

Mate KAPOVIĆ

*University of Zagreb*

## **HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ADJECTIVE ACCENTUATION IN CROATIAN (SUFFIXLESS, \*-*bnъ* AND \*-*bkъ* ADJECTIVES)<sup>1</sup>**

### **Introduction<sup>2</sup>**

The article deals with the historical development of the accentuation of suffixless (root), \*-*bnъ* and \*-*bkъ* adjectives. Their development is analyzed in detail from their Proto-Slavic origin to their modern reflexes in Štokavian, Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects.<sup>3</sup> The dialectal data is taken from previously published dialectal descriptions, but also from the author's own extensive and previously unpublished field data – mostly from Posavina<sup>4</sup> and Vrgorska krajina. As we shall see, the analysis of the historical development of adjectival accentuation can provide us with interesting insights that go beyond the scope of adjectives. A careful historical study of adjectival accentuation reveals many interesting early changes and isoglosses in Štok/Čak/Kajk., helps us understand the modern dialectal forms, which are then

---

<sup>1</sup> The name *Croatian* is used because the article deals mostly with data from dialects spoken in Croatia. Of course, it goes without saying that the analysis of the developments in Štokavian is valid not only for the dialects of Štokavian spoken in Croatia or by ethnic Croats but also for those spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro.

<sup>2</sup> I would like to thank Tijmen Pronk, Dijana Ćurković and especially Mikhail Osłon for proofreading of the article. I also owe my gratitude to Misha Osłon for letting me use his Juraj Križanić database (material from Križanić's texts that does not have an explicit reference stems from this database) and for helping me with it.

<sup>3</sup> The separate treatment of Štokavian, Čakavian and Kajkavian should be regarded as provisory. The whole South Slavic territory is a prototypical example of a dialect continuum (cf. Vermeer 1982; Kapović 2011d, 150–152).

<sup>4</sup> The field material from Posavina often provides insights that cannot be found in the classical work of Ivšić's (1913), where the information needed for this kind of studies is usually insufficient and sometimes even misleading.

far more useful from a comparative Slavic perspective and shed light on some important prosodic changes that occurred in the history of Štok/Čak/Kajk., such as the ‘One mora law’ (cf. Kapović 2011b). The rest of the topics related to adjectives (i.e. adjectives with other suffixes, comparative and adverbs) will be analyzed in future works.

Unlike nouns, where the accentual paradigm, if it changes at all, changes mostly in individual words as a result of which the descriptions of the history of noun accentuation deal mostly with paradigmatic accentuation,<sup>5</sup> when dealing with adjectives the accentual paradigm is often changed in a whole class of adjectives or large groups of adjectives at once. That is why it is possible for all (or most) of the adjectives with a certain suffix and a specific number of syllables to shift entirely to another accentual paradigm, e.g. for *-an* adjectives to shift from a.p. A to a.p. C.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the history of adjectival accentuation deals more with such interparadigmatic shifts than with intraparadigmatic changes, unlike the history of noun accentuation that deals mostly with intraparadigmatic changes (i.e. the changes of the accent in various cases in different accentual paradigms). This is also due to the fact that indefinite adjectives in Slavic mostly have the same declension as nouns, while the accentuation of the definite forms is constant in all cases, i.e. identical to the accentuation of the nominative. Of course, such paradigmatic shifts need not be marked in lists of adjectives.<sup>7</sup> Another specific trait of adjective accentuation is the importance of analyzing all or most of the available examples. That is the only way to interpret the

<sup>5</sup> Cf. for instance Kapović 2010.

<sup>6</sup> We use *a, b, c* for Proto-Slavic accentual paradigms (a.p.) and A, B, C for modern, synchronic accentual paradigms. The semicolon (;) is used to mark the long variant of the synchronic accentual paradigms (like a.p. B: or C:). Other abbreviations include: sg. (singular), pl. (plural); nom. (nominative), gen. (genitive), dat. (dative), acc. (accusative), voc. (vocative), loc. (locative), instr. (instrumental) (also N/G/D/A/V/L/I. and n/g/d/a/v/l/i. for sg. and pl. respectively in paradigms); m. (masculine), f. (feminine), n. (neuter); adj. (adjective); def. (definite), indef. (indefinite); dial. (dialect), Stand. (Standard); ct. (century); Croat. (Croatian), Štok. (Štokavian), Čak. (Čakavian), Kajk. (Kajkavian), Lith. (Lithuanian), Slv. (Slovene), OCS (Old Church Slavic), PSI. (Proto-Slavic), BSI (Balto-Slavic). The mark + is used for (dialectal) forms that are not directly attested in a given source but can be supposed as such according to the rules given in the description.

<sup>7</sup> If these were marked, almost all adjectives would be A/B/C, which would make the list practically useless.

development of the accentual pattern of a certain class of adjectives, since it is very common for the original pattern to be preserved in just one or a couple of words (for instance in *gol* ‘naked’, *bos* ‘barefoot’, *bolan* ‘painful’, *tanak* ‘thin’, *gorak* ‘bitter’, *dobar* ‘good’). Thus, it is useless just to analyze the accentual paradigms in general without paying attention to what happened to the adjectives that belonged to certain accentual patterns.

In some cases, it is very difficult to establish a ‘common’ or ‘original’ accentual paradigm (even if the Proto-Slavic reconstruction is certain) so the grouping in the lists of adjectives should be regarded as provisional. Some of the changes are described in more than one place in the article – for instance, if there is an a.p. *a* > a.p. C shift, this can be analyzed both in the a.p. *a* or a.p. *c* section of the text. The text should be read as a whole since many parts are not repeated or are not repeated in detail – for instance, if some feature is analyzed in Štokavian, the same or a similar feature will not be analyzed in Čakavian or it will be analyzed in less detail; or – if the same process occurs in different adjectival groups (e.g. both in root and \*-ьнъ adjectives), it will be dealt with when describing the accentuation of the first group and just be mentioned briefly elsewhere.

### The suffixless adjectives

#### 1. a.p. *a*

##### PROTO-SLAVIC

##### indefinite adjectives

**m**

\*čístъ ‘clean’

**f**

\*čǐsta

**n**

\*čǐsto

##### definite adjectives

**m**

\*čǐstъjь

**f**

\*čǐstaja

**n**

\*čǐstoje

The a.p. *a* root (suffixless) adjectives had a constant acute on the stem in Proto-Slavic, either on the first (\*čístъ) or on any other syllable (\*bogǣтъ). The short syllable equivalent was the short neo-acute (\*gotòvъ). The stress remains in the same position in definite adjectives.

Cf. in Russian:

*pad* – *páda* – *pádo*

In some adjectives in Russian, the root stress is preserved (a.p. A). But monosyllabic adjectives usually shift to a.p. C in short forms,<sup>8</sup> cf. *чист* –

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Stankiewicz 1993, 202.

*чистá* – *чúсто* (but both *чúсты* and *чисты́* in the plural). The original stress position is preserved in def. forms: *чúстый* – *чúстая* – *чúстое*.

# Štokavian

## indefinite adjectives

**m**      **f**                      **n**  
*čist*    *čista* (*čista*)    *čisto* (*čisto*)

## definite adjectives

**m**                      **f**                      **n**  
*čistī* (*čistī*)    *čistā* (*čistā*)    *čistō* (*čistō*)

The original a.p. *a* adjectives have a constant “on the stem in the classical (Daničić-Vuk) literary Štokavian,<sup>9</sup> i.e. their reflex is a.p. A. This is also the situation in many Štokavian dialects. However, the same kind of fixed root stress, i.e. the synchronic a.p. A, is seen in original short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives such as *nōv* ‘new’, the one exception being the adjective *gōl*<sup>10</sup> ‘naked’, which remains in a.p. B.<sup>11, 12</sup> Here, we can see a tendency of adjectives splitting into two classes based on the quantity of the root (something similar exists in \*-ьнъ adjectives as well, see below). Thus, we have adjectives with a short root vowel (whether they are ultimately derived from the original a.p. *a* acute or from the original a.p. *b* short neo-acute) in a.p. A (except for *gol* and *bos*), while adjectives with a long root vowel belong to a.p. B: or a.p. C: (the B: vs. C: opposition is lost in many dialects). Thus in the East, a number of Štokavian dialects show a shift a.p. C: > B:, while a number of Western dialects, mostly Čakavian, have the opposite change in most adjectives – a.p. B: > C:. In classical literary Štokavian, one finds the system with all short vowel monosyllabic suffixless adjectives in a.p. A and all long vowel monosyllabic suffixless adjectives in a.p. B:, thus *sīt* – *sīta* – *sīto* ‘satiated’ / *nōv* – *nōva* – *nōvo* ‘new’ : *žūt* – *žūta* – *žūto* ‘yellow’ / *drāg* – *drāga* – *drāgo* ‘dear’.<sup>13</sup> The merger of the original

<sup>9</sup> Cf. for instance Даничић 1925, 213.

<sup>10</sup> The form *gōl* in standard Croatian is secondary compared to *gō*. The length is due to the vocalization of the final -l# (*gōl* > *gōo* > *gō* → *gōl*).

<sup>11</sup> Similarly, the semantically close adjective *bōs* ‘barefoot’ remains the only monosyllabic short vowel a.p. C adjective in many dialects.

<sup>12</sup> Of course, all of this concerns the suffixless adjectives alone. Cf. the preservation of a.p. B in adjectives with suffixes like *širōko* ‘wide’, *zelèno* ‘green’, *debèlo* ‘fat’, *dòbro* ‘good’, *tòplo* ‘warm’.

<sup>13</sup> This was the case in classical, Vuk-Daničić, ‘Serbo-Croatian’. In the contemporary Croatian norm, the situation is a little different, because the Western Štokavian archaic distinction of a.p. B: and C: (*žūto* : *drāgo*) is getting back into the standard norm.

a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b* (*sīt* = *nōv*) encompasses both Štokavian and Čakavian, which is a major accentual innovation. However, this merger is not certain in the case of Kajkavian – the situation there is inconclusive (see below).

In later versions of literary Štokavian, as well as in contemporary Standard Croatian, one finds both the original a.p. A (i.e. a constant *`* in all indef. forms) but also the newer a.p. B (*čisto* / *nōvo*).<sup>14</sup> This sort of shift is common to many Štokavian dialects. In a.p. A, the short falling accent is constant in all forms, while in a.p. B all cases except nom. (and acc. sg. if the noun is non-animate) have a *`* (i.e. original end stress): nom. sg. *čist* ‘clean’, gen. sg. *čista* / *čista*, dat. sg. *čistu* / *čistu*, instr. sg. *čistīm* / *čistīm*, etc.

For the preservation of a.p. A, cf. Šapatinovac (Ivšić 1907, 141–142) with a.p. A in adjectives such as *slāb* – *slāba* – *slābo* ‘weak’ (also *čist*, *zdrāv* ‘healthy’ – these are the only adjectives given) and Osijek (Benić 2007, 13, 24–25): *svjēž* – *svjēža* – *svjēže* ‘fresh’ (also *čist*, *gnjō* ‘rotten’, *slāb*, *stār* ‘old’, *sīt*; *nōv*, *prōst* ‘rude’, *spōr* ‘slow’, *strōg* ‘strict’, *smēđ* ‘brown’<sup>15</sup> but *pūn* ‘full’ (B)). For a partial preservation of a.p. A, cf. for instance Bačka (Sekulić 2005): *slāb* – *slāba* – *slābo* (the same in *pūn*, *nōv*) but also *zrila* ‘ripe’, nom. pl. f. *zrile*, acc. sg. f. *riđu*. For Posavian adjectives, see below as well.

The above-mentioned a.p. B is, all things considered, secondary in comparison to the older a.p. A, thus *čist* / *nōv* A > B. The merger of original a.p. *a* adjectives like *slāb* < \**slābъ* and original short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives like *lōš* < \**lōšъ* ‘bad’ is not a recent change, considering that a.p. A in adjectives like these appears in Čakavian as well (see below). It seems that the distinction of the original a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives is not preserved anywhere in Croatian (except, in a very limited way, in a few adverbs<sup>16</sup> and in Križanić’s dialect, see below). Theoretically speaking, a.p. B (*čisto* = *prōsto*) in certain dialects could also be explained

<sup>14</sup> Doublets of that type appear in the standard language since PHKJ (1960). Cf. also for instance Matešić 1970, 164; Stankiewicz 1993, 126, etc.

<sup>15</sup> Benić says that the forms *stāra* instead of the more frequent *stāra* and *sita* instead of the much more frequent *sita* appear sporadically as well, but that such variants are almost non-existent in other examples.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *mālo* ‘few’ (and *zāmalo* ‘almost’), *rāno* ‘early’ (and *zārana*) from the original a.p. *a*, but *skōro* ‘recently; almost’ (the original a.p. *b*).

as the result of the old merger of a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives not in a.p. A but in a.p. B. That is to say that in some dialects the merger of original *čīsto* / *novō* went in the direction of *čīsto* / *nōvo* (A) while in others it went in the direction of *čīsto* / *nōvo* (B). However, this option does not seem very likely since the progress of the secondary shift A > B can be clearly observed in some dialects (cf. the Posavian data below).

The mix of the paradigmatic reflexes of the original a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b* is most easily explained on the basis of the same form in nom. sg. m. (*čīst* = *nōv*), since both the old acute (\**čīstь*) and the old short neo-circumflex (\**nōvь*) yield the same result. By analogy to these forms, the same accent can be generalized in other forms as well. However, it is unusual for an analogy of this kind, i.e. short vowel a.p. *b* > a.p. A shift, to have occurred so early. In addition, it seems that the root fixation of stress in the old short vowel a.p. *b* cannot be a result of the equation *čīst* = *nōv*, considering the fact that the merger was already present in Križanić's language, where the reflexes of the old acute and the short neo-acute had not yet merged completely (see below).

Apart from the already mentioned shift a.p. A > B, there is another possible shift, a.p. A > C', which occurs, for instance, in Western Štokavian Dalmatian dialects, cf. *čīst* – *čīsta* – *čīsto* there.<sup>17</sup> In those dialects, all of the original a.p. A adjectives (originally a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives except for *gol*) shifted to a.p. C' with just a few exceptions (the common one being, from Imotski to Vrgorac and Neretva, the adjective *pūn*, which shifts to a.p. B and not a.p. C').

Šimundić (1971, 126–127), as usual, has alternative forms – both a.p. A and C' for most adjectives such as *čīst* and *nōv* but also a.p. B for *pūn* and a.p. A or B for *tīj* 'quiet' (and *lāk* 'light', which is originally an \*-ькь adjective).

In Prapatnice in Vrgorska krajina (my data), one finds the secondary a.p. C' with the pattern *dūg* 'long' (gen. sg. *dūga*) – f. *dūga* – n. *dūgo* – pl. m. *dūgi* – def. *dūgī*. The same pattern is seen in the adjectives: *čīst*, *křt* 'brittle', f. *mīla* – n. *mīlo* 'nice' (def. *mīlō*), *mřk* 'glum', *sīt*, *slāb*, *stār* 'old',

<sup>17</sup> A.p. C' means that there is no lengthening in nom. sg. m. (as in *bōs*), which is a characteristic of the original a.p. C.

*str̥m* ‘steep’, *šk̥rt* ‘stingy’ (gen. sg. m. *šk̥rta*) – f. *šk̥rta* (gen. sg. f. *šk̥rtē*, acc. sg. f. *šk̥rtu*), *zdr̥v* ‘healthy’, as well as in: *l̥š* – *l̥ša* – *l̥šo*, *l̥k*, *n̥v*, *pr̥st* ‘rude’, *sp̥r* ‘slow’. The exceptions are *t̥j* – *t̥ja* – *t̥jo* ‘quiet’ (due to the disappearance of *-h-*, the lengthening in front of *-j#* and analogy in other forms) and the adjectives *p̥n*, *v̥ija* ‘boiling’ and *z̥ija* ‘ripe’ that shift to a.p. B: *p̥n* (gen. sg. m. *p̥na*) – f. *p̥na* (gen. sg. f. *p̥nē*) – n. *p̥no* (also a frequent adverb *p̥no*) – pl. *p̥ni*.

In the Ijekavian Štokavian dialect of Neretvanska krajina (Vidović 2007, 209), the adjectives *zr̥o*, *d̥g*, *l̥š*, *str̥g* belong to a.p. C', *p̥n* to a.p. B, while *b̥s* belongs to a.p. B' (*b̥s* – f. *b̥sa* – n. *b̥so* with the length in nom. sg. m. as a remnant of the original a.p. C).<sup>18</sup>

The shift to a.p. C' is seen in Dubrovnik as well, which is thus in concordance with the Dalmatian Neo-Štokavian dialects to the north of it. Cf. Dubrovnik *n̥v* – *n̥va* – *n̥vo*, as well as *č̥st*, *dug*, *plah* ‘timid’, *tih* (Budmani 1883, 172).

In Molise Croatian (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), an emigrant Štokavian dialect in Italy (with its origins in the hinterland of the town of Makarska and near the river Cetina, which is dialectologically close to the dialects just mentioned), one finds the following – preserved a.p. A in a group of adjectives: *č̥st*, *-a*, *-o* (the same pattern in *n̥v*, *s̥t*, *s̥t̥r̥*, *zdr̥v*), while the other group shifts to a.p. C': *d̥g* – *d̥ga*<sup>19</sup> – *d̥go* (the same pattern in *m̥k* ‘soft’, *p̥n*, *z̥ij̥a*, *ž̥k* ‘bitter’).<sup>20</sup> This clearly represents the older phase of a.p. A > C' shift in this area. At the time of their departure, the shift had obviously already taken place, but it was clearly still a change in progress – the process was not complete, as is the case in the dialects of the area today.

In the Old Štokavian Slavonian dialect, the situation is different. As we have already seen, the original a.p. A is preserved in Šaptinovac. Ivšić

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *b̥s* – *b̥sa* – *b̥so* in Imotska (Šimundić 1971, 131) and Vrgorska Krajina (my data).

<sup>19</sup> From the older \**dug̃a*, since the dialect has *kanovačko* lengthening (i.e. ' instead of '̃).

<sup>20</sup> The form *z̥ij̥a* seems to be a regular reflex of the older \**zr̥il* (cf. also variants *g̃ol* and *g̃oj̥a* and *c̃ij̥a* from \**c̃il* ‘whole’) even though the development is not quite clear. The adjectives *m̥k* and *ž̥k* are not \*-ькь adjectives originally (see below).

(1913 2, 42–43) claims that the shift of a.p. A to a.p. C' is general in Posavina, as in the already discussed dialects of Dalmatinska Zagora (Imotski and Vrgorac), cf. nom. sg. f. *čista*, *lōša*, *novā* – nom. sg. n. *lōšo* – acc. sg. f. *ù\_čistu vòdu* ‘into clean water’),<sup>21</sup> while Baotić (1979, 196) notes a split of the original a.p. A adjectives in Kostrč in the Bosnian part of Posavina to a.p. A (such as *čīo* ‘hale’, *dūg*, *pūn*, *tròm* ‘inert’, *strög*, etc.) and a.p. C' (such as *čīst*, *tūst* ‘fat’, *lōš*, *prōst*, etc.). In Southern Baranja<sup>22</sup> Sekereš (1977, 388) gives the pattern *stār* – *stāra* – *stāro* (also *prāv* ‘straight’), while *mīl* ‘nice’ and *lōš* take a.p. B.

That Ivšić's claims of a general a.p. C' pattern in Posavina in these kinds of adjectives are wrong, is confirmed not only by the already mentioned later studies but also by my own field material from Posavina. Here, we shall present the data from seven Posavian villages – in all of them, the original a.p. A is preserved in many adjectives and in some of the dialects in most of them. The most archaic dialects are those of Budrovci, Brodski Stupnik, (Slavonski) Koba and Sikerevci. In Budrovci, only *spôr* (*spòra* – *spòro*) shifts to a.p. C, with a.p. A perfectly preserved in all other adjectives, cf. *slāb* – *slāba* – *slābo* – def. *slābō* (thus also *čīl* – *čīla*, *čīst*, *tròm* – *trōma*, *lōš*, *mīk*, *nōv* – *nōva*, *prāv*, *prōst*, *pūn* – *pūna*, *sīt*, *smēđ*, *stār* – *stāra*, *stfm* – *stīma*, *strög*, *tīh*, *trūl* – *trūla*, *vjēšt*, *vrēl* – *vrēla*, *zdrāv* – *zdrāva*, *zrēl* – *zrēla*). In Brodski Stupnik, only *čīst* shifts to a.p. B (*čīsta* – *čīsto*), while all other adjectives (*čīl*, *lōš*, *mīl*, *mīk*, *nōv*, *prāv*, *prōst*, *pūn*, *rīđa* ‘red haired’, *sīt*, *slāb*, *smēđ*, *spōr*, *stār*, *stīm*, *strög*, *tīh*, *tròm*, *trūl* ‘rotten’, *vrēl*, *zdrāv*, *zrēl*) preserve the original a.p. A. In Kobaš, most adjectives preserve the original a.p. A (*mīl*, *nōv*, *prōst* (def. C), *pūn*, *sīt*, *slāb*, *smēđ*, *spōr*, *stār*, *strög*, *tīh*, *zdrāv*), while only two adjectives (*čīst* and *tāšt* ‘vain’) shift to a.p. C'. In Sikerevci, almost all adjectives remain in a.p. A (thus *prōst*, *pūn*, *rīđ*, *ròm* ‘lame’, *slāb*, *smēđ*, *sīt*, *stār* (and C), *strög*, *tīh*, *trūl*, *zdrāv*, *zrēl*), while *čīst* and *spôr* shift to a.p. C/C' (the adj. *škft* has a.p. C: pattern). In Babina Greda, a.p. A is preserved by *pūn* (also C'), *rād* ‘glad’, *rīđ*, *slāb*, *spôr* (also C), *stār*, *strög*, *tīh*, *zdrāv*, while *nōv* shifts to the mixed a.p. A-B and *čīst*, *prōst*, *sīt*

<sup>21</sup> Ivšić notes the monosyllabic adjectival a.p. B only in *lakā* – *lakō* ‘easy’ but this is, as already mentioned, originally an \*-ъкъ adjective.

<sup>22</sup> This is actually the northern part of the present day Croatian Baranja, since Northern Baranja is today a part of southern Hungary.



to a.p. C'. In Slobodnica, the original a.p. A is preserved in *čīl* (*čīla* – *čīlo*), *pūn*, *snēn*, *stār*; *mřk*, *prāv*, *sīt*, *slāb*, *sřm*, *strög*, the shift to a.p. B is seen in *nōv* – *nōva* – *nōvo* (and *spōr*, *vrēl*, *zrēl*) and the innovative a.p. C' in *čřst*, *pröst*, *vjęšt*; *trūl*, *zdrāv*.<sup>23</sup> In Orubica, the situation is the most complex and innovative. There, a.p. A is preserved by *pūn*, *slāb*, *směđ*, *spōr*, *strög*, *trūl*, *zrīl*, while the other adjectives (*čřst*, *nōv*, *prāv*, *pröst*, *sīt*, *stār*, *tāšt*, *tīh*, *zdrāv*, *žōk* 'bitter') shift to all kinds of combinations and mixes of the original a.p. A and the newer a.p. B and C' with a great deal of vacillation and alternative forms. It is interesting that the adj. *čřst* loses the original a.p. A in all dialects except for Šaptinovac and Budrovci.

The shift to a.p. C', in spite of the preservation and further spread of the original a.p. C in many Western Štokavian (and Čakavian) dialects, may seem unmotivated, since there is only one old short vowel a.p. *c* adjective in Croatian: *bōs* – *bōsa* – *bōso* and, even there, nom. sg. m. of a.p. C is different from nom. sg. m. of a.p. A (*bōs* ≠ *čřst*). Of course, adjectives like *glādan* of a.p. C type are much more numerous. The distinction in nom. sg. m. forms remains even when innovative forms such as *čřsta* appear. The situation in Neretvanska krajina, where adjectives like *dūg* have a.p. C' pattern, but *bōs* belongs to a.p. B' (see above), shows that the only monosyllabic a.p. C adjective (*bōs*) did not take part in the a.p. A > C' shift. It must have been a part of a wider tendency of generalization of mobile accentuation in adjectives.

This process could perhaps be explained as a result of the general hegemony of the a.p. C type in adjectives in the dialects under discussion, i.e. considering *-an* and *-ak* adjectives, etc. as well. It is also possible that we are not dealing with the shift of a.p. A > a.p. C' but instead with a more complex shift of a.p. A > B > C', i.e. the pattern *čřst* – *čřsta* – *čřsto* (C') would be a result of the change from older *čřst* – *čřsta* – *čřsto* (B), which would, in turn, be from older *čřst* – *čřsta* – *čřsto* (A). This possible process of A > B > C', however, does not completely explain the appearance of the new a.p. C type here, in spite of the *bōs* ≠ *čřst* relation. In addition, it is perhaps too complicated to assume two phases of innovation (A > B > C)

<sup>23</sup> The adj. *māl* shifted to a.p. B: (*māla* – *mālo*) and *lōš* has a vacillation, i.e. a.p. B/C (*lōš* – *lōša* – *lōšo* / *lōšo*).

instead of one, since these are in other aspects rather archaic dialects. It seems that the lengthening in nom. sg. m., typical for the original a.p. C, was not considered an obstacle for the new accentual mobility to develop in adjectives that were previously immobile.

In most cases, the old accent of definite adjectives is preserved (e.g. *mīlī, sītī, slābī, smjēlī* ‘courageous’, *zdrāvī, trūlī, sītī*), but in some cases, the original form (*čīstī*) can have a variant or can be completely replaced by the secondary a.p. C type accent (*čīstī*).<sup>24</sup> Cf. also *dūgī* ‘long’ (beside *dūgī*). It is interesting that the original a.p. C accent ` is lost in many dialects (thus one has *bōsī, drāgī* ‘dear’ instead of the older *bōsī, drāgī*) so in some dialects there can be a peculiar situation that the type ` exists only in original a.p. a adjectives such as *dūgī*. The old short vowel a.p. b adjectives mostly retain the original root accent ` in long forms (*prōstī, nōvī, spōrī, lōšī*, etc.). Accentual type like *čīstī* is not a result of the influence of forms like *bōsī / drāgī* (original a.p. C) in all dialects. Since this accentual type is lost in many dialects, that kind of influence would be very unlikely in some of them. The spread of the new ` type in a.p. A can also be due to analogy to younger (A > B) indefinite forms like *čīsta, čīsto* or to *čīsta, čīsto* (A > C'). For instance, in the Posavian dialects of Kobaš and Sikerevci that preserve the original a.p. A in nearly all adjectives, it is very indicative that the type ` is found only in the definite form of *čīst*, which is practically the only root adjective that has shifted to a.p. C' in those dialects.<sup>25</sup> Of course, the rise of the innovative ` type in the original a.p. A may differ in various dialects.

Ivšić (1913 2, 49) notes the original type *gōlī, nōvī* but also the innovative type *novā*, as well as *čīstī* and *čīstī* (like *bōsī / bōsī*) for Posavina. For Šaptinovac Ivšić (1907, 142) gives the preserved a.p. A (*čīst – čīsta – čīsto*) but also a generalized innovative type of the def. *čīstī, slabī, zdravī*. According to Ivšić, the shift in def. adjectives occurred in all cases in Šaptinovac and not just in some of them, as is the situation elsewhere. Since a.p. A is preserved in indef. adjectives in Šaptinovac, the accent type of *čīstī* should probably be attributed to analogy to the original a.p. C forms *suvi*

<sup>24</sup> Cf. also *prvī → prīvī* ‘first’.

<sup>25</sup> In Slobodnica, most of the adjectives remain in a.p. A but a considerable number shifts to a.p. B and C. Still, only the form *čīstī* has such an innovative accent. All other examples have the original accent, cf. *čīlī, stīrmī, prōstī, snēnī, spōrī*, etc.

‘dry’ and *lutî* ‘mad’ although it is not clear why *-î* would be generalized in all a.p. A adjectives, at least according to Ivšić’s not-so-explicit description, while it is attested in only two of the original a.p. *c* reflexes.<sup>26</sup> As for Kostrč in Bosanska Posavina, Baotić (1979, 196–197) does not explicitly say what kind of accent appears in a.p. A definite forms, but it seems that they tend to keep the stem accent. As for original a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives that have shifted to a.p. C', their def. forms have either final accentuation only (i.e. *-î*, *-â*, *-ô*) or final accentuation alongside the original variant (i.e. stem stress). The shift to the a.p. C def. stress pattern occurs in most adjectives in Neretvanska krajina as well.<sup>27</sup> Šimundić (1971, 137) has both older forms like *čîstî* and younger like *čistî* but claims that the latter are more frequent. In Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina), like in Dobranje and Vidonje, it seems that all or most adjectives behave like *čîstî*, *sîî*, etc. except *mîlî*, *nôvî*, which preserve the original pattern. In Prapatnice, forms like *čîstî* appear beside the new a.p. C' (*čîst* – *čista* – *čisto*) so one can suppose analogy of the indef. *čista* to the def. *čistâ*, but original a.p. C forms such as *bôsî*, *brzî*, *gûstî*, etc. could also be an important source of analogy, since they are well preserved in the dialect. The innovative *`* type also appears in a.p. B, cf. the def. *gôlâ* with the indef. *gôla*. Budmani (1883, 173) notes *čîstî* for Dubrovnik and the same pattern for all other adjectives with *`* in at least some indef. forms (except for *nov* – similar to Prapatnice and Dobranje / Vidonje), cf. also *dûgî* (Rešetar 1900, 129). In Dubrovnik,

<sup>26</sup> The innovative *-î* also appears in all adjectives with suffixes that belong to the synchronic a.p. C – *mokrî* ‘wet’, *toplî* ‘warm’, *sretnî* ‘happy’, *tankî* ‘thin’. The only example of those in which one would historically expect desinential stress in the definite form is *tankî*. This could be a case of analogy to examples like the latter, but there is too little data to be certain. Synchronically, the accent of the def. f. *mokrâ* can hardly be due to analogy to the indef. f. *mókra*. Such an analogy works perfectly in Neo-Štokavian where the indef. *mókra* can easily influence the def. *mòkrâ* the result being the newer def. form *mòkrâ*. However, in Old Štokavian, with no stress retraction (and with *kanovačko* lengthening in Šapatinovac as well), such an analogy does not work. One could perhaps suppose the analogy of the def. form *mokrâ* to the old *\*mokrâ* (the proto-form of today’s *mókra*).

<sup>27</sup> For the villages of Dobranje and Vidonje Vidović (2007, 203) gives only *tihî* (cf. also the old *gûstî*, etc. in a.p. C) but such accentuation is present in other examples as well (*čîstî*, *dûgî*, *lòšî*, *pròstî*, *sîî*, *zdràvî*, etc.), except for *nôvî* and *mîlî*, which preserve the old accent (Domagoj Vidović, private communication).

the A > C' shift in def. adjectives may have to do with the same sort of pattern shift in the indef. forms but not necessarily – in some dialects, forms like *dùgî* appear alongside *dùg* – *dùga* – *dùgo* (B). In Molise (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), one finds older (def. *nòvi*, *pùni*, *zdràvi*, *zrîli*, *žûki*) but also younger forms (*dùgî*, gen. sg. m. *dùgôga* but f. *dùga*, gen. sg. f. *dùge*), as well as peculiar forms like the def. *čísti*, *-a*, *méki*, *-a* 'soft' (gen. sg. m. *mèkoga* but gen. sg. f. *méke*).<sup>28</sup>

In four original a.p. *a* adjectives an unusual a.p. B: definite pattern is found. Cf. the indef. forms *prāv*, *ràn* 'early', *stār*, *mào* 'small' (*màla* – *màlo*, ARj) and the adverbs *pràvo* 'right', *ràno* 'early', *màlo* 'little' but the def. forms *prāvī*, *rānī*,<sup>29</sup> *mālī*,<sup>30</sup> *stārī*, which derive from the older forms *prāvi*, *rāni*, *māli*, *stāri*, attested with the neo-acute in Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 50) and in other Štokavian dialects that preserve the neo-acute (like in Poljica near Omiš). These adjectives have neo-acute in Čakavian as well (see below). Thus, this is not a case of the old neo-circumflex that appears in Kajkavian or in North Čakavian (*mālī*, etc.), as some wrongly think. It should also be emphasized that all Štokavian (and South and Central Čakavian) dialects seem to have such stress, which clearly points to an old innovation. Some Štokavian dialects distinguish the forms *prāvī* and *prāvi* / *prāvī*,<sup>31</sup> while the secondary type B: can spread to other adjectives as well, cf. *zdrāvī* / *zdrāvi* and *slābī* / *slāvi* in Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 137).<sup>32</sup> There is also the younger form *kāsnī* 'late' that

<sup>28</sup> The forms *čísti*, *méki* could be derived from \*čistī, \*mekī but the supposed shortening of the final syllable is unexpected.

<sup>29</sup> In some dialects, the variant with the expected *ī* exists as well (for instance in Osijek, cf. Benić 2007, 24). This can either be original or a back-formation by analogy to the indef. forms.

<sup>30</sup> The length can be transferred to the indef. form as well, cf. *māl*. However, in many dialects only the def. form *mālī* exists, while in others, like Prapatnice, the def. and indef. forms are distinguished by accent alone – cf. the indef. *mālī* (but the def. *mālī*), *māla*, *málo* (a.p. B:).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. in Budmani 1867 *prāvī* (and secondary *prāvi*) 'dritto' but *prāvī* 'vero', in Kostrč (Baotić 1979, 196) *prāvī* 'right' and *prāvi* 'suitable', as well as *prāvī* in Slobodnica in Posavina (my data). Cf. also Вукотић 1940, 284 for Piva and Drobnjaci, and Николић 1964, 279 for Srijem.

<sup>32</sup> In Molise, in the example *mālī* a usual, typically Molisean, shortening occurs in gen. sg. m. form *màloga* but not in *stāri* – gen. sg. m. *stāroga*. Cf. also below for other examples of such a shortening in Molise.

exists in some dialects beside the older *kāsni*, which is probably due to analogy with *rāni* ‘early’.

Although it is quite clear that in these cases we are dealing with secondary forms and an analogy to the a.p. B: type, the reason for such an analogy specifically in these adjectives is not too clear. Perhaps it is not accidental that all primary examples have a resonant (-v-, -n-, -l-, -r-) as the final consonant of the stem. However, cf. also *zdrāvī* (but dialectally *zdrâvī* as well), *pūnī* and *mīlī* with no lengthening. One may also surmise that the same unusual lengthening before -v- is found in the form *přvī* ‘first’ instead of *přvī*, although in this case this is just a variant that exists in some (but not all) Štokavian dialects.

In compound adjectives with a linking -o- and zero suffix, there is a tendency (relatively young) for the accent to shift from the middle -ò- (which is the original place of stress in most cases) to the very first syllable, while leaving the syllable after -o- long. Cf. *gològlav* ‘bareheaded’ > *gòloglāv*, *bosònog* ‘barefoot’ > *bòsonōg*. The same kind of change occurs in nouns that are derived in the same manner (although the younger accent is more frequent in nouns than in adjectives): *sudòper* ‘dish-washer’ > *sùdopēr*, *kamenòlom* ‘quarry’ > *kāmenolōm*, etc.

### ČAKAVIAN (Orbanići)<sup>33</sup>

#### indefinite adjectives

**m***čīs***f***čīsta***n***čīsto*

#### definite adjectives

**m***čīsti***f***čīsta***n**

In Čakavian, archaic dialects maintain a.p. A (< Proto-Slavic a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b*), while others show a shift (partial or general) to a.p. C'. There is no shift to a.p. B, as in some Štokavian dialects, since a.p. C is dominant in Čakavian (cf. also the shift B > C below). Such a situation in the Čakavian South is a continuation of a similar situation in Dalmatian West Štokavian dialects. One other thing that distinguishes Čakavian from Štokavian is that in Čakavian a.p. A (or what becomes of it) the def. adj. type -î accent is less frequent than in Štokavian. This is hardly strange, since this type of accent is much less frequent in Čakavian in a.p. C as well, where

<sup>33</sup> Kalsbeek 1998, 429.

it would be expected historically, so it is no wonder that it could not have influenced a.p. A in that regard.

There are two basic types of developments in Čakavian. One group of dialects preserves the original a.p. A, while the other shows partial or complete transfer of monosyllabic adjectives to a.p. C'. Definite forms usually have the original stem stress.<sup>34</sup> The first, archaic, group is represented, for example, by Hvar<sup>35</sup> *čist* – *čista* (and *čistà*, there is no mention of such a variant for other adjectives<sup>36</sup>) – *čisto*, constant stem stress also in *dùg*, *sīt*, *tīh*, *slāb* (*slāba*),<sup>37</sup> *lōš*, *nōv*, *trōm*, def. *čīsti*, etc.;<sup>38</sup> Filipjakov<sup>39</sup> *čist* – *čista* – *čisto* (the same in *slāb*, *sīt*, *prōst*, *spōr*, while the length from nom. sg. m. is generalized in all forms in *nōv* – *nōva* – *nōvo*); Preko<sup>40</sup> *čist* – *čista* – *čisto* (the same in *sīt*, *nōv*, *prōst*, *spōr*, while *slāb* – *slāba* – *slābo* has generalized the lengthening from the f. and n.); Pag<sup>41</sup> *brēja* f. 'with young (of animals)', *dùg* – *dùga* – *dùgo* – def. *dūgi*, *ślāb* – *ślāba* – *ślābo* – def. *ślābi* 'weak', *nōv* – *nōva* – *nōvo* – def. *nōvi*, *zūk* – *zūka* – *zūko* – def. *zūki* 'bitter', etc.;<sup>42</sup> Susak<sup>43</sup> *dālχ* – *dālχa* – *dālχo* – def. *dālχi* 'long' (*nōf*, *pūn*, *slāp*, *sīt*, *tāšć*, *zdrāf* also belong to a.p. A); Senj<sup>44</sup> *lōš* – *lōša* – *lōšo* (the same pattern in *čist*, *sīt*, *slāb*, *pūn*, *zrēl*, *prōst*, *nōv*), def. *lōši* etc; Orlec<sup>45</sup> *stār* – *stāra* – *stāro*, *čist*, *slāp*, *sīt*; Rijeka<sup>46</sup> *dūh* 'long', *pūn*, *sīt*, *slāb*, *stār*, *tīh*, *zdrāv* (constant

<sup>34</sup> Of course, there are exceptions. Cf. *novī* in Novi Vinodolski (the very name of the town is also *Novī*).

<sup>35</sup> Hraste 1935, 32; ČDL.

<sup>36</sup> ČDL gives only *čista* for the dialect of Brusje on the island of Hvar.

<sup>37</sup> In ČDL, the data given for Hvar in general is *slāb* (cf. *slōb* in Brač), *-a*, *-o* (i.e. *+slāba*, *+slābo* if not a mistake).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Pitve (Hvar, my data): *slāb* – *slāba* – *slābo*, *sīt* – *sīta* – *sīto* and Vrboska on Hvar (Matković 2004): *čist*, *-a*, *-o*, *pūn* – *pūna*, *-o*, *sīt*, *-a*, *-o*, *slāb* – *slāba* – *slābo*, *zdrōv* – *zdrāva*, *-o*, *zrīl* – *zrīla*, *-o* but *stōr* – *stōrā* – *stōro* 'old' with a shift to a.p. C (because of the lengthening in *stōr* and the def. form *stōri*).

<sup>39</sup> Near Zadar, data by Nikola Vuletić.

<sup>40</sup> On the island of Ugljan, data by Nikola Vuletić.

<sup>41</sup> Kustić 2002, 62.

<sup>42</sup> The final closed syllable is lengthened on Pag, cf. also the nouns *brōāt* 'brother', *narōd* 'people' (Kustić 2002, 50–51).

<sup>43</sup> Hamm, Hraste, Guberina 1956, 113–114.

<sup>44</sup> Moguš 1966, 76.

<sup>45</sup> Houtzagers 1985, 117–119.

<sup>46</sup> Strohal 1895, 158.

root stress) and *zrêl* – <sup>+</sup>*zrêla*, *nôv* – <sup>+</sup>*nôva*; Orbanici<sup>47</sup> *zdrâf* – *zdrâva* – *zdrâvo*, *n<sup>o</sup>ôf* – *nôva*, *pûn* – *pûna*, *slâp* – *slâba*, *sît* – *sîta*, *stâr* – *stâra*, etc. In Grobnik,<sup>48</sup> the original pattern is preserved in *sît* (*-a*, *-o*, also *dûg*, *râd* ‘glad’, *slâb*, *stîm* ‘steep’), *stâr* – *stâra* – *stâro* (also *mîl*, *pûn*, *trûl* ‘rotten’, *vrêl* ‘boiling’, *zdrâv*, *zrêl* ‘ripe’), but there is a shift in *čîst* – *čîstâ* – *čîsto* (also *škrît*, *tâšć* ‘slim, empty’).<sup>49</sup> The original a.p. A occurs, as we have seen, in all of the Čakavian territory, from the South to the North.

On Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 82–83; 1973) there is a transitional system with a group of adjectives preserving the original pattern (*hrôm*, *-a*, *-o*, the same in *lôš*, *tîh*, *prâv*, all a.p. A), a group with variant stress (*zdrâv* – *zdravâ* / *zdrâva*, *žûk* – *žûka* / *žukâ* – *žûko*, a.p. A/C') and a group with complete shift to a.p. C' (*čîst* – *čîstâ*, acc. sg. f. *čîstu* – *čîsto*, the same in *dûg*, *slâb*, *sît*, *stîm*, *tâšć* and *pûn*, *stâr*). In definite forms, the original pattern can be preserved (*mîlî*, *nôvî*), but there are also innovative forms with desinential stress (*čîstî*, *dugî*). On Brač (Šimunović 2009, 44), as opposed to the more archaic Hvar, there is a vacillation of a.p. A/C' in the adjectives *dûg*, *tîh*, *sît*,<sup>50</sup> *trôm*, *prôst* (the last adjective belongs to a.p. A only in the dictionary), while the other group of adjectives has the younger a.p. C' only: *nôv* – *novâ* – *nôvo*, the same in *zdrôv* – *zdravâ* – *zdrâvo*, *vrîl*, *zdrîl* ‘ripe’, *pûn*, *slôb* (cf. the long forms: *dûgi*, *nôvi*, *tîhi*, *trômi*, *prôsti*, *zdrâvi*, *vrîli*).<sup>51</sup>

For the younger *-î* in the definite forms of adjectives in Čakavian a.p. A, cf. for instance Novi Vinodolski *čîstî* (next to *čîstî*), Krasica *slabâ* (Langston 2006, 184–185).

As in Štokavian, South Čakavian also shows the unexpected ~ in a.p. A of some adjectives, cf. Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) *m<sup>o</sup>âlî*, *pr<sup>o</sup>âvî*, *st<sup>o</sup>ârî*, *r<sup>o</sup>ânî* and Brač (Šimunović 2009) *môli*, *prôvi*, *stôri*, *rôni* (but *zdrâvi* < \**zdrâvî*), which is in complete agreement with Štokavian.

<sup>47</sup> Kalsbeek 1998, 143–144.

<sup>48</sup> Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 95, 100–101, 105.

<sup>49</sup> As for the reflex of the old short vowel a.p. *b* in Grobnik, cf. *nôv* – *novâ* – *nôvo* (C) and *prôst* – *prostâ* – *prôsto* (C) ‘usual, simple’ as well as *prôst* – *prostâ* – *prôsto* (C' < \*A) ‘rude’ in a.p. C but *trôm* – *trôma* – *trômo* ‘inert’ (A).

<sup>50</sup> In the dictionary, the accent *sîta* is noted as stemming from Bol and *sîtâ* as from Dračevica.

<sup>51</sup> For Pučišća on Brač (Domagoj Vidović, p.c.) cf. *dûg* in a.p. A/C' (*dûg* / *dûg* – *dûga* / *dugâ* – *dûgo*) and only a.p. C' elsewhere (*pûn* – *punâ* – *pûno*, *prôst* – *prostâ* – *prôsto*, etc.). Def. adj. have root stress (*dûgi*, *sîti*, *trômi*, *nôvi*, etc.).



In Senj (Moguš 1966, 76), such an accent appears in several other adjectives as well: *nōvi*, *prāvi*, *zdrāvi*. In the North of the Čakavian territory, these adjectives have neo-circumflex (which appears in all a.p. A adjectives in Kajkavian, Slovene and some North Čakavian dialects); cf. Novi Vinodolski (Langston 2006, 184): *stārī* but *dūgī*, *mīlī*, *sītī*, *slābī*, etc., Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 144) *māli*, *prāvi*, *stāri*, *rāni* (and the indef. *rān* by analogy) but not in other adjectives: *dūgi*, *mīli*, *tīhi*, etc. The Orbanići form *kāsan* ‘late’ has the circumflex probably by analogy to the older def. form \**kāsni* (the present day def. form is the secondary *kāsni*, shaped by analogy to the new indef. form *kāsan*). In Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 118), only two adjectives, which have secondary neo-acute in the South, have neo-circumflex: *māli* and *prāvi* (cf. *stāri* < \**stārī*, *rāni* < \**rārī*).<sup>52</sup> As already pointed out regarding Štokavian, the reason for the occurrence of such a secondary accent in these specific adjectives is not clear – perhaps it is due only to their frequency, which was the reason for the (slightly paradoxical) analogical a.p. B: accent in the South, while in the North the old neo-circumflex was preserved in these same adjectives (the neo-circumflex might have been the feature of all a.p. A adjectives originally as is still the case in some dialects).

In other dialects of the Čakavian North, the neo-circumflex can be regular in all a.p. A adjective definite forms: cf. Kastav (Belić 1914, 19, 28–29): *dūgī*, *mīlī*, *pūnī*, *sītī*, *slābī*, *tīhī*, *zdrāvī*, the same in polysyllabic adjectives: *bogātī* ‘rich’, *rjāvī* ‘rusty’, etc. Cf. also Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 95, 100–101, 105): *dūgī*, *stārī*, *vrēlī*, *mīlī*, *gotōvī*, *bogātī* (also in definite forms of *bradāt* ‘beardy’, *glavāt* ‘with a big head’, *kosmāt* ‘hairy’, *očīt* ‘obvious’, *kamenīt* ‘stony’, etc.), *korīsnī* ‘useful’, *pobōžnī* ‘pious’ (the same in the def. form *siromāšān* ‘poor’) but nonetheless <sup>+</sup>*sītī*, <sup>+</sup>*slābī*, <sup>+</sup>*velikī*, <sup>+</sup>*očītī*, <sup>+</sup>*lāčnī*, <sup>+</sup>*srīčnī*, *čīstī* (the indef. form being *čīst* C’), *bīstrī* ‘clear’, etc.

It is not certain what the original situation was like concerning the neo-circumflex in definite a.p. A adjective forms in the North of the Čakavian territory or if there was any unity there to begin with. Some dialects, like Kastav, have the length in all a.p. A definite forms, like Kajkavian

<sup>52</sup> These two forms could also theoretically derive from the older \**stārī* and \**rārī*.



and Slovene, while others, like the dialect of Novi Vinodolski, have it in traces only. One possibility is that originally all (or most) of the Northern Čakavian dialects had the neo-circumflex in a.p. A def. adj. forms – a feature that was later lost in many dialects by analogy to indef. forms. The other possibility is that in some dialects the neo-circumflex was never present in all adjectives. The difference between Čakavian North and Slovene / Kajkavian is that Čakavian has the neo-circumflex while at the same time preserving posttonic length (of course, in dialects that preserve it in other cases as well). Here, there are once more two possibilities. One is that this posttonic length was never lost during the process of the neo-circumflex lengthening and the other is that it was lost but then restored by analogy to a.p. B and a.p. C, where the preservation would be expected in any case.

#### KAJKAVIAN (Velika Rakovica)<sup>53</sup>

##### indefinite adjectives

**m**

*sīt*

**f**

*sīta*

**n**

*sīto*

##### definite adjectives

**m**

*sēiti* (Bednja)<sup>54</sup>

**f**

**n**

The reflexes of the Proto-Slavic a.p. *a* in Kajkavian are clear. The reflex is a synchronic a.p. A in all dialects, which means the constant root stress in indef. forms and, typical for Kajkavian and Slovene, the neo-circumflex in def. forms. Thus in most archaic Kajkavian dialects, the indef. forms are *čīst* – *čīsta* – *čīsto* and the def. ones are *čēisti* – *čēista* – *čēisto*. The neo-circumflex is attributed to the old contraction length in the ending, cf. Štok. *čīstī* – *čīsta* – *čīstō* from PS1. \*čīstъjъ > \*čīstyjъ > \*čīstī, etc. In some less archaic Kajk. dialects, the neo-circumflex may be replaced by an analogical " from the indef. forms, i.e. def. *čēisti* by analogy to the indef. *čīst*. Other changes (like the spread of the a.p. B: type in V. Rakovica) are less frequent.

Cf. in Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 304–305) *čīst*<sup>55</sup> – def. *čēisti*, the same in *slōb*, *sīt*, *stōr*, *zdrōv*, *dūg*, *mīl*, *mūl* 'little'. In polysyllabic adjectives, the

<sup>53</sup> March 1981, 265.

<sup>54</sup> Jedvaj 1956, 305. The V. Rakovica forms *sīt* – *sīta* – *sīto* are secondary.

<sup>55</sup> In Bednja, only nom. sg. m. exists as a separate indef. form. In all other cases, the def. forms are used (Jedvaj 1956, 303).

neo-circumflex appears in internal syllables, e.g. in *sěrdīt – sedēiti* ‘angry’, *kŷēs mōt – kesmāoti* ‘hairy’ but not in first syllable: *hrōpov(i)* ‘coarse’, *šāpov(i)* ‘lame’, etc.<sup>56</sup>

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265–266): *sīt – sīta – sīto*, the same in *pun, mal, dug, mil, prav, star, zdrav, trul, zrel* and *nov*. The def. forms have an innovative neo-acute (def. *sīti*, etc.), taken from a.p. B.: The same situation is found in the polysyllabic adjectives: *bogāt – bogāta – bogāto*, the same pattern in *gotōv* ‘finished’, *strpliv* ‘patient’, etc., cf. the secondary def. forms *bogāti*, etc. For the reflexes of the old short a.p. *b* see below.

