

# Early Slavic short and long *o* and *e*

TIJMEN PRONK

*Universiteit Leiden, P.N. van Eyckhof 2, NL – 2311 BV Leiden,  
T.C.Pronk@hum.leidenuniv.nl*

---

SCN IX/1 [2016], 5–33

Članek obravnava razvoj praslovanskih novoakutiranih vokalov \**o* in \**e*, ki se v sodobnih slovanskih jezikih odražata kot kratka vokala, dvoglasnika ali dolga vokala. Njun odraz je pogojen z izvorom novega akuta – če je nastal z naglasnim umikom s končnega jera, sta se novonaglašena \**o* oz. \**e* podaljšala, kasneje pa v številnih slovanskih narečjih diftongizirala; če je novoakutirani glas nastal na drug način, je kvantiteta novonaglašenega \**o* ali \**e* odvisna od narečja.

The article<sup>1</sup> discusses the development of the Proto-Slavic vowels \**o* and \**e* with a neoacute accent. These vowels are reflected as short vowels, diphthongs or long vowels in the modern Slavic languages. Their outcome is conditioned by the origin of the neoacute: if it arose through retraction of the accent from a word-final *jer*, the newly accented \**o* or \**e* became long and was subsequently diphthongized in a number of Slavic dialects. If the neoacute accent arose in a different way, the quantity of the newly accented \**o* or \**e* depends on the dialect.

**Ključne besede:** vokal, novi akut, praslovanščina, slovanski jeziki

**Key words:** vowel, neoacute, Proto-Slavic, Slavic languages

---

## 1 \**O* and \**e* in Slavic

It is a well-known fact from the historical grammar of Slavic that the vowels \**o* and \**e* go back to historically short vowels. Nevertheless, late Proto-Slavic

---

<sup>1</sup> Part of the research for this article was conducted within the project *Documentation and Interpretation of the Earliest Croatian*, financed by the Croatian Science Foundation. I am much obliged to Frederik Kortlandt with whom I discussed many of the problems discussed in this article.

\**e* or \**o* could be long or short. Long \**e* and \**o* arose under the following circumstances:<sup>2</sup>

1. through contraction after the deletion of intervocalic \**j*, first in posttonic syllables, e.g. Cz. nom.sg.n. *nové*, gen.sg. *nového* (Vaillant 1950: 195, Kortlandt 2011: 38).
2. through assimilation of a preceding \**j*, e.g. \**pišē-* < \**pišje-* (Kortlandt 2015: 66).
3. under a rising tone (a “neoacute”<sup>3</sup>) (Van Wijk 1916, Vaillant 1950: 265ff.).

It is the last category this paper is concerned with. When we collect all examples of neoacute \**e* or \**o* we can distinguish two categories:

1. \**e* or \**o* which is reflected as a long vowel or diphthong in all Slavic languages which provide evidence about vowel length, with a few minor exceptions.
2. \**e* or \**o* which is reflected as a long vowel or diphthong in some languages but as a short vowel in others.

The variation we find is connected with the fact that the rising accent referred to as “neoacute” has multiple origins (cf. Kortlandt 2015: 69). I will give a brief explanation of the origin of the different reflexes, after which the relevant material will be discussed. We can distinguish four processes which resulted in rising accents that can be referred to as a neoacute (in the examples below I will write the neoacute with a grave accent (\**è*, \**ò*) regardless of its length):

- a) neoacute that arose as a result of the retraction of the accent from a final jer onto a preceding syllable, which obtained a rising accent, e.g. 2sg.pres. \**nesesĭb* > \**nesèsĭb*, *l*-ptc. m.sg. \**neslĭb* > \**nèsĭb*.
- b) neoacute that arose as a result of Dybo’s law, according to which a non-acute, non-falling accent shifted to the following syllable. If that syllable contained

<sup>2</sup> There are more early lengthenings, but those are limited to smaller dialect areas, e.g. lengthening before voiced consonants in closed syllables (e.g., Polish *bóg* < \**bōgъ*). Lengthening in monosyllabic forms with a falling accent (e.g. Sln. *bôg* < \**bōgъ*) might be a common Slavic development (Kortlandt 2011: 305), but length is found in western South Slavic only. In this paper I have chosen to consistently use the term “Proto-Slavic” to refer to the language spoken until the last innovations common to all of Slavic no earlier than the first half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, without distinguishing between “Proto-Slavic” and “Common Slavic”, “Early Proto-Slavic” and “Late Proto-Slavic” or using similar formal periodizations because such a distinction would have no influence on the outcome of the present discussion.

<sup>3</sup> In Slavic accentology, the term “neoacute”, in its widest sense, refers to a subgroup of the rising accents that are reconstructed for Proto-Slavic. They contrast with the “acute”, which is a short rising accent on the vowels \**a*, \**i*, \**y*, \**u*, \**ę* or \**o* or a diphthong. The most precise definition of what a “neoacute” is, is the following: 1) any rising accent on the vowels \**e*, \**o*, \**ь* or \**ъ* (e.g. \**sědmъ*, gen.pl. \**nōgъ*, \**dĭnъ*, nom.sg. \**bōbъ*, nom.sg.m. \**dēsнъ*, gen.sg. \**potōka*); 2) a long rising accent on the vowels \**a*, \**i*, \**y*, \**u*, \**ę* or \**o* or a diphthong (e.g. \**sūsā*, \**stōrža*, gen.pl. \**zīmъ*). In medial stressed syllables (not counting word-final jers), the difference between neoacute and acute cannot be seen directly, because Proto-Slavic had no distinctive length in medial stressed syllables.

a short vowel, it obtained a rising accent, e.g. *\*pòtokъ* > *\*potòkъ*. Dybo's law did not shift the accent onto a word-final jer (Kortlandt 2011: 17–19, 170f.), with the possible exception of final jer preceded by a tautosyllabic resonant (*\*-CRb/ь*) in Czech and South Slavic, see below. Accordingly, the old non-final rising accent of nom.sg. *\*kòhъ*, *\*otìcъ*, gen.pl. *\*žènъ* was preserved. This rising accent is identical to the one in *\*potòkъ*.

- c) neoacute that arose as a result of Stang's law, according to which a long falling accent in a final syllable (not counting final jers) was shifted to the preceding syllable, which obtained a rising accent, e.g. 2sg.pres. *\*možěšъ* > *\*mòžešъ*.
- d) neoacute that arose as a result of the retraction of the accent from an internal jer onto a preceding syllable, which obtained a rising accent, e.g. *\*koń̀bskъjb* > *\*kòń̀bskъjb*.

These four developments affected all of Slavic but they did not take place at the same time. The relative chronology of these changes accounts for the length differences of neoacute *\*o* and *\*e* in the individual Slavic languages we will now proceed to discuss. Note that a) affected words belonging to the Proto-Slavic accent paradigm *c*, while b), c) and d) affected words belonging to accent paradigm *b* (on these accentual paradigms see Stang 1957). There are a few innovations in the individual Slavic languages that need to be kept in mind. In Czech, Upper Sorbian and Slovene, short rising vowels were lengthened in non-final syllables (with different additional conditions in the individual languages, see Greenberg 2000: 128ff., Kortlandt 2011: 341f., Derksen 2008), while in Ukrainian *\*o* was *\*o* lengthened if jer (*ь* or *ъ*) was lost in the following syllable and *\*e* if a front jer (*ѣ*) was lost in the following syllable (Shevelov 1979: 302ff., 318ff.).

In forms in which *\*e*, *\*o* is consistently long or a diphthong in the relevant Slavic languages, the accent was originally on a word-final jer and was retracted onto the preceding syllable (development a) above). The vowel that received the stress was apparently lengthened. This retraction is found exclusively in paradigms with mobile accentuation and can be dated before the other developments mentioned above (cf. Kortlandt 2011: 170, 338f.). Evidence for a long vowel comes from:

- the gen.pl. of nouns with mobile accentuation (i.e. belonging to accent paradigm *c*): Čakavian (Vrgada) *kòs* 'hair', *nebēs* 'heaven', Slovene *nóg* 'leg', Czech *synů* 'son'. The long vowel in the gen.pl. of mobile nouns is clearly of Proto-Slavic origin and it spread to non-mobile nouns in South Slavic (S, Cr., Sln. *krâv* 'cow') and Slovak (*òs* 'wasp', *síl* 'power', *kopyt* 'hoof') and in Polish in the *ā*-stems (*òs* 'wasp', *mąk* 'suffering'), but not in the neuter *o*-stems (*peť* 'fetter', *blot* 'marsh', Kortlandt 2011: 54), and not at all not in Czech, where a long vowel is found in some mobile nouns in the older language and today only in relic forms (Verweij 1994: 507f.).
- the nom.sg.m. of the possessive pronouns *\*mojb*, *\*tvojb*, *\*svojb*: Ru. dial. *môj*, Cz. *můj*, Slk. *môj*, Sln. *mój*, Kajk. (Bednja) *mýej*, Čak. (Brač) *mōj* (van Wijk

- 1916: 323ff.). In Slovak *tvoj, svoj*, the original *ô* became *o* after the initial cluster eding in *-v-*, cf. Slk. dial. *svój, tvój*, Cz. *svůj, tvůj* (Pauliny 1990: 176). The paradigm of these pronouns has end-stress in Slavic. The nom.sg. form must have had end-stress at an earlier stage as well. If the stress had been on the root, it should have had a falling tone (*\*mǝjь* etc.), and this tone should have been preserved in most of Slovene, Kajkavian and Čakavian. These forms are not due to early Slavic lengthening before *\*-jь*, as van Wijk (ibidem: 325) suggested (cf. Nonnenmacher-Pribić 1961: 94).
- the adverb *\*domovъ* ‘home’, an old dat.sg. to the *u*-stem *\*domъ* (Ru. dial. *domôj*, OCz. *domóv*, Cz. *domů*, Sln. *domóv* (secondary *domôv*)). The short reflex in Slk. *domov* is due to the following *\*y* (Verweij 1994: 515). Ukr. dial. *domív* preserves the final accentuation but provides no information about the original length of the *\*o*. The stress must have been on the final jer in early Proto-Slavic, because *\*domъ* belongs to the accentual type with stress alternating between the initial and final syllables. The attested stress on the medial syllable of *\*domovъ* can therefore only be due to a retraction of the stress from the final jer.
  - the imperatives *\*(ne) bojь se* ‘(do not) fear!’, *\*stojь* ‘stand’ (Čak., Kajk. *stôj, bôj se*, Sln. *stôj, bôj se*, Cz. *stůj*, dial. (Silezian) *bůj*, Slk. *bôj*, but *stoj* with an analogical short vowel. The present of these verbs has mobile accentuation. If the stress had originally been on the root in the 2sg. imperative, it should have had a falling tone (*\*bôjь, \*stôjь*), and this tone should have been preserved in most of Slovene, Kajkavian and Čakavian.
  - present forms of mobile verbs of the type Čakavian (Senj) *pijě, pečě*. The long rising accent originates in the 2sg. *\*nesěšь* < *\*nesešь* and 3sg. *\*nesé(tь)* < *\*nesetь* (on the latter ending see Kortlandt 2009: 157ff.). The long rising vowel resulted from the retraction of the accent from a final jer and can be compared to the long vowel in the gen.pl. The long vowel is found in some Čakavian dialects, e.g., apart from the Senj dialect mentioned above, Susak *rest'ê, klad'ê*, in various Štokavian dialects (cf. Kapović 2009), e.g. Posavian *pečě, tečě*, Neoštok. dial. *pěčěš*, in Prekmurje Slovene (Cankova) *nāsě, zābē*,<sup>4</sup> and in Central Slovak, *nesie, pečie*. Kajkavian, most of Slovene and Čakavian and part of Štokavian generalized a short suffix vowel, as did Czech and part of Slovak (cf. Vermeer 1984: 380ff.). In much of Štokavian and Čakavian, we find a redistribution of vowel length depending on the length of the root vowel: the suffix is long when the root vowel is short and the suffix is short

<sup>4</sup> Suffix-stress is also preserved in north-west Slovene: Gailtal *nāsě, račě*, Resia *nasě, bodě*. The timbre of the vowel is surprising, because long *\*ē* otherwise became Gailtal *iā*, Resia *i* e.g. *līād, lit* < *\*lēdь, šīast* < *\*šēstь*. Perhaps the vowel was originally short (like in the neighbouring Slovene dialects) and was lengthened analogically at an early stage, i.e. before the loss of post-tonic length in verbs like 3sg. *\*brj'sē, \*bôdē, \*kupûjē* > Gailtal *brīše, kəpûje, bôde*) but after the raising of *\*ē*. Alternatively, the timbre of the vowel may have been restored after the raising of *\*ē* to *\*ē̄* in analogy to verbs with a long root-vowel and a short stressed suffix, e.g. *\*rāstē, \*trēsē* > Gailtal *rāste, trése*, Resia *rāstę*.

when the root vowel is long (ibidem: 365f., the same distribution is found in north-western Slovene).

