

UDK 811.16'342.8

811.16'366.5

Izvorni znanstveni članak

Rukopis primljen 2. XI. 2012.

Prihvaćen za tisak 24. X. 2013.

Tijmen Pronk  
 Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje  
 Republike Austrije 16, HR-10000 Zagreb  
 tpronk@ihjj.hr

## ON THE ACCENTUATION OF *L*-PARTICIPLES OF THE TYPE *NESLǃ* IN WESTERN SOUTH SLAVIC\*

The article analyzes the accentuation of western South Slavic *l*-participles of verbal stems ending in an occlusive that are formed by adding the formant *\*-l-* directly to the stem, e.g. *\*nes-lǃ*, Croatian *něsao*, Slovene *něsel*. Data from Slovene, Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian dialects are compared and discussed against the background of late Proto-Slavic and early dialectal accentual and phonological changes. The operation of accentological changes such as Dybo's law, Stang's law and the rise of the neocircumflex, as well as the reduction of weak jers caused alternations in tone, vowel-length and position of the ictus. These alterations could be analogically eliminated or extended at different times and in different areas during the linguistic history of western South Slavic, thus causing the rise of some of the earliest isoglosses in the area in which western South Slavic is spoken.

### 1. Introduction

The present article is concerned with the accentuation of a subgroup of the *l*-participles of verbal stems ending in an occlusive that are formed by adding

---

\* I am grateful to Willem Vermeer and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. In the text of this article, dialectal forms are accompanied by a reference to the work they have been taken from. For a number of frequently cited Croatian dialects these references have been omitted. The dialects in question are the following, with the relevant source in brackets: Bednja (Jedvaj 1956), Hvar (Hraste 1926–1927, Hraste et al. 1979), Kali (Benić 2011), Lika Čakavian (Ivić 1964), Lika Štokavian (Milković 2009), Novi (Belić 2000), Omišalj (Vermeer 1980), Orbanici (Kalsbeek 1988), Orlec (Houtzagers 1985), Pag (Kustić 2002), Prigorje (Rožić 1893a, 1893b, 1894), Senj (Moguš 1966), Varaždin (Lipljin 2002) and Vrgada (Jurišić 1973).

the formant *\*-l-* directly to the stem. Examples of such *l*-participles are given below, arranged according to the quantity of the root vowel, treating acute roots as a separate group. Cases of which the accentuation is not entirely certain are marked with a query. The overview is not intended to be exhaustive. I have not included verbs that have a nasal present and an infinitive in *\*-nqti* (Slovene, Croatian dialectal *-nit(i)*). The reason for this is that these verbs often have a secondary acute root, also in the *l*-participle, e.g. in Russian *gásla*, *gáslo* to *gásnut* ‘to extinguish’ with fixed root stress pointing to an acute (cf. Croatian *gàsnuti*), while the outer-Slavic evidence points to a non-acute root, cf. Lithuanian *gèsti* ‘to decay, deteriorate’. In the remainder of the article, the three groups will be referred to as groups I, II and III.

I. With the reflex of a short root vowel: *bodlъ*, *eblъ*, *gnetlъ*, *greblъ*, *kvьtlъ*, *leglъ* (in most languages replaced by *leglъ*, cf. Vaillant 1966: 182), *metlъ*, *moglъ*, *neslъ*, *peklъ*, *pletlъ*, *reklъ*, *soplъ*, *šьdlъ*, *teklъ*, *teplъ*, *vedlъ*, *vezlъ* and *žьglъ*.

II. With the reflex of a long root vowel or diphthong: *ььrglъ*, *čььrplъ*, *dblъlъ*, *gòdlъ*, *lèklъ* (?), *mètlъ*, *prèglъ*, *rastlъ*, *seglъ*, *stььrglъ*, *trèslъ*, *tlъklъ*, *vlъklъ*, and *zèblъ*.

III. With an acute root we find: *ědlъ*, *dviglъ*, *gryzlъ*, *gyblъ*, *kladlъ*, *kradlъ*, *lězlъ*, *leglъ* (see under I), *mьlzlъ*, *padlъ*, *paslъ*, *prèdlъ*, *pьlzlъ* (?), *-rétlъ*, *sědlъ*, *séklъ* (?), *striglъ*, *tvrglъ* and *vьrglъ*.

In the following sections a number of prosodic changes and accentual properties of (late) Proto-Slavic that are relevant for our discussion will be introduced. The changes are given in the chronological order in which they took place according to Kortlandt (e.g. 2011: 321f.).

## 2. Dybo’s law

Dybo’s law is a Proto-Slavic accent shift according to which a non-acute, non-falling accent shifted to the following syllable. If that syllable contained a long vowel, the new accent was long falling: *\*nòsĩšь > \*nosĩšь*. Following Kortlandt, I believe final jers did not receive the accent as a result of Dybo’s law (but see below). The majority of scholars maintain that in originally barytone words such as *\*korlъ*, *\*końbъ*, *\*bobъ*, the accent was first shifted to the final jer and subsequently retracted onto the root again, cf., e.g., Olander 2010: 140ff. (with an overview of previous literature), Holzer 2009: 169, Kapović 2005: 33, Garde 1976: 222 (who believes the law did not affect West Slavic).

The main reason to assume that final jers did not receive the accent is the fact that in those cases where a final stressed jer lost its accent, the preceding vowel was lengthened. This is shown by the gen.pl. of mobile nouns, which has a long root vowel in various Slavic languages, e.g. such as Čakavian (Vrgada) *kōs* ‘hair’, Slovene *nōg* ‘leg’, Czech *synŭ* ‘son’, Slovak *strán*, Polish *raqk* ‘hand, arm’ < \**nogъ*, \**kosъ*, \**synovъ*, \**stornъ*, \**rqkъ*. The vowel-length is clearly of Proto-Slavic origin and it spread to non-mobile nouns in South Slavic (*krâv* ‘cow’) and Slovak (*ôs* ‘wasp’, *síl* ‘power’, *kopyt* ‘hoof’), but not in Czech, where it is found with some mobile nouns in the older language and now only in relic forms (Verweij 1994: 507f.) and in Polish in the *ā*-stems (*ós* ‘wasp’, *maqk* ‘suffering’), but not in the neuter *o*-stems (*pęt* ‘fetter’, *blot* ‘marsh’, Kortlandt 2011: 54). Czech and Polish show that the long vowel was originally limited to the mobile paradigm. It follows that it must be due to a phonetic development unique to the mobile paradigm, which is the accent retraction described above. Alternative scenarios assume that the lengthening in the genitive plural can be traced back to an ending consisting of a long jer, i.e. \**-ъ* (Ebeling 1967: 588, Dybo 2000: 21, 38). In addition to the fact that the long jer itself is of obscure origin (the length of \**-ъ* cannot be inherited because of the timbre of the vowel), scenario does not provide an explanation for the distribution of the length, while Ebeling’s scenario does not explain the final stress of Neo-Štokavian gen. pl. *kosácā* ‘mowers’, *ovácā* ‘sheep’ (Kortlandt 2011: 18).

The final accentuation of the Proto-Slavic genitive plural of mobile paradigms is not the result of Dybo’s law but it goes back to Proto-Balto-Slavic, cf. Lithuanian gen.pl. *nagŭ* ‘hoof’, *kasŭ* ‘braid’, *sūnŭ* ‘son’. Because the nominative of nouns like \**końb* and \**bobъ* generally has a short vowel in South Slavic, it can hardly have undergone the same stress retraction as \**nogъ* and \**kosъ*. Examples like \**końb* and \**bobъ* are not particularly likely to have an analogically short vowel after the oblique cases, because these were oxytone, with the exception of the genitive, locative and instrumental plural. During the period following Dybo’s law, dialectal differences were starting to arise in western South Slavic and it is doubtful that analogical processes would have affected the whole area by this time. It would therefore be surprising that no traces of an old long vowel in nominatives of the type \**końb*, \**bóbъ* have been preserved if it existed.

A long vowel is, however, reflected in West and East Slavic: Czech *kůň*, Slovak *kôň*, Ukrainian *kin*, Russian dial. *kón*, Slovak *bób*, Ukrainian *bib* (but Czech *bob*) etc. It is thought that this long vowel is due to later innovations (see Verweij 1994: 515, Kortlandt 2011: 307). The short vowel of Slovak *osem*, *oheň* and the participle form *mohol* provide a strong indication that the diphthong that arose in examples like Slovak *kôň* and *bób* is due to these words be-

ing monosyllabic (although Verweij, l.c., assumes that *osem* and *oheň* result from a regular development  $*\hat{o} > o$ - in word-initial position). We will briefly return to the form *mohol* towards the end of this paper. In East Slavic every  $*o$  with a rising tone became  $*\hat{o}$  (> Ukrainian *i*), and every  $-o$ - in a monosyllabic form became Ukrainian *-i-*, e.g. *visim* ‘eight’, *mig*, *viz*, which means that East Slavic does not provide any evidence about the original length of the vowel.

### 3. Stang’s law

According to Stang’s law, which is one of the last common Slavic developments, a long falling accent in a final syllable (not counting final jers) was shifted to the preceding syllable, which received a so-called neoacute:  $*mo\check{z}e\check{s} > *m\grave{o}ze\check{s}$ ,  $*nos\grave{i}\check{s}b > *n\grave{o}si\check{s}b$ ,  $*sel\grave{a} > *s\grave{e}la$ . The long stressed vowel that lost its accent was shortened (except in Lechitic, cf. the detailed discussion in Vermeer 1984: 362–383). Many Slavic systems which provide information about the vowel length of the now post-tonic vowel underwent analogies that obscured the picture. The original situation is preserved in, e.g., Croatian  $m\grave{o}ze\check{s} < *m\grave{o}ze\check{s}b < *mo\check{z}e\check{s}b$  versus  $l\grave{e}z\check{e}\check{s} < *l\grave{e}z\check{e}\check{s}b$ ; Slovene 2sg.pres.  $n\grave{o}si\check{s} < *n\grave{o}si\check{s}b < *nos\grave{i}\check{s}b$  versus  $v\grave{i}di\check{s} < *v\grave{i}di\check{s}b$ ; neuter plural  $s\grave{e}la < *s\grave{e}la < *sel\grave{a}$  versus  $m\grave{e}sta < *m\grave{e}st\grave{a}$  (cf. Bednja Kajkavian *s\grave{a}lo* versus *m\grave{i}esto*, Jedvaj 1956: 298).