In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), cf. *zdrāf* (f. and n. forms *zdrāva* and *zdrāvo* are irrelevant due to the retraction that occurs in the dialect, cf. *nōga* ‘leg’, *vōda* ‘water’, *žēna* ‘woman’), indef. nom. pl. f. *zrēlę* ‘ripe’ – def. nom. sg. m. *zrēli* and *gologlāf* ‘with no hat’ – def. *gologlāvi* but also *brěj – brēja – brějo, slāp – slāba – slābo* – def. *slābi* (the same in *sīt*). In the last three adjectives, one sees curious cases of levelling, with secondary *ˆ* in the indef. nom. sg. m. due to the old def. forms, while the def. forms have the secondary *˘* from the old indef. forms. The neo-circumflex is well preserved in the adjectives that have def. forms only: *čīsti, tīhi, stāri, māli* (adverb *mālo*), *prāvi, rāni, vrēli, dōgi, mīli*, etc.

Rožić (1893–1894 2, 141–144, 147–148, 152, 166) asserts that in Prigorje, unlike Štok., it is impossible to distinguish def. and indef. forms by accent alone (i.e. that there is no pattern of indef. *zdrāv* – def. *zdrāvi*). In his description of Prigorje, one finds the pattern: *zdrāv – zdrāva – zdrāvo* (in oblique cases, older forms like *zdrāvega* go together with newer forms like *zdravěga*).<sup>57</sup> The following adjectives have this pattern as well: *slāb, čīst, dūg, pūn, sīt, stār* (but f. *stāra / stāra* – here, the trace of the old neo-circumflex from the def. forms is preserved), *tīj* ‘quiet’, *zrěl, brěj*. Cf. also in polysyllabic adjectives: *bōgat* – f. *bogāta* – n. *bogāti* (*-i* instead of *-o*), *sřdit* – f. *srdīta*. In some adjectives, the old *ˆ* from the old def. forms appears: *rān* – f. *rāna* – n. *rāni* (instead of *-o*), *mīl* – f. *mīla* – n. *mīlo*.<sup>58</sup> Here, the f. and n. forms were originally def. forms. Such a situation is found in *pījan* –

<sup>56</sup> In this position, the neo-circumflex is probably not to be expected in any case.

<sup>57</sup> Rožić’s accentual marks are adapted in this article. The mark *˘* is used for his *˘* and *ˆ* for his *ˆ*.

<sup>58</sup> The form *māl* has the secondary forms *māla, máló* in f. and n.

f. *pijǎna* / *pijâna* – n. *pijǎni* / *pijâni* (instead of -o) ‘drunk’ next to the old indef. forms, as well as in *kòsmat*, *gìzdav* ‘gaudy’, *pìšiv* ‘crummy’. The old neo-circumflex has been generalized in all forms in *kamenît* – f. *kamenîta* – n. *kamenîti* and ^ is found in denominative adjectives like *lêtni* ‘summer’, *krûšni* ‘bread’, etc. that have def. forms only.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 268, 270), Proto-Slavic a.p. *a* adjectives form three groups now. The first one preserves the original pattern: *mǎl* – *mǎla* – *mǎlo* – def. *mǎli*. The other adjectives are *dùk* ‘long’, *mìl*, *prǎf* ‘real’, *stǎr*, *zdrǎf*, *zrèl* and polysyllabic *dugovrǎt* ‘long neck’, *črlenkǎst* ‘reddish’, *gologlǎf*, etc. In the other group, the def. forms have the innovative ˘ from the indef. forms: *sît* – *sîta* – *sîto* – def. *sîti* and the same in *pùn*, *trùl*, *vrèl*, *vîl* and *brdovît* ‘hilly’, *žùčkast* ‘yellowish’, *mřšaf* ‘skinny’, etc. The third, smallest group, has transferred to a.p. C' and has the same pattern as *gòl* – *gòla* (< \*golǎ) – *gòlo* ‘naked’. The adjectives are *slǎp* ‘weak’, *plǎh* and *čîst* (the latter preserves the original def. accent in the phrase *Čîsta srîda* ‘Ash Wednesday’). Def. forms in Ozalj have ^, but this can be either the original a.p. *a* neo-circumflex or a reflex of the old neo-acute from a.p. B: (this pattern spreads to a.p. C as well).

In Turopolje (Šojat 1982, 400), def. forms lose the neo-circumflex and the pattern is *dòk* – *dògi* ‘long’ (the same in *zdrǎf*, *čîst*). The adjectives *stǎr* and *slǎp* ‘weak’ can shift to a.p. C (*stâr*, *slâp*), probably due to analogy to the old def. forms that had the neo-circumflex. An interesting development is seen in the secondary indef. form *mǎli*, which has the old def. accent, while the new def. form has the secondary neo-acute: *mǎli* (cf. in Prapatnice Štok. indef. *mǎlî* but def. *mǎlî*).

As we have seen, in Štok/Čak. the old short vowel a.p. *b* has the same reflex as the old a.p. *a*. However, the situation with the old short vowel a.p. *b* is not as clear in Kajkavian, one of the reasons being the lack of data. In V. Rakovica, only three adjectives are attested. The adj. *nov* is a.p. A (like *sît*, etc.), while *prost* and *loš* are a.p. C', next to *gòl* – *golǎ* – *gòlo* (originally also a.p. *b*). In Bednja, Jedvaj gives only the adj. *nȳev* (def. *nȳevi*) ‘new’, which is in a.p. C (next to a whole slew of the original a.p. *b* adjectives such as *žout* ‘yellow’ and *gȳel* ‘naked’). In Turopolje, the one form *nòv* – *nòva* (cf. also *bòs* – *bòsa* / *bòsa*, originally a.p. *c*) tells us nothing, just like Rožić’s two adjectives from Prigorje that belong to a.p. C: *nòv* – *nòva* – *nòvo* (the

same in *prôst*). In Težak's Ozalj, *nõf* 'new' belongs to a.p. A together with *māl* (def. *māli*); *lõjš* 'bad' and *spõr* are in a.p. C' (like *gõl* – *gõla* – *gõlo* – def. *gõli*) and *prôst* is in a.p. C: (having the same pattern as *líp* – *lípa* – *lípo* 'beautiful'). In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), one finds only the def. *lõši* (which seems to be an innovative a.p. A form) and *nõvi*, *lõši* (which do not point to a.p. A). According to what we have seen, it is not clear whether the process of merger of the old a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b*, which is visible in Štok/Čak. (with the exception of \**golъ* that remains in a.p. B), can be attributed to Kajkavian as well. In Slovene, there is no such merger (see below). However, the situation in Križanić's dialect points to a process similar to that in Štok/Čak. (setting the problem of the phonetic reflex of the old acute and short neo-acute aside).

In Križanić's dialect, the shift of the old short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives to a.p. A is clear, unlike elsewhere in Kajk., cf. *lòш* – *лóше*, *Hòв* – nom. pl. m. *нóви* – nom. dual n. *нóва* (cf. def. *Hòви*), etc. However, one thing is interesting in Križanić's dialect. According to the Russian accentological school,<sup>59</sup> the reflex of the old acute (´ in Križanić's texts) and the old short neo-acute (˘ in Križanić's texts) is different in monosyllabic words in prepausal position. Cf. the words *брáм* 'brother', *мрáz* 'frost', *бúч* 'whip', *рáj* 'heaven', *птíиц* 'bird', *хлíб* 'bread', *цáр* 'emperor', etc. (all from the old acute, a.p. *a*) but *сàн* 'dream', *крòв* 'roof', *вòл* 'ox', *сòм* 'catfish', *дòждь* 'rain', *кòнь* 'horse', *кòш* 'basket', etc. (all from the old short neo-acute, a.p. *b*). This distinction is neutralized in non-prepausal positions and in polysyllabic words, cf. both *jezíк* and *jezik* 'language, tongue'. The distinction is seen in adjectives as well, albeit with much more vacillation than in nouns. Cf. *dólg* 'long', *mál*, *sláb*, *Стáр*, *zdráw* (but *Кньáст* 'lame' and *Нíишц* / *Нíишц*) vs. *зòл* 'evil', *лòш*, *Hòв*, *Хрòм*, *Тòишц* (with variants with ´: *zól*, *chróm*),<sup>60</sup> *Тóишц*, while *Скóр* is written with ´ only).

Alternatively, this distinction might be explained as graphic only, but the exact distribution of the accent marks is hard to explain in this way. The other possibility would be that these signs were intended to point to different accentual patterns in other forms, for instance the distinction of

<sup>59</sup> Дыбо 1968, 221; Osion 2011.

<sup>60</sup> This adjective seems to belong to a synchronic a.p. B (cf. nom. pl. m. *Хромѹ*, gen. pl. *chromich*).

конѧ and брѧма. This suggestion might work for nouns but not so much for adjectives since there the old short vowel a.p. *b* has the same immobile root stress as the original a.p. *a*, cf. *nówo* = *Cmápo*. However, the variants of ' / ` (зòл / зóл) that exist in almost all of the old short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives and in some old a.p. *a* ones might be significant. This could point to the relation of these graphic signs with the type of accentual paradigmatic patterns even if these signs indeed represent different phonetic tones with different historical background.<sup>61</sup> The third option would be that these are just some sort of allotones on different vowels since the old acute and old short neo-acute do not usually appear on the same vowels. However, words like *càh* and *бpám* speak against such a suggestion (even though such words are expectedly rare).

In any case, it seems reasonable to assume that the original distinction of the acute and the short neo-acute could be maintained in monosyllabic nouns in prepausal positions in Križanić's texts (of course, this would point to the fact that such a distinction had previously existed in other positions as well). However, this is problematic when one considers the interpretation of the obvious fact that the original short vowel a.p. *b* shifts to a.p. *A* in all Štok/Čak. dialects (and apparently in Križanić's dialect as well). Such a shift (although unusual by itself considering it was quite early) can hardly be explained if we take into account Križanić's data where the equation of *čĭst* = *nōv*, unlike elsewhere, does not hold true. Perhaps this could be explained by the fact that the old acute and old short neo-acute have functioned in some sort of complementary distribution since the Proto- or Common Slavic period. The old acute was present on long vowels only and the short neo-acute on short vowels only. Thus, the short neo-acute (or some other prosodeme with the same reflex in later dialects) functioned as a sort of 'replacement' of the old acute on short vowels. We see this in prefixal derivatives like \*sqšědъ 'neighbor' – they had the old acute if the root was long but the short neo-acute (or some sort of tone that has the same

<sup>61</sup> One could perhaps assume that Križanić found it easier to distinguish ' from ` if there was a distinction in other forms as well. Križanić might have understood the connection of ' with constant root stress and the connection of ` with the post-stem stress, even if these tones were indeed different in pronunciation. This may also point to a gradual disappearance of this distinction in Križanić's dialect.

reflex) if the root was short, for instance in \*potòkъ ‘brook’. Therefore, it is perhaps not too strange that the phonetic distinction of *čist* and *nov* could be preserved even if these two phonetic realizations (that usually appeared on different vowels in any case) were functionally the same prosodeme. In that case, the analogy to \*čist – \*čista – \*čisto may have caused the appearance of the innovative \*nōva – \*nōvo instead of the older \*novā – \*novò in spite of the fact that \*nōv was phonetically different from \*čist. Besides, one should point out that the accent of the old a.p. *a* and short vowel a.p. *b* was the same in the def. forms (see below), which may have had some influence.

Cf. in Slovene:

*sīt – sīta – sīto – def. sīti*

Slovene is different from Kajkavian in that it has the neo-circumflex in most adjectives in the indef. nom. sg. f. (due to the same kind of logic that causes the neo-circumflex to appear in some *ā*-stems derivatives and in feminine participle forms) and not just in def. forms. Cf. *bogat* (< \*bogāt) – *bogāta* – *bogāto* for polysyllabic adjectives. However, there is no change in some adjectives, cf. the indef. *stāra*, *rāda*, *čista* (also *sīva*, which is a.p. *b* originally).<sup>62</sup> Unlike Štok. and Čak., the adjectives of the type of *nōv* and *hrōm* (the old short vowel a.p. *b*) remain in a.p. B, i.e. there is no merger with a.p. A – *nōva* but *sīta*.

**a.p. A:**<sup>63</sup> *br'ed* with young (of animals), *c'ič*,<sup>64</sup> *č'il* astir, *č'ist* clean (cf. the Stand. Croat. verb *čistiti* clean),<sup>65</sup> *d'ug* long, *h'rl* eager (> B:, cf. *h'rliti* rush joyfully), *hr'om* lame (< \*B), *'istī* same (> *istī* C, cf. *īstina* truth), *klj'ast* game, lame, *k'rt* crisp, *l'ak* easy, light (PSl. *b*, originally an \*-ъкъ adj., dial. *lagak*), *l'oš* bad (< \*B), *m'al* small (> B:, def. B:, cf. the adverbs

<sup>62</sup> Breznik 1924, 94; Stankiewicz 1993, 65.

<sup>63</sup> The words in word-lists are written in some sort of (Štok.) ‘prototype’ forms, with *ě* for different reflexes of the *yat* and with non-vocalized final *-l*, thus *směl* and not *smio*, etc.

<sup>64</sup> Usually only in the phrase *čičā zīma* ‘freezing cold’ but cf. also Baotić 1979, 196.

<sup>65</sup> In the brackets, we give cognate words (in their Standard Croatian form) to show if a certain adjective belongs to the original a.p. *a* (with cognate words having constant “) or not.

*mălo* ‘little, bit’ – *zămalo* ‘almost’, *m’ek* soft (also C:, PSI. *c*, originally an \*-ѣкъ adj., dial. *mekak*), *m’il* pleasant (cf. *militi se* feel like doing something), *mn’ogī* many (cf. *mnòžiti* multiply), *m’rk* glum, *n’ov* new (< \*B, cf. *obnòviti* renew), *pl’ah* timid (> C:, cf. *plăšiti* scare), *pr’av* real (def. B:, cf. *prăvo* right, *pòpraviti* fix), *pr’ost* rude, simple (< \*B, also C, PSI. *b*),<sup>66</sup> *p’rvī* first (> C, B:), *p’un* full (cf. *pùniti* fill), *r’ad* glad (cf. *rădo* gladly, *rădovati* rejoice), *r’an* early (> C:, def. B:, cf. *răno* early, *răniti* be early), *r’iđ* red haired (also C:), *r’us* red haired (also C:), *s’it* satiated (cf. *nàsiti se* satiate), *skl’on* apt (< \*B, cf. *sklòniti* put away), *sk’or* soon to be, recent (< \*B, cf. *skòro* soon, recently), *sl’ab* weak (cf. *slăbjeti* grow weak), *sm’ed* brown (< \*B, > B:), *sm’ěl* bold (cf. *smjèti* may), *sn’en* sleepy, *sp’or* slow (< \*B, cf. *uspòriti* slow down),<sup>67</sup> *st’ar* old (def. B:, cf. *stărjeti* grow old), *st’rm* stipe, *str’og* strict (< \*B, cf. *postròžiti* stricken), *sv’ěž* fresh (a loanword from Czech, cf. *òsvježiti* freshen up), *šk’rt* stingy (C: in Posavina),<sup>68</sup> *t’ašt* vane (< \*B), *t’ih* silent (> B:/C:),<sup>69</sup> *tr’om* inert (< \*B), *tr’ul* rotten (cf. *trùliti* rotten), *ub’og* poor (> ‘ubog), *v’ěšt* accomplished (cf. *vjěštica* witch), *v’it* slim, *vr’el* hot (for water) (cf. *vrèti*), *v’rl* brave, *zdr’av* healthy (def. A > B:, cf. *òzdraviti* get well / healthy), *zn’an* known (> B:/C:), *zr’el*<sup>70</sup> ripe (cf. *zrèti*), *ž’uk* bitter (originally an \*-ѣкъ adj., cf. the variant *žuhak*)

Note: etymologically, the old a.p. *a* and the old short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives are easy to distinguish since the latter always have one of the old short vowels in the root (\*e, \*o, \*ь or \*ъ), while the former have old long vowels (all other ones).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Дыбо 2000, 217 and Slv. *pròst* – *prósta* for a.p. *b*.

<sup>67</sup> Since this is a prefixal derivation, one could expect also \*сърòгъ – \*сърòра – \*сърòро with the constant a.p. *a* stress already in PSI. but examples like *uspòriti* point to a.p. *b* (thus \*сърòгъ – \*сърòра – \*сърòро).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. for instance Sikerevci, Brodski Stupnik, Budrovci and Slobodnica *škřt*.

<sup>69</sup> The length is probably always due to forms like *tīj* with the new -j, with a lengthening in front of -j (which is a regular phonetic rule in many dialects).

<sup>70</sup> The adjectives *tròm*, *smò*, *vrèò*, *zrèò* are originally participles of the verbs *triti* ‘crush’, *smjèti* ‘may’, *vrèti* ‘boil’, *zrèti* ‘ripen’.

2. a.p. *b*

## PROTO-SLAVIC

## short vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m       | f     | n     |
|---------|-------|-------|
| *gòlъ   | *golà | *golò |
| ‘naked’ |       |       |

## definite adjectives

| m       | f       | n       |
|---------|---------|---------|
| *gòlъjъ | *gòlaja | *gòloje |

## long vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m        | f      | n      |
|----------|--------|--------|
| *žǫltъ   | *žǫltà | *žǫltò |
| ‘yellow’ |        |        |

## definite adjectives

| m        | f        | n        |
|----------|----------|----------|
| *žǫltъjъ | *žǫltaja | *žǫltoje |

The accentual pattern of the indef. a.p. *b* adj. in PSI. is simple. The stress is always on the syllable immediately following the stem (\*golà, \*golò), except in the cases where final *yers* cannot be stressed (\*gòlъ), i.e. the situation is the same as in nouns (\*snòrъ ‘bundle’, gen. sg. \*snopà, dat. sg. \*snopù). Long forms are more problematic – all Slavic languages point to the neo-acute on the stem: \*gòlъjъ, \*žǫltъjъ (Croat. *gòlī*, dial. *žūtī*). However, what is not clear is the origin of the neo-acute in this position. There are two possibilities – retraction by Ivšić’s Law (i.e. the retraction of the stress after the operation of Dybo’s Law) or the absence of Dybo’s Law. The supposed retraction by Ivšić’s (Stang’s) Law is often attributed to the contraction of the ending (\*-ъjъ, \*-ǫja, \*-òje) after Dybo’s Law, which would have caused the appearance of the non-initial falling accent (\*-ȳ, \*-â, \*-ô). This accent would have then retracted to the preceding syllable as a neo-acute (the same as in \*pȳtǫjete ‘you are asking’ > \*pȳtâte > Croat. dial. *pītāte*).<sup>71</sup> However, there are a number of problems with this explanation (Kapović 2005b, 34; Langston 2006, 270f). Firstly, the neo-acute on the stem is Pan-Slavic, which means that this pattern must be quite an early development. However, vowel contractions are anything but early and Pan-Slavic. The vowel contraction is a rather late development in Slavic, it is often absent in East Slavic and in other Slavic languages it occurs in various

<sup>71</sup> For such an explanation, cf. Stang 1957, 101–102.



ways and to various extent (cf. e.g. Croat. *bòjati se* ‘be afraid’ but Czech/Slv. *báti se*).<sup>72</sup> To set the said theory into the realm of impossibilities even more, in Russian the nom/acc. sg/pl. endings are not contracted even today, cf. Russian nom/acc. sg. m. *бѣлый* ‘white’, nom. sg. f. *бѣлая*, acc. sg. f. *бѣлую*, nom/acc. sg. n. *бѣлое*, nom/acc. pl. *бѣлые*. What is more, in Old Russian the contraction was not complete even in oblique cases. The late date of the contraction in def. adj. forms is clear from its results as well, which are different in various languages / dialects, cf. OCS *-ajego* / *-aago* / *-ago*, Croat. *-ōg(a)* (with the vocalism by analogy to the pronominal *-oga* < \*-ogo as in \*togo ‘of that’), Czech *-ého* (with a new long *-ě-* and not a *yat*), Polish *-ego*, etc. From what has been said, it is clear that no contraction of any kind can explain the accent of the def. a.p. *b* adj. forms<sup>73</sup> even if no other explanation is at hand.

Compared to a.p. *c*, the number of suffixless a.p. *b* adjectives is quite small. This is still a trait of a.p. B in those Croatian dialects that maintain the original B/C opposition.

Cf. in Russian:

*бел* – *белá* – *бѣлó* (def. *бѣлый*)

Only a few monosyllabic (suffixless) adjectives remain in a.p. B in Russian. Some of the synchronic a.p. B adjectives are historically secondary (like *стар*), while many show a variant shift to a.p. C (cf. the above-mentioned older *белó* and younger *бѣло* and *белы* / *бѣлы* in pl.).<sup>74</sup>

<sup>72</sup> For the contraction in Slavic, cf. for instance Marvan 2000.

<sup>73</sup> This, however, does not bother Kortlandt (2005, 127) for some reason, who explains the neo-acute on the root via contraction and retraction while completely disregarding previously mentioned obvious facts concerning those processes. Still, one must note that, if the said contraction were Proto-Slavic, since this is a.p. *b*, the stress would be on the first post-stem syllable in all forms, which would yield a new falling tone in all forms after the contraction. In this case, Ivšić’s law could easily explain the root stress of a.p. *b* def. forms, while the final stress of the def. a.p. *c* forms could be explained as due to the existence of both the new circumflex and new neo-acute in the endings in post-contraction times (see below), which would be an obstacle for the consistent retraction of the accent (since the neo-acute does not retract, unlike the neo-circumflex, – the latter could remain on the ending by analogy to the former). However, the problem is that def. a.p. *b* forms have root stress even in East Slavic, where there was no contraction.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. for instance Stankiewicz 1993, 202.

## ŠTOKAVIAN

## short vowel

## indefinite adjectives

|                            |             |             |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>m</b>                   | <b>f</b>    | <b>n</b>    |
| <i>gô(l)</i> <sup>75</sup> | <i>gòla</i> | <i>gòlo</i> |

## definite adjectives

|                    |                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>m</b>           | <b>f</b>           | <b>n</b>           |
| <i>gòlī (gòlī)</i> | <i>gòlā (gòlā)</i> | <i>gòlō (gòlō)</i> |

## long vowel

## indefinite adjectives

|            |             |             |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>m</b>   | <b>f</b>    | <b>n</b>    |
| <i>žūt</i> | <i>žúta</i> | <i>žúto</i> |

## definite adjectives

|             |             |             |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>m</b>    | <b>f</b>    | <b>n</b>    |
| <i>žūtī</i> | <i>žūtā</i> | <i>žūtō</i> |

As already said, the a.p. B group of adjectives is quite small in those Western Štok. dialects that still preserve a distinct a.p. C. Beside the adjectives with def. forms only (like *òpčī* ‘general’)<sup>76</sup> and participles like *vrūč* ‘hot’, the a.p. B group is made-up practically only of long vowel (i.e. a.p. B:) adjectives meaning color (like *cřn* ‘black’). The reason for this is that in Štok. (and Čak.) almost all old short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives have shifted to a.p. A, as we have seen: thus, *nòv* – *nòva* – *nòvo* = *čřst* – *čřsta* – *čřsto*. These adjectives can again shift to a.p. B but together with the original a.p. *a* adjectives, *nòv* – *nòva* – *nòvo* = *čřst* – *čřsta* – *čřsto*. The motivation for this was obviously the same accent in nom. sg. m. (*nòv* = *čřst* < \**nòvъ*, \**čřstъ*, however see above for Križanić) as well as the same accent in the def. forms (*nòvī* = *čřstī* < \**nòvъjъ*, \**čřstъjъ*) – this seems to be an old development. The only short vowel a.p. *b* monosyllabic adj. that has avoided the shift to a.p. A *gô(l)*, which is regularly a.p. B in Štok. (*gòla*, *gòlo*), similarly to the semantically close *bôs* ‘barefoot’ which is the only monosyllabic short vowel a.p. C adj.<sup>77</sup> (in *-an* adjectives, the word *bolan* ‘painful’ represents such an exception). The adj. *zào* ‘evil’ has remained in a.p. B as well, but

<sup>75</sup> As already mentioned, the length is due to the process *gòl* > \**gòo* (vocalization of final *-l*) > *gô* (contraction) > *gòl* (analogical reintroduction of final *-l* in some dialects). The older form / accent *gòl* (beside the younger variant *gô*) is preserved in the dialect of Vidonje in Neretvanska Krajina (Vidović 2009, 292).

<sup>76</sup> Such examples can also be a.p. A synchronically if one looks at adjectives alone but other forms can point to a.p. B (cf. *poòpčiti* ‘generalize’).

<sup>77</sup> Cf. in Dubrovnik: *gô* – *gòla* – *gòlo* but *bôs* – *bòsa* – *bòso* (Rešetar 1900, 113).

here the shift to a.p. A was not possible because of the specific stem type that has mobile *a* (i.e. the reflex of the *yer*), which is the reason why this adjective preserves end stress (*zlă*, *zlö*) even in Neo-Štokavian. Of course, in the dialects where the original a.p. C adjectives have shifted to a.p. B (and a.p. C is no more), a.p. B is much larger (there, one finds adjectives like *mlâd* – *mlâda* – *mlâdo* ‘young’ and *bôs* – *bôsa* – *bôso* in a.p. B). The preservation of a.p. C is typical for the Western Štokavian dialects (this is an isogloss connecting Western Štokavian to Čakavian), while a.p. C is not present in the Eastern Štokavian dialects.

In a.p. B def. forms, one usually finds “ / ~ (i.e. “ / ^ in Neo-Štok.). However, in short vowel adj. the secondary ` also appears, for instance the innovative *gòlī* instead of the older *gölī* (as already said, *gol* is the only monosyllabic adjective in a.p. B, but a.p. B appears in adjectives with other suffixes as well and the original def. pattern is the same there). This is a case of a mixture with the old a.p. C forms and / or the influence of indef. forms. Since the original desinential stress in a.p. C is quite rare (*bôsī* being the only real short vowel monosyllabic adjective and the type *dràgī* ‘dear’ being frequently lost), it is much more probable that secondary forms like the def. *gòlā* – *gòlō* instead of the older *gölā* – *gölō* are due to analogy to the indef. forms *gòla* – *gòlo* and not to analogy to original a.p. C forms like *bòsā* – *bòsō* or *dràgā* – *dràgō*. See above for a similar problem with the secondary accent of a.p. A def. forms.

Ivšić (1913 2, 42, 44, 49) gives the following indef. adjectives for the Posavian a.p. B: *gôl*<sup>78</sup>, *vrûc*, *jāk* ‘strong’ (in some dial.), *bīl* ‘white’, *cīl* ‘whole’, *gñīl* ‘rotten’, *mlāk* ‘lukewarm’, *žūt*, *cñn*, and the following def. ones: *gölī*, *cñnī*, *bīlī*, *vrûcī*. Baotić (1979, 198) gives the following a.p. B adj. for Kostrč: *blīd* ‘pale’, *cīl*, *cñn*, *fīn* ‘fine’ (a loanword), *gñīl*, *māl* (secondarily in a.p. B), *plāv* ‘blue’, *sīv* ‘grey’, *strān* ‘foreign’, *vrān* ‘black’ (see below), *žūt*, while *vrûc*, *jāk* and *mlāk*<sup>79</sup> are in a.p. C. From the short vowels adj., there is only *gô* (*gòla*, *gòlo*). In the def. forms, he gives *bīlī*, *gölī*, etc. In Šaptinovac, according to Ivšić (1907, 140), a.p. B in monosyllabic

<sup>78</sup> The circumflex in *gôl* is due to the pre-resonant lengthening (from the older \*göl).

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Ivšić’s *mlāk* and my data where *mlāk* is a.p. B: in Budrovci and a.p. C: (*mlāk*) in Slobodnica.

(suffixless) adjectives is absent, with all adjectives shifting to a.p. C (cf. there *cŕn* – *cŕna* – *cŕno*).

My data from Posavina (from the villages of Sikerevci, Orubica, Kobaš, Babina Greda, Slobodnica, Budrovci) show the following for a.p. B. As in Ivšić's description, the adjectives meaning colors – *bīl*, *cŕn*, *plāv*, *žūt* – are a.p. B everywhere. In the same semantic group, there is also *sīv* in Orubica, Kobaš, Budrovci and Slobodnica (cf. also Kostrč above) but *sīv* (C:) in Sikerevci and Babina Greda<sup>80</sup> (in Babina Greda, Budrovci and Slobodnica, *sīd* 'grey-haired' remains in a.p. C: as well). An a.p. C > B shift is seen in *vrān* as well (attested as B in Sikerevci and Babina Greda, cf. a.p. B in Neretvanska krajina and Kostrč). The adj. *blīd* has also shifted to a.p. B: in all dialects in Posavina<sup>81</sup> (the same in Ivšić and Baotić, as well as in Imotska and Vrgorska krajina and Dubrovnik but not in Neretvanska krajina). This is a case of a Štokavian innovation (cf. Czech *bledý* for the original a.p. *c*), the same as *jāk* (in Sikerevci and Budrovci, the same in Ivšić, B also in Vrgorska krajina and Dubrovnik but not in Kostrč and Neretvanska krajina), cf. Czech *jaký* for the original a.p. *c*. Such a Štokavian innovation is seen in the adj. *cil* as well (I have *cilo* attested for Orubica,<sup>82</sup> cf. Czech *celý* for the original a.p. *c*) – in Posavina, the problem is that today mostly just the def. form *cīlŕ* is used. In Sikerevci and Kobaš, an a.p. C > B shift is seen in the adj. *blāg* 'mild' (cf. also B in Prapatnice below but Czech *blahý* for the original a.p. *c*). For paradigmatic shifts in adjectives in general, see below. The short vowel stem *gōl* remains a.p. B everywhere in Posavina and *vrūc* has shifted to a.p. C in all mentioned dialects in my data, which is in accord with Baotić's data but not with Ivšić's. As in Kostrč, the adj. *māl* is a.p. B: in all mentioned dialects (the original a.p. A is seen in the adverb *mālo*). The neo-acute in the indef. form is taken from the frequent def. form *mālŕ* – secondary forms *mālă* / *māla* and *mālō* / *málo* (B) are results of analogy to *māl*.

<sup>80</sup> Originally a.p. *a* (see below). A.p. C: is due to analogy to the form *sīv*, which is the expected reflex of \*sīvъ with a pre-resonant lengthening. The form *sīv* (B:) is due to analogy to other adjectives meaning colors.

<sup>81</sup> The adj. *grīl* can also be a.p. B: in Posavina (thus in Slobodnica and Budrovci for instance). Cf. also a.p. B: in Prapatnice as well.

<sup>82</sup> It is interesting that the def. form *cjēlŕ* is common in Neo-Štokavian Slavonia, with the accent probably due to analogy to the a.p. B indef. form.

In Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina, my data), a.p. B: is found in the usual adjectives: *cŕn* (gen. sg. *cŕna*, dat. sg. *cŕnu*) – *cŕna* – *cŕno* – nom. pl. m. *cŕni* – def. *cŕnī*, the same in *bija* (*bila* – *bilo*) ‘white’, *rīđ*, *sīd*, *sīv*, *vrūc* (gen. sg. *vrūca* – nom. sg. f. *vrūca* – nom. sg. n. *vrūco*), *žūt*. The adj. *cīl* (gen. sg. *cila*, dat. sg. *cīlu*) is also in a.p. B, as well as the short vowel adj. *gō* (gen. sg. *gōla*) – *gōla* – *gōlo* – nom. pl. m. *gōli* – def. *gōlō* (gen. sg. m. *gōlōga*). Other adjectives that belong to this a.p. are *blīd* (cf. Posavina *blīd*), *blāg*, *gñīl*, *jāk* (cf. the adverb *jāko*),<sup>83</sup> *mlād* (with traces of the original a.p. C, see below), *mlāk*, *vlāš* (*vlāša* – *vlāšo*) ‘soft’ (cf. a.p. B: for this adjective in Imotska krajina as well). As we see, a.p. B mainly consists of adjectives meaning color (but not of *vrān*, which is C). Besides these adjectives, *pūn*, *vrīja* ‘hot’ and *zrīja* ‘ripe’ shift to a.p. B from a.p. A and adjectives like *blīd*, *blāg*, *jāk*, etc. are also in a.p. B, as usual in (at least some) Štok. dialects (see the a.p. C list below). All of these adjectives are in opposition to the preserved a.p. C pattern one finds in cases like nom. pl. m. *bŕzi* ‘quick’, *čvrsti* ‘hard’, *drāgi* ‘dear’, *glūvi* ‘deaf’, *sūvi* ‘dry’, etc. (see below).

For Imotski and Bekija, Šimundić (1971, 130–131) gives a simple a.p. B for *vrūc* – *vrūca* – *vrūce* only. The mixed a.p. B/C consists of *blīd* – *blīda* – *blīdo* / *blīdo*, *cil* / *cijo*, *gñīl* / *ñijo*, *jak*, *mlad*, *sid*, *vlaš*, *žut*. For the adjectives *blāg*, *jāk*, *plāv* and *rīđ* Šimundić gives the pattern of *blāga* / *blāga* – *blāgo* / *blāgo* (B/C), with variant accent even in nom. sg. f. form. This mixed B/C type is in accord with a.p. B: in Vrgorska krajina in these very adjectives.<sup>84</sup> In spite of the fact that all a.p. B adjectives have a.p. C variants, the distinction of the original a.p. B and a.p. C is well preserved since a.p. C always has the pattern of *līp* – *līpa* – *līpo* with no variants. In this dialect, there is no B : C but B/C : C opposition, because of the influence of a.p. C on the original a.p. B.

In Vidonje and Dobranje in Neretvanska krajina,<sup>85</sup> a.p. B, among other adjectives, includes: *bījēl*, *cŕn*, *sīv*, *žūt*, *cō* / *cījēl* (but a.p. C when used with the word *vino* ‘wine’), *sījēd*, *vrūc*, *vrān*, *bŕz*, *čvrst* (the last three secondarily), while *blījēd*, *blāg*, *lījēn*, *sām*, *gōl* / *gō* / *gōl*, *jāk*, *gñīl* are in a.p. C.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. the adverb *jāko* in Dubrovnik as well (Rešetar 1900, 135).

<sup>84</sup> Interesting correspondences like these are just hinted at here. There has been no accentological dialect geography research in Croatia.

<sup>85</sup> Domagoj Vidović (p.c.).

In Dubrovnik (Rešetar 1900, 114), cf. a.p. B: *vrûć* – *vrûća* – *vrûće*, pl. *vrûći* – *vrûće* – *vrûća*, the same in *žut*, *jak*, *mlak*, *tuđ*, *crn*, *skur* (an Italian loanword – a.p. B because of the color semantics), *bïo* (*bijèla* – *bijèlo*), *bljijed* and *gñio*.

In Molise (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), the only remnant of a.p. B is the adverb *vrûčo*, while all other a.p. *b* adj. shift to a.p. C: *gòl* (*gòjâ*) – *gòla* (gen. sg. m. *gòla*, f. *góle*), *cřn* – *cřna* – *cřno* (the same in *žût*).<sup>86</sup> The adj. *sîv* has generalized *ˆ* in all forms. The complete disappearance of a.p. B is the result of the same tendency that is often seen in Čakavian.

All indef. oblique forms (both old preserved PSI. indef. forms and new ones with def. endings, see below) have the rising accent (end stress in Old Štok.), while def. forms have the stem stress: indef. dat. sg. f. *žútōj* – def. dat. sg. f. *žútōj*, indef. instr. sg. m/n. *žútīm* – def. instr. sg. m/n. *žútīm*, etc. The original opposition of the indef. gen. sg. m/n. *žúta* – def. gen. sg. m/n. *žútōg(a)* can be replaced by the innovative indef. gen. sg. m/n. *žútōg(a)* – def. gen. sg. m/n. *žútōg(a)*. More on this below in the a.p. C part.

ČAKAVIAN (*gòl* – **Senj**,<sup>87</sup> *bïl* – **Vrgada**)<sup>88</sup>

#### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

|            |             |             |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>m</b>   | <b>f</b>    | <b>n</b>    |
| <i>gòl</i> | <i>golă</i> | <i>golò</i> |

##### definite adjectives

|                           |             |             |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>m</b>                  | <b>f</b>    | <b>n</b>    |
| <i>gòli</i> <sup>89</sup> | <i>gòla</i> | <i>gòlo</i> |

#### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

|              |             |          |
|--------------|-------------|----------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>    | <b>n</b> |
| <i>bï(l)</i> | <i>bïlă</i> |          |

##### definite adjectives

|             |             |                         |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| <b>m</b>    | <b>f</b>    | <b>n</b>                |
| <i>bïlò</i> | <i>bïlī</i> | <i>bïl<sup>o</sup>ā</i> |

Concerning the suffixless monosyllabic adjectives, a.p. B is far worse preserved in Čakavian than in Štokavian. In all Čakavian dialects, at least some of the original a.p. *b* adjectives shift to a.p. C and, in some of the

<sup>86</sup> Cf. def. *žûti* with a typical Molisean shortening in gen. sg. *žûtoga*. Cf. also *sîvi* – gen. sg. *sîvoga*.

<sup>87</sup> Moguš 1966, 77.

<sup>88</sup> Jurišić 1973.

<sup>89</sup> Instead of the expected \**gòli* by analogy to *gòl*, where the neo-acute is due to pre-resonant lengthening, and by analogy to other (long vowel) adjectives.

dialects, this occurs in all or almost all of the adjectives. On the other hand, most Čak. dialects preserve at least a few adjectives of the original a.p. B. The shift to a.p. C is not strange since the number of a.p. C adjectives was much greater to begin with.

One should also note that in Čak., unlike Neo-Štok., *žūt* is usually different from *drâg*, but this does not obstruct the a.p. B: > C: shift. The pivotal point for the B > C shift is probably constituted by feminine forms like *žūtà* = *drāgà*, as well as by the def. forms where the original a.p. *b* pattern was generalized in Čak. (*žūtī* = *drāgī*). As in Štokavian, *gol* is an exception since it maintains its a.p. B in some dialects, unlike all other short vowel suffixless a.p. *b* adjectives, which have merged with the original a.p. *a* adjectives (see above).<sup>90</sup>

On Hvar, Hraste (1935, 32) attests only a.p. C: u *žūt* – *žūtà* – *žūto* (def. *žūti*), *gōl* – *golà* – *gòlo* (def. *gòli*). However, there are some remnants of a.p. B: even there. Cf. the *čōran* – *čōrnà* – *čōrnò* ‘black’ in ČDL (this is obviously a Hvar form, cf. the Brač *čr̃n* and the Vrboska form below) and the transitional a.p. B:-C: form from Pitve (my data): nom. sg. n. *žūtò* – nom. pl. *žūti* (B:) but *žūt* – nom. pl. f. *žūte* (C:) (and nom. pl. n. *žūtà* that can be both B and C). The preservation of the original a.p. B: is seen in Vrboska as well (Matković 2004): *bīl* – *bīlā* – *bīlò*, *čōran* – *čōrnà* – *čōrnò* (B:) but *žūt* – *žūtà* – *žūto* and *gūol* – *golā* – *gòlo* with the shift to a.p. C:.

Cf. the Brač forms (Šimunović 2009, 44): *žūt*, *vrûc*, *bīl* (def. *bīli*), *čr̃n*, *sīv* (all a.p. C) but *gōl* – *golà* – *golò* (def. *gòli*) and, of course, *zōl* (*zlà*, *zlò*) remaining in a.p. B.

The Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 82) adjectives *vrûc*, *žūt* (and *sîd*)<sup>91</sup> belong to a.p. C but *gō* – *golā* – *golò* (def. *golī* with the secondary accent), *bī* – *bīlā* – *bīlò* (def. *bīlī*), *cr̃n* – *cr̃nà* – *cr̃nò* (def. *cr̃nī*) remain in a.p. B.

The case of the dialect of Okruk on the island of Čiovo<sup>92</sup> is very interesting. In this dialect, the distinction of the old a.p. B: and a.p. C: is

<sup>90</sup> That the adj. *gol* is a special case in Čak. as well is seen even in cases where a.p. B is not preserved, because then *gol* shifts to a.p. C (like all other a.p. *b* adjectives in Čak.), i.e. it does not merge with the old a.p. *a* like *nov* and the other old short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives.

<sup>91</sup> The adj. *sijed* is originally a.p. *c* (see below) but we list it here since it is often a.p. B: in Štokavian.

<sup>92</sup> Data by Ante Jurić.

well preserved, as in some Western Štok. dialects, but the influence of a.p. C is present nevertheless. Cf. for a.p. B the pattern *bîl* – *bîla* – *bîlo* (< \**bîlā*, \**bîlō* by a regular phonetic retraction) and the same for *žût*, *cîŋ*, *vrûć*, *sîv*, *sîd* and *lîp* (which shifted to B from the old C). Opposed to this pattern, we see the a.p. C pattern in adjectives like *drâg* – *drâga* (< \**drāgā*) – *drâgo* (the same in *mlâd*, *blîd*, *jût*, etc.). The distinction is preserved in neuter forms only, but it is nonetheless stable. The circumflex in the nom. sg. m. is apparently the result of the influence of a.p. C,<sup>93</sup> present here, as elsewhere in Čakavian, but in Okruk only nom. sg. m. form merged with a.p. C, while neuter forms (and thus the whole pattern) remained distinct. This is a unique case in our Čak. data presented here. This preservation of a.p. B: can be seen as an isogloss connecting this dialect with Western Štok., and the same goes for the fact that the adj. *sîv* and *sîd* belong to a.p. B:, which is also a typical Štok. feature. This is just one of the instances pointing to a Štok.-Čak. dialectal continuum.

In the dialect of Filipjakov,<sup>94</sup> a.p. B: is completely gone. Cf. *bîl* – *bîla* – *bîlo* (˘ is generalized in a.p. C as well, see below), the same in *cîŋ*, *žût* (and *sîd*). Even the adj. *gol* has shifted to a.p. C: *gôl* / *gôja* – *gôla* / *gôlā* – *gôlo* (the latter by analogy to *bôs*, see below, and by generalization of length).

In Preko on the island of Ugljan,<sup>95</sup> all adjectives have shifted to a.p. C as in the near-by Filipjakov: *bîl* – *bîela* – *bîelo*, the same in *vrûć*, *žût* (and *sîd*; in *cîŋ* – *cîna* – *cîno* the syllabic *r* is shortened). Cf. also *guô* – *gôla* – *gôlo* (by analogy to *buôs*, see below).

On Rab (Kušar 1894, 33–34), the adj. *bêl*, *vrûć*, *žût* (and *sêd*) are in a.p. C, but *gôl* – *golā* – *golō* – pl. *golî* – *golě* remains in a.p. B (*bôs* has shifted to a.p. B by analogy, but in the def. form we have *golî* by analogy to the old def. form *bôs*).

In Senj (Moguš 1966), *bêl*, *vrûć*, *žût* (and *sîv*) are in a.p. C, but *gôl* and *cîŋ* remain a.p. B.

In Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 106), cf. the preservation of a.p. B in *gôl* – *golā* – *golō* (gen. sg. m. *golā*) as opposed to *bôs* – *bosā* – *bōso*

<sup>93</sup> It is important to note that the dialect preserves the distinction of the neo-acute and circumflex perfectly in all positions.

<sup>94</sup> Data by Nikola Vuletić.

<sup>95</sup> The forms recorded by Nikola Vuletić.



(C). In the long vowel group, a.p. B: is preserved in: *črn* / *črn* – *črnà* / *črnà* – *črnò* / *črnò* but not in *běl* – *bělà* – *bělo*, *žût* – *žûtà* – *žûto*. The adj. *sîv* belongs to a.p. C: (*sîvâ* – *sîvo*).

A.p. B is attested by *běl* – *bělò* (def. *bělŭ*) in Novi Vinodolski (Беличъ 1909, 185), for Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 120–121) cf. *belò* (def. *bělŭ*), *slân* – *slanà* – *slanò* (def. *slāni*), *gòl* (f. and n. are not attested), and in Orbaníci (Kalsbeek 1998, 145) *g<sup>u</sup>òl* – *golà* – *golò* (B) but *b'él*, *črn*, *žût* with a shift to a.p. C.

In Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 157–158), a.p. B is attested in the type *žût* – *žûtà* – *žûtò* – def. *žûti*. Here, one finds the adj. *běl* as well but also many old a.p. c adjectives (*sûh*, *glûh*, *lêp*, *lên* ‘lazy’, etc.), which is strange in Čak. The indef. gen. sg. m/n. *žûtà* has the alternative form *žûtega* (cf. the def. gen. sg. m/n. *žûtega*), while the indef. dat. sg. m/n. *žûtù* has the variant *žûtemù* (cf. the def. gen. sg. m/n. *žûtemu*). The end-stressed *-ogà* / *-egà* and *-omù* / *-emù* are found (in a.p. B and C) in Grobnik as well. See below for the discussion of these forms.

KAJKAVIAN (*gòl* – **Velika Rakovica**,<sup>96</sup> *žût* – **Prigorje**)<sup>97</sup>

#### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m          | f           | n           |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>gòl</i> | <i>golà</i> | <i>gòlo</i> |

##### definite adjectives

| m           | f           | n           |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>gòli</i> | <i>gòla</i> | <i>gòlo</i> |

#### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m          | f           | n           |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>žût</i> | <i>žûta</i> | <i>žûti</i> |

##### definite adjectives

| m | f | n |
|---|---|---|
|   |   |   |

(instead of *-o*)

The hegemony of a.p. C is typical for Kajkavian as well, even more radically than in Čakavian.<sup>98</sup> In most of modern Kajk. dialects, a.p. B is

<sup>96</sup> March 1981, 265.

<sup>97</sup> Rožić 1893–1894 2, 144.

<sup>98</sup> Generally speaking, the East (Eastern Štok.) is prone to a.p. B, while the West (Western Štok., Čak., Kajk.) is prone to a.p. C, with Western Štok. being more moderate and Kajk. and Čak. more ‘a.p. C radical’ since they are spoken farther to the west.

completely missing. A special reflex of a.p. B: is found only in Rožić's Prigorje dialect and the old A/B/C distinction is preserved in Križanić's language. One other characteristic of Kajkavian is the fact that, at least in part of it, there is no merger of the old a.p. *a* and the old short vowel a.p. *b*. This is an isogloss that connects (a part of) Kajkavian with Slovene and distinguishes it from Štokavian / Čakavian. More Kajkavian data is needed.

As already said, a.p. B is preserved in Rožić's (1983–1984 2, 143–144) description of the dialect of Prigorje. A.p. B is seen in long vowel adjectives like *žût* – *žúta* – n. *žúti*, cf. the same pattern in *bêl*, *čr̃n*, as well as in *plâv*, *sêd*, *sîv*<sup>99</sup> (with these three adj. in a.p. B, just like in Štokavian), while in *vrûc* – *vrúca* – *vrúce* / *vrúce* one finds a variant shift to a.p. C. As for the old a.p. *c*, some of the adjectives have completely shifted to a.p. B, *svêt* – *svéta* – n. *svéti*, while others vacillate, like *sûv* – *sûva* – *sûvo* / *sûvo* (B:/C:). But, not taking into account the adj. *vrûc* and the color adjectives, the vacillation is present in the original a.p. *c* only, while the original a.p. *b* adjectives have only ' in the neuter gender. Curiously, the adj. *gôl* has shifted to a.p. A (*gôla* – *gôlo*) in Prigorje.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 270), the shift to a.p. C is clear in long vowel stems: *bêl*, *žût*, *vrûc* (but *gorûc* – *gorúca* – *gorúce* in a.p. B), cf. also *plâf* 'blue', *rîc* 'red haired', *sîf* 'grey' in a.p. C. In short vowels stems, the shift to a.p. C' is present as well: cf. *gôl* – *gôla* – *gôlo* (def. *gôli* – with a typical Kajk. generalization of the long neo-acute in the short vowel a.p. B def. forms) and the same pattern in *lôjš* 'bad', *nôr* 'crazy' (this word is typical for Kajk.). The adj. *čr̃n* – *črna* – *črno* (def. *čr̃ni*) is also in a.p. C'. For the reflexes of the original a.p. *a* and the old short vowel a.p. *b* in Križanić's dialect, see above.

In V. Rakovica (March 1981, 265), all adjectives have shifted to a.p. C': *gôl*, *pröst*, *lôš*; *vrûc*, *žût*, *čr̃n* (cf. also *plâv*, *sîv*). The same is in Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305) – cf. long stem adjectives *čêrn*,<sup>100</sup> *bîel*, *žôut*, *vrôuc* and short stem ones *gêl* 'naked', *nêv* 'new'<sup>101</sup> (def. forms with the neo-acute).

<sup>99</sup> Mistakenly written as *sîv* in the article.

<sup>100</sup> Written as *čêrn* in the article, probably by mistake.

<sup>101</sup> It is interesting that these forms have *ˆ* (and not *˘*) in nom. sg. m. (thus, it is the real a.p. C and not a.p. C'). This is probably analogical to long stems (that have merged with short stems elsewhere in Bednja as well) and perhaps the def. forms.

As to the old short vowel a.p. *b*, the adjectives from Bednja are too few (only two – although they do point to different outcomes of the old a.p. *a* and the old short vowel a.p. *b*). As for V. Rakovica, the data shows the following. The original a.p. *a* adjectives (joined by *nõv*, see above) yield a.p. A, while the old short vowel a.p. *b* reflects as a.p. C' (i.e. a.p. C with no  $\hat{~}$  in nom. sg. m.). Despite the fact that there are only three a.p. C' adjectives derived from the original short vowel a.p. *b*, it is clear that there was no merger of the old short vowel a.p. *b* and the old a.p. *a* here (with the V. Rakovica a.p. C' being a result of the older unchanged short vowel a.p. B),<sup>102</sup> unlike in Štok/Čak. where the two groups merge into a.p. A (or the reflex of it).