In all other cases, neoacute *\*o* and *\*e* are reflected as short in some languages, but as long or diphthongal in others. Štokavian and Čakavian *always* have a short reflex in these categories (disregarding later lengthenings in specific environments). Russian dialects with a distinction between monophthongal and diphthongal reflexes of *\*o* always have a diphthongal reflex of neoacute *\*o*. Long/diphthongal reflexes are relatively frequent in monosyllabic forms of nominal paradigms belonging to accent paradigm *b* and in those cases in which *\*e* or *\*o* received the accent as a result of Stang's law or the retraction of the accent from a weak internal jer:

- the nom.sg. of masculine (*j*)*o*-stems belonging to Proto-Slavic accent paradigm *b*: *\*košb*, *\*konjb*, *\*potb*, *\*bobv* etc. The root vowel is short in South Slavic, but long in Russian dialects and predominantly long in West Slavic. The diphthongal reflex in Ru. dial. *stól*, *kón*, *snóp* etc. is in line with fact that any neoacute *\*o* becomes Ru. dial. *ó*. I agree with Kortlandt (2011: 345f.) that the reflex of a long vowel in, e.g., Czech *kůň*, *stůl*, *nůž*, Slovak *kôň*, *stól*, *nôž* is likely to be due to analogy with other case-forms with stem-stress, e.g. loc.sg. *\*kóni*, gen.pl. *\*kón*, loc.pl. *\*kónix*, inst.pl. *\*kóni*. In South Slavic, except Kajkavian, only the gen.pl. had a long vowel (see below). Accordingly, there was no motive for introducing a long vowel in the nom.sg. form in South Slavic, as there was in Czech and Slovak.
- the definite form of adjectives belonging to accent paradigm *b*: *\*novbvb*, *\*golbvb*, *\*dobrvbvb*. The accent was originally on the final stem-syllable (*\*nòvbvb*), after which post-tonic *\*-vbvb* was contracted to *\*-v̄yj*, the accent shifted to the following syllable according to Dybo's law (> *\*novýj*), from which it was retracted again as a result of Stang's law (> *\*nòvyj*/*\*nóvyj*).
- *i*-presents belonging to accent paradigm *b*: *\*nosišb*, *\*volišb*, *\*modlišb*, *\*xodišb*. Here, too, the neoacute results from Stang's law. We find a diphthong in Russian dialects, a long vowel in Kajkavian, but a short vowel in Slk. *nosiš*, Pl. *nośisz* because of the (originally) long vowel in the following syllable.
- *je*-presents belonging to accent paradigm *b*: *\*steješb*, *\*glod'ešb*. The thematic present *\*možešb* also belongs here (cf. Vermeer 1984: 363). It has a diphthongal reflex in Russian dialects and Slovak, a long reflex in Kajkavian and an analogical short reflex in Pl. *może*.
- individual case forms of nouns belonging to accent paradigm *b*, e.g. loc.sg. *\*vòlě*, *\*kóni*, loc.pl. *\*vòlěx*, *\*kónix*, inst.pl. *\*vòly*, *\*kóni*.
- the *volja*-type, which is much discussed in the literature, cf. Stang 1957: 57ff., Kapović 2007, Fecht 2010, Kortlandt 2015. The neoacute in this category is the result of Stang's law, which caused the stress to shift from the ending (*\*volâ*) to the preceding syllable. Examples with *\*o* are *\*voļa*, *\*koža*, *\*xod'a*, *\*voña* and *\*noša*. We find a reflex of a long vowel in Slovak, East Slavic and Kajkavian and reflexes of a short vowel in Čakavian and Štokavian. The *volja*-type was frequently influenced by *ja*-stems with different accentuation and by nouns in *-bja*, e.g. Slk. *koža*, *noša* instead of *\*kôža*, *\*nôša*,

USorb. *wola*, *koža* instead of *\*wóla*, *\*kóža*, Ru. dial. *voljá* instead of *\*vólja*, Štokavian *hòđa* instead of *\*hòđa*, Old Polish *wolà*, *wonià* (with analogical long *\*-ā* < *\*-bja*) instead of *\*wola*, *\*wonia*, S, Cr. *hòđa*, *tònja* instead of *\*hòđa*, *\*tònja* etc. Besides *ja*-stems, a neoacute is sometimes also found in other *a*-stems, such as *\*kora* ‘bast’ (in analogy to *\*koža* ‘skin’) and the loanwords *\*škoda* ‘damage, pity’ and *\*sobota* ‘Saturday’.

- words in which the accent was retracted from a medial weak jer onto a preceding vowel: *\*kònjьskъjьb*, *\*žènjьskъjьb*, *\*sèlьskъjьb*, *\*otròčъjьb*, *\*pòsълješъb*, *\*dòjьdešъb*, *\*glèzъn*.<sup>5</sup> It is often difficult to determine the original length of the vowel in these cases. The short stem vowel of Cz. *koňský*, *ženský*, *zelí*, Slk. *konský*, *ženský*, dial. *zelé* can be connected to the following syllable which contains a long vowel, cf. the reflex of a long stem vowel in USorb. *kónski*, Slnc. *kóunshī*.

In all other cases short reflexes are dominant:

- *l*-participle of mobile athematic verbs: *\*něslъb*, *\*pèklъb*, *\*bòdlъb*. Short in South Slavic, long in Slovak (*niesol*), short in modern Czech (*nesl*), but cf. Old Czech *védł*. The accent was originally on the final syllable, from which it was retracted causing a diphthongal reflex in Slovak, but not in Czech or South Slavic. Kortlandt (2014: 130) considers the short reflexes in South Slavic to be due to analogy.
- the *l*-participle *\*mòglъb* (accent paradigm *b*). The accent was on the first syllable before the application of Dybo’s law and shifted to the final jer in South Slavic (to be retracted again later), but remained on the first syllable in West Slavic in view of Slovak *mohol*. The latter was apparently accentually distinct from *niesol*, which has a diphthong due to a retraction of the accent from the final syllable. The reflexes of neoacute *\*o* in *\*mòglъb* are consistently short, except in OCz. *móhl*, Slovak dial. *móhol* (Ukr. *mih* and Sln. *mógel* are due to regular lengthenings in these languages). The long reflex in Old Czech and Slovak was probably introduced analogically (Kortlandt 2011: 345).

<sup>5</sup> The type *\*zelъje*, *\*perъje*, *\*grobъje*, *\*kozъjъb* is slightly more complicated because one expects final unstressed *\*-ъje* to have been contracted before Dybo’s law (*\*zèlъje* > *\*zèlě* etc., cf. Kortlandt 2011: 38). This should have become *\*zelě* as a result of Dybo’s law and then *\*zèle* as a result of Stang’s law. Apparently, the sequence *\*-b(j)e* was restored on the basis of caseforms in which no contraction had taken place (e.g. the gen.sg. *\*-b(j)a*, cf. the preserved cluster of Štok., Čak. *bràća* ‘brothers’ < *\*bratъja*) and on the basis of nouns in which the suffix was stressed *\*-b(j)e* (>*\*-bje* after Dybo’s law, reflected in, e.g., Čak. (Novi) *vočí*, *kamení*, *zelí*). Later contraction of *\*-b(j)e* produced the long final vowel of Vrgada *pěrjě*, *zèlě*, *gròzjě*, Novi *pěrjī*, *zelénjī*, *kòzjī*, Grobnik *pěrjī*, *vesějī*, *gròbhjī* etc. The restoration of posttonic *\*-b(j)e* in *\*perъje*, *\*grobъje* etc. probably took place before Dybo’s law (which then shifted the accent to the jer: *\*zelb(j)e*). If this is correct, the neoacute on the initial syllable of *\*zèlъje* in western South Slavic is due to the retraction of the accent from an internal jer (Kortlandt 2014: 129).

Similar examples are found in the nom.sg.m. of nouns and adjectives belonging to accent paradigm *b* with a stem ending in a resonant: nom.sg. \**odrъ*, \**bobrъ*/\**bebrъ*, \**koprъ*, \**kosmъ*, nom.sg.m. \**dobrъ*, \**mokrъ*, \**ostrъ*, \**teplъ*/\**toplъ*. These have a short vowel in South Slavic, but Old Czech has *dóbr*. Note that Slovak has a long reflex in *kópor* and *vódor*, which may indicate that this is the regular reflex of \**ò* in this type of words (cf. Slk. dial. *móhol*). However, in view of the secondary -*ò*- in masculine *o*-stems like *kôň* and *stól*, it is conceivable that we are dealing with an analogical -*ò*- here as well. Masculine *o*-stems of the type \**odrъ* etc. were sometimes subject to generalization of final stress from the oblique cases after the introduction of a secondary jer in the second syllable, e.g. Neoštok. *òdar*. This generalization was fuelled by analogy with nouns with a disyllabic stem of which the second syllable contained a jer, e.g. \**orъlbъ*, \**onъnbъ*, \**onъnbъ*, \**osъlbъ* (Neoštok. *òrao*, *òvan*, Ru. *os'ól*, *ov'ós*). The noun \**ognъ* (m. i)/ \**ogńbъ* (m. jo) 'fire' has final stress in the nom.sg. in almost all languages (Ru. *ogón'*, Sln. *ógenj*, Neoštok. *òganj*).<sup>6</sup> This final stress points to a relatively early introduction of a prop-vowel between \**g* and \**ń* (compared to the type \**odrъ*, \**koprъ*). This may be because \**ognъ*/\**ogńbъ* shares its initial \**o*- with \**orъlbъ*, \**onъnbъ*, \**onъnbъ*, \**osъlbъ* or because the word-final cluster \**-gń* that arose after the loss of the final jer was not tolerated.

The cardinals \**sedmъ* and \**osmъ* also belong here. They have a diphthongal reflex in Ru. dial. *vósem'*, but a short reflex in Cz. *osm*, Slk. *osem*, Pl. *osiem*, Sln. *vùšesem*, Štok., Čak. *òsam*, Kajk. *òsem* (Sln. *òsam* is ambiguous, USorb. has *wósom* next to *wosom*). In contrast, the ordinals \**sedmъjbъ*, \**osmъjbъ* are predominantly attested with a long vowel or diphthong, cf. Cz. dial. *úsmý*, Slk. *òsmý*, Pl. *ósmy*, Sln. *vóusmī*, Polab. *vásmě*, Čak. *òsmī*, Kajk. *òsmi*, Sln. dial. (Prekmurje) *'ousmi*, although USorb. *wosmy* has the reflex of a short vowel. The diphthong in the East Slavic cardinal is the regular reflex of neoacute \**ò* (cf. Vaillant 1950: 187). In both the cardinal and the ordinal the accent was on the initial syllable before Dybo's law (\**òsmъ*, \**òsmъjbъ*), where it stayed in \**òsmъ* in Slovak *osem* but shifted to the final jer and was retracted again in (Western) South Slavic (> \**osmъ* > \**òsmъ*, cf. Pronk 2013: 115f.). In the ordinal \**òsmъjbъ*, the initial stress is due to a combination of Dybo's and Stang's laws, see above on \**novъjbъ* etc. The Russian definite form *vos'mój* exists since Old Russian (Zaliznjak 2011: 168) next to a form with root stress, *ós'myj*, Ru. dial. and Ukr. *vós'myj*. Similar doublets exist for \**sedmъjbъ* (ibidem: 167), cf. *sedmy* but *sedmája* in the 14<sup>th</sup> century Čudovskij Novyj Zavet. The forms with suffix stress are probably secondary in analogy to *šestýj* 'sixth' (rarely *šéstyj*, which is probably analogical to *òsmýj*). South Slavic dialects that preserve traces of end stress in the definite form of mobile adjectives, such as the Čakavian dialect of Novi and the Štokavian dialects of the Posavina, preserve the old root stress in the ordinals 'sixth', 'seventh' and 'eighth': Novi *sedmī*, *òsmī* (Belić

<sup>6</sup> With the exception of some Čakavian dialects (e.g. Brač *ògon*), in which we also frequently find unexpected initial stress in forms with a medial jer (e.g. Brač *òca* < \**otъca*, *pīsto* < \**pīstъto*, *òral* < \**orъlbъ*, examples from Šimunović 2009).

