

THE ACCENTUATION OF NEUTER NOUNS IN SLOVENE AND WEST BULGARIAN

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

The Slovene neo-circumflex is our major source of information for the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic long vowels in posttonic syllables (cf. Kortlandt 1976). As I have pointed out earlier (1975: 27 and 1976: 3f.), trisyllabic word forms which have medial stress as a result of the Proto-Slavic progressive accent shift known as Dybo's law manifest a long reflex of originally acute vowels in final syllables, e.g. *osnôva* 'base', *zabâva* 'amusement', *nosîla* '(she) carried', *pisâla* '(she) wrote', *telêta* 'calves', *ženâmi* 'women (inst.)', but *gostîla* '(she) treated', *kovâla* '(she) forged', also *sedêla* '(she) sat', *želêla* '(she) wished', where the stress had never been on the initial syllable. The resulting metatony in the Slovene *l*-participle was extended by analogy in the dialects, e.g. *želêla*, also *mîslila*, *videla* beside *mîslila* '(she) thought', *videla* '(she) saw' (cf. Rigler 1970 on the geographical distribution of these variants). Thus, we reconstruct a long final vowel in Proto-Slavic **osnòvâ*, **zâbâvâ*, **nosîlâ*, **p̃vsâlâ*, **telêtâ*, **ženâmî*, but a short final vowel in **sêdêla*, **želêla*, also **imènâ* 'names', **ženâ* 'woman'. The rise of the long vowel must be attributed to an early loss of the acute in post-posttonic syllables, as I have argued earlier (1975: 11 and passim).

As a result of the development in post-posttonic syllables, the unstressed nom.acc.pl. ending of the neuter consonant stems was always long, e.g. **sêmenâ* 'seeds', **plemènâ* 'tribes', **àgnêtâ* 'lambs', **telêtâ*. This length spread to the unstressed nom.acc.pl. ending of the neuter *o*-stems, e.g. **lêtâ*, Sln. *lêta* 'years'. I have dated this analogical development to the period before Dybo's law (1975: 32 and 1976: 5). It must have been anterior to the loss of the acute in stressed syllables because it did not affect such forms as *drvâ* 'firewood', which has original final stress. We may now ask the question: did the length spread to all neuter *o*-stems with an unstressed nom.acc.pl. ending before Dybo's law? I think that it did, and this is substantially in agreement with Stang's view (1957: 83), but I will return to the question at the end of this article. Thus, I assume analogical lengthening in **sêlâ*, after the Proto-Slavic progressive accent shift **selâ*, then retraction of the stress according to Stang's law yielding **sèla* with a neo-acute root vowel and a short ending, Sln. *sêla* 'settlements'. The accentuation of *pôlja* 'fields', which represents Proto-Slavic end-stressed **pol'â*, must have been taken from the singular, where it is regular after a preposition, e.g. loc.sg. *pôlju* (cf.

Kortlandt 1976: 7). The neo-circumflex eventually spread to such forms as *vīna* ‘wines’ (ibidem).

If this is correct, we have to reconstruct the following nom.acc.sg. and pl. forms of disyllabic neuters for the end of the Proto-Slavic period:

- (a) *lěto, *lětā;
- (b) *selò, *sèla < *selā;
- (c) *pòl’e, *pol’à.

Neuter consonant stems had unstressed *-ā and stressed *-à in the plural form. The long ending was generalized in Slovak and Babina Greda Posavian, and the short ending in neoštokavian and Omišalj čakavian (Vermeer 1984: 374). Most Posavian dialects tend to have a long ending in all cases except *drvā*, while Novi čakavian has a short ending in disyllabic neuters and a long ending in consonant stems and in the isolated expression *na mestá* ‘to the fields’ (ibidem). The long ending of Slk. *mestá* ‘towns’ and Varoš Posavian *žitā* ‘cereals’ must go back to the Proto-Slavic period because it provides the model for the analogical extension of the long vowel. Vermeer has pointed out that at least in a part of the Proto-čakavian dialects this analogical extension must have taken place before Stang’s law already in order to account for such instances as Novi *jája* ‘eggs’, *jelíta* ‘entrails’, *pòļa* ‘fields’, Omišalj *jája* (1984: 375). These nouns belong to the mobile accent pattern (c), while the distinction between (b) and (c) nouns has been preserved in Omišalj loc.pl. *sělīh* ‘villages’ versus *jājīh* ‘eggs’ (with loss of the tonal contrast).

