THE MAIN FEATURES OF SOUTH SLAVIC ACCENTOLOGY

Lew R. Micklesen

In this paper I explore the gross features of accentological development in Serbo-Croatian [SC], Slovene [Sn] and Bulgarian [Bg]. This survey will performe be just a special case of the general history of Slavic accentology, but with particular South Slavic features manifesting themselves, especially in the later developmental stages.

I begin my account in late Common Slavic [CS] at a point when the three main accentological paradigms for nouns, adjectives and verbs have been established: the barytonic (root-stressed) pattern; the final-columnar [FC] pattern (stress on the first syllable of the desinence); and the mobile pattern, where the stress alternates in a fixed pattern between the first and final syllables of the inflectional forms. Just how these three basic paradigms evolved is a fascinating and critical part of the complete story, but, unfortunately, lies for the most part beyond the scope of this discussion. I need say only that barytonic and FC words contain derived roots or stems, while mobile words are essentially non-derived forms without any obvious suffixes. As derived forms, barytonic and FC words are found with lengthened-grade roots and normal-grade roots, respectively; and may represent chronologically different levels of derivation.

In Table I are displayed the late CS paradigms for typical South Slavic words, and the paradigms for the same words in the modern languages. For Late CS, note particularly the position of stress and the length of the accented syllable; and note that at the stage chosen here there are no syllables with rising intonation—all accented syllables, both long and short, have unmarked falling intonation. For the modern languages, note the degree of agreement with the CS paradigms:

The most spectacular phonological event in the history of the Slavic languages, with far-reaching side-effects on the prosodic system, was the loss of the jers, producing the neo-acute accents. It is reasonable to assume that the jers were lost in three stages: 1) internally, 2) final when unstressed, 3) final when stressed. Weak internal jers appeared among a few fem. compound postverbals, collective nouns, and derived adjectives. The first category is nicely exemplified by *o = süp + a → Sn ospa, SC ōspa,2 where the jer was lost and the stress drawn back to the resulting long syllable. Collective nouns with iJ-occurred among fem. and neut. nouns: *soux + iJ + a → Sn súa, SC súa, Bg suša; *storg + iJ + a → Sn stráža, SC stráža, Bg stráža; *tirn + iJ + ã → Sn tráže, SC tráže, Bg tráne. In a more advanced stage of the original formula we have, e.g., *sušítuţa, where the jer disappeared and the stress was retracted to yield the neo-acute (rising) accent on the resulting long syllable. The falling accent in the SC forms was due to a later shift from a marked rising to an unmarked falling stress. The same suffix, -iJ-, was used with neut. o-stems to form verbal nouns on the past pass. pecple -î/-n- stem. Here we frequently observe the same kind of retraction: SC plëténje trësëntje Sn pletenje trëšënje, Bg plëtene trësemi; but such formations must have arisen over a considerable time span, because we have final stress in most disyllabic forms and a few others: SC bránde bëdëne bitë uzëče, Sn bránde bedëne bitë vëše. Much leveling has occurred in Bg: branë bdëne cëtene piene kriene.

