

UDK 811.163.42'28(091)

811.16'342.41(091)

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Rukopis primljen 23. X. 2021.

Prihvaćen za tisak 14. I. 2022.

doi.org/10.31724/rihjj.48.1.4

Mate Kapović

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb

orcid.org/0000-0001-7938-4323

mkapovic@ffzg.hr

ON THE REFLECTION OF UNACCENTED LENGTH
AND THE SHORT NEO-ACUTE IN SLAVIC, THE *KŎKŎT*
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 *kŏkŏt* '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 *obŏrna 'defence' type accent, and the Čakavian *črnŏna* 'blackness' and *dvorišće* 'courtyard' type accent. Additionally, the paper deals with some issues concerning Kortlandt's rather problematic methodology, rhetorics, discussion and presentation style.

0. Introduction¹

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 Slovencian), 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 papers² – the negligence of important data³; disregard of other scholars' research⁴ and ignoring important critiques of his ideas⁵; dismissals of other scholars' ideas without discussion and trying to prove his point⁶; unwillingness to explain in detail even his own views⁷; loose or unclear references⁸; citing mostly Leiden scholars⁹; attempts to switch the topic to irrelevant points while ignoring important ones¹⁰; masking his inability to respond to criticism of his ideas with unfounded “methodological” accusations of other scholars¹¹; 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.

² Kapović 2017a: 398; Kapović 2019: 76, 126–127.

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.

⁵ Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 388–389, 396³⁸; Kapović 2019: 77, 90–91.

⁶ Cf. e.g. Kapović 2019: 113.

⁷ Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 395³¹, 398⁴⁰.

⁸ Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 381³. See also below in the paper for Kortlandt's false quoting of Dybo concerning the *čěrnina ‘blackness’

⁹ Kapović 2017a: 388¹⁷; Kapović 2019: 90⁴⁴.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 388–389; Kapović 2019: 80, 91, 113, 116–117.

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 opposite¹²; frequent mistakes with and mistreatment of the data¹³; avoiding serious discussion of the material and always repeating the same couple of examples¹⁴, 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 *ð 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 data¹⁵ 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 ignorance¹⁶ about the length in Štokavian/Čakavian *kòkòt* ‘rooster’ and *mlādōst* ‘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”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

“the input criteria of [my] rules in order to arrive at the correct output” (on the contrary, it is Kortlandt who devises multiple unnecessary distinctions, rules and analogies).

¹² Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 385; Kapović 2019: 78–80.

¹³ Cf. e.g. Kapović 2017a: 389¹⁹ (Kortlandt does not take into account the important Slovene *nosīti* ‘to carry’ neo-circumflex type and, quite unbelievably, wrongly thinks that Cres Čakavian *kāmik* ‘stone’ and *kāvran* ‘raven’ have a neo-circumflex), 394³⁰ (Kortlandt wrongly thinks that Čakavian always has the *ogrāda* ‘fence’ type accent); Kapović 2019: 80⁹ (Kortlandt wrongly and inappropriately cites Hvar Čakavian *rūkīma* ‘arms’), 107 (Kortlandt wrongly adduces *jāblān* ‘poplar’ among *gōvōr* ‘speech’ type words), 112 (Kortlandt thinks that only the type *kopā* ‘digs’ occurs in Čakavian – cf. now Kapović 2020a for that), 116¹²⁸ (Kortlandt wrongly cites two decontextualized words in *-ište*).

¹⁴ Kapović 2019: 126.

¹⁵ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 387–388; Kapović 2019: 88–90.

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⁽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 myself¹⁸ is the reflection of unaccented (pre- and posttonic length¹⁹) in West and Western South Slavic, e.g. in forms like *rǫkà ‘hand, arm’ (pretonic length) and *gòlǫbь ‘pigeon’, *měšěcь ‘month’ (posttonic non-final length). My stance is that both pre- and posttonic length are generally phonetically preserved (in some positions²⁰) 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 *rūkà* (> standard Štokavian *rúka*) and Štokavian/Čakavian *gòlūb*, *m(j)ěšēc/mīsēc* (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 *měsíc* but not in *paměť* ‘memory’²¹) 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 acc^{sg} *ruku*²², 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 *klěti*, *mrijěti*²⁴ – see below for infinitives in Czech) and gen^{sg} *devíti* ‘nine’, *desíti* ‘ten’ (~ Russian gen^{sg} *девяти́*, *десяти́*)²⁵. For posttonic non-final length, I take the brevity in old a. p. *c* as regular and phonetic in West Slavic, while I consider

¹⁸ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 382–388; Kapović 2019: 79–91.

¹⁹ Not including final open syllables, which is a separate issue (cf. Kapović 2015: 526–550).

²⁰ For details cf. Kapović 2015: 416–550.

²¹ Cf. the list in Kapović 2015: 504–507.

²² 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).

²³ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 382; Kapović 2019: 79.

²⁴ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 384; Kapović 2019: 82–83.

²⁵ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 384–385; Kapović 2019: 84–85.

a number of possibilities to explain the dual reflection (long and short) in a. p. *a*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 *rúka* supposedly from the older ***rùka*), 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 ***rùka* (or ***klèti* in verbs) and the supposedly restored length is present only in some forms, cf. e.g. the length in Neo-Štokavian *rúka* but no length in dat/loc/instr^{pl} *rùkama*²⁷. To be fair, one has to admit that even those that assume that Neo-Štokavian *rúka* is phonetic have to assume a secondary gen^{sg} *rúkē* and a secondary instr^{sg} *rúkōm* (but unchanged gen^{pl} *rùkū* and dat/loc/instr^{pl} *rùkama*). 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 *rúkē* < *rūkē* and *rúkōm* < *rūkōm* 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 *ùčī* 'learns', dialectal *dādū* 'they give' (not to mention forms like *jùnāk* < *junāk* 'hero' in a. p. *b*), etc.²⁸ On the other hand, the supposedly expected kortlandtite ***rùka* (or ***trěseš*) is nowhere attested in Štokavian (nor old ***rūkā*, ***trěšš* 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

²⁶ Cf. Kapović 2019: 85–88.

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 *trěseš* 'you shake', etc.

²⁸ Cf. Kapović 2015: 499–500. The old *rúkē/rúkē*, *rúkōm/rúkōm* is common in Montenegrin dialects.

²⁹ The short *róka* < *rokā* 'arm' and a few other examples (*gréda* 'beam', *péta* 'heel') are attested in literary Slovene but they must be analogical to old a. p. *c* accusative forms like *rokŏ* (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 *trěsti* 'to shake' – *trěseš* 'you shake'. For more details and some dialectal data see Kapović 2015: 427–428.

³⁰ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 387–388; Kapović 2019: 88–90.

