ON THE REFLECTION OF UNACCENTED LENGTH AND THE SHORT NEO-ACUTE IN SLAVIC, THE KÔKÔT TYPE LENGTHENING IN ŠTOKAVIAN/ČAKAVIAN AND OTHER ISSUES

This is the sixth instalment in the discussion between Frederik Kortlandt and the author of this article on several problems of historical Slavic accentology. The paper discusses the reflection of pre- and posttonic length (in accentual paradigm a and c) in Western South Slavic and West Slavic, the reflection of the short neo-acute in Kajkavian and Czech, and the kôkôt ‘rooster’ type lengthening in accentual paradigm c in Štokavian and Čakavian. A few other topics are also shortly discussed – such as the accent of the genitive plural, the *obôrna ‘defence’ type accent, and the Čakavian črîna ‘blackness’ and dvorišće ‘courtyard’ type accent. Additionally, the paper deals with some issues concerning Kortlandt’s rather problematic methodology, rhetorics, discussion and presentation style.
This article is the latest instalment in an ongoing discussion between Frederik Kortlandt and the author of this paper on various topics of Western South Slavic (Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian/Slovene), Western Slavic (Czech/Slovak and Slovincian), Slavic and, to a lesser extent, Balto-Slavic and Indo-European, accentuation. The discussion started with Kortlandt 2016 (: 478–479), followed by Kapović 2017a, Kortlandt 2018, Kapović 2019, Kortlandt 2020 and now this paper.

Kortlandt 2020 is riddled with all the usual characteristics of his general modus operandi, which I have criticized amply in my previous papers – the negligence of important data; disregard of other scholars’ research and ignoring important critiques of his ideas; dismissals of other scholars’ ideas without discussion and trying to prove his point; unwillingness to explain in detail even his own views; loose or unclear references; citing mostly Leiden scholars; attempts to switch the topic to irrelevant points while ignoring important ones; masking his inability to respond to criticism of his ideas with unfounded “methodological” accusations of other scholars; randomly and without evidence claiming

1 The subject of this paper was presented at the Zoom conference “Балто-славянская компаративистика. Акцентология. Дальнее родство языков” (Moscow, April 27-28 2021), organized in honor of Vladimir A. Dybo’s 90th birthday, to whom I dedicate this article. My respect goes for V. A. Dybo not only as a scholar – much of the present paper deals with theories that are at least partly based on views, theories and discoveries of Dybo and the Moscow accentological school – but also as a person. I especially keep in fond memory our fieldwork expedition in Posavina in 2007 and 2010. It was an honor to be a roommate of Dybo’s for a week or so and witness his enormous work ethic in person. I would also like to thank Mikhail Oslon for his help with the literature, Siniša Habijanec for his help with Slovak, Rafał Szeptyński for his comments on a few Polish forms, and David Mandić for carefully reading and commenting on the first draft of the paper.

3 Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 382, 385; Kapović 2019: 79–80 and Babik 2007 (see also below in section 5).
4 Cf. e.g. Kapović 2019: 91.
6 Cf. e.g. Kapović 2019: 113.
7 Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 395, 398.
8 Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 381. See also below in the paper for Kortlandt’s false quoting of Dybo concerning the *čarnina ‘blackness’
9 Kapović 2017a: 388; Kapović 2019: 90.
11 Kapović 2017a: 382, 394. Cf. also Kortlandt’s (2020: 133–134) unfounded allegations in the summary of his paper that I supposedly disregard “the chronological aspects of linguistic developments” (as if any kind of historical linguistics is possible without relative chronology), “the linguistic system in which developments take place” (as if any kind of modern linguistic analysis is possible without it) and that I multiply
that something is “evidently analogical” though the real situation is quite the opposite\(^\text{12}\); frequent mistakes with and mistreatment of the data\(^\text{13}\); avoiding serious discussion of the material and always repeating the same couple of examples\(^\text{14}\), etc.

The difference of opinion in a discussion is not unexpected. It is quite usual that two scholars will have different accounts of certain problems, e.g. the reflex of pretonic and posttonic length in Slavic, the reflex of *ò in monosyllables in Czech/Slovak, etc. However, it is quite unusual that one of the scholars in discussion completely ignores vast amounts of data that are contrary to his ideas – as is the case with Kortlandt’s successive ignoring of Slovincian and wider West Slavic i-verb data\(^\text{15}\) concerning the problem of pretonic length in Slavic (see below) – and that an expert, though widely regarded as a serious scholar of Slavic accentuation, can be completely unaware of basic information on languages he is discussing – as is the case with Kortlandt’s ignorance\(^\text{16}\) about the length in Štokavian/Čakavian kòkòt ‘rooster’ and mlàdöst ‘youth’ type (see below).

I will disregard Kortlandt’s ad hominem remarks (e.g. “incessant cascade of personal insults”, “offensive remarks”, “One can only hope for a more civil encounter of opinions in the future”\(^\text{17}\)) and limit myself to once again respond to his claims on the issues themselves in order to further the scholarly debate in the most constructive manner possible. I will not comment on everything Kortlandt mentions in his paper (2020), but only on topics where he misrepresents my stances or is most obviously wrong about crucial data or interpretations. In spite of everything, I am pleased that this discussion has once again provided me with

\(^{12}\) Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 385; Kapović 2019: 78–80.

\(^{13}\) Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 389\(^\text{19}\) (Kortlandt does not take into account the important Slovene nosìti ‘to carry’ neo-circumflex type and, quite unbelievably, wrongly thinks that Cres Čakavian kàmik ‘stone’ and kàvran ‘raven’ have a neo-circumflex, 394\(^\text{20}\) (Kortlandt wrongly thinks that Čakavian always has the ogràda ‘fence’ type accent); Kapović 2019: 80\(^\text{2}\) (Kortlandt wrongly and inappropriately cites Hvar Čakavian ràkìma ‘arms’), 107 (Kortlandt wrongly adduces jàblàn ‘poplar’ among gòvòr ‘speech’ type words), 112 (Kortlandt thinks that only the type kòpa ‘digs’ occurs in Čakavian – cf. now Kapović 2020a for that), 116\(^\text{22}\) (Kortlandt wrongly cites two decontextualized words in -ište).

\(^{14}\) Kapović 2019: 126.


\(^{16}\) Cf. e.g. Kortlandt 2006: 35 (simply saying “I regard [it] as analogical” is not proof or an explanation) and Kapović 2017a: 391–392\(^\text{24}\); Kapović 2019: 102–103, 106.

\(^{17}\) Kortlandt 2020: 133, 139.
the opportunity to put forward my views on certain aspects of historical Slavic accentology.

1. Pretonic and posttonic length

One major topic of disagreement between Kortlandt and myself is the reflection of unaccented (pre- and posttonic length) in West and Western South Slavic, e.g. in forms like *rǭkâ ‘hand, arm’ (pretonic length) and *gȍlǭbs ‘pigeon’, *mȅ̋sćь ‘month’ (posttonic non-final length). My stance is that both pre- and posttonic length are generally phonetically preserved (in some positions) in Štokavian/Čakavian (and Kajkavian in case of pretonic length and via neo-circumflex in case of posttonic length as well), cf. archaic Štokavian/Čakavian rūkȁ (> standard Štokavian rúka) and Štokavian/Čakavian gȍlūb, m(j)ȅsēc/mȉsēc (in conservative dialects that preserve posttonic length phonetically, including the formal standard dialect). In Czech (and West Slavic in general), traces of pretonic length are usually absent (ruka, not **rouka), while posttonic length is present in some accentual paradigm a forms (e.g. in měsic but not in paměť ‘memory’) but almost never in accentual paradigm c forms (e.g. holub).

I subscribe to the traditional view and take the short reflexes of pretonic length in West Slavic as analogical (e.g. ruka is short by analogy to acc²⁸ ruki²², where brevity is expected and regular²³), as there are some isolated instances with preserved length, e.g. Czech klíti ‘to curse’, mříti ‘to die’ (~ conservative Štokavian kléti, mrijéti²⁴ – see below for infinitives in Czech) and gens²⁷ devíti ‘nine’, desíti ‘ten’ (~ Russian gen⁸ dešátu, desiatu²⁵). For posttonic non-final length, I take the brevity in old a. p. c as regular and phonetic in West Slavic, while I consider

---

²⁹ Not including final open syllables, which is a separate issue (cf. Kapović 2015: 526–550).
³¹ Cf. the list in Kapović 2015: 504–507.
³² This analogy is easy – e.g. in the ā-stem paradigm of ruka one expects the original short reflex in 17 of 21 cases (sg/pl/du) and in the present paradigm of třesu (sg/pl/du) one expects it in the 7 f 9 original persons (cf. Kapović 2019: 79, 81).
a number of possibilities to explain the dual reflection (long and short) in a. p. 26. Kortlandt, on the other hand, thinks that all old (a. p. c) pretonic lengths were shortened everywhere and that all posttonic lengths were preserved everywhere (in both West Slavic and Western South Slavic). Thus, he has to assume an immense analogical reintroduction of pretonic length in a. p. c in Western South Slavic (e.g. Neo-Štokavian růka supposedly from the older **růka), which is not as easy and trivial as the one presumed in West Slavic – there are no traces of the supposed original brevity as in **růka (or **klèti in verbs) and the supposedly restored length is present only in some forms, cf. e.g. the length in Neo-Štokavian růka but no length in dat/loc/instrpl růkama27. To be fair, one has to admit that even those that assume that Neo-Štokavian růka is phonetic have to assume a secondary gen8 růkē and a secondary instr8 růkōm (but unchanged genpl růkū and dat/loc/instrpl růkama). However, that is different from Kortlandt’s supposed reintroduction of length in a. p. c. Štokavian has a number of forms in which the original shortening in front of the old neo-acute can be seen – while růkē < růkē and růkōm < růkōm most usually have a secondary length (though not everywhere!), there are plenty of original a. p. c forms with a pre-neo-acute shortened syllable that cannot be secondary, like účī ‘learns’, dialectal dàdū ‘they give’ (not to mention forms like júnāk < júnāk ‘hero’ in a. p. b), etc.28 On the other hand, the supposedly expected kortlandtite **růka (or **trèseš) is nowhere attested in Štokavian (nor old **rûkā, **trĕšēš or their reflexes in Čakavian or Kajkavian29). Concerning this supposed and very suspicious analogical reintroduction of length, Kortlandt never discusses the details and problems, not even in his third article (Kortlandt 2020). That is another example of his modus operandi with him simply asserting a supposed solution, without details, without discussing the problems or really engaging with critiques of his ideas. Another problem is that West Slavic has an original short root in a. p. b infinitives of i- and a-verbs30

27 For a detailed breakdown cf. Kapović 2017a: 385–387; Kapović 2019: 79–82. See also below for the troublesome supposed restoration of length in trèses ‘you shake’, etc.
29 The short rōka < rokā ‘arm’ and a few other examples (grēda ‘beam’, pēta ‘heel’) are attested in literary Slovene but they must be analagous to old a. p. c accusative forms like rokō (with the Slovene progressive shift of the old circumflex) since only stressed mid vowels can be closed in Slovene (the height deriving from the old length). Traces of old pretonic length in literary Slovene are seen in a. p. c forms like trēsti ‘to shake’ – trēses ‘you shake’. For more details and some dialectal data see Kapović 2015: 427–428.
(e.g. Old Czech braniti ‘to defend’, but Modern Czech brániti with a secondary analogical length), which is something he mostly, quite strikingly, ignores and glosses over for the second time (see below), though it completely shatters his account (pretonic length in a. p. b is supposed to be preserved in all cases in Kortlandt’s view). As for non-final posttonic length, while I consider words like Czech holub as having the expected and phonetic brevity, he thinks it is analogical to forms with pretonic length, while for short reflexes in some a. p. a forms he assumes an ad hoc shift to a. p. c (which would work in my system as well, though it remains completely ad hoc).

