

THE CIRCUMFLEX ACCENT: A CONFRONTATION OF
ACCENTOLOGICAL CLASSES AS DOCUMENTED IN SLOVENE

Lew R. Micklesen

In this paper I shall be making reference to accentological classes established centuries ago in all the Slavic languages. As is known, many investigators in the area of Slavic accentology confine themselves to the following three accentological classes: 1) barytonic (root stress), 2) oxytonic (final stress), and 3) mobile (various patterns of root vs. final stress). These may be nicely exemplified among masculine nouns in Russian:

<i>Barytonic</i>		<i>Oxytonic</i>		<i>Mobile</i>	
rak	ráki	nož	noží	zub	zúby
ráka	rákov	nožá	nožěj	zúba	zubóv
ráku	rákam	nožú	nožám	zúbu	zubám
ráka	rákov	nož	noží	zub	zúby
rákom	rákami	nožóm	nožámi	zúbom	zubámi
ráke	rákax	nožé	nožáx	zúbe	zubáx

The above classes are valid as indicators of a certain stage in the history of Slavic accentology, but they do not coincide exactly with the primary accentological classes. The primary classes are the barytonic class, as illustrated above, that most likely arose in the case of laryngealized root syllables; the oxytonic class, which corresponds not to the above oxytonic class but to the mobile class; and the final-columnar class that is the forerunner of the oxytonic class above. The primary oxytonic class was characterized by having the stress throughout the paradigm on the last syllable of each form. The final-columnar class arose because the stress was placed just after a consonantal derivational morpheme. In the case of "nož" above the derivational element is $-i-$, and the underlying basic stem would be $no\hat{g}h + i'$ with the stress placed after the $-i-$ in all forms of the paradigm, i.e., on the first syllable of the desinence. In other words, oxytonic words are basic underived words, while all derivatives with a nonlaryngealized root are final-columnar words.

What I would like to do in this paper is to account for the development of the basic mobile pattern from the original oxytonic

pattern. I would like to show that the mobile pattern arose because of certain tensions created between the old oxytonic and final-columnar patterns and because there was a strong tendency to preserve some degree of difference between accentological patterns. The tensions mentioned above are the result of the coincidence of stress on monosyllabic desinences in both oxytonic and final-columnar stress patterns. I shall argue that the confrontation of the two patterns in monosyllabic desinences caused the stress in the case of oxytonic words, with essentially a marginal or peripheral stress, to shift from the final mora of the word to the other extreme, the absolutely initial mora of the word. It is also very important to note that, when this retraction occurred on an initial long syllable (-VV-, -VR-), the stress landed on the first mora of such dimoric combinations (- $\acute{V}V$ -, - $\acute{V}R$ -); and the so-called circumflex accent was born. This was definitely not an accentual structure inherited from Indo-European, as is frequently assumed. Even though this was a Common Slavic development, I want to address the problem primarily in terms of Slovene because of the interesting evidence contained in this language. It is true that there are other later manifestations of tension between accentological classes in Slovene, but here I want to concentrate on this first very critical one.

Let us turn to an examination of the evidence. Most of our discussion will involve various oxytonic patterns, but we must first of all establish the final-columnar pattern as a point of reference because of the suggested contrast between certain oxytonic and final-columnar forms. This pattern is characteristic of $\dot{i}o$ -stems and various other derived o -stems. For convenience I use the $\dot{i}o$ -stem noun "konj" as an example because I have ready access to the entire paradigm in Conservative Standard Slovene.¹

<i>Pre-Slavic</i>			
	Singular	Plural	Dual
N	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}s$	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}is$	N/A/V kon + \dot{i} + \acute{o}
G	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}d$	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}m$	G/L kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}us$
D	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}u$	kon + \dot{i} + \acute{o} + mus	D/I kon + \dot{i} + \acute{o} + $\bar{m}\bar{a}$
A	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}m$	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}ns$	
I	kon + \dot{i} + \acute{o} + mi	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}is$	
L	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}i$	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}i$ + su	
V	kon + \dot{i} + $\acute{o}u$		

Slovene

N	kònj	kónji	N/A	kónja
G	kónja	kónj	D/I	kónjema
D	kónju	kónjem		
A	kónja	kónje		
I	kónjem	kónji		
L	kónju/kónju	kónjih		

All we want to derive from this display is that the Slovene paradigm does point directly to the final-columnar stress postulated for the pre-Slavic paradigm. The ` accent in the NS is the neo-acute accent on a short vowel. The ´ accent on the close o in the GP is the neo-acute on a short vowel lengthened secondarily in this case form in both Slovene and Serbo-Croatian. All the other accents are on long open ɔ̄ and are the result of a late retraction from a final short vowel to a preceding short vowel that was subsequently lengthened to ɔ̄ : under stress. The alternative LS form *kônju* is apparently an analogical form introduced to distinguish between the DS and LS since this distinction is consistently made in the reflexes of the oxytonic paradigms and has been carried over to the final-columnar pattern.