- 2000: 143), Posavina *šestī, sēdmī, ōsmī*, but *prvī* ‘first’ (Ivšić 1913: 56f.). The long root vowel in Čakavian and Štokavian is analogical after *pětī* ‘fifth’, *devětī* ‘ninth’ etc., and the same is true for the long vowel of OCz. and Cz. dial. *šestý, sēdmý*, Polish *siódmy, ósmy* (Bulaxovskij 1983: 109, Kapović 2007: 92, fn. 5).
- the second syllable of nouns with a polysyllabic stem like *\*potok-*, *\*nārod-*, *\*b̄rlog-*, *\*vīnogord-*, *\*e/olen-*, *\*plemen-* etc. It received the accent from the first syllable as a result of Dybo’s law.
  - the final syllable of the nom.acc.sg. of neuter nouns and adjectives belonging to a.p. *b*: *\*d̄bno*, *\*pis̄bmo*, *\*lice*, *\*novo*. Here the vowel is generally short, but diphthongal in Ru. dial. *dn̄o*, *pis̄m̄o*, *šyrok̄o*. The long vowel of Sln. dial. *dn̄ó*, *rojstv̄ó* is due to more recent lengthening of *\*-ò*, probably originally only when followed by a clitic (Ramovš 1921: 235f.). There is also *rojstv̄ó*, the timbre of which may be analogical to that of other neuter *o*-stems where it is regular, e.g. *mes̄o*, *ok̄o*, *l̄eto*. The long ending is, however, reminiscent of that of Čak. (e.g. Novi, Vrgada) *-stv̄o*, *-stv̄ō* (cf. Belić 2000: 142, 159): *dr̄ūšt̄v̄ō*, *tr̄ōjstv̄ó*, where the analogy proposed for Slovene would not work. Belić (ibidem: 142) explained the Čakavian long vowel from a merger of the suffixes *\*-bstvo* and *\*-bstvbje* (similarly already Škrabec for Slovene, see Valjavec 1897: 211). The latter would regularly have produced long endings, cf. Čak. (Novi) *kamenī*, (Vrgada) *kor̄ēñē*, Sln. dial. (Nadiški) *koraniā*, (Prekmurje) *zelenj̄e* < *\*-bje* (Šekli 2013: 142f.). The neocircumflex of Sln. *otr̄ōšt̄vo*, *ž̄ēn̄stvo* < *\*otroč̄bstvo*, *\*žen̄stvo* is probably not due to the internal weak jer (cf. *otr̄óški*, *ž̄ėnski* < *\*otroč̄bsk̄bj̄b*, *\*žen̄bsk̄bj̄b*, see Pronk 2013) and therefore also points to a long ending.

There is one category in which we find long *\*e*, *\*o* next to short *\*e*, *\*o* which is not connected with the neoacute:

- the nom.sg. of masculine (*j*)*o*-stems with a monosyllabic stem belonging to Proto-Slavic accent paradigm *c*: *\*boḡb*, *\*most̄b*, *\*gnoj̄b*, *\*med̄b*, *\*led̄b* etc. The root vowel is short in West Slavic, but long in western South Slavic, where vowels with a falling tone were regularly lengthened in monosyllabic words (not counting final jers).

As the first set of examples above shows, all languages have a long reflex of *\*o* and *\*e* when these vowels became stressed as a result of the accent-retraction from a final weak jer (except when preceded by an occlusive plus resonant). In Štokavian and Čakavian, the reflex of neoacute *\*o* and *\*e* is short in all other cases. We will now briefly discuss the situation in East Slavic, West Slavic and Kajkavian before treating the Slovene data in more detail.

## 2 East Slavic

In Russian dialects we find a reflex of neoacute *\*o* that differs from that of *\*o* with an originally falling accent, e.g. from Stang’s law (*gônit*, *lôvit*, *xôceš*,

*pôret, tônet, dôbryj, gólyj*), from Dybo's law (*potôk, gotôv, sbôr, urôk, mnôgo, molokô, šyrokô*), in masculine (*j*)*o*-stems belonging to a.p. *b* (*stôl, kôn, nôž, kôl, topôr, šyrôk*), with retraction from a final jer (*môj, domôj, synôf, gôr*), with retraction from an internal jer (*nôžka, dvôrnik, pômnit'*) and before \*-CR<sub>b</sub>/<sub>b</sub> (*môg, vosem'*).<sup>7</sup> Forms with polnoglasié also have a stressed diphthong, e.g., with acute *korôva, borôd, kolôt'*, with neoacute *kolôtit, molôčnyj, golôvka*. Originally stressed \**o* in a penultimate syllable before a weak jer is reflected as *o*: gen.pl. *por, sov* (*sová* and *porá* belong to accent paradigm *b*).

In Ukrainian, neoacute \**o* and \**e* remained unchanged, e.g. *môžet', nôsyt', toržestvó, gréblja* 'dam', unless they were followed by a weak jer. Every \**o* before a syllable in which a jer was lost, regardless of its original intonation, was lengthened and diphthongized and eventually became *i* (word-initial *vi-*) in the standard language (Shevelov 1979: 318f.). Every \**e* before a syllable in which a front jer was lost also became *i*. Only the reflex of \**e* before a syllable in which a back jer was lost depended on the original accentuation of the \**e*. According to Shevelov, the reflex of \**e* before a lost back jer is *i* "under a retracted stress" (o.c., 323), e.g., *nis* 'carried', gen.pl. *kolís, sil*, otherwise it is *e*. The original distribution is obscured by the changes \**e* > \**o* (after a palatal consonant) > *i* (if a jer was lost in the following syllable), interdialectal borrowing and analogies (Bulaxovs'kyj 1943, Shevelov 1979: 327). It seems plausible that the *-i-* of *nis* and *kolís* was originally a long \**ē* that had been lengthened as a result of the retraction of the stress from the final jer (\**nesl̥* > \**nésl̥*, cf. Slk. *niesol*) and merged with the reflex of \**ě* in Ukrainian.

A special case are instances in which the final syllable of a word contains stressed *-ó-* as a result of *polnoglasié*, e.g., with acute *polón, moróz, horóx*, gen. pl. *vorón, kolód*, but analogical *porih* 'threshold', with neoacute *ohoród, xvoróst, storóža, horóža, voróta, molótyš*. The regular reflex is *-ó-*, not *-i-* in spite of the lost jer at the end of the word. We do, however, often find *-i-* in the gen.pl. of mobile nouns (*holív, vorít, boríd, storín*, cf. also *čeríd*, but *derév*), derivatives with the suffix *-ka* (*holívka* (but *holóvka* of cabbage, cheese, onions etc.), *borídka*, but *storóžka*) and in the masculine singular form of the *l*-ptc. (*volík, f. voloklá, berih, f. berehlá*). It has been argued that the opposition between Ukr. *holív* and *moróz* reflects an earlier tonal opposition between acute and neoacute accents (Bulaxovskij 1958: 87f., Žovtobrjux et al. 1980: 94f., Kortlandt 2011: 172), but this idea cannot be maintained, as is shown by isolated examples with *-oró-* from a neoacute like *ohoród, xvoróst, storóža, horóža* and *voróta* (Seliščev 1951: 170, Zaliznjak 1985: 161-163), and by the absence of forms with *-oRi-* or *-eRi-* in texts before the late 17<sup>th</sup> century (Shevelov 1979: 109, 607). The forms with *-i-* all contain analogical *-i-*, like in *korôva, korív, korívka, beréza, beríz, berízka, bloxá, blix, blíška, voróta, vorít, vorítka*. Forms like *nis, kolís* and *sil* mentioned above formed the model for the introduction of *-i-* for *-e-* in *berih, beríz, čeríd* etc.

<sup>7</sup> Data given here are from sources quoted by van Wijk (1916) and Vasil'ev (1929).

### 3 West Slavic

Slovak has a diphthongal reflex of neoacute \**o* (in a few examples also of neoacute \**e*), except before a syllable containing a long vowel, e.g. in *i*-presents of the type *nosím* and adjectives of the type *konský*. A short reflex of the neoacute appears to the regular outcome in a number of disyllabic forms ending in a jer which had initial stress before Dybo's law, e.g. the numerals *sedem*, *osem* and the *l*-participle *mohl* (but dial. *móhol*).

It has traditionally been assumed that Czech had the same reflexes as Slovak (cf. Nonnenmacher-Pribić 1961: 95), although the situation in Czech is difficult to assess. Czech lengthened acute and neoacute vowels in disyllabic words unless the following syllable contained a long vowel, which largely obscured the original situation, cf. the ambiguous *může*, *půjdeš*, *nosiš*, *dobry*, *zelí*. The Czech loc. and ins.pl. of (*j*)*o*-stems belonging to a.p. *b* have a short reflex of a neoacute \**o* (e.g. *stolech*, *stoly*), but this can easily be due to analogy with other forms of the paradigm. The ins.pl. *kožemi* (secondarily also *kůžemi*) to *kůže* might point to an originally short reflex, but the \**o* is probably analogical to gen.pl. *koží*, dat.pl. *kožím*, loc.pl. *kožích*, all with a regular short reflex because of the long vowel in the final syllable (cf. Bulaxovskij 1983: 109). The short root vowel of *je*-presents like *meleš*, *tešeš*, *češeš*, *steleš*, *pošeš* is due to analogy, cf. the long reflex in *kůleš* (but OCz. *koleš*), OCz. *uořeš* (ibidem). The only evidence for an originally long or diphthongal reflex in Czech is indirect and comes from the nom.acc.sg. of the masculine (*j*)*o*-stems. The *o*-stem paradigm with length in the nom.sg. (*stůl*) but a short vowel in the rest of the paradigm (*stola*) must be relatively old in view of the fact that Slovak shows the same pattern: *stól*, *stola*. In Czech, this pattern is found with a number of nouns with a root containing \*-*o*- originally belonging to a.p. *b*, viz. *kůň*, *dvůr*, *půst*, *stůl*, *kůl*, *vůl*, *nůž*, but also with nouns belonging to a.p. *c*: *bůh*, *vůz*, *důl*, *dům*, *lůj*, *hnůj* (Verweij 1994: 525ff.). In Slovak, (*j*)*o*-stems with -*ô*- throughout the paradigm or in the nom.sg. only predominantly belong to a.p. *b* (ibidem: 530ff.). It can be observed that nom.sg. forms with a short root vowel replaced forms with a long root vowel within Czech (Nonnenmacher-Pribić 1961: 94). Van Wijk regarded the long reflex as the regular outcome of neoacute \**o* in *kůň* etc. Kortlandt (2014: 128) rejects Van Wijk's view because of the large number of counterexamples and suggests that the long reflex was introduced from case forms in which the accent was retracted onto the root as a result of Stang's law, i.e. loc.sg. \**kônji*, loc.pl. \**kônjix*, ins.pl. \**kônji*. If this is correct, these cases would originally have had a long root vowel (or, in Kortlandt's formulation, a diphthong). Nonnenmacher-Pribić (1961: 95), following Kul'bakin, assumed that the long reflex in the nom.sg. was due to the retraction of the accent from a final jer. This is problematic because, as Kortlandt has shown (2011: 17ff.), the consistently short root vowel of S, Cr., Sln. *kõnj* and other masculine (*j*)*o*-stems belonging to accent paradigm *b* indicates that the final jer of \**konjъ* etc. was never accented. Although this is evidently correct for South Slavic, the West Slavic data are less transparent. Nevertheless, the contrast between

the short root vowel of Slk. *mohol*, *osem* < \**mòglb*, \**òsmb* (accent paradigm *b*) and *niesol* < \**nesl̂b* (accent paradigm *c*) appears to indicate that Dybo's law had not shifted the accent to the final jer of \**mòglb* and \**òsmb*.<sup>8</sup> I therefore agree with Kortlandt that analogical origin for nominatives of the type *stŭl*, *stól* is most likely.

A factor that may have had some influence on the introduction of a long vowel in the nom.sg. of masculine (*j*)*o*-stems is the existence of a small group of nouns which originally (i.e. before Dybo's law) had final stress in the nom. sg. form. In late Proto-Slavic, the accent was retracted onto the stem syllable, which was lengthened as a result. An example of such a word is PSI. \**dъzdjb* 'rain' (Derksen 2008: 15f., cf. the long vowel of OCz. *děšč*, Slk. *dážd'*, Štok. (Vuk) *dážd*, Čak. (Orbanići) *dāš*, (Lumbarda) *dāž*).<sup>9</sup> Other examples are speculative, e.g. \**nožb* 'knife' (long in Neoštokavian *nōž*, Old Štokavian, Čakavian *nōž*, Cz. *nůž*, Slk. *nōž*, short in Sln. *nōž*, Kajkavian *nōž* (e.g. Bednja *něž*, but with a long vowel in Fertóhomok *nōž*), \**ežb* 'hedgehog' (long in Neoštokavian *jěž*, *jěža*, Sln. *jěž* (cf. dial. (Gaital) *íəž*), perhaps also USorb. *jěž* (but cf. Derksen 2008: 125f.), short in Cz. (dial.), Slk. *jež*) and \**dvorb* 'court, yard' (long in Neoštokavian *dvôr*, gen.sg. *dvóra*, Old Štokavian, Čakavian, Kajkavian *dvôr*, Sln. dial. (Gaital) *dúər*, Cz. *dvŭr*, short in Sln. *dvòr*; Slk. *dvor* is ambiguous).<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The situation is different in western South Slavic, where both \**mogl̂b* and \**nesl̂b* are reflected with a short root-vowel (e.g., Kajkavian *mògel*, *něsel*), pointing to earlier \**mogl̂b*, \**nesl̂b*, both with end-stress. If the accent had been on the root the Kajkavian and Slovene forms should have had a neocircumflex. Apparently, in western South Slavic Dybo's law did shift the accent onto final \*-*CRb*, to be retracted again later. This is confirmed by the consistently short root-vowel of other words with this structure, e.g., Kajkavian *òsem*, *dòber* (Pronk 2013, although Kortlandt (2014: 130) regards these forms as secondary). In Czech, words with the structure *Ce/oCRb/ь* consistently have a short root vowel: *nesl*, *pekl*, *sedm*, *osm*, *mohl*, *dobr*, *bobr*, *odr*, *kopr*. In Slovak, some of these have a diphthong: *niesol*, *piekol*, *vòdor*, *kòpor*, dial. *mòhol*. Czech *nesl*, *sedm* etc. did not undergo the Czech lengthening of short vowels with a rising accent in penultimate syllables of disyllabic words (*kráva* < \**kráva*) because the forms were apparently monosyllabic at the time. An exception is OCz. *móhl*, which may have a secondary long reflex, like Slk. dial. *mòhol*. The reflex of a long vowel in USorb. *wósom* is due to the regular Upper Sorbian lengthening of a short rising vowel.

