

Keith Langston  
University of Georgia  
Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages  
201 Joseph E. Brown Hall  
Athens, GA 30602 USA  
*langston@uga.edu*

## COMMON SLAVIC ACCENTUAL PARADIGM (D): A REEVALUATION OF EVIDENCE FROM ČAKAVIAN

Data from certain Čakavian dialects have repeatedly been cited as evidence for the reconstruction of a Common Slavic accentual paradigm (d). This article provides a critical examination of the available data within the context of the Čakavian prosodic systems and their historical development and argues that such data should be treated with caution. The accentuation of these forms may well represent innovations within individual dialects rather than traces of an archaic accentual pattern. Due to the questionable value of much of the data and the lack of agreement among the individual Čakavian dialects, the evidence from this dialect group provides little support for the reconstruction of a distinct Common Slavic accentual paradigm (d).<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Introduction

A number of Slavic accentologists reconstruct a special “mixed” accentual paradigm [a. p.] (d) for some masculine nouns in Common Slavic (CS). Although nouns belonging to the posited type (d) are indistinguishable from reflexes of the mobile a. p. (c) in most Slavic dialects, evidence for a. p. (d) has been adduced from a number of areas. The Čakavian dialects have been prominent among these; some of the first evidence for what later came to be labeled a. p. (d) was from the Čakavian dialect group (Illič-Svityč 1963: 118-119), and scholars have repeatedly referred to these data since that time. Unfortunately, little consideration has been given to the reliability of the sources or to the specific characteristics of the Čakavian prosodic systems in which

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Mate Kapović and Pepijn Hendriks for their helpful comments.

these forms are found. While the Čakavian dialect group as a whole is known for the conservative nature of its prosodic systems, the accentual patterns of different types of nouns and other parts of speech have been restructured in various ways. This article aims to provide a critical examination of the available Čakavian data for the accentuation of masculine nouns that reflect CS a. p. (c) and (d), which will be considered together here because of the significant amount of overlap between these types in Čakavian. Following a brief outline of the posited development of a. p. (c) and (d) in Common Slavic, I will discuss the reflexes of type (c) in Čakavian, where the inherited accentual pattern has been altered as the result of phonological developments, and the alternations in masculine nouns also tend to be restricted or eliminated in many dialects. Possible reflexes of type (d) will be examined next within the contexts of the individual dialects in which these forms are attested.

## 2. Origins of Accentual Types (C) and (D)

According to the reconstructions proposed by Illič-Svityč (1963), Dybo (e.g., 1981), and others, the Slavic mobile a. p. (c) corresponds to Indo-European (IE) oxytone forms, while the Slavic oxytone a. p. (b) corresponds to IE barytone forms with an original short vowel or short diphthong.<sup>2</sup> The final stress of the latter type developed as the result of a shift of the accent from a non-acute vowel to the following syllable in Slavic, generally known as Dybo's law (see Dybo 1962).<sup>3</sup> However, a significant subset of masculine nouns in Slavic does not conform to this general scheme; while IE neuter barytona with a short vowel that switched to masculine gender in Slavic are reflected as type (b), original masculine *o*- and *u*-stems fell together with type (c). This generaliza-

---

<sup>2</sup> The terms oxytone and barytone here represent a simplification; according to Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev (1993: 92-93), the former represent IE forms containing only recessive (low-tone) syllables, while the latter were forms containing at least one dominant (high-tone) syllable.

<sup>3</sup> This law is also known as the law of Illič-Svityč (see Collinge 1985: 32), but here the latter name will be used to refer to the generalization of the mobile accentual pattern to original barytone forms (see below). It should be noted that Dybo and his colleagues have revised their view of the rightward shift of the accent from non-acute vowels, seeing it now as a "multi-stage process" that did not affect all Slavic dialects in the same way (e.g., Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev 1993: 18-21). See Hendriks (2003) for a particularly clear review of the evolution of this hypothesis in the work of the linguists of the "Moscow accentological school."

tion of the mobile accentual pattern to original barytona forms is often referred to as Illič-Svityč's law. Illič-Svityč suggested that the merger of the original masculine barytona with the mobile accentual paradigm in Slavic was only partial (1963: 119), citing data from certain Čakavian and western Ukrainian dialects that he considered to represent relics of the earlier, pre-merger state of affairs. After later research uncovered forms with a similar accentuation in other areas, Dybo and others proposed that the original masculine barytona constituted a separate a. p. (d) in CS, with a circumflex accent on the initial syllable in the NA sg., as in type (c), and a final stress in the other forms (Bulatova, Dybo, and Nikolaev 1988; Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev 1990, 1993). This reconstruction is summarized in the following chart:

(1) Balto-Slavic accentual paradigms (Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev 1990: 50)<sup>4</sup>

IE	Barytona		Oxytona	
	Long	Short	Long	Short
Baltic a. p.	<i>1</i>		<i>2</i>	
Lithuanian a. p.	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
Slavic a. p.	<i>a</i>	<i>b (d)</i>	<i>c</i>	

The existence of a separate CS a. p. (d) is not uncontroversial. Although Kortlandt incorporates many of the same basic assumptions in his reconstruction of the development of the Slavic accentual system from IE, his relative chronology would seem to preclude the existence of a separate a. p. (d) as described by Dybo et al. On their interpretation, masculine barytona developed a final stress everywhere except the NA sg., but later assimilated to type (c) in most Slavic dialects. According to Kortlandt (1975, 1994), the generalization of accentual mobility to masculine *o*-stems with a non-acute root vowel (the law of Illič-Svityč) took place before the shift of the accent from non-acute vowels to the following syllable by Dybo's law. These original barytona would therefore have been directly assimilated into a. p. (c), and would not have had the opportunity to develop into a distinct CS "mixed paradigm" combining characteristics of types (c) and (b) in different grammatical forms. For Kortlandt, the sources of evidence cited for the posited CS

<sup>4</sup> This table gives only the basic correspondences between the Balto-Slavic and IE accentual types, omitting certain other developments such as Hirt's law.

a. p. (d) simply represent areas where the law of Illič-Svityč did not operate. Vermeer (2001) is highly critical of the overall methodology and the (mis)use of dialectal material by the linguists of the “Moscow accentological school,” with particular reference to their reconstruction of a. p. (d).<sup>5</sup> He points out that it violates a basic principle of the theory of dominant and recessive morphemes advanced by these scholars and that they fail to provide an adequate explanation for the development of the posited circumflex accent in the NA sg. of these nouns (Vermeer 2001: 154-155). Stankiewicz also does not accept the existence of a CS a. p. (d), which is not surprising since he rejects many of the basic assumptions of the work of Stang and of the “Moscow school” (see, for example, Stankiewicz 1993).