When it comes to the proposed analogical spread of brevity in Czech accentual paradigm c, Kortlandt (2020: 135) simply once again asserts that “[i]n fact, there never was an analogical development in Czech”, without adding anything new to the discussion. He does not even try to disprove my claims that such an analogy would be, as already mentioned, very simple due to prevalence of expected short reflexes, e.g. in nominal ā-stems or e-presents, he ignores the remnants of pretonic length in West Slavic such as Czech klíti ‘to curse’ (but see below) and gensg deviti ‘nine’, desiti ‘ten’. The same goes for his assertation (Kortlandt 2020) that “pre-Dybo pretonic length was restored in růka (c) on the analogy of the barytone forms acc.sg. rǘku and nom.acc.pl. rǘke, though not in obl.pl. rûkama”. Again, he is just repeating his stance without any discussion. There is no response to my critique that this kind of analogy is very difficult if not impossible. Repetition of simple unproven assertions is not a proper academic discussion. Though Kortlandt did not try to respond to my criticism of his ideas in detail or to provide his own detailed explanation of them, he does provide a couple of remarks not really relevant for the discussion. Thus, he goes on (Kortlandt 2020) asserting that “[a]t a later stage, the analogy affected obl.pl. glávama of gláva (c) ‘head’, which was in many dialects replaced by glávama, as Kapovič notes himself”. This is true, indisputable and widely known, but completely irrelevant for the crux of the discussion because nobody disputes that forms like glávama (dat/loc/instrpl ‘heads’) are original. Completely puzzling is what follows, where Kortlandt (2020) says that I do “not explain the difference between the accent patterns of růka (c) and trůba (b)”. What is there to explain, that is not

generally known and acknowledged, of the difference of accentual paradigm $b$ and $c$ in $\tilde{a}$-stems? I have written about the accent patterns of Štokavian $\tilde{a}$-stem a. p. $b$ and $c$ in much more details than Kortlandt (cf. Kapović 2011) and thus this remark makes no sense at all. The same goes for Kortlandt’s (2020) next claim that I do not explain “the difference between the short vowels of mālina and jèzik and the long vowels of zábava and národ”. Now, it is one thing to say that he does not agree with my analysis, but to imply that I do not explain this at all is both very incorrect and factually untrue. I have dealt with the issue of pretonic length in much more details than Kortlandt (cf. Kapović 2015: 416–501) and, unlike Kortlandt, I do not just adduce four examples from standard Neo-Štokavian (again, this is typical of his modus operandi) but I actually discuss most of the available data (with all examples, counterexamples and problematic issues) in almost hundred pages. It is clear and hardly disputable that the shortening in mālina ‘raspberry’ and jèzik ‘tongue, language’ type is regular and expected, just like the retention of length in národ ‘people’ type (though the details are rather complicated). The length in the zábava ‘party’ type is in my opinion secondary and probably due to tendency of generalization of length in these prefixes (somewhat similar to the later and separate tendency of generalization of the “kanovačko” length in prefixes in some dialect of modern Neo-Štokavian, e.g. innovative pòvrat ‘return’ instead of the older pòvrat, pònos ‘pride’ instead of pònos, etc.). The original short prefix is seen in the Štokavian variant zábava type (from older/expected *zábava), which Kortlandt does not mention, because he always adduces a couple of examples only and never gets involved with a detailed examination of all the data. It is important to note methodologically that there is a huge difference between my careful examination of a number of forms, different possibilities, problems and possible solutions and unclear points in Kapović 2015, even if one does not agree with my final conclusions, and Kortlandt’s short-hand one-sentence delivering of final judgments. We can conclude this paragraph with another Kortlandt’s (2020) claim: “Kapović thinks (2019: 81) that the restoration of pretonic length in Čakavian 2nd sg. trēšēš and

---

38 It has to be noted that I, unlike Kortlandt, rather often leave a question open or point to more than one possible solution if the data is not clear or allows different interpretations.
3rd sg. *trêsè, disregarding the thematic aorist (original imperfect) paradigm with 2nd and 3rd sg. *trése, in compounds -trése.” This is problematic in a number of ways. First of all, I think that it is unnecessary to assume that the length in *trêsês ‘you shake’ is secondary at all. My point is that if it were secondary, the primary (!) source (Kapović 2019), i.e. the pivot form inside the paradigm, would have to have been the early disappearing and unattested old *trêsu (this original accent seems to be unattested for a. p. c of e-verbs in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian), which is not very convincing. I also point to the fact that it is very strange that the supposed reintroduction of length appears only in Čakavian (when speaking of the most conservative systems) singular forms *trêsês, *trêsè ‘shakes’ but not in plural forms *trêsemô ‘we shake’, *trësetè ‘you all shake’, *trësû ‘they shake’, and that it would be very strange that no Čakavian (or Štokavian or Kajkavian) dialect shows any trace of the supposed original short **trêsè(š). The advantage of my proposition over Kortlandt’s is clear – in my view, the length in Štokavian infinitive *tréstî ‘to shake’, present *tréseš ‘you shake’, l-participle *trêso ‘shook’, aorist (po)trésoh ‘I shook’, pôtrëse ‘you/he shook’, imperative *tréstî! ‘shake!’ (and the n-participle variant *trësen ‘shaken’) is expected and phonetically regular. According to Kortlandt’s hypothesis, only *trësao and pôtrëse would have an expected and phonetically regular length (and *tréstî if one is to accept his rather questionable idea that this is actually an old b-stress form inside a c-paradigm and not just a simple desinential stress in a. p. c – see the section 2 in this paper39), while all other forms have supposedly reintroduced it (see below for the infinitive and Kortlandt’s ad hoc solutions there) – he himself never addresses this problem. Of course, my model entails a generalization of brevity in West Slavic, but there the process is much simpler and there are traces of old length40 (while there are no traces of the supposed original brevity in a. p. c in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian that would confirm Kortlandt’s hypothesis).

As for posttonic length, Kortlandt (2020: 136) reasserts his claim that “posttonic long vowels were never shortened” and that “Kapović agrees that posttonic length is preserved in Serbian and Croatian, but not in West Slavic, where

39 Kortlandt also seems to have a different idea about the original accent of the imperative, but this is difficult to comment since he never presented his ideas in full concerning this supposed reintroduction of length in Western South Slavic a. p. C.

posttonic long vowels are allegedly shortened sometimes in accent paradigm (a) and always in accent paradigm (c). This is a peculiar opinion.” It is peculiar that Kortlandt thinks that my view is peculiar. Because my view is simply what the data shows – Western South Slavic preserves all length (seen only indirectly and in the place of the old acute through the neo-circumflex in Kajkavian/Slovene) and West Slavic has it only in some of the old a. p. a forms (old acute posttonic length usually does not show length by analogy in most dialects⁴¹). Kortlandt (2020), further on, says that I claim “that the shortening in paradigms with an initial acute tone (a) was conditioned by High and Low tones in the posttonic syllables that had somehow survived since time immemorial”. But no, unlike Kortlandt, I rarely assert things as if I had a time machine and field recordings of Proto- and Common Slavic. This is simply one of the ideas I presented which may be the solution for the inconsistent reflection of posttonic length in a. p. a in West Slavic⁴². Kortlandt’s ad hoc assumption that half of the a. p. a nouns simply switched to a. p. c works just fine in my model – what is more, it works even better because in my model the loss of posttonic length in a. p. c (whether one interprets it as loss of length in unaccented words or loss of length in words with an initial falling tone) is phonetic and not analogical as in Kortlandt’s heterodox doctrine. One of the advantages of my theory⁴³ is that I interpret the reflection of both Czech vlast ‘homeland’ < *vȏlstь (cf. Štokavian vlȃst ‘government, dominion’) and Czech oblast ‘area’ < *ȍbvolstь (cf. Štokavian ŏblȏst ‘area’) as part of the same phonetic process (loss of length in unaccented words or words with an initial falling tone), while Kortlandt has to assume that these are two different processes, the other one (in oblast) involving large scale generalization of brevity from pretonic position (which is itself problematic).

2. Length in West Slavic infinitives with monosyllabic roots

In our discussion concerning Slavic pretonic length, the matter of reflexes of pretonic length in West Slavic verbs with monosyllabic roots (such as *trĕstî ‘to shake’) and its long reflexes (such as Slovincian trîsc) was also a matter of dis-

---

pute⁴⁴. Here, I maintained the traditional explanation that length in such forms is preserved and original⁴⁵, while Kortlandt was trying to explain this length in another way because according to his hypothesis (the general shortening of pretonic length in accentual paradigm c) the length should not be there (neither in Štokavian tréstí nor in Slovincian třḯsc). But before recounting our discussion and responding to Kortlandt’s new claims, let us first take a look at the West Slavic material (from my perspective).

There were three basic types of monosyllabic-root infinitives accentually speaking:

1) infinitives with the old acute like *pīti ‘to drink’
2) infinitives with the old pretonic length like *trĕstī ‘to shake’
3) infinitives with the original short vowel like *nestī ‘to carry’

Almost all type 2 verbs belonged to a. p. c (and thus are of the most interest for our present discussion), the only exception being *ěti ‘to go’ (a. p. b), type 3 verbs were mostly a. p. c (except for the post-Dybo *mogti ‘to be able to’, which was a. p. b), while type 1 verbs were most diverse – they belong to either a. p. a (like *čěti ‘to hear’ – *čějǫ ‘I hear’), a-b (like *šěti ‘to sew’ – *šějǫ ‘I sew’), c (like *pěti – *pějǫ ‘I drink’ – *pělā ‘drank’) or a-c (*grṳzti ‘to bite’ – *grṳzǫ ‘I bite’ – *grṳzla ‘bit’).

Now, what one would expect in West Slavic is:

1) short reflexes of the old acute (except in Czech, where length is expected)
2) long reflexes of the pretonic length
3) short reflexes of the original short vowel

This is what we more or less find in Slovianian⁴⁶, which is most archaic. In modern Polish, we find a generalized unexpected/innovative length in type 1 (not always so in older language) and unexpected long reflexes in type 1 appear also in some Slovak verbs. Type 2 practically always shows the expected long reflexes everywhere. In all the major modern West Slavic languages (Polish, Czech, Slo-

---

⁴⁵ Cf. e.g. Stang 1957: 153.
vák) we find the unexpected long reflexes almost completely generalized in type 3, but Old Polish and Old Czech show that this is an innovation.