We now turn to the Bulgarian evidence. While case forms were lost in this language, the paradigm was enriched by the rise of the definite article. Like other enclitics, the article attracted the stress from barytone forms of nouns belonging to the mobile accent pattern (c), e.g. *kosttā* ‘the bone’. The origin of this accent shift, which is known as Dolobko’s law, can be dated to the period before Dybo’s law (cf. Kortlandt 1975: 39). Slovene *lahkegà*, *lahkemù* ‘light (gen., dat.)’ show that the stress shifted to the final syllable of the enclitic pronoun. Elsewhere I have argued that the stress was retracted from a short vowel in a final open syllable to a preceding open syllable in early Bulgarian (1982: 93), e.g. *vīno* ‘wine’, *sèlo* ‘village’, *rešèto* ‘sieve’, *kostite* ‘the bones’, MBulg. *vlbkatògo* ‘of the wolf’, as opposed to *rebrò* ‘rib’, *vlaknò* ‘fiber’, *mladosttā* ‘the youth’, *sin mù* ‘his son’. As a result of this retraction, the stress falls on the vowel before the article in neuter (c) nouns, e.g. *senòto* ‘the hay’, *brašnòto* ‘the flour’, *polèto* ‘the field’. This accentuation spread by analogy to the indefinite form in many dialects and in the literary language, e.g. *senò*, *brašnò*, *polè*.

On the basis of these developments, we can predict the following phonetic reflexes of the Proto-Slavic accent patterns established above:

- (a) *lèto, *lètoto, *lèta, *lètata;
- (b) *sèlo, *selòto, *sèla, *selàta;
- (b') *rebrò, *rebròto, *rèbra, *rebràta;
- (c) *pòle, *polèto, *pòl'a, *pol'àta;
- (c') *brašno, *brašnòto, *brašnà, *brašnàta.

Here we may add end-stressed *selò*, *selà*, *rebrà*, *polè*, *pol'à*, *brašno* under the influence of the definite forms.

We now arrive at the central question of this article: are there traces of the long plural ending *-ā in Bulgarian? It goes without saying that there is no direct evidence in (a) nouns because vowel quantity was lost in this linguistic area, but it is possible that the long vowel spread to (c) nouns, as it did in Slovak and Posavian, and if this is actually the case, we expect pattern (c') instead of (c) because the stress was not retracted from long vowels (cf. Kortlandt 1982: 96). We must therefore examine the distribution of the accent patterns in the separate dialects, in the spirit of Rigler's work. If the accent patterns of *sèlo* and *polè* are kept distinct, as they are in the literary language, we have to reconstruct a long ending in **pol'á* for the stage at which the Bulgarian accent retraction took place.

There are several complications which have to be taken into account. First of all, there is a tendency toward generalization of an accentual opposition between singular and plural forms, as in Russian. The opposition in indefinite (b') and (c') nouns can easily be extended to the corresponding definite forms. Secondly, the early Bulgarian accent retraction did not reach all dialects, as is clear from the Banat paradigms *rəkà*, *rəkàta*, *ràce*, *ràcetè* '(the) hand(s)', *sàrci*, *sàrcitò*, *sàrcà*, *sàrcàta* '(the) heart(s)' (Stojkov 1967: 157f.). This is probably a southeastern feature. Thirdly, the original state of affairs has often been obscured by later retractions, especially in the western dialects. For example, plural forms have generalized retracted stress in the area of Blagoevgrad, giving rise to a paradigm *vìno*, *vinòto*, *vìna*, *vìnata* '(the) wine(s)'. West Bulgarian and Macedonian texts from the middle ages exhibit essentially the same accentual system as texts of eastern provenance, though the number of variants is larger (cf. Kortlandt 1982: 94). It may therefore be expedient to examine the distribution of accent patterns (c) and (c') in the West Bulgarian dialects.