### 3. Accentual Type (C)

According to most scholars, masculine *o*-stem nouns belonging to a. p. (c) carried an accent on the grammatical ending in the oblique cases of the plural and an accent on the initial syllable of the word (or clitic + word group) in the other forms in CS (see Stang 1957: 74-5, Garde 1976: 27). The L sg. ending *-u* that occurs in many Čakavian dialects, taken from the *u*-stem declension, also originally carried the accent. Most Čakavian dialects exhibit a number of other innovations in the endings of the plural; some of these, such as the G pl. endings borrowed from the *i*- and *u*-declensions, also carried the accent in CS, while other endings are later formations.

The basic outline of the inherited accentual pattern can still be seen in Čakavian, but due to various innovations it is not fully reflected in any individual dialect. Examples of short-vowel stems are given in (2). Note that many of the examples of type (c) nouns cited here and in the rest of this section have been attributed to a. p. (d) by Dybo et al. in various publications (see the Appendix). In fact, it is difficult to find suitable examples of the type (c) pattern in the attested Čakavian data without including forms that may have originally belonged to type (d).

---

<sup>5</sup> I would like to thank Rick Derksen for drawing my attention to this publication by Vermeer. Due to its relative obscurity (an appendix in English to the second, revised edition of Werner Lehfeldt’s 1993 monograph, *Einführung in die morphologische Konzeption der slavischen Akzentologie*), I was unaware of its existence during the preparation of the original version of this paper.

(2) Short-vowel stems<sup>6</sup>

Vrgada (Jurišić 1973, Steinhauer 1973: 367)

<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
NA <i>bôg, brôd, môst</i>	NA <i>bròdi, mòsti</i>
G <i>bòga, bròda</i>	G <i>brodī, mostōv</i> (beside <i>bròdī, mòstōv</i> )
D <i>bògu</i>	DIL <i>brodīn, mostīn</i> (beside <i>bròdīn, mòstīn</i> )
I <i>bògon, bròdon</i>	
L <i>brodū, mostū</i>	

Jardasi

<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
N <i>vôz</i>	N <i>vòzi</i>
L <i>vòze</i>	G <i>vozī (vòzī)</i> L <i>vozēh (vòzēh)</i>

Stems with a long vowel in the final/single stem syllable most often exhibit a different alternation in the plural, with a Čakavian acute accent on the final syllable of the stem instead of an accent on the grammatical ending in the oblique cases.

(3) Long-vowel stems

Vrgada (Jurišić 1973, Steinhauer 1973: 367-368)

<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
NA <i>g<sup>o</sup>âs, zûb</i>	NA <i>zûbi</i>
G <i>zûba</i>	G <i>zûbī</i>

<sup>6</sup> Where no reference is given, the cited data are from my own field research, conducted in 1998. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Iva Lukežić and Sanja Zubčić of the University of Rijeka for their generous assistance in locating and interviewing informants. For published sources page numbers are normally not given when the forms can be found in a comprehensive dictionary included in the cited work. The various transcriptions used in these studies have been regularized and simplified here to some extent. In particular, *â* has been replaced by *a*, the Čakavian acute accent is indicated everywhere by a tilde, and the combined macron and breve used by Belić (1909) to indicate reduced or variable length has been replaced by a macron since this level of phonetic detail is irrelevant for our purposes. In keeping with the normal practice in Croatian dialect studies, the symbols for the long and short falling accents are used to indicate long and short stressed vowels in dialects that lack distinctive pitch.

D <i>zūbu</i>	DIL <i>zūbīn</i>
I <i>zūbon</i>	
L <i>g<sup>l</sup>āsũ, zūbũ</i>	
Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998: 98)	
<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
N <i>klās, m<sup>u</sup>ōš, vlās</i>	NA <i>klāsi, m<sup>u</sup>ōži, vlāsi</i>
G <i>klāsa, m<sup>u</sup>ōža</i>	G <i>klāsi, m<sup>u</sup>ōži, vlāsi</i>
D <i>m<sup>u</sup>ōžu</i>	D <i>m<sup>u</sup>ōžen</i>
I <i>klāson, m<sup>u</sup>ōžen</i>	I <i>m<sup>u</sup>ōži, vlāsi</i>
L <i>vlāse</i>	L <i>klāseh, vlāseh</i>

In some instances we find oblique plural forms with an accent on the ending, often with shortening of the stem vowel; e.g., Tkon N pl. *sīni*, G pl. *sinōv*, DI pl. *sinīn* (DAQ #137); Vrgada *gr<sup>o</sup>ād*, G pl. *gradōv*, DIL pl. *gradīn*; *mīsēc*, G pl. *misecōv/misēcī*, DIL pl. *misecīn* (Steinhauer 367-368, 370). It seems clear that the Čakavian acute in the forms in (3) is the result of the retraction of the accent to a preceding long vowel, which we can posit as a general phonological rule for Čakavian (Langston 1999: 14).<sup>7</sup>

(4) Retraction of the Čakavian acute accent to a preceding long syllable

$\check{v}c\check{v} \rightarrow \check{v}c\bar{v}$  (e.g., Vrgada G pl. *\*zūbī > zūbī*)

In other words, the oblique plural forms of long-vowel stems illustrated in (3) must have originally had the same alternation as the short vowel stems, with an accent on the ending. Forms with this type of retraction are attested throughout the Čakavian dialect zone, and this shift parallels the retractions of a long falling accent resulting from contraction to a preceding long vowel (e.g., pres. t. 2 sg. *\*pītāš > pītāš* vs. *kopāš*; Novi masc. N sg. def. *\*mlāđi > mlāđi* vs. *novī*), although it is not implemented as consistently.

<sup>7</sup> This is open to different interpretations. On the assumption that pretonic long vowels were always shortened before two moras (Kapović 2003), with the length in forms such as these later restored by analogy to other members of the paradigm, this shift of the accent could be seen as a strategy to avoid prohibited  $\check{v}c\check{v}/\check{v}c\check{v}$  sequences while maintaining the length of the stem vowel.

There is a general tendency in Čakavian to restrict or eliminate accentual alternations in circumflex masculine nouns. For example, some dialects limit the accentual alternation in the plural to the G (or the syncretic GL form, as in Novi) in some or all nouns.

(5) Alternation in the plural limited to the G(L)

Novi (Belić 1909: 209)	Silba (DAQ #128)
<u>plural</u>	<u>plural</u>
NA <i>vlâsi</i>	N <i>nôhti, zîdi</i>
GL <i>vlâsîh/vlâsîh</i>	G <i>nohtôv, zidôv</i>
D <i>vlâsôn</i>	I <i>nôhtima</i>
I <i>vlâsi</i>	L <i>nôhtih, zîdih</i>

In Dračevica on Brač (and possibly in other dialects on Hvar and Brač), short-vowel stems have the alternation only in the DIL pl, where it is optional.