It is very likely that we find the same retraction among the pronominalized forms of derived adjectives with FC stress. A good case in point here is the adjective *kort-û + k-û-ţf, in all its inflected forms. Here the pretonic medial jer was lost, and the stress retracted to produce neo-acute (rising) accents on the preceding long syllable: Sn kratki, SC krâtî i, Bg
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### COMMON SLAVIC NOUNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Barytonic</th>
<th>Final Columnar</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSg</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožа</td>
<td>zöbа</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožу</td>
<td>zöbу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>prágomyь</td>
<td>nožemь</td>
<td>zöbomь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>prägeь</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbe/ıpубь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPI</td>
<td>prági</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>prági</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>prágomь</td>
<td>nožemь</td>
<td>zöbomь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>prági</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>prági</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>prágéхь</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbхь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADu</td>
<td>präga</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbа</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>prágu</td>
<td>nožу</td>
<td>zöbу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>prágoma</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zöbома</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SERBO-CROATIAN NOUNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>prágь</th>
<th>nožь</th>
<th>rūb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožа</td>
<td>rūbа</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožу</td>
<td>rūбу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>rūбь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>prágомь</td>
<td>nožемь</td>
<td>rūбомь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>prägeь</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>rūбу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPI</td>
<td>prágovi</td>
<td>nožевь</td>
<td>rūхи</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>prágovь</td>
<td>nožевь</td>
<td>rūба</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>prágovima</td>
<td>nožевима</td>
<td>rūбима</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>prágove</td>
<td>nožеве</td>
<td>rūбе</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>prágove</td>
<td>nožевима</td>
<td>rūбима</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>prágovima</td>
<td>nožевима</td>
<td>rūбима</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SLOVENE NOUNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>prágg</th>
<th>nožь</th>
<th>zöб</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožа</td>
<td>zоба</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožу</td>
<td>zобу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>prágь</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zобь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>prágomь</td>
<td>nožемь</td>
<td>zобомь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>prägeь</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zобу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPI</td>
<td>prági</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zобь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>prágovь</td>
<td>nožевь</td>
<td>zоба</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>prágovima</td>
<td>nožевима</td>
<td>zобима</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>prágove</td>
<td>nožеве</td>
<td>zобе</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>prágove</td>
<td>nožевима</td>
<td>zобима</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>prágovima</td>
<td>nožевима</td>
<td>zобима</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADu</td>
<td>präga</td>
<td>nožа</td>
<td>zоба</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>prágoma</td>
<td>nožь</td>
<td>zобома</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BULGARIAN NOUNS

prag, prage, pragat
pragove

noj, noza, nozat
nozove

ADJECTIVES

BARYTONIC

CS: star, stara, staro

FINAL COLUMNAR

dobr, dobr, dobr
doabre

MOBILE

mlad, mlada, mlado
mlad

SC: star, stara, staro

dobar, dobra, dboro
dobar

Sn: star, stara, staro

dobar, dobra, dboro
dobar

Bg: star, stara, staro

dobar, dobr, dobr
dobrat

VERBS

BARYTONIC

CS: sedq sedesq sedqat

sesti

sedem seden seden

sedi seda sedli

SC: sedem sedes sedo

sesti

sedem sden seden

sedi seda sedli

Sn: sedem sedes sedo

sesti

sedem seden seden

sedi seda sedli

Bg: sedna sedneq sednat

sednax

sednai sednala sednali

CS: pasqi sredqi sredpti

sedi pasaq sredali

Sn: pisem pisato pisal

pisem pisato pisal

Bg: pisem piseto pisalo

pisem piseto pisalo

TABLE I
kratkiyat. SC again produced the unmarked falling accent at a later date, and Bg had only the one articulated form. Note that the SC short forms kratak, krátka, krátko indicate that the neo-acute retraction did not take place in these forms because in the canonical masc. form the medial jer is strong, not weak. Adjectives in Sn were particularly susceptible to analogical influences, and there is good evidence that, here, original */o e/ are pronounced open [œ] rather than close [o e], which is what is expected under the neo-acute: Sn krátki tesni těží vs. SC krótki těšni těží.

We are next concerned with the neo-acute developing when final stressed jers were lost. This can be adequately illustrated with the FC and oxytonic words in Table I. SC nôč, Sn nôč, Bg nôčat show the original stress retracted from the jer desinences. The lengthening in SC was secondary. The root stress in the Bg form could be the result of analogy on the nonarticulated form. We would expect the stress to remain on the stem-final strong jer. In the Sn oxytonic forms GPI zobóv, DPI zobém, LPI zobět we see neo-acute accents on the desinences with compensatory lengthening in the GPI DPI. Among the adjectival forms SC dôbar. Sn dôber illustrate the neo-acute on a short vowel, while SC bêo Sn bêl record the same accent on a long root vowel. Bg dobár is secondary, because there was no original jer preceding the -r suffix. The most important manifestation of the neo-acute in the verbal system is, of course, among oxytonic verbs with desinences terminating in a jer: SC učim učiš, Sn učím učiš. Bg uča učiš has a secondary recessive accent. The neo-acute also appears in the masc. of -l- and -n- participles: SC něsa, Sn něsél, Bg něsöl; SC plěten, Sn plečen, Sn okován, Bg okován.