<sup>9</sup> Many Čakavian dialects have an analogical short vowel in this word. The falling tone of Brač *dōž*, Hvar (Brusje) *dōrž* shows that its long vowel is due to relatively recent secondary lengthening before a resonant as in *lōn* 'linen cloth' < \**l̂nb̂*. The lengthening probably took place in the unattested nom.acc.sg. \**dar*, which developed from \**daž* < \**dъzdjb* with rotacism as in *mōre*- < \**može*-. The nominative was later adapted to the oblique stem \**dažj*-.

<sup>10</sup> The remarkable long vowel of \**dvorb* was pointed out to me by Willem Vermeer. It may indicate that this word had end-stress in Slavic before Dybo's law, contrasting with the paradigm of Lith. *dvāras*, which reflects earlier initial stress, and Sanskrit *dvāram*, also with initial stress. The shift from a Proto-Indo-European neuter to a Balto-Slavic masculine *o*-stem also points to original initial stress (Illič-Svityč's law). It is difficult to derive the apparent end-stress of \**dvorb* from a *u*-stem paradigm. Such a paradigm would probably have to be due to analogy with a Proto-Slavic nom.sg. \**dom̂b*, but the

The word for ‘hedgehog’ has joined a.p. *c* in Čakavian and Kajkavian (*jěž*, *jěža*). In *\*nožb* and *\*ežb* the long vowel may also be due to lengthening before *-ž*, as prof. Kortlandt suggested to me. In either case, the words for ‘rain’ and ‘knife’ were inherited into Czech and Slovak with a long vowel in the nom. acc.sg. and a short vowel in the other forms. There may have been a few more nouns of this type (perhaps *\*odrb* ‘bed, couch’ and *\*koprb* ‘dill’, cf. Slk. *vodor* ‘threshing floor’, *kôpor*).

#### 4 Kajkavian

In his monumental *Jezik Hrvata Kajkavaca* (1936), Štjepan Ivšić gives the following overview of categories in which Kajkavian has a long rising accent on an etymologically short vowel:

1. *zělje*, *grōblje*, *stōlnjak*
2. nom.pl.n. *sēla*, *rēbra*, *rešēta*, *ōkna*, *jājca* (cf. sg. *jajcē*)
3. gen.pl. *lōnec*, *kōnec*
4. loc. and ins.pl.m. and n. *kōni(h)*, *vōli(h)*, *lōnci(h)*, *kōli(h)*
5. the definite form of certain adj., *dōbri*, *nōvi*, *širōki*, *zelēni*
6. the ordinals *trētji*, *sēdmi*, *ōsmi*
7. adjectives like *žēnski*, *kōňski*, *peklēnski*, *bōžji*<sup>11</sup>

There are also a few categories in which neoacute *\*o* and *\*e* are not reflected with a long rising accent:

1. the *volja*-type: *vōlja*, *kōža*, *stēlja*, with a circumflex. For the somewhat aberrant Kajkavian dialect of Hidegség and Fertőhomok in Hungary, Houtzagers (1999) provides forms with a short vowel: *vōja*, *kōža*.
2. presents of *i*-verbs of the type *nōsim*, *hōdim*. The short vowel must be analogical.

evidence for such a form is limited to Cz. *dŭm*, while South Slavic *dōm* and Ru. dial. *dom* (not *\*dōm*) point to Proto-Slavic *\*dōmь*. In theory, we could be dealing with traces of an old difference between nom.sg. *\*domь* and acc.sg. *\*dōmь*, corresponding to the mobile pattern reflected in Lith. nom.sg. *medūs*, acc.sg. *mēdy*, but it seems that the initial accentuation of the accusative was generalized in the *u*- and *i*-stems already in Proto-Slavic (cf. Cr. *méd*, *gōst*, *pēt*, Cz. *med*, *host*, *pēt*). The *u*-stem gen.sg. *\*dvoru* in West Slavic (Cz. *dvoru*, Pl. *dworu*) is a recent innovation. There is no trace of a *u*-stem in OCS or East Slavic and Proto-Slavic derivatives like *\*dvorьnь* and *\*dvorišče* are derived from the older *o*-stem.

<sup>11</sup> Houtzagers’ description of the dialect of Hidegség and Fertőhomok (1999) gives short accents: *žēnsko*, *kōnjsko*, *sēlski*. I found hardly any other exceptions to Ivšić’s categories with long *ō*, *ē* in descriptions of Kajkavian dialects. There are a few lexemes with unexpected reflexes which may be due to analogy or local phonetic changes, e.g. Mursko Središće *st’oljak* and *k’ojnskj*, where one would expect *ou* < *\*ō*, cf. *gr’qubje*, *k’qula* (data from Blažek & Grozdana Rob 2014).

3. internal and final \*o and \*e that received the stress as a result of Dybo's law: *potòka, selò*.
4. originally disyllabic words ending in \*-Cb/ь or \*-CRb/ь: *kònj, vòl, òsem, nèsel, dòber*.
5. early borrowings with short stressed \*ò: *sobòta, škòda*.

It follows that in Kajkavian, neoacute \*o and \*e are reflected as a long vowel if the neoacute resulted from Stang's law or the retraction of the accent from a final or internal jer. The unexpected short vowel in the present of *i*-verbs (*nòsim, hòdim*) must be analogical to regular short \*o in forms without initial stress like 1sg. \*nošù, 1pl. *nosimo* etc. It has traditionally been assumed that the falling accent of the *vòlja*-type in Kajkavian is a neocircumflex. If this is correct, the neocircumflex is probably due to a long vowel in the ending (\*-jā etc.) which was restored on the basis of other *ja*-stems. The original short ending was preserved in the dialect of Hidegség and Fertóhomok. Note the sharp contrast between the Kajkavian falling accent on the root and the accentual mobility found in neighbouring Slovene (Pannonian in the North and perhaps the Kozjansko-Bizeljsko dialects of Styrian in the West, see below), both being replacements of the original paradigm with a neoacute on the root.

## 5 Slovene

We will now proceed to discuss the Slovene evidence for the development of neoacute \*o and \*e. It is often not immediately clear whether we are dealing with a reflex of an original long or short vowel in Slovene because of the lengthening of short stressed vowels in non-final syllables (“*brata*-lengthening”, on which see Rigler 2001: 302ff., Zorko 1998: 189ff., Greenberg 2000: 128ff.). The main evidence comes from:

- eastern dialects that did not undergo *brata*-lengthening;
- dialects in which the timbre of the vowel that underwent *brata*-lengthening is distinct from the timbre of older long \*ō and \*ē, especially the northern ones in which *brata*-lengthening is a late phenomenon.

Ramovš (1921) discussed the development of neoacute \*o in Slovene in detail and concluded that the reflex of neoacute \*o was long in a) absolute initial position, b) closed syllables and c) absolute final position. A short reflex would be regular in other open syllables. Rigler (2001: 67) rightly pointed out the weaknesses of Ramovš's view. He argued on the basis of more dialectal data that, instead, the predominantly long reflex of Kajkavian was also the primary reflex in Slovene, at least “v pretežni večini” (ibidem: 418). Elsewhere, he more carefully stated that “so namreč tudi v slovenščini nastopila daljšanja v posameznih kategorijah, ki se precej ujemajo s kajkavskimi podaljšavami” (ibidem: 399). Rigler (ibidem: 25, 69ff., 313) distinguishes between early lengthening of neoacute \*o and \*e, which produced a long vowel that merged with existing

long \**o* and \**e* in individual words, often different in different dialects, and later lengthening which affected all remaining cases. The former category includes those cases in which other Slavic languages also have a long reflex, such as the genitive plural, but also some other examples collected by Ramovš and Rigler himself. Rigler discussed the relevant historical Lower Carniolan (dolenski) data in his important article *Pregled osnovnih razvojnih etap v slovenskem vokalizmu* and the Carinthian (koroški) data in his later *Pripombe* (“remarks”) to his *Pregled*. The main objection against Rigler’s scenario is that his occasional early lengthenings do not have the character of a sound law (with the exception of the pan-Slavic long vowel in words in which the accent was originally on a final jer). This suggests that they are at least partly due to analogy, and for most long reflexes adequate models for the secondary introduction of a long vowel can be indeed adduced, as will be shown below.

An important source for our purposes is the standard language as represented in Pleteršnik’s dictionary and works based on it, e.g. Breznik’s *Slovenska slovnica za srednje šole*. Here we find -*ô*- and -*ê*- for neoacute \**o* and \**e* in all categories (*kônjih*, *vôlja*, *nevôlja*, *môrem*, *pôljem*, *nôsím*, *kôzji*, *kônjski*, *potôka*, *mêljem*, *zêlje*, *žênski*, *sêlski*, *debêla*, *jelêna*) except in final syllables (*bôb*; *kônj*, *dnô*, *gumnô*, *jajcê*) and those forms in which \**o* received the stress from a final jer (*domôv*, *môj*, *gôr*, but *nebês*). The timbre of -*ô*-, the reflex of neoacute \**o* in non-final syllables, contrasts with the reflex of long \**ô* that arose through lengthening of monosyllabic \**o* with a falling tone, e.g. *bôg*, *kôst*, and with that that arose as a result of the forward shift of the falling accent onto a following syllable, e.g. *mesô*, *sirôta*.<sup>12</sup> The timbre of \**o* with a neocircumflex, however, is identical to that of neoacute \**o*: *kônju*, *kônjih*, *kônji*, *dobrôta*, *otrôštvo*, *gotôvim* (cf. inf. *gotôviti*). The reflex of \**e* is identical in all categories: *lêd*, *poljê*, gen. sg. *imêna*, *plemênski*. It contrasts with *ê*, which is the regular reflex of Proto-Slavic \**ě* (*jat*’).

In some Slovene dialects, inherited long \**ô* merged with neoacute \**o*, e.g. in Upper Carniola into *o*, Črni Vrh *uə* (Tominec 1964: 13f.), Banjšice *uo* (Logar 1996: 15, 306f.). However, most dialects retain a distinction, e.g. Lower Carniolan, Inner Carniolan \**ô* > *u* (Pleteršnik’s *o*), but neoacute \**o* > *uo* in non-final syllables (Pleteršnik’s *o*), Ter, Nadiža \**ô* > *uo*, but neoacute \**o* > *ô* in non-final syllables (cf. Logar 1996: 12), Tolmin \**ô* > *uo*, but neoacute \**o* > *ô* in non-final syllables, Gailtal \**ô* > *uə*, but neoacute \**o* > *o* in non-final syllables (*kôža*, *pätôka*, *òlje*) etc.

Forms in which \**o* received the stress from a final jer have the same reflex as circumflex long \**ô* in all dialects, e.g. Lower Carniolan *múj*, *núx*, Gailtal *múaj*, *núag*. This is not surprising, because such examples have a long vowel in the rest of Slavic as well. In Lower Carniolan, we also find the reflex of old \**ô* in loc.pl. *kújnəh*, ins.pl. *kújnə*, which is clearly analogical to the gen.pl. *kújn* (Škrabec 1917: 225, Ramovš 1921: 229f.). The same analogy took place elsewhere, e.g. Upper Savinja (Spodnje Kraše, Weiss 2001) gen.pl. *ut’rô:k*, loc.