(6) Alternation in the plural limited to the DIL

Dračevica (Hraste and Šimunović 1979: xxvi)

<u>plural</u>
N <i>bròdi</i>
G <i>bròdih/bròdov</i>
DIL <i>bròdima(n)/brođima(n)</i>

In many dialects the alternation in the plural has been largely or entirely eliminated in short-vowel stems. For example, in Novi, according to Belić, the alternation is optional in the plural of short-vowel stems: GL pl. *brođih/bròđih, vozîh/vòzîh* (Belić 1909: 208-209). My informants for this dialect (in 1998) had only stem stress in these forms; e.g., *bròđih, mòstîh, vòzîh*. Additional examples:

(7) Alternation in the plural of short-vowel stems eliminated

Viškovo

<i>brôd</i> , G pl. <i>bròdî</i> , L pl. <i>bròdêh; môst</i> , G pl. <i>mòstî</i> , L pl. <i>mòstêh, vôz</i> , G pl. <i>vòzî</i> , L pl. <i>vòzêh</i> (vs. <i>grâd</i> , G pl. <i>grâdî</i> , L pl. <i>grâdêh; cvêt</i> , G pl. <i>cvêtî, ôblâk</i> , G pl. <i>oblâkî</i> )
---

Orbanići (Kalsbeek 1998: 98)

*b<sup>u</sup>ôk*, L pl. *bðkah*, *r<sup>u</sup>ôh*, I pl. *rðgi* (cf. the long-vowel stems cited in (3) above).

Variant oblique plural forms of long-vowel stems with an initial falling accent are widely attested throughout the Čakavian area, so there is a tendency to eliminate the alternation in these forms as well; e.g., Dračevica N pl. *grôdi*, G pl. *grôdih/gradôv*, DIL *grôdima(n)/grôd`ima(n)* (Hraste and Šimunović 1979: xxvi).

In the singular, the final accent on the L sg. ending *-u* is generally well-preserved throughout the Čakavian area, although most dialects limit this to inanimate nouns. Some dialects also appear to restrict the alternation to monosyllabic stems, while others have eliminated the alternation in all masculine nouns.

(8) Alternation in the L sg.

a. limited to inanimate nouns

Senj (Moguš 1966: 65-67)

L sg. *sînu* vs. *brodù*, *dānù*, etc.

b. limited to monosyllabic stems (inanimate)

Tkon (DAQ #137)

L sg. *mšsecu* (G pl. *misēci*), L sg. *ðbičaju* (G pl. *običajēv*) vs. L sg. *brīgù*, *grāđù*, *snīgù*, *zīdù*, etc.

c. eliminated in all masculine nouns

Crikvenica

L sg. *bròdu*, *grādu*, *lāhtu*, *lèdu*, *mòstu*, *nòsu*, *zīdu*, *zūbu*

Jadranovo

L sg. *bròdu*, *grādu*, *lāktu*, *lèdu*, *mšēcu*, *mòstu*, *nòsu*, *vòzu*, *zīdu*, *zūbu*

Kraljevica (DAQ #95)

L sg. *grādu*, *lāhtu*, *mšsecu*, *snīgu*, *zīdu*, *zūbu*

#### 4. Accentual Type (D)

As can be seen in many of the examples above, nouns originally belonging to a. p. (d) according to the reconstruction posited by

Dybo et al. typically follow the type (c) accentual pattern in Čakavian, which has itself been subject to a number of modifications. However, in some dialects the accentuation of these nouns could reflect traces of the reconstructed type (d) pattern; i.e., an initial circumflex accent in the NA sg. and an accent on the grammatical ending in the remaining forms. These dialects will be considered individually.

The first of these is the dialect of the island of Susak, which was described by Hamm, Hraste, and Guberina (1956, henceforth HHG). Here we find some nouns that have the reflex of an original circumflex accent in the NA sg. but an accent on the grammatical ending in the oblique singular forms. The short-vowel stems have the same lengthening in the NA sg. that we regularly find throughout Croatian and other western South Slavic dialects in historical circumflex stems. In the plural these nouns in Susak have an accent on the initial syllable in all forms.

(9) Susak type (d) pattern (HHG 106)

<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>	<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
NA <i>lîst</i>	NA <i>lîsti</i>	NA <i>pl<sup>h</sup>ôt</i>	NA <i>plòti</i>
G <i>lîstà</i>	G <i>lîsti/lîstof</i>	G <i>plotà</i>	
D <i>lîstù</i>	D <i>lîston</i>		
I <i>lîst<sup>u</sup>ôn</i>	I <i>lîsti</i>		
L <i>lîstì/lîstù</i>	L <i>lîsti</i>		

It must be noted here that Hamm, Hraste, and Guberina's description has been criticized as inaccurate on a number of counts. Although they mark distinctions in pitch, inconsistencies in their own data lead one to suspect that it is not phonemic; this conclusion was reached by Ivić in his review of this study (1959), as well as by Vermeer (1975) and Steinhauer (1975). Both Vermeer and Steinhauer had access to tape recordings given them by Guberina, and Steinhauer reported that Guberina agreed in a personal communication that there was no pitch opposition in this dialect (1975: 24). Consequently, I have replaced the symbol for the Čakavian acute with a circumflex accent in all the Susak data cited here.

This accentual pattern illustrated in (9) is contrasted with that of other nouns, which presumably reflect the accentuation of the origi-

nal circumflex type in this dialect, shown in (10); however, note that both of these nouns have been cited as originally belonging to a. p. (d), based on evidence from other Slavic dialects (see Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev 1990, 1993).

(10) Susak type (c) pattern (HHG 104)

<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>	<u>singular</u>
NA <i>brīx</i>	NA <i>brīyi</i>	NA <i>br<sup>u</sup>ōt</i>
G <i>brīya</i>	G <i>brīyi/brīyof</i>	G <i>brōda</i>
D <i>brīyu</i>	D <i>brīyon</i>	
I <i>brīyon</i>	I <i>brīyi</i>	
L <i>brīyĩ/brīyũ</i>	L <i>brīyi</i>	L <i>brodũ</i>

Like the long-vowel stems, the plural of the nouns with a short stem vowel also has a columnar accent on the initial syllable according to HHG, although they do not cite examples of these forms, so all of these nouns have presumably eliminated the original alternation in the plural. The accent on the ending *-i* of the L sg. is probably due to analogy to the form in *-u*, which is apparently more widespread, judging by comments in HHG (cf. HHG 100, where the authors state that the ending *-i* is used by the older generation).

Finally, the type (b) accentual pattern is represented by nouns such as *grob*:

(11) Susak type (b) pattern, short-vowel stems (HHG 106)

<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
NA <i>yrōp</i>	NA <i>yrōbi</i>
G <i>yrōbǎ</i>	G <i>yrōbi/yrōbof</i>
D <i>yrōbũ</i>	D <i>yrōbon</i>
I <i>yrōbōn</i>	I <i>yrōbi</i>
L <i>yrōbĩ/yrōbũ</i>	L <i>yrōbi</i>

The lengthening of the stem vowel in the plural of *yrōp* can most likely be attributed to a general tendency to lengthen low and mid vowels in accented internal (open) syllables, which is also observed in other

Čakavian dialects. Various researchers have described the quantity of these lengthened vowels as ranging from half-long to equal to that of original long vowels under accent. This lengthening appears to be a purely phonetic phenomenon that allows a significant degree of variation, which may account for the inconsistency of its notation in the data from Susak in HHG. However, there are enough examples to suggest that this lengthening is indeed characteristic of the Susak dialect; e.g., *brät*, G sg. *brāta*, *māk*, G sg. *māka* (HHG 103), *mēne*, *glēdaju*, (HHG 67), *vōdu*, *govōri* (HHG 69); cf. Cres (Orlec) *māteri*, *mēsto*, *nōgu* (Houtzagers 1985); Ugljan (Kali) *bāba*, *bōlest*, *kolēno* (Houtzagers and Budovskaja 1996), etc.