Ronelle Alexander has recently studied the relevant material in some detail (1988). She lists nine major accent patterns:

- (1) *sìto*, *sìtoto*, *sìta*, *sìtata*;
- (2) *vìno*, *vinòto*, *vìna*, *vìnata*;
- (3) *zàrno*, *zàrnoto*, *zàrna*, *zàrnàta*;
- (4) *krìlo*, *krilòto*, *krìla*, *krilàta*;
- (5) *pèro*, *pèroto*, *perà*, *peràta*;

- (6) *vlaknò, vlaknòto, vlàkna, vlàknata*;
 (7) *rebrò, rebròto, rèbra, rebràta*;
 (8) *sèno, senòto, senà, senàta*;
 (9) *licè, licèto, licà, licàta*.

On the basis of the considerations set forth above I predict the following reflexes of the Proto-Slavic accent patterns:

- (a) yields (1). If the long plural ending $*-\bar{a}$ spread to (c) nouns, we expect that analogical introduction of accentual mobility in (a) nouns may lead to a merger with accent pattern (c) rather than (b);
- (b) and (b') yield (4) and (7). Furthermore, regularization of (7) may yield either (6) or (9);
- (c) and (c') yield (4) and (8). Furthermore, regularization of (8) may yield either (5) or (9). If the long plural ending $*-\bar{a}$ spread to (c) nouns before the Bulgarian accent retraction, all nouns of this class should belong to pattern (8), and subsequently perhaps to (5) or (9).

I shall now briefly discuss the material of the eight dialects from which Alexander adduces the largest number of examples. It must be noted that *sərce* will be classified as (c), not (b), cf. Sln. *srcĕ*. Like Alexander, I shall treat the dialects anti-clockwise, starting from the southeast.

I. Smoljan: (b) and (c) yield 20× (8), 8× (5), 3× (1), and (4) in *uho* 'ear', while (a) yields 10× (5), 4× (8), 2× (1). It appears that (b) nouns adopted pattern (c), which had a long plural ending $*-\bar{a}$, except in the word *uho*, which had the dual ending $*-i$; (a) nouns adopted accentual mobility at a stage when (b) and (c) nouns were already replacing (8) by (5). The nouns with fixed stress (1) are consonant stems.

II. Sadovo: (c) yields (4) in *uho, oko, dərvo*, variation between (4) and (8) in *zlato, more, nebo, pole, vreme*, (1) in *ime* 'name', further 8× (8), and (9) in *prase* 'pig'; (b) yield 13× (8), including *mleko*, which must be added to Alexander's list, 2× (4), variation between (4) and (8) in *srebro*, (5) in *dəno* and in *runo*, which must be added to Alexander's list, (9) in *tele*, (1) in *lice* (cf. Georgiev 1907: 433); (a) yields 5× (5), 4× (8), 1× (4), 1× variation between (4) and (8), 2× (1). It follows that the short plural ending $*-a$ was preserved in $*drvà$ and probably in $*mor'à, *pol'à, *nebesà, *vrĕmenà, *imenà$, while most other nouns may have had the long ending $*-\bar{a}$; the variation between (4) and (8) in *zlato* 'gold' and *srebro* 'silver' can easily be due to mutual influence. As in Smoljan, the reflex of pattern (c) was adopted by (b) nouns and later by (a) nouns.

III. Ihtiman: (c) yields (4) in *uho, oko, dərvo*, 6× (8), 2× (9), further (7) in *červo* 'intestine' and (5) in *ime* and *vreme*; (b) yields (4) in *selo* and *platno*, (8) in

mleko, lice, čelo, pismo, (7) in *rebro, vedro, jajce*, variation between (7) and (9) in *vlakno*, further 4× (9), 1× (1); (a) yields 3× (1), 3× (8), 2× (5). Here we must add *prase* (9), *tele* (9), *agne* (5) and (9), which are missing in Alexander's list (cf. Mladenov 1966: 113). It appears that the short ending *-a was preserved in **drvā* and the long ending generalized elsewhere, while the Bulgarian retraction of the stress is reflected in *selo, mleko, lice, čelo*, and its absence in *rebro, vedro, jajce, vlakno*, by analogy *červo*; (a) nouns adopted the mobile pattern to a lesser extent than in Smoljan and Sadovo. In the dialect of Dobroslavci, which is structurally close to Ihtiman, pattern (b) is reflected as (4) in *pero* and 10× as (8) or (9).

