After the very well-organized Leiden conference for which we must be grateful to Tijmen Pronk, it seems appropriate for me to review some of the papers, as I did after the previous conferences in Zagreb and Copenhagen. The aim of this review is merely to point out some of the differences of opinion which require further debate.

Mislav Benić presents a detailed description of verbal accentuation in the dialect of Kuklůčica on the island of Ugljan. The dialect has no tonal distinctions but does have vowel quantity in stressed and pretonic syllables, with large-scale lengthening of short vowels under the stress. It has preserved the Common Slavic distinction between original pretonic long vowels, which were shortened as a result of the rise of the new timbre differences, and new pretonic long vowels which arose as a result of Dybo’s law (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 126-128), e.g. jazik ‘tongue’ (with secondary lengthening of the stressed vowel) versus nářod ‘people’. It has also preserved the distinction between simplex verbs with mobile stress, e.g. budin ‘wake up’, gasin ‘turn off’, and compound verbs where the prefix lost the stress to the root in accordance with Dybo’s law, e.g. prebūdin, ugašin (ibidem, 127). Moreover, it has preserved the accentual mobility of the original nasal present in něznon ‘don’t know’ (cf. Kortlandt 1985) and the retracted stress of the original imperative in vící, cidi of vüčên ‘pull’, cídin ‘filter’ (cf. Kortlandt 1979: 53).

Miguel Carrasquera Vidal proposes a derivation of acute and circumflex tones from the syllable structure of the proto-language. His account involves tones on unstressed syllables, resyllabifications, analogical replacements, ad hoc rules for different stem formations and for different languages, secondary developments, unexplained exceptions for which he posits a PIE distinction between *i and *j, and structural ambiguity of the postvocalic ending *-ns. He lists a number of Slavic Auslautgesetze in order to arrive at the correct output. Since I have discussed all of the issues elsewhere, I shall not return to the many points of disagreement here.

Vladimir Dybo compares the West Caucasian, Balto-Slavic and Japanese accent systems in terms of “dominant” and “recessive” morphemes expressed in syllables and contours. In my review of last year’s conference in Copenhagen, I have shown how the class of dominant suffixes originated from several retrac-
tions of the stress in Balto-Slavic. Unlike Japanese, where the extant accent systems go back to reductions of a system with a distinction between high and low tone in every syllable (cf. Kortlandt 1993), the systems attested in Balto-Slavic developed from a prosodic system which strongly resembles what we find in Vedic Sanskrit. In another contribution, Dybo subscribes to my analysis of the Old Prussian accentual system (1974), concentrating on the verb, the stem formation of which I have discussed elsewhere (1987).

Ronald Feldstein is primarily concerned with the more recent development of nominal accent patterns in West Slavic. He claims that the long vowels of Czech kráva ‘cow’ and brázda ‘furrow’ have retained length in stressed and pretonic position, respectively, while the short vowel of strana ‘side’ was taken from the acc.sg. form stranu. In fact, the long vowel of kráva resulted from recent lengthening of a short rising vowel (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 125, 2006a: 32), the long vowel of brázda became pretonic as a result of Dybo’s law, and the original pretonic long vowel of strana was regularly shortened when the new timbre distinctions arose (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 126, 2006a: 36f.). The short vowel of *kráva was never lengthened in the oblique forms krav, kravám, kravách, kravami, Slovak krava, SCr. kráva, Polish krowa < *krówa, but Upper Sorbian kruwa < krówa with the same lengthening as in Czech kráva, vůle, kůže, which was clearly more recent than the rise of the new timbre distinctions. As a result, we find length in accent paradigm (b), absence of length in (c), and alternation between long and short vowels in (a). The original distribution was blurred by secondary lengthening before word-final voiced fricatives and resonants and by paradigmatic generalizations.