The oxytonic paradigms, which are distributed over u-stems, i-stems, and underived o-stems, will furnish us with the kind of evidence we need to explore the fairly complex problem of tension between final-columnar and oxytonic paradigms in monosyllabic desinences. Again in each case the pre-Slavic paradigm is listed to underscore the nature of the desinences and the relationship of this paradigm to the corresponding Slovene paradigm. The first oxytonic paradigm will be that for the u-stems.

*u-stems**Pre-Slavic*

	Singular	Plural		Dual
N	sūn + ús	sūn + oū + és	N/A/V	sūn + ū
G	sūn + óus	sūn + oū̄ + óm	G/L	sūn + oū + óus
D	sūn + oū + éi	sūn + u + mús	D/I	sūn + u + mǎ
A	sūn + úm	sūn + úns		
I	sūn + u + mí	sūn + u + mís		
L	sūn + oū + í	sūn + u + sú		
V	sún + oū			

Slovene

N	sîn	sinôvi	N/A	sîna/sinôva
G	sinû/sîna	sinôv	D/I	sînoma/sinôvoma
D	sînu	sinôvom		
A	sinû/sîna	sinôve		
I	sînom	sinmí		
L	sínu	sinôvih		

In spite of the fact that u-stems survive in the modern Slavic languages with their characteristic endings employed only in certain cases and with their specific u-stem suffix only in plural forms; they are of strategic importance to us because they were exclusively oxytonic, and, when they did influence o-stem paradigms both accentologically and formally, they affected primarily oxytonic o-stems. From this u-stem paradigm we should learn that the following cases have monosyllabic desinences: NS, GS, AS, N/ADu. The same case forms in the final-columnar io-stem paradigm have monosyllabic desinences; and, if our theory of tension is valid, we would expect retraction of the stress in oxytonic words to the first mora of the word with the concomitant appearance of the circumflex accent. Among the forms with monosyllabic desinences we find such a circumflex in the NS, GS, and N/ADu. The results are illusory, however, in Slovene because the only legitimate circumflex on the first syllable is that in the NS. In Slovene after the loss of final jers all oxytonic forms with initial stress on either a long or short syllable advanced the stress by one syllable, thereby establishing a circumflex accent on the next syllable. This means that *sîna* in GS, N/ADu is an analogical form probably based on the NS and that *sinû* (GS), *sinôve* (AP), and *sinôva* (N/ADu) are forms with the expected circumflex accent on the following syllable. It is true that *sinôve* and *sinôva* have the -ov- extension (i.e., a disyllabic desinence), but they are responding accentologically to a general pattern established among other oxytonic classes with monosyllabic desinences. The same can be said for the NP form *sinôvi*, which, while it has an underlying disyllabic desinence, is nevertheless obeying a general rule. All this will become clearer as we proceed through the discussion of other oxytonic stem types. The pre-Slavic form of the LS, *sūnouí*, may require some explanation. The usual formulation is given as *sūnōū* with either an original or secondary stress on the final long diphthong,² which in the latter case supposedly attracted the stress because of its inherent rising quality. Our thesis, on the other hand, affirms that the original desinence was disyllabic -ou + i, attested elsewhere in Indo European,³

an ending that persisted through the period of the formation of the circumflex accent. At a later date presumably the stress was lost on the final short high vowel, the stress was retracted to the preceding vowel, and the final short -i was lost. The reader will also have noticed the DS *sînu* and IS *sînom* with no indication, i.e., *sînu*, *sînom*, of a former final stress with disyllabic desinences. As far as I know, there is no pertinent information in older Slovene, but Old Russian shows clearly an earlier final stress in the IS and some evidence for final stress in the DS.⁴ A discussion of the i-stem paradigm follows.