<sup>12</sup> Note that in the present day standard language *o/o* and *ê/ê* are not distinguished.

pl. *ut'ro:cəh*, Podjuna (Ojstrica, Zorko 1991) gen.pl. *ot'ru:ək*, ins.pl. *ot'ru:əcmi*, Gailtal (Potoče, Pronk 2009: 58) gen.pl. *trúək*, loc.pl. *trúəcəh*, ins.pl. *trúəcmi* 'child'. Another category in which Lower Carniolan sometimes has *-u-* for neoacute *\*o* is the nom.pl. of some neuter nouns, e.g. *úkna*, *kúla*. Here too, influence from the gen.pl. *\*ókən*, *\*kól* seems likely.<sup>13</sup>

In eastern dialects without *brata*-lengthening, the reflexes are partly identical to those of Kajkavian. In the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century literary language of Prekmurje long *\*ō* > *ou* (merging with long *\*ō̄*) and *\*ē* > *ē* (written *é*, merging with the reflexes of long jers and *\*ē̄*). Neocircumflex *\*o* > *ou*: *osnoviti*, *dobrouta*, loc.sg. *potouki*. Neoacute *\*o* and *\*e* merged with the long vowels in some categories, but remain short in others.<sup>14</sup>

A long vowel is found, as expected, when the neoacute is due to the retraction from a final jer: gen.pl. *noug*, *nebéfz*, analogically also *'zén*. There are also examples in which we find *ou* as the reflex of neoacute *\*o* that arose as a result of Stang's law: *koula* (pl.) 'wagon', *kouza*, *kouzo*, *kouzov*, *kouze*, *nouvi* (cf. also *ponouviti*), *zeléno*, *vefzéli*, *fzédmi*, *ousmi*. We also find a long reflex in *pérje*, where the neoacute is due to retraction from an internal jer, but in some younger dialectal data this word has a short reflex: long Porabje *pérdje* but short Cankova ins.sg. *perjem*, Martinje *p'ierd'e*.

The reflexes that appear to point to a long reflex of neoacute *\*o* or *\*e* that arose as a result of Stang's law are suspect of being secondary. The definite adjectival forms *nouvi* and *zeléno* probably have a secondary neocircumflex, like in most other Slovene dialects. This also applies to the long vowel of *fzédmi*, *ousmi*, which may alternatively have obtained a long vowel (cf. *séjzti*) in analogy to *péti*, *devéti* like in Čakavian, Štokavian, dialectal Czech and Polish. The noun *koža* has the reflex of a long vowel throughout the paradigm and this long reflex is also found more to the West in Northern Styrian (see the data on two Pohorje dialects below). Because in Northern Styrian neoacute vowels

<sup>13</sup> Ramovš also mentions a few other cases with Inner Carniolan *-u-* for neoacute *\*o*. The long reflex in *pujde* 'goes' (but Pleteršnik *pójdem*) cannot be separated from the long vowel of Čakavian, Old Štokavian *dōjdě*, Neoštokavian *dōdē* (Ivšić 1911: 146, cf. also Kajkavian *dōjde*), and must therefore be old. The length cannot be due to recent lengthening before *-j-* because south-eastern Čakavian has an acute (Brač *dōjde*, cf. *krōj* < *\*krāj* with later lengthening). The forms can be explained by assuming that they received initial stress as a result of Stang's law after contraction of *\*-o(j)b-* to *\*-ōj-*: *\*pōbdē* > *\*pōvdē* > *\*pōjđe* > *\*pōjde*. The long reflex in Inner Carniolan *puljski*, *gurski* < *\*pōljski*, *\*gōrski* is secondary for older *\*gorski*, *\*poljski* (cf. Pleteršnik *górski*, *póljski*, S, Cr. *gòrskī*, *pòljskī*). The vocalism is probably analogical to the gen.pl. *\*gór*, *\*pólj*, cf. Carinthian (Rož) *žlānsqi* for more archaic (Gailtal) *žēnski* on the basis of the gen.pl. *žlān*. Similarly, Lower Carniolan *būžji* replaces earlier *\*božji* (cf. Pleteršnik *bōžji*, S, Cr. *bòžjī*). The origin of the long reflex in Gailtal *kúəzji*, Prekmurje *kouzgi* must perhaps also be sought in the gen.pl. *\*kóz*. The long vowel of Sln. *kdó* (Inner Carniolan *gdú*, Gailtal *túə* etc.) is due to an early irregular and probably originally syntactically conditioned lengthening of inherited *\*kьtō*.

<sup>14</sup> Data cited here stem from the works of Števan Kūzmič, Mikloš Kūzmič and Jožef Košič, who consistently distinguish *-o-* from *-ou-*, as cited in Novak 2006.

consistently show reflexes of an earlier short vowel, the length in Prekmurje *kouza* cannot be taken as evidence for a long or diphthongal reflex of neoacute \**o* from Stang's law. One possibility is that *kouza* reflects \**kôža*, like in Kajkavian (Rigler 2001: 70). Neuter plurals like *koula*, *oukna* may be compared to Lower Carniolan *kûla*, *ûkna* and have an analogical long reflex from the gen.pl., or they have an analogical neocircumflex after the type sg. *mesto*, pl. *mejsta*. Carinthian (Rož) has a short reflex in these cases (ibidem: 68).

A short vowel is consistently found when the neoacute is due to Dybo's law, retraction from an internal jer (except *pérje*) and in disyllabic forms ending in a jer: dat.sg. *potoki*, *skoda*, *řzobota*, *konyszki*, *senřzka*, *kozjo* (acc.sg.f.), *poslem*, *bob*, *boj*, *neřzao*, *tekao*, *mogao*, *oster*, *topeo*, *řzedem*, *ořzem*. Like in Kajkavian, the present of the *i*-stems has a short root vowel: *nosi*, *hodimo*, *vodi*. The present *morem*, *mores*, *more* etc. also has a short root vowel.

A special case is \**voļa*, which shows vowel alternation: nom.sg. *vola*, acc.sg. *volo* with a short vowel, but gen.sg. *voule*, dat.sg. *vouli*, ins.sg. *voulov* with a diphthong reflecting length. Similarly *nevola*, acc.sg. *nevolo*, gen.sg. *nevoule*, loc.sg. *nevouli*, gen.pl. *nevoul*, dat.pl. *nevólám*, loc.pl. *nevol(j)áj* 'misfortune'. In his *Historical phonology of the Slovene language*, Greenberg (2000: 128, fn. 24) cites a paradigm with mobile accentuation reflecting a generalized pattern from Prekmurje material: nom. 'vola, acc. vo'lou, gen. vo'le:, dat. po 'vouli, ins. z vo'louf. A similar paradigm is given in Mukič's 2005 Porabje dictionary: *vóla*, gen. *řidane volé*, but *dóbre vâu*, acc. *volâu*, but *za mójga/tvójga vólo*, dat./loc. *po vâu*, *pr vâu*, cf. also *nevóla*, acc. *nevólo*, *po nevóli*. The Prekmurje forms can all be derived from a paradigm with mobile accentuation, forms with a long root vowel are due to the forward shift of the old circumflex from a prefix onto the root: \**pö voļi* > \**po vól*. The mobile paradigm can be compared to that of *volja* in Old Russian and is secondary. In the case of Prekmurje Slovene it was probably the mobile noun \**želja* 'wish' that was the source of the mobility, cf. *zsela*, *v zseli* in Pavel's grammar (2013).

The Prekmurje data above correspond to the data given in Pavel's normative Prekmurje grammar and in the dialectological literature. An extensive overview of the data is given in the appendix to this article. I will here only provide some additional data not attested or attested with a different reflex in the literary language: Pavel (2013) long gen.pl. *lô*, nom.pl.n. *domô*, *plécsa*, *bédra*, *péra*, short *svoj*, gen.sg. *jelena*, 1sg.pres. *orjem*, *posztelem*, *polem*, *kolem*, Porabje (Mukič 2005) long *rébra*, *domâu*, short *mèčen*, *tèšen*, Žetinci/Sichelsdorf (Zorko 1998) long *do'ma:u*, short 'nôša, 'zelje, Polana (Greenberg 1993) long *gr'ouzdjâ*, short *m'älä*, *p'älä*, *s'ädmi*, Martinje (ibidem) short *z'ield'a*.

In all of northern Slovene, including Pannonian, and in Kajkavian, a neocircumflex was retracted onto a long vowel, e.g. *písala* < \**pīsála*. In some words this shift also took place onto a syllable containing \**o*, e.g. *ótava* < *otâva* and nom.acc.pl. *kólěna* < \**kolěna*. In those cases the shift was probably analogical (Pronk 2007). The newly stressed \**o* is reflected as long in Pannonian, e.g. Cankova *kôpita*, *kôlina*, Martinje 'aotavla.

The data available to me for other Pannonian Slovene dialects without *brata*-lengthening, i.e. Prlekija, eastern Haloze and eastern Slovenske Gorice, mainly shows short reflexes of neoacute \*o and \*e (for an exception see below).<sup>15</sup> The categories that have a long vowel in Prekmurje (definite adjectives, neuter plurals, the word *koža*, some forms of *volja*) are, however, poorly represented in the literature. The only examples I found are Slovenske Gorice (Koletnik 2001) *'ko:uža* and Cerkevnik (Rajh 2002) *'dobre 'võ:le* with a long vowel and Biserjane (Zorko 2009) *pot 'kožoj* and *'kõla* with a short vowel. Interesting examples with a short reflex are Slovenske Gorice *'õsmj, 'meče*, eastern Haloze (Zorko 1998) *'noša, 'xõja, 'zelje*. The dialects more to the west all took part in *brata*-lengthening. The northern dialects of Slovene nevertheless almost always distinguish neoacute \*o and \*e from older long \*ē and \*ō. The reflexes in western Pannonian and northern Styrian are comparable to those in eastern Pannonian. Long reflexes are found in, e.g., western Haloze *'na:uvi*, eastern Pohorje *'kouža*, but in most other cases the reflex of neoacute \*o and \*e is a short vowel that was later lengthened as a result of *brata*-lengthening.

In some Styrian dialects, such as the Cental Styrian, Central Savinja and Kozjansko-Bizeljsko dialects, neoacute \*o and \*e with *brata*-lengthening merged with older long \*ō and \*ē. The situation here is not identical to that in Kajkavian because long and lengthened \*e merged with \*ě. The Kozjansko-Bizeljsko dialects show some exceptions to the generally long reflex of neoacute \*o and \*e in non-final syllables: Lesično *'xõ:ja, 'nõ:ša, 'võ:ja*, Pišcece *'xõ:ja, š'kõ:da, g'ro:jzdje* (but *'vu:la*), Kapele *'xõ:ja, 'nõ:ša* (but *'vu:la*). These dialects may originally have had the same mobile paradigm for \*xõja, \*noša and, in Lesično, \*volja that is found in Pannonian.<sup>16</sup>

The Carinthian dialects carried out *brata*-lengthening relatively recently (cf. Rigler 2001: 315). Some of the categories that show an analogical long reflex in Lower Carniolan or Pannonian have a short reflex in Carinthian that was later lengthened as a result of *brata*-lengthening, e.g. the noun *koža* and the nominative and accusative plural of neuter nouns like *okno, selo* etc. The Carinthian dialects are further interesting with regard to the question what the primary reflex of neoacute \*o and \*e was, because all Carinthian dialects with the exception of the Gailtal dialect have a twofold reflex in those examples in which Lower Carniolan and Pannonian point to a short reflex. Originally short \*ě and neoacute e have identical twofold reflexes, so the rise of twofold reflex can be dated after the merger of short \*e and \*ě. According to Rigler (2001:

<sup>15</sup> The nom.sg.m. *moj, tvoj, svoj* have an analogical short vowel in most of Pannonian (Rigler 2001: 65), but cf. Šafarski (southern Prlekija) *'mõ:j*, Biserjane (north-western Prlekija) *'mõ:j, t'võ:j, s'võ:j*. In the Western Haloze dialect of Zgornja Sveča (Zorko 2009: 197ff.), we find a long reflex in *'võ:la* and *'xõ:ja* as opposed to the short reflex in *'nu:õsim, p'ru:õsim, š'ku:õda* (cf. *ku:õza, 'nõ:č*). This is reminiscent of the long reflex in \**koža* in eastern Slovene and of the long falling vowel in the *volja*-type in Kajkavian. Data from other Haloze dialects show a short reflex in \**volja* and \**xõja* (see the appendix).

<sup>16</sup> In the dialect of the village of Mostec, on the other hand, the forms *vula* and *kuža* reflect earlier \**võlja* and \**kõža*, similar to what is found in neighbouring Kajkavian.