(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 \bar{a} -stems³¹ or *e*-presents, he ignores the remnants of pretonic length in West Slavic such as Czech *klíti* ‘to curse’ (but see below) and gen^{sg} *devíti* ‘nine’, *desíti* ‘ten’³². The same goes for his assertion (Kortlandt 2020) that “pre-Dybo pretonic length was restored in *rúka* (c) on the analogy of the barytone forms acc.sg. *rúku* and nom.acc.pl. *rúke*, though not in obl.pl. *rúkama*”. 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 impossible³³. 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 Kapović 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/instr^{pl} ‘heads’) are original. Completely puzzling is what follows, where Kortlandt (2020) says that I do “not explain the difference between the accent patterns of *rúka* (c) and *trúba* (b)”. What is there to explain, that is not

³¹ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 382; Kapović 2019: 79.

³² Cf. Kapović 2017a: 384–385; Kapović 2019: 84–85.

³³ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 386; Kapović 2019: 79–80.

generally known and acknowledged, of the difference of accentual paradigm *b* and *c* in \bar{a} -stems? I have written about the accent patterns of Štokavian \bar{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 *màlina* 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 *màlina* 'raspberry' and *jèzik* 'tongue, language' type is regular and expected³⁴, just like the retention of length in *národ* 'people' type³⁵ (though the details are rather complicated). The length in the *zábava* 'party' type is in my opinion secondary³⁶ 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 *póvrat* 'return' instead of the older *pòvrat*, *pónos* 'pride' instead of *pònos*³⁷, etc.). The original short prefix is seen in the Štokavian variant *zàbava* type (from older/expected **zàbava*), 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 conclusions³⁸, 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. *trēsěš* and

³⁴ Cf. Kapović 2015: 463–498.

³⁵ Cf. Kapović 2015: 440–463.

³⁶ Cf. Kapović 2015: 454–458.

³⁷ Cf. Kapović 2015: 742–743.

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. *trēsè* can only be based on 1st sg. **trēsQ*, disregarding the thematic aorist (original imperfect) paradigm with 2nd and 3rd sg. *trēse*, in compounds *-trēse*.” This is problematic in a number of ways. First of all, I think that it is unnecessary to assume that the length in *trēsěš* ‘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 **trēsu* (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 *trēsěš*, *trēsè* ‘shakes’ but not in plural forms *trēsēmō* ‘we shake’, *trēsētè* ‘you all shake’, *trēsū* ‘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 ***trēsè(š)*. The advantage of my proposition over Kortlandt’s is clear – in my view, the length in Štokavian infinitive *trésti* ‘to shake’, present *trēseš* ‘you shake’, *l*-participle *trēsao* ‘shook’, aorist (*po*)*trēsoh* ‘I shook’, *pòtrēse* ‘you/he shook’, imperative *trési!* ‘shake!’ (and the *n*-participle variant *trēsen* ‘shaken’) is expected and phonetically regular. According to Kortlandt’s hypothesis, only *trēsao* and *pòtrēse* would have an expected and phonetically regular length (and *trésti* 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 “post-tonic long vowels were never shortened” and that “Kapović agrees that post-tonic 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*.

⁴⁰ Kapović 2017a: 382, 384–385; 2019: 79, 81–85.

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’ < *vōlstь (cf. Štokavian *vlast* ‘government, dominion’) and Czech *oblast* ‘area’ < *öbvolstь (cf. Štokavian *öblāst* ‘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 *trēsti ‘to shake’) and its long reflexes (such as Slovincian *trīisc*) was also a matter of dis-

⁴¹ Kapović 2015: 516–525.

⁴² Cf. Kapović 2019: 87.

⁴³ Cf. Kapović 2019: 88.

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 *trésti* nor in Slovincian *trǐisc*). 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 *pǐti 'to drink'
- 2) infinitives with the old pretonic length like *trēsti 'to shake'
- 3) infinitives with the original short vowel like *nesti '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 *iti '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 *čǔti 'to hear' – *čǔjǫ 'I hear'), *a-b* (like *šǐti 'to sew' – *šǐjǫ 'I sew'), *c* (like *pǐti – *pǐjǫ 'I drink' – *pǐlǎ 'drank') or *a-c* (*grǔzti 'to bite' – *grǔzǫ 'I bite' – *grǔzla '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 Slovincian⁴⁶, 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-

⁴⁴ Kapović 2017a: 384; Kapović 2019: 82–83.

⁴⁵ Cf. e.g. Stang 1957: 153.

⁴⁶ Cf. again Stang 1957: 153.

vak) 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 verbs⁴⁷ 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

bic 'to be', *čuc* 'to feel', *dac* 'to give', *gńic* 'to rot', *grisc* 'to bite', *jesc* 'to eat', *klasc* 'to put down', *kloc* 'to prick' (*kǫlti), *lesc* 'to crawl'⁴⁸, *vobuc* 'to put on shoes' (*obūti), *pjic* 'to drink', *ploc* 'to weed' (*pělti), *přisc* 'to spin' (*prědti), *šic* 'to sew', *tic* 'to become fat' (*tǃti), *vjic* 'to wind', *znac* 'to know', *žic* 'to live'

There are only two exceptions to this. One is the unexpectedly long *dīc* 'to blow' < *dǫti – *dmjq* 'I blow', which has the length by analogy to *žīc* 'to wring' – *žmjq* (cf. the same type of present: *dmjq* ~ *žmjq*), where the length is expected (cf. Štokavian *nàduti* 'to blow' but *sàžēti* < older *sažēti* 'to summarize'). Other verbs, like *cīc*, *klīc* (see below), etc. might have been an influence as well. The other unexpected long reflex is found in *stīrc* 'to shear' (*strǃgti), with the unexpected length in present *stīrgq* '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 *strǃžešb (cf. Štokavian *strǃžeš*), where it would be phonetically expected, which would then be generalized in the present and also in the infinitive *stīrc*. However, that is very tentative since *stīrc* would seem to be the only such example.

2) long reflexes of the old pretonic length

začīc 'to start' (*čēti), *dřēc* 'to tear', *jīc* 'to go'⁴⁹, *klīc* 'to curse', *mřēc* 'to die', (*ros*)*pjīc* 'to spread' (*pēti), *přēc* 'to push' (*perti), *přīc* 'to harness' (*prēgti), *střēc* 'to guard' (*stergti), *cīc* 'to cut' (*tēti), *tlūc* 'to pound', *třēc* 'to rub' (*terti),

⁴⁷ We will not list verbs with an initial yer in disyllabic roots like *pǃrāti 'to wash'.

⁴⁸ The present form *lězq* (a. p. *a*) 'I crawl' has a curious unexpected length.