*i-stems**Pre-Slavic*

	Singular	Plural		Dual
N	kost + ís	kost + ís	N/A/V	kost + í
G	kost + éis	kost + ei + óm	G/L	kost + ei + óus
D	kost + ei + éi	kost + i + mús	D/I	kost + i + má
A	kost + ím	kost + íns		
I	kost + i + iám	kost + i + mí		
L	kost + ei + í	kost + i + sú		
V	kóst + ei			

Slovene

N	kôst	kostî	N/A	kostî
G	kostí	kostí	D/I	kostéma
D	kósti	kostém		
A	kôst	kostî		
I	kostjó	kostmí		
L	kósti	kostéh		

The i-stem nouns will also yield important information for our purpose, for they are predominantly oxytonic (only a few of them are barytonic). In fact, they have become so thoroughly oxytonic that there seem to be no derivatives with an expected final-columnar stress. That is, suffixed nouns behave or seem to behave just as oxytonic nouns should, e.g., Slovene *bolêst*, *čeljûst*, *jesên*, *zelên*, and the same is true of prefixed derivatives, which should have a columnar stress on the root syllable, e.g., *namên*, *oblâst*, *povêst*, all with a stress typical of oxytonic nouns. The pre-Slavic paradigm above shows that the same cases (plus the NP) have monosyllabic desinences

as among the u-stems: NS, GS, AS, NP, AP, N/ADu. This implies that a retraction will take place to the initial mora in these forms; and, indeed, we find perfect correspondence among the Slovene forms if we take into consideration the expected advancement of stress in the GS, NP, AP, and N/ADu. Some scholars may object to my assumptions about the underlying forms for the DS and the LS. As is well known, the DS ending -i in extant i-stems is usually ascribed to the influence of the DS for the *ia*-stems, and the LS is usually considered to consist only of the thematic suffix -e_i. I would advocate a strict parallelism with the u-stem paradigm. In the case of the DS it is easily possible to assume the following development of the disyllabic desinence: -e_i + é_i > -**ij** > -í. The LS desinence -e_i + í could have developed into - **ij** and then -í, or the stress on the final short -i could have been lost so that -é_i > -é_i > -í, as I suggested in the case of the u-stem LS. The Slovene indication of an earlier final stress in *kósti* (DS) is supposed to be only an imitation of the LS; but Jaksche⁵ notes that in Trubar and in dialects one finds a final stress in the DS, and Kolesov⁶ notes that Lorentz in his work on Slovencian asserts that the root stress there in the DS is secondary. When we inspect some other i-stem paradigms, we are first of all encouraged by the fact that a pluralia tantum noun like *ljudjê* has the same accentological paradigm as *kôst*: NP *ljudjê*, GP *ljudí*, DP *ljudêm*, AP *ljudí*, IP *ljudmí*, LP *ljudêh*. This paradigm does raise a question about the NP form *ljudjê*. The ending here was originally associated with masculine i-stems such as **ghost* + e_i + é_s, a disyllabic desinence that eventually yielded *gostbje*. The problem here is whether the stress was or was not retracted from this disyllabic desinence; and, if it was, whether by phonetic or purely analogical means. Former i-stems such as *ljudjê*, *tatjê*, *golôbje*, *gospôdje*, *gostjê*, and *črvjê* and oxytonic o-stems such as *volcjê*, *voztjê*, *zobjê*, *moztjê*, and *lasjê* look interesting but do not give real proof that the stress was retracted from the -**bjé**. There are a few NP forms like *góstje*, *gróbjje* with the stress on an open \mathfrak{C} hinting at a later retraction from a final short vowel to a preceding short vowel, but this apparent development could be vitiated by competing NP forms *gósti*, *gróbi* also with open \mathfrak{C} , indicating nothing more than an analogical alliance with final-columnar nouns. It is quite possible that *gost jé* survived the oxytonic retraction as a disyllabic desinence and then succumbed to a neo-acute retraction over the medial *jer* and yielded *góstje* with a stressed close o. Then analogical forces in this type of paradigm advanced the stress to give all the nominative plurals cited above. Since we have the same problem with the NP of u-stems (-ou + é_s, where there is no medial *jer*) we might also claim that in the case of these two disyllabic desinences the circumflex retraction did take place but only by analogical

pressure from great numbers of feminine i-stem nouns and o-stem nouns, where the NP had monosyllabic desinences. Another apparent problem is lodged in the accentology of the numerals 5-10, where the Slavic languages show retraction in the N: Sn. *pêt, desêt*, SCr. *pêt, dèsēt*, Russ. *désjat'*, but a final stress in the G: Sn. *pétih, desétih*, Russ. *pjati, desjati*. Stang⁷ has discussed this problem at some length, and I agree with him that these words are all derivatives with a basic final-columnar stress. Only the N/A forms have undergone retraction. This possibility is especially clear in Slovene, where *sédem* and *ósem* have the neo-acute accent we expect from a substantive with a final-columnar stress.