Let us start with Slovincian, which presents a rather clear picture. The verbs\(^{47}\) will be cited in Stankiewicz’s (1993: 314–315, 321) transcription, which is simpler and more transparent than original Lorentz’s (the stress is initial in all the cited verbs so we will omit it here):

1) short reflexes of the old acute


There are only two exceptions to this. One is the unexpectedly long dīć ‘to blow’ < *dŏti – dmjâ ‘I blow’, which has the length by analogy to žić ‘to wring’ – žmjà (cf. the same type of present: dmjà ~ žmjà), where the length is expected (cf. Štokavian nàduti ‘to blow’ but sãžẽti < older sažẽti ‘to summarize’). Other verbs, like cić, klīc (see below), etc. might have been an influence as well. The other unexpected long reflex is found in střīc ‘to shear’ (*strǐgti), with the unexpected length in present střīgã ‘I shear’ as well. One could perhaps claim that this present is one of the rare West Slavic examples with the preserved a. p. c length from the original forms like *strīžeš (cf. Štokavian strīžeš), where it would be phonetically expected, which would then be generalized in the present and also in the infinitive střīc. However, that is very tentative since střīc would seem to be the only such example.

2) long reflexes of the old pretonic length

začić ‘to start’ (*čětši), dřēc ‘to tear’, jić ‘to go\(^{49}\), klīc ‘to curse’, mřēc ‘to die’, (ros)pjijc ‘to spread’ (*pěšti), přěc ‘to push’ (*pertši), přěc ‘to harness’ (*prěgtši), střēc ‘to guard’ (*stergšti), cić ‘to cut’ (*tšti), tľuç ‘to pound’, třēc ‘to rub’ (*terši),

\(^{47}\) We will not list verbs with an initial yer in disyllabic roots like *přáti ‘to wash’.

\(^{48}\) The present form lēżq (a. p. a) ‘I crawl’ has a curious unexpected length.

\(^{49}\) The length here is original (cf. also Czech jiti and the Štokavian variant ići – the other Štokavian variant ići is analogical to idēš ‘you go’). Derksen’s (2008) reconstruction *jši is wrong – *iti (from older *ejši) is indicated by Czech jiti (but jdu < *jšdq ‘I go’) and Lithuanian ešt (most Slavic languages/dialects merge original *i- and *jš-).
There are two exceptions. One is *rosć ‘to grow’ (*orstǫ), where one would expect the length (cf. Polish *róść, Štokavian *rásti). It is easy enough to say that the infinitive was influenced by the present form *rostą ‘I grow’ (*ȏrstǫ), where the brevity is expected (and the short syllable is generalized in all present forms), but it would be strange that this would be the only verb where such an analogy has occurred (the present forms of all three types above have short roots, cf. e.g. *čują ‘I feel’, *bodość ‘I goad’, *tluką ‘I pound’). The other exception is *suc ‘to pour’ (cf. Štokavian *nàsūti < nasúti for the length) – an ad hoc but easy solution would be an analogy to *čuc ‘to feel’, *truc ‘to kill’, *psuc ‘to spoil’ (also *vobuc ‘to put on shoes’), though the length is preserved in *tlūc ‘to pound’.

3) short reflexes of the old short vowels

*bosć ‘to goad’, *ceć ‘to flow’ (*tekći), *gnięsc ‘to knead’, *mjesc ‘to throw’, *moc ‘to be able to’50, *ńesc ‘to carry’, *pjesc ‘to bake’, *plesć ‘to twist’, *rjec ‘to say’, *vjesc ‘to lead (by vehicle)’ (*veztı), *žeć ‘to burn’

Now, let us see the situation in Polish, which is geographically close to Slovincian, but with far less rich (Standard Polish, unlike Slovincian, shows traces of old length only in q and ó) and conservative data:

1) unexpected modern long reflexes in the place of the old acute

*dąć ‘to blow’ (*dőtti), *kłóc ‘to prickle’ (*költti), *miąć ‘to crimp’ (*mętti), *prząść ‘to weave’ (*prędęti), *żąc ‘to reap’ (*żętti)

While one would expect a short reflex of the old acute in Polish (cf. Polish *pęto ‘jess, fetter’ < *pőto), we see a long reflex in these infinitives. Cf. already in the 16th century (SPXVI): *dąć, *miąć, *żąć, *prząść but also *przęść. This must be secondary, as confirmed by Old Polish *przęść51 in place of modern *prząść. The length must have been introduced by analogy to the type 2, where the length was expected in the infinitive and the present forms had a short root, as in the type 1. Thus *dęć – *dmę yielded an innovative *dąć – *dmę by analogy to the original *jać – *jmę (see below), while the original *przęść – *przedę yielded a secondary *prząść

---

50 Cf. also the present forms: 1st *mogę ‘I can’ but 2nd *mőžeš ‘you can’ – *mőže ‘(s)he can’ (Stankiewicz 1993: 321), which have the same reflexes as Czech *mohu – *může – *může.
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– przędę by analogy to the original trząść – trzęsę. The length has thus become a new generalized feature of the infinitive.

2) long reflexes of the old pretonic length

zacząć ‘to start’, gąść ‘to play a musical instrument’, jać ‘to take’, kląc ‘to swear’, piąć ‘to climb’, sprząć ‘to couple’ (*pręgti), rósć ‘to grow’, trząść ‘to shake’, dial. wлеч.’to pull’

While there are few exceptions, almost all verbs have the expected length. Moreover, as already said, this type influenced the original acute infinitives as well. The present forms of these verbs have the short root, e.g. gęde ‘I play a musical instrument’, if they have any vowel at all in the root (e.g. zaczę ‘I start’).

3) unexpected modern long reflexes of the old short vowels

bóść ‘to gore’, móc ‘to be able, can’, dial. nieść ‘to carry’, dial. więść ‘to drive’

In Modern Polish, we find an unexpected length in old short root verbs, just like in Czech and Slovak (see below). However, the older language shows that this is not the original situation. In 16th century (SPXVI), only the unlengthened bóść is attested, the short móc is still more frequent than the long móc, and both the short nieść and the long niejść are attested. Cf. also the short reflexes in przebóść and móc in Old Polish (SS). The innovative length is probably due to both the wider tendency (apparent in old acute roots too) of generalization of length in the infinitives and the influence of the masculine l-participle (Modern Polish mógł, bódl), with a phonetic length due to final voiced segments. Thus, one can imagine the old bóść – bodę yielding the new bóść – bodę by analogy to the original rósć – rostę.

The Czech data is, at least superficially, rather similar to the Polish one, though the material is far richer due to Czech preserving the old quantitative distinctions. Czech is a special case because it sports a phonetic length in place of the old acute (in the first syllable of disyllabic forms), unlike Slovincian, Polish and Slovak. Due to that and the spread of secondary analogical length in old short-

53 Cf. Polish dialectal blęść ‘to rave’ (ESSJa; SP), surely due to analogy to the present 1st blędę.
54 Dialectal forms from Stang 1957: 153.
55 The Old Czech data are from Gebauer 1970; ŠES; Šimek 1947; MSČS; ESSČ. In these dictionaries, it is necessary to look at the exact sentence-attestations (if available) to check the brevity/length because the main lemma (the infinitive) is not always attested/reliable/the only attested variant.
vowel stems, the length in the monosyllabic-root verbs has been almost generalized in the infinitive:

1) long reflexes in place of the old acute56


The length from the old acute is found in almost all Czech verbs. The one exception is _spěti_ ‘to move’, where the short vowel is probably due to influence of common prefixed forms _dospěti_ ‘to arrive’ and _uspěti_ ‘to succeed’, where the shortening is expected (since the forms are tri- and not disyllabic58). Cf. also _dáti_ ‘to give’ but _dodati_ ‘to add’ (also _hnáti_ ‘to drive’ – _dohnati_ ‘to drive’, _sláti_ ‘to send’ – _poslati_ ‘to send’ in words with an original yer in the initial syllable: *gъnъti, *sъlъti). However, this original alternation was analogically displaced in most verbs, cf. the analogical length in _probíti_ ‘to pierce’, _dobýti_ ‘to gain’, _pojíti_ ‘to eat a little’, _nakrýst_ ‘to steal a lot’, _pokrýt_ ‘to cover’, _popíti_ ‘to drink’, etc. The present of these verbs is always short, e.g. _kradu_ ‘I steal’, _píji_ ‘I drink’, _předu_ ‘I spin’ (znám ‘I know’ is long because it is contractual59).

2) long reflexes of the old pretonic length

Old Czech60 _blěsti_ ‘to talk/chatter/blab’ (*blěstí), _začíti_ ‘to start’, _dříti_ ‘to scratch/rub’, _housti_ ‘to play an instrument’, _jíti_ ‘to go’ (*íti), _klíti_ ‘to curse’, dial. _licit_ ‘to trap the birds’ (*lěktí61), _másti_ ‘to confuse’ (*měští), _mříti_ ‘to die’, _příti_ ‘to dis-

---

56 Verbs with disyllabic roots with a yer in the first syllable, like *přrāti ‘to wash’, also regularly have the length in Czech (prāti), but this may not be the original reflex of the old acute (cf. Kapovič 2015: 228), and such verbs are not listed here.

57 Cf. also Czech _čísti_ ‘to read’ and _kvísti_ ‘to bloom’, where it is difficult to reconstruct the Common Slavic accent.

58 Cf. also both _smíti_ and _směti_ ‘to be allowed’ from the old *smětti with a yer in the initial syllable here.


60 Gebauer 1970; Šimek 1947; MSČS; ESSČ. The attestation of length is dubious.

61 ÈSSJa.
pute’, růsti ‘to grow’, Old Czech skú(b)sti, souti ‘to pour’, tlouci ‘to beat’, třásti ‘to shake’, Old Czech viezti ‘to bind’ (*vězští), vléci ‘to drag’, zavřítí ‘to close’, vzíti ‘to take’, záběsti ‘to freeze’, Old Czech žříeti ‘to eat’

All verbs show the expected long reflex. The e-present forms are always short, e.g. třesu ‘I shake’, if they have any vowel at all in the root, e.g. mřu ‘I die’.