⁴⁹ The length here is original (cf. also Czech *jíti* and the Štokavian variant *íci* – the other Štokavian variant *íci* is analogical to *īdēs* 'you go'). Derksen's (2008) reconstruction *jǃti is wrong – *iti (from older *ejtēi) is indicated by Czech *jíti* (but *jdu* < *jǃdq 'I go') and Lithuanian *eiti* (most Slavic languages/dialects merge original *i- and *jǃ-).

třisc ‘to shake’, *vjisc* ‘to tie’ (*vĕzti), *vřec* ‘to lock’ (*verti), *vzjic* ‘to take’ (*jĕti), *žic* ‘to wring’ (*žĕti – *žĕmq)

There are two exceptions. One is *rosc* ‘to grow’ (*orsti), where one would expect the length (cf. Polish *rosć*, Štokavian *rásti*). It is easy enough to say that the infinitive was influenced by the present form *rostq* ‘I grow’ (*ōrstq), 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. *čujq* ‘I feel’, *bodq* ‘I goad’, *tlukq* ‘I pound’). The other exception is *suc* ‘to pour’ (cf. Štokavian *nāsūti* < *nasūti* 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

bosc ‘to goad’, *cec* ‘to flow’ (*tekti), *ghesc* ‘to knead’, *mjesc* ‘to throw’, *moc* ‘to be able to’⁵⁰, *nesc* ‘to carry’, *pjec* ‘to bake’, *plesc* ‘to twist’, *řec* ‘to say’, *vjesc* ‘to lead (by vehicle)’ (*vezti), *žec* ‘to burn’

Now, let us see the situation in Polish, which is geographically close to Slovenian, but with far less rich (Standard Polish, unlike Slovenian, 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

dać ‘to blow’ (*dĕti), *klóć* ‘to prick’ (*kólti), *miąć* ‘to crimp’ (*mĕti), *prząść* ‘to weave’ (*prĕditi), *żąć* ‘to reap’ (*žĕti)

While one would expect a short reflex of the old acute in Polish (cf. Polish *pęto* ‘jess, fetter’ < *pĕto), we see a long reflex in these infinitives. Cf. already in the 16th century (SPXVI): *dać*, *miąć*, *żąć*, *prząść* but also *prześć*. This must be secondary, as confirmed by Old Polish *prześć*⁵¹ 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 *dĕć – *dmę* yielded an innovative *dać* – *dmę* by analogy to the original *jać* – *jmę* (see below), while the original *prześć* – *przędę* yielded a secondary *prząść*

⁵⁰ Cf. also the present forms: 1st *moga* ‘I can’ but 2nd *mōžeš* ‘you can’ – *mōže* ‘(s)he can’ (Stankiewicz 1993: 321), which have the same reflexes as Czech *mohu* – *můžeš* – *může*.

⁵¹ Stang 1957: 153.

– *przędę* by analogy to the original *trząść* – *trzęse*. The length has thus become a new generalized feature of the infinitive.

2) long reflexes of the old pretonic length

zacząć ‘to start’, *gąć* ‘to play a musical instrument’, *jąć* ‘to take’, *kląć* ‘to swear’, *piąć* ‘to climb’, *sprząc* ‘to couple’ (**pręgti*), *róść* ‘to grow’, *trząść* ‘to shake’, dial. *włéc*⁵² ‘to pull’

While there are few exceptions⁵³, 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. *zacznę* ‘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. *wieść* ‘to drive’⁵⁴

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 *bość* is attested, the short *moc* 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 *przebość* and *moc* 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 *bość* – *bodę* yielding the new *bóść* – *bodę* by analogy to the original *róść* – *rostę*.

The Czech data⁵⁵ 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-

⁵² Stang 1957: 153.

⁵³ Cf. Polish dialectal *blęść* ‘to rave’ (ÉSSJa; SP), surely due to analogy to the present 1st *blęde*.

⁵⁴ Dialectal forms from Stang 1957: 153.

⁵⁵ The Old Czech data are from Gebauer 1970; S&S; 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

bíti ‘to beat’, *býti* ‘to be’, *čísti* ‘to read’, *dáti* ‘to give’, *douti* ‘to blow’, *hníti* ‘to rot’, *hryžti* ‘to bite’, *chtíti* ‘to want’, *jísti* ‘to eat’, *klásti* ‘to put’, *krásti* ‘to steal’, *krýti* ‘to cover’, *lězti* ‘to crawl’, *lítí* ‘to pour’, *mlíti* ‘to grind’, *mýti* ‘to wash’, *obouti* ‘to put on a shoe’, Old Czech *pásti* ‘to fall’ (1st *padu* ‘I fall’), *pásti* ‘to graze’ (1st *pasu* ‘I graze’), *píti* ‘to drink’, *plíti* ‘to weed’, *přísti* ‘to spin’, *rýti* ‘to dig’, *síci* ‘to reap’, *stržici* ‘to guard’, *souti* ‘to pour’, *šíti* ‘to sew’, *títi* ‘to cut’, *tříti* ‘to rub’, *týti* ‘to become fat’, *víti* ‘to wreath’, *vříti* ‘to boil’, *znáti* ‘to know’, *žíti* ‘to live’ (1st *žiji* ‘I live’), *žíti* ‘to reap’ (1st *žnu* ‘I reap’)⁵⁷

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: **gьnāti*, **sьlāti*). However, this original alternation was analogically displaced in most verbs, cf. the analogical length in *probíti* ‘to pierce’, *dobýti* ‘to gain’, *pojísti* ‘to eat a little’, *nakrásti* ‘to steal a lot’, *pokryti* ‘to cover’, *popíti* ‘to drink’, etc. The present of these verbs is always short, e.g. *kradu* ‘I steal’, *piji* ‘I drink’, *předu* ‘I spin’ (*znám* ‘I know’ is long because it is contractional⁵⁹).

2) long reflexes of the old pretonic length

Old Czech⁶⁰ *blěsti* ‘to talk/chat/ter/blur’ (**blēsti*), *začítí* ‘to start’, *dřítí* ‘to scratch/rub’, *housti* ‘to play an instrument’, *jítí* ‘to go’ (**īti*), *klítí* ‘to curse’, dial. *lícť* ‘to trap the birds’ (**lĕkťi*⁶¹), *másti* ‘to confuse’ (**mēsti*), *mřítí* ‘to die’, *přítí* ‘to dis-

⁵⁶ Verbs with disyllabic roots with a yer in the first syllable, like **prǣti* ‘to wash’, also regularly have the length in Czech (*práti*), but this may not be the original reflex of the old acute (cf. Kapović 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 **sьmĕti* with a yer in the initial syllable here.

⁵⁹ Cf. Kapović 2020a: 374, 399–400, 402.

⁶⁰ Gebauer 1970; Šimek 1947; MS&S; ESSČ. The attestation of length is dubious.