69ff., 313), this twofold reflex is due to two independent waves of lengthening, first in individual cases, and subsequently in all non-final penultimate syllables. This seems extremely unlikely. The attested material is explained much better if one assumes that the conditioning factor for the twofold reflex are the following sounds (Logar 1996: 20, Zdovc 1972: 92, Zorko 1998: 194, Karničar 1990: 30).<sup>17</sup> Before \*/ (perhaps also \**n* and \**j*) and syllables containing -*i*- (perhaps also \**j*), the reflex was a closed vowel, in most other cases the reflex is an open vowel or diphthong, e.g. Kapla *cve'tęe:la* vs. *cve'tę:li*, Ojstrica *ne'dę:la* vs. *b'ręe:za*, cf. also \**jàgoda* > *je'goo:da*, but \**dęteļa* > *de'tę:la*. Paradigmatic alternations that arose as a result of the phonetic split could be removed or reshuffled by analogies that obscured the picture. If we look at the individual lexemes, we can identify some words that are attested only with a closed vowel, e.g. \**nosim*, \**prosim*, \**xodim*, \**meljem*, \**volja*, \**zelje* and \**sedm*, some that are attested only with an open vowel or diphthong, e.g. \**nesl*, \**tekl*, \**pekl*, \**koža*, \**škoda*, \**mečem* and \**morem*, and some which are attested with both reflexes, e.g. Ojstrice '*nɔ:ša* and '*nɔo:ša*, Ojstrice '*xɔ:ja*, but Pernice '*xoo:ja*, Rinkolach/Rinkole *mɔkr*, but Pernice *moo:ker*, Rinkolach/Rinkole *tɔpu*, *ɔkna*, but Grafenbach/Kneža *toǎpu*, *oǎna*, Suetschach/Sveče *pó:šlam*, but Ebriach/Obir *pǎ:šlem*. The details of the development remain unclear and additional data are required to give a complete account of the development.

I conclude that the Slovene reflex of neoacute \**o* and \**e* is not identical to that in Kajkavian, as Rigler claimed, but rather to that in Čakavian and Štokavian: it was always short, except in those cases in which it arose through retraction of the accent from a final jer. This long vowel sometimes spread throughout paradigms or to derivatives from the same root. Some seemingly long reflexes in other positions in dialects without tonal opposition actually reflect a (analogical) neocircumflex accent. This is probably the case in the word *koža*, which has a reflex of a long root vowel in Pannonian and Styrian, like in Kajkavian. Other *volja*-type nouns (*hoja*, *noša*) reflect a short root vowel in these dialects, with the exception *volja* itself, which reflects a paradigm with mobile accentuation in eastern Slovene.

## 6 The rise of long \**ō* and \**ē* in Slavic

In 1916, van Wijk's posited "daß schon im Urslavischen das steigend betonte *o* etwas länger war als das fallend betonte". His thesis was accepted by Ramovš in his discussion of the reflexes of neoacute \**o* in Slovene and later by Kortlandt, who argued that "Stang's law yielded a Common Slavic quantitatively neutral rising diphthong \**u̯o̯*" (2011: 21). There is no evidence to support this point of view. The diphthongal reflex of \**o* that is found in a number of Slovene dia-

<sup>17</sup> Zorko's idea "da je široki refleks koroški, ozki pa štajerski" (1989: 398) does not explain the attested distribution, nor the fact that the twofold reflex is found as far West as the Rož dialect.

lects, e.g. in Lower Carniolan, cannot be equated directly with the Slovak and dialectal Russian diphthongal reflexes.<sup>18</sup> In late Proto-Slavic, \*o was at first always short. It obtained a new long counterpart with the rise of long \*ō as a result of various accent retractions. In Kajkavian and Slovak, \*o that received the accent as a result of the accent retraction from a weak final or internal jer or as a result of Stang's law was lengthened. The evidence that the primary reflex in Slovak was a long vowel and not a diphthong is provided by the gen. pl., where we find a diphthong if the root-vowel was \*o, but a long vowel in roots containing \*a, \*i etc. Also cf. Central Slovak *dobruo* < \**dobrō* < \**dobroje* (Krajčovič 1971: 48, 78). In Kajkavian, the long vowel is preserved.

The new long \*ō eventually became the back counterpart of long \*ē in Slovak (but not of short \*ě!) and was diphthongized. The same happened in Kajkavian (cf. Vermeer 1983: 454) and Slovene (cf. Rigler 2001: 19, Vermeer 1982: 99, 102), but in Slovene long \*ō occurred in a largely different set of forms. Slovene, like the rest of western South Slavic, lengthened \*o in monosyllables with a circumflex tone (\**bōg*, \**nōs*, \**bōs*). Further instances of long \*ō arose as a result of the forward shift of the circumflex (\**kolō*, acc.sg. \**sirōtq*, \**bosō*). The fact that Slovene has a short reflex of neoacute \*o and \*e in all cases except those that arose through the relatively early retraction of the accent from final jers may be connected with the rise of long \*ō in other environments.

The diphthongization of short neoacute \*e and \*o in some Slovene dialects (e.g. Lower Carniolan, Styrian) is a relatively recent development that took place after *brata*-lengthening and cannot be connected directly to diphthongal reflexes elsewhere in Slavic. In Lower Carniolan, the diphthongization did not affect \*e and \*o that had not been lengthened, but it did affect neoacute \*o that did not arise through accent retraction, e.g. Ribnica *krōp*, gen.sg. *krūōpa* 'boiling water' (Rigler 2001: 175) < \*(v<sup>2</sup>)*krōpъ*, \*(v<sup>2</sup>)*krōpa*. It also affected neocircumflex \*ō. In Styrian, the diphthongization also affected originally short stressed \*ě, which had merged with short \*e before *brata*-lengthening, e.g. Upper Savinja *zīele* < \*-ē-, *sīeme* < \*-ě-.

## 7 Conclusion

Originally short \*e and \*o were lengthened as a result of the common Slavic retraction of the accent from a word-final jer and as a result of a number of later, dialectal Slavic lengthenings of short rising vowels. These lengthenings

<sup>18</sup> Kortlandt (personal communication, cf. also 2011: 250) adduces the western Slovene dialect of Drežnica, which has a distinction between the rising diphthongs *iē* and *iĕ*, as evidence for a diphthongal reflex of neoacute \*e that arose as a result of Stang's law. Kortlandt's interpretation of the Drežnica dialect is based on the unpublished field data collected by Logar and presented in tabular form by Greenberg (2000: 171). Greenberg's overview of the vowel system suggests that neither diphthong is in fact the reflex of neoacute \*e, which is instead continued by a monophthong *ē*.

sometimes affected only \**o*, sometimes both \**e* and \**o* and sometimes all short rising vowels. New long \**ō* and \**ē* were subsequently diphthongized in most Slavic dialects. These diphthongizations must be viewed as independent innovations of the dialects in question, although the structural motivation for the diphthongizations was often identical.

#### APPENDIX: NEOACUTE \**O* AND \**E* IN NORTHERN SLOVENE DIALECTS

The following is an overview of the reflexes of neoacute \**o* and \**e* in the northern dialects of Slovene that (partly) distinguish neoacute \**o* and \**e* from long \**ē* and \**ō*. For most dialects a distinction is made between long and short reflexes. For an overview of the development of the relevant vowel systems I refer to Greenberg 2000: 167ff.<sup>19</sup>

##### **Pannonian**

Porabje (Mukič 2005): long *domāu*, *pečén*, *rēbra* (cf. sg. *rēbro*), *kāula/kāule*, *kāuža*, acc. *kāužo*, *pód káužov*, *s káužev*, *njègvi káuži*, *nāuvi*, *sédmi*, *āusmi*, *pérdje*, short *prósi*, *tóčin*, *gónin*, *mój*, *tvój*, *svój*, *móren*, *mèčen*, *škóda*, *těšen*, *dóber*, *móker*, *žènski*, *kónjski*, *sèden*, *ósen*, *sobóta*, *potóka*, “*volja*” *vóla*, *žídane volé*, *dóbre vāule*, acc. *volāu*, *za mójga/tvójga vólo*, *po vāuli*, *pr vāuli*, *nevóla*, *nevólo*, *po nevóli*.

(Števanovci/Apátistvánfalva, Hungary, Zorko 1998: 101ff., 2009: 286ff.): long *do'ma:u*, *zo'vɛ:n*, *ža'nɛ:n*, *'a:usmi*, *na:ui*, short *'nieso*, (cf. *'niesla*), *'pieko*, *'zienska*, *'nuosim*, *'nuoša*, *'vuola*, *p'ruosim*, *'duobar*, *'duobri*, *'muoj*, *'tvuoj*, *'uosan*, *'sieden*.

Prekmurje (Pavel's 2013 normative Prekmurje grammar): long *domó*, gen. pl. *lónec*, *neszém*, *treszém*, *paszém*, *zsivém*, long nom.acc.pl.n. *plécsa*, *bédra*, *péra*, *kóla*, *kópita*, *kólina*, *szédmi*, *ószi*, *veszéli*, short gen.sg. *jelena*, *zenszka*, *nebeszki*, *svoj*, ins.sg. *perjem*, *oszter*, *moker*, *dober*, *szedem*, *oszem*, *reko*, *teko*, *neszo*, *morem*, *hodim*, *noszim*, *gonim*, *orjem*, *posztelem*, *polem*, *kolem*, “*volja*” *vola*, *zavolo toga*, but *po vóli/povóli*.

Northern Prekmurje (Cankova, Zorko 2003): *'zeldže*, *'nōsi*, *p'roši*, *'peko* (but cf. *'pekli*), *po'vo:uli(k)*, *'dōber*, *pe'čɛ:n*, *pe'čɛ:š* etc. (*'moj* after *'moja*, *'mojega* etc.), Greenberg 1993: *z'elʒɛ* (pages 468 and 474)/*z'e:lʒɛ* (page 473), *nes'e* etc., *k'oužá*,

<sup>19</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Marko Jesenšek, who kindly provided me with much of the dialect literature from which forms are cited here.

(Martinje, Greenberg 1993): long *bar'eim*, *pid'eiš* < \**pyješb*, *k'aožl*, gen.pl. *k'aos*, *'aotavla*, short *z'ield'l*, *p'ierd'e*, *jal'iena*, *p'ielam*, *pərn'iesɔ*, *m'uorlaš*, *pr'uosi*, *'uodi* < \**xodi*.

(Žetinci/Sichelsdorf, Austria, Zorko 1998: 87ff.): long *'kō:uža*, short *'nōsin*, *'nōša*, *p'rōsin*, *š'kōda*, *'vōla*, *'mōga*, *'nesa*, *'peka*, *'zelje*, *'ženska*, *'seden*.

Central Prekmurje (Polana, Greenberg 1993): long *gr'ouzdjā*, *n'oug*, *na k'oulänä*, *näs'ie*, *cvät'ie*, *živ'ie*, short *m'älä*, *p'lälä*, *s'ädän*, *s'ädmi*, *m'orämo*, *n'osimo*, *v'ozi*.

Southern Prekmurje (Turnišče & Žižki, Zorko 2006: 99f.): long *'nesi:en*, *'zebi:e*, short *'nōsin*, *p'rōsin*, *š'kōda*, *'zelje*, *'nesu*.

North-western Prlekija (Rajh 2010): long *'kō:ža*, gen.sg. *'kō:že*, *'re:bra* (sg. *'rebro/a*), *'ō:kna*, *'ō:ken* (sg. *'ōkno/a*), *'kō:la*, *'kō:rita*, *'kō:pita*, *'kō:lna*, *'kō:len* (sg. *kō'lēno/a*), *'ō:smi*, *'pē:rje*, *g'rō:zdje*, short *'xōdin*, *'nōsin*, *'ōsen*, *'žēnin*, *'nesa*, *'tešen*, *'dōber*, *'mōker*, *'tōpel*, *z'nōšeni*, *raz'lōžin*, *raz'lōženi*, “volja” *'vōla*, gen. *'vō:le*, dat.loc. *'vō:li*, acc. *'vōlo*, ins. *'vōloj*.

(Cerkvenjak, Rajh 2002: 11ff.): *'dōber*, *'mōker*, *'ōster*, *'tōpel*, *'vōla*, *'tōga* *'vōlo*, but *'dōbre* *'vō:le*, *'nesa* (but cf. *'nesla*).

(Biserjane, Zorko 2009: 254ff.): long *s* *'kō:n*, *'mōj*, *t'vōj*, *s'vōj*, short *pot* *'kožoj*, *'zelje*, *'xōdin*, *'nōsin*, *p'rōsi*, *k'met*, *'nesa*, *po'tōka*, *te'lesa*, *je'lēna* (with raising before \**n*), *'mōreš*, *'kōla* (cf. *'nō:č*, *b'rēza*, *'koza*, *'sestra*).

Southern Prlekija (Šafarski, Zorko 2006: 100f.): *mōj*, *'ženska*, *'pērje*, *p'rōsin*, *š'kōda* (*'reko* < \**reklb* after \**'rekla* because of its vocalism).

Eastern Haloze (Zorko 1998: 14ff., 2006: 103): *'nōsin/m*, *p'rōsin/m*, *'vōla*, *'nōša*, *'xōja*, *'dōbr*, *'zelje*, *k'meta*, *'ženska*, *'ženix* (cf. *'bo:uk*, secondary *'muj*)

(Videm pri Ptuj, Zorko 2009: 225ff.) *'kōula* (gen.sg. *ko'lē:*), *'vōla*, *'hōdin*, *'ōsen*, acc.sg. *'mōtiko*, *'rōbača*, *k'jeden* (secondary *'muj*, *'tvuj*, *'svuj*, *do'mu*).