3) unexpected modern long reflexes of the old short (a. p. c) vowels

bůsti ‘to stab’ (but Old Czech bosti and buosti), hnísti ‘to knead’ (*gnesti), Old Czech hrzesti ‘to bury’ (*gretí), kvěstí ‘to bloom’, Old Czech léci ‘to lie down’, městi ‘to sweep’ (Old Czech miesti), něsti ‘to carry’ (but Old Czech more frequent nesti and less frequent něsti), pěci ‘to bake’ (but Old Czech pcy), plěsti ‘to knit’ (Old Czech plěsti72), říci ‘to say’, téci ‘to flow’, věsti ‘to lead’, vězti ‘to carry’73

As we can see, all the originally short root a. p. c verbs have length today, while in Old Czech this was not completely generalized74 (*grebtí, *pektí had the original short root; *bostí, *nestí had both the original short and the innovative long root; *legtí, *mestí and perhaps *plesti had only the long root). The short-root forms are also found in the dialects, e.g. nest, vest, plest75. The only modern exception is moci ‘to be able to’ – originally the only a. p. b verb of this type. While all other modern verbs have short-root e-present forms, e.g. peku ‘I bake’, vedu ‘I lead’ (some do not have a vowel at all, e.g. jdu ‘I go’) etc., the modern Czech moci

---

62 Šimek 1947; MSěS (the actual attestation of length is questionable).
63 Šimek 1947; MSěS.
64 ESSČ.
65 Gebauer 1970.
67 The vocalism is younger, analogical to 1° present singular kvetu etc.
68 Gebauer 1970; MSěS; ESSČ.
69 Gebauer 1970.
70 Gebauer 1970; SěS.
71 SěS.
72 SěS – also short plesi?
73 It is not clear if the Old Czech length in the infinitive is actually attested in the last four verbs (cf. MSěS; Šimek 1947; ESSČ). The same goes for the Old Czech žéci (Šimek 1947; MSěS) ‘to burn’ and for the root in teti (MSěS) ‘to throb’ (*teptí).
74 It is possible, at least for some verbs, that certain Old Czech variants were accidentally not attested.
has the exceptional long-root e-present: můžeš ‘you can’ \(^{76}\) < *môžešь (but not in mohu ‘I can’ < *mogь). This reverse alternation (short–long instead of long–short) is hardly coincidental, i.e. the length in the present forms is certainly part of the reason (together with ‘can’ being one of the most common verbs \(^{77}\)) why moci remained short. The length in type 3 verbs like *nesti has to be secondary\(^{78}\) and due to analogy to the originally long roots (type 2), e.g. bosti – bodu ‘I stab’ would yield bůsti – bodu by analogy to the original růsti – rostu, *vesti – vedu ‘I lead’ would yield vésti – vedu by analogy to the original vléci – vleku ‘I drag’ etc., though examples of clear analogies are not numerous (due to differences in vocalism in type 2 and 3). Moreover, since the length is phonetically regular and expected in both the type 1 (a. p. a) and 2 (long a. p. c), it is no wonder that the alternation of the short-root present and long-root infinitive was generalized especially since type 3 (short a. p. c) was vastly outnumbered (even more if we consider verbs like sláti ‘to send’ < *sъlъti, which are not listed above). Thus, the situation is similar to the one in Polish. The generalization of length in infinitives and brevity in present forms in reflexes of old a. p. a and a. p. c is confirmed by Old Czech (Gebauer 1970) lěci but negative neleci (like dáti – dodati above in type 1).

The situation in Slovak is relatively similar to Czech:

1) (inconsistent) short reflexes in the place of the old acute


While many infinitives have the expected short root, almost as many have the unexpected long root: hryzt ‘to bite’, klášt ‘to put’ liat ‘to pour’, liezt ‘to crawl’, mlieť (but dial. mlet’) ‘to grind’, pást ‘to graze’, priast ‘to weave’, spieť ‘to go/lead’, triet ‘to rub’ (also smiet ‘to be allowed’ from *sъmětí with a yer in the initial syllable). This is probably due to analogy to the type 2, e.g. the original

---

\(^{76}\) For my take and overview of the general development of the short neo-acute in West Slavic cf. Kapović 2022.

\(^{77}\) Cf. e.g. Štokavian synchronically exceptional (but historically expected/original) present mògu ‘I can’ – mőžeš ‘you can’ with the accent alternation and the original short -eš preserved (the same in hòću ‘I will’ – hòćeš ‘you will’).

\(^{78}\) That was Stang’s (1957: 153) conclusion as well.
*klást* – *kladie* changed to a newer *klášt* – *kladie* ‘puts’ by analogy to the original *rást* ‘to grow’ – *rastie* ‘grows’, while the original *smiet* – *smie* changed to *smieť* – *smie* ‘may’ by analogy to *mriet* ‘to die’ – *mríe* ‘dies’. In general, there was a tendency, as in Czech and Polish, to spread the alternation between long-root infinitive and short-root present.

2) long reflexes of the old pretonic length

*drieť* ‘to rub’, *ísť* ‘to go’, *kliat* ‘to swear’, *miast* ‘to mix’, *mriet* ‘to die’, *pniet* ‘to stretch’, *priet* ‘to argue’, *rást* ‘to grow’, *triasť* ‘to shake’, *vlieť* ‘to drag’

The old length is mostly preserved. The only verb that lost it is *začať* ‘to get started’ (*čeťi*) – *začne* ‘gets started’, which could be due to analogy to the original pattern *žať* ‘to mow’ (*žeťi*) – *žne* ‘mows’.

3) unexpected long reflexes of the old short vowels

*miesť* ‘to sweep’, *môct* ‘to be able, can’, *niest* ‘to carry’, *piect* ‘to bake’, *riect* ‘to say’, *tiect* ‘to flow’, *viest* ‘to lead’, *viezt* ‘to drive’

The root of all old short-root verbs is long in modern standard Slovak, even in *môct* ‘to be able’ (unlike Czech *moci*). This must be due to the same kind of process as in Czech, e.g. the original *rect* – *rečie* changes to *riect* – *rečie* by analogy to the original *vliect* – *vlečie* (of course, *môct* is by analogy to *môže* ‘can’). Again, there was a tendency to generalize the alternation between long-root infinitive and short-root present, originally found only in type 2, though it is interesting that it has encompassed all the old short-root verbs (but not all the acute-root verbs).

To go back to discussion with Kortlandt, let us see the chronology of our dispute. As already mentioned, Kortlandt (unlike the traditional approach) maintains that pretonic length is phonetically and regularly shortened in West Slavic in a. p. c. Thus, Kortlandt (2018: 290) claims that *třásti* is analogical to *třásl*, while assuming no less than a late Balto-Slavic (!) retraction 79 for *klíti* and *mříti* (the Czech *l*-participle *mřel* ‘died’ does not allow for an analogy, unlike *třásl*80), which would, it seems (Kortlandt 2011: 344), mean that pre-Dybo Slavic did not have *klěti*, *merti* with the end-stressed a. p. c forms, as would be expected (cf.

---

79 Which he describes e.g. in Kortlandt 2011: 160–162.
80 Cf. Kapović 2019: 82–83 and e.g. Kajkavian *trẽsel* but *hmřl* for the tone opposition.
Dybo 1981: 213), but the supposedly originally immobile **klēti > *klēti (like *mogti > *mogti in a. p. b). While that would formally yield the actually attested outcomes within Kortlandt’s doctrine, I find it implausible and superfluous, and maintain that a straightforward desinence-stressed a. p. c form *klēti (in opposition to an enclinomenon in the supine *klēts) is more than satisfying and much simpler, especially considering other problems with Kortlandt’s ideas about pretonic length. It is quite remarkable that Kortlandt at that time thought (he later changed his opinion – see below), as it would seem, that Czech třásti and Czech mříti have a different origin of their length (the first supposedly having length by analogy from třásl, the other from way back when in Late Balto-Slavic!). Thus, Štokavian třěsti and mrijěti would perhaps have to have a different source of length as well, it seems, according to Kortlandt 2018 (though it is difficult to be sure because Kortlandt frequently does not provide exact explanations even about his own hypotheses, so one is often left to guesswork). In my view, it is much simpler to assume that all these infinitives, both in West Slavic (which we presented in some detail above) and Western South Slavic have a simple phonetic reflex of the old pretonic length.

As for Kortlandt’s (2020: 135) latest contribution to this discussion, he starts with a curious claim that “[c]ontrary to Kapović’s statement (2019: 83), the Slavic infinitive in -ti does not continue a loc.sg. form of the i-stems but a dat.sg. form in *-teiei (with haplology)”. I fail to see the relevance of such a claim for our discussion. Both Proto-Indo-European *-tejej and *-tēj would yield Slavic -ti. The reason why the infinitive is usually analyzed as originally the locative singular of verbal nouns in *-tis (cf. e.g. Vaillant 1966: 127) is in the accent, i.e. both the infinitive and the locative singular of nominal i-stems have a dominant ending (which means end stress when the root is not dominant, i.e. in a. p. c). This is still clearly seen in Štokavian, cf. the noun pěć ‘stove’ – locsg pèći and the infinitive pèći ‘to bake’. The locative of pěć is identical even today (at least in more conservative Neo-Štokavian dialects, including the classical standard system) to the infinitive, while the dative singular has a different accent: datsg pěći ‘to the stove’ (it is the same with můć ‘power’ – datsg mŏći – locsg mòći and the infinitive mòći ‘to be able’, but *mōgti is a. p. b). If Kortlandt thinks that the Slavic infinitive ending stems from the datsg and not from locsg he should try to prove it. Simply asserting that communis opinio is wrong is hardly enough. Kortlandt (2020) goes on to say that “[i]there was another infinitive of Balto-Slavic origin in *-ti,
Prussian poūt, Polish róść ‘to grow’, trząść ‘to shake’, kląć ‘to curse’ < *-tǐ, with a long vowel from retraction of the accent from the final jer.” So it seems that Kortlandt has a new explanation for the length in West Slavic monosyllabic-root infinitives – the ending of the infinitive (which one? where?) was supposedly an end-stressed *-tǐ. He does not explain whether this means that he has given up on the hypothesis of a supposed Late Balto-Slavic retraction in (some of) these infinitives. He does (2020) however add that “Kapović does not distinguish between the different types of infinitive”. Thus, in a simple rhetorical reversal, Kortlandt’s problems with length have somehow become my supposed problems with not distinguishing (?) different types of infinitive. Of course, Kortlandt did not really explain what there is to distinguish and why one should distinguish it (and why 2018 Kortlandt did not distinguish them!) – except for saving his ideas on pretonic length in West Slavic. Basically, we can assume (one has to guess because Kortlandt has a habit of being vague and not explaining thoroughly his own ideas) that Kortlandt thinks that Slavic did not have only the ending -ti in the infinitive but also *-tь. This enables him, though he is not explicit about it, to generate not only long trząść in Polish but also long bóść etc. because he thinks that Ivšić’s rule (retracting the original stress from a final weak yer) causes general lengthening, thus, presumably, **)tręštь > **)tręštь and **)nestь > *něstь. At first glance, this may look like a nice way to explain Czech forms like něst(i) etc. (as opposed to short moc(i), but there are serious problems with this. First of all, we have already shown (see above) that Old Polish and Old Czech (and some modern dialects) show short root-vowels here, which look older – e.g. in Polish it is clear that bóść is younger than bość, etc. Secondly, Slovincian, which seems to be the most conservative, has an almost perfect distribution of length where it is expected (in *tręsti type) and brevity where expected (in *nesti and *prędti type). Kortlandt (2020) says that “Czech largely generalized the long vowel while Slovincian generalized the short vowel to some extent” – the first part about Czech is true enough, as we have shown, but the second one makes no sense. Slovincian has (in Stankiewicz’s transcription again, 1993: 314) |přisc < *prędti, |ňesc < *nesti and |tříšc < *tręsti, with an almost perfect opposition of the first two types to the third one, despite the short root-vowel in all present forms, cf. |přądą ‘I spin’, |ňosą ‘I carry’, |třąsą ‘I shake’ (not also that the accent is generalized in all the adduced forms). How can brevity be generalized only in those verbs which originally had a short (or phonetically regularly shortened)
root? That is impossible. It is clear that Slovincian preserves the original West Slavic distribution of length (just as it is archaic in other aspects in the verbal accentual system), which is further indicated by Old Polish and Old Czech, which are closer to Slovincian than modern Polish and modern Czech are. Another big problem with Kortlandt’s supposed *-tъ in the infinitive is that there are reasons why *-ti is generally taken as original and why the short endings like -t, -ť, -ć, -č etc., which appear all across Slavia, are usually considered younger and derived (via a non-phonetic morphological shortening). Even Kortlandt himself seems to have been a proponent of such an interpretation not too long ago: “the loss of final *-i e.g. in Russian peč’ ‘to bake’, where stressed -i is preserved in the dialects (cf. Stang 1957: 151f.), and similar loss of -i in the other Slavic languages does not inspire confidence in the possibility of reconstructing the original form and accentuation of the infinitive” (Kortlandt 2011: 425). In any case, while it is clear why Kortlandt would now prefer for some *-tъ to exist to help him with pretonic length in a. p. c in West Slavic, the reasons for the classical reconstruction of only *-ti are clear. The ending -i starts disappearing since 13-14th century in Russian, but is still not entirely gone and dialects show -i in forms where it is not present in standard Russian (Vaillant 1966: 129–130; Stang 1957: 151–152). In some languages, -ti is preserved – e.g. in Old Church Slavic, mostly in Ukrainian (Vaillant 1966: 130) and always in Kajkavian (where the infinitival -ti is opposed to the preserved supine -t81). Polish has -ć/-c since the beginning of historical records (Vaillant 1966), but in Czech -t starts to appear only from the end of the 14th century, -ti is still present in some dialects and has only recently been removed from the official standard dialect (Vaillant 1966: 130–131). In Slovene the short -t/-č appear from the 16th century and in Štokavian from the end of the 14th century (Daničič 1874: 255) – however, there are still both Štokavian and Čakavian dialects that preserve -ti/-či. In any case, though Kortlandt may find the idea of an infinitive *-tъ useful for resolving his problems with pretonic length, the evidence for it is otherwise rather poor and there seems to be no reason to assume an ad hoc *-tъ in the infinitive.