Given this pattern of lengthening, the plural forms of the short-vowel stems of the different types shown in (9), (10), and (11) are probably identical, despite the different notations in HHG. They would all be expected to have a long falling accent on the stem, which may be in free variation with a short falling accent in nouns with an inherently short stem vowel.

The accentuation of type (b) nouns with a long stem vowel is unclear. According to HHG, nouns like *klūč* (shown in 12) carry the accent on the ending throughout the singular and plural; they also state that some nouns of this type have an accent on the initial syllable in the plural, like *yrōp*, but the only example they cite to illustrate this actually has a short stem vowel (HHG 106). One would expect that the generalization of the accent on the final stem syllable should have affected the long-vowel stems as well as those with a short vowel, but one cannot be certain from the available data.

(12) Susak type (b) pattern, long-vowel stems (HHG 106)

	<u>singular</u>		<u>plural</u>
NA	<i>klūč</i>	NA	<i>klūčī</i>
G	<i>klūčā</i>	G	<i>klūčī/klūčōf</i>
D	<i>klūčū</i>	D	<i>klūčōn</i>
I	<i>klūč<sup>i</sup>ēn</i>	I	<i>klūčī</i>
L	<i>klūčī/klūčū</i>	L	<i>klūčī</i>

The loss of the distinction between the rising and falling pitch, the secondary lengthening of original short vowels, and the partial overlap between the accentuation of the plural forms of type (b) and (c)

masculine nouns caused by the generalization of a columnar accent on the stem have all served to blur the distinctions between the original accentual types in the dialect of Susak. It is very possible that the accentuation of the putative a. p. (d) forms like those in (9) above could represent a later confusion of types (b) and (c) in this dialect, as has also been suggested earlier by Stankiewicz (1993: 34). Some of the forms in question are attested with accentual doublets in HHG, so the final stress in the oblique singular forms is at best a variant, occurring side by side with an initial accent.

(13) Accentual doublets for type (d) nouns

*b<sup>u</sup>ôk*, G sg. *bokà* (HHG 106)

*B<sup>u</sup>ôk*, *Bôka* (toponym, HHG 153, 69)

*r<sup>u</sup>ôx*, *royà* (HHG 106)

*r<sup>u</sup>ôx*, *rôya* (HHG 104)

*yrât*, *yradà* [sic] (HHG 106)

*yrât*, *yrâda* [sic] (HHG 90)

*lîst*, *lîstà* (HHG 106)

*lîst*, *lîsta* (HHG 104)

*zûp*, *zûbà* (HHG 106)

*zûp*, *zûba* (HHG 70, 90)

The reliability of the Susak data that have been cited as archaisms, reflecting exceptions to the law of Illič-Svityč, has also been questioned by Vermeer (1984: 358-360, 2001: 138). Given all the uncertainties about these data, more research would be necessary to confirm the accentuation of these forms as well as those of nouns belonging to other accentual types before they can confidently be used as evidence for the reconstructed a. p. (d).

End-stressed forms corresponding to many of those on Susak were recorded for the dialect of Sali on Dugi Otok by Elena Budovskaja, as reported by Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev (1993: 107-8).

(14) Sali

*bôk*, G g. *bokà*, N pl. *bocì*; *plôt*, G sg. *plotà*, N pl. *plôti*

*brûs*, G sg. *brūsà*, N pl. *brūsì*; *vrât*, G sg. *vrâtà*, N pl. *vrâti/vrâtì*

In Sali, the accent on the grammatical ending in the plural is different from the pattern we see in Susak for this type of noun, but some forms are also attested with a stem stress, and variant forms may be possible for the other nouns as well. Like Susak, this dialect has no pitch distinctions, so the long-vowel stems like *brūs* would be identical to type (b). The short-vowel stems differ from type (b) potentially in the length of the NA sg. form, where the long vowel in *bōk* or *plōt* could represent an original short circumflex accent that was later lengthened. However, dialects on Dugi Otok typically lengthen vowels in accented closed syllables in all types of stems, so the short-vowel stems in question also cannot be reliably distinguished from type (b) in this dialect; compare the forms in (14) with type (b) *bōb/bōb*, G sg. *bobā* (Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev 1993: 107); *pōp/pōp*, G sg. *popā* (Finka 1977). Unfortunately, there is only a limited amount of information about the accentual patterns of different types of nouns on Dugi Otok in the literature; the main study of this dialect, Finka (1977), does not give complete paradigms for the different accentual types of stems. As a result, the possibility that the examples cited by Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev (1993) may represent a later confusion of accentual types (b) and (c) within this dialect cannot be ruled out. In fact, they themselves point out examples of a. p. (b) nouns that have switched to type (c) in this dialect; e.g., G sg. *grīxa/grīxā*, *sūda* (1993: 108).

In the dialect of Senj there are a few short-vowel stems whose accentuation could reflect the reconstructed a. p. (d); e.g.,

(15) Senj (Moguš 1966: 67)

	<u>singular</u>		<u>plural</u>
NA	<i>drōb</i>	N	<i>drōbi</i>
G	<i>drobā</i>	A	<i>drōbe</i>
D	<i>drōbu</i>	G	<i>drobī</i>
I	<i>drobōn</i>	DIL	<i>drobīn</i>
L	<i>drobū</i>		

Note that the pattern here is different from that of Susak and Sali: the D sg. has an initial stress, which is opposed to the final stress of the L sg. with the same ending *-u*, and the plural exhibits an alternation

between an initial accent in the NA and a final accent in the oblique cases, like the historical a. p. (c) nouns. There are no long-vowel stems with this type of accentuation in Senj, according to Moguš's description, but it is unclear why the presumed traces of the type (d) pattern would have only been preserved in short-vowel stems.

The dialect of Rab presents a picture similar to that of Senj. In Kušar's (1894) description we find a few short-vowel a. p. (d) nouns that have a final stress in the oblique singular forms here, but this accentuation is not attested for any long-vowel stems.

(16) Rab (Kušar 1894)

*bôk*, G sg. *bokã*, *môst*, *mostã*, *plôd*, *plodã*, *pôst*, *postã* (31-32); *drôb*, *drobã* (50); *pôt*, *potã* (52)

Because of the general lengthening of accented short vowels in closed syllables, these nouns have fallen together with type (b) in this dialect, as in Sali; cf. N sg. *bôb*, *pôp* (Kušar 1894: 12).