### 4. Shortening of long falling vowels in internal syllables

As stated above, a long vowel that received the stress as a result of Dybo’s law obtained a falling tone. When the syllable containing this long falling vowel was the final syllable of the word (not counting word-final jers), the accent was retracted onto the preceding syllable according to Stang’s law. It was not retracted from medial syllables. Instead, the long vowel was shortened (Kortlandt 2011: 322): Croatian  $p\grave{o}vrata\check{k} < *povr\grave{a}t\check{a}k\check{b} < (pre-Dybo) *p\grave{o}vr\grave{a}t\check{a}k\check{b}$ ,  $z\grave{a}slu\check{z}an < *z\grave{a}sl\grave{u}\check{z}b\check{b} < (pre-Dybo) *z\grave{a}sl\grave{u}\check{z}b\check{b}$ ,  $zgr\grave{a}da < *s\check{b}gr\grave{a}d\grave{a} < (pre-Dybo) *s\check{b}gr\grave{a}d\grave{a}$ , cf. the long vowel of *vr\grave{a}titi*, *sl\grave{u}\check{z}iti*, gen.sg. *gr\grave{a}da*. A similar alternation is preserved in *b\grave{i}rati* ‘to gather’ with a long root vowel versus prefixed *p\grave{o}birati* ‘to pick up’, *pr\grave{e}birati* ‘to pluck’ with a short one (more examples of shortened long root vowels in iterative verbs can be found in Pronk 2012: 22f.). Compounds showing a short reflex of an internal stressed ‘long’ vowel are Croatian *gol\grave{o}glav*, *gol\grave{o}brad*, *ljev\grave{o}ruk*, Slovene *gol\grave{o}gl\grave{a}v*, *gol\grave{o}br\grave{a}d*, Russian *gol\grave{o}gol\acute{o}vyj*, Polish *lewor\acute{e}ki < \*gol\grave{o}g\acute{o}lv\check{b},  $*gol\grave{o}b\grave{o}rd\check{b}$ ,  $*l\acute{e}vor\grave{o}k\check{b} < (pre-Dybo) *gol\grave{o}g\acute{o}lv\check{b}$ ,  $*gol\grave{o}b\grave{o}rd\check{b}$ ,  $*l\acute{e}v\grave{o}r\grave{o}k\check{b}$ , cf. Croatian *gl\grave{a}va*, *br\grave{a}da*, *r\acute{u}ka*. The second element of the compound obtained a shortened vowel in all case forms*

except the nom.sg.m., where the stressed syllable was word-final and the short vowel was introduced analogically. The shortened vowel in medial syllables was automatically rising in Proto-Slavic, falling vowels were limited to initial syllables.

## 5. Accentual variation between simple and prefixed verbal forms

In otherwise mobile verbs with a prefix, the accent was fixed on the prefix before the operation of Dybo's law. In the terminology of the Moscow accentologists, prefixes were dominant before the operation of Dybo's law. Acute prefixes appear as stressed in Slavic, while non-acute prefixes lose the accent to the following syllable, cf. Russian *výbor* versus *nabór*, *pribór*, Slovene *pátoka* versus *potòk*, Čakavian (Omišalj) *perè*, *prālā* versus *zìpere*, *zìprāla* (Vermeer 1984: 340) etc. Due to this accentual behaviour an alternation arose between verbal forms without a prefix with mobile stress and prefixed forms with fixed stress on the second syllable as reflected in Neoštokavian 1pl. aorist *klésmo*, *mrijès-mo* versus *zàklēsmo*, *ùmrijesmo*, 1sg. present *lòmīm* versus *prèlomīm*, *slòmīm*, (Daničić 1896: 22, 52ff.). The opposition is preserved in a significant number of living systems, amongst others in the southern Istrian dialects discussed by David Mandić elsewhere in this volume, as well as, e.g., in Senj *gorī*, *učī* versus *izgòri*, *naūči* (Moguš 1966: 93, 96, 97), and on the other end of the dialect spectrum in Kosovo-Metohija *činīm*, *lomīm* versus *učinim*, *slòmim* (Elezović 1932, 1935). The accentual opposition between prefixed and simple verbs also gave rise to the accentual opposition between Okruk *lòvin* 'I catch' versus *lovīn* 'I hunt' (Ante Jurić, material presented at the conference *Dani akcentologije*). The former generalized the accent of the perfective prefixed form *\*ulòvin*, while the latter continues the imperfective form without a prefix. For abundant examples from numerous other Croatian dialects I refer to Kapović 2011.

In those cases in which a long root vowel received the accent from a prefix as a result of Dybo's law the root vowel was regularly shortened according to the shortening under 4., e.g. in *záslužan* 'deserving' < *\*zāslūžьnъ* < (pre-Dybo) *\*zāslūžьnъ*.

## 6. The rise of the neocircumflex

The neocircumflex is a long falling accent that is found in Slovene, Kajkavian (including Gorski Kotar) and some of the northern Čakavian dialects (in a more restricted set of forms, see below). It arose regularly from a Proto-Slavic short rising accent through compensatory lengthening (Stang 1957: 28ff., Ko-

rtlandt 2011: 51ff.; this view essentially goes back to Baudouin de Courtenay and Valjavec). The short vowel in question was either an original acute, as in \**rĭbĭnak*, \**krĭvŏ*, \**dĕlam*, \**stĭrca*, or any other short rising accent, as in loc. sg. \**kŏnju*, \**osnŏva*, Slovene *telĕta*. Long rising accents were not affected, e.g. Slovene loc.sg. *hlĕvu*. The compensatory lengthening that caused the neocircumflex regularly occurred when the following syllable contained an originally long vowel that was shortened or when a weak jer was lost in the following syllable. The latter condition normally does not apply to weak jers in final position, with the exception of the masculine singular forms of the *l*-participle and nouns ending in a resonant, such as Slovene *kĕzen*, *ŏgel* and *vĕter*. In Kajkavian, the short accent of part of the oblique cases was apparently introduced into the nominative, probably in analogy to the model *brĕt*, *brĕta*, e.g., Varaždin *v'etĕr*, Bednja *vĕter*. On the basis of the neocircumflex in words of the type Slovene *kĕzen*, Kortlandt assumed that final jers that were preceded by a resonant in the same syllable were lost later than other jers in final position (2011: 52). The former caused compensatory lengthening in the preceding syllable, while the latter did not. In this context Dybo's interpretation of the rise of the neocircumflex (2000: 36) should be mentioned. He assumes that the fall of a weak jer in a following syllable did not cause a neocircumflex directly, but through compensatory lengthening of the *following* syllable, which was subsequently shortened causing a neocircumflex in the (now) preceding syllable: \**bĕbĕstvo* > \**bĕbĕstvŏ* > Slovene *bĕbstvo* (on \*-*stvŏ* see Valjavec 1897: 211f.). In view of the neocircumflex in Slovene *kĕzen*, *ŏgel* and *vĕter*, it seems more likely to me that it was the loss of the jer that caused the neocircumflex directly.

I do not subscribe to the view that the neocircumflex arose through analogy, as was defended most recently by Langston (2007, for criticism of this view see Vermeer 1982, 1984: 366ff.). Langston mentions a number of objections against the traditional idea that the neocircumflex arose through compensatory lengthening. Part of these objections is based on typological arguments. These arguments may indicate that the proposed type of "compensatory lengthening" is not widely attested elsewhere, but they hardly prove it did not take place.

Langston adduces two formal objections regarding the two categories in which we find a neocircumflex in North-West Čakavian, i.e. the definite form of some adjectives that have fixed root stress (e.g., *stĕrĭ*, cf. the examples in Zubčić & Sanković 2008) and the present tense in *-e-* of verbs with fixed root stress (e.g., *plĕče*, *kupŭješ*). In northern Čakavian dialects that preserve post-tonic length, those adjectives that have a neocircumflex in the definite form also have a long post-tonic vowel. If one accepts that the rise of the neocircumflex coincided with the shortening of the post-tonic vowel, the attested

post-tonic length must have been restored. In the attested systems, all adjectives have long desinential vowels throughout the definite paradigm (see, e.g., Belić 2000: 165f., Lukežić & Zubčić 2007: 93). Taking into account that proponents of “compensatory lengthening” nowadays assume that in North-West Čakavian the neocircumflex developed regularly in disyllabic words only (Kortlandt 2011: 57f.), it is not difficult to find a model for the restoration of length in cases like *stârī*.