81 For the relation of the development of the infinitive and supine in Slavic, cf. e.g. a short description in Mihaljević 2014: 184–185.
3. The short root in a. p. b i- and averbs in West Slavic

And now we come to one of the most frustrating things about our discussion. Already Stang (1957: 42) has noted that the root in West Slavic i- and averbs was originally short in a. p. b (shortened before an internal old acute82), e.g. in Old Polish sędzić ‘to judge’, przystępić ‘to approach’, żądać ‘to demand’ (where the root should be long according to Kortlandt’s doctrine). This system with the short a. p. b root in the infinitive but a long root in the present was preserved only in Slovincian in modern times83 – cf. Stang 1957; Dybo 2000: 91–92. In most modern West Slavic languages/dialects84, the length was reintroduced into the infinitives from the present tense forms, as in modern Polish sędzić (instead of Old Polish sędzić) by analogy to sądzisz ‘you judge’. Cf. in Stankiewicz’s transcription85 Slovincian i-verbs blążic ‘to err’ (cf. Czech86 blouditi ‘to wander’), brońic ‘to defend’ (cf. Czech bráníti), krocic ‘to shorten’ (cf. Czech kráttiti), kupjic ‘to buy’ (cf. Czech koupiti), mlocic ‘to thresh’ (cf. Czech mlátiti), rąbjic ‘to cut’ (cf. Czech roubiti ‘to line’), sąźic ‘to judge’ (cf. Czech souditi), vločic ‘to drag’ (cf. Czech vláčiti ‘to haul’), xvalic ‘to praise’ (cf. Czech chváliti); Slovincian a-je-verbs kazac ‘to order’ (cf. Czech kázati ‘to preach’), kapac ‘to bathe’ (cf. Czech koupati), klicac ‘to kneel’ (cf. Štokavian kléčati87), lizac ‘to lick’ (cf. Czech lízati), skakac ‘to jump’ (cf. Czech skákati), zevac ‘to yawn’ (cf. Czech zivati), zibac ‘to rock’ (cf. Štokavian zíbati); as well as Slovincian a-aje-verbs bivac ‘to abide’ (cf. Czech bývati ‘to live’), gadac ‘to speak’ (cf. Czech hádati ‘to guess’), mjéšac ‘to mix’ (cf. Štokavian mijéšati), pîtac ‘to ask’ (cf. Czech pytati), żądac ‘to demand’ (cf. Czech żádati). In Old Czech, unlike Modern Czech where the infinitive always has an innovative length by analogy to the present tense forms, one also finds short imperative a. p. b forms, though the material seems to

82 Or, more precisely, before an internal dominant old acute, as per the Moscow accentological school (Dybo 2000: 92).

83 Even Slovincian has the innovative length in the infinitives of nö-verbs, cf. cignonc ‘to pull’, kixnoc ‘to sneeze’, mör(l)knoc ‘to fall silent’, máxnoc ‘to wave’, šćipnoc ‘to pinch’ (Stankiewicz 1993: 315).

84 Though there are some other remnants, cf. Kapović 2019: 89 for a short overview.

85 Stankiewicz 1993: 315–316 (the accent in all forms quoted here is on the first syllable and is omitted – the i- and a-infinitives always have the non-initial blążic type accent, while monosyllabic-stem infinitives always have the initial bראc type accent in Stankiewicz’s interpretation), the original in Lorentz 1903: 325, 335, 348–349; Lorentz 1908–1912.

86 Modern Czech has innovative length (including diphthongs, like ou < ú) in these infinitives.

87 Czech klečeti is an é-verb (with an expected shortening in a. p. c).
be rather scarce (Gebauer 1970): braniti, kratyt, mlatiti; kazati; bywati, hádati and hadati; dawaty/dávati88 (cf. Modern Czech dávati ‘to give’). The same is with Old Polish (SS) i-verbs: błądzić ‘to err’ (→ Modern Polish blądzić) (pres. 2\textsuperscript{pl} błądzicie, imp. 2\textsuperscript{pl} błądzicie!), rębić ‘to cut’ (pres. 3\textsuperscript{sg} rąbi, imp. 2\textsuperscript{sg} rębil!, l-part. rąbil), sędzić ‘to judge’ (→ modern sądzić) (pres. 2\textsuperscript{sg} sądzisz, imp. 2\textsuperscript{pl} sędzicie!, l-part. sądził), stępić ‘to tread’ (→ modern stąpić) (pres. 2\textsuperscript{sg} stąpisz, imp. 2\textsuperscript{sg} stępi!, l-part. stąpił). As can be seen, Old Polish has short roots in the a. p. b infinitives (and the imperative) but length in the present (and l-participle)\textsuperscript{91} – in Modern Polish, the length is generalized (cf. already in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century rąbić but sędzić/sądzić, stępić/stąpić – SPXVI).

So what does Kortlandt do with such massive evidence that point to the original shortened root-vowels in West Slavic a. p. b of i- and a-verbs, which are a serious blow to his doctrine on preservation of pretonic length in a. p. b (in opposition to a supposed shortening of pretonic length in a. p. c)? One would expect that he would at least try to explain away all these forms – most of all Slovincian, which is best attested and has systematic brevity in a. p. i-infinitive. But no. The first time, Kortlandt (2011: 264)\textsuperscript{92} commented only on two Old Polish verbs. Even in that he was hardly successful, having to employ very complex and highly implausible hypotheses, including something like **sọdjitii (!?) instead of the normal *sọditii (a. p. b) and assuming the supposed a. p. c for *stọpitii (completely ad hoc and unfounded because the verb is obviously a. p. b).

---

88 The second variant under the lemma hádati.

89 Cf. the difference between 2\textsuperscript{pl} present and imperative in vocalism only. In Modern Polish, the vocalism is the same but the imperative is syncopated: 2\textsuperscript{pl} pres. błądzicie (as in Old Polish) – 2\textsuperscript{pl} imp. błądzicie!.

90 In Old Polish męcić ‘to stir’ (→ Modern Polish mącić) one finds both the pres. 2\textsuperscript{sg} mącisz but also męcisz, both l-part. mącil and męcili – an innovative shift from a. p. b → c seems to have been in effect, though the younger c-forms have since disappeared and Modern Polish has generalized long b-reflexes in all forms. Polish bronić ‘to defend’ – pres. 2\textsuperscript{sg} bronisz (the same in Old Polish (SS)) seems to have gone through with a similar analogical process and the short reflexes, originally expected in the infinitive and imperative, were generalized throughout. In any case, the old length seems not to be seen in Old Polish (SS) ro\textsuperscript{dla}, cf. Old Polish młocić ‘to tresh’ – pres. 2\textsuperscript{sg} młocisz (but Modern Polish młócic – młócisz with a generalized reflex of the length) and Old Polish wrócić(i) ‘to return’ – pres. 2\textsuperscript{sg} wrocisz (Modern Polish wrócić – wrócić).

91 According to the Moscow accentological school, the length is shortened before a medial dominant acute (to which the accent shifted earlier by de Saussure’s law) but not before a medial recessive acute (to which the accent shifted only later by Dybo’s law, i.e. the rightward shift of the dominant circumflex/neo-acute). The dominant morphemes are those that are stressed in the mobile a. p. c (when the root is recessive), thus Slavic *čînti ‘to do’ and *čînti! ‘do!’ but *čînilъ ‘did’ (all a. p. c) – cf. e.g. Dybo 2000: 90–94; Kapović 2019: 88–89. In 2\textsuperscript{sg} imperative, where the dominant acute is final and not medial, one would expect the length to be preserved, but Old Polish 2\textsuperscript{sg} sędzîl is analogical to 2\textsuperscript{pl} sędzicie!, where the shortening is expected.

92 Originally published in 2005, responding to one of my early papers.
This is simply repeated in Kortlandt 2018: 291, adding, quite unbelievably, that “the short root vowel in the Old Polish infinitives sędzić ‘to judge’, przystępić ‘to approach’, żądać ‘to demand’ (Kapović 2017a: 387) offers a serious problem for the theory that these verbs belong to accent paradigm (b)”. Thus, if certain verbs do not adhere to his a. p. b theories, Kortlandt can just magically, with no reasonable arguments, say they are not a. p. b (while ignoring almost all other data). This, of course, does not suffice. For the a. p. b of the first two verbs cf. Kapović 2019: 90 (with references) and for *żędâti, cf. Modern Polish żądać, Modern Czech žádati, Slovak žiadať (all having the infinitive length introduced from the original a. p. b present forms), which is in complete accord with Russian жадать ‘to thirst for’ – жадаешь ‘you thirst for’ (old *žēdâjěšь > *žēdâšь > *žēdâšь > Czech žádáš ‘you demand”93). To put it simply – these three words are clearly a. p. b. There is no reason whatsoever to doubt that – that is, unless you prescribe to Kortlandt’s curious and unviable ideas on the development of pretonic length in Slavic. Not to mention that these are not the only such verbs in Old Czech and Old Polish (see above). Kortlandt almost completely ignores Slovincian i-verbs and just comments (Kortlandt: 2018) on “pьsati, piše- ‘write’, dъxati, duše- ‘breathe’”, apparently to imply that the short infinitive root in Slovincian a-verbs is due to original yers in the infinitive. However, while that would perhaps be fine for these two verbs, that does not explain the i-verbs in general, nor the rest of a-verbs94 (see above). The crescendo comes in Kortlandt’s latest instalment (Kortlandt 2020: 1367), where he has nothing more to say about the whole problem of West Slavic material completely destroying his a. p. b pretonic length hypothesis than one sentence in a footnote, in which he says nothing new: “As to Old Polish sędzić, przystępić, żądać, I may simply refer to what I have written earlier (Kapović 2018: 291)”. This is typical of Kortlandt’s modus operandi. He ignores Slovincian i-verbs again (!) (which agree with Old Czech and other Old Polish examples listed above) and does not even try to provide any kind of solution (though there is no convincing solution because Kortlandt is evidently wrong, since everything points to the length in modern West Slavic root-vowels in a. p. b infinitives being innovative and secondary). All he does is to repeat once more what he has already said, as if his completely ad hoc and unconvincing ideas will become more reasonable through simple repetition. The

worst is that he does not even admit the problem – the fact that Slovincian, Old Polish, Old Czech, Hanakian Czech and Middle Bulgarian (Kapović 2019: 89) present a serious argument against his doctrine. He simply ignores it, pretending for the third time that the problem is just in three Old Polish i-verbs (though he was not able to explain away even those) and that two Slovincian a-verbs can account for the whole Slovincian system. This is simply not an honest academic discussion. Historical linguistics is not a game of jousting and who is right and who is not – we should be working together honestly and trying to find the best theory to explain the data. We should not be ignoring data in one paper after another and pretend that repetition until exhaustion can be a substitute for a serious scholarly discussion.