Georg Holzer defines “Urslavisch” as the last stage of prehistoric Slavic before the earliest dialectal differentiation. This corresponds to the end of my Early Middle Slavic and the beginning of my Late Middle Slavic period (e.g., 2005: 120, 2006a: 27). Holzer reconstructs the following prosodic characteristics for this stage:

1. He posits the existence of “betonungslos” word forms, e.g. Ru. storonu ‘side’ in ná storonu and SCr. pripovijest ‘story’ in ná pripovijest. Unfortunately, he remains silent about the accentuation of these nouns when there is no preposition to take the accent (cf. Kortlandt 1978: 72-76 and 2006b: 36f. for discussion). He compares them with “betonungslos” word forms in Vedic Sanskrit, which are actually characterized by distinctive low tones (cf. Kortlandt 1986: 156). In order to simplify the discussion, I shall therefore assume that “betonungslos” stands for “having low tones only”.

2. Holzer dates Meillet’s law “im Nachurslavischen” because of the pretonic lengthening in Ukr. ratáj ‘ploughman’. However, this accentuation is clearly secondary, cf. Ru. rátaj, Bulg. rátaj, Slovene rátaj, SCr. rátar, all pointing to fixed stress on the initial syllable. Similarly, the accent of Ru. ramjáno ‘very’
must be secondary in view of Slovene ráméno while the accent of the secondary derivative lanítá ‘cheek’ does not prove anything. Czech láň ‘hind’ evidently represents accent pattern (a), as is clear from Slovene lânjac.

(3) Holzer maintains that all original long vowels were still long, which is correct in the sense that the rise of the new timbre distinctions belongs to the Late Middle Slavic period. However, the monophthongization of diphthongs belongs to the Early Middle Slavic period and is not “nachurslavisch”, contrary to his statement (cf. Kortlandt 2006a: 33ff.).

(4) Holzer correctly dates Dybo’s law “im Nachurslavischen”. His unification of “AP a und b” into “ein einziges AP a” cannot be recommended because it can easily lead to confusion.

(5) “Das Urslavische hatte noch keinen Neoakut”. This statement is correct in the sense that the retractions of the stress from which new rising vowels originated can be dated after the rise of the new timbre distinctions. However, the origin of non-acute rising vowels must be dated to the end of the Early Middle Slavic period.

(6) Hirt’s law must be dated to the Balto-Slavic period (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 116ff.). Following Illič-Svityč’s original formulation (1963: 81ff.), Holzer assumes that the accent was not retracted from an acute syllable. This limitation, which is not supported by independent evidence, is at variance with the regular character of the retraction in the aH-stems, e.g. SCR. gríva ‘mane’, and must therefore be rejected. Accentual mobility was preserved in the Slavic i- and u-stems, e.g. SCR. kljjet ‘shed’, sin ‘son’, where polysyllabic case forms predominated in the paradigm.

(7) Holzer assumes that a word-initial high tone was lost in two-syllable words ending in *-as < *-os, yielding a separate accent pattern (d), e.g. in SCR. zúb ‘tooth’, něbo ‘heaven’, Greek γόμφος, νέφος. This is a highly peculiar rule which cannot be correct (cf. Kortlandt 2006a: 33).

(8) Antevocalic laryngeals were lost in Early Slavic, as is clear from Ru. soxá ‘plough’, Lith. šaká ‘branch’. Syllabic *Hi and *Hu yielded acute vowels after Hirt’s law in Balto-Slavic already, e.g. SCR. pítí ‘to drink’, píla ‘(she) drank’ (with loss of the pretonic acute as a result of Meillet’s law) of the root *poHi- < PIE *peʕwi-.

(9) On the basis of these assumptions, Holzer reconstructs three accent paradigms, viz. a, which comprises (a) and (b), c, which is identical with (c), and d, which is identical with (b) except in the nom.sg. form of the o- and s-stems and is generally reflected as (c) in the historical languages. In this conception, the entire paradigm of *zambas became mobile under the influence of the sole nom.sg. form in *-as before this ending was replaced by *-u in all Slavic languages.
I shall not discuss the separate nominal paradigms, which can now be compared with my reconstructions (2008). Verbal paradigms are not homogeneous. While Holzer adduces Scr. viši 'to twist', which has an acute infinitive (a) but a mobile present and l-participle (c), he does not discuss gristi 'to bite' or sjèći 'to cut', which have an acute infinitive and l-participle (a) but a mobile present (c), or such verbs as pèći 'to bake', which have an end-stressed infinitive and l-participle (b) but a mobile present (c), and lèći 'to lie down', which has an acute present (a) but an end-stressed infinitive and l-participle (b).