Langston’s second objection is that the present tense suffix *-e-* cannot be shown to have been long before the rise of the neocircumflex. Vermeer has clearly shown that in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> persons singular of the present tense of mobile verbs a Proto-Slavic long stressed *-e-* has been preserved in a large number of areas: Slovak *nesie*, Prekmurje Slovene *vličé* and in many Čakavian dialects that do not have neocircumflex: Susak *parnes’ê*, Senj *kradě*, Kali *pletîê*, Vrgada *donesě*, Weingraben *peč’ie*, Žumberak *berê* (Vermeer 1984: 359f., 365f., 381, Houtzagers & Budovskaja 1996: 162, Moguš 1966: 89). The Čakavian dialects with a neocircumflex have a short *-e-* in these examples (Vermeer 1982: 292). This is no coincidence. These dialects had a short *-e-* in examples like *plâče* after it had obtained a neocircumflex. This favoured generalization of the short *-e-* in all paradigms. In other Čakavian dialects the long post-tonic vowel was retained in *plăčē* and related verbs and supported the length in *nesē* (post-tonic length was later lost in much of Central and South Čakavian). This explains why the isogloss between the mobile presents *nesè* and *nesē* seems to be identical to that between *plâče* and *plăčē* (on distribution of long and short *e* over the late Proto-Slavic verbal paradigms see Vermeer 1984: 363, on the origin of the long thematic vowel in *plăčē* see ibidem: 362).

Langston argues that the long vowel of *nesē* arose late and may be of analogical origin (2007: 86). However, the fact that the long vowel is found in an area that is larger than the one in which the neocircumflex is found makes it likely the long ending is older than the rise of the neocircumflex. When stating that »there is no evidence for the lengthening of short vowels under the neoacute accent in other forms in most Čakavian dialects« (l.c.), Langston ignores the fact that the neoacute that arose as a result of the retraction of the accent from a final *jer* is generally long, cf. Čakavian gen.pl. *nôg* < *\*nogò* and the examples given above under 2., as opposed to the neoacute found in *vòlja*, *mòžeš* < *\*vòļa*, *\*mòžešb*, which is short in Čakavian.

The most powerful argument against a phonetic origin for the neocircumflex is the fact that verbs with a present in *-a-* or *-i-* do not show a neocircumflex: Novi *opràvī*, *dělā*, but *plâče* (Langston 2007: 84). Here, again, it is important

to take into account that the Čakavian neocircumflex is claimed to have arisen in disyllabic forms only. The difference between the two categories is that regular \**oprâvi*, \**oprâvimo*, \**dêla*, \**dêlâmo* was more likely to generalize the variant without neocircumflex when post-tonic length was restored. Extra pressure was probably exerted by paradigms of the type *nòsī*, *nòsīmo* (also with restored post-tonic length, cf. Slovene *nósi* < \**nòsi*). As in other South-Slavic dialects, length was generalized more easily in the suffix of the *a*- and *i*-verbs than in the *e*-verbs because in the former two it was more widespread in the first place.

A final point of discussion with regard to the neocircumflex is whether it only occurs instead of an old acute, as is traditionally assumed, or also instead of a short neoacute. Traditionally it is thought that those cases in which a neocircumflex is found instead of a (short) neoacute are of analogical origin. Quite apart from the large scale analogy that is required in such a scenario, there is no evident model for the introduction of the neocircumflex in forms such as \**dobrôta*, \**osnôva*, \**zdrâvje*, \**telêtina*, Slovene *podôba*, *rabôta* (thus Pleteršnik for *rabôta*?), Kajkavian *vôlja*, *kôža*, *mênum*, *tôbum*. Moreover, there are no true counterexamples to the scenario that assumes that the old and new short acute were treated alike. Slovene *pérje*, *zélje* (neoacute) as opposed to *brêzje* (acute) and *kôzji* (neoacute) as opposed to *krâvji* (acute), e.g., cannot be used as counterexamples. Slovene *pérje*, *zélje* and *kôzji* underwent Stang's law with regular shortening of the second syllable (section 3.). Because the following syllable was shortened it did not cause a neocircumflex at a later stage.

A different case is Slovene 2sg.pres. *póšlješ*, in which the weak jer that was lost between *-š-* and *-lj-* should have triggered the rise of a neocircumflex. Similar exceptions to the rule are the adjectives *kónjski* and *žénski*. The absence of a neocircumflex in these words appears to be linked with the origin of the rising accent: it results from the retraction of the accent from an internal weak jer. These examples provide insight in the mechanism behind the rise of the neocircumflex: if the jer was stressed, it lost its stress to the preceding syllable. If it was not stressed, it caused lengthening of the preceding syllable when it was lost. These processes occurred simultaneously and are both the result of the weakening of the jer. In this context it is important to realize that in western South Slavic jers were preserved if they received a neoacute as a result of Stang's law, e.g. Štokavian *tâsta*, *šâljēm*, *tâknēm*, Slovene *tâšča*, *tâknem* (Ivić 1998: 457f.). This implies that by the time Stang's law operated internal jers could still receive the stress, unlike in West-Slavic (cf. Old Polish *ćcia*, Old Czech *tšče*, Polish *tkniesz*, Czech *tkneš*. Russian has *těšča* but *pošlěš*, *tkněš*). Slovene *póšlješ kónjski* and *žénski* regularly reflect \**pošb̌leš(ь)*, \**koňbsǩj(ь)*,

\*žen̥sk̥j(b). The apparent counterexample Slovene (Pleteršnik) \*svêkrva – which looks like a reflex of \*svekr̥v- with retraction *and* neocircumflex – is only attested in dialects without tonal opposition and its accent is therefore unknown (Snoj 1994: 499, fn. 51). Similar *ū*-stems like Pleteršnik's *lôkva* and *zâ(l)va* are suspect of having a ghost accent as well, because the former is otherwise only reliably attested with a root *lók*- and for the latter Pleteršnik adduces only dialect areas that provide no evidence about the intonation. I conclude that the original acute and the short neoacute were lengthened due to loss of a jer or shortening of a long vowel in a following syllable, the former also applying to loss of word-final jer if preceded by a resonant in the same syllable (the type Slovene *kâzen* < \*kâzn̥).

## 7. Analogical spread of \*-ā in the f.sg. form of the *l*-participle

Before we continue to discuss the *l*-participles of the *nesl̥*-type, there is an early Croatian dialectal innovation that deserves attention because it will play a role in the discussion that follows. Vermeer observed that Stang's law operated in many dialects in the feminine form of the *l*-participle of mobile verbs (1984: 376f.): rather than being end-stressed, as one would expect on the basis of the comparative evidence, they have a long rising tone on the syllable preceding the ending, e.g. Brusje (Hvar) *prô(l)*, *prôla*, *prôlo* 'wash', *dëro(l)*, *derôla*, *dërolo* 'skin', Vrgada *bî*, *bîla*, *bîlo*, *bîli*, *dôbî*, *dôbîla*, *dôbîlo*, Ličko Lešće (Lika Čakavian) *spâla*, Davor (West Posavian) *bîo*, *bîla*, *bîlo* (Kapović 2009: 118), Bednja *pêil*, *pîlo*, *pêile* 'drink', *plotêil/plâotil*, *platîlo* (for \**plotîlo*), *plâotile/plotêile*, Domaslovec *pîli* vs. *pîla* (Šojat 1973: 52, 54). Paradigms like these are found in Southeast and Central Čakavian, Kajkavian and West Posavian.

The origin of this phenomenon lies in the fact that the feminine forms of the *l*-participle had a long ending with some verbs and a short one with other verbs. A post-tonic long vowel ending of the feminine form of the *l*-participle is preserved indirectly in Kajkavian and Slovene. It is reflected by a neocircumflex (see above under 6.) in such forms as Kajkavian *krâla*, *gorêla*, which was extended analogically to *vîdela*. Post-tonic length in this ending was eventually lost analogically in the other South Slavic dialects.

The long variant of the ending was apparently introduced analogically in the mentioned dialects, after which they provided input for Stang's law (see above under 3): \**pîlâ* >> \**pîlâ* > *pîla*. I see no reason to consider the development a »nefonetski pomak«, as Kapović does (2008: 32, fn. 107), who does not mention Vermeer's solution. Vermeer's explanation requires the assumption that the

long ending of the feminine forms of the *l*-participle enjoyed some productivity during a period before Stang's law, while most present-day dialects only have a short desinential vowel. This seemingly contradictory situation is explained by the observation that the long stressed vowels that were affected by Stang's law were shortened in the process (see 3. above). Before the law, the number of post-tonic long vowels was therefore significantly larger than after it. As a result, vowel length in the ending was more likely to become productive before Stang's law than after it.

## 8. *l*-participles from verbs with an acute root

In Štokavian and Čakavian, the acute verbs (group III in the introduction) are reflected with a short stressed root vowel in all forms of the *l*-participle, cf. Croatian *gr̆zao*, *gr̆zla*, *gr̆zlo*, *gr̆zle*, Novi *gr̆zāl*, *gr̆zla*. In archaic Kajkavian we find a neocircumflex in the root in the masculine and feminine forms: *gr̆zēl*, *gr̆zla*, *gr̆zlo*, *gr̆zli*. Slovene only has the neocircumflex in the masculine form: *gr̆zēl*, *gr̆zla*, *gr̆zlo*, *gr̆zli*.

In Slovene, on the other hand, a neocircumflex was introduced analogically in the masculine singular form of verbs with a non-acute long root vowel (group II) after the other forms of the *l*-participle had obtained a long rising accent in both groups II and III, but not I. Thus we find *tr̆sēl*, *tr̆sla* like *gr̆zēl*, *gr̆zla* (Kortlandt 2011: 56).