4. The kȍkōt ‘rooster’ type accent

The posttonic length in Štokavian/Čakavian a. p. C polysyllabic o- and i-stems like kȍkōt ‘rooster’ and kȍkōš ‘hen’ is a major part of the discussion between Kortlandt and myself. However, it has also been one of the more frustrating ones, due to Kortlandt’s obvious ignorance of the Štokavian/Čakavian synchronic systems (not only of dialects but of standard Neo-Štokavian as well!) and his downright refusal to really discuss it – as in many cases, he simply replies with one-liners, unfounded dismissals and propositions of completely impossible supposed later analogical developments. This is what he says in his latest paper (Kortlandt 2020: 137): “According to Kapović (2019: 101), ‘it is clear that the lengthening in the kȍkōt type cannot be separated from the lengthening in the bȏg type’, in spite of the fact that we always find a short vowel in forms like kȍkot beside kȍkōt in the former type and never such forms as **bȏg beside bȏg in the latter”. This is a truly bizarre statement. First of all, and this is not a question of theory or one’s perspective but of basic facts and description, it is completely false “that we always find a short vowel in forms like kȍkot beside kȍkōt in the former type and never such forms as **bȏg beside bȏg in the latter”. This is a truly bizarre statement. First of all, and this is not a question of theory or one’s perspective but of basic facts and description, it is completely false “that we always find a short vowel in forms like kȍkot beside kȍkōt”. No, we do not. All relevant Štokavian (and Čakavian) accentual systems always have length in the o-stem kȍkōt ‘rooster’ and i-stem kȍkōš ‘hen’ type. The only cases when we find kȍkōt and kȍkōš are:

95 For my take (with further references) see Kapović 2017a: 391–394; Kapović 2019: 100–108.
a) systems without posttonic length (generally or in some positions)\textsuperscript{96} – e.g. Belgrade Štokavian (and many modern East Štokavian dialects in general) or Central Čakavian

b) rare systems which preserve posttonic length phonetically but have an analogical brevity in nom/acc\textsuperscript{8} – e.g. some o-stems in modern Dubrovnik dialect\textsuperscript{97} or o-stems generally in Vrgada Čakavian\textsuperscript{98}

Thus, the absence of length in the Štokavian/Čakavian \textit{kòkòt} type is always either phonetic (no posttonic length in the dialect – in general or partially) or analogical (loss of length by analogy to oblique cases) – these are usually rather young phenomena (except perhaps in the case of the southern part of Ikavian-Ekavian Central Čakavian, where the phonetic absence of posttonic length may be older). The absence of length is never morphonological – there are no dialects where we have an old \textit{kòkòt} type.

The second part of Kortlandt’s claim, that there are “never such forms as **\textit{bòg} beside \textit{bòg}” is even more strange. What does that even mean? Words like \textit{mòć} ‘power’ and \textit{pömòć} ‘help’ have the length which has the same diachronic origin of early Western South Slavic provenance, but that does not mean that the circumflex and the posttonic length will behave the same later on. For instance, many eastern (and some other) Štokavian dialects lose posttonic length partially (e.g. they will often have \textit{gòvòr} ‘speech’ but \textit{kòlàč} ‘cake’, for instance in Osijek) or sometimes fully (e.g. both \textit{gòvòr} and \textit{kòlàč}, for instance in Belgrade\textsuperscript{99}). But there are no Štokavian dialects where \textsuperscript{\textdegree} yields \textsuperscript{\textacute} phonetically\textsuperscript{100}. This is not strange because these are different processes and stressed length is much more easily preserved in general. There are rare cases where there are variants like \textit{gòst} and \textit{gòst} ‘guest’ (gen\textsuperscript{g} \textit{gòsta} in both cases) but \textit{gòst} is a very young analogy to gen\textsuperscript{g} \textit{gòsta}, dat\textsuperscript{g} \textit{gòstu}, etc. In other such examples, the oblique cases usually have a different pattern as well: e.g. we have \textit{bòk} – gen\textsuperscript{g} \textit{bòka} (a. p. C) and \textit{bòk} –

\textsuperscript{96} Cf. Kapović 2015: 750–762.

\textsuperscript{97} Cf. Ligorio and Kapović 2011 and modern Dubrovnik \textit{kòkòt} compared to older \textit{kòkòt} (Kapović 2019: 106–107).

\textsuperscript{98} Where this is clearly connected to the loss of accentual mobility in old a. p. C (Kapović 2019: 104).

\textsuperscript{99} This is the older Belgrade system. The newer parallel Belgrade system has a dynamic stress with no tone or length distinction (and is thus very similar to the modern urban Zagreb system except for stress position).

\textsuperscript{100} In the mentioned Belgrade system (see the previous note), all the Neo-Štokavian prosodemes facultatively (or completely for some speakers) yield a single dynamic accent.
gen\textsuperscript{g} bòka (a. p. B) ‘hip’ or döm – gen\textsuperscript{g} dòma (a. p. C) and döm – gen\textsuperscript{g} dòma (a. p. B) ‘home’\textsuperscript{101}. In any case, this has nothing to do with the length in the kòkòt type.

Kortlandt (2020: 137) goes on: “In my earlier studies I have made clear why the Proto-Slavic lengthening in *bògъ was a logical consequence of Dybo’s law (Kortlandt 1989: 53; 2011a: 171; 2018: 292) whereas the lengthening in S/Cr. kòkòt was an analogical development that did not reach all of the dialects”. Yes, Kortlandt has a hypothesis about the lengthening in bòg, where he pushes an early Western South Slavic innovation\textsuperscript{102} back to Proto-Slavic (!) on a rather abstract basis, but he never had anything to say about the length in the kòkòt type – this is his third paper where he is supposed to be discussing it and not really saying anything at all except claiming without any arguments that it is analogical and falsifying basic accentological and dialectological data. Let us say it one more time – there are no relevant Štokavian and Čakavian dialects without the kòkòt/kòkòš type lengthening. These dialects simply do not exist. It is amazing how Kortlandt can claim such a thing in one sentence without even trying to show some arguments for that. As if a simple unbased assertion is proof.

Kortlandt is obviously not aware of the fact of the systemic and non-facultative nominative/(accusative) singular length in final closed syllables in short suffix o- and i-stem synchronic accentual paradigm c of Štokavian nouns such as gôvôr ‘talk’, kòkòt ‘rooster’, göspôd ‘lord’ (cf. the descriptions of Neo-Štokavian in e.g. Daničić 1925: 38, 46; Matešić 1970: 69–71; Stankiewicz 1993: 103, 109; NHKJ: 50; Klaić 2013: 28–29, etc.) or kòkòš ‘hen’, bölest ‘sickness’, and mlâdôst ‘youth’ (cf. the descriptions of Neo-Štokavian in e.g. Budmani 1867: 36; Daničić 1925: 83–84; Matešić 1970: 92; Stankiewicz 1993: 109; NHKJ: 89, 98; Klaić 2013: 122–124, etc.). It is uncanny that in 2020’s in a serious discussion on the history of Slavic accentuation one has to explain that Štokavian kòkòt and kòkòš have posttonic length, which is not haphazard or irrelevant but a stable trait of the system.

\textsuperscript{101} Cf. e.g. bòk, döm in ARj but bôk, dôm in ERj. Different paradigms in bok are probably due to different reflexes of the old a. p. d, while döm (B) is just a younger innovation (döm – dôma → dôm – dôma → döm – dòma).

Kortlandt (2020: 137) does attempt to criticize my process of *kȍkȣь > kȍkόt and correctly quotes me that the process “was ‘due to a simple compensatory lengthening caused by the fall of final yers’ in all forms with an initial circumflex (falling) tone”. However, he goes on to say that I claim “that the long vowel was later eliminated in polysyllabic words by a large number of different local developments”. That is not true. The long vowel was eliminated only by analogy in instrue forms like *bȍgōm (only bōgom is attested) by analogy to instrue popōm > pȍpom ‘priest’ (b) and brȁtom ‘brother’ (a). The only local developments are the very late and rare analogies and phonetic shortenings of posttonic length in general (see above). He adds: “It again suggests the preservation of ancient High and Low tones in posttonic syllables that lengthened (instead of shortened, as in West Slavic) the corresponding vowels in accent paradigm (c).” Yes, in West Slavic the data shows that the original length (as in *kȣrãkъ ‘step’) was lost in a. p. c (in all positions, not only in yer-ending forms), while in Western South Slavic (or at least in Štokavian/Čakavian – Slovene/Kajkavian did not preserve posttonic length) the data shows that originally short vowels (as in *gȍspodь ‘lord’) were lengthened in a. p. c forms with an initial accent and ending with a yer. This is not something I made up from thin air – it is just what the data show when you look at it carefully. The difference of West and South Slavic is not strange – the length behaves differently in West and South Slavic in a. p. c in initial/stressed position as well, cf. *gȣrdь ‘city’ yielding a short vowel in Czech hrad but a long one in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian/Slovene grȃd. However, I do not suppose “the preservation of ancient High and Low tones in posttonic syllables that lengthened (...) the corresponding vowels”. I simply observe the data, which shows that the last originally short pre-yer vowel is lengthened in a. p. c enclinomena forms. I do not claim to know the phonetic specifics of it – it makes no difference whether this occurred in unaccented forms (and whether they were unaccented phonetically, at least in some forms, or only phonologically) or in words with an initial circumflex. Kortlandt tries to make my interpretation unappealing by suggesting that the lengthening occurs in low tone (recessive) syllables, but I never claimed that. What I said is that the lengthening occurred in words with an initial circumflex, i.e. in unaccented words. And the interpretation of a. p. c forms with an initial circumflex as unaccented (again, whether really unaccented in a phonetic sense or simply abstractly in a phonological sense) is a widely accepted hypothesis, not just typical for the Moscow accentological
school (MAS). If one wants to avoid the unaccented part totally, that makes no problem for the interpretation, which is thus quite acceptable to non-MAS accentologists as well – for instance, this process is accepted by Holzer (2007: 68–69), who is neither a MAS accentologist nor does he operate with high and low tones at such a late stage. Kortlandt’s (2020) final point is “that the lengthening in such forms as S/Cr. pȍmōć ‘help’ can easily have arisen on the analogy of forms like pȍ mȍć ‘for the power’”. Here, Kortlandt takes my examples – by which I tried to show how bizarre it is to suggest that mȍć ‘power’, pȍ mȍć and pȍmōć do not have lengths of same origin – to try to offer some kind of solution for his problems. However, while pȍmōć can theoretically be influenced by pȍ mȍć (while this pȍ mȍć itself would have to be analogical to mȍć, according to Kortlandt), what about kȍkōš? Does kȍkōš have the posttonic length by analogy to kȍst ‘bone’? Does kȍkōt have the length by analogy to bȍg ‘god’? One thing is clear – Kortlandt is not able to explain this systematic length in these a. p. c forms, nor why they appear in a. p. c only. All he can say, and all he has been saying for six years and three papers now, is that it is somehow analogical and falsely claim that this phenomenon is not a feature of all Štokavian/Čakavian dialects (which it clearly is). That is not an explanation and it does not work. Kortlandt should look at the data and not just cling to his bold but inaccurate hypotheses from 1975.