So far we have been able to establish quite satisfactorily on the basis of the u-stem and i-stem nouns that in all six cases, NS, GS, AS, NP, AP, N/ADu, where there was an essentially monosyllabic desinence, retraction has taken place in these predominantly oxytonic paradigms. The next task is to examine oxytonic o-stems, whose desinences are closely related to those of all the final-columnar paradigms.

*o-stems**Pre-Slavic*

	Singular	Plural		Dual
N	ghombh + ós	ghombh + óis	N/A/V	ghombh + ó
G	ghombh + ód	ghombh + óm	G/L	ghombh + óus
D	ghombh + óu	ghombh + o + mús	D/I	ghombh + o + má
A	ghombh + óm	ghombh + óns		
I	ghombh + o + mí	ghombh + óis		
L	ghombh + ói	ghombh + oi + sú		
V	ghómbh + e			

Slovene

N	zôb	zobjê/zobôvi	N/A	zobâ
G	zôba/zobâ	zôb/zobóv	D/I	zobéma
D	zôbu	zobém		
A	zôb	zobê		
I	zôbom	zobmí		
L	zóbu	zobéh		

This oxytonic paradigm requires some careful discussion because in the pre-Slavic paradigm we have more than the usual six cases with monosyllabic desinences, in fact, five additional ones: DS, LS, GP, IP, and G/LDu. There is a strong temptation to invoke the accentological pressure of the i- and u-stem paradigms, particularly of the u-stem paradigm, which has greatly influenced the o-stems; but we shall first have to examine the details. I see no other recourse in the case of the GP and G/LDu, especially since the i- and u-stem endings have had a tremendous influence on the o-stems throughout the Slavic languages. That leaves the DS, LS, and IP for further consideration. It seems that the original LS can be dealt with fairly easily. The original ending was compounded of the paradigmatic theme vowel -o- plus the specific locative suffix -i. The two had to form the monosyllabic diphthong -óĭ, and the stress would have been retracted from this syllable to the first mora of the word. This initial stress is amply attested even in Old Russian, and this retraction may account in Old Russian for the location of stress on syllabic prepositions in the LS:⁸ *ó bože, ná brode, vor ná vore, ná družu, ná muži, ó cvětě, pó trusě*. It is very likely that the u-stem desinence -ú appeared first of all in the LS of oxytonic o-stems after the retraction took place in order to combat the homonymous desinences that had appeared in the LS and DS of the o-stems. The original DS ending -ě would have developed apparently from the thematic vowel -o plus the usual dative case morpheme -ei, which would combine to yield -oi > -ě. This monosyllabic ending would also have favored retraction of the stress to the initial syllable. We therefore have a situation after retraction among oxytonic o-stems where both the DS and LS end in unstressed -ě. This homonymy was then relieved by the appearance of stressed -ú from the u-stem paradigm in the LS. This -us that had become established among the oxytonic nouns in the LS could have spread to oxytonic nouns in the DS if the stress were kept different in each case, that is, on the stem in the DS and on the ending in the LS. After that the -u ending could have become generalized in the dative of all o-stem accentological classes to provide a further distinction between the two cases. In languages like Slovene and Serbo-Croatian the -u ending spread subsequently throughout all accentological classes in the LS as well. If the stress was retracted in the DS, the question arises why was it not consistently advanced to the next syllable as in *možû, bogû*? It is possible that it occurred only rarely because speakers wanted to maintain an accentual distinction between the dative with root-stress and the locative with desinential stress. Jaksche⁹ states that a final stress was quite well attested in the DS in the older literature. The advancement of stress could have taken place after the loss of jers, and the stress was later readjusted

to the initial position. The IS *zôbom* with no hint of a former final stress on a disyllabic desinence must be analogical. Both Old Russian and earlier Slovene attest final stress in this case; it is well attested in Slovene⁹ and fairly well attested in Old Russian.⁸