The rise of the neocircumflex was posterior to the simplification of a cluster of dental stop plus *-l*. The latter development is found in all of East Slavic and South Slavic, with the exception of a few northern Slovene dialects. The assumption that the change *\*dl*, *\*tl* > *\*l* took place before the rise of the neocircumflex accounts for the absence of a neocircumflex in Bednja *kr̆l*, *yep̆l*, *pyej̆l*, Sveta Nedelja *poj̆l* (Šojat 1973: 53), Prigorje *kr̆l*, *j̆l*, *pr̆l*, Varaždin *kr̆l* (with secondary lengthening of a short vowel, cf. the older long vowel in fem. *kr̆la*) < *\*kradl̆*, *\*-padl̆*, *\*ēdl̆*, *\*pr̆dl̆*. If the stop had been retained we would expect a neocircumflex as in *gr̆ēzel*, *p̆āosel* < *\*gr̆izl̆*, *\*pasl̆*. Incidentally, these Kajkavian forms provide additional proof that the neocircumflex arose as a result of a phonetic process. The forms further show that the rise of the neocircumflex in the *l*-participle is not regular in monosyllables, as Babik argues (2005: 111ff.), because we would then expect *\*kr̆l̆*. The Bednja paradigm *kl̆ōsti*, *kl̆ōl*, *kl̆ōlo*, *kl̆ōle* from the acute root *\*kl̆ād-* arose analogically after the type *tr̆āsti*, *z̆āpsti* on the basis of the shared mobile present.

## 9. Verbs with a non-acute root: Kajkavian and Slovene

We will now look at the other verbs, those with a non-acute root vowel. Russian has the following pattern: root-stress in the masculine singular form, end stress in the other forms: *nēs*, *neslá*, *nesló*, *neslí*. In Slovene, the same pattern is found, be it somewhat obscured by various later Slovene innovations. The standard language has *něsel*, *něsla*, *něslo*, *něsli* etc., which corresponds to, e.g., Gailtal *rěku*, *rjǎkwa* (Pronk 2009: 120), Črni Vrh *'ri:əku*, *'rɛ:kla* (Tominec 1964: 193), Južnotranjski *'ri:əku*, *'riɛ:kla* (Rigler 1963: 44, 122), Slovenskogoriški *'ri:əko*, *'rie:kla* (Koletnik 2001: 160). A similar situation is found in some northwestern Kajkavian dialects: Hum na Sutli *r'əkɔ*, *r'əkla*, Pavlovec *r'ėikɔ*, *r'ėkla* (Celinić 2010). In the few Slovene dialects that have not undergone the stress-retraction from final short vowels, the Russian pattern is clearly visible: Resia *něsal*, *naslǎ*, m.pl. *nislǎ* (Steenwijk 1992: 155), Rož *něsov*, *nasvǎ*, m.pl. *nōslǎ* (Scheinigg 1882).

In the Slovene dialect of Sele, which is closely related to the Rož dialect cited in the previous paragraph but did undergo stress-retractions, the vocalism of the non-masculine forms has been generalized: *něsu*, *něsua* (Isačenko 1939). Interesting forms from a few dialects within the Slovene borders directly to the East of Sele are provided by Babik (2005: 124, fn. 75), who cites from a monograph by Zorko I do not have access to: Sveti Duh m.sg. *'pɛ:ko*, f.sg. *'pɛ:kla*, but m.pl. *'pɛklij*, Remšnik f.sg. *'pɛ:kla*, m.pl. *'pɛklij*. In these dialects, the oxytone type has been influenced by the mobile one of the type *\*dǎlǎ*, *\*dǎlǎ*, *\*dǎli*. The m.pl. form reflects *\*pɛklij* with regular retraction of the circumflex in these dialects (cf. Zorko 1989), the root stress of the feminine form is analogical to that in *\*dǎla* < *\*dǎlǎ*. In Remšnik, the long root vowel in *\*dǎlǎ* has been extended analogically to the m.sg. form in the paradigm *'li:əgɔ* (as if < *\*lɛgǎ*), *'lɛ:gla*, m.pl. *'lɛglij*.

At least part of the Kajkavian dialects generalized root stress in all forms of the *l*-participle, e.g. Bednja *nǎsel*, *nǎslo*, *nǎsle*, *rǎkel*, *rǎklo*, *rǎkle*, (*nǎō*)*prǎl*, *prǎlo*, *prǎle* (with a neocircumflex in the feminine form), *rōsel*, *rōslo*, *rōsle*. Many other Kajkavian dialects are inconclusive with regard to the original accent in *\*nesla*, *\*neslo* etc., because the accent was retracted from a final open syllable in all dialects except for a narrow band in the western part of the Kajkavian speech area (Ivšić 1936: 80f.). Only those dialects that lengthen a vowel that receives the accent through retraction show whether or not the accent was on the ending. Thus, e.g., Mraclin *rěkla* (Šojat 1982: 417) reflects root-stress, as an end-stressed form would have been reflected as *\*rěkla*. The only fact we

can gather from most other Kajkavian dialects is that the masculine form has no neocircumflex, e.g., Varaždin *r'ek̆el*, Prigorje *rèkal*.

This raises an interesting question: why does Kajkavian not have a neocircumflex in forms like Bednja *nàsel*, while it has one in *grêizel*. As we have seen above (section 6.), the neocircumflex arose from any short non-falling accent, both from an original acute and from other sources (generally lumped together as “neoacute”). Therefore, one would expect the masculine form *\*nès̆lb* to undergo the same development that we find in *grêizel* < *\*griz̆lb*. Although the Kajkavian material does not rule out analogical influence from the other forms of the *l*-participle, the situation is different in Slovene. There, the masculine singular form is isolated and must therefore be old, cf. the adduced Resian paradigm *něsal*, *nasl̆b*, m.pl. *nisl̆b*. The same argument applies to the nominative singular of a number of adjectives: Slovene *dòber*, *mòker*, *òster*, *zamòkel* and *tòpel*. The adjective *zamòkel* is originally an *l*-participle and *tòpel* continues a similar formation. The other forms of these adjectives reflect non-initial stress, e.g., *dòbra*, *mòkra*, *zamòkla*, *òstra*, *tòpla*. One might also expect a neocircumflex in the numerals *sèdem* and *òsem*.

In view of Kortlandt's observation that final jers that were preceded by a tautosyllabic resonant must have been preserved up to the time of rise of the neocircumflex (cf. above under 6.), there is a way to explain the cited forms without a neocircumflex: they were end-stressed when the neocircumflex arose: *\*nēs̆l̆b*, *\*trēs̆l̆b*, *\*dobr̆b* etc. The fall of a weak unstressed jer caused compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, while the subsequent or simultaneous fall of a stressed final jer was accompanied by loss of the accent to the preceding syllable. Taking this into account, we can set up the following chronology for Slovene and Kajkavian, perhaps also for the rest of western South Slavic:

1. Final jers are weakened and lose the stress to a preceding syllable, which is lengthened if it was short: gen.pl. *\*noğb̆* > *\*nōğb̆*. This did not affect final jers after a tautosyllabic resonant: *\*nēs̆l̆b*. If it did, we would expect a long rising accent: *\*nēs̆l̆b̆*, which is actually attested in Slovak *niesol* (which will be discussed towards the end of this article).

2. Dybo's law shifts any non-falling, non-acute accent to a following syllable. It does not shift the accent to a following jer, which could not carry the accent anymore (cf. the discussion under 2. above), unless it was preceded by a tautosyllabic resonant: *\*bòb̆b̆* = *\*bòbb̆b̆*, *\*kòń̆b̆* = *\*kòń̆bb̆b̆*, but *\*sèdm̆b̆* > *sedm̆b̆*, *\*dòbr̆b̆* > *dobr̆b̆*.

3. Final weak jers that are preceded by a tautosyllabic resonant are weakened as well, causing compensatory lengthening of a preceding stressed short

vowel or – when they were stressed – loss of the stress to a preceding syllable: \**dobr̂* > \**dòbr*, \**nesl̂* > \**nèsl*, \**grizl̂* > \**grìzl*. Other final jers had already been lost and did not cause a preceding stressed vowel to be lengthened: \**bràt*, \**bòb*, \**kòń*.

## 10. Verbs with a non-acute root: Štokavian and Čakavian

In Štokavian we usually find the same pattern as in Russian and Slovene, including in the works of Vuk and Daničić: barytonesis in the masculine singular, oxytonesis elsewhere: *pěkao*, *pěkla*, *pěklo*, *pěkli*. This system has been preserved best in most eastern and southern dialects, cf. Uskoci *rěkō*, *rěkla* (Stanić 1974: 132, 133), Bjelopavlići *plěo*, *plèle* (Ćupić 1977: 22, 95), Divci (Koluvara) *doveo*, *dověli* (Nikolić 1969: 31, 37), and in the Fojnička Nahija *doveo*, *dověli* (Brozović 2007: 59, 144). Dubrovnik and its surrounding areas often retain oxytony in the feminine form (copying the pattern *dāo*, *dāla*, *dālo*), sometimes also in other forms of the paradigm, e.g. Dubrovnik *trēsō*, *trēsla*, *trēslo*, Dubrava (Pelješac) *plěo*, *plěla*, *plèlo* but *rěkō*, *rěkla*, *rěklo* (Kapović 2008: 33, fn. 111), Mljet *istékla*, *utékla*, *pléla* (Šimunović 1970: 242). In more northern and western Štokavian dialects, however, we often find barytonesis throughout the paradigm (cf. the detailed discussion in Kapović 2008: 32ff.). In Bosanska Posavina, e.g., we find barytone forms throughout the participle: *pěkō*, *pěkla*, *pěklo* (Baotić 1979: 210), next to the standard type. Notably, verbs of type II are always in accordance with the Vuk type in this dialect: *trěso*, *trēsla*, *trēslo*. Ivšić observed that throughout Posavian Štokavian, the type with fixed root stress is the more common, although traces of end-stress occur, e.g. Otok *mogl̂* *bi*, Novo Selo *rěkle* (1913: 94f.). For the western part of Slavonia, Kapović adduces originally barytone forms from a number of points (2009). Kapović observes that in Neo-Štokavian in Slavonia, final stress is preserved more often in frequent verbs, forms without a prefix and in forms with a long root vowel (2008: 33). For more Slavonian material, reflecting both types of accentuation, I refer to Kapović 2008, l.c.