Evidence of a final stress in the oblique singular in a few a. p. (d) masculine nouns has also been adduced from the dialect of Devínska Nová Ves in Slovakia (see Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev 1993: 108-110). Although this dialect has retracted the accent from final syllables, the lengthening and diphthongization of original short stressed *e* and *o* provide information about the earlier position of the accent, if one assumes that the differences in length are not the result of later analogical changes. According to Vážný's (1927) description this dialect has distinctive pitch, but the long neoacute is reflected as falling; e.g., *králj*, *pláca*, *píšem*. Stressed short vowels were lengthened in final syllables (e.g., *míš*, G sg. *míša*) and in non-final syllables stressed mid and low vowels were lengthened and developed a rising accent; e.g., *bãba*, *objěda*, *nyôsim*. The stress was later retracted from final syllables, yielding a falling accent on the preceding syllable; e.g., *trãva*, inf. *kûpit*. Original short vowels that received the accent as the result of this retraction remain short; e.g., *ðbied*.

(17) Devínska Nová Ves (Vážný 1927)

*buôk*, G sg. *buôka* (< \*bôka) /bôka (< \*bokã), L sg. *bôki* (< \*bokî)  
*vuož*, G sg. *vôza*, L sg. *vôzi*

The reconstructed type (d) is indistinguishable from type (b) in this dialect, as can be seen in examples such as *būōb*, G sg. *bōba*, N pl. *bōbi*, but differs from type (c); e.g., *ruōd*, G sg. *ruōda*. However, other nouns that are thought to have belonged to a. p. (d) are only attested with reflexes of a stem stress; e.g., *nuōs*, G sg. *nuōsa*, *ruōg*, G sg. *ruōga*. The variations in length are also not always reliable indicators of the original place of the accent, since they have clearly been subject to analogical levelings; cf. N sg. *nuōga*, *uōblak/ōblak*, etc. Due to the loss of earlier pitch distinctions, there are no differences between types (b), (c), and (d) for long-vowel stems except in the length of some of the endings; e.g., type (b) *krāl̄j*, G sg. *krāl̄ja*, G pl. *krāl̄juov*, D pl. *krāl̄juom*, L pl. *krāl̄j̄t̄*; type (c) *s̄in*, G sg. *s̄ina*, N pl. *s̄ini* (no other forms cited); type (d) *grād*, G sg. *grāda*, G pl. *grādov*, D pl. *grādom*, L pl. *grādi* (66).

Some similar forms are found in Baumgarten, which is part of the same larger group of relatively homogeneous Burgenland dialects (the Hacı and Poljanci dialects; see Neweklowsky 1978), although the reflexes here do not always correspond to those in Devínska Nová Ves. In Koschat's (1978) description of Baumgarten the forms *puōt*, G sg. *pōta*, *nuōs*, N pl. *nōsi* are attested and she indicates that *puōs(t)*, *pluōt* also have the same alternation in length, with the short vowel indicating a retracted accent. Neweklowsky (1978: 73, 95) gives the example *m̄uos*, G sg. *m̄osta* in his descriptions of the Hacı/Poljanci and Dolinci groups with no attribution to any individual dialect. Additional examples can be found in the southern Burgenland ikavian Čakavian dialects, which have better preserved the original position of the accent; e.g., Stegersbach *m̄uos*, G sg. *most'a* (Neweklowsky 1978: 139, 144, cited by Vermeer 1984: 361); Stinatz *b'uoj*, G sg. *boj'a*, *n'uos*, *nos'a*, *pl'uo*, *plot'a*, *z'uo*, *zvon'a*; *ml'a:t*, *ml'a:t'a*, *vl'a:k*, *vl'a:k'a* (Neweklowsky 1989).

Another source of data cited originally by Illič-Svityč (1963) that has been repeatedly mentioned by scholars in connection with this topic is Nemanić's description of some "Istrian" dialects.

(18) Unidentified "Istrian" dialects (Nemanić 1883: 370ff.)

*nōs*, G sg. *nōsa/mosã*

*brēg*, G sg. *brēga/brēgã*, L sg. *brēgě*

Nemanić cites variant end-stressed singular forms for about 25 nouns, although for some of these he gives only the L sg. in *-ě*, which

could be due to the influence of parallel forms in *-ü*; while Nemanić himself does not actually cite any L sg. forms in *-u*, this ending does occur in some of the dialects in the area he describes. On the whole, it is difficult to know how to interpret these data. According to what Nemanić states in his introduction (1883: 363-366), this study covers the dialects of northeastern Istria, nearby coastal areas, and the island of Krk. Nemanić was living in Pazin at the time, and he specifically thanks individuals from Bakar, Kraljevica, Vrbnik, Buzet, Cerovlje, Zarečje, and Pazin for their help, so one may assume that he drew on data from these specific locales. Although many of the dialects in this area have distinctive pitch, he indicates only quantity and place of stress in his transcription (consequently, his acute accent, representing a long stressed vowel, is replaced in the data cited here with a circumflex). Moreover, he cites only ekavian forms, in spite of the fact that the area includes both ekavian dialects and dialects with a dual reflex of *jat*' (*i*/e-kavian dialects). Although he writes in the introduction that he cites words in the form that he considers to be most common in the area that he studied (1883: 365-366), this statement is meaningless because these dialects belong to a variety of subgroups that differ significantly from one another. In fact, his data include many accentual and quantitative doublets that presumably reflect some of this interdialectal variation, if they do not represent mistakes; cf. the variants *vùk*, *vùka* (369), *vûk*, *vûka* (371), *vûk*, *vûka* (373), to cite just one example. All of these factors suggest that the value of Nemanić's data is highly questionable (see also Vermeer 2001: 136-7). However, Vermeer (1984: 361) cites an example of a (b)-stressed paradigm for the noun *grad* from a description of the dialect of Sveti Ivan i Pavao (Zgrabljic 1907), in the same general area covered by Nemanić's study. Although this is the only noun attested with this accentuation, Vermeer sees this as a possible confirmation of the existence of the end-stressed forms cited by Nemanić in some Istrian dialects (cf. also the forms from Žminj given in 19 below).

In a thorough study of the data available in other Čakavian dialect descriptions I was able to uncover only a few isolated examples that could reflect the reconstructed a. p. (d):

(19) Other dialects

Silba: *nôs*, N pl. *nosì* (DAQ #128)

Žminj: *vôs*, G sg. *vozã*, I sg. *vòzon*, L sg. *vòze*; *cv'êt*, N pl. *cv'êtì* (DAQ #103)

In addition, Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev (1993: 111) cite Hvar (Brusje) *bǎrk* ‘moustache’, G sg. *barkǎ*, N pl. *barci*, *tǔrg*, Gsg. *tǔrgǎ*; Brač (Dračevica) *šǐp*, G sg. *srpǎ* as examples of the switch of nouns from a. p. (d) to (b), which they see as a regular development in some dialects for stems with an earlier \*-br-/-br-. The nouns *krov* and *vrh*, which have also been cited as belonging to a. p. (d), belong to type (b) in a number of Čakavian dialects as well as in Štokavian; e.g., Novi *krǔv*, G sg. *krovǎ*, *vřh*, *vrhǎ* (Belić 1909: 213-214), Senj *krǔv*, *krovǎ* (Moguš 1966: 66), Vrgada *krǔv*, *krovǎ/krǔva*, *vřh*, *vrhǎ* (Jurišić 1973); cf. standard Croatian *krǔv*, *krǔva*, *vřh/vřh*, *vřha*.