In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), one finds the def. forms only: *běli*, *črni*, *žđti*, *sīvi* and *gōli* (with a secondary *o*), which show the typical Kajkavian  $\tilde{~}$  in the original short vowel stems as well (Ivšić 1936, 72).<sup>103</sup> Cf. also *nōvi*, *prōsti*, *nōri*. These forms, together with those from V. Rakovica, confirm that at least in part of Kajk. the old short vowel a.p. *b* did not merge with the old a.p. *a*, unlike in Štok/Čak.

Križanić's language preserves the old A/B/C distinction in short vowel stems: *mál* – *mála* – *málo* (A), *Гòл* – gen. sg. *зь голá* – nom. pl. *Голí*, etc. (B), *Bôc* – nom. pl. *bósi* (C). However, the distinction is gone in the def. forms in a typically Kajkavian manner: *máli*, *Гòлиъ*, *Bôciъ* (there is no distinction of  $\hat{~}$  and  $\tilde{~}$  in Križanić's texts). Cf. Ослон 2011, 110 for the def. form. In long vowel stems, the distinction between B: and C: is in recession, as it seems, although data is scarce for B: Cf. *свѣт* – *свѣтá* – *свѣто* for C:, while the originally a.p. *b* adjectives *Чѣрн* – *czernó* / *czêrno* and *Бѣл* – *belá* – *beló* / *bélo* (should be *\*bêlo*) – nom. pl. *bjelí* apparently show a vacillating B/C paradigm. Križanić's data obviously attests the beginning of the general tendency of a B: > C: shift in Kajkavian.

Cf. Slovene:

*bél* – *béla* – *bélo* / *belô* (def. *béli* / *bēli*)

<sup>102</sup> Had the adjectives *gōl*, *prōst*, *lōš* (*b*) already merged with old a.p. *a* adjectives like *sīt*, it would not have been possible for them to shift to a.p. C' secondarily, with the old a.p. *a* adjectives remaining in a.p. A.

<sup>103</sup> For a discussion on the phonetic development of Proto-Slavic *\*b̃* > Kajkavian  $\tilde{~}$ , see Kapović (forthcoming).

In Slovene, a.p. B is preserved in both short (like *nǫv*) and long vowel stems, but there is a variant a.p. C form in the neuter gender, while in def. forms a neo-circumflex can appear by analogy to a.p. A.

**a.p. B:** *běľ* 'white, *cṛn* 'black, *gol* 'naked, *jedīnī* only, *lē'vī* left, *mogūc'* (and *m'ogūc*) possible, *'opcī* general, *plāv* 'blue (PSl. *c*).<sup>104</sup> *sīnj* ' (marine) blue (PSl. *a*).<sup>105</sup> *sīv* 'grey (also C: < A,<sup>106</sup> PSl. *a*).<sup>107</sup> *vrūc'* hot (> C:), *zal*<sup>108</sup> evil, *žūt* 'yellow

Three most frequent Proto-Slavic long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives were color terms –\*běľь, \*čьrnъ and \*žьltъ. This is preserved in Croatian and has influenced other adjectives denoting color to shift to a.p. B:; since a.p. B: has become a salient marker of the adjectives used for color terms.<sup>109</sup> Thus, \*sīnъ and \*sīvъ shift to a.p. B: from a.p. *a*, while \*blēdъ, \*sēdъ and \*pōlvъ shift to a.p. B: from a.p. *c*. A.p. B: shift tendencies are not necessarily general and early (at least not in all of the adjectives),<sup>110</sup> since the original a.p. is preserved in some dialects (cf. *sīv*, *blijědo* and *sīdo* above). As part of this tendency, the adj. \*vōrnъ 'black' also shifted to a.p. B: in some dialects, and the adj. \*mīrkъ 'glum' shifted from a.p. A to a.p. B: in some dialects as well.

<sup>104</sup> For the PSl. a.p. *c* cf. a.p. C in Zaliznyak's data (Зализняк 1985, 138) and Czech / Slovak *plavý*. Lithuanian has both *palvas* and *pālvās*. Snoj (in his dictionary) claims that Slovene *plāv* – *plāva* (a.p. A) is a loanword from other Slavic languages.

<sup>105</sup> For the PSl. a.p. *a* cf. a.p. A in Zaliznyak's data (Зализняк 1985, 133) and Czech / Slovak *siný*.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. ARj for the form *sīv* in Žumberak.

<sup>107</sup> For PSl. \*sīvъ (a.p. *a*) cf. e.g. Slv. *sīv* – *síva*, Czech / Slovak *siný* and Lithuanian *šývas*.

<sup>108</sup> The adj. *zǎo* – *zlǎ* – *zlō*, because of its morphonological structure (mobile *a*, i.e. the reflex of the *yer* in the root) remains in a.p. B and preserves the end stress (the ending being the only syllable) even in dialects that have experienced retraction. Here, beside the expected def. form *zli* – *zlā* – *zlō* (with end stress, like in a.p. C, but again due to the specific structure of this word) the secondary def. form *zli* – *zlǎ* – *zlō* with the shortened ending is also attested in some dialects (probably by analogy to the indef. forms).

<sup>109</sup> At least in Štok., for Čak. and Kajk. it is difficult to say since a.p. B in suffixless adjectives is generally moribund or marginal there (but cf. above the Prigorje data for Kajk.).

<sup>110</sup> The exact territorial and dialectal extent of these changes is still to be examined in details.

## 3. a.p. c

## PROTO-SLAVIC

## short vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m                | f     | n     |
|------------------|-------|-------|
| *bǫsъ ‘barefoot’ | *bosá | *bǫso |

## definite adjectives

| m       | f       | n       |
|---------|---------|---------|
| *bosъjь | *bosǎja | *bosojě |

## long vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m           | f     | n     |
|-------------|-------|-------|
| *sûxъ ‘dry’ | *sûxá | *sûxo |

## definite adjectives

| m                      | f       | n       |
|------------------------|---------|---------|
| *suxъjь <sup>111</sup> | *suxǎja | *suxojě |

In PSl., the indef. forms of adj. were morphologically exactly the same as nouns of *o*-stems (masculine and neuter) and *ā*-stems (feminine). The accentual pattern was the same as well. Thus, \*bǫsъ and \*sûxъ have the same kind of accentual paradigm as e.g. \*bǫgъ ‘god’ and \*gǫrdъ ‘town’, \*bosá and \*sûxá as \*vodá ‘water’ and \*rǫká ‘arm’ (cf. e.g. acc. sg. \*bǫsǫ, \*sûxǫ) and \*bǫso, \*sûxo like \*zvǫno ‘bell’, \*zǫlto ‘gold’.

In def. adj., the stress was always on the last syllable or on the one before that. The exact position depended on the accentological properties of certain endings, i.e. on accentual valences. In indef. adjectives, like in nouns, some forms had absolute initial stress (if the ending had (–) valence), while others had end stress (if the ending was (+)). Thus, forms like \*bǫsъ, nom. sg. n. \*bǫso, gen. sg. m/n. \*bǫsa, dat. sg. m/n. \*bǫsu, dat. sg. f. \*bǫsě, acc. sg. f. \*bǫsǫ, etc. are stress-initial, but forms like gen. pl. \*bosъ, nom. sg. f. \*bosá, gen. sg. f. \*bosý, etc. have final accentuation. Definite adjective forms are made by adding the forms of the demonstrative pronoun \*jь, \*jǎ, \*jě (cf. Дыбо 1981, 36 for the reconstruction) on the indef. forms (or, later, on the stem \*bosъ- / bосy- in some cases). If an indef. form had its own ictus, i.e. if it was not unaccented (= with absolute initial stress), but had a strong (+) ending, like the forms \*bosá (i.e. \*bosǎ), gen. sg. f. \*bosý, gen. pl. \*bosъ, the stress remained in the same position in the complex def. form as well: \*bosǎja, def. gen. sg. f. \*bosýjě, def. gen. pl. \*bosъjь > \*bosýjь, etc. But if the form was unaccented (an *enclinenomenon*, i.e. a form with the (–) ending), the stress was on the final syllable, according to the rule of

<sup>111</sup> From the older \*bosъjь, \*suxъjь.

Vasiļev and Dolobko (cf. \*дѣнь ‘day’ but \*дѣньсь > Croat. *dànas* ‘today’). If the second part of the complex adj. (i.e. the form of the pronoun \*jь) was monosyllabic, the stress was on the last syllable, of course, e.g. def. nom. sg. m. \*bosъjь, def. nom. sg. n. \*bosojě. If the pronoun forms were disyllabic (in oblique cases), where they were end-stressed (gen. sg. m/n. \*jegò, dat. sg. m/n. \*jemù, loc. pl. \*jīxъ, instr. pl. \*jīmi),<sup>112</sup> the stress of the def. adj. form was also on the last syllable (i.e. on the second syllable of the second part of the complex adj. form): def. gen. sg. m/n. \*bosajegò, def. dat. sg. m/n. \*bosajemù,<sup>113</sup> etc. In this way, for instance, the distinction of the def. acc. sg. f. \*bosqjò (< \*bòsq + \*jò) and the def. instr. sg. f. \*bosqjò (< \*bosojò + \*(je)jò) was created. The whole paradigm is as follows:

|     | m.                     | n.                       | f.      |
|-----|------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| sg. |                        |                          |         |
| N.  | *bosъjь <sup>114</sup> | *bosojě                  | *bosǎja |
| G.  |                        | *bosajegò                | *bosýje |
| D.  |                        | *bosujemù                | *bosěji |
| A.  | *bosъjь                | *bosojě                  | *bosqjò |
| L.  |                        | *bosějemъ                | *bosěji |
| I.  |                        | *bosyjimъ <sup>115</sup> | *bosqjò |
| pl. |                        |                          |         |
| n.  | *bosiji                | *bosǎja                  | *bosyjě |
| g.  |                        | *bosъjь <sup>116</sup>   |         |
| d.  |                        | *bosyjimъ <sup>117</sup> |         |
| a.  | *bosyjě                | *bosǎja                  | *bosyjě |
| l.  |                        | *bosyjixъ <sup>118</sup> |         |
| i.  |                        | *bosyjimi                |         |

<sup>112</sup> For the reconstruction, cf. Дыбо 1981, 34, 36 and the oldest Štok. accent *njèga*, *njèmu* (Štok. *njīma* is secondary compared to PSI. \*jīmá).

<sup>113</sup> As a parallel for \*bòsa + \*jegò > \*bosajegò cf. \*pêťъ + (gen. pl.) \*desěťъ > \*pêťdesěťъ (Croat. *pedesēt* > *pedèsēt*).

<sup>114</sup> From the older \*bosъjь.

<sup>115</sup> The nominative form (\*bosъ + \*jimъ) was taken instead of the expected \*bosomъ + \*jimъ. \*-ъ then yields \*-y- in front of \*-j- and the form \*bosyjimъ (OCS *bosyjimъ*) appears. Cf. Ham 1970, 140.

<sup>116</sup> From the older \*bosъjь.

<sup>117</sup> Instead of \*bosomъ + \*jimъ. \*-y- in the middle is either from the nominative form \*bosъ (which lengthens the ending \*-ъ- to \*-y- in front of \*-j-), by analogy to gen. pl. (where the indef. ending is also \*-ъ- that lengthens to \*-y- in front of \*-j-) or from instr. pl. (where the indef. ending is \*-y-).

<sup>118</sup> Instead of \*bosěxъ + \*jixъ.

Note. In dat., loc. and instr. pl. the reconstruction is not completely clear. The accent of the def. form would differ depending on the derivation. If the stem \*bосy- is to be derived from the orthotonic instr. pl. \*bосy (with (+) ending), this would yield the accent \*bосy̑jimi in the complex form as well. If \*bосy- is to be derived from nom. sg. \*bōsъ (*enclinenon*), one would expect the forms: dat. pl. \*bосyjīmъ < \*bосyjīmъ, loc. pl. \*bосyjīxъ > \*bосyjīxъ. These forms could have perhaps influenced the instr. pl. \*bосy̑jimi to become \*bосyjīmi.<sup>119</sup> Since these endings were contracted later in Slavic and since one would expect levellings of all sorts in these cases, it is impossible to tell what the original accent of these forms was.

It is clear that such a paradigm was quite complex as regards stress position, i.e. whether it was on the ultimate or the penultimate syllable, upon which the intonation of the contracted vowel depended. There was a tendency to generalize the stress position, e.g. \*bосōje by analogy to \*bосy̑jъ and \*bосāja instead of the older \*bосojê. It is understood that this means that a part of the presented reconstructions is actually not corroborated by the later data because of different levellings – it is rather based on a structural analysis of the system.<sup>120</sup>

Cf. Russian:

*мóлод* – *мóлодá* – *мóлодо* (def. *мóлодóй*)

In Russian, a.p. C is quite well preserved and most of the root adjectives belong to it. Many of the original a.p. *a* (e.g. *сыт*) and a.p. *b* (e.g. *зол*) adjectives have secondarily shifted to a.p. C. Except for the mobile stress of the indef. forms, the end stress of the def. forms is also well preserved.

An important role in the reconstruction of PSI. adj. accentual types is played by West Slavic languages. There, the original a.p. *c* adjectives preserve the shortened vowel in the root,<sup>121</sup> cf. Czech *blahý*, *bledý*, *suchý*.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Slv. *-iml* in a.p. C.

<sup>120</sup> Stang's (1957, 103) reconstruction and analysis of a.p. *c* def. adj. accentuation is not correct. The accent type *sūhī* (instead of *suhī*), which he wishes to explain from a Proto- or Common Slavic perspective, due to the ending contractions (which was a later phenomenon), does not have anything to do with PSI. Forms like *sūhī* are much younger forms and are due to analogy to a.p. B (see below).

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Kapović 2005a, 97–100.

The brevity appears in the reflexes of the original a.p. *a* as well, cf. *starý*, *zdravý*, but not in the original a.p. *b*, where the root remains long: *hloupý* ‘stupid’, *moudrý* ‘clever’, *bílý* ‘white’.

# ŠTOKAVIAN

## short vowel

### indefinite adjectives

| m          | f           | n                           |
|------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>bôs</i> | <i>bòsa</i> | <i>bòso</i> ( <i>bòso</i> ) |

### definite adjectives

| m                           | f                           | n                           |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>bòsī</i> ( <i>bòsī</i> ) | <i>bòsā</i> ( <i>bòsī</i> ) | <i>bòsō</i> ( <i>bòsī</i> ) |

## long vowel

### indefinite adjectives

| m          | f           | n                           |
|------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>sûh</i> | <i>sûha</i> | <i>sûho</i> ( <i>sûho</i> ) |

### definite adjectives

| m           | f           | n           |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>sûhī</i> | <i>sûhā</i> | <i>sûhō</i> |

The accentuation of indef. declension of a.p. C adjectives is the same as in nouns – of course, in those cases where the original endings are preserved:

N. *sûh* – *sûho* – *sûha* (cf. *grād* – *zlâto* – *dûša* soul)

G. *sûha* – *sûhē* (cf. *grâda* / *zlâta* – *dûšē*)

D. *sûhu* (cf. *grâdu* / *zlâtu*)

A. *sûh* / *sûha* – *sûho* – *sûhu* (cf. *grād* / *vûka* wolf – *zlâto* – *dûšu*)

L. *sûhu*<sup>122</sup> (cf. *grâdu* – *zlâtu*)<sup>123</sup>

n. *sûhi* – *sûha* – *sûhe*

a. *sûhe* – *sûha* – *sûhe*

<sup>122</sup> Since many dialects do not have indef. adjectival declension, the opposition of dat/loc. sg. in a.p. C (cf. Kapović 2010, 79–81) or adjectival a.p. C, it is not clear if a dialect exists in which indef. dat. sg. m/n. *sûhu* and indef. loc. sg. m/n. \**sûhu* would be different or if these forms are always the same. Looking at the data from the dialects preserving indef. adj. declension and a.p. C, it seems that indef. dat. sg. m/n. is identical to indef. loc. sg. m/n., just like in neuter and masculine animate *o*-stems. Cf. dat/loc. sg. *sûhu* in Dubrovnik (Rešetar 1900, 121), in Prapatnice (Vrgorska Krajina, my data): *ð\_sûvu krîvu* ‘(living) on old bread’, *nă\_lîpu mîstu* ‘in a nice place’, *nă\_krîvu mîstu* ‘in a wrong place’, in Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 44) *û\_tûđu sèlu* ‘in a foreign village’, *nă\_lîpu mjěstu*.

<sup>123</sup> For the accentuation of neuter *o*-stems, cf. Kapović 2011a.



In other cases / forms, the endings were taken from the def. declension (see below for the explanation of accent in those cases):

DL. *súhōj*

I. *súhīm* – *súhōm* (cf. *dúšōm*)

g. *súhīh*

dli. *súhīm(a)*<sup>124</sup>

The indef. a.p. C forms (as opposed to a.p. B) are preserved in Western Štokavian, for instance in Posavina and Dalmatinska Zagora (which are connected to Čak. through this isogloss). There, the a.p. C pattern (*drâg* – *drága* – *drâgo* – pl. *drâgi* – *drâge* – *drága*) stands in opposition to the a.p. B pattern (*žût* – *žúta* – *žúto* – pl. *žúti* – *žúte* – *žúta*). On the other hand, in the Eastern Štok. dialects (e.g. in the East Herzegovinian dialect) a.p. C is absent and only a.p. B is found: *drâg* / *žût* – *drága* / *žúta* – *drâgo* / *žúto* – *drâgi* / *žúti* – *drâge* / *žúte* – *drága* / *žúta*.<sup>125</sup> Such a system, with a.p. B only, is, for instance, represented by the classical literary Štokavian of the Vuk-Daničić type (i.e. in classical ‘Serbo-Croatian’). In certain recent Standard Croatian handbooks however, the a.p. B : C distinction in adjectives is reintroduced based on Western tokavian dialects.<sup>126</sup> Of course, a.p. C is not preserved everywhere in the west. There are some Western tokavian dialects where a.p. C is partially or completely gone and in some dial. the older and younger forms fluctuate and coexist. In some urban Western tok. dial., a younger generalized, apparently quite recent, a.p. B: appears instead of the older a.p. C:.

In the merger of a.p. B and a.p. C, the pivotal forms are *drága* = *žúta* that have the same accent in both paradigms (the same in gen. sg. f. *drágē* / *žútē*, instr. sg. f. *drágōm* / *žútōm*, etc.). The new form *drâgo* is analogical to the form *drága*. In Neo-Štok., the merger of a.p. B and C is facilitated by the merger of the neo-acute and circumflex, which yields *drâg* = *žût* for

<sup>124</sup> The same is in Dubrovnik (Rešetar 1900, 121) but with the following differences: instr. sg. m/n. *súhijem*, gen. pl. *súhijeh*, dat/loc/instr. pl. *súhijem*.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. e.g. in Mostar *grúbo* ‘rough’, *mládo* ‘young’, *lúto* ‘angry’ (Milas 1903, 95–96) – however, a.p. C appears there as well sometimes.

<sup>126</sup> For instance in ŠRHJ.

the older *drâg* : *žŭt*. It is for this reason that the disappearance of a.p. B in Eastern Štok. is often related to the supposed early disappearance of the neo-acute there. However, one must bear in mind that the opposite tendency, a.p. B: > C:, is strongest in Čakavian, where the distinction of the neo-acute and circumflex is most often preserved. There, it is clear that the distinction of *drâg* : *žŭt* is not an obstacle for the merger of these two accentual types. In some dialects, the role of the younger accent of the def. forms may have had an influence. Def. forms like *drâgī* (< *drăgī*) have the younger accent analogical to a.p. B: – since the accent was already the same in the def. forms, there may have been a tendency to merge them in the indef. ones as well. In addition, the def. form *drâgō* is much more distinct from the younger indef. form *drágo* than from the older indef. form *drâgo*, especially in dialects where posttonic length tends to disappear. It is imaginable that the rising accent was perceived as a salient marker of indefiniteness, while the falling accent became a marker of definiteness.

The only example of an a.p. C short vowel stem is the adj. *bôs*, which in its nom. sg. m. retains the lengthening seen elsewhere in nominatives sg. of a.p. *c* ending in a *yer*, e.g. in nouns like *môst* ‘bridge’ or *kôst* ‘bone’ (Kapović 2008a, 12–13). This adjective preserves the original a.p. C in many dialects (except in those where it is completely absent, of course) and it preserves the length in nom. sg. m. even if it shifts to a.p. B – thus, secondary *bôso* / *bosô* but *bôs* nonetheless. Short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives were rare already in PSI. and in Croatian only *bôs* was preserved. The other case of the old a.p. *c* adjective with a short vowel is the adj. *kôs* ‘slant’, but here there were two possible results and the short a.p. C was in fact not preserved anywhere, as it seems. In some dialects, the length from nom. sg. m. form *kôs* was generalized yielding a.p. C: in this way: *kôs* – *kósa* – *kôso* (like *drâg* – *drága* – *drâgo*).<sup>127</sup> Elsewhere, this adjective shifted to a.p. A,<sup>128</sup> like short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives. Thus, only *bôs* remained in the a.p. C group. The situation is similar in other Slavic languages as well, due to the short vowel a.p. C adjectives being rare already in PSI. In Zaliznyak’s

<sup>127</sup> The length is even transferred to the related verb, thus *kôsiti* ‘go against, make slant’ instead of the older *kòsiti*. For Čak., cf. *kôs*, *-a*, *-o* in Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007).

<sup>128</sup> The form *kôs* is attested in Vuk’s dictionary and ARj.

Old Russian data,<sup>129</sup> a.p. C consists mainly of old long vowel stems. From originally short vowel stems, one finds only the adjectives *босъ*, *косъ*, *простъ* (this adj. shifted to a.p. B quite early in Štokavian, it seems), *новъ* and *скоръ* (which were originally a.p. *b*, cf. Croat. *nŏv*, *skŏr*) and *деснъ* ‘right (side)’, attested solely as definite in Croat. (*děsnŭ*).<sup>130</sup>

For indef. adjectives in Posavina, cf. the type *bôs* – *bòsa* – *bòso*<sup>131</sup> and *mlâd* – *mlâda* – *mlâdo*, as well as proclitic shift: *nă\_bosu nŏgu* ‘on a bare foot’, *iz\_tŭđa (sèla)* ‘from a foreign (village)’, *ŭ\_tŭđu sèlu*, *nă\_lîpu mjèstu*, *ŭ\_sŭvu zëmļu* ‘in a dry soil’ (Ivšić 1913 2, 42–44). The phonetically oldest Posavian type, with no retractions, is seen in Sikerevci (my data): *bôs* – *bosă* – *bòso* – pl. *bòsi* – *bòse* and *břz* – *břză* – *břzo* – pl. *břzi* – *břze*.<sup>132</sup> In Kostrč (Baotić 1979, 196), cf. *bôs* – *bòsa* – *bòso*; *mlâd* – *mlâda* – *mlâdo* (the same pattern in *mlâk*, *grûb*, *blâg*, *živ*, etc.). A.p. C is well preserved in Posavina in general. Cf. e.g. the type *lîp* – *lîpa* – *lîpo* – pl. *lîpi* – *lîpe* in Babina Greda (thus also *blâg*, *břz*, *čêst*, *drâg*, *glŭp*, *glŭv*, *gŭst*, *grûb*, *krŭt*, *lîn*, *lîp*, *lŭt*, *mlâd*, *nîm*, *pŭst*, *sîd*, *skŭp*, *slân*, *slîp*, *sŭv*, *svêt*, *tvřd*, *živ* + *sîv*).

In Šaptinovac (Ivšić 1907, 140), a.p. C is preserved (*lêp* – *lêpa* – *lêpo*)<sup>133</sup>, but there is no a.p. B in root adj., i.e. all of them shifted to a.p. C (*cřn* – *cřna* – *cřno*). The opposite happened in Southern Baranja (Sekereš 1977, 388): *mlâd* – *mlâda* – *mlâdo* (the same in *drâg*, *glŭv*, etc. but also *vrŭc*, *žŭt*) with a complete merger of the original a.p. *b* and *c*. This is corroborated by my data from the Baranja dialect of Batina: *drâg* – *drâga* – *drâgo*, etc. A consistent a.p. C: pattern like *drâga* – *drâgo* is found in the innovative

<sup>129</sup> Зализняк 1985, 138.

<sup>130</sup> Here, the original a.p. C accentuation of the def. form is preserved (the secondary form *děsnŭ* is due to analogy to *lijěvŭ* ‘left’). The remnants of the old indef. forms are seen in adverbial forms like *nădesno* ‘to the right’, *ŭdesno* ‘to the right’, *zděsna* ‘from the right side’, etc.

<sup>131</sup> A secondary type like Slobodnica *bôs* – *bòsa* – *bòso* is rare in Posavina.

<sup>132</sup> An interesting case is the adj. *sŭv* – *sŭva* – *sŭvo* in Šljivoševci in Podravina (my data), where one sees the shortening in the hiatus due to *h*-dropping: *\*sŭho* > *\*sŭo* > *\*sŭo* → *sŭvo* (with *-v-* to do away with the hiatus). Such a shortening is rather rare in adjectives, while it is more frequent in nouns, cf. *ŭ(h/v)o* instead of *ŭho* ‘ear’, gen. sg. *dŭ(h/v)a* instead of *dŭha* ‘ghost’, *stră(h/v)a* instead of *strâha* ‘fear’, etc. For the shortening in the hiatus, cf. also Štok. *bŭo* ‘was’, *dăo* ‘gave’ from the older *bŭl*, *dâl*.

<sup>133</sup> However, with one innovation, in nom. pl. n. there is *ˆ* and not *˘*, cf. *blâga* (f. sg.) but *blâga* (n. pl.).

Posavian dialect of Brodski Stupnik<sup>134</sup> as well (my data). A similar, but unfinished, tendency to the C: > B: shift is found in the dialect of Slobodnica, where some adjectives remain in a.p. C: (*sûv*, *svêt*, *tûp*, *tvřd*, *živ*, etc.), while in others variants like *drâgo* / *drágo* occur (thus in *gûst*, *krût*, *krîv*, *lîn*, *lîp*, etc.) with a great deal of vacillation. Cf. the same case in Budrovci with a great deal of variation and mixed patterns: *břz* – *brza* – *břzo* – pl. *brzi* – *brze*, *čvrst* – *čvrsta* – *čvrsto* – pl. *čvrsti* – *čvrste*, *glûv* – *glûva* – *glûvo* – pl. *glûvi* – *glûve*, *lûd* – *lûda* – *lûdo* / *lûdo* – pl. *lûdi* – *lûde*, etc.

In Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 130–131), a.p. C (type *lîp* – *lípa* – *lîpo*) is well preserved in a number of adjectives. In acc. sg. f., older forms like *lîpu* have younger variants like *lípu*. In *mlad* and *blîd*, the neuter forms have the variants *blîdo* / *blído* (i.e. type B/C), which is in accord, as said, with a.p. B: in these adjectives in Vrgorska krajina (in *blijed* this is a case of a broader Štok. innovation and in *mlad* it is a case of a regional Imotski-Vrgorac innovation).<sup>135</sup>

In Prapatnice in Vrgorska krajina (my data), a.p. C is quite stable and frequent: *sûv* (gen. sg. *sûva*, *dô\_sûva*, dat. sg. *sûvu*, loc. sg. *ô\_sûvu*) – f. *sûva* – n. *sûvo* – pl. *sûvi* – *sûve* – *sûva* (def. *sûvî*). The same in *břz* (but def. *brzî*), *čvrst* (def. *čvrstî* / *čvrstî*), *drâg*, *glûv*, *gûst* (def. f. *gûstâ*), *vrân*, *krîv* ‘guilty’, *lîn* ‘laizy’, *lîp*, *lûd* ‘crazy’, *lût*, *pûst* ‘empty’, *skûp* ‘expensive’, *slân* ‘salty’, *slîp* ‘blind’, *svêt*, *tûđî*, *tvřd* ‘firm’, *živ* ‘alive’, etc. A.p. C is preserved in *bôs* – *bôsa* (*nâ\_bosu nõgu*) – *bôso* – pl. *bôsi* – *bôse* (def. *bôsî*). The adj. *blâg*, *blîd*, *gnîl*, *jâk*, *mlâk*, *sâm* are, however, in a.p. B: (see above), in accord with the situation in Imotska krajina. The adj. *mlâd* (*mlâda* – *mlâdo* – pl. *mlâdi*) exhibits vacillation, cf. the attested *za\_mlâda čòvika* ‘for a young man’ and the phrase *nâ\_mlâdu je, zàrěšće* ‘(s)he is young, (s)he’ll be OK’ (talking about a wound).

Cf. in Neretvanska krajina (Vidović 2007, 209): *mlâk* – *mlâka* – *mlâko* (the same pattern in *glûp* ‘stupid’, *tûp* ‘dull’, *živ*, *gnîl*, *čvrst*, *slân*), while *bôs*, *tûđ* (*tûda* – *tûde*) and *svêt* shift to a.p. B. In Dubrovnik (Rešetar 1900, 114), cf. *drâg* – *drága* – *drâgo*, pl. *drâgi* – *drâge* – *drága* (the same

<sup>134</sup> Thus in all a.p. C: examples. The distinction between a.p. B: and a.p. C: is in nom. sg. m. form, cf. *cřn*, *žût* but *krîv*, *krût*, with both a.p. B: and C: having ‘ in f. and n. forms.

<sup>135</sup> As opposed to Vrgorska and Imotska Krajina, *mlad* remains a.p. C in Neretvanska Krajina (Domagoj Vidović, p.c.).

in *gluh*, *grub*, *gust* ‘thick’, *živ*, *kriv*, *lud*, *lut*, *mlad*, *pust*, *svet*, *sijed*, etc.). In Molise (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), a.p. C: is generally preserved: *cijâ – cîla – cîlo* (gen. sg. m/n. *cîla*, f. *cîle*), *lîp – lîpa – lîpo* (gen. sg. m/n. *lîpa*, f. -e) – def. *lîpi*, -a (gen. sg. m/n. *lîpoga*, f. *lîpe*), *lût – lûta – lûto* (gen. sg. *lûta*, -e) – def. *lûti* (gen. sg. *lûtoga*, -e), *slîp, -a* (gen. sg. *slîpa*, *slipe*) – def. *slîpi*, -a (gen. sg. *slîpoga*, *slipe*),<sup>136</sup> *tûst – tûsta – tûsto*, etc. This is a typical Molisean shortening in gen. sg. and other oblique cases.

Generalization of the falling accent, typical for some Čak. dialects, is less frequent in Štok. but not unknown, cf. in Prčanj (Rešetar 1900, 114): *svêt – svêta – svêto* (the same in *lîjep*), and in some Molisean adjectives: *gûst, -a, -o, sûh, -a, -o* (gen. sg. *sûha*, -e) – def. *sûhi* (*sûhoga*, *sûhe*), and in *krîv, -a / krîva* (*krîvoga*, *krîve / krîve*) with variants.

Originally, a.p. C def. forms had end stress, which is attested in Croat. forms such as *bôsî* and *tûđî* (cf. dial. *bosî*, *tuđî* with no retraction). Depending on the PSl. situation, in some cases after the contraction one would expect end stress in Croat. (as in \**bosajegò* > \*\**bosōgā*), in other cases long falling accent (as in \**bosāja* > \**bosāja* > *bosā*) because the original accent was on the first of the contracted vowels, and in some cases one would expect the neo-acute (e.g. in \**bosoje* > \*\**bosō*). Of course, such variations in different cases (the interchange of ~ and ^) would be quite complex and levellings would be expected (with either ~ or ^ being generalized), which is exactly what happened. Here, we give PSl. forms, the expected reflexes in Croat. and then Old Štok. forms from Kostrč (Baotić 1979, 197),<sup>137</sup> Ivšić’s description of Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 42–44, 49–51)<sup>138</sup> and from my Posavian data:

<sup>136</sup> In examples like *grûb – grûba, -o* (the same in *drâg, gnjîl, žîv*), the supposed neuter forms (like \**grûbo*) may be absent and due to inadequate accent marking in the dictionary, considering the fact that a.p. B: is almost completely gone from Molise (see above).

<sup>137</sup> Baotić gives these stressed endings in the example *čisti*, which is a secondary member of this accentual pattern (cf. the older Kostrč version *čistî*) but here it makes no difference. In Ivšić 1913, there is no data for the whole def. and indef. adjectival declension.

<sup>138</sup> Of course, one should be careful with Ivšić’s data since the specific forms are taken from different local dialects, which probably have different systems and different individual forms. It is also interesting to note that Ivšić does not give all oblique cases but that all of the ones mentioned have the neo-acute.

| Proto-Slavic <sup>139</sup>                   | expected in Croat.                             | Old Štok. (Kostrč)       | Old Štok. (Domaljevac) <sup>140</sup> | Old Štok. (Slobodnica) <sup>141</sup> | Old Štok. (Posavina – Ivšić) |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| N. *-ŷjъ (?) <sup>142</sup><br>*-ojě<br>*-āja | *-ĩ (?)<br>*-ō<br>*-ā                          | -ĩ<br>-ō<br>-ā           | -ĩ<br>-ō<br>-ā                        | -ĩ<br>-ō<br>-ā                        | -ĩ<br><br>-ā                 |
| G. *-ajegó<br>*-ěję                           | *-ōgā <sup>143</sup><br>*-ē <sup>144</sup> (?) | -ōg<br>-ē <sup>145</sup> | -ōg<br>-ē                             | -ōg<br>-ē                             | -ōg <sup>146</sup>           |
| D. *-ujemú<br>*-ěji                           | *-ōmū <sup>147</sup><br>*-ōj <sup>148</sup>    | -ōm<br>-ōj               | -ōm<br><br>-ōj                        | -ōm<br>-ōj                            | -ōj <sup>149</sup>           |
| A. *-ŷjъ (?)<br>*-ojě<br>*-ojǫ                | *-ĩ (?)<br>*-ō<br>*-ū                          | -ĩ (-ōg)<br>-ō<br>-ū     | -ōg<br><br>-ū                         | <br><br>-ū                            |                              |

<sup>139</sup> We take soft PSI. variant for the cases in which they were later generalized in Štok.

<sup>140</sup> My data. The forms / accents are from the declension of the adj. *muški* ‘male’.

<sup>141</sup> My data.

<sup>142</sup> Or \*-ŷjъ if the new \*-y- is short (but cf. Croat. dial. \*-ĩ in gen. pl. of *i*-stems). If \*-ĩ is to be expected in Croatian, the analogical spread of the circumflex is more problematic.

<sup>143</sup> The expected form would actually be \*-āgō but \*-ā- changed to \*-ō- because of the influence of pronouns like *\*togo* > *toga*, *\*ovogo* > *ovoga*, *\*onogo* > *onoga*, etc., while the final *-a* is analogical to nominal / indef. adj. ending *-a*. The length of the first vowel in *-ōga* is from the old \*-āgo, where it is of contractual origin, which is supported by other cases where the vowel is also long (*-oga* is short in pronouns, cf. *tōga*).

<sup>144</sup> In Croat., \*-ěję > *-ē* (with the soft variant being generalized). One would expect *\*-ějje* to indeed yield *-ē* but if PSI. *\*-ę* was actually *\*-ĕ* (with the final neo-acute as a reflex of BSL. circumflex), it is not clear what *\*-ěję* would yield. One possibility is that the neo-acute of the first syllable would prevail and the other is that the end result might still be a falling accent because the original stress was on the first (and not the second) syllable.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. *-ē* in indef. adjectives (= nouns).

<sup>146</sup> Ivšić only gives indef. *bosē*, where this form is expected, like in the nominal gen. sg. *vodē*.

<sup>147</sup> With analogical vocalism, like in gen. sg.

<sup>148</sup> The dat/loc. sg. f. ending *-ōj* is due to analogy to loc. sg. m/n. *-ōm* (and also dat. sg. *-ōmu*), i.e. the vowel *\*-o-* is due to that influence (the ending *-ōm(u)* in m/n. is, on the other hand, due to pronominal endings). The old endings *\*-ěji* / *\*-iji* could not yield the ending *-ōj* regularly. The length, i.e. the neo-acute in *\*-ojī* > *\*-ōj* has the same origin as instr. sg. of *ā*-stems (where *\*-ojū* > *\*-ouū* > *\*-ōv* (→ *\*-ōm*)).

<sup>149</sup> Ivšić gives this form in the indef. declension but, since this ending is originally a def. one taken into indef. declension, the form is relevant for the def. declension as well.

|                                                    |                                             |                                                            |                                     |                                     |                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| L. * <i>-ĕjěmъ</i><br>* <i>-ĕji</i>                | * <i>-ōm</i> <sup>150</sup><br>* <i>-ōj</i> | <i>-ōm</i><br><i>-ōj</i>                                   |                                     |                                     | <i>-ōm</i><br><i>-ōj</i> <sup>151</sup> |
| I. * <i>-yĭmъ</i><br>* <i>-ŏjŏ</i>                 | * <i>-ĭm</i><br>* <i>-ōm</i> <sup>152</sup> | <i>-ĭm/-ĭm</i><br><i>-ōm/-</i><br><i>ōm</i> <sup>153</sup> | <i>-ĭm</i><br><i>-ōm</i>            | <i>-ĭm</i><br><i>-ōm</i>            | <i>-ĭm</i> <sup>154</sup>               |
| n. * <i>-iji</i><br>* <i>-āja</i><br>* <i>-ejĕ</i> | * <i>-ĭ</i><br>* <i>-â</i><br>* <i>-ĕ</i>   | <i>-ĭ</i><br><i>-â</i><br><i>-ĕ</i>                        | <i>-ĭ</i><br><i>-â</i><br><i>-ĕ</i> | <i>-ĭ</i><br><i>-â</i><br><i>-ĕ</i> |                                         |
| g. * <i>-ŷjъ</i>                                   | * <i>-ĭ</i>                                 | <i>-ĭ/-ĭ</i>                                               | <i>-ĭ</i>                           | <i>-ĭ/-ĭ (?)</i>                    |                                         |
| d. * <i>-yĭmъ</i> or<br>* <i>-ŷjĭmъ</i>            | * <i>-ĭm</i> or<br>* <i>-ĭm</i>             | <i>-ĭm/-ĭm</i><br>(dli.)                                   | <i>-ĭm</i> (loc.)                   | <i>-ĭm</i> (loc.)                   |                                         |
| a. * <i>-ejĕ</i><br>* <i>-āja</i><br>* <i>-ejĕ</i> | * <i>-ĕ</i><br>* <i>-â</i><br>* <i>-ĕ</i>   | <i>-ĕ</i><br><i>-â</i><br><i>-ĕ</i>                        | <i>-ĕ</i>                           | <i>-ĕ</i>                           |                                         |
| l. * <i>-yĭxъ</i> or<br>* <i>-ŷjĭxъ</i>            | * <i>-ĭh</i> or<br>* <i>-ĭh</i>             | <i>-ĭ/-ĭ</i>                                               |                                     |                                     |                                         |
| i. * <i>-ŷjimi</i>                                 | * <i>-ĭmi</i>                               |                                                            |                                     |                                     |                                         |

In Čak., at least in some dialects (see below),  $\hat{}$  is generalized in all cases. In Štok., one finds a vacillation between  $\hat{}$  and  $\tilde{}$ , the exact pattern depending on the dialect (although more data is needed). In Bosnian Posavina,<sup>155</sup> most cases have  $\hat{}$ , but  $\tilde{}$  also appears, and in Ivšić's Posavian data one finds even more neo-acute accents in the paradigm.<sup>156</sup> The following changes occurred<sup>157</sup> if we compare the attested forms with what is expected:

<sup>150</sup> Vocalism by analogy to \**tomъ*.

<sup>151</sup> Again, these forms are given by Ivšić as indef. (the def. form would have the accent *mŕtv-*) but since these endings are originally from the def. declension, we take them to be relevant here (albeit with a *caveat*).

<sup>152</sup> Older \**-ōv*, like in instr. sg. of *ā*-stems.

<sup>153</sup> The same in indef. declension. Cf. from *čista* (indef., secondary a.p. C) also *čistōm* / *čistōm*. This is especially interesting when compared to only *-ōm* (e.g. *vodōm*) in instr. sg. of *ā*-stem nouns. In indef. instr. sg. f. this is, then, due to analogy to def. forms, while in instr. sg. m/n. the ending is originally from the def. declension in any case.

<sup>154</sup> Ivšić only has indef. instr. sg. f. *bosōm*, *mrtvōm* 'dead'.

<sup>155</sup> Kostrč and Domaljevac are villages in Bosnian Posavina, relatively close to each other. My data from Domaljevac are in accord with Baotić's from Kostrč, except for the fact that in mine there are no variants in instr. sg. and dat. pl., which may be just a coincidence (Baotić described his native dialect so he knew all possible variants, of course).

<sup>156</sup> In my data from the village of Slobodnica in the Croatian part of Posavina, the neo-acute is not so frequent. This can either be an old dialectal difference from Ivšić's data or an innovation in the last one hundred years since Ivšić's research.

<sup>157</sup> A role may have been played by pronominal accent (cf. Ivšić 1913 2, 37–38). For instance, the pronoun *taj* can have both  $\hat{}$  and  $\tilde{}$  in oblique cases in Posavina.

NOM. SG.  $-\hat{o}$  (n.) by analogy to  $-\hat{a}$  ( $-\hat{i}$  is either original or analogical to  $-\hat{a}$ ).

GEN. SG. the form  $-\hat{o}g$  is obviously younger than Ivšić's  $-\hat{o}g$  (the neo-acute is expected in the truncated form derived from the expected  $*-\hat{o}g\grave{a}$ ) and made by analogy to other cases where the falling tone is expected;  $-\hat{e}$  (f.) is expected (cf.  $-\hat{e}$  in gen. sg. of indef. adj. /  $\bar{a}$ -stem nouns)

DAT. SG. the form  $-\hat{o}mu$  has the position of stress by analogy to other cases, and  $\hat{~}$  in  $-\hat{o}j$  (f.) is also analogical – Ivšić's  $-\hat{o}j$  is expected here

ACC. SG. the accent  $-\hat{u}$  (f.) is analogical

LOC. SG. Ivšić has the expected  $-\hat{o}m$  /  $-\hat{o}j$ ; the forms  $-\hat{o}m$  /  $-\hat{o}j$  have the accent by analogy to other cases with  $\hat{~}$

INSTR. SG. the expected  $*-\hat{i}m$  (m/n.),  $*-\hat{o}m$  (f.) yields Baotić's variant  $\sim/\sim$  in both forms

NOM. PL.  $\hat{~}$  is taken to n. and f. form by analogy to other cases

GEN. PL. in Posavina, both the expected  $\hat{~}$  and  $\sim$  are found – this could be due to loc. pl.  $-\hat{i}(h)$  (if this is to be expected here)<sup>158</sup> or by analogy to pronominal forms (cf. Posavian  $\acute{n}\hat{i}$  beside  $\acute{n}\hat{i}$ <sup>159</sup> < PS1.  $*j\hat{i}x\bar{b}$ )<sup>160</sup>

DAT. PL. both  $\hat{~}$  and  $\sim$  appear and the reconstruction is not clear

ACC. PL. as in nom. pl.

LOC. PL. as in dat. pl.

In Posavina, it is remarkable that the accentuation in the endings has not been levelled (it still has both  $\sim$  and  $\hat{~}$ ). Of course, the distribution of circumflex / neo-acute is different from what one would expect from PS1. if there have been no analogical developments. The situation varies across dialects, as we have seen.

The original desinential stress of the def. a.p. C forms is nowhere consistently preserved in tokavian. In short vowel root adjectives, the end stress can be preserved in  $b\grave{o}s\bar{i}$  (which can otherwise change to a younger  $b\hat{o}s\bar{i}$ ). On the other hand, such an accent appears secondarily also in  $\check{c}\bar{i}s\bar{i}$  (instead of  $\check{c}\hat{i}s\bar{i}$ , originally a.p. A) or in  $g\grave{o}l\bar{i}$  (instead of  $g\hat{o}l\bar{i}$ , originally a.p. B). Sometimes both younger and older forms coexist. In long vowel root adjectives, the end stress presumes a shortened root vowel ( $sv\grave{e}t\bar{i}$ ) as

<sup>158</sup> Especially in Posavina, where the final  $-h$  is lost and gen. and dat. pl. merge.

<sup>159</sup> Ivšić 1913 2, 36.

<sup>160</sup> One should also bear in mind that the neo-acute is a sort of a marker of gen. pl. (cf. for instance  $-\hat{i}$  in  $i$ -stems).



opposed to the preserved length in indef. forms (*svēt* – *svéta* – *svêto*, if not levelled to *svêto*). Due to a tendency to generalize length in def. forms as well, they shift from C to B: type. Thus, one gets *svētī* > *svēti* instead of the older *svēti*, which means that the quantitative alternation is lost.<sup>161</sup> For the preservation of a.p. C def. end stress, see below.

The younger accent of the *svētī* / *svēti* type is generalized in some dialects in all (or almost all) adjectives, while other dialects preserve the original pattern in some examples. Most of dialects (the standard language included) preserve the original accent in the adj. *tùđī* ‘foreign’ because here the indef. forms (*tûđ* – *túđa* – *tûđe* / *túđe*) are usually not used anymore in most dialects and there is thus no tendency to generalize the length. There is no connection between the preservation of the old a.p. C in indef. forms and the preservation of the old a.p. C pattern in def. forms. For instance, in some dialects in Dalmatinska Zagora, the indef. a.p. C type is well preserved, while the C type in def. forms is preserved in certain adjectives but not nearly as well as in indef. forms. In Posavina, however, a.p. C indef. forms are very well preserved, but the type C is rarely preserved in def. forms (except, curiously, secondarily in the old a.p. B and C). And, of course, there is the case of Čak., where a.p. C has a hegemony in indef. stems, while the type C is, for instance, practically absent from long vowel suffixless def. adjectives (unlike Štok.). It is interesting that the type C accent (i.e. end stress) is preserved in many dialects almost only in secondary forms, e.g. in the original a.p. *a*, etc., while it is not present in a.p. C (or in original a.p. C adjectives).

In the contemporary standard language, in the long vowel a.p. C suffixless adj., only the *drâgī* type is present (except for the adj. *tùđī*).<sup>162</sup>

<sup>161</sup> Theoretically, forms like *\*\*svēti* could have come about but it seems that this did not happen anywhere in regular adjectives (however, cf. the type *vrâžjī* with a secondary length in the Eastern Štok. dialects instead of the original *vrâžjī* with a shortened root in the West).

<sup>162</sup> Daničić (1872, 91–92, 94, Даничић 1925, 213, 215) gives the following examples for literary Štokavian: *čēstī* / *čēsī* frequent, *svētī* / *svēti*, *krûpnī* / *krûpni* large, *žitkī* / *žitki* viscous, *krâtkī* / *krâtki* short, *rètkī* / *rĭjetki* rare, *strâšnī* / *strâšni* terrifying, *têškī* (next to the secondary *těškī* – the usual form being *têškī*), etc. Leskien (1914, 386f) gives for the literary language: *čēstī* / *čēsī*, *glûhī* / *glûhi*, *gnjilī* / *gnjili*, *gûstī* / *gûstī*, *ljûti* / *ljûti*, *riđī* / *riđi*, *slânī* / *slânī*, *sûhī* / *sûhi*, *svētī* / *svēti*, *tûđī* / *tûđi*, *tvrdī* / *tvrdi*,

However, in dialects the *dràgī* type is preserved in various adjectives and to various extent. This type has also secondarily spread to the original a.p. *a* and a.p. *b* adjectives. Here, we shall give some examples (not only for root adjectives): in Šapinovac (Ivšić 1907, 142) only *suvi* and *luti*, in Posavina in general (Ivšić 1913 2, 49–50): *tudi*, *mladi*, rarely *strašni*<sup>163</sup> *ladni*, *těski*, in Dubrovnik: *gladni*, *gluhi*, *luti*, *plitki*, *slani*, *suh*, *tudi*, *prazni* (originally a.p. *b*), <sup>+</sup>*tvrdi*, *těski* and secondarily *vruci* (Budmani 1883, 173; Rešetar 1900, 129),<sup>164</sup> in Imotski and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 137, 139): *krupni* (originally a.p. *b*), *těski* (and secondarily in many short vowel adj.). In Neretvanska krajina (Vidović 2007, 203; 2009, 289): *gusti* ‘dense’, *rjetki*, *těski*, *tjesni* ‘narrow’ (a.p. *c*) and *ružni* ‘ugly’, *krupni*, *prazni*, *ravni* ‘straight’ (a.p. *b*).<sup>165</sup> More Štokavian examples are given in Matešić 1970, 175–176. Cf. also in Prčanj and Ozrinići the original accent in the phrase *strašni sūd* ‘Judgement Day’ as opposed to the usual form *strāšni* (Rešetar 1900, 128).

The *˘˘* pattern in long vowel adjectives is quite frequent in Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina, my data) – in the original a.p. *c* (*ladni* ‘cold’, *těski*) but elsewhere as well (*glatki* ‘smooth’, *niski* ‘low’), often beside a younger variant *˘˘* (*bisni* / *bisni* ‘mad, rabid’). The *˘˘* type appears in almost all -CC-adjectives (i.e. adjectives with the stem ending in a consonantal group) – it is most frequent there (although it does not appear in all adjectives, for instance in some -*an* adjectives which are not a.p. *C* or do not stem from the original a.p. *c*). This old pattern appears in some suffixless adjectives of the original a.p. *c* (for instance *gustā čorba* ‘dense soup’, *břzi* ‘fast’). The *˘˘* pattern is frequent in common idioms, like in *čvrsti bětōn* ‘solid concrete’ (idiom), but *tō je tāj čvrsti bětōn* ‘it’s is that (already mentioned) solid concrete’ (normal attribute + noun).

---

*vruci* / *vruci* (secondarily), *gladni* / *gladni* hungry, *kratki* / *kratki*, *krupni* / *krupni*, *mrsni* / *mrsni* meaty, *plitki* / *plitki* shallow, *prazni* / *prazni* empty, *retki* / *rjetki*, *svjesni* / *svijesni* conscious, *strašni* / *strāšni*, *těski* / *těski*, *vitki* / *vitki* slim, *žitki* / *žitki*.