The barytone reflexes are also found in the western Štokavian dialects in Croatia, e.g., Omiš *rěkli*, Kotezi *ispekla* (Čilaš Šimpraga 2010: 191); Imotska *mōgā*, *mōgla*, *mōglo* etc., »ovakvi su još *pěc*, *těc*, *rěc*« (Šimundić 1971: 155), *bōjo*, *bōla*, *bōl*.

Oxytone non-masculine singular forms are retained more to the southeast in the villages of Vidonje and Dobranje, where short root verbs of the *neslʷ* type became mobile (*těkō*, *těkla*, *těklo*; *pěkō*, *pěkla*, *pěklo*), while those with a long

root reflect oxytony: *râstō, rāsła, ráslo; vûkō, vûkla, vûklo* (Vidović 2007: 209). Oxytone forms are further found around Šibenik and in and around Dubrovnik (Kapović 2008: 33f.), and in the Ikavian that is spoken around Perušić in Lika (Milković 2009: 532): *rèkō, rèkla, pèkō, pèkla, bō, bòla, plē, plèla* etc. The rest of Lika predominantly has reflexes of root-stress (idem: 533). Tomljenović also gives reflexes of fixed root stress for the Bunjevački Ikavian dialect spoken in the area northeast of Senj: *pèkā, pèkla, pèklo; rèkā, rèkla, rèklo; izrekā, izrekla, izreklo; plèja, plèla, plèlo; trēsā, trēsła, trēslo; istrēsā, istrēsła, istrēslo* (1910–1911: 599f.).

In Čakavian, the same two variants are found. Here follows an overview of the material, which largely overlaps with the collection of data in Langston 2006: 205 and Kapović 2008: 33. I have chosen to follow the distinction between Northwest Čakavian, Central Čakavian and Southeast Čakavian introduced by Vermeer (1982: 289), which is also followed by Langston (2006).

In Northwest Čakavian, evidence for the archaic type with end stress is readily available (cf. also Zubčić 2003): Novi *pèkāl, peklà, peklò, trēsāl, trēsłà, potúkāl, potúkliš, Omišalj (Krk) reklò, sopliš, tekliš, tepliš, vèrhliš, strēsłà, dosèglà, obèkliš, zlèglò, rāslò, Orbanici rèka, reklà, reklò, grèba, greblà, grebliš, Orlec (Cres) rèkel, reklà, reklò, neslà, nesliš, peklà, peklíš* (with lengthening of stressed non-final non-high vowels), Klana *rèkau, reklà, reklò, Grobnik rèkāl, reklà, reklò*. An exception is the Boljun dialect in Istria, for which Zubčić (2003: 151) adduces the paradigm *p'eka, p'ekla, p'eklo*. She shows that there the accent may have been generalized on the first syllable in the same way as in the adjective *t'epa, t'epla, t'eplo* (cf. the more archaic *dobr'a, dobr'o*).

Verbs with a long root vowel often show root stress in Orbanici and Orlec: Orbanici *tr'ēsła, narāsła, virāslo, skūbla, skūblo*, Cres *trēsła, trēsliš, narāsła, narāslo, sōpel, sōpliš, tēlkel, tēkliš*. Except for Boljun *t'ūka, t'ūkla, t'ūklo*, where root stress is also attested in verbs with a short root vowel, I have not found such forms in any of the more eastern Northwest Čakavian dialects.

In the Central Čakavian dialects, on the other hand, we find barytony in forms with an originally short or a long root vowel, which is always reflected as short: Senj *pèkal, pèkla, pèklo; rāsł, rāsła, rāslo; trēsł, trēsła, trēslo*. In dialects with lengthening of vowels in closed syllables we find, e.g., Rab *ogrèbal, ogrèbla* (Langston 2006: 205), Pag *'peka, 'piekla* (the same forms are found in Stinatz in the Burgenland, Neweklowsky 1989: 98), Metajna (Pag) *lèga, lègla, rèka, rèkla* (Vranić 2004: 18), Kukljica (Ugljan) *trēsò, trēsła; tūko, tūkla; tèko, tēkla; pèko, pèkla*, but *rèko, reklà, lègo, leglâ* and *vřgo, vrglâ*. For Kukljica, Benić (2011: 9) assumes that the short vowel in masculine singular forms like

*trěso* and *tũko* arose analogically after the root vowel of forms like *'piekla* had been lengthened. This is not impossible, but in view of the fact that Senj, which did not undergo the same lengthening, has short vowels in these forms, it seems more likely that the dialects with lengthening in closed syllables also had a short vowel in all forms to start with. In Lika Čakavian we find a short root vowel, like in Senj: Ličko Lešće *vũkla*. In Lika Štokavian dialects that generalized root stress we find no shortening: *rēsā, rēsła, rēslo, trēsā, trēsła, trēslo*.

In Žumberak we find examples with a retracted accent from a final open syllable: *rěkla, izvěla, odvěli* (all from Jurkovo Selo), *pomògli* (Uniate) (Skok 1912: 350, 356). Skok further cites *reklä\_je*, where the final accent is retained (1911: 382).

On Vrgada, which has a Southeast Čakavian dialect, root stress has been generalized: *rěk ā, rěkla; spēk ā, spēkla; těk ā, těkła*, but length was retained in *trēs ā, trēsła*. The same situation is found on Brač and Hvar, e.g. Hvar *pěka, pěkła, pěklo* and with a retained long vowel *trěsa(l), trěsła, trěslo; zěba(l), zěbla, zěblo* etc.

The situation is thus as follows: in Žumberak and the eastern part of Northwest Čakavian the original situation is maintained, but Orbanići and Orlec show root stress if the root vowel is long. In Central and Southeast Čakavian, both types show root stress, with the exception of a few verbs on Ugljan and probably elsewhere as well. Kapović, e.g., cites Korčula *rěklo* and Blato (Korčula) *provelĩ* (2008: 33). Further, we find shortening of the long vowel in forms like *trěsła* in Senj and probably in the whole northern part of Central Čakavian. Vrgada, Brač and Hvar have long vowels in these cases.

I have so far largely ignored roots ending in a dental stop for reasons that will become apparent below. These roots show the same accentual reflexes as the other verbs of the *nesl̥*-type in Central and Southeast Čakavian. We do not find remnants of end-stress. The following are a few examples: Vrgada *mě, měla* < *\*metl-*; *plě, plěla* < *\*pletl-*; Hvar *měl, měla, plê(l), plěla, plělo*; Pag *'mie, 'mela*, Kali (Ugljan) *doviě, dověla* (Houtzagers & Budovskaja 1996), Senj *bõl, bõla, bõlo, cvāl, cvāla, cvālo*. The masculine singular forms above all show lengthening before a tautosyllabic resonant (which later dropped in the majority of dialects). This type has merged with the reflex of the *l*-participle of acute roots that end in a dental stop of the type *krāl; krāla*, cf. Hvar *krô(l), krāla, krālo*, Dračevica (Brač) *plê(l), plěla*, Vrgada *prě, prěla*, Senj *prěl, prěla, prělo* < *\*prędl-*. In Northwest Čakavian, oxytony is preserved on Orlec (Cres): *probolā, probolĩ, cvelā, cvelò*, Omišalj (Krk) *plelā, pomelā, pomelĩ* and in Novi *plelā, dovelā, probolā*, but in Orbanići we find variation: the verb *bõs* has fixed

root stress in the *l*-ptc.: *b<sup>o</sup>đ*, *bòle*, *prob<sup>o</sup>đ*, *probòli*, *ubòla*, *ubòle*, *zabòlo*. The verbs *plès*, *gnjès* and *mès* show variants with root stress next to less frequent variants with end stress: *pl'è*, *plèla*, *plèlo*, *plèli*, *plèle*, *splèle*, *uplèla*, *zaplèla*, *zaplèli* but also *plelà*, *plelò*, *plelè*; *gnj'è*, *gnjèla*, *gnjèli*, *zagnjèla*, but also *gnjeli*. For the verb *mès*, Kalsbeek even provides statistics when there are two variants (1988: 489): *mèla* (attested twice), *mèli* (2x), *mèle*, but also *melà* (1x), *meli* (1x), with prefix *namèla*, *pomèla*, *pomèli* (4x), but also *pomeli* (1x).

Kapović describes the unexpected stem-stress in the cases discussed above to a tendency to avoid desinential stress (2008: 32):

»Tako su svi kajk. i čak. govori proveli inovativno pravilo da infinitivni nastavak (-*ti*, -*ći*) ne može biti naglašen, a tako je i u mnogim Žštok. govorima. U cijelom je kajk., te u dijelu čak. i štok., to pravilo prošireno i na glagolske pridjeve radne 1. glagolske vrste koji završavaju na suglasnik, a u kajk. i manjem dijelu čak. i štok. i na glagolske pridjeve radne općenito.«

Although this observation accounts for the apparent haphazardness of the phenomenon, it seems desirable to look for an explanation in terms of sound laws and analogy. An explanation in terms of analogy is readily available. As was explained above (section 5.), there was an accentual difference between prefixed and non-prefixed forms of mobile verbs. Vermeer (1984: 377) and Langston (2006: 285) suggest that the fixed root stress may have been generalized from forms with a verbal prefix. The difference is preserved in the *l*-participle in Benić's data from Kukljica, where we find mobile *rèko*, *reklà*, *lègo*, *leglà* and *vřgo*, *vřglà* but root stressed *izrèko*, *izrèkla*, *zalègo*, *zalègla* and *uvřgla se*. In a similar manner, Houtzagers and Budovskaja's material from Kali contains the same three mobile verbs *rèka*, *reklà*, *lèga*, *leglà* and *vřga*, *vřglà*, but *sliègla* 'hatch'. The verbs 'to say' and 'to throw' are not attested with any prefix in the substantial amount of material provided by the authors, perhaps indicating the low frequency of such formations, as opposed to all other verbs of this class, which are abundantly attested with a prefix (and a diphthong reflecting a lengthened *-e-*), e.g., *ispièkli*, *narièsla*, *otièkla*, *snièsla*, *dovièzla*, *izvièzle*, *povükli*, *pozièbla*, *istrièsla* etc. These forms gave rise to such simplex forms as *vièzla* and *tièkla*. Kapović's data from Šibenik show a similar distribution: *dòšla*, *dòšlo*, but *prònašà*, *prònašla*, *prònašlo*, *òtišà*, *òtišla*, *òtišlo*. He further draws attention to the fact that Štokavian often retains an opposition between *mòglo* and *pòmoglo* (2008: 33). Finally, it is remarkable that in Orbanići, where we find doublets of the type *mèla* next to *melà* that were discussed above, there is only one attestation of a prefixed verbal form with end stress (*pomeli*), while those without a prefix are more frequent.