⁶¹ ĚSSJa.

pute', *růsti* 'to grow', Old Czech⁶² *skú(b)sti*, *souti* 'to pour', *tlouci* 'to beat', *třásti* 'to shake', Old Czech⁶³ *viezti* 'to bind' (**vězti*), *vléci* 'to drag', *zavřítí* 'to close', *vzítí* 'to take', *zábsti* 'to freeze', Old Czech⁶⁴ *žřieti* '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 Czech⁶⁵ *bosti* and *buosti*), *hnísti* 'to knead' (**gnesti*), Old Czech⁶⁶ *hrzesti* 'to bury' (**grebtí*), *kvéstí*⁶⁷ 'to bloom', Old Czech⁶⁸ *léci* 'to lie down', *méstí* 'to sweep' (Old Czech⁶⁹ *miesti*), *nésti* 'to carry' (but Old Czech⁷⁰ more frequent *nesti* and less frequent *nésti*), *péci* 'to bake' (but Old Czech⁷¹ *pecy*), *pléstí* 'to knit' (Old Czech *plésti*⁷²), *říci* 'to say', *téci* 'to flow', *vésti* 'to lead', *véztí* '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*, **pekti* had the original short root; **bosti*, **nesti* had both the original short and the innovative long root; **legti*, **mesti* and perhaps **plesti* had only the long root). The short-root forms are also found in the dialects, e.g. *nest*, *vest*, *plestí*⁷⁵. 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; MSčS (the actual attestation of length is questionable).

⁶³ Šimek 1947; MSčS.

⁶⁴ ESSČ.

⁶⁵ Gebauer 1970.

⁶⁶ Gebauer 1970.

⁶⁷ The vocalism is younger, analogical to 1st present singular *kvetu* etc.

⁶⁸ Gebauer 1970; MSčS; ESSČ.

⁶⁹ Gebauer 1970.

⁷⁰ Gebauer 1970; SčS.

⁷¹ SčS.

⁷² SčS – also short *plesti*?

⁷³ It is not clear if the Old Czech length in the infinitive is actually attested in the last four verbs (cf. MSčS; Šimek 1947; ESSČ). The same goes for the Old Czech *žéci* (Šimek 1947; MSčS) 'to burn' and for the root in *tetí* (MSčS) 'to throb' (**tepti*).

⁷⁴ It is possible, at least for some verbs, that certain Old Czech variants were accidentally not attested.

⁷⁵ Trávníček 1935: 268; Stang 1957: 153.

has the exceptional long-root *e*-present: *můžješ* ‘you can’⁷⁶ < **mòžješ* (but not in *mohu* ‘I can’ < **mogŏ*). 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 verbs⁷⁷) why *moci* remained short. The length in type 3 verbs like **nesti* has to be secondary⁷⁸ and due to analogy to the originally long roots (type 2), e.g. *bosti* – *bodu* ‘I stab’ would yield *bŭsti* – *bodu* by analogy to the original *rŭsti* – *rostu*, **vesti* – *vedu* ‘I lead’ would yield *věsti* – *vedu* by analogy to the original *vlěci* – *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’ < **slŏti*, 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

bit’ ‘to beat’, *čut’* ‘to hear’, *dat’* ‘to give’, *kryt’* ‘to cover’, *myt’* ‘to wash’, *obut’* ‘to put on shoes’, *pit’* ‘to drink’, *pl’ut’* ‘to spit’, *ryt’* ‘to dig’, *šit’* ‘to sew’, *vit’* ‘to wind’, *znat’* ‘to know’, *žat’* ‘to reap’, *žit’* ‘to live’

While many infinitives have the expected short root, almost as many have the unexpected long root: *hrýzt’* ‘to bite’, *klást’* ‘to put’ *liat’* ‘to pour’, *liezt’* ‘to crawl’, *mliet’* (but dial. *mlet’*) ‘to grind’, *pást’* ‘to graze’, *priast’* ‘to weave’, *spiet’* ‘to go/lead’, *triet’* ‘to rub’ (also *smiet’* ‘to be allowed’ from **slmĕti* 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’ – *mòžješ* ‘you can’ with the accent alternation and the original short *-eš* preserved (the same in *hòcu* ‘I will’ – *hòčeš* ‘you will’).

⁷⁸ That was Stang’s (1957: 153) conclusion as well.

**klast* – *kladie* changed to a newer *klást* – *kladie* ‘puts’ by analogy to the original *rást* ‘to grow’ – *rastie* ‘grows’, while the original **smet* – *smie* changed to *smiet*– *smie* ‘may’ by analogy to *mriet* ‘to die’ – *mrie* ‘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

driet ‘to rub’, *íst* ‘to go’, *kliat* ‘to swear’, *miast* ‘to mix’, *mriet* ‘to die’, *pniet* ‘to stretch’, *priet* ‘to argue’, *rást* ‘to grow’, *tríast* ‘to shake’, *vliect* ‘to drag’

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

3) unexpected long reflexes of the old short vowels

miest ‘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 (!) retraction⁷⁹ 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 **klĕti*, **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 *trĕsel* but *hmřl* for the tone opposition.

Dybo 1981: 213), but the supposedly originally immobile ***klĕti* > **klĕti* (like **mògti* > **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 **klĕti* (in opposition to an enclinenomenon in the supine **klĕtъ*) 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 *trásti* and Czech *mřiti* have a different origin of their length (the first supposedly having length by analogy from *trásl*, the other from way back when in Late Balto-Slavic!). Thus, Štokavian *trĕsti* and *mrijĕti* 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 **-tejei* and **-tĕi* 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 *pĕc* ‘stove’ – loc^{sg} *pĕci* and the infinitive *pĕci* ‘to bake’. The locative of *pĕc* 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: dat^{sg} *pĕci* ‘to the stove’ (it is the same with *môc* ‘power’ – dat^{sg} *mòci* – loc^{sg} *mòci* and the infinitive *mòci* ‘to be able’, but **mogti* is a. p. b). If Kortlandt thinks that the Slavic infinitive ending stems from the dat^{sg} and not from loc^{sg} he should try to prove it. Simply asserting that communis opinio is wrong is hardly enough. Kortlandt (2020) goes on to say that “[t]here was another infinitive of Balto-Slavic origin in **-ti*,

Prussian *poūt*, Polish *róść* ‘to grow’, *trząść* ‘to shake’, *kląć* ‘to curse’ < *-tǫ, 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 *-tǫ. 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 *-tǫ. 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, **tręstǫ > **tręstǫ and **nestǫ > *něstǫ. At first glance, this may look like a nice way to explain Czech forms like *něst(i)* etc. (as opposed to short *moci*), 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) *prisc* < *prędti, *ńesc* < *nesti and *trisc* < *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. *prądq* ‘I spin’, *ńosq* ‘I carry’, *trąsq* ‘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 *-*tb* in the infinitive is that there are reasons why *-*ti* is generally taken as original and why the short endings like -*t*, -*t'*, -*ć*, -*c* 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 *pec'* ‘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 *-*tb* 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 -*t'*⁸¹). 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 (Daničić 1874: 255) – however, there are still both Štokavian and Čakavian dialects that preserve -*ti*/*-ći*. In any case, though Kortlandt may find the idea of an infinitive *-*tb* 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 *-*tb* in the infinitive.

⁸¹ For the relation of the development of the infinitive and supine in Slavic, cf. e.g. a short description in Mihaļjević 2014: 184–185.