5. The reflexes of the short neo-acute in Kajkavian and Czech

Kajkavian is known for having ~ as the reflex of Proto-Slavic * in some positions, e.g. nom/accpl sȅla ‘villages’ < *sèlā (cf. sȅlā with a regular short ~ in some Štokavian/Čakavian dialects) but bȍb ‘bean’ < *bòbъ (the same as in Štokavian/Čakavian). The lengthening of the Proto-Slavic short neo-acute in Kajkavian (and originally in Slovene as well) occurs in the following conditions according to my interpretation of the problem (summarized from Kapović 2015: 377–399):

a) before a dominant (+) length in open final syllables: e.g. sȅla ‘villages’ < Proto-Slavic *sȅlā (including genpl lȍnec ‘pots’ < *lȍnєčč)
b) before a contractional length: e.g. nõvi ‘new’ < *nòvŷ < Proto-Slavic *nòvъjь

c) before a medial weak yer in resonant-first clusters: e.g. pẽrce ‘little feather’ < Proto-Slavic *пèрьce

d) before a medial weak yer in j-second clusters: e.g. grõbje ‘graveyard’ < Proto-Slavic *грóбьje)

My theory perfectly describes the actually attested data. However, it does involve accepting the existence of valencies as phonetically real at the time of the lengthening in early Western South Slavic at the period of the dropping of weak yers (though researchers not operating with valencies could take the length to be analogical to a. p. c)\(^{103}\) and a long genitive plural ending (see below). Kortlandt (2020: 138) has a different opinion: “I have reconstructed *iè and *uò for those instances of *è and *ò that received the accent as a result of Stang’s law though the distinction is not reflected in most languages (cf. especially Kortlandt 2014b and 2016). In Kajkavian, *iè and *uò merged with long *é and *ò that had originated from the retraction of the accent from final jers, e.g. õsmi ‘eighth’, širõki ‘broad’, zelêni ‘green’, pl. rešêta ‘sieves’, loc.sg. stõlu ‘table’, gen.pl. nõvih ‘new’, distinct from the short vowel in kõnj ‘horse’, ôsem ‘eight’, dõber ‘good’, mõgel ‘could’, selò ‘village’, gen.sg. potõka ‘brook’”. Thus, Kortlandt thinks that it is the supposed Stang’s law that is responsible for the neo-acute lengthening in Kajkavian (and Slovene), e.g. *sèlā > **sêla > **sêla > sêla. He basically reconstructs Stang’s law in all cases of a long vowel in final syllables (while my theory operates with length only). This is all fine if one wants to assume that Dybo’s law yields a falling tone (which is not correct – see the next section of this paper) and that there is such a thing as Stang’s law (see below), which I do not agree with, and if one is fine with reconstructing special diphthongs that are “not reflected in most languages”. However, the problem with Kortlandt’s hypothesis is that it does not account for the pẽrce and grõbje type accent, where the solution with Stang’s law does not look promising. Kortlandt has nothing to say on that, just as he is ignoring my elaboration of basic Ivšić’s positions where the Kajkavian neo-acute lengthening occurs\(^{104}\). This is typical of Kortlandt’s modus

---

\(^{103}\) Cf. Kapović 2015: 622, 631. Cf. also Kapović 2017b for earliest Kajkavian developments and its position in a wider Western South Slavic continuum.

\(^{104}\) Cf. Kapović 2019: 77.
operandi – when presented with a more detailed treatment of a problem, he does not even try to incorporate the new findings into his own doctrine, he simply ignores them (unless a discovery is made by one of his disciples working inside of his own doctrine). This kind of symbolic erasure is the complete opposite of how an honest scholarship should function. Linguistic science should not be a competition but a collaboration.

Kortlandt (2020: 138) once again reiterates that “[t]he short vowel in the present tense nȍsi- was introduced on the basis of the other forms of the verb (not merely on the basis of the original 1st sg. form, as Kapović suggests)”. I have already shown how that is very problematic\(^{105}\) – Kortlandt, as usual, does not respond to criticism. His point that nȍs- was introduced on the basis of other forms and not only on the basis of 1st sg. *noš ‘I carry’ is inadequate. As is the case with the c-paradigm of treseš etc. (see section 1 above), the point is that there is no real pivot point for such an analogy in the paradigm itself (*noš is replaced early by analogical nȍs in and in any case has an unaccented *nȍs- and not an accented *nȍs-). And, by the way, what “other forms of the verb”? The only that comes to mind with nȍs- is the n-participle nȍšen ‘carried’ (and perhaps the imperfect). So one would have to assume that the supposed original Kortlandtian Kajkavian *noš – **nȍsi – **nȍsi – **nosimo – **nosite – **nose would yield the actually attested Kajkavian nȍsim – nȍsiš – nȍsi – nȍsimo – nȍsite – nȍse (the same as in Štokavian and Čakavian, where it is completely regular phonetically!) by analogy to the marginal nȍšen? And all that without any trace of the supposedly original accentuation? That looks all but impossible – of course, Kortlandt does not mention any of this because he prefers to be vague and not to engage with the problematic issues concerning his fantastic hypotheses. Kortlandt (2020) also disagrees with my “postulation of ‘super-long’ vowels from contraction in order to explain the difference between nȍsiš and nȍvih”. However, the simple fact is that my solution is definitely much better in explaining the data than his impossible analogical nȍs- in all 6 forms in the a. p. b present tense, as discussed above. My theory is not a “methodological error”, as Kortlandt implies, but the simplest solution to a factual opposition in Kajkavian (lengthening in nȍvih ‘of the new ones’ but no lengthening in nȍsiš ‘you carry’).

\(^{105}\) Kapović 2017a: 395; Kapović 2019: 78, 109. According to Kortlandt one would, for instance, expect Old Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian **nosimo – **nosite in the present tense, which is, of course, nowhere attested.
As for the reflection of *ò in Czech/Slovak, Kortlandt (2020: 138) says that “Kapović maintains (2019: 117) ‘that Czech ť, Slovak ô is the phonetic reflex of *ò in monosyllables’106. This is contradicted by Czech osm, Slovak osem < *ösmь, oheň < *ögņь, mohol < *mòglъ (…”) As I already said, there is no initial *ô- in Czech/Slovak and this might have easily been a separate additional phonetic law, just like a number of analogies are also possible to explain these o-’s (cf. Kapović 2019: 119). As for Slovak mohol ‘could’, as Kortlandt (2011: 345) himself admits, the variant môhol is well attested in Slovak in three peripheral non-contiguous areas (Babik 2007: 70–73). I find it hard to understand Kortlandt’s (2011: 345) reasoning that “the alleged analogical shortening in mohol is quite unmotivated” – why is it so difficult to assume that mohol (instead of the older môhol) is due to analogy to feminine mohla and neuter mohlo? As for Czech kûn, Slovak kôň, Kortlandt (2020: 138) sticks with his interpretation “that the root vowel of nom. sg. Czech kûn, Slovak kôň was taken from the case forms where Stang’s law had operated before the general retraction of the accent in the other case forms that restored initial o- in polysyllables”. I find that proposition totally unconvincing (cf. the detailed explanation why in Kapović 2019: 117–119) but I have nothing to add here because Kortlandt, once again, completely ignored my criticism and simply restated his own view without any additional arguments. I see no point in simple reiteration of one’s views over and over again.

6. The genitive plural

One of the biggest points of contention in the discussion so far has been the ending and the accent of the genitive plural (primarily in o- and ā-stems). While Kortlandt posits a short *-ъ (from Proto-Indo-European *-om) and thinks that length in e.g. Štokavian žâbâ ‘frogs’ (a. p. A), ōsā ‘wasps’ (a. p. B) and vôdâ ‘waters’ (a. p. C) is due to the length-inducing retraction in **vôdЪ (via curious and not really clear analogies), I follow Dybo (2000: 21) in reconstructing an original *-ѣ (from *-öm < Proto-Indo-European *-o-om and *-eh₂-om), which then lengthened the roots of words of all accentual paradigms through a special compensatory lengthening typical for this unique long-yer ending. Dybo’s theo-

106 Cf. e.g. OCA: 147–148; Babik 2007: 74–75.
ry is better than Kortlandt’s not only because it accounts phonetically for all the lengthenings (while Kortlandt’s does so only for a. p. c), but because it also accounts for the Neo-Štokavian ending -ɑ and Slovene variant ending -á (for which Kortlandt offers a very unconvincing explanation). Since I have explained my theory on the genitive plural in detail in the last article (Kapović 2019: 92–100) and since I have also written about it additionally in a separate paper (Kapović 2021), there is no point in detailing my approach to the problem once again – I will limit myself to reply to Kortlandt’s assertions from his last paper.

Kortlandt (2020: 137) says that “the S/Cr. gen.pl. ending -ɑ is attested several centuries after the loss of final *-ъ”. Štokavian -ɑ is indeed attested from the 14th century (and Slovene -ā from the 16th century). However, that is not that strange. In my view, the ending -ɑ did not appear in all forms from the beginning as is now the case in Neo-Štokavian (by the way, the ending -á is still only facultative and appears only in a. p. C in Slovene). Originally, I reconstruct the complex system of different genpl endings, with both *-Ø and *-ʒ (*žȃb ‘frogs’ – *ō̄s ‘wasps’ – *planinȳ ‘mountains’). This means that the ending *-ʒ (which preceded modern -ā) was originally found only in some of the forms in some of the dialects. The ending -ɑ was thus attested when it began to spread internally in the system (from original trisyllabic a. p. c forms to other forms) and through inter-dialectal diffusion (which ended with the complete, but very late, generalization of -ɑ in modern standard Neo-Štokavian). Kortlandt (2020) then says that “the alleged long *-ʒ has no place in the phonological system between the rise of the new timbre distinctions and its earliest reflexes”. This may be true for Kortlandt’s doctrine (which has many other serious problems, however), but otherwise the development of something like *-ōm > *-ūm > *-ʒ works without any problems (see Kapović 2021: 326–327). Kortlandt (2020: 138) finishes with the claim that “its supposed marginal existence is only postulated in order to arrive at the desired outcome in accordance with the theory”. I fail to see how that is a critique. Of course that something is assumed because it helps us explain certain phenomena – why would anyone suppose anything if it has no explanatory value and if there are no reasons to reconstruct it? As it turns out, there are more than good reasons to reconstruct *-ʒ: besides the ones already mentioned (the lengthening and Štokavian/Slovene -ɑ), it explains Old Serbian -b̥, has a direct cognate in Balto-Slavic (Lithuanian -u̯), and appears in Slavic exactly where one
would expect it from a Proto-Indo-European perspective – in o- and eh₂-stems (for details see Kapović 2021).