Western Haloze (Žetale, Zorko 1998: 25ff.), with *brata*-lengthening: *'nu:osim*, *'mu:olim*, *p'ru:osim*, *'xu:odim*, *'nu:oša*, *'vu:ola*, *'xu:oja*, *š'ku:oda*, *'du:obr*, *'mu:okr*, *'na:uvi* (cf. *'ku:oš*, *'ku:oz*, *'ba:uk*), secondary *'mu:oj*, neoacute \**e* merged with the reflex of \**ē*: *'pē:č* like *'nē:so*, *'pē:ko*, *'rē:ko*, *'sē:dŋ*, *'zē:le*, *'žē:naska*, *'žē:nix* (but *'čälo*, *'räkla* with retraction of the accent from the final syllable).

(Zgornja Sveča, Zorko 2009: 197ff.) *'nu:osim*, *p'ru:osim*, *š'ku:oda*, *'vō:la*, *'xōja* (cf. *'ku:oz*, *'nō:č*).

Slovenske Gorice (Koletnik 2001). The eastern part of the dialect did not undergo *brata*-lengthening. Accordingly, we find short reflexes in 'xòdin, 'nòsin, p'ròsin, 'mòlin, 'vòla, ne'vòla, za'vòlo, 'òsen, 'kòple, 'kòleš, 'òlje, 'òsmj, 'mòga, so'bòta, š'kòda, 'melen, 'nesa, od'nesa, 'reka, 'peka, 'zelje, 'ženska, 'meče, 'seden, but long 'ko:uža, g'ro:uždje. Like most of Pannonian, 'moj, 'tvøj have a secondary short vowel. The western part of the dialect underwent *brata*-lengthening: 'nu:òsin, š'ku:òda, 'u:òsŋ, š'ku:òrja, 'vu:òla, 'xu:òja, 'du:òber (cf. k'ru:òp, 'pu:òt), but 'ko:uža (cf. 'no:us); 'mie:len, 'sie:dŋ 'zie:lje (cf. k'mie:t, 'mie:ša, s'nie:xa). The m.sg. form of the participle has a secondary neocircumflex in 'pè:ka, 'nè:sa, 'rè:ka (f.sg. 'rekla etc.) < \*nês], \*pêk], \*rêk], cf. g'ri:izo (f.sg. g'ri:zla) < \*grîz].

The dialects more to the west all took part in *brata*-lengthening. With regard to the reflexes of neoacute \*o and \*e, the northern dialects are of interest. Below, data from a number of those dialects are presented.

### Styrian

In some Styrian dialects, short \*o in monosyllables produced a diphthong that is identical to the reflex of \*o that received the accent through retraction from a final syllable, i.e. 'kuoš = 'kuoza, k'miet = 'žiena.

Eastern Pohorje (Kopivnik, Zorko 2009: 140ff.) 'hu:oja, 'vu:ola, 'nu:osim, p'ru:osim, š'ku:oda, 'ni:eso, 'mi:ečem, 'si:edn, 'zi:ele, s'pi:eko (cf. 'ku:oš and the different reflexes in 'bri:eza, da'mu:u, 'kuo:za, 'žie:na, dre've:jsa, 'le:jt, 'pe:jč, 'no:uč).

(Fram, Zorko 1998: 126ff.): long 'kouža, short 'xu:oja, 'nu:osim, 'vu:ola, p'ru:osim, š'ku:oda, po'tu:oka, 'ni:eso, 'ri:eko, 'zi:ele, ječ'mi:ena.

Southern Pohorje (Oplotnica, Zorko 1998: 138ff.): long 'kauža (cf. 'baŋk 'bog'), short 'vu:la, 'nu:sjm, 'pru:sjm, 'du:ber, 'xu:ja, š'ku:da, š'ku:rja, 'nu:ret 'vinograd', p'òtu:ka, z'lu:ženo, 'ri:kò, 'pi:kò, 'zi:le, ječ'mi:na (cf. 'pač 'peč', 'rièkla 'rekla', 'kuoš, k'miet).

Sevnica-Krško (Zemljak 2001): 'vu:òla, 'xu:òja, 'nu:òša, 'nu:òsŋ, p'ru:òsŋ, g'ru:òjze, š'ku:òda, k'mi:èta, 'mi:ečem, 'pi:èku, 'ri:èku, pər'ti:èku, 'zi:èle, 'zi:ènska (secondary 'duo:bər, 'pi:rje).

Upper Savinja (Luče, Rigler 2001: 217ff.): short xûòdi, nûòsj, gûòŋjm, ûòsəm, tûòpu, ûòle, zîèle, žîèŋjn, nîèsu, pîèku, sîèdam (cf. pèč, bôk). Any \*o that received the stress through the forward shift of the acute or the retraction of the neocircumflex has the same timbre as neoacute \*o: jagûòda, bəkûòjca 'bukovica, bukev', kukûòjca 'kukovica, kukavica', mûòtka 'motika', ûòtava 'otava'. The retractions of a short final syllable and from syllable with a long

falling accent (but not a neocircumflex) yielded different diphthongs: *buōga*, *vuōda*, *njēbā*, *žjēna*.

(Spodnje Kraše, Weiss 2001): *'nē:su*, *'pē:ku*, *'zē:lę*, *'pē:rjə*, *'žē:nęn*, *'nō:sęm*, *'xō:dę*, *'dō:bər*, *š'kō:da*, *š'kō:rja*, *'kō:ža*, *'xō:ja*, *'nō:ša*, also cf. *'vəla*, *jə'gō:da*, *'mō:tka* (cf. *'nō:s*, *'pē:č*, *'kuo:za*, *'šjē:nə*, *'žjē:na*). The word *'žē:nske* has a 'long' reflex which is probably due to a local innovation.

In the other Styrian dialects neoacute \*o and \*e with *brata*-lengthening merged with older long \*ō and \*ē.

Kozjansko-Bizeljsko (Lesično, Zorko 2009: 184ff.) *'u:sŋ*, *'nu:sim*, *p'ru:sim*, *š'ku:da*, *g'ru:jzde*, but *'xə:ja*, *'nə:ša*, *'və:ja*.

(Pišce, Zorko 2009: 187ff.): *'vu:la*, *'nu:sim*, *p'ru:sŋ*, but *'xə:ja*, *š'kə:da*, *g'rə:jzde*.

(Kapele, Zorko 2009: 190ff.): *'nu:sŋ*, *p'ru:sŋ*, *š'ku:da*, *'vu:la*, but *'xə:ja*, *'nə:ša*.

(Mostec, Toporišič 1962): long *damû*, *sinûf*, *nûk*, *nûsi*, *mûli*, *sêla*, *mêlem*, *jelêna*, *rêku* < \*-ó-, \*-é-, *vula*, *kuža* < \*-ô-.

Central Styrian (Šmarje pri Jelšah, Povše 1988): *dumáv*, *utráuk*, *utráučmi*, *dáubar*, *máuj*, *áusŋ*, *háudim*, *gáunim*, *váuzim*, *káuplem*, *máurem*, *máugu*, *sáidŋ*, *te tráik(i)*, *ráik(u)*, *dráimlem*, *putáiplem*, *ječmáina*, *jeláina* (cf. *ukáu*, *ráič*, *kmiět*, *škuóf*, *žjēna*, *nuōga*).

(Žahenberc, Zorko 2009: 202): long *'xa:uja*, *'na:usim*, *p'ra:usim*, short *'nu:oša* (cf. *me'sa:u*, *'kuo:za*).

### Carinthian

In most of Carinthian except the Gailtal dialect, neoacute \*o and \*e and acute \*ě have twofold reflexes depending on the following sounds (see section 5 above).

Kozjak (Kapla, Zorko 1998: 194ff.): *'nə:sim*, *p'rə:sim*, *'və:zim*, *'nə:šen*, *p'rə:šen*, *z'və:žen*, *'mę:lem*, *'kə:lem*, *'pə:lem*, *'nę:so* (cf. *'nę:swa*, *'nesli*), *'rę:ko* (*rę:kwa*, *'rekli*), *'pę:ko*, (*pę:kwa*, *'pekli*), but secondary *'mu:ərm*.

Northern Pohorje-Remšnik (Remšnik, Zorko 2009: 83ff.) *'və:la*, *b'rə:dim*, *'gə:nim*, *'nə:sim*, *'xə:dim*, *'lə:mim*, *'mə:dlim*, *p'rə:sim*, *'tə:čim*, *'žę:nim se*, *'sę:dom*, *s'tę:la*, *pəg'rę:ba*, *t'rę:tkj*, *sər'še:na*, *'tę:še*, *'pę:lem se*, *kle'pę:če*, *o'tę:pa*, but *'nę:so*, *'pę:kə*, *'rę:kə*, *'tę:pə*, *'kə:ža*, *'mə:kər*, *'də:bər*, *'xə:ja*, *'nə:ša*, *pə'kə:šen*, *pə'tə:ka*, *pə'də:bŋ*, *'p'rə:šen*, *s'xə:jen*, *š'kə:da*, *z'lə:men* (cf. *nę'dę:la*, *kə'lę:na* < \*-ě-, *'nu:ək*, *'ši:əst*, *'sę:strə*).

Mežica (Strojna, Zorko 2009: 31ff.) 'zɛ:le, 'xɔ:je, 'nɔ:še, 'vɔ:le, 'žɛ:ni sa, p'rɔ:sim, 'nɔ:sim, 'xɔ:dim, 'sɛ:dŋ, 'nɛ:su, 'rɛ:ku, but 'dɔ:ri < \*dòbri.

Podjuna (Pernice, Zorko 1988): 'zɛ:le, 'sɛ:dom, but 'nee:so ('nee:sla, -o, -e but 'nesli), 'pee:ko, ječ'mee:na; 'nɔ:sim, p'rɔ:sim, but 'xoo:ja, 'moo:ker, š'koo:da.

(Ojstrica, Zorko 1991, 1998: 190ff.): 'wɔ:la, 'xɔ:ja, 'nɔ:ša/'nɔ:ša, 'nɔ:sim, 'mɔ:dlim, 'ɔ:som, but 'kɔo:ža, š'kɔo:da; 'mɛ:lem, 'zɛ:le, 'žɛ:naska, 'žɛ:nin, le'mɛ:ža, but 'mɛ:čem, 'dɛ:sn, 'nɛ:so ('nɛ:swa, 'nesli), 'pɛ:ko ('pɛ:kwa, 'pekli), 'rɛ:ko ('rɛ:kwa/'rekwa, 'rekli).

(Rinkolach/Rinkole, Zdovc 1972: 92), with tonal opposition: gen.pl. *nú<sup>2</sup>x, kóža, mǒrš, mǒre, sǎbóta, škǒda, pǎrje, nǐsu, pǐku, tǐku*, with a closed vowel *hǒja, uǒla, grǒzǒje, snǒpje, kǒzja, ta nǒua, hǒdi, prǒsi, nǒsi, puhǒjen, naprǒšen, utrǒška, dǒbr, mǒkr, tǒpu, ǒkna, zǐle, sǐdŋ, sǐdmi*, cf. also *ǒtǒua*, but *ǒgrada, mǒtǒka, hǒduua, prǒsuua* with a retracted neocircumflex (cf. *muǒja sǐastra*, gen.sg. *stǒgǒ < \*stogǒ*). Younger speakers of the dialect have a change \*ǐ > ǐ before a nasal: *jačmǐna, jalǐna* (ibidem: 96).

Ebriach/Obir (Karničar 1990), with tonal opposition: *nó:x, utrǒ:q, mó:hu, qǒ:jsq, utrǒ:šq, žǐ:jsq, zǐ:le, qǒ:zi, wǒ:la, xǒ:ja, qǒ:lem, móǒ:re, póǒ:šlem, qǒǒ:ža, téǒ:šem, méǒ:čem, mé:lem, nǒ:sǎm, xǒ:dǎm, réǒ:qu, néǒ:su, dó:bǎr, mó:qǎr, sǎbǒǒ:ta, škǒǒ:da, wǒǒ:tawa, puhǒǒ:ba, ječmǐ:na, jelǐ:na, séǒ:dǎm* 'seventh', *sé:dǎm* 'seven' (cf. *bǒ:x, lǐ:d*).

Rož (Grafenbach/Kneža, Logar 1996: 292ff.), with tonal opposition: *sé:dŋ, ta trǐ:tǐ, žǐ:n(ǒ) sa, utǐlé:ne, neǐsu, pumeǒđu, pleǒđu, teǒǐu, seǒđŋ, puameǒna*, (before *ǐ*) *zǒ:l(ǒ), mó:lŋ; nǒ:sŋ, uǒ:zǒ, ǒ:sŋ, uǒ:la, đǒ:ǒǎr, hrǒ:zđi, ǐǒǒža, oǒsmǒ, oǒǒna, toǒpu, ǐǒǒpǐ, sǐǒǒpan*, cf. gen.pl. *žǐǎn*, but *žǐǎnsǐa, pǐri*. Judging by the reflexes of acute \*ǐ in non-final syllables, the situation is more complicated here, e.g. *đǐ:u(ǒ), meǒstǒ, pǐ:na/peǒna, urǐ:ha, đǐ:čla*. Cf. further, with stress retractions, *'nǐǒǒ, 'sastra, 'zǐmuǒa*. The latter show two different outcomes of pretonic \*e, also dependent on the following sounds (ibidem: 296).