3. The short root in a. p. *b i-* and *a-*verbs 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 *a-*verbs was originally short in a. p. *b* (shortened before an internal old acute⁸²), e.g. in Old Polish *sędzić* ‘to judge’, *przystąpić* ‘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 *sądzić* (instead of Old Polish *sędzić*) by analogy to *sądzisz* ‘you judge’. Cf. in Stankiewicz’s transcription⁸⁵ Slovincian *i*-verbs *blązic* ‘to err’ (cf. Czech⁸⁶ *blouditi* ‘to wander’), *broníc* ‘to defend’ (cf. Czech *brániti*), *krocic* ‘to shorten’ (cf. Czech *krátiti*), *kupjic* ‘to buy’ (cf. Czech *koupiti*), *mlocic* ‘to thresh’ (cf. Czech *mlátiti*), *raǰjic* ‘to cut’ (cf. Czech *roubiti* ‘to line’), *saǰic* ‘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 *kléčati*⁸⁷), *lizac* ‘to lick’ (cf. Czech *lizati*), *skakac* ‘to jump’ (cf. Czech *skákat*), *zevac* ‘to yawn’ (cf. Czech *zívat*), *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’), *mješac* ‘to mix’ (cf. Štokavian *mijěšati*), *pitac* ‘to ask’ (cf. Czech *pýtati*), *žqdac* ‘to demand’ (cf. Czech *žádati*). 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 infinitive 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 *nq*-verbs, cf. *cīgnqec* ‘to pull’, *kīxnqec* ‘to sneeze’, *mō(l)knqec* ‘to fall silent’, *māxnqec* ‘to wave’, *ščīpnqec* ‘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 *bl/qzic* type accent, while monosyllabic-stem infinitives always have the initial *lbrac* 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 < ů*) in these infinitives.

⁸⁷ Czech *klečeti* is an *ě*-verb (with an expected shortening in a. p. *c*).

be rather scarce (Gebauer 1970): *braniti*, *kratyt*, *mlatiti*; *kazati*; *bywati*, *hádati* and *hadati*; *dawaty/dávati*⁸⁸ (cf. Modern Czech *dávati* ‘to give’). The same is with Old Polish (SS) *i*-verbs: *blędzić* ‘to err’ (→ Modern Polish *blądzić*) (pres. 2^{pl} *blądzicie*, imp. 2^{pl} *blędzicie!*⁸⁹), *rębić* ‘to cut’ (pres. 3^{sg} *rąbi*, imp. 2^{sg} *rębi!*, *l*-part. *rąbił*), *sędzić* ‘to judge’ (→ modern *sądzić*) (pres. 2^{sg} *sądzisz*, imp. 2^{pl} *sędzicie!*, *l*-part. *sądził*), *stępić* ‘to tread’ (→ modern *stąpić*) (pres. 2^{sg} *stąpisz*, imp. 2^{sg} *stępi!*, *l*-part. *stąpił*)⁹⁰. 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)⁹¹ – in Modern Polish, the length is generalized (cf. already in the 16th 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. *b* *i*- and *a*-verbs infinitive. But no. The first time, Kortlandt (2011: 264)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 ***sǫdbjiti* (!?) instead of the normal **sǫditi* (a. p. *b*) and assuming the supposed a. p. *c* for **stopiti* (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^{pl} present and imperative in vocalism only. In Modern Polish, the vocalism is the same but the imperative is syncope: 2^{pl} pres. *blądzicie* (as in Old Polish) – 2^{pl} imp. *blądźcie!*.

⁹⁰ In Old Polish *męcić* ‘to stir’ (→ Modern Polish *mącić*) one finds both the pres. 2^{sg} *mącisz* but also *męcisz*, both *l*-part. *mącił* 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^{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) *rolto*, cf. Old Polish *młocić* ‘to thresh’ – pres. 2^{sg} *młocisz* (but Modern Polish *młócić* – *młócisz* with a generalized reflex of the length) and Old Polish *wrocici(i)* ‘to return’ – pres. 2^{sg} *wrocisz* (Modern Polish *wrócić* – *wrócisz*).

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 **číniti* ‘to do’ and **čínite!* ‘do!’ but **čīnīlǫ* ‘did’ (all a. p. *c*) – cf. e.g. Dybo 2000: 90–94; Kapović 2019: 88–89. In 2^{sg} imperative, where the dominant acute is final and not medial, one would expect the length to be preserved, but Old Polish 2^{sg} *sędzi!* is analogical to 2^{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’, *żędać* ‘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 **žędāti*, cf. Modern Polish *żądać*, Modern Czech *žadati*, Slovak *žiadať* (all having the infinitive length introduced from the original a. p. *b* present forms), which is in complete accord with Russian *жада́ть* ‘to thirst for’ – *жада́ешь* ‘you thirst for’ (old **žēdāješъ* > **žēdāšъ* > **žēdāšь* > 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 “*psati, 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: 136²), 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, żędać*, 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

⁹³ Cf. Kapović 2015: 342.

⁹⁴ Cf. Kapović 2019: 91.

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 *kòkòt* ‘rooster’ type accent

The posttonic length in Štokavian/Čakavian a. p. C polysyllabic *o*- and *i*-stems like *kòkòt* ‘rooster’ and *kòkòš* ‘hen’ is a major part of the discussion between Kortlandt and myself⁹⁵. 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 *kòkòt* type cannot be separated from the lengthening in the *bòg* type’, in spite of the fact that we always find a short vowel in forms like *kòkot* beside *kòkòt* in the former type and never such forms as **bòg* beside *bòg* 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 *kòkot* beside *kòkòt*”. No, we do not. All relevant Štokavian (and Čakavian) accentual systems always have length in the *o*-stem *kòkòt* ‘rooster’ and *i*-stem *kòkòš* ‘hen’ type. The only cases when we find *kòkòt* and *kòkòš* 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)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^{sg} – e.g. some *o*-stems in modern Dubrovnik dialect⁹⁷ or *o*-stems generally in Vrgada Čakavian⁹⁸

Thus, the absence of length in the Štokavian/Čakavian *kðkõt* 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 *kðkõt* type.

The second part of Kortlandt's claim, that there are “never such forms as ***bðg* beside *bôg*” is even more strange. What does that even mean? Words like *môc* ‘power’ and *pðmðc* ‘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 *gðvør* ‘speech’ but *kòlāč* ‘cake’, for instance in Osijek) or sometimes fully (e.g. both *gðvør* and *kòlāč*, for instance in Belgrade⁹⁹). But there are no Štokavian dialects where *ˆ* yields *˝* phonetically¹⁰⁰. 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 *gôst* and *gðst* ‘guest’ (gen^{sg} *gðsta* in both cases) but *gðst* is a very young analogy to gen^{sg} *gðsta*, dat^{sg} *gðstu*, etc. In other such examples, the oblique cases usually have a different pattern as well: e.g. we have *bòk* – gen^{sg} *bðka* (a. p. C) and *bòk* –

⁹⁶ Cf. Kapović 2015: 750–762.

