

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 perforce 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:¹

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 = sŭp + ā* → Sn *óspa*, SC *òspa*,² where the jer was lost and the stress drawn back to the resulting long syllable. Collective nouns with *ŷj-* occurred among fem. and neut. nouns: **soux + ŷj + ā* → Sn *súša*, SC *súša*, Bg *sùša*; **storg + ŷj + ā* → Sn *stráža*, SC *stráža*, Bg *stràža*; **ŷrn + ŷj + ē* → Sn *tŷnje*, SC *tŷnje*, Bg *tràne*. In a more advanced stage of the original formula we have, e.g., **sušŷjā*, 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, *-ŷj-*, was used with neut. *o-*stems to form verbal nouns on the past pass. pcppl. *-t/-n-* stem. Here we frequently observe the same kind of retraction: SC *plètēnje trēsēnje* Sn *pletenje trésenje*, Bg *plètene trēsēne*; 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 *bránje bdénje bíce uzéce*, Sn *bránje bedenje bíje vzéje*. Much leveling has occurred in Bg: *branè bdēne čētene 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-ŷ + k-ŷj-ŷj*, in all its inflected forms. Here the pretonic medial jer was lost, and the stress retracted to produce neo-acute accents on the preceding long syllable: Sn *krátki*, SC *krâtki* *ī*, Bg

COMMON SLAVIC NOUNS

	BARYTONIC	FINAL COLUMNAR	MOBILE
NSg	práǵʔ	nožǐ	zǒbʔ
G	práǵa	nožá	zǒba
D	práǵu	nožú	zǒbu
A	práǵʔ	nožǐ	zǒbʔ
I	práǵomʔ	nožǐemʔ	zǒbomʔ
L	práǵǝ	noži	zǒbǝ/zǒbú
NPI	práǵi	noži	zǒbi
G	práǵʔ	nožǐ	zǒbʔ
D	práǵomʔ	nožǐemʔ	zǒbomʔ
A	práǵy	nožǐ	zǒby
I	práǵy	noži	zǒbý
L	práǵǝxʔ	nožixʔ	zǒbǝxʔ
NADu	práǵa	nožá	zǒba
GL	práǵu	nožú	zǒbú
DI	práǵoma	nožema	zǒbomá

SERBO-CROATIAN NOUNS

NSg	pràǵ	nôž	zûb
G	pràǵa	nôža	zûba
D	pràǵu	nôžu	zûbu
A	pràǵ	nôž	zûb
I	pràǵom	nôžem	zûbom
L	pràǵu	nôžu	zûbu
NPI	pràǵovi	nôževi	zûbi
G	pràǵovâ	nôževâ	zûbâ
D	pràǵovima	nôževima	zûbima
A	pràǵove	nôževe	zûbe
I	pràǵovima	nôževima	zûbima
L	pràǵovima	nôževima	zûbima

SLOVENE NOUNS

NSg	pràǵ	nôž	zôb
G	pràǵa	nôža	zôbâ
D	pràǵu	nôžu	zôbu
A	pràǵ	nôž	zôb
I	pràǵom	nôžem	zôbom
L	pràǵu	nôžu	zôbu
NPI	pràǵi	nôži	zôbjǝ
G	pràǵov	nôžov	zôbôv
D	pràǵom	nôžem	zôbém
A	pràǵe	nôže	zôbǝ
I	pràǵi	nôži	zôbmǝ
L	pràǵih	nôžih	zôbǝh
NADu	pràǵa	nôža	zôbâ
DI	pràǵoma	nôžema	zôbéma

BULGARIAN NOUNS

prag, pràga, pràgăt
pràgove

noĩ, nõža, nõžăt
nožove

zãb, zãbà, zãbăt
zãbi

ADJECTIVES

	BARYTONIC	FINAL COLUMNAR	MOBILE
CS:	star, stàra, stàro stàrъjъ	dobrъ, dobrá, dobrò dobrъjъ	mlàdъ, miadá, mlàdo mlàdъjъ
SC:	stâr, stàra, stàro stârĩ	đobar, đobra, đobro đobrĩ	mlâd, mlâda, mlâdo mlâdĩ
Sn:	stâr, stàra, stàro stârĩ	dóber, dóbra, dóbro dóbrĩ	mlâd, mlâda, mlâdò mlâdĩ
Bg:	star, stàra, stàro stàrijat	dobâr, dobrà, dobrò dobrijat	mlad, mlâda, mlàdo mlâdijat

VERBS

	BARYTONIC	FINAL COLUMNAR	MOBILE
CS:	sêdq sêdešъ sêdqtъ sêsti sêlъ sêla sêli	pišp pišêšъ pišqъ pъsáti pъsálъ pъsála pъsáli	účq učisъ učqtъ učiti učilъ učilá učili
SC:	sêdnêm sêdnêš sêdnũ sêsti sêo sêla sêli	pîšêm pîšêš pîšũ pisati písao písala písalo	učim učis uče učiti učio učila učili
Sn:	sêdem sêdeš sêdo sêsti sêl, sêla, sêli	pîšêm pîšêš pîšejo pisáti písál písála písáli	učim učis učijo učiti učil učíla učíli
Bg:	sêdna sêdneš sêdnat sêdnâx sêdnâl sêdnâla sêdnâli	piša pišeš pišat pisâx pisâl písála písáli	uča učis učat učix učil učíla učíli

TABLE I

kràtkijat. 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 *krátak*, *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 [ɔɛ] rather than close [o e], which is what is expected under the neo-acute: Sn *kròtki tēsni težki* vs. SC *kròtkī tēsni tēžkī*.

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 *nòž*, Sn *nòž*, Bg *nòžat* 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*, DPl *zobém*, LPl *zobéh* we see neo-acute accents on the desinences with compensatory lengthening in the GPI DPl. Among the adjectival forms SC *dòbar*, Sn *dóber* illustrate the neo-acute on a short vowel, while SC *bèò* Sn *bél* record the same accent on a long root vowel. Bg *dobār* 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 *učím učĩš*, Sn *učím učĩš*. Bg *uča učĩš* has a secondary recessive accent. The neo-acute also appears in the masc. of *-l-* and *-n-* participles: SC *nēsao*, Sn *nésel*, Bg *nēsāl*; SC *pletèn*, Sn *pletèn*,³ 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 *-ŭjĩ*, ISgM/N *-ŭjimĩ*, LSgM/N *-ějemiĩ*, GPI LPl *-ŭjixũ*, DPl *-ŭjimũ*. After the *-VjV-* sequences coalesced (*-y- ← -ŭji-*, *-ě- ← -ěj-*), 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 **dobruŭjĩ* → SC *dòbrĩ*, Sn *dòbri*,⁴ **bèlũjĩ* → SC *bèlĩ*, Sn *bèlĩ*. 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 *učím učĩš* above) then, to preserve the **oxytonic : FC** opposition, a verb such as **pišèšĩ pišèti* retracted the stress from the thematic vowel to the root syllable, and another neo-acute was created: SC *pĩšèm pĩšèš*, Sn *pĩšèm pĩšèš*, Bg *piša pišèš*.

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 *mlādĩ* → *mlādĩ*, *drāglĩ* → *drāgĩ*, *gōsthĩ* → *gōstĩ* (Old Norm *mlādi*, *drāgi*, *gōsti*). The same neo-acute occurred in SC: *mlādĩ drāgĩ gūstĩ*. This change may also have occurred in Bg: *mlādijat drāgijat gāstijat*, 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 *bošĩ*. The SC variant forms are not clear, for we have a new acute in *bòsĩ* and a much later retraction in *bòsĩ*. It is always possible that *bòsĩ* and even *mlādĩ* 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 *-lje-*: when this contracted to *-ǎ-*, the stress migrated back to pretonic length. All three languages clearly show this retraction: Sn *púščam ubíjam*, SC *púšťam ubǐjam*, Bg *púšťam ubívam*. Only SC shows some retraction here to a pretonic short vowel: Sn *kopâm igrâm*, SC *köpâm ĩgrâm*, Bg *kopàja igràja*. 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 *mlátim kúpim*, SC *mlátim kúpim*, Bg *mlátja kúpja*, 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 *nósim*, SC *nòsim*, Bg *nòsja*, 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 *dèlam lípo mèseć stári* ← **dèlām lípō mēsēc stārī*. The corresponding SC forms prove conclusively that lengthening was confined to Sn: SC *dělām lǐpom mēsēc stārī*. The form *stārī* is isolated and anomalous; barytonic adjectives by rule have a short root syllable, *dügī, mīlī, pūnī, 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 zelēni* ← *gōlī širōkī zelēnī*. Note that these long forms had accented close vowels, while the corresponding short forms had open vowels, *širōko, zeleno*.

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 **zǫbū*. 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, NPl, APl, 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 NPl APl 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 non-derived 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 *cvět dōb glās klās léd* with the very same accentual pattern. In Bg the corresponding words have an advanced stress in the articulated forms: *cvetāt dābāt glasā klasāt ledāt*. 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:

$z\ddot{u}b\ddot{u} + t\ddot{u} \rightarrow z\ddot{u}b\ddot{u} + t$. Occasionally the original plural desinence *-i* offers additional proof, as in $z\ddot{u}b\ddot{i}$. Nonderived *i*-stems in Sn such as *k\ddot{o}st \ddot{o}s r\ddot{e}\check{c} s\ddot{o}l* display an accentual paradigm similar to that of *z\ddot{o}b*. The related Bg articulated forms have the advanced stress on the article: *k\ddot{o}st\ddot{a} \ddot{o}s\ddot{a} r\ddot{e}\check{c}\ddot{t}\ddot{a} s\ddot{o}l\ddot{t}\ddot{a}. Here, of course, the final *jer* in the NSg was a weak one and the stress was automatically advanced to the article: $k\ddot{o}st\ddot{i} + t\ddot{a} \rightarrow k\ddot{o}st + t\ddot{a}$. Strangely enough, the plural ending *-i* did not attract the stress: *dl\ddot{a}ni k\ddot{o}st\ddot{i} \ddot{o}si r\ddot{e}\check{c}\ddot{i}. Nonderived neuter nouns also have the advanced stress in Sn: *neb\ddot{o} pros\ddot{o} sen\ddot{o} uh\ddot{o}; and the same is true for Bg: *n\ddot{e}b\ddot{o} pros\ddot{o} sen\ddot{o} ux\ddot{o}. In Sn nonderived adjectives the stress was advanced in all the short forms except the fem.Sg and neut.Pl: neut.Sg *mlad\ddot{o}, masc.Pl *mlad\ddot{i}, fem.Pl *mlad\ddot{e}, masc.Du *mlad\ddot{a}, fem.neut.Du *mlad\ddot{e} (although alternative analogical forms with root stress do exist). *dr\ddot{a}g*, *gl\ddot{u}h g\ddot{o}st h\ddot{u}d kr\ddot{i}v* are accented in the same manner. Bg adjectives with their thoroughgoing root stress resisted this advancement.*********

In view of the several retractions giving rise to neo-acute accents, especially those on long syllables,⁵ 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 retractions 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.fem.; (g) non-barytonic infinitives; (h) imperatives, 2nd Sg; (i) all FC *l*-participles except masc.sg; (j) mobile *l*-participles, Sg.fem.; e.g.:

(a): Sn *gr\ddot{a}du br\ddot{e}gu*, SC *gr\ddot{a}du br\ddot{e}gu*; (b): Sn *z\ddot{i}ma z\ddot{i}mi*, SC *z\ddot{i}ma z\ddot{i}mi*; (c): Sn *v\ddot{i}no*, SC *v\ddot{i}no*; (d): Sn *klj\ddot{u}\check{c}a*, SC *klj\ddot{u}\check{c}a*; (e): Sn *b\ddot{e}la okr\ddot{u}glo*, SC *b\ddot{e}la okr\ddot{u}glo*; (f): Sn *ml\ddot{a}da sl\ddot{e}pa*, SC *ml\ddot{a}da p\ddot{u}sta*; (g): Sn *tr\ddot{e}sti mr\ddot{e}ti*, SC *tr\ddot{e}sti mr\ddot{e}ti*; (h): Sn *tr\ddot{e}si s\ddot{o}di*, SC *tr\ddot{e}si s\ddot{u}di*; (i): Sn *tr\ddot{e}sla m\ddot{e}to r\ddot{a}sli* SC *tr\ddot{e}sla m\ddot{e}lo r\ddot{a}sli*; (j): Sn *br\ddot{a}la za\check{c}ela u\check{c}la*, SC *br\ddot{a}la kl\ddot{e}la*.

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 *tr\ddot{e}sem r\ddot{a}stem* SC *tr\ddot{e}s\ddot{e}m r\ddot{a}st\ddot{e}m*; (b) Sn *s\ddot{o}dil p\ddot{i}sal dr\ddot{z}al* SC *s\ddot{u}dio p\ddot{i}sao v\ddot{e}zao* (formerly blocked); (c) Sn *s\ddot{o}dit p\ddot{i}sat dr\ddot{z}at*; (d) Sn *s\ddot{o}sed z\ddot{a}kon* SC *s\ddot{u}sed z\ddot{a}kon*.

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: *klj\ddot{u}\check{c}\ddot{a}t \check{s}it\ddot{a}t brj\ddot{a}st\ddot{a}t*, 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: *v\ddot{i}n\ddot{o} mlj\ddot{a}ko/mlek\ddot{o} r\ddot{u}no s\ddot{u}kno*, but there are many with end stress only: *dlet\ddot{o} kril\ddot{o} lic\ddot{e}*. *l*-participles exhibit both retracted and non-retracted stress: *p\ddot{i}sal v\ddot{e}z\ddot{a}l s\ddot{a}dil*; 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: *tr\ddot{e}si p\ddot{i}ši v\ddot{e}ži*.

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 /*ə*/ or onto /*i* *u*/, which

had presumably become centralized by that time; therefore, today's *stezà igràj sukno* have final stress. The /o e/ in Sn that received the new stress were pronounced [ɔɛ] 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 *kònja òkno*, SC *kònja òkno*; (b) Sn *dòbro širòka*, SC *dòbro širòka*; (c) Sn *jezik kòžuh*, SC *jezik kòžuh*; (d) Sn *mòstu kòsti*, SC *mòstu kòsti*; (e) Sn *gòri žèni*, SC *gòri žèni*; (f) Sn *pletem bòdem*, SC *pletèm bòdèm*; (g) Sn *pleti pròsi*, SC *plèti pròsi*; (h) Sn *plèlo pèkla*, SC *plèlo pèkla*; (i) Sn *pletèna pèčèna*, SC *pletèna pèčèna*; (j) Sn *pletì pèči*, SC *plèti pèči*.

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: *kònjat bòbāt mèčāt*; 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 čovèk kožùx*. Short form adjectives all have the recessive stress: *širòka debèlo visòka*; 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: *bedrò rebrò èlò sèlò*. Present finite forms and imperatives do not retract: *pletà pleti pèkà pèči*. Bg FC l-participles do have recessive stress: *plè plèla pèkàl pèkla*; but again this may be due to their original neo-acute in the masc. form. Past passive participles even have the root stress: *plèten plètena, pèčen pèčèna*; 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:

jèlenu gòrama bèsèda telètina čèsala písala náglasak ljùbimac pítanje nárèčje prígoda učiteljica dòlina plètući trèsući rásitie plètie stranè gòrè momákà jezèrà glávà pomòčnik isplètu lómè.

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 NPl): *drùg drùgovi vrât vrâtovi lîst lîstovi*. 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: *súnce* GPI *sùnācā*; *mlādōst* *mùdrōst*; *zākleo* *zāklēla*; *nāčēt* *nāčēta* *īškovān* *īškovāna*; 23 Sg. aorist *zāklē* *zātrubī*; *nāgrada* *prijava*. 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): *biljka* *biljākā* *mājka* *mājākā* *brōjka* *brōjākā*.

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) IPl IDu of a-stems, (e) various polysyllabic fem. nouns, (f) the NPl. 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 *brála*; e.g.:

(a) *pletīmo* *pletīte* *pletīva* *pletīta*, (b) *cvātēmo* *cvātēte*, (c) *jelēnu* *kovāča*, (d) *gorāmi* *zimāma*, (e) *bēsēda* *telētina*, (f) *vretēna* *jāgnetā*, (g) *tkāla* *česāla* *kupovāla*.

Note that this particular lengthening did not affect disyllabic words where no model with a medial circumflex could have existed: *līpa* *mīši* *létu* *rāka* *mīslī*.

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:⁶

(a) *kānja* *dōbro* *kōsti* *ženi* *pletēm* *pleti* *plēli* *plesti* *pletēna*, (b) *līpa* *mīši* *létu* *dēlati* *dēlalo* *būkovina* *prāvička*, (c) *brāti* *krenīti* *kupovālo* *želēti* *želélo* *ločīti* *ločīlo*.

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).

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 *ī* and *ŭ*, 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 /*ε* ɔ/.

REFERENCES

1. The following abbreviations are used: NGDAIL for the cases; SgDuPl for the numbers; MFN and masc.fem.neut. for the genders. For Sn, the 'Old Norm' is used throughout, but with *ε* ɔ 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 /*ε* ɔ/, 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 *plèten* with secondary recessive stress.
4. Sn *dǎbri* has been influenced by the corresponding short forms with open [ɔ].
5. E.g., Sn *pīšem mlátim kréne mládi béli hváljen sójen*; SC *pīšēm mlátīm krēnē mládi bēlī hváljen súdjen*.
6. Note that the fem. I-participle had already acquired the long falling accent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brabec, I., M. Hraste, S. Živković. 1954. *Gramatika hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika* (Zagreb: Školjska knjiga).
- Bajec, A., et al. 1962. *Slovenski pravopis* (Ljubljana: Državna založba).
- Jaksche, Harald. 1965. *Slavische Akzentuation II. Slovenisch* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Lencek, Rado L. 1966. *The Verb Pattern of Contemporary Slovene* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- 1982. *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language* (Columbus, OH: Slavica).
- Micklesen, Lew R. 1980. "Analogy in the accentological history of Conservative Slovene," *Slovene Studies* 2: 3-14.
- 1981. "Razvitak akcenatske norme u glagolskom sistemu srpsko-hrvatskog književnog jezika," *Naučni sestanak slavista u Vukovi dane . . . 1980* 10/1: 161-74.
- 1984. "Bases of accentological change in Serbo-Croatian," *Zbornik matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27/28: 449-60.
- Passov, P., and X. Parvev. 1975. *Pravogovoren rečnik na bālgarskija ezik* (Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo).
- Peco, Asim. 1980. *Osnovi akcentologije srpskohrvatskog jezika* (Beograd: Naučna knjiga).
- Scatton, Ernest A. 1983. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Bulgarian* (Columbus: Slavica).
- Shevelov, George Y. 1965. *A Prehistory of Slavic* (New York: Columbia UP).
- Toporišič, Jože. 1976. *Slovenska slovnica* (Maribor: Obzorja).

POVZETEK

GLAVNE ZNAČILNOSTI JUŽNOSLOVANSKEGA NAGLASOSLOVJA

Avtor začenja svojo razpravo v sredini južnoslovanskega naglasoslovja, kjer so tri naglasne paradigme že ustaljene. Najprej dokumentira po kronološkem zaporedju upad polglasnikov, odločilen za vse nadaljnje naglasne spremembe, in njegove posledice. Sledi pomik naglasa v začetno naglašanih oblikah premične paradigme, znan v slov. in bolg. Zatem je vrsta umikov: 1) s kratkih odprtih končnih zlogov na prejšnje dolge zloge (slov. in srbohrv.), 2) s kratkih odprtih končnih zlogov na prejšnje kratke zloge (slov. in srbohrv.), in 3) splošni umik za en zlog (zadnja faza novoštokavskega premika v srbohrv.) Nazadnje so omenjene spremembe v dolžini naglašanih zlogov: skrajšanje 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.