IV. Gorno Pole (near Stanke Dimitrov): (c) yields 8× (4), 3× (2) or (4), further (1) in *zlato*, variation between (1) and (3) in *ime*, and (9) in *žrebe* 'foal'; (b) yields (6) and/or (9) in *gneздо, platno, rebro, sedlo, vlakno, vedro, jajce, srebro, sukno, dleto, lice, vino, rešeto*, (4) in *krilo, pero, gumno, pismo*, (2) or (4) in *mleko* and *runo*, variation between (4) and (6) or (9) in *selo* and *čelo*, and (1) in *dāno*; (a) yields 4× (1), 3× (4), 1× (2) or (4), 1× (3), and 2× variation between (6) and (1) or (4). I conclude that there is no trace of the long plural ending *-ā, while the Bulgarian accent retraction is reflected in *krilo, pero, mleko, runo, selo, čelo, dāno*, as opposed to *gneздо, platno, rebro, sedlo, vlakno, vedro, jajce, srebro, sukno*.

V. Kjustendil: (c) yields (4) in *meso*, variation between (4) and (8) or (9) in *dārvo* and *oko*, between (7) and (9) in *uho*, further (3) in *ime*, (6) in *krosno* 'beam', (8) in *more* and *vreme*, (9) in *prase* and *žrebe*; (b) yields (7) in *platno, sedlo*, (6) in *jajce, tele*, (4) in *dāno, čelo, pismo*, further 6× (2), 1× (1), 1× (9); (a) yields 8× (1), 1× (2), 1× (8). This points to a short plural ending *-a in **drvā* and **imenā* and a long ending *-ā in **prasētā* and **žrēbētā*, while the Bulgarian accent retraction is reflected in *dāno, čelo, krilo, pero, selo*, as opposed to *platno, sedlo, jajce*.

VI. Šiškovci (Kjustendilsko Pole): (c) yields (4) in *dārvo, oko, telo*, (2) in *meso, sərce*, perhaps (1) in *vreme*, (8) in *more, nebo, pole*, (9) in *uho, žrebe*; (b) yields 7× (2) and/or (4), 1× (1), further (6) in *jajce* 'egg', (9) in *vāže* 'rope'; (a) yields 7× (1), 1× (2), 1× (5), 2× variation between (1) and (5), including *stado*, to be corrected in Alexander's list (cf. Bojadžieva 1931: 255f.). This points to a long plural ending *-ā in **nebesā* and **žrēbētā* and a short ending in most other nouns. The Bulgarian accent retraction was generalized in (b) nouns, except for *jajce*.

VII. Leško (near Blagoevgrad): (c) yields (4) in *oko*, (2) in *dārvo, seno, meso, brašno*, (1) in *ime, more, nebo, vreme, proso, sərce*, (6) in *krosno, testo, zlato, prase, uho, žrebe*; (b) yields (6) in *gneздо, platno, rebro, sedlo, vlakno, vedro, srebro, sukno, lice, dāno*, (2) in *selo, vino*, (1) in *krilo, mleko, čelo, runo, pismo, gumno*, (9) in *vāže*; (a) yields 15× (1) only. This dialect generalized retracted stress in all plural forms except *očite* 'the eyes'. It suggests a short ending in **drvā*, **imenā*, **vremenā*, **nebesā*, and a long ending in **prasētā*, **žrēbētā*; the

accentuation of *krosno* and *zlato* may have been taken from *platno* and *srebro*, respectively. It testifies to the Bulgarian accent retraction in *selo*, *vino*, *krilo*, *mleko*, *čelo*, *runo*, and to its absence in *gnezdo*, *platno*, *rebro*, *sedlo*, *vlakno*, *vedro*, *srebro*, *sukno*. It displays no analogical mobility of the stress in (a) nouns.

VIII. Goce Delčev: (c) yields (8) in *meso*, *dārvo*, *pole*, *sərce*, (5) in *zlato*, *vreme*, *telo*, variation between (1) and (5) in *ime*; (b) yields 8× (5), including *vino*, which is missing in Alexander's list, further (8) in *rebro*, (1) in *tele*; (a) yields 7× (5), but (1) in *agne* 'lamb'; Alexander mistakenly writes (4) instead of (5) for this dialect (cf. Mirčev 1936: 58f.). This suggests that neuter *o*-stems had a long plural ending **-ā*; the Bulgarian accent retraction was apparently generalized in (b) nouns, as in Šiškovci, and eventually (a) and (b) nouns adopted accentual mobility at a stage when (c) nouns were already replacing (8) by (5), as in Smoljan. The remaining nouns with fixed stress (1) are consonant stems. There are traces of pattern (4) in *òko*, *okòto*, *òči*, *òčite*, *ùši*, *ùšite*, which Alexander does not mention.