<sup>163</sup> However, this isolated piece of data is not very reliable since it can easily be secondary.

<sup>164</sup> The old accent is also seen in the idiom *ne prđoklači ludiĵeh* ‘don’t speak rubbish’ (my data) – cf. the archaic gen. form *ludiĵeh* here with the usual innovative def. form *ludi*.

<sup>165</sup> As can be seen, the region of Imotski / Vrgorac / Metković again has some common accentual isoglosses.

In Štokavian, the morphological distinction of the indef. vs. def. declension is not preserved in all cases. The following cases have the morphological distinction (first we give the indef. and then the def. form): nom/acc. sg. m. *drâg* – *drâgī* (older *drâgī* & *passim*), gen/(acc). sg. m/n. *drâga* (younger *drâga*) – *drâgōg(a)*, dat/loc. sg. m/n. *drâgu* (or younger *drâgu*) – *drâgōm(u/e)*. In the second group of cases, the forms have become the same by the expected phonological-morphological historical changes (if we disregard the difference in accent and length of the endings): nom/acc. sg. n. *drâgo* (younger *drâgo*) – *drâgō* (older *drâgō* & *passim*), nom. sg. f. & nom/acc. pl. n. *drâga* – *drâgā*, gen. sg. f. *drâgē* – *drâgē*, acc. sg. f. *drâgu* – *drâgū*, instr. sg. f. *drâgōm* – *drâgōm*, nom. pl. m. *drâgi* – *drâgī*, nom. pl. f. *drâge* – *drâgē*, acc. pl. m/f. *drâge* – *drâgē*. In all other cases, the old indef. forms (identical to nominal forms) were lost and def. endings were taken instead. However, these new forms have taken the accent from other indef. cases and thus differentiate themselves from the def. forms: dat/loc. sg. f. *drâgōj* (by analogy to the nom sg. *drâga*, gen. sg. *drâgē*, instr. sg. *drâgōm*) – *drâgōj*,<sup>166</sup> instr. sg. *drâgīm* (see below for the explanation) – *drâgīm*, gen. pl. *drâgīh* – *drâgīh*, dat/loc/instr. pl. *drâgīm(a)* – *drâgīm(a)*. By taking the rising accent (i.e. end stress) in these forms, a new distinction of indef. and def. forms is created, the same that is present in a.p. B (indef. *drâgīm* : def. *drâgīm* ⇔ *drâgīm* in C like indef. *žūtīm* : def. *žūtīm* in B). The rising accent of the new a.p. C instr. sg. m/n. indef. forms (like *drâgīm*) is most problematic, since there was probably no rising accents in the old sg. indef. declension, except perhaps in loc. sg. \**drâgu* (see above), and since the PSI. indef. instr. sg. form was \**dōrgomъ* with initial stress. In feminine forms, where the rising accent was present in gen. sg. *drâgē* and inst. sg. *drâgōm* the new dat/loc. sg. form *drâgōj* is not such a problem (cf. also the PSI. indef. a.p. c dat. sg. \**dōržě* but loc. sg. \**doržě* with end stress, like in nominal *ā*-stems). The new masculine form *drâgīm* can be interpreted as analogical in stress to the feminine form *drâgōm*, where this accent is expected (cf. instr. sg. *glāvōm* ‘head’). Another influence may have been the expected end stress in a.p. C plural forms, especially that of dat. pl., which is identical to the instr. sg. after the fall of final *yers*. In plural forms, the

<sup>166</sup> Cf. in the Čak. dial. of Dobrinj on the island of Krk (Milčetić 1895, 116) indef. loc. sg. *v lîpi kotîgi* : def. loc. sg. *v lîpoj kotîgi*.

rising accent (end stress) is expected in accordance to the accent of the old indef. forms – gen. pl. \*drāg, dat. pl. m/n. \*drāgōm, f. \*drāgām, loc. m/n. \*drāžēh, f. \*drāgāh, instr. m/n. \*drāgī, f. \*drāgāmi (these supposed forms, identical to nominal ones, are nowhere attested and must have been lost very early). In the standard language and in some Štok. dialects, this indef/def. distinction is well preserved, while in some of them it may be lost in oblique cases (then the accents of def. forms tend to prevail) and, of course, the indef. declension generally tends to be lost in many dialects as well. Nevertheless, even after old indef. forms like gen. sg. *drāga*, dat. sg. *drāgu* (which are preserved, for instance, in the dialects of Dalmatinska Zagora or Posavina) are lost, the old distinction between indef. and def. forms can be maintained by accent: indef. gen. sg. *drāgōg* – def. gen. sg. *drāgōg* (the same in dat. sg. *drāgōm* – *drāgōm*). Cf. in Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 42–44): gen. sg. m/n. *mrtvōg*, loc. sg. m/n. *mrtvōm*, instr. sg. m/n. *mrtvīm*, *mlādīm*, instr. sg. f. *mrtvōm*, gen. pl. *mrtvī*, *sūvī*. Here, only the accent tells us that these are indef. forms (def. forms would have the accent *mrtv-*, *mlād-*, *sūv-* in all forms). Such an accentual distinction (older and newer) can be found in a.p. B as well, cf. for instance instr. m/n. indef. *žūtīm* – def. *žūtīm*, etc.

#### ČAKAVIAN (Vrgada)<sup>167</sup>

##### short vowel

###### indefinite adjectives

| m          | f           | n           |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>bôs</i> | <i>bosă</i> | <i>böso</i> |

###### definite adjectives

| m           | f                       | n           |
|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| <i>bosî</i> | <i>bos<sup>o</sup>â</i> | <i>bosô</i> |

##### long vowel

###### indefinite adjectives

| m          | f           | n           |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>sûh</i> | <i>sûhă</i> | <i>sûho</i> |

###### definite adjectives

| m           | f                       | n |
|-------------|-------------------------|---|
| <i>sûhî</i> | <i>Sûh<sup>o</sup>â</i> |   |

A.p. C is well preserved in indef. forms in most Čakavian dialects – what is more, it usually spreads to some of the original a.p. *b* adjectives as well. In def. forms, the original *-î* is preserved in short vowel stems like *bosî* in some dialects, while analogical *bösî* appears in others. Cf. *bosî*, *bos<sup>o</sup>â*, *bosô* on Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 83). In long vowel adjectives, the original pattern has almost completely perished. The *drāg* (C) type adjectives in Čakavian

<sup>167</sup> Jurišić 1973.

have *drāgĩ* pattern in def. forms, like in many Štokavian dialects, except for the fact that, unlike in Štokavian, adjectives where the original accent is preserved are very rare, cf. *jǎkĩ* beside *jākĩ* in Novi Vinodolski.<sup>168</sup> In Čakavian, the original *-ĩ* in long vowel stems is best preserved in denominal adjectives on *-skĩ*, *-nĩ*, *-jĩ*, which are always definite (see below). This accentual pattern, like in Posavina, is especially frequent in secondary forms, where it would not be expected historically, cf. *modrĩ* ‘blue’, *žuhkĩ*, *novĩ* (Novi Vinodolski),<sup>169</sup> *golĩ*, *dugĩ*, *glatkĩ* (Vrgada)<sup>170</sup>, etc. But see also *večnĩ* ‘eternal’ in Novi,<sup>171</sup> which might be old. The change *\*dragĩ* ⇒ *drāgĩ* occurs by analogy to a.p. B., which undoes the long : short alternation between indef. and def. forms. The middle type *\*drāgĩ* does not occur anywhere in Štokavian. However, it seems that it perhaps may be found in Čakavian, cf. the already cited, but quite exceptional, form *jǎkĩ* in Novi Vinodolski.<sup>172</sup>

For the examples of preservation of a.p. C in indef. forms in Čak., cf.: Hvar (Hraste 1935, 32) *mlōd* – *mlōdā* – *mlōdo* – def. *mlōdi* ‘young’ (the same in *pūst*, *slīp* ‘blind’, *sūh*, secondary also in *žūt* and *stōr* ‘old’), Pitve (Hvar, my data) *lūd* – *lūdā* – *lūdo* – pl. *lūdi* – *lūde*, *drōg* – *drōgā* – *drōgo* ‘dear’, *živ* – *živā* – *živo*, *gūst* – *gūstā* – *gūsto*, *tūp* – *tūpā* – *tūpo*, *mlōd* – *mlōdā* – *mlōdo*, *līn* – *līnā* – *līno* ‘lazy’, *jūt* – *jūtā* – *jūto* ‘angry’, *krīv* – *krīvā* – *krīvo* (adverb *nākrivo*), *sūh* – *sūhā* – *sūho*, *grūb* – *grūbā* – *grūbo* ‘ugly’, etc., Vrboska (Hvar, Matković 2004) *līn* – *līnā* – *līno*, the same in *cīl* ‘whole’, *glūh*, *līp*, *slīp*, *živ*, etc., *būos* – *bosā* – *bōso*, Brač (Šimunović 2009, 44) *svēt* – *svētā* – *svēto* – def. *svēti* (the same in *mlōd*, *sūh*, *blīd* ‘pale’, *līn*, etc.) but *bōs* – *bosā* – *bōso* with a shift to a.p. B.,<sup>173</sup> Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 82; 1973) *bōs* – *bosā* – *bōso* (*nā\_bosu nōgu*), *drōāg* – *drōāgā* – *drōāgo* (the same in *glūh*, *gūst*, *krīv*, *līp* ‘beautiful’, etc.), Senj (Moguš 1966, 76–77) *mlād* –

<sup>168</sup> Беличъ 1909, 205.

<sup>169</sup> The examples are from Zubčić 2004, 626.

<sup>170</sup> Jurišić 1966, 83.

<sup>171</sup> Zubčić, Sanković 2008, 59.

<sup>172</sup> Forms like *drāgĩ* are to be explained by analogy (to a.p. B.) in Čakavian, which occurs due to the tendency for length to be generalized to all forms. There is no need for abstract (and somewhat ahistorical) phonological rules of some sort of retraction from a length to a preceding length proposed by Langston (2007, 126).

<sup>173</sup> Cf. in Vrboska (Hvar) both *būos* and *gūol* in a.p. C and on Brač both *bōs* and *gōl* in a.p. B.

*mlādä* – *mlādo* – def. *mlādi* (the same in *blēd*, *drāg*, *glūh*, *gūst*, *jāk*, *krīv*, etc.), *bôs* – *bosä* – *böso* – pl. *bosì* (with a B type stress in the pl., Moguš 2002), Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 121–122) *blēt* – *bledä* – *blēdi* – def. *blēdi* (the same in *cēl*, *drāh* ‘dear’, *glūh*, etc.), *bôs* – *bosä* – *bōsi* (analogy to the form *bôs* and long vowel adj.) – def. *bōsi* (by analogy to long vowel stems),<sup>174</sup> Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 106) *blāg* (cf. the innovative nom. pl. m. <sup>+</sup>blāgī)<sup>175</sup> – *blāgä* (but the younger acc. sg. f. <sup>+</sup>blāgū) – *blāgo* (in nom. pl. both the original <sup>+</sup>blāgä and younger <sup>+</sup>blāga) – def. *blāgī* (by analogy to a.p. A), the same in *blēd*, *cēl*, *cēn*, *drāg*, *glūh*, *gnīl*, *gūst*, *jāk*, *jūt*, *krīv*, the short version: *bôs* – *bosä* – *bōso*, etc., Orbanici (Kalsbeek 1998, 145–146) *mlāt* – *mlādä* – pl. *mlādi* – def. *mlādi* (the same in *drāh*, *glūh*, *krīf* ‘guilty’, *jāk*, etc.).

As for innovation, cf. on Rab (Kušar 1894, 33) *blēd* – *blēdä* – <sup>+</sup>blēdo (the same in *drāg*, *glūh*, *lēn*, etc., and secondarily in *vrūc*, *žūt*) but generalized <sup>ˆ</sup> to all forms (including f.) in adjectives such as *krīv*, *grūb*, *gūst*, *žīv* (and secondarily in *bēl*). In Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 158), some of the old a.p. *c* adjectives shift to a.p. B (*blēd*, *glūh*, *slān* ‘salty’, *žīv*, etc.), which is otherwise very rare in Čak., while the other group generalizes <sup>ˆ</sup> to all forms (thus *de facto* shifting to a.p. A: – thus in *drāg*, *gūst*, *lēv* ‘left’, *nēm* ‘dumb’, *dīv* ‘wild’, etc.).<sup>176</sup> A similar situation is in Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), where a.p. B: includes *žīv* – *žīva* – *žīvo* (also *jāk*, *krīv*) while a.p. A: (*lūd* – *lūda* – *lūdo* with generalized <sup>ˆ</sup> to all forms) includes the adj. *līp*, *blāg*, *glūv* ‘deaf’, *gūst*, *tūp* and secondarily also *bēl* (cf. *u pōl bēla dāna* ‘out of nowhere (lit. in the middle of a white day)’) and *vrūc*. The generalization of <sup>ˆ</sup> occurs in Filipjakov as well: *drāg* – *drāga* – *drāgo* (likewise in *sūv* ‘dry’, *žīv*, etc.) and Preko:<sup>177</sup> *drōg* – *drōga* – *drōgo* (the same in *sūh*, *žīv*, etc.). The original mobility in Filipjakov can be seen in *bôs* – *bōsa* / *bōsā* – *bōso*

<sup>174</sup> The forms *bôs* and *blēd* are already the same. Then, after the pretonic length disappears, *bosä* = *bledä*, so it is no wonder that *bōso* gets a secondary length, which is present in the def. form *bōsi* as well.

<sup>175</sup> Cf. also the oblique cases: the indef. gen/loc. pl. <sup>+</sup>blāgīh, dat. pl. <sup>+</sup>blāgīn, instr. pl. <sup>+</sup>blāgīmi (cf. def. gen/loc. pl. <sup>+</sup>blāgīh, dat. pl. <sup>+</sup>blāgīn, instr. pl. <sup>+</sup>blāgīmi). For the shortness of indef. endings, see below.

<sup>176</sup> The adjectives from this subgroup may have fixed <sup>ˆ</sup> by analogy to Venetian loans such as *čār*, *zvēlt*, which have this pattern originally (although another Venetism, *skūr*, is in the type B).

<sup>177</sup> The data for Filipjakov and Preko are recorded by Nikola Vuletić.

( $\acute{}$  in n. is analogical to m. and to *kanovačko* lengthening in f.). In Preko, the accent is generalized in this adjective as well: *buôs* – *bôsa* – *bôso*.

As for the end stress in def. forms, which is originally a trait of a.p. C, it seems that the tone is always falling in Čakavian (unlike in Štok., see above) although additional data is needed. Cf. in Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 111, 116): nom. sg. *-î*, *-â*, gen. sg. *-ê*, acc. sg. *-û*, loc. sg. *-ôj*, nom. pl. *-ê*, in Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 129): nom. sg. *-î*, *-<sup>u</sup>ô*, *-â*, gen. sg. *-<sup>i</sup>êga*, *-<sup>i</sup>ê*, dat. sg. *-<sup>i</sup>êmu*, *-<sup>i</sup>ê*, loc. sg. *-<sup>i</sup>ên*, *-<sup>i</sup>ê*, instr. sg. *-<sup>i</sup>ên*, *-<sup>u</sup>ôn*, nom. pl. *-î*, gen/loc. pl. *-<sup>i</sup>êh*, dat. pl. *-<sup>i</sup>ên*, acc. pl. *-î* / *-<sup>i</sup>êh*, *-<sup>i</sup>ê*, instr. pl. *-<sup>i</sup>êmi* (the variant forms with the short accent are secondary) and on Vrgada (Jurišić 1973): nom. sg. *-î*, *-<sup>o</sup>â*, *-ô*, gen. sg. *muškôga*, *sinov<sup>l</sup>ê* ‘son’s’, acc. sg. f. *desnû*, loc. sg. f. *na turskôj* ‘Turkish’, instr. sg. f. *vražjôn* ‘devil’s’, nom. pl. *muškî*, *tankê* ‘thin’. The ‘falling’ variants, i.e. the stress on the first part of the ending, are generalized in Russian as well, cf. *cyxóŭ* – gen. sg. *cyxózo*<sup>178</sup> – dat. sg. *cyxómy*, etc.

In Čakavian, one finds end stress in the adjectival gen. and dat. sg. forms *-ogă* / *-egă* and *-omû* / *-emû* in Northern Čakavian dialects, for instance in Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 158) and Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 92–93). In Rijeka, forms like gen. sg. *zûtegă*, dat. sg. *zûtemû* are presented as variants of the old indef. forms gen. sg. *zûtă*, dat. sg. *zûtû*, so these forms appear only as alternative (secondary) forms in indef. declension. Strohal’s examples are from a.p. B: and it is not clear if such an accent can appear in a.p. A: < a.p. c as well. However, it is clear, as we have seen, that a great deal of the old a.p. c adjectives shifted to a.p. B: there. In Grobnik, the accents *-ogă* / *-egă* and *-omû* / *-emû* appear in all accentual paradigms in indef. declension (Zubčić 2004, 626; Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 102, 105).<sup>179</sup>

<sup>178</sup> But cf. also a Russian aristocratic surname *Цыховó*, which could perhaps be a trace of the old accentuation of gen. sg.

<sup>179</sup> In Lukežić, Zubčić 2007 the description method is rather strange since instead of paradigms exemplified by certain words only endings are given and those are defined by accentedness / non-accentedness and not by accentual paradigm. In addition, the position of stress and accentual types of different accentual patterns are indicated by symbols in tables instead of by concrete examples. Still, in Zubčić 2004, 626 it is explicitly stated that in the Grobnik dialect the stress in the sg. of indef. declension is always on the last or only vowel of the grammatical morpheme. The following examples are given: gen. sg. *čisto/egă* ‘clean’, *visoko/egă* ‘tall’, dat. sg. *čisto/emû*, *visoko/emû*.



In spite of what might seem obvious at first glance, these forms are not the reflexes of the expected \*-ōgǝ and \*-ōmǝ from the PSI. def. \*-ajegò and \*-ujemǝ. That is clear from the following facts. First of all, the first syllable of the ending is short (cf. the long unaccented def. -ōga / -ēga and -ōmu / -ēmu in Grobnik). Secondly, such an accent occurs not only in a.p. C but in a.p. B as well (what is more, the only concrete form from Rijeka is indeed a.p. B, despite the fact that the local synchronic a.p. B: includes many old a.p. *c* adjectives). Thirdly, this accent does not occur in the def. but rather in the indef. declension, where these def. endings are obviously secondary (in Grobnik, only these new indef. endings exist, while in Rijeka they coexist with the older indef. endings). How did these secondary forms develop? In Rijeka, the accent of the old indef. forms gen. sg. *zūtǎ*, dat. sg. *zūtǝ* was simply taken into new indef. forms with the endings -ega, -emu thus making *zūtegǎ*, *zūtemǝ* – the ending is still -ǎ, -ǝ, but new -eg-, -em- are inserted in front of it. Possible sources of analogy are pronominal forms like *jednegǎ*, *jednemǝ* (Strohal 1895, 164), where such an accent is expected. The borrowing of the pronominal accent / ending can be supposed to be based on the short first syllable of the ending, which is typical for pronouns (as well as for new indef. forms). Besides, many pronouns have the indefinite-looking nom. sg. with gen/dat. sg. with short (non-contracted) ending -ogǎ / -omǝ. When the old indef. (nominal) endings were in the process of disappearing in Northern Čakavian, the model for younger endings was obviously constituted by (indef.) pronominal forms and not def. adjectival forms. Cf. also Grobnik indef. forms *kogǎ* / *kegǎ* (short first syllable and end stress) as opposed to *kōga* / *kēga*<sup>180</sup> (long and stressed first syllable). In this way, the original distinction of def. and indef. gen. and dat. sg. is preserved by accent, despite the fact that the original indef. forms begin to disappear, cf. in Rijeka: indef. gen. sg. *zūtǎ* : def. gen. sg. *zūtega*, indef. dat. sg. *zūtǝ* : def. dat. sg. *zūtemu* ⇒ indef. gen. sg. *zūtegǎ* : def. gen. sg. *zūtega*, indef. dat. sg. *zūtemǝ* : def. dat. sg. *zūtemu*. So the conclusion is that these forms are local innovations and not PSI. archaisms.

Another interesting fact is that end-stressed endings of oblique plural cases are short in the Čakavian indef. declension, despite the fact that those

<sup>180</sup> Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 107.



are originally old def. forms (taken secondarily into the indef. declension), which should have long vowels due to contraction. Cf. Stand. Croat. indef. dat/loc/instr. pl. *žútīm(a)* : def. dat/loc/instr. pl. *žútīma* with the Grobnik forms (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 93) indef. gen/loc. pl. *-ih*, instr. pl. *-imi*. Also Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 157) indef. loc. pl. *zūtèh*, instr. pl. *zūtèmi*<sup>181</sup>. The short endings in dat. pl. *-im*, gen/loc. pl. *-ih*, instr. pl. *-imi* are present in Križanić's dialect as well. In unstressed indef. declension (and in def. declension, where endings are always unstressed), cf. in Grobnik the length in the gen/loc. pl. *-ih* and instr. pl. *-imi*. Short stressed endings are probably due to analogy to pronominal endings like the gen/loc. pl. *nìh*, instr. pl. *nìmi*, even though short vowel is not expected there neither (cf. PS1. \*jĭxъ, \*jimi, Дыбо 1981, 36). Such an analogy would be in accord with the influence of pronominal *-ogă*, *-omû* on new adjectival forms (see above).

#### KAJKAVIAN (Velika Rakovica)<sup>182</sup>

##### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

|                    |              |              |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>m</b>           | <b>f</b>     | <b>n</b>     |
| <i>blêd</i> 'pale' | <i>blêdă</i> | <i>blêdo</i> |

##### definite adjectives

|              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>     | <b>n</b>     |
| <i>blêdi</i> | <i>blêda</i> | <i>blêdo</i> |

Archaic Kajkavian dialects preserve the original a.p. C pattern (*mlâd* – *mlâdă* – *mlâdo*), which is, if it changes, most often transformed into a pattern with the generalized  $\hat{}$  (like in some Čakavian dialects). This a.p. C type includes also the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives, since Kajkavian mostly does not have a synchronic a.p. B (opposed to a.p. C) in root adjectives, with the exception of Rožić's Prigorje (see below). Thus, the three PS1. types are reduced to two types in Kajkavian (like in many Štok. and Čak. dialects as well), with the distinction of two types being in the length of indef. forms (*sît* : *drâg* / *črñ*) and the intonation of def. forms (*sîti* : *drăgi* / *črñi*).

In V. Rakovica (March 1981, 265), all long vowel adjectives are in a.p. C; i.e. the old long vowel a.p. *b* and a.p. *c* have merged (e.g. *mlâd*, *žîv* and *črñ*, *žût* are all in a.p. C:), while the short vowel a.p. C' (type *gòl* – *golă* –

<sup>181</sup> In dat. pl. Grobnik has *-în* and Rijeka *-ên*, which is due to pre-resonant lengthening, typical for Čakavian.

<sup>182</sup> March 1981, 265.

*gölo*) consists of *göl*, *pröst* and *löss*, presumably all secondarily. The old a.p. *b* and *c* have merged in Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305) as well: *drâog* ‘dear’, *mlâod* ‘young’ are the same as *žout* ‘yellow’, *vrôuč* ‘hot’ (there are no special indef. f. and n. forms in Bednja), etc. In Turopolje (Šojat 1981, 400), a.p. A: with  $\hat{}$  in all forms (< \*C) also consists of both the old a.p. *c* and a.p. *b* (*mlât* – *mlâda*, the same in *drâk* ‘dear’, *žif* ‘live’ and *cân*, *bêl*, etc.). In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 272), the type C (*lîp* – *lîpa* – *lîpo*) also encompasses the old a.p. *c* (*drâk*, *gûst*, *lîn*) as well as the old a.p. *b* (*bêl*, *vrûc*, *žût*). In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), cf. a.p. C in *žif* – *žîva* (with regular retraction) – *žîvo* – def. *žîvi*, *krîf* – *krîva* (acc. sg. *na krîvu*) – *krîvo* – def. *krîvi* (secondarily) and *bôs* – *bôsa* – *bôso*, while in most other adjectives only the def. form is attested (*lêpi*, *lêni*, *glûhi*, *gõsti* ‘dense’, *mlâdi*, *sûhi*, etc.).<sup>183</sup>

In Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894 2, 143–144), the process is apparently opposite to the rest of Kajkavian – the original a.p. *b* and *c* merge in a.p. B: (*mlâd* – *mlâda* – *mlâdi*, gen. sg. *mlâdega* and *mladěga*, etc. – likewise in *gûst*, *žîv* but also in *črîn*, *žût*), not in a.p. C:. However, this again yields the same result as in other Kajkavian dialects – the merger of the original a.p. *b* and *c*. Still, the old a.p. *b* : *c* distinction is preserved in Prigorje in a limited way in the fact that some of the old a.p. *c* adjectives preserve, mostly with variants, the accent  $\hat{}$  in the neuter form, while the old a.p. *b* adjectives do not exhibit that (with the exception of the adj. *vrûc*). Cf. *žîvo* / *žîvo*, *krîvo* (only this form!), *slêpo* / *slêpo*, *sûvo* / *sûvo* – the other adjectives, except for *vrûce* / *vrûce*, have only  $\acute{}$  in the neuter form.

In Kajkavian a.p. C, def. forms have a neo-acute on the stem (from the original a.p. *b*): *mlâdi*, *sûhi*, etc. Unlike Štok. and Čak. forms like *mlādī*, Kajk. *mlâdi* could also be the result of Ivšić’s retraction (\**mladi* > \**mlādī* > *mlâdi* like \**zābāva* > \**zābava*). Old end stressed *-î* is preserved in traces, cf. e.g. *divjî* ‘wild’ in V. Rakovica (only def. form) but mostly in denominal adjectives with the suffixes *-ji*, *-ni*, *-ski*, such as *muškî* ‘male’, *zubnî* ‘dental’, *ludskî* ‘human’ in V. Rakovica, *luckî* ‘human’, *cvitnî* ‘flower’, *zubnî* in Ozalj, etc. Still, Valjavec (1895, 137) gives the forms *dragî* (originally a.p. *c*), *dobrî* (originally a.p. *b*) from old texts. A remnant of this type is also the form *trđî* ‘hard’ (beside younger *třdi*) in Turopolje (Šojat 1982, 400).

<sup>183</sup> Valjavec (1894, 225) has the form *žîv* in his Kajkavian but only  $\acute{}$  in all other forms (*žîva* – *žîvo* – pl. *žîvi* – *žîve*, etc.).

Težak (1981, 267–268) claims for Ozalj that most of the adjectives in the indef. form have the long rising accent in the forms *-ěga*, *-ěmu*. The forms given are (268–270, 272): *črněga* / *črněmu*, *dobrěga* / *dobrěmu* ‘good’, *tetiněga* ‘aunt’s’, *pametněga* / *pametněmu* ‘clever’, *zrelěga*, *strašněga* ‘terrible’, *goručěga* ‘burning’, etc. The forms *-ěga*, *-ěmu* look like the reflexes of PSl. *\*-ajegò*, *\*-ujemù* in the def. declension of the old a.p. *c*, but the problem is that these endings appear in the *indef.* declension (def. declension has stem stress) and that they are found not only in a.p. *C* but in all accentual paradigms. In Ozalj, the first syllable of the ending was originally short, as can be seen from the open *ę* (Težak 1981, 212) – the same in Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894, 140, 142–143) forms *zdravěga* / *zdravěmu* (a), *žutěga* / *žutěmu* (b), *mladěga* / *mladěmu* (c), with generalized accent (with root stress variants) and in Križanić’s dialect (see below). This, as in the case of Čakavian, shows that these endings are not the reflexes of the PSl. a.p. *c* def. forms. It is possible that, as in Rijeka Čakavian, old forms like gen. sg. *\*dobrā* and dat. sg. *\*dobrū* (a.p. *B*) got secondary endings *-ega* / *-emu*, which, by analogy to the original forms, maintained desinential stress (*\*dobregā* / *\*dobremū*) that is not connected to the old a.p. *c* def. stress. In this scenario, other than the proposed contamination of the endings *\*-ā* and *\*-ega*, one should also assume the secondary spread of this accent from a.p. *B* to other accentual paradigms but, as in North Čakavian, pronominal forms such as *mojěga* ‘mine’, *mojěmu*, *čijěga* ‘whose’, *ověga* ‘this’, *jeněga* ‘one’, etc. were surely influential as well.<sup>184</sup> Another possibility is that the end stress in the gen/dat. sg. is analogical to the stress on the ending in other indef. forms (instr. pl. *dobrīmi*,<sup>185</sup> gen. sg. f. *dobrē*, inst. sg. m/n. *dobrīm*<sup>186</sup> / f. *dobrūm*, etc.) although the motivation for *\*-egā* / *-emū* and not *\*-ěga* or *\*-ěga* would be unclear. In the Ozalj area, such an accentuation

<sup>184</sup> Of course, if one were to assume that these forms are indeed connected to the old def. a.p. *c*, one could also assume that pronominal endings, with a short first syllable, have influenced the original inherited adjectival end stressed forms with the original long first syllable. However, this scenario does not look probable for the already mentioned reasons (e.g. that this end stress appears only in innovative indef. forms, etc.).

<sup>185</sup> Cf. the shortness of the stressed ending in Čak. The shortness could be explained by analogy to the old nom. pl. *\*dobrī* as well.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Štok. indef. instr. m/n. *dòbrīm* (B), *mládīm* (C).

existed already in 17th century, which is obvious in Križanić's gen/dat. sg. forms: gen. sg. *bridkogò*, *Siñegò*, dat. sg. *Siñemù* (from *Siñ* – *Siñba* – *Siñbe*, B:), gen. sg. *Dobrogò* (B), *Tešćegò* (originally a.p. *b*), etc. Križanić's forms attest the shortness of the first syllable of the ending (cf. also the pronominal forms *Mojegò*, *Tvojegò*, as well as indef. gen. sg. *dobrâ*, dat. sg. *Dobrù*).<sup>187</sup> In Križanić's language, end stressed gen/dat. sg. appear only in the indef. a.p. B (*давнoгò* 'ancient', *praznogò*) and a.p. C forms (*нpoчmoгò* from *prôst*), which also points to the secondarity of these forms. In def. forms, the accent is never on the last syllable of the ending (cf., for instance, Križanić's *мужскoгo*).

In Turopolje, in the oblique cases of the def. declension one finds (Šojat 1981, 400): gen. sg. *dobrôga*, dat. sg. *dobrômu* (which may be derived from \**dobrôgä*, \**dobrômü*) along with *dôbroga*, *dôbromu*, and also *zelenôga* / *zêlenoga* 'green', *črlenôga* 'red', *krvavôga* / *křvavoga* 'bloody', *kupovnôga* (from *kupovnî*) 'store-bought', *zmešnôga* (from *zmešnî*) 'meat', *vražôga* 'devil's', etc. Although this is not a very archaic dialect, it is not clear how one could explain such forms if not as an archaism, i.e. as traces of the original a.p. *c* def. forms that are preserved in some adjectives. It is true that this accent occurs in the old a.p. *b* adjectives as well (*dobrôga*, *zelenôga*, *črlenôga*), but it is present in the old a.p. *c* adjectives (*krvavôga*) and, what is especially significant, it also appears in the oblique cases of nom. sg. forms in *-î* (*zmešnî* – *zmešnôga*), which is exactly where one would expect it historically.

Cf. in Slovene:

*mlâd* – *mlâda* – *mladô*

Slovene preserves the original a.p. C pattern (cf. acc. sg. f. *mladô*, nom. pl. m. *mladî*, nom. pl. f. *mladê*, etc.).<sup>188</sup> A.p. C consists of original a.p. *c* adjectives (such as *bôs*, *blâg*, *drâg*, *glûh*, etc.) but also of some secondary cases (like *mîl* and *pôln* of the original a.p. *a*<sup>189</sup> or *žôlt* 'yellow' of the original a.p. *b*). In Slovene, a.p. C adjectives (but also adj. of other accentual paradigms, cf. *stârega* / *staregä* and *stâremu* / *staremü* the same

<sup>187</sup> Križanić 1984, 87–88.

<sup>188</sup> Cf. also innovative patterns *grôb* – *grôba* – *grobô* and *mlâd* – *mlâda* – *mlâdo* (Toporišič 2004, 324–325).

<sup>189</sup> A > C by analogical transfer of neo-circumflex from def. forms to indef. ones and then by reanalysis of the neo-circumflex as the old circumflex and the rise of a.p. C accentuation in other forms.

as *mládega* / *mladegä*, *mládemu* / *mlademü*)<sup>190</sup> can have end stress in the oblique cases: *bosəgä*, *bledəgä*, *dragəgä*, *suhəgä*, etc. Such an accent now appears in the indef. declension, but in the 19th century they occurred in the def. declension as well (Stankiewicz 1993, 66–67). It is not clear if these cases are archaic (thus reflexes of the original a.p. *c* def. end stress) or innovative, as in some Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects.

**a.p. C:** *'blāg* mild (Štok. also B:), *'blēd* pale (Štok. also B:, PSI. *c*)<sup>191</sup> *'bos* barefoot, *'br̥z* quick, *'cēl* whole (Štok. also B:, PSI. *b/c*)<sup>192</sup> *'čēst* frequent, *'čvr̥st* hard, *desn̥t* right (also B > B:)<sup>193</sup>, *'dīv* wild (Čak., in Štok. only *divlj̥t*)<sup>194</sup> *'drāg* dear, *'glūh* deaf, *'glūp*<sup>195</sup> stupid (PSI. *b*), *'gnjil* rotten (Štok. also B:, > A)<sup>196</sup> *'gūst* dense, *'gr̥d* ugly (PSI. *b/c*), *'grūb* rude, *'jāk* strong (> Štok. B:, PSI. *c*)<sup>197</sup> *'kōs* narrow (< \*C, also > A), *'krīv* guilty, *'křnj* broken, unfinished, *'krūt* rigid, *'kūs* tailless, *'lēn* lazy, *'lēp* beautiful, *'ljūt* angry (PSI. *b*), *'lūd* crazy, *'mlād* young (> B:), *'mlāk* tepid (Štok. also B:),<sup>198</sup> *'nāg* naked,

<sup>190</sup> Valjavec 1894, 144, 170.

<sup>191</sup> For the reconstruction of PSI. a.p. *c*, see Дыбо 1981, 109 (cf. also Czech *bledý*). As already said, this adjective is frequently a.p. B: in Štok. (in dialects that preserve the old a.p. B: / a.p. C: opposition), e.g. in Imotska and Vrgorska Krajina and in Posavina (cf. *blīd* in Ivšić 1913 2, 44, which is corroborated by my data from Sikerevci, Orubica, Babina Greda and Kobaš).

<sup>192</sup> For the PSI. a.p. *c*, cf. a.p. C in Zaliznyak's data (Зализняк 1985, 138), Czech *celý* and Slv. *cěl*. For the PSI. a.p. *b*, cf. Дыбо 2000, 219.

<sup>193</sup> The a.p. C indef. form is preserved in adverbs like *nādesno*, *ūdesno* to the right, *zdēsna* from the right, cf. also Vrgada *sādesna* (Jurišić 1973).

<sup>194</sup> Cf. indef. *dīv* (a.p. A: < a.p. *c*) in Rijeka (Strohal 1895, 158), *dīv* (C) in Orlec (Houtzagers 1985, 121) and *dīv* in Crikvenica (Ivančić-Dusper 2003). It is quite possible that the Čakavian a.p. C is secondary, considering a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: of Štok. *dīvan* (see below). We are dealing with the same Proto-Indo-European root (\*deyw-) in both cases, however it is not impossible that a differentiation (including accentual one) ensued due to differing semantics.

<sup>195</sup> This is not a native word (cf. ARj).

<sup>196</sup> In Štokavian, the vowel in *gnīl* is shortened after the vocalization of the final *l* and thus we get *gnīo*. By analogy, this can yield *gnīla*, *gnīlo* (and further *gnīla*, *gnīlo*, etc.) instead of the older *gnīla*, *gnīlo* / *gnīlo* (cf. thus in Dubrovnik, Rešetar 1900, 114).

<sup>197</sup> Cf. Дыбо 1981, 36 for a.p. *c* (also Czech *jaký*). In Štokavian, a.p. B: is attested in Dubrovnik and Dalmatinska zagora all way to Posavina.

<sup>198</sup> Cf. e.g. Posavian *mlāk* (Ivšić 1913 2, 44 and my data from Slobodnica) and *mlāko* – pl. *mlāki* in Prapatnice (Vrgorska Krajina). This is in accord with *mlāčan* – *mlāčna* – *mlāčno* or *mlāčan* in Štokavian.

'*nēm* mute, '*prēk* important, '*pūst* desolate, '*sām*<sup>199</sup> alone, '*sēd* grey-haired (> B:, PSI. *c*),<sup>200</sup> '*skūp* expensive, '*slān* salty, '*slēp* blind, '*strān* alien (also A and B:), '*sūh* dry, '*svēt* holy, '*štūr* meager, '*tūd* foreign (*tud'ī*),<sup>201</sup> '*tūp* dull, blunt, '*tūst* fat (also A), '*tvrd* hard, '*vrān* black (> B:), '*žīv* alive

### The accentuation of gen/dat. sg. in a.p. *c* definite adjectives declension

As we have seen, in PSI. the gen/dat. sg. m/n. of the a.p. *c* def. declension were end-stressed: gen. sg. \*-ajegò, dat. sg. \*-ujemù. After contraction and analogical changes, one would expect Croat. gen. sg. \*-ògà and dat. sg. \*-òmù from these forms. But in a.p. C def. adj. declension one does not find end-stress in the standard language nor in most dialects, instead, the accent is on the first syllable of the ending. Cf. Stand. Croat. *tùdī*, gen. sg. *tùdēga*, dat. sg. *tùdēmu*. Still, we have shown a number of cases where the original desinential stress is possibly preserved:

Posavina (Ivšić) – gen. sg. -òg

Ozrinići (Crna Gora) – *ľuckī* human, gen. sg. *ľuckóga*, dat. sg. *ľuckóme*

Turopolje – gen. sg. -òga, dat. sg. -òmu (*zmēsñī*, gen. sg. *zmēsñōga*)

Rijeka & Grobnik – indef. gen. sg. -o/egà, dat. sg. -o/emù

Prigorje (Rožić) – gen. sg. -éga, dat. sg. -ému

Ozalj – indef. gen. sg. -éga, dat. sg. -ému

Križanić (17th ct.) – indef. gen. sg. -ogò, dat. sg. -omu

These forms do not belong to the same category. The first three examples are indeed cases of preservation of the original PSI. gen/dat. sg. def. a.p. *c* forms. These forms appear in the def. declension and in adjectives where

<sup>199</sup> Ivšić 1913 2, 44 gives the accentuation *sām* – *samà* – *samò* for some Posavian dial. I have the older form *samà* attested beside the younger *sáma* in Babina Greda. The Babina Greda form \*\**sāmà* mentioned in Kapović 2008b, 119f and Kapović 2008a, 30 is incorrect (the only forms that appear in the dialect are *samà* and *sáma*). The rise of the forms *samà* / *samò* is not clear. This might be an analogy to the expected shortening in the old forms \**samogà*, \**samomù* (*sam* is originally declined pronominally – historically speaking, it is not really an adjective).

<sup>200</sup> For the PSI. a.p. *c*, cf. a.p. C in Zaliznyak's data (Зализняк 1985, 138), Slv. *sêd* and Czech / Slovak *šedý*.

<sup>201</sup> Adj. *tīj* (*tūdī*) in Senj (Moguš 1966, 76) is shortened due to the influence of the old def. form. Many Štok. dialects preserve the old def. a.p. C form only in this adj. (this only applies to root adjectives, of course) because here the indef. forms are frequently lost and often only the def. form *tūdī* / *tudī* exists, without corresponding indef. forms whose length could influence the def. ones.

one expects the old a.p. c. Posavian *-ōg*, Montenegrin *luckóga / luckóme* and probably Turopolje ending *-ōga / -ōmu* should be interpreted as reflexes of the PSI. *\*-ajegó* and *\*-ujemù*.

The other cases are due to innovations that only accidentally look like the original PSI. forms. Firstly, in Rijeka / Grobnik and Ozalj / Križanić one deals with forms appearing in the indef. declension only (in Rožić's description, there is no distinction of def/indef. adjectives), where these endings cannot be original, while in the def. declension such forms do not exist, which seems significant. Secondly, Kajkavian and Čakavian forms have the short first ending syllable (the same as in pronominal *-ogă, -omû*), which clearly points to the secondarity of such forms and their development by analogy to pronominal *-ogă / -omû* forms like *jednogă, samogă, onomû*, etc. Thirdly, these forms are not limited to a.p. C in any of the mentioned dialects but appear in other accentual paradigms as well.

When dealing with the description of the accentual development of other adjectives (i.e. the ones with suffixes), we shall mostly deal with details specific for those types of adjectives, leaving behind what has already been said in the description of root adjectives, i.e. as a general rule, the shared developments of root adjectives and adjectives with suffixes will not be repeated.

For the data and reconstruction of the PSI. accentuation of *\*-ьнъ* adjectives, cf. Дыбо 1981, 72–94.

### **\*-ьнъ adjectives**

#### **1. a.p. a**

##### **PROTO-SLAVIC**

##### **indefinite adjectives**

| <b>m</b>           | <b>f</b>       | <b>n</b>       |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>*găďьнъ</i>     | <i>*găďьна</i> | <i>*găďьно</i> |
| 'despicable, ugly' |                |                |

##### **definite adjectives**

| <b>m</b>         | <b>f</b>         | <b>n</b>         |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <i>*găďьнъјъ</i> | <i>*găďьнаја</i> | <i>*găďьноје</i> |

In Proto-Slavic, a.p. *a* has constant root stress, the same as in root adjectives.

Cf. Old Russian:<sup>202</sup>

*вѣренъ – вѣрна – вѣрно* 'faithful'

<sup>202</sup> Дыбо 1981, 72.

A.p. A is preserved in modern Russian as well, although with some paradigm shifts.

#### ŠTOKAVIAN

##### indefinite adjectives

|              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>     | <b>n</b>     |
| <i>gădan</i> | <i>gădna</i> | <i>gădno</i> |

##### definite adjectives

|              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>     | <b>n</b>     |
| <i>gădnī</i> | <i>gădnā</i> | <i>gădnō</i> |

The PSI. a.p. *a* reflex is expectedly a.p. A with constant " in the standard language and many dialects. This a.p. A can change into secondary accentual types, like a.p. B or C, in some dialects.

Old short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives, such as *môćan* 'powerful' (cf. *môć* 'power', C) and *čăstan* 'honorable' (cf. *čăst* 'honor', C), have merged with the original a.p. *a*. It seems that this was a general change in all dialects, the reason being the fact that the old acute and the old short circumflex both yield the same reflex (") in Štok/Čak/Kajk., cf. \*gădъnъ > *gădan* as well as \*čăstъnъ > *čăstan*. The old a.p. *c* adjectives lose the accentual mobility (and stress shifts to proclitics) and thus become identical to the old a.p. *a* adjectives. The exception here is only the adj. *bôlan* 'painful' and Križanić's 17th ct. short vowel mobile system (see below). Of course, it is clear that adjectives such as *môćan*, *čăstan*, *sôćan* 'juicy' (cf. *sôk* 'juice', C) cannot be the original a.p. *a* adjectives since they have originally short vowels \*o and \*ъ in their stems.

Other secondary members of the a.p. A group are also adjectives such as *vjěćan* 'eternal', *bîtan* 'important', *svjěstan* 'conscious' (however, cf. the variants *vijěćan*, *bîtan*, *svijěstan* below), also originally a.p. *c* adjectives (cf. *vijêk* 'age', *bîť* 'essence', *svijêst* 'consciousness', all C) but with a long vowel (\*ě and \*i are originally long vowels). The shortening of the original \*věčъnъ and \*bîťnъ precedes in the following way. According to the rules of the old long circumflex shortening, i.e. the 'One mora law',<sup>203</sup>

<sup>203</sup> Cf. the examples \*gôrdъ > *grăd* city, \*gôrda > *grăda* city (gen. sg.), \*bôľbъnъ > *bûbanj* drum, \*môžъsko > *mûško* male, \*môldostъ > *mlădôst* youth, \*sŭnove > *sînovi* sons. The 'One mora law' states that PSI. \*^ is preserved in Štok/Čak/Kajk. only in front of one or fewer morae, while it is shortened in front of one and half or more morae (PSI. \*e/o counts as one mora, \*ъ/ь as half a mora and all other vowels as two morae, except in final open syllables where they count as one mora). See Kapović 2011b for more details and examples.



\*vĕčьnъ – \*vĕčьnā – \*vĕčьno would yield \*vijêčan (as *bûbanj* ‘drum’, *glâdan* ‘hungry’) – \*vijêčna (like *gûmno*)<sup>204</sup> – \*vjêčno (like *mûško* ‘male’). The shortened form would also be expected in all sg. oblique m/n. forms, i.e. in all forms with no *yer* at the end of the word, e.g. in gen. sg. \*vjêčna, dat. sg. \*vjêčnu (from \*vĕčьna, \*vĕčьnu) and in feminine forms with initial stress (e.g. in acc. sg. \*vĕčьnŏ > \*vjêčnu, cf. acc. sg. *djêcu* ‘children’), etc. (see below), as well as in the original def. form \*vječni (cf. Križanić *wecznîm*), as well as in compound adjectives like *vjekòvječan* ‘eternal’ and *dugòvječan* ‘long lived’ (\*-vĕčьnъ in compounds). The short falling accent was then generalized by analogy to the forms in which it was expected. By this process, with the disappearance of the proclitic accentual shift, the shift to a.p. A *de facto* occurred. Next to shortened variants like *vjêčan*, *bîtan* (if it is not a literary newer word, see below), *svjêstan*, the variants *vijêčan*, *bîtan*, *svijêstan* (some of them quite rare) also exist – here, ^ from other forms was generalized (possibly due to the influence of the nouns *vijêk*, *bît*, *svijêst*). For other cases of generalizations and shortenings, see below. In adjectives where “ is generalized, the shift to a.p. A is also present. In adjectives (or adjective variants) where ^ is generalized, a.p. C: is preserved (of course, if it exists in the system). Levellings and different variants existing in dialects are different in different adjectives.

In effect, almost all short vowel adjectives (except *bòlan* in some dialects) shift to a.p. A (regardless whether they stem from the original a.p. *a*, short vowel a.p. *c* or shortened long vowel a.p. *c*), while a.p. B: and a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: (reflexes of the original a.p. *b*) and a.p. C: consist of long vowel adjectives only. In this way, a sort of complementary distribution by root quantity arises and the PSI. accentual paradigm opposition becomes relevant for long vowel adjectives only.

In resonant-final stem adjectives (such as *sîlan* ‘mighty’, *žĕljan* ‘anxious’, *vòljan* ‘willing’, *vjêran* ‘faithful’) in f. and n. in Štokavian dialects with pre-resonant lengthening in closed syllables (i.e. all except Eastern Bosnian dialect), the said lengthening occurs and we get *sîlna* – *sîlno*, etc. By analogy to these forms, ^ can be generalized in all forms thus yielding a.p. A:, i.e. the pattern *sîlan* – *sîlna* – *sîlno* (which is synchronically identical to a.p.

<sup>204</sup> Cf. Kapović 2005a, 89–90.

AB., see below). In some cases, this a.p. A: can shift further to a.p. B: or C: (*vjêran* or *vjêran* – *vjêrna* – *vjêrno*). On the other hand, by analogy to *sîlan* one can also get *sîlna* – *sîlno* with the generalized short stem.

The lengthening occurs, of course, in polysyllabic adjectives as well, after which a retraction to the initial stem (even across several syllables) ensues. Cf. *samòvoljan* ‘self-willed’ – *samòvōljna* (cf. the noun *samòvolja* ‘self will’ for the accent) ⇔ *samòvōljan* (by analogy) – *samòvōljna* > *sāmovōljan* – *sāmovōljna* (cf. also *jednòstavan* > *jědnostāvan* ‘simple’, *punòkrvan* > *pūnokr̄van* ‘full blooded’, *punòpravan* > *pūnoprāvan* ‘full (e.g. member)’, etc.).<sup>205</sup> This tendency can be seen in other types of words as well, cf. also *talijānskī* / *talijānskī* > *tālijānskī* ‘Italian’, *odustāo* / *odustao* > *odustō* / *odustō* > *ōdustō* ‘gave up’<sup>206</sup>, etc. Nevertheless, although this new generalized length does indeed have a role in this process, such a shift occurs even in adjectives with no -RC-, such as *raznòvrstan* > *rāznovrstan* ‘miscellaneous’, *punòljetan* > *pūnoljetan* ‘of age’, etc. This is a result of a younger (in some cases very recent but not completely clear) tendency for the stress to shift from the connector -ò-<sup>207</sup> to the initial syllable of the word, not only in adjectives but also in nouns, cf. also *samòvolja* > younger *sāmovolja*. Such a shift (or sort of a ‘metatony’ in Neo-Štokavian) can occur in disyllabic root forms such as *ùmoran* ‘tired’ (cf. *ùmor* ‘tiredness’) ⇔ *ùmōran* > *ùmōran* as well.<sup>208</sup>

Secondarily, a.p. A can shift to a.p. C (or B) in some dialects in all or some adjectives. This shift occurs only in the adjectives with “ on the first syllable, thus *čūdan* – *čūdna* – *čūdno* (A) shifts to *čūdan* – *čūdna* – *čūdno*

<sup>205</sup> In some adjectives, the older accent is rare or completely disappears, cf. *zādovōljan* ‘satisfied’ (the older accent would be *zadòvoljan*) but frequent *dòvōljan* next to younger *dōvōljan* ‘sufficient’. In dialects with strong synchronic a.p. C, secondary f. forms like *zadovōljna* can appear (cf. in Posavina, Ivšić 1913 2, 170).