Analogical neo-acutes engendered by original neo-acutes are very prominent in the Slavic accentological systems. Such neo-acutes were formed among both pronominalized adjectives and present-tense verbal forms. The following CS adjectival desinences ended in jers: NSgM ASgM -ájí, ISgM/N -ůjímí, LSgM/N -ějěmí, GPI LPI -ůjixú, DPI -ůjimů. After the -VjV- sequences coalesced (-j- ↔ -ůj-, -e- ↔ -ěje-), the stress on the final jer in oxytonic forms was retracted to the newly-formed monophthongs; and then the stress in corresponding FC adjectives (those that had not already retracted over medial jers) was pulled back to the root syllables, in order that the original opposition oxytonic : FC should be maintained. Thus *dobrújí → SC dôbrí, Sn dôbrí; *bělají → SC bělí, Sn bělí. The same general story may be documented among the present verbal forms. When the final jers were lost in oxytonic verbs, and the neo-acute was formed (as in Sn učim učiš above) then, to preserve the oxytonic : FC opposition, a verb such as *pisěšťi píšěři retracted the stress from the thematic vowel to the root syllable, and another neo-acute was created: SC pisěm píšěš, Sn píšem píšěš, Bg píša píšèš.

Attention has already been directed to the -VjV- coalescences and their role in some of the earlier manifestations of the neo-acute among pronominalized adjectives. We shall now see that, in oxytonic adjectives, newly lengthened syllables created by this coalescence did not keep their stress if the immediate pretonic syllable was also long. The stress was retracted to the preceding syllable and gave rise there to yet another neo-acute. This development is especially clear in Sn, where mláď → mládí, dráží → dráží, göstí → göstí (Old Norm mláď, dráží, göstí). The same neo-acute occurred in SC: mládí dráží göstí. This change may also have occurred in Bg: mláđijat dragijat göstijat, although we have no direct proof of this process, given the practically universal stem stress in Bg adjectives. One of the reasons for this state of affairs was, probably, this very contraction. Note that there was no contraction in Sn if the pretonic syllable was short: Sn bosį. The SC variant forms are not clear, for we have a new acute in bösį and a much later retraction in bösį. It is always possible that bösį and even mláĎi arose by analogy with the neo-acute in FC
adjectives, but on the basis of other instances of retraction to a preceding long syllable I would guess that only the former is analogical.

The same retraction can be demonstrated in the present-tense forms that had at one time the sequence -bje-: when this contracted to -a-, the stress migrated back to pretonic length. All three languages clearly show this retraction: Sn puščam ubižam, SC puščam ubežam, Bg puščam ubivam. Only SC shows some retraction here to a pretonic short vowel: Sn kopām igrām, SC kopām igrām, Bg kopāja igrāja. In view of these Bg facts Shevelov (1965:556) suggests that contraction after short vowels may have postdated that after long vowels. One might be tempted to include here -iti verbs like Sn mlātim kūpim, SC mlātim kūpm, Bg mlāta kūpa, but the contraction of the -eje- sequence must be a much earlier phenomenon because the full sequence cannot be demonstrated in any Slavic language. Besides, the retraction occurred readily with pretonic short vowels: Sn nosim, SC nosim, Bg nosja, and the whole development must have been due to parallel retraction, as discussed above.

Inspired by the preceding retraction to long vowels, barytonic (short) vowels in Sn became long before newly lengthened posttonic vowels. This change occurred among barytonic verbs, nouns, and various kinds of adjectives. Thus we have dēlām lipo mēsec stāri ← * dēlām lipō mēseč stārī. The corresponding SC forms prove conclusively that lengthening was confined to Sn: SC dēlām līpom mēseč stārī. The form stārī is isolated and anomalous; barytonic adjectives by rule have a short root syllable, dūgī, mīlī, pūntī, slābī. A further analogy developed in Sn FC adjectives with a neo-acute on the short vowel directly preceding a single consonant. Here the neo-acute was metatonized into a circumflex: gōli širōki zelēnī ← gōli širōkī zelēnī. Note that these long forms had accented close vowels, while the corresponding short forms had open vowels, širsko, zelena.