The last controversial case is the IP. As is known, the desinence here seems to be compounded of the thematic vowel -o plus the case ending -īs, yielding -oīs. The usual hypothesis holds that the *io*-stems produced -ī from -ioīs > -ieīs > -ī and that this ending forced a corresponding ending -y from stems ending in nonpalatalized consonants. This monosyllabic desinence would presumably have permitted retraction to the initial syllable, but the evidence is not clear either in Old Russian or in Slovene. Kolesov¹⁰ states that a root-stress predominates, and he records about twice as many instances of root-stress as of end-stress. This would indicate that the stress did retract at one time but advanced again because of the homonymy with nominative and accusative plural forms. Where desinences from other paradigms are used in Old Russian, the clearly predominant stress is -ámi, -mí, as expected in disyllabic end-stressed forms of these two types. The situation is less clear in Slovene, where IP forms augmented by -ov- as in *bregôvi*, *grobôvi*, *vozôvi* are not particularly instructive because they follow the nominative plural. Just as in Russian, a number of oxytonic nouns have the ending -mí: *črvmí*, *gostmí*, *rogmí*, *vozmí*, but only some indication that the oxytonic accentual pattern was maintained. Some of the same words have alternative IP forms like: *črvi*, *gosti*, *vrti*. This could give some indication that the stress was retracted in this case form, but the same pattern may also be found among modern reflexes of final-columnar nouns: *kônji*, *stôli*. No clear-cut decision is possible here, but the evidence in Old Russian with a predominance of root-stressed forms leads me to assume a retraction here followed by a restoration of oxytonicity by means of desinences from other paradigms probably because of the homonymy with AP forms.

The very same can be said for the GP and G/LDu forms, which I perhaps dismissed too abruptly above. It is just possible that here too a retraction occurred in the initial mora. Kolesov¹¹ gives us only one interesting example, *ízъ lukъ*, for a GP with an indication of retraction; but, on the other hand, we have *volós* in the modern language and a few GP forms in Slovene like *lás*, *môz*, *rôg*, *vôz*, *zôb* that belie any retraction. It may have occurred sporadically but was curtailed by the identity of the resulting form with the N/AS. In the face of the slim evidence for retraction in these five case forms compiled above, it may be expedient to consider them as at least candidates for retraction that fell under the influence of disyllabic desinences from the essentially oxytonic *i*-stems and *u*-stems.

There is some evidence for oxytonicity among neuter nouns. For illustration I juxtapose the singular and dual for an oxytonic and a final-columnar paradigm. The plural is not of particular interest in this case because secondary shifts of stress have occurred to maintain a contrast between the singular and plural paradigms.

Slovene

		<i>Oxytonic</i>		<i>Final-Columnar</i>			
		Singular	Dual	Singular		Dual	
N	poljê	N/A	pôlji	N	ókno	N/A	ókni
G	poljâ	D/I	pôljema	G	ókna	D/I	óknomâ
D	pôlju			D	óknu		
A	poljê			A	ókno		
I	pôljem			I	óknom		
L	pôlju			L	óknu		

In the above oxytonic paradigm we want to take notice of the evidence of stress advancement in the N/AS and GS. The GS had the same monosyllabic desinence as in the masculine o-stems. The N/AS also had a monosyllabic desinence, most likely originating in the pronominal ending for the same cases -od > -o, and then implying the usual retraction and the subsequent Slovene advancement. The rest of the cases display the secondary circumflex accent that is characteristic of many situations that are not the product of the two analogical retractions occurring some time after the loss of the jers. In the LS we would expect *pólju*, but it appears that we have the regularized *pôlju* because there were no neuter u-stems. In the N/ADu we would expect *poljî*; here as well as in the D/IDu we find the same accentual leveling. Obviously there are more analogical forces at work among neuter nouns than among masculine nouns.

The short forms of the adjectives yield the same results as the nominal paradigms we have examined. The short forms appear only in the nominative case. I list below examples from the masculine and neuter singular and masculine plural. The feminine form is not pertinent here; the a-stem declension has basically a final-columnar accentual pattern, i.e., there is no accentological opposition here. Any evidence of retraction and subsequent advancement of stress among the a-stems as AS *gorô*, N/AP *gorê* seems to be analogically induced.