⁹⁷ Cf. Ligorio and Kapović 2011 and modern Dubrovnik *kðkõt* compared to older *kðkõt* (Kapović 2019: 106–107).

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

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).

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^{sg} *bòka* (a. p. B) ‘hip’ or *dòm* – gen^{sg} *dòma* (a. p. C) and *dòm* – gen^{sg} *dòma* (a. p. B) ‘home’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 innovation¹⁰² 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 *gòvòr* ‘talk’, *kòkòt* ‘rooster’, *gòspòd* ‘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’, *bòlèst* ‘sickness’, and *mlàdòst* ‘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.

¹⁰¹ Cf. e.g. *bòk*, *dòm* in ARj but *bòk*, *dòm* in ERj. Different paradigms in *bok* are probably due to different reflexes of the old a. p. *d*, while *dòm* (B) is just a younger innovation (*dòm* – *dòma* → *dòm* – *dòma* → *dòm* – *dòma*).

¹⁰² Cf. Kapović 2015: 621–622, 627 for relative chronology.

Kortlandt (2020: 137) does attempt to criticize my process of **kòkotъ > kòkōt* 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 instr^{sg} forms like **bögōm* (only *bògom* is attested) by analogy to instr^{sg} *popòm > pòpom* ‘priest’ (b) and *brätom* ‘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 **kòrākъ* ‘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 **gòspodъ* ‘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. **gòrdъ* ‘city’ yielding a short vowel in Czech *hrad* but a long one in Štokavian/Čakavian/Kajkavian/Slovene *grād*. 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 enclitomena 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. *pòmōc* ‘help’ can easily have arisen on the analogy of forms like *pò mōc* ‘for the power’”. Here, Kortlandt takes my examples – by which I tried to show how bizarre it is to suggest that *mōc* ‘power’, *pò mōc* and *pòmōc* do not have lengths of same origin – to try to offer some kind of solution for his problems. However, while *pòmōc* can theoretically be influenced by *pò mōc* (while this *pò mōc* itself would have to be analogical to *mōc*, according to Kortlandt), what about *kòkōš*? Does *kòkōš* have the posttonic length by analogy to *kòst* ‘bone’? Does *kòkòt* have the length by analogy to *bòg* ‘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 \sim as the reflex of Proto-Slavic * $\acute{}$ in some positions, e.g. nom/acc^{pl} *sēla* ‘villages’ < **sělā* (cf. *sělā* with a regular short \sim in some Štokavian/Čakavian dialects) but *bòb* ‘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. *sēla* ‘villages’ < Proto-Slavic **sělā* (including gen^{pl} *lōnec* ‘pots’ < **lònbĕř*)

b) before a contractional length: e.g. *nōvi* ‘new’ < **nòvȳ* < Proto-Slavic **nòvъjъ*

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

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

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 **è* and **ò* 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, **è* and **ò* merged with long **é* and **ó* that had originated from the retraction of the accent from final jers, e.g. *òsmi* ‘eighth’, *širòki* ‘broad’, *zelēni* ‘green’, pl. *rešēta* ‘sieves’, loc.sg. *stòlu* ‘table’, gen.pl. *nōvih* ‘new’, distinct from the short vowel in *kōnj* ‘horse’, *òsem* ‘eight’, *dōber* ‘good’, *mògel* ‘could’, *selò* ‘village’, gen.sg. *potòka* ‘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* > ***selā* > ***s’èlā* > *sēla*. 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 *pěrcе* and *grōbje* 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 occurs¹⁰⁴. 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 *nõsi-* 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 problematic¹⁰⁵ – Kortlandt, as usual, does not respond to criticism. His point that *nõs-* was introduced on the basis of other forms and not only on the basis of 1^{sg} **nošù* ‘I carry’ is inadequate. As is the case with the *c*-paradigm of *trešeš* etc. (see section 1 above), the point is that there is no real pivot point for such an analogy in the paradigm itself (**nošù* is replaced early by analogical *nõsim* and in any case has an unaccented **nõs-* and not an accented **nõs-*). And, by the way, what “other forms of the verb”? The only that comes to mind with *nõs-* is the *n*-participle *nõšen* ‘carried’ (and perhaps the imperfect). So one would have to assume that the supposed original Kortlandtian Kajkavian **nošù* – ***nõsiš* – ***nõsi* – ***nosimo* – ***nosite* – ***nõse* would yield the actually attested Kajkavian *nõsim* – *nõsiš* – *nõsi* – *nõsimo* – *nõsite* – *nõse* (the same as in Štokavian and Čakavian, where it is completely regular phonetically!) by analogy to the marginal *nõšen*? 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 *nõsiš* and *nõvih*”. However, the simple fact is that my solution is definitely much better in explaining the data than his impossible analogical *nõs-* 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 *nõvih* ‘of the new ones’ but no lengthening in *nõsiš* ‘you carry’).

¹⁰⁵ Kapović 2017a: 395³¹; 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 *ů*, Slovak *ô* is the phonetic reflex of *ò in monosyllables’¹⁰⁶. This is contradicted by Czech *osm*, Slovak *osem* < *òsmь, *oheň* < *ògъь, *mohol* < *mòglъ (...).” As I already said, there is no initial *ò- 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 *kůň*, Slovak *kôň*, Kortlandt (2020: 138) sticks with his interpretation “that the root vowel of nom. sg. Czech *kůň*, 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 *žābā* ‘frogs’ (a. p. A), *ósā* ‘wasps’ (a. p. B) and *vódā* ‘waters’ (a. p. C) is due to the length-inducing retraction in **vodъ (via curious and not really clear analogies), I follow Dybo (2000: 21) in reconstructing an original *-ъ (from *-ōm < 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-ye 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 $-\bar{a}$ and Slovene variant ending $-\acute{a}$ (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 $-\bar{a}$ is attested several centuries after the loss of final $*-z$ ”. Štokavian $-\bar{a}$ is indeed attested from the 14th century (and Slovene $-\bar{a}$ from the 16th century). However, that is not that strange. In my view, the ending $-\bar{a}$ did not appear in all forms from the beginning as is now the case in Neo-Štokavian (by the way, the ending $-\acute{a}$ is still only facultative and appears only in a. p. *C* in Slovene). Originally, I reconstruct the complex system of different gen^{pl} endings, with both $*-\emptyset$ and $*-\tilde{\text{z}}$ ($*\tilde{\text{z}}\hat{\text{a}}\text{b}$ ‘frogs’ – $*\tilde{\text{o}}\text{s}$ ‘wasps’ – $*\text{planin}\tilde{\text{a}}$ ‘mountains’). This means that the ending $*-\tilde{\text{z}}$ (which preceded modern $-\bar{a}$) was originally found only in some of the forms in some of the dialects. The ending $-\bar{a}$ 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 $-\bar{a}$ in modern standard Neo-Štokavian). Kortlandt (2020) then says that “the alleged long $*-\bar{\text{z}}$ 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 $*-\bar{\text{o}}\text{m} > *-\bar{\text{u}}\text{m} > *-\bar{\text{z}}$ 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 $*-\bar{\text{z}}$: besides the ones already mentioned (the lengthening and Štokavian/Slovene $-\bar{a}$), it explains Old Serbian $-\text{bb}$, has a direct cognate in Balto-Slavic (Lithuanian $-\text{u}$), 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 *obǫrna ‘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 *zastáva ‘flag’ – *obǫrna ‘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 *obǫrna > *obǫrna 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 **zāstāvā) 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-acute¹⁰⁸. 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 discussion¹⁰⁹, 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 *dvorīšće* ‘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 law¹¹⁰, Kortlandt’s view on the development of the neo-acute in Kajkavian – see above – and Kortlandt’s hypothesis on the accent in *obórna 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,’ *dvorīšće* ‘courtyard,’ the accentual development of Slavic types like Slovene *volár* ‘ox-keeper,’ Čakavian *popīč* ‘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,’ *dvorīšće* ‘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.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Kapović 2017a: 394–395; Kapović 2019: 112–113.