<sup>206</sup> This occurs in all -ao l-participles. In some dialects, like in Dubrovnik (*zamòtō*, *odustō*), there is no retraction at all in this type of cases, in others it occurs only in the masculine form (Prapatnice *zāmōtā* but *zamòtala* – *zamòtalo*), while in others, like often in Posavina, it can analogically spread to all forms (*zāmōtāla* – *zāmōtālo* by analogy to *zāmōtō*), often with older variants (*zamòtala* and *zāmōtāla*).

<sup>207</sup> Not in the case of -ò- only, cf. also *očigledan* > *ōčiglēdan* ‘obvious’ (in *ùgle-dan* > *ùglēdan* ‘prestigious, respectable’ the length can be analogical to *ùglēd* ‘respectability’).

<sup>208</sup> But cf. also *ùgodan* > *ùgodan* ‘pleasant’ without lengthening (and -RC-).

(C) and *žalostan* – *žalosna* – *žalosno* (A) to *žalostan* – *žalòsna* – *žalosno* (C) ‘sad’ (see below for polysyllabic adjectives). However, in cases like *òbičan* – *òbična* – *òbično* (A) ‘usual’ (i.e. adjectives with medial “ or ` in preceding syllable in Neo-Štokavian) there is no change. That is because, logically, the original acute a.p. A “ can be mixed with the a.p. C type initial stress only if it is placed on the first syllable.

In Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina), a.p. A generally shifted to a.p. C: *sìtan* – *sìtna* – *sìtno* (def. *sitnī*) ‘tiny’. The same in *čùdan*, *gàdan*, *jàdan* ‘poor’, *křšan* ‘strong’, *kùžan* ‘contagious’ (but def. *kùžnī*), *skòtan* ‘with young (of dogs)’ (but def. *skòtnā*), *srìtan* ‘happy’, *vìčan* ‘apt’. The old short vowel a.p. *c* goes here as well (*pòsan* ‘fast’ – def. *pòsnī krùv* ‘fast bread’, *pòtan* ‘sweaty’), the same as the shortened old long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives *krìpan* ‘invigorated’ (gen. sg. *krìpna čòvika* ‘of an invigorated man’) – def. *krìpnī* / *kripnī*, *slàstan* ‘tasty’ (def. *slàsnī*) and *ždrìbna* ‘with young (of mares)’ (def. *ždrìbnā kòbila* ‘the mare with young’). The adjectives with the generalized pre-RC- lengthening are *vìran* – *vìrna* – *vìrno* – def. *vìrnī* and *sìlan* – *sìlna* (!) – *sìlno* – def. *sìlnī*. The adj. *òran* ‘eager’ shifts to a.p. C: after the length generalization: *òrna* – *òrno* – def. *òrnī*. Cf. also the unusual a.p. B in *žèljan* – *žèljna* – *žèljno* – def. *žèljnī* (and the adj. *vóljna* from this same original type).

In Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 127–128, 130), in one group of adjectives a.p. A shifts optionally to a.p. C, e.g. *čùdan* – *čùdna* / *čùdna*, the same in *jàdan*, *vlàžan* ‘moist’, etc. This pattern is followed also by *kàsan* ‘late’, which obviously cannot be a.p. *a* originally (cf. the vocalism in \*кѡсьнѣ) and the shortened old long vowel a.p. *c* adj. *rèdan* ‘orderly’ (cf. *réd* – *rêda* ‘order’) and *krìpan*. The other group of adjectives has completely shifted to a.p. C: *gàdan* – *gàdna* – *gàdno*, the same in *mučan* ‘nauseous, painful’, *sitan*, etc.<sup>209</sup> (originally a.p. *a*) but also *moćan*, *soćan* (originally a.p. *c*). As can be seen, the reflex of the original a.p. *a* is the same as the one of the old short vowel a.p. *c* with a generalized “(\*сѡсьнѣ). Theoretically, +sòćan – +sòćna – +sòćno could be a regular reflex of the old a.p. *c*, but this is not very likely – the shift to a.p. A and then later A

<sup>209</sup> Cf. a similar kind of vacillation in a part of Imotska Krajina (Studenci) as attested by Babić 2008: *jàdan* – *jàdna* – *jàdno* (A), *gàdan* – *gàdna* – *gàdno* (C) and *bržan* – *bržna* / *brižna* – *brižno* (A/C).

> C is more probable. This new a.p. C is actually a.p. C-B, cf. the variant forms in oblique m/n. cases like gen. sg. *gādna* and *gàdna* (the latter form is the one we would expect in a.p. B). In some adjectives in Imotska krajina, as well as in other dialects, a secondary lengthening / shortening occurs by which certain adjectives shift from or to a.p. A. Cf. the variant forms: *brīžan* ⇔ *brīžan* ‘caring’ (~ *brīga* ‘care’), *kūžan* ⇔ *kūžan* (~ *kūga* ‘plague’), *pòsan* ⇔ *pòsan* (perhaps by analogy to *pòst*, gen. sg. *pòsta* ‘fast’), *sūzan* ⇔ *sūzan* ‘full of tears’ (the length cannot be original, cf. \**slyza*), as well as *grīšan* ⇔ *grīšan* ‘sinful’ (cf. Stand. Croat. *griječ*, gen. sg. *griječa*, dial. *grīj*, cf. the shortening also in *grěšnīk* ‘sinner’, which is also not clear), *ščēdan* ⇔ *ščēdan* ‘frugal’ (cf. Stand. Croat. *štedjeti* ‘save (e.g. money)’). Cf. also *časān* – *časna* / *časna* – *časno* ‘honorable’. Most of these cases, concerning both the secondary lengthening (like in *kūžan*) and shortening (like in *grīšan*), are difficult to explain (except for *pòsan* and *časān*). One could assume that this is some kind of analogy to adjectives like *glāsan* : *glāsan* ‘loud’ (not attested by Šimundić) or, with another suffix, *vītak* : *vītak* ‘slim’, which is attested in the dialect and originally is probably a.p. c. Secondary forms like *kūžan* and *grěšan* could perhaps cast a shadow of doubt upon the supposition that alternations like *glāsan* / *glāsan* are indeed a result of different levellings after the operation of the ‘One mora law’ and not a case of some hard-to-explain secondary lengthening / shortening. Still, considering that such variants appear mostly in the original a.p. c, where they are easy to explain by the said levellings and since the number of adjectives like *glāsan* / *glāsan* is larger than those of sporadic words like *kūžan* / *kūžan*, the ‘One mora law’ explanation looks viable. Secondary lengthenings / shortenings in a.p. A and B can be explained by analogy to the alternations in a.p. C as well as in individual ways – *pòstan* by analogy to *pòst*, *lāžan* ‘false’ instead of *lāžan* by analogy to *lāž* ‘lie’, *časān* instead of *časān* by analogy to *čas*, *brīžan* / *brīžan* as a younger derivation,, etc.<sup>210</sup>

Budmani (1883, 172) gives a.p. C for *sitan* in Dubrovnik. Cf. the shift to a.p. C in Šaptinovac (Ivšić 1907, 140–141) *srětan* – *srětna* – *srětno* (the same in *sītan*, *gādan*, *sīčan* ‘alike’). For Posavina, Ivšić (1913 2, 43)

<sup>210</sup> Explanations like *jāsan* ‘clear’ (instead of *jāsan*) being analogical to *glāsan*, etc. are perhaps not as convincing.

gives only *sitnā – sītno*, *vlažnā – vlāžno*, thus also a shift to a.p. C. Baotić for Kostrč (1971, 199) gives only the a.p. C adjectives *sītān*, *pöstān* (the same as for adjectives like *čīst*). However, the sparse data from Ivšić and Baotić is not representative of the whole Posavina. A.p. A can be preserved in Posavina, at least partially. In my data from the village of Slobodnica, a.p. A (with the pattern *blätān – blätna – blätno – pl. blätni*) is preserved in most of the adjectives: *blätān*, *čüdān*, *gädān*, *gläsān*, *grěšān*, *jädān*, *jäsān*, *mlēdān* crisp, *skötna*, *slözān*, *štětān*, *zlöbān*, *rödna*, *pöstān*, *rösān*, *spräsna* ‘with young (of sows)’, *ždrěbna* ‘with young (of mares)’. The accent of def. forms is often old (like *čüdnī*) but can also be innovative in some adjectives (*blatnī*). In others, the A > C shift is sometimes attested, cf. *vīčān – vīčna – vīčno* (the same in *sītān*, *strāšān* ‘ugly’ and *vlāžān*). I also have attestations of two adjectives with a secondary shift to a.p. B’ (*sličān – slična – slično*, the same in *sprětān*) and to a mixed a.p. B-C (*svjěstān – svjēsna – svjēsno*, the same in *srětān*). There is an obvious secondary tendency for a.p. A to shift to a.p. C (and a further tendency for this new a.p. C to shift to a.p. B’). Secondary length can be seen in the adjectives (that have def. forms only in the dial.) *lāznī* (with the circumflex from the noun) and *kāsnī* (with the secondary neo-acute in the def. form). The -RC- length is generalized in adjectives like *slāvan – slāvna – slāvno – def. slāvnī* (the same in *ôran*, *sīlan*, *vôlan*), while this type of pattern shifts to the secondary a.p. B: in *žélān – žélna – žélno – def. žēlnī*.

Polysyllabic adjectives in -an with “ from the old acute (i.e. the original a.p. a) – *rädostan* ‘joyful’, *žälöstan*, *pämetan* ‘clever’, etc. – are in Štok. either a.p. A (constant “ on the first / root syllable) or a.p. C (mobile stress, i.e. f. forms such as *radòsna / žalòsna / pamètna*). A.p. C in the old a.p. a adjectives is due to analogy to adjectives like *bölestan* ‘sick’ and *slöbòdan* ‘free’ that stem from the original a.p. c (cf. the inherited *bolèsna*, *slobòdna*, a.p. C). Usually, all of these adjectives behave in the same manner in Štokavian, i.e. there is no distinction between the old a.p. a and a.p. c (cf. the preservation of the original opposition in Brač / Hvar Čakavian below). In many Štokavian dialects (perhaps in all of them), the present a.p. A in these cases is to be derived from the older generalized a.p. C. Thus, the original *\*slobodnā (c) / \*pämetyāna (a) ⇔ \*slobodnā / \*pametnā (C) ⇔ \*slobodnā / \*pametnā (C) or \*slöbodna / \*pämetna (A, by analogy to forms*

with initial stress). Of course, the possibility exists that in some dialects a.p. A was generalized from the beginning, but it seems that as a rule almost all archaic Štokavian dialects exhibit a.p. C in these adjectives. It must be said that a shift to a.p. C by polysyllabic adjectives like *žalostan* can, it seems, be independent of the shift of disyllabic adjectives (like *čudan*) to a.p. C since in some dialects the original a.p. A is preserved in disyllabic adjectives but not in polysyllabic where a.p. C is generalized (thus *čudna* but *pamètna*). This could perhaps be related to the A > C shift in the basic nouns *pāmēt*, *rādōst*, *žālōst*.

The original distinction of a.p. *a* and a.p. *c* in adjectives like *pāmetan* / *bōlestan* is preserved, except in traces in Brač / Hvar, in some derivatives as well – cf. *bolēsnica* ‘sick woman’, *Slobodnīca* (a village in Slavonia) from \*bōlestъnъ, \*slōbodъnъ but *sūze rādosnice* ‘tears of joy’, *pāmetnica* ‘clever woman (disparaging)’<sup>211</sup> from \*rādostъnъ, \*pāmētъnъ.

The shift to a.p. C, as said, does not occur in medial “ (i.e. Neo-Štok. ‘ on the preceding syllable), i.e. in adjectives like *kōristan* ‘useful’, *žēljezan* ‘iron’, etc., which remain in a.p. A.

In Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 127–128), cf. +bōlestan – +bōlesna / bolēsna – +bōlesno with variants in f. form (the same in *milosan* ‘merciful’, *rados(t)an*, *slobodan*, *žalostan*). For Šaprinovac (Ivšić 1907, 140–141), cf. the type *pāmetan* – *pamètna* – *pāmetno* (the same in *prāvedan* ‘just’ and secondary *ūmoran*). Ivšić (1913 2, 47) gives only *bolesnā* / *bolēsna* (acc. sg. *bōlesnu*, instr. sg. *bolesnōm*) for Posavina, and the same for *pametnā* / *pamètna*, *radosnā* / *radōsna*, *žalosnā* / *žālōsna*, *slobodnā* / *slobōdna*. He does not mention the type A in such adjectives in Posavina at all. Still, it can be found today, cf. in Orubica (my data) innovative *slōbodān* – *slōbodna* but *bōlestān* – *bolēsna* and in Slobodnica (my data) *prāvedān* – *prāvedna* – *prāvedno* and the same in *pāmetna*, *žālosna*, *slōbodna*, *srāmotna* but *bōlestān* – *bolēsna* – *bōlesno*. As for def. forms, the older accent is preserved in the village name *Slobodnā*, while the younger accent is attested in forms like *bōlesnī*, *žālōsnā*, gen. sg. *žālōsnē* (Ivšić 1913 2, 50–51), cf. also in Slobodnica (my data) *pravēdnī*, *slobōdnī*,

<sup>211</sup> The accent attested in ARj (and some dialects) is, however, *pamètnica*, but this must be secondary.

*žalòsnī*, etc. In other dialects and in the standard language, the youngest def. forms such as *slòbodnī*, *žàlosnī* appear. They are made by analogy to the generalized indef. *slòbodan* – *slòbodna*. For Kostrč, Baotić (1979, 201–202) gives variant forms *bòlestān* – *bolèsna* / *bòlesna* – *bòlesno* (the same in *bùnōvān* ‘giddy’, *gòjāzān* ‘fat’, *drùžēvān* ‘friendly’, *īmūcān* ‘wealthy’, *mòčvārān* ‘swampy’, *òsōrān* ‘gruff’, *ràdostān*, *prījāzān* ‘nice’, etc.) with a note that the initially accented forms are more frequent. The type C accent occurs in all adjectives in Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina): *bòlestan* – *bolèsna* – *bòlesno* – def. *bòlesnī*, also *pamètna*, *slobòdna*, *sramòtna* ‘shameful’, *žalòsna*<sup>212</sup> (gen. sg. *žalòsnē žēnē* ‘of a sad woman’, *žàlosna čòvika* ‘of a sad man’).

### ČAKAVIAN (Vrgada)<sup>213</sup>

#### indefinite adjectives

| m            | f            | n            |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>gādan</i> | <i>gādna</i> | <i>gādno</i> |

#### definite adjectives

| m                           | f | n |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <i>jādni</i> <sup>214</sup> |   |   |

The tendencies in Čakavian are more or less in accord with the Štokavian ones. A.p. *a* yields a.p. A with constant “ on the stem and possible secondary shifts to a.p. C in some adjectives / dialects. As in Štokavian, the old short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives have shifted to a.p. A (even in *bolan*). This is a general Štok-Čak-Kajk. tendency in \*-ьнъ adjectives to split into those with short vowel stems, i.e. into a.p. A (no matter what their origin is), and those with long vowel stems, i.e. into the accentual types that originate from the PSi. (long) a.p. *b* and *c*. However, this tendency is hardly very old since there is still the short vowel a.p. C in Križanić’s language.

In Čakavian, the shortening of the old long vowel a.p. *c* is seen only in the adjectives *bītan*, *kriṗan* and *strāsan*. It seems as if the number of adjectives with the generalization of the shortened vowels after the operation of the ‘One mora law’ is lower in Čakavian than in Štokavian, i.e. that the generalization of length was a more frequent process in Čakavian, but such a conclusion might just be an outcome of the insufficient knowledge of Čakavian data. On the other hand, the processes having to do with

<sup>212</sup> These forms are now archaic in the dialect.

<sup>213</sup> Jurišić 1973.

<sup>214</sup> Jurišić 1966, 83.



lengthening / shortening in front of -RC- and other secondary lengthenings are similar to those in Štokavian.

Hraste (1935, 32–33) in his description of the dialect(s) of Hvar does not mention a.p. A -an adjectives. Among Brusje adjectives in ČDL one finds: *brīžna*, *čēdna* ‘chaste’, *čūdna*, *kriṗna*, *skōtna*, etc. The adj. *ghōjnā* ‘purulent’ is in a.p. C due to generalization of the -RC- length and a following shift to a.p. C. The form *kūžan* has the usual secondary (unclear) length (see below). From Pitve on Hvar I have attested just the following forms: *šēs̃tan* – *šēs̃na* – *šēs̃no* ‘pretty’ and *jād̃an* – *jād̃na* – *jād̃no* (one would expect \**jād̃an* – \**jād̃na* – \**jād̃no*). In Vrboska on Hvar (Matković 2004), the forms *srič̃an* – *srič̃na* – *srič̃no* ‘happy’ and *lās̃tan* – *lās̃na* – *lās̃no* ‘rested’ are found.<sup>215</sup> In *žēj̃an* – *žēj̃nā*, *žēj̃nō* ‘anxious’, one can see a strange accentual pattern after the pre-resonant lengthening. As the given adjectives clearly show, the old a.p. A is, generally speaking, preserved on Hvar – just as in root adjectives but unlike the more innovative Brač dialect.

On Brač (Šimunović 2009, 44), cf. *sītan* – *sītna* – *sītno* (also *ūmidan* ‘wet’, *pōstan*, *m̃rsan*, *sladokūsan* ‘sweet loving’, *zimogrōzan* ‘cold-fearing’, *jubopītan* ‘curious’) and a comment that many of the adjectives of this type have a variant end stress: *umidnā*, *m̃rsnā*, i.e. the A/C vacillation. However, in the dictionary, Šimunović in cases like *čūdan* (def. *čūdni*), *slič̃an* (def. *sliš̃ni*), *jād̃an*, *plāč̃an* ‘crying’, etc. does not note feminine end stress so one can assume that the a.p. A pattern is more frequent here. The original a.p. *a* has merged with the old short vowel a.p. *c*, cf. *mōč̃an*, *plōdan* ‘fruitful’, *kās̃an* ‘late’.

In *ghōjan* – *ghōjnā* – *ghōjno*, it is possible to think of the preservation of the old a.p. *c* of \*gnǫjъnъ, but this could also be a secondary accent from a.p. A – first by introduction of the new *ˆ* in the n. and f. form in front of -jn-, then by transferring it to the m. form by analogy and then by \**ghōjna* yielding younger *ghōjnā* (as on Hvar). Likewise in the adj. ‘anxious’ (*žēj̃an* – *žēj̃nā* – *žēj̃no*) but without the generalization of *ˆ* in the m. form (cf. the basic forms *ghōj* ‘dung’ and *žēja* ‘wish’ that may or may not have influenced these adjectives). The other possibility is that the old a.p. *c* is preserved here – perhaps because of the very pre-resonant length,

<sup>215</sup> The example *pōtan* – *potnā* – *pōtno* may be a short vowel a.p. C archaism.



cf. the preservation of a.p. C in Štok. *bòlan*, but cf. the Brač form *bòlan* – *bòlna* – *bòlno* with a shift to a.p. A and the generalization of  $\hat{}$ . But cf. the surely secondary a.p. C in *sìlan* – *sìlnà* – *sìlno* (also in *vìran*), where first  $\hat{}$  from pre-resonant forms is generalized and then the secondary a.p. C forms develop. In the def. forms, the accent remains of the a.p. A type: *sìlni*, *vìrni*, unlike the def. forms *gñòjni*, *žèjni*. This might support the hypothesis that a.p. *c* is preserved in *gñòjan* and *žèjan*. Beside *sìlan* and *vìran*, cf. also *bùran* where  $\hat{}$  remains in all three forms (in the m. form by analogy, of course). Some of the old a.p. *a* adjectives experience the complete shift to a.p. C, e.g. *smìran* – *smìrnà* – *smìrno* – def. *smìrni* ‘meek’ (cf. Štok. *smjèran*). After the pre-resonant lengthening an unusual levelling occurs in *òràn* – *òrnà* – *òrno*, where the process was probably: \*A (\**öran* – \**örna* – \**örho*)  $\Rightarrow$  \*A: (\**öran* – \**örna* – \**örho*, the generalization of the length)  $\Rightarrow$  \*C: (\**öran* – \**örnà* – \**örno*, analogy to a.p. C)  $\Rightarrow$  B:-C: *òràn* – *òrnà* – *òrno* (the m. form by analogy to the f. form and the appearance of a new mixed accentual pattern). The original a.p. A (this Čak. a.p. A is, of course, not PSI. since there is an \**o* in the root) can still be seen in the def. *òrni*. These kinds of mixed synchronic patterns are attested in other adjectives on Brač as well.

We see an interesting accentuation in *pòtan* – *potnà* – *potnò* (def. *pòtni*, the same in ČDL) ‘sweaty’ (cf. *pòt* – *pòta* ‘sweat’, PSI. *c*), where the origin of this secondary type is not clear (perhaps it is in the influence of adjectives like *òštar* – *oštrà* – *oštrò* ‘sharp’, although the motivation is unclear – cf. also *pòtan* in a.p. C in Vrboška and B' on Rab, as on Brač).<sup>216</sup> Unlike Štok. *svjèstan* (with a much less frequent variant *svijèstan*), cf. the Brač a.p. C: in *svìstan* – *svìsnà* – *svìsno*. Here, the original length from *svìsnà* and *svìstan* was preserved and generalized – thus the word remained in a.p. C (the length of the basic form *svìst* may have helped as well).

One witnesses unclear lengthenings, similar to those in Štokavian, in same kind of adjectives with different variants of generalization and post-lengthening development, cf. *sùzan* (-*a*, -*o*) but *suzà* – *sùzu* / *suzù* (PSI. \*slъzъnъ, a.p. *c*), *brìžan* – *brìžnà* – *brìžno* (but def. *brìžni*) and *kùžan* – *kùžnà* – *kùžno* (cf. *kùga*, see below for the accentual pattern).

<sup>216</sup> Cf. the Rab form *pòtan* – *potnà* – *potnò* (Kušar 1894, 34).

On Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 83; 1973), the largest group of adjectives preserves a.p. A: *jādan* – *jādna* – *jādno* (the same in *křšan*, *mřsan*, *prřdan* ‘useful’, *sřlčan* ‘alike’, *vlžan* ‘moist’). These are joined by the old short vowel a.p. c adjectives: *drōban* ‘tiny’, *pōtan*, *kāsān* (def. *kasnī*). An optional shift to a.p. C is attested in *sītan* – *sītnā* / *sītna* – *sītno* (A/C) and a complete one in *skōtan* – *skotnā* – *skōtno* (C) ‘with young (of animals)’. In resonant ending root adjectives, two different forms of developments from length alternation can be seen: the generalization of a short vowel in all forms as in *žēlan* – *žēlna* (-o) or the generalization of *ˆ* and a shift to a.p. C: *vīran* – *vīrnā* – *vīrno* – def. *vīrnī*. As on Brač, the adj. *svīstan* – *svīsna* – *svīsno* has a generalized length with the preservation of a.p. C (cf. Štok. *svjěstan* A). Unclear secondary lengthening, as elsewhere in Čakavian and Štokavian, is seen in *brīžan* (-a, -o).

In Senj (Moguš 1966, 76), a.p. A remains: *blātan* – *+blātna* – *+blātno* – def. *+blātnī* ‘muddy’ (the same in *čūdān*). Cf. also *pōsan* – *+pōsna* – *+pōsno* but def. *+pōsni* from the old short vowel a.p. c.

In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), cf. the pattern *gādan* – *gādna* – *gādno* – def. *gādni*, the same in *blātan*, *jādan* (unlike Grobnik, Orlec and Orbanići, see below), *jāsān* ‘clear’, *jūžan*, *sīlan* – *sīlna* – *sīlno* (all a.p. a) with a generalized *˜* from pre-resonant lengthening and *bītan*, *křpān* (a.p. c).

In Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 96–97, 101, 105–106), one finds the following situation. There is an a.p. A with no *ˆ* in def. forms, as in *lāčān* – *lāčna* – *lāčno* – def. *lāčnī* ‘hungry’ and also in *čūdān*, *sītān*, *sřlčān*, *slōžān*, *sřřčān*, *zlōbān*, etc. This pattern is found also in polysyllables *podōbān*,<sup>217</sup> *zadovōjān* (*zadovōjna*, *zadovōjno* – def. *zadovōjnī*). In other group of polysyllabic adjectives the neo-circumflex appears: *korīstan* – *korīsna* – *korīsno* – def. *korīsni* (also in *pobōžān* ‘religious’, *siromāšān* ‘poor’). In a.p. A, together with the old a.p. a adjectives, there are also old short vowel a.p. c adjectives such as *drōbān* – *drōbna* – *drōbno* (*drōbnī*), *mōčān*, *plōdān*, *vōdān* ‘watery’, *žējān* (*žējna* – *žējno*), etc., as well as the shortened old long vowel adj. *křpān*. Some adjectives shifted to a.p. C, cf. *blātān* – *blātnā* – *blātno* – def. *blātnī* (*pōtān* is also C). The adjective

<sup>217</sup> There is only *podōbnī* attested as the def. form but also *spodōbnī* in the same meaning (‘alike’).

*jâdân – jâdnâ – jâdno* – def. *jâdnī* ‘miserable’ has a.p. C: and not a.p. A, cf. also the nominal variants *jâd – jâda* and *jâd – jâda* ‘misery’ and Orlec and Orbanici. The adjective *brîžân* shifted to a.p. B:, while an unusual mixed pattern is seen in *sîlân – sîlnâ – sîlno* after the pre-resonant lengthening.

In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), cf. *blâtan, cûdan, lâcan, sîlan, slâvan, vëran* for a.p. A. A.p. A consists of the old short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives (*dröban, bölan – \*bôlna*) and the shortened old long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives (*strâsan*). As elsewhere, the adj. *brîzan* is lengthened.

In Orlec (Houtzagers 1985), cf. a.p. A in *blâten, lâčen – lâšni, mûčen – mûšni*. The adj. *brîžni* has only def. forms that point to the indef. \*brîžen (with the usual unclear lengthening) that no longer exists. The adj. *pöten – potnâ* does not show if it is a.p. B or C. The adjective *bölen – bolnâ – bolnô – pl. bolni* is in a.p. B. The adj. *jâden – jâdnâ – jâdni* is in a.p. C:, as in Grobnik and Orbanici. The number of adjectives is too small for any general conclusions.

In Orbanici (Kalsbeek 1998, 143–144), cf. the preserved a.p. A in the type *srëćan – srëćna – srëćno* (the same in *blâtan, lâčan, mûčan*, nom. pl. f. *sîtne*, nom. pl. m. *složni*). These adjectives are joined by the old short vowel a.p. *c*: *dröban – dröbna – dröbno*, the same in *pötan, plödna*. Cf. also *bölen – b<sup>u</sup>ölna – b<sup>u</sup>ölno* and *žëlan – ž<sup>i</sup>ëlna – ž<sup>i</sup>ëlno* with a shift to a.p. A as well but with the pre-resonant lengthening. The adverb *bitno* shows the shortening of the old a.p. *c* and the adj. *jâdan – jâdnâ / jâdna – jâdni* is in a.p. C: as elsewhere in the North. The unclear lengthening is seen in *brîžan – brîžna – brîžno*. Of course, here it might be due to analogy to the old neo-circumflex in def. forms. For *kâsan* see above.

As for the polysyllabic adjectives of the original a.p. *a* with a “ on the first syllable (which are mixed with the polysyllabic adj. of the original a.p. *c* with a “ on the first syllable), cf. the levelled Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) *žâlostan, pâmetan* ‘clever’ and *bölestan, slöbodan* all in a.p. A, Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007) *slöbodân – slöbodna – slöbodno* (same for *pâmetân*), Orlec (Houtzagers 1985) *pâmeten – pâmetno, žâlosen – žâlosno* ‘sad’ and Orbanici (Kalsbeek 1998) *pâmetna, žâlosan – žâlosna, slöbodno – slöbodni*. At least in some of these dialects, a.p. A could be a result of the older generalization directly to a.p. A and not from the older earlier overall generalization of a.p. C, mentioned in the section on Štokavian (see

above). However, unlike Štokavian, the original opposition is partially preserved in some Čakavian dialects. Cf. on Brač (ČDL; Šimunović 2009), a.p. A in *pāmetan*, *žālostan*, *prāvedan* ‘just’, *rādostan* ‘joyful’ (all originally a.p. *a*) but also secondarily in *pākostan* ‘spiteful’ and *ōbločan* ‘cloudy’ (originally a.p. *c*) vs. the preserved a.p. C in *slōbodan* – *slobolnā* – *slōbolno* and *bōlestan* – *bolesnā* – *bolesnō* (with the neuter accent by analogy to the feminine form).<sup>218, 219</sup> Such a distinction is supported by my data from Pitve on Hvar: *pāmetan* – *pāmetna* – *pāmetno*, *rādosan* – *rādosna* – *rādosno*, *žālosna* – *žālosni* (A) but *bōlestan* – *bolesnā* – *bōlesno* – pl. *bōlesni* – *bōlesne* (C).

#### KAJKAVIAN (Ozalj)<sup>220</sup>

##### indefinite adjectives

| m     | f      | n      |
|-------|--------|--------|
| věran | +věrna | +věrno |

##### definite adjectives

| m     | f      | n      |
|-------|--------|--------|
| +věni | +věrna | +věrno |

In Kajkavian, the most frequent reflex of a.p. *a* is a.p. A (which can secondarily shift to a.p. C), i.e. the constant ˘ in indef. forms and ˆ in def. ones (if the neo-circumflex is not secondarily replaced by ˘). This pattern, beside the original a.p. *a* adjectives, consists of the old short vowel a.p. *c* (like \*rǫtъnъ) and the shortened old long vowel a.p. *c* (like \*gōlsъnъ). The tendency of all adjectives with short and shortened roots to shift to a.p. A (regardless of the original a.p.) and only long vowel adjectives to remain in a.p. B and C is present in Kajkavian as well, just like in Štokavian / Čakavian.

In some dialects, the length from the forms with a closed syllable can spread to all forms. In Kajkavian (and in Slovene), the old acute lengthens to ˆ in front of every -CC- (not just -RC- as in most Štok/Čak. dialects) where the old *yer* was dropped. The alternation of ˘ : ˆ type like \*srěčen –

<sup>218</sup> Since this accent is attested in both ČDL and Šimunović 2009, this is surely not a mistake.

<sup>219</sup> According to Domagoj Vidović (p.c.) in Pučišća on Brač *pāmetan*, *rādostan*, *slōbodan* and *bōlestan* are in a.p. A/C (i.e. there is vacillation), while *žālostan* and *ōbločan* are just a.p. A. Here, the old types have merged even though the results are not the same for all words.

<sup>220</sup> Težak 1981, 270.

\*srěčna – \*srěčno would be expected in all old a.p. *a* adjectives, but what one finds in Kajkavian is just the type \*srěčen – \*srěčna – \*srěčno with a generalized " by analogy to probably not just nom. sg. m. but to adjectives with " in all indef. forms, i.e. those that have " not from the old acute but from the old short (like \*pòten – \*pòtno, and \*pòtna by analogy) or long circumflex (like \*glāsno and \*glāsen, \*glāsna by analogy).

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265–266), the type A (*sjājen* – def. *sjājni* 'bright') consists of: *věren*, *směren*, polysyllabic *želězen*, etc. and *sjājen* (the shortened a.p. *c*?). There is also a type C (probably of secondary origin from the older \*A type) connected with the type A: *glāsen* – <sup>+</sup>*glasnā* – <sup>+</sup>*glāsno* – def. <sup>+</sup>*glāsni*. This a.p. C consists of:

- a) the original a.p. *a* adjectives: *kmīčen* 'dark', *plāšen* 'timid', *srěčen*, *sīten*
- b) the adj. *těmen* 'dark' (PSl. *b*)
- c) the original short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives: *pòten*, *ròsen* 'dewy', *sòčen*
- d) the original long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives: *glāsen*, *māsten* (cf. *māstēn* in Varaždin but *māstēn* in Turopolje), *strāšen* 'terrifying' (the vowel is shortened in *skřben* as well)

Cf. a.p. B: in adjectives like *mīrēn* – *mīrnā* – *mīrnò* (see below).

In Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305), unlike V. Rakovica, the expected pattern of the " and ^ alternation in indef/def. forms is present: *věren* – def. *vierni*. This type consists of the old a.p. *a* adjectives (*čyden* – *čēydni* 'strange', *lōčen* – *lāočni* 'hungry', *srāčen* – *srāčni* 'happy', *blōten* – *blāotni* 'muddy', *siremōšen* – *siremāošni* 'poor', *provīčen* – *provēični* 'just', *spedēben* – *spedēybni* 'alike) that are joined by *mōren* – *māorni* 'diligent' (probably a.p. *b* originally, cf. Stand. Croat. *mārīti*, Siče *māri*) and *mīren* – *mēirni* 'still' (originally a.p. *c* with the shortening of ^, its generalization and a shift to a.p. A). The adj. *drēben* – *drēybni* 'tiny' (a.p. *c*) and *pūmeten* 'clever' with its secondary def. form *pumātni* are also here.

In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), a.p. A (i.e. " on the stem – f. and n. are irrelevant due to the retraction, cf. *nōga* < \**nogā* 'leg') consists of:

- a) the original a.p. *a* adjectives: *blāten*, *čūdēn*, *gādēn* (comp. *gādņēši*), *jādēn* (comp. *jādņēši*), *jāšen*, *pobōžēn*, *sīten* (comp. *sītnēši*), *sklādēn* 'balanced' (comp. *sklādņēši*), *sličēn* (comp. *sličņēši*), *smřtēn* 'mortal', *sprētēn* 'skilful' (but comp. *sprētnēši*), *srěčen* (comp. *srěčņēši*), def.

*svilni* ‘silk’, *věren* (comp. *věrněši*), *vičen* ‘used to’, *vlāžen*, *vòlen* ‘willing’, *zlòben* (comp. *zlòbněši*);

- b) the original a.p. *a* adjectives  $\Rightarrow$  a.p. A: (by analogy to the -CC- and perhaps def. forms): *čēden*, *kūžen*, *sīlen*, *smēren* (cf. Štok. younger *smjēran*, *sīlan*);
- c) the original short vowel a.p. *c*: *kēsēn* (comp. *kēsneši*),<sup>221</sup> *mōčen* (comp. *močneši*), *rōsen* (but comp. *rōsneši*), def. *skōtni*, *sōčen*, *trōšen* ‘decrepit’ (but comp. *trōšneši*), *žēlen*;
- d) the original long vowel a.p. *c*: *glāsēn* (comp. *glasneši*), *gnūsēn* ‘awful’ (but with a secondary comp. *gnūsneši*), *māstēn* (comp. *masneši*), *rēden*, *slāstēn*, *vēcēn*, *zrāčen*.

The distinction between a.p. A < a.p. *a* and a.p. A < a.p. *c* is apparent in the comparative form although the opposition is not perfect, cf. *jādneši* (*a*) but *glasneši* (*c*). This pattern is confirmed by \*-ъкъ adjectives as well (see below).

In Turopolje (Šojat 1982, 400), cf. *srēcēn*, *mēcēn* ‘quick, expeditious’, *sprēten* for a.p. A.

Valjavec (1894, 226–228) gives the following a.p. A adjectives for Kajkavian:

- a) the original a.p. *a* adjectives: *blāten*, *čēden*, *čūden*, *jāden*, *jāsen*, *lāčen*, *mūčen*, *sīlen*, *sīten*, *vēren*, *vlāžen*, *zlōben* (the adj. *slāven* has a generalized length from the -CC- forms);<sup>222</sup>
- b) the original short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives: *bōžen*, *čāsen*, *drōben*, *kēsen*, *mōčen*, *plōden*, *rōden*, *znōjen*, *žēlen*;
- c) the original long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives: *vēcēn*, *glāsēn* (cf. Štok. *vjēcān* and *glāsān* / *glāsān*).

The adj. *tēmen* (and *tēmen*, f. *tēmna*, PSI. *b*) and originally short vowel adj. *grōzen* / *grōzen* and *ōren* are in this group as well.

In Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894 2, 145, 151–152, 157, 160), “ in nom. sg. m. is found in:

<sup>221</sup> The f. and n. form are unusual: *kēsna* – *kēsno*.

<sup>222</sup> It is interesting that in Kajkavian the generalization of  $\hat{}$  occurs almost in the very same examples as in Štokavian (*slavēn*, *verēn*, *smerēn*), i.e. in front of -RC-, in spite of the fact that Kajkavian lengthening is not limited to pre-RC- positions only (after the loss of the *yers*) but occurs in front of any -CC- group. Perhaps this is just a coincidence.

- a) the original a.p. *a* adjectives: *blātan*, *mūčan*, *sličan*, *slōžan*, *srēćan* (together with two adj. with the generalized -CC- length: *sītan*, *vēran*);<sup>223</sup>
- b) the original short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives: *trēšan* ‘decrepit’, *drēban* ‘tiny’, *kēsen*;
- c) the original long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives: *vēcān*, *glāsān*, *skřban* (?).

The adj. *tēman* (PSl. *b*) is here as well, while the adj. *jādan*, *lāćan* belong to another type. For polysyllabic adjectives, cf. (*s*)*pōmetan* and *spomētan* (-*a*, -*o*) ‘clever’, *slōbodan*, *ōblaćan*.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 268, 270–271), there are three accentual patterns among adjectives that have “ at least in some of the indef. forms:

- I) the type *svīlan* – *svīlna* – *svīlni* – def. *svīlni* and the same in *smērān* and *vērān* except for the variant def. forms *smērni* and <sup>+</sup>*vērni*. The shortened stem adj. *sjājān* and *strāšān* are also here.
- II) the type C.: *glāsān* – <sup>+</sup>*glāsna* – <sup>+</sup>*glāsno* – def. <sup>+</sup>*glāsni*. This is a pattern with the length in the def. forms that consists of:
  - a) the original a.p. *a* adjectives: *būćān*, *plāšān*, *srīćān*;
  - b) the original short vowel a.p. *c*: *kāsān*, *rōsān* (secondarily), *trōšān* (+ *tāmān*, PSl. *b*);
  - c) the original long vowel a.p. *c*: *glāsān*, *māsān* ‘greasy’, *srāmān* ‘shy’, *strāšān* (with an a.p. *A* variant).
- III) the type C: *rōsān* – *rōsna* – *rōsno* – def. *rōsni*. This type consists of:
  - a) the original a.p. *a*: *kmīćān*, *sītān*;
  - b) the original short vowel a.p. *c*: *pōtān*, *rōsān* (secondarily also in C.), *sōćān*.

The only distinction of a.p. C. and a.p. C is in def. forms (<sup>+</sup>*glāsni* : *rōsni*). The Ozalj indef. f. form *glāsna* can be derived from both *\*glāsna* and *\*glasna*, although the def. forms show that the length was preserved up to a point (of course, the very form *\*glāsna* is secondary, i.e. made by analogy to a.p. *b*).

In the 17th century dialect of Križanić, the synchronic a.p. *A*, like in *Cīlen* – *cīlna* – *sīlno*, *Tājen* / *Tājen* – *mājna* – *tāino* / *tāino* ‘secret’, *wēren* – *wērna* – *wērno* (cf. also *Slāwen* – *slāwno*, the form *slāwna* [slāvnā]

<sup>223</sup> ^ can also be the result of the analogy to the def. forms.

is probably an error), was, it seems, still different from the synchronic short vowel a.p. C type (from the old short vowel a.p. c) found in adjectives like *czésten* – *Czestná* (but also *чѣстна*) – *czéstno* ‘honorable’, *zóden* – *godná* – *zódno* (cf. Ослоп 2011, 123). As opposed to *-an* adjectives, where Križanić’s dialect preserves a.p. A, in *-ak* adjectives a.p. A shifts to a.p. C.

**a.p. A:** *b’itan* important (also C:, cf. *bît* – *bîti* essence),<sup>224</sup> *bl’atan* muddy (cf. *blâto* mud), *br’ižan* attentive (> A:, cf. *brîga* ‘concern’, a loanword from Italian), *b’ūran* turbulent (< \*A, cf. *būra* gale), *č’astan* honorable (> A:, PSl. c, cf. *čâst* – *čâsti* ‘honor’, Križanić C), *č’edan* virgin, chaste, *čem’eran* sorrowful (and *č’emēran*, cf. *čēmer* / *čēmēr* sorrow, pain), *č’udan* strange (cf. *čūdo* miracle), *dr’oban* tiny (PSl. c), *g’adan* awful (cf. *gād* – *gāda* bastard), *gn’ojan* purulent (> A:, and C:, PSl. c, cf. *gnôj* – *gnôja* dung), *h’ulan* unrespectful (> A:, cf. *hūliti* <sup>225</sup> be unrespectful / ungrateful), *j’adan* poor (also C:, cf. *jād* – *jāda*<sup>226</sup> misery), *j’asan* clear (> C:),<sup>227</sup> *k’asan* late (PSl. b?, cf. *kàsni* be late < \*kъsnīti), *k’išan* rainy (cf. *kīša* rain), *k’ršan* strong (cf. *křš* – *křša* karst), *kr’ěpan* brisk (PSl. c <sup>228</sup>), *k’užan* contagious (> A:, cf. *kūga* plague), *l’ačan* hungry, *l’agodan* easygoing, *l’astan* easy (also B:/C:), *l’ažan* false (> A:, cf. *lāž* – *lāži* lie), *m’očan* powerful (PSl. c, cf. *môc* – *môci* power), *’oran* willing (> A:), *p’ametan* clever (> C, cf. *pāmetovati* try / pretend to be smart), *pl’ačan* crying (cf. *plāč* – *plāča* crying), *pl’odan* fertile (Psl. c, cf. *plôd* – *plôda* fruit), *por’očan* prone to vice (cf. *pòrok* vice), *p’ostan* fast (> A:, cf. *pôst* – *pôsta* fast day), *p’otan* sweaty, *p’ozdan* late, *pr’avedan* fair (> C, cf. *prāv* right), *r’adostan* cheerful (> C, cf. *rādovati* be cheerful), *r’odan* fertile (PSl. c, cf. *rôd* – *rôda* kin), *r’osan*

<sup>224</sup> It is possible that *bitan* is a newer and literary word (cf. the attestations in ARj) and, as such, irrelevant for accentological purposes. However, today it does occur in dialects as well.

<sup>225</sup> Also *hūliti*.

<sup>226</sup> Also *jād* – *jāda* (and an a.p. c adjective in accordance with this variant).

<sup>227</sup> Cf. Lith. *aiškus* for the acute, i.e. a.p. a. But Siče *objàsni* – *objàsni* ‘clear up’ with a shortening points to the older a.p. C (\*jasnī) (Kapović 2011c).

<sup>228</sup> Cf. the reconstructed a.p. c for \*krěpъkъ and \*krěpъ in Дыбо 1981, 104–105 and also Slovene *krepīm*, Czech *křepiti* (with a short vowel) for a.p. c. A.p. B: in Posavina (Siče: *pokrîpîmo*, Magić Mala: *krîpi*) is secondary – this is one of the PSl. a.p. c verbs that shift to a.p. B: in Siče and Magić Mala (cf. Kapović 2011c).



dewy (PSl. *c*, cf. *ròsa* – *ròsu* dew), *s'ětan* mopish (cf. *sjěta* downcast), *s'ılan* forceful (> A:, cf. *sìla* force), *sirom'ašan* poor (cf. *siròmašiti* <sup>229</sup> get poor), *s'itan* tiny, *skl'adan* symmetrical (cf. *skläd* – *sklāda* harmony), *sk'otan* with young (of animals) (cf. *skòt* – *skòta* spawn), *skr'oman* humble (a loanword from Czech), *sl'astan* tasty (and C:, PSl. *c*, cf. *slāst* – *slāsti* sweetness), *sl'avan* famous (> A:, cf. *slāva* fame), *sl'ičan* alike (cf. *slīka* picture), *sl'ožan* in concord (cf. *slòga* concord), *sm'ěran* meek (> A:, cf. *mjèriti* measure), *sm'rtan* mortal (cf. *smřt* – *smřti* death), *s'očan* juicy (PSl. *c*, cf. *sòk* – *sòka* juice), *spas'oban* capable (> *sp'osoban*), *spr'asna* with young (of sows)<sup>230</sup> (PSl. *c*, cf. *prāse*, Siče *se prasī* <sup>231</sup>), *spr'etan* skilful, *s'rdāčan* cordial (also *srd'ačan*), *sr'ětan* happy (cf. *srěsti* meet, *srěca* luck), *st'ālan* constant (< \*A), *s'uzan* tearful (> A:, PSl. *c*, cf. *sùza* – *sùzu* tear), *sv'ěstan* aware (also C:, cf. *svijēst* – *svijēsti* awareness), *sv'ılan* silky (but cf. *svīla* – *svīlu* silk),<sup>232</sup> *št'etan* harmful (cf. *štěta* harm), *tr'ošan* decrepit (cf. *tròšiti* spend), *t'uroban* gloomy, *ug'odan* comfortable (> *'ugodan*),<sup>233</sup> *um'oran* tired (> A: > *'umōran*, cf. *ùmor* tiredness), *v'ěčan* eternal (also A<sup>B</sup>:<sup>234</sup> PSl. *c*, cf. *vijēk* – *vijēka* age), *v'ěran* faithful (> A: > B:/C:, cf. *vjěra* faith), *v'ičan* adept, *vl'ažan* moist (cf. *vlāga* moist), *v'odan* watery (PSl. *c*, cf. *vòda* – *vòdu* water), *v'oljan* willing (> A:, cf. *vòlja* will), *zāv'idan* envious, *zl'oban* mean (cf. *zlòba* spite), *zn'ojan* sweaty (> A:, cf. *znôj* – *znòja* sweat), *ž'alostan* sad (> C, cf. *žāliti* mourn, be sorry), *ždr'ěbna* with young (of mares) (PSl. *c*, cf. *ždrijěbe* foal, Siče *se ždrebī*), *žel'ėzan* iron (cf. *žèljezo* iron), *ž'eljan* desirous (> A: > B:/C:, and C, PSl. *c*, cf. *žèlja* – *žèlju* wish)

<sup>229</sup> The noun *siròmah* (B) is secondary.

<sup>230</sup> Cf. ARj and Slobodnica *sprāsna* for the accent.

<sup>231</sup> The Posavian villages of Siče and Magić Mala preserve an archaic *i*-verb system without many changes that have occurred in other Štok/Čak. dialects (for instance *prasī* instead of the innovative *prāsī*). This is why their verbal a.p. can help in the reconstruction of the related original adjectival a.p. (for instance, *prasī* in Siče and the noun *prāse* point to the original a.p. *c* for the adj. \*porsъnъ as well). For the *i*-verbs, see more in Kapović 2011c.

<sup>232</sup> Adjectival a.p. A is unclear.

<sup>233</sup> Cf. the noun *ùgoda*.

<sup>234</sup> Cf. *vjječan* in Vuk, ARj and Daničić 1872, 94.

2. a.p. *b*

## PROTO-SLAVIC

## short vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m       | f       | n       |
|---------|---------|---------|
| *tǫmъnъ | *tǫmъna | *tǫmъno |
| ‘dark’  |         |         |

## definite adjectives

| m         | f         | n         |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| *tǫmъnъjъ | *tǫmъnaja | *tǫmъnoje |

## long vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m                     | f        | n                       |
|-----------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| *krāsъnъ              | *krāsъna | *krāsъno <sup>235</sup> |
| ‘wonderful, splendid’ |          |                         |

## definite adjectives

| m          | f          | n          |
|------------|------------|------------|
| *krāsъnъjъ | *krāsъnaja | *krāsъnoje |

In Proto-Slavic, the adjectives of the immobile non-acute a.p. had the stress on the first syllable: \*krāsъnъ – \*krāsъna – \*krāsъno. After the operation of Dybo’s law, one gets \*krāsĭnъ – \*krāsĭna – \*krāsĭno with a constant post-stem stress. When the *yers* begin to weaken, the form \*krāsъnъ remains unchanged because the *yer* there is in strong position (in front of another *yer* in the following syllable). In two of the other forms, the stress is retracted (by Ivšić’s law) to the root: \*krāsĭna > \*krāsna and \*krāsĭno > \*krāsno (the alternative being that there was no Dybo’s law stress shift to the *yers* to begin with). For such a reconstruction, cf. Дыбо 1981, 94. \*-ъnъ (and \*-ъkъ) adjectives had suffixes beginning with *yers* and this fact yielded an accentual mobility of some sort in a.p. *b*, since the stress in the m. form differed from those in the f. and n. form due to the morphonological structure of the suffixes in question. This could have caused an early restructuring of the original accentual type. Thus, in Old Russian (Дыбо 1981, 72) the original pattern is remodeled to a younger one: *зрѣиѣнъ* – *зрѣиѣна* – *зрѣиѣно* (cf. the Štok. type *túžan* – *túžna* – *túžno*), where the f. and n. form get the desinential stress by analogy to the m. form (after the fall of the final *yer*) and the usual accentual pattern elsewhere in a.p. *b* (cf. e.g. the type \*debělъ – \*debělā – \*debělò ‘fat’).

<sup>235</sup> In the m. form, the *yer* is in strong and in the f. and n. forms in weak position, which means that the latter have a neo-acute on the stem (cf. \*sŏdъ and gen. sg. \*sŏdā ‘court’).

## ŠTOKAVIAN

## short vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m                           | f            | n            |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>táman</i> <sup>236</sup> | <i>támna</i> | <i>támno</i> |

## definite adjectives

| m            | f            | n            |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>tâmnī</i> | <i>tâmnā</i> | <i>tâmnō</i> |

## long vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m             | f             | n             |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>krâsan</i> | <i>krâsna</i> | <i>krâsno</i> |
| <i>túžan</i>  | <i>túžna</i>  | <i>túžno</i>  |

## definite adjectives

| m             | f             | n             |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>krâsnī</i> | <i>krâsnā</i> | <i>krâsnō</i> |
| <i>tūžnī</i>  | <i>tūžnā</i>  | <i>tūžnō</i>  |

The reflexes of the old a.p. *b* in Štokavian are just long vowel stems. The reason for that is the low number of short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives in the first place (the only one to reflect in Croat. being \**тъмѣнь*) but also because, as already mentioned, all adjectives with a short or shortened stem merged with a.p. *a*, i.e. shifted to a.p. A. A similar situation exists in the suffixless adjectives where only long vowel adjectives remain in a.p. B and C (with the exception of *gol* and *bos* in many dialects). In tokavian, the originally short vowel adj. *táman* has length due to *-mn-* but also perhaps due to the secondary length in the basic noun *táma*.