The next accentological development in South Slavic purports to be the well-known advancement of stress, seen in a variety of grammatical forms in Sn. Here we propose that this phenomenon was linked with certain similar apparent advancements in Bg. This change did not occur in SC. Let us examine the originally mobile paradigm for *zōbū. As intimated above, the original oxytonic retraction took place consistently in all the various oxytonic paradigms, from monosyllabic desinences to the initial syllable in the NSg, GSg, ASg, NPI, API, and NADu forms. If we now look closely at the corresponding Sn paradigm we see that, where possible, it was exactly in these case forms that the advancement occurred: note the final stress in the GSg NPI API and NADu forms. Since this advancement is to be dated after the loss of the jers it could not be realized in the NASg. We can easily assume that at the time of the advancement all the other forms in the paradigm exhibited absolute final stress; the stress shift therefore represents an attempt to regularize the place of stress on the final syllable. Since the loss of jers in the NASg placed the stress on the single syllable, we may also assume that this could have triggered the advancement in the other, disyllabic, forms. It is interesting that this advancement produced a long-falling accent. If a retraction always yields a rising accent, we would expect an advancement to produce a falling one; and the only way to mark this kind of intonation clearly is by means of length.

Let us first document oxytonic, palpably nonderived forms. Such items are to be found among o-stems (primarily non-verbals), i-stems, and qualitative adjectives. Besides our example zōb we find in Sn cvet dōb glās klās lēd with the very same accentual pattern. In Bg the corresponding words have an advanced stress in the articulated forms: cvetǎt dǎbǎt glǎsǎ klasǎr iedǎt. This is the only remaining kind of Bg form that clearly shows advancement on oxytones, and it shows that the stress was advanced to the strong jer:
zúbā + tū → zúbā + t. Occasionally the original plural desinence -i offers additional proof, as in zūbi. Nonderived i-stems in Sn such as kost ņēc sōl display an accentual paradigm similar to that of zōb. The related Bg articulated forms have the advanced stress on the article: kosttā ostā rečtā soltā. Here, of course, the final ā in the NSg was a weak one and the stress was automatically advanced to the article: kosttā + tā → kost + tā. Strangely enough, the plural ending -i did not attract the stress: dlānī kost įrī rečēi. Nonderived neuter nouns also have the advanced stress in Sn: nēbō prosō senō uḥō; and the same is true for Bg: nēbō prosō senō uxbdō. In Sn nonderived adjectives the stress was advanced in all the short forms except the fem.Sg and neut.PL: neut.Sg mlādō, masc.PL mlādī, fem.PL mladē, masc.Du mladē, fem.neut.Du mladē (although alternative analogical forms with root stress do exist). drāg, glāh gost hūd krī are accented in the same manner. Bg adjectives with their thoroughgoing root stress resisted this advancement.

In view of the several retraction giving rise to neo-acute accents, especially those on long syllables, it is not surprising at all that one of the next developments should be general retraction from final short open syllables to preceding long syllables. The previous neo-acute retraction may not have been required as a spur for this new retraction, since pretonic long vowels frequently attract the stress, but the prevalence of non-final stress was certainly of importance. Note that this retraction in SC occurred after the original neo-acutes had passed from a marked to an unmarked status (falling intonation). A number of morphological situations were involved in this retraction: (a) oxytonic o-stem nouns, LSg; (b) a-stem nouns, NSg, DLSg; (c) FC neut. nouns, Sg; (d) FC masc. nouns, GSG; (e) FC short adjectives; (f) oxytonic short adjectives, Sg.fm.; (g) non-barytonic infinitives; (h) imperatives, 2nd Sg; (i) all FC l-participles except masc.sg; (j) mobile l-participles, Sg.fm; e.g.:

(a): Sn grādu brēgū, SC grādu brēgū; (b): Sn zīma zīmī, SC zīma zīmī; (c): Sn vīno, SC vīno; (d): Sn kļūcā, SC kļūcā; (e): Sn bēla okrūglo, SC bēla okrūglo; (f): Sn mlāda sēpa, SC mlāda pāsta; (g): Sn trēsti mrēti, SC trēsti mrēti; (h): Sn trēsi sōdi, SC trēsi südi; (i): Sn trēsla mēlo rāsā SC trēsla mēlo rāsā; (j): Sn brāla začēla učāla, SC brāla klēa.