Although prefixed postverbal nouns do not exhibit the reconstructed type (d) pattern in Čakavian, with reflexes of an initial accent in the NA sg. vs. final stress in the other forms, Kortlandt (1975: 28) cites the forms *razdél* (= *razd’ěl*), *razdělǎ* (from Nemanić 1883: 407) as an additional example of exceptions to the law of Illič-Svityč in Čakavian. Kortlandt (1979) suggests that the IE distinction between barytone abstract nouns and oxytone concrete/agent nouns (e.g., Greek τόμος ‘cut, cutting’: τομός ‘one who cuts’) can be discerned in the accentuation of masculine prefixed postverbal nouns in Slavic. For Slavic he reconstructs an initial accent for the IE barytone prefixed postverbals and a stress on the root for IE oxytone prefixed postverbals; e.g., \*národuN, \*povóduN. The former would be reflected in Slavic with an accent on the root syllable by Dybo’s law, while the latter would have developed an alternation between initial and final stress by the laws of Illič-Svityč and Pedersen (Kortlandt 1975: 28; cf. also Verweij 1991). Although this theory has a certain appeal since it is supported by a number of examples where the abstract: concrete semantic distinction correlates with the position of the accent in modern Slavic languages, the continued productivity of this type within Slavic and the possibility of analogy and semantic change often make the original accentuation of a given postverbal noun uncertain. Consequently, it is difficult to determine whether these nouns in Čakavian might represent exceptions to Illič-Svityč’s law or later developments.

With this caveat in mind, we can consider the available data. Besides *razdel*, the only other postverbal nouns cited by Nemanić (1883) with a final stress are *načín*, G sg. *načǐnǎ* (407) and *pokrǔv*, *pokrovǎ* (405); cf. also the stem-stressed variants *rǎzdél*, *rǎzdělǎ*, *nǎčín*, *nǎčǐna* (402). Otherwise, prefixed postverbal nouns tend to have a fixed stress on the root, e.g., *povǔd*, *povǔda* (396); cf. also standard Croatian *pǔvod*, vs.

Russian *póvod, na povodú*. In the case of *razděl, nač ín*, and *pokrôv*, the length of the final vowel is conditioned by the following sonorant<sup>8</sup> and this vowel would be expected to carry a long rising accent (recall that some of the dialects described by Nemanić have pitch distinctions, although he does not indicate this). This would facilitate the absorption of these nouns into type (b), since the long rising accent could be confused with the reflex of the neoacute. The noun *pokrov* like *krov* also tends to fall together with type (b) elsewhere in Čakavian; e.g., Novi *pokrôv*, G sg. *pokrovã* (Belić 1909: 216), Cres (Orlec) *pokrôf*, I sg. *pokrovôn* (Houtzagers 1985). In the other dialects discussed above with end-stressed reflexes for a. p. (d) monosyllabic nouns, there appear to be no attested examples of prefixed postverbal nouns with a final stress.

## 5. Conclusion

As this survey has shown, forms that may represent traces of the reconstructed CS a. p. (d) are found in Čakavian only in a few dialects, and for some of these the reliability of the data is questionable. A comparison of attested forms for individual words shows that there is only a limited amount of agreement among these dialects (see the Appendix), and there are none where all of the attested nouns that supposedly belonged to a. p. (d) have a final stress. Furthermore, for the dialects where we have information about the full set of inflected forms, the accentual patterns of these nouns are not identical. Although this type of variation would not be unexpected in forms that are thought to represent exceptions to an early analogical change (the law of Illič-Svityč) in CS, it does seem to weaken the argument that they constituted a coherent accentual type in CS with a distinct accentual pattern.

Almost all of the Čakavian dialects in question have lost original pitch distinctions and exhibit secondary lengthenings of original short vowels in accented syllables. As a result, even if these data are compatible with the reconstructed a. p. (d), in most cases these forms cannot be cited as proof of an original circumflex accent in the NA sg. It is only in the short-vowel stems *b<sup>u</sup>ôk*, *br<sup>u</sup>ôt*, *pl<sup>u</sup>ôt*, *r<sup>u</sup>ôx* in Susak; *drôb*, *lôv*,

---

<sup>8</sup> The consonant *v* triggers pre-sonorant lengthening in many but not all Čakavian dialects.

*môst, nôs, pôst* in Senj; and *drôb, grôb, nôs, vôz* cited by Nemanić where the length of the NA sg. form has no obvious explanation other than the general lengthening of original short circumflex vowels in final closed syllables.

Contrary to the practice of the “Moscow accentological school,” the anomalous accentual patterns exhibited by these nouns cannot simply be assumed to represent an archaism. The loss of pitch distinctions and secondary lengthening of vowels seen in many of these dialects blur the distinctions between the original accentual types, which could facilitate analogical change as suggested above. A. p. (c) is unproductive, encompassing only a small number of masculine nouns, so it is not unreasonable to suppose that these nouns could be attracted to one of the other accentual types. As shown in §3, a. p. (c) nouns in Čakavian dialects tend to eliminate the original alternations, adopting a stem stress in many or all forms. The “mixed” accentual pattern seen in some dialects above could represent an opposing tendency to assimilate these nouns into type (b). One should also take into consideration the fact that none of these anomalous forms are attested in more prosodically conservative dialects for which we have reliable descriptions, such as Novi or Vrgada.

In favor of the supposition that the accentuation of the a. p. (d) nouns in certain Čakavian dialects represents an archaism is the fact that a final stress is practically never attested for nouns that originally belonged to a. p. (c) according to this reconstruction, although it is possible to find a few exceptions; e.g., “Istria” *šîn, šîňă* (Nemanić 1883: 376), Baumgarten and Devínska Nová Ves *dòmŭom < \*domôm* (adv. ‘to home’). However, it should be noted that the list of a. p. (d) nouns has both expanded and changed in various publications by Dybo et al., as pointed out by Vermeer (2001: 139, 141), and they far outnumber the nouns designated as a. p. (c). Besides the nouns that they present in numbered lists to exemplify a. p. (d) [41 items in Bulatova, Dybo, and Nikolaev (1988: 53-59) and 42 in Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev (1990: 139-149), with only partial overlap between these two lists], additional a. p. (d) nouns are cited in these works in subsequent discussions of individual dialects without any further justification. One gets the impression that nouns are sometimes attributed to a. p. (d) whenever a final stress is attested anywhere in Slavic, without considering the possibility that some of these examples may represent local innovations. The first installment of the *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii. Slovar’*