The PSl. a.p. *b* is succeeded in tokavian by two accentual types: a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:<sup>237</sup> (like *krâsan* < *krâsan*) and a.p. B: (like *túžan* < *tūžǎn* sad), between which, of course, there are many overlaps. The *krâsan* type is formed by generalization of the PSl. accent from the forms \**krāsъna* and \**krāsъno*. By analogy to *krâsna* and *krâsno* one gets *krâsan* as well, while the *tūžǎn* type is formed by generalization of the accent from the form \**krāsъnъ*. Thus, by analogy to *tūžǎn* one also gets *tūžnǎ*, *tūžnō*. The expected reflexes \**krāsǎn* – \**krāsna* – \**krāsno* break into two different patterns with local discrepancies

<sup>236</sup> This example is not very good but there are only a few old short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives. The length is generalized from the forms with pre-resonant lengthening in front of *-mn-*. The secondary length in the basic noun *táma* (older *tmǎ*) < \**тъmǎ* is probably due to the influence of the adjective, although there are other examples of such lengthenings in nouns, cf. Stand. Croat. *stǎblo* instead of the older *stǎblo* (e.g. in Dubrovnik) < \**stǎblō*.

<sup>237</sup> The sign <sup>B</sup> means that the a.p. in question is derived from a.p. B even though it is not a.p. B anymore (but a.p. A:).

in the exact grouping of specific adjectives. An additional problem is the disappearance of the old a.p. *c* adjectives in some dialects, which means that the original pattern *glâdan – glâdna – glâdno* may also yield a.p. B: (*glâdan – glâdna – glâdno*). Furthermore, in Neo-Štokavian the type A<sup>B</sup>: (*krâsan*) merges with the type A: (*slâvan* – with the generalization of  $\hat{}$  by analogy to the forms with -RC-, see above). The distinction, however, is preserved in Slavonian Old Štokavian (*krâsan* : *slâvan*).

In classical literary Štokavian (where there is no special a.p. C:, which has merged with a.p. B:, as in suffixless adjectives – thus *glâdno* instead of *glâdno*), there are two accentual types (cf. e.g. Matešić 1970, 170, 173):

- I) a.p. B: (*bûdan – bûdna – bûdno* awake), which consists of:
  - a) the original long a.p. *b*: *râvan* flat, *smijêsan* funny, *vrijêdan* worthy, *tûžan* sad, etc.;
  - b) the original long a.p. *c*: *bijêsan*, *glâdan*, *zlâtan* gold, etc.;
- II) a.p. A: (*dîvan – dîvna – dîvno*), which consists of:
  - a) original a.p. *a* adjectives with the generalized length from the -RC- forms: *bûran* turbulent, *vjêran*, *sîlan*, etc.;
  - b) original a.p. *b* adjectives: *dîčan* proud, *jâvan* public, *kîvan* bitter, *krâsan*, etc.;<sup>238</sup>
  - c) original short a.p. *c* adjectives with the generalized length from the -RC- forms: *znôjan*, *gnôjan*, *žêljan*, etc.;
  - d) some original long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives: *srâman* shy, *skûban* caring, etc.

There is a great deal of overlap and variant forms in these two types, of course. Cf. e.g. *zlâtan* (B:) and *zlâtan* (A:), *kvâran* (B:) and *kvâran* (A:), *gnjêvan* (B:) and *gnjêvan* (A:). As already said, the expected \**dîčan – \*dîčna – \*dîčno* yield the types *dîčan – dîčna – dîčno* and *dičan – dična – dično*, which then mixes with the secondary type *žêljan – žêljna – žêljno* (from the old short vowel a.p. *c* or a.p. *a*) and with the type *glâdan – glâdna – glâdno*, where ' was generalized by analogy to the f. form and the type *tûžan – tûžna – tûžno* instead of the original *glâdan – glâdna – glâdno*. The unclear shortening of the old a.p. *b* is seen in *grêšan* (next to the variant *grijêšan*, which is rare today).<sup>239</sup>

<sup>238</sup> For a list of such adjectives, cf. also Daničić 1872, 94.

<sup>239</sup> Cf. also the unexpected shortening in the noun *grêšnik* 'sinner'.

In Imotska krajina and Bekija (Šimundić 1971, 128, 130–32), the situation is quite complicated due to many variant forms and levellings.<sup>240</sup> There are four accentual types there that are connected to a.p. *b*:

- I) a.p. B: (*míran* – *mírna* – *mírno* peaceful) with only two adjectives: *míran* and *vridan*;
- II) a.p. A:/A:-B: (*sjâjan* – *sjâjna* / *sjájna* – *sjájno* / *sjájno*) – only *sjâjan* and *tûžan*;
- III) a.p. C:/B: (*dîčan* – *dîčna* – *dîčno*, gen. sg. *dîčna* / *dîčna*, dat. sg. *dîčnu* / *dîčnu*, etc.), which consists of:
  - a) the original a.p. *a* adjectives with the generalized -RC- length: *smíran*, *viran*;
  - b) the original long a.p. *b*: *dîčan*, *grdan*, *krupan* large, *mličan* milky, *mrsan* (and A:/C:), *snažan*, *stidan*, *žedan*, *žudan* (+ *tavan* ‘dark’, PSl. short vowel a.p. *b*);
  - c) the original short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives with the generalized length from the -RC- forms: *bolan*, *gojan*;
  - d) the original long vowel a.p. *c* adj.: *bisan* furious, *gladan*, *masan* greasy, *slasan*;
- IV) a.p. A:/C: (*čâsan* – *čâsna* / *časna* – *časno*), which consists of:
  - a) the original a.p. *a* adjectives with the generalized length from the -RC- forms: *slavan*, *voljan*;
  - b) the original a.p. *b* adjectives: *divan*, *mrsan* (also C:/B:), *ravan*;
  - c) the original short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives with secondary length: *čâsan* honorable.

Here, numerous analogies have led to the formation of various secondary accentual types with many variant forms. This means that there is no clear a.p. B:, a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: and a.p. C: – everything is mixed. These original types were joined by the adjectives of the original a.p. *a* with the generalized length

<sup>240</sup> A precautionary note is in order. It is not certain whether such a system is a real description of the situation on the field in many or most of the local dialects there or if it is a result of Šimundić's methodology of describing the accentual system of the whole area at the same time, while in fact trying to describe numerous different local dialects that are close but not identical. It can very well be that the situation in specific local dialects might not be so complicated and might be more archaic than the impression one may get from Šimundić's description.

from the -RC- forms as well as by the originally short vowel adjectives that got some kind of secondary length like *čâsan*. For the originally a.p. *b* adjectives *grîšan* and *ščêdan* ‘thrifty’ one finds the unclear shortened variants *grîšan* and *ščêdan* as well.

In Prapatnice in Vrgorska krajina (my data), the situation is as follows. A.p. B: is found in just a couple of adjectives from the old(er) a.p. *b*: *míran* – *mírna* – *mírno* – def. *mîrnî* / *mîrnî* (this in relation to Štok. *mîr* B:), the same for *dûžan*, *mrâčan*, *râvan*, *stîdan* (gen. sg. *stîdna* and def. *stîdnî*). Some of the original a.p. *c* adjectives have shifted to a.p. B: (see below). A.p. B:-C: is found in *vrîdan* (gen. sg. *vrîdna*) – *vrîdna* – *vrîdno* – def. gen. sg. *vrîdnōga* and the same in *kívan* and *rûžan* (but def. *rûžnî*). As for the other adjectives of the old a.p. *b*, there is shortening in *grîšan* (gen. sg. *grîšna*) – *grîšna* – *grîšno* (and a shift to a.p. A > C), and others shift to a.p. C: *bîdan* – *bîdna* – *bîdno* – def. *bîdnî*, the same in *gřdan* (def. *gřdnē žēnē* of the nasty woman), *krûpan* (def. *krûpnî*), *mlâčan* lukewarm, *mřsan* (def. *mřsnē ránē* of the greasy food), *mûtan* blurred (def. *mûtnō* / *mûtnō*), *prâzan* (def. *prâznî* / *prâznî*), *prîsan* raw (def. *prîsnā pōgača*), *smîšan* funny (def. *smîšnî*), *trîzan* sober (def. *trîznî* / *trîznî*), *žêdan* (def. *žêdnî*). As we can see, few of the old a.p. *b* adjectives have remained in a.p. B:, while the majority shifted, partially or completely, to a.p. C. As in Imotska krajina, this is also part of the general tendency of a.p. C to prevail in these dialects.

Rešetar (1900, 115, 118) gives the following data for his southwest tokavian dialects. A.p. B: in Dubrovnik is attested only in *míran* (like in Imotska and Vrgorska krajina, the old a.p. *c*),<sup>241</sup> *dûžan* ‘in debts’ and *lâsan*. All other adjectives, it seems, belong to a.p. C: – e.g. *prazan*, *žedan* and *smîješan* (which are a.p. B: elsewhere) and the same is for all adj. that are A<sup>B</sup>: as *dîvan* elsewhere. In Dubrovnik, the expected type \**dîvan* – \**dîvna* – \**dîvno* is disposed of by changing \**dîvan* to \**dîvan* by analogy to \**glâdan*.

In Ozrinići and Prčanj, Rešetar attests the type *tûžan* – *tûžna* – *tûžno*, in which all old patterns are merged:

- a) adjectives that are A<sup>B</sup>: elsewhere – *grdan*, *griješan*, *dičan*, *kivan*, *krasan*, *trudan*;

<sup>241</sup> In Štokavian, the noun *mîr* is often a.p. B: (gen. sg. *míra*) so one might expect *míran* (B:) to be in accord with that. However, the basic noun is a.p. C: (gen. sg. *mîra*) in Dubrovnik (*mîr* in a.p. B: is a Roman loanword meaning ‘wall’, cf. Latin *mûrus*).

- b) adjectives that are B: elsewhere – *dužan*, *miran*, *mutan*, *prazan*, *žedan*;
- c) the adj. *slavan* (the old a.p. *a* with the generalized  $\hat{}$  from the -RC-forms);
- d) the old a.p. *c* – *gladan*, *zlatan*, *strašan* terrifying.

The only oxytonic adj. is *rūžān* – *rūžnā* – *rūžnō*. In Ozrinići (Rešetar 1900, 117), the adj. *đīman* – *đīmna* – *đīmno* ‘wonderful’ (with *-mn-* < *-vn-*) is also attested, where  $\bar{}$  is probably due to misinterpretation of  $\hat{}$  in front of *-mn-* as a positional preresonant length, which led to the formation of *đīman* as opposed to *\*đīmna* just like *sīlan* is opposed to *sīlna* (then  $\bar{}$  is generalized in the other two forms as well).

In Southern Baranja, according to Sekereš (1977, 389), there is only a.p. B:, both from the old a.p. *b* (*krúpan*, *rávan*) and the old a.p. *c* (*bísan*, *gládan*, *ládan* cold), although the data is scarce. For Šaptinovac, Ivšić (1907, 140, 142) gives only a.p. C: – the adjectives are mostly from the original a.p. *c* (like *lādan*, etc.) but also *rūžan* – *rúžna* – *rūžno* and *žedan*. For Posavina in general, Ivšić (1913 2, 45) gives the adjectives *mūtan*, *prāzan*, *tāvan* ‘dark’ (old a.p. *b*) in a.p. C, together with old a.p. *c* adjectives like *gládan*, etc. However, he also notes the forms: *krúpan* / *krūpān*, *prāzan*, *rūžān* – *rúžno*, *vrīdan* / *vrīdān*, *žedan* / *žēdān* (*b*) as well as secondary *vīran* / *vīrān* (*a*), *žēlan* / *žēlān* (< *\*A* < *c*). According to Ivšić’s scanty data, at least some Posavian dialects preserve the opposition of a.p. B: and C: at least partially. According to Ivšić, the type A<sup>B</sup>: is not present in Posavina because this type has merged with a.p. C:, but he provides no actual data to support the claim. Such a merger looks rather strange considering that the Neo-Štokavian type *đīvan* would be *\*đīvān* – *\*đīvna* – *\*đívno* in Posavina, which is a fact that Ivšić has apparently failed to notice. It would be hard to imagine that the mentioned type could mix with the type *\*glādān* – *\*glādnā* – *\*glāдно* (except perhaps through the generalized def. forms *\*đīvnī* / *\*glādnī*). Besides, later data from Posavina clearly show that the type with the constant  $\tilde{}$  exists there as well. Cf. my data from Orubica: *đīvan* – *đīvna* – *đívno*, *trīzan* – *trīzna* – *trīžno*, *smīšan*, and also *bīdan* – *bīdnā* (!) – *bīдно* – pl. *bīdni* (cf. *glādan* – *glādnā* – *glāдно* in a.p. C). Such a pattern with the constant  $\tilde{}$  exists in *-ak* adjectives as well (see below).

In the Posavina dialect of Slobodnica (my data), the adjectives of the old a.p. *b* have turned into various different groups:

- a) a.p. B:, cf. *krúpān* – *krúpna* – *krúpno* (thus also *mútān*, *prázān*, *vridān*, *támān* and *mírān*);
- b) a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:, cf. *dīčān* – *dīčna* – *dīčno* (thus also *gřdān*, *māžān*, *prāšān*);
- c) a.p. C:-A<sup>B</sup>:( < \*A<sup>B</sup>:), cf. *stīdan* – *stīdna* – *stīdno* (thus also *gřdān* / *gřdān* – *gřdna* – *gřdno*);
- d) a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:/B: in various forms, cf. *smīšān* / *smīšan* – *smīšna* – *smīšno* (thus also *trīžān* / *trīžān*) and *žédān* – *žédna* / *žédna* – *žédno* / *žédno*;
- e) a.p. C:-B:, cf. *dūžān* – *dūžna* – *dūžno* (thus also *sjājān*);
- f) a.p. A:, cf. *dīvan* – *dīvna* – *dívno* (thus also *krāsan*, *kvāran*, *mřsan*).

In the adj. *rávān* / *rāvan* / *rāvan* – *rávna* / *rāvna* – *rāvno* there is a complete mixture, and in the adj. *grěšān* the root is shortened.

For Kostrč, Baotić (1979, 198–199) gives a pattern with the constant neo-acute on the stem as in adjectives like *dīčān*, *gřdān*, *krúpān*, *mličān*, *trūdān* (all adjectives with A<sup>B</sup>: or B: in Neo-Štokavian) and *žédān*. In these adjectives, the end stress can appear in some cases like *trūdñā je*<sup>242</sup> ‘she is pregnant’ but not very frequently. This pattern is in agreement with the Neo-Štokavian type *krāsan* – *krāsna* – *krāsno* and, together with previously mentioned data from my field recordings in Posavina, shows that Ivšić made a mistake in his description of *-an* adjectives in Posavina. However, one finds in Kostrč, like in Slobodnica above, also the pattern with the constant  $\hat{}$  that includes *dīvān*, *būjān* ‘lush’, *gñēvān*, *kīvān*, *slāvān*, *stālān* ‘constant’. This type is not easy to explain, especially considering the fact that the first four adjectives should have constant  $\sim$ . Their accent could be explained by analogy to *slāvān* and *stālān*, where the constant  $\hat{}$  is due to the generalization from the *-RC-* forms in the old a.p. *a*, but it is not clear how and why the constant neo-acute would be replaced by the constant circumflex in these adjectives. Still, it is noteworthy that in the adjectives with the constant neo-acute (like *dīčān*) there are no resonant-ending stem ones, while in all adjectives with the constant neo-circumflex all stems end in a resonant (mostly *-v-*). This may indeed point to an analogy to the *slāvān* type. Regrettably, Baotić gave no other examples (there are probably

<sup>242</sup> Baotić, probably by mistake, has *trudñā je* with no pretonic length.



more of them). In any case, it seems safe to assume that the *dīvān* type is secondary in Kostrč. Two adjectives, *krāsān* and *prīsān* (a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: type elsewhere) shift to a.p. C in Kostrč.

Except for the C: type (as in *māstān* – *māsna* – *māsno*) there is also the Kostrč a.p. B:/C: type, which continues the older a.p. B: type, cf. the pattern *mīrān* / *mīrān* – *mīrna* – *mīrno* / *mīrno* (thus with variant B: and C: forms). This group mostly consists of old a.p. *b* adjectives, cf. *mīrān* / *mīrān* (PSl. *c*, Štok. also B:), <sup>+</sup>*kvārān* / *kvārān*, <sup>+</sup>*stīdān* / *stīdān*, <sup>+</sup>*tāmān* / *tāmān* (the short vowel a.p. *b* originally) and <sup>+</sup>*dūžān* / *dūžān*. These are joined by <sup>+</sup>*žēlān* / *žēlān* (with the generalized length and the development of B:/C: < \*A < \*c), which shifts to a.p. B: elsewhere in Posavina as well.

The Kostrč system, it seems, points to an older system with a.p. C:, a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: (the constant neo-acute) and a.p. B: (with end stress). This system was altered in that some a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: adjectives acquired constant circumflex, while some old a.p. B: adjectives developed variant a.p. C: forms. In addition, a couple of adjectives shifted to other accentual paradigms.

ČAKAVIAN (*t°āman* – **Vrgada**,<sup>243</sup> *bīdan* – **Pitve**)<sup>244</sup>

#### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>m</b>      | <b>f</b>      | <b>n</b>      |
| <i>t°āman</i> | <i>t°āmna</i> | <i>t°āmno</i> |

##### definite adjectives

|               |          |          |
|---------------|----------|----------|
| <b>m</b>      | <b>f</b> | <b>n</b> |
| <i>t°āmnī</i> |          |          |

#### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

|              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>     | <b>n</b>     |
| <i>bīdan</i> | <i>bīdna</i> | <i>bīdno</i> |

##### definite adjectives

|          |          |          |
|----------|----------|----------|
| <b>m</b> | <b>f</b> | <b>n</b> |
|----------|----------|----------|

In Čakavian, the original scheme \**dičān* – \**dična* – \**dično* develops in different ways. Some northern dialects (like Grobnik, Rijeka and Orlec), preserve a.p. *b* quite well, while in many other dialects this type completely shifts to a.p. C: (thus in Senj, Vrgada and in most adjectives in Orbanići). This shows the hegemony of a.p. C in Čakavian in \*-ьнѣ adjectives as in other types of adjectives. The dialects that preserve a.p. *b* do it in different

<sup>243</sup> Jurišić 1973.

<sup>244</sup> My data.

ways. On Brač, some of them remain in a.p. A<sup>B</sup>., while some shift to a.p. C:. Perhaps the maintenance of the a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: type has something to do with the proximity of the South Dalmatian insular Čakavian to Western Štokavian. A.p. B: is, as already said, well preserved in Grobnik, although a portion of the adjectives goes over to a.p. C:. In Orlec, most of the adjectives are in a.p. B:. On Susak and in Trtni, both a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: and a.p. B: exist. This is an exception since Čakavian dialects in general, unlike Štokavian, usually do not have both type A<sup>B</sup>: and type B: as a reflex of the old a.p. *b* (the same is in Kajkavian).

Hraste (1935, 33) mentions only a.p. C for Hvar (*ghûsan* – *ghûsnâ* – *ghûsno*), but ČDL gives the forms *bîdan*, *-na*, *-no*, *trûdan* – *trûdna* (cf. the secondary *trûdnâ* in Dračevica on Brač), *grîšan* but *mûtnâ* (with a shift to C) for Brusje. The adjective *dîvan* looks like an old a.p. *a* adjective with the generalized length (see below for Brač). The adjective *gârdan* – *garnâ* – *garnô* ‘nasty’ looks suspect – it is not clear if this is some peculiar innovation or a remnant of the old a.p. B: type (as in Štokavian) that is lost elsewhere on Hvar. Cf. my data from the dial. of Pitve: *bîdan* – *bîdna* – *bîdno* – pl. *bîdni* – *bîdne*, *smîšan* – *smîšna* – *smîšno*, *trîzan* – *trîzna* – *trîžno* (the original a.p. *b*) and secondary *glôdan* – *glôdna* – *glôdno* – pl. *glôdni* – *glôdne*, *jîdan* – *jîdna* – *jîdno* angry (the PSl. a.p. *c*). In Vrboska (Matković 2004), cf. *bîdan* – *bîdna* – *bîdno*, *žîedan* but *trîzan* – *trîznâ* – *trîžno*, *vrîdan* – *vrîdnâ* – *vrîdno* with a shift to a.p. C (the adjectives *glôdan*, *-dna*, *-dno*, *jîdan* are also secondarily in a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:).

On Brač (Šimunović 2009), the adjectives corresponding to type A<sup>B</sup>: and B: adjectives in Štokavian belong to two large groups – types A<sup>B</sup>: and C:. Starting with the original *\*dîčân* – *\*dîčna* – *\*dîčno* pattern, some adjectives generalized the accent of the f. and n. forms in the m. forms as well, which has yielded the pattern *dîčân*, *-na*, *-no*, i.e. the new a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:. The other group merged with reflexes of the old a.p. *c* like *glâdan* – *glâdnâ* – *glâdno*. The merger with a.p. C: might have occurred in more than one way. However, most probable is a middle phase of a.p. B:, i.e. the expected *\*vrîdân* – *\*vrîdna* – *\*vrîdno* firstly yielding *\*vrîdân* – *\*vrîdnâ* – *\*vrîdnô* and then creating the new forms *\*vrîdan* and *\*vrîdno* by analogy to a.p. C: (*\*dûžan*, *\*dûžno*) on the basis of the accentually identical f. forms *\*vrîdnâ* (B:) and *\*dûžnâ* (C:). Thus, for a portion of the original a.p. *b* adjectives one gets the pattern *vrîdan*, *vrîdnâ*, *vrîdno* (C:). Simply put, all adjectives with

a neo-acute in the m. form belong to a.p. A<sup>B</sup>. These forms usually exhibit constant neo-acute stress in all forms (like *prōzan*, *-zna*, *-zno*), but in some cases different forms are possible (including end stressed forms *trūdñä*) – sometimes only in Dračevica, sometimes generally,<sup>245</sup> most often only as variants, but as the only option in *smīšan*. The adjective *tūžan* – *tūžñä* – *tūžno* has a special transitional sub-type (*mīran* can also have such an accentuation next to the usual a.p. C:).

A.p. A<sup>B</sup>: (type *prōzan*, *-zna*, *-zno*) consists of the old a.p. *b* adjectives: *bīdan* (Pučišća:<sup>246</sup> *bīdan* / *bīdan*), *dīčan*, *grīšan* (Pučišća: *grīšan*), *mlōčan*, *rūžan*, *prōzan*, *smīšan* (*smīšñä* – *smīšno*), *sīdan*, *trūdan* (Dračevica: *trūdñä*), *tūžan* – *tūžñä* – *tūžno*, *žēdan* – *žēdñä* – *žēdno*. These are joined by *glōdan*, *-dna*, *-dno* (Dračevica: *glōlñä* – *glōlno*), originally a.p. *c*.

A.p. C: (type *tīsan* – *tīsnä* – *tīsno*) consists of: *grđan* (unreliable due to the shortened *r*), *mřsan* (the same), *mūtan*, *prīsan* raw, *rōvan* flat, *trīzan*, *vrīdan* (all a.p. *b* originally), as well as *mīran* (*mīran* – *mīrñä* – *mīrno* in the dictionary).

A.p. A: (with the circumflex in all forms), which looks like the original a.p. *a* with a generalized circumflex from the -RC- forms (*būjan*, *-jna*, *-jno*) consists of *būjan*, *dīvan* and *grōzan*. It is possible that this a.p. A: is a product of the levelling of the older a.p. C:.

On Vrgada (Jurišić 1966, 82; 1973), all of the old a.p. *b* adjectives shifted to a.p. C: (type *dūžan* – *dūžñä* – *dūžno*)<sup>247</sup> – *ml°āčan*, *mūtan*, *pr°āzan*, *prīsan*, *r°āvan*, *sm°āman* (cf. Siče: *māmi* ‘lures’ for a.p. *b*), *smīšan*, *l°āman*, *trīzan*, *tūžan* (*tūžñä* and *tūžna*), *trūdan*, *vrīdan*. In this a.p. C:, some of the forms can have sporadic neo-acute root stress, cf. *dūžna*, *gl°ādna*, *trūdna*. This is, however, probably an innovation (cf. *d°āla* instead of the expected \**dālā*<sup>248</sup> in the verbs) and not the preservation of the original a.p. *b* forms.

<sup>245</sup> In the cases where Dračevica is not explicitly mentioned in the entry.

<sup>246</sup> The forms from Pučišća are from Domagoj Vidović (p.c.).

<sup>247</sup> Except for *mřsan* – *mřsna* – *mřsno*, which shifts to a.p. A due to the shortening of *r*.

<sup>248</sup> On Vrgada, except for such systemic (but not regular phonetic) retractions, there are also a couple of other examples of sporadic retractions like gen. sg. *pūta* ‘of the way’ instead of the expected \**pūtā* and *krūpa* ‘hale’ instead of the expected \**krūpā*.

On Susak (Hamm, Hraste, Guberina 1956, 114), both type A<sup>B</sup>: and type B: exist, which is otherwise very rare in Čakavian. Thus, in a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: we find the original a.p. *b* adjectives *mûtan* and *dûžan*, as well as secondary *zlâtan* (originally a.p. *c*), while a.p. B: is preserved in adjectives like *răvăn – răvnă – răvnò, trûdăn – trûdnă – trûdnò* and *žajăn* ‘thirsty’.

In Senj (Moguš 1966, 77), as on Vrgada, there is only a.p. C: – *grîšan, krûpan, mûtan, prâzan, tûžan, vrîdan*.

In Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 96, 98, 104), the largest portion of the old a.p. *b* adjectives is preserved in a.p. B:, cf. *blûdân – blûdnă – blûdnò*, the same for *dûžân, grîšân, prâžân, răvân, smîšân, trêžân, trûdân, vrîdân, žêjân* ‘žedan’ (and also some of the old a.p. *c* adjectives like *bûdân* ‘awake’). A few of the old a.p. *b* adjectives shifted to a.p. C: (pattern: *glâsân – glâsnă – glâsno* ‘loud’), cf. *mjâčân* lukewarm, *mûtân, prêsân, snâžân*. The adj. *krûpân, -a, -o (-î)* and *krâsân* shifted to a.p. A: (probably via the older \*C: < \*B:). In Trtni in the Kastav area (Zubčić, Sanković 2008: 57), cf. *žêjân – žêjna – žêjno* (A<sup>B</sup>:) but *smêšân – smêšnă – smêšnò* (B:, likewise in *trêžân, trûdân*).

In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), the old a.p. *b* is preserved as a.p. B: in the adjectives *grêsân* sinful, *mûtân, prêsân, răvân, trêžân, tûžân, zêjân* thirsty.<sup>249</sup> The following adjectives of the old a.p. *b* also have a.p. C: (> A:, with *ê* in all indef. forms) variants: *dûžan / dûžân, prâžan / prâžân, trûdan / trûdân, vrêdan / vrêdân*. The adj. *mlâcan* lukewarm shifted to the other paradigm completely. Cf. also *mrâcan* and *prâsan / prâsân*.

In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), just three adjectives, *dûžan, snâžan* and *vrîdan* remain in a.p. B: (there is no a.p. B: / a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: distinction in the dialect due to retraction of the final accent) and the rest shift to a.p. A: < \*C:, e.g. *krûpan – krûpna – krûpno* (the same in *bâjan, bjêdan, bûjan, grîdan, kîvan, mlîčan, mûtân, sjâjan, stîdan, sûšan, trûdan, trîžan, tûžan, rûžan, žêdan*), cf. also the village name *Krâsno* (*nă Krasno* clearly shows a transfer to a.p. C:). The short vowel from the old long vowel a.p. *b* is found in *smîšan*, which is very unusual. In addition, in *grîšan – grîšna – grîšno* one finds a sort of a middle phase of this peculiar shortening in the old long vowel a.p. *b*.

<sup>249</sup> Some examples have *-ân*, some *-ăn*.

In Orlec (Houtzagers 1985), not many of the old a.p. *b* adjectives are attested but, of those that are, most belong to a.p. B: – *ravěŋ* / *rāvēn* – *ravnǝ*, *prazěŋ* / *prāzen* – *praznǝ*, *truděŋ* – *trudnǝ* – pl. *trudnǝ*, *žajěŋ* ‘thirsty’. There is one (secondary) case of a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: – *mǐren*. Two of the old a.p. *b* adjectives, *stǐdno* and *trēzen*, shift to a.p. C: > A: (ˆ in all indef. forms). Two forms exhibit unclear shortenings: def. *směšni*, *kǐvan*.

In Orbaníci (Kalsbeek 1998), there are only three adjectives in a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: – *trǔdan*, *vrǐēdan* and *žǐēdna*, while all other adjectives shift to a.p. C: – *dīćan*, *krūpan*, *prāzan*, *prǐēsan*, *rāvan*, *stǐdna*, *stvārno* really (adverb, cf. Grobnik *stvārno*), *trǐēzan*, *tūžan*.

#### KAJKAVIAN (Velika Rakovica)<sup>250</sup>

##### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m            | f      | n      |
|--------------|--------|--------|
| <i>těmen</i> | +temnǎ | +tēmno |

##### definite adjectives

| m      | f      | n      |
|--------|--------|--------|
| +tēmni | +tēmna | +tēmno |

##### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m            | f      | n      |
|--------------|--------|--------|
| <i>tūžěŋ</i> | +tūžnǎ | +tūžnǝ |

##### definite adjectives

| m      | f      | n      |
|--------|--------|--------|
| +tūžni | +tūžna | +tūžno |

The reflex of the old a.p. *b* in Kajkavian is either a synchronic a.p. B: (end stress or its reflex) or a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: (constant neo-acute in all indef. forms). The first option is present in V. Rakovica, Bednja and Prigorje and the other one in Varaždin and Turopolje, although in the latter two this could be just a phonetic reflex of the older a.p. B: (cf. *rǝka* < \**rǝkǎ* ‘hand’ and *jǎřem* < \**jǎřem* ‘yoke’ in Turopolje). In most of the dialects, the reflexes of the old a.p. *b* and *c* are merged (thus in all dialects below except Varaždin and, of course, Križanić) – in the synchronic a.p. B: nonetheless, which is contrary to the tendency towards the hegemony of a.p. C in suffixless adjectives. As already mentioned, in Kajkavian, as well as in Štok/Čak., there is a tendency for all of the adjectives with short and shortened root (their a.p. origin aside) to shift to a.p. A (see above), while only long stem adjectives remain in a.p.

<sup>250</sup> March 1981, 264–265.

B/C (in the case of \*-ьнъ adjectives they merge in a.p. B:). Thus, there is a polarization according to the root vowel quantity.

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 264), the old a.p. *b* yields a.p. B:, cf. *grěšĕn*, *prāzĕn*, *sūšĕn*, *šālĕn* joke, *trūdĕn*, *tūžĕn*, *vrĕdĕn*, *žĕdĕn* (all unshortened adjectives of the old a.p. *c* belong here as well – *mīrĕn*, *glādĕn*, *prāšĕn* dusty). The adj. *tĕmen* (originally short vowel a.p. *b*) is in a.p. C, together with other adjectives with short / shortened stem (whatever their original a.p. – a.p. *a*, short vowel a.p. *b*, short vowel a.p. *c* or shortened long vowel a.p. *c*). Thus in V. Rakovica, the *-en* adjectives are in a.p. C (< \*A) if short (similar to Štokavian) and in a.p. B: if long.

Jedvaj (1956, 305) gives only a few examples for Bednja. A.p. B: is found in the adjectives *kvāōrĕn* ‘rotten’, *trĕyĕdĕn* ‘difficult, pregnant’ and *žājĕn* ‘thirsty’ (PSl. *b*), while *mōren* ‘caring’ (cf. Siče: *māri* cares) show an unclear shortening.

Valjavec (1894, 227–228) in his description of Kajkavian gives the following adjectives with ‘, where both old a.p. *b* and *c* adjectives are found (in opposition to all of the adjectives with ‘, regardless of their origin):

- a) the original a.p. *b*: *bĕden*, *blūden*, *būjen*, *dīčen*, *dīven*, *dūžen*, *jālen*, *kvāren*, *krāsen*, *mlāčen*, *mūten*, *prāzen*, *prĕsen*, *rāven*, *rūžen*, *sjājen*, *smĕšen*, *snāžen*, *trĕzen*, *tūžen* *žĕden*;
- b) the original a.p. *c*: *bĕsen*, *glāden*, *hlāden*, *māsten*, *mīren*, *prāšen*, *strāšen*.<sup>251</sup>

The origin of the forms with ‘ that Valjavec gives as variants in some cases is unclear (most are a.p. *b* by origin):<sup>252</sup> *dīčen*, *grĕšen*, *grōzen*, *jāven*, *mlĕčen*, *mlĕden*, *rūjen*, *skŕben*, *slāven*, *tĕmen*, *trūden*, *tūžen* (Valjavec says that *dīčen*, *grĕšen*, etc. is more frequent). Such an accent would be expected in front of consonantal groups, which could be generalized in cases like *slāven* (a.p. *a*) and *tĕmen* (the short vowel a.p. *b* originally), but it is unclear how this type could spread to such a large number of cases.

In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), most of the original a.p. *b* adjectives yield a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: cf. *dīčĕn* (but *dīčna*), *grĕšĕn*, *jālĕn*, *kvārĕn*, *mlāčĕn*, *mūtĕn*, *prāžĕn*, *rāven*, *smĕšĕn*, *trĕžĕn*, *trūdĕn*, *vrĕdĕn*, *žĕjĕn*. These are joined by most of

<sup>251</sup> The reconstruction of the original a.p. is not certain in some of these cases, and the Kajkavian a.p. needs not necessarily correspond to the Štokavian one. But the general picture is still the same in this case.

<sup>252</sup> Valjavec 1894, 226.

old a.p. *c* adjectives like *būden*, *glāden*, *zlāten* (next to the old short vowel a.p. *c* adj. *drōben*), etc., as well as by *lāčēn* (the original a.p. *a*) *stālēn* as well. On the other hand, the adj. *snāžēn*, *tōžēn*, *ūmen* (a.p. *b* originally) shift to a.p. *C*:. The adj. *māžen* is short (cf. also Varaždin *māza* ‘pet’ but Štok. *māza* ~ *māzan* / *māzan* – *māzna* / *māzna*).

In Turopolje (Šojat 1981, 400), both the old a.p. *b* (*dōžēn*, *smēšēn*, *trēžen*, *vrāven* straight, flat, *žējen*) and the old a.p. *c* (*bēšen*, *glāden*, *māsten*) yield a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:.

In Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894 2, 156–157), a.p. B: encompasses the old a.p. *b* and *c* adjectives (the pattern: *mrsan* – *mrsna* – *mrsni* (n.)):

- a) the original a.p. *b*: *dīčan*, *dūžan*, *grēšan*, *mrāčen*, *mrsan*, *mūtan*, *prēsan*, *rāvan*, *snāžan*, *sūšan*, *trēzan*, *trūdan*, *tūžan*, *žēdan*;
- b) the original a.p. *c*: *glāsan*, *jādan*, *lādan*, *māsan*, *mēran* “miran”, *zlātan*.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 273), the situation is the same as in Rožić’s description of Prigorje – the old a.p. *b* and *c* merge in Ozalj a.p. B: (the pattern *mīran* – *mīrna* – *mīrno* – def. *mīrni*):

- a) the original a.p. *b*: *grīšan*, *mnāčēn* lukewarm, *mūtēn*, *prāžēn*, *rāmēn* flat, straight, *sūšēn*, *šālēn*, *trūdēn*, *tūžēn*, *vrīdēn*, *žēdēn*;
- b) the original a.p. *c*: *bīsēn*, *būdēn*, *glādēn*.

Cf. a.p. B: in Križanić: *Būden* – *Būдно* – def. *bīdnyi*, *Dāven* / *dawén* – *daw-nó*, *Kpācen*, *Prāzen* – *praznó*, *smesžen* – *smeszná* – *smesznó*, *trežen*, etc.

In Slovene, the old a.p. *b* is preserved in the pattern *rāvēn* – *rāvna* – *rāvno* (with a secondary pattern *ravēn* – *ravnā* – *ravnō*), cf. also *tāmēn* – *tāmnā* – *tāmnō*, but there is also a great deal of vacillation and paradigmatic shifts (cf. a.p. *C* variant *ravān* as well).<sup>253</sup>

**a.p. B:**<sup>254</sup> : *bē’dan* wretched (and *bē’dan* A<sup>B</sup>:, PSI. *b*, cf. *bijēda* – *bijēdu* misery), *dāvan’* ancient, *dūžan’* in debt (cf. *dūg* – *dūga* debt but PSI. \*dŭlgъ, *d*)<sup>255</sup> *krūpan’* large (cf. *krūpa* – *krūpu* hail), *mlāčēn’* lukewarm

<sup>253</sup> Cf. Stankiewicz 1993, 63–64; Toporišić 2004, 324.

<sup>254</sup> It is clear that the split of the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives into a.p. B: and a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: should be regarded as provisional. This exact division, with a great deal of vacillation, functions mostly in Štokavian only. The split is not present synchronically in all dialects, nor should it be necessarily reconstructed for older stages. The two types can be regarded as one synchronic type for some dialects.

<sup>255</sup> The adjectival a.p. *b* (very well attested by different Štok/Čak. dialects, in spite of the Old Russian a.p. *C*, see above) is connected to a.p. *d* of the basic noun.

(and *mlā'čan* A<sup>B</sup>: but *mlâk* C:/B:), *mūtan'* blurred (cf. Siče *mūtīm*), *prāzan'* empty (and *prā'zan* A<sup>B</sup>:, PSI. *b*), *prēsān'* raw (and *prē'san* A<sup>B</sup>:), *rāvan'* flat (and *rā'van* A<sup>B</sup>:, PSI. *b*), *rāzan'* various (usually def. *rā'znī*), *rūžan* ugly (cf. Siče: *rūžim*), *směšan'* funny (and *smě'san* A<sup>B</sup>:, PSI. *b*, cf. *smijêh* – *smijêha* laughter, Siče: *smjěši* smiles), *snāžan'* strong (cf. *snága* strength B:/B:-C:/C:, Siče: *osnāžim* I make stronger), *tāman'* dark (also A<sup>B</sup>: and A, PSI. *b*, cf. *tāma* – *tāmu* darkness), *trězan'* sober (and *trě'zan* A<sup>B</sup>:), *těsan'* tight (originally \*tēsny),<sup>256</sup> *trūdan'* pregnant, tired (and *trū'dan*, PSI. *b*, cf. *trūd* – *trūda* effort, Siče: *trūdī* tries), *tūžan'* sad (and *tū'žan* A<sup>B</sup>:, PSI. *b*, cf. *túga* – *túgu* sadness), *vāžan'* important (a Czech / Russian loanword), *vrědan'* worthy (cf. *vrijědnost* 'worth' and Siče: *vrīdī* it is worth), *žēdan'* thirsty (and *žē'dan* A<sup>B</sup>:, > C:)<sup>257</sup>

**a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:**<sup>258</sup> : *bā'jan* fantastic, *blū'dan* wanton (cf. Siče: *blūdim*), *bū'jan* lush (but cf. *būjati* flourish), *dī'čan* glorious (cf. *dika* – *diku* pride, Siče: *dīčimo* we take pride), *dī'van* wonderful (cf. Siče *dīvi se* admires), *gnjē'van* furious (and *gnjēvan'* but cf. *gnjêv* – *gnjêva* fury), *gř'dan* nasty (cf. Siče: *gřdim* I scold), *grě'san* sinful (> *gr'ěšan* A, cf. *grijêh* – *grijêha* 'sin' but Siče: *grišim* I sin), *grō'zan* terrible (cf. *gróza* – *grózu* dread), *jā'llan* envious (but cf. *jâl* – *jála* envy), *jā'van* public (cf. *jáva* – *jávu* wake), *kī'van* bitter, *kljū'čan* key (> A, cf. *kljūč* – *kljūča* key), *krā'san* lovely (cf. Siče: *ukrāsīm* I decorate), *kvā'ran* corrupted (cf. *kvâr* – *kvára* breakage), *mā'zan* cuddly, *mlě'čan* milky (cf. *mlijêko* milk), *mrā'čan'* dark (also C:?, cf. *mrâk* – *mrâka* dark but PSI. \*morkъ *d/b*), *mř'san* meaty, fat (> C:, cf. Siče: *mřsīm*), *sjā'jan* bright (and B:, Kajk. also A < \*c?, but cf. *sjâj* – *sjâja* brightness), *stī'dan* shy (but cf. *stīd* – *stīda* shame, PSI. *b/d*, Siče: *stīdī* is ashamed), *stvā'ran* real (cf. Čak.-Kajk. *stvār* thing), *sū'san* dry (cf. dial. *sūša*), *tā'jan* secret (but cf. *tājīm* I keep a secret, Siče: *tajīm*), *ū'man* wise (but cf. *ûm* – *ûma*<sup>259</sup> mind), *vř'stan* great (cf. *vřsta* – *vřstu* type, sort, > A), *žū'dan* anxious

Note: In Neo-Štokavian, a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: is synchronically, of course, identical to a.p. A:, which appears by length levelling from the forms with pre-

<sup>256</sup> Thus, not a \*-ънъ adjective originally.

<sup>257</sup> We reconstruct a.p. *b* on the basis of the frequent a.p. *b* reflexes in Kajk., Čak. (which is very significant considering the hegemony of a.p. C there), and Posavina.

<sup>258</sup> A.p. A deriving from a.p. B, cf. *dīčān* < *dīčān* in concordance with *dika* (B).

<sup>259</sup> But Russian *ум* – *ума*.



resonant lengthening. Thus, *dīčan* – *dīčna* – *dīčno* (cf. *dika* – *diku*) is in Neo-Štokavian the same as *sīlan* – *sīlna* – *sīlno* (cf. *sīla* and older *sīlan*). However, the distinction, putting the historical one aside, is still maintained in Old Štokavian: *dīčan* but *sīlan*.

### 3. a.p. c

#### PROTO-SLAVIC

##### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m           | f        | n        |
|-------------|----------|----------|
| *čьstьnъ    | *čьstьnā | *čьstьno |
| ‘honorable’ |          |          |

##### definite adjectives

| m          | f          | n          |
|------------|------------|------------|
| *čьstьnъjь | *čьstьnāja | *čьstьnojě |

##### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m        | f        | n        |
|----------|----------|----------|
| *gōldьnъ | *goldьnā | *gōldьno |
| ‘hungry’ |          |          |

##### definite adjectives

| m          | f          | n          |
|------------|------------|------------|
| *goldьnъjь | *goldьnāja | *goldьnojě |

Cf. a.p. C in Old Russian *долженъ* – *должна* – *должно* (Дыбо 1981, 72). The a.p. C pattern has been preserved to a point in the modern language as well but with a great deal of vacillation and paradigmatic shifts.

#### ŠTOKAVIAN

##### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m             | f            | n            |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>čăstan</i> | <i>čăсна</i> | <i>čăsno</i> |

##### definite adjectives

| m            | f            | n            |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>čăsnī</i> | <i>čăsnā</i> | <i>čăsnō</i> |

##### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m                 | f             | n             |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>glādan</i>     | <i>glādna</i> | <i>glādno</i> |
| (glādan) (glādno) |               |               |

##### definite adjectives

| m             | f             | n             |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>glādnī</i> | <i>glādnā</i> | <i>glādnō</i> |

A.p. C: is preserved in Western Štokavian (e.g. in Dalmatinska Zagora, Lika, Posavina), while it disappears, shifting to a.p. B:, in Eastern Štokavian,

including the classical literary Štokavian Vuk-Daničić norm with younger *gládan* – *gládna* – *gládno* instead of the older *glādan* – *glādna* – *glādno* (C:) by analogy to *túžan* – *túžna* – *túžno* (B:). In the present a.p. C, only the long vowel stem adjectives remain (as well as the short vowel adj. *bòlan* ‘painful’ – at least in some dialects, cf. this to *bòs* in the suffixless adjectives), while all of the old short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives shifted to a.p. A (see above). In all of Štok/Čak/Kajk., only Križanić’s dialect differs from this. In this way, a polarization of adjectives based on quantity appears. In opposition to the Proto-Slavic system with three a.p. in all adjectives, a new system appears where the short vowel adjectives (with the exception of *gol* and *bos* among the suffixless adjectives and *bolan* among \*-ьнъ adjectives) are in a.p. A (or a secondary a.p. stemming from it), while long vowel adjectives preserve the opposition between a.p. B and C. This opposition is secondarily disposed of in many dialects – by merging into a.p. B in the East and, in a more limited way, by the domination of a.p. C in the West.

Unlike in suffixless adjectives (like *drâg* – *drága* – *drâgo*), there was no simple reflex for the long vowel stem adjectives with the suffix \*-ьнъ – the unforgiving phonetic laws stood in their way. According to the ‘One mora law’ (cf. Kapović 2011b and see above), the Proto-Slavic long circumflex is preserved in shorter words but shortened in longer ones (measured in morae). According to the law, one would expect shortening in some forms of \*-ьнъ adjectives and the preservation of the long circumflex in other forms. Thus, one expects the shortening in e.g. \*gòlsъno > *gläsno* (like in \*môžъsko > *mùško* ‘male’ or \*dětъcъ > *djěcu* acc. sg. ‘children’) but not in \*gòlsъnъ > *glâsan* (cf. \*òlkъtъ > *lâkat* ‘elbow’ and \*bôbъnъ > *bûbanj* ‘drum’). We give here the Proto-Slavic long vowel a.p. *c* paradigm and its expected outcome in Štokavian:<sup>260</sup>

Proto-Slavic

m. – n. – f.

N. \*gòlsъnъ – \*gòlsъno – \*gòlsnà

G. \*gòlsъna – \*gòlsъny

D. \*gòlsъnu – (\*gòlsъně)

<sup>260</sup> For Štokavian, only the reflexes of the old indef. forms are given, while the later borrowed def. forms are disregarded – the same forms in PSl. are written in brackets.

A. \*gôlsъnъ – \*gôlsъno – \*gôlsъnъ

L. \*gôlsъnĕ – (\*golsъnĕ)

I. (\*gôlsъnomъ) – \*golsъnojĕ

n. \*gôlsъni – \*golsъnā – \*gôlsъny

(g. \*golsъnъ)

(d. \*golsъnomъ – \*golsъnānъ)

a. \*gôlsъny – \*golsъnā – \*gôlsъny

(l. \*golsъnĕxъ – \*golsъnāxъ)

(i. \*golsъny – \*golsъnāmi)

the expected post-one-mora-law forms

m. – n. – f.

N. \*glāsān – \*glāsno – \*glāsna

G. \*glāsna – \*glasnĕ

D. \*glāsnu

A. \*glāsān / \*glāsna – \*glāsno – \*glāsnu

L. \*glāsne (\*glāsnu)<sup>261</sup>

I. \*glasnōm

n. \*glāsni – \*glāsna – \*glāsne

a. \*glāsne – \*glāsna – \*glāsne

It is understandable that such a system can hardly have been stable. The alternation of long and short syllables in the paradigm was settled by generalizing either length or shortness. Thus, one gets *glāsan*<sup>262</sup> – *glāsna* – *glāsno* if the length was generalized and *glāsan* – *glāsna* – *glāsno* if the shortness was generalized. The latter belongs to a.p. A – this is the case in all modern dialects – with a middle phase of the short a.p. C, attested in Križanić's dialect: *Гласен* – *glasná* – nom. pl. m. *glāsni* – *glasnich*. Sometimes both long and short forms (*glāsan* / *glāsan*) coexist in the same dialect, and sometimes we find one form in one and the other form in another dialect, while in some cases the same form is generalized everywhere (e.g.

<sup>261</sup> For the initial, and not final, accent in loc. sg. see above.

<sup>262</sup> The length in the final syllable disappears as in words like *lākat*, *būbanj*.

*glâdan* is long everywhere and *rědan* is short everywhere, at least according to our data).<sup>263</sup>

The shortening of the old long vowel a.p. *c* can be seen in the following Štokavian adjectives:

- a) only shortened stem – *rědan*, *sprāsna*, *ždrěbna*;
- b) both the shortened and the long stem – *bītan* / *bītan*, *glāsna* / *glāsan*, *gnūsna* / *gnūsan* awful, *krěpan* / *krijēpan*, *prāsna* / *prāsan* dusty, *slāstan* / *slāstan* delicious, *shěžan* / *snijēžan* snowy, *strāsna* / *strāsan* scary, *svjěstan* / *svijēstan* aware, *vjěčan* / *vijēčan*, *žučan* / *žūčan*.

In the rest of the cases, the length has been generalized. The outcome of intraparadigmatic levelling is likely to have been influenced by other, extraparadigmatic, forms as well (i.e. the forms that were not part of the indef. adjectival a.p. *c* declension). Thus, the generalization of length in *glasna* may have been influenced by the noun *glās*, while the generalization of the short syllable may have been stimulated by the original def. form \*glasnī. In any case, there was a tendency to get rid of the complex quantitative alternations (this was also the reason that the secondary def. form \*glāsnī instead of \*glasnī was created later).

As already said, the old short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives shifted to a.p. A (see above). The only exception is the adj. *bolan* in some dialects. This may be because it has *-ln-*, hence vocalization of *l* and lengthening: *bōlan* – *bó(l)na* – *bô(l)no* (by analogy also *bōlan*, which can yield the pattern *bōlan* – *bōlna* – *bōlno*). The original accents are well preserved in the forms *bōlan* and *bóna* that have turned into vernacular forms of address, i.e. emphatic words in a number of Bosnian-Herzegovinian (and Dalmatinska Zagora) dialects, e.g. *dódi bōlan!* ‘come!’ (to males) and *dódi bóna!* ‘come!’ (to females).

For the old and new accent in def. forms (e.g. *hlàdnī* / *hlādnī*) see above.