Adam Hyllested reconstructs an Indo-Uralic numeral 'one' with a medial *k, e.g. in Finnish yksi, which is reflected as a laryngeal *H in the acute of Lith. vienas. In his contribution to the present conference, Tijmen Pronk has shown that the acute must rather be explained from laryngeal metathesis in Balto-Slavic *Hino- (cf. also Derksen 2003).

Mate Kapović presents a most useful overview of the accentuation of i-verbs in Croatian dialects. While the accent paradigms (b) and (c) are often faithfully reflected in many dialects, there are a number of secondary developments which blur the picture. On the one hand, Stang’s law did not operate before a clitic because it was limited to final syllables not counting final jers (cf. Kortlandt 2006a: 36). This resulted in such alternations as Ru. (Petr) kúrit vs. (vulkan) kurítsja ‘smokes’ and sàdit vs. (solnce) sadítsja ‘sets’, which led to a redistribution opposing transitive (b) to intransitive (c) verbs. On the other hand, the accent was retracted onto restored long root vowels in paradigm (c), which could then join paradigm (b). Both developments were already established by Carl Ebeling (1967: 593). Moreover, the distinction between simplex verbs with mobile stress (c) and compounds where Dybo’s law shifted the stress from the prefix to the root so as to yield e.g. Kukljica ugȃsin (a) and prebȗdin (b) was mostly lost.

Apart from these secondary developments, the heterogeneous origin of the i-flexion must be taken into account. In my view, this class represents not only denominatives, which as a rule preserve the accent pattern of the underlying noun, as well as causatives and iteratives, which belong to accent pattern (b), but also athematic factitives and perfects, which belong to accent pattern (c) and may be compared with Latin capiō ‘take’ and sedeō ‘sit’ (cf. Kortlandt 1979: 59-62, 1987: 106-109, 1992, 2007a: 134-137, 2007b: 230). Kapović’s data suggest that the original accentuation of the athematic i-flexion is best preserved in the čakavian and neo-stokavian dialects of southern Dalmatia and was lost in the northern dialects of Croatia.

Keith Langston reconsiders tone reversal in kajkavian dialects where original circumflex and neo-circumflex are rising while the neo-acute is falling, e.g. Vrbovec mȅso, tȅsto, mȉslim, súša, pȉšem, sȅla. He establishes the following relative chronology:
(1) Circumflex stems advance the accent, e.g. měso > *měsô.
(2) Rising (neo-acute) accent becomes falling, e.g. kljúč > kljúč, súša > súša, pišem > pišem.
(3) Stress is retracted from final short syllables, e.g. *měsô > měso, *důšà > dùša.


(1) pôlje > *polôj, jâgoda > *jagodà.
(2) mlátim > mlátimm, mlátimo > mlátimo.
(3) *polôj > polôje, *jagodà > jagôda.
(4) lôpáta > lôpáta, pitáti > pitáti, mlâtiti > mlâtiti.
(5) pôljé > pôlje, jagôda > jagôda, lôpáta > lôpáta.
(6) mlátimo > mlátimo in some dialects.

This account could be simplified by the assumption that the accent was retracted from an analogous neo-circumflex in *lopáta > lôpáta at stage (4) of the chronology, which would eliminate the need to assume distinctive tone on short vowels at that stage. While Langston has clearly shown that the kajkavian development is different from other instances of tone reversal, the mechanism of accent shifts is strongly reminiscent of the way tonogenesis came about earlier and elsewhere in Baltic and Slavic (cf. Kortlandt 2006a: 36f., 2006b: 362f.).

Orsat Ligorio discusses the accent system of present-day Dubrovnik. In contrast to the literary language, this dialect has preserved original short vowels posttonically in sjèver ‘north’, djèver ‘brother-in-law’, jávor ‘maple’, nà bor beside bôr ‘pine’, pretonically in sùhì beside sùh ‘dry’, and under the stress in sèdmi ‘7th’, òsmì ‘8th’.