(Dybo, Zamjatina, and Nikolaev 1993) introduces a number of additional qualifications and discrepancies: lists of IE correspondences to the Slavic accentual types in the Introduction (93-94) include 25 nouns labeled D plus 9 more that are marked B/D, D/B, or D~B<sup>9</sup>; the designations here do not always match those in the Dictionary section (e.g., *voz* is marked D on p. 93 and C/D on p. 294); similarly, some other nouns that are cited simply as belonging to a. p. (d) later in the Introduction in the discussion of the Čakavian data are given in the Dictionary with dual labels. These compound labels are used when Dybo et al. posit the existence of accentual variants in CS, but the precise criteria used for assigning nouns to different categories such as B/D, B/(D), or D/B are not clear. Furthermore, dialectal forms with the same accentuation are sometimes cited as evidence for different CS accentual paradigms; e.g. the Sali forms *čěp/čěp̄*, G sg. *čepà*, N pl. *čepì*, G pl. *čepôv* are identified as reflexes of a. p. (b) (171), while the forms *pôd*, *podã*, *podì*, *podôv* are said to reflect a. p. (d) (245).

It is possible that the anomalous Čakavian forms considered here could represent exceptions to the law of Illič-Svityč that went on to develop final stress like the neuter barytona, although further study is clearly needed to verify the data. However, given the ambiguities inherent in much of this material and the lack of agreement among the individual dialects, the Čakavian evidence provides little support for the reconstruction of a separate a. p. (d).

## Appendix

The following table compares reflexes of a. p. (d) nouns attested in at least one of the Čakavian dialects discussed above. The numbers following the noun indicate the work in which it is cited as a. p. (d): 1 = Bulatova et al. (1988), 2 = Dybo et al. (1990), 3 = Dybo et al. (1993) [including nouns marked here as B/D, C/D]. In the table nouns are marked as type (d) if the accentuation of the NA sg. could reflect an original circumflex accent and end-stress is attested in the oblique singular (other than the L) and/or the NA pl. The designation b(d) is used

---

<sup>9</sup> Dybo et al. normally distinguish between lower-case letters representing CS accentual paradigms (a, b, c, d) and upper-case letters representing the reflexes of these as distinct accentual types attested in various Slavic dialects. Here, however, they use upper-case letters in reference to the reconstructed CS forms.

where the posited a. p. (d) cannot be distinguished from the reflexes of a. p. (b) because of later phonological developments, and c\* indicates that a final stress is attested only in the L sg. in *-e/i*, where it may be secondary. Cells are left blank if the word is not attested or the original accentuation cannot be determined from the available data.

Nouns cited as belonging to a. p. (d)	Susak	Sali	“Istria” (Nemanić 1883)	Senj
short-vowel stems				
bok (1, 2, 3)	c/d	b(d)	c	
bor (3)		b(d)		
brod (3)	c	b(d)/c	c	c
čemer (3)			c	
dol (3)			c	
drob (1, 3)		b(d)/c	c?/d <sup>l</sup>	d
glog (3)				
grob (3)	b	c	b/d	b
grom (3)		c	c	
krov (3)	b		b(d)	b
lov (3)			c	d
most (3)		b	c	d
mozak (1, 3)		b(d)	c	
nos (3)		b(d)	c/d	d
pepel (1)			c	
plod (3)			c	
plot (1, 3)	d	b(d)	c	
pod (3)	b	b(d)	b	b
post (3)			c	d
pot (1, 3)	c	b(d)	c	c
rog (1, 2, 3)	c/d	b(d)	c	c
roj (2)				b/c
rov (3)			b	
stog (2, 3)			c	
svekar (3)			b(d)/c	
večer (1, 2, 3)	c		c	
vosk (1, 3)		c	c	
voz (1, 2, 3)			c/d	
zvon (2, 3)	c		c	
long-vowel stems				
běs (1, 3)				c
blud (1)			c	
brav (2)			c	

K. Langston: Common Slavic Accentual Paradigm (d):  
A Reevaluation of Evidence from Čakavian

---

Rab	Stinatz	Devínska Nová Ves	Baum- garten
b(d)		b(d)/c	
	c		
b(d)	(c) <sup>2</sup>		
		b(d)	
	c	b(d)	b(d)
		b(d)	
b(d)	b(d)	b(d)/c	b(d)
b(d)	c	b(d)/c	
	b(d)	c	b(d)
	c	c	
b(d)			
	b(d)	c	b(d)
b(d)	c	b(d)	
b(d)		b(d)	b(d)
b(d)			b(d)
c	c	c	c*
	c		
	c	c	
	c	c	c
	c	b(d)	c
	b(d)	b(d)	c

Tones and Theories:  
 Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology

Nouns cited as belonging to a. p. (d)	Susak	Sali	“Istria” (Nemanić 1883)	Senj
brĕg (2, 3)	c	b(d)	b(d)/c	c
brk (3)			c	
brus (1, 2, 3)	b(d)	b(d)	c	c
cĕp (1, 2, 3)			b(d)/c	
cvĕt (2)			c	c
čas (2)		a	a	
čun (1, 2)				b
dub (1)			b(d)/c	
dug (1, 3)	c		c	c
glad (3)	c	b(d)/c		c
grad (1, 2, 3)	b(d)/c	b(d)	b(d)/c	c
hlad (3)	b(d)	b(d)	c*	c
kljun (3)			b(d)/c	c
kos (3)			c	
krug (1, 2)			c	
kus (1)			c	
list (1, 2, 3)	b(d)/c	b(d)	c	c
lug (1)			b(d)/c	
luk (1)			b(d)/c	
mĕh (3)	c		c	c
mlat (1, 2)			c	
mrak (1, 2)			c	
prah (1, 2)	c <sup>3</sup>	b(d)	c	c
prut (1, 2)			c	
red (1, 2)			c	c
sad (1, 3)	b(d)	c	c	
slĕd (1, 2)			c*	
smĕh (1)	b(d)		b(d)	b
snĕg (1, 3)	c	b(d)	b(d)/c	c
sram (1)	c	c	c	c
srp (1, 2, 3)			c	
stid (1, 2)			a	
strah (1)	c		c*	c
trg (1, 3)				b
val (1)			c	c
vĕk (1, 2)			c	
vid (3)			a	



Nouns cited as belonging to a. p. (d)	Susak	Sali	“Istria” (Nemanić 1883)	Senj
vlas (1, 2, 3)			b(d)/c	
vrag (1)	c		b(d)/c	c
vrat (2, 3)	b(d)	b(d)	c	c
vrës (2)			c	
vrh (1, 2, 3)	b(d)		b(d)/c	
zid (3)	b(d)		c*	c
znak (1)			c	
zrak (1)			b(d)/c	
zub (1, 2, 3)	b(d)/c		c	c

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> The stem-stressed and end-stressed variants of these nouns are defined differently by Nemanić: *dròb*, *dròba*; *dròp*, *dròpa*; and *drôp*, *drôpa* are glossed ‘brisa’ (refuse grapes left after pressing, grape skins), while *dròb*, *drobà* is glossed ‘exta’ (entrails).