It is thus conceivable that the generalization of the accent of prefixed forms caused the root stress that is found in Čakavian. In Orbaníci this process is taking place before our eyes. Vermeer (1984: 377) has convincingly argued that influence from the prefixed forms also explains the short root vowel that we find in the mainland dialects in forms like Senj *trèsła*, *trèslo*, *trèsli*, *ràsłal*, *ràsłal*, *ràsłal*, Ličko Lešće *vùkla*. The same explanation applies to the short root vowel in masculine forms like Kukljica *trèso* and *tùko* in other Central Čakavian dialects (the other forms of the paradigm are ambiguous in this respect). The root vowel was regularly shortened after it had received the accent from the prefix as a result of Dybo's law (see section 2.).

For Central Čakavian we can posit paradigms like *\*trèsl̥(̣)*, *\*trèsl̥à*, *\*trèsl̥ò* next to *\*s(̣)trèsl̥(̣)*, *\*s(̣)trèsl̥a*, *\*s(̣)trèsl̥o* (with regular shortening, see section 4.). Note that by the time these paradigms existed, most other athematic paradigms with a root in a vowel had columnal stress because the accent had already been retracted in *dâl*, *dâlà*, *dâlo* to *dâl*, *dâla*, *dâlo*. This no doubt worked in favour of the generalization of root stress in *\*bòl̥(̣)*, *\*bòla*, *\*bòlo* and *\*trèsl̥(̣)*, *\*trèsl̥a*, *\*trèsl̥o*. In Northwest Čakavian (and most of Štokavian, Slovene and Russian), on the other hand, final stress was usually generalized in the feminine, neuter and plural forms of the prefixed variants, cf. Cres *speklà*, *spekl̥i*, *uteklà*, *utekl̥i*. In Northwest Čakavian and in parts of Southeast Čakavian, a long root vowel had been introduced analogically in prefixed forms of the type *\*s(̣)trèsl̥(̣)*, *\*s(̣)trèsl̥a*, *\*s(̣)trèsl̥o* even before root stress was generalized in the simple verb.

The Kajkavian and Štokavian dialects that reflect root stress in at least part of the *l*-participles under scrutiny can be explained in the same way as the Čakavian ones: the accentual difference between forms with and without a prefix was generalized in favour of the prefixed forms. Traces of the old distribution are found in western Šumadija Neoštokavian (Cer). Here verbs without prefix reflect oxytone forms only, while prefixed verbs show variants reflecting root stress or end stress: *dòvela* and *dovèla*; *nàplela* and *naplèla*; *istekla* and *istèkla*; *prilegla* and *prilègla* (Moskovljević 1928–1929: 38).

The fixed root stress in the *l*-participles of the *nesl̥*-type cannot be equated to the initial stress of *dâla* which was a result of Stang's law, see above under 7. This follows from the following considerations:

1. We would expect a long rising root vowel in Kajkavian if it were (*\*\*tèkla*, cf. *zèlje*, *sèla*, *sèdmi*), or a neocircumflex as in *mèla* < *\*metlà* (see below).
2. Part of Posavian Štokavian has columnal stress in, e.g., *pèkō*, *pèkla*, *pèklo*, but no neoacute in forms like *bila* and *dála*. Similarly, in Orbaníci Čakavian, root stress is being generalized in *bòle*, *plèla* etc., but we find end stress in *dâlà*.

3. If the root stress was due to a retraction in the feminine form, we would expect to find traces of a paradigm *\*pèkļ*, *\*pèkļa*, *\*pekl̃*, *\*pekl̃i*. I have not found such a paradigm anywhere.

4. Explaining the columnal stress from a retraction in the feminine form does not explain the shortening of long root vowels that we find in Ličko Lešće *vùkla* and Senj *trèsla*.

The analogical spread of the long variant of the feminine singular ending *\*-lā*, which caused the neoacute in *dāla*, must therefore have been limited to roots ending in a vowel in those Čakavian dialects where we find it. A similar situation is found in Slovene, where the neocircumflex of Slovene *znāla* points to post-tonic long *\*-ā* (Vermeer 1984: 377), while roots ending in a consonant retained the short ending, e.g., *grizla*. The fact that the analogical spread affected roots ending in a vowel, but not those ending in a consonant is not unexpected. The source of the long vowel were mostly verbs in *-iti* and *-ati*, in which final *-lā* was always preceded by a vowel.

In Kajkavian, on the other hand, we have to distinguish two separate analogical introductions of the long ending: one before Stang's law and one after it. First, the long ending was introduced in all cases in which the ending was preceded by a vowel, as in Čakavian. This caused the accent to retract in the type *dāla*. The same retraction must also have affected older oxytone participles with a root ending in a dental. This caused the early split between *\*metla*, which has a neocircumflex in Kajkavian, and the originally accentually identical *\*nesla*, which does not have a circumflex. As is usual with Kajkavian, the data are limited. We can adduce Rožić's material from Prigorje, with the warning that the dialect probably does not have tonal opposition on short vowels, in spite of the fact that tones are written (Rožić 1893a: 97f.): *rèkal*, *rèkla*, *rèklo* versus *bòl*, *bòla*, *bòlo*, the latter pattern is identical to that of originally acute roots like *kràl*, *krāla*, *krālo* (Rožić 1894: 63f.). For Bednja, Jedvaj gives *nāsel*, *nāsla*, *nāsl̃e*, but observes that *gnjāsti*, *cvèsti*, *bèsti* with a root in a dental form their *l*-participle like acute *prāsti*, *prāl*, *prālo*, *prāle*, without providing the actual forms (1956: 312). Cf. further Domaslovec *pl̃l*, *pl̃la* (Šojat 1973: 52).

We can thus reconstruct *\*melā* >> *\*melā* > *\*mèla*. The simplification of *\*-dl-*, *\*-tl-* to *-l-* must therefore be older than the first spread of long *\*-lā* and Stang's law. The stress retraction in *\*mela* probably also affected Central and Southeast Čakavian as well as the western dialects of Posavian Štokavian, although there the difference between the retraction and the later generalization of root stress cannot be discerned (except for the fact that the infrequent exceptions to the generalization of root stress rarely include verbs of the type *\*mes-*

*ti*, *\*bosti* etc.). The reason why I assume that these Čakavian and Posavian dialects underwent the development *\*mel̆* >> *\*melā* > *\*mèla* as well is that it is unlikely that the ending of *\*mel̆* would not have been lengthened while that of *\*dāl̆* was.

In Kajkavian, after the retraction of the stress in *\*mèla*, the long ending *\*-lā* was once more introduced, this time affecting all cases in which the ending was unstressed. Thus we get *\*mèla* > *\*mèlā* and *\*gr̆zla* > *\*gr̆zlā*. This innovation is purely Kajkavian and caused the neocircumflex that we find in these words: *mèla*, *gr̆zla*. I presume that the accented vowel in *\*mèla* was short enough to be affected by the rise of the neocircumflex (the short neoacute is otherwise reflected as long in Kajkavian, e.g. *zēlje*). The second introduction of posttonic length did not affect feminine forms of the type *\*rekl̆* in Kajkavian because they were still oxytone at the time.

Finally, I want to return to the Northwest Čakavian dialects of Orbanići and Orlec where we find retraction of the ictus onto a long root vowel in examples like *narāsla*, but not in *rekl̆*, cf. also Orbanići *dāl̆*, Orlec *dal̆* where the final stress is preserved. This situation is of a different nature than the one we have seen in the other dialects because here vowel length plays a role. The retraction in *narāsla* etc. can tentatively be explained as a result of the fact that Proto-Slavic had pretonic but not prepretonic length after Dybo's law. When length was restored in verbal prefixes such as *na-*, *pri-*, *za-*, the ictus shifted onto the syllable directly following the prefix (either analogically or as a sound law), thus avoiding prepretonic length: Northwest Čakavian *\*nārāslā* > *\*narāslā* >> *\*nārāslā* > *\*nārāsla*. At a later stage the long vowel of the prefix was shortened and root stress was generalized in mobile verbs with a long root vowel. Ebeling (1967: 593) convincingly argued that the same development is found in, e.g., Neo-Štokavian *trēsēte*, *tréseno* with accent retraction, as opposed to *pečēte*, *pečeno* without retraction, both verbs reflecting an originally mobile paradigm.

## 11. Slovak

We have seen above that the accentuation of the *l*-participle suggests that the deletion of final jers in Kajkavian and Slovene occurred later if the jer in question was preceded by a tautosyllabic resonant. Whether the same is true for the rest of South Slavic remains unclear, although the generally attested short root vowel of the masculine singular form of the *\*nesl̆*-type probably indicates that it is. In Slovak, however, the situation appears to be different.

A brief look at the distribution of infinitive forms in Slovak is relevant for the following discussion of the *l*-participle. Infinitives with a root-final obstruent show a long root vowel (even if the other languages point to original root stress): acute *hrýzt'*, *klást'*, *liezt'*, *pást'*, *priast'*, *siect'*, non-acute *hniest'*, *hriebst'*, *miest'*, *niest'*, *piect'*, *pliest'*, *riect'*, *tiect'*, *viest'*, *viezt'*, *môct'*. A short stem vowel is found in acute verbal roots that are not closed by an obstruent: *byt'*, *dat'*, *dut'*, *-jat'*, *pät'*, *-t'at'*, *bit'*, *myt'* (Nonnemacher-Pribić 1961: 108f.).

The length of the stem vowel of the Slovak infinitives adduced above thus depends on whether or not the root is closed by an obstruent. More or less the same distribution applies to the *l*-participle, with the exception of *mohol*, *mohla*, where we find a short root vowel. Slovak dialects clearly show that the long reflex of Proto-Slavic short vowels was originally restricted to the masculine singular form of the *l*-participle: *\*niesol*, but *\*nesla*. In view of the correspondence between the infinitive and masculine singular form of the *l*-participle, the long vowel is probably connected with the fact that both forms ended in a jer. One is naturally reminded of the long vowel that arose in the genitive plural of mobile nouns through retraction of the accent from the final jer to the preceding vowel (see section 2. above). The natural assumption is thus that the accentual pattern of the mobile paradigm spread to the infinitive and *l*-participle of other verbs in an obstruent, i.e. those with an acute root. The basis for the analogy is the fact that all these verbs were already mobile in the present tense, cf. Čakavian *grīzěš*, *pāsěš*, *prēděš* etc. Subsequently, retraction of the accent from a final jer resulted in a long root vowel: *\*nesl̆* > *\*něsl̆*, *\*gryzl̆* > *\*gr̆yzl̆*. It follows that in Slovak the retraction of the accent from final jers after tautosyllabic resonants yielded pretonic long vowels. This need not have been simultaneous with the retraction from a weak jer in the genitive plural, but the outcome is the same.

On the basis of the fact that the verb *mohol*, *mohla* etc. reflects an exceptional short root vowel in Slovak, Kortlandt assumes that there was a difference between originally end-stressed *\*nesl̆* > *\*něsl̆* on the one hand and originally root-stressed *\*mògl̆* on the other. This is in agreement with the fact that the latter verb is the only one of this kind which forms a present tense according to accent paradigm (b) (*môžes'*), while the *\*nesl̆*-type has a present tense according to paradigm (c). As observed above, the final stress of *\*nesl̆* was introduced in verbs with an acute root that end in an obstruent on the basis of the fact that the present tense was mobile in both types. The fact that the final stress was not introduced in *\*mògl̆* in all dialects can thus be connected with the fact that it did not have the same accentuation in the present tense as *\*nesl̆*.

The criticism of Kortlandt's view offered by Babik (2007) and Olander (2009: 209) fails to take away the impression that we are dealing with the retention of an older opposition. The fact that we find *môhol* and similar forms in dialects (cf. Babik 2007: 70ff.), is a hardly surprising innovation on the basis of the present tense forms (*môžem*) and the pattern *\*niesol*, *\*nesla*, as was argued by Kortlandt 2011: 345. At the conference *Dani akcentologije* in Zagreb, where the present paper was first presented, Siniša Habijanec rightly pointed out that the short root vowel of Slovak *bodol* cannot be adduced as a counterexample because it is clearly analogical to the infinitive *bodnut'* and we have seen above that the timbre of the root vowel in the *l*-participle is connected with that of the infinitive.

The difference between *mohol* and *niesol* indicates that final jers after a tautosyllabic resonant lost the accent in Slovak before Dybo's law. Otherwise the two paradigms would have merged as a result of a shift *\*mòglǔ > \*moglǔ*, as they did in South Slavic.

## 12. Relative chronology

The relative chronology of the developments discussed in the article can be concluded to be as follows:

1. Retraction of the accent from final jers, not affecting those cases in which the jer is preceded by a tautosyllabic resonant in (part of?) western South Slavic. The newly accented vowel obtained a long rising tone (e.g., gen.pl. *\*nògǔ* and in Slovak *niesol*).

2. Dybo's law, causing the shift *\*mòglǔ > \*moglǔ* in South Slavic, but not in West Slavic.

3. Simplification of *\*-dl-*, *\*-tl-* to *-l-* in most of South Slavic (and probably around the same time in East Slavic). This development is posterior to 1. because of Kajkavian (Prigorje) *bòl*, Čakavian (Brač) *mêl* (with secondary lengthening), which have the reflex of a short vowel rather than a long neoacute vowel (i.e. *\*bodlǔ > \*bolǔ > \*bòlǔ*).

4. Spread of the long ending of the feminine *l*-participle to all verb forms in which the *\*l* was directly preceded by a vowel in a large part of western South Slavic. This accounts for a) Southeast and Central Čakavian, Kajkavian and West Posavian *dāla* (the Slovene data are ambiguous), b) Kajkavian *mēla* and probably Southeast and Central Čakavian *mēla*, and c) Kajkavian and Slovene dialectal *gorêla*. The innovation did not reach Northwest Čakavian.

5. Stang's law, yielding the initial stress of Southeast and Central Čakavian and Kajkavian *dāla* and Kajkavian *mēla*, Southeast and Central Čakavian, West Posavian *plēla*.

6. Spread of the long ending to all cases in which the ending was unstressed in Kajkavian.

7. The rise of the neocircumflex in Slovene, Kajkavian and Northwest Čakavian, giving rise to, amongst others: Kajkavian *mēla*, *grīzla*, Kajkavian, Slovene *grīzel*, dialectal *gorēla* (Rigler 2001: 322ff., 342).

8. The retraction of the stress from final jers that had escaped the retraction under 1. This change is probably simultaneous with 7. and with the stress shift from weak internal jers onto a preceding syllable (e.g. Slovene *pōšlješ*).

9. The analogical introduction of root stress in paradigms like *\*nēsla*, *\*nēslo*, *\*nēsli*, *\*nēsle* in parts of Čakavian, Kajkavian and Štokavian. In those dialects that had undergone the retraction in the type *\*mēla* < *\*melā* according to 5., the feminine form was already barytone and only the neuter and plural forms obtained secondary root stress in verbs of this type.

#### Literature:

- BABIK, ZBIGNIEW 2005. Na marginesie najnowszej fonologii historycznej języka słoweńskiego. *Rocznik Slawistyczny*, 55, Wrocław, 93–136.
- BABIK, ZBIGNIEW 2007. Przyczynki do gramatyki historycznej języka słowackiego. Z dziejów participium *\*moglъ*. *Rocznik Slawistyczny*, 56, Wrocław, 69–82.
- BAOČIĆ, JOSIP 1979. Akcenatski sistem sela Kostrča u bosanskoj Posavini. *Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik*, 2, Sarajevo, 161–267.
- BELIĆ, ALEKSANDAR 2000. Beleške o čakavskim govorima. U: *O dijalektima* (= *Izabrana dela A. Belića*, 10), Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 136–186.
- BENIĆ, MISLAV 2011. Der Akzent bei den Verben der Mundart der Ortschaft Kukljica. U: Tijmen Pronk i Rick Derksen (ur.), *Accent Matters: Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 37), Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi, 1–17.
- BROZOVIĆ, DALIBOR 2007. *Govor u dolini rijeke Fojnice* (= *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 13). Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- CELINIĆ, ANITA 2010. Vokalizam gornjosutlanskih govora. U: Mijo Lončarić (ur.), *Prinosi hrvatskoj dijalektnoj fonologiji*. Split–Zagreb: Književni krug–IHJJ, 7–76.

- ČILAŠ ŠIMPRAGA, ANKICA 2010. Ikavski štokavski govori između rijeke Krke i Neretve. U: Mijo Lončarić (ur.), *Prinosi hrvatskoj dijalektalnoj fonologiji*. Split–Zagreb: Književni krug–IHJJ, 159–224.
- ČUPIĆ, DRAGO 1977. *Govor Bjelopavlića* (= *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 23). Beograd: Institut za srpskohrvatski jezik.
- DANIČIĆ, ĐURO 1896. *Akcenti u glagola*. Zagreb: Knjižara jugoslavenske akademije.
- DYBO, VLADIMIR 2000. *Morfonologizovannye paradigmatičeskie akcentnye sistemy. Tipologija i genezis. Tom I*. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- EBELING, CARL 1967. Historical laws of Slavic accentuation. In: *To honor Roman Jakobson I*, 577–593. The Hague–Paris: Mouton.
- ELEZOVIĆ, GLIŠA 1932., 1935. *Rečnik kosovsko-metohiskog dijalekta*. Beograd: Grafički umetnički zavod “Planeta”.
- GARDE, PAUL 1976. *Histoire de l'accentuation slave*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
- HOLZER, GEORG 2009. Urslavische Prosodie. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, 55, Wien, 151–178.
- HOUTZAGERS, PETER 1985. *The Čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 5). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- HOUTZAGERS, PETER; ELENA BUDOVSKAJA 1996. Nominal and verbal inflexion in the Čakavian dialect of Kali on the island of Ugljan. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 23, 143–166.
- HRASTE, MATE 1926.–1927. Crstice o bruškom dialektu. *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 6, Beograd, 180–214.
- HRASTE, MATE; PETAR ŠIMUNOVIĆ; REINHOLD OLESCH 1979. *Čakavisches-Deutsches Lexikon I*. Köln–Wien: Böhlau.
- ISAČENKO, ALEKSANDR V. 1939. *Narečje vasi Sele na Rožu*. Ljubljana: Znanstveno društvo.
- IVIĆ, PAVLE 1964. O govoru ličkih čakavaca (okolina Otočca). *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku*, 7, Beograd, 127–139.
- IVIĆ, PAVLE 1998. *Rasprave, studije, članci 1: o fonologiji* (= *Celokupna dela*, X/1). Sremski Karlovci–Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.
- IVŠIĆ, STJEPAN 1913. Današnji posavski govor (svršetak). *Rad JAZU*, 197, Zagreb, 9–138.
- IVŠIĆ, STJEPAN 1936. Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca: o stogodišnjici našega novoga prapopisa i književnog jezika. *Ljetopis JAZU*, 48, Zagreb, 47–88.
- JEDVAJ, JOSIP 1956. Bednjanski govor. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 1, Zagreb, 279–330.