<sup>263</sup> It is quite possible that there are some dialectal variants of various adjectives that are not noted in this article due to the author’s unawareness of their existence or due to the fact that these dialects / forms have not yet been described in a satisfactory manner. More research in the future will provide new data, which will make our view of the accentual development of adjectives more precise.

The situation in the Old Štokavian Slavonian dialect is as follows. In Southern Baranja, there is only a.p. B: – both for the old a.p. *b* and *c* (see above). In Šaptinovac (Ivšić 1907, 140), in opposition to Baranja, only a.p. C: is found: (*dûžan* – *dûžna* – *dûžno*, the same for *lâdan*, *mâstan*, *strâšan*). For a.p. C in Posavina, Ivšić (1913 2, 45) notes *glâdan* – *glâdna* (acc. sg. *glâdnu*) – *glâdno*, *dûžan*, *zlâtan*, etc. Some of the old a.p. *b* adjectives shift to a.p. C as well (see above). Baotić (1979, 198–199) gives the following a.p. C adjectives for Kostrč (the pattern *mâstân* – *mâsna* – *mâsno* – def. *mâsnĩ*): *glâdân*, *mâstân*, *lâdân* cold (a.p. *c*) and secondarily *krâsân*, *prîsân* (a.p. *b* originally). In Slobodnica (my data), *bîsan* – *bîsna* – *bîsno* remains in a.p. C:; three adjectives show a tendency to shift to B: (*glâdân* – *glâdna* – *glâdno* / *glâdno*; *lâdân* / *lâdân* – *lâdna* – *lâdno*; *mâstân* – *mâsna* – *mâsno*) and two have shifted to a.p. B: completely (*bûdân* – *bûdna* – *bûdno*, the same for *zlâtân*).

In Imotska krajina, the old a.p. *c* yields the transitional a.p. C:/B: (see above).<sup>264</sup> Rešetar (1900, 115) gives the adjectives *gladan*, *prašan*, *žedan* for a.p. C in Dubrovnik (many old a.p. *b* adjectives shift to C, see above). The hegemony of a.p. C is typical for Rešetar's 'southwestern Štokavian dialects' (see above for Prčanj and Ozrinići).

In Prapatnice (Vrgorska krajina), the old a.p. *c* adjectives either:

- a) stay in a.p. C: *glâdan* – *glâdna* – *glâdno* – def. *glâdnĩ*, the same for *bîsan* (def. *bîsnĩ* / *bîsnĩ*), *glâsan* (def. *glâsnĩ*), *mâsan* (def. *mâsnĩ* / *mâsnĩ*), *zlâtan* (def. *zlâtnĩ* / *zlâtnĩ*);
- b) shift to a.p. B: *bûdan*<sup>265</sup> – *bûdna* – *bûdno* – def. *bûdnĩ*, *srâman* (def. *srâmnĩ* / *srâmnĩ*);

or c) get stuck in between (B:-C:): *lâdan* / *lâdan* (gen. sg. *lâdna*) – *lâdna* – *lâdno* / *lâdno* – def. *lâdnĩ* (cf. a similar situation in this adjective in Imotska krajina);

A.p. C is preserved in *bôlan* – *bó(l)na* – *bôlno* – def. *bôlnĩ*.

<sup>264</sup> Except for the already mentioned examples, cf. also *lâdan* but *lâdna* – *lâdno* (Šimundić 1971, 132).

<sup>265</sup> Cf. also *bûdan* (B:) in Slobodnica in Posavina (my data).

ČAKAVIAN (*bòlan* – **Orbanići**,<sup>266</sup> *glâdăn* – **Novi Vinodolski**)<sup>267</sup>

**short vowel**

**indefinite adjectives**

**m**      **f**      **n**  
*bòlan*    *b<sup>u</sup>òlna*    *b<sup>u</sup>òlno* <sup>268</sup>

**definite adjectives**

**m**      **f**      **n**

**long vowel**

**indefinite adjectives**

**m**      **f**      **n**  
*glâdăn*    *glâdnă*    *glâdno*

**definite adjectives**

**m**      **f**      **n**  
*glâdnî*

As usual, a.p. C is well preserved in Čakavian. In some dialects (e.g. Vrgada, Senj), it remains the only a.p. In others, mixture with a.p. B and shifts to other accentual paradigms occur. As for the a.p. C pattern itself, the results are numerous – preservation of the original pattern (e.g. in Grobnik or Senj), generalization of  $\hat{\text{~}}$  in all forms (e.g. in Gacka and partly in Orbanići) or other changes (like the Vrgada retraction of the type *gl<sup>o</sup>ădnă* ⇒ *gl<sup>o</sup>ădna*).

Hraste (1935, 33) mentions only a.p. C in long stems for Hvar: *gñûsan* – *gñûsnă* – *gñûsno* – def. *gñûsni*, *mîran* – *mîrnă* – *mîrno* – def. *mîrni*. In Vrboska (Matković 2004), cf. *bîsan* – *bîsnă* – *bîsno* and *dûžan*. The shortening of a.p. *c* can be seen in the adverb *kri̇pno* and the secondary shift to a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: in *glôdan*, *-dna*, *-dno*, *jîdan*. The adjectives *pòtan* – *potnă* – *pòtno* and *žèjan* – *žiejnă*, *žiejnò* (\*C > C-B) ‘willing’ are, as already said, either secondary developments from the older a.p. A or a continuation of the original a.p. *c* (more data is needed).

On Brač (Šimunović 2009), as already seen, a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: and a.p. C: exist. The latter consists of just two old a.p. *c* adjectives (*gñûsan*, *svîstan*) and by many old a.p. *b* ones (see above). The adj. *bûdan*, *glôdan* shifted to a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:, while some other old a.p. *c* adj. developed mixed paradigms:

- a) a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:-C: <sub>1</sub> *srôman* – *srômnă* – *srômno*;
- b) a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:-C: <sub>2</sub> *hlôdan* – *hlôdnă* – *hlôdno* and *mîran* / *mîran* – *mîrnă* – *mîrno* (the same in *tûžan*, which is a.p. *b* originally).

<sup>266</sup> Kalsbeek 1998, 420.

<sup>267</sup> Langston 2006, 178, 182.

<sup>268</sup> The f/n. neo-acute is due to pre-resonant lengthening in a.p. A.

Shortening of the old a.p. *c* is seen in *krîpan*.

On Vrgada and Senj, a.p. C, which is the only remaining a.p. there, consists of the old a.p. *c* and *b* (see above). On Vrgada, shortening is seen in the *krîpan* – *kripnâ* – *krîpno* (probably from the older a.p. A). The variant *krîpno* in n. is interesting.

In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), a.p. *c* is preserved in adjectives like *glâdan*, *mîran*, *zlâtan* (cf. also *mrâcan* and *prâsan* / *prâsân* with this pattern), where the pattern has the generalized  $\hat{}$  in all forms. The old short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives (*dröban*, *bölan*) are in a.p. A, as well as the shortened *strâsan* ‘scary’.

In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), most of the old a.p. *c* adjectives stay in a.p. A: (< \*C:) with the generalized circumflex: *bîsan* – *bîsna* – *bîsno* (thus also *bûdan*, *glâdan*, *lâdan*, *snîžan*, *vîdan*, *zlâtan*). The shortening is seen in *gnjûsan*, *krîpan* and the adverb *glâsno*.

In Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007), the short vowel a.p. C is perhaps preserved in *bölan* – *bölnâ* – *bölno*. The one in *pötân* – *potnâ* – *pötno* may also theoretically be archaic but the secondary a.p. C from the older a.p. A as in *blätân* – *blatnâ* – *blätno* (see above) is more probable. Of course, the same kind of development is possible for *bölan* as well. The reflexes of the long vowel a.p. *c* are for instance *glâsân* – *glâsnâ* – *glâsno*, the same for *ghûsân*, *jâdân*, *mâsân*, *skřbân*.<sup>269</sup> In a couple of adjectives,  $\hat{}$  is generalized in all forms: *strâsân* – *strâsna* – *strâsno*, as variants also in *zlâtân*, *zrâčân* (thus in the dictionary part but *zlâtnâ*, *zrâčnâ* in the grammatical introduction).<sup>270</sup> Some of the old a.p. *b* adjectives shift to a.p. C: and some of the old a.p. *c* adjectives to a.p. B: (*būdân*). Shortening is seen in *krîpân*, as in other dialects.

Data from Orlec (Houtzagers 1985) is scarce. Only two secondary examples are attested *stîdno* and *trêzen* (originally a.p. *b*), while *mîren* and *žajèn* have a.p. *b* reflexes.

In Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998), a.p. C is represented by *ghûsan* – *ghûsna* / *ghûsnâ* – *ghûsno*, *hlâdan*, *mîran* – *mîrna*, *strâšan*. The shift to a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: is seen in *zlâtan* and a number of old a.p. *b* adjectives shifted to a.p. C (see above).

<sup>269</sup> The variant *skřbân* is the result of a tendency to shorten syllabic  $\check{r}$  (cf. *křv* / *křv* ‘blood’ in Grobnik).

<sup>270</sup> Lukežić, Zubčić 2007, 106.

KAJKAVIAN (**Velika Rakovica**)<sup>271</sup>**short vowel****indefinite adjectives**

| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>                  | <b>n</b>                  |
|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>rōsen</i> | <sup>+</sup> <i>rosnā</i> | <sup>+</sup> <i>rōsno</i> |

**definite adjectives**

| <b>m</b>                  | <b>f</b>                  | <b>n</b>                  |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <sup>+</sup> <i>rōsni</i> | <sup>+</sup> <i>rōsna</i> | <sup>+</sup> <i>rōsno</i> |

**long vowel****indefinite adjectives**

| <b>m</b>      | <b>f</b>                   | <b>n</b>                   |
|---------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>glādēn</i> | <sup>+</sup> <i>glādnā</i> | <sup>+</sup> <i>glādnō</i> |

**definite adjectives**

| <b>m</b>                   | <b>f</b>                   | <b>n</b>                   |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <sup>+</sup> <i>glādni</i> | <sup>+</sup> <i>glādna</i> | <sup>+</sup> <i>glādnō</i> |

In most of Kajkavian dialects, the old a.p. *c* merges with the old a.p. *b* – most often in a.p. B<sup>:</sup>. The distinction is maintained in Varaždin with a somewhat changed roster of members of a.p. B<sup>:</sup>:<sup>272</sup> and C.

According to the sources with which we operate here, the shortening of the old long vowel a.p. *c* is seen in the following Kajk. adjectives:

- a) shortened stem only – *gnūsēn*, *rěden*, *slāstēn*, *srāmēn*, *věčēn*, *zrāčēn*, *žōčēn*;
- b) both shortened and long stem – *glāsēn* / *glāsen*, *māstēn* / *māsten*, *mīrēn* (Bednja) / *mīren*, *sjājēn* / *sjājen* (?), *skřbēn* / *skřben* (?), *strāšēn* / *strāšen*, *zlātēn* (Križanić only) / *zlāten*.

In other adjectives, the length is generalized. Shortened stem adjectives are more numerous in Kajkavian than in Štokavian, while Štokavian, on the other hand, has more of them than Čakavian. For shortened adjectives, see above under a.p. A as well, and for the dialects with a.p. *b* = *c* reflexes cf. above under a.p. B.

It is important to note that “, which stems from the original \*<sup>ˆ</sup> by the ‘One mora law’, does not lengthen in front of -CC- (unlike the old acute). That is the reason why Kajk. has the pattern *glāsēn* – *glāsna* – *glāsno* in the old long vowel a.p. *c* and not \*\**glāsna* – \*\**glāsno*. This pattern has also influenced

<sup>271</sup> March 1981, 264–265.

<sup>272</sup> Of course, the question of naming synchronic a.p. is always somewhat arbitrary. For instance, the Varaždin opposition of *trūden* and *dōžen* can be treated as a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: vs. C: as well as a.p. B: vs. C: (more so considering that a dialect with a stress retraction cannot have a real end-stressed a.p. B:). If a dialect cannot distinguish (due to retractions) between a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: and B:, we generally name it B:.



the old a.p. *a* adjectives (see above). Cf. also the Varaždin (Lipljin 2002) form *mũško* ‘male’ < \*mõžьsko for this kind of development.

In V. Rakovica (March 1981, 264), there is only a.p. B: in the long vowel adjectives, where all old non-shortened a.p. *c* adjectives are (*mĩrèn*, *glādèn*, *prāšèn*). The stem vowel is shortened in *glāsen*, *māsten*, *strāšen*, *skr̥ben*. In Valjavec’s Kajkavian, Rožić’s Prigorje, Ozalj and Turopolje, the old a.p. *c* and *b* adjectives merge in a.p. B (see above).

However, in Varaždin (Lipljin 2002) a.p. B: and C stay separate. Some of the old a.p. *b* adjectives shifted to a.p. C and some of the old a.p. *a* adjectives have secondary  $\hat{}$  (see above), while the adjectives *dõžen* and *vĩden* are the only old a.p. *c* adjectives that remain in a.p. C (additionally, the def. form *strāšni* and the adverb *strāšno* may be from \*strāšen; similarly also def. *sjājni* and adverb *sjājno*). The adjectives *bĩdžen*, *glādžen*, *měžen* peaceful, *mr̥čžen*, *zlātžen* (as well as the originally short vowel a.p. *c* adj. *drõbžen*) shifted to a.p. B:. As already seen, the root is shortened in most adjectives: *glāsen* (comp. *glasnēši*), *gñusen* (but a secondary comp. *gñusnēši*), *māsten* (comp. *masnēši*), *rědžen*, *srāmžen*, *zrāčžen* (but comp. *zrāčnēši*), def. *žũčni*. Their adherence to a.p. *c* is confirmed, in some cases, by the accent on the comparative form ending (*gñusnēši* and *zrāčnēši* have secondary accent but other adjectival groups, i.e. adjectives with other suffixes, also show the connection of the comparative accent and the original mobile paradigm).

For Križanić’s a.p. C:, cf. *dõlžen* – *dolžná* – *dõlžno*. Križanić’s 17th century dialect is an exception because, as opposed to contemporary dialects, it preserves the short and shortened a.p. C, i.e. the shortness / shortening of the root is not equal to a.p. A. Cf. *czésten* – *Czestná* – *czéstno* / *czéstno* – gen. pl. *czestních* (and acc. pl. *czéstnich*) – def. *czestní* ‘honorable’ for the old short vowel a.p. *c*, as well as *Глāцен* – *glasná* – nom. pl. m. *glāśni* – gen. pl. *glasních* and *strāszen* – *strasznà* – *strászno* – nom. pl. m. *strāszni* – gen. pl. *straszních* – def. *strasznâia* for the shortened old long vowel a.p. *c*. The adjective *Злāтєн* – *злāтна* (with a shortening not seen in modern dialects) is an exception. The final accentuation in def. a.p. *c* forms is also well preserved in adjectives with a short root, cf. *rodnõgo*, *rodnĩm*, *земнāja*, etc.

In Slovene, the old a.p. *c* is preserved in the pattern *hladān* – *hlādna* – *hladnõ*, cf. also *dolžān* and *bolān*, *drobān*, *močān*, etc. As can be clearly

seen, unlike Štok/Čak/Kajk., both the old short and long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives remain in a.p. C. The short vowel a.p. *c* > A shift was not possible in Slovene since there the old circumflex intonation regularly shifts to the next syllable.

**a.p. C:** '*běsan* angry, enraged (cf. *bijēs – bijēsa* rage), '*bolan* painful (> C: > A<sup>B:</sup>, cf. *bōl – bōli* pain), '*bolestan* sick (> A, cf. *bōljeti* hurt), '*būdan* awake (cf. Siče: *budī* awakes), '*bunovan* delirious (> '*bunōvan*, cf. *būnilo* delirium), '*glādan* hungry, '*glāsan* loud (and *gl'asan* A < Križanić C, PSI. *c*, cf. *glās – glāsa* voice), '*gnūsan* hideous (and *gn'usan* A), '*gojāzan* obese, '*hlādan* cold (> B:, cf. *hlād – hlāda* shade), '*imūcan* wealthy, '*māstan* greasy (and A in Kajk., PSI. *c*, cf. *māst – māsti* 'grease', Siče: *mastī*), '*mīran* peaceful (Štok. B: and A<sup>B:</sup>,<sup>273</sup> > Kajk. also A; PSI. *c*), '*obēstan* rampant (> A),<sup>274</sup> '*oblācan*<sup>275</sup> cloudy, '*očājan*<sup>276</sup> desperate, '*olovan* lead (> '*olōvan*), '*osoran* gruff (> '*osōran*), '*pakostan* vicious (cf. *öpāk* vicious, *näopāko* reversely), '*prāšan* dusty (also *pr'ašan* A and A<sup>B:</sup>, cf. *prâh – prâha* dust,<sup>277</sup> Siče: *prašī*), '*prijāzan*<sup>278</sup> friendly, '*prūdan* useful (also A),<sup>279</sup> '*skr̥ban* (? , also A in Kajk., cf. *skr̥b – skr̥bi* care), '*slobodan* free (> A, cf. *oslobòditi* liberate), '*sněžan* snowy (also A, cf. *snijēg – snijēga* snow),<sup>280</sup> '*srāman* shy (also A<sup>B:</sup>, and A in Kajk., cf. *srām – srāma* shame, *srāmim se* I am ashamed), '*sramotan* shameful, '*strāšan* horrid (also A < Križanić C, PSI. *c*, *strâh – strâha* fear

<sup>273</sup> In Štokavian, *miran* can act as the reflex of the old a.p. *b* since the basic word *mir* shifted to a.p. B secondarily in many Štokavian dialects, while remaining a.p. C in Čakavian and Kajkavian. Cf. also Siče *mīre se* 'they make peace', which might be a parallel to the basic noun shifting to a.p. B in Štokavian.

<sup>274</sup> Cf. the f. *obisna* in Grabarje in Posavina (Ivšić 1913 2, 47) and *ōbīsan – obīsna – ōbīsno* in Prapatnice (Vrgorska Krajina, my data). The posttonic length is due to analogy to the noun *ōbijēst* 'frolic' (cf. *pāmētan* vs. *pāmēt* with an expected shortening).

<sup>275</sup> The posttonic length of *ōblācan* has the length by analogy to *ōblāk* 'cloud'.

<sup>276</sup> The length is by analogy to *ōčāj* 'despair'.

<sup>277</sup> But PSI. \*pōrхъ (a.p. *d*).

<sup>278</sup> The forms *prijāzan*, *gōjāzani*, *imūcan* (with the posttonic length) are secondary. Cf. *īubazan* (ARj) (originally also \**prijazan*, \**gōjazan*) and *imūcan* (ARj). In any case, the suffix *-azan* stems from \*-bъznъ, where the length cannot be original.

<sup>279</sup> The variants exist in the verbs *prūditi* : *prūditī* as well.

<sup>280</sup> Cf. *sněžan* and *sniježan* in ARj. But PSI. \*sněгъ (a.p. *d*), cf. also Siče *sněži* 'it snows'.

but *strāšiti* frighten), *ʹvīdan* apparent (and A<sup>B</sup>.; cf. *vīd* – *vīda* sight), *ʹzlātan* golden (>A<sup>B</sup>.; cf. *zlāto* gold), *ʹzrāčan* airy (cf. *zrāk* – *zrāka* air),<sup>281</sup> *ʹzvūčan* sonorous (literary word), *ʹžūčan* bitter (and A, cf. *žûč* – *žûči* gall)

### \*-ѣкъ adjectives<sup>282</sup>

#### 1. a.p. *a*

##### PROTO-SLAVIC

##### indefinite adjectives

| m        | f        | n        |
|----------|----------|----------|
| *mьrзъкъ | *mьrзъka | *mьrзъko |
| ‘odious’ |          |          |

##### definite adjectives

| m          | f          | n          |
|------------|------------|------------|
| *mьrзъкъjъ | *mьrзъkaja | *mьrзъkoje |

##### ŠTOKAVIAN

##### indefinite adjectives

| m     | f       | n       |
|-------|---------|---------|
| mъzak | mъska   | mъsko   |
|       | (mъska) | (mъsko) |

##### definite adjectives

| m     | f     | n     |
|-------|-------|-------|
| mъskī | mъskā | mъskō |

In Štokavian, the *-ak* adjective a.p. A behaves like any other a.p. A. It can shift secondarily to a.p. B' or C. The a.p. B' variant (*mъzak* – *mъska* – *mъsko*)<sup>283</sup> exists in the standard language as well, unlike in *-an* adjectives where this is not the case. In this regard, *-ak* adjectives do not behave in the same way as *-an* adjectives since dialects exist where *glādak* – *glātka* – *glātko* ‘smooth’ has an innovative a.p. B' (like *dūg* – *dūga* – *dūgo* ‘long’), but a.p. A *gādan* – *gādna* – *gādno* ‘nasty’ is preserved. Similar to that, there are dialects (e.g. many Posavian ones) where a.p. A is more or less preserved in the suffixless adjectives (like *slāb*), while having shifted to the younger a.p. C in *-ak* and *-an* adjectives. Thus, there is not necessarily a parallelism of paradigmatic shifts between different adjective groups.

<sup>281</sup> But PSI. \*zōrkъ (a.p. d). A.p. C: of the adjective in the list is provisory.

<sup>282</sup> Fort the material and reconstruction of \*-ѣкъ adjectives, cf. Дыбо 1981, 94–107 and Дыбо 2000, 160–175. The suffix \*-къ was added to the old *u*-adjectives in PSI. after the loss of this adjectival declension, e.g. \*blizъкъ ‘close’ from the older \*blizъ, cf. Croat. *blīz* ‘close’ and the adverb *blīzu* ‘close’.

<sup>283</sup> This a.p. B' can shift to a full a.p. B type *mъzak* – *mъska* – *mъsko*.

The origin of the Štokavian a.p. A, as in Čakavian and Kajkavian, is highly diverse – it includes adjectives from all PS1. accentual paradigms. This is not strange if one considers the fact that short vowel stem adjectives are by far the most numerous in the dialects. Thus, a.p. A consists of:

- a) the original a.p. *a* adjectives – *glādak*, *gībak* mobile, *mīzak*, *rēzak* acrid, *tīpak* sour, *žīdak* viscous, *žūhak* bitter;
- b) the original short vowel a.p. *b* adjectives – *krōtak* meek;
- c) the shortened old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives – *blīzak* close, *krātak* short (dial. *krātak*), *ljūbak* lovely, *nīzak* short, low, *ūzak* narrow (dial. *ūzak*);
- d) the original long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives – *brīdak* cutting, *dīzak* audacious, *krēpak* brisk, *kīhak* fragile, *pītak* drinkable, *slādak* sweet, *vītak* slim.

Except for the mentioned examples, there are a few other adjectives for which the reconstruction of the PS1. original a.p. is not certain. As for a.p. *a*, the situation is clear. The old short vowel a.p. *b* and *c* adjectives join a.p. A in the same way that \*-ьнъ adjectives do. The forms \*krōtka – \*krōtko (a.p. *b*) regularly yield *krōtka* – *krōtko* and *krōtak* (for PS1. \*krotъkъ) is analogical to them. Thus, one gets a.p. A.

The shortening of the long vowel a.p. *c* is similar to the situation in \*-ьнъ adjectives. In adjectives like \*sōldъkъ, gen. sg. \*sōldka – f. \*sōldkă – n. \*sōldko, one would expect \*slādāk, gen. sg. m. \*slātka – f. \*slātkă – n. \*slātko, with quantitative alternations. As in \*-ьнъ adjectives, levellings occur. The generalization of short vowels yields a.p. A, *slādak* – *slātka* – *slātko* (where the place of the stress in f. *slātka* is analogical to *slātko* and *slādak*). What is different is that in *-an* adjectives the short version was generalized in just a few cases (like *slāstan*), many adjectives (like *glādan*) generalized the long version, while a certain number of cases exhibits both long and short variants (*glāsan* and *glāsān*). The peculiarity of *-ak* adjectives lies in the fact that most often shortened variants are generalized (except for *tēzak*, which is completely shortened only in some Čakavian dialects and partially in a few Štokavian ones, see below). That is why there are but a few cases of quantitative variations in *-ak* adjectives in the dialects (*vītak* / *vītak*, Šimundić 1971, 128, and *pītak* / *pītak*, as well as a somewhat special case *mēk(ak)* / *mēk*).

For the shortening in a.p. *b*, see below.

In def. forms, " on the root is expected, e.g. *glàtkī*. A secondary accent like *glàtkī* can also appear. Since a number of old a.p. *c* adjectives shifted to a.p. A, one could expect forms like *slàtkī* to be archaisms rather than innovations. Theoretically, the adjectives that have shifted to a.p. A by generalizing the " variants may have preserved the old a.p. *c* def. accent. Of course, that is impossible to prove today. It is not rare that in a dialect some of a.p. A adjectives (or a.p. B adjectives stemming from the older a.p. A) have one accent, while other adjectives have a different one (e.g. *dṛskī* 'rude' but *plītkī* 'shallow', etc.).

In Imotska krajina (Šimundić 1971, 126–128, 130), *tṛpak* 'sour' and *kròtak* are in a.p. A/C, i.e. the older a.p. A is preserved as a variant next to the newer a.p. C, while all other adjectives (*gibak*, *gladak*, *žitak*; *kratak*; *kròtak*; *tanak*; *sladak*, *vītak*) shift to a.p. C completely (*tanak*, as one can see, did not remain in a.p. C but shifted to a.p. A and then again to a.p. C).<sup>284</sup> In Prapatnice, all of the adjectives shift to a.p. C (even the def. forms are a.p. C): *glàdak* – *glàtkā* – *glàtko* – def. *glàtkī* (the same for *krīpak*, *pītak*, *slàdak*, *vītak*; *nīzak*, *ūzak*). Rešetar (1900, 115, 117) gives a.p. C for Dubrovnik *usak* narrow, *sladak*, while attesting only *kràtak* – *kràtkā* – *kràtko* for Prčanj and Ozrinići (with an a.p. B: variant in Ozrinići).

Ivšić (1907, 140) gives type C for Šaptinovac: *slàdak* – *slátka* – *slàtko*.<sup>285</sup> For Posavina, Ivšić (1913 2, 43) attests only *slàtkā* : *slàtko* (C) for Štitar and *mṛska* (A) for Brod. Baotić (1979, 198–199) has only a.p. C for Kostrč in *glàdak*, *židak*; *slàdak*,<sup>286</sup> *vītak*. According to my data from Posavina, the adj. *glàdak*, *tṛpak*, *sklīzak* slippery, *mṛzak*, *nīzak*, *blīzak*, *dṛzak*, *slàdak* have such an accent everywhere and belong to a.p. C in most dialects, cf. Sikerevci *mṛzak* – *mṛskā* – *mṛsko* – def. *mṛskī*. In Orubica, Kobaš and Slobodnica, all adjectives belong to a.p. C (cf. also Slobodnica *kṛk* – *kṛka* – *kṛko* fragile), in Sikerevci only *dṛzak* remains in a.p. A, while in Babina

<sup>284</sup> A different development, \*tānak – \*tānka – \*tānko → +tānak – +tānka – +tānko (by short vowel generalization), is also possible.

<sup>285</sup> The form *slátka* is from the older \*slatkā via *kanovačko* lengthening and should be regarded the same as *slátka* elsewhere in the Slavonian dialect group.

<sup>286</sup> The form *slādāk* is probably a misprint.

Greda only *glādak* is still in a.p. A. One should note that such a situation is different from that with suffixless adjectives, where most adjectives in Kobaš and Sikerevci preserve the old a.p. A. In Brodski Stupnik, the old a.p. A is preserved in suffixless adjectives, but all *-ak* adjectives shift to a.p. B (*blīzak* – *bliska* – *blisko* – def. *bliskī*).

ČAKAVIAN (Vrgada)<sup>287</sup>

**indefinite adjectives**

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>m</b>      | <b>f</b>      | <b>n</b>      |
| <i>glādak</i> | <i>glatkā</i> | <i>glātko</i> |

**definite adjectives**

|               |                |          |
|---------------|----------------|----------|
| <b>m</b>      | <b>f</b>       | <b>n</b> |
| <i>glatkī</i> | <i>glatk°ā</i> |          |

What we said for the Štokavian a.p. A holds more or less for Čakavian as well. A.p. A is preserved in some Čakavian dialects, while it shifts to a.p. C, or less frequently to a.p. B, in others.

On Brač (Šimunović 2009), a.p. A is preserved in one adjective (*nīzak* – *nīska* – *nīsko*), while it shifts in other to a.p. B' (*glādak* – *glalkā* – *glalkō*, *mīzak* – *mīskā* – *mīskō*), quite certainly through an older a.p. C phase, in which *slādak* – *slalkā* – *slōlko*, *blīzak* – *bliskā* – *blisko* and *ūzak* have remained.

We have seen that on Hvar a.p. A is preserved in suffixless and *-an* adjectives. However, the situation with *-ak* adjectives is different, although data is scarce. The preservation of a.p. A in Brusje can probably be seen in nom. pl. f. *bliske* (ČDL gives *blīzak* (!) – *bliska* – *blisko* as basic forms), but the shift to a.p. C is seen in *mārzak* – *mārskā* – *mārsko* and *slādak* – *slarkā* – *slōrko*. A.p. C is also attested in *plīlkā* ‘shallow’.<sup>288</sup>

On Vrgada (Jurišić 1973), all adjectives belong to a.p. C (*glādak*, *nīzak*, *ūsak*). In Filipjakov and Preko,<sup>289</sup> a.p. A is preserved in all adjectives, cf. Filipjakov *glādak*, *nīzak*, *blīzak*, *ūzak*, *slādak*, *tānak* (here in a.p. A as well) and Preko *glādak* – *glātka* – *glātko* (and *slādak* – *slātka* – *slātko* with lengthening by analogy to the m. form where it is expected), *nīzak*, *blīzak*, *ūzak*, *tānak* – *tōnka* – *tōnko* (with regular lengthenings) but also *tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško* (cf. below for *težak*).

<sup>287</sup> Jurišić 1973.

<sup>288</sup> Hraste (1935) does not mention *-ak* adjectives at all, but cf. also Vrboska (Matković 2004) *slatkī* and the form *slalkō* from Pitve (my data), which point to the shortened \*slādak i.e. \*slādak.

<sup>289</sup> Data by Nikola Vuletić.

On Rab (Kušar 1894, 34), a.p. A is preserved: *krätak* (def. *krätki*). A.p. A is also found in an old a.p. *b* adjective that is normally not shortened: *rëdak* rare (def. *rëtki*, in the city also *rëtki*). On Susak,<sup>290</sup> a.p. A is preserved but with some superficial changes: *γlätk* – *γlätka* – *γlätko* smooth, *üssk* – *üsska* – *üssko* narrow, *tänk* – *tänka* – *tänka*, *slädak* – *slätka* – *slätko*.

In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), *zühak* and *nizak* remain in a.p. A, while *lähak* 'light' is in a.p. B' (+*lahkä* – +*lahkö*), which is probably an innovation compared to the older a.p. A. A.p. *a* data from Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007) is quite scarce. In the synchronic a.p. A, there is only *tänak* – *tänka* – *tänko* (def. *tänkī*), originally a.p. *c*, while the old a.p. *a* adjectives acquire a new mobility: *glädak* – *glatkä* – *glätko* (def. *glätkī*), *zühak* – *zuhkä* – *zühko* (def. *zühkī*).

In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), a.p. A is stabile: *glädak* – *glätka* – *glätko*. The old a.p. *a* adjectives are joined by the old a.p. *b* (*krätak*, *nizak*, *üzak*, see below) and a.p. *c* adjectives (*tänak* and shortened *kriřpak*, *přtak*, *slädak*).

In Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 151), a.p. A is preserved, cf. *glädak* – *glätka* – *glätko* (the same in *nizak*, *krötak*, *lägak* light, *mëkak* soft, *tänak*, *slädak*, *tëžak* heavy).

#### KAJKAVIAN (Velika Rakovica)<sup>291</sup>

##### indefinite adjectives

|               |                 |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>m</b>      | <b>f</b>        | <b>n</b>        |
| <i>glädek</i> | + <i>glatkä</i> | + <i>glätko</i> |

##### definite adjectives

|                 |                 |                 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>m</b>        | <b>f</b>        | <b>n</b>        |
| + <i>glätki</i> | + <i>glätka</i> | + <i>glätko</i> |

In Kajkavian, some dialects preserve a.p. A, while in others it shifts to a.p. C or B. In the Kajkavian a.p. A, i.e. among the adjectives with " , there can be more examples than in Štokavian (for instance, \**rëdek* and \**tëžek*, that are A<sup>B</sup>; B: or C: in Štokavian, can be in a.p. A in Kajkavian).

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265), all *-ek* adjectives (*glädek*, *mëhek*, *nizak*, *slädak*, *žühek*) are in a.p. C, which is a substitute there for an older a.p. A.

The Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305) adjectives with " in the indef. m. form (this is the only indef. form remaining in the dialect) can be divided into a.p.

<sup>290</sup> Hamm, Hraste, Guberina 1956, 112–114.

<sup>291</sup> March 1981, 265.

A (those having  $\hat{~}$  in def. forms) and into a.p. B: (those with the neo-acute in def. forms). In the first group, there is only *nizek* – *něiski* (which is, by the way, originally a.p. *b*), while the rest of the adjectives are in the second one: *glòdek* – *glòtki* (the same for *krèpek*, *kròtek*, *làihek*, *màihek*, *rèdek*, *slòdek*, *tènek*, *žùhek*). All of the PSI. a.p. are here and the syllable is shortened even in *rèdek*. Valjavec (1894, 227) under his a.p. A, i.e. adjectives with  $\hat{~}$ , also gives words of various origins: *glàdek*, *mřzek*, *sklizek*, *žùhek* (*a*), *lègek*, *nizek*, *ùzek* (*b*), *brìdek*, *kròtek*, *tènek*, *krèpek*, *křhek*, *mèhek*, *slàdek* (*c*).

In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), a.p. A is also very heterogeneous historically, but the distinction between the old a.p. *a* and *c* remains in the comparative form. Cf. in the old a.p. *a*: *mřzek* (comp. *mřskęši*), *sklizek* (comp. *skliskęši*), def. *gřpki*, *glàdek* (*glàtkęši*), *rězek*, def. *třpki*, *žùhek*. From the old a.p. *b* there are *lèhek* and *blizek* (comp. *bliskęši*). In the case of the old a.p. *c*, most adjectives have the stress on the ending in the comparative form: *kròtek* (but secondary comp. *kròtkęši*), *měhek* (comp. *měhkęši*, younger *měhkęši*), *brìdek* (comp. *britkęši*), def. *krěpki*, *křhek* (comp. *krhkęši*), *pìtek*, *plìtek* (comp. *plitkęši*), *slàdek* (def. *slàtki* and *slàtki* corny), *tězek* (comp. *těžęši*).

In Turopolje (Šojat 1982, 400), there is the A > B shift, cf. *lègek* – *lěka* < \**lěkä*, *nizek* – *niska* < \**niskä*, *mèkek* – *měka*, *slàdek* – *slàtkä* / *slàtkä*.

In Prigorje (Rožić 1893–1894 2, 145, 151, 153), adjectives like *nizak* – *niska* / *niska* – *nisko* / *nisko* (the same for *glàdak*, *slàdak*, *tènak*) have younger a.p. B variants, while the original a.p. A is preserved in *kr'ak* – *kr'ka* – *kr'ko* ‘fragile’.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 271, 273), all adjectives shifted to a.p. C, cf. *těžak* – *těška* < \**těškä* – *těško*, the same in *glàdak*, *měfak*, *nizak*, *slàdak*. The A > C shift is not new in this area, it appears already in Križanić's dialect, cf. his<sup>292</sup> *glàdko* – *glatká*.

**a.p. A:** *bl'izak* close (PSI. *b*, cf. *blizu* near, *blížiti se* come near), *br'idak* cutting (PSI. *c*, cf. *brìd* – *brìda* edge), *d'rzak* audacious (PSI. *c*)<sup>293</sup> *d'ugačak* long (> C, and *dug'ačak* A and *dugačak'* B, cf. *düğ*), *g'ibak* mobile (PSI. *a*), *gl'adak* smooth (PSI. *a*, cf. *glàditi* caress), *gr'omak* stentorian (a Russian loanword), *'èdak* acrid (and A:/B:, rare in spoken language), *kr'epak* brisk (PSI. *c*, cf. *krijepiti* freshen), *k'rhak* fragile (PSI. *c*), *kr'otak* meek (PSI. *b*, cf.

<sup>292</sup> Cited from Дыбо 1981, 98. Križanić was born near Ozalj.

<sup>293</sup> Cf. Slv. *dřz* – *dřza* (C:).



*kròtiti* tame), *lj'ubak* lovely (PSl. *b*, cf. Siče: *lŭbīm*<sup>294</sup> I kiss), *m'rzak* odious (cf. *m'rzjeti* hate, PSl. *a*), *n'izak* short, low (PSl. *b*), *p'itak* potable (PSl. *c?*, cf. *p'iti* drink – *p'ila* she drank), *pl'itak* shallow (and A<sup>B</sup>:/B:/C:),<sup>295</sup> *p'rhak* crisp (cf. *pr'hnuti*), *r'ěžak* acrid (cf. *rězati* cut), *skl'izak* slippery (cf. *sklízati se* slide, skate), *sl'adak* sweet (PSl. *c*, cf. *slād* malt, *sláditi se* eat something sweet), *t'rpak* sour (PSl. *a*), *v'itak* slim (PSl. *c?*, cf. *v'iti* flutter – *v'ila* 'she fluttered' but also *v'it* slim), *ž'idak* viscous (> B:, PSl. *a*), *ž'uhak* bitter (PSl. *a*)

## 2. a.p. *b*

### PROTO-SLAVIC

#### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives definite adjectives

| m        | f        | n        | m          | f          | n          |
|----------|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|
| *l'ǫgъkъ | *l'ǫgъka | *l'ǫgъko | *l'ǫgъkъjъ | *l'ǫgъkaja | *l'ǫgъkoje |
| 'light'  |          |          |            |            |            |

#### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives definite adjectives

| m        | f      | n      | m        | f        | n        |
|----------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| *ǫzъkъ   | *ǫzъka | *ǫzъko | *ǫzъkъjъ | *ǫzъkaja | *ǫzъkoje |
| 'narrow' |        |        |          |          |          |

As in \*-ъnъ adjectives, the a.p. *b* stress was, prior to the operation of Dybo's law, always on the stem (like in a.p. *a* but without the acute intonation). After Dybo's law, we find the stress on the first poststem syllable: \*ǫzъkъ – \*ǫzъka – \*ǫzъko. However, the *yers* weaken and lose their ability to be stressed in weak position – Ivšić's retraction occurs and we get the forms \*ǫzъka – \*ǫzъko (the alternative being that there was no progressive shift of stress in these cases to begin with), while the stress of \*ǫzъkъ, on a strong *yer*, remained where it was. Thus a new surface mobility arises, as in \*-ъnъ adjectives, which yields opportunities for various kinds of levelling in the dialects, the form \*ǫzъkъ or \*ǫzъka being taken for pivotal – cf. dial.

<sup>294</sup> Cf. Дыбо 2000, 219 for a.p. *b*.

<sup>295</sup> Cf. Czech / Slovak *plytký* (which can be either from a.p. *a* or *c*). In PSl. this was probably a.p. *a* (cf. the basic verb \*plýti) but in Croat. dialects it behaves as a reflex of a.p. *b*.

Croat. *úzak* and *üzak*. However, this levelling was not so important. A larger role was played by a shortening process, which took place in the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives in a number of dialects (Štok/Kajk/Čak.) that yields such forms as *üzak*. Such a shortening cannot be phonetically regular, i.e. it is not a case of real shortening. This is probably to be explained by an analogical spread of the a.p. A pattern, since it was by far the most numerous (encompassing the old a.p. a, practically all of the old long vowel a.p. *c* and almost all of the short vowel a.p. *b* and *c* adjectives), while the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives were a rather small group.

#### ŠTOKAVIAN

##### short vowel

###### indefinite adjectives

|            |                    |                    |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>m</b>   | <b>f</b>           | <b>n</b>           |
| <i>lāk</i> | <i>lāka (lāka)</i> | <i>lāko (lāko)</i> |

###### definite adjectives

|             |             |             |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>m</b>    | <b>f</b>    | <b>n</b>    |
| <i>lākī</i> | <i>lākā</i> | <i>lākō</i> |

##### long vowel

###### indefinite adjectives

|             |                    |                    |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>m</b>    | <b>f</b>           | <b>n</b>           |
| <i>üzak</i> | <i>üska (üska)</i> | <i>üsko (üsko)</i> |

###### definite adjectives

|                    |                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>m</b>           | <b>f</b>           | <b>n</b>           |
| <i>üskī (üskī)</i> | <i>üskā (üskā)</i> | <i>üskō (üskō)</i> |

There are four possibilities for the development of the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives in Štokavian:

- a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: reflex (e.g. *krātak* – *krātka* – *krātko*), i.e. generalization of the accent from the forms \*koĩťka – \*koĩťko;
- the a.p. B: reflex (e.g. *krātak* – *krātka* – *krātko*), i.e. generalization of the accent from the original form \*kortĩkь;<sup>296</sup>
- the short root, i.e. a shift to a.p. A (e.g. *krātak* – *krātka* – *krātko*);<sup>297</sup>
- a secondary shift to a.p. C: (e.g. *krātak* – *krātka* – *krātko*).

It seems that the *-ak* adjectives a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: is not preserved in Neo-Štokavian dialects, unlike the type *dīvan* (< *dīvan*) in *-an* adjectives that is

<sup>296</sup> Of course, *krātak* (B:) can also be derived from the older a.p. C:, for instance, which can then be an innovation derived from the older a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:, etc. These developments may be different in dialects and in some cases it may be difficult to establish the real historical scenario.

<sup>297</sup> A.p. A can, of course, as usual shift to a.p. B'/B (*krātak* / *krātak* – *krātka* – *krātko*) or C (*krātak* – *krātka* – *krātko*).

quite frequent. The type A<sup>B</sup>: in *-ak* adjectives is preserved only in the Old Štokavian Slavonian dialect<sup>298</sup> that preserves the separate neo-acute accent. In Neo-Štokavian dialects, this type shifted to a.p. C:; it seems – \*krātak – \*krātkā – \*krātko > \*krātak – \*krātkā – \*krātko ⇔ *krātak* – *krātkā* – *krātko*. Of course, in the Eastern dialects, where a.p. C: has vanished, a.p. B: is preserved (*krātak* – *krātkā* – *krātko*). As already said, a.p. B: can be a secondary development from the older a.p. C: and even older a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:; as well as a direct reflex of the generalized PSI. forms with end stress.

The adjectives that were originally the PSI. long vowel a.p. *b* can be divided into four groups depending on their reflexes in Štokavian:

- a) *kratak* – short (the secondary a.p. A or a later development of it) or long (the original A<sup>B</sup>:, B: or secondary C:) – the same goes for *plitak* as well;
- b) *rijedak* – always long in Štok. (A<sup>B</sup>:, B: or secondary C:) except exceptionally in Posavina;
- c) *blizak*, *nizak* – the *-z-* ending stem adjectives that are always short (a.p. A or something that develops of it);
- d) *uzak* – the adjective with a stem in *-z-*, which is always short (A), except in the Slavonian dialectal group (where it can be A<sup>B</sup>: or B:).

As already said, the short vowel in adjectives like *krātak*, *blīzak*, *nīzak*, *ūzak* is certainly secondary (cf. Czech *krátký*, *blízky*, *nízky*, *úzký*), and, for some adjectives, the older long vowel forms are attested in dialects (*krātak*, *ūzak*). These short forms are not easy to explain phonetically, although three of those adjectives have a stem in *-z-* (cf. also *dřzak*, *mřzak*, *sklīzak* that are also synchronically a.p. A). Interdialectal variation of this type occurs in *plitak* / *plītak* as well. The easiest explanation, as already said, is that this is an analogy to a.p. A, which is the a.p. encompassing most of the *-ak* adjectives, even though such an analogy seems somewhat odd. One should also say that some dialects show transitional forms like *ūzak* – *ūska* in Batina (Baranja). For more examples, see below.

As for the original short vowel stems, the adj. *krōtak* (originally a.p. *b*), as already said, shifts to a.p. A and for *lāk* see below.

In Imotska krajina (Šimundić 1971, 127), the adj. \*krātak has a short vowel and there is unfortunately no mention of other a.p. *b* *-ak* adjectives.

<sup>298</sup> Posavian is a part of the Slavonian dialect group.

In Prapatnice, *nřzak* and *řzak* are short, while *krřtak* – *krřtka* – *krřtko* – def. *krřtkř* (the same in *rřdak*) have shifted to a.p. C. In Dubrovnik (Rešetar 1900, 117), *krřtak* is in a.p. C (also *plřtak*), cf. Prčanj *krřtak* (A) and Ozrinići *krřtak* (A) but also *krřtřk* – *krřtka* – *krřtko* (B:). In Molise (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000), cf. *nřzak* but *krřtřk* – *krřtka*, -o in B:<sup>299</sup>

Sekereš gives only a.p. B: (*krřtak*, *plřtak*, *rřdak* as well as *těžak*) for Baranja (1977, 389). However, my field data from one of those dialects (Batina) is not in accord with this (see below). Ivšić (1913 2, 45–50) mentions only a.p. B: (*krřtak*) and a.p. C: (*rřdak*), which is not representative for the Slavonian dialect group. Baotić (1979, 198–199) attests a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: (*krřtak* – *krřtka* – *krřtko*) in all adjectives (cf. also *plřtak*, *rřdak*, *řzak*) for Kostrč.

In my Slavonian dialect field data, most of the local dialects have a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: (like Kostrč) – that is the case in Sikerevci, Orubica, Babina Greda, Velika Kapanica, Slobodnica, Šljivoševci and Batina. Slobodnica, Orubica, Babina Greda, Velika Kapanica and Šljivoševci have neo-acute (*krřtak*, *rřdak*, *řzak*, *plřtak*) in all indef. forms,<sup>300</sup> just like Kostrč.

The dialect of Sikerevci and Batina have some peculiar features. In Sikerevci, beside forms with constant neo-acute (*krřtak*, *plřtak*, *rřdak*, *řzak*) there are also variant forms *přřtak*, *rřdak*, *řzak*. In Batina, we find *krřtak* and *rřdak* and all other forms with neo-acute but *plřtak* – *plřtka* – *plřtko* and *řzak* – *řska* – *řsko* with short vowel forms only in the masculine. The situation in Sikerevci and Batina shows a transitional stage, between the old a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: and the new a.p. A, probably going in the direction of the situation present in most of Neo-Štokavian dialects.

In Kobaš and Brodski Stupnik, we find a.p. B: in these adjectives, cf. Kobaš *rřdak* – *rřtka* – *rřtko* (the same in *krřtak*, *plřtak*, *řzak*) and Brodski Stupnik *krřtak*, *plřtak*, *rřtko* (plus *těžak* and *górak* secondarily). This is in accord with Ivšić's *krřtak* (but not his *rřdak*, which is not attested at all in my data).

The Slavonian data available up until now clearly shows, although this cannot be seen by the scant and unrepresentative data provided by Ivšić,

<sup>299</sup> The form *krřtřk* is a regular Molise reflex of the old \**krřtřk*.

<sup>300</sup> I have no attestations for *řzak* from V. Kapanica or Šljivoševci. Cf. also *krřtak* – *krřtka* – *krřtko* in Magić Mala and Davor.

that, unlike Neo-Štokavian, most of the dialects have preserved the original a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: in the place of the old a.p. *b*, while a few Posavian dialects have a.p. B: instead of it.

ČAKAVIAN (*lăgak* – **Grobnik**,<sup>301</sup> *krătak* – **Orbanići**)<sup>302</sup>

#### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

|              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>     | <b>n</b>     |
| <i>lăgak</i> | <i>lahkă</i> | <i>lăhko</i> |

##### definite adjectives

|              |           |           |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>  | <b>n</b>  |
| <i>lăhkī</i> | <i>-ā</i> | <i>-ō</i> |

#### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

|               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>m</b>      | <b>f</b>      | <b>n</b>      |
| <i>krătak</i> | <i>krătka</i> | <i>krătko</i> |

##### definite adjectives

|          |          |          |
|----------|----------|----------|
| <b>m</b> | <b>f</b> | <b>n</b> |
|----------|----------|----------|

In Čakavian, it seems that the stem is always short in the adjectives *blīzak*, *nīzak* (but cf. *vu:zāk* in Donjosutlanski dial., DGO), while *kratak* and *ředak* show both the shortness and the preservation of a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: or B:, depending on the dialect. The preservation of a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: is found both in the South 1 (Hvar / Brač) and in the North (Orbanići), while a.p. B: is attested in the North (Rijeka, Grobnik). Of course, as in other adjectives, the old a.p. *b* can shift to a.p. C here as well, in accordance with a general propensity for a.p. C in Čakavian.

From Pitve on Hvar, I have the form *krôtak* – *krôlka* – *krôlko* with the preservation of a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: (cf. also *krôtak* in Brusje, ČDL) attested but *rīlkă* – *rīlko* ‘rare’ with a shift to a.p. C. In Vrboska on Hvar (Matković 2004), cf. *krôtak* – *krôtkă* – *krôtko* with a shift to a.p. C and the same in *plîtak* – *plîtkă* – *plîtko* but with a probably later generalization of  $\hat{}$ .

On Brač (Šimunović 2009), *blīzak*, *nīzak* and *ūzak* are short, while a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: is preserved in *krôtak* – *krôlka* – *krôlko* and *rīdak* – *rīlkă* – *rīlko* shifted to a.p. C (the same in *plîtak*).

On Vrgada (Jurišić 1973), *nīzak* and *ūsak* are short, while *krôatak* – *krôatkă* – *krôatko* (and *plîtak*, *rîtak*) have shifted to a.p. C. In Filipjakov, *krătak* – *krătka* – *krătko* (the same in *plîtak*, *rīdak*), as in Preko<sup>303</sup> (the only difference being in the vocalism of *krôtak* in Preko), can be both a

<sup>301</sup> Lukežić, Zubčić 2007.