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 **-īna* words derived from dominant non-acute/immobile (a. p. b) roots such as **čьŋнъ* ‘black’ (i.e. **čьŋnina* > **čьrnīna*¹¹¹). The part of Dybo’s paper that Kortlandt quotes (Dybo 1968: 172–174¹¹²) 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 **čьŋnina* > **čьrnīna* is seen in **dvōrišče* > **dvōrišće* ‘courtyard’, though there was a number of different accentual variants in **-išče* and the development was quite complex¹¹³. What does Kortlandt have to say about that? Not much. He (Kortlandt 2020: 138) simply asserts that “[t]he differences between S/Cr. *dvōrište* (b) ‘yard’ and *blātīšte* (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: 293¹¹⁴ and in Kortlandt 2011: 266¹¹⁵ (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 *starīna* 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’.

¹¹² Dybo 1968: 213 (the same in Dybo 1981: 189 and Dybo 2000: 207) just lists **īstīna* ‘truth’ – **čьrnīna* ‘blackness’ – **polnīnā* ‘mountain’ once again in a table.

¹¹³ See Kapović 2015: 192–193, 521; Kapović 2019: 116.

¹¹⁴ “Original differences have been preserved e.g. in *dvōrište* (b) ‘yard’ versus *blātīšte* (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 *dvōrište* ‘yard’ but not in *blātīšte* ‘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 mentioned¹¹⁶, it is problematic to use the words *blätīšte* and *dvòrište* 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 *blätīšte* and *dvòrište* are not at all problematic from the perspective of my theory even if one wants to have only the acute *-īšče and interpret the length in *blätīšte* as a reflex of the old acute posttonic length (which would then be preserved as in *břďāni* ‘highlanders’ opposed to *sěłani* ‘villagers’¹¹⁷) – this is not impossible, though it is not certain that this is the origin of the length in *-īšte* in all Štokavian dialects. The problem for Kortlandt, which he does not address at all, is the common Štokavian variant *dvòrīšte* that is to be derived from older *dvorište* (as attested directly in a number of Čakavian dialects)¹¹⁸. While one can suppose that Štokavian *dvòrīšte* could be secondary for older *dvorište* by analogy to *blätīšte*, there is no way how one can explain Čakavian *dvorišće* as secondary from the older *dvorišće* (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”): *-īna* and *-īna* (see above), *-īn* and *-īn*, *-īca* and *-īca*, *-īć* and *-īć*¹¹⁹. As for Czech *pekař* and *rybář*, once again, even if **pekař* 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’s¹²⁰. 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: 116¹²⁸.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Kapović 2015: 520–521.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Kapović 2015: 192–193 for dialectological data.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Kapović 2015: 184–195 and Kapović 2019: 114–116.

¹²⁰ Cf. Kapović 2019: 88.

References

- ARJ = *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. Vol. I–XXIII*. 1881–1976. JAZU. Zagreb.
- BAWIK, ZBIGNIEW. 2007. Przyczynki do gramatyki historycznej języka słowieńskiego. *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 55. 93–136.
- БОЈАНИЋ, МИХАИЛО; ТРИВУНАЦ, РАСТИСЛАВА. 2002. *Рјечник дубровачког говора*. Институт за српски језик САНУ. Београд. [BOJANIĆ, MIHAILO; TRIVUNAC, RASTISLAVA. 2002. *Rječnik dubrovačkog govora*. Institut za srpski jezik SANU. Beograd.]
- BUDMANI, PIETRO. 1867. *Grammatica della lingua serbo-croata (illirica)*. [A spese dell' autore.] Vienna.
- ДАНИЧИЋ, ЂУРО. 1874. *Историја облика српскога или хрватскога језика до свршетка XVII вијека*. Државна штампарија. Биоград. [DANIČIĆ, ĐURO. 1874. *Istoriја oblika srpskoga ili hrvatskoga jezika do svršetka XVII vijeka*. Državna štampariја. Biograd.]
- ДАНИЧИЋ, ЂУРО. 1925. *Српски акценати*. Графички завод „Макарије“ А. Д. Београд – Земун. [DANIČIĆ, ĐURO. 1925. *Srpski akcenti*. Grafički завод „Makarije“ A. D. Beograd – Zemun.]
- DERKSEN, RICK. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Brill. Leiden – Boston.
- ДЫБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 1968. Акцентология и словообразование в славянском. *Славянское языкознание: VI международный съезд славистов (Прага, август, 1968 г.) Доклады советской делегации*. Наука. Москва. 148–224. [DYBO, VLADIMIR A. 1968. *Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom. Slavjanskoje jazykoznanie: VI meždunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov (Praga, avgust, 1968. g.) Doklady sovetsoj delegacii*. Nauka. Moskva. 148–224.]
- ДЫБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 1981. *Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском*. Наука. Москва. [DYBO, VLADIMIR A. 1981. *Slavjanskaja akcentologija. Opyt rekonstrukcii sistemy akcentnyh paradigm v praslavjanskom*. Nauka. Moskva.]
- ДЫБО, ВЛАДИМИР А. 2000. *Морфологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис. Том I. Языки русской культуры*. Москва. [DYBO, VLADIMIR A. 2000. *Morfologizirovannye paradigmatičeskie akcentnye sistemy. Tipologija i genezis. Tom I. Jazyki russoj kul'tury*. Moskva.]
- ERJ = *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*. Eds. Matasović, Ranko; Jojić, Ljiljana. Novi liber. Zagreb.
- ESSČ = *Elektronický slovník staré češtiny*. <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx>.
- ЭССЯ = *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Т. 1–41*. 1974–2018. Наука.

Москва. [ÈSSJa = Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskih jazykov. T. 1–41. 1974–2018. Nauka. Moskva.]

GEBAUER, JAN. ²1970. *Slovník staročeský. I–II*. Academia. Praha. <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx>.