We may now try to put the evidence together in order to arrive at a tentative reconstruction of the original distribution of the long and short plural endings in West Bulgarian. It appears that all dialects may have had a short ending in **drvà*, **imenà*, **vrēmenà*, and a long ending in **prasētá*, **žrēbētá*, and at least some of the *o*-stems. The long ending may to a large extent have been generalized in the northern and eastern dialects (I, II, III, VIII), but not in the western dialects (IV, V, VI, VII). There is direct evidence for the Bulgarian accent retraction in the north (III) and the west (IV, V, VI, VII), while mobility was generalized in the Rhodope dialects (I, II, VIII), as was retracted stress in plural forms in the southwest (VII).

Turning back to the other Slavic languages, we see that the Bulgarian evidence for a long plural ending **-ā* is in agreement with the material from Slovene and its neighbors. The analogical extension of the long vowel to **prasētá* and **žrēbētá* parallels the transfer of these words from class (c) to class (b) in Slovene (cf. Stang 1957: 93). The preservation of the short ending in **drvà* is also found in Slovene and Posavian. The preservation of the short vowel in **imenà*, **vrēmenà* and the generalization of the long vowel in **prasētá*, **žrēbētá* are reminiscent of the preservation and generalization of accent pattern (c) in modern Russian *imená*, *vremená*, *plemená*, *semená*, and the generalization of pattern (b) in *porosjáta*, *žerebjáta*, *jagnjáta*, cf. *teljáta*. In the *o*-stems, the long ending **-ā* must have spread to (b) nouns before Stang's law already because these would otherwise have joined pattern (c) as a result of the early Bulgarian accent retraction, yielding patterns (4), (8), (5), (9), but never giving rise to (7) and (6). After Stang's law, the long plural ending in the *o*-stems was limited to accent pattern (a), from where it spread to (c) before the Bulgarian accent retraction

because these nouns would otherwise have joined pattern (b), which yielded (4), (7), (6), (9) but did not give rise to (8) and (5). There can be no doubt that the accent retraction affected the West Bulgarian dialects, not only because it is directly reflected in the accentual distribution of the material (see especially dialects IV and VII above), but also because it gave rise to accent pattern (4), which would not otherwise have come into existence. An exception must be made for the dialect of Smoljan (I), where the material is inconclusive.

Thus, the West Bulgarian dialects corroborate the reliability of the Slovene evidence for Proto-Slavic vowel quantity in final syllables. Conversely, the Slovene material offers a basis for explaining the rise and development of accent classes in West Bulgarian dialects.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, R.
1988 The accentuation of neuter nouns in Balkan Slavic. *American contributions to the tenth international congress of slavists*. Columbus: Slavica, 7-34.
- Bojadžieva, J.
1931 Kjustendilskitě polčani i tēhnijat govor. *Izvēstija na Seminara po slavjanska filologija pri Universiteta v Sofija* 7, 181-329.
- Georgiev, S. pop
1907 Po govora v s. Češnegir Nova-Mahala (Stanimaško). *Izvēstija na Seminara po slavjanska filologija pri Universiteta v Sofija* 2, 411-444.
- Kortlandt, F.
1975 *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder; also www.kortlandt.nl.
1976 The Slovene neo-circumflex. *The Slavonic and East European Review* 54/134, 1-10.
1982 Sravnitel'n'o-istoričeskie kommentarii k bolgarskomu udareniju. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 25/1, 91-96.
- Mirčev, K.
1936 *Nevropskijat govor*. Sofija: Pridvorna pečatnica.
- Mladenov, M.
1966 *Ihtimanskijat govor*. Sofija: Izd. na BAN.
- Rigler, J.
1970 Akcentske variante, *Slavistična Revija* 18, 5-15.
- Stang, C.S.
1957 *Slavonic Accentuation*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Stojkov, S.
1967 *Banatskijat govor*. Sofija: Izd. na BAN.
- Vermeer, W.R.
1984 On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: The quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5/2, 331-395.