* < \**gorъ*, i od \* $\bar{e}$ , \* $\bar{o}$  koji nisu postali naglašeni kao posljedica povlačenja naglaska, kao u *bòb* < \**bòbъ*, *dnò* < \**dъnò* < \**dъno* (Diboov zakon).

Jasno je da su \* $\acute{o}$  i \* $\bar{o}$  ostali razlikovni u slovenskome jeziku. U kajkavskome narječju, odrazi \* $\bar{e}$ , \* $\bar{o}$  nastali Stangovim zakonom su se izjednačili s odrazima \* $\acute{e}$ , \* $\acute{o}$  nastalim ranim povlačenjem naglaska s krajnjega poluglasa, a ne s \* $\bar{e}$ , \* $\bar{o}$  koji nisu postali naglašeni kao posljedica povlačenja naglaska. Nalazimo razliku između \* $\bar{e}$ , \* $\bar{o}$  i \* $\bar{e}$ , \* $\bar{o}$  u početnim i središnjim slogovima. U štokavskome narječju, \* $\bar{e}$  i \* $\bar{o}$  izgubili su dvoglasni dio i rano su izjednačeni s \* $\acute{e}$  i \* $\acute{o}$ .

U slovačkome jeziku, razlika između \* $\bar{o}$  i \* $\bar{o}$  se odražava kao razlika između *o* i  $\bar{o}$ , dok je razlika između \* $\bar{e}$  i \* $\acute{e}$  sačuvana kao razlika između *e* i *ie*. Dugi samoglasnik koji nalazimo u češkome *kůň* i slovačkome *kôň* nije nastao fonet-

ski nego je uveden iz padežnih oblika u kojima se naglasak povukao na korijen u skladu sa Stangovim zakonom. Slovačko ô također je fonetski odraz dugosilaznoga \*ô u položaju iza labijalnoga suglasnika, gdje se očito skratilo u \*<sup>u</sup>ò. Kasno praslavensko kraćenje dugosilaznih samoglasnika dalo je \*<sup>u</sup>ò < \*ô u češkome, što se poslije razvilo u ů.

Posvojne zamjenice \**mojb*, \**tvojb*, \**svojb* i imperativi \*(*ne*) *bojb sę* i \**stojb* imaju odraz \*ó. Budući da se litavske posvojne zamjenice *màno*, *tàvo*, *sàvo* ne sklanjaju u posvojnim konstrukcijama, smatram da se indoeuropski posvojni oblici izvorno nisu sklanjali i da ih je slavenski zamijenio s oblicima \**moiH*, \**tuoiH*, \**suoiH*, s naglašenim \**iH*, kao u latinskome *meī*, *tuī*, *suī*. Kasnije, ovi oblici postali su tematizirani i dobili su sklonidbu zamjenice \**jb*. Za imperative \**stojb* i \**bojb sę* možemo rekonstruirati \**stojì* i \**bojì* s naglašenim dočetnim slogom, nakon čega je došlo do ispadanja međusamoglasničkoga \**j* i resilabifikacije.

Ključne riječi: novi akut, Stangov zakon, povlačenje naglaska, posvojne zamjenice

Keywords: neo-acute, Stang's law, accent retraction, possessive pronouns