This process spread to the closely-related situations where pretonic length preceded a blocked short-voweled syllable. The application of the rule was not universal here, but the greatest consistency is found in (a) the present tense, (b) l-participles, (c) supines, and (d) various compounds, e.g.:

(a) Sn trēsem rāstsem SC trēsem rāstsem; (b) Sn sōdīl pisāl držal SC sūdio pisāo vézao (formerly blocked); (c) Sn sōdit pisāt držat; (d) Sn sōsed zākon SC sūsed zākon.

Bg does not seem to have taken part in this retraction. There is just a suggestion of this process in the fact that a fairly significant number of FC masc. nouns have root stress in the articulated forms: kļūcāt stītā brjāstā, but this kind of stress could be merely an imitation of the neo-acute in the non-articulated form. Short-form adjectives are very consistent in their root stress, but, as we know, root stress is a universal feature among Bg adjectives. Some neut. nouns have root stress: vīno mlājāko/mlēkō rūno sākno, but there are many with end stress only: dleō krīlō līce. l-participles exhibit both retracted and non-retracted stress: pisāl vēzlā sādāl; this is not too significant when we consider the great tendency toward root stress in the verbal system. Imperatives in Bg do not have retracted stress: tresī piši veči.

The effects of the previous retraction from a final short syllable to a preceding long could easily have passed on to situations where a stressed final short syllable was preceded by a short. This is what could have happened universally in SC and (with some reservations) in Sn also. In Sn, this retraction was limited to short syllables containing nonreduced vowels, i.e., /o e/. No retraction occurred onto the centralized vowel /a/ or onto /i u/, which
had presumably become centralized by that time; therefore, today’s stezža igráj sukňo have final stress. The /ov/ in Sn that received the new stress were pronounced [œː] and have maintained this pronunciation to this day, although they have become lengthened. Again, this recessive stress appears throughout the morphology: (a) FC nouns, (b) FC adjectives, (c) medial-columnar nouns, (d) oxytonic nouns, LSg, (e) a-stem nouns, DLSG, (f) present-tense forms, (g) imperatives, 2nd Sg, (h) FC l-participles, (i) FC past passive participles, (j) FC infinitives; e.g.,

(a) Sn kozja okno, SC kozja okno; (b) Sn džbro širška, SC džbro širška; (c) Sn jezik kozuh, SC jezik kožuh; (d) Sn moštukost, SC moštu kost; (e) Sn gori ženi, SC gori ženi; (f) Sn pletem bdem, SC plétem bðdém; (g) Sn pleć prsi, SC pléi prúsi; (h) Sn plelo pekla, SC plélo pèkla; (i) Sn pletena pečena, SC pletena pečena; (j) Sn pleti poci, SC pleti pêći.

At this point the reader will have recognized that I have made an obvious connection between the two Sn retractions and the general neo-Štokavian retraction in SC. The latter is dated in the 15th century, but, according to Peco (1980:47-52), its final stages may be relegated to the end of the 14th century or the very onset of the 15th. Most scholars assume it to have been a stepwise process, and Peco lists a schedule very much in agreement with what is proposed here.

Other analogical forces seem to have been at work in the corresponding Bg words. Once again there is only a hint of a similar retraction in a few morphological forms that can just as readily be explained in other ways. The articulated forms of FC masc. nouns with a short root vowel frequently display root stress: kozjat bôbat mèçat; but here the formerly accented syllable was not a final one, and the recessive stress may be laid at the door of the original neo-acute. Medial-columnar masc. nouns rarely show recessive stress: ežik êovêk kožùx. Short form adjectives all have the recessive stress: širška debelo visôka; but these are undoubtedly all due to the original neo-acute on the canonical masc. form. Neuter nouns are mixed, but all may have the final stress: bedrô rebrô cêlô sêlô. Present finite forms and imperatives do not retract: pletê pleti pekê peći. Bg FC l-participles do have recessive stress: plel plêla pekâl pêkla; but again this may be due to their original neo-acute in the masc. form. Past passive participles even have the root stress: pleten pletena, pêchen pêčena; but this seems only a part of the general tendency to promulgate root stress in various past forms.