*Pre-Slavic**Final-Columnar*

Masculine	Neuter	Masculine Plural
bhēl + ós	bhēl + ód	bhēl + óis
gal + ós	gal + ód	gal + óis
dhabhr + ós	dhabhr + ód	dhabhr + óis

Oxytonic

bhos + ós	bhos + ód	bhos + óis
mold + ós	mold + ód	mold + óis

*Slovene**Final-Columnar*

bél	bélo	béli
gòl	gólo	góli
dóber	dóbro	dóbri

Oxytonic

bôs	bosô	bosî
mlâd	mladô	mladî

In the Slovene oxytonic forms we see clearly the same accentological picture as among the nouns with evidence of retraction in the masculine singular forms and retraction plus advancement in the neuter singular and masculine plural forms. The masculine singular final-columnar forms show the expected neo-acute accent, while the other forms exhibit the much later retraction from short final syllables to preceding long and short syllables.

The reader is undoubtedly aware of the fact that there are other instances of this kind of retraction from monosyllabic desinences found here and there in the Slavic verbal system. These are only analogical manifestations of this shift, however, because in all the

categories listed below the forms are derivative and all had an original final-columnar stress. From the examples below it will be obvious that analogy seems to have promoted retraction just in the case of inherently oxytonic verbal stems and just in those instances where oxytonic and final columnar forms would be expected to clash. In these verbal forms, however, there would ostensibly be no direct confrontation between a final-columnar stress and an oxytonic stress. All oxytonic forms would be stressed originally either on the syllable containing the derivational consonant or on the absolutely final syllable of the word. All other verb stems would have the stress on the preceding thematic vowel, and there would be no accentological confrontation. This is a complex issue. At the present time and in view of all the evidence I would prefer to state that the derivatives of oxytonic stems have a final-columnar stress, as expected, and that the indications of oxytonicity in the forms below are analogical in origin. Here are the categories where this change has been or is documented in the Slavic languages:

Present Active Participle (in origin)

Russian: gljádja, mólča; Slovene: gledê, molčê;
Serbo-Croatian: hõte, nêhote

Past Active Participle

Old Russian: sózvavъ, náčenъ, stvórivъ, pózivъ

Perfect Participle

Russian: pródal, pródalo; Slovene: gostîl, gostîlo;
Serbo-Croatian: pǒpio, pǒpîlo

Past Passive Participle

Russian: zánjat, zánjato; Slovene: začêť, začêto;
Serbo-Croatian: õrân, õrâno

Supine

Slovene: letêť, smejâť, kovâť, učîť, brâť

There are, however, two cases in the Slavic verbal system where there seems to have been original tension between oxytonic and final-columnar paradigms just as in the case of the nominal system. The first instance is a historical and dialectal phenomenon that has undoubtedly been readjusted in the modern literary languages and the other dialects. It concerns a retraction to the initial syllable of first person singular forms in medieval Russian and in some Bulgarian dialects. I cite some examples as listed by Stang.¹²

Old Russian

léžu, vélju, stóju
 góvorju, póložu, sótvorju, várju
 prívedu, pótrjasu, vózzovu, zóvu, žívu

Bulgarian Dialects

čéta, pía, pléta, réka

As the data show, this retraction appears only in the first person singular of oxytonic verbs. This is the one personal form where the stress in oxytonic and final-columnar verbs coincides. In all other personal forms oxytonic verbs would have stresses like -eš', -iš', -et', -it', etc., while final-columnar verbs would be stressed as follows: -éši, -íši; -étb, -ítb, etc. The predominance of the final stress among oxytonic stems shifted the stress to the final syllable of the 1 sg. form in time. These data have prompted Stang and other investigators¹³ to postulate an original initial stress in the 1 sg., but it is much more reasonable to assume an original final stress in view of the rationale behind the retraction proposed here.