HOLZER, GEORG. 2007. *Historische Grammatik des Kroatischen. Einleitung und Lautgeschichte der Standardsprache*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main – Berlin – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Wien.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2011. Naglasak ā-osnova u hrvatskom – povijesni razvoj. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 17. 147–172.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2015. *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije. Fonetika*. Matica hrvatska. Zagreb.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2017a. On shortening, lengthening, and accent shifts in Slavic. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 43/2. 381–402.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2017b. The Position of Kajkavian in the South Slavic Dialect Continuum in Light of Old Accentual Isoglosses. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 62/4. 606–620.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2019. Shortening, lengthening, and reconstruction: notes on historical Slavic accentology. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 45/1. 75–133.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2020a. On the Retraction of the Neo-Circumflex in Čakavian. *Dijalekti, jezična povijest i tradicija. Zbornik u čast Josipu Liscu*. Eds. Bratulić, Josip; Čupković, Gordana; Galić, Josip. Sveučilište u Zadru – Matica hrvatska – Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Zadru. Zadar. 373–408.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2020b. Stang's Law. *Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics*. Ed. Greenberg, Marc L. Brill. Leiden – Boston. https://www.academia.edu/42775901/Accentology_ESSL_.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2021. The Genitive Plural Ending in Proto-Indo-European and Slavic. *Vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai. Proceedings of the international conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII, Ljubljana 4-7 June 2019, celebrating one hundred years of Indo-European comparative linguistics at the University of Ljubljana*. Eds. Repanšek, Luka; Bichlmeier, Harald; Sadovski, Velizar. Baar-Verlag. Hamburg. 321–345.

KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2022 [to appear]. The Dialectal Dissolution of Proto-Slavonic: Accentological Approach. *The Oxford Guide to the Slavonic Languages*. Eds. Fellerer, Jan; Bermel, Neil. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

KLAIĆ, BRATOLJUB. 2013. *Naglasni sustav standardnoga hrvatskog jezika*. Izvirni rukopis uredio: Božidar Smiljanić. Nova knjiga Rast. Zagreb.

KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2011. *Selected writings on Slavic and general linguistics*. Rodopi. Amsterdam.

- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2016. On the rise of neo-acute *e and *o. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 42/2. 471–482.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2018. Rise and fall of vowel length in Slavic. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 44/1. 287–297.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2020. The Prehistory of the Slavic Vowel System (A Reply to Mate Kapović). *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 46/1. 133–140.
- LIGORIO, ORSAT; KAPOVIĆ, MATE. 2011. O naglasku dvosložnih o-osnova s kratkosilaznim naglaskom u Dubrovniku. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* VII/2. 327–366.
- LORENTZ, FRIEDRICH. 1903. *Slovinzische Grammatik*. Издание Второго Отдѣленія Императорской Академіи Наукъ [Izdanie Vtorogo Otdělenija Imperatorskoj Akademii Naukʹ] / Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Санкт-Петербург [Sankt-Peterburg] / St. Petersburg.
- LORENTZ, FRIEDRICH. 1908–1912. *Slovinzisches Wörterbuch. Teil 1–2*. Издание Отдѣленія Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академіи Наукъ [Izdanie Otdělenija Russkago Jazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Naukʹ] / Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Санкт-Петербург [Sankt-Peterburg] / St. Petersburg.
- MATEŠIĆ, JOSIP. 1970. *Der Wortakzent in der serbokroatischen Schriftsprache*. Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. Heidelberg.
- MIHALJEVIĆ, MILAN. 2014. *Slavenska poredbena gramatika. 2. dio: Morfologija, Prozodija, Slavenska pradomovina*. Školska knjiga. Zagreb.
- MSČS = BĚLIČ, JAROMÍR; KAMIŠ, ADOLF; KUČERA, KAREL. 1979. *Malý staročeský slovník*. Státní pedagogické nakladatelství. Praha. <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx>.
- NHKJ = VUKUŠIĆ, STJEPAN; ZORIČIĆ, IVAN; GRASELLI-VUKUŠIĆ, MARIJA. 2007. *Naglasak u hrvatskome književnom jeziku*. Globus. Zagreb.
- OSA = ДЫБО, В. А.; ЗАМЯТИНА, Г. И.; НИКОЛАЕВ, С. Л. 1993. *Основы славянской акцентологии. Словарь*. Наука. Москва. [OSA = DYBO, V. A.; ZAMJATINA, G. I.; NIKOLAEV, S. L. 1993. *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii. Slovarʹ*. Nauka. Moskva.]
- SP = SŁAWSKI, FRANCISZEK (ed.). *Słownik prastowiański. Vol. 1–8*. 1974–2001. Ossolineum. Wrocław.
- SPXVI = *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. <http://spxvi.edu.pl/o-slovníku/pracownia/>
- SČS = *Staročeský slovník. 1–26*. 1968–2008. Academia. Praha. <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx>.
- SS = *Słownik staropolski. Tom I–XI*. 1953–2002. Polska akademia nauk – Instytut języka polskiego. Warszawa – Kraków.
- STANG, CHRISTIAN S. 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*. I kommisjon hos H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard). Oslo.

STANKIEWICZ, EDWARD. 1993. *The Accentual Patterns of the Slavic Languages*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, CA.

ŠIMEK, FRANTIŠEK. 1947. *Slovníček staré češtiny*. Orbis. Praha. <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx>.

TRÁVNÍČEK, FRANTIŠEK. 1935. *Historická mluvnice československá*. Melantrich. Praha.

VAILLANT, ANDRÉ. 1966. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome III: Le Verbe*. Klincksieck. Paris.

VUK = КАРАЏИЋ, ВУК СТЕФ. ⁴1935. *Srpski rječnik istumačen њемачкијем и латинскијем ријечима*. Штампарија Краљевине Југославије. Београд. [VUK = KARADŽIĆ, VUK STEF. ⁴1935. *Srpski rječnik istumačen njemačkijem i latinskijem riječima*. Štamparija Kraljevine Jugoslavije. Beograd.]

O odrazu nenaglašene dužine i kratkog neoakuta u slavenskom, duženju tipa *kðkōt* 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 *kðkōt* u naglasnoj paradigmi *c* u štokavskom i čakavskom. Govori se ukratko i o još nekoliko tema – kao što su naglasak genitiva množine, naglasak prefikslnih tvorbi poput *obōrna ‘obrana’ te o čakavskim naglasnim tipovima *črnīna* i *dvorīšće*. Dodatno se u članku raspravlja i o nekim problematičnim pojavama u vezi s Kortlandtovom metodologijom, retorikom, diskutiranjem i načinom prezentacije.

Keywords: accentuation, accentology, accent, Slavic, Štokavian, Čakavian, Kajkavian, West Slavic, Czech

Ključne riječi: akcentuacija, akcentologija, naglasak, slavenski, štokavski, čakavski, kajkavski, zapadnoslavenski, češki