7. The *obőrna ‘defence’ type accent

Kortlandt (2020: 137–138) for once, after I had previously criticized him that he does not properly contextualize my views, correctly presents my ideas on the *zastāva ‘flag’ – *obőrna ‘defence’ – *prigòda ‘chance’ type accent. His comment is though, as usual, that “[t]his again shows Kapović’s disregard of chronology, his disregard of structural features, and his multiplication of rules because the metathesis had already taken place in South and West Slavic and the acute had already been lost in posttonic syllables before Dybo’s law, yielding a short vowel in the first posttonic syllable”. I do not disregard chronology – I simply do not agree with Kortlandt’s chronology because it often does not work and is frequently not convincing. His note on the metathesis above is irrelevant since I am not even taking a stance on when the analogical development of *obőrna > *obörna occurred. I do not think it is possible to know that for sure – it might have been an older process (occurring back when this was actually *abarnā) or later (when this was already *obrana). What I write as *oborna is a traditional formulaic reconstruction of Proto-Slavic (in reality, *oborna is closer to later Common Slavic – real Proto-Slavic form would be *abarnā), not a firm stance on when this analogical generalization actually occurred. Unlike Kortlandt’s doctrine, which apparently needs for his process to occur at the very exact moment in his elaborate but often unconvincing relative chronology, my process works just fine independently of such fanciful minutia. I do not multiply the rules – Kortlandt is the one who does that. I simply operate with commonly reconstructed Proto-/Common Slavic prosodemes and claim that there was a tendency to generalize the non-etymological old acute (from forms where it was etymological) on long vowels in prefixed derivatives and compounds. Kortlandt is the one who, on the other hand, has to introduce special and heterodox views on the shortening of the supposed post-Dybo falling accent (which I have already shown that does not work107). He also has to assume that (almost) all prefixed

107 Kapović 2017a: 39531; Kapović 2019: 78, 109. See also the section 5 in this paper.
derivatives originally had a (pre-Dybo) accent on the prefix (and not a valence-based free accent) – that is not very different from my generalization of the old acute on post-prefix/post-interfix *-o- long vowels in the first syllable of the lexical root of derivatives and compounds. He also has to assume a new ** which behaves like the old acute (e.g. in his **žāstāvā) but is not the old acute. He also has to assume that a post-Dybo accent on non-acute long vowels yields a falling tone, though there is no proof of that – quite the opposite, there is an immense amount of evidence that what we get in that situation is a (long) neo-acute. In any case, I have clearly presented my point of view already in Kapović 2017a: 394–396 and Kapović 2019: 108–117. As for the question of the retraction of the neo-circumflex that was also a part of that discussion, I point to my new paper Kapović 2020a, which, among other things, presents a relative chronology of the retraction of the neo-circumflex (Kapović 2020a: 402–403).

8. The črnīna ‘blackness’ and dvorišče ‘courtyard’ type accent

In order to prove that the result of the rightward shift of the accent (Dybo’s law) is a falling accent on non-acute internal long vowels (on which rests the supposed Stang’s law, Kortlandt’s view on the development of the neo-acute in Kajkavian – see above – and Kortlandt’s hypothesis on the accent in *obőrna type derivatives and compounds) Kortlandt needs to disprove my claim, following Dybo, that the real result in such cases is a long neo-acute, which I prove with the following accentual types: Čakavian type črnīna ‘blackness,’ ravnīca ‘plane,’ dvorišče ‘courtyard,’ the accentual development of Slavic types like Slovene volār ‘ox-keeper,’ Čakavian popiČ ‘little priest,’ Old Štokavian (Posavina) sestrīn ‘sister’s’, etc. (see Kapović 2017a: 395 for further references). How Kortlandt tries to prove I am wrong, however, is quite amazing and unbelievable. This is what he says (Kortlandt 2020: 138): “The long vowel in Čakavian črnīna ‘blackness’, ravnīca ‘plane’, dvorišče ‘courtyard’ etc. is clearly analogical (cf. already Dybo 1968: 172–174 and 213)”. As always, there is no argumentation

108 Cf. Kapović 2017a: 395; Kapović 2019: 109 and the last section of this paper.
110 For a short overview of the supposed Stang’s law see now Kapović 2020b. For my criticism of the supposed law (which Kortlandt simply ignored) see Kapović 2017a: 39122.
and no discussion – only Kortlandt’s proclamation of “truth”. But what is most bizarre is his quotation of Dybo. The thing is, what Dybo writes in the said reference does not prove that (North) Čakavian črnina type is “clearly analogical” at all. Quite the opposite – Dybo (1968: 174) claims the same thing I claim, that this is the original accent of the circumflex *-ina words derived from dominant non-acute/immobile (a. p. b) roots such as *čyñyně ‘black’ (i.e. *čyñyna > *čyñnina[111]). The part of Dybo’s paper that Kortlandt quotes (Dybo 1968: 172–174[112]) is the same text that is published in Dybo 1981: 144–146 and Dybo 2000: 201–204, that I quote in Kapović 2015: 185 and Kapović 2017a: 395. Thus, not only does Dybo not prove what Kortlandt says he does, but Dybo’s ideas are the basis of my ideas (which I develop further and with more details and dialectological data). How is it possible that Kortlandt not only does not seriously respond to my criticism of his ideas but as “proof” quotes something (though in its earlier version) that I quote and base my theory upon in the first place? I shall let other scholars be the judges in this one.

The same kind of progressive shift we see in *čyñyna > *čyñnina is seen in *dvorišče > *dvorišče ‘courtyard’, though there was a number of different accentual variants in *-išče and the development was quite complex[113]. What does Kortlandt have to say about that? Not much. He (Kortlandt 2020: 138) simply asserts that “[t]he differences between S/Cr. dvorište (b) ‘yard’ and blatīšte (a) ‘mud-pit’ and between Czech pekař (c) ‘baker’ and rybář (a) ‘fisherman’ reflect the original distribution”. Now, this is just a slightly different wording of the same thing (with the same four examples) he said in Kortlandt 2018: 293[114] and in Kortlandt 2011: 266[115] (in his first discussion with me). This is what Kortlandt does – endless repetition of always the same couple of examples without details,

[111] This type later disappeared in e.g. Štokavian but spread analogically to many forms in North Čakavian. Here I have to add that a reference is missing for the Štokavian word stārīna ‘antiquity’ that I mention in my previous paper (Kapović 2019: 115). Both Vuk and ARj adduce only the younger accent starina for this word – the older accent stārīna is found e.g. in Dubrovnik (Bojanić and Trivunac 2002), though there it means ‘birth house, ancestors’ house’.


[114] “Original differences have been preserved e.g. in dvorište (b) ‘yard’ versus blatīšte (a) ‘mud-pit’ and Czech pekař (c) ‘baker’ versus rybář (a) ‘fisherman’ (…)”.

[115] “My view that pretonic long vowels were shortened while posttonic long vowels were preserved in Proto-Slavic is corroborated by such derivatives as Czech pekař ‘baker’ versus rybář ‘fisherman’ (…)” and “The shortening of the medial long vowel in dvorište ‘yard’ but not in blatīšte ‘mud-pit’ is regular (…)”. 
new arguments or discussion. I fail to see the point of that – at least from the perspective of trying to have an honest and productive scholarly debate. But even disregarding his tedious and pointless repetition, there are a number of problems with this that Kortlandt simply ignores. First of all, as I have already mentioned\(^{116}\), it is problematic to use the words \textit{blȁtīštē} and \textit{dvòrištē} he always uses, because though that type of accentual relation does exist in some dialects (which he never quotes), the forms he quotes are from different dialects in Vuk’s dictionary and cannot be taken as part of the same system. Secondly, the forms \textit{blȁtīštē} and \textit{dvòrištē} are not at all problematic from the perspective of my theory even if one wants to have only the acute *-išče and interpret the length in \textit{blȁtīštē} as a reflex of the old acute posttonic length (which would then be preserved as in \textit{bȑđāni ‘highlanders’ opposed to sèšanì ‘villagers’}\(^{117}\)) – this is not impossible, though it is not certain that this is the origin of the length in -ištē in all Štokavian dialects. The problem for Kortlandt, which he does not address at all, is the common Štokavian variant \textit{dvòrīštē} that is to be derived from older \textit{dvòrištē} (as attested directly in a number of Čakavian dialects)\(^{118}\). While one can suppose that Štokavian \textit{dvòrīštē} could be secondary for older \textit{dvòrištē} by analogy to \textit{blȁtīštē}, there is no way how one can explain Čakavian \textit{dvorĩšće} as secondary from the older \textit{dvorĩšće} (both types are widely attested, sometimes even in a same local dialect). What is more, Kortlandt completely disregards that the same type of variants exists in other suffixes (that I call “the Hirt suffixes”): -ȉna and -ȋna (see above), -ȋn and -ı̯n, -ȉca and -ȋca, -ȋč and -ȕc\(^{119}\). As for Czech pekař and rybář, once again, even if *pekarь is indeed a. p. c (which is very suspicious), these examples work just fine from the perspective of my theory – even better than from Kortlandt’s\(^{120}\). Thus, the constant repetition is superfluous – these isolated examples, besides being questionable on various accounts, do not at all disprove any of my positions. Kortlandt should try to expand on his views instead of simple repeated assertions, which do not contribute to the discussion.

\(^{116}\) Kapović 2019: 116\(^{28}\).


\(^{120}\) Cf. Kapović 2019: 88.
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O odrazu nenaglašene dužine i kratkog neoakuta u slavenskom, duženju tipa kȍkōt u štokavskom/čakavskom i drugim problemima

Sažetak

Ovo je šesti članak u diskusiji između Frederika Kortlandta i autora ovog članka o raznim problemima povijesne slavenske akcentologije. U članku se raspravlja o odrazu prednaglasnih i zanaglasnih dužina (u naglasnoj paradigmi a i c) u zapadnojužnoslavenskom i zapadnoslavenskom, o odrazu kratkog neoakuta u kajkavskom i češkom i o duženju tipa k闾k闾t u naglasnoj paradigmi c u štokavskom i čakavskom. Govori se ukratko i o još nekoliko tema – kao što su naglasak genitiva množine, naglasak prefiksalskih tvorbi poput *obőrna ‘obrana’ te o čakavskim naglasnim tipovima ěrnĩna i dvorišće. Dodatno se u članku raspravlja i o nekim problematičnim pojavama u vezi s Kortlandtovom metodologijom, retorikom, diskutiranjem i načinom prezentacije.
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