<sup>302</sup> Kalsbeek 1998.

<sup>303</sup> Recorded by Nikola Vuletić.

continuant of the old a.p. C and the old a.p. A<sup>B</sup>;<sup>304</sup> while *blīzak*, *nīzak*, *ūzak* have a short vowel.

On Rab (Kušar 1894, 34), *krātak* is short and the same occurs, which is not very usual, in *rēdak* as well (def. *rētki* but also *rētki* in the city of Rab). The short form is seen in the def. *plītki* / *plitkī* as well (there is no indef. form). On Susak (Hamm, Hraste, Guberina 1956, 112–114), we find a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: in *r<sup>i</sup>ētk* – *r<sup>i</sup>ētk*a – *r<sup>i</sup>ētk*o (*ūsk* is short), while *plītāk* (*plītf*) – *plītva* – *plītvo* seems to preserve the original PSI. a.p. *b* accentual pattern, but it is not possible to make conclusions on isolated forms.

In Senj according to Moguš (1966, 77; 2002), *krātak* and *rēdak* belong to a.p. C (as well as *plītak* – the adj. *blīzak*, *nīzak*, *ūzak* are short). In Rijeka (Strohal 1894, 159), *nīzak* is short, the old short vowel *lāhak* is in a.p. B' (+*lahk*ā – +*lahk*ö), while *krātāk* and *rēdāk* are in a.p. B: Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007) shows the short vowel in *ūzak*, the shift to a.p. C in *lāgak* – *lahk*ā – *lāhk*o and a.p. B: in *krātāk* – *krātk*ā – *krātk*ö, as well as in *rēdāk* and *plītāk*. In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), *rēdak* – *rētk*a – *rētk*o shifted to a.p. A: (< \*C:) and *krātak*, *nīzak*, *ūzak* (+ *plītak*) are short (but cf. the def. *krātki* / *krātki*, where the expected length can still be seen).

From Orlec (Houtzagers 1985), not much data is attested since these adjectives have def. forms only, but def. *nīski*, *ūski* does point to the short vowel and def. *krātka* and *plītki* to a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: or B: in the historic indef. forms. In Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998, 151), the short vowel is present in *nīzak*, *krātak* – *krātka* – *krātko* (and *plītak*) are in a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:. Cf. also a.p. A in the old short vowel a.p. *b* adj. *krōtak* – pl. *krōtki*, *lāgak* – f. *lāhka*.

KAJKAVIAN (*lājhek* ‘light’ – **Bednja**,<sup>305</sup> *nīzek* – **Velika Rakovica**)<sup>306</sup>

#### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

**m**            **f**            **n**  
*lājhek*

##### definite adjectives

**m**            **f**            **n**  
*lājhki*

<sup>304</sup> Preko has no neo-acute whatsoever and Filipjakov only in traces.

<sup>305</sup> Jedvaj 1956, 305.

<sup>306</sup> March 1981, 265.

**long vowel****indefinite adjectives**

| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>           | <b>n</b>           |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>nĭzek</i> | <sup>+</sup> niskă | <sup>+</sup> nĭsko |

**definite adjectives**

| <b>m</b>           | <b>f</b>           | <b>n</b>           |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <sup>+</sup> nĭski | <sup>+</sup> nĭska | <sup>+</sup> nĭsko |

There are basically two options in the reflexes of the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives in Kajkavian. One is shortening of the stem, sometimes even in cases like \*rěďbъkъ, which does not appear in Štokavian, and the other one is the preservation of the original reflexes of a.p. *b*, either in the shape of a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: or B: (although the distinction of these two types is not possible in most Kajkavian dialects that have retracted the accent). Križanić's data from the 17th century is especially interesting since they provide insights related to the dating of some processes (see below).

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265), only the form *nĭzek*, with a short stem, is attested. In Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305), the short stem is seen in *nĭzek*, *krōtek* 'short', *rědek* and *vūzek*, while a trace of the old a.p. *b* is probably to be seen in the def. forms *krōtki*, *rĭetki*, *vūski*. Valjavec (1894, 227) has short *nĭzek*, *ūzek* and long *krátek*, *rédak* (also *plítek*). In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002), the short vowel is present in *blĭžek* (and *plĭžek*), while the direct reflex of the old a.p. *b* can be seen in *krāžek*, *nĭžek* (comp. *nĭžęši*), *rěđek*, def. *vōski* 'narrow'. The neo-acute is also secondarily present in the masculine forms of *žĭžek* – *žĭtka* – *žĭtko* (originally a.p. *a*) and *vĭžek* – *vĭtka* (acc. sg. *vĭtku*) – *vĭtko* (originally probably a.p. *c*). The Varaždin form *nĭžek* is very archaic and interesting since this adjective has the secondary short stem in almost all Kajk/Čak/Štok. dialects. In Turopolje (Šojat 1981, 400), *nĭžek* is short, while the old a.p. *b* length is present in *krāžek*, *rěđek*.<sup>307</sup>

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 271, 273), the short vowel is seen in *nĭžak* (also in Rožić's description), and a.p. B: in *krátak* – <sup>+</sup>krátka – <sup>+</sup>krátka. Such a system in the place of the old a.p. *b* is attested by Križanić<sup>308</sup> as well: *блѣзок*.<sup>309</sup>

<sup>307</sup> In dialects like Turopolje and Varaždin, there can be no distinction between a.p. A<sup>B</sup>: and B: due to the retraction of the type *glāva* < \*glāvā 'head'.

<sup>308</sup> Cited from Дыбо 1981, 97.

<sup>309</sup> Križanić often does not note the stress after the pretonic length. The ending *-ok* is, of course, Russian but the accents are from Križanić's local mother tongue.

(but also *blizok* [blizok]) – *блѣзко*, *krātok* – *krātkó*, *pūdok* – *pūtκό*, *ѿзек*. In the adjective *Nízok* – *nizká*<sup>310</sup> one can see the short vowel and the shift to a.p. C (the same in Težak's and Rožić's description). This clearly points to the fact that the curious short vowel forms in the old long vowel a.p. *b* occur at least as early as the 17th century, i.e. that this is not some kind of more recent change (but cf. Varaždin *nžek*), even though this is already clear from the geographical spread of this feature. Regrettably, there is no attestation for *\*blizьkъ* and *\*qzьkъ* in Težak's and Rožić's description, since these adjectives are still a.p. B: in Križanić' texts. One should also note that Križanić's a.p. B: in *\*blizьkъ* is unique among Kajk/Čak/Štok. dialects since it seems that all modern dialects show a short vowel in this adjective.

**a.p. B:** *krā'tak* short (> C:, A, PSI. *b*, cf. *krátiti* shorten), *rě'dak* rare (also B: and Posavina/Kajk/Čak. A, > C:, PSI. *b*), *ū'zak* narrow (and B:, > A, PSI. *b*, cf. *súziti* to narrow)

### 3. a.p. *c*

#### PROTO-SLAVIC

##### short vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m                 | f       | n       |
|-------------------|---------|---------|
| *tьnьkъ<br>'thin' | *tьnьká | *tьnьko |

##### definite adjectives

| m         | f         | n         |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| *tьnьkъjъ | *tьnьkája | *tьnьkojě |

##### long vowel

##### indefinite adjectives

| m                                 | f       | n       |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|
| *tęgьkъ <sup>311</sup><br>'heavy' | *tęgьká | *tęgьko |

##### definite adjectives

| m         | f         | n         |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| *tęgьkъjъ | *tęgьkája | *tęgьkojě |

<sup>310</sup> Cited from Дыбо 2000, 165.

<sup>311</sup> The form *\*tęgьkъ* with *\*-ž-* is younger.



## ŠTOKAVIAN

## short vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m            | f                    | n                    |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <i>tànak</i> | <i>tánka / tǎnka</i> | <i>tânko / tǎnko</i> |

## definite adjectives

| m            | f            | n            |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>tànkī</i> | <i>tànkā</i> | <i>tànkō</i> |

## long vowel

## indefinite adjectives

| m                    | f            | n                    |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| <i>tēžak (téžak)</i> | <i>tēška</i> | <i>tēško (téško)</i> |

## definite adjectives

| m            | f            | n            |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>tēškī</i> | <i>tēškā</i> | <i>tēškō</i> |

A.p. C is preserved in a number of Štokavian dialects in two of the old short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives, *gōrak* – *górka* – *gōrko* and *tànak* – *tánka* – *tânko*,<sup>312</sup> and in one old long vowel a.p. *c* adjective, *tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško*. In Štokavian, after the operation of the ‘One mora law’, the length in all forms has generalized only in *tēžak* (and dialectally as a variant in *vītak* / *vītak* and *mēk* ‘soft’ with a variant *měk*, see below). In all other old long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives, the short vowel forms are generalized together with the shift to a.p. A, cf. *brīdak*, *dřzak*, *krěpak*, *křhak*, *slādak*, etc.

In the adj. *težak*, as in old long vowel a.p. *c* -an adjectives, one would expect shortening of the old long circumflex in some forms. Thus, one would expect the pattern *\*tēžāk* – *\*tēškā* – *\*tēško*. The forms with the expected shortening (i.e. with “) of the old long circumflex have been generalized in many Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects (see below). In Neo-Štokavian, the length is generalized in all dialects (*tēžak* or younger *téžak*), but traces of the old shortened forms are preserved in some Posavian dialects (see below) that have the shortened form *těžak* together with the length in other forms. One would actually not expect “ in this form (nom. sg. m.), but this is certainly due to the influence of all other masculine forms, where “ is expected according to the ‘One mora law’ (gen. sg. *\*tēška*, dat. sg. *\*tēšku*, nom. pl. *\*tēški*, acc. pl. *\*tēške*, etc.). One could also think that the original shortening is preserved in the phrase *těško tēbi* ‘beware!’ (cf. the usual adverb *těško*), but this is very questionable since such a shortening occurs

<sup>312</sup> In *gorak*, length is often generalized (thus *gōrak* or *górak*, with a shift to B). In *tanak*, shortness is usually generalized (thus *tǎnka* / *tànka*, *tǎnko* / *tànko*).

in the phrase *blāgo tēbi* ‘you’re lucky!’ as well (cf. the usual adverb *blāgo* ‘mild’), where the short vowel form cannot be archaic.

In Imotska krajina (Šimundić 1971, 130–131), *težak*, *plitak*, *vitak* and *gorak* (with generalized length) are in a.p. C:-B: (+*tēžak* – +*tēška* – +*tēško* but gen. sg. m/n. +*tēška* / *tēška*, dat. sg. m/n. +*tēšku* / *tēšku*, etc.). Cf. in Prapatnice *tēžak* (gen. sg. m/n. *tēška*) – *tēška* – *tēško* – def. *tēškī* and also *gōrak* – *gōrka* – *gōrko* – def. *gōrkī* and *tānak* – *tānka* – *tānko* – def. *tānkī* with the preserved a.p. C. Cf. in Molise<sup>313</sup> a.p. B:-C: in *tēžāk*<sup>314</sup> (gen. sg. m/n. *tēška*) – *tēška* – *tēško*.

Sekereš (1977, 389) gives *tēžak* in a.p. B: for Southern Baranja (the same for *krātak*, *plitak*, *ridak*). However, in my data from Batina in Baranja the more archaic pattern *tēžak* / *tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško* – def. *tēški* is attested. This dialect also usually generalizes ‘, i.e. a.p. B:, but the adjective in question is archaic. Cf. also the example *gōrak* – *gōrka* – *gōrko* – def. *gōrkī* in Batina with the younger neuter form.

Ivšić (1907, 140) gives a.p. C: for Šaptinovac *tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško* and for Posavina in general (Ivšić 1913 2, 45, 50) the examples *gōrak* – *gōrko*, *tānak* – *tānka* – *tānko* and *tēžak* – *tēško*. The situation in Kostrč (Baotić 1979, 198–199) is the same.

However, my Slavonian data present a different and more interesting picture concerning the adjective *težak*. Orubica, Davor, Batina and Kobaš have the usual a.p. C: that is mentioned in Ivšić (with a partial mix with a.p. B: in Batina and Kobaš<sup>315</sup> and a complete transfer to a.p. B: in Slobodnica),<sup>316</sup> cf. Orubica *tēžak* – *tēškä* – *tēško* – pl. *tēški* – *tēške* – def. *tēško*. However, in the dialects of Sikerevci, Babina Greda and Velika Kopanica one finds an unusual a.p. A-C:. Cf. in Sikerevci *tēžak* – *tēškä* – *tēško* – pl. *tēške* – def. *tēški*, in Babina Greda *tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško* – pl. *tēški* – *tēške* and in V. Kopanica *tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško* – pl. *tēški* – *tēške* – def. *tēške*. Here we see a shortening that is not present elsewhere in Štokavian, it seems, though

<sup>313</sup> Piccoli, Sammartino 2000.

<sup>314</sup> The pre-form is \**tēžāk*, cf. also in Molise *pètāk* – gen. sg. *pétka* for such an accentual development (Piccoli, Sammartino 2000, xxvi).

<sup>315</sup> Cf. Batina *tēžak* / *tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško* – def. *tēški* and Kobaš *tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško* – pl. *tēški* – *tēške* – def. *tēškī*.

<sup>316</sup> *Tēžak* – *tēška* – *tēško* – def. *tēškī*.

it is attested in some Čakavian and Kajkavian dialects (but generalized in all forms).

Adjectives like *dřzak* and *slădak* (the original a.p. *c*) are always shortened in Slavonia (see above).

As for the original short vowel a.p. *c* adjectives (*gorak*, *tanak*), most dialects preserve the old a.p. *C*, while innovative forms are rare (see above for *gorak* in Batina). For the preservation of a.p. *C*, cf. Slobodnica (*göřak* – *górka* – *gôrko* – def. *gôrki*, *tănak* – *tánka* – *tânko* – def. *tănkî*), Sikerevci (*göřak* – *göřkă* – *gôrko* – def. *gôrki*),<sup>317</sup> Orubica (*tănak* – *tănkă* – *tânko* – pl. *tănkî* – *tânke* – def. *tănkě*), Babina Greda (*göřak* – *górka* – *gôrko* – pl. *gôrki* – *gôrke*, *tănak* – *tánka* – *tânko* – pl. *tănkî* – *tânke*) and Kobaš (*göřak* – *górka* – *gôrko* – def. *gôrko*, *tănak* – *tánka* – *tânko* – pl. *tănkî* – *tânke* – def. *tănkô*). Note that Kobaš even preserves the old def. *gôrko*.

#### ČAKAVIAN (*Vrgada*)<sup>318</sup>

##### short vowel

###### indefinite adjectives

|              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>     | <b>n</b>     |
| <i>tănak</i> | <i>tankă</i> | <i>tânko</i> |

###### definite adjectives

|              |          |          |
|--------------|----------|----------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b> | <b>n</b> |
| <i>tankî</i> |          |          |

##### long vowel

###### indefinite adjectives

|              |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b>     | <b>n</b>     |
| <i>těžak</i> | <i>těškă</i> | <i>těško</i> |

###### definite adjectives

|              |          |          |
|--------------|----------|----------|
| <b>m</b>     | <b>f</b> | <b>n</b> |
| <i>těškî</i> |          |          |

As we have seen, after the operation of the ‘One mora law’ the length is generalized only in *těžak* (dialectally also in *vîtak* and *mêk*) in Štokavian, as opposed to the generalized short vowel in other adjectives. Some Čakavian dialects have generalized length in *těžak* as well – this type occurs in South Čakavian, which is generally closer to Western Štokavian than other Čakavian dialects are. However, the generalization of the short vowel (or the presence of “ just in nom. sg. m. as in Posavina) is still far more common in Čakavian than in Štokavian (where it is present, it seems, only in the

<sup>317</sup> I have the forms *tănak* – *tănkă* – *tănkô* – def. *tănkî* attested in Sikerevci but perhaps *tănkô* is not reliable.

<sup>318</sup> Jurišić 1973.

Slavonian dialect group).<sup>319</sup> On the other hand, in the South one can find the length in the adj. *měk* as well, which is a reshaped old \*-ькъ adjective (see below). The short adjectives *gorak* and *tanak*, as in Štokavian, preserve the original a.p. C in many dialects. Selca on the island of Brač (data by Nataša Šprljan) are remarkable in the preservice of the expected length in adjectives *gōrāk*, *tānāk* and facultatively in *těžāk* (cf. also nouns like *lākāt*, *nōhāt*, *mōzāk*), by analogy also in *glādāk*, *krātāk* (the length in adjectives like *mōcān* is irrelevant because of the pre-resonant lengthening in the dialect).

From Pitve on Hvar, I have the forms *těžak* – *těška* – *těško* – pl. *těški* – *těške* with an a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:-C: mixed paradigm / vacillation. In Vrboska (Matković 2004), the original a.p. C is preserved in *tānak* – *tōnkā* – *tōnko* and *tīěžak* – *tīేశkā* – *tīేశko*. Brač (Šimunović 2009) is similar: *gōrak* – *gōrkā* – *gōrko*, *tānak* – *tānkā* / *tōnkā* – *tōnko* and *těžak* – *těškā* – *těško*.

Vrgada (Jurišić 1973) has the preserved a.p. C in *gōrak* – *gōrkā* – *gōrko* and *tānak* – *tānkā* – *tānko*, as well as the southernmost example with " in *těžak* – *těškā* – *těško*. As can be seen, Vrgada shows the length in nom. sg. m. only, just like in the mentioned Posavian dialects.

In Filipjakov<sup>320</sup> near Zadar, one finds *tānak* – *tānkā* – *tānko* (A), with the generalized accent from the old nom. sg. m. form, and *těžak* – *těška* – *těško* with a generalized ^ in all forms. In Preko on the island of Ugljan, ^ is generalized in *tānak* – *tōnkā* – *tōnko*, but *těžak* – *těška* – *těško* has the generalized ". This is, according to our data, the southernmost Čakavian dialect that has a complete generalization of " in *težak*.

The short vowel in *těžak* (def. *těški*, in the city *těški*) is attested on Rab as well (Kušar 1894, 34). In Senj (Moguš 2002), the situation is interesting. The short *tānak* – *tānkā* – *tānko* preserves the original a.p. C, while *těžak* – *těška* has a shortened root (but cf. def. *těški* with length).

In Grobnik (Lukežić, Zubčić 2007), a.p. C is preserved in *gōrak* – *gōrkā* – *gōrko* (def. *gōrkī*) and the shortened forms are generalized not just in *krīpak* and *slādak* but also in *těžak* – *teškā* – *těško* (def. *těškī*). In Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998), the younger a.p. A is seen in *tānak* – *tānkā* – *tānko* as well as in *těžak* – *těška* – *těško* (A) but without a secondary shift to a.p. C

<sup>319</sup> Moreover, even this is a new discovery since Ivšić does not mention such forms.

<sup>320</sup> The Filipjakov and Preko forms recorded by Nikola Vuletić.

as in Grobnik. Of course, it is not completely impossible that the Grobnik a.p. C in *těžak* is actually an archaism and not a case of  $C < *A$ , but this is not very likely in the light of adjectives like *glădak* – *glatkă* – *glătko*. In Gacka (Kranjčević 2003), *těžak* shifted to a.p. B: and *krîpak*, *pîtak*, *slădak* are short (*tănak* is also in a.p. A).

KAJKAVIAN (*těnjek* – **Bednja**,<sup>321</sup> *slădek* – **Velika Rakovica**)<sup>322</sup>

**short vowel**

**indefinite adjectives**

**m**      **f**      **n**

*těnjek*

**definite adjectives**

**m**      **f**      **n**

*tîenki*

**long vowel**

**indefinite adjectives**

**m**      **f**      **n**

*slădek*    +slatkă    +slătko

**definite adjectives**

**m**      **f**      **n**

+slătki    +slătka    +slătko

In Štokavian, the only adjective that has generalized the long stem is *těžak* (in most of the other old long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives the shortened form was generalized), while the short *těžak* is limited to some Posavian dialects. In Čakavian, the form *těžak* and the shortening are more widespread than in Štokavian, and in Kajkavian the generalization of the shortened forms in the old long vowel a.p. *c* occurs in all adjectives, including *tęžęk* (however, this adjective is not attested in many dialects, i.e. in their dialectal descriptions).

In Velika Rakovica (March 1981, 265), the adj. *měhek* is short and belongs to a.p. C ( $< *A$ ). The accent of *mrskî* (originally a.p. *a*) is probably due to analogy to synchronically / superficially similar, but historically / derivationally completely different, adjectives such as *lovskî* ‘hunting’, *tatskî* ‘thief’s’, *ludskî* ‘other people’s’. In Bednja (Jedvaj 1956, 305), a.p. B<sup>323</sup> is seen in *těnek* – *tîenki*, and the short vowel (and a.p. B) in *krěpek* – *krîepki*, *măihęk* – *măihki* and *slădek* – *slôtki*. Valjavec (1894, 227) notes the short vowel in *brîdek*, *krěpek*, *křhek*, *měhek*, *slădek* and a secondary length by analogy to the -CC- forms in *górek*. In Varaždin (Lipljin 2002),

<sup>321</sup> Jedvaj 1956, 305.

<sup>322</sup> March 1981, 265.

<sup>323</sup> Of course, this a.p. B is conditional, standing in opposition to a.p. A (with a neo-circumflex in def. forms).

the shortening occurs in all old vowel a.p. *c* adjectives (*br̥dēk*, *m̥h̥ek*, *t̥ž̥ek*, etc.), while the old a.p. *c* is signaled by the accent in the comparative (see above). For Prigorje and Turopolje see above.

In Ozalj (Težak 1981, 271), a.p. C (probably from the older a.p. A) is seen in *t̥ž̥ak* – *t̥ška* < \**t̥škä* – *t̥ško* (the same in *m̥f̥ak* ‘soft’, *sl̥ad̥ak* from the old a.p. *c* adjectives). This situation in Ozalj is supported by Križanić’s<sup>324</sup> forms: *крѹнок* – *крѣкѹ* – *крѣнко*, *Мѣкок* – *з’мечкѹиу*, *мѣжок* – *мѣжко* – loc. pl. *мѣжкѹх*, *брѹдок* – *брѹдко* – gen. sg. *bridkogó* (the mobility has developed in the old a.p. *a* like *glatká* – *gládko*, etc.). Križanić’s data show us that the shortening of the old long vowel a.p. *c* occurred already in the 17th century in all adjectives in that area and that these adjectives had already merged with the old a.p. *a* adjectives in the modern a.p. C. This situation is preserved up until today in Ozalj.

**a.p. C:** ‘gorak bitter (> C:), ‘tanak thin (> A, PSI. *c*, cf. *stánjiti* to thin), ‘t̥ž̥ak heavy, difficult (also A and A-C:, cf. *t̥ž̥iti* weigh)

### Shortenings and lengthenings in \*-ьнъ and \*-ькъ adjectives

Here, we shall give an overview of the old long vowel \*-ьнъ and \*-ькъ adjectives in which shortening of stems occurs (in a.p. *c* and *b*) and \*-ьнъ adjectives of the old a.p. *a* in which lengthening occurs. What we do not consider here are obvious and clear cases of pre-resonant lengthening (or pre-consonant group lengthening in Kajkavian) and later generalizations of such a length (like in *górka* or *sílna*).

#### \*-ьнъ ADJECTIVES<sup>325</sup>

- a) the old long vowel a.p. *c* – only short vowel attested

*r̥ēdan*, *spr̥āsna*, *ždr̥ēbna*

- b) the old long vowel a.p. *c* – short vowel in some dialects, long in others

*b̥ītan* / *bītan*, *gl̥āsan* / *glāsan*, *gn̥jūsan* / *gnjūsan*, *kr̥ēpan* / *krēpan*,<sup>326</sup>  
*m̥āstan* / *māstan* (A in Kajk.), *m̥īran* / *mīran* (A in Kajk.),<sup>327</sup> *pr̥āšan* /

<sup>324</sup> Дыбо 1981, 98.

<sup>325</sup> Different *yat* reflexes are marked with a *ě*. The phonological traits of the examples are Štokavian.

<sup>326</sup> For *krijepan* cf. ARj, where this form is given according to Della Bella’s *krijepan*.

<sup>327</sup> Usually a.p. B: in Štok. in relation to the innovative a.p. B: in the basic word *mīr* – *mīra* ‘peace’ (instead of the older *mīr* – *mīra*).

*prāšan*, *sjājan* / *sjājan* (A in Kajk.), *skřban* / *skřban* (A in Kajk.),  
*slāstan* / *slāstan*, *sněžan* / *sněžan*, *srāman* / *srāman* (A in Kajk.),  
*strāšan* / *strāšan* (A in Čak., Kajk. and Posavina), *svěstan* / *svěstan*,  
*věčan* / *věčan*,<sup>328</sup> *zrāčan* / *zrāčan* (A in Kajk.), *žüčan* / *žüčan*

- c) the old long vowel a.p. *c* – only long vowel attested

*bēsan*, *būdan*, *dūžan*, *glādan*, *hlādan*, *mrāčan*, *zlātan*

- d) the old long vowel a.p. *b* – adjectives with secondary shortening

*grěšan* / *grěšan*, *kljüčan* / *kljüčan*, *māran* / *māran* (A in Kajk.),  
*směšan* / *směšan* (Gacka), *svīlan*, *štēdan* / *štēdan*

- e) a.p. A – adjectives with secondary lengthening

*brīžan* / *brīžan*, *būčan* / *būčan*, *čāstan* / *čāstan*, *jāsan* / *jāsan*, *kūžan* /  
*kūžan*, *lāžan* / *lāžan*, *pōstan* / *pōstan*, *sūzan* / *sūzan*

\*-ЪКЪ ADJECTIVES

- a) the old long vowel a.p. *c* – only short vowel attested

*brīdak*, *dřzak*, *krěpak*, *křhak*, *slādak*

- b) the old long vowel a.p. *c* – short vowel in some dialects, long in others

*měk(ak)* / *mēk*, *pītak* / *pītak*, *těžak* / *těžak*, *vītak* / *vītak*

- c) the old long vowel a.p. *b* – only secondary short vowel attested

*ljūbak*

- d) the old long vowel a.p. *b* – short vowel in some dialects, long in others

*blīzāk* / *blīzak* (B: only in Križanić), *krātak* / *krātak*, *nīzak* / *nīzak*  
 (A<sup>B</sup>: in Kajk.), *plītak* / *plītak*, *rědāk* / *rědak* (A in Posavina/Kajk/  
 Čak.), *ūzak* / *ūzak*

As already said a couple of times, the ‘One mora law’ operates in the old long vowel a.p. *c* \*-ЪПЪ and \*-ЪКЪ adjectival forms, which yields shortened vowels in some forms (like n. \*glāдно / \*věčno, \*těško / \*křhko, gen. sg. m/n. \*glādna / \*věčna, \*těška / \*křhka, etc.) but length in others (like in \*glādān / \*věcān, \*těžāk / \*křhāk, f. \*glādnā / \*věcnā, \*těškā / \*křhkā),

<sup>328</sup> Today usually *vječan* in Štokavian but Vuk and ARj have *viječan*, while Daničić 1872, 94 lists this adjective in the same type as *dīvan*, i.e. in a.p. A<sup>B</sup>:. The length in *viječan* could also be due to analogy to the noun *vijek* (i.e. *vijék*) and not from the old unshortened forms.

cf. also \*bŏbъnъ > *bûbanj* and \*mŏžъsko > *mûško*. The result of this is that in some adjectives the length (*glâdan*, *têžak*) and in others the shortness (*vyjěčan*, *kŕhak*) is later generalized. The mechanisms of shortening and later generalizations were basically the same in both the old \*-ъnъ and \*-ъkъ a.p. *c* adjectives, but the results varied.

In \*-ъnъ adjectives, according to our data, brevity is always generalized only in 3 adjectives and length in 7 of them. If Kajkavian is taken out of the picture, there are 15 adjectives that are always long. Thus, we can conclude that in Štokavian and Čakavian the length is usually generalized in \*-ъnъ adjectives, while in Kajkavian this need not be the case. In Štokavian, there are 10 adjectives with a quantitative variation in different dialects – this group is more numerous in Kajkavian. The shortening of the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives occurs in 4 cases and the secondary lengthening in a.p. *A* in 8 of them (mostly in Štokavian).

In the old long vowel a.p. *c*, the reflexes are impossible to account for if one does not resort to the ‘One mora law’. On the other hand, the apparent shortening in a couple of old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives is a different thing altogether. As already said, this is probably to be explained by the influence of the more numerous group of a.p. *A* adjectives but, whatever the explanation, this does not influence the processes we see in the old long vowel a.p. *c* that are due to the operation of the ‘One mora law’. The unexpected shortening in the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives is usual in only three cases – *grěšan* (cf. also the noun *grěšnĭk* ‘sinner’ instead of the expected *grijěšnĭk*), *kljüčan* (but this is not an old word, cf. ARj), and *svĭlan* (this form is, however, not in frequent use today). The other three examples are local (Bednja, Gacka and Imotski).

As for the secondary lengthenings in a.p. *A*, an explanation is extremely hard to find in a couple of cases (*brĭžan*, *kûžan*, *sûzan*).<sup>329</sup> In some of the adjectives (*čâstan*, *lâžan*, *pôstan*), the influence of the basic nouns is obvious (*čâst*, *lâž*, *pôst*), while in *bûčan* and *jâsan* one can speculate, perhaps not all too convincingly, on the analogy to the rhyming adjectives *žüčan* / *žûčan* and *glâsan* / *glâsan*. The secondary long vowel variants could have also

<sup>329</sup> It must be noted that the basic word *brĭga*, from which *brĭžan* / *brĭžan* is derived, is an Italian loanword.



been influenced by the cases with generalized length from the pre-resonant lengthened forms. Thus, it is possible to imagine that the pattern of *slāvan* / *slāvan* or *sīlan* / *sīlan* (together with *glāsan* / *glāsan* in the old a.p. *c*) might have influenced the rise of the secondary *kūžan* / *kūžan* alternation, etc. However, as in the case of the irregular shortening in the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives, these lengthenings in a.p. *A* also cannot invalidate the operation of the ‘One mora law’ in the old long vowel a.p. *c*.

The processes that occur in \*-ѣкъ adjectives are similar but not the same. In the old long vowel a.p. *c*, the same thing happens as in \*-ѣнь adjectives. However, only the short vowel is attested in most adjectives – in 5 of them, while no adjective has generalized the length only (although *těžak* is always long in Neo-Štokavian). There are 4 adjectives with both short and long variants attested.<sup>330</sup> In \*-ѣкъ adjectives, mixed paradigms, like *těžak* – *těškā* – *těško* in some Posavian dialects, also occur, but the accentual pattern is not the one that would be regularly expected, i.e. not \**těžak* – \**těškā* – \**těško*. In the neuter form, the length was taken from the masculine and feminine form and the m. form has the short vowel by analogy to other forms like gen. sg. \**těška*, dat. sg. \**těšku*, nom. pl. \**těški*, acc. pl. \**těške*, etc., where the shortening is regularly expected.

As for a.p. *b*, the secondary short vowel forms in the old long vowel a.p. *b* are far more important in \*-ѣкъ than in \*-ѣнь adjectives, where it is just a question of a few side examples. However, in \*-ѣкъ adjectives there is one example that always has a secondary short vowel and 6 of them with both the expected a.p. *b* reflexes and the secondary short vowels in many dialects (i.e. a.p. *A*). The long vowel is, however, quite exceptional in *blizak* and *nizak* and the short one is non-existent in *ředak* in Neo-Štokavian (in Posavina / Čakavian / Kajkavian, it is attested as both short and long).

As in \*-ѣнь adjectives, the supposed shortening in the old long vowel a.p. *b* (which is probably a type of analogy) cannot invalidate the operation of the ‘One mora law’ in the old long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives. The ‘One mora law’ operates in nouns as well, together with the following generalizations

<sup>330</sup> Probably by analogy to the operation of the ‘One mora law’ in the old long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives and to the secondary quantitative variations in the old long vowel a.p. *b*, the secondary form *řidak* is attested instead of *řīdak* (cf. Daničić 1872, 93).

of quantity (cf. *lăkat* and *lâkat* ‘elbow’). Since it operates in nouns, it must have operated in adjectives as well. Without the ‘One mora law’, the accentual development of \*-ьнѣ and \*-ѣкъ adjectives is hard to explain. In \*-ѣкъ adjectives, where the short vowel is generalized in most of the old long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives, it is exactly this process that makes the later analogical shift of the old long vowel a.p. *b* adjectives to a.p. *A* possible. The merger of the old a.p. *a*, the most of the old long vowel a.p. *c*, the old short a.p. *b* and *c* (except for *gorak* and *tanak* that remain *C*) in the modern a.p. *A* brings about a state in which most *-ak* adjectives have a short vowel (like *glădak*, *slădak*), which then also enables the analogical shift of the old long vowel a.p. *b* (i.e. a.p. *A<sup>B</sup>*: or *B*:) adjectives to a.p. *A* (e.g. *krătak* / *krătāk* ⇨ *krătak*). Transitional stages like *üzak* – *ũska* – *ũsko* are also attested (see above). As already said, the shift to a.p. *A* can be considered a tendency for all *-ak* adjectives to generalize the short vowel, i.e. a tendency for the rise of the categorial accent – however, this tendency has not been brought to an end almost anywhere.<sup>331</sup> A part of this process might have been rhyming analogies like *glătka* / *slătka* / *krătka* or *sklĩska* / *nĩska* / *blĩska*,<sup>332</sup> etc. Even if such an explanation is not accepted, the interdialectal analysis as well as comparison with other Slavic languages points to the clear fact that forms like *krătak* and *üzak* are definitely secondary in opposition to the original *krătak* and *ũzak*.

### The adjectives *lak*, *mek*, *žuk*

Three Croat. adjectives ended in \*-къкъ in PSI.: \*žьlkъкъ (*a*), \*lьgъкъ (*b*), \*mêċъкъ (*c*). After the fall of weak *yers*, the consonantal groups *-kk-* / *-gk-* emerged. In Kajkavian and part of Čakavian, these were changed to *-hk-*, which yielded forms like *lagak* – *lahka* and *mekak* – *mehka* in the Čakavian North and *legek* (frequently analogical *leĥek*) – *leĥka* and *mêķek* (frequently analogical *mêĥek*) – *mêĥka* in Kajkavian. As in other old long vowel a.p. *c* adjectives in Kajk/Čak., the shortened vowel forms are generalized in \*mêċъкъ as well. In Štokavian and the Čakavian South, *-kk-* did not yield *-hk-* but *-k-*, thus *žuka*, *meka*, *laka* and then, by analogy, also

<sup>331</sup> Cf. also Дыбо 2000, 165, where the tendency of the B type disappearing in Serbian / Croatian is mentioned.

<sup>332</sup> This would explain why *üzak* is preserved in some (Old) Štokavian dialects, but *blīzak* / *nīzak* is not.

*žuk*, *mek*, *lak* (the standard language, however, has the form *žuhak*). Thus, instead of the old \*-ькъ adjectives, the new suffixless forms appeared.<sup>333</sup> The adj. *žuk* remains in a.p. A (it can shift to other a.p. later together with other root adjectives, of course).<sup>334</sup> The adj. *lak* becomes a.p. A, by analogy to \*lǫgъka – \*lǫgъko. The original \*mękъkъ – \*mękъkă – \*mękъko should yield \*męk (gen. sg. \*męka, dat. sg. \*męku, etc.) – \*mękă / \*męka – \*męko. In most dialects, the short vowel has been generalized, i.e. *męk* (A), but not in the south-west, cf. Dubrovnik (and Prčanj) *męk*<sup>335</sup> for Štokavian and Vrboska on Hvar *mĕk* – *mĕkă* – *mĕko* (Matković 2004) and Brač *męk* – *mękă* – *męko* (Šimunović 2009) for Čakavian.

#### KROATŲ KALBOS BŪDVARDŽIŲ KIRČIAVIMO RAIDĀ (NEPRIESAGINIAI BŪDVARDŽIAI IR BŪDVARDŽIAI SU PRIESAGOMIS \*-bmb, \*-bkb)

##### Santrauka

Straipsnyje pristatoma kroatų kalbos būdvardžių kirčiavimo raidos apžvalga. Atskirai aptariama nepriesaginių būdvardžių ir būdvardžių su priesagomis \*-bmb, \*-bkb kirčiavimo raida nuo slavų prokalbės formų iki refleksų šiuolaikinėse štokavų, čakavų bei kaikavų tarmėse. Remiamasi anksčiau paskelbtais šnektų aprašais, taip pat paties autoriaus surinkta gausia iki šiol neskelbta tarmių medžiaga – daugiausia iš Posavinės ir Vrgorska Krajinos. Kruopšti būdvardžių kirčiavimo tarmėse analizė leidžia geriau suprasti ne tik pačių būdvardžių kirčiavimo istoriją, bet ir gerokai platesnes lyginamosios slavų kalbotyros problemas: straipsnyje atskleista nemažai reikšmingų ankstyvajame raidos etape vykusių prozodinių pakitimų ir štokavų-čakavų-kaikavų izoglosų, naujai interpretuotos kai kurios dabartinės tarmių formos.

<sup>333</sup> New forms with the originally diminutive suffix *-ahan* also appear: *mekahan* and *lagahan*. In most of Štokavian dialects, this leads to *mekan* and *lagan* after the loss of *h* (these forms are actually analogical to *mekana* / *lagana* < *mekahna* / *lagahna* because they should otherwise be *mekaan* / *lagaan*, as is attested in some dialects, cf. ARj). The original a.p. C is preserved in *mekan* (and by analogy to it appears also in *lagan*), cf. in Posavina *mękăn* – *mękană* – *mękano*.

<sup>334</sup> Cf. *žđk* in Orubica in Posavina (my data), with a special sporadic development of the old \*l̥, typical for western Posavina (in the literature, the form *čđn* ‘boat’ (cf. Stand. Croat. *čŭn*) is also attested in Orubica – my informants could not confirm this but I have the form *čđn* ‘small boat’ from Siče attested), Brač *žuk* (Šimunović 2009) and Filipjakov *žuk* (Nikola Vuletić, p.c.).

<sup>335</sup> Rešetar 1900, 114.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ARj – *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* 1–23, Zagreb: JAZU, 1881–1976.
- Babić, Ivan 2008, *Studenački rječnik*, Studenci: Župni ured Studenci.
- Baotić, Josip 1979, Akcenatski sistem sela Kostrča u Bosanskoj Posavini, *Bosanskohercegovački dijalektološki zbornik* 2, 161–267.
- Belić, Aleksandar 1914, *Akcenatske studije* 1, Beograd: Srpska kraljevska akademija.
- Benić, Mislav 2007, Osnovni podaci o osječkoj akcentuaciji, *Filologija* 48, 1–28.
- Breznik, Anton 1924<sup>3</sup>, *Slovenska slovnica za srednje šole*, Prevalje.
- Budmani, Pietro 1867, *Grammatica della lingua serbo-croata (illirica)*, Vienna.
- Budmani, Pero 1883, Dubrovački dijalekt, kako se sada govori, *Rad JAZU* 65, 155–179.
- ČDL – Mate Hraste, Petar Šimunović, Reinhold Olesch, *Čakavisch-deutsches Lexikon* 1, Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1979.
- Daničić, Gjuro 1872, Prilog za istoriju akcentuacije hrvatske ili srpske, *Rad JAZU* 20, 150–233.
- DGO – Božica Jakolić, Jasna Horvat (ur.) 2007, *Dolnjosutlanski govor i običaji*, Šenkovec: OŠ Ivana Perkovca.
- Hamm, Josip 1970<sup>3</sup>, *Staroslavenska gramatika*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Hamm, Josip, Mate Hraste, Petar Guberina 1956, Govor otoka Suska, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 7–213.
- Houtzagers, H. P(eter) 1985, *The čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres* (= *Studies in Slavic and general linguistics* 5), Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Hraste, Mate 1935, Čakavski dijalekat ostrva Hvara, *Biblioteka Južnoslovenskog filologa* 14, 1–57.
- Ivančić-Dusper, Đurđica 2003, *Crkvěniškī besedār*, Rijeka: Adamić.
- Ivšić, Stjepan 1907, Šaptinovačko narječje, *Rad JAZU* 168, 113–162.
- Ivšić, Stjepan 1913, Današnji posavski govor 1–2, *Rad JAZU* 196, 124–254; 197, 9–138.
- Ivšić, Stjepan 1936, Jezik Hrvata kajkavaca, *Ljetopis JAZU* 48, 47–88.
- Jedvaj, Josip 1956, Bednjanski govor, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 279–330.
- Jurišić, Blaž 1966, *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade* 1: Uvod, Zagreb: JAZU.
- Jurišić, Blaž 1973, *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade, uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima* 2: Rječnik, Zagreb: JAZU.
- Kalsbeek, Janneke 1998, *The Čakavian Dialect of Orbanici near Žminj in Istria*, Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Kapović, Mate 2005a, The development of Proto-Slavic quantity (from Proto-Slavic to Modern Slavic languages), *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 73–111.

Kapović, Mate 2005b, Slavic length again, *Filologija* 45, 29–45.

Kapović, Mate 2008a, Razvoj hrvatske akcentuacije, *Filologija* 51, 1–39.

Kapović, Mate 2008b, O naglasku u staroškotavskom slavonskom dijalektu, *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina* 4, 115–147.

Kapović, Mate 2010, Naglasak o-osnova muškog roda u hrvatskom – povijesni razvoj, *Filologija* 54, 51–109.

Kapović, Mate 2011a, Naglasak imenica srednjeg roda u hrvatskom – povijesni razvoj, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 17, 109–146.

Kapović, Mate 2011b, Shortening of the Slavic long circumflex – *one mora law* in Croatian, *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 57, 123–130.

Kapović, Mate 2011c, The Accentuation of *i*-verbs in Croatian Dialects, in Tijmen Pronk, Rick Derksen (eds.), *Accent matters. Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 109–233.

Kapović, Mate 2011d, *Čiji je jezik?*, Zagreb: Algoritam.

Kapović, Mate (forthcoming), The Oldest Phonetic Accentual Isoglosses in Western South Slavic (the proceedings of *Dani akcentologije* 2011).

Kortlandt, Frederik 2005, From Serbo-Croatian to Indo-European, *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 113–130.

Kranjčević, Milan 2003, *Ričnik gacke čakavščine. Kōnpoljski divān*, Otočac: Katedra Čakavskog sabora pokrajine Gacke – Grafrade.

Križanić, Juraj 1984, *Gramatično izkazanje ob ruskom jeziku*, Zagreb: JAZU.

Kustić, Nikola 2002, *Čakavski govor grada Paga s rječnikom*, Zagreb: Društvo Pažana i prijatelja grada Paga.

Kušar, Marcel 1894, Rapski dijalekat, *Rad JAZU* 118, 1–54.

Langston, Keith 2006, *Čakavian prosody. The accentual patterns of the Čakavian dialects of Croatian*, Bloomington: Slavica.

Langston, Keith 2007, Common Slavic accentual paradigm (d): a reevaluation of evidence from Čakavian, in Mate Kapović, Ranko Matasović (eds.), *Tones and Theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*, Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 121–150.

Leskien, August 1914, *Grammatik der serbokroatischen Sprache*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Lipljin, Tomislav 2002, *Rječnik varaždinskoga kajkavskog govora*, Varaždin: Garestin d.o.o.

Lukežić, Iva, Sanja Zubčić 2007, *Grobnički govor XX. stoljeća (gramatika i rječnik)*, Rijeka: Katedra Čakavskog sabora Grobnišćine.

March, William J. 1981, Kajkavian inflectional morphophonemics: an analysis of the morphology of dialects of Velika Rakovica, Virje, and Bednja, *Rad JAZU* 388, 237–312.

Marvan, Jiří 2000, *Jazykové milénium: slovanská kontrakce a její český zdroj*, Praha: Academia.

Matešić, Josip 1970, *Der Wortakzent in der serbokroatischen Schriftsprache*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Matković, Dinko 2004, *Rječnik frazema i poslovice govora Vrboske na otoku Hvaru*, Jelsa: Matica hrvatska.

Milas, Matej 1903, Današnji mostarski dijalekat, *Rad JAZU* 153, 47–97.

Milčetić, Ivan 1895, Čakavština Kvarnerskih otoka, *Rad JAZU* 121, 92–131.

Moguš, Milan 1966, Današnji senjski govor, *Senjski zbornik* 2, 5–152.

Moguš, Milan 2002, *Senjski rječnik*, Zagreb, Senj: HAZU/MH Senj.

Oslon, Michail 2011, Über den Silbenakzent in Juraj Križanićs Dialekt, in Roman Sukač (ed.), *From present to past and back. Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology* (= *Potsdam Linguistic Investigations* 7), Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 100–112.

PHKJ – *Pravopis hrvatskosrpskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska; Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1960.

Piccoli, Agostina, Antonio Sammartino 2000, *Dizionario dell' idioma croato-molisano di Montemitro / Rječnik moliškohrvatskoga govora Mundimitra* [Redazione della parte fonematica e croata / Sastavljanje i priređivanje fonološkoga i hrvatskoga dijela: Snježana Marčec, Mira Menac-Mihalić], Montemitro, Zagreb: Fondazione “Agostina Piccoli”, Matica hrvatska.

Rešetar, Milan 1900, *Die serbokroatische Betonung südwestlicher Mundarten*, Wien: Alfred Holden, K. u K. Hof- und Universitäts-Buchhandler.

Rožić, Vatroslav 1893–1984, Kajkavački dijalekat u Prigorju 1–3, *Rad JAZU* 115, 68–136; 116, 113–174; 118, 55–115.

Sekereš, Stjepan 1977, Govor Hrvata u južnoj Baranji, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 4, 323–484.

Sekulić, Ante 2005, *Rječnik govora bačkih Hrvata*, Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Katolički institut za kulturu, povijest i duhovnost “Ivan Antunović”.

Snoj, Marko 2003<sup>2</sup>, *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana: Modrijan.

Stang, Christian S. 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo: I kommisjon hos H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).

Stankiewicz, Edward 1993, *The accentual patterns of the Slavic languages*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Strohal, Rudolf 1895, Osobine današnjega riječkoga narječja, *Rad JAZU* 43, 103–188.

Šimundić, Mate 1971, *Govor Imotske krajine i Bekije*, Sarajevo: ANUBIH.

Šimunović, Petar 2009<sup>2</sup>, *Rječnik bračkih čakavskih govora*, Zagreb: Golden marketing, Tehnička knjiga.

ŠRHJ – Milica Mihaljević, Lana Hudeček (eds.), *Školski rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Školska knjiga (forthcoming).

Šojat, Antun 1982, Turopoljski govori, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 6, 317–493.

Težak, Stjepko 1981, Ozaljski govor, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 5, 203–428.

Toporišič, Jože 2004<sup>4</sup>, *Slovenska slovnica*, Maribor: Založba Obzorja.

Valjavec, Matija 1894, Prinos k naglasu u (novo-)slovenskom jeziku i hrvatskoj kajkavštini, *Rad JAZU* 119, 143–238.

Valjavec, Matija 1895, Prinos k naglasu u (novo-)slovenskom jeziku i hrvatskoj kajkavštini, *Rad JAZU* 121, 132–185.

Vermeer, Willem 1982, On the principal sources for the study of Čakavian dialects with neocircumflex in adjectives and *e*-presents, in A.A. Barentsen, R. Sprenger, M.G.M. Tielemans (eds.), *South Slavic and Balkan Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 2), 279–340.

Vidović, Domagoj 2007, Accentual alternations in Neo-Štokavian Ijekavian dialects of Neretvanska krajina, in Mate Kapović, Ranko Matasović (eds.), *Tones and theories. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*, Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 199–210.

Vidović, Domagoj 2009, Utjecaj migracija na novoštokavske ijekavske govore u Neretvanskoj krajini i Donjoj Hercegovini, *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 15, 283–304.

Vuk – Вук Стеф. Караџић, *Српски рјечник иступачен нјемачкијем и латинскијем ријечима*, Београд: Штампарија Краљевине Југославије, 1935.

Zubčić, Sanja 2004, Akcent pridjeva u nekim sjeverozapadnim čakavskim govorima, *Zbornik radova s Međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa Riječki filološki dani* 5, 619–632.

Zubčić, Sanja, Ivana Sanković 2008, Akcenatski tipovi pridjeva u mjesnome govoru Trtna, *Fluminensia* 20(2), 51–62.

Беличъ, А.И. 1909, Замѣтки по чакавскимъ говорамъ, *Извѣстія Отдѣленія русскаго языка и словесности Императорской Академіи Наукъ* 14(2), 181–266.

Вуковић, Јован 1940, Акценат говора Пиве и Дробњака, *Српски дијалектолошки зборник* 10, 185–417.

Даничић, Ђура 1925, *Српски акценати*, Београд: Српска краљевска академија.

Дыбо, Владимир Антонович 1968, Акцентология и словообразование в славянском, in *Славянское языкознание. VI Международный съезд славистов. Прага, август 1968 г., Доклады советской делегации*, Москва: Наука, 148–224.

Дыбо, Владимир Антонович 1981, *Славянская акцентология. Опыт реконструкции системы акцентных парадигм в праславянском*, Москва: Наука.

Дыбо, Владимир Антонович 2000, *Морфонологизированные парадигматические акцентные системы. Типология и генезис 1*, Москва: Языки русской культуры.

Зализняк, Андрей Анатольевич 1985, *От праславянской акцентуации к русской*, Москва: Наука.

Николић, Берислав 1964, Сремски говор, *Српски дијалектолошки зборник XIV*, 203–412.

Ослон, Михаил Владимирович 2011, Закон Крижанича: доводы против теории «правостороннего дрейфа», in Elena Stadnik-Holzer (Hrsg.), *Baltische und slavische Prosodie. International Workshop on Balto-Slavic accentology IV (Scheibbs, 2.–4. Juli 2008)*, *Scheibbs Internationaler Sprachhistorische Tage I*, Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 99–131.

*Mate KAPOVIĆ*

*Department of Linguistics*

*University of Zagreb*

*Ivana Lučića 3*

*HR-10000 Zagreb*

*Croatia*

*[kapovic@gmail.com]*