If we are correct in our assumption of a stepwise development in the neo-Štokavian retraction, then the next logical accentological event should have been the extension of this process to all words with existing stress on non-initial syllables, or to all words with existing stress on final long syllables. This operation completed the effect of the neo-Štokavian retraction. Note that in this (reasonably long) selection of examples, the stress was on a non-final syllable or on a final long syllable:

ježenu gôrama bêšeda teletîna čêsala píšala náglasak šibimac pîtânje nárêče prîgoda učeljico dolina pletûči trêšûći râstîte pletûte strûûc gôrê momûká ježerá glâvá pomôcûnik ispûtû lômê.

The last three events to be discussed here, to round out the general picture of South Slavic accentology, do not involve movements of stress but rather changes in the length of accented syllables. These changes concern only SC and Sn, since Bg by this time had long lost CS length distinctions. The first of these changes is the shortening in SC of a variety of long-falling accents located on initial syllables immediately before one long, or two or more short, syllables. The two short syllables seem to count as one long one here; bear in mind that in Sn too at one time we have encountered an intolerance of two successive
where the new \(-ovi\) suffix appears in plural formation, e.g. (NSg NPI): \(dr\,ug\,dr\,ugovi\) \(vr\,at\) \(vr\,atovi\) \(li\,st\) \(li\,stovi\). The second group comprises the products of a secondary oxytonic retraction, where a variety of derivatives has yielded an initial stress on a long syllable: \(s\,unc\) GPI \(s\,unc\,c\); \(ml\,d\,ost\) \(m\,d\,r\,ost\); \(z\,kle\,o\) \(z\,kl\,ela\); \(n\,ac\,et\) \(n\,ac\,eta\) \(isk\,ov\,an\) \(isk\,ov\,ana\); 23 Sg. aorist \(z\,kle\) \(z\,tr\,ub\); \(n\,grad\,a\) \(p\,ri\,java\). As representatives of the third group I have discovered only some a-stem neo-acute formations where length was either maintained or created before sonorants, e.g. (NSg GPI): \(bi\,lj\,ka\) \(bi\,lj\,k\,a\) \(m\,aj\,ka\) \(m\,aj\,k\,a\) \(br\,oj\,ka\) \(br\,oj\,k\,a\).

The last two length adjustments are both lengthenings, and occur only in Sn. The first is the lengthening of fixed medial short stresses, to produce the so called ‘new circumflex’ of Conservative Standard Slovene. It is quite easy to conceive of this occurrence as a lengthening, if one considers the many instances of medial length brought about by both retractions (rising) and advancements (falling). There are a number of morphological situations here: (a) Pl. and Du. imperatives, (b) present tense forms where a secondary retraction was blocked by a reduced vowel, (c) LSg of polysyllabic o-stems, (d) IPI IDu of a-stems, (e) various polysyllabic fem. nouns, (f) the NPI. of neut. nouns, most of them retracted from the final syllable before the loss of jers, and (g) fem. Sg. of the l-participle, motivated by the long-rising on fem. forms such as \(br\,ala\); e.g.:  
(a) \(ple\,ti\,mo\) \(ple\,ti\,va\) \(ple\,ti\,va\), (b) \(cv\,et\,e\,mo\) \(cv\,et\,e\,te\), (c) \(je\,l\,e\,nu\) \(kov\,a\,c\), (d) \(gor\,ami\) \(z\,im\,a\,ma\), (e) \(bes\,e\,da\) \(tel\,e\,t\,i\,na\), (f) \(v\,re\,t\,e\,na\) \(j\,ag\,ne\,ta\), (g) \(tk\,a\,la\) \(ces\,a\,la\) \(ku\,po\,v\,a\,la\).

Note that this particular lengthening did not affect disyllabic words where no model with a medial circumflex could have existed: \(li\,pa\) \(mi\,si\) \(le\,to\) \(r\,a\,ka\) \(mi\,si\).