(Suetschach/Sveče, Feinig 1985), with tonal opposition: *sé:dǎm, trǐ:tǐ, jalǐ:na, žǐ:nǎm se, puhǒǒ:ba, jačmǐ:na, pǐ:lam, mé:č(l)am, qlǐ:plam, té:šam, wǒ:la, xǒ:ja, nǒ:ša, sqǒ:rja, nǒ:sǎm, wǒ:zǎm, xǒ:dǎm, pó:šlam, qǒ:plam, hrǒ:zdǐǒ, but qǒ:ža, né:su, pǐ:qu, té:qu, ré:qu*, cf. f.sg., m.du. *raqw'a*, f.du., pl. *raq'l'e*, m.pl. *raq'l'ǒ*. Twofold reflex of acute \*ǐ in non-final syllables: *čwǐ:qa, sǒse:dǒ, wrǐ:šǒ/wrǐ:xǒ, dé:qla*, but *brǐ:za, mrǐ:ža, dé:wǒ, lé:tǒ, qǒlé:nǒ, pulǐ:nǒ, mé:stǒ, cé:sta, smrǐ:qa, pǐ:na, strǐ:xa, nawǐ:sta*. The examples are identical to those of Logar. Cf. also gen.pl. *žǐ:n*, nom.sg. *m'e:d* 'medica' (gen.sg. *jmǐ:na* (after nom.acc.sg. *jm'e:?*), but *qǒlǐ:sa, wramǐ:na*), as opposed to gen.pl. *n'u:x, q'u:jǐ*. Cf. also the limited data for nearby Frießnitz/Breznica (Rigler 2001: 279ff.): *ǐǒ:ža, nǒ:sǎm, xǒ:dǐo, wǒ:la, pǐ:kou, mé:lam*.

Gailtal (Potschach, Pronk 2009), with tonal opposition and a single reflex for short neoacute \*o and \*e. Vowels in closed syllables were regularly shortened: *móre, óla, nóša, kóža, kòple, péle, klèple, dòbr, tópu, nábése, pátóka, ženšči, sabbóta, nésu, tèku, rèku, nòsn, hòdn, gónən*, definite forms with a neocircumflex: *nòbi*, but *zəlīani, bəsūāči*, secondary *kúāzji*. Long reflexes: *múāj, núāg, gúār*.

## LITERATURE

Aleksandar BELIĆ, 2000: Beleške o čakavskim govorima. *O dijalektima*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva. (Izabrana dela A. Belića, 10). 136–186.

Đuro BLAŽEKA, Grozdana ROB, 2014: *Rječnik Murskog Središća*. Zagreb: Učiteljski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Anton BREZNIK, 1916: *Slovenska slovnica za srednje šole*. Klagenfurt: Družba sv. Mohorja.

Leonid Arsenijovyč BULAXOVSKYJ, 1947: Sxidnoslov’jans’ki movy jak dzhereło vidbuduvannja spil’noslov’jans’koi akcentologičnoi systemy. *Movoznanstvo* 4–5, 7–17.

Leonid Arsen’evič BULAXOVSKIJ, 1958: Otrazhenija *tak nazyvajemoj novoakutovoj intonacii drevnejšego slavjanskogo jazyka v vostočnoslavjanskix. Voprosy jazykoznanija* 7/2, 87–92.

–, 1983: *Izbrannye trudy v pjati tomax. Tom pjatyj: slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.

Rick DERKSEN, 2008a: Quantity patterns in the Upper Sorbian noun. *Evidence and counter-evidence. Essays in honour of Frederik Kortlandt. Volume I: Balto-Slavic and Indo-European linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 32). 121–135.

–, 2008b: Slavic evidence for Balto–Slavic oxytona. *Stressing the past: Papers from the Second International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology (IWoba II). University of Copenhagen, 1-3 September 2006*. Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 35). 15–19.

Rainer FECHT, 2010: *Neoakut in der slavischen Wortbildung: Der volja-Typ*. Röll. Dettelbach.

Tatjana FEINIG, 1985: *Govor vasi Sveče v Rožu s težiščem na morfologiji*. (Unpublished thesis). Klagenfurt.

Marc L. GREENBERG, 1993: Glasoslovni opis treh prekmurskih govorov in komentar k zgodovinskemu glasoslovju in oblikoglasju prekmurskega narečja. *Slavistična revija* 41/4, 465–487.

–, 2000: *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Peter HOUTZAGERS, 1999: *The Kajkavian dialect of Hidegség and Fertőhomok*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 27).

- Stjepan IVŠIĆ, 1911: Prilog za slavenski akcentat. *Rad JAZU* 187, 133–208.
- , 1913: Današnji posavski govor (svršetak). *Rad JAZU* 197, 9–138.
- , 1936: Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca. *Ljetopis JAZU* 48, 47–88.
- Mate KAPOVIĆ, 2007: The \**vòl'ā*-type accent in Slavic. *Tones and Theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. 89–104.
- , 2009: O naglasku *e*-glagolâ u zapadnoj Posavini. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* 5, 107–121.
- Ludwig KARNIČAR, 1990: *Der Obir-Dialekt in Kärnten; die Mundart von Ebriach/Obirsko im Vergleich mit den Nachbarmundarten von Zell/Sele und Trögern/Korte*. Vienna.
- Mihaela KOLETNIK, 2001: *Slovenskogoriško narečje*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. (Zora, 12).
- Frederik KORTLANDT, 2009: *Baltic & Balto-Slavica*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi.
- , 2011: *Selected writings on Slavic and general linguistics*. Amsterdam-New York, NY: Rodopi.
- , 2014: On the accentuation of *nesl̥b* and related issues. *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 40/1, 127–131.
- , 2015: Proto-Slavic \**j*, Van Wijk's law, and *ē*-stems. *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 41/1, 65–76.
- Rudolf KRAJČOVIČ, 1971: *Náčrt dejín slovenského jazyka*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- Tine LOGAR, 1996: *Dialektološke in jezikozgodovinske razprave*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU, Institut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša.
- Francek MUKIČ, 2005: *Porabsko-knjižnoslovensko-madžarski slovar*. Szombathely: Zveza Slovencev na Madžarskem.
- Elisabeth NONNENMACHER-PRIBIČ, 1961: *Die baltoslavischen Akzent- und Intonationsverhältnisse und ihr quantitativer Reflex im Slovakischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Vilko NOVAK, 2006: *Slovar stare knjižne prekmurščine*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- Avgust PAVEL, 2013: *Prekmurska slovenska slovnica/Vend nyelvtan*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. (Zora, 100).
- Tijmen PRONK, 2007: The retraction of the neocircumflex in the Carinthian dialects of Slovene (on Ivšić's retraction). *Tones and Theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. 171–183.
- , 2009: *The Slovene Dialect of Egg and Patschach in the Gailtal, Austria*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 36).

- , 2013: On the accentuation of *l*-participles of the type *neslъ* in western South Slavic. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 39/1, 105–131.
- Bernhard RAJH, 2002: *Od narečja do vzhodnoštajerskega knjižnega jezika*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. (Zora, 19).
- , 2010: *Gúčati po antújoško*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. (Zora, 73).
- Fran RAMOVŠ, 1921: O slovenskem novoakutiranem *ò > ó, ó, õ*. *Slavia* 2, 227–239.
- Jakob RIGLER, 2001: *Zbrani spisi 1: Jezikozgodovinske in dialektološke razprave*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- Afanasij Matveevič SELIŠČEV, 1951: *Staroslavjanskij jazyk. Čast' pervaja: vvedenie fonetika*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe učebno pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo ministerstva prosvješčenija RSFSR.
- George Yurii SHEVELOV, 1979: *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Christian STANG, 1957: *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- Matej ŠEKLI, 2013: Sklonidba i naglasak imenica srednjega roda *o*-sklonidbe u govoru sela Jevšček kraj Livka (nadiški dijalekt slovenskoga jezika). *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 39/1, 133–145.
- Petar ŠIMUNOVIĆ, 2009: *Rječnik bračkih čakavskih govora*. Drugo dopunjeno i popravljeno izdanje. Zagreb: Golden marketing-Tehnička knjiga.
- Stanislav ŠKRABEC, 1917: *Jezikoslovni spisi*. I. zvezek, 2. snopič. Ljubljana: Leonova Družba.
- Ivan TOMINEC, 1964: *Črnovrški dialekt. Kratka monografija in slovar*. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Jože TOPORIŠIČ, 1962: Ablösung des relevanten Wortintonationssystems durch den Quantitätsunterschied in einer slovenischen Mundart. *Scando-Slavica* 8, 239–254.
- André VAILLANT, 1950: *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome I: Phonologie*. Paris-Lyon: C. Klincksieck.
- Matija VALJAVEC, 1897: Glavne točke o naglasu književne slovenštine. *Rad JAZU* 132, 116–213.
- Nicolaas VAN WIJK, 1916: Zur sekundären steigenden Intonation im Slavischen, vornehmlich in ursprünglich kurzen Silben. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 36, 321–377.
- Leonid Lazarevič VASIL'EV, 1929: *O značenii kamory v nekotoryx drevnerusskix pamjatnikax XVI–XVII vekov*. Leningrad: AN SSSR.
- Willem VERMEER, 1982: Raising of \**ě* and loss of the nasal feature in Slovene. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 25/1, 97–120.
- , 1983: The rise and fall of the kajkavian vowel system. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 3, 439–477.

--, 1984: On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: the quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5/2, 331–395.

Arno VERWEIJ, 1994: Quantity patterns of substantives in Czech and Slovak. *Dutch contributions to the 11th international congress of Slavists: Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 22). 493–564.

Peter WEISS, 2001: Fonološki opis govora kraja Spodnje Kraše (SLA 314). *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 7/1–2, 321–347.

Andrej Anatol'evič ZALIZNJAK, 1985: *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k ruskoj*. Moskva: Nauka.

--, 2011: *Trudy po akcentologii. Tom II: drevnerusskij i starovelikorusskij akcentologičeskij slovar'–ukazatel' (xiv–xvii vv.)*. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskix kul'tur.

Paul ZDOVC, 1972: *Die Mundart des Südöstlichen Jauntales in Kärnten: Lautlehre und Akzent der Mundart der "Poljanci"*. Wien: Verlag der ÖAW.

Melita ZEMLJAK, 2001: Fonološki opis posavskega govora v Stržišču. *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 7/1–2, 349–363.

Zinka ZORKO, 1988: Perniški govor. *Wiener slavistischer Almanach* 22, 255–272.

--, 1989: Vzhodnokoroški govori v Dravski dolini, na severnem Pohorju in v Dravskem obmejnem hribovju. *Zbornik razprav iz slovanskega jezikoslovja: Tinetu Logarju ob sedemdesetletnici*. Ljubljana: SAZU. 395–405.

--, 1991: Oblikoslovje Ojstrice nad Dravogradom (z glasoslovnim orisom). *Slavistična revija* 39/1, 15–28.

--, 1998: *Haloško narečje in druge dialektološke študije*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. (Zora, 6).

--, 2003: Oblikoslovje in leksika v govoru Cankove. *Avgust Pavel*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. (Zora, 23). 73–94.

--, 2006: Samoglasniški sestavi v vzhodnih govorih panonske in štajerske narečne skupine. *Diahronija in sinhronija v dialektoloških raziskavah*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. (Zora, 41). 98–107.

--, 2009: *Narečjeslovne razprave o koroških, štajerskih in panonskih govorov*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo. (Zora, 64).

Myxajlo Andrijovyč ŽOVTOBRJUX, Oleksij Tymofijovyč VOLOX, Stefan Pylypovyč SAMIJLENKO, Ilarion Ilarionovyč SLIN'KO, 1980: *Istorična gramatyka ukraïns'koï movy*. Kyïv: Holovne vydavnyctvo vydavnyčoho objednanyja "Vyšča škola".

## ZGODNJESLOVANSKA KRATKA IN DOLGA O IN E

Prvotno kratka vokala \*o in \*e sta bila podaljšana kot rezultat skupnega slovanskega naglasnega umika s končnega jera in kot rezultat številnih kasnejših narečnih slovanskih podaljšav kratkih rastočih vokalov. Te podaljšave so včasih vplivale le na vokal \*o, včasih na vokala \*e in \*o in včasih na vse kratke rastoče vokale. Nova dolga vokala \*ō in \*ē sta bila kasneje v večini slovanskih narečij diftongizirana. Ta pojav je sicer treba obravnavati kot neodvisne narečne inovacije, četudi je bila strukturna motivacija za diftongizacijo pogosto identična.

Prispevku je dodan izčrpen pregled novoakutiranih refleksov \*o in \*e v severnih slovanskih narečjih.

---