The second case of original retraction is not so clear because it has been attended by numerous analogical developments. It shows up in the 2/3 sg. aorist forms in Serbo-Croatian, where originally the personal endings -s and -t were suffixed to the whole roster of verbal stems and once again tension would have been created between oxytonic and final-columnar forms. I repeat that analogy has greatly obscured this particular process of retraction, but it must have begun with oxytonic stems because all with one exception underwent the retraction. Thus, the following retractions must have taken place among oxytonic stems:

nes + é + s/t > nĕse	iz = trens + é + s/t > ĭstrĕse
za = klín + s/t > zăklĕ	iz = péi + s/t > ĭspi
zuv + ā + s/t > z'vas/t > zvâ	or + ā + s/t > đrā
iz = bir + ā + s/t > ĭzb ras/t > ĭzbrā	poi + ĭ + s/t > pđji
lom + ĭ + s/t > lŏmĭ	

The only exception to this retraction among oxytonic stems is found in stems in -ĕ-:

tbrp + é + s/t > trpe	gor + é + s/t > gðre
-----------------------	----------------------

where we see only the results of the 15th-century Stokavian retraction. There are possibly two factors which may have combined to prevent the expected retraction: 1) a final-columnar verb like *raz* = um + é + s/t > razùme did not undergo retraction, 2) the great predominance of the theme vowel -ā- among *thematic* oxytonic verbs. Note that the retraction readily occurs when the -ĕ- was changed to -ā-: *za* = d rž + ā + s/t > zădržā.

Final-columnar verbs that seem to have also undergone retraction in the 2/3 sg. aorist fall into three classes: 1) the -i/-ā- class, 2) the -ā/-ā-class, and 3) the -n/-nu class:

- 1) kŭpovā, čĕsā, zătrepetā; pĭsa, véza
- 2) zăigrā, răzvenčā; razbĭva, vâlja
- 3) mĭnŭ, tŏnŭ

Note in classes 1) and 2) that a long root-vowel just before the stressed thematic -ā- prevented the retraction. It seems that, when the retraction did occur in these two classes, it was inspired by oxytonic verbs with an -a- because the latter all contained short vowels before the theme vowel, e.g., *izbbrā*, *dozbrva*, *izora*, *okova*, etc. In the case of the -n/-nu- verbs retraction occurred probably by virtue of the general tendency towards an initial stress. There are also no original oxytonic stems in this class. Initial stress in the 2/3 sg. aorist extends analogically even to barytonic stems, but it is limited to barytonic stems with thematic vowels except -e-: *pđgazĭ*, *pđginŭ*, *pđgledā*, *pđmazā*, *đbjedova*; but *zăsedē*, *dŏstiže* (the -e in the preceding two examples is not a thematic vowel; it is a fill-vowel), *răzbi* (the -i here is part of the root), *ĭzvide* (this -e is a bona fide thematic vowel). Note that the final -e and -a in *trpe*, *razùme*, *véza* and *razbĭva* were shortened because they were stressed -eés/t, -aás/t at the critical time when old acute syllables were shortened. The unstressed -iis/t, -aas/t, and -uus/t did not shorten at that time and were protected from shortening subsequently by their final consonants.

We have seen that in every morphological situation where oxytonic paradigms clash accentologically with final-columnar paradigms in monosyllabic desinences, there is ample evidence for the migration of the stress from the final syllable of oxytonic forms to their initial syllable. In this way in inflectional forms such as the NS, GS, AS, NP, AP, and N/ADu among oxytonic nouns, the 1 sg. present tense and the 2/3 sg. aorist among oxytonic verbs, the so-called old circumflex accent was produced on long vowels or diphthongs in initial syllables and a regular stress on short vowels in the same circumstances.

University of Washington

REFERENCES

1. Harald Jaksche, 1965. *Slavische Akzentuation II. Slovenisch*, Harrassowitz. Wiesbaden: pp. 65-66.
2. Christian S. Stang, 1957. *Slavonic Accentuation*. Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo I: Hist.-fil. klasse, 3. Aschehoug and Co. Oslo: p. 15.
V. V. Kolesov, 1972. *Istorija russkogo udarenija*. Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta. Leningrad: p. 181.
3. Carl D. Buck, 1933. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago: p. 172.
4. V. V. Kolesov, *op. cit.* pp. 184-186.
5. Harald Jaksche, *op. cit.* p. 59.
6. V. V. Kolesov, *op. cit.* p. 79.
7. Christian S. Stang, *op. cit.* p. 88 and fn. 66, p. 183.
8. V. V. Kolesov, *op. cit.* pp. 131-138.
9. Harald Jaksche, *op. cit.* p. 69.
10. V. V. Kolesov, *op. cit.*, p. 153.
11. V. V. Kolesov, *op. cit.* p. 150.
12. Christian S. Stang, *op. cit.* pp. 109-111.
13. V. A. Dybo, 1962. *O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole*. *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 5. pp. 10-15.