- JURIŠIĆ, BLAŽ 1973. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade. II. dio: Rječnik*. Zagreb: JAZU.
- KALSBECK, JANNEKE 1988. *The Čakavian Dialect of Orbančići near Žminj in Istria* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 25). Amsterdam–Atlanta: Rodopi.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE 2005. Slavic length again. *Filologija*, 45, Zagreb, 29–45.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE 2008. Razvoj hrvatske akcentuacije. *Filologija*, 51, Zagreb, 1–39.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE 2009. O naglasku *e*-glagolâ u zapadnoj Posavini. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, 5, Zadar, 107–121.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE 2011. The accentuation of *i*-verbs in Croatian dialects. U: Tijmen Pronk i Rick Derksen (ur.), *Accent Matters: Papers on Balto–Slavic accentology* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 37), Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi, 109–233.
- KOLETNIK, MIHAELA 2001. *Slovenskogoriško narečje* (= *Zora*, 12). Maribor: Slavistično društvo.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK 2011. *Selected Writings on Slavic and General Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 39). Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi.
- KUSTIĆ, NIKOLA 2002. *Čakavski govor grada Paga s rječnikom*. Zagreb: Društvo Pažana i prijatelja grada Paga u Zagrebu.
- LANGSTON, KEITH 2006. *Čakavian Prosody: The Accentual Patterns of the Čakavian Dialects of Croatian*. Bloomington: Slavica.
- LANGSTON, KEITH 2007. The Neocircumflex in Western South Slavic. *Slovenski jezik/Slovene Linguistic Studies*, 6, Ljubljana–Lawrence, 77–95.
- LIPLJIN, TOMISLAV 2002. *Rječnik varaždinskoga kajkavskog govora*. Varaždin: Garestin.
- MILKOVIĆ, IVAN 2009. *Lička štokavska ikavica*. Zagreb: Pergamena.
- MOGUŠ, MILAN 1966. Današnji senjski govor, *Senjski zbornik*, 2, Senj, 5–152.
- MOSKOVLJEVIĆ, MILOŠ 1928.–1929. Akcenti pocerskog govora. *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 7, Beograd, 5–68.
- NEWEKLOWSKY, GERHARD 1989. *Der kroatische Dialekt von Stinatz. Wörterbuch* (= *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach, Sonderband 25*). Wien: Gesellschaft für Förderung slawistischer Studien.
- NIKOLIĆ, BERISLAV 1969. Kolubarski govor. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik*, 18, Beograd, 1–71.
- NONNENMACHER-PRIBIĆ, ELISABETH 1961. *Die baltoslavischen Akzent- und Intonationsverhältnisse und ihr quantitativer Reflex im Slovakischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- OLANDER, THOMAS 2009. *Balto–Slavic Accentual Mobility* (= *Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs*, 199). Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- PRONK, TIJMEN 2009. *The Slovene Dialect of Egg and Potschach in the Gailtal, Austria* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 36). Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi.
- PRONK, TIJMEN 2012. Indo-European long vowels and Balto-Slavic accentuation. *Baltistica*, 47/2, Vilnius, 205–247.
- RIGLER, JAKOB 1963. *Južnotranjski govori: akcent in glasoslovje govorov med Snežnikom in Slavnikom*. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- RIGLER, JAKOB 2001. *Zbrani spisi I: jezikozgodovinske in dialektološke razprave*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- ROŽIĆ, VATROSLAV 1893a. Kajkavski dijalekat u Prigorju. *Rad JAZU*, 115, Zagreb, 68–136.
- ROŽIĆ, VATROSLAV 1893b. Kajkavski dijalekat u Prigorju. *Rad JAZU*, 116, Zagreb, 113–174.
- ROŽIĆ, VATROSLAV 1894. Kajkavski dijalekat u Prigorju. *Rad JAZU*, 118, Zagreb, 55–115.
- SCHNEINIGG, JOHANN 1882. Die Assimilation im Rosenthaler Dialect. Ein Beitrag zur kärntisch-slovenischen Dialectforschung. *XXXII. Programm des k.k. Staats-Gymnasium zu Klagenfurt*, Klagenfurt, 3–27.
- SKOK, PETAR 1911. Mundartliches aus Žumberak (Sichelburg) I. *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 32, Berlin, 363–382.
- SKOK, PETAR 1912. Mundartliches aus Žumberak (Sichelburg) II. *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 33, Berlin, 338–375.
- SNOJ, MARKO 1994. Naglaševanje praslovanskih -y/-ъv- osnov ženskega spola. *Slavistična revija*, 42/4, Ljubljana, 491–528.
- STANG, CHRISTIAN 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- STANIĆ, MILIJA 1974. *Uskočki govor* (= *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik*, 20). Beograd: Institut za srpskohrvatski jezik.
- STEENWIJK, HAN 1992. *The Slovene Dialect of Resia, San Giorgio* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 18). Amsterdam–Atlanta: Rodopi.
- ŠIMUNDIĆ, MATE 1971. *Govor Imotske krajine i Bekije*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH.
- ŠIMUNOVIĆ, PETAR 1970. Toponimijsko-dijalekatski prinosi s Mljeta. *Filologija*, 6, Zagreb, 237–245.
- ŠOJAT, ANTUN 1973. Govor u Samoboru i njegovoj okolici. *Rasprave Instituta za jezik JAZU*, 2, Zagreb, 51–72.
- ŠOJAT, ANTUN 1982. Turopoljski govori. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, 6, Zagreb, 317–493.

- TOMINEC, IVAN 1964. *Črnovrški dialekt. Kratka monografija in slovar*. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- TOMLJENOVIĆ, GR. 1910.–1911. Bunjevački dijalekat zaleđa senjskoga s osobitim obzirom na naglas. *Nastavni vjesnik*, 19, Zagreb, 335–348, 401–414, 483–499, 579–604.
- VAILLANT, ANDRÉ 1966. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome III: le verbe*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- VALJAVEC, MATIJA 1897. Glavne točke o naglasu književne slovenštine, *Rad JAZU*, 132, Zagreb, 116–213.
- VERMEER, WILLEM 1980. Die Konjugation in der nordwestčakavischen Mundart Omišaljs. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 1, Amsterdam, 439–472.
- VERMEER, WILLEM 1982. On the principal sources for the study of čakavian dialects with neocircumflex in adjectives and *e*-presents. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 2, Amsterdam, 279–340.
- VERMEER, WILLEM 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, Berlin, 331–395.
- VERWEIJ, ARNO 1994. Quantity patterns of substantives in Czech and Slovak. U: Adriaan Barentsen et al. (ur.), *Dutch contributions to the 11th international congress of Slavists: Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 22). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 493–564.
- VIDOVIĆ, DOMAGOJ 2007. Accentual alternations in Neo-Štokavian Ijekavian dialects of Neretvanska Krajina. U: Mate Kapović i Ranko Matasović (ur.), *Tones and Theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*. Zagreb: IHJJ, 199–211.
- VRANIĆ, SILVANA 2004. Glagolski oblici u govoru Metajne na Pagu. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 30, Zagreb, 203–241.
- ZORKO, ZINKA 1989. Vzhodnokoroški govori v Dravski dolini, na severnem Pohorju in v Dravskem obmejne hribovju. U: Franc Jakopin (ur.), *Zbornik razprav iz slovanskega jezikoslovja: Tinetu Logarju ob sedemdesetletnici*. Ljubljana: SAZU, 395–405.
- ZUBČIĆ, SANJA 2003. Akcent glagolskoga pridjeva radnoga u sjeverozapadnim čakavskim govorima. *Čakavska rič*, 31/1–2, Split, 139–163.
- ZUBČIĆ, SANJA; IVANA SANKOVIĆ 2008. Akcenatski tipovi pridjeva u mjesnome govoru Trtna. *Fluminensia*, 20/2, Rijeka, 51–62.

## O akcentuaciji glagolskih pridjeva radnih tipa *nesl̥* u zapadnojužnoslavenskom

### Sažetak

U članku se analizira akcentuacija zapadnojužnoslavenskih glagolskih pridjeva radnih, tvorenih od glagolskih osnova koje završavaju na okluziv dodatkom sufiksa *\*-l-* neposredno na osnovu, npr. *\*nes-l̥*, hrv. *něsao*, sln. *něsel*. Uspoređuje se građa iz čakavskih, kajkavskih, štokavskih i slovenskih govora. Ta se građa promatra u svjetlu kasnih općeslavenskih i ranih dijalektnih akcentatskih i fonoloških promjena. Glasovne promjene poput Diboova zakona, Stangova zakona, nastanka novoga cirkumfleksa i gubitka slabih poluglasa prouzročile su unutarparadigmatske i međuparadigmatske alternacije po tonu, duljini i mjestu naglaska. Te su alternacije mogle biti proširene ili uklonjene u različitim arealima i u različitim razdobljima u povijesti zapadnojužnoslavenskoga. Tako su nastale neke od najranijih izoglosa na ovom području.

Key words: verbal accentuation, Proto-Slavic, Čakavian, Kajkavian, Štokavian, Slovene  
Ključne riječi: glagolska akcentuacija, praslavenski, čakavski, kajkavski, štokavski, slovenski