<sup>2</sup> These nouns are feminine in the dialect of Stinatz: *dr’uob*, G sg. *dr’uobi*; *z’i:d*, *z’i:di*.

<sup>3</sup> In HHG (104) the forms of this word are given as *prâx*, *prâγα*, but it seems safe to assume that the γ is a typographical error.

K. Langston: Common Slavic Accentual Paradigm (d):  
A Reevaluation of Evidence from Čakavian

---

Rab	Stinatz	Devínska Nová Ves	Baum- garten
c	c		
c	c		
	c		
	(c) <sup>2</sup>		
	c		
c	c		

References:

- BELIĆ, ALEKSANDAR 1909. Zametki po čakavskim govoram. *Izvestija otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk* 14, 181-266.
- BULATOVA, R.V.; V.A. DYBO; S.L. NIKOLAEV 1988. Problemy akcentologičeskix dialektizmov v praslavjanskom. *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie. X Meždunarodnyj sjezd slavistov*. Ed. N. I. Tolstoj. Moscow: Nauka, 31-66.
- COLLINGE, N.E. 1985. *The laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series IV, Current issues in linguistic theory 35. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- DAQ: Questionnaires for the Croatian Dialect Atlas, Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb.
- DYBO, V.A. 1962. O rekonstrukcii udarenija v praslavjanskom glagole. *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 6, 3-27.
- DYBO, V.A. 1981. *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Moscow: Nauka.
- DYBO, V.A.; G.I. ZAMJATINA; S.L. NIKOLAEV 1990. *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii*. Moscow: Nauka.
- DYBO, V.A.; G.I. ZAMJATINA; S.L. NIKOLAEV 1993. *Osnovy slavjanskoj akcentologii. Slovar'. Neproizvodnye osnovy mužškogo roda*. Moscow: Nauka.
- FINKA, BOŽIDAR 1977. Dugootočki čakavski govori. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 4, 7-178.
- GARDE, PAUL 1976. *Histoire de l'accentuation slave*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.
- HAMM, JOSIP; MATE HRASTE; PETAR GUBERINA 1956. Govor otoka Suska. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 7-213.
- HENDRIKS, PEPIJN 2003. A note on Stang's law in Moscow accentology. *Dutch contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists. Studies in Slavic and general linguistics* 30. Ed. Jos Schaecken, Peter Houtzagers, and Janneke Kalsbeek. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 107-123.
- HOUTZAGERS, PETER 1985. *The Čakavian dialect of Orlec on the island of Cres*. Studies in Slavic and general linguistics 5. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- HOUTZAGERS, PETER; ELENA BUDOVSKAJA 1996. Nominal and verbal inflexion in the Čakavian dialect of Kali on the island of Ugljan. Studies in South Slavic and Balkan linguistics, Studies in Slavic and general linguistics 23, Ed. A. A. Barentson et al. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi, 143-166.

- HRASTE, MATE; PETAR ŠIMUNOVIĆ 1979. *Čakavisches-deutsches Lexikon*. Cologne-Vienna: Böhlau.
- ILLIČ-SVITYČ, V.M. 1963. *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- IVIĆ, PAVLE 1959. Mate Hraste, Josip Hamm i Petar Guberina: O govoru otoka Suska (review article). *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 2, 171-183.
- JURIŠIĆ, BLAŽ 1973. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade. Uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima*. Zagreb.
- KALSBECK, JANNEKE 1998. *The Čakavian dialect of Orbančići near Žminj in Istria*. Studies in Slavic and general linguistics 25. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- KAPOVIĆ, MATE 2003. Razvoj starih dugih samoglasa u hrvatskom i ostalim slavenskim jezicima. *Filologija* 41, 51-82.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK 1975. *Slavic accentuation: A study in relative chronology*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK 1979. Sur l'accentuation des noms postverbaux en slave. *Dutch contributions to the Eighth International Congress of Slavists*. Ed. Jan M. Meijer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 325-328.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK 1994. From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic. *Journal of Indo-European studies* 22, 91-112. (A corrected version can be accessed at <http://www.kortlandt.nl/publications/art066e.pdf>)
- KOSCHAT, HELENE 1978. *Die čakavisches Mundart von Baumgarten im Burgenland*. Schriften der Balkankommission, Linguistische Abteilung XXIV/2. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- KUŠAR, MARCEL 1894. Rapski dijalekat. *Rad JAZU* 118, 1-54.
- LANGSTON, KEITH 1999. Analyzing the accentual patterns of Čakavian dialects. *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 11, 1-21.
- MOGUŠ, MILAN 1966. *Današnji senjski govor*. Poseban otisak iz *Senjskog zbornika* 2. Senj.
- NEMANIĆ, D. 1883. Čakavisches-kroatische Studien. *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften* 104, 363-428.
- NEWKLOWSKY, GERHARD 1978. *Die kroatischen Dialekte des Burgenlandes und der angrenzenden Gebiete*. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- NEWKLOWSKY, GERHARD 1979. *Der kroatische Dialekt von Stinatz. Wörterbuch*. Wiener slavistischer Almanach, Sonderband 25. Vienna: Gesellschaft zur Förderung slavistischer Studien.

- STANG, CHRISTIAN S. 1957. *Slavonic accentuation*. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademie.
- STANKIEWICZ, EDWARD 1993. *The accentual patterns of the Slavic languages*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- STEINHAEUER, HEIN 1973. *Čakavian studies*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton.
- STEINHAEUER, HEIN 1975. The phonemic system of the Susak dialect. *Linguistics* 162, 17-39.
- VÁŽNÝ, VÁCLAV 1927. Čakavské nářečí v slovenském podunají. *Sborník Filosofické fakulty University Komenského v Bratislavě* V/47, 121-336.
- VERMEER, WILLEM 1975. Problems in the synchronic and diachronic phonology of Susak Čakavian. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 18, 139-159.
- VERMEER, WILLEM 1984. On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: The quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues. *Folia linguistica historica* 5, 331-395.
- VERMEER, WILLEM 2001. Appendix: Critical observations on the *modus operandi* of the Moscow Accentological School. *Einführung in die morphologische Konzeption der slavischen Akzentologie*. By Werner Lehfeldt. 2nd revised edition. Munich: Otto Sagner, 131-161.
- VERWEIJ, ARNO 1991. An accentological approach to postverbals in Czech and Slovak. *Studies in West Slavic and Baltic linguistics*. Studies in Slavic and general linguistics 16. Ed. A.A. Barentsen, B.M. Groen, and R. Sprenger. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 361-386.
- ZGRABLJIĆ, D. 1907. Čakavski dijalekat u Sv. Ivanu i Pavlu te Žminju u Istri (svršetak). *IV. Program C. K. Velike državne gimnazije u Pazinu za školsku godinu 1906.-1907*. Pazin, III-XXXIX.