The second Sn lengthening embraced all the remaining vowels under accent in short open syllables. This could have been abetted by the gradual accumulation of long vowels under stress over the centuries, especially in those syllables with original pretonic length. Examples here include (a) words with former pretonic short syllables, (b) barytonic words with stress on the first short syllable, and (c) medial columnar words with a short vowel under stress:  
(a) \(ko\,nj\,a\) \(d\,e\,bro\) \(ko\,st\,i\) \(\tilde{z}e\,ni\) \(ple\,tem\) \(ple\,ti\) \(ple\,ti\) \(ple\,ti\) \(ple\,te\,na\), (b) \(li\,pa\) \(mi\,si\) \(le\,to\) \(d\,e\,lat\) \(d\,e\,l\,a\) \(b\,uk\,o\,v\,i\,na\) \(p\,r\,a\,vi\,c\,i\,k\,a\), (c) \(br\,a\,ti\) \(k\,ren\,ti\) \(ku\,po\,v\,a\,lo\) \(\tilde{z}e\,le\,ti\) \(\tilde{z}e\,le\,lo\) \(lo\,c\,ti\) \(lo\,c\,lo\).

Beginning with the fall of the jers, I have attempted to link the accentological histories of the three South Slavic literary languages that have more or less free stress. I have dealt, in chronological order, with: (1) the retraction occasioned by the loss of the jers (Sn, SC, Bg); (2) the analogical retraction generated by the loss of the jers, and calculated to retain the oxytonic : FC opposition (Sn, SC, Bg); (3) the retraction from the newly contracted (long) syllables onto pretonic longs (Sn, SC, Bg); (4) the analogical lengthening before long syllables, based on development 3 (Sn); (5) the oxytonic advancement (Sn, Bg); (6) the retraction from final short syllables to pretonic longs (Sn, SC); (7) the retraction from final short syllables to pretonic shorts (Sn, SC); (8) retractions elsewhere (in terms of changes 6 - 7) (SC); and (9) changes in length, involving shortening (SC) and lengthening (Sn).

University of Washington
EDITORS’ NOTE: We regret the inconvenience to this article’s readers, and the imposition on its author, occasioned by typographical expedients which resulted from modifications in the printing system. Note in particular, in the text, the use of į and ū, respectively, for the soft and hard jers; the use of the circumflex accent for long falling vowels in SC; and the permanent omission of the acute accent on Sn /e ə/.

REFERENCES
1. The following abbreviations are used: NGDAIL for the cases; SgDuPI for the numbers; MFN and masc.fem.neut. for the genders. For Sn, the ‘Old Norm’ is used throughout, but with e ə for the traditionally unaccented open ‘e o’, and e o for closed ‘e o’, traditionally marked with subscript dots and hooks. Standard accentological diacritics are used, except on /e ə/, which are to be read as always bearing the acute accent. Note also that only the Standard Sn, SC and Bg languages are considered here.
2. Missing in Bg.
3. Bg plëten with secondary recessive stress.
4. Sn d:brì has been influenced by the corresponding short forms with open [ɔ].
5. E.g., Sn pšem mlàtim krëne mlàdù bëli hvaljen sòjen; SC pšèm mlàtim krënè mlàdà bëli hvaljèn šàdjen.
6. Note that the fem. l-participle had already acquired the long falling accent.
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POVZETEK
GLAVNE ZNAČILNOSTI JUŽNOSLOVANSKEGA NAGLASOSLOVJA

Avtor zacenja svojo razpravo v sredini južnoslovanskega naglasoslova, kjer so tri naglasne paradigme že ustaljene. Najprej dokumentira po kronoloskem zaporedju upad polglasnikov, odločilen za vse nadaljnje naglasne spremembe, in njegove posledice. Sledi pomik naglasa v začetno naglašenih oblikah premične paradigm. Zatem je vrsta umikov: 1) 5 kratkih odprtih končnih zlogov na prejšnje dolge (slov. in srbohrv.), 2) s kratkih odprtih končnih zlogov na prejšnje kratke zlogove (slov. in srbohrv.), in 3) splošni umik za en zlog (zadnja faza novoštokavskega premika v srbohrv.) Nazadnje so omenjene spremembe v dolžini naglašenih zlogov: skrajanje začetnih cirkumflektiranih zlogov pred enim dolgim ali dvema kratkima zlogoma v srbohrv. in podaljšanje odprtih zlogov v slov: 1) srednji baritonski zlogi postanejo cirkumflektirani in 2) vsi ostali zlogi postanejo akutirani.