Roman Sukač criticizes Kapovič’s recent articles about Proto-Slavic quantity. He observes a lack of chronological insight, failure to give proper credit to earlier investigators (Vondrák, Trávníčeck, Lamprecht), failure to see changes in a broader perspective, heavy reliance on his mother tongue and disregard of local developments elsewhere, and use of inappropriate examples (cf. also Kortlandt 2005). Perhaps most striking is the way Kapovič suppresses the names of the greatest South Slavic dialectologists of the 20th century, Aleksandar Belić (e.g., 1909) and Pavle Ivič (e.g., 1958).

The acute is not simply reflected as length in Czech because we find both long and short reflexes in the standard language and in the dialects, length being more frequent in the south-west and short reflexes predominating in the Moravian dialects. The original shortening of the acute can be identified with the rise of the new timbre distinctions. Short rising vowels were lengthened at a
more recent stage in Czech, e.g. kráva, bláto, dial. krava, blato, also vůle, kůže, and Upper Sorbian, e.g. kruwa < krówa, blóto. This lengthening was regular in open first syllables of disyllabic word forms and blocked by a long vowel in the following syllable, e.g. kámen ‘stone’, gen.sg. kamene, lžíce ‘spoon’, gen.pl. lžic, dat.pl. lžicím, psáti ‘to write’, spáti ‘to sleep’, preterit psal, spal (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 125).

The neo-acute is a heterogeneous category. The oldest long rising vowels arose at the end of my Early Middle Slavic period (6.10, cf. Kortlandt 2005: 119f., 2006a: 27), e.g. Slovak tráva ‘grass’, národ ‘people’, útroba ‘intestines’, also pýtaťsa ‘to inquire’, miešať ‘to blend’, stúpať ‘to mount’. These vowels remained long when they lost the stress to the following syllable in accordance with Dybo’s law (8.7). More recent long rising vowels arose from the retraction of the stress from final jers (8.2), e.g. gen.pl. nôh ‘feet’, rúk ‘hands’, also niesol ‘carried’ < *neslъ̀, 2nd sg. niesieš < *nesešъ̀, from the retraction of the stress from long falling vowels in final syllables (Stang’s law, 9.3), e.g. vôľa ‘will’, 2nd sg. môžeš ‘can’, pôjdeš ‘will go’, also pýtať, miešať, stúpať (cf. Kortlandt 2006a: 35), from the retraction of the stress from non-final jers (10.3), e.g. rúčka ‘penholder’, dcérka ‘little daughter’, and from the lengthening of short rising vowels in Czech kráva and Upper Sorbian kruwa (10.6). Other long vowels developed from compensatory lengthening after the loss of final jers, e.g. Czech bůh ‘god’, dům ‘house’, kůň ‘horse’, nůž ‘knife’.

Original (pre-Dybo) pretonic long vowels were shortened when the new timbre distinctions arose (7.13), e.g. SCR. jězik, málina, rákita, daléko, svědok, důžník, gladník, grádskí, rúkama, ruční, ručník, hládní, těšík, můški, gustí, světi, kriví, mladí, drági, glühí, mékí, súhí, čak. (Hvar, Vrgada, Susak) muški, Slovene mehki, Czech chladný, těžký, suchý, ruka, ručník, humno, sukno, Polish sędzia (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 126f., 2006a: 36f.). Long vowels which became pretonic as a result of Dybo’s law (8.7) remained long, e.g. SCR. národ, rážlíka, zábava, tráva, trávní, trávník, bèli, půtník, Czech bílý, poutník, tráva, trávník, zábava, útroba, Polish wątroba. The long vowels of Czech plátno ‘linen’, vlákno ‘fibre’, Slovak síkno ‘cloth’ were taken from the plural (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 127). Posttonic long vowels were usually preserved in Proto-Slavic (cf. Kortlandt 2005: 128f.).

I conclude that the Leiden conference was a great success. Since both Georg Holzer and Roman Sukač have offered to host future conferences on Balto-Slavic accentology, we can be sure that this important forum of discussion will be continued in the years to come.